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ABSTRACT

Policy formulation is a critical phase of the public policy process when goals, priorities and options of a policy are decided by a small group of experts. Although public policy formulation is in the domain of the government, the role of non-state actors has become apparent and significant. This study established that non-state agents acting as a policy network contributed to formulation of the National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy in Kenya. The process was coordinated and managed by the former Ministry of State for Special Programmes. A descriptive qualitative case study design was employed to examine the collective role played by the non-state actors in formulation of the Disaster Risk Reduction Policy. Advocacy Coalitions Framework approach was used as a theoretical framework to assess their structure and contribution in this process. This study considered non-state actors as a policy subsystem as opposed to analysing individual contributions. Data was collected in Nairobi from June – August 2013 using semi-structured questionnaires, interviews, informal conversations and analysis of secondary documents. In consultation with the former Ministry of State for Special Programmes 21 organisations were selected through a non-random sampling technique. These were organisations whose participation was consistent and were considered most useful respondents. The study aimed at identifying types of non-state actors that participated in formulation of the Disaster Risk Reduction Policy, establish the nature of their contribution and examine factors that affected their engagement. Data was analysed with the aid of Microsoft Excel. The study established that the main categories of non-state participants were intergovernmental organisations, international non-governmental organisations, national non-governmental organisations, universities, research institutions/think tanks and consultancy firms. The Ministry of State for Special Programmes remained the lead actor coordinating and controlling the process. Inter-governmental and international non-governmental organisations were the majority of the non-state actors. Even though the groups of non-state actors could be likened to a policy subsystem, Disaster Risk Reduction actors can be termed as a nascent as opposed to a mature subsystem. According to findings NSAs contributed in policy formulation through funding, research and data analysis, technical support and lobbying policy makers. Inadequate political will, interruption by political processes, high turnover rates among non-state actors, weak strategies for policy engagement were some of the key challenges facing non-state actors as they engaged in public policy formulation. Use of evidence, capacity building on national policy processes and disaster risk reduction, existence of an international policy framework on Disaster Risk Reduction were the main facilitating factors. The study recommends that the Government of Kenya should build capacity of non-state actors in public policy processes to enhance their effectiveness in public policy engagement. Non-state actors on the other hand need to act as a coalition, incorporate informal approaches into formal processes, allocate funds for their participation, conduct targeted sustained lobbying and use evidence during their engagement in public policy formulation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACF</td>
<td>Advocacy Coalition Framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAL</td>
<td>Arid and Semi-Arid Lands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMESA</td>
<td>Common Market for East and Southern Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRR</td>
<td>Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>East African Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>European Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoK</td>
<td>Government of Kenya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPPN</td>
<td>Global Public Policy Networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>Hyogo Framework of Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICPAC</td>
<td>Climate Predictions and Applications Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAD</td>
<td>Inter-Governmental Authority on Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGOs</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoSSP</td>
<td>Ministry of State for Special Programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSAs</td>
<td>Non-State Actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECs</td>
<td>Regional Economic Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDMCOE</td>
<td>Regional Disaster Management Centre of Excellence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISDR</td>
<td>United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DEFINITION OF KEY TERMS

Disaster: Serious disruption of the functioning of the society causing widespread human, material or environmental damage and losses which exceed the ability of the affected community to cope using their own resources.

Disaster Management: The sum of activities implemented in order to prevent or reduce the impacts of disaster. They include disaster risk reduction, preparedness, response and recovery after a disaster.

Disaster Risk Reduction: The concept and practice of reducing disaster risks through systematic efforts to analyse and manage the causal factors of disasters, including through reduced exposure to hazards, lessened vulnerability of people and property, wise management of land and the environment, and improved preparedness for adverse events.

Non-State Actors: A wide range of entities that are non-governmental in nature. The range includes among others intergovernmental organisations, civil society organisations, think tanks and private enterprises. Such organisations are not established by an Act of Parliament. The term is sometimes used interchangeably with non-governmental organisations, civil society organisations, and non-institutional actors. The Government of Kenya refers to this group broadly as external stakeholders.

Policy: A proposed course of action by an individual, organisation in an effort to reach a goal or achieve an objective.

Policy Actors: Persons and organisations who participate in the policy process.

Policy Cycle: Stages in a policy process. The common policy cycle includes agenda setting, Policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation and monitoring and evaluation.

Policy Formulation: Development of effective and acceptable courses of action to address what has been placed on policy agenda.

Public Policy: The plan of action that the government pursues in an effort to solve public problems. Public policy is within the jurisdiction of state government or its agents.

Policy Network: An extra-formal interaction that occurs among individuals and organisations that have an interest in a particular policy issue.

State Actors: The state is synonymous with government. State Actors are institutions and individuals appointed by the government into the public service and who the government authorises to act in policy issues on its behalf. This category is sometimes known as the bureaucracy. In Kenya, state actors are referred to as internal actors and comprise Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies.
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CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

Theodoulou and Cahn (1994) assert that public policy is an outcome of interaction between governmental and nongovernmental actors. In spite of the multi-actor approach, the dominant legitimate role of the government in determining, implementing and enforcing public policies cannot be contested (Sutton 1999). The government lends legitimacy to public policies, ensures universality and monopolises coercion in society for implementation of its policies. While the government remains at the core of public policy processes, contributions by non-state actors as key stakeholders is increasingly becoming apparent and significant.

According to Bossuyt (2000), involving non-state actors in formulation and implementation of public policy has become widespread in both developed and developing countries. Bossuyt sees this phenomenon as a new form of participatory democracy that promotes consensual decision-making by incorporating key stakeholders who would eventually play a critical role in implementation of public policies. Participatory approach in public policy formulation accrues several benefits such as increasing ownership, fostering new public-private partnerships, consolidating democratisation and improving sustainability. Bossuyt however notes that the roles of the various actors in public policy making remains to be clarified.

In Africa, participation by non-state actors in public policy has evolved since the post-independence period. Whereas in the post-independence period, they were predominantly
engaged in policy implementation by supporting development programmes, their participation has expanded to include advocacy and lobbying, policy formulation and acting as watchdogs to keep governments accountable for their commitments.

For a long time, African governance was characterised by dictatorial and military regimes that treated non-state actors such as civil society institutions with suspicions. While non-state actors in more developed countries became active in public policy processes, such vibrancy did not exist in the non-democratic or transitional democratic states of Sub-Saharan Africa. Lack of policy framework to guide participation in public policy further hampered engagement by non-state actors (Kalu 2004). Additionally, in many developing countries like Kenya matters of social justice such as us famine, drought, flooding, and corruption rarely feature in government public policy agenda. Non-governmental actors therefore force such issues into public agenda and support policy formulation (Ibid). Policy formulation refers to the policymaking phase where ideas are drafted and translated into government programmes.

Sessional Paper number 1 of 2006 on Non-governmental Organisations appears to be among the first official documents in which the Government of Kenya committed to engage with NGOs on policy matters (GoK 2006). More recently, the 2010 Constitution encouraged public participation in decision-making and opened up public policy arena to a wide range of NSAs (Constitution of Kenya 2010, Article 232). The Government recognises that State – non-state actors’ partnership in policy process enhances ownership and facilitates implementation of public decisions. It acknowledges that limited
stakeholder engagement is a recipe for policy failure (GoK 2010, GoK 2012). In spite of the recent developments, the role that non-state actors play in public policy formulation in Kenya remains to be clearly documented.

Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) is a fairly new concept popularised after the World Conference on Disaster Reduction which was held in Hyogo, Japan in 2005. One of the recommendations was to ensure that DRR is a national and local priority with strong institutional basis for implementation. It also called for formation of national platforms on disaster risk reduction that caters for diversity of actors associated with the complexity of DRR (UNISDR, 2005). The Hyogo Framework of Action 2005 – 2015 gave an impetus to the Government of Kenya in consultation with non-state actors (NSAs) to develop the National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy (DRR Policy). The role that non-state actors played in formulation of the DRR Policy has not been investigated and documented. This study set out to identify the type of NSAs that participated in this process, examine the nature of their contribution, investigate factors that influenced their participation and suggest recommendations to guide participation by NSAs in similar policy formulation processes. The study drew from the concept of policy networks and Advocacy Coalition Framework Approach to examine and explain the collective approach by non-state actors in collaboration with governmental actors during process of formulation of the DRR Policy.
1.2 Statement of the Problem
Public policy research in Kenya has concentrated on analysis of the substance and implications of public policies with little consideration of the policy making process. This study attempted to contribute to reducing this gap by examining the role that non-state actors play in public policy making process. While non-state actors such as intergovernmental organisations, civil society organisations, trade unions, private sector, policy think tanks and professional bodies among others have previously participated in important policy processes in Kenya, it is not clear what their role has been. Documents examined confirm that there were a variety of non-governmental actors who contributed to formulation of the National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy; whereas the responsibility of the Government in public policy formulation is obvious, there is scanty information on the types of non-state actors who contributed to this process, the nature of their contribution and factors that affected their engagement. Where such important experiences are not adequately documented, it may lead to gap in lesson learning and subsequently poor and ineffective engagement between the Government and non-state actors in critical stages of public policy process.

1.3 Research Questions
The study was guided by the following research questions:

i. What types of non-state actors participated in formulation of the National Policy for Disaster Risk Reduction?
ii. In what ways did these NSAs contribute during the policy formulation process?
iii. What factors facilitated their participation?
iv. What challenges did the non-state actors face?
1.4 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study were to:

i. Identify the types of NSAs that participated in formulation of the National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy (DRR Policy);

ii. Examine contributions made by the NSAs in formulation of the DRR Policy;

iii. Investigate factors that facilitated participation by NSAs during DRR Policy formulation;

iv. Identify key challenges faced by the NSAs during the policy formulation process;

1.5 Research Assumptions

The following assumptions were made:

i. That a wide variety of non-state actors contributed to the formulation of the National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy;

ii. NSAs contributed significantly in development of the policy;

iii. NSAs engaged in the process as a policy subsystem with common policy beliefs hence building synergies to facilitate their participation;

iv. There was close collaboration and minimum conflicts between State and NSAs.

1.6 Justification and Significance of the Study

Disaster Risk Reduction is a complex concept with no clear-cut solutions; developing a national policy in DRR requires a multi-sectoral approach involving several actors. It is important to understand how the different actors interact and the contribution they make to such policy processes.
This study is significant to the Government of Kenya, public policy researchers and groups such as donor agencies and non-state actors. For the Government of Kenya, this study provides useful information on how non-state actors can complement Government’s efforts in policy formulation and decision-making. For public policy researchers the study presents perspectives from Kenya especially as it relates to Advocacy Coalition Framework Approach and the concept of policy networks in developing countries. This research recommends strategies that can facilitate participation by non-state actors in public policy formulation and render it more effective.

1.7 Scope and Limitations

The study is based on experiences of non-state actors during formulation of National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy. Definition of the term non-state actors is elusive and inconclusive as the term encompasses an array of institutions that are non-governmental in nature. Within the scope of this study the term will be limited to those organisations that participated in formulation of the National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy which are not considered as state agencies. While the policy cycle is composed of several stages, this study is in reference to the policy formulation stage which is a period of research, debate, drafting and redrafting before the draft policy document is approved for submission to the legislature (Corkery et al 1995). The study was limited by the general lack of previous research on policy making processes in Kenya and particularly research in DRR policies. Finally, this study considered the group of NSAs as a subsystem and did not seek to analyse individual type of institutions that made up the group of NSAs.
CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Review of Related Literature

2.1.1 Introduction

Private institutions and individuals have addressed the roles that non-state actors play in public policy processes. Studies have been concentrated in developed countries where non-state actors have a longer history of influencing public policy. Additionally, application of policy network approach to studying disaster risk reduction policies is limited. There is a general dearth of information on experiences of non-state actors’ engagement in public policy formulation in Kenya. This chapter reviews the work of other authors and specifies concepts relating to roles of non-state actors in public policy formulation. A brief analysis of policy cycle helps to situate the policy stage that the study is focusing on. The review attempts to define and classify non-state actors and explains the concept of policy networks. The section concludes by identifying gaps in the literature reviewed and proposes a theoretical framework informing the study.

2.1.2 Development of the National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy: Brief History

Despite the recurrent nature of disasters and the economic, social and political vulnerability of the country to hazards, Kenya lacked a comprehensive disaster management framework (Suda 2000). Suda asserts that in the absence of a disaster management policy, response to disaster tended to be ad-hoc and uncoordinated short term measures in the form of emergency relief services to the worst affected areas. Suda emphasises that emergency relief is not the answer to disasters as disaster management should involve a continuum of activities integrated into development. Additionally, it has
been established that costs of disaster response can be significantly reduced where disaster management system exists (GoK 2009). Save the Children and Oxfam recommends management of risks as opposed to the crisis and the importance of early response to reduce losses resulting from disasters (Save the Children and Oxfam, 2012).

In order to establish a more proactive approach to managing disasters, the Government embarked on a process to develop a policy. Need for a policy on disaster management was triggered off by the poorly coordinated response to the 1998 bomb attack on the embassy of the United States of America in Nairobi, Kenya. Preliminary consultations of a disaster management policy began in 1999. The government through the disaster management-related ministries worked in close collaboration with actors in humanitarian response, academic and research institutions, experts in disaster management, civil society organisations and donors through numerous sessions to gather input and advice from the different stakeholders.

Kenya committed to implementation of the Hyogo Framework of Action (HFA) 2005 – 2015 in which one of the priority outcomes was to establish a functioning national multi-sectorial platform for disaster risk reduction (UNISDR, 2005). In its 2011 – 2013 HFA implementation progress report, Kenya indicated that a National Platform for Disaster Management had been formed and was made up of 15 civil society members, 2 National financial and planning institutions, 46 sectoral organisations, 6 science and academic institutions, and 1 women’s organisation. The report commends the role played by the
National Platform in drafting of the DRR policy. The platform is evidence of collaboration between NSAs and state actors in formulation of the DRR policy.

The first draft policy initially known as the National Policy for Disaster Management was submitted to the Departmental Committee on Labour and Social Welfare in 2000. The Committee recommended that issues of climate change be included in the draft. General Elections in 2002 slowed down its progress. In 2003, the draft was submitted to the Cabinet Sub-Committee that recommended for inclusion of issues on social protection. Once more, the national referendum on the constitution in 2005 interrupted progress of the draft. In 2009 the Government started another phase of consultation with key stakeholders. In February 2011, the draft policy was edited to conform to the structure of Government following promulgation of the new constitution in August 2010. In March 2012 the Departmental Committee on Labour and Social Welfare approved the draft policy for submission to the Cabinet and the name changed from National Policy for Disaster Management to National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy (DRR Policy).

2.1.3 Public Policymaking Process: An Overview
Public policy refers to the solutions that the government puts in place in an attempt to solve public problems (Ripley and Franklin 1987). The policy process is the course of action by the government to decide what will be done about the perceived problems. This decision-making process involves the government as the main actor but also other individuals and institutions who influence and are affected by the particular policy. Casey (1998) asserts that there has been diversification and growth in the number of actors in
public policy making. Although policy making is the responsibility of the government, public policy is a result of interaction with actors external to the government.

Policy process is generally perceived to progress in stages. The stages model was first proposed by Harrold Laswell in the 1950s in what became known as a Policy Cycle. The traditional Linear Model considers policy-making as a problem-solving practice which is rational, balanced, objective and analytical (Sutton 1999). Other authors however perceive public policy process as dominated by chaos, do not have clear-cut beginning and ending and involves many actors including government, interest groups and other stakeholders. The linear model begins with agenda setting, policy formulation and decision-making, implementation and finally monitoring and evaluation (Stone et al 2001; Brinkernoff and Goldsmith 2001). In spite of the criticism, the simple linear model has become the conventional way of describing the policy process and is useful in identifying the key components relevant to the policy process (Court et al 2006; Jann and Wegrich 2006). The figure below illustrates the policy cycle and actors.
While public policy process is an interaction between state and non-state actors, it is eventually the state that authoritatively determines implements and enforces public policy. The government lends legitimacy to policies, renders them universal and monopolises coercion in the society for implementation of public policy (Sutton 1999). Jann and Weigrich (2006) explain that the final adoption of a public policy is in the realm of the cabinet and the parliament.

This study is concerned with the policy formulation phase. Cochran and Malone (1999) explain that policy formulation takes up the “what” questions: what is the plan for dealing
with the problem? What are the goals and priorities, what options are available to achieve those goals? What are the costs and benefits of each option? What are the externalities, positive or negative associated with each alternative? Bucardo and Maharjan (2004) indicate that each policy stage presents a series of opportunities and challenges for participation for both the public officials and external groups.

While the government is often faced with several issues requiring attention, not all of these issues in the agenda universe become policy problems. Only issues that capture government’s attention evolve to be incorporated into government’s agenda and are considered for further action. John Kingdon (1995) developed an approach to agenda setting and policy formulation known as the three streams framework to explain how certain issues get to be included in government’s agenda. In this approach, there are three unrelated streams: problem stream which consists of information about real world problems or past government interventions, a policy stream/community composed of researchers, advocates and other specialists who analyse problems and formulate possible alternatives and a political stream consisting of elections and legislative leadership.

According to Kingdon (1995), policies emerge when policy entrepreneurs seize windows of opportunity to couple a problem stream with a political stream. Sabatier (1988) views policies as a function of the interaction of competing advocacy coalitions within a policy subsystem/community, changes external to the subsystem and effects of stable parameters.
Policy formulation is a stage where expressed problems, proposals and demands are transformed into government programmes. It is a process where government interacts with social actors forming a stable pattern of relationships known as policy networks to debate and determine policy options and turn ideas into concrete proposals. The role of scientific policy advice becomes crucial. Think tanks and international organisations are useful to foster and facilitate exchange and transfer of policy ideas, solutions and problem perceptions (Stone 2004).

According to Sidney (2006), Policy Formulation is the part of the pre-decision phase of policy-making which involves identifying or crafting a set of policy alternatives to address a problem and narrowing that set of solution in preparation to final policy decision. At this stage proposed actions are articulated, debated and drafted in a language suitable for law. Sidney states that, in general, there are fewer participants at this stage compared to agenda-setting, implementation and evaluation. Most of the work takes place away from the public eye. Policy formulation is usually handled by experts in the government bureaucracies, in think tanks with details formulated by the staff of the relevant department. It is an iterative process and may involve long periods of debates, workshops and seminars, drafting and re-drafting until a final draft is ready to be presented to the legislature. Jann and Weigrich (2007) conclude that policy formulation proceeds as a complex social process in which state actors play an important role but not necessarily a decisive role.
2.2 Public Policy Actors

2.2.1 State Actors

The state is also known as government. Kraft and Furlong (2009) define government as the institutions and political processes through which public policy choices are made. The processes and institutions represent the legal authority to govern people. A state is characterised by defined boundaries, a people, system of government and sovereignty.

Each state has a system within which laws are made and enforced and policies are decided and implemented. Within such a system there are elected and appointed individuals. Caplan (2009) identifies state actors as elected officials (the executive and the legislature) and officers appointed by the government (bureaucracy). The state appoints individuals and institutions to hold office and act subject to the state’s authority.

2.2.2 Non-State Actors

There is generally no common agreement in literature on the definition of Non-State Actors (NSAs). The term is often applied to a variety of organisations that are non-governmental in nature, that are neither homogenous nor monolithic (Chinkin et al 1998). To circumvent this confusion, authors tend to define the term within the context and scope of their literature. Casey (1998) uses the term extra-Governmental Actors. Hemment (2004) uses the term The Third Sector to refer to civil society organisations and non-governmental organisations.
The term of NSAs has featured commonly in international development cooperation discourse especially as it pertains to relationship among donor agencies, international organisations and civil society. European Union (EU) in the Cotonou Agreement with African Carribean and Pacific countries (ACP) uses the term to describe a range of organisations that bring together the principal, existing or emerging, structures of the society outside the government and public administration. NSAs are created voluntarily with the aim of promoting an issue or an interest, either general or specific. They are independent of the state and can be profit or non-profit-making. NSAs include non-governmental organisations/community-based organisations (NGO/CBO) and their representative platforms in different sectors, social partners (trade unions, employer associations), private sector associations and business organisations, associations of churches and confessional movements, universities, cultural associations and media (EU COM 2002/598)

Bossuyt et al (2002) identify eleven categories of NSAs in the Kenyan context. They include development NGOs, political NGOs focusing on human rights democracy and good governance, community based organisations, movements and mutual aid Groups, religious and faith-based groups, professional associations, cooperative and farmers associations, business associations, small scale traders, trade unions, research, knowledge generations and sharing organisations and media.

Inter-governmental organisations (IGOs) created by nation-states is one notable actor in cross-border policies. Atman (2003), states that IGOs are voluntary associations of
sovereign states established to pursue objectives that the states are unable to realise themselves and for which they want to cooperate through some level of formal structure. With 193 member states, the UN is the largest IGO. Other examples include UN affiliated organisations, the EU and Regional Economic Communities (RECs) such as the East African Community (EAC), Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA).

Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) are established by certain groups of individuals, businessmen and other societal forces. Various types of NGOs exist ranging from transnational organisations, donor-organised, community-initiated among others. Atman identifies 5 key types of NGOs that have influenced international politics: multinational organisations, national liberation movements, epistemic communities, religious and humanitarian organisations and terrorist and drug-traffics organisations (Narco-terrorrists). From the list, it evident that not all NGOs necessarily for public good; their agenda being un-civic (Ulimwengu 2007, Perkin and Court 2005).

According to Caplan (2009), the term Non-State Actors generally include any entity that is not a state such as religious organisations, civil groups, armed groups, terrorists and occasionally International Organisations. Cahn (2012) refers to this group as Non-Institutional Actors. The Government of Kenya has used the terms Internal and External stakeholders to differentiate the two groups of policy actors (GoK 2012).
2.3 Policy Networks and Public Policy Making

Since the 70s, the concepts of policy networks and policy communities have been useful in explaining the interaction of state and the various NSAs on specific policy positions (Sutton 1999, Hazlehurst 2001). Literature on Policy Networks is complex and there is no agreement even on definition of terms. Attempts at typology by authors are neither conclusive nor comprehensive (Sutton 1999; Perkin and Court 2005; Turnpenny 2005; Hudson and Lowe 2009). Smith (1977) arranges types of networks in a continuum ranging from the most closed and highly formalised Policy Community on one hand to the more loosely structured Issue Networks. A Policy Community is described by Stone (2001) as a stable and highly integrated network of policy actors from both inside and outside government.

Policy network denotes extra-formal interactions that occur between and among government agencies, interest groups, corporations, industry associations and other institutions and individuals in the policy process (Miller and Demir 2006). Miller and Demir describe policy network as a relatively stable relationship of a non-hierarchical and interdependence nature linking actors who share common interests in a policy issue. Hudson and Lowe (2009) posit that policy networks are characterised by interdependence and reliance on each other to meet their objectives, continuous exchange of resources among members, game-like interaction to achieve objectives and autonomy. Networks are self-organising and have no internal or external sovereign authority though some network members may be more influential than others.
By forming networks, policy actors leverage their strengths such as money, knowledge and connections to enhance effectiveness at solving public problems. They can equally bypass obstacles to consensus, assemble coalitions for change, marshal and amplify evidence and mobilise resources to enhance their engagement in the policy process. Ferris and Mintrom (2002) assert that through cooperation and exchange of knowledge, resources and skills in policy debates, the network members achieve common goals in a more effective and efficient manner.

Do Phu Hai (2013) sees technical knowledge of the subject of the policy as the minimum qualification for membership to a policy network. He asserts that this requirement is particularly critical during policy formulation as it allows an actor to comment, at least hypothetically on the feasible of options proposed to resolve a policy problem.

2.3.1 **Roles of Policy Networks in Policy Formulation**

Perkin and Court (2005) sum up the functions of the members of a policy network into six categories. These include filters, amplifiers, facilitators, convenors, community builders and investors. As amplifiers, they decide what information is worth paying attention to and organises it into manageable form. As amplifiers, they facilitate the understanding of ideas while as convenors they bring together people or groups of people. As facilitators, they support members to carry out their activities more effectively through offering access to services and facilities. Community builder supports networking and sustain values and standards of individuals among the network. As investors, the community provide technical assistance, skills and funding to support
members in carrying out their activities. Members of the network may assume more than one role.

Perkin and Court suggest that NSAs collectively inform policy makers of options and build consensus on issues. They act as a knowledge bank by providing high quality and credible evidence to support their arguments. They also channel resources and expertise gained from experience of working in the policy area under discussion. Through informal interactions, they can bypass stalemates to facilitate consensus.

2.3.2 Advantages of Policy Networks Approach

Non-state actors are likely to achieve more in public policy engagement by forming networks as opposed to acting individually. Sutton (1999) stresses that a crucial part of all policy practice is actually and specifically what and who is included. In multi-actor approach to public policy, the government assumes the role of network manager due to its special resources and unique legitimacy as the representative of common interests (Klijn and Koppenjan 2002). Hazlehurst (2001) notes that network approach is useful in co-opting specialised knowledge into the policy process. Networks allow segmentation and specialisation which renders problem-solving more effective. Each individual actor has a limit as none will have all the information required to solve complex problems. Policy networks guarantee participation by a range of individuals, groups and organisations which means that variety of interests and values are considered.
By acting in a network, NSAs are able to pool resources both financial and technical, act with one voice, cut administrative costs, combine local knowledge and international resources, learn from past experiences of each other and avoid contradictory or misinterpreted research (Chowdhry et al 2006).

2.3.3 Challenges facing Policy Networks in Policy Formulation

Court (2006) divides obstacles to effective engagement by NSAs in policy process into factors inherent to the NSAs themselves and factors external to the NSA. The main external factor is the adverse political context within which the NSAs operate. Where the political environment is not supportive, NSAs may not make meaningful engagement with the state actors in national policy process.

Factors inherent to the NSAs include limited understanding of specific policy process, institutions and actors, weak strategies for policy engagement, inadequate use of evidence, weak communication approaches, working in isolated manner and limited capacity for policy influence (Court 2006).

2.3.4 Suggestions to Enhance effectiveness of Policy Networks in Policy Formulation

In order to increase effectiveness, NSAs must understand the policy process. Litabingwa et al (1997) emphasize the importance of networking and establishing close proximity with policy makers and building alliance with people of influence including politicians. NSAs need to conduct policy research and analysis to support their engagement.
Perkin and Court identify certain success factors for effective policy engagement and influencing by NSAs. These include clarity of coordination structures and objective, strength in numbers, representativeness, quality of evidence, packaging of evidence, sustainability, presence of key individuals, making use of informal links, complimenting state actors and use of ICT in communication.

Establishing clear coordination structures and objective facilitates communication and smooth interaction among the network members. Numbers strengthen advocacy. Larger number of NSAs in a policy process means wider representation and stronger voice for advocacy.

Non-state actors provide evidence base for policy formulation. From the pool of knowledge and expertise, NSAs would improve their effectiveness by use of quality and quantity of evidence which will in turn lead to credibility and legitimacy of arguments. Evidence must be packaged in a language that can be understood by the policy makers.

Policy formulation can be long and tedious. It involves research and debates, drafting and review sometimes extending over long periods of time. NSAs must be ready to sustain their action and maintain pressure over the period of engagement. NSAs require funding base in order to remain actively engaged in the policy process.

The role of influential people cannot be ignored. Linkages with people of influence both within and outside the NSA networks can be useful in bypassing obstacles. Access to
powerful individuals may facilitate informal engagements with policy makers hence overcoming stalemate and transmitting innovative knowledge in the formal process.

2.4 Non-state Actors and Public Policy Making in Kenya

In Kenya, public policies emerge in various ways including presidential declarations, party manifestos, pressure from international and donor communities and the public and matters of interest to legislators. In 2012, the former Office of the Prime Minister attempted to streamline public policymaking and launched a National Handbook of Public Policy Making in Kenya. The book recognised the crucial role of both internal and external stakeholders. Internal stakeholders were identified as Ministries and Cabinet Secretaries, the Cabinet, Parliamentary Committees, Cabinet Office, state departments and the Office of the Attorney General. Public registered bodies, international community and think tanks are classified as external stakeholders. The Handbook was not formally adopted as the Government’s position on policy formulation.

While conducting an institutional analysis of non-state actors in Kenya, Bossuyt et al note that “engagement of non-state actors in public policy in Kenya is not entirely new or novel” (Bossuyt et al 2002: 22). Kenya Association of Manufacturers, Federation of Kenya Employers, and Institute of Certified Accountants of Kenya are cited as some of the private sector associations that have for a long time participated in public policy formulation especially relating to the business environment. Some non-governmental organisations have received mixed reception by the Government into policy processes ranging from cordial to sometimes complete rebuff.
2.5 Gaps in Literature Reviewed

In Kenya, the role of non-state actors in formulation of disaster risk reduction policy has not been adequately researched and documented. Previous research on role of non-state actors in public policy has been conducted in the more developed mature democracies. In such context NSAs have participated in public policy processes for a longer time and have established themselves as significant stakeholders. This is not the situation in most Sub-Saharan African where democracy is nascent or in transition presenting unique challenges to the NSAs. Also, while the concept of Advocacy Coalitions Framework has been used to analyse policy coalitions in developed countries, such analysis is limited in Africa and in Kenya more specifically.

Literature confirms NSAs as key actors in formulation of various public policies in different countries. Studies conducted by Casey (1998) in Spain for example concluded that although non-governmental actors have not established themselves as strong independent actors in immigration policy process, they do participate actively. Bossuyt and Carlsson (2002) points to the increasing space for private stakeholder engagement in policy processes in Kenya. Tantivess and Walt (2008) illustrate the critical role played by NSAs in public policy to scale up of antiretroviral therapy in Thailand. Koivisto (2013) also confirms the active involvement of development agencies in DRR Policies in Mozambique due to the strong linkage between disasters and development.

Kenya has made tremendous developments in democracy including promulgating the 2010 constitution that encouraged citizen participation in public decision-making.
processes. Although the Government recognises NSAs as key stakeholders in public policy formulation, research focusing on their role and contribution remains inadequate. Additionally, while there have been several studies analysing and evaluating implications of public policies, there is dearth of information on public policy processes in Kenya.

2.6 Theoretical Framework
Various models have been advanced to explain public policy formulation process. They include Institutionalism that places government institutions at the centre of public policy and views public policy as an institutional output. Process model emphasises the process of public policy as opposed to the substance. Rationalism judges public policy based on social benefits that accrues from the policy vis-a-vis the costs of the policy. Incrementalism avoids making drastic changes to existing policies preferring incremental modification, while group theory sees policy as group equilibrium. Elite theory sees policy as being shaped by elites, while the game theory perceives public policy as being a rational choice from among competing interests. The theories described so far, do not adequately address engagement and contributions by policy actors. Advocacy coalition framework approach completes this gap.

Advocacy Coalitions Framework (AFC) was designed and promoted in the 1980s by Paul Sabatier and Hank Jenkins-Smith to explain the structure and behaviour within policy coalitions, the central role of scientific and technical information, set of beliefs to inform policy change in a particular policy sub-system.
According to Sabatier and Weible (2007), ACF assumes that policymaking is a complex process that requires the policy actors to specialise in a specific policy area if they have to influence policy. Such specialisation occurs in a policy sub-system where participants have considerably long period of seeking to influence policy in a particular area of interest. A policy subsystem is composed of legislators, agency officials, heads of interest groups, researchers, journalists who specialise in the policy area.

ACF further assumes that participants within a policy sub-system hold strong beliefs that they are driven to translate into actual policy. Universities, policy analysts, consultants and other technical participants' role in policymaking is perceived as crucial given the important role of scientific and technical information in modifying the beliefs of policy participants (Sabatier and Weible, 2007).

ACF is interested in policy change that takes place over a long period of time and Sabatier and Weible define this period as ranging from 10 years onwards. It is assumed that the system of beliefs would remain stable over this period. Given this definition of the period of framework, two policy subsystems are distinguished as mature policy subsystems and nascent subsystems.

Koivisto (2013) identifies certain characteristics common to mature subsystems: Participants regard themselves as semiautonomous community who share a domain of expertise; they have sought to influence public policy in that domain over a fairly long period (10 years or more); there exists specialised units within the relevant government
agencies to deal with the policy of interest; there exists interest groups or specialised subunits within interest groups that regard this as a major policy topic.

Koivisto (Ibid) asserts that this theory was created in the developed economies where national advocacy coalitions are mature and influential in national policy processes. It has however not been tested in DRR Policy subsystem in developing countries where international organisations and institutions influence and play a significant role in national policy processes (Koivisto 2013). ACF provides a useful framework in analysing the role of non-state actors in DRR Policy formulation in Kenya.
CHAPTER THREE

3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Overview
This chapter outlines methodology employed in conducting the study. It discusses methods used to collect, analyse and present data. It details research design, variables, location of the study, study population, sampling techniques and sample size, research instruments, validity and reliability, data collection and analysis procedures. The section on data management and ethical considerations concludes.

3.2 Research Design
This study adopted a qualitative case study approach. Case study was selected due to its effectiveness in detailing holistic in-depth investigation and contextual analysis of limited number of events or conditions and their relationships (Tellis 1997). According to Yin (2004) the case study method is effective in examining, a case within its real life context. The study is largely qualitative based on interviews with non-state actors who participated in formulation of the DRR policy in Kenya. Sadovnik (2006) affirms that qualitative research is useful in public policy research. Numbers were used for illustrative purposes and to explain findings.

3.3 Variables
This research is a descriptive study where variables were used to describe a phenomenon as opposed to understanding cause and effect. Key variables were broadly divided into 3 areas: Type of NSAs, nature of contribution of NSAs and factors influencing participation. The table below summarises the subcomponents of the variables.
Table 1: Outcome Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Variables</th>
<th>Subcomponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of NSA</td>
<td>Inter-governmental organisation/International NGO/National NGO/Academic Institution/Research Institutions/Private Association/Community-Based Organisation/Trade Union/Consultancy firm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of NSA</td>
<td>- Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Knowledge Generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factors influencing participation</td>
<td>Inherent to the organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Knowledge and Expertise in policy formulation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Knowledge and expertise in Disaster Risk Reduction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Resource base to sustain engagement in the policy process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Level of commitment to the policy process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External to the organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Funding environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Political will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Clarity of objectives and roles of policy actors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4 Site of the Study

The study was conducted in Nairobi County. Nairobi is the capital of Kenya where most organisations have their headquarters. Additionally, it is the seat of the Government where all Government processes are coordinated. Even though some consultations during the policy process took place outside Nairobi, the process was centrally coordinated by the former MoSSP in Nairobi. Additionally, all the NSAs sampled had their headquarters and the overall DRR focal person in Nairobi. This location facilitated access and interaction with respondents.
3.5 Study Population
The target population for the proposed study comprised 21 NSAs who were recommended by the MoSSP and perceived to have been most actively engaged during the DRR policy formulation process. The population was composed of local and international organisations engaged in disaster management and humanitarian relief, UN Agencies, Academic and Research Institutions and consultancy firms.

3.6 Sampling Techniques and Sample Size
This study employed non-probability sampling. According to Henry (2009) non-probability sampling allows human judgement to influence which individuals are selected for a study. It enables the researcher to select cases of practical significance to the study. It ensures evidence is obtained from individuals whose experiences are relevant to the study. Documents consulted and discussions held with officials at the MoSSP identified 21 organisations whose participation was consistent throughout the process. Respondents were selected through a combination of convenience and critical cases design.

3.7 Research Instruments
Semi-structured questionnaires were used to collect data during interviews. The instrument was appropriate due to its ability to obtain a large amount of data at low costs. Topic-relevant secondary documents such as meeting and workshop reports provided additional information. Informal conversations provided valuable information as the researcher was able to engage with the respondents beyond the pre-written questions and to further understand the perspectives articulated by the respondents.
3.8 Validity and Reliability
To enhance validity of data collected, questionnaires were pre-tested with 5 respondents to assess effectiveness and adequacy in answering research questions. These trial respondents were not selected from the research sample. Feedback from pre-test sample informed correction and update in the final version of the questionnaire. Test-retest technique was used to test reliability of data.

3.9 Data Collection Procedure
During field study data was collected through interviews conducted with the DRR focal person whose department was responsible for participating in the policy formulation. During the DRR Policy process, each organisation was requested by the MoSSP to nominate two representatives. In most cases, the researcher sought audience with only one respondent in the organisation unless both the representatives were willing to be interviewed together. Related secondary documents such as progress reports, meeting minutes, correspondence and memos were also analysed for additional information.

Due to the nature of work of most respondents, it was not easy to get appointments as some of them were away from Nairobi on field assignments. In such cases, questionnaires were e-mailed followed by telephone interviews. The field work was carried out in two months (June – August 2013).

3.10 Data Analysis and Reporting
Data obtained from document analysis and during interview were categorised and analysed through descriptive statistical method. Microsoft Excel was used to group and
analyse data and present them in graphical forms. Analysis of findings treated the NSAs as a single block as opposed to analysing the role of each type of NSAs. Such disaggregation was only used to explain findings. Findings were presented in line with the research questions: types of NSAs, contribution by the NSAs, challenges faced by the NSAs, facilitating factors, and suggested recommendations from the study.

3.11 Data Management and Ethical Considerations
The study was conducted with absolute respect of the respondents. Interaction was based on informed consent and preceded with clear explanation of the objective of the research, the process and the role of the respondent. Questionnaire responses were anonymous and identity protected by codes. The researcher assured respondents that information obtained was for the sole purpose of the study. All documents consulted have been acknowledged and referenced with citations.
CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the field study conducted through semi-structured questionnaires to assess the role of non-state actors in public policy formulation in Kenya. Additionally, secondary documents were consulted and discussions held with state actors to better understand the national public policy process in general and in particular, the National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy process. Data was collected from June – August 2013 through semi-structured questionnaires supplemented by oral and telephone interviews, consultations with government officials and review of secondary documents. Data was analysed using MS-Excel. Non-state actors were considered as a unit in line with the concept of a policy network or a policy subsystem as advanced by Sabatier and Weible (2007). Findings are presented in a descriptive manner and graphs and tables used for illustrative purposes. Kombo and Tromp (2010) explain that the major purpose of descriptive research is to describe the existing state of affairs.

4.2 General information

4.2.1 Response Rate

At the start of the field study, a visit was made to the former Ministry of State for Special Programmes (MoSS) to collect background information. Other contacts were made with the National Draught Management Authority (NADMA). Background information included public policy process in Kenya, history and the process of formulation of the
National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy and recommendations on organizations that were deemed most useful to this study.

The study was carried out between June and August 2013. A call was made to the offices of the suggested organizations and in all cases persons who participated in the DRR policy formulation process were selected to be the respondent. Where the person had left the organisation, the researcher had to make an effort to find them. It was not easy to get appointment with some of the designated respondents as some were on field assignments for long periods. In such a case the questionnaire had to be e-mailed followed by telephone interview. After persistent follow up, 17 interviews were conducted representing a response rate of 81%. In spite of several attempts, it was not possible to interview 4 organizations. The table below summarizes the response rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Interviewed</th>
<th>Not interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of respondents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage rate of response</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.1 Rate of response**

Source (survey data, 2013)

4.3 Findings and Discussions

4.3.1 Types of non-state actors that participated in formulation of DRR Policy

From a list of options, respondents were asked to select the one that best described their organisation. The objective of the question was to identify the type of organizations that participated in development of the DRR Policy. Figure 4.1 illustrates the types of non-state organisations represented during the DRR Policy formulation process:
4.3.1.1 Inter-governmental organisations

Inter-governmental organisations made up 35% of total respondents. These were predominantly UN agencies such as United Nations Development Program (UNDP), United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) and Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO). Inter-governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) was represented through its climate prediction specialised agency known as Climate Prediction and Applications Centre (ICPAC).

It was established that the intergovernmental organisations had specialised knowledge and skills in DRR and brought cross boarder experiences to the DRR Policy formulation process. UNISDR for example leads and sets standard for DRR efforts globally. UNDP is the development arm of the UN and was useful in showing linkages between development and DRR. Additionally, DRR is among the thematic areas of UNDP Kenya’s programs. FAO brought experience from drought as a common disaster trend and management of food security. ICPAC also has technical expertise in climate change.
management. One male respondent from an intergovernmental organisation indicated that “intergovernmental organisations are important actors even in national public policy processes as they have information on benchmarks and standards on similar policies beyond the national borders. They are also experienced in developing DRR policies elsewhere which only need to be adapted to the situation in Kenya: You don’t have to re-invent the wheel since similar policies have existed elsewhere”.

4.3.1.2 International NGOs

According to the findings, there were 29% International non-governmental organisations (NGOs). These are NGOs that have international presence with headquarters mostly in developed countries. Notable International NGOs in the DRR Policy process were Oxfam, Action aid, Cordaid and World Vision International. Like the inter-governmental organisations, international NGOs bring cross-border experiences; have greater access to funds from their headquarters often in more developed countries, link policy and practice and sometimes also have vast experience in the various policy processes. It was established that Oxfam in addition to implementing development projects also focuses on policy research. Since international organisations have specific areas of focus such as humanitarian work, they tend to be active in policies that relate to their areas of interest.

4.3.1.3 National NGOs

National NGOs made up 18% of the NSAs group. These are NGOs that are managed by Kenyans. Some may be affiliated to partners beyond Kenya, but they are considered as indigenous. Notable actors from this category included the Kenya Red Cross Society and
St John’s Ambulance which have a national reputation for their work as first responders in emergency situations. National NGOs access communities that are normally inaccessible to international actors. Kenya Red Cross Society for example has branches in all parts of the country and has wide experience in dealing with communities in a variety of incidences. In the DRR Policy formulation process, it appears that national NGOs were underrepresented compared to the international actors.

4.3.1.4 Consultancy firms

Consultancy firms made ups 18% of the NSAs. These are private firms who are hired at a fee for their specialised knowledge in a specific area. Consultancy firms may have expertise in many areas. Notable consultancy firm during the DRR process was Calibrare. Using consultancy firms facilitated collating discussion materials and drafting the policy document. A female respondent from the NGOs mentioned that “consultancy firms had the tough role of developing drafts for debates. This was really helpful since none of the other actors had time to write the drafts”.

4.3.1.5 Research Institutes/Think tanks

Research Institutes and Think Tank equally made up 18% of the composition. These are organisations with wide experience and capacity to generate knowledge necessary for policy. Among research institutions that took part in DRR policy is the Development and Environmental Research Agency (DERA).
4.3.1.6 Universities

Universities especially those with DRR departments were also incorporated and made up 18% of the composition. Key Universities in DRR Policy formulation were University of Nairobi and Masinde Muliro University of Science and Technology.

The findings support the existence of a multi-actor approach in to the DRR policy formulation in Kenya. The multi-actor approach was driven by the fact that DRR is a complex concept and formulation of an effective policy would need a multi-stakeholder approach to ensure all the components are considered (UNISDR 2005). There was a National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction which provided a forum for DRR actors in Kenya to meet and share experiences. It is from this Platform that the DRR policy actors were drawn. In this way the National Platform could be considered as a DRR policy community or network in Kenya.

According to Bossuyt et al (2002), there are 10 types of non-state actors that operate in Kenya. These include Development NGOs, Political NGOs focusing on human rights, Democracy, good governance, Community Based Organisations, Religious or Faith-based groups, Professional Associations, Corporative and Farmers Associations, Business Associations, Trade Unions, Research, Knowledge generation and sharing organisations. This study established that out of the many types of non-state actors identified by authors, in the DRR process, there were inter-governmental organisations, international NGOs, national NGOs, Research, Knowledge generation and sharing organisations such as universities. There were also consultancy firms.
Burcado and Maharjan (2004) emphasise the importance of combining technical and sectoral expertise with commonsense and the everyday experience of ordinary people for better policy design. The DRR Policy formulation was in line with this proposal. Although, the role of the Government line ministry appeared to be dominant as the coordinator, the process of DRR policy formulation incorporated civil societies, research and academic institutions and intergovernmental agencies.

Authors (Sabatier, 1988, Stone, 2004, Court et al, 2006 and Jann and Weigrich, 2007) stress the need for interaction by of multiple actors in public policy formulation through approaches such as policy subsystems, policy communities, policy networks and advocacy coalition framework. Court et al (2006) discourages isolated approach to policy engagement by actors. They instead assert that in a network, actors complement each other and enhance collective resources. Sabatier and Weible (2007) emphasise the importance of scientific research and the role of academic and research institutions in a policy subsystem. Stone (2004) underscores the importance of pressure groups, research institutions and international institutions to foster exchanges.

According to Sabatier and Weible's (2007) Advocacy Coalition Framework, a mature policy subsystem is one in which participants have been actively seeking to influence policy in their area or interest for at least a decade or more. Nascent subsystems have existed for shorter periods. It also assumes that participants hold strong beliefs and are motivated to translate these beliefs into actual policy. Given this description of a policy subsystem, the DRR policy platform could be classified as a nascent subsystem. All the
actors in the DRR Policy process had a form of engagement in DRR; training and capacity building, research and advisory services or disaster management and relief. In this way, they all had an interest in influencing DRR policies. However the umbrella that brings the actors together which is the National Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction has been in existence for less than 10 years. Also given that DRR is a new concept in Kenya having gained popularity only after the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2005 actors have not had enough time to mature in the policy issues relating to DRR.

Koivisto (2013) indicates that in developing countries, it is common to find significant level of involvement of international organisations and donors in national policy process. The same case was observed during the DRR policy process in Kenya where international NGOs and intergovernmental organisations constituted 64% of the actors. One male respondent from a national NGO indicated that “international organisations are believed to have better capacity in DRR and are better funded hence giving them a greater opportunity to participate compared to the poorly funded local organisations”

4.3.2 Disaster Risk Reduction activities implemented by NSA

The essence of this question was to determine the extent to which NSAs engage in policy work. Figure 4.2 illustrates the result.
4.3.2.1 DRR Research and Advisory Services

According to the findings, 24% of the respondents conduct DRR Research and advisory services. In this case, there was also a mixture of actors: intergovernmental organisations conduct research and offered advisory services to member states. UNDP Kenya for example has a strategic policy advisory unit whose goal is to contribute to policy dialogue in Kenya. International NGOs were also involved in research: Oxfam for example conducts research in various development issues including disaster management and recommends options for policy. It appeared that research and advisory services were the core business of consultancy firms and research organisations. A male respondent from a consultancy form indicated that “We offer consultancy is many areas of development, research is one of our key areas”

4.3.2.2 Disaster Response and Relief

It was established that 65% of the organisations were involved in disaster response and relief. One male respondent from an NGO intimated that “Disaster response is our core mandate – we are first responders, we are expected to be the first to arrive. We also have local experience and we have as presence in every part of the country”. A female
respondent from an international NGO mentioned that “We are also a humanitarian organisation in addition to development. We help communities recover from disaster and to rebuild their lives”. The type of disaster response and relief activities cited by the NSAs including actual response during disaster, supporting recovery by helping communities rebuild their livelihoods and funding humanitarian responses.

4.3.2.3 Training and Capacity Building

The findings revealed that 65% of the respondents were involved in training capacity building. Such respondents included the universities, intergovernmental organisations and the NGOs. Universities indicated that their core area was training; they therefore offered undergraduate, graduate and professional development courses in Disaster Management. The NGOs offered training to communities and institutions on disaster management. Red Cross Society for example indicated that they train schools, colleges and other institutions on first aid and other disaster response approaches. The forms of capacity building cited by respondents included training through workshops and simulations, resource support and offering surge capacity to actors during disaster response.

The response above shows that NSAs as a group have varied knowledge and skills in DRR depending on programmes they implement. The results also indicate that organisations can played multiple roles in DRR. The primary role of non-governmental organisations appeared to be training and capacity building and disaster response and relief although some of the International NGOs notably Oxfam and Actionaid also worked in DRR Research and Advisory services. Research and advisory services are
mainly undertaken by the specialised intergovernmental organisations such as UNISDR and ICPAC, universities, consultancies and research institutions.

Hai (2013) emphasized the central place of technical knowledge in the subject area of the policy by the actors. For an actor to be effective, they must have some experience in the area of discussion. The actors in the DRR Policy formulation were all already involved in some aspect of DRR; this equipped them with knowledge to better contribute to formulation of the policy.

4.3.3 Beneficiaries of NSAs Disaster Risk Reduction Programmes

Respondents were asked to indicate the primary beneficiaries of their disaster risk reduction programmes. This was to enable the researcher find out who the NSAs engage with in terms of policy interventions. Table 4.2 illustrates the responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary beneficiaries of NSAs disaster risk reduction programmes</th>
<th>% organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental organisations</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots communities</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Primary beneficiaries of NSAs disaster risk reduction programmes

4.3.3.1 Governments

It emerged that only 18% of the respondents had governments as the primary beneficiaries. This figure was composed of mostly the intergovernmental organisations whose services are mostly for the member states. A female respondent from an international NGO indicated that “while sometimes we work with ministries of the
government, this is not our core mandate, our target beneficiaries over and above all are the communities”

4.3.3.2 Students

Students were identified by 24% or respondents mostly the universities and the National NGOs. A male respondent from the university explained that their courses are primarily academic and students who undertake those courses are their key beneficiaries. The universities also indicated that although they offer consultancy services in DRR, this was just an extra activity whenever contracted.

4.3.3.3 Non-governmental organisations

Non-governmental organisations were cited by 41% of the respondents. The non-governmental organisations benefited mostly from advisory services of specialised intergovernmental agencies and consultancy firms. They were also funding recipients from the intergovernmental agencies such as UNDP.

4.3.3.4 Grassroots Communities

According to the results, grassroots communities were beneficiaries for 88% of the organisations. It emerged that most of the support was in terms of disaster response, humanitarian relief and support for recovery after a disaster such as drought. It is mostly the NGOs and some intergovernmental organisations who worked directly with the grassroots communities.
This result goes on further to confirm that most NSAs deal mostly in policy implementation. Only 18% of the respondents cited the Government as their principle beneficiary. The mix of the NSAs experience is considered important for policy design as recommended by Burcado and Maharjan (2004).

4.3.4 Organizations with previous experience in public policy formulation in Kenya

Respondents were asked if they had staff that had previous experience in policy formulation process prior to their engagement in the DRR Policy process in Kenya. 71% had limited experience, 29% had never participated DRR policy formulation. The table below summarises this finding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have the staff in your organisation had previous experience in public policy formulation in Kenya?</th>
<th>% responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Several cases of policy engagement</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited experience in policy engagement</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No previous engagement</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Organisations that have staff with prior experience in public policy formulation in Kenya

This finding supports Court et al (2002) assertion that in Kenya, until recently the Government was the principal actor in the policy-making arena where the executive issued policy statements that were then debated in parliament. Engaging with non-state actors although not new in Kenya, it is only in the recent past that more non-state actors are accessing public policy-making spaces. It is therefore not surprising that most of the actors only had limited experience in public policy formulation in Kenya. “We have been mostly engaged with the government when it comes to disaster response and conducting
capacity building programmes. Rarely have we sat down to formulate policy in spite of having been in the field of disaster management for a very long time”, remarked a female respondent from a national NGO.

4.3.5 Public policy processes in which NSAs have expertise

This question was seeking to determine components of public policy processes in which organisations have expertise. Figure 4.3 illustrates this result.

![Figure 4.3: Areas of public policy process in which organisations have expertise](image)

4.3.5.1 Public Policy Advocacy and Lobbying

According to the findings, 88% of the respondents were engaged in public policy advocacy and lobbying. Advocacy involves activities to gain support for a particular action or cause. International and National NGOs were the majority of this group. One male respondent from an international NGO mentioned that “Advocacy must be incorporated into our programmes whether it is lobbying the government or the community to support actions that eventual benefit them”. The NGOs indicated that their
advocacy involved creating awareness on DRR among the communities they work with and also lobbying policymakers to accept their proposals.

4.3.5.2 Public Policy formulation

There were 71% of respondents who indicated that they have expertise in public policy formulation. It was however not clear the extent of their expertise in policy formulation. It was evident that the intergovernmental and international non-governmental organisations, universities, research institutions and consultancy firms dominated the group of those with public policy formulation expertise. Oxfam for example cited their involvement into linking policy research and development practice to ensure policy formulation is informed by evidence.

4.3.5.3 Public Policy Research and Analysis

Only 35% of the respondents indicated that they had expertise in public policy research and analysis. These were mainly the intergovernmental organisations, research institutions and consultancy firms.

4.3.5.4 Public Policy Implementation

All the respondents indicated that they were involved in public policy implementation. There were however varied forms of implementation. The NGOs were involved in working directly with communities. Universities implemented government policies through their curriculum, while research and consultancy firms indicated that they had been involved in designing programmes to implement various public policies.
This result confirms that all actors had some form of experience in policy process and sometimes play multiple roles in policy engagement. Oxfam for example had been carrying out an integrated approach to DRR that incorporates development, humanitarian relief and campaigns. Certain types of organisations were perceived as being more competent particular policy aspects; the NGOs were particularly singled out by respondents as having good capacity for policy implementation and lobbying. One male respondent from a university noted that “the NGOs are in constant touch with their constituencies always implementing programmes among communities. They are also good in advocacy since they are more interested in being visible and remaining relevant in their mandate”.

4.3.6 Period of engagement in the DRR policy formulation process

Respondents were asked to indicate the duration of their engagement in the DRR Policy formulation process in terms of number of years. Figure 4.4 illustrate the results.
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**Figure 4.4:** Period of engagement by NSAs in DRR policy formulation process
There were 53% of respondents who had been engaged in the process for 3 – 4 years, 29% for 1 – 2 years while 18% had been engaged for over 4 years.

According to Sabatier and Weible (2007), a mature policy subsystem is one that has existed for over 10 years. Since the DRR Policy actors have only existed as a community for less than the standard 10 years, it can be classified more as a nascent subsystem. It was apparent that while DRR programmes have existed in Kenya for a long time, there were independent actors addressing the issues in an isolated manner. This prevented the creation of a network. The National Platform for DRR appears to have been the first formal platform where the DRR actors converge as a policy community. It was more common for the UN through the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) to coordinate response for large scale disaster such as that of the Horn of Africa drought situation of 2011. This forum is mainly to coordinate disaster response at a time of crisis. The National Platform on the other hand was founded to increase national leadership and commitment for DRR and to enhance coordination and collaboration among national stakeholders. It is this Platform that provided a foundation for establishment of a DRR policy community in Kenya.

4.3.7 Nature of NSAs contribution during the DRR Policy formulation process

Respondents were asked to indicate the nature of their contribution during formulation of the DRR Policy. Figure 4.5 below illustrates this finding.
4.3.7.1 Policy Validation

All the respondents attended the last meeting to validate the policy document. Policy validation is where the actors endorse the final policy outcome document. According to a female respondent, a programme officer from an intergovernmental organisation “It was necessary that all the actors that had been involved in the process to be present for validation; this would ensure that consensus is built around all matters of importance before the policy document is submitted to the legislature.”

4.3.7.2 Research and Knowledge Generation

There were 88% of respondents who contributed to research and knowledge generation. The extent and type of research differed. Intergovernmental organisations, consultancies, research institutions and universities conducted research on DRR policies from other countries in order to draw lessons and best practices. Consultancy firms and research institutions provided data and conducted analysis. NGOs brought experience from their
interaction with communities in the field. In this way almost all the actors were involved in knowledge-generation and experience-sharing.

4.3.7.3 Technical support in policy analysis and writing

Research findings established that 18% of the organisations analysed policy options and recommended policy options. There were 59% of respondents who supported policy writing ensuring proper language was used. One male respondent from a national NGO commended "international expertise and experience" brought by UNISDR, UN specialised agency for DRR.

4.3.7.4 Funding

According to results, DRR Policy formulation process was funded by 18% of the respondents. Public policy formulation can be a costly affair that requires funds. The funds were necessary to assemble actors for discussions, pay for operational costs and utilities and also hire experts and consultants in the area of DRR. It was also evident from the research that it was the inter-governmental organisations and international NGOs that provided funds.

4.3.7.5 Lobbying and Convening

There were 12% of respondents mainly from the NGOs who contributed by lobbying policy makers. However, one male respondent from a National NGO confessed that their lobbying skills were not adequately utilised due to poor strategies and lack of funds. He intimated that "NGOs are very good in lobbying and they know how to talk to influential
people on the side which would have facilitated the policy process. Unfortunately they kept on holding strategy meetings and never really reached out to the target audiences”.

It was evident that organisations used various means to lobby policy makers. These include developing policy briefs, facilitating formation of caucuses by leaders of affected communities and convening meetings for leaders and non-state actors to discuss ways of tackling DRR issues such as drought and floods.

Stover and Johnson (1999) in their study on *The Art of Policy Formulation: Experiences from Africa in Developing National HIV/AIDS Policies* suggested that actors in public formulation contribute in different ways, others in more than one way. Technocrats provide information and conduct technical analysis, interest groups represent the concern of their constituencies and donors support the process with funds and technical assistance, provide international recommendations and guidelines.

Perkin and Court (2005) summarise the role of networks in policy processes as filters, amplifiers, convenors, facilitators, community builders and investors. Sabatier and Weible (2007) emphasise the role of scientific information in public policy making. Voltolini (2012) identified the role of non-state actors as provision of information, raising awareness, framing issues and setting the agenda. From literature, roles of non-state actors in public policy formulation can summarised as funding, technical support, provision of scientific information, facilitating consensus building among actors and
lobbying and advocacy. Roles of NSAs during the DRR Policy formulation confirm the earlier findings by authors.

4.3.8 Challenges faced by NSAs during the DRR Formulation process

Respondents were asked to identify challenges that they faced in the course of their engagement in DRR Policy formulation. The responses were grouped into factors that are external and beyond the control of the NSAs and those inherent to NSAs actors. The responses for both external and internal factors are summarised in the table 4.6 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From your perception, which of the following challenges did the group of NSAs face during the policy formulation process</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate political will</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Political processes (e.g elections)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of clarity in national policy process</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate donor-interest in DRR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited funding support for NSAs support</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnover among NSAs staff engaging in DRR Policy formulation</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak strategies for policy engagement</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing priority among the NSAs (internal to the organisation and between organisations)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited understanding of DRR concept</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of internal funding to sustain participation by NSAs</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited capacity for lobbying</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate data to support discussions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6 Challenges faced by NSAs during the DRR Policy formulation

4.3.8.1 External Challenges

4.3.8.1.1 Inadequate political will

All the NSAs cited inadequate political will as one of the key challenges facing their engagement in policy formulation in Kenya. A female respondent from a national NGO
argued that “policies where politicians have keen interest often pass very quickly. For the case of the DRR policy, discussions began in 1997, with the actual formulation starting in 2006. It is only until 2013 that an executive order has been ordered by the president and yet disasters happen every other day in Kenya”.

This finding supports Court et al’s (2006) assertion adverse political context as one of the key challenges that CSOs and other NSAs face when engaging in public policy. In the case of the DRR process the adversity in political context was not due to harsh or unfriendly political environment; the Government worked with non-state actors willingly, the challenge was lack of prioritisation of the DRR Policy by the legislature and the Executive and hence the delay in adopting the policy.

4.3.8.1.2 Interferences by political processes

While generally the political environment for the DRR policy appeared to be friendly for the non-state actors, political processes and activities interfered with progress of policy formulation. All the actors cited political activities as major impediment. The first draft of the DRR policy was prepared in 2006, a year before the 2007 general elections. By this time members of parliament were already in a campaign mode and no meaningful attention could be paid to the document. Then there were campaigns for referendum in relation to the 2010 constitution. Successful referendum and subsequent promulgation of the 2010 Constitution necessitated further realignment of the draft DRR policy with the new constitution. All these political activities interrupt policy formulation, making it a long, difficult and expensive task for the NSAs.
Although no author has mentioned political processes as a challenge, it was proposed by all the respondents. One female respondent from an inter-governmental organisation explained that although in a number of occasions, the draft policy document was ready for debate, the cabinet who are also politicians were in a campaign mode and the document could not progress. Change in administration after elections was another source of interference as the policy at hand may not be a priority of the new regime. All these political processes demotivate non-state actors

4.3.8.1.3 Lack of clarity in national policy processes

There were 12% of respondents mentioned lacked of clarity in national policy processes as a challenge. According to other respondents, the Ministry of State of Special Programmes provided sufficient clarifications and guidance with regards to national policy processes. Such information was useful in improving knowledge and awareness of non-state actors in national policy processes. One male respondent from a university explained that, "the Ministry conducted trainings whenever aspects of national policy procedures appeared to be unclear". The only challenge was that some of the actors due to other engagements at times missed some of the training sessions.

4.3.8.2 Internal Challenges

4.3.8.2.1 Turnover among the NSAs staff

Turnover among NSAs staff was cited by 76% of the respondents. A female respondent from an international NGO indicated that turnover among the NSAs staff led to gaps and interfered with progress of the policy process. Turnover was especially high among the
NGOs and some inter-governmental organisations where staff are employed on contracts based on project life. The staff may then leave once the project ends. Where such a person is replaced, the replacement takes time to be oriented into the role.

4.3.8.2.2 Weak strategies for policy engagement

There were 76% of respondents admitted that NSAs had weak strategies to engage in policy debates. Court et al (2006) advises that NSAs must learn to adopt appropriate strategies to engage during each critical policy processes. At policy formulation, they must act as a resource bank providing credible information and also use informal links to bypass formal processes.

4.3.8.2.3 Competing priorities among and between NSAs

It was apparent during the interviews that the DRR policy formulation process did not have the same level of priority among all the NSAs. 76% noted that competing priorities was a challenge. Some of the participants had to attend to other duties at their organisations, and consequently had to miss some of the sittings.

Also, there was no common understanding among the NSAs on the contents of the DRR Policy document. It was evident that different non-state actors especially among the NGOs were focused on different components of DRR. Some were more focused on drought and food security, others on floods and yet others on disaster response. Due to this complex nature of DRR, conflict was expected. There was therefore need to build consensus on the content and the language of the policy document. This complexity and
conflict among DRR actors in not unique to Kenya as Koivisto (2013) explains that DRR problems are complex with many different interests which is a source of conflict among the actors.

4.3.8.2.4 Limited understanding of the concept DRR

Understanding of DRR concept varied among the actors; while the international agencies and international NGOs like Oxfam and Cordaid had long experience, others had less knowledge especially on approaching DRR as a policy issue.

Given that DRR is a complex concept with no clear-cut solutions, 71% of the NSAs felt that limited understanding of concepts, programmes and other DRR approaches negatively impacted their engagement. It was apparent that while the actors all had experience in working in different components of DRR such as drought management and food security, disaster management and relief, research and knowledge generation and academia, they acted in an isolated manner leading to differences in understanding in how to commonly approach DRR from policy perspective.

4.3.8.2.5 Lack of internal funding to sustain participation by NSAs

According to the results, 71% of the NSAs noted that lack of internal/own funding to support the DRR Policy process was a challenge. From analysis of results, only 18% of the NSAs indicated that they had funded the DRR policy process. This means that the other 86% relied on this common fund. The NSAs could not lobby adequately due to lack
of other funding. A female respondent from an international NGO explained that advocacy while important, was lacking since NSA had very limited funding streams.

4.3.8.2.6 Limited capacity for lobbying

NSAs indicated that they did not adequately lobby policy makers. 71% of the respondents felt that the NSAS lacked finances to lobby relevant policy makers. They did not also employ any strategies to help them achieve this. A male respondent from a university suggested that “while especially the NGOs were very good at lobbying, they did not use this strength”. He suggested that “with their strong capacity in lobbying, it would have been useful if the NGOs dedicated some resources to support a retreat by MPs and other key leaders from drought and floods-prone parts of the country to lobby and make them understand the need and importance for such a policy”. In the same way, the NSAs did not also effectively use their informal contacts to bypass some of the formal processes.

Court et al (2006) in their study titled “Policy Engagement: How Civil Societies can be more Effective” noted that challenges that civil societies faced in policy engagement include limited staff capacity, insufficient funds, insufficient knowledge about policy processes, policy process not open to CSOs engagement, policymakers not trusting CSOs evidence, corruption among policymakers, CSOs not having enough time to dedicate to policy engagement.

Court et al identified challenges internal to the CSOs to be the most common. This case is similar to the DRR process where while the Government created and enabling
environment for NSAs participation, the actors themselves faced challenges such as lacking internal funds, weak capacities to engage, competing priorities and turnover among the non-state actors.

4.3.9 Factors that facilitated NSAs engagement during DRR policy formulation

Respondents were asked to select from a set of claims factors that facilitated their participation in the DRR policy formulation process. Table 4.5 summarises responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From your observation, which of the following facilitated NSAs participation in formulation of the DRR Policy</th>
<th>% Agree</th>
<th>% Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building in policy engagement and DRR</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of ICT in communication</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate and quality information</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation by experts in DRR from both NSA group and the Government</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of coordination structures and objectives</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal participation opportunity for state and non-state actors</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate funding to sustain participation by NSAs</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate representation of actors concerned with various components of DRR in Kenya</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Informal links to facilitate NSAs engagement</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Existence of international protocol on the policy issue</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Factors that facilitated NSAs participation during DRR Policy formulation

4.3.9.1 Capacity building in policy engagement and concept of DRR

All (100%) the respondents agreed that capacity building on national policy processes and on the concept of DRR greatly facilitated NSAs engagement. The Ministry of State for Special Programmes trained actors in Government policy making processes. Also, the intergovernmental agencies notably UNISDR conducted trainings on the concept of DRR.
and the Hyogo Framework of Action. Since the actors approached DRR from different points of view such as academia, researcher and practitioner, it was necessary to have a common understanding of DRR as a policy. International NGOs that already longstanding DRR programmes such as Oxfam were also useful in supporting capacity building for their colleagues. One female respondent from an international NGO indicated that “What we know best if disaster management and relief. The trainings helped us understand how to engage with the Government on policy”.

4.3.9.2 Use of ICT

All respondents agreed that ICT proved to be extremely useful throughout the process. E-mail was the most common form of communication and ensured information was shared in a timely manner and that the actors had documents in soft copies for their reference. Also, it was easy for working teams to call each other. Information on DRR was accessible through internet. To all actors, this question seemed to have an obvious answer; a male respondent from a university summed up the question on ICT by saying “ICT is an integral part of life, you can’t do without it”

4.3.9.3 Adequate and quality information

All the respondents felt that availability and use of adequate information facilitated their participation. Some of the actors especially the international organisations produced policy briefs that provided key background information necessary for DRR Policy formulation. Court et al (2006) emphasise that relevant, objective, generalisable and practical evidence is useful in improving credibility and legitimacy of the non-state actors
with policy makers. They emphasize that policymakers have preference for empirical research such as surveys, quantitative data that help them envision solutions based on evidence. According to Sabatier and Weible (2007) scientific and technical information is important in modifying the beliefs of policy participants.

4.3.9.4 Participation by experts in DRR from both NSA group and the Government

There were 94% of respondents who agreed with this assertion. DRR is a complex process that requires a multi-sectoral approach. During DRR Policy formulation process, there were actors from academia, research and practitioners. There were experts in climate change adaptation, drought management, food security, humanitarian response and policy writing among others. Government actors provided expertise and knowledge on DRR efforts in Kenya, national policy processes and how they relate to national administrative structures. This mix of knowledge and experience proved useful for a comprehensive national DRR Policy.

4.3.9.5 Clarity of coordination structures and objectives

According to results, 94% agreed that clarity in coordination structures proved to be useful in minimising confusion. The Ministry of State for Special Programmes was in-charge and coordinated the whole process. The NSAs also organised themselves in small groups to work on assignments. Such working groups also assigned responsibilities which ensured objective were met with ease.
4.3.9.6 Equal participation opportunity for state and non-state actors

It was established that 88% of the actors agreed that equal opportunity to participate was useful in NSAs' engagement in DRR Policy formulation. A male respondent from a national NGO indicated that “inclusion of the non-state actors as key stakeholder in this (DRR Policy) process clearly indicate that the Government values our support to its programmes”.

4.3.9.7 Adequate funding to sustain participation by NSAs

Adequate funding was a key facilitating factor according to 88% of NSAs. According to a male respondent from an intergovernmental organisation “Non-state actors have the will and the knowledge useful in policy engagement, but usually they lack funding to sustain their participation”. Some respondents recommended that while there was adequate central funding, the NSAs themselves also need to generate their own funding to enable them conduct additional activities such as lobbying and advocacy.

4.3.9.8 Use of informal links to facilitate NSAs engagement

Litabingwa et al (1997) emphasises the importance of networking especially with influential people to facilitate NSAs' engagement in policy processes. Only 41% of the respondents agreed that use of informal links was useful. This is because most respondents felt that the informal approach was not used. One female respondent from an international NGO confessed that “informal links are important for any policy engagement as it is an opportunity to lobby and fast track the process. Unfortunately we hardly resorted to talking to influential people away from the main deliberations”
4.3.9.9 Existence of International policy frameworks

Although this option was not provided by the researcher, 56% of the respondents indicated that existence of international policy frameworks in DRR facilitated their engagement. It was apparent that international policy frameworks spur donor interest and drive national policy processes especially for developing countries. For the case of DRR Policy in Kenya, the recommendations of the World Conference in Disaster Reduction held in Japan in January 2005 spelled DRR strategies and action plan. The Hyogo Framework of Action (2005 – 2015) led to commitments from governments and donors to work towards disaster risk reduction. Such an international framework supports policy engagement by NSAs even at national levels.

4.3.10 Suggestions by respondents to enhance NSAs’ engagement in public policy formulation

Respondents were asked to suggest ways by which non-state actors could improve their effectiveness in public policy engagements. The following were the responses

i. NSAs should approach policy engagement as a coalition with common objectives as opposed to working in isolation. A male respondent from a national NGO advised that “non-state actors should build consensus on common language and common positions. This helps streamline participation. It is only by pulling in the same direction that NGOs can be identified as a strong credible force”.

ii. NSAs should enhance their capacity in policy engagement. Limited capacity and weak strategies limit the impact of NSAs in public policy engagement. A male respondent from a national NGO commented that “NSAs must have a strategy to
engage with the Government and not just follow what the Government actors say. It is the only way NSAs can add value in the policy process”

iii. NSAs need to mobilise own funds to sustain their participation in policy formulation. It was evident that all the NSAs relied on the limited funding available from donors. A female respondent from an international NGO remarked that “If each non-state actor had dedicated some funds to support engagement in the policy process, perhaps the process would have not taken so long”.

iv. NSAs need to better target their advocacy and lobbying skills and sustain it throughout the engagement period. A male respondent from a university noted that while advocacy and lobbying plays and important role in persuading policy makers, this strength of the NSAs was not adequately applied. NSAs therefore need to conduct more, better focused and effective advocacy and lobbying.
CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This study assessed the role played by non-state actors in public policy formulation in Kenya using the National Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction as a case study. It was guided by four key research questions (a) What types of non-state actors participated in the formulation of the DRR Policy? (b) In what ways did these NSAs contribute during the DRR Policy formulation process? (c) What challenges did the NSAs face during the process? (d) What factors facilitated their participation in the process?

5.2 Summary of findings

5.2.1 Types of non-state actors in public policy formulation

The study revealed that there were six broad categories of NSAs that participated in the DRR Policy process: intergovernmental organisations, international NGOs, national NGOs, consultancy firms, research institutions and universities. It was apparent that inter-governmental and international NGOs were the majority. The Ministry of State for Special Programmes coordinated policy formulation process. All the organisations that participated in the DRR Policy formulation process were members of the National Platform for DRR. While the group of actors can be likened to a policy subsystem, it is still a nascent system that needs to be developed to maturity.
5.2.2 Nature of Contribution by NSAs during DRR Policy formulation in Kenya

According to the research, NSAs contributed in the DRR Policy formulation through funding, research and knowledge generation, technical support in terms of sharing international guidelines and cross-border experiences, drafting the policy document and lobbying and consensus building. It was apparent that organisations may contribute in more than one way. Funding was provided by the intergovernmental organisations and the international NGOs. It was noted that other NSAs did not raise own funds to sustain their participation and relied solely on the central funding to the Ministry of State for Special Programmes. It was evident that the DRR policy formulation relied heavily on donor funding.

Research firms provided data, conducted analysis as part of evidence base for the DRR policy. Consultancy firms were used to undertake the technical work such as drafting the policy contents. Specialised inter-governmental organisations and international NGOs with a stronger capacity on DRR provided capacity building to the rest of the actors and also shared international guidelines on DRR. All the NSAs participated at the validation forum for final policy document. Lobbying policy makers was also identified as a key contribution by NSAs especially the NGOs, although for the case of DRR, it was not adequately used.
5.2.3 Factors facilitating participation by non-state actors in public policy formulation

The research established that the following factors facilitated engagement by non-state actors in the DRR Policy process: Capacity building in national policy processes and specifically in DRR as a concept, use of ICT, availability of adequate and quality information, participation by experts from in DRR from Government and non-state actors and clarity of coordination structures. Others factors include equal opportunity to participate, adequate funding and use of informal links to by-pass formal processes. Existence of an international policy framework coupled with donor commitment and interest was also cited by the respondents.

5.2.4 Challenges faced by NSA during in public policy formulation process

The study identified the following factors as challenges that non-state actors faced while participating in the DRR Policy formulation process: inadequate political will, political processes and activities, lack of clarity in national policy processes, turnover among the non-state actor group, weak strategies for policy engagement, competing priorities among and between the non-state actors, limited understanding of the concept of DRR, lack of internal funding at individual organisational level to sustain participation and limited capacity for lobbying. The Government and the specialised DRR Agencies from the intergovernmental organisations organised capacity building sessions to better equip other non-state actors to engage in the DRR Policy process.
5.3 Conclusions

The case of DRR formulation process in Kenya is evidence of non-state actors’ participation in public policy formulation. It is clear that the Government has opened up space for non-state actors to participate in public policy formulation. For the DRR Policy process, the relationship between state and non-state actors appeared to have been cordial. It is evident that the DRR policy was the result of interactions of technical knowledge and experience by various actors. International actors still play a dominant role in national policy processes, while the Government’s line Ministry directs and coordinates activities. Research and policy analysis was an integral part of the DRR policy formulation. The multi-actor approach to the DRR Policy formulation within the framework of National Platform of Disaster Risk Reduction provides a case for analysis of actors operating as a policy subsystem. Although the mix of actors in DRR policy can be likened to a policy subsystem, it is at a nascent stage. However more research is required to assess the extent to which DRR policy actors in Kenya fit into a policy subsystem as advanced by the Advocacy Coalition Framework Approach.

Challenges that NSAs faced can be divided into two broad categories: challenges external and internal to the NSAs. External challenges can be minimised through focused and well-targeted strategies for advocacy and forming alliances with the relevant state actors. Non-state actors can reduce their internal challenges through capacity building and use of evidence to convince policymakers. It was evident that international policy frameworks and donor interest were crucial to enhancing NSAs engagement in national policy processes in Kenya.
5.4 Recommendations

5.4.1 Government to conduct capacity building for NSAs in public policy processes

It is evident from the research that Government of Kenya has opened up space for NSAs to engage in policy formulation. While most of the NSAs especially the national NGOs had experience in advocacy and policy implementation, they had limited experience and were less familiar with national policy formulation processes including drafting. The Government can build non-state actors’ capacities on national policy processes to ensure NSAs are effective contributors.

5.4.2 Recommendations for NSAs

5.4.2.1 Conduct targeted and sustained lobbying

Lobbying and advocacy are useful in getting buy-in from policymakers. Non-state actors will benefit if they target relevant audiences and sustained lobbying throughout the formulation process. NSAs need to identify the relevant policy-makers to lobby, develop messages that resonate with them and adopt strategies that bring the legislators together for information-sharing sessions including both formal and informal meetings.

5.4.2.2 Use informal processes to fast-track policy adoption

Formal processes in public policy formulation can be time consuming; informal processes can help reduce this lag. NSAs need to identify champions among law makers and other influential people, build a strong alliance with such champions, and equip them with information they need to lobby in parliament and other important spaces.
5.4.2.3 Allocate own funds to sustain participation

In this study, it was established that only three organisations funded DRR policy formulation process. Over-reliance on a few donors may slow down the process. NSAs need to mobilise their own resources to sustain their participation. In this way, consultations can be held more frequently to fast track the formulation process.

5.4.2.4 Use research and evidence during policy engagement with state actors

Evidence is a powerful communication tool in supporting policy claims and positions. As NSAs engage in policy process, there is need to conduct research to ensure their claims are backed by credible evidence. Such information should be presented in a clear way devoid of jargons. Policy makers are rarely technical people; they need supportive evidence to be presented in clear simple convincing terms.

5.4.2.5 Act as a group/coalition in public policy engagement

Non-state actors are likely to achieve better results if they acted as a coalition as opposed to approaching policy engagement as lone actors. It is common to find several non-state actors all affected by a particular policy. Such non-state actors need to form coalitions in order to leverage on each other’s strengths and resources, consolidate such resources and focus them on the relevant policy objective.
5.5 Suggestions for further research

From the study, it was apparent that national and indigenous non-state actors were underrepresented and yet the national policies affect the citizens. Further research is required to establish the extent to which such organisations participate and influence national public policy processes; how they get incorporated into the national policy debate, their interests, challenges they face and how can their participation be made more effective. Such a study would be relevant in helping to build the capacity of local non-state actors and reduce dependency on international actors.
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Appendix 1: Research Instrument

ROLE OF NON-STATE ACTORS IN FORMULATION OF THE KENYA NATIONAL DISASTER RISK REDUCTION POLICY

Introduction
Loise Asewe Ochanda is a post-graduate student at Kenyatta University pursuing a Masters Degree in Public Policy and Administration (MPPA). She is currently undertaking a study to determine the role of Non State Actors (NSAs) in formulation of the National Disaster Risk Reduction Policy. This research is a requirement in partial fulfilment for the award of the degree. Loise is kindly requesting your cooperation in completing this questionnaire.

The term Non State Actors refers to those participants who were drawn from institutions other than ministries and state agencies/corporations. Policy considered is limited to public policy which is a result of government engagement.

Thank you in advance for supporting this research process.

Loise Ochanda

1. In which of the following categories would you classify your organization (Select the most appropriate)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>International NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>National NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community Based Organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Inter-governmental organization (UN, EU, RECs etc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Research Institution/Think Tank</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Consultancy Firm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Private Sector Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other, Please indicate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What disaster risk reduction activities does your organisation engage in? Please list
   (Training and capacity development, Research and policy advisory, disaster response and relief etc)
3. Who are the primary beneficiaries of the DRR Programmes implemented by your organisation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Governments and intergovernmental organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-Governmental organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grassroots community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other, Please indicate:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Are there staff in your organisation who have ever participated in public policy formulation in Kenya (apart from the DRR policy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. In which of the following public policy processes does your organisation have expertise?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public policy implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public policy research and analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public policy formulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Public policy advocacy and lobbying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What was the period of engagement by your organisation in the DRR policy formulation process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 - 3 Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4 - 5 Years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. In what way did your organization contribute to the formulation of Disaster Risk Reduction policy (Select as appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Convening (Bringing groups together for discussions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Facilitating (Provide access to services and information)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Research and knowledge generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Policy analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Policy writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Policy validation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Other: Please indicate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. From your observation, which of the following factors facilitated NSAs participation in formulation of the DRR Policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of coordination structures and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal participation opportunity for state and non-state actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate representation of actors concerned with various components of DRR in Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate and quality information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate funding to sustain participation by NSAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation by experts in DRR from both NSA group and the Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building in policy engagement and DRR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Informal links to facilitate NSAs engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of ICT in communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: Please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. From your opinion, which of the following challenges did the group of NSAs face during the policy formulation process? Please add other challenges that may be missing from the list.

**A. External Challenges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lack of political goodwill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inadequate funding support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lack of donor interest in DRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lack of clarity in national policy process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other, please indicate:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. Challenges inherent to the group of NSAs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Select</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Limited understanding of DRR policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Weak strategies for policy engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inadequate data to support discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Limited capacity for lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Turnover among NSAs staff engaging in the DRR policy formulation process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lack of internal funding to sustain participation by NSAs staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Competing priority among the NSAs (intra and inter group of NSAs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Other, please indicate:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. If you were to participate in a similar policy process, what would you recommend in order to enhance the effectiveness of Non-State Actors?