

City	
Country	Kenya
Population	3,100,000
Title of policy or practice	Urban Early Warning and Early Action Initiative
Subtitle (optional)	The practice involves the carrying out of periodic randomized and stratified surveillance by city field offers to assess the food security situation of the urban and low income community of the city using novel urban-sensitive indicators and their thresholds.
URL video	https://youtu.be/daUPxPNxdKw
Category	Social and Economic Equity
SDGs	SDGs: 1,2,11.
Brief description	<p>Context or background framework</p> <p>A civil unrest took place in late 2007 and early 2008 in which supply routes of food to the city were cut-off. There was overt acute food insecurity in the city but existing tools could not detect it. The rural and largely weather-based food assessment tool was inadequate for urban areas where food insecurity was not weather-based but was based on lack of access to food. Further, the use of Global Acute Malnutrition(GAM) rate tool or Severe Acute Malnutrition rate tool would leave huge urban populations at risk of food insecurity before it could trigger some emergency response. This practice was therefore necessitated by the insensitivity of existing tools of monitoring food security to the urban realities of high population density and variances of economic statuses. The tool applied is called Urban Early Warning Early Action (UEWEA) tool.</p> <p>Goals</p> <p>The goals of the practice are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To scientifically document the food situation of city population in 4 categories (normal, alert, alarm and emergency) so that contingency plans for each category may be rolled out. • To identify food insecure urban population at the emergency level so that rapid response measures may be instituted to save lives. <p>Five (5) indicators and thresholds used in the UEWEA tool are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of households experiencing shocks (e.g. evictions, fires, floods); • Equalized monthly income (based on number of persons in households and whether older or younger than 14 years) (in Kenya shillings); • Number of food baskets in purchased one month; • Percentage of households with at least one stable income earner; • Percentage of households with at least one child reporting diarrhoea. <p>Enumerators are sent to the community twice a month to collect data on the 5 indicators using randomized stratified sampling method. Data is collected using GPS-enabled cell phones and submitted electronically. Data entry, capture and analysis are done using an electronic dashboard, which also generates reports. The reports of the surveillance are disseminated promptly to stakeholders and role players. When the thresholds have been surpassed negatively, the surveillance tool also triggers early action cum response in respect of each of the situations with the aim of alleviating the food insecurity and reverting the status of the community back to "normal".</p> <p>So far, 6 surveillance missions have been carried out and their results analysed and disseminated to role-players: Korogocho was in emergency, Mukuru in alarm and Kibera in normal.</p>

Trends have emerged from the practice where the levels of food vulnerability are becoming predictable and this would improve planning. For example, in the 6 missions, Korogocho was at emergency level 5 times, Kibera 2 times and Mukuru 1 time.

Complementing this practice is the enactment of the Nairobi City County Disasters and Emergencies Management Act through which a Council has been established to steer response to disasters and emergencies for example the early warnings given by the Urban Early Warning and Early Action tool. Further, response plans have been drafted with stakeholders and are undergoing validation and institutionalization.

Jurisdictions

The practice uses technology derived from research that was carried in 3 low-income informal settlements of Kibera, Mukuru and Korogocho. Pilot trials and roll out has also been carried out in the same settlements. At present, roll out in the entire city is planned.

Beneficiaries

The UEWEA tool and practice clearly identifies food-vulnerable populations who are actually the respondents in the surveillance component. The cause of the vulnerability is identified through each of the 5 indicators using quantitative data and therefore clearly informs specific interventions, such as boosting of incomes, mitigation of shocks, and management of impacts of food prices. The targeted community has 203,000 households with a dependent ratio of 1 household to 6 persons.

The mitigation measures applied during food security emergency include food relief rations and cash transfers. At alert and alarm phases, capacity is given to the community to improve their situation toward "normal" such as heightened agricultural extension while identifying the vulnerable persons and stockpiling food and nutritional supplements.

This is complimented by the monthly monitoring of food prices of the staple crops in the slum areas.

Lessons learned

The carrying out of the practice has taught the following lessons:

- Urban food insecurity is camouflaged by the perceived economic prosperity reflected by the good infrastructure and utilities obtaining in the area; however, pockets of poverty and other vulnerability exist;
- Rural-based food situation assessment tools are inappropriate in urban areas as the indicators are different;
- Urban food insecurity results largely from low incomes by consumers; a sustainable solution is to boost peoples' incomes;
- The need to constantly monitor monthly food prices of the staple commodities.

<p>Date of start and state (ongoing/completed)</p>	<p>02/2017 Ongoing</p>
<p>Actors and stakeholders involvement</p>	<p>The development and roll out of the practice has involved the following actors and stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Food, Agriculture and Forestry department of the City County government —this is the lead agency in the practice; • The Health Services Department of the city county government — this office provides staff for the surveillance missions and implements contingency plans relevant to nutrition; • Urban Early Warning and Early Action Consortium comprising Concern Worldwide, Kenya Red Cross Society and Oxfam GB — 3 non-state actors that entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the Nairobi City County Government for the purpose of transferring

	<p>the UEWEA technology from the consortium to actors 1 and 2 above. The Consortium also provided financial and material resources for the pilot trials of the tool;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Deputy County Commissioners for the project areas who chair disaster committees in which dissemination of surveillance reports is done.
Approach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2009-2016 — Research was carried out called "indicator surveillance for urban emergencies" as reported at https://aphrc.org/backup/post/projects/indicator-development-for-surveillance-of-urban-emergencies-idsue and https://www.concernusa.org/project-profile/idsue/ and https://www.concern.net/insights/indicator-development-surveillance-urban-ememencies-julv-2015 . The research was approved by the Kenya Medical Research Institute. The result was the five indicators and thresholds for urban food security situations and the UEWEA tool. 2. 2016-2017 — Discussions between Concern Worldwide, Kenya Red Cross, Oxfam and World Vision and the Nairobi City County Government on the research findings and UEWEA that resulted in a Memorandum of Understanding for technology transfer to the latter; World Vision later exited. 3. 2007-2018 — Pilot trials for UEWEA and roll out in Nairobi City County. 4. 2018+ - Institutionalization of UEWEA food security surveillance in official city county development plan and continuation of implementation.
Innovation	<p>The UEWEA practice is novel. It was pioneered in Nairobi City. It is clearly superior to the known food security assessment tools at national and international context with respect to urban food situation assessment. Under the national system, field missions are carried out periodically to assess parameters that have little to do with the urban situation such as weather, crops planted and harvested, etc. Urban food security is a factor of incomes which determines access to food.</p> <p>The national surveillance system is qualitative and under-developed and for that reason does not adequately speak to the policy processes. The UEWEA tool is quantitative, specific, measurable, repeatable and timely. The results are inferable to a community in a small area and sampling is done at the household level.</p> <p>The national system is not sensitive to urban situations, having been developed and practiced in rural settings. The UEWEA tool is developed for urban areas and sensitive to urban situation. It will aid assessment of the extent of implementation of activities to achieve Sustainable Development Goal 1, 2 and 11 in the urban setting.</p> <p>Finally, the tool is linked to early action at local levels. The Deputy County Commissioner implements the findings at the sub-county level. The national system only triggers response with different agencies and at the macro-level.</p>
Impact	<p>The UEWEA tool and practice clearly identifies vulnerable populations who are actually the respondents in the surveillance component. The cause of the vulnerability is identified through each of the 5 indicators using quantitative data. Vulnerability due to poverty (as illuminated by responses to questions on equalized income, stable income earner and number of food baskets afforded by the household) is highlighted and this gives direction to the intervention necessary to improve resilience. Child diarrhoea is a proxy indicator for the level of poverty in the affected household. Vulnerability due to shocks is also identified by the tool, with shocks including eviction from houses, flooding, mugging and fires. This again affords correct response to food emergency based on the actual cause of the vulnerability.</p> <p>In the practice the following early actions have been put in place:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subsistence food production: promotion of sustainability of domestic food production through targeted extension services. This is a routine activity in all communities; • A total of 3,034 households (female 2,085 and male 949) of Kibera, Korogocho and Mukuru were in one month provided with Ksh 2,000= each to lift them out of the emergency food situation; • Upon detection of food insecurity reflected by child diarrhoea in Kibera, Korogocho and Mukuru, 1,500 households were in one month taken through awareness creation, water testing, mass screening and distribution of nutritional supplements in order to lift them from food situation.
<p>Inclusion</p>	<p>The UEWEA practice complies with thematic inclusiveness by involving 3 local authorities cum county departments (i.e. agriculture, health and disaster management) and two levels of government (i.e. county with respect to early warning and national with respect to early action). Further, the UEWEA practice is fully socially inclusive where civil society is partnering with city county government. The search on the urban food security surveillance was carried out by civil society (i.e. Concern Worldwide and partners) under the approval of government's Kenya Medical Research Institute and with the support of the Department for International Development. The city government is leading in implementation of the practice under official partnership with other governmental and non-governmental actors. The preparation of response packages has been done through public workshops of governmental, non-governmental and private sector actors.</p>
<p>Adversity coefficient</p>	<p>Severe economic hardship predisposing to conflict</p> <p>The practice areas of Kibera, Mukuru and Korogocho suffers impacts of extreme economic hardship that both the research component and the roll out have to surmount. Respondents are very poor. They are very suspicious of investigators mistaking them for agents of opposing political parties or enforcers of government directives and in some cases agents of donors exploiting their situation for financial gain. One surveillance mission had to be postponed owing to hostility toward the investigators when they were associated with a locally-unpopular political party during electioneering.</p> <p>The areas have high prevalence of muggings and other crimes, more so targeted against strangers. One enumerator was robbed of a cell phone and another of a handbag. To gain access to the communities, two-pronged measures are used. First, investigators and enumerators have been using branded shirts of the partner Kenya Red Cross and also other official county government attire. This identifies the visitors. Secondly, community members are incorporated into the missions and are paid tokens; their role is to guide the visitors and introduce them to the respondents.</p> <p>Administrative challenges</p> <p>The researchers faced difficulties in transmitting their findings to city government and having the technology adopted. Firstly, the office responsible for emergencies and disaster was apparently not aware of food-related emergencies and rejected the overtures of the researchers, sending them to agriculture department. At the agriculture department the management took very long to adopt a technology driven by non-governmental bodies. The persistence and focus of the UEWEA Consortium finally bore fruit when the renamed Food, Agriculture and Forestry Department embraced the practice as one of its core functions.</p>