

PARTNERSHIP FOR RESILIENCE AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Targeting and Layering Progress Review Meeting for Garissa County

Introduction

The Partnership for Resilience and Economic Growth brings together humanitarian and development partners to build resilience among vulnerable pastoralist communities in northern Kenya. It includes USAID programs and implementing partners in nine (9) Arid and Semi-Arid Land (ASAL) counties and builds on community-identified strengths and priorities.

The primary purpose of targeting and layering is to embrace data-driven decision-making among PREG partners to select layering sites and activities. The model is expected to help PREG partners use data systematically and intelligently to select sites of convergence and support the coordination of implementation, accountability, and reporting on layering activities.

The targeting process defines how to gather and analyze sufficient data and information to guide partners to draw informed conclusions regarding selecting the most appropriate sites for layering and convergence of services through collective impact, sequencing, layering, and integration and thus improving the attainment of resilience outcomes.

Last year, USAID instituted Targeting and Layering in Garissa county in its new programming approach and partnership with Garissa county. Through that initiative, vulnerable wards were selected in Garissa county for partners to layer their activities. Therefore, the Targeting and Layering progress review meeting sought to take stock of progress made in implementing activities in the selected sites.

Workshop objectives

The objectives of the Targeting and Layering progress review workshop were to;

- Review progress made in the implementation of activities in the selected sites for Garissa county.
- Reflect on the process of selection of layering sites.
- Take stock of learnings from the targeting and layering to inform future programming.

Partner Activities in Garissa County Layering Sites

The Garissa county layering sites were identified using the percentage of individuals below the poverty line, unimproved water sources, unimproved sanitation, humanitarian caseloads, and wasting. These parameters were weighted and ranked using the application of the scoring tool and targeting framework. The most vulnerable wards in Garissa county were Danyere, Jarajara, and Balambala. Below is a summary of activities by partners in Garissa county on the above layering sites.

	Balambala Ward	Jarajara Ward	Danyere Ward
LMS AAI	 Support small business development to provide intermediary services in the livestock market -capacity building of livestock marketing association REAP-saving groups supporting ultra-poor women 	 Planning for fodder production, but the river shifted Expanding the Livestock marketing association and Jarajara has some members 	- Supporting livestock marketing activities in the local feeder market to ensure representation and linkage to livestock marketing association members in Balambala
LMS AA2	 -in the REAP program, they are bringing a local sub-grantee on board, and it will be working with the ward planning committee, who in turn bring their local priorities, which the government approves -WASH/Nutrition sensitive programming and awareness creation which is aligned to the household level 		
AVCD/ILRI	-electronic disease surveillance -tracking livestock sale body -COVID-19 market protocol through MOH requirement to curb the spread	-Electronic livestock disease surveillance	- Electronic livestock disease surveillance
W.F. P	-Nutrition intervention- supporting Ministry of Health -Agri-nutrition support to local farmers -Capacity strengthening forward- based level committee	-Nutrition intervention- supporting Ministry of Health -Agri-nutrition support to local farmers	-Supporting ten sites with resilience livelihood intervention -Agri-nutrition intervention through
UNICEF	-Nutrition -WASH		

Review of Garissa County Targeting and Layering Activity

Using the below Guideline/Tool for measurement, accountability, and reporting tool derived from the PREG Targeting framework is tailor-made to help obtain feedback, data, and information about the layering activities and progress thereof. Using this information, Garissa PREG partners decided what aspects of the action plan work and what areas need improvement. This helped draw conclusions about targeting and layering and the efforts. Below are findings from the session.

Key Element	Guiding Discussion Questions	PREG Members Feedback
I. Baseline information	 Did partners agree on any baseline information for the layering sites? Which indicators were selected for monitoring? Were any consultations with local communities undertaken to agree on the priorities? What commitments were made to clarify how the progress against indicators will be used to determine completion or transition from the site? 	*No baseline data *No indicator *No consultation *No commitment
2. Structures	 Were there any structures beyond the PREG partnership formed to monitor progress? What accountability framework was put in place? What was the role of government in this framework? What was the role of local communities? 	*No structure *No framework *No agreement
3. Progress Reporting	 What progress has been realized so far? How are partners putting together all the crucial information to report progress? Any visualization techniques? Is the progress information being shared with local communities? How is that being done? (please take a record of any of the progress reports if available) What innovations, if any, have been deployed to facilitate this? 	*Despite no baseline LMS, ILRI & WFP Having been working together and specifically on Synergy between markets. *WFP, ILRI, and LMS have collaborated in the three wards, despite the reporting system. It was not that clear, and there was No other PREG who had activities in the three wards. *The implementing partners have been closely working with the communities, and they have developed various reports from the field. *Individual partners have their innovations to use.
4. Challenges	• What are the main challenges in the implementation of the current workplan?	 COVID-19 restriction Challenging to implement virtually. Information on the humanitarian caseloads. No deliberate support that triggered by implementing partners, which was systematic.

Key Element	Guiding Discussion Questions	PREG Members Feedback
	• What actions be taken to address them?	• Lack of PREG members follow up after the development of the targeting site.
• What actions be taken to address them:	• Collect baseline data plan for a start.	
		• Consolidate activities into a plan.
	• How is progress in implementation sites be measured? How Can this be improved?	• implementation of the plan
		 Share the layering plan- Kelvin/Ismail
		• Joint implementation of the plan,
		Monitoring and M&E
		• consistency on attending the PREG focal Person for institution memory.
m		• Philip of WFP was selected to lead the process of re-starting the conversation on "layering and sequencing."
		• layering and integration should be discussed at the office level and not in the PREG meeting.
		• quarterly reporting is essential

Key Findings, Next Steps, and Action Points

- PREG Partners in Garissa are implementing activities in the vulnerable wards, there is lack of reporting system, no follow up from PREG.
- PREG Partners are not aware of reporting tool on the layering sites.
- PREG Learning to share work plan template for partners to input ongoing activities in the layering sites as well as share a reporting tool.
- Partners agreed on quarterly reporting on the layering sites.
- Philip Loonyo of WFP was appointed as the lead for Garissa county on the county's layering activities.
- There was no deliberate effort in working in the layering sites, the partners working on the sites were guided by internal program plans.
- Partners were satisfied with the T&L process, thus no need to select other layering sites but improve on collaboration and reporting on current sites.

Participants List

	Name	Organization
1.	Siyat Moge Gure-	LMS AA2 & PREG LEAD
2.	Ismail Ali	RLA
3.	Philip Loonyo	WFP
4.	Mukhtar Muhumed	World Vision
5.	Amina Aden	KEFRI
6.	Abdihakim S Mohamed-	Director Water-Garissa County
7.	Abdisemet Bulle Osman	AVCD
8.	Osman Aden	M&E Water Department
9.	Abdirahman Sheikh Yussuf	ROAD International
10.	John Kutwa LMS AA I	LMS AAT
11.	Kelvin Musikoyo	RLA