

**MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND MINERAL RESOURCES: NATIONAL CLIMATE CHANGE  
RESPONSE STRATEGY ACTION PLAN**

**Consultative Meeting,**

**27 -29 February 2012, KCB Karen**

---

(Session 1)

**1. INTRODUCTORY SESSION FOR SC6 AND SC7 TWG MEMBERS**

The session was opened by Mr. Stephen Kinguyu who welcomed all members to the workshop on behalf of the PS MEMR, Ali Mohamed. For the benefit of SC6 & SC7 and the TWG members who were new in the process, the Chair made a presentation introducing the action plan process, the subcomponents terms of reference and the thematic working group members' terms of reference.

**1.1 Action Plan Process Presentation**

Stephen gave an overview of the National Climate Change Response Strategy (NCCRS) and the Action Plan Process. He explained that the action plan process was to help operationalize the NCCRS. He shared the coordination structure of the action plan process, saying that it was spearheaded by the Government of Kenya and that it involved stakeholders from the government, the private sector, civil society organizations and communities who had representation in the taskforce and thematic working groups of the action plan process.

He introduced the 9 subcomponents (SCs) of the action plan process to the members indicating their roles and how they were interrelated. These were: Long-term National Low Carbon Development Pathway (SC1); Enabling Policy and Regulatory Framework (SC2); National Adaptation Plan (SC3); Nationally Appropriate Mitigations Actions (SC4); National Technology Action Plan (SC5); National Performance and Benefit Measurement (SC6); Knowledge Management and Capacity Development (SC7); Finance (SC8); Coordination (SC9).

He said SC6 and SC7 which had just began their work and would present their initial views on their proposed work, receive feedback, revise, and submit the inception reports to the Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources for approval before their work would get underway.

The chair informed members that the operationalization of NCCRS through the action plan was a priority for Kenya and that once the action plan was complete, the output from the various SCs would be mainstreamed into various sectors of the economy to be implemented.

***Questions, Clarifications, Comments from the members***

**Qn.** What was the right balance between adaptation and mitigation funding because the priority for most development partners was mitigation because it had a lot of investment opportunities.

**Answer.** It was noted that there was no clear cut way of having a balance between funds for mitigation and adaptation as there were well developed frameworks for mitigation but not yet for adaptation. Some suggested approaches to bring about a balance between adaptation and mitigation were to develop mitigation programs with core benefits in adaptation and to negotiate bilateral programs that bring about successful emissions reductions while also building resilience amongst communities. The other option would be to understand the core-benefits of both mitigation and adaptation, putting up frameworks to understand which ones could be of benefit to the county and choosing the best outcome.

**Comment.** Anthony of SC7 thanked Stephen for the presentation and said it helped them see the linkage between the various SCs and also noticed that some of the SCs had moved quite a bit in terms of beginning their work, some had not begun and some were just beginning.

**Qn.** He asked if there was a timeframe set for completion of all the SCs work and for the development of the action plan. **Answer.** Stephen answered that the timeline was June 2012 when most of the processes were expected to be completed so as to start the actual implementation.

**Qn.** Maureen SC6 asked how the legal and political issues that affect mitigation and resilience would be addressed. **Answer.** Stephen answered that SC2 was responsible for addressing issues of policy and regulatory framework and that the political issues would be addressed through having sessions with parliament. He added that SC8, the finance subcomponent would hold parliamentary group meetings to talk of climate finance. He said that there would be a special sensitization session with the members of parliament and that the consultants would be informed when needed to make presentations to those forums. He also mentioned a parallel program on the private members bill where some climate change members are invited to make contributions.

## **1.2 Thematic Working Group (TWG) TORs Presentation**

The chair reported that the Taskforce proposed the setting up of Thematic Working Groups for for each Subcomponent. He spelt out the objectives of the TWGs, the overall one being to provide focused technical support for SC consultants and to link the process to initiatives currently being undertaken across the country. He also highlighted the TWGs major work was to review and comment on the technical outputs of the SCs as part of the quality assurance aspect of the AP process and to make recommendations to the Taskforce. The TWGs would also act as a repository for this specialized knowledge after the AP process is concluded.

The Chair continued that the TWGs expected outputs would be reflected in the outputs of the SC teams and that all TWG decisions would be recorded in minutes drafted by the consultant teams. Expectations of the TWGs with regard to participatory and inclusive approaches were shared with the meeting. On the membership of the TWGs, the presenter reported that the list of nominated members had not yet been finalized, but mentioned that the lists were close to completion and that at for most of the TWGs,

a TF member had been nominated as the convener. He informed the meeting that the secretariat would provide support to convene meetings and additional logistical support.

### ***Questions, Clarifications, Comments from the members***

**Qn.** SC 6 consultant sought to know if the minutes of the TWG meetings would be shared to all consultants. **Answer.** He was informed that the TWG members would not be meeting alone but with the consultants and that the consultants would be responsible for the preparation of the minutes of the TWG meetings. However, whenever possible, someone from the secretariat would join the TWG meetings. Once minutes are agreed, they will be shared through the coordination tool.

**Comment.** The consultants were asked to always have an objective of the TWG meetings, and that it was their prerogative to know what actions they wanted their thematic working group to take to help take the process forward. And that the TWG minutes were expected to have clear action points agreed on and timelines for feedback.

(Session 2)

## **2. INCEPTION WORKSHOP FOR SC 6 & SC 7**

Session chaired by Charles Mutai

### **2.1 Subcomponent 6 Presentation (*Full presentation at kccap website*)**

SC6 consultant presented the approach, the proposed activities, and their outputs as stated in their TORs, as well as the SC interdependencies, relevant issues and deadlines.

After giving their initial thoughts, the team invited inputs from the members of the other SC teams expressed their wish to build on and complement work that had already been done, and to participate and consult with various stakeholders.

### **Questions, Comments, Responses**

**Comment.** The team was asked to develop a national MRV framework that would capture both mitigation and adaptation and the synergies between them.

**Qn.** The team was asked if the MRV framework would be up to output level or outcome level and also if it would look at individual projects or programs and go towards assessing and reporting the results or policies as well. **Answer.** The framework would look at outcomes and results rather than outputs and would initially look at reporting on the mitigation and NAMAs actions.

**Comment.** The team was reminded to look at experiences from other developing countries and not only from UK experiences. The team said they will take account of the Kenya context.

**Qn.** The team was asked if the framework will certify the Durban specifications for the system or will they limit it to the type of data that Kenya requires. **Answer.** The framework would be generic but they would try to make it as helpful and specific as possible.

**Comment.** SC7 commented that they will be looking at knowledge management and capacity development and told the consultants that as they do their work indicating areas where they needed capacity building they will be linking up with them to see how to incorporate into their SC.

**Comment.** The Ministry of Agriculture representative suggested to the team to work with specific sectors and come up with specific MRVs for those sectors rather than come up with only generic MRVs. The team responded it was not them to indicate what the specific MRVs should be as they would be building on what was already done and decided, but promised to make them as specific as possible.

**Comment.** The team was reminded to mainstream their scope of work and indicators for success with the MTP review and Vision 2030.

## **2.2 Subcomponent 7 Presentation - *(Full presentation at kccap website)***

The SCs representative introduced his team and went on to share their main objective, their scope of work and their understanding of capacity development. He shared their work-plan and their ideas about developing a climate change knowledge management platform.

### **Questions, Comments, Responses**

**Qn.** A concern was raised about sequencing their activities with those of other SCs. **Answer.** They would work together with the other SCs to get to know what the SCs want from them and for them to indicate what they would want from the other subcomponents and to harmonize the SCs mutual areas of interest.

**Qn.** There was a question on whether the team would have knowledge products. **Answer.** They would have knowledge products in their knowledge platform as they have the capacity to build multimedia knowledge products and added that they would recommend strong public awareness efforts to ensure that all stakeholders know about the action plan.

### **Comments.**

- The team was asked to capture the relevant chapter of the harmonized action plan and to refer to the UNFCCC capacity development model. They were told that their driving force should be to meet national priorities using Vision 2030 and to implement the NCCRS before meeting other UNFCCC obligations. Their presentation on knowledge management platform failed to capture the issues of information, education, awareness and the elements of the knowledge management platform that would be necessary for the process to move forward. For instance, the team was asked to show how they would measure the capacity of an indigenous farmer, how they would approach that assessment and at the institutional level, what the indices would be.

- The team was asked to make their website simple and powerful. The OPM representative also recommended to the team to provide a maintenance plan for their platform and proposed that they work with the ICT board on how things can be designed to work.
- On the capacity development component, the team was asked what considerations they have, given that there might be a different political landscape with the new elections based on the new constitution and the capacity needs that will be there at that time.
- The ministry of agriculture representative informed the team about a process that is going at her ministry on to concretize on training needs and interventions for both adaptation and mitigation. They were asked to build on such efforts and also efforts of other institutions to know what was already happening.

### **Responses to comments**

- The team appreciated the comments and indicated that they would refocus their work on the action plan relating to the constitution. On the issue of capacity for who, they would clarify that to indicate their target. They said that the elements that would be contained in their portal would be elements of receiving and pushing knowledge, list of institutions, research current and contemporary, and will thus be a living platform that captures and makes available new information about climate change.
- The consultants said that they would continue to engage with the secretariat to fine tune their work and what was expected of them.

Stephen Kinguyu informed all the SCs that there was already so much knowledge and capacity on the ground and that they needed to take the action plan process higher than what was already on the ground. He urged them to contact existing institutions already addressing similar issues and that had a wealth of information related to climate change. He advised SC7 to sit with others and address gaps existing in the SC. All the SCs were asked to move with speed and convene with TWGs.

As a way forward, the AP coordinator asked SC6 and SC7 to integrate the comments received into their ideas and give a draft and that further guidance would be given to SC7.

(Session 3)

### **3. CLOSED SESSION WITH SC REPRESENTATIVES**

SC9 Coordinator made introductory remarks to the SC teams, on the purpose of the closed door meeting, which was to have plenary discussion on the overall progress, to share ideas on the vision of the final product, the county consultation workshop plan and aligning and sequencing SCs work.

#### **Questions, Comments, Responses**

The new consultants requested for information or materials on what had been going on in the process to enable them to be up to date with what was expected of them and to avoid re-inventing the wheel

considering that the time remaining to finish the action plan was short. For information on key government contacts, the coordinator informed them that they would work through the TF members. They also asked for previous minutes, quick notes, and information on coordinating meetings. The coordinator asked them to share their lists so she could inform them who to contact. She promised to share notes on initial meetings.

The SC representatives shared their views of their anticipated final products beside their technical reports indicating if they would be sessional papers, policy briefs, areas related to specific budget lines, notifications, or office files. She asked them to share these views so that all consultants could see where they were and have consensus on where their way forward.

Each subcomponent shared what their anticipated final products were and their vision of the final combined action plan product. They held a discussion on this but it was not conclusive. Some views expressed were to have an overall 20 page publication, an executive summary that would be available to policy makers and higher level people, or an overall action plan document that would expand into 150-200 pages, where every SC would have 10-20 pages to share their findings and that would be available electronically. Also that it should be something that every Kenyan should read, very short and crisp with as little supporting analysis as possible, with the rest as annexes.

(Session 4)

#### **4. SUBCOMPONENT 2 PRESENTATION (*Full presentation at kccap website*)**

The SC2 representatives made a presentation on their progress report and their next steps.

##### **Questions, Comments, Responses from the members**

The team was asked to show the economic impacts of the new regulations, to give suggestions on how these laws could be enforced and guidelines on the improvement of the regulations in their laws.

**Qn.** The team was informed that the ministry of finance through treasury was trying to come up with a carbon trading and finance policy and framework and was asked how the new one they were proposing was different. The team was asked how it was doing to deal with the international property rights issues as it was a critical issue for developing countries, would they match them or do away with one.

**Answer.** The team agreed to do consultations with the ministry of finance. On the economic impact of new regulations they said they would do a methodology and not a detailed analysis but that this would be discussed further. On the issue of intellectual property the team indicated that the TWG would advise what is suitable for the developing country or not.

**Qn.** Would the policy framework respond to gaps in the existing policy or would it be an assessment of needs and priorities. The gender mainstreaming expert indicated that the policy framework needed to respond to the issues that Kenya was currently struggling with and to also address equity and gender. It was noted that men needed to be considered when looking at gender. **Answer.** The team responded

that the constitution of Kenya was clear about gender issues and it was a national duty for them to consider it.

**Qn.** There was a question about how the team chose the sample for county consultations and about who was driving the action plan process, saying that if the process was not owned, then its implementation would be a challenge. **Answer.** The team responded that the Ministry of Environment and Mineral Resources was driving the process and that the consultations involved all stakeholders who constituted the taskforce, thematic working groups members and other stakeholders to be consulted during the country consultations.

**Comment.** The members were reminded to ensure that the legal framework that the consultants were developing for the country was implementable. The team was asked to consult with the commission for implementation to ensure that when they do work and that the feedback on the bill would be discussed as appropriate.

(Session 5)

## **5. SUBCOMPONENT 3 PRESENTATION *(Full presentation at kccap website)***

The subcomponent 3 representative shared their tasks and progress to date and their conclusions.

### **Questions, Comments, Responses from members**

#### **Comments**

- The team was asked to capture both local and international institutions, formal and informal institutions in their consultations, as well as to give examples of both indigenous and external technologies. They were also asked to classify government and private institutions separately so that those of government come out clearly. The team was asked if it was possible to do risk assessment by region and to show which institutions would take the lead.

The team appreciated the views and agreed to incorporate them in their work.

- The OPM representative said there was need for structured consultations focused on the interlinkages between the subcomponents and that this needed to be shared with the stakeholders to see how this has been addressed. There was also need to provide capacity building indicators and estimates on costs to inform on-going work. The issues of sustainability, coordination and information management were important and that linkages and in-depth discussions had to happen so as to be sustainable. He also said that the OPM had plans to support MRV program and would liaise with Ministry of environment to put funds for organizing the meeting the consultants had talked about.
- The team was asked to make adaptation a business case in order to capture the private sector.

- On trans-boundary issues, the team was asked to consider programs that were taking place in Tanzania, Uganda that would affect Kenya's development programs. For instance, Somalia was expected to drill petroleum products, the big talk about extending the continental shelf.

**Response.** The team responded that they were trying to capture costs of adaptation actions but that they would not manage to do fresh costing studies within the timeline of the project. They would however consider possibility of having a costing workshop and they would discuss this with the CCS. The team agreed to work on the interlinkages with other SCs and that their transboundary list was not exhaustive.

The chair, Stephen Kinguyu thanked SC3 for their presentation. He reminded the TWG members to share their expertise to inform the process to help the consultants get their work right. He also asked the SC2 team to share their long list of laws that they kept referring to with the other participants.

The members were informed that all documents for sharing would be uploaded to the [www.kccap.info](http://www.kccap.info) website where they could access them.

The consultants were reminded to get in touch with TWG conveners to move the process forward. The meeting was informed that Patrick Chabeda, the OPM representative had promised to help with the coordination of TWG 2 instead of Eunice Lumallas.

Francis Nguatah, Provincial Director of Meteorology Central province, appreciated the process and said he could see the entry point for organizing the county consultations. Stephen Kinguyu clarified that the provincial directors were the focal points for county consultations and urged them to interact with consultants as this was a good opportunity.

He thanked the presenters and once again asked the members to get consultants contacts to communicate with them directly.

(Session 6)

## **6. PRESENTATION ON T21 (Full presentation at kccap website)**

The chair, Stephen Kinguyu welcomed all to the session and made an adjustment to the days' program to have the county consultations discussions in the afternoon so as to give a chance to the Kenya Meteorology directors to give their ideas. He however said that the presentation from the Threshold 21 (T21) would be given by the Ministry of planning representative, Mr. C. Wangombe.

The presenter, Mr. Wangombe mentioned that the T21 team comprised of different people in government whose role was to integrate climate issues in national planning. He said the team was now finalizing the T21 report that documents the project and the results of what they had done in different stages. He said that Climate Change had not had key areas within national planning but the government had taken it seriously to have it in the next MTP and vision 2030.

In his presentation, the presenter indicated that T21 was chosen as a vehicle to enable comprehensive risk assessment adaptation and mitigation measures to be captured in national planning. He said that T21 captures the strengths of other models such as economic models, computer programme models, among others. He also shared the requirements they went through in preparing the model.

### **Questions, Comments and Responses from members**

**Qn.** The presenter was asked to explain the assumptions and limitations that they put into the T21 model, to do the optimization of the variable of an environment with varied people interacting together for the purpose of viability of the model and also the sensitivity analysis of the model. He was also asked why they have interrogated green house gases only and not other pollutants.

**Answer.** The presenter said they had many assumptions based on Vision 2030, for example, looking at other investment targets of the government as well as issues highlighted within NCCRS, the main document in making the model. Also an assumption on what level of growth they are expecting in terms of GDP. The challenges faced in the model are mostly the issues of data but have documented many issues that have happened and Kenya meteorology had been instrumental in this. On sensitivity analysis, the presenter said that they have been able to look at this for various models to ensure what they were doing is not out of what should be done within the model. The Key areas of investment for the model, he said were the climate mitigation and adaptation investments, that is, within agriculture, or sectoral investments, greening investments. Why have they only considered only green house gases and not other pollutants, he said they will interrogate the issue further and see how to put it in the model.

**Qn. & Answer.** On the question of scenario analysis and checking correlativity's in the climate variables, the presenter said, for instance in the changing variability's in land use, they have the land model and have got some people from department of remote sensing to deal with that area to tell them how the movement or change of land has been undergoing within the last 30 years and then they incorporated it into the current situation.

**Qn.** Considering that rainfall variability was a driver in all economic development and external trade, the presenter was asked how they had taken into account in their scenario development of climate. He was also asked how the T21 model would help the government of Kenya and ministry of planning to revise monetary allocations, besides, a member raised concern about how the team ensures that the data they have is good quality.

### **Responses**

In response to the question on variability in climate change and scenario development of climate, the presenter said they used KMD data from the past and assessed how it was performing and captured the changes in the model and are thus able to check what happens to GDP and other sectors for instance when there is flooding or drought.

On how T21 would be used to advise the budgeting process, the presenter explained that they intended by the time they finalize and have the report to share with key policy people, as they went to the next MTP, no money would be given to any sector unless it was in the plan. This was to ensure issues of Climate Change are in the plan and hence get budgeting.

About data quality and what had been done on that, the presenter said that KMD was key in getting them the right numbers and that they had national data within the modeling stages to ensure their numbers were valid, true and quality.

**Qn.** The SC 3 representative asked if they could be invited to the T21 validation workshops and was asking the kind of detail involved in the model so that they could pick up to incorporate in their plan. She also asked how much investment had gone into adaptation in terms of monitoring.

### **Responses**

The T21 presenter responded that the report could be ready to be shared out within a month from the time of the meeting. He said that they had already done a validation workshop and were having sectoral meetings with experts in specific sectors to ensure what they would be line with the sector.

About adaptation investment versus national investment happening, there was no clear cut line to show what was for adaptation and for national development. But other than the investments that were purely driven to achieve specific climate change interventions, most of the others were like national investments. But as a government, there was the aspect of social welfare across the board but he agreed that it would be good if they had an investment that addressed issues of national development, adaptation, and others. However, he cautioned that this was not a conclusive answer.

About adaptation costing issues, the representative promised to have a one on one talk with the consultants. He also said that the model would be available to the public to critique.

A member raised concern that there was a lot of sectoral allocations being made but climate change was left out. He advised that the specific entry points be considered such as drought allocations to ensure climate change was not forgotten.

On the issue of the T21 model influencing policy makers, the presenter said that the model would give different options to them and it would be up to the policy makers to decide which options to take, although, it would be expected to inform what they would want to do.

In response to a question on the inclusion of community projects in the model, the presenter said that what they had in the model was what the government and the private sector was doing. At the community level they would need more information and promised to invite the participant to talk to the T21 team to give them some of the activities that were community based and that interested them in adaptations.

(Session 7)

## **7. SUBCOMPONENT 4 PRESENTATION (Full presentation at kccap website)**

The SC 4 team made their presentation and shared their workplan and their approach.

### **Questions, Comments, Responses from members**

**Qn.** The team was asked why they would not develop NAMAs. **Answer.** They would not give proposals of NAMAs but would prioritize NAMA proposals. They gave an example of the mitigation options in the transport sector and said they would assess what would be the impact on the carbon path or if they introduced gas fuel, what would be the impact and then the government would decide based on the information given what they think would be a NAMA to be developed and implemented. So clarified that they would not develop the NAMAs to bankable levels, but that the concept would be there.

**Qn.** The team was asked if they would come up with a REDD readiness plan or if they will inform Kenyans about the national readiness plan as submitted to the UN. The team was asked to make proposals on how urban mass transport could be achieved in Kenya. On how the ordinary farmers who wanted to do investment towards carbon stocks could benefit from carbon trade.

**Answer.** The consultants responded that they were in consultation with KFS on REDD plus readiness to ensure their analysis was complementary. They also said that they would try to identify activities that would be potential NAMAs but that could be implemented at the small scale levels and thus benefit small scale farmers.

### **Comments.**

- There was a general view among the participants that the team had made a great improvement from their last presentation in November. They had tried to capture their aspirations of where Kenyans wanted to go as had been presented in the transport sector example.
- The team was informed that there were so many desk reviews about where Kenya would like to be in the next 30 years that they could refer to, including vision 2030 and they were also told to use examples of other countries that had been where Kenya is today, such as Thailand that had major transport crisis and that was now so improved. They were told to listen to contributions from citizens on transport system and encapsulate the aspirations in the sector and it would help a lot.
- The consultants were asked to institutionalize the system where the strategic assessment they do will be available to Kenyans who would use it in their decision making.
- The team was asked to look at other pollutants that affect the air quality other than the GHG alone that would have an impact on health and on other sectors of the economy. On the general equilibrium and general model to project the GHG, a member suggested that the team considers using international vehicle emission model that would give distribution of the other pollutants.

- The team was told that the factsheets they update should give substantial information for them to meet their obligations under UNFCCC including issues of funding. They were asked not to shy away from promoting mitigation actions that had been listed. The need for clarity on who gets what was emphasized..
- A member highlighted the importance of issues of urban planning and governance when looking at transport. He suggested that the team proposes how to deal with the challenges of urban mass transport, for example, proposing the increasing of parking fees or reducing parking spaces, proposing use of smart buses, by-passes.
- The team was asked to look at the contribution of other works such as the LAMU port project, the , Thika road upgrading, just a weekend at one of the parks, Konza city and also the boda-boda and motorcycle industry to see the contribution to carbon intensity level and to make recommendations.

### **Responses**

The presenter was in agreement with the participants in the above comments and said the team would incorporate them in their work. On the issue of other pollutants, he said that their mandate was limited to GHG as defined in the Kyoto protocol and more specifically to the ones important within the country.

On how to institutionalize the process, there is a lot of work going on and they would work together with e.g. T21 to see how to move this process ahead.

**Qn.** The team was asked why they could not consider water management as a NAMA. **Answer.** There was an opportunity for mitigation in water management; however, they would have to look whether the voluntary methodologies of calculating emission reductions would be acceptable for the NAMA.

(Session 8)

### **8. SUBCOMPONENT 8 PRESENTATION (Full presentation at kccap website)**

SC8 consultant made a presentation on their tasks, their approach, and on their recommendations.

### **Questions, Comments, Responses from members**

**Question and Comments.** The concerns raised by the members were as follows. The claim that grants should not take the lion's share of the climate finance. That one year budget was too short; concrete accountability mechanism needed to be created; there were questions on benefits-sharing, additionality of climate finance over ODA, need to give priority to financial instruments that have multiplying effects, government keen to benefit from public private partnerships. There were suggestions to prioritize adaptation financing by private sector.

**Responses.** The team responded that funds would be limited, and therefore could not rush to distribute everything as a pure grant. Private sectors needed to receive funding from climate for additional or incremental costs. Budget cycle if longer would be better for predictability and steadiness. On devolution to counties fund-structure, the team said that Kenya is a unitary state, but there would be ways of involving counties in representation. For instance, counties could be represented in the steering committee.

**Qn. & Answer.** On questions about transparency, accountability and legitimacy and the meeting was informed that precise determinants of accountability were yet to be decided.

**Qn.** The team was asked how the private sectors, civil society would access the fund considering that there was tendency towards financing large and mitigation type activities, and also what the investment strategy of the fund was related to national development priorities and Vision 2030 priorities?

**Answer.** The team said that they had proposed a fund that deals with adaptation and mitigation and dispenses grants and loans. They said that the efficiency of fund would be partially determined by number of actors it can work with, but that it could be possible to channel funds down to lower levels. Funding could be available for smaller communities, but meeting the strict criteria can be quite difficult. Need to design a fund which can remove barriers to accessing conventional climate finance.

## **9. OUTCOME EXPECTED IN THE WHOLE ACTION PLAN PROCESS**

Virinder of DFID said that the action plan process was useful and shared some predictions on the way forward. He appreciated that it was a huge task being undertaken by the TF, TWGs, the ministry of environment and the climate experts.

- While commenting on the products of the process, the participant asked how the action plan would be different from the NCCRS and what would it mean for low carbon in the country. He informed the consultants that the government works with on notifications, government orders, budget lines, costing proposals, briefs for policy, and performance contracts that institutionalize the government of Kenya.
- Along with what they produce for technical reports the consultants were asked to ensure they had the briefs ready to be used by the TF to push for the action plan issues in all ministries and this is what could make a difference between what the NCCRS was and what the Action Plan would be.
- He also said that a higher level of challenge or quality control needed to come out from the TWGs, TF and other members on the feasibility of what was being provided by the consultants. And added that the process should change the way the government of Kenya make low carbon decisions, structures for the people on the ground, and so the action plan products should take care of that. They should look at measurability of things and this would be critical. Unless their inputs fed into what is happening daily in the country things would not change. He said that the challenge was for

all the stakeholders, including donors and development partners to ensure the consultants develop implementable, challengeable and costable outputs.

- The members present supported the views on the consultants having implementable products that would result from proper quality checks by all concerned. It was reiterated that the products needed to be in form of notifications, government orders, budget lines, costing proposals, briefs for policy, and performance contracts that the government works with.

The project coordinator thanked everyone for participating in the workshop. She mentioned the anticipated time of completion of project as June/July 2012. She gave a brief to the members about the county consultations that would have one representative from each of the technical teams, as well as two representatives from the taskforce. She mentioned 23-25 April, at KCB Karen as the next date for a joint consultations meeting and 4-6 June as the date for the validation workshop that would be held in Nairobi. There would however be specific consultation with Kenyan civil society, as well as the private sector, collaboration with SUNY with members of Parliament on Climate Change Bill.

The chair closed the workshop by thanking all participants for their dedication and enthusiasm.