

# Targeting and Layering Progress Review Meeting for Isiolo 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 convergence sites 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 to improve the attainment of resilience outcomes.

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

## 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 Isiolo 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 Isiolo County Layering Sites

Isiolo 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 Isiolo County were Chari, Oldonyiro, and Sericho. Below is a summary of activities by partners in Isiolo County on the above layering sites.

Partners	Chari Ward	Oldonyiro Ward	Sericho Ward
LMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conducted a baseline survey on disease surveillance,</li> <li>Joint work planning to implement Livestock production, particularly in veterinary services areas, pool resources to reach a bigger scale in conducting training.</li> </ul>		
TUSOME	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision and replenishment of CBC English and Kiswahili language textbooks grade 1-3 to all public primary schools</li> <li>Provision of leveled readers to all public primary schools</li> <li>Provision of SNE HI and VI CBC language activities to SNE schools in the County</li> <li>Training of curriculum support officers, headteachers, and teachers</li> <li>Supporting CSOs during classroom observations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision and replenishment of CBC English and Kiswahili language textbooks grade 1-3 to all public primary schools</li> <li>Provision of leveled readers to all public primary schools</li> <li>Provision of SNE HI and VI CBC language activities to SNE schools in the County</li> <li>Training of curriculum support officers, headteachers, and teachers</li> <li>Supporting CSOs during classroom observations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision and replenishment of CBC English and Kiswahili language textbooks grade 1-3 to all public primary schools</li> <li>Provision of leveled readers to all public primary schools</li> <li>Provision of SNE HI and VI CBC language activities to SNE schools in the County</li> <li>Training of curriculum support officers, headteachers, and teachers</li> <li>Supporting CSOs during classroom observations</li> </ul>
NAWIRI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participatory provision of livestock input to the household (HH)</li> </ul>		

Partners	Chari Ward	Oldonyiro Ward	Sericho Ward
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unconditional cash transfer, business grant (SILC)</li> </ul>		
LMS REAP, Mercy Corps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building capacity of community institutions and link them up with relevant County departments and partners established ward development planning committees.</li> </ul>		
WFP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rangeland rehabilitation (control and management of <i>Prosopis juliflora</i>, wetland rehabilitation along Ewaso Nyiro River, and pasture production)</li> <li>Agricultural and Biosystems engineering services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support upscaling of the honey value chain through the increased promotion of aggregation value addition and marketing</li> <li>Training and extension support on pasture and grass seed production</li> <li>Nutrition sensitive Agriculture to establish kitchen garden for the production of OFSP and AIVs.</li> <li>Village saving and lending association (VSLAs)</li> <li>Support youth entrepreneurship and agri-business skills training and mentorship</li> <li>Fodder and grass seed production</li> <li>Local poultry production</li> <li>Economic Empowerment (VSLA)</li> <li>Cash transfer</li> <li>Agricultural and Biosystems engineering services</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agricultural and Biosystems engineering services</li> <li>Rangeland rehabilitation (control and management of invasive species and environmental conservation)</li> </ul>

Partners	Chari Ward	Oldonyiro Ward	Sericho Ward
AVCD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developed an electronic disease surveillance system and linking pastoralists for use in reporting livestock disease.</li> <li>Supporting closed user group (CUG) to enhance disease surveillance and reporting.</li> <li>Supporting livestock sale yards Act and regulation to enhance livestock marketing in the county</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developed an electronic disease surveillance system and linking pastoralists for use in reporting livestock disease.</li> <li>Supporting closed user groups to enhance disease surveillance and reporting.</li> <li>Supporting livestock sale yards Act and regulation to enhance livestock marketing in the county</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developed an electronic disease surveillance system and linking pastoralists for use in reporting livestock disease.</li> <li>Supporting closed user groups to enhance disease surveillance and reporting.</li> <li>Supporting livestock sale yards Act and regulation to enhance livestock marketing in the county</li> </ul>
UNICEF			
NRT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supporting sustainable rangeland management systems</li> <li>Strengthen Conservancies Institutional Structure, Leadership, and Governance</li> </ul>		
SIDAI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Developing a model of disease control to promote sustainable disease control for SHOATS on how to stimulate demand for routine service practice among pastoralist communities in Merti Sub-county</li> </ul>		

## Review of Isiolo 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, Isiolo 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
1.	<b>Baseline information</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did partners agree on any baseline information for the layering sites?</li> <li>• Which indicators were selected for monitoring?</li> <li>• Were any consultations with local communities undertaken to agree on the priorities?</li> <li>• What commitments were made to clarify how the progress against indicators will be used to determine completion or transition from the site?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No baseline data</li> <li>- No indicator</li> <li>- No consultation</li> <li>- No commitment</li> </ul>
2.	<b>Structures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were there any structures beyond the PREG partnership formed to monitor progress?]</li> <li>• What accountability framework was put in place?</li> <li>• What was the role of government in this framework? What was the role of local communities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No structure. However, NAWIRI is in the process of reviving an already existing platform such as the Multi-sectoral Platform (MSP). This platform will engage all partners, both state and non-state actors, in the nutrition component.</li> <li>- Isiolo PREG team developed an M&amp;E tool to track progress, with the lead being from the Kenya RAPID project.</li> <li>- Partners laid out the government's role and commitment. However, this was not followed up due to COVID and offboarding of K-RAPID.</li> </ul>

3. <b>Progress Reporting</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What progress has been realized so far?</li> <li>• How are partners putting together all the crucial information to report progress? Any visualization techniques?</li> <li>• 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)</li> <li>• What innovations, if any, have been deployed to facilitate this?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Despite no baseline and no proper reporting mechanisms. WFP and LMS have made deliberate efforts to layer their livestock production activity. This includes components on veterinary services and synergy between markets.</li> <li>- WFP, ILRI, and LMS have collaborated in the three wards, despite the reporting system.</li> <li>- There was no reporting on the implementation progress.</li> <li>- The implementing partners have been closely working with the communities; however, every partner has been sharing the information with the community individually.</li> <li>- Individual partners have their innovations to use—for instance, the use of ward-level planning committees created through LMS AA2 platforms.</li> </ul>
4. <b>Challenges</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What are the main challenges in the implementation of the current workplan?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- COVID-19.</li> <li>- Lack of flexibility in terms of resource allocation for joint layering perspectives</li> </ul> <p>The nutrition component budget was deliberately chopped off by the County department and perceived as a key priority area.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What actions be taken to address them?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- County Government commitment is limited in resource allocation due to delay in the transfer of cash from the national Government.</li> <li>- Transition of partners prompts some gaps in sectoral leadership, e.g., K-RAPID.</li> </ul>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is progress in implementation sites be measured? How can this be improved?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Collect baseline data plan for a start.</li> <li>- Consolidate activities into a plan and implement the plan.</li> <li>WFP (Charles Songok) to share the M &amp; M&amp;E tool developed by partners to monitor layering progress.</li> <li>- Isiolo PREG to identify a new leader to take over the progress monitoring from K-RAPID.</li> <li>- Share the layering tools developed during the FY 20 targeting and layering workshop.</li> <li>- PREG learning to support partner simplify the monitoring tool and reporting mechanisms developed.</li> <li>- layering and sequencing should be discussed at monthly PREG meetings.</li> <li>- quarterly reporting.</li> </ul>

## Key Findings, Next Steps, and Action Points

- ❖ PREG Partners in Isiolo are implementing activities in some of 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.
- ❖ Isiolo PREG partners have developed a different layering tool to what was developed in FY 20 targeting and layering workshop. PREG learning to follow up and see whether the current tool being used is sufficient or to reintroduce the previous layering tool.
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ Charles Songok of WFP to follow up on the M&E tool designed to monitor the layering efforts and share with the team.
- ❖ PREG partners to identify a lead on the layering efforts in the upcoming PREG monthly meeting.
- ❖ There was no deliberate effort in working in the layering sites, the partners working on the sites were guided by internal program plans. However, there is a deliberate effort to collaborate with other PREG partners with similar priorities in the sites.
- ❖ 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.

## Participant List

	Name	Organization
1.	Charles Songok	WFP & PREG Deputy Lead
2.	Hassan Godana	NRT
3.	Martin Waweru	NAWIRI
4.	Hassan Guyo	RLA
5.	Yasmin Farah	RLA
6.	Michele Waguku	TUSOME
7.	Bitacha Sora	Mercy corps
8.	Boru Jarso	Boma Project