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1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

This Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Framework (VMGF), also referred to as an Indigenous People Planning Framework (IPPF), has been prepared for the Government of Kenya (GoK) by the Nile Basin Initiative’s (NBI) Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program – Coordinating Unit (NELSAP-CU; client) under the Nile Cooperation for Results (NCORE) Project.

This VMGF for Kenya for the Nile Cooperation for Results project has been prepared based on the Operational Policy 4.10 of the World Bank ("Bank") and the applicable laws and regulations of the Government of Kenya. It is to guide the preparation of potential future investments that may affect Vulnerable and Marginalised Groups (VMGs), for which the preparatory activities are financed by NCORE. The presence of Indigenous Peoples is not anticipated in any of the sub-project areas being studied to feasibility level under the NCORE project, except possibly in Kenya at the Sio-Sango project site. This Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) – also referred to as Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Framework (VGMF) - is being prepared because the presence of Indigenous Peoples (vulnerable and marginalized groups) is a possibility. In case VMGs are identified in the potential Sio-Sango project, this VGMF provides the overarching principles and guidelines to facilitate the preparation of Indigenous Peoples Plans (VMGP), as well as other required actions.

OP 4.10 contributes to the Bank’s mission of poverty reduction and sustainable development by ensuring that the development process fully respects the dignity, human rights, economies, and cultures of Indigenous Peoples. For all projects that are proposed for Bank financing and affect Vulnerable and Marginalised Groups (VMGs), the Bank requires the borrower to engage in a process of free, prior, and informed consultation. The Bank provides project financing only where free, prior, and informed consultation results in broad community support to the project by the affected vulnerable and marginalised groups. Such Bank-financed projects include measures to:-

(a) Avoid potentially adverse effects on the Indigenous Peoples’ communities; or

(b) When avoidance is not feasible, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for such effects

(c) Ensure that the vulnerable and marginalised people receive social and economic benefits that are culturally appropriate and gender as well as inter-generationally inclusive. The VMGF must be based on free, prior and informed consultations with indigenous peoples.

The objectives of the policy are to avoid adverse impacts on vulnerable and marginalised groups and to provide them with culturally appropriate benefits.

1.1.1 Reasons for the use of a Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Framework

A Vulnerable and Marginalised Groups Framework is developed before a proposed project design is finalised, because it is not possible at that stage of project development to identify all of the adverse impacts that a project could have. This situation applies to the Sio-Sango irrigation and watershed
management project SSIWM, for which project preparation is being financed by NCORE, and which is located in the Sio-Malaba-Malakisi sub-catchment of the Nile Basin.¹

To qualify for funding from the Bank and following best practice documented in the World Bank’s policy on Indigenous Peoples (OP 4.10), NELSAP-CU has prepared a Vulnerable and Marginalised Groups Framework (VMGF) to ensure that the development process fully respects the dignity, human rights, economies, and culture of vulnerable and marginalised people and that the NCORE investment has broad community support from the affected vulnerable and marginalised people. The NCORE project has prepared a VMGF in case VMGs are found to be affected by the proposed SSIWMP project, and to identify steps of action if the GoK proceeds with implementation of the project.

The VMGF outlines the processes and principles of screening to determine if a proposed investment impacts adversely on vulnerable communities, the preparation of a VMGP (including the social assessment process, consultation and stakeholder engagement), disclosure procedures, communication and grievances redress mechanism. If VMGs are determined to exist in the SSIWMP area, a detailed VMGP will be prepared.

The VMGF recognizes the distinct circumstances that expose VMGs to different types of risks and impacts from development projects. As social groups with identities that are often distinct from dominant groups in their national societies, VMGs are frequently among the most marginalized and vulnerable segments of the population. As a result, their economic, social, and legal status often limit their capacity to defend their rights to lands, territories, and other productive resources, and restricts their ability to participate in and benefit from development. At the same time, this policy, together with the Involuntary Resettlement Policy (RPF) and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) already prepared for NCORE, recognizes that VMGs play a vital role in sustainable development and emphasizes that the need for conservation should be combined with the need to benefit VMGs in order to ensure long-term sustainable management of critical ecosystems.

This VMGF describes the policy requirements and planning procedures that NELSAP-CU and any possible eventual Executing Agency (EA) will follow during the preparation and implementation of investment projects especially those identified as occurring in areas where VMGs are present.

This VMGF is to be used by NELSAP-CU/NCORE in order to ensure that the World Bank indigenous people’s policies, with emphasis on Operational Policy OP 4.10 (Indigenous People) are adequately addressed, and will then become an information asset for future agencies – e.g. government agencies in Kenya or contracting firms – charged with implementing investment project. The purpose of this VMGF is to ensure that management of issues related to vulnerable and marginalised people is understood and to the extent possible integrated into studies being conducted under the NCORE project, as well as for future use if the project is being implemented to ensure effective mitigation of potentially adverse impacts while enhancing accruing benefits.

1.2 Project Background

Kenya is one of the riparian states of the Nile Basin, with 9% of the country’s area and 16 million Kenyans living within the Nile basin. There is mounting pressure on water resources in the region due to

¹ The NCORE project will finance the preparation of a feasibility study, design and Environmental and Social Impact Assessment for the proposed SSMWRD project infrastructure; however, NCORE does not include financing for the eventual construction or implementation of the proposed investment, i.e. construction of the physical infrastructure that may lead to possible adverse impacts on indigenous/vulnerable groups.
environmental constraints and various factors. In Kenya, water resources are constrained due to the increasing population and its exponential growth rate which stands at 2.9% currently (KNWP, 2012). This combined with catchment degradation; global warming and climate change has and will continue to affect river flows. The Upper Sio area is characterized by seasonal changes (largely sufficient volumes during the rainy season and scarce during the dry season). This makes the area water stressed hence affecting the people in the area who depend on agriculture as a source of their livelihood. The situation is expected to get worse as the population increases and as demand by the different water use sectors out-matches the existing supply, a situation which is a recipe for conflicts. Within Busia County like many other regions in Kenya, frequent food insecurity looms periodically.

Kenya is one of the members of the Nile Basin Initiative and has actively participated in the NBI since its establishment in 1999. The NBI is an intergovernmental water forum that includes all of the riparian states of the Nile Basin. The NBI is made up of three centers – Nile Secretariat for building Basin-wide trust and confidence among riparians and two subsidiary action programs Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program Coordinating Unit (NELSAP-CU) and Eastern Nile Subsidiary Action Program (ENSAP) which were designed to show “action on the ground,” through joint development projects that demonstrated the value of cooperation. The NBI’s Nile Cooperation for Results (NCORE) project supports technical assistance that strengthens cooperation, improves water resources management and the knowledge base, and undertakes investment preparation, so that the projects may be implemented with future financing. By assisting in feasibility studies, the project demonstrates the benefits of transboundary cooperation. It contributes to the higher level objectives of sustainable development, climate resilient economic growth and poverty reduction set by the NBI by leveraging country-level work and addressing regional development challenges through the continued support to a coordinated platform for planning. The project’s development objective is to “to facilitate cooperative water resource management and development in the Nile Basin.” NCORE builds on the comparative advantage and extensive body of work achieved by each of the NBI centers – NELSAP-CU, under NCORE, will prepare feasibility studies and social and environmental impact analysis studies in several regions first identified through NELSAP’s previous scoping studies, including a multi-sectoral investment opportunities analysis (MSIOA).

Within Kenya, NCORE is financing the study and preparation (feasibility, design and ESIA studies) of the Sio-Sango Irrigation and Watershed Management Project (SSIWMP). It falls within the NELSAP Policy Guidelines and country priorities, is demand driven and if constructed, is expected to contribute towards improvement in water and food security and restoration of the sub-catchment.

1.3 Project Description
The achievement of Kenya’s development objectives on food security, poverty reduction, and economic growth depends on the ability of the country to efficiently use and manage its available water resources. Water is a productive input into priority economic sectors under Kenya’s Vision 2030 such as agriculture, industry, energy and tourism, and lack of water security causes economic losses and constrains growth potential. In 2004, the World Bank estimated that losses from climate variability average about 2.4 percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per year with a further 0.5 percent loss from water resources degradation, seriously impacting the country’s economic growth and competitiveness.

With annual freshwater availability of approximately 647 m³ per capita, Kenya is already classified as a water scarce country. Over 80 percent of Kenya’s area is arid or semi-arid where a reliable supply of water is a limiting factor for economic development. Rapid increases in water demand are driven by

---

2 The Sio- Malaba- Malakisi country policies include Kenya’s 2002 Water Policy and Uganda’s 1999 Water Policy.
population growth, economic growth, and urbanization. Underinvestment in water infrastructure in Kenya for the last two decades has resulted in a total water supply storage capacity of 3.1 m$^3$ per capita, one of the lowest levels in the world, which leaves the country vulnerable to climate and hydrologic variability.

The Sio and the Malaba-Malakisi river catchments are located along the Kenya–Uganda border and drain two adjacent areas on the southern slopes of Mt. Elgon. The Malaba and Malakisi Rivers originate from the slopes of Mt. Elgon. The Sio River originates from wetlands to the west of Bungoma Town. The Sio River catchment occupies an area of 1450 km$^2$ and the Malaba-Malakisi catchment an area of 1790 km$^2$. The main challenges in the SMM catchment relate to: fast growing population leading to extreme pressure on natural resources; high poverty levels; low water and sanitation coverage; water and food insufficiency which hampers sustainable economic development; high disease prevalence; frequent destructive floods and natural catastrophes; low access to electricity and gender inequality. These challenges were identified as part of a pre-feasibility study conducted by NELSAP on the SMM sub-catchment. The study identified 14 dam sites on the Kenya side that would produce 1,122 kW, thousands ha in irrigation, water supply services and increased watershed management. Following consultative process and multi-criteria analysis of the sites, the Sio-Sango was chosen as one of the project sites for preparation advancement to feasibility stage.

Based on a pre-feasibility report developed by NELSAP on the Sio-Malaba-Malakisi sub-catchment of the Nile, challenges in the sub-catchment as well as Kenya’s development objectives make clear the need to develop the existing water storage potential for use in agricultural development for improved food security in the region. The project intends to improve the living conditions and incomes of rural populations in Bumula District of Bungoma County in Western Kenya, and the surrounding watersheds. Impacts include development of irrigation & drainage areas, small hydropower generation and water supply. An estimated 1,199ha of irrigation potential within Lower Sio Basin could be realized through water storage which will contribute enormously towards wealth and employment creation which is in line with Economic Recovery Strategy (ERS), Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and aspirations of Vision 2030. The vision recognizes Kenya as a water scarce country with its water per capita per annum of 647 m$^3$ (NWRMS, 2007) and proposes water storage as a viable option for agriculture and power production.

This activity of the NCORE project triggers the OP 4.10 since it will involve preparation investments that may be located in areas where vulnerable or marginalised groups are present in, or have collective attachment to, the project area. This VMGF and will be complemented by two other safeguards instruments: Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) accompanied by Environmental and Social Management Plans (ESMPs) for each sub project identified and a Resettlement Policy Framework (RPF), which will be conducted with NCORE funds by NELSAP-CU, and will provide standards and procedures for compensation for any land acquisition, assets, or restriction of access to resources that SSIWMP investment may require, in accordance with World Bank OP 4.12 – Involuntary Resettlement.

1.4 Possibility of Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups in Sio-Sango IWMProject Area

The African Commission’s Working Group of Experts on Indigenous Populations & Communities affirms that “almost all African states host a rich variety of different ethnic groups. All of these groups are indigenous to Africa. However, some are in a structural subordinate position to the dominating groups and the state, leading to marginalization and discrimination. It is this situation that the indigenous concept, in its modern analytical form, and the international legal framework attached to it, addresses.”
While it has not yet been determined if VMPs exist in the area of the potential Sio Sango IWMP being prepared through NCORE, Indigenous Peoples (OP 4.10) is triggered\(^3\) in case VMPs are determined to be affected by the potential project. In addition to OP 4.10, screening and profiling marginalized community and marginal groups will be done in line with the interpretation of section 260 of the Kenya Constitution, 2012 which provides a list of those categorized as Marginalized Communities and Marginalized Groups.\(^4\) See table 1 for indicative list of groups that are categorized as VMGs using criteria from section 260 of the Constitution of Kenya (CoK).

This VMGF covers all the vulnerable and marginalised groups in Kenya as defined by the Constitution of Kenya (CoK) on the communities’ categorised thus so. The reason why all the vulnerable and marginalized groups are considered in this VMGF is principally because the Sio-Sango may contain communities that could be classified as vulnerable/marginalized/indigenous. Although a location for a reservoir and irrigation project has been identified, by the time construction begins (if the project goes forward), a different location or different project specifications might be under consideration. As such, during the screening of the SSIWMP sub-project, further determination and exclusion will be made.

Although the groups listed in table 1 (see section 4.32) are categorised as VMGs under GoK’s legislation, they would also need to meet the Bank’s criteria for determining whether they are Indigenous Peoples. Given that the application of OP 4.10 in Kenya is evolving, the framework document describes what groups GoK recognizes as vulnerable and marginalized and the Bank’s policy criteria for determining if they are Indigenous Peoples. Hence for that reason, the list provided in annex 7 by GOK is only indicative for the moment.

The marginalised and vulnerable communities face similar problems. From the formal legal point of view they are citizens equal to all other Kenyans. However, they do not have the same access to land and other resources, social and political influence, legal status and/or organizational, technical or economic capacities as other citizens of Kenya. The Ogiek and Sengwer for example, who formerly ranged over broad areas of uninterrupted forests as full-time foragers, have increasingly been restricted to areas with home ‘bases’ involving agriculture and livestock rearing and outlying areas where some honey gathering is still practiced. The continual expropriation of land and steadily intensifying restrictions on access to natural resources – especially forests - have further increased their sedentarization, marginalization, social discrimination, and impoverishment. The Ogiek and Sengwer, who are more dependent on forests than others, were - often in contravention of their legal utilization rights - forced out of forests with little or no compensation, and with little or no land to go to or resources to live on.

1.5 Vulnerable & Marginalized Groups Requirements
The World Bank’s Operational and Procedural Policies, specifically OP 4.10 requires the implementing agency of this type of work to prepare a VMGF which establishes a mechanism to determine and assess future potential social impacts of the planned investments/activities under the proposed NCORE project on vulnerable and marginalized groups.

\(^3\) See Annex 1 for World Bank Operational Policy (O.P.) 4.10 Indigenous Peoples.

\(^4\) The Constitution states that a marginalized community/groups is one that meet the following criteria: (a) A community that are unable to participate in the integrated social economic life of Kenya as a whole due to (i) relatively small population or (ii) any other reasons; (b) Traditional Community that has remained outside the integrated social and economic life of Kenya as a whole; (c) Indigenous community that has retained a traditional lifestyle and livelihood based on a hunter-gatherer economy; and (d) Pastoral persons or communities, whether: (i) nomadic or (ii) a settled community that, because of its relative geographic isolation, has experienced only marginal participation in the integrated social and economic life of Kenya.
Projects affecting the vulnerable and marginalized, whether adversely or positively, therefore, need to be prepared with care and with the participation of affected communities. The requirements include social analysis to improve the understanding of the local context and affected communities; a process of free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected vulnerable and marginalized communities in order to fully identify their views and to obtain their broad community support to the project; and development of project-specific measures to avoid adverse impacts and enhance culturally appropriate benefits.

This Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Framework (VMGF) sets out:

- The types of investments likely to be proposed for financing under the project.
- The potential positive and adverse effects of such investments on VMGs.
- A plan for carrying out the social assessment for such investments.
- If VMGs are determined to be present or linked to the project, a framework for ensuring free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected VMGs at each stage of project preparation and implementation.
- Institutional arrangements (including capacity building where necessary) for screening project-supported investments, evaluating their effects on VMGs, preparing VMGPs, and addressing any grievances.
- Monitoring and reporting arrangements, including mechanisms and benchmarks appropriate to the project.
- Disclosure arrangements for VMGPs to be prepared under the VMGF.

1.5.1 Screening, Preparation and Implementation of VMGPs

The steps to be undertaken for the preparation of VMGP, if needed for the SSIWMP, will include a screening process, to determine whether VMGs are present in, or have collective attachment to, the project area. This screening will be conducted by the environmental and social specialists within the NELSAP-CU and their consultants, in collaboration with the national and local agencies that would be involved with the SSIWMP investment, and if needed using consultants with expertise on the social and cultural groups in the project area. Ideally the screening for VMGs should also follow the GOK’s framework for identification of Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups (VMGs) according to the New Constitution of Kenya (CoK). However, owing to the fact that the list of groups considered to be vulnerable and marginalized by the GOK is extensive and may not necessarily meet the criteria for consideration of VMGs by the Bank, during screening, the Bank criteria for identification of VMGs as per OP 4.10 will be used to make a determination instead.

If, based on the screening, it is concluded that VMGs are present in, or have collective attachment to, the project area, a social assessment will be undertaken by executing partner agencies of the investment project with direct support of the environmental and social specialists in the implementing agency PMU to evaluate the projects’ potential positive and adverse effects on the VMGs, and to examine project alternatives where adverse effects may be significant. The breadth, depth, and type of analysis in the social assessment will be proportional to the nature and scale of the proposed project’s potential effects on the VMGs, whether such effects are positive or adverse. Consultation and participation will be mandatory as part of the preparation of the VMGPs which will include engaging in free, prior, and informed consultation with the vulnerable and marginalized groups.

Preparation of any necessary SSIWMP VMGP will be done in accordance with the requirements of OP 4.10 and each VMGP will be submitted to the Bank for review before the respective investment is considered eligible for Bank financing under the broader investment framework. Annex 3 section of this report outlines the contents of a VMGP.
The need for a VMGP will depend on the nature and scale of the SSIWMP impact and vulnerability of VMGs. The social assessment will identify requirements for preparing a VMGP and/or incorporation of VMGP elements in other project design documents such as resettlement plan. A VMGP would be required if VMGs are found to be distinct and vulnerable and they experience significant impacts, including (i) adverse impacts on customary rights of use and access to land and natural resources; (ii) negative effects on the socioeconomic and cultural integrity; (iii) effects on health, education, livelihood, access to the project benefits, and social security status; and (iv) other impacts that may alter or undermine indigenous knowledge and customary institutions.

The VMGP will set out the measures whereby the executing agency (EA) will consult with VMGs and ensure that (i) affected VMGs receive culturally appropriate social and economic benefits; and (ii) when potential adverse impacts on VMGs are identified, these will be avoided to the maximum extent possible. Where this avoidance is proven to be impossible, VMGP will outline measures to minimize, mitigate, and compensate for the adverse impacts.

The level of detail and comprehensiveness of VMGP will vary depending on the specifics of the project and the nature of impacts to be addressed. If the impacts are limited to acquisition of customary land, the elements of VMGP will be combined to the RAP. If VMGs are the sole or overwhelming majority of the SSIWMP beneficiaries, the elements of the VMGP could be integrated into the sub project design or documents such as community development program to ensure that all VMGs participate in and receive culturally appropriate benefits from the sub project. No separate VMGP will be prepared in such cases.

1.5.2 Consultation and Stakeholder Engagement

This framework seeks to ensure that VMGs are informed, consulted, and mobilized to participate in the SSIWMP. The Executing Agency for the SSIWMP and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) active in the project area will undertake consultation throughout project implementation. Participation of VMGs is to be ensured in selecting, designing and implementing the SSIWMPs. The EA will undertake prior consultations with any likely impacted VMGs and those who work with and/or are knowledgeable of VMGs development issues and concerns. To facilitate effective participation, the EA will follow a timetable to consult VMGs at different stages of the project program cycle, especially during preparation of the civil works program. Also, the Executing Agency will undertake a social impact assessment (SIA) to gather relevant information on demographic data; (i) social, cultural and economic situation; and (ii) social, cultural and economic impacts — positive and negative — on the indigenous communities in the relevant SSIWMP area.

1.5.3 Grievance Redress Mechanisms

A grievance redress mechanism will be developed for addressing the grievances from the affected VMGs related to SSIWMP implementation. The procedure of grievance redress will be incorporated in the project information pamphlet to be distributed prior to implementation. Participatory consultation with affected households will be undertaken during project planning and implementation stages.

The EA will establish a mechanism to receive and facilitate resolution of affected VMGs concerns, complaints, and grievances about the project’s safeguards performance, if the SSIWMP has VMGs impacts, with assistance from Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO). Under the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), a Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) will be formed for the SSIWMP with involvement of VMGs representative & local stakeholders. The GRCs are to be formed and activated during the VMGP's implementation process to allow VMGs sufficient time to lodge complaints and safeguard their recognized interests. Assistance to VMGs will be given to document and record the complaint, and if necessary, provide advocate services to address the GRC. The grievance redress mechanisms is designed with the objective of solving disputes at the earliest possible time which will be
in the interest of all parties concerned and therefore implicitly discourages referring such matters to the law courts for resolution which would otherwise take a considerably longer time.

As is normal practice under customary law, attempts will be made to ensure that all disputes in communities are solved by the traditional leaders after a thorough investigation of the facts using the services of his officials. The traditional dispute resolution structures existing for each of the VMGs will be used as the first step in resolving grievances.

All the grievances will be channeled to the existing structures in Kenya for handling grievances beginning with the traditional institutions as the first step before resorting to the Kenyan Courts of Law as the last resort. The EA will make the public aware of the GRM through public awareness campaigns.

Marginalized and vulnerable communities will be provided with a variety of options for communicating issues and concerns, including in writing, orally, by telephone, over the internet or through more informal methods as part of the grievance redress mechanism. In the case of marginalized groups (such as women and young people), a more proactive approach may be needed to ensure that their concerns have been identified and articulated. This will be done, for example, by providing for an independent person to meet periodically with such groups and to act as an intermediary. Where a third party mechanism is part of the procedural approach to handling complaints, one option will be to include women or youth as representatives on the body that deals with grievances. It should be made clear that access to the mechanism is without prejudice to the complainant’s right to legal recourse. Prior to the approval of individual VMGPs, all the affected VMGs will have been informed of the process for expressing dissatisfaction and seeking redress. The grievance procedure will be simple and administered as far as possible at the local levels to facilitate access, flexibility and ensure transparency.

1.5.4 Disclosure
This VMGF will be made available to the public, and if VMGs are identified, to potentially affected VMGs in an appropriate form, manner, and language. Once it has been drafted NELSAP-CU will send the social assessment and draft VMGF to the Bank for review. As the Sio-Sango MWRDP is not being constructed/implemented under the NCORE project, and financing for the construction work has not yet been identified, it is not yet known if the World Bank would be involved with the Sio-Sango project after the NCORE project is completed. If the World Bank is involved in financing the project, the Project implementation will need to comply with all World Bank safeguards policies, including OP 4.10 and relevant disclosure principles.

Once prepared, if the SSIWMP project is to proceed to construction/implementation, the GOK should make the documents available to the affected communities in the same manner as the earlier draft documents, at an appropriate point in implementation. The VMGP should be disclosed to the affected VMGs with detailed information of the SSIWMP. This will need to be done through public consultation and made available as brochures, leaflets, or booklets, using local languages. Summary of the VMGP should be made available in hard copies and in language at: (i) Offices of the EA; (ii) District or County Office; and (iv) any other local level public offices. Electronic versions of the framework as well as the VMGPs will be placed on the official website of the EA and MOALF and the official website of Bank after approval and endorsement of the VMGF and each VMGP by the Bank.

1.5.5 Capacity Building and Training
If VMGs are identified in the SSIWMP, effective implementation of the Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Framework will require that adequate capacity enhancement within institutions and other stakeholders are undertaken including the VMGs especially in regard to monitoring and evaluation. There is need for capacity building through training to be conducted by investment implementing agencies. In the initial preparatory stages the use of the environmental and social safeguard specialists
within the NELSAP-CU, and their consultants, to prepare any necessary VMGPs working in collaboration with the staff from the national and local agencies, to learn on the job through pairing is recommended.

1.5.6 Monitoring and Evaluation
The implementation of VMGPs should be monitored. The executing agency will need to establish a monitoring system involving SSIWMP staff, partner implementing agencies, local governments, and VMGs to ensure effective implementation of VMGP. A set of monitoring indicators will need to be determined during VMGP implementation and will be guided by the indicators contained in the document (see table 3 section 7), which will need to be monitored on a regular basis. Appropriate monitoring formats will be prepared for monitoring and reporting requirements.

If the SSIWMP is to have significant adverse impacts on VMGPs, external experts or NGOs will need to be engaged by the EA to verify monitoring information of the VMGP. The NGOs will collect baseline data including qualitative information and analyze the same to assess the impacts of the project on indigenous people. The external experts will advise on compliance issues and if any significant issues are found, the EA will prepare a corrective action plan or an update to the approved VMGP. The EA requires implementing the corrective actions and following up these actions to ensure their effectiveness.

Several key indicators and topics for monitoring and evaluation of VMGP are (i) process of consultation activities; (ii) appropriateness of affected assets valuation and compensation cultural, political and economic status of VMGP in comparison with pre project condition; (v) status of VMGs as identified in the SA; (vi) any disadvantaged conditions to VMGs that was not anticipated during the preparation of VMGPs, that required corrective actions; and (vii) grievance redress issues.

The EA will collect required data/information and regularly analyze project outputs and impacts considering impact on VMGs, and semi-annually report the results to the Bank.

1.5.7 Annual Reporting and Performance Review
Annual progress reports should be prepared by each executing partner agency. If the World Bank is involved in any future financing of project construction or implementation, these reports should be submitted to the Bank. If the World Bank is not involved in project finance, an independent review panel should be established.

1.5.8 Budget
All costs for implementation of any necessary VMGP will need to be financed by the GoK/Executing Agencies. The costs will be estimated during feasibility, based on interviews with community members and relevant government officials. This will be updated after the detailed survey and investigation as well as further consultations with VMGs. The budget for the implementation of the VMGP will mainly include costs for skills development & self-employment training of the VMGs, consultation/meetings, information dissemination, NGO/Agency hiring for VMGP implementation & monitoring, GRM etc. Once the SSIWMP has been prepared and finalized in the context of the VMGF, the required budget is to be allocated by the EA for proper implementation of the VMGP. The VMGPs budget will also include costs for implementation of VMGPs, such as salaries and travel costs of the relevant project staff. In summary there should be adequate budgetary provisions to implement any VMGP where necessary for the SSIWMP development.
2 INTRODUCTION

This Chapter of the VMGF highlights and describes the NCORE project, particularly parts that pertain to preparation of the investment project within Kenya, outlining the project development objectives, justification for the proposed project and specific component relevant to the text.

2.1 Project Background Description

2.1.1 Country and sector context/ Project Concept

The Nile River Basin is shared by eleven countries: Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda. One of the world’s longest and most extensive river systems – its length at 6,695 km and its watershed covering one-tenth of Africa’s total land mass – the Nile River is also a vital natural resource and the economic lifeline for the estimated 238 million people who live within the boundaries of the Basin and for the over 437 million people who live in the countries that share and depend on Nile waters. The Nile is the primary source of water for many riparians, particularly those located in downstream reaches (e.g., Egypt receives 97% of its freshwater from the Nile; Sudan, 91%).

The tremendous potential for development in the basin is largely untapped, which constrains economic growth. Four of the Nile riparian countries are amongst the world’s ten poorest, with per capita incomes in the range of US$100-200 per year. All economies are highly dependent on usage of natural resources, including for agriculture and tourism. An estimated 75% of the population of Nile basin countries lives in rural areas, where food security and livelihoods are highly vulnerable to the vagaries of nature. Floods and droughts routinely cause devastation; the floods in South Sudan, Sudan and Uganda and drought in Ethiopia are recent examples. The future is uncertain, but growing climate variability could significantly alter the hydrology of the Nile and increase the intensity and frequency of extreme events, leading to evermore disastrous impacts.

Each Nile riparian country faces unique challenges, but all have ambitious national development plans to fuel economic growth and promote poverty alleviation efforts that depend critically on the sustainable use and management of shared Nile waters. These include enhanced energy availability, food production, transportation, industrial development, domestic supplies for rapidly increasing populations, and environmental conservation for tourism and to protect the economic life of important water-related infrastructure.

About 50,000 km² of Western Kenya, or about 9% of the country, is located along the eastern banks of Lake Victoria in the Nile Basin, in an area that inhabits 16 million Kenyans or 40% of the country’s population. The Sio and the Malaba-Malakisi River sub-catchments are sub-basins of the Nile Basin, and are located along the Kenya–Uganda border and drain two adjacent areas on the southern slopes of Mt. Elgon. The Malaba and Malakisi Rivers originate from the slopes of Mt. Elgon. The Sio River originates from wetlands to the west of Bungoma Town. The rivers are transboundary in nature and some sections of both rivers form the boundary of the two countries. The Sio River discharges into Lake Victoria while the Malaba River flows westwards into Lake Kyoga after it is joined by the Malakisi River.

On the Kenyan portion, the catchments comprise the Sio-Malakisi-Malaba Management Unit which is part of the Lake Victoria North Catchment Area. The Lake Victoria North Catchment Area is managed by the Kenyan Water Resources Management Authority (WRMA). The SMM River Basin is shared by the Bududa, Bugiri, Busia, Butaleja, Manafwa, Namutumba, Pallisa, and Tororo districts in Uganda, and
Bungoma (North, South, East, and West), Busia, Mt. Elgon, and Teso districts in Kenya. Agriculture is by far the largest consumptive water use within the basin. It covers crop irrigation, water for livestock and aquaculture. An analysis of available literature on the size and location of existing and potential irrigation schemes, livestock water demands and aquaculture facilities within the SMM basin have provided a fairly good understanding of the agricultural water demands within the catchment.

Both Kenya and Uganda have made efforts to determine their respective national irrigation potential. The Kenya irrigation Master plan (MOALF, 2009) made three class distinctions: namely High, Medium and Low potential irrigation areas. According to the master plan, High irrigation potential is the potential that can be readily developed and includes those areas that have been earmarked for development by various development agencies, mainly National Irrigation Boards, River Basin Authorities, NGOs and the proposed projects in the irrigation profiles formulated by IDB. These included areas that would contribute to enhancing food and income securities for the local communities. Medium irrigation potential comprised of areas with adequate water of good quality and land resources but with relative poor access to market. Low irrigation potential comprised of areas that would require flow regulation (water storage dams) and very poor access to market.

According to the Kenya Irrigation and Drainage Master Plan (2009), the national irrigation potential is estimated to be 497,400 ha, and the government targets to expand land under irrigation and drainage by 40,000 ha per year. This gives an average irrigation growth rate of 6%. On the other hand for Uganda, the Strategic Sector Investment Plan (SSIP, 2009) targets irrigation development to have increased by 45% by 2035 within a period of 25 years. This gives an average growth rate of about 2%. By 2035 irrigation water demand in SMM basin would reach 664 million cubic meters per year.

The projected quantity of domestic water demand in the SMM basin primarily depends on the projected 2035 population and the anticipated coverage levels at that time. Kenya has an even more ambitious target of achieving 100% rural and urban water coverage by 2030 (Kenya Vision 2030), five years earlier than the planning horizon for this study. The Government of Kenya identifies “sustainable access to safe water and basic sanitation to all Kenyans” as the overall goal of the National Water Services Strategy (NWSS). The NWSS aims to increase access to drinking water supply that complies with Kenyan standards for drinking water quality to 80 per cent in urban areas by 2015, in line with the MDG target of reducing the time to the nearest public outlet and back home to an average of 30 min. The 2035 SMM basin population is projected to be approximately four million (4012000) people. There is markedly more urbanisation on the Kenyan side of the SMM basin. It is anticipated that 35% of the total population on the Kenyan SMM basin population will be residing in urban centres by 2035. As such, future needs in this sub-catchment necessitate development planning and preparation today.

2.1.2 Sectoral and Institutional Context

Kenya’s low freshwater endowment of 647 m³ per capita per year puts it in the bottom eight percent of countries globally. The country is characterized by significant geographical disparities in water availability and use. Over 80 percent of Kenya’s area is arid or semi-arid where a reliable supply of water is the limiting factor for economic development. Rapid increases in water demand are driven by population growth, economic growth, and urbanization. The increasing water stress also results in growing competition and conflicts over available water, as outlined in the Government of Kenya’s (GOK) economic development and poverty reduction plan, Vision 2030.

Lack of water security causes economic losses and constrains growth potential. Water is a prerequisite for economic production and human development. Securing a reliable supply of water for key economic areas will be critical to achieving Kenya’s development plans under Vision 2030. In 2004, the World
Bank estimated that losses from climate variability average about 2.4 percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per year with a further 0.5 percent loss from water resources degradation, seriously impacting the country’s competitiveness. Water security is therefore critical for Kenya’s two economic engines, Nairobi and Mombasa, and for the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs) and western provinces; all of which experience significant water stress. A number of opportunities exist in ASALs and western provinces to increase the productive use of water through multipurpose water resource development. The productivity and resilience of the agricultural sector could be increased through a reliable supply of water; significant opportunities exist to increase both large-scale and small-scale irrigation.

Kenya’s “water towers,” which generate most of the country’s runoff, are degraded due to poor land use practices, deforestation, encroachment on recharge areas, and pollution. Catchment degradation increases Kenya’s vulnerability to hydrologic variability. Investments in storage must be accompanied by improvements in water service delivery and catchment protection.

As part of its efforts to address water resources challenges, Kenya has been part of the Nile Basin Initiative, since establishment of the intergovernmental agency in 1999. The NBI is dedicated to equitable and sustainable management and development of the shared water resources of the Nile Basin. NBI Member States include Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda (Eritrea is an observer). The NBI has defined its shared vision: “to achieve sustainable socio-economic development through equitable utilization of and benefit from, the common Nile Basin water resources”. In pursuit of this vision, it has embarked on a number of activities relating to both knowledge/analysis as well as on-the-ground project development and implementation facilitation. The NBI organizational structure includes the Nile Basin Secretariat (Nile – SEC) in Uganda, the Eastern Nile Technical Regional Office (ENTRO) in Ethiopia and the Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program Coordination Unit (NELSAP-CU) in Rwanda; national offices in each country; and advisory committees and technical working groups operating on a project or country basis.

The Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) is a regional partnership for spurring growth and addressing the critical challenges of the Nile River Basin. The NBI has become the only regional water organization for all Nile Basin countries, and a catalyst for integrated growth, investment and risk management. The initial work of the NBI was organized into two complementary programs: the Shared Vision Program, to build trust and confidence among transboundary professionals; and the Subsidiary Action Program, which was designed to show “action on the ground,” through joint development projects that, demonstrated the value of cooperation.

The Nile Equatorial Lakes sub-basin of the Nile river basin includes a great complex of lakes, wetlands and rivers/tributaries whose geographic location can be described as either “inter-country” (i.e. crossing an international border) or “in-country” (i.e. wholly within one country, but part of the wider Nile transboundary system). Significant water resources management and development projects on the rivers and lakes within the Nile Basin, are therefore ‘Nile projects’ since they will have some regional implications, to a greater or lesser extent. NELSAP promotes investments in power development and trade, water resources management and development, management of lakes and fisheries, agricultural development, and control of water hyacinth. The NELSAP mission is to contribute to the eradication of poverty, to promote economic growth, and to reverse environmental degradation in the NEL region. Over more than a decade, NELSAP has prepared multiple studies that have led to identification of investment options in the NEL region, and advancement of these investments along the preparation pipeline. These include pre-feasibility studies on sub-catchments along the region which resulted in identifying individual development projects, one of which is the Sio-Sango project within the Sio-Malaba-Malakisi sub-catchment.
2.2 Project Description

2.2.1 NCORE Project

The NCORE project supports technical assistance that strengthens cooperation, improves water resources management and the knowledge base, and undertakes investment preparation, so that the projects may be implemented with future financing. By assisting in feasibility studies, the project will demonstrate the benefits of transboundary cooperation. It will contribute to the higher level objectives of sustainable development, climate resilient economic growth and poverty reduction by leveraging country-level work and addressing regional development challenges through the continued support to a coordinated platform for planning. This work will account for potential cumulative impacts; identify environmental and social safeguards enhancing national investments; and mitigate climate risks. Collectively, this Project builds on the successes of the NBI to date and would capitalize on decades of Bank (and other donors) engagement in the broader Nile basin and the specific agriculture, energy and water sector program of riparian countries.

The NCORE project is expected to be $33.3 million in size and extends to April 2017 (it is funded by $18.8 million in NBTF funds and $14.5 million in CIWA funds). The development objective for the proposed project is “to facilitate cooperative water resource management and development in the Nile Basin.” This would be achieved through the provision of targeted technical assistance to the NBI member countries and broader stakeholders, to facilitate cooperative activities, improve integrated water resources planning and management, and identify and prepare studies of potential investments of regional significance.

The project consists of three components, each of which intends to provide customized support to facilitate activities in the three operational NBI centers – the Nile Secretariat (Nile-SEC), the Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program Coordination Unit (NELSAP-CU), and the Eastern Nile Technical Regional Office (ENTRO). The proposed activities have been prioritized based on their potential impact and on the technical merits of the proposals, and are in-line with the NBI Strategic Plan and available resources for the Project. Many of the activities proposed aim to sustain, enhance, apply and expand upon the work and products supported through previous NBI activities. The support takes into account the historical evolution, comparative advantage, strategic plans and mandates of each of these centers.

Component 1 of NCORE, Advancing Nile Basin-Wide Cooperation and Analysis, supports the Secretariat in its two core functions of facilitating cooperation and water resources management.

Component 2 of NCORE, Promotion of Sustainable Development and Planning in the Nile Equatorial Lakes Region, builds on NELSAP’s efforts to identify and prepare potential strategic cooperative investment opportunities. Under this component, NELSAP seeks prepare additional water resources investments in the NEL region. In particular, this will include feasibility studies and ESIAs to be conducted primarily for irrigated agriculture projects prioritized by the riparian countries (building on pre-feasibility and detailed identification work), including irrigation expansion of up to 55,000 ha, concomitant power generation of around 30MW and bulk water supply improvement; and (ii) related social and environmental safeguards assessments for these investments (i.e., ESIAs, RAPs, etc). The SSIWMP is being financed through this component.
Component 3 of NCORE, **Promotion of Sustainable Development and Planning in the Eastern Nile Region**, supports ENTRO in strengthening its knowledge base and analytical framework as well as promoting sustainable development and growth in the Eastern Nile.

### 2.2.2 Sio-Sango Irrigation and Watershed Management Project

The Sio-Sango Irrigation and watershed management Project is part of the investment programs advanced by NELSAP for project preparation, at the request of the GoK. Pre-feasibility studies were completed in 2010 after which it was included in the NELSAP strategic Plan 2012-2016, approved by the NELCOM in January 2012.

The proposed Sio-Sango Irrigation and watershed management (SSIWM) project is located along River Sio and lies in Sio Sango village, Kabula sub-location in Kabula location of Bumula district in Bungoma County in Western Kenya. The proposed project is envisaged to include a concrete dam of 18m high, with a storage capacity of 6.2 MCM which will enable irrigated agriculture for 1,199 ha, and small hydropower generation of 0.005 MW, domestic water supply, and restoration of degraded watersheds upstream of the dam.

The project is expected to improve the living conditions and incomes of rural populations in Bumula District of Bungoma County in Western Kenya, and the surrounding watersheds. Impacts include development of irrigation & drainage areas, small hydropower generation and water supply infrastructure, as well as conservation of watersheds. The outcome will be improved readiness of water resources management projects for implementation.

NCORE is expected to fund US$ 0.9 million for the short term (2013-2014), including feasibility studies, detailed design, ESIA, and capacity building. Currently, implementation costs for the project are estimated at US$ 39.5 million, including construction, construction supervision, as well as O&M for 25 years. However, these costs will be revised in the course of completion of the feasibility study and ESIA.

### 2.2.3 Implementation Arrangements

The Project will be implemented by the Government of Kenya through the Ministry of Agriculture Livestock and Fisheries. The NELSAP CU in collaboration with the Ministry responsible for irrigation/agriculture, National Focal Point Officer, and Task Team Members will provide the overall coordination support.

**Roles and responsibilities of key project players – during the NCORE Project**

**NELSAP CU.** The NELSAP CU will be responsible for overall technical and fiduciary oversight for the NCORE project, including the implementation of the Feasibility Studies, Designs, and ESIA for the Sio Sango project, including the development of a VMGP, if it is deemed necessary. They will be responsible for providing technical support to the country, fiduciary management and overall quality control. In implementing this project, the NELSAP CU will ensure close coordination with other ongoing country and basin projects, to ensure information exchange.

**Project Task Team:** A project task team comprising government technical staff will be formed for the irrigation scheme to be developed. Members of the team will meet as needed and will be responsible for (1) monitoring project progress and resolving implementation constraints; and (2) approving technical reports from the consultants.
**NFPO:** A National Focal Point Officer and technical experts appointed by the Government of Kenya from the Ministry’s of Agriculture and Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural resources will coordinate national level activities and ensure project coordination with relevant national institutions and development projects.

**Stakeholder Involvement:** A broader range of stakeholders will be engaged in project activities as appropriate and in accordance with an agreed Stakeholder Consultation and Communication Plan drawn from the NBI public consultation framework.

**SMWRD Executing Agency:** executing or implementing agency is the agency that will lead project implementation of the SMWRD investment infrastructure once decision has been made to develop the feasibility study prepared under NCORE into implementation of an investment project.

Further institutional arrangements for construction/implementation of the SSIWM project will be determined through the Feasibility Study, design, and ESIA processes. This institutional arrangement will be elaborated in the VMGP.
3 METHODOLOGY AND CONSULTATION

The study was conducted using the following approaches and methodologies namely:

3.1 Detailed and in-depth literature review
Review on the existing baseline information and literature material was undertaken and helped in gaining a further and deeper understanding of the project. Among the documents that were reviewed in order to familiarize and deeply understand the project included:

- World Bank Indigenous Peoples Operational Policy OP 4.10
- Technical Mission Aide Memoire
- Other relevant VMGF documents prepared in Kenya for bank projects
- NCORE Project Appraisal Document
- Constitution of Kenya
- Relevant legislative documents in Kenya on vulnerable and marginalised groups

3.2 Preparation of VMGF
Preparation of the VMGF involved:

- Collation of baseline data on the Vulnerable and Marginalized Communities in Kenya including lifestyle, livelihood, history;
- Identification of potential positive and negative impacts of the proposed investments on the VMGs, if VMGs exist in the project areas;
- Formulation of monitoring and evaluation plan.

The process described in this VMGF is similar to the VMG process framework for other ongoing water resource development projects taking place in Kenya, under the Government of Kenya Water Security and Climate Resilience Project, Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources. Many of the principles from that VMGF have been retained, to maintain consistency and to increase ease of implementation by the Government of Kenya. That VMGF was developed through meetings and consultations in November and December 2012 during WSCRPMU workshops, representatives from EAs were present and issues related to VMGs were discussed. The following key institutions were consulted for the development of that VMGF:

1. Ministry of Regional Development Authorities
2. Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries National Irrigation Board
3. National Environment Trust Fund
4. Coast Water Development Authority
5. Lake Victoria North Water Services Board
6. Lake Victoria South Water Services Board
7. Athi Water Services Board
8. National Environment Management Authority

An additional consultation was held for the SSIWMP VMGF on May 16, 2014 at the Offices of the Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources in Nairobi, Kenya. The focus of the consultation
was to disseminate and receive feedback on the VMGF. A summary of the consultations on the VMGF is included in Annex 8.

Through the VMG screening process, and if VMGs are identified in association with the SSIWMP, additional consultation will be undertaken, as detailed in sections 6 and 8 of this VMGF.
4 SOCIAL ASSESSMENT OF THE VULNERABLE & MARGINALISED GROUPS IN KENYA

The SSIWM specific project investment is still under study and has not yet been designed, hence it is not yet possible to determine whether marginalized and vulnerable communities could be affected. This is to be determined through the VMG screening process, to be undertaken by NELSAP-CU. The annex 7 of this report describes all the vulnerable and marginalized communities in Kenya as described by the constitution of Kenya. However, even though the GOK’s constitution spells out communities categorized as vulnerable and marginalized, OP. 4.10 expressly defines the criteria within which a group is considered or qualifies to be vulnerable and or marginalized. During screening, groups categorized as vulnerable and marginalized by GOK will be subjected to the banks threshold screening of indigenous groups before they are qualified to meet the banks criteria and trigger OP. 4.10 (some groups, such as the Ogiek and Sengwer, have met the criteria for OP 4.10 in other Bank-financed projects).

4.1 Vulnerable and Marginalized Peoples in Kenya

In Kenya, the peoples who identify with the indigenous movement are mainly pastoralists and hunter-gatherers as well as a number of small farming communities. Pastoralists are estimated to comprise 25% of the national population, while the largest individual community of hunter gatherers numbers approximately 30,000.

Pastoralists mostly occupy the arid and semi-arid lands of northern Kenya and towards the border between Kenya and Tanzania in the south. Hunter-gatherers include the Ogiek, Sengwer, Yaaku, Waata, El Molo, Malakote, Wagoshi and Sanya, while pastoralists include the Turkana, Rendille, Borana, Maasai, Samburu, Ilchamus, Somali, Gabra, Pokot, Endorois and others. They all face land and resource tenure insecurity, poor service delivery, poor political representation, discrimination and exclusion. Their situation seems to get worse each year, with increasing competition for resources in their areas. Both pastoralists and hunter-gatherers face land and resource tenure insecurity, poor service delivery, poor political representation, discrimination and exclusion. Their situation seems to get worse each year, with increasing competition for resources in their areas.

4.2 Brief Highlight of Vulnerable and Marginalized Peoples in Kenya

The vulnerable and marginalized groups in Kenya as per the CoK are described below in summary with a detailed description of the same contained in annex 7 of the report.

**Sengwer**

The Sengwer live in the three administrative districts of Marakwet, West Pokot and Trans Nzoia in and along Cherangany Hills. They are estimated to be 50,000 (30,000 of them live in their traditional territories and another 20,000 in the diaspora). They lived by hunting and bee keeping. In his evidence before the 1932 Kenyan Land Commission, Mr. C.H. Kirk, stated how they used to go over Cherengany shooting and the only peoples with whom they came into contact along Cherengany Hills were the Cherengany Dorobo, a small tribe of Dorobo (Sengwer).

As so many other ethnic minorities, the Sengwer were considered by the British to be served best if they were forced to assimilate with their dominant neighbors. Due to that their traditional structure was not recognized and integrated as independent ethnic group in the system of indirect rule, but as sub-structure of their neighbors. As their land in the plains of Trans Nzoia turned out to be the best area for agricultural production in Kenya, they were displaced entirely from there to make way for white farmers.
A minority stayed behind as farm workers, but the majority went up into the forests of the Cherangany hills. As the Sengwer were not considered as independent group, they were also not invited to join the settlement schemes in which the independent Kenya redistributed the white farms to the farm workers and the dominant ethnic groups of the area. While most Sengwer are officially landless, some few Sengwer especially in the northern parts of the Cherangany hills received some land, but even this land is contested.

Livelihood
Before the colonial time, Sengwer used to be hunters and honey-gatherers. Following their contacts with the Arabs and the Maasai some adopted small scale agriculture (shifting cultivation) and/or livestock rearing, but it is said that hunting remained their main source of livelihood until the 1920s. The elders reported collective as well as individual hunting techniques. Gathering of fruits and other non-timber-forest-products is mostly done by women, while honey collection from beehives as well as from natural places such as holes in trees etc. is traditionally a male activity. It has - beside being eaten - a variety of uses: Honey is mixed with water as a daily drink (breakfast), and used to brew beer; Honey plays a major role in marriages and other ceremonies. Before marriage, honey is given to the mother of the bride as part of the dowry. Honey has also medical use. People apply it to their body to drive away mosquitoes and against muscle pains. Another smelly mixture is spread around the compounds to keep wildlife at distance. Millet and Sorghum are the “traditional” crops, which were inherited from the Arab traders and mostly planted in the lowlands.

The current status of Indigenous Sengwer
The Sengwer have increasingly been restricted to areas with home ‘bases’ involving agriculture and livestock rearing and outlying areas where some honey gathering is still practiced. The Sengwer continue to experience expropriation of their land and restrictions on access to natural resources- especially forests and water- which have further increased their sedentarization, marginalization, social discrimination, and impoverishment. Even though they are considered, from the formal legal point of view, as citizens equal to all other Kenyans, they do not have the same access to land and other resources, protection against cattle rustlers, social and political influence, legal status and/or organizational, technical or economic capacities as other Kenyan citizens.

Ogiek
The Ogiek (Ogiot - sing.) ethnic group consists of 20-30 groups of former hunters and honey-gatherers, mostly living in forested highlands in western Kenya. Local groups have more specific names, e.g., Kaplelach, Kipsang’any, Kapchepkendi etc. Okiek, a Kalenjin language of the Southern Nilotic group, is the mother tongue of most Ogiek people, but several groups now speak Maasai as their first language. Traditionally the Ogiek had occupied most of the forests in the extreme west and south of Western Kenya, but today their main area of living is in and around the Mau forest, which is not part of the operational areas. Nevertheless, some Ogiek groups are found in the Upper Yala catchment near the villages Serengoni, Senghalo (Nandi South), in the Kipkurere forest (Nandi South) and some live scattered in the Uasin Gishu district.

Livelihood
Traditionally the Ogiek divided land into lineage-owned tracts stretching along the escarpment slope. Tracts transected four or five ecological zones, giving families access to honey and game during each season. Residence groups were small extended families, patrilineal cores that might be joined by affine and matrilineal relatives. Six to ten adjacent lineages constituted a named local group, i.e. a significant unit of cultural identity and history.
Unlike many other hunter-gatherers, beside of honey, Ogiek collect hardly any plants, fruits or non-timber-forest-products from the forest. Honey is eaten, stored for future use, brewed into beer and traded. It is said to have been the main product for the barter with their agricultural and/or pastoralist neighbours.

Starting in the 1920s the Ogiek started to cultivate small millet and maize gardens due to reduced production from the forest. This led to a more sedentary lifestyle in mid altitude forest and - in turn - a further increase of agriculture and/or pastoralism. Today, agriculture is the main source of subsistence and income, which is supported through some livestock rearing, hunting (which is illegal) and bee-keeping. Honey gathering is still a key activity and carried out the traditional way, with few Ogiek using modern bee-hives and/or processing the honey for regional markets. Blackburn concludes: "without honey and condition of getting it, Ogiek life would be entirely different. This explains why the Ogiek live in the forest" (Blackburn 1974:151).

Their access to land varies very much from village to village. Before independence most Ogiek lived on state or trust land (i.e. in the forests) with all usufructuary rights, but no letters of allotment. Following independence, the land reform and the general land demarcation in 1969 usufructuary rights were outlawed. Legal access to land is now channelled through individual land titles and - in the Maasai-dominated districts – group ranches. Group-ranch demarcation began in the 1970s, crossing lineage land boundaries, incorporating non-Ogiek into some groups, and registering significant parts of Ogiek land to non-Ogiek. During the same time, the Ogiek were evicted from the forest reserves. As they were not provided with any land or compensation most had to go back and live illegally in the forests until the next eviction-team would show up. The regular evictions, arrests and loss of property, crops and even lives further increased the poverty of the Ogiek, underlined their social discrimination and cemented their marginalization.

**Turkana**

The Turkana people are the second largest of the pastoral people of Kenya with a population of 1,034,000. They occupy the far northwest corner of the nation, an area of about 67,000 square kilometers. This nomadic community moved to Kenya from Karamojong in eastern Uganda. The Turkana tribe occupies the semi Desert Turkana District in the Rift valley province of Kenya. Around 1700, the Turkana emigrated from the Uganda area over a period of years. They took over the area which is the Turkana district today by simply displacing the existing people of the area. Turkana warriors today still take pride in their reputation as the most fearless fighters in East Africa. Adherence to the traditional religion is weak and seems almost nonchalant among the Turkana.

**Location in the Country** - Rift Valley Province, Turkana, Samburu, Trans-Nzoia, Laikipia, Isiolo districts, west and south of Lake Turkana; Turkwel and Kerio rivers

**Livelihood:** Like the Maasai and tribes, Turkana people keeps herds of **cattle, goats and Camel.** Livestock is a very important part of the Turkana people. Their animals are the main source of income and food. Turkana’s have also pursued other non-pastoral income-earning activity in both urban and rural environments. This includes various forms of wholesale and retail trade (e.g. selling livestock, milk, hides and skins, honey, and artisan goods etc.), traditional rental property ownership and sales, waged employment (local and non-local, including working as a hired herder, farm worker, and migrant laborer), farming (subsistence and commercial), and the gathering and selling of wild products (e.g. gum arabic, firewood, or medicinal plants). Fishing in Lake Turkana is another, long standing, form of diversification. Fishermen along Lake Turkana migrate to follow the patterns of fish movement. The pastoralists also supplement their livelihoods by selling the fish. Many of them have also taken up weaving mats and baskets particularly near the lake where weaving material is readily available from the Doum Palm. Other natural resource-based livelihood diversification activities have included the
collection and sale of aloe, gum arabic, honey, wild fruits, firewood, and the production and sale of charcoal and alcohol.

Rendille
The Rendille are a Cushitic tribe that inhabits the climatically harsh region between Marsabit hills and Lake Turkana in Northern Kenya where they neighbor the Borana, Gabbra, Samburu and Turkana tribes. They (Rendile) consist of nine clans and seven sub clans. They are culturally similar to the Gabbra, having adopted some Borana customs and being related to the Somali people to the east. Rendille are semi-nomadic pastoralists whose most important animal is the camel. The original home of the Rendille people was in Ethiopia. They were forced to migrate southwards into Kenya due to frequent conflicts with the Oromo tribe over pasture and water for their animals. Being pastoralists, the lifestyle of the Rendille revolves around their livestock. In the northerly areas, camels are their main source of livelihood. This is because camels are best adapted to the desert conditions that prevail in the northern Kenya. The camels are an important source of milk and meat for the Rendille people. There are about eight or nine sub clans including the Urowen, Dispahai, Rongumo, Lukumai (Nahgan), Tupsha, Garteilan, Matarbah, Otola, and Saale with an estimated population of 63,000. The Rendille are located in Eastern Province, Marsabit District, between Lake Turkana and Marsabit Mt. The primary towns include Marsabet, Laisamis, Merille, Logologo, Loyangalani, Korr, Kamboi, Ngurunit, and Kargi.

Livelihood: The Rendille people are traditionally pastoralists keeping goats, sheep, cattle, donkeys, and camels. Their nomadic lifestyle is become more prominent in the areas exposed to little urbanization and modernization. In the recent past though, their livelihood has experienced constant competing interests from the Samburus and Gabras leading them to constant conflict over land and water resources particularly at the borderline of the boundary districts. In the most cases, the raids and conflicts have had the objective to replenish their herds depleted by severe droughts, diseases, raiding or other calamities.

Gabra
The Gabra are an Oromo people who live as camel-herding nomads, mainly in the Chalbi desert of northern Kenya and the highlands of southern Ethiopia. They are closely associated with other Oromo, especially their non-nomadic neighbors, the Borana. The Gabra speak the Borana dialect of Oromo, which belongs to the Cushitic branch of the Afro-Asiatic language family and have a population of about 3,000. They are located in Samburu District, Lake Baringo south and east shores; and in Rift Valley Province (Chamus), Baringo District.

Livelihood: Gabra are pastoralists who keep and depend on cattle, sheep, goats, donkey, and camels. They solely rely on access to water and pastures for the survival of their livestock. Typical Gabra household keeps 5-10 cattle; 20-25 goats; 15-20 sheep; and 0-5 camels. Cattle provide the majority of income from livestock production followed by goats, sheep, and camels. Majority of the grain consumed by Gabra household in this zone is purchased. This includes maize, rice, and sugar. Households also rely on the wild food including fruits and berries, honey, roots, and tubes. Climate change has had an impact on new weather patterns and prolonged drought pushing the Gabra community to frequent water shortages. They have a conglomerate of peoples living north of the Tana River in Kenya, the area around Lake Turkana and the highlands of southern Ethiopia.

Ajuran
The Ajuran are ethnically Somalis. They were a kingdom that ruled Somalia before the advent of Europeans into Africa. When the rest of the Somalis got fed up with their rule they took up arms against them in war popularly known as Eji iyo Ajuran meaning the rest of Somalis vs. the Ajuran. The wars that ensued deposed the kingdom and drove some of the Ajuran as far as where they live today in the North Eastern Kenya and Eastern part of Ethiopia. Some of those who settled in present day Kenya eventually
adopted the language and customs of their neighbors and hosts, the Borana. The Ajuran are best known in Somali history for establishing the Gareen dynasty based in Qalaafo (now part of Ethiopia). The Gareen dynasty ruled parts of East Africa from the 16th to the 20th century. Among the Kenyan Ajuran people, the majority speak the Borana language as their first language while others speak the Somali language as their first language especially those from Wajir North District in the areas of Wakhe and Garren. It is vital to note that since Somali is the language of wider communication in Northeastern Province, even the Ajuran who speak Borana as their first language learn the language. The link between the Garreh and Ajuran is their primary language which is Borana and not Somali. Population: 59,000. Location in the Country: Eastern Province, Marsabit, Isiolo and Moyale districts, Wajir North.

**Livelihood:** The Ajurans, like the rest other Somali tribes of Northern Kenya have traditionally lived a nomadic life. This way of life is dictated by the climate which is semi-arid with two seasonal rains. They follow water and pasture for the animals they keep such as cattle, camels, goats, sheep, donkeys and mules that provide them their livelihood. Where the land is good for farming there are settled populations growing corn, millet, sorghum and some fruits and vegetables. The Ajuran live in an area with relatively high rainfall and good pasture for their animals. However, this blessing has on many occasions become troublesome to them in terms of marauding neighbors in need of the same resources. The intrusion by others has periodically resulted in clashes. Today, the Ajuran allow others to live and pasture their animals in their communal land. Some of the main causes of their vulnerability include the following: erosion of assets due to armed conflict during intermittent inter/intra-clan conflict, resulting in poverty; protracted conflict and insecurity; Systematic marginalization and discrimination based on ethnicity and caste; poor access to economic/employment opportunities. Notably, their right and ability of the transhumant pastoralists to eventually return to their homes characterizes this type of seasonal movement and gives rise to certain analyses.

**Maasai**
Kenya's most well-known ethnic tribe, the Maasai (or Masai) are semi-nomadic people located primarily in Kenya and northern Tanzania. They are considered to be part of the Nilotic family of African tribal groups, just as the Scilluk from Sudan and the Acholi from Uganda. The Maasai probably migrated from the Nile valley in Ethiopia and Sudan to Maasailand (central and south-western Kenya and northern Tanzania) sometime around 1600 AD, along the route of lakes Chew Bahir and Turkana (ex Rudolph), bringing their domesticated cattle with them. Once considered fierce warriors, feared by all tribes in the zone, the Maasai lost most of their power during the late XIX century, as a consequence of a string of natural and historic calamities. They were hit by drought, smallpox, and cattle pest, and contemporarily had to mourn the departure of Laibon Mbatiani, their respected and much admired leader, direct descendant of the mythical OlMasinta, founder of the tribe. The Maasai speak the Maasai language, an Eastern Nilotic language closely related to Samburu (or Sampur), the language of the Samburu people of central Kenya, and to Camus spoken south and southeast of Lake Baringo. Maasai’s population is about 684,000 and is located in the Rift Valley Province, Kajiado and Narok districts.

**Livelihood:** The Maasai are cattle and goat herders, their economy almost exclusively based on their animal stock, from which they take most of their food: meat, milk, and even blood, as certain sacred rituals involve the drinking of cow blood. Moreover, the huts of the Maasai are built from dried cattle dung.

**Ilchamus**
They are originally a pastoralist people who used to live on the mainland but due to clashes they have been forced to migrate to an island in Lake Baringo. It is a very traditional and culturally bound society, hierarchical and male-dominated. They live from fishing in small boats made of balsam tree that dates back maybe a thousand years. They also do some souvenirs and they have some livestock. Many are uneducated and illiterate. They are eager to learn new things, participating and seemingly eager to create
a better life. They communicate mainly in their local language. They have a population of 34,000 and are located in Southeast and south shore of Lake Baringo, and southwest shore as far north as Kampi ya Samaki.

**Livelihood:** The majority of the Ilchamus practice both livestock rearing and agriculture, but on the islands in Lake Baringo there are about 800 Ilchamus who live nearly entirely from fishing. The mainland Ilchamus are semi-pastoralists with a long history of small scale agriculture. The main types of livestock owned by the Ilchamus are cattle (zebus), sheep (red maasai and dopper cross) and goats (small east African), but their herds are significantly smaller than those of their neighbours. The key problems here are the insufficient security against aggressions from their neighbours, access to water and pressure of other people on their land due to the non-existence of land titles. The nearest markets are at Marigat and Kiserian.

**Aweer**
The Aweer are a remnant hunter-gatherer group living along the Kenyan coast in Lamu District on the mainland. In the last 30 years, the Aweer have faced very difficult times. In 1967, their homeland became a battle field in the war between Kenya and Somalia. In Kenya today, they are a vulnerable group, struggling to survive, in search of a new identity. Traditionally they depend on their elders for leadership and do not normally meet for village discussion. There are some men who have more than one wife, and each wife has her own house in which she lives with her children. The husband does not have his own home but lives with each wife periodically. The Aweer have a population of 8,000 and are located in the Coast Province, behind Lamu, and Tana River districts in forests; North-Eastern Province, Garissa District.

**Livelihood:** Hunters and Gatherers. They are indigenous hunter/gatherers famous for their longbows and poison arrows. The Aweer are often referred to - and even sometimes refer to themselves - as the "Boni". Considered by some as pejorative, Boni is based on the swahili word "kubuni" which means 'to move', in reference to their proclivity, historically, to move around in pursuit of their livelihoods, rather than settle in one place. The lives of the Aweer were drastically changed when the Kenyan government curtailed their traditional way of life as a response to the insecurity of the region after the Shifaa War (1963–1967), forcing them to settle in villages along the Hindi-Kiunga Road on Government Land between the Boni National Reserve and the Dodori National Reserve while adopting slash and burn agriculture.

**Pokot**
They speak Pökoot, language of the Southern Nilotic language family which is close to the Marakwet, Nandi, Tuken and other members of the Kalanjen grouping. Kenya's 2009 census puts the total number of Pokot speakers at about 620,000 in Kenya. They have once considered part of the Kalenjin people who were highland Nilotic people who originated in southern Ethiopia and migrated southward into Kenya as early as 2,000 years ago. Though the Pokot consider themselves to be one people, they are basically divided into two sub-groups based on livelihood. Population: 662,000. The Pokot are located in the Rift Valley Province, Baringo and West Pokot districts.

**Livelihood:** It is usually claimed that from the earliest time of the original Pokot, they were agriculturalist, they did not have many cattle, and the few they had were taken by wild animals abounding the area. They have been hunters and gatherer living in caves. Currently, Pokot are semi-nomadic, semi-pastoralists who live in the lowlands west and north of Kapenguria and throughout Kacheliba Division and Nginyang Division, Baringo District. These people herd cattle, sheep, and goats and live off the products of their stock. The other half of the Pokoot are agriculturalists who live anywhere conditions allow farming. Mixed farming is practiced in the areas of Kapenguria, Lelan and parts of Chepararia. These areas have recorded rainfall between 120mm to 160mm while pastoral areas include Kiwawa, Kasei, Alale and parts of Sigor receiving 80mm and 120mm. The livelihood of Pokot has led to constant conflict between them
and other pastoral communities – the Turkana, Matheniko and the Pokot of Uganda. This clash has been sustained by semi-arid savannah and wooded grassland terrain that cuts along the habitation area. Resources such as land, pasture, water points are communally owned and they are no specific individual rights.

**Endorois**

Endorois community is a minority community that was living adjacent to Lake Baringo and has a population of about 20,000. However, the Government of Kenya forcibly removed the Endorois from their ancestral lands around the Lake Bogoria area of the Baringo and Koibatek Administrative Districts, as well as in the Nakuru and Laikipia Administrative Districts within the Rift Valley Province in Kenya, without proper prior consultations, adequate and effective compensation. Endorois are a community of approximately 60,000 people who, for centuries, have lived in the Lake Bogoria area. They claim that prior to the dispossession of Endorois land through the creation of the Lake Hannington Game Reserve in 1973, and a subsequent re-gazetting of the Lake Bogoria Game Reserve in 1978 by the Government of Kenya, the Endorois had established, and, for centuries, practiced a sustainable way of life which was inextricably linked to their ancestral land.

However, since 1978 the Endorois have been denied access to their land, neighbouring tribes as bona fide owners of the land and that they continued to occupy and enjoy undisturbed use of the land under the British colonial administration, although the British claimed title to the land in the name of the British Crown. At independence in 1963, the British Crown’s claim to Endorois land was passed on to the respective County Councils. However, under Section 115 of the Kenyan Constitution, the Country Councils held this land in trust, on behalf of the Endorois community, who remained on the land and continued to hold, use and enjoy it. The Endorois’ customary rights over the Lake Bogoria region were not challenged until the 1973 gazetting of the land by the Government of Kenya. The act of gazetting and, therefore, dispossession of the land is central to their current predicament.

The area surrounding Lake Bogoria is fertile land, providing green pasture and medicinal salt licks, which help raise healthy cattle. Lake Bogoria is central to the Endorois religious and traditional practices. The community’s historical prayer sites, places for circumcision rituals, and other cultural ceremonies are around Lake Bogoria. These sites were used on a weekly or monthly basis for smaller local ceremonies, and on an annual basis for cultural festivities involving Endorois from the whole region. The Complainants claim that the Endorois believe that the spirits of all Endorois, no matter where they are buried, live on in the Lake, with annual festivals taking place at the Lake. They believe that the Monchongoi forest is considered the birthplace of the Endorois and the settlement of the first Endorois community. Despite the lack of understanding of the Endorois community regarding what had been decided by the Kenyan Wildlife Service (hereinafter KWS) informed certain Endorois elders shortly after the creation of the Game Reserve that 400 Endorois families would be compensated with plots of "fertile land." The undertaking also specified, according to the Complainants, that the community would receive 25% of the tourist revenue from the Game Reserve and 85% of the employment generated, and that cattle dips and fresh water dams would be constructed by the State.

To date, the Endorois community has not received adequate compensation for this eviction, nor have they benefited from the proceeds of the reserve. Because they no longer have free accesses to the lake or land, their property rights have been violated and their spiritual, cultural and economic ties to the land severed. Once able to migrate with the seasons between Lake Bogoria and the Mochongoi forest, the Endorois are now forced to live on a strip of semi-arid land between their two traditional sites with no access to sustain their former cattle rearing and bee-keeping livelihood. The eviction of the Endorois people by the Kenyan government and the ‘gazetting’ (or public declaration of state ownership) of their land began in 1973 and continued until 1986.
Livelihood: Dependent on land and fishing from Lake Bogoria. Critically, land for the Endorois is held in very high esteem, since tribal land, in addition to securing subsistence and livelihood, is seen as sacred, being inextricably linked to the cultural integrity of the community and its traditional way of life.

Boni
The Boni people are known for their unique tradition of whistling to birds that guide them to honey. They are found in Northeastern Kenya's district of Ijara and Lamu district. Their population is about 4,000, compared to 25,000 half a century ago (Source: Organization for the Development of Lamu Communities (ODLC). They are nomadic hunter-gatherer tribe of mainly Cushitic origin with a unique characteristic. The community sources their subsistence from forest products such as honey, wild plants/fruits for consumption and medicinal purposes. The Boni are found in the North-Eastern part of Lamu district and Ijara District. They are concentrated mainly in Witu, Hindi and Kiunga divisions. The community is located in villages of Bargoni (Hindi Division), Milimani, Bodhei, Basuba, Mangai, Mararani, Kiangwe and Kiunga (Kiunga division), Pandanguo and Jima (Witu Division).

The Boni live in forested areas of the district i.e. within the Witu and Boni forests. They live deep into the forest and only come out to the periphery when there is hardship or hunger. They perceive the forest in the Boni inhabited areas as communally theirs. However, with the gazettement of all the forest by the government this has become a source of conflict.

Watha
The Watha people are mostly found in the rural arid and semi-arid lands of the country. A minority of them live in thick forests scattered all over the country. The people are traditionally hunters and gatherers. In Malindi district a Watha community is found in four divisions (i.e. Malindi, Langobaya, Marafa and Magarini). In Tana River district the Watha are found in Sombo and Laza divisions while in Mandera the Watha are found in Central division. The population of Watha community in the districts is estimated at approximately 30,000 persons. This is only 2.7% of the entire Malindi, Mandera and Tana River district population.

The Watha people are traditionally hunters and gatherers. However since the government abolished unlicensed hunting of game and wild animals, the Watha people now live in permanent settlements, some of them along the river and where there are forests, mainly in the mixed farming and livestock farming zones. The forests afford them an opportunity to practice bee keeping while those along the river practice crop production.

The land tenure system in the district is communal ownership. Most of the land in the three districts of Malindi, Mandera and Tana River are currently under trust land by the county councils. Few influential people in the district have however managed to acquire title deeds from the land offices in Nairobi. However, most of this trust lands are controlled by the majority tribes and becomes a point of conflict if the smaller tribes and outsiders get involved. This is what has pushed the small and marginalized tribes like Watha deep into the forests.

4.3 No specific legislation on Vulnerable & Marginalized Groups in Kenya
There is no specific legislation governing vulnerable and marginalized peoples in Kenya. However, the Constitution of Kenya (CoK) 2010 recognizes the rights of VMGs and requires that they be accorded special focus, attention and support. The CoK goes further and defines who are VMGs in Kenya and describes the VMGs in Kenya.
4.3.1  2010 Constitution of Kenya

The new constitution of Kenya 2010 specifically includes minorities and marginalized communities as a result of various historical processes, with specific reference to indigenous peoples. The definition of marginalized groups, being broad, encompasses most of the groups that identify as indigenous peoples. Kenya however, abstained from the vote when the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 2007.

4.3.2  Constitutional Implementation

Kenya’s 2010 Constitution provides a rich and complex array of civil and political rights, socio-economic rights and collective rights that are of relevance to indigenous communities. While important, constitutional provisions alone are not enough. They require a body of enabling laws, regulations and policies to guide and facilitate their effective implementation. In 2011, Kenya’s parliament enacted 22 laws. In the main, these laws are of general application and will have a bearing on the way in which the state exercises power in various sectors, some of them of fundamental importance to indigenous communities.

Laws relating to reform of the judiciary, such as the Supreme Courts Act as well as the Vetting of Judges and Magistrates’ Act, are already transforming the way in which the judiciary is dealing with claims presented to it by local communities. The revamped judiciary is already opening its doors to the poorest and hitherto excluded sectors of Kenyan society. Indicative of this changed attitude on the part of the judiciary - at least at the highest level – is the fact that the deputy president of the Supreme Court met with elders from the Endorois indigenous people in July 2011 and assured them of the possibility of supporting the implementation of the African Commission’s decision in favor of the community. More substantively, indigenous groups are already using the revamped judiciary to ventilate their rights. For example, in *Ibrahim Sangor Osman et al.* the Hon. Minister of State for Provincial Administration & Internal Security, the High Court in Embu awarded a global sum of Kshs. 224,600,000 (US$ 2,670,750), equating to US$ 2,378, to each of the 1,123 evictees from Medina within Garissa town of Northern Kenya as damages following their forced eviction from their ancestral land within the jurisdiction of the Municipal Council of Garissa. All the petitioners were Kenyan Somalis. The court also declared that the petitioners’ fundamental right to life (Article 26), right to inherent human dignity and security of the person (Articles 28 & 29), right to access information (Article 35), economic, social and specific rights (Articles 43 & 53 (1) (b) (c) (d) and the right to fair administrative action (Article 47) had been violated by virtue of the eviction from the alleged public land and the consequent demolition of property by the Kenya police.

Additionally, the adoption of a law establishing the Environment and Land Court is important for indigenous communities given that the Court will “hear and determine disputes relating to environment and land, including disputes: (a) relating to environmental planning and protection, trade, climate issues, land use planning, title, tenure, boundaries, rates, rents, valuations, mining, minerals and other natural resources; (b) relating to compulsory acquisition of land; (c) relating to land administration and management; (d) relating to public, private and community land and contracts, chooses in action or other instruments granting any enforceable interests in land; and (e) any other dispute relating to environment and land.” While most indigenous communities are yet to become aware of the existence of this court, it will be an important arena for determining the land rights challenges of indigenous communities such as the Ogiek, which have remained unaddressed for decades.

In the main, though, constitutional implementation has so far failed to take cognizance of indigenous peoples’ core concerns. The Election Act, as well as the Political Parties Act, has failed to clearly articulate mechanisms for the political participation of indigenous peoples in terms of Article 100 of the Constitution. The constituency boundary reviews that started in 2011 indicate a limited commitment on
the part of the state to implement important court decisions that have a bearing on indigenous peoples’ representation, such as that of Il-Chamus. Conversely, attempts to implement such decisions following limited consultation of indigenous communities have tended to exacerbate conflicts between different indigenous groups.

The National Land Commission (NLC) established in Article 67 of the Constitution has been constituted in order, inter alia, to resolve land-related historical injustices. This is expected to fundamentally impact on community land tenure arrangements including requiring the Commission to review illegally acquired land. The National Land Commission has appointed a Task force to formulate legislation on investigation and adjudication of complains arising out of historical land injustices. Reforms aimed at decentralizing governance to 47 counties have also been undertaken. Such devolution, if well implemented, is likely to yield dividends for indigenous communities and hitherto vulnerable and marginalized groups.

The new Revenue Allocation Commission, mandated by Article 204 of the Constitution to earmark 0.5% of annual state revenue to the development of marginalized areas, in addition to 15% of national revenue for direct transfer to county governments, has yet to take a specific interest in the concerns of indigenous communities. In implementing Article 59 of the Constitution, the government has split the Equality and Human Rights Commission into three: the Human Rights Commission, the Commission on Administrative Justice and the Gender Commission. These bifurcated human rights institutions may serve to either provide increased opportunities for indigenous peoples’ rights activism or to weaken the collaboration hitherto established with the previous Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR).

Table 1. List of Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups as per the New Kenyan Constitution;
Source: ERMIS Africa Ethnographic Survey of Marginalized Groups, 2005-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Other Names Usually derogatory</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
<th>Livelihood</th>
<th>Administrative Location Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sengwer</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>HG/Farmers</td>
<td>Trans-Nzoia; Uasin-Gishu; West Pokot; Keiyo-Marakwet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogiek</td>
<td>Dorobo</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>HG/Farmers</td>
<td>Nakuru; Baringo; Uasin Gishu; Bomet; Kericho; Narok; Nandi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waatha</td>
<td>Wasanye</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>HG/Farmers</td>
<td>Kwale; Tana River; Marsabit, Kilifi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aweer</td>
<td>Boni</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>Lamu, Tana River, Laikipia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yiaaku</td>
<td>Dorobo</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>HG/Farmers</td>
<td>Marsabit, Samburu, Laikipia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Molo</td>
<td>Dorobo</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>Marsabit, Samburu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilchamus</td>
<td></td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>Fishing/Farmers/ Livestock Keeper</td>
<td>Baringo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endorois</td>
<td>Dorobo</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>Fishing/Farmers/ Livestock Keeper</td>
<td>Baringo, Laikipia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borana</td>
<td></td>
<td>136,936</td>
<td>Pastoralists</td>
<td>Marsabit, Wajir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabra</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>Pastoralists</td>
<td>Marsabit, Samburu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rendille</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>Pastoralists</td>
<td>Marsabit, Samburu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkana</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,008,463</td>
<td>Pastoralists</td>
<td>Turkana, Baringo, Laikipia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pokot</td>
<td></td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>Pastoralists</td>
<td>West Pokot/Baringo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maasai</td>
<td></td>
<td>666,000</td>
<td>Pastoralists</td>
<td>Narok, Kajiado</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Internet based – several sites
6 Source: ERMIS Africa Ethnographic Survey of Marginalized Groups, 2005-2012
7 Ibid.
Figure 4. Map showing locations of Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups as per the CoK
5 POTENTIAL POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE IMPACTS OF SSIWMP ON VULNERABLE & MARGINALISED GROUPS

Critical to the determination of potential adverse impacts is an analysis of the relative vulnerability of, and risks to, the affected vulnerable and marginalized communities given their distinct circumstances and close ties to land and natural resources, as well as their lack of access to opportunities relative to other social groups in the communities, regions, or national societies in which they live. The potential beneficial impacts of the SMWRD proposed project investment to the vulnerable and marginalised communities include among others:

5.1 Potential Beneficial Impacts
- Water availability and access that will boost local economic development
- Increased numbers of people with access to safe drinking water
- Reduction in water-borne diseases
- Improved nutritional status
- Enhanced food security
- Reduced vulnerability levels associated with water scarcity or floods
- Disaster risk reduction and climate risk
- Reduced poverty levels
- Improved levels of cleanliness, sanitation and hygiene
- Reduced workloads and distances by women and girls to the river to fetch water
- Time freed from fetching water for women and girls re-directed to other development initiatives
- Children no longer left in the care of grandparents when women and girls go to fetch water
- Improved infrastructure and services (e.g. access to clean water, power, roads)
- Enhanced employment and business opportunities
- Increased income flows through compensation payments
- Improved living standards due to increased wealth
- Government assistance for community development initiatives and livelihood support programs
- Environmental restoration and protection (e.g. through reforestation initiatives, improved fire management)
- Special measures for the improvement of marginal groups (e.g. through education, small business development programs).

5.2 Potential Negative Impacts
Adverse project impacts include:
- Concentration of people and livestock around constructed water points
- Loss of land
- Loss of water rights
- Increased encroachment on territory by outsiders who will attracted by water availability
- Increase in soil erosion
- Loss of biodiversity
- Payment for water (which is currently fetched by women free of charge)
- Increased incidences of water borne disease-malaria, bilharzias, etc
- Possible destruction of water sources
- Loss of or limited access to grazing land/pasture
- Physical or economic displacement and resettlement
- Reduced ability to carry on traditional livelihoods due to loss of access to land and/or damage or destruction of key resources (forests, water, fisheries)
- Destruction of, or damage to, culturally significant sites and landscapes – both tangible and intangible
- Social dislocation and erosion of cultural values as a result of rapid economic and social change (e.g. the shift from a subsistence to a cash economy)
- Increased risk of exposure to diseases such as AIDS, tuberculosis and other communicable diseases
- Increased exposure to alcohol, gambling and other “social vices”
- Further marginalization of some groups (e.g. women)
- “Outsiders” (e.g. workers) moving on to traditional lands due to areas being opened up by the construction of dams, bulk water supply, irrigation schemes. Large-scale uncontrolled in-migration contributing to increased competition for resources and social tensions.

5.3 Proposed Mitigation Measures
A summary of the potential adverse impacts of sub project investments under SSIWM on any potential VMGs and possible mitigation actions are highlighted in table 2 below and should be considered as a guideline in the development of investment specific VMGP in terms of mitigation measures and considerations.
Table 2. Potential Adverse Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Possible Actions</th>
<th>Responsibilities and Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concentration of people and livestock around water points a likely cause of conflict or degradation of soil</td>
<td>Ensure adequate distribution of water points for both people and livestock</td>
<td>Initial costs might be higher, but in long run will be cost effective and will contribute to environmental sustainability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of water rights</td>
<td>Ensure that adequate benefits and/or compensation be provided based on agreements reached through free, prior and informed consultations</td>
<td>Executing agencies will implement any agreements reached through the preparation of the SSIWMP, and the GOK would provide resources to implement these agreements. Executing agencies will also implement any other agreements reached under the framework of other projects. In this case, the associated development partner or the GOK would be expected to provide the necessary resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of Land</td>
<td>No displacement of VMGs and thus exclude all sub projects screened and determined to trigger displacement of VMGs. Because physical relocation of VMGs is particularly complex and may have significant adverse impacts on their identity, culture, and customary livelihoods, the Bank requires the borrower to explore alternative project designs to avoid physical relocation of Indigenous Peoples. In exceptional circumstances, when it is not feasible to avoid relocation, the borrower will not carry out such relocation without obtaining broad support for it from the affected Indigenous Peoples’ communities as part of the free, prior, and informed consultation process. In such cases, the borrower prepares a resettlement plan in accordance with the requirements of OP 4.12, Involuntary Resettlement that is compatible with the VMGs cultural preferences, and includes a land-based resettlement strategy. As part of the resettlement plan, the borrower documents the results of the consultation process. Where possible, the resettlement plan should allow the affected VMGs to return to the lands and territories they traditionally owned, or customarily used or occupied, if the reasons for their relocation cease to exist.</td>
<td>executing partner agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased risk of exposure to diseases such as HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and other communicable diseases</td>
<td>Design public health messages and measures to combat spread of diseases</td>
<td>Executing Partner Agencies/MWI/MOPHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Economic Displacement of VMGs</td>
<td>No physical displacement of VMGs and thus exclude all sub projects screened and determined to trigger</td>
<td>executing partner agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups (VMGs)</td>
<td>Compensation and Support Measures</td>
<td>Executing Partner Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loss of traditional livelihoods</strong></td>
<td>Design projects to blend with traditional livelihoods to the extent possible</td>
<td>Executing partner agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Encroachment on and degradation of land, territory and natural resources</strong></td>
<td>Provide for meaningful representation of the VMGs in decision making in project preparation - investment planning and operations and maintenance of service provision – providing for the VMPs the voice to shape the benefits they would like to see from the project. Implement VMGP to re-assert VMGs rights to land and other natural resources affected by the project. Ensure adherence to the project Resettlement Policy Framework. Control in-migration of people from outside the area.</td>
<td>Strict control of migration may not be possible within the context of Kenya where there is no restriction to free movement of citizens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation of women in decision-making processes</strong></td>
<td>Executing agencies should include community stakeholders in the ownership and decision making to encourage the community to decide on self-management and financing of the operations and maintenance of their own infrastructure Increase hygiene and public health campaigns to sensitize the community Increase funding to community water supply bodies to ensure that water is treated while at the same time ensuring that water supply facilities are rehabilitated and kept in good condition.</td>
<td>Capacity of women to be enhanced through exposure and leadership training so that at least one third of them can get involved in the management water service and management institutions including attending meetings convened by such institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased incidences of water-borne diseases</strong></td>
<td>Mitigation Plan for combating Water Borne related diseases to be put in place</td>
<td>Government of Kenya-Ministry of Public Health and Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased marginalization and exclusion of the VMGs</strong></td>
<td>Adequate communication framework to ensure VMPs voices are heard, pending issues resolved and grievances heard Strike a balance between water supply in rural and urban areas</td>
<td>Executing Agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 FRAMEWORK FOR ENSURING FREE, PRIOR, AND INFORMED CONSULTATION

OP 4.10 requires that a process of free, prior, and informed consultation, with the affected vulnerable and marginalized communities, of the potential adverse and positive effects of the project be designed and used in consultation. It is likely that some of the proposed investments will result in significant adverse impacts for vulnerable and marginalized communities and as such the VMGs should be informed and consulted prior to project implementation.

Free, prior and informed consultation (FPIC), in relation to activities taking place on indigenous lands, refers to a process whereby affected vulnerable and marginalized communities, freely have the choice, based on sufficient information concerning the benefits and disadvantages of the project, of whether and how these activities occur, according to their systems of customary decision making.

This VMG establishes an appropriate gender and inter-generationally inclusive framework that provides opportunities for consultation at each stage of project preparation and implementation of investment projects, and other local civil society organizations (CSOs) identified by the affected Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups.

Free and prior informed consultation of the vulnerable and marginalized communities will be conducted at each stage of the project, and particularly during project preparation, to fully identify their views and ascertain their broad community support for the project in the following ways:

6.1 SSIWM Project Screening

Screening of all the SSIWM project investment will be a mandatory requirement to determine if vulnerable and marginalized people are present. Any project investment involving involuntary resettlement, acquisition or physical relocation of VMGs will be avoided at all costs and actually excluded for consideration.

Early in SSIWM Project preparation, screening to determine whether Indigenous Peoples are present in, or have collective attachment to, the project area. In conducting this screening, the technical judgment of qualified social scientists with expertise on the social and cultural groups in the project area will be sought. Consultations with any identified VMGs concerned and the executing agency will be undertaken. The Government of Kenya’s framework for identification of VMGs during project screening will be followed only and only when that framework is consistent with this policy.

However, the selected investment project may not impact the entire group or it may impact non-vulnerable group living in their midst (several VM groups appear to be dispersed among other ethnic groups). In view of which it is necessary to carefully identify who will be adversely affected by the

Box 1. The Elements of Free, Prior and Informed Consent

- **Free** – people are able to freely make decisions without coercion, intimidation or manipulation
- **Prior** – sufficient time is allocated for people to be involved in the decision-making process before key project decisions are made and impacts occur
- **Informed** – people are fully informed about the project and its potential impacts and benefits, and the various perspectives regarding the project (both positive and negative)
- **Consultation** – there are effective uses of consultation methods appropriate to the social and cultural values of the affected Indigenous Peoples’ communities and their local conditions and, in designing these methods, gives special attention to the concerns of Indigenous women, youth, and children and their access to development opportunities and benefits.

Adapted from UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Interests (UNPFII), the Tebtebba Foundation, the International Indian Treaty Council and others.
SSIWMP which may well turn out to be part of a VM group or parts of several different groups only some of which are VM. This will be done during the screening phase.

### Box 2. Indigenous Peoples in the Africa Region

Applying OP 4.10 in the Sub-Saharan African context poses significant challenges, the most important of which is determining to whom the policy applies. Many countries in the region are multi-ethnic, with tribal and local affiliations often cutting across geographical boundaries and national identities. Due to migration of peoples and attendant assimilation from inter-marriage, plus centuries of colonialism, the notions of “place” and “group identity” are often unclear. As a result, governments in the region, as well as local groups themselves, have become highly sensitive to applying and using the term Indigenous Peoples. Meanwhile, there are parallel efforts at the global level to officially recognize distinct, vulnerable social and cultural groups. These efforts, while meeting international definitions of Indigenous Peoples, have been difficult to apply in AFR due to increasing disagreements between government and local populations, especially grassroots social organizations and their advocates who support a more inclusive view. In the past, the Bank’s Indigenous Peoples Policy has been applied to some of the most marginalized and vulnerable social and cultural groups who date back to pre-colonial times. Bank-financed projects provided social services and livelihood support to groups with relatively small populations who traditionally, and in a few cases still, live by foraging (hunting, gathering, and fishing) and whose claims to land have been routinely rejected by neighboring groups (adapted from World Bank 2011).

#### 6.1.1 Preparation of Social Screening Form

The Environmental and Social Specialists from NELSAP-CU and their consultants will prepare the screening forms in collaboration with the executing agency for the specific SSIWMP considered for implementation. A sample screening form is shown in annex 1. The OP 4.10 of the World Bank suggests “to use the term ‘indigenous peoples’ in a generic sense to refer to a distinct, vulnerable, social and cultural group possessing the following characteristics in varying degrees:

- **Self-identification as members of a distinct indigenous cultural group and recognition of this identity by others;**
- **Collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats or ancestral territories in the operational area and to the natural resources in these habitats and territories;**
- **Customary cultural, economic, social, or political institutions that are separate from those of the dominant society and culture; and**
- **An indigenous language, often different from the official language of the country or region.”**

Therefore, during the screening exercise, even though the GOK has an exhaustive list of VMGs, the above stated definition and characteristics of VMGs according to the Bank will be used to screen and determine if indeed the VMGs on the GOK list meet the threshold and can be considered indigenous. If the results show that there are VMGs in the zone of influence of the proposed sub-project, a Social Assessment (SA) will be planned for those areas.

**Screening Criteria:** The NELSAP-CU team, the suGoK EA and Consultants will visit any and all VMGs settlements near the selected SSIWMP areas which may be affected and influenced by the SSIWMP components. Public meetings will be arranged in selected communities by NELSAP-CU with the VMGs and their leaders to provide them information about the SSIWMP and take their views on the SSIWMP.

During this visit, the screening team mentioned above will undertake screening of the VMGs with the help of the community leaders and local authorities. The screening will cover the following aspects:

1. Name(s) of VMGs in the area;
2. Total number of VMGs in the area;
3. Percentage of VMGs to that of total area/locality population
4. Number and percentage of VM households along the zone of influence of the proposed SSIWMP.
5. Any land acquisition required from any VMGs for the SSIWMP?
6. If so, any alternatives to avoid land acquisition?
7. If no, will this SSIWMP be excluded?
8. Will a VMGP be required if a SSIWMP passes through any VMG?
9. If no, why?

If the results of the screening indicate the presence of VMGs in the zone of influence of the proposed SSIWMP, a social assessment will be undertaken for those areas.

6.2 Social Assessment Process

If, based on the screening, the NELSAP-CU (in conjunction with the Government of Kenya) concludes that VMGs are present in, or have collective attachment to, the project area; NELSAP-CU will undertake a social assessment to evaluate the project’s potential positive and adverse effects on the VMGs, and to examine project alternatives where adverse effects may be significant. The breadth, depth, and type of analysis required for the social assessment will be proportional to the nature and scale of the proposed SSIWM project’s potential and effects on the Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups present. The implementing agency will prepare detailed Terms of Reference (ToR) for the social assessment study once it is determined that VMGs are present in the project area. Annex 4 contains draft sample ToRs for the development of a VMGPs.

The social assessment will also identify if the proposed investment will involve change in use or management of commonly held properties in the community as well as involving the commercial development of natural and cultural resources on lands or territories that VMGs traditionally owned, or customarily used or occupied. The social assessment will ensure free, prior and informed consultation with the VMGs during project planning and implementation. It will ensure that mitigation of potential adverse impacts, deriving from project activities, will be based on a participatory and consultative process acceptable to the World Bank and the VMGs themselves.

Sub project investments will comply with the following other than social screening namely:-

- Conserve and sustainably use land and other natural resources that impact on VMGs and other communities
- Provide equitable share of benefits to VMGs and mitigate any possible adverse impacts
- Be socially and culturally acceptable to the VMGs and economically feasible so that the VMGs are not further discriminated/marginalized
- Be institutionally feasible: Local institutionally capacity should be adequate to take up activities
- Be environmentally sustainable and avoid detrimental impacts from those activities that cannot be mitigated
- Be elected and owned by the VMGs and other communities through participatory consultation
- Be supported by training and capacity building to enhance VMGs and community development

6.2.1 Steering Committee for the SSIWMP

A SSIWMP steering committee will be established at the project area once it has been determined that VMGs are present in an area and that a VMGP is needed. The steering committee will comprise of the following representatives from the area namely:-

1. County Administrator/representative
2. District Administrator
3. Representative of CBOs/NGOs active in the area
4. Representative of the VMGs
5. Women representative from the VMGs
6. Youth representative from the VMGs
7. Government ministries representatives e.g. Ministry of Lands, Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources, Ministry of Youth and Gender, Ministry Culture and National Heritage etc.
8. Consultants (social specialists)
9. Representative from the Executing Agency e.g. Social Development Specialist

6.2.2 Role of SSIWMP – VMG Steering Committee
The SSIWMP - VMG steering committee will play the following roles in relation to the development of VMGPs.

1. Identification of the VMGs
2. Support in undertaking the Social Assessment
3. Facilitate meetings with VMGs and consultants
4. Recommend mitigation measures for the VMGPs
5. Address grievances from VMGs
6. Monitor implementation of the VMGPs

6.3 Methodology of Social Assessment

Combined qualitative and quantitative analysis method
Since a Social Assessment (SA) is comprehensive and involves complex social issues, quantitative analysis is preferred, such as for population structure, educational level and socioeconomic indicators. These indicators are analyzed arithmetically and evaluated objectively. Qualitative indicators that cannot be quantified should be analyzed and evaluated through a combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis, but primarily qualitative analysis.

Comparative analysis method
The comparative analysis method is designed to find out the social profile of a project area in the absence of the project, and the impacts of the project on the area after its completion, thereby identifying the natures and degrees of different benefits and impacts.

Logic framework analysis method
This method is used to analyze causalities of things, and identify the project objectives and the related prerequisites by analyzing a series of processes related to the project in order to improve the project design.

Stakeholder analysis method
Stakeholders refer to all parties directly or indirectly interested in the Project, and affecting the success of the Project directly or indirectly. In the stakeholder analysis method, we have to first identify different stakeholders involved in the Project and prepare a stakeholder identification table, then evaluate their attitudes to and expectations for the Project, and their importance for the success of the Project, and analyze their interactions with the Project, and finally propose measures to be taken for different stakeholders during project implementation.

Participatory assessment
Participatory assessment is a method that involves all stakeholders in SA. The key points include listening to all stakeholders’ opinions sincerely, extensively, patiently and modestly, respecting all participants, showing interests in their knowledge, speeches and behaviors, and encouraging them to share their knowledge and ideas. Through a semi-structured survey and whole-process participation, this method will make compensation and resettlement programs, measures for mitigating social risks, and other programs concerning the affected persons’ immediate interests more operable and acceptable.

Other methods
A number of data analysis tools and methods may be used in undertaking SA, including: 1) socioeconomic survey; 2) related agency analysis; 3) social gender analysis; 4) social impact analysis; 5) poverty analysis; and 6) social risk assessment.

6.3.1 Survey/Data Gathering Methods
The process of gathering baseline information on demographic social, cultural, and political characteristics of the affected VMGs, the land and territories that they have traditionally owned or customarily used or occupied, and the natural resources on which they depend will be through a participatory rural appraisal mapping exercise involving the VMGs in the proposed project investment area. There is absolute need to map the community resources where the project investments are targeted to determine the sphere of influence, how the vulnerable and marginalized communities utilize the said resources so as identify their access to and/or control of these.

Regarding customary rights of VMGs to use of common resources, the mapping will provide information on (i) location and size of the area and condition of resource, (ii) primary users, including those that belong to VMGs that currently use or depend on these common resources, (iii) secondary users and the types of uses they make, (iv) the effects of these uses on the VMGs, and (vi) mitigation measures of adverse impacts if any.

The following survey methods should be used mainly in SA for sub project investments where a VMGP is required:

**Literature review:** is intended to learn the history and background of the project, and the social and economic development of each project area, which is an important basis for in-depth field survey. The SA team should collect feasibility study reports, plans and other documents related to the Project according to the Bank policies of Indigenous Peoples and Involuntary Resettlement, including:

- **Statistics:** social and economic development statistics of the sub project area; census and sampling population survey data; statistics on social relief.
- **Documents:** documents of construction, traffic on project implementation; provisions of civil affairs authorities on minimum living security; documents of the social security authorities on unemployment and medical insurance.
- **Research findings:** existing research findings on road construction planning, flood control, water treatment, and other findings related to the Project Design documents related to the Project: project proposals, feasibility study reports and relevant documents.
- **Review of Legal Framework:** A review, on a scale appropriate to the project, of the legal and institutional framework applicable to VMGs. However, a common shortcoming in addressing the legal issues, whether in the section on the legal framework or later on in the VMGP, is the lack of correspondence between the legal rights of VMGs and project design. In many cases the
description of indigenous legislation is very general and is not fully consistent with the specific situation of VMGs in the project area, for instance regarding land and natural resources, an issue of importance to Indigenous Peoples.

- **Focus Group Discussions (FGD):** Should be held with officials and technicians of competent authorities aimed to learn their attitude to, ideas about and suggestions for the Project, local social and economic development level, social security condition, people’s employment, per capita income level, local impacts of the Project, production level and living standard of stakeholders, and government policies on project implementation.

### 6.3.2 Stakeholder Identification

All the interested and affected stakeholders will be identified with specific focus of the vulnerable and marginalized groups and will include an elaboration of a culturally appropriate process for consulting with the VMGs at each stage of project preparation and implementation. A stakeholder mapping exercise will be conducted for each of the proposed investment where there is a likelihood of VMGs being affected and the stakeholder mapping process will ensure that all the interested and affected stakeholders are identified and included in the social assessment process including impact identification and mitigation.

### 6.3.3 Stakeholder Consultation

Once screening has been conducted and an investment found to be located in an area where vulnerable and marginalized groups are present, the existing administrative structures – county and district leaders will be used to inform the vulnerable and marginalized communities about the proposed sub project. County or District Development Committees in collaboration with the agencies within agencies executing the investment will facilitate and arrange for consultative meetings with members of the vulnerable and marginalized groups and in these meetings there will be free and prior information about the proposed sub project, the proposed location, and potential adverse impacts of the project on the marginalized and vulnerable groups.

Such consultation will include use of indigenous languages, allowing time for consensus building, and selecting appropriate venues to facilitate the articulation by VMGs of their views and preferences. Representatives of the vulnerable and marginalized groups in collaboration with the local administration in the sub project area will select a venue that is considered by way of mutual consensus as appropriate.

Engagement will be based on honest and open provision of information, and in a form that is accessible to VMGs. Engagement will begin at the earliest possible stage, prior to substantive on-the-ground activity implementation. Engagement, wherever possible, will be undertaken through traditional authorities and structures within communities and with respect for traditional decision-making structures and processes. However, recognition of the limitation these structures sometimes pose for some groups, such as women and young people will be taken into account.

Good practice community engagement, in the context of Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups and projects, will aim to ensure that:

- **Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups have an understanding of their rights**
- **Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups are informed about, and comprehend the full range (short, medium and long-term) of social and environmental impacts – positive and negative – that can result from the proposed investment**
- **Any concerns that Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups have about potentially negative impacts are understood and addressed by the executing agency for SSIWM**
- Traditional knowledge informs the design and implementation of mitigation strategies and is treated respectfully
- There is mutual understanding and respect between the MWI and executing agencies and the Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups as well as other stakeholders
- Vulnerable and Marginalized People aspirations are taken into account in project planning so that people have ownership of, and participate fully in decisions about, community development programs and initiatives
- The project has the broad, on-going support of the Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups
- The voices of all in the Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups are heard; that is, engagement processes are inclusive.

6.3.4 Impact Identification Including Long Term
The assessment of each sub project investment beneficial and adverse impacts will be conducted based on free, prior, and informed consultation, with the affected Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups (VMGs), on the potential adverse and positive effects of the investment. In a participatory process the determination of potential adverse impacts will entail an analysis of the relative vulnerability of, and risks to, the affected VMGs given their distinct circumstances and close ties to land and natural resources, as well as their lack of access to opportunities relative to other social groups in the communities, regions, or national societies in which they live.

Another concern is that while projects may consider short-term positive or negative impacts, they usually fail to consider the long-term impacts that project interventions could have on the livelihood, social organization and cultural integrity of VMGs, such as irrigation, dams or road improvement projects that may open up remote areas and increase pressure on indigenous lands and resources. Therefore the identification of impacts will have to consider the long term impacts as well.

6.3.5 Determination of Mitigation Measures
The identification and evaluation, based on free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected VMGs, of measures necessary to avoid adverse effects, or if such measures are not feasible, the identification of measures to minimize, mitigate, or compensate for such effects, and to ensure that the VMGs receive culturally appropriate benefits under the project will be conducted in a participatory manner. The use of the above mentioned methods in the SA process will be used in determining mitigation measures. Mitigation measures may involve compensation as well and typical mitigation actions or compensation may include among others:

1. Building and operating schools
2. Enhancing food security
3. Achieving secure land rights

6.3.6 Development of strategies for participation of Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups
Participation will be through meetings with the different groups of the vulnerable and marginalized communities primarily to ensure that the results of the mapping exercise are presented and comments including review of the results are done and agree on its implications regarding proposed investments and activities, resource access restrictions, mitigation/compensatory measures and VMGs participation arrangements for project activities. Sub project activities selected should ensure that the VMGs do not:

- Face further physical and economic displacements from land and forests traditionally utilized by them as source of livelihood and basis for their cultural and social system,
- lose further legal access to natural resources, which are an important source of livelihood and basis for their cultural and social system,
- Become even more marginalized in the society and disintegrate from the nation, receive less assistance from governmental services,
- Have less capacities to defend their legal rights,
- Become or remain as dependent of other ethnic groups, and
- Lose their cultural and social identity.

### 6.3.7 Strategies for inclusion of women and youth

While it is important to acknowledge the role of elders and other traditional community leaders, it should not automatically be assumed that those who occupy formal leadership positions, whether they be traditional or government appointed, represent all interests in the community. In particular, the executing agency and its partners need to be sensitive to those sections of the community who are frequently excluded from the decision-making process, such as women and young people.

During the Social Assessment, where it is determined that traditional decision-making structures exclude women and younger people, it may be necessary to obtain input from these groups by less direct means (for example, and where possible, via community needs surveys and baseline studies, or through informal discussions with small groups).

**Overall the executing agencies will have to consider and apply the following strategies in order to avoid many of these problems associated with VMGs and specifically the agency should:**

- Confer with the VMGs at the outset on how they wish to be engaged
- Understand and respect local entry protocols as they relate to permission to enter a community and access traditional lands
- Commit to open and transparent communication and engagement from the beginning and have a considered approach in place
- Conduct an initial risk analysis prior to entering the area and implement controls to mitigate key risks
- Ensure that all representatives of the SSIWM executing partner agencies (including third party subcontractors and agents) are well briefed on local customs, history and legal status, and understand the need for cultural sensitivity
- Regularly monitor performance in engagement
- Enlist the services of reputable advisers with good local knowledge.

It is a good idea for representatives of SSIWM executing partner agencies to be present at initial meetings wherever possible and to meet with the traditional heads of communities, as this demonstrates respect and sets the scene for building long-term trust and relationships with communities.

1. Agreement on acceptable time frames to make decisions throughout the lifetime of the project, taking into consideration logistics, local customs, commercial requirements and time needed to build trusting relationships should be pursued. Ensure that it is clear how the timetable for involvement links into when project decisions are made. Ideally, VMGs initial involvement should be sought well in advance of commencement or authorization of activities, taking into account VMGs own decision-making processes and structures.

2. Agreement on a mechanism to resolve disputes or grievances in order to proactively address the likelihood that differences of opinion will arise.

3. Agreement on the terms and conditions for the provision of any ongoing community support with affected vulnerable and marginalized stakeholders and any associated reciprocal obligations.
4. Record the process and decisions reached where VMGs are involved, including the results of any monitoring or reviews, to provide a record for current or future generations who may be affected by the decisions, and to ensure transparency in the decision-making process. Support the communities’ capacity to engage in decision making: for example, by providing access to independent expert advice, capacity building, facilitation and mediation, or involving external observers.

6.3.8 Capacity Building

During the vulnerable and marginalized peoples ‘orientation and mobilization process, the interest, capacity and skills of the VMGs and their institutions, CBOs and NGOs for natural resource management, including social screening, will be assessed. This will be conducted through a detailed capacity needs assessment geared at ascertaining the inherent strengths and capacities and designing a capacity building/strengthening plan. This VMGF proposes the provision of training for the VMGs in among others resource mapping, natural resource management evaluation, planning, record keeping, basic account keeping and monitoring and evaluation.

The staff within the executing agency will provide training for the partner executing agencies in social impact, social assessment, implementation of the VMGF with special attention to developing their knowledge on VMGF background, history and areas of concern as well as their skills for community orientation, free, prior and informed consultative planning, PRA tools and techniques.

6.3.9 Establish equitable representation of VMGs in decision making organs within

If VMGs are identified in the project area, NELSAP-CU, in cooperation with the GoK, will ensure that the VMGs are well represented in the county and district steering committees to articulate issues important to them including ensuring that in each sub project if and when screening ascertains that VMGs are likely to be affected, as part of equitable representation, VMGs will be represented in the sub project implementation and planning unit. They will help make decisions on their needs and priorities with facilitation and guidance from and the partner executing agencies. In so doing, VMGs representatives will take the following into account:

- **Conservation of natural resources by adopting specific, tangible actions that demonstrate sustainable use and management, linked with improving their livelihoods while upholding their rights, culture and dignity.**
- **Social sustainability ensuring that their livelihoods and way of life are not adversely impacted but rather improved and that there is equitable share of benefits with VMGs and that measures to mitigate or eliminate adverse impacts, if any, on them are adequate**
- **Environmental sustainability ensuring that detrimental environmental impacts such as depletion of biodiversity are avoided or mitigated**
7 THE VULNERABLE & MARGINALISED GROUPS PLAN

The constitution of Kenya recognizes a number of communities in various parts of the country and vulnerable and marginalized (see table 1 and annex 3) but although they may be considered VMGs under GoK’s legislation, they also need to meet the Bank's criteria for determining whether they are indigenous. The Bank’s policy criteria for determining indigenousness will be used during the social assessment and a determination and evaluation made if the policy will be triggered. If the VMGs support the sub-Project implementation a VMGP will be developed.

This Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Framework (VMGF) contains specific measures to ensure that the VMGs receive social and economic benefits that are culturally appropriate, including measures to enhance the capacity of the project implementing agencies and other stakeholders. This VMGF calls for the preparation of a VMGP where VMGs are determined to be present or have a collective attachment. The Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Plan (VMGP) will be prepared in a flexible and pragmatic manner, and its level of detail will varies depending on the specific project and the nature of effects to be addressed.

7.1.1 Elements of a Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Plan

VMGs that will be prepared (if determined necessary for the SSIWM) will include the following elements, as needed:

1. A summary of a scale appropriate to the project, of the legal and institutional framework applicable to Indigenous Peoples. Baseline information on the demographic, social, cultural, and political characteristics of the affected Indigenous Peoples’ communities, the land and territories that they have traditionally owned or customarily used or occupied, and the natural resources on which they depend.
2. A summary of the social assessment.
3. A summary of results of the free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected VMGs that was carried out during project preparation and that led to broad community support for the project.
4. A framework for ensuring free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected VMGs during project implementation.
5. An action plan of measures to ensure that the VMGs receive social and economic benefits that are culturally appropriate, including, if necessary, measures to enhance the capacity of the project implementing agencies.
6. When potential adverse effects on VMGs are identified, appropriate action plans of measures to avoid, minimize, mitigate, or compensate for these adverse effects.
7. The cost estimates and financing plan for the VMGP; each sub project will bear full cost of assisting and rehabilitating VMGs.
8. Accessible procedures appropriate to the project to address grievances by the affected VMGs arising from project implementation. When designing the grievance procedures, the borrower takes into account the availability of judicial recourse and customary dispute settlement mechanisms among the VMGs’.
9. Mechanisms and benchmarks appropriate to the project for monitoring, evaluating, and reporting on the implementation of the VMGP. The monitoring and evaluation mechanisms should include arrangements for the free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected VMGs’.

Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Plan
The action plan will consist of a number of activities and will include mitigation measures of potentially negative impacts, modification of sub-project design, and development assistance. Where there is land acquisition in VMGs, the Project will ensure that their rights will not be violated and that they be compensated for the use of any part of their land in a manner that is culturally acceptable to them. The compensation will follow the Resettlement Policy Framework of the project.
### Table 3. Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>Carry out an inventory of VMGs in the proposed sub project operation areas</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU and executing partner executing agencies/VMGs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If VMGs are found to be potentially linked with the proposed project, the following will be undertaken:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Orientation and Mobilization</td>
<td>Reconnaissance survey</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU and partner executing agencies/ Vulnerable and Marginalized Peoples Organizations/ Elders</td>
<td>Population and dynamics of VMPs in screened areas well understood by key players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td>VMGs in all areas identified give broad support for the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations with Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups</td>
<td>Participatory Rural Appraisals</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU and executing partner executing agencies</td>
<td>Information from consultations verified by VMGs and VMGOs as correct and a true representation of their needs and priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping of community resources critical to VMGs</td>
<td>Baseline Surveys</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU and executing partner executing agencies VMGOs</td>
<td>Community transect reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information from consultations verified by VMGs and VMGOs as correct and a true representation of natural, cultural and social, technical resources critical to their survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of strategies for participation of VMGs and mitigation measures</td>
<td>Social Screening</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU and executing partner executing agencies VMGOs</td>
<td>Activities implemented respect the conditions and do not leave the VMGs worse off than they were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities respect the rights, culture and dignity of the VMGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out VMGP(s), if the need arises</td>
<td>If the inventory documents that the proposed sub projects dams might impact on the indigenous peoples: carry out VMGs Carrying out training and provide backstopping</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU</td>
<td>The VMGs are accepted by the GoK, the World Bank and the VMGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>Trainings for VMGs and VMPOs</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU and executing partner executing agencies VMGOs</td>
<td>VMGs and VMGOs use training to advance their cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Implementing Agencies</td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable representation of VMGs in decision making organs</td>
<td>Election of representatives Annual Steering Committee meetings Bi-annual District Level meetings</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU and executing partner executing agencies VMGOs</td>
<td>Active participation of VMGs in forums VMGs and M&amp;E indicate that representation is satisfactory to the VMGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory M&amp;E with VMGs</td>
<td>Internal M&amp;E External M&amp;E</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU VMGOs</td>
<td>M&amp;E reports accessible to VMPs and implementing agencies Mechanism for feedback into VMGF in place and implemented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Capacity Building for implementation of VMGPF</td>
<td>Training of staff from Partner executing agencies and VMG Organizations</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU and executing partner executing agencies</td>
<td>Participants are able to implement VMGF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 STRATEGY FOR PARTICIPATION & CONSULTATION WITH VULNERABLE & MARGINALISED GROUPS

Participation of VMGs in selection, design and implementation of the SSIWMPs will largely determine the extent to which the VMGP objectives would be achieved. Where adverse impacts are likely, the Executing Agency (EA) will undertake prior and informed consultations with the likely affected indigenous communities and those who work with and/or are knowledgeable of indigenous people’s development issues and concerns. To facilitate effective participation, EA will follow a timetable to consult indigenous people communities at different stages of the Project program cycle, especially during preparation of the civil works program. The primary objectives would be to examine the following:

1) To seek their inputs/feedback to avoid or minimize the potential adverse impacts associated with the required works;
2) Identify culturally appropriate impact mitigation measures; and
3) Assess and adopt economic opportunities which the EA could promote to complement the measures required to mitigate the adverse impacts.

Consultations will be carried out broadly in two stages. First, prior to final selection of any SSIWMP located in an area inhabited by VMGs, the EA will consult the VMGs about the need for, and the probable positive and negative impacts associated with the expansion/renovation works. Second, prior to detailed impact assessment, ascertain how the VMGs in general perceive the need for undertaking physical works for the SSIWMP and gather any inputs/feedback they might offer for better outcomes, which would eventually be addressed in VMGPs and design of the physical works.

The EA will:
1) Facilitate widespread participation of VMGs with adequate gender and generational representation; customary/traditional VMG organizations; community elders/leaders; and civil society organizations VMGs development issues and concerns.
2) Provide them with all relevant information about the SSIWMP, including that on potential adverse impacts, organize and conduct the consultations in manners to ensure free expression of their views and preferences.
3) Document details of all consultation meetings, with VMGs perceptions of the proposed works and the associated impacts, especially the adverse ones; any inputs/feedbacks offered by VMGs; and an account of the conditions agreed with indigenous people.

The EA will assess the detailed impacts at household and community levels, with a particular focus on the adverse impacts perceived by VMGs and the probable (and feasible) mitigation and community development measures. To ensure continuing informed participation and more focused discussions, the EA will provide indigenous people with the impact details of the proposed civil works. Consultations will cover topics/areas concerning cultural and socioeconomic characteristics, as well as those indigenous people consider important. Consultations will continue throughout the preparation and implementation period, with increasing focus on the households which might be directly affected. Consultation stages,
probable participants, methods, and expected outcomes are suggested in the VMGs consultation matrix below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation Stages</th>
<th>Consultation Participants</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Expected Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening of the proposed sub projects, Reconnaissance &amp; ground verification</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU, consultants (Social Scientists) &amp; other stakeholders</td>
<td>VMGs, including likely affected IPs, IP organizations, community leaders/elders, key informants</td>
<td>Visit of proposed sub project sites, IP settlements &amp; surroundings, Open meetings, focus group discussions, spot interviews, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth study of risks and benefits taking into consideration, inter alia the conditions that led to community consensus</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU, project consultants (Social Scientist), NGOs / CBOs, other knowledgeable persons</td>
<td>Would-be affected VMGs, VMGs, organizations, Community leaders/elders, key informants</td>
<td>Formal/informal interviews; focus group discussions; hotspot discussion on specific impacts, alternatives, and mitigation; etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Assessment (SA)</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU, project consultants (Social Scientist)</td>
<td>Adversely affected individual VMGs/households</td>
<td>Structured survey questionnaires covering quantitative &amp; qualitative information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of civil works and VMGP</td>
<td>NELSAP-CU, project consultants (Social Scientist) and other stakeholders</td>
<td>VMGs, organizations, community leaders/elders, adversely affected VMGs</td>
<td>Group consultations, hotspot discussions, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Government of Kenya, consultants (Social Scientists) &amp; other stakeholders</td>
<td>Individual VMGs, organizations, community leaders/elders &amp; other stakeholders</td>
<td>Implementation monitoring committees (formal or informal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation</td>
<td>Government of Kenya, consultants (Social Scientists), NGOs &amp; CBOs</td>
<td>VMGs organizations/groups and individuals</td>
<td>Formal participation in review and monitoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following strategies should also be included in the project to support the participation of the VMGs:

- The project needs to accommodate the most vulnerable and destitute members of VMGs, especially those who have been living in the project area.

- Encourage members of VMGs’ to be get involved in various development planning, implementation, operation and maintenance (O&M) activities in the project through arranging related training;
- Assist members of VMGs’ to develop their capacity and capability to enable them to participate in proposed sub projects;
- Explore avenues for creating employment opportunities for VM women;
- The project should ensure adequate resources and technical support for the implementation of the action plan for VMGs’.
- At all stages culturally appropriate communication methods (verbal and nonverbal, in local language) should be used to ensure meaningful consultation.
- (iv) Provision to ensure involvement of indigenous community members in various training activities as part of the project to make their livelihoods more sustainable;

Once the VMGs are identified in the project area, the VMGPs will ensure mitigation of any adverse impact of the project. The sub project should ensure benefits to the VMGs by providing, in consultation with the VMGs themselves, opportunity to get them involved in various income earning opportunities and activities;

The following issues need to be addressed during the implementation stage of the project:

- Provision of an effective mechanism for monitoring implementation of the VMGF and any VMGPs
- Development of accountability mechanism to ensure the planned benefits of the project are received by indigenous people;
- Involve suitably experienced NGOs to address the VMGs’ vulnerability through developing and implementing action plans;
- Ensuring appropriate budgetary allocation of resources for the VMGs’ development plans;
- Provision of technical assistance for sustaining the VMGF;
- Ensure that VMGs traditional social organizations, cultural heritage, traditional political and community organizations are protected;
9 GRIEVANCES REDRESS MECHANISM

Even with the best-designed social impact assessments, agreements, engagement programs and risk mitigation strategies, conflicts and disagreements can still occur, in some cases with the potential for rapid escalation. Grievance handling procedures are required to ensure that VMGs are able to lodge complaints or concerns, without cost, and with the assurance of a timely and satisfactory resolution of the issue. Stakeholders will be informed of the intention to implement the grievance mechanism, and the procedure will be communicated at the time that the VMGPS are finalized.

Vulnerable and marginalized local communities and stakeholders may raise a grievance to the NELSAP-CU during project preparation, and at all times with the executing agencies about any issues covered in this framework and the application of the framework. The VMGs should be informed about this possibility and contact information of the respective organizations at relevant levels should be made available. These arrangements should be described in the project-specific frameworks and VMGPS along with the more project-specific grievance and conflict resolution mechanism. Many of the factors that may give rise to conflict between VMGs and proposed project investments can be a source of conflict with non-VMGs as well. These include, for example:

- Establishing a project investment in the absence of broad community support
- Inadequate engagement or decision-making processes
- Inadequate or inequitable compensation for land
- Inequitable distribution of benefits
- Broken promises and unmet expectations of benefits
- Failing to generate opportunities for employment, training, supply or community development
- Environmental degradation
- Disruption to amenity and lifestyle
- Loss of livelihood
- Violation of human rights
- Social dislocation
- Historical grievances not being adequately addressed.

In addition, however, there are some contextual factors that have particular salience for vulnerable and marginalized people and their relations with sub project investments. For example, a lack of respect (perceived or actual) for indigenous customary rights or culture, history and spirituality, is likely to trigger a strong reaction. Similarly, issues around access to and control of land and the recognition of sovereignty are very important for many VMGs and can lead to serious conflict if they are not handled sensitively and with due respect for the rights of affected groups.

9.1 Overview

A key element during the development of the sub project investment VMGPS will be the development and implementation of a grievance mechanism. Grievances will be actively managed and tracked to ensure that appropriate resolution and actions are taken. A clear time schedule will be defined for resolving grievances, ensuring that they are addressed in an appropriate and timely manner, with corrective actions being implemented if appropriate and the complainant being informed of the outcome. The grievance procedure will be simple and will be administered as far as possible, at the sub project level by the relevant institutions and partners.
The grievance procedure does not replace existing legal processes. Based on consensus, the procedures will seek to resolve issues quickly in order to expedite the receipt of entitlements, without resorting to expensive and time-consuming legal actions. If the grievance procedure fails to provide a result, complainants can still seek legal redress bearing in mind that the constitution of the Government of Kenya recognizes the rights of vulnerable and marginalized groups.

9.2 Grievance Redress Process

All sections of a community associated with the project, including those with low levels of literacy, should be able to access the grievances mechanism easily. The SSIWM executing partner agencies should facilitate access by maintaining and publicizing multiple access points to complaint mechanisms, such as at the project site and in key locations within communities, including downstream and remote communities.

A grievance redress mechanism will be developed for addressing the grievances from the affected VMGs related to sub project implementation. The procedure of grievance redress will be incorporated in the project information pamphlet to be distributed prior to implementation. Participatory consultation with affected households will be undertaken during project planning and implementation stages.

The EA will establish a mechanism to receive and facilitate resolution of affected VMGs concerns, complaints, and grievances about the project’s safeguards performance at SSIWMP having VMGs impacts, with assistance from Non-Governmental Organisations (NGO).

9.2.1 Establishment of Grievance Redress Committee

A Grievance Redress Committee will be established at the project area once it has been determined that VMGs are present in an area and that a VMGP is needed. Under the Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), a Grievance Redress Committee (GRC) will be formed for each sub project with involvement of VMGs representative & local stakeholders. The GRC will comprise of the following representatives from the area namely:-

1. County Administrator/representative
2. District Administrator
3. Representative of CBOs/NGOs active in the area
4. Representative of the VMGs
5. Women representative from the VMGs
6. Youth representative from the VMGs
7. Government ministries representatives e.g. Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development; Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources; Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries, Ministry of Sports, Culture and Arts; Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Services etc.
8. Consultants (social specialists)
9. Representative from the Executing Agency e.g. Social Development Specialist

The GRCs are to be formed and activated during the VMGPs implementation process to allow VMGs sufficient time to lodge complaints and safeguard their recognized interests. Assistance to VMGs will be given to document and record the complaint, and if necessary, provide advocate services to address the grievances. The grievance redress mechanisms is designed with the objective of solving disputes at the earliest possible time which will be in the interest of all parties concerned and therefore implicitly discourages referring such matters to the law courts for resolution which would otherwise take a considerably longer time.
As is normal practice under customary law, attempts will be made to ensure that all disputes in communities are solved by the traditional leaders via the GRC after a thorough investigation of the facts using the services of his officials. The traditional dispute resolution structures existing for each of the VMGs will be used as the first step in resolving grievances.

Marginalized and vulnerable communities will be provided with a variety of options for communicating issues and concerns, including in writing, orally, by telephone, over the internet or through more informal methods as part of the grievance redress mechanism. In the case of marginalized groups (such as women and young people), a more proactive approach may be needed to ensure that their concerns have been identified and articulated. This will be done, for example, by providing for an independent person to meet periodically with such groups and to act as an intermediary. Where a third party mechanism is part of the procedural approach to handling complaints, one option will be to include women or youth as representatives on the body that deals with grievances. It should be made clear that access to the mechanism is without prejudice to the complainant’s right to legal recourse. Prior to the approval of individual VMGPs, all the affected VMGs will have been informed of the process for expressing dissatisfaction and seeking redress. The grievance procedure will be simple and administered as far as possible at the local levels to facilitate access, flexibility and ensure transparency.

How conflicts and disagreements are interpreted and handled is shaped by culture, both indigenous and corporate. For this reason, it is very important that executing partner agencies in the SSIWMP understand the cultural preferences that VMGs have for dealing with disputes. Well-designed and executed baseline studies should be used to help to build this understanding.

Before the approval of individual VMGPs all the affected VMGs will have to be informed of the process for expressing dissatisfaction and to seek redress. The grievance procedure will be simple and administered as far as possible at the local levels to facilitate access, flexibility and ensure transparency.

9.2.2 Use of Alternative Dispute Resettlement Mechanisms
The Land Act, 2012, Part VIII/128 provides for dispute resolution through the Land and Environment Court. However, as is normal practice under customary law, all disputes in communities are solved by the leaders after a thorough investigation of the facts using the services of local officials. The traditional dispute resolution structures existing for each of the MVGs will be used as the first step in resolving grievances. All attempts would be made to settle grievances. Those seeking redress and wishing to state grievances would do so by notifying their traditional leader of the VMGs or the appropriate district authority, who will in turn inform and consult with EA and implementing partner agencies of the SMWRD project investment.

9.2.3 Further Redress—Kenya Court of Law
All the grievances that will not be resolved by the GRC or which the VMGs are dissatisfied with in terms of resolution will be channeled to the existing structures in Kenya for handling grievances which is the Kenyan Courts of Law as the last resort.

9.2.4 Complain Pattern
If a complaint pattern emerges, the district and County administrations, with the traditional leaders will discuss possible remediation. The local leaders will be required to give advice concerning the need for revisions to procedures. Once they agree on necessary and appropriate changes, then a written description of the changed process will be made., the district and regional administrations and the traditional leaders and representatives will be responsible for communicating any changes to future potential PAPs when the consultation process with them begins.
In selecting a grievance structure, the VMGs should take into account their customary dispute settlement mechanisms, the availability of judicial recourse and the fact that it should be a structure considered by all stakeholders as an independent and qualified actor.

The aim will be to integrate both indigenous and corporate ways of resolving problems into the complaints mechanism. Systems and procedures must adequately reflect VMGs preferences for direct or indirect interaction, negotiation, debate, dialogue, and application of indigenous traditional management and/or ceremony, with external agents to ensure mutually acceptable processes and outcomes.

Where a sub project investment is dealing with more than one VMG, there may well be multiple culturally appropriate methods for dealing with problems by different interests. Given the often marked differences between corporate and indigenous cultures, it is highly desirable to utilize processes that focus on dialogue, building cross-cultural understanding and through this, finding mutually agreeable solutions. Such approaches are more equitable and, on a practical level, are more likely to facilitate viable, long-term resolution of community issues and concerns.

9.2.5 Grievance Log

Documentation and Recording

Documentation of complaints and grievances is important, including those that are communicated informally and orally. These should be logged, assessed, assigned to an individual for management, tracked and closed out or “signed off” when resolved, ideally with the complainant(s) being consulted, where appropriate, and informed of the resolution. Records provide a way of understanding patterns and trends in complaints, disputes and grievances over time. While transparency should be maintained – for example, through regular reports on issues raised and rates of resolution – provision should also be made for confidentiality of information or anonymity of the complainant(s) whenever necessary.

A grievance log will be established by the SSIWM executing partner agencies and copies of the records kept with all the relevant authorities at the County, District and Village level and will be used in monitoring of complaints and grievances.

In each sub project investment, the executing partner agency will appoint a VMGs/Project Liaison Officer (PLO) who will ensure that each complaint has an individual reference number, and is appropriately tracked and recorded actions are completed. The log also contains a record of the person responsible for an individual complaint, and records dates for the following events:

- Date the complaint was reported;
- Date the grievance log was uploaded onto the project database;
- Date information on proposed corrective action sent to complainant (if appropriate);
- The date the complaint was closed out; and
- Date response was sent to complainant.

Responding to complaints

Once parties agree on a path forward – such as an apology, compensation or an adjustment to operations – an action plan should be formalized and implemented. Depending on the issue, responses may vary from a single task to a program of work that involves different parts of the operation. Effective responses will also include engagement with parties involved to ensure that the response continues to be appropriate and understood. Communities should also be advised of the close-out of the issue and what has been done to achieve it. This feedback provides an opportunity for executing partner agency in the SSIWM to demonstrate that it has addressed the issue as well as confirming that the community considers the response satisfactory and the matter closed.
**Understanding root causes**

As outlined above, there are many factors that can potentially lead to conflict or disagreement between SSIWM investment project and communities, both vulnerable and marginalized or otherwise. Although it is not always possible to identify root causes, some issues will warrant deeper analysis in order to better understand the issue and avoid its further escalation. In the absence of a tailored methodology for analyzing community-related disputes and grievances, these methods may be adapted to guide this analysis. Funding will be allocated in during the preparation of each VMGP to support community-based research to highlight the VMGs perspective which could further provide a deeper understanding of the causes of conflict.

**9.2.6 Monitoring Complaints**

It is important to collect data on community interactions – from low-level concerns and complaints to ongoing disputes and higher-order grievances – so that patterns can be identified and project management alerted to high-risk issues. Effective monitoring may also help to prevent the escalation of lower-level disputes into more serious conflicts.

Information related to monitoring of the VMGPs will be gathered through various channels, such as formal review, evaluation and analysis or through day-to-day interaction with VMGs. Monitoring will help determine the effectiveness of processes for responding to community concerns; for example, by tracking complaint resolution rates over time. This information can then be used to refine the system and improve the outcomes being achieved. The outcomes of monitoring should be reported formally to the community on a regular basis, in addition to being used for internal management purposes. The VMGs/Project Liaison Officer for each sub project investment will be responsible for:

- Providing the project investment reports detailing the number and status of complaints;
- Any outstanding issues to be addressed; and
- Monthly reports, including analysis of the type of complaints, levels of complaints, and actions to reduce complaints.
10.1 Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) are fundamental components of projects involving affected communities. Monitoring should be participatory and include the monitoring of beneficial and adverse impacts on Indigenous peoples within project impact areas. M&E should be based on free, prior and informed consultation with the VMGs who should play an integral role in its implementation.

Implementation arrangements for possible implementation of the proposed SSIWM project have not been determined. However, it is likely that all monitoring activities will principally remain the responsibility of the Government of Kenya/SMWRD partner executing agency implementing that particular sub project with oversight from a designated GoK Ministry. Each executing partner agency of the SSIWM will be responsible for compiling the data and auditing for completeness of the records, and they will be responsible for providing compiled M&E information to the.

The overall goal of the M&E process for the Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Plan is to ensure that:
- Effective communication and consultation takes place;
- Reporting of any grievances that require resolution;
- Document the performance of the as regards the VMGs; and allow program managers and participants to evaluate whether the affected VMGs have maintained their rights, culture and dignity and that they are not worse off than they were before the project.

The specific objectives of evaluation will include:
1. An assessment of the compliance of activities undertaken in relation to the objectives and methods identified in the VMGF;
2. An assessment of the consultation procedures that have taken place at the community and individual level;
3. An assessment on whether the affected communities have had access to mitigation activities;
4. The occurrence of grievances and extent of resolution of disputes;
5. An evaluation of the impact of the Project on income and standard of living within the communities; and
6. Identification of actions that can improve the positive impact of the Project and mitigate potential negative impacts.

The VMGPs will indicate parameters to be monitored, institute monitoring milestones and provide resources necessary to carry out the monitoring activities. The will institute an administrative reporting system that will:-

- Provide timely information about all grievances arising as a result of activities;
- Identify any grievances that have not been resolved at a local level and require resolution through the involvement of the;
- Document the timely completion of project obligations for all vulnerable and marginalized peoples grievances;
The M&E reports for each sub project investment will be prepared by each sub project executing partner agency of the each year and presented to VMGs for feedback etc., before being handed over to the VMGF-committees at district or county level for discussion and prepare recommendations on how to fine-tune the VMGP. There will be a sub project steering committee which will be established for each sub project where VMGs are involved and a representative of the VMGs will sit in this committee. The M and E report will be submitted to this committee for review and then submitted to the established independent review body (donor partner or otherwise).

Every year an independent external evaluation should be carried out to further crosscheck the quality and to guarantee that the indigenous peoples’ dignity, human rights, economies, and cultures are respected by the SSIWMP, that all decisions which affect any of these are based on the free, prior, and informed consultation with the indigenous peoples, that the indigenous peoples receive social and economic benefits that are culturally appropriate and gender and inter-generationally inclusive, that adverse effects on the indigenous peoples’ communities are, as much as possible, avoided, and if this was according to the VMGF sub project committees not feasible, minimize, mitigate, or compensate in a culturally appropriate manner, based on broad support by the indigenous peoples’ communities.

10.1.1 Participatory Impact Monitoring
The monitoring and evaluation of the VMGF implementation as well as the implementation of the sub projects in the operational areas inhabited by VMGs is an important management tool, which should include arrangements for the free, prior, and informed consultations with the affected VMGs. The implementation of the participatory impact monitoring (PIM) at district or county level will be an important element to assist the various structures to fine-tune their intervention in view to maximize culturally appropriate benefits and provide space for the indigenous peoples’ communities to voice their concerns.

The PIM will be based on the data gathered by the screening process/social assessments, the organizations of the VMGs, the relevant governmental structures (lands, forests, development and social) at county or district level etc. The organizations representing the VMGs will play a key role as facilitator of the PIM process and the selection of the facilitators will be the decision of the communities, but it is advised to choose people who are able to elaborate on the basis of the PIM reports, which reflect the situation on the ground in a transparent and plausible way.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building for implementation of VMPPF</td>
<td>Number of individuals &amp; institutions trained</td>
<td>Government of Kenya/EA</td>
<td>Training workshops reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Orientation and Mobilization</td>
<td>Number of VMGs meetings; Number of VMGs sensitized</td>
<td>Government of Kenya/EA, Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Organizations/Elders</td>
<td>Reconnaissance survey reports Community meeting reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations with Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups:</td>
<td>Number of PRA/RRA Attendance of PRA/RRA PRA reports acceptable to VMGs</td>
<td>Government of Kenya/EA, Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Organizations</td>
<td>RRA reports PRA reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping of community resources critical to VMGs</td>
<td>Level of VP participation Reports verified and accepted by VMGs</td>
<td>Government of Kenya/EA, Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Organizations</td>
<td>Baseline survey reports Community transect reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of strategies for participation of VMGs and mitigation</td>
<td>Social Screening completed</td>
<td>Government of Kenya/EA, Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Organizations</td>
<td>SSIWMP reports Implementing agencies reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building</td>
<td>Types of training Number of Trainings Attendance by VMGs</td>
<td>Government of Kenya/EA, Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Organizations</td>
<td>Training reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equitable representation of VMG in decision making organs</td>
<td>Number of meetings attended by VMG representatives Number and types of VMGs issues articulated</td>
<td>Government of Kenya/EA, Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Organizations</td>
<td>District Level and National Steering Committee reports VMGO reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory M&amp;E with VMG</td>
<td>Internal M&amp;E External M&amp;E</td>
<td>Government of Kenya/EA, Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 DISCLOSURE ARRANGEMENTS FOR VMGPs

11.1 Communication framework
During the immediate project preparation phase (feasibility study, design and ESIA) of the SSMWRP, NELSAP-CU will be the principal institution for this project, with a coordinator appointed in its main offices in Kigali, as well as in the Sio-Malaba-Malakisi sub-basin office. During this period of project preparation, NELSAP-CU will also be responsible for day-to-day oversight and execution of the preparatory studies (project management, financial management, procurement, disbursement, monitoring, including environmental and social aspects of the project etc.).

This communication framework elaborates principles, strategies and structures on how the SSIWMP and the affected VMGs should interact at each stage of project preparation and implementation to satisfy the criteria of free, prior and informed consultations. As the project has not been studied to feasibility level, it is not yet clear if the SSIWMP will proceed to construction and implementation. Implementation arrangements for a potential SSIWMP will be determined through the project preparation process. For this reason, the communications framework for the implementation period only covers broad principles at this time.

If a determination is made during the screening that the SSIWMP project is likely to be located in an area connected with VMGs and hence likely to interfere with their livelihood and rights, a project steering committee will be formed. The committee will be comprised of NELSAP-CU and relevant GoK officials (including possibly a representative from the executing partner that will implement the SSIWMP, and other sectoral ministries) and representative from the VMGs. This committee will provide a linkage between SSIWMP, the VMGs and the district or county administration. It should meet once every month and work as focal point for all VMGF related issues at during the implementation of that sub project.

It should be informed about all kinds of SSIWMP activities and communicate relevant information through the VMGs representatives to the vulnerable and marginalized communities. It should also gather information and feedback from the vulnerable and marginalized communities to channel them to the relevant governmental structures and the SSIWMP EA.

The elected representative of the VMGs for a particular sub project will be in charge to facilitate the communication between the VMGs in their area. They will be elected during the pilot phase of the VMGF after a further introduction and general discussion on the VMGF, the communication channels etc. to ensure that the elected representatives have broad community support and are elected on the base of free, prior and informed consultations.

11.2 Disclosure
This VMGF and sub project VMGPs will be made available to the affected VMGs in an appropriate form, manner, and language. Each VMGP will be disclosed to the affected VMG with detailed information of the SSIWMP. This will be done through public consultation and made available as brochures, leaflets, or booklets, using local languages. Summary of the VMGP will be made available in hard copies and in language at: (i) Offices of the EA; (ii) District or County Office; and (iv) any other local level public offices. Electronic versions of the framework as well as the VMGPs will be placed on the official website of the EA and MOALF (and likely the official website of any potential financier of project
implementation after approval and endorsement of the VMGF and each VMGP by the potential financier\(^8\).

11.3 **Roles and Responsibilities**

11.3.1 **NELSAP-CU and the EAs**

During project preparation (during the period of Feasibility Study, design, and ESIA financed by the NCORE project), NELSAP CU will remain principally responsible for following the requirements of this framework. During implementation, it is presumed that this responsibility would shift to the GoK/EA. The responsible party will ensure that VMGs are consulted and benefit in culturally appropriate ways. They will avoid adverse impacts on indigenous communities, or where this is not possible develop with the participation of affected communities measures to mitigate and compensate for such impacts.

NELSAP-CU, specifically the environment and social safeguard specialists, will remain responsible for:

- Screening for projects affecting Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups;
- If required, assess the adequacy of the assessment of project impacts and the proposed measures to address issues pertaining to affected indigenous communities. When doing so project activities, impacts and social risks, circumstances of the affected indigenous communities, and the capacity of the applicant to implement the measures should be assessed. If the risks or complexity of particular issues
- Assess the adequacy of the consultation process and the affected indigenous communities’ broad support to the project—and not provide funding until such broad support has been ascertained; and

11.3.2 **Non-Governmental Organizations**

The NGOs present and active in the area will be used during the social assessment studies as well as during the monitoring and evaluation of the SSIWMP. The formation of Grievance Redress Committees and Steering Committees for each SSIWMP investment will also include representation by NGOs.

11.3.3 **World Bank**

The Bank will receive any VMGP prepared with NCORE funds and review and provide a No Objection or otherwise.

\(^8\) As financiers/donors have differing rules with respect to VMGs, the exact process will need to be agreed between the GoK and the financier of the project.
12 REFERENCES


11. ERMIS Africa Ethnographic Survey of Marginalized Groups, 2005-2012


18. World Bank Indigenous Peoples Policy OP. 4.10


21. UN Human Rights and Indigenous Issues: 92

22. Organization for the Development of Lamu Communities
### 13 ANNEX

#### 13.1 Annex 1 - Social Screening Form

This form/checklist will be filled by SSIWMP Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL SCREENING FORM FOR ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. BACKGROUND INFORMATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 1. Type/description/justification of proposed activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2. Location of activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3. Duration of activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4. Focal point and person for activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>B. EXPECTED BENEFITS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1. Benefits for local people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2. Benefits to Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups (VMGs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3. Total Number of expected beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4. Total Number of expected Vulnerable and Marginalized Peoples beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5. Ratio of B4 and B5; Are benefits distributed equitably?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If NO state remedial measures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>C. POTENTIAL ADVERSE SOCIAL IMPACTS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1. Will activity entail restriction of access of VMP to lands and related natural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes exclude from project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. Will activity entail commercial development of natural and cultural resources critical to VMGs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes exclude from project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. Will activity entail physical relocation of Vulnerable and Marginalized Peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes exclude from project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>D. CONSULTATION WITH IP</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1. Has VMP orientation to project been done for this group?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2. Has PRA/RRA been done in this area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3. Did the VMP give broad support for project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by: _____________________  Verified by: _____________________

Date: _____________________  Date: _____________________

Note: Attach sketch maps, PRA/RRA results and other relevant documents.
13.2 Annex 2 - Contents Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OP 4.10, Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework</th>
<th>These policies were prepared for use by World Bank staff and are not necessarily a complete treatment of the subject.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The Indigenous Peoples Planning Framework (IPPF) sets out:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The types of programs and subprojects likely to be proposed for financing under the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The potential positive and adverse effects of such programs or subprojects on Indigenous Peoples.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) A plan for carrying out the social assessment for such programs or subprojects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) A framework for ensuring free, prior, and informed consultation with the affected Indigenous Peoples' communities at each stage of project preparation and implementation (see paragraph 10 of this policy).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Institutional arrangements (including capacity building where necessary) for screening project-supported activities, evaluating their effects on Indigenous Peoples, preparing IPPs, and addressing any grievances.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Monitoring and reporting arrangements, including mechanisms and benchmarks appropriate to the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Disclosure arrangements for IPPs to be prepared under the IPPF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.3 Annex 3-Contents of Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Plan (VMGP), OP 4.10

Indigenous Peoples Development Plan

Prerequisites

Prerequisites of a successful development plan for indigenous peoples are as follows:

(a) The key step in project design is the preparation of a culturally appropriate development plan based on full consideration of the options preferred by the indigenous people affected by the project.

(b) Studies should make all efforts to anticipate adverse trends likely to be induced by the project and develop the means to avoid or mitigate harm.

(c) The institutions responsible for government interaction with indigenous peoples should possess the social, technical, and legal skills needed for carrying out the proposed development activities. Implementation arrangements should be kept simple. They should normally involve appropriate existing institutions, local organizations, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) with expertise in matters relating to indigenous peoples.

(d) Local patterns of social organization, religious beliefs, and resource use should be taken into account in the plan's design.

(e) Development activities should support production systems that are well adapted to the needs and environment of indigenous peoples, and should help production systems under stress to attain sustainable levels.

(f) The plan should avoid creating or aggravating the dependency of indigenous people on project entities. Planning should encourage early handover of project management to local people. As needed, the plan should include general education and training in management skills for indigenous people from the onset of the project.

(g) Successful planning for indigenous peoples frequently requires long lead times, as well as arrangements for extended follow-up. Remote or neglected areas where little previous experience is available often require additional research and pilot programs to fine-tune development proposals.

(h) Where effective programs are already functioning, Bank support can take the form of incremental funding to strengthen them rather than the development of entirely new programs.

Contents of VMGP

The development plan should be prepared in tandem with the preparation of the main investment. In many cases, proper protection of the rights of indigenous people will require the implementation of special project components that may lie outside the primary project's objectives. These components can include activities related to health and nutrition, productive infrastructure, linguistic and cultural preservation, entitlement to natural resources, and education. The project component for indigenous people’s development should include the following elements, as needed:
(a) **Legal Framework.** The plan should contain an assessment of (i) the legal status of the groups covered by this OD, as reflected in the country's constitution, legislation, and subsidiary legislation (regulations, administrative orders, etc.); and (ii) the ability of such groups to obtain access to and effectively use the legal system to defend their rights. Particular attention should be given to the rights of indigenous peoples to use and develop the lands that they occupy, to be protected against illegal intruders, and to have access to natural resources (such as forests, wildlife, and water) vital to their subsistence and reproduction.

(b) **Baseline Data.** Baseline data should include (i) accurate, up-to-date maps and aerial photographs of the area of project influence and the areas inhabited by indigenous peoples; (ii) analysis of the social structure and income sources of the population; (iii) inventories of the resources that indigenous people use and technical data on their production systems; and (iv) the relationship of indigenous peoples to other local and national groups. It is particularly important that baseline studies capture the full range of production and marketing activities in which indigenous people are engaged. Site visits by qualified social and technical experts should verify and update secondary sources.

(c) **Land Tenure.** When local legislation needs strengthening, the Bank should offer to advise and assist the borrower in establishing legal recognition of the customary or traditional land tenure systems of indigenous peoples. Where the traditional lands of indigenous peoples have been brought by law into the domain of the state and where it is inappropriate to convert traditional rights into those of legal ownership, alternative arrangements should be implemented to grant long-term, renewable rights of custodianship and use to indigenous peoples. These steps should be taken before the initiation of other planning steps that may be contingent on recognized land titles.

(d) **Strategy for Local Participation.** Mechanisms should be devised and maintained for participation by indigenous people in decision making throughout project planning, implementation, and evaluation. Many of the larger groups of indigenous people have their own representative organizations that provide effective channels for communicating local preferences. Traditional leaders occupy pivotal positions for mobilizing people and should be brought into the planning process, with due concern for ensuring genuine representation of the indigenous population. No foolproof methods exist, however, to guarantee full local-level participation. Sociological and technical advice provided through the regional environment divisions (REDs) is often needed to develop mechanisms appropriate for the project area.

(e) **Technical Identification of Development or Mitigation Activities.** Technical proposals should proceed from on-site research by qualified professionals acceptable to the Bank. Detailed descriptions should be prepared and appraised for such proposed services as education, training, health, credit, and legal assistance. Technical descriptions should be included for the planned investments in productive infrastructure. Plans that draw upon indigenous knowledge are often more successful than those introducing entirely new principles and institutions. For example, the potential contribution of traditional health providers should be considered in planning delivery systems for health care.

(f) **Institutional Capacity.** The government institutions assigned responsibility for indigenous peoples are often weak. Assessing the track record, capabilities, and needs of those institutions is a fundamental requirement. Organizational issues that need to be addressed through Bank assistance are the (i) availability of funds for investments and field operations; (ii) adequacy of experienced professional staff; (iii) ability of Indigenous Peoples’ own organizations, local administration authorities, and local NGOs to interact with specialized government institutions; (iv) ability of the executing agency to mobilize other agencies involved in the plan's implementation; and (v) adequacy of field presence.

(g) **Implementation Schedule.** Components should include an implementation schedule with benchmarks by which progress can be measured at appropriate intervals. Pilot programs are often needed to provide
planning information for phasing the project component for indigenous peoples with the main investment. The plan should pursue the long-term sustainability of project activities subsequent to completion of disbursement.

(h) Monitoring and Evaluation. Independent monitoring capacities are usually needed when the institutions responsible for indigenous populations have weak management histories. Monitoring by representatives of Indigenous Peoples’ own organizations can be an efficient way for the project management to absorb the perspectives of indigenous beneficiaries and is encouraged by the Bank. Monitoring units should be staffed by experienced social science professionals, and reporting formats and schedules appropriate to the project's needs should be established. Monitoring and evaluation reports should be reviewed jointly by the senior management of the implementing agency and by the Bank. The evaluation reports should be made available to the public.

(i) Cost Estimates and Financing Plan. The plan should include detailed cost estimates for planned activities and investments. The estimates should be broken down into unit costs by project year and linked to a financing plan. Such programs as revolving credit funds that provide indigenous people with investment pools should indicate their accounting procedures and mechanisms for financial transfer and replenishment. It is usually helpful to have as high a share as possible of direct financial participation by the Bank in project components dealing with indigenous peoples.
13.4 **Annex 4- SAMPLE TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR DEVELOPING A VMGP**

A. **Executive Summary of the Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups Plan**

2. This section should concisely describe the critical facts, significant findings, and recommended actions.

B. **Description of the Project/Background Information**

3. This section provides a general description of the project; discusses project components and activities that may bring impacts on indigenous people; and identify project area.

The ToR should provide pertinent background for preparing the VMGP. This would include a brief description of:

- Statement of the project objectives,
- Implementing agency/sponsor and their requirements for conducting a VMGP,
- Project components, especially those that will finance subprojects;
- Anticipated types of subprojects/components, and what types will not be financed by the project;
- Areas of influence to be assessed (description plus good map)
- Summary of environmental/social setting
- Applicable Bank safeguards policies, and consequent Project preparation requirements.

The ToR should also include a brief history of the project, including alternatives considered, its current status and timetable, and the identities of any associated projects. Also include a description of other project preparation activities underway (e.g., legal analysis, institutional analysis, social assessment, baseline study).

C. **Social Impact Assessment**

4. This section should among others entail:

(i) Review of the legal and institutional framework applicable to indigenous people in the project context

(ii) Provide baseline information on the demographic, social, cultural, and political characteristics of the affected Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups (VMGs); the land and territories that they have traditionally owned or customarily used or occupied; and the natural resources on which they depend.

(iii) Identify key project stakeholders and elaborate a culturally appropriate and gender-sensitive process for meaningful consultation with VMGs at each stage of project preparation and implementation, taking the review and baseline information into account.

(iv) Assess, based on meaningful consultation with the affected indigenous people’s communities, the potential adverse and positive effects of the project. Critical to the determination of potential adverse impacts is a gender-sensitive analysis of the relative vulnerability of, and risks to, the affected indigenous people’s communities given their particular circumstances and close ties to land and natural resources, as well as their lack of access to opportunities relative to those available to other social groups in the communities, regions, or national societies in which they live.

(v) Include a gender-sensitive assessment of the affected VMGs perceptions about the project and its impact on their social, economic, and cultural status.
(vi) identify and recommend, based on meaningful consultation with the affected indigenous peoples communities, the measures necessary to avoid adverse effects or, if such measures are not possible, identifies measures to minimize, mitigate, and/or compensate for such effects and to ensure that the indigenous peoples receive culturally appropriate benefits under the project.

**Information Disclosure, Consultation and Participation**

5. This section of the ToR should:
   (i) Describe the information disclosure, consultation and participation process with the affected VMGs that was carried out during project preparation;

   (ii) Summarize their comments on the results of the social impact assessment and identifies concerns raised during consultation and how these have been addressed in project design;

   (iii) in the case of project activities requiring broad community support, document the process and outcome of consultations with affected indigenous people’s communities and any agreement resulting from such consultations for the project activities and safeguard measures addressing the impacts of such activities;

   (iv) Describe consultation and participation mechanisms to be used during implementation to ensure indigenous people’s participation during implementation; and

   (v) Confirm disclosure of the draft and final VMG to the affected VMGs.

**E. Beneficial Measures**

6. This section should describe and specify the measures to ensure that the VMGs receive social and economic benefits that are culturally appropriate, and gender responsive.

**F. Mitigation Measures**

7. This section should specify the measures to avoid adverse impacts on indigenous people; and where the avoidance is impossible, specifies the measures to minimize mitigate and compensate for identified unavoidable adverse impacts for each affected indigenous people groups.

**G. Capacity Building**

8. This section should provide measures to strengthen the social, legal, and technical capabilities of (a) government institutions to address indigenous people’s issues in the project area; and (b) indigenous people’s organizations in the project area to enable them to represent the affected indigenous peoples more effectively.

**H. Grievance Redress Mechanism**

9. This section should describe the procedures to redress grievances by affected indigenous people’s communities. It also explains how the procedures are accessible to VMGs and culturally appropriate and gender sensitive.

**I. Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation**

10. This section should describe the mechanisms and benchmarks appropriate to the project for monitoring, and evaluating the implementation of the VMGP. It also specifies arrangements for participation of affected indigenous people in the preparation and validation of monitoring, and evaluation reports.
**J. Consulting Team**
11. The general skills required of VMGP team are: Social development Specialist or Anthropologist, Stakeholder engagement specialist, Community Development expert.

**K. Services, Facilities and Materials to be provided by the Client**
The ToR should specify what services, facilities and materials will be provided to the Consultant by the World Bank and the Borrower, for example:

- The Project ISDS and draft PAD;
- Relevant background documentation and studies;
- Example VMGPs that demonstrate best practice, especially from the region or country;
- Making all necessary arrangements for facilitating the work of the Consultant and to provide access to government authorities, other Project stakeholders, and Project sites.

**L. Schedule and Deliverables**
Specify dates for the consultancy deliverables (e.g. detailed work plan within 2 weeks, interim report within 7 weeks, and final draft report within 10 weeks of contract signature), and the overall duration of the consultancy (e.g. 15 weeks from contract signature).

**M. Technical Proposal Contents**
The ToR should require a technical proposal that at least:

- Demonstrates that the Consultant understands the overall scope and nature of the VMGP preparation work, and what will be required to respond satisfactorily to each component of the ToR;
- Demonstrates that the Consultant and his proposed team have relevant and appropriate experience to carry out all components of the ToR. Detailed curriculum vitae for each team member must be included;
- Describes the overall methodology for carrying out each component of the ToR, including desk and field studies, and data collection and analysis methods; and
- Provides an initial plan of work, outputs, and staff assignments with levels of effort by task.

**N. Budget and Payments**
The ToR should indicate if there is a budget ceiling for the consultancy. The ToR should specify the payment schedule (e.g. 10% on contract signature, 10% on delivery of detailed work plan, 40% on delivery of interim report, 30% on delivery of final draft VMGP, 10% on delivery of final VMGP).

**0. Other Information**
Include here lists of data sources, project background reports and studies, relevant publications, and other items to which the consultant's attention should be directed.
### 13.5 Annex 5- Sample Fact Sheet for VMGPs; VMGP Review – Fact Sheet for VMGPs

This form/checklist will be filled by SSIWMP Team and World Bank as part of review and monitoring

**[Country] – [Project ID #] – [Project Name]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reviewer:</td>
<td>Date of Mission:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country:</td>
<td>Project Loan Amount:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project title:</td>
<td>Total Project Cost:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project ID:</td>
<td>Appraisal Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPP #:</td>
<td>Effectiveness Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Manager:</td>
<td>Closing Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment Spec.</td>
<td>Last PSR/ISR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Spec.</td>
<td>MTR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### REVIEW SUMMARY (Based on Desk and Field Review)

**Issues / Observations**

**Proposed Actions (short term / long term, for TTL, SD, etc.)**

### B. SAFEGUARD IDENTIFICATION AND COMPLIANCE AT PREPARATION

**1 Environmental Safeguard Classification:**

**2 Safeguard Policies Triggered at Preparation According to the ISDS, EDS, ESDS, PAD:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicable</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Assessment (OP/BP 4.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural Habitats (OP/GP 4.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry (OP 4.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pest Management (OP 4.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural Property (OP 4.11) – OPN 11.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indigenous Peoples (OP 4.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Safety of Dams (OP/BP 4.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects in Disputed Areas (OP/BP 7.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Involuntary Resettlement (OP 4.12) – OD 4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects on International Waterways (OP/BP 7.50)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3 Project Objective and Components

**Project Objectives**

**Project Description**

### 4 Social Safeguard Triggers: Are there any social safeguard policies which should have been triggered but were not?

### C. SOCIAL MANAGEMENT PLANS AT PREPARATION

**This review is based on IPP PAD SA RAP ISDS (check all that applies)**

**SCREENING**

**Have all IP groups in project area been identified (is screening by the Bank adequate)?**

**SOCIAL ASSESSMENT**

**Has a social assessment taken place (is baseline data given)? Provide summary of social assessment.**

**Has the legal framework regarding IPs been described?**

**Have benefits/adverse impacts to IP groups been identified?**

**CONSULTATION, PARTICIPATION, COMMUNITY SUPPORT**

**Have IPs been involved in free, prior and informed consultation (at the project’s preparation stage)? Are there any**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does the project have verifiable broad community support (and how has it dealt with the issue of community representation)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a framework for consultation with IPs during the project implementation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIGENOUS PEOPLES PLAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a specific action plan (implementation schedule)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the IPP include activities that benefit IP?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are activities culturally appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have institutional arrangements for IPP been described?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a separate budget earmarked for IPP?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there specific monitoring indicators? If yes, are these monitoring indicators disaggregated by ethnicity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a complaint/conflict resolution mechanism been outlined?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure: Were IPP/IPPF disclosed at the <em>Infoshop</em>? Y / N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was IPP/IPPF disclosed in Country and in a form and language accessible to IPs? Y / N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What’s missing:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If applicable, what considerations have been given to the recognition of the rights to lands and natural resources of IPs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If applicable, what considerations have been given to the IP sharing of benefits in the commercial development of natural and cultural resources?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the project involve the physical relocation of IPs (and have they formally agreed to it)? If yes, has the project prepared a resettlement instrument (resettlement policy framework, process framework, resettlement action plan)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. IMPLEMENTATION AND SUPERVISION (Based on initial desk review and verified by field assessment)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Social Safeguards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Have issues (anticipated and unexpected) been monitored and reported systematically in Aide Memoires and ISRs? Have appropriate actions been taken?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Were social specialists included in supervision missions and how often?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 What are the project impacts on IPs culture, livelihoods and social organization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 In terms of consultation process, are there ongoing consultations with the IP communities? Are there records of carried out consultations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Have any social risks been identified? Have appropriate risk management strategies/actions been recommended to the Borrower?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Are IPOs (beyond the community level) actively engaged throughout the life of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7 Does the project contribute to the respect of IP rights as recognized by the country’s legal and policy systems?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Are IPPF and/or IPP implemented satisfactorily? Are they effective? Is funding adequate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 In relation to the implementation of IPPF/IPP, were problems identified, if any? If yes, how were they resolved by the Borrower?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Effectiveness of Monitoring Program

3.1 Has the monitoring program been adequately supervised? Are performance indicators effective?

### Effectiveness of Institutional Responsibilities/Training as outlined in the project documents

### Effectiveness of relevant Legal Covenants: Is compliance with legal covenants being adequately supervised?

#### E. SITE VISIT(s)

- Date
- Location

1.1 Activity

1.2 Observations

#### F. OVERALL ASSESSMENT (including desk and field reviews)

1 Overall Assessment and Risk Rating

1.1 To what extent is the OP4.10 relevant in delivering effective development to IP?

1.2 To what extent has OP4.10 (and previously OD4.20) been applied and how?

1.3 To what extent has OP4.10 been efficacious (cost effective) in achieving its objectives?

#### 2 Recommendations

3.1 Project specific

3.2 Country / Program specific

#### 3 List of Attachments

- Key People Met
- photos
- etc.

#### G. FEEDBACK FROM TTL / SD

- Date of feedback received
### Annex 6- Three Point Rank Order System for VMGPs

This form/checklist will be filled by NELSAP-CU/SSIWM PMU Team and World Bank as part of review and monitoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screening</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Have all IP groups in project area been identified (is screening adequate)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>The names of some groups have been mentioned; baseline survey has been proposed; Aggregates all groups together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Detailed description of all indigenous groups is given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Assessment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Has a social assessment been done (Is baseline data given)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Proposed to collect all relevant data - no specifics; data briefly stated; or not updated, data not disaggregated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disaggregated population data of IP; relevant socio-economic indicators have been stated; data that needs to be collected are listed;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has legal framework been described?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Brief mention of framework given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Constitutional provisions, legal statutes and government programs in relevant sectors related to indigenous peoples stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have benefits/ adverse impacts to IP groups been identified?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Discussed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Potential impacts have been briefly discussed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Potential positive and negative impacts identified and discussed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultation, Participation, Community Support</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have IP been involved in free, prior and informed consultation at the project implementation stage? Are there any records of consultation?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not determinable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Brief mention that consultations have taken place; no details provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Detailed description of process given; appropriate methods used, interlocutors are representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does project have verifiable broad community support (and how has it dealt with the issue of community representation)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>States that IP groups will be involved in preparing village/community action plans; participation process briefly discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Detailed description of participation strategy and action steps given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indigenous People Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Is there a framework for consultation with IPs during the project implementation?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Passing mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Detailed arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is there a specific plan (implementation schedule)?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Flexible time frame (activities need to be proposed); given activity wise; year-wise distribution; mentioned but integrated into another project document (RAP, etc.); no separate treatment; combined with RAP;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Detailed description given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Does the IPP/IPDP include activities that</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit IP</td>
<td>Activities stated but not detailed</td>
<td>Activities clearly specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Are activities culturally appropriate?</th>
<th>Not stated</th>
<th>Cultural concerns noted but not explicit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Have institutional arrangements for IPP been described?</th>
<th>Not stated</th>
<th>Mentioned but integrated into another project document RAP, etc.; no separate treatment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Is a separate budget earmarked for IPP?</th>
<th>Not stated</th>
<th>Mentioned but integrated into another project document (RAP, etc.); not broken down activity-wise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are there specific monitoring indicators?</th>
<th>Not mentioned</th>
<th>Proposed that monitoring indicators shall be designed later; Project outcomes that need to be monitored are stated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has a complaint/conflict resolution mechanism been outlined?</th>
<th>Not mentioned</th>
<th>Passing mention of mechanism in document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were the Indigenous Peoples Plan or Framework (IPP/IPPF) disclosed in Infoshop and in Country in an appropriate language?</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Disclosed in Infoshop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If applicable, what considerations have been given to the recognition of the rights to lands and natural resources of IPs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. If applicable, what considerations have been given to the IP sharing of benefits in the commercial development of natural and cultural resources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Does the project involve the physical relocation of IPs (and have they formally agreed to it)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.7 Annex 7 - Profile of Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups in Kenya

The Constitution of Kenya has established a list of all the vulnerable and marginalized groups in Kenya and they are described below. Although they may be considered as VMGs under GoK's legislation, they also need to meet the Bank's criteria for determining whether they are indigenous. Given that this topic is currently under discussion, the framework document describes what groups GoK recognizes as vulnerable and marginalized and the Bank's policy criteria for determining indigenousness - through the social assessment of the SSIWMP, an evaluation is made if a VMGP will be needed for the SSIWMP.

13.7.1 Sengwer

The Sengwer live in the three administrative districts of Marakwet, West Pokot and Trans Nzoia in and along Cherangany Hills. They are estimated to be 50,000 (30,000 of them live in their traditional territories and another 20,000 in the diaspora). The Sengwer in Kapenguria and Kesogon hold the total population of the Sengwer at 70,000. They lived by hunting and bee keeping. In his evidence before the 1932 Kenyan Land Commission, Mr. C.H. Kirk, stated how they used to go over Cherengany shooting and the only peoples with whom they came into contact along Cherengany Hills were the Cherengany Dorobo, a small tribe of Dorobo (Sengwer). The Sengwer in diaspora are spread in and out of Kenya living amongst Maasai (Kenya and Uganda), Pokot (Uganda and Kenya), Sabiny (Uganda), Luhya (Sirikwa Mpai, Apa Sengeli), Tugen, Ogiek, Kipsigis, Nandi, Marakwet, Keiyo, Sabaot (Kiptum 2006).

Oral history traces the history of the Sengwer back to a man called Sengwer, who is considered to be the mythical first inhabitant of the Cherangany hills. It is said that he had two sons named Sirikwa (elder) and Mitia, whose children formed the clans: Kapchepororwo, Kapchepar (Kaptoyoi), Kapumpo, Kaptogom, Kapcherop, Kakisango, Kimarich (Kamosus), Kapsormei (Kapseto), Kapteteke, Kipsirat, Kamengetiony (Kopoch & Kapkotet), Kaplema and Kamesieu. Each patrilineage is said to have had their portion of land running from the highlands to the plains. The elders said that before the advent of the colonialists, the Sengwer lived during the rainy season in the vast plains of what is today Trans-Nzoia and during the dry season in the forest on the mountain slopes of the Cherangany hills. It is said that the Sengwer lived in good relation with their neighbors as they were not competing for the same resources, but barter honey and dry meat for food crops and/or milk etc.

It is believed that the first Arab slave and ivory hunters came to the area around 1600 and oral history claims that the Sengwer have been quite involved into the trade. In exchange for the ivory they were provided with Millet and Sorghum seedlings. During the Maasai immigration they acquired their first cattle, but it is a common belief that hunting and gathering remained the main source of livelihood for all Sengwer until the mid of the last century.

As so many other ethnic minorities, the Sengwer were considered by the British to be served best if they were forced to assimilate with their dominant neighbors. Due to that their traditional structure was not recognized and integrated as independent ethnic group in the system of indirect rule, but as sub-structure of their neighbors. As their land in the plains of Trans Nzoia turned out to be the best area for agricultural production in Kenya, they were displaced entirely from there to make way for white farmers. A minority stayed behind as farm workers, but the majority went up into the forests of the Cherangany hills. When the government started to protect the water-catchments and forests in the 1920ies and 30ies as forest reserves, they acknowledged the presence of the Sengwer and provided them with all usufructuary rights for this area as well as the right to farm on the openings in the forest. They enjoyed these rights until the 1970ies, when a new fashion of conservation recommended that all hunting should be prohibited and forests should be cleansed of people.
As the Sengwer were not considered as independent group, they were also not invited to join the settlement schemes in which the independent Kenya redistributed the white farms to the farm workers and the dominant ethnic groups of the area. While most Sengwer are officially landless, some few Sengwer especially in the northern parts of the Cherangany hills received some land, but even this land is contested.

Livelihood
Before the colonial time, Sengwer used to be hunters and honey-gatherers. Following their contacts with the Arabs and the Maasai some adopted small scale agriculture (shifting cultivation) and/or livestock rearing, but it is said that hunting remained their main source of livelihood until the 1920s. The elders reported collective as well as individual hunting techniques. During the Sakas (collective hunt) a group of people would try to circle large animals such as elephants and buffalos on the plains and spear or arrow them down. In contrast, the Kwo (individual hunt) is carried out by a nuclear family and mostly based on the use of poisoned baits and/or traps.

Gathering of fruits and other non-timber-forest-products is mostly done by women, while honey collection from beehives as well as from natural places such as holes in trees etc. is traditionally a male activity. It has - beside being eaten - a variety of uses: Honey is mixed with water as a daily drink (breakfast), and used to brew beer; Honey plays a major role in marriages and other ceremonies. Before marriage, honey is given to the mother of the bride as part of the dowry. The night before the marriage, wife and husband had to smear honey on their future house, each starting in a different direction until they meet and unite. Honey has also medical use. People apply it to their body to drive away mosquitoes and against muscle pains. Another smelly mixture is spread around the compounds to keep wildlife at distance.

Millet and Sorghum are the “traditional” crops, which were inherited from the Arab traders and mostly planted in the lowlands. These days, maize, potatoes, beans and a variety of vegetable are grown. Before land became scarce, the Sengwer used shifting cultivation patterns and changed their farms every three years. Transplanting, harvesting transforming, marketing and preparing of crops is considered beside of gathering, the provision of water and the education of the children as core female activities.

The Sengwer learned to keep animals, especially cattle, from the Maasai, when these arrived in the area in the context of their expansion from the north. The herds of the Sengwer are - also due to the common cattle rustling - very small and milk and livestock mostly used for auto-consumption. Most of the ancestral land of the Sengwer is occupied either by other ethnic groups or demarcated as forests, which prohibit legal settlements or agriculture. It is said that around 20% of the Sengwer have legal access to land, but that these plots are on average only 2.5 acres per household, i.e. very small. The majority of the community members are landless. Significant parts of the ancestral lands have been demarcated as forests: Kapkanyar 70,000 acres; Kipteber 57,000 acres; Kapingot 10,800 acres; Chemurgoi 9,800 acres; Sogotio 8,800 acres; Kerer 5,340 acres; Kaisingor 2,680 acres and Embobut 8,000 acres. The problem of the Sengwer to access land and/or resources legally might best be described best through an assessment of the three communities visited:

The Embobut forest in the Marakwet district contains, according to local sources, approximately 5,000 Sengwer, which claim to have arrived in the area in the 1930s when they were displaced from the plains of Trans-Nzoia. The settlements are located right on top of the highest lines of the Cherangany hills, with a view into the Rift Valley and the plains of Trans-Nzoia on either side, but without roads, schools, health infrastructure as it is officially considered as forest. The people who took refuge there, report of ongoing conflicts with forest officials and neighboring communities. They commonly stated that the forest guards would arrive every three to four years to burn and destroy their houses and farms in the name of forest
conservation and to loot their property. In the meantime armed cattle rustlers would come time and again to take crops and cattle and shoot those who resisted. The Sengwer of the Embobut forest made clear that the local and central administration did not react on any complaints against the evictions, with the argument that the Sengwer are illegally in the area and due to that not entitled to any protection from the state and county council. Their average annual cash income is said to be around KSh 3,000 (USD 40) per household as significant parts of their production are taken away before they can market it.

The situation of the Sengwer of the Kapolet forest is not much better. Presently there are 487 Sengwer households living in this half-legal settlement, which had been given to them after they invaded a state lodge. The history of these people is closely linked to the quest of the Sengwer for land and recognition: In result of years of broken promises from side of the government approximately 2,000 Sengwer invaded on March, 22, 1997 a state owned farm in the plains (ADC Milimani) and stayed there even when their elders and leaders were arrested. After a month of serious fights, the government offered them a new settlement scheme in the Kapolet forest (in total over 3,000 acres) in exchange for a peaceful end of the invasion. The Sengwer accepted, and in a first phase 1,000 acres were demarcated for nearly 500 households, who moved in the same month, but the promised letters of allotment were not even issued by December 2005 with the official reason that the land is officially a forest and due to that not suitable for a settlement scheme. Due to the same reason, the second and third phase of the settlement scheme, which supposed to provide the entire 3,000 acres to Sengwer, have not yet started.

In view of legal access to land, the Sengwer of the Talau Location are quite lucky. All 755 households have letters of allotment and they are satisfied with the quality and size of their lands, but they also have significant problems: Only in 2005 about 20 Sengwer of this small location with a total population of around 4,000 people have been killed by cattle rustlers. The total loss of cattle is reported to be around 400 and the non-economic losses might be even higher as most families have to be on alert each night. The Sengwer complained bitterly that even those cattle which have been identified to be theirs, were not returned and that no support was coming from the government. In contrast, some rifles, which had been organized by the only Sengwer councilor to protect the lives and property of the Sengwer, have been confiscated by the police, leaving the Sengwer unarmed to stand well equipped intruders. From that perspective it is not surprising that most Sengwer feel marginalized by the government.

Social organization
Patrilineages led by the elders are the traditional form of self-organization. In contrast to other hunter-gatherer societies, the influence of the elders seems to be quite strong among the Sengwer and have also survived the advent of modern forms of self-organization. In their struggle for land and recognition the Sengwer-elites have created a good number of Community Based Organizations and NGOs among others the Sengwer Indigenous Development Project and the Hunter-Gatherer Forum of Kenya, Sengwer land allocation committee). These groups will be consulted during the stakeholder consultation period.

Those Sengwer who have managed to obtain legal access to land also received some form of representation at local and regional level. The Sengwer of the Talau location have a Sengwer sub-chief and also an elected councilor (who presently serves as assistant mayor) in the county council since 1971, while those Sengwer who remain in illegal (Embubut forest) or partly legal settlements (Kapolet forest), are not represented by one of their people, but by members of other ethnic groups in the area.

Ancestral Territories, Lands and Natural Resources
The Sengwer tribal boundary covers the whole of what is today’s Cherengany constituency, parts of Sabaot and Kwanza constituencies in Trans-Nzoia district, parts of Lugari district, parts of West and East Marakwet constituencies in Marakwet district, and parts of Kapenguria and Sogor constituencies in West Pokot district. Before the coming of the colonialists Sengwer lived in these areas from time immemorial
and bordered the Nandi, Pokot (Suk), Marakwet, Uasin Gishu Maasai, Keiyo, Karamojong (Uganda), Kony, and Sebei (Uganda) communities (Kiptum 2006).

The Sengwer claim to have used the forest continuously since the advent of colonial government. The Sengwer in West Pokot (Kapenguria and Kesogon) complain about Pokot cattle rustlers who steal their cattle, kill their people and hide in the forests. The ancestral land of the Sengwer commences from Kiporoom River in Uasin Gishu District and extents along Kapsumbeywet River through Ziwa (Sirikwa) center, Moiben Posta and Kose hills in Uasin Gishu from here it goes down to join Moiben River. The boundary goes up Moiben River to the confluence of Ko’ngipsebe and Kamowo streams. It turns eastwards to cover areas of Maron Sub-location in Emboput location in Marakwet District.

Turning to the West it then goes to Kamolookon along Marakwet/West Pokot and Marakwet boundary. From here it drops to Sebit, Somor, then to Kongelai and up along Swom River. From Swom river to the confluence of Swom and Cheptenden River and from hereto the confluence of Cheptenden River and Moiben River where these two Rivers confluence with Kiboroom (Kiptum 2002). Today, the Sengwer believe that land the Cherenganyi Hills and the plains was their ancestral land before it was taken away to make room for White settlements (KARI 2005).

**Alienation of Sengwer ancestral lands**

The alienation of Sengwer traditional territory has been going on systematically since the colonial times. The British colonial administrators alienated much of Sengwer land for European settlement. The Chairman of the Carter Land Commission (1932) was clear in stating that “there was no question of the Europeans’ land being handed back to the Sengwer”.

The Sengwer who occupied Soi (the plains of Kapchepkoilel) lost their land stretching from Kapkoi in Trans Nzoia through Naitiri to Turbo in Uasin Gishu to white settlers. Likewise, the territory from Turbo, through Ziwa (Sirikwa) all the way to Moiben was also lost to colonial settlement. Other communities which took over land belonging to the Sengwer include Marakwet, Keiyo, Pokot (Suk), Nandi, and recently other migrants such as Kikuyu, Akamba, Kisii and a few Turkana. The Marakwet for example settled in between the Moyben and the Ndungiserr and spread beyond over the Cherenganyi country. In 1938 and 1939, meetings were held at Lelan in Cherenganyi to consider the claims of the members of the Cherengayi tribe to expel the Elgeyo who occupied the Cherenganyi location.

This claim was based on prior occupation by the Cherenganyi and bad behavior taught to the Cherenganyi by the young people of the Elgeyo. In 1939 there were 50 Elgeyo immigrants owning approximately 1,200 hectares of land belonging to the Sengwer. A large area of Sengwer land was converted into forests and thus denying access to their home, herbal medicine, food and peaceful coexistence with nature. In 1943 for example, some of the Cherenganyi ‘Dorobo’ once more attempted to return to Kapolet Forest reserve in spite of the police raid and severe penalties imposed on them. The then Assistant Conservator of forests instructed the District Commissioner to shift them once and for all from the forest into West Suk.

The following are some of the Sengwer ancestral lands that were converted into forest:-

1. Kapkanyar 70,000 acres
2. Kipteber 57,000 acres
3. Kapolet 10,800 acres
4. Chemurgoi 9,800 acres
5. Sogotio 8,800 acres
6. Kerer 5,340 acres
7. Kaisingor 2,680 acres
8. Empoput 8,000 acres
Part of Sengwer ancestral land in Trans Nzoia was converted into a game park. It is now known as Saiwa Swamp National Park. This was and is still a home for wild animals. This area was one of the most prestigious hunting areas of the Sengwer people. Immediately, after independence most of the land left by the Europeans was given out as settlement schemes to groups and individuals while the remaining portion was made Agricultural Development Cooperation (ADC) farms run by the government. After independence Sengwer territory continued to be lost to other groups such as the Marakwet, Kisii and Kikuyu.

**Forced Assimilation and Loss of Identity**

Assimilation policies and lack of recognition of separate and distinct identities of hunter-gatherers in Kenya began in colonial days, when it was decided that they be absorbed into larger ethnic communities. In 1932, Mr. A.C. Hoey giving evidence before the Kenya Land Commission had an idea “of amalgamating the Elgeyo and Marakwet and Cherenganyi (Sengwer) into one tribe” without the right to identity, right to profess and enjoy their cultural values and traditions. While other communities were given native reserves, Sengwer community was not considered. The colonial administration also promoted livestock keeping and potato planting for purposes of transforming the hunter/gatherer livelihood systems of the Sengwer and in so doing undermined Sengwer culture, language, customs and laws. This strategy was also aimed at getting the Sengwer out of the forest. The post-independence government also failed to provide for a classification of hunter-gatherers as separate groups, and by imposing a ban on hunting in 1970s, the independent government imposed more changes of the livelihoods of the Sengwer.

**Land tenure among the Sengwer (past and present)**

Discussions with the community revealed that only about 70 per cent of them have partial ownership of land, having been issued with allotment letters by the government. The area around Kapolet forest is still gazetted as forest land not available for settlement. Those in Emboput forest are literally squatters with no papers which exposes them to regular evictions. Sengwer resettlement along the Kapolet and the Emboput forests face more problems associated with land ownership. The Sengwer in Talau location in Kapenguria (West Pokot district) are relatively better off, in that they have ownership documents and have relatively made more investment on their land (KARI 2005).

**The current status of Indigenous Sengwer**

The Sengwer have increasingly been restricted to areas with home ‘bases’ involving agriculture and livestock rearing and outlying areas where some honey gathering is still practiced. The Sengwer continue to experience expropriation of their land and restrictions on access to natural resources- especially forests and water- which have further increased their sedentarization, marginalization, social discrimination, and impoverishment. Even though they are considered, from the formal legal point of view, as citizens equal to all other Kenyans, they do not have the same access to land and other resources, protection against cattle rustlers, social and political influence, legal status and/or organizational, technical or economic capacities as other Kenyan citizens. The Sengwer can be characterized thus:

- The incomes of indigenous peoples are only about one third of those of other rural Kenyan households.
- Most of them are landless, and lack legal access to natural resources or other assets for income generation.
- They are ill equipped to defend even the informal, de facto access that they retain to the remnants of their ‘homelands’ from encroachment or restriction by outside authorities and interests
- They do not have the institutional capacity or degree of empowerment that will enable them to benefit from reform processes in the forestry, water and lands sectors which are intended to give more say to communities in the management of resources that are central to this project.
• Few indigenous people hold positions in government, even at junior levels (such as chiefs and sub-chiefs).
• Face further physical and economic displacements from their lands and forests traditionally utilized by them as a source of livelihood and basis for their cultural and social survival;
• Lose all legal access to natural resources, which are an important source of livelihood and basis for their cultural and social system;
• Continue to be harassed by cattle rustlers;
• Become even more marginalized in the society and become alienated from national life;
• Receive less support from governmental services;
• Have less capacities to defend their legal rights;
• Become or remain dependent on other ethnic groups;
• Lose their cultural and social identity;
• They have little representation even as local government councilors, let alone at higher political levels, and are thus administered and represented by members of non-governmental groups (NGOs)

13.7.2 Ogiek

The Ogiek (Ogiot - sing.) ethnic group consists of 20-30 groups of former hunters and honey-gatherers, mostly living in forested highlands in western Kenya. Local groups have more specific names, e.g., Kaplelach, Kipsang'any, Kapchepkendi e.t.c. Okiek, a Kalenjin language of the Southern Nilotic group, is the mother tongue of most Ogiek people, but several groups now speak Maasai as their first language. Traditionally the Ogiek had occupied most of the forests in the extreme west and south of Western Kenya, but today their main area of living is in and around the Mau forest, which is not part of the operational areas. Nevertheless, some Ogiek groups are found in the Upper Yala catchment near the villages Serengoni, Senghalo (Nandi South), in the Kipkurere forest (Nandi South) and some live scattered in the Uasin Gishu district.

Most publications (Ogiek.org etc.) and most NGOs assume that the hunter-gatherers at Mt. Elgon belong to the Ogiek and that they are not – as they claim - an independent hunter-gatherer group. Their argument is not very convincing as they address themselves as Dorobo, which is – as said before - the Maa word for people without cattle, while they share most cultural practices with the Ogiek. Precise demographic figures are not available as the last national census did not count the Ogiek as an independent group.

History

Knowledge of Ogiek history before 1900 is limited. Oral history traces back the origin to the Kiplombe hills near Siswek. It is said that all Ogiek have lived there before a famine forced some of them to migrate to the Mau and Tindiret forests. Before the advent of the colonialists, they were already involved in the local and regional trading networks, bartering honey and meat for agricultural products.

Colonial administration affected Ogiek groups in different ways. Between the 1920s and 1940s, many Ogiek were displaced from their lands by European farmers, while others – especially deeper in the forests – received at least full usufructuary rights for their lands, which were transformed into forest reserves. Initially they had limited direct government interaction, but felt colonial policies through the ever increasing encroachment of their neighbours, who were forced into the forests by the government to create space for the farms in the plains. Due to the reduction of land and increasing hunting pressure, the Ogiek gradually diversified their economy, adding agriculture and/or herding to the traditional hunter-gatherer lifestyle.

Livelihood
Traditionally the Ogiek divided land into lineage-owned tracts stretching along the escarpment slope. Tracts transected four or five ecological zones, giving families access to honey and game during each season. Residence groups were small extended families, patrilineal cores that might be joined by affine and matrilineal relatives. Six to ten adjacent lineages constituted a named local group, i.e. a significant unit of cultural identity and history.

Unlike many other hunter-gatherers, beside of honey, Ogiek collect hardly any plants, fruits or non-timber-forest-products from the forest. Honey is eaten, stored for future use, brewed into beer and traded. It is said to have been the main product for the barter with their agricultural and/or pastoralist neighbours. Traditionally the Ogiek hunt with dogs, bows and arrows, spears, clubs and poison. Traditionally they were going for buffalos, elephants, duikers, hyraxes, bongos, and giant forest hogs. Now that hunting is illegal, they only hunt with small traps around their garden farms resulting in some meat from monkeys and other smaller game.

Starting in the 1920ies the Ogiek stated to cultivate small millet and maize gardens due to reduced production from the forest. This led to a more sedentary lifestyle in mid altitude forest and - in turn - a further increase of agriculture and/or pastoralism. Today, agriculture is the main source of subsistence and income, which is supported through some livestock rearing, hunting (which is illegal) and bee-keeping. Honey gathering is still a key activity and carried out the traditional way, with few Ogiek using modern bee-hives and/or processing the honey for regional markets. Blackburn concludes: "without honey and condition of getting it, Ogiek life would be entirely different. This explains why the Ogiek live in the forest" (Blackburn 1974:151).

The economic activities are organized by gender groups: Men traditionally make beehives; collect honey, hunt and these days herd cattle and/or clear land to plant maize and beans. Women's work traditionally included building the houses under thick canopies (Sanet) and the making of leather bags, straps and clothing. Today they concentrate on the planting and harvesting of crops, the processing and cooking of food, the maintaining of firewood and water supplies and the childcare.

Their access to land varies very much from village to village. Before independence most Ogiek lived on state or trust land (i.e. in the forests) with all usufructuary rights, but no letters of allotment. Following independence, the land reform and the general land demarcation in 1969 usufructuary rights were outlawed. Legal access to land is now channelled through individual land titles and - in the Maasai-dominated districts – group ranches. Group-ranch demarcation began in the 1970s, crossing lineage land boundaries, incorporating non-Ogiek into some groups, and registering significant parts of Ogiek land to non-Ogiek. During the same time, the Ogiek were evicted from the forest reserves. As they were not provided with any land or compensation most had to go back and live illegally in the forests until the next eviction-team would show up. The regular evictions, arrests and loss of property, crops and even lives further increased the poverty of the Ogiek, underlined their social discrimination and cemented their marginalization.

Those Ogiek that managed to obtain group-ranch titles, started in the 80ties and 90ties to divide the land into individual plots following the example of their neighbours and supported by governmental services. Settlement patterns shifted again as people moved to live on their own land, but it also attracted many Ogiek to lease or sell their lands to other ethnic groups. Many of these land sales were technically illegal as they were made before group-ranches were legally divided and many sales were undertaken before Ogiek learned about the market value of their land and at ridiculously low prices. Today the majority of the Ogiek have still no legal access to land or any source of livelihood and live at the mercy of their non-Ogiek neighbours and local and national governments in which they are not represented (Huntingford 1929, 1954; Blackburn 1976, 1982; Kratz 1981, 1994; Marshall 1994; Tuweit 2004).

**Social organization**
Ogiek live in local groups dispersed throughout the highlands, typically near one or more other Ogiek groups and adjacent to more populous ethnic groups. In quite a good number of cases Ogiek speak their neighbours’ language better than their own. Ogiek groups thus have distinctive histories of interaction with one another, with their neighbours, and with local government administration. Modes of social organization vary among Ogiek groups, but in general one can say that patrilineages are central in land holding and residence, legal matters, inheritance, and marriage arrangement, while matrilineal and affine relations are important for ceremonial occasions, in some residential and work groups, and in emotional terms. Further units are the age-sets, which create relationships among members, crosscutting relations defined by lineage and clan. Women have no separate age-sets, but become associated with male age-sets through relatives. Political and legal matters are discussed in meetings of men.

Depending on the issue, gatherings involve men from one lineage, several lineages, or a large neighborhood. All adult men have the right to attend and speak at meetings, though older men often speak more extensively. This changes of course in meetings with officials as most elders don’t speak Swahili or English. Women were traditionally excluded from formal councils, but this traditional setting is no longer ruling as government officials and external visitors demand and invite the presence of all gender groups (Huntingford 1929, 1954; Blackburn 1976, 1982; Kratz 1981, 1994; Marshall 1994).

13.7.3 Turkana

The Turkana people are the second largest of the pastoral people of Kenya with a population of 1,034,000. They occupy the far northwest corner of the nation, an area of about 67,000 square kilometers. Turkana tribe is the second largest pastoral community in Kenya. This nomadic community moved to Kenya from Karamojong in eastern Uganda. The Turkana tribe occupies the semi Desert Turkana District in the Rift valley province of Kenya. Around 1700, the Turkana emigrated from the Uganda area over a period of years. They took over the area which is the Turkana district today by simply displacing the existing people of the area. Turkana warriors today still take pride in their reputation as the most fearless fighters in East Africa. Adherence to the traditional religion is weak and seems almost nonchalant among the Turkana.

Location in the Country - Rift Valley Province, Turkana, Samburu, Trans-Nzoia, Laikipia, Isiolo districts, west and south of Lake Turkana; Turkwel and Kerio rivers

Livelihood: Like the Maasai and tribes, Turkana people keeps herds of cattle, goats and Camel. Livestock is a very important part of the Turkana people. Their animals are the main source of income and food. However, recurring drought in Turkana district adversely affect the nomadic livelihood. Turkana’s have also pursued other non-pastoral income-earning activity in both urban and rural environments. This includes various forms of wholesale and retail trade (e.g. selling livestock, milk, hides and skins, honey, and artisan goods etc.), traditional rental property ownership and sales, waged employment (local and non-local, including working as a hired herder, farm worker, and migrant laborer), farming (subsistence and commercial), and the gathering and selling of wild products (e.g. gum arabic, firewood, or medicinal plants). The sale of livestock and milk products at the herd gate are not included in this definition, nor are herd diversification strategies that instigate a mix of animal species to cope with drought etc. Over recent years, Turkanas have also had to employ other supportive activities to supplement pastoralism, which has proved to be ineffective in meeting all their economic and social needs. Key areas of activity include sedentary agriculture, particularly along the Turkwel River, where settled farmers and agro-pastoralists grow maize, sorghum, sukuma, oranges, mangoes, bananas and vegetables.

Fishing in Lake Turkana is another, long standing, form of diversification. Fishermen along Lake Turkana migrate to follow the patterns of fish movement. The pastoralists also supplement their livelihoods by
selling the fish. Many of them have also taken up weaving mats and baskets particularly near the lake where weaving material is readily available from the Doum Palm. Other natural resource-based livelihood diversification activities have included the collection and sale of aloe, gum arabic, honey, wild fruits, firewood, and the production and sale of charcoal and alcohol. In addition, there is now more emphasis on the processing and sale of skins and hides.

Cultural Profile: The biggest events for life of Turkana are marriage and child birth. Other cultural rituals such as circumcision are completed with little ceremony. The marriage however, may be in process for as long as three years. Subsequent to the payment of bride price, the wife to be is brought into the home of her husband. The wedding ceremony is not performed until after at least one healthy child is weaned. Houses are constructed over a wooden framework of domed saplings on which fronds of the Doum Palm tree *Hyphaene thebaica*, hides or skins, are thatched and lashed on. The house is large enough to house a family of six. Usually during the wet season they are elongated and covered with cow dung. Animals are kept in a brush wood pen. Due to changes in the climatic conditions most Turkana have started changing from the traditional method of herding cattle to agro-pastoralism. Traditionally, men and women both wear wraps made of rectangular woven materials and animal skins. Today these cloths are normally purchased, having been manufactured in Nairobi or elsewhere in Kenya. Often men wear their wraps similar to tunics, with one end connected with the other end over the right shoulder, and carry wrist knives made of steel and goat hide. Men also carry stools (known as ekicholong) and will use these for simple chairs rather than sitting on the hot midday sand. These stools also double as headrests, keeping one's head elevated from the sand, and protecting any ceremonial head decorations from being damaged.

It is also not uncommon for men to carry several staves; one is used for walking and balance when carrying loads; the other, usually slimmer and longer, is used to prod livestock during herding activities. Women will customarily wear necklaces, and will shave their hair completely which often has beads attached to the loose ends of hair. Men wear their hair shaved. Women wear two pieces of cloth, one being wrapped around the waist while the other covers the top. Traditionally leather wraps covered with ostrich egg shell beads were the norm for women's undergarments, though these are now uncommon in many areas. The Turkana people have elaborate clothing and adornment styles. Clothing is used to distinguish between age groups, development stages, occasions and status of individuals or groups in the Turkana community.

13.7.4 Rendille

The Rendille are a Cushitic tribe that inhabits the climatically harsh region between Marsabit hills and Lake Turkana in Northern Kenya where they neighbor the Borana, Gabbra, Samburu and Turkana tribes. They (Rendile) consist of nine clans and seven sub clans. They are culturally similar to the Gabbra, having adopted some Borana customs and being related to the Somali people to the east. Rendille are semi-nomadic pastoralists whose most important animal is the camel. The original home of the Rendille people was in Ethiopia. They were forced to migrate southwards into Kenya due to frequent conflicts with the Oromo tribe over pasture and water for their animals. Being pastoralists, the lifestyle of the Rendille revolves around their livestock. In the northerly areas, camels are their main source of livelihood. This is because camels are best adapted to the desert conditions that prevail in the northern Kenya. The camels are an important source of milk and meat for the Rendille people. When migrating to new pastures, the camels are also used to carry all the family possessions in a specially designed saddle. The Rendille people living in the southern and less dry part of their region have had a good relationship with their Samburu neighbors where intermarriage with the Samburu has led to the emergence of a hybrid culture. Their ceremonies are similar to the Old Testament Jewish traditions, providing a basis for discussion of Christ's sacrifice and an opportune introduction to personal salvation.

Traditionally the Rendille are a very religious people, believing in one God, an omnipresent creator and provider who answers prayer and cares for the poor. They practice many magical rituals, involving their
canals or sheep. For example, the way a certain bull camel approaches a proposed new settlement area is taken as a good or bad omen. A propitious camel may be placed outside the camp facing the direction of an expected enemy attack in order to prevent the attack. Age-sets are the main component of Rendille society.

The oral history of this Cushitic tribe indicates they are of Jewish descent. They traveled through the Suez Canal through Ethiopia to their present homeland. They descended through the Cushitic family lines with the Somali people. When the Somali people were traveling from the Suez Canal through Ethiopia the Somali people chose to go toward Somalia for good pastures. The Rendille people refused to go with them and separated to their present homeland around Marsabit.

They had rejected the land of the Somali's and were thereafter called Rertit. The Somalis consider them rejected people. Their name "Rendille" is a colonial misinterpretation of the word "rertit", which means separated, refused or rejected in the Somali and Rendille languages. The Rendille occupy an area in Northeastern Province of Kenya from the Merille River and Serolivi in the South to Loyangalani in the North from Marsabit and Merti in the East to Lontolio in the West. The climate of their homeland is semi arid. The Rendille people speak Rendille, which is very close to Somali but is spoken more slowly. Many Rendille also speak Samburu (the tribe neighboring them to the South). Those of the Rendille language are called Rendille and those who speak Samburu are called Arielle Rendille.

There are about eight or nine sub clans including the Urowen, Dispahai, Rongumo, Lukumai (Nahgan), Tupsha, Garteilan, Matarbah, Otola, and Saale with an estimated population of 63,000.

**Location in the Country**: Eastern Province, Marsabit District, between Lake Turkana and Marsabit Mt. The primary towns include Marsabet, Laisamis, Merille, Logologo, Loyangalani, Korr, Kamboi, Ngurunit, and Kargi.

**Livelihood**: The Rendille people are traditionally pastoralists keeping goats, sheep, cattle, donkeys, and camels. Their nomadic lifestyle is become more prominent in the areas exposed to little urbanization and modernization. In the recent past though, their livelihood has experienced constant competing interests from the Samburus and Gabras leading them to constant conflict over land and water resources particularly at the borderline of the boundary districts. In the most cases, the raids and conflicts have had the objective to replenish their herds depleted by severe droughts, diseases, raiding or other calamities. Elders often sanction the raids blessing raiders before they set off. During draught some take little lambs to the raga or laga (dry river bed) and sacrifice them to god asking for rain. Others go to Mount Moile where the women sing and pour milk and men offer sacrifices of goats to the gods and ask for rain.

**Cultural Profile**: In terms of creed, many Rendille practice a traditional religion centered on the worship of Waaq/Wakh. In the related Oromo culture, Waaq denotes the single god of the early pre-Abrahamic, montheistic faith believed to have been adhered to by Cushitic groups. Some Rendille have also adopted Islam or Christianity. Initiation rituals take place precisely every seven or fourteen years, creating a series of generational age-sets, each with its own role in society. In the common Kenyan practice, the first initiation is circumcision. Men have many stages of warrior-hood, but women are simply married or unmarried.

Traditional dress includes beautiful beads worn by the women around the neck, wrists, and ankles. Children can often be seen without clothing. The moran wears colorful shukas (clothe wrapped around their bodies) and colors their hair with a mud/mineral mixture. Men often wear a wrapped cloth rather than trousers. Western clothing is becoming more popular, but more among the men than the women. Ancestral spirits of deceased men must be appeased. Among some of the Rendille, after a man dies, the manyatta will be burned, a sheep slaughtered, and the family must move to another place. Rites of
passage include the young men (moran) living in the bush, learning traditional skills, and undergoing traditional circumcision. Men marry after circumcision and the time of becoming a moran is as young as about eighteen to twenty years.

The Rendille are organized into an age grade system of patrilineal lineage groups (keiya), which are subsumed under fifteen clans (goup). Of those, only nine are considered authentic Rendille. These Northern Rendille or Rendille proper are consequently the only ones that are included in the traditional Rendille moiety (belesi). The remaining six clans that are excluded from the moiety consist of mixed individuals. Five of those clans are of Rendille (Cushitic) and Samburu (Nilotic) descent. Collectively, the latter hybrid groups are referred to as the Ariaal or Southern Rendille.

13.7.5 Gabra
The Gabra are an Oromo people who live as camel-herding nomads, mainly in the Chalbi desert of northern Kenya and the highlands of southern Ethiopia. They are closely associated with other Oromo, especially their non-nomadic neighbors, the Borana. The Gabra speak the Borana dialect of Oromo, which belongs to the Cushitic branch of the Afro-Asiatic language family. Population: 3,000

Location in the Country: Samburu District, Lake Baringo south and east shores; Rift Valley Province (Chamus), Baringo District

Livelihood: Gabra are pastoralists who keep and depend on cattle, sheep, goats, donkey, and camels. They solely rely on access to water and pastures for the survival of their livestock. Typical Gabra household keeps 5-10 cattle; 20-25 goats; 15-20 sheep; and 0-5 camels. Cattle provide the majority of income from livestock production followed by goats, sheep, and camels. Majority of the grain consumed by Gabra household in this zone is purchased. This includes maize, rice, and sugar. Households also rely on the wild food including fruits and berries, honey, roots, and tubers. Climate change has had an impact on new weather patterns and prolonged drought pushing the Gabra community to frequent water shortages. As a result leading to mass migration their migration in search of pastures and water for their animals. They have a conglomerate of peoples living north of the Tana River in Kenya, the area around Lake Turkana and the highlands of southern Ethiopia.

For the Gabra, to live in balance with a trying environment is to protect land, animal, and fellow Gabra. Thus, they practice certain food and plant taboos; preserve full-grown trees called "korma" (bulls), and revere pregnant women and pregnant animals. As resource managers, they migrate to the highlands during the rainy season to allow the dry season pasture to replenish its water resources. Perhaps most symbolic of the Gabra's identity is the proverb: "a poor man shames us all." Since mutual support is imperative for their survival as nomads, no Gabra may be allowed to go hungry, go without animals, or be refused hospitality or assistance. A person who refuses to help others is labeled "al baku," a stigma that stays affixed to the family for generations. The practice of camel lending exemplifies this support system.

The Gabra have a mixed-livestock economy consisting of camels, cattle, sheep, and goats. It is almost entirely based on reciprocity. Most central to the way of life and economy is the camel. When a Gabra comes into possession of a camel, it's named to ensure the Gabra's right of ownership. The camel will be loaned or given to other Gabra in need, and a future act of reciprocity will be expected. In this sense, camels provide great security; they also provide most of the meat and the dry season's supply of milk. The also transport goods and water from foraging areas to surrounding villages. Selling camels and their by-products to outsiders is taboo. Villages and camps are outside foraging grounds for several reasons: camels are unpredictable, don't forage near their own dung, and destroy the vegetation within nine miles. The Gabra split their camps into two sites. The settlement - "i"ola" - ranges from three to twenty-five huts. Satellite camps - "fora" - are smaller and far from the settlement. In fora, young men watch over part of
the clan's herds to prevent pastures from being consumed too quickly. Splitting the herd also protects it from thieves, disease, or other disaster.

Cultural Profile: Since many young Gabra men are separated from the main camp for long periods of time, marriages are often postponed. In fact, 50 percent of Gabra women are unmarried until well into their thirties. This, along with the Gabra's postpartum sex taboo, controls the population. Living in the fora also excludes young men from the political and social activities of the main camp. Young men of herding age (19-33) qualify as "pre-adults" in men's five-stage life cycle. The stages are (1) children; (2) men aged 19-33; (3) male political elders, a status achieved when a man marries; (4) spiritual elders; and (5) retired elders. These stages, ideally separated by eight years, are usually initiated with a long pilgrimage to the shrines of mythical founders. Gabra life is labor-intensive, so everyone has specific tasks. Although the men decide when to migrate, women pack and unpack the camp site before and after migration. In fact, women "own" the huts and have complete authority over them. From age 7, children work six to seven hours a day, mainly tending the animals, while grandmothers largely rear and educate the young. Men are active in three levels of political and judicial administration. The camp is run by its headman.

The district is comprised of a number of camps, whose council of men decides on stock, organization, raids, defense, disputes, and assistance for victims of stock epidemics and raids. The five phratries, the largest regional group, have assemblies that serve as a mobile judicial, administrative, and spiritual hubs. Women's political contributions are subtle. Although they refer to themselves as children in regard to the political process, and although men demean the contributions women make, men often defer to women in certain matters.

The Gabra's ornamentation and physical culture is similar to many other Cushitic-speaking camel herders. The latter include the Rendille and Somali, all of whom the Gabra describe as warra dassee ("people of the mat"), in reference to the mat-covered, portable tents, which accompany their nomadic lifestyle. The Borana, on the other hand, are described by the Gabbra as warrra buyyoo ("people of the grass"), in reference to the grass huts that characterize their sedentary lifestyle. Gabra homes, called mandasse, are light, dome-shaped tents made of acacia roots, and covered with sisal grass mats, textiles, and camel hides. Each mandasse is divided into four quarters; a public quadrant each for male visitors, female visitors, and a private quadrant each for parents and children. A mandasse can be completely disassembled and converted into a camel-carried palanquin in which children and the elderly travel. Gabra live in small villages, or ola made up of several mandasse. Ola move short distances as many as twelve times per year, in search of better grazing for the camels and other animals the Gabra rely on.

13.7.6 Ajuran

The Ajuran are ethnically Somalis. They were a kingdom that ruled Somalia before the advent of Europeans into Africa. When the rest of the Somalis got fed up with their rule they took up arms against them in war popularly known as Eji iyo Ajuran meaning the rest of Somalis vs. the Ajuran. The wars that ensued deposed the kingdom and drove some of the Ajuran as far as where they live today in the North Eastern Kenya and Eastern part of Ethiopia. Some of those who settled in present day Kenya eventually adopted the language and customs of their neighbors and hosts, the Borana. The Ajuran are best known in Somali history for establishing the Gareen dynasty based in Qalaafo (now part of Ethiopia). The Gareen dynasty ruled parts of East Africa from the 16th to the 20th century. Among the Kenyan Ajuran people, the majority speak the Borana language as their first language while others speak the Somali language as their first language especially those from Wajir North District in the areas of Wakhe and Garren. It is vital to note that since Somali is the language of wider communication in Northeastern Province, even the Ajuran who speak Borana as their first language learn the language. The link between the Garreh and Ajuran is their primary language which is Borana and not Somali. Population: 59,000.
Location in the Country: Eastern Province, Marsabit, Isiolo and Moyale districts, Wajir North

Livelihood: The Ajurans, like the rest other Somali tribes of Northern Kenya have traditionally lived a nomadic life. This way of life is dictated by the climate which is semi-arid with two seasonal rains. They follow water and pasture for the animals they keep such as cattle, camels, goats, sheep, donkeys and mules that provide them their livelihood. Where the land is good for farming there are settled populations growing corn, millet, sorghum and some fruits and vegetables. The Ajuran live in an area with relatively high rainfall and good pasture for their animals. However, this blessing has on many occasions become troublesome to them in terms of marauding neighbors in need of the same resources. The intrusion by others has periodically resulted in clashes. Today, the Ajuran allow others to live and pasture their animals in their communal land. Some of the main causes of their vulnerability include the following: erosion of assets due to armed conflict during intermittent inter/intra-clan conflict, resulting in poverty; protracted conflict and insecurity; Systematic marginalisation and discrimination based on ethnicity and caste; poor access to economic/employment opportunities. Ajuran population travel great distances in search of food, pasture and water especially during times of stress as a key coping mechanism. Notably, their right and ability of the transhumant pastoralists to eventually return to their homes characterizes this type of seasonal movement and gives rise to certain analyses. Of importance in the understanding of vulnerability are the changes in displacement trends.

Cultural Profile: The Ajuran clan is divided into seven (7) sub-clans, which are further divided into sections and sub-sections. Currently there are only two sub-clans the Walmega and Wakhle sub-clans that greatly live in Wajir County of North Eastern Region, Kenya. They also partly live in lower Jubbah in Somalia and Region five (5) of Ethiopia. Some of those who settled in present day Kenya eventually adopted the language and customs of their neighbours and hosts, the Borana. Among the Kenyan Ajuran people, the majority speak the Borana language as their first language while others speak the Somali language as their first language especially those from Wajir North District in the areas of Wakhle and Garren sections. It is vital to note that since Somali is the language of wider communication in Northeastern Province, even the Ajuran who speak Borana as their first language learnt the language as they assimilated with Boranas during the great migration.

13.7.7 Maasai
Kenya's most well-known ethnic tribe, the Maasai (or Masai) are semi-nomadic people located primarily in Kenya and northern Tanzania. They are considered to be part of the Nilotic family of African tribal groups, just as the Scilluk from Sudan and the Acholi from Uganda. The Maasai probably migrated from the Nile valley in Ethiopia and Sudan to Maasailand (central and south-western Kenya and northern Tanzania) sometime around 1600 AD, along the route of lakes Chew Bahir and Turkana (ex Rudolph), bringing their domesticated cattle with them. Once considered fierce warriors, feared by all tribes in the zone, the Maasai lost most of their power during the late XIX century, as a consequence of a string of natural and historic calamities. They were hit by drought, smallpox, and cattle pest, and contemporarily had to mourn the departure of Laibon Mbatiani, their respected and much admired leader, direct descendant of the mythical OlMasinta, founder of the tribe. The Maasai speak the Maasai language, an Eastern Nilotic language closely related to Samburu (or Sampur), the language of the Samburu people of central Kenya, and to Camus spoken south and southeast of Lake Baringo. Population: 684,000

Location in the Country: Rift Valley Province, Kajiado and Narok districts
Livelihood:
The Maasai are cattle and goat herders, their economy almost exclusively based on their animal stock, from which they take most of their food: meat, milk, and even blood, as certain sacred rituals involve the drinking of cow blood. Moreover, the huts of the Maasai are built from dried cattle dung.

Cultural Profile: In spite of their reputation as fierce warriors, Maasai culture revolves around their cattle. One of their spiritual beliefs is that their rain god Ngai gave all cattle to the Maasai people, and therefore anyone else who possesses cattle must have stolen them from the Maasai. This has led to some fatal altercations with other tribes of the regions over the centuries when they attempt to reclaim their "property". Despite the growth of modern civilization, the Maasai have largely managed to maintain their traditional ways, although this becomes more challenging each year. Circumcision is performed on both sexes, with the elder men circumcising the teenage boys (who are not permitted to make a noise during the ceremony), and the elder women circumcising the teenage girls (for whom crying is permitted). Attempts by the Kenyan government to stamp out female circumcision have failed, primarily due to the fact that it is the Maasai women who defend the practice, not the men.

Natural Environment: The ability to graze their cattle over large territories, for example, has diminished considerably in recent years, due to increased urbanisation and the declaration of the Maasai Mara and Serengeti game reserves, which was all formerly Maasai grazing land.

13.7.8 Ildhamus
They are originally a pastoralist people who used to live on the mainland but due to clashes they have been forced to migrate to an island in Lake Baringo. It is a very traditional and culturally bound society, hierarchical and male-dominated. They live from fishing in small boats made of balsam tree that dates back maybe a thousand years. They also do some souvenirs and they have some livestock. Many are uneducated and illiterate. They are eager to learn new things, participating and seemingly eager to create a better life. They communicate mainly in their local language.

Population: 34,000

Location in the Country: Southeast and south shore of Lake Baringo, and southwest shore as far north as Kampi ya Samaki.

Livelihood: The majority of the Ilchamus practice both livestock rearing and agriculture, but on the islands in Lake Baringo there are about 800 Ilchamus who live nearly entirely from fishing. The mainland Ilchamus are semi-pastoralists with a long history of small scale agriculture. The main types of livestock owned by the Ilchamus are cattle (zebus), sheep (red maasai and dopper cross) and goats (small east African), but their herds are significantly smaller than those of their neighbours. The key problems here are the insufficient security against aggressions from their neighbours, access to water and pressure of other people on their land due to the non-existence of land titles. The nearest markets are at Marigat and Kiserian.

The Ilchamus fishing communities, on four of the seven islands of Lake Baringo, has a total population of around 800 people, are even more disfavoured. Due to the absence of significant rains and irrigation systems, they don’t cultivate anything and the grazing areas on the island sustain only very limited numbers of livestock. The only source of income is fishing and for about ten people on the main island (Ol Kokwai), jobs in the Baringo island camp. Income from fishing (Tilapia, Catfish and Mudfish) has reduced significantly over the last years as industrial fishing carried out in 70s and 80s from the mainland and by migrants from other areas has significantly reduced the stocks. As they are unable to stop fishing to allow the stock to recover, even their very limited fishing reduces the stocks further. The ever reducing stocks are associated by the villagers to environmental degrading (sedimentation from erosion along the
contributors) and overexploitation in the 70s and early 80s, and on the other hand to the increasing population of crocodiles, which are totally protected and are said to affect not only the fish stocks, but also cause significant losses of livestock and even human lives.

The fishing itself is carried out by the men, while the women smoke and market the fish on the mainland. Revenues are small and hardly able to provide enough cash to buy maize etc. to feed the islanders. Famine seems to be a common problem and is mostly covered by subsidies from the owner of the Lake Baringo island camp and other white families, who have houses on the islands. While this secures the survival of the Ilchamus during famines, it also increases their dependency and marginalisation. Agriculture is carried out at very small scale and nearly entirely for subsistence due to limited rainfalls in the area and due to the fact that the Ilchamus have been displaced from their former land in which they had established small scale irrigation schemes. Two modern irrigation schemes (with small dams) at the Perkerra and Molo Rivers have enhanced the situation and enable the families involved to produce enough to even commerce parts of it. The main products cultivated are maize, beans and millet.

Cultural Profile: Traditionally the Ilchamus don’t seem to have any central authority, but are ruled by the elders of the patrilineages. The Ilchamus claim that structures above the level of the clan were first introduced in the 60s in preparation of independence. The first sub-chief was elected around 1970. Presently, Ilchamus chiefs and councillors have been elected in all six locations where they constitute the majority, but in none where they are in the minority. Because of their being considered as a Maasai subgroup and due to that as nomadic herders, their relation to and dependence on land for their small scale agriculture have not been considered when “developing” the area. The Ilchamus have been moved around by all kinds of people and for all kinds of activities and interests. The last major displacement took place in the 40s and 50s, when significant Ilchamus populations were moved away for the Perkerra Irrigation scheme near Marigat.

13.7.9 Aweer

The Aweer are a remnant hunter-gatherer group living along the Kenyan coast in Lamu District on the mainland. In the last 30 years, the Aweer have faced very difficult times. In 1967, their homeland became a battle field in the war between Kenya and Somalia. In Kenya today, they are a vulnerable group, struggling to survive, in search of a new identity. Traditionally they depend on their elders for leadership and do not normally meet for village discussion. There are some men who have more than one wife, and each wife has her own house in which she lives with her children. The husband does not have his own home but lives with each wife periodically. Population: 8,000

Location in the Country: Coast Province, behind Lamu, and Tana River districts in forests; North-Eastern Province, Garissa District.

Livelihood: Hunters and Gatherers. They are indigenous hunter/gatherers famous for their longbows and poison arrows. The Aweer are often referred to - and even sometimes refer to themselves - as the "Boni". Considered by some as pejorative, Boni is based on the swahili word "kubuni" which means 'to move', in reference to their proclivity, historically, to move around in pursuit of their livelihoods, rather than settle in one place. The lives of the Aweer were drastically changed when the Kenyan government curtailed their traditional way of life as a response to the insecurity of the region after the Shifta War (1963–1967), forcing them to settle in villages along the Hindi-Kiunga Road on Government Land between the Boni National Reserve and the Dodori National Reserve while adopting slash and burn agriculture.

The Aweer are also best known for its unusual practice of using semi-domesticated birds to find honey, with whistling signals. Their remote territory is heavily wooded and the tribes are traditionally hunter-gathers, rather than the typical Kenyan cattle herders. They live off forest resources and farming in Lamu. They are the smallest of the four indigenous groups in the area. In recent times though, their livelihoods
have been encroached and partially destroyed. They depend on the forest not only for the economic but for their spiritual, economic and political survival.

Cultural Profile: Although the majority of the Aweer settled in villages located in this corridor between the two reserves, some established themselves in nearby Bajuni villages. Today, the Aweer have adopted slash and burn agriculture as their main source of livelihoods, but they continue to engage in many of their traditional practices, utilizing the nearby forests for the collection of wild honey, plants for traditional medicine and building materials, and bush meat to supplement their diets. With laws banning the hunting of all wildlife in Kenya, the Aweer's traditional way of life is in danger. The Aweer are mostly Muslim, like other coastal tribes.

13.7.10 Pokot
They speak Pökoot, language of the Southern Nilotic language family which is close to the Marakwet, Nandi, Tuken and other members of the Kalanjen grouping. Kenya's 2009 census puts the total number of Pokot speakers at about 620,000 in Kenya. They have once considered part of the Kalenjin people who were highland Nilotic people who originated in southern Ethiopia and migrated southward into Kenya as early as 2,000 years ago. Though the Pokot consider themselves to be one people, they are basically divided into two sub-groups based on livelihood. About half of the homestead is the social center for the Pokot. Here a man lives with his wives, each having their own hut. All members of the family live here and the stock is corralled here at night. The man of the family rules the homestead, telling the others what duties they are to perform. Population: 662,000

Location in the Country: Rift Valley Province, Baringo and West Pokot districts

Livelihood: It is usually claimed that from the earliest time of the original Pokot, they were agriculturalist, they did not have many cattle, and the few they had were taken by wild animals abounding the area. They have been hunters and gatherer living in caves. Currently, Pokot are semi-nomadic, semi-pastoralists who live in the lowlands west and north of Kapenguria and throughout Kacheliba Division and Nginyang Division, Baringo District. These people herd cattle, sheep, and goats and live off the products of their stock. The other half of the Pokot are agriculturalists who live anywhere conditions allow farming. Mixed farming is practiced in the areas of Kapenguria, Lelan and parts of Chepararia. These areas have recorded rainfall between 120mm to 160mm while pastoral areas include Kiwawa, Kasei, Alale and parts of Sigor receiving 80mm and 120mm.

The livelihood of Pokot has led to constant conflict between them and other pastoral communities – the Turkana, Matheniko and the Pokot of Uganda. This clash has been sustained by semi-arid savannah and wooded grassland terrain that cuts along the habitation area. Resources such as land, pasture, water points are communally owned and they are no specific individual rights.

Cultural Profile: The Pokot people are made up of two main groups: the "cattle people," who are herdsmen who live on the plains, and the "grain people," farmers who live on the mountainsides. The lives of the herdsmen are harsher than those of their farming neighbors, but they have more wealth, because cattle are considered to be valuable by both groups. In addition to cattle, both groups have some goats, sheep and a few donkeys or camels. The Pokot are proud of their culture. They are one of the last groups in Kenya that have refused to be influenced by modern ways. In Pokot cosmology, the universe has two realms, the above and the below. The above, remote and unknowable, is the abode of the most powerful deities—Tororot, Asis (sun), and llat (rain); the below is the abode of humans, animals, and plants. Men and women are considered responsible for the peace and prosperity of the realm that they inhabit, but they must rely upon divine vitality and knowledge to achieve and maintain these conditions.
The Pokot communicate with their deities through prayer and sacrifice: Tororot is said to listen to his creatures below, Asis to witness their activities, and llat to serve as a messenger between the two realms. Deities, in turn, communicate with humans, warning and rebuking them about their misconduct. Christianity has reshaped Pokot cosmology, primarily by reducing the number of deities, while augmenting their attributes. The divine messenger llat has a human counterpart called a werkoyon (prophet), who foresees disaster and recommends expiation, usually animal sacrifice, to alleviate it. A werkoyon may be either male or female; his or her ability to foresee and to advise is considered a divinely given gift, to be used on behalf of all Pokot. The main ceremonies mark transitions in the social lives of individuals and communities. Especially notable among these are the cleansing of a couple expecting their first child; the cleansing of newborn infants and their mothers; the cleansing of twins and other children who are born under unusual circumstances; male and female initiation; marriage; sapanu, a coming-of-age ceremony for men; and summer-solstice, harvest, and healing.

13.7.11 Endorois
Endorois community is a minority community that was living adjacent to Lake Baringo. However, the Government of Kenya forcibly removed the Endorois from their ancestral lands around the Lake Bogoria area of the Baringo and Koibatek Administrative Districts, as well as in the Nakuru and Laikipia Administrative Districts within the Rift Valley Province in Kenya, without proper prior consultations, adequate and effective compensation. Endorois are a community of approximately 60,000 people who, for centuries, have lived in the Lake Bogoria area. They claim that prior to the dispossession of Endorois land through the creation of the Lake Hannington Game Reserve in 1973, and a subsequent re-gazetting of the Lake Bogoria Game Reserve in 1978 by the Government of Kenya, the Endorois had established, and, for centuries, practiced a sustainable way of life which was inextricably linked to their ancestral land.

However, since 1978 the Endorois have been denied access to their land, neighbouring tribes as bona fide owners of the land and that they continued to occupy and enjoy undisturbed use of the land under the British colonial administration, although the British claimed title to the land in the name of the British Crown. At independence in 1963, the British Crown’s claim to Endorois land was passed on to the respective County Councils. However, under Section 115 of the Kenyan Constitution, the Country Councils held this land in trust, on behalf of the Endorois community, who remained on the land and continued to hold, use and enjoy it. The Endorois’ customary rights over the Lake Bogoria region were not challenged until the 1973 gazetting of the land by the Government of Kenya. The act of gazetting and, therefore, dispossession of the land is central to the present to their current predicament.

The area surrounding Lake Bogoria is fertile land, providing green pasture and medicinal salt licks, which help raise healthy cattle. Lake Bogoria is central to the Endorois religious and traditional practices. The community’s historical prayer sites, places for circumcision rituals, and other cultural ceremonies are around Lake Bogoria. These sites were used on a weekly or monthly basis for smaller local ceremonies, and on an annual basis for cultural festivities involving Endorois from the whole region. The Complainants claim that the Endorois believe that the spirits of all Endorois, no matter where they are buried, live on in the Lake, with annual festivals taking place at the Lake. They believe that the Monchongoi forest is considered the birthplace of the Endorois and the settlement of the first Endorois community. Despite the lack of understanding of the Endorois community regarding what had been decided by the Kenyan Wildlife Service (hereinafter KWS) informed certain Endorois elders shortly after the creation of the Game Reserve that 400 Endorois families would be compensated with plots of “fertile land.” The undertaking also specified, according to the Complainants, that the community would receive 25% of the tourist revenue from the Game Reserve and 85% of the employment generated, and that cattle dips and fresh water dams would be constructed by the State.
Although the High Court recognized that Lake Bogoria had been Trust Land for the Endorois, it stated that the Endorois had effectively lost any legal claim as a result of the designation of the land as a Game Reserve in 1973 and in 1974. It concluded that the money given in 1986 to 170 families for the cost of relocating represented the fulfillment of any duty owed by the authorities towards the Endorois for the loss of their ancestral land. Since then, Endorois have not owned until recently, when African Human Rights courts passed judgment to force Government to compensate them.

To date, the Endorois community has not received adequate compensation for this eviction, nor have they benefited from the proceeds of the reserve. Because they no longer have free access to the lake or land, their property rights have been violated and their spiritual, cultural and economic ties to the land severed. Once able to migrate with the seasons between Lake Bogoria and the Mochongoi forest, the Endorois are now forced to live on a strip of semi-arid land between their two traditional sites with no access to sustain their former cattle rearing and bee-keeping livelihood. The eviction of the Endorois people by the Kenyan government and the ‘gazetting’ (or public declaration of state ownership) of their land began in 1973 and continued until 1986. Population: 20,000

Location: Around the environs of Lake Baringo.

Livelihood: Dependant on land and fishing from Lake Bogoria. Critically, land for the Endorois is held in very high esteem, since tribal land, in addition to securing subsistence and livelihood, is seen as sacred, being inextricably linked to the cultural integrity of the community and its traditional way of life. Land, they claim, belongs to the community and not the individual and is essential to the preservation and survival as a traditional people. Endorois health, livelihood, religion and culture are all intimately connected with their traditional land, as grazing lands, sacred religious sites and plants used for traditional medicine are all situated around the shores of Lake Bogoria. At present the Endorois live in a number of locations on the periphery of the Reserve – which the Endorois are not only being forced from fertile lands to semi-arid areas, but have also been divided as a community and displaced from their traditional and ancestral lands. Their access to the Lake Bogoria region, is a right for the community and the Government of Kenya continues to deny the community effective participation in decisions affecting their own land, in violation of their right to development. This has jeopardized the community’s pastoral enterprise and imperiled its cultural integrity. They also claim that 30 years after the evictions began; the Endorois still do not have full and fair compensation for the loss of their land and their rights on to it. They further allege that the process of evicting them from their traditional land not only violates Endorois community property rights, but spiritual, cultural and economic ties to the land are severed.

13.7.12 Boni

The Boni people are known for their unique tradition of whistling to birds that guide them to honey. They are found in Northeastern Kenya's district of Ijara and Lamu district. Their population is about 4,000, compared to 25,000 half a century ago (Source: Organization for the Development of Lamu Communities (ODLC). They are nomadic hunter-gatherer tribe of mainly Cushitic origin with a unique characteristic. The community sources their subsistence from forest products such as honey, wild plants/fruits for consumption and medicinal purposes. The Boni are found in the North-Eastern part of Lamu district and Ijara District. They are concentrated mainly in Witu, Hindi and Kiunga divisions. The community is located in villages of Bargoni (Hindi Division), Milimani, Bodhei, Basuba, Mangai, Mararani, Kiangwe and Kiunga (Kiunga division), Pandanguo and Jima (Witu Division).

The Boni live in forested areas of the district i.e. within the Witu and Boni forests. They live deep into the forest and only come out to the periphery when there is hardship or hunger. They perceive the forest in the Boni inhabited areas as communally theirs. However, with the gazettlement of all the forest by the government this has become a source of conflict.
**13.7.13 Watha**

The Watha people are mostly found in the rural arid and semi arid lands of the country. A minority of them live in thick forests scattered all over the country. The people are traditionally hunters and gatherers. In Malindi district a Watha community is found in four divisions (i.e. Malindi, Langobaya, Marafa and Magarini). In Tana River district the Watha are found in Sombo and Laza divisions while in Mandera the Watha are found in Central division. The population of Watha community in the districts is estimated at approximately 30,000 persons. This is only 2.7% of the entire Malindi, Mandera and Tana River district population.

The Watha people are traditionally hunters and gatherers. However since the government abolished unlicensed hunting of game and wild animals, the Watha people now live in permanent settlements, some of them along the river and where there are forests, mainly in the mixed farming and livestock farming zones. The forests afford them an opportunity to practice bee keeping while those along the river practice crop production.

The land tenure system in the district is communal ownership. Most of the land in the three districts of Malindi, Mandera and Tana River are currently under trust land by the county councils. Few influential people in the district have however managed to acquire title deeds from the land offices in Nairobi. However, most of this trust lands are controlled by the majority tribes and becomes a point of conflict if the smaller tribes and outsiders get involved. This is what has pushed the small and marginalized tribes like Watha deep into the forests.
### 13.8 Annex 8- Summary of Consultations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSULTATIONS MEETING CONDUCTED</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>Decisions/discussion points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Consultations on the VMGF for the Kenya Water Security and Climate Resilience Project - Ministry of Water and Irrigation | November and December 2012 | 1. Ministry of Regional Development Authorities  
2. Ministry of Water and Irrigation  
3. National Irrigation Board  
4. National Environment Trust Fund  
5. Coast Water Development Authority  
6. Lake Victoria North Water Services Board  
7. Lake Victoria South Water Services Board  
8. Athi Water Services Board  
9. National Environment Management Authority | 1. Review of draft VMGF  
2. Discussion of baseline information on the Vulnerable and Marginalized Communities in Kenya including lifestyle, livelihood, history;  
3. Identification of positive and negative impacts of the proposed water investments on the VMGs;  
4. Monitoring and evaluation plan. |
| 2 Dissemination and Review of Draft VMGF for the SSIWMP - Nairobi, Kenya | May 16th, 2014 | Technical staff from Nile Ministries (Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources; National Irrigation Board; National Environmental Management Authority), Sub-Basin organizations | 1. The meeting noted the importance of developing a VMGF and confirmed the commitment of Kenya in ensuring the rights of minorities.  
2. The meeting noted that a similar document had been developed for Kenya with regard to the Kenya Enhanced Water Security and Climate Resilience project.  
3. The meeting recommended the development of criterion for vulnerability that should capture in addition to minority status, factors such as disability, HIV status, gender and generational aspects within the Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups. It should capture both environmental and social vulnerabilities.  
4. The meeting recommended the inclusion of the levels of government as they currently exist in Kenya and especially the county government must be included as a significant stakeholder. In that regard, the meeting considered that the involvement of the county government cannot be over emphasized and future consultations should be done at county of Bungoma level. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSULTATIONS MEETING CONDUCTED</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>Decisions/discussion points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. The meeting noted the importance of monitoring, evaluation and audit and commended the application of participatory impact monitoring of the Vulnerable and Marginalized Groups plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. In applicable legislative and institutional framework, the meeting noted that in fact the National Land Commission had been instituted as per the CoK and was in place to implement the National Land Policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. The meeting agreed to further review the VMGF and provide additional comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>