

Kibera Pilot Project French Embassy Evaluation Report

Component of Nairobi River Basin Project - Phase II



Beneficiary organisation : Ushirika wa Maisha na Maendeleo Kianda (UMMK)
Local operator : African Network for the Prevention and Protection Against Child Abuse and Neglect (ANPPCAN)
External operator : United Nations Environment Programme - Regional Office for Africa (UNEP)
Project No: 2002-FSD-001 / Basin Nairobi-UNEP
Duration: 5 April 2002 - 16 March 2005
SFD Funding: Kshs 5 Million

← One of the drainage built within the project

➤ Context

A strong environmental pressure is put on Nairobi River Basin (regular increase of Nairobi population, growing urbanisation and industrialisation, industrial wastes, sewerage problems, slums waste rejected directly into the river, etc.). This intense pollution creates health problems in the surrounding communities and a deregulation of the ecosystem.

Nairobi River Basin project aimed at resolving these issues. Phase I consisted in a precise evaluation of the situation of the river, and in setting up education programmes to sensitize the communities and build their capacities. Phase II, started in 2002, aimed at improving the living conditions of people settled along the river. One of the components of this phase II was the pilot project funded by the French Embassy.

The target population was the 1,200 households of Kianda 'A' village in Kibera. The beneficiaries were represented by UMMK, a local CBO which was started by the community in 1994. From the start, this CBO was supported by ANPPCAN, a local NGO. ANPPCAN was also financed by the project to bring technical support to UMMK and build the capacities of the organisation. The project was accepted by the Steering Committee on the 5th of April 2002. The total amount of the project was Kshs. 10,048,600 of which the SFD supported a total amount of 5 million.



In comparison, an area that was not part of the project ➤

➤ Overall objective

The general objective was to improve in a sustainable way the environmental situation of Nairobi River Basin and the living conditions of the population living in this geographical area.

The specific objectives were as follows:

- Improvement of health and well being of a pilot community gathering 1,200 household in Kianda A village, Kibera.
- Provision of quality water.
- Promotion of environmental sanitation and waste management practices.
- Promotional activities on safeguarding the river.
- Involving the beneficiaries and ensuring the sustainability of the project.

➤ **Conclusions of the evaluation of 2004**

Strengths

- Drainage systems were built and water was available. The concrete drainage systems improved the cleanliness of the place since it was leading dirty and rainwater down stream. The people said the place was cleaner than it was before the establishment of the project.
- Water borne diseases had reduced since there was not stagnant dirty water as there used to be before.
- Leaflets and brochures were published through the work of ANPPCAN.

Challenges

- Community involvement was low especially in waste management and maintaining the drainage. There were many places along the drainage with stagnant solid waste products.
- The community was not fully mobilised on environmental cleanliness. Most of them were not taking initiative to clean the drainage, as it was anticipated.
- The project was relying on the income generated from the sale of water and the use of bathroom facilities that were part of the project. The money raised however was mostly spent on maintaining the septic tanks, which were built too small to cater for the needs of the residents.

Recommendations

- Mobilise the community through community meetings, posters and other methods to raise awareness on environmental cleanliness and the maintenance of the drainage system.
- Collaborate with other donor partners to resolve the issue of septic tank, which was too expensive to maintain. Many people suggested that the bathroom drainage be led to the main drainage system of the city council.

[from : Evaluation Mission - October 2004]

➤ **Situation today**

The drainage system, the water supply and the ablution blocks (part of the same project but funded by the Embassy of Belgium) are still there. People of UMMK are still running them and they look clean and maintained. Apparently, a cleaning of the sewerage is organised every Monday, and the site, while visited on a Friday, looked clean. In any case, the contrast is very obvious with areas which do not have such a drainage system. (see pictures)

Some of the challenges have been addressed. The maintenance is better. A Youth Group has taken up with the activity of solid waste management. They are cleaning the slum area on a voluntary basis, collecting garbage for a small fee in the estates and sorting plastic and metal so as to resell them to recycling industry. However, this activity is not a result of the trainings organised through the project and did not benefit from the equipment bought through the project. But this shows that there is dynamism in the Community.

On the negative side, it is to be noted that the problem with the exhaustion of the septic tanks is still there. UMMK still has to exhaust them once a week and the cost of it takes most of the revenues collected for the use of the ablution blocs. They have not found other donors to fund bigger tanks, and the linking of their system to Nairobi City Council sewerage system is for the moment technically impossible.

In general, if UMMK manages to run the activities, they get too little to develop new activities for their CBO. They also explained that this is due to the mentality of people who do not understand why they have to pay when it is the French Embassy or Embassy of Belgium who donated this equipment and infrastructure. Some community members even believe that UMMK members get a high remuneration from the donors, and this led to jealousy and even sabotage. Thus this visit confirmed the problems of community mobilisation that was noted during the first evaluation. This attitude has prevented so far UMMK to raise their tariffs so that they could make real benefits and get out of their dependency syndrome.

➤ **Management of the project**

Three main stakeholders participated in the implementation of the project: UMMK; ANPPCAN; UNEP - Regional Office for Africa.

UMMK: This CBO has shown a real potential, even if the training they have received still need to be reinforced. This potential however seems to be rather the results of their 10 year of support from ANPPCAN than of the one-year project funded by the Embassy. Their main problems at the moment and that could threaten the sustainability of the project seem to be:

- Weaknesses in management and accountability: UMMK has not shown any evidence that they were keeping rigorous accounts of their revenues and expenditures. They were able to state some figures, but these were quite imprecise;
- problems of sensitization to get out of the dependency syndrome;

ANPPCAN: The people who were in charge of the project have apparently left the organisation. UMMK has a positive appreciation of the assistance they brought them. However, today the person in charge of the organisation seems to have very little knowledge of what has been going on in UMMK since ANPPCAN no longer works in Kibera.

UNEP: There have been huge difficulties between UNEP and the Embassy on the reporting procedures during the implementation of the project. This comes from the fact that each of these two organisations has its own accountability procedures that are not compatible. It would probably have been advisable to finance directly ANPPCAN and UMMK and sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with UNEP. If UNEP was to do the same project now, they would focus on (1) the available funds for each phase (Initially there were 3 planned phases without any guarantees to find enough money to go on the next step), (2) the training aspect of the project as well as the capitalization of the lessons learnt, (3) a better initial identification of the market to make sure that the IGA components are sustainable.

➤ **Key challenges**

- UMMK relies on external assistance to develop new activities;
- The sustainability of the ablution blocks is not ensured at the moment;

➤ **Recommendations**

- **The capacities of UMMK need to be built** in financial management and in community sensitization. They need to understand and be able to sensitize the community on the fact that they have to count first on themselves if they want to develop rather than on external donors.
- UMMK needs to **redefine the tariffs and organisation** of the ablution blocks and of other activities so as to increase their profitability and utilise the profits to develop other activities.
- UMMK has to **raise funds** to be able to solve the problem they have with the septic tank.