



## Tool G-3

# Scanning and appraisal for planning interventions in a new community

December 2018

# Tool G-3

## Scanning and appraisal for planning interventions in a new community

### Objective

To assist personnel from county government or other facilitating organizations to scan rangeland management processes and activities that may already be taking place in a community and to appraise the level of organization and capacity of any institution and system that the community may have for managing resources. Anticipated output

### Anticipated output

An outline of what kinds of interventions the facilitating organization should prioritize in any particular rangeland community

### Participants in this activity

Staff from the facilitating organization (consulting with local stakeholders)

### Introduction

There is a logical sequence of stages and steps to the participatory rangeland management (PRM) process (see Tool G-2). However, these must always be adapted to the local context. When beginning activities in a new community, you should not assume that there is no community organization responsible for managing resources or that there are no rangeland management activities taking place. The PRM process should build on good practices and existing systems that a community may already have. This means that first you need to know what practices and systems exist.

Build on the systems that communities already have.

This tool is meant to guide personnel from the facilitating organization to scan rangeland activities and processes that are already taking place and to appraise the level of organization and capacity of community organizations that are engaged in rangeland management. These may have been supported by earlier projects and programs or they may be traditional management systems. This kind of appraisal can be thought of as part of the first step of PRM (see Tool G-2).

Carrying out a scan and appraisal will typically involve discussions with a wide range of local stakeholders in a community, as well as with personnel from government and nongovernment organizations who are familiar with the area. It may also involve community workshops, mapping and other kinds of investigations that would be part of the first step of the PRM process.

## Key appraisal questions

This tool is based on a series of questions organized according to the Four Legs of PRM. The answers to the questions will suggest what kinds of interventions the facilitating organization should prioritize in the target community. Because it is important that all four legs are strong, the questions help to identify what kinds of interventions aimed at strengthening one or another of the legs need to be prioritized. See also Worksheet G-3-I below, which contains a checklist to help you summarize your findings.

Early stages: getting the community standing on four legs

First Leg main appraisal question: Is there a representative community rangeland management institution in place?

Do not assume that you need to help the community to create a new rangeland management institution. There may already be a community conservancy, a group ranch committee, a water resource users association or some other organization or system in place that is managing resources or could be assisted to do so.

The word representative in this question is important. If there is already a community organization in place, but it is not democratic—if, for instance, it excludes women or excludes any ethnic minorities that are in the community—then it is not a good candidate for the rangeland management institution that the facilitating organization will work with.

If the answer to this question is 'no', then the facilitating organization should work with the community to help establish a representative rangeland management institution, either by creating a new one, or helping to ensure that existing organizations become more inclusive.

Second Leg main appraisal question: Is there a system of planned grazing, zoning or other form of rangeland management that is understood by the community?

This question asks whether there is a basic grazing plan, or some other basic rangeland management system, already in place. This may involve, at the most basic level, a categorization of pastures into wet and dry season grazing areas and some rules for enforcing the grazing pattern. It is important, too, that the community at large is aware of the grazing plan and rules.

If the answer to this question is 'no', then the facilitating organization should help the rangeland management institution, and the community generally, to develop at least a basic grazing plan that is understood and owned by the community.

Third Leg main appraisal questions: Has the rangeland unit been defined and agreed with neighbouring communities? Are neighbouring communities aware of what the target community is doing and that it has a rangeland management institution that is managing resources on behalf the community?

Before moving on to more elaborate rangeland management and restoration interventions it is important that channels of communication with neighbouring communities have been established. Communications with neighbouring communities should have been initiated, and the extent of the rangeland unit should be more or less clear and understood by target community and by neighbours. If this has been done, then the foundation for a landscape approach to rangeland management is being built.

If the answer to either of these questions is 'no', then the facilitating organization should work with the community on activities to begin strengthening the Third Leg of rangeland management.

Fourth Leg main appraisal questions: Are the relevant government authorities aware of the rangeland management institution? Is the form and organizational structure of the rangeland management institution such that it could qualify to be recognized by county or national government?

It may not be that the rangeland management institution has completed some process for formal recognition by government. However, at this stage it is important at least that the relevant government authorities are aware of the institution. The facilitating organization should have a plan for identifying under which legal framework the community institution would eventually be recognized: e.g. the 2016 Community Land Act, or county rangeland management legislation, or the Water Resource Users Association framework, etc. Each of these frameworks has certain minimal requirements such as having a constitution, having a minimum number of women on the committee/board of directors, having an annual general meeting for the whole community, etc. The appraisal should identify whether the rangeland management institution will be able to meet these criteria.

If the answer to either these questions is 'no', then the facilitating organization should support the rangeland management institution to make contact with the relevant government authority and to prepare itself to meet the criteria for recognition.

If the answer to all of the above question is 'yes', then you can assume that the community and its PRM activities are standing on all four legs. If so, next you can focus on building the community's capacity and strengthening each of the four legs.

Later stages: building capacity and strengthening the four legs

First Leg main appraisal question: Is the rangeland management institution autonomously carrying out its management and governance responsibilities?

Effective governance by the rangeland management institution is an important element in PRM. This question revolves around the capacity of the institution. Is it meeting regularly? Does it organize general meetings for the whole community annually or even more often? Does it have an annual work plan? Is it proactively addressing any problems that arise? Are there systems of accountability of the institution to the community in place? For the First Leg of rangeland management, once a rangeland management institution has been established, the next level is to consider whether it is standing on its own. This appraisal question is concerned with the capacity of the institution and whether it is standing on its own.

If the answer to the above question is 'no', then the facilitating organization should plan interventions that build the capacity of the rangeland management institution and strengthen community governance, including ensuring that the institution is accountable to the community.

Second Leg main appraisal question: Are the community's grazing plans and other rangeland management interventions being enforced and implemented?

For the Second Leg of rangeland management, once a basic grazing plan is in place, the next aspect of the appraisal considers to what extent it is being implemented and enforced. Neither the implementation nor the enforcement is likely to be perfect—they seldom are—but you want to know if the community is at least attempting to implement its plans. In other words, this question considers whether the community the grazing plans or any other rangeland management interventions, are more than just pieces of paper.

If the answer to the above question is 'no', then the facilitating organization should help the rangeland management institution to assess what obstacles there are to implementation and enforcement and assist them to plan how to remove the obstacles.

Third Leg main appraisal question: Have constructive relations been established with communities and rangeland users in the wider landscape?

For the Third Leg, the appraisal question considers whether relations and planning in the broader landscape have gone beyond mere awareness to establish effective collaboration. This may be in the form of a landscape management plan, intercommunity agreements about stock routes and shared grazing areas, or agreeing on mechanisms for resolving disputes among different communities.

If the answer to the above question is 'no', then the facilitating organization may prioritize activities that involve inter-community planning and implementation of a landscape approach.

Fourth Leg main appraisal question: Has the government formally recognized the rangeland management institution, and any grazing plans or other elements of its rangeland management system?

The key appraisal question here is whether the rangeland management institution has received formal recognition from government giving it the authority to manage resources within the rangeland unit.

If the answer to the above question is 'no', then the facilitating organization can include in its program activities to help the community to go through the formal processes of registration and recognition.

# Appraisal

## Worksheet G-3-1

### Checklist for Scanning and Appraisal

Stage	Main appraisal questions	Yes/No	Comments
Early stages: Getting the community standing on four legs	1 <sup>st</sup> leg: Is there a representative community rangeland management institution in place?		
	2 <sup>nd</sup> leg: Is there a system of planned grazing, zoning or other form of rangeland management that is understood by the community?		
	3 <sup>rd</sup> leg: Has the rangeland unit been defined and agreed with neighbouring communities? Are neighbouring communities aware of what the target community is doing and that is has a rangeland management institution that is managing resources on behalf the community?		
	4 <sup>th</sup> leg: Are the relevant government authorities aware of the rangeland management institution? Is the form and organizational structure of the rangeland management institution such that it could qualify to be recognized by county or national government?		
Later stages: Building capacity and strengthening the four legs	1 <sup>st</sup> leg: Is the rangeland management institution autonomously carrying out its management and governance responsibilities?		
	2 <sup>nd</sup> leg: Are the community's grazing plans and other rangeland management interventions being enforced and implemented?		
	3 <sup>rd</sup> leg: Have constructive relations been established with communities and rangeland users in the wider landscape?		
	4 <sup>th</sup> leg: Has the government formally recognized the rangeland management institution, and any grazing plans or other elements of its rangeland management system?		

This document is part of the Participatory rangeland management toolkit for Kenya, an initiative led by the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI). This tool was developed by ILRI, with financial assistance from the United States Agency for International Development Feed the Future Kenya Accelerated Value Chain Development (AVCD) program.

Photo credit: ILRI/Fiona Flintan

Citation: Robinson, L.W. 2018. *Scanning and appraisal for planning interventions in a new community. Tool G-3 of the Participatory Rangeland Management Toolkit for Kenya*. Nairobi, Kenya: ILRI.



This publication is licensed for use under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence. To view this licence, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>.



The main goal of the Kenya Accelerated Value Chain Development (AVCD) program under the Feed the Future initiative is to sustainably reduce poverty and hunger in the Feed the Future zones of influence in Kenya.



The International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) works to improve food security and reduce poverty in developing countries through research for better and more sustainable use of livestock. ILRI is a CGIAR research centre. It works through a network of regional and country offices and projects in East, South and Southeast Asia, and Central, East, Southern and West Africa. [ilri.org](http://ilri.org)



CGIAR is a global agricultural research partnership for a food-secure future. Its research is carried out by 15 research centres in collaboration with hundreds of partner organizations. [cgiar.org](http://cgiar.org)

*Patron: Professor Peter C Doherty AC, FAA, FRS*

*Animal scientist, Nobel Prize Laureate for Physiology or Medicine—1996*

Box 30709, Nairobi 00100 Kenya  
Phone +254 20 422 3000  
Fax +254 20 422 3001  
Email [ilri-kenya@cgiar.org](mailto:ilri-kenya@cgiar.org)

[ilri.org](http://ilri.org)  
*better lives through livestock*

ILRI is a CGIAR research centre

Box 5689, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia  
Phone +251 11 617 2000  
Fax +251 11 667 6923  
Email [ilri-ethiopia@cgiar.org](mailto:ilri-ethiopia@cgiar.org)