

Shared governance of climate change and natural resources issues in East Africa

*Roz Price
Institute of Development Studies
05 October 2018*

Question

Please provide a summary of published commentary and opinion about the ability of current governance arrangements within the region to facilitate a regional approach to shared climate change and natural resource management issues in East Africa.

Contents

1. Summary
2. Regional institutions
3. National governments
4. Other regional programmes
5. References

The K4D helpdesk service provides brief summaries of current research, evidence, and lessons learned. Helpdesk reports are not rigorous or systematic reviews; they are intended to provide an introduction to the most important evidence related to a research question. They draw on a rapid desk-based review of published literature and consultation with subject specialists.

Helpdesk reports are commissioned by the UK Department for International Development and other Government departments, but the views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, the UK Government, K4D or any other contributing organisation. For further information, please contact helpdesk@k4d.info.

1. Summary

This review aims to provide a snapshot of current governance arrangements in the East African region to deal with shared climate change and natural resource management issues. Far from being exhaustive, this review intends to provide a brief overview of the key climate-focused institutions and arrangements for eastern Africa (and sometimes southern Africa as these regional governance arrangements can overlap), with an emphasis on institutions that formulate the regional plans and responses. National responses are also briefly touched upon for some countries and some recent regional donor programmes are explored. Eastern Africa is home to two key regional economic communities (RECs): the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD) and the East African Community (EAC), and these are the focus of much of this review. This review used both peer reviewed and grey literature. Issues of gender were not explored.

Key findings include:

- Robust evidence was limited on the success of previous regional programmes and the ability of East Africa to have a shared response in the future. Although the need for a regional response to climate change, in tandem with national responses, was apparent in the majority of the literature.
- Regional institutions have a critical role to play in supporting solutions to trans-boundary issues related to a changing climate
- Both the EAC and IGAD are seen as key players in the region in relation to climate change and both have attempted to mainstream climate change into their policies and programmes.
- The final evaluation of the COMESA-EAC-SADC Tripartite Climate Change Programme (2010-2016) concluded that the idea of a joint programme for COMESA, EAC and SADC was ambitious, but good, providing an opportunity to draw on the different strengths the RECs.
- Most African countries have developed national climate-related policies, plans, and actions. 'Policy coherence' is widely recognised as necessary for effective climate change responses by governments. However, much of the progress in policy coherence has focussed on vertical integration, aiming to mainstream climate change issues and actions into particular sectors and the different policy levels and scales within them, rather than horizontal, cross-sectoral linkages. Effective legal frameworks are also key for the management of newly discovered extractive resources in east Africa. However, legal frameworks that have emerged after the discoveries of extractives in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda are not yet well suited to secure effective and democratic governance over natural resources.
- There are a number of donors, intergovernmental organisations and UN agencies working in East Africa on regional responses to climate change. Programmes include USAID's Planning for Resilience in East Africa through Policy, Adaptation, Research, and Economic Development (PREPARED) project that ran from 2012 until 2018, and DFID's current Weather and Climate Information Services for Africa – East Africa (WISER_EA) programme.

2. Regional institutions

Continent-wide institutions

Maupin (2017: 134) provides a brief summary of some of the key organisations that play a critical role in increasing climate awareness and knowledge on the African continent, notably at the

instigation of the African Union (AU). A Climate Information for Development Initiative (ClimDev) was created in 2007 in order to address a request from African countries to include climate change into national planning and management. In 2009, the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN), a permanent forum for African Environmental Ministers that exists since 1985, established the Nairobi Declaration on the African Process for Combating Climate Change. In 2010, the African Climate Policy Centre (ACPC), which today provides policy support, was established under the umbrella of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) and ClimDev. Other organisations that give support to combat climate change in Africa include the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), created in 2001, which spurs Africa's development by bridging existing gaps in priority sectors (including climate change). The African Development bank (AfDB) works closely with the AU and UNECA to enhance the ClimDev initiative by enabling partnerships between government institutions and the private sector and by operating the ClimDev special fund (CDSF). In 2014, the AU also created the African Risk Capacity (ARC), which is a specialised agency to complement existing multi-levelled disaster reduction capacities (Maupin, 2017: 134).

Denton et al. (2016) highlight how regional institutions have a critical role to play in supporting solutions to trans-boundary issues related to a changing climate. The African continent is organised at the regional level under the AU. The AU's Assembly of Heads of State and Government has officially recognised eight Regional Economic Communities (RECs). Two of these are based in East Africa: the East African Community (EAC), with five countries; and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) with eight countries. There are a number of regional and national responses to climate change in Africa and joint initiatives. Furthermore, there are other bilateral and multilateral activities toward climate change mitigation and adaptation in East Africa.

The African Union (AU)

Recognising the need for a common position for Africa on climate change issues, the AU in 2009 mandated the African Union Commission (AUC) to facilitate the development of an "African Strategy". Thus, the Climate Change and Desertification Unit was established by the Department of Rural Economy and Agriculture. The AUC also elaborated a comprehensive African strategy on climate change, including the development of sectoral technical backup data on the impacts of climate change, how much it would cost the economy and the amount of carbon sequestered in various African ecosystems (Faiyetole and Adesina, 2017: 733).

In early 2016, the AU launched a regional development plan, Agenda 2063, which focuses on transformative economic development and productive employment, specifically for young people, economic integration and gender equality. The AU and RECs take increasing responsibility for regional issues and there is an explicit political will for regional integration and collaboration, this can be seen in the increasingly active role that African regional organisations and their member states are taking in conflict management, management of cross-border natural resources and economic integration (Ministry of Foreign Affairs Sweden, 2016: 8). While regional organisations have been strengthened in their normative role, there is a gap between commitments at regional level and implementation at national level, where implementation is slow. The AU and regional organisations continue to be challenged by weak capacity and results-based management in several parts of the organisation and by unpredictable finances. For this reason, there is a need to continue reform efforts and strengthen the capacity of organisations (Ministry of Foreign Affairs Sweden, 2016: 8).

The AU established the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) as a strategy which aims to achieve agriculture-based growth and food security on the continent. The technical body of the AUC, the NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency (NPCA), has been mandated to coordinate the implementation of CAADP. German Development Cooperation (GIZ) on behalf of the German government supports the AUC and NPCA in mainstreaming CAADP in 55 AU member states (Esche and Jabril, 2017). The intervention assists the AUC and NPCA with technical expertise and advisory services to support AU member states in the development of climate-friendly National Agricultural Investment Plans (NAIPs) and the implementation of climate-smart agricultural measures. In addition, the intervention focuses on strengthening CAADP institutions' climate change capacities and on sharing experiences across the continent through the continental exchange platform 'African Climate Smart Agriculture Alliance' (Esche and Jabril, 2017).

Regional Economic Communities (RECs)

At its Special Session in 2010, AMCEN called on the RECs to exhibit leadership and develop a Comprehensive Framework Programme on Climate Change in Africa to guide the implementation of climate change interventions. The AU has also mandated RECs to implement its regional integration agenda on economic development. Denton et al. (2016), focussing on the 8 RECs in Africa, demonstrates the ability of regional institutions to pool existing knowledge and resources, leverage local and national policies, and give a voice and robust bargaining position to African countries at international negotiations. Denton et al. (2016: 4) argue that regional institutions have a key role to play in sharing information on successful practices across Africa, and in fostering the scaling-up and scaling-out of these practices throughout the region. Further, they argue that RECs are also well positioned to support local and national institutions in identifying policy, capacity and other knowledge gaps (particularly those of a trans-boundary nature) – especially during the design of National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) – and building capacity to fill these gaps. Denton et al. (2016) also highlight that many environment-related institutions in Africa were created forty plus years ago with specific stand-alone mandates (e.g. water), and tend to be poorly equipped for cross-cutting issues such as climate change. Improving institutional capacity in RECs will not only improve their potential to leverage local and national policies and to strengthen the power of member countries at international negotiations, but may also position them better to benefit from climate finance opportunities. They suggest that any new arrangements should be flexible enough to evolve with changes in regional political integration processes, strategic national geopolitical interests, and the climate change negotiation process (Denton et al., 2016: 7).

Denton et al. (2016: 7-11) put forward three strategic options for institutional arrangements that will maximise the leadership potential of RECs with regards to climate change issues:

1. Establishing and strengthening Climate Change Units (CCUs)

The strategy proposes the establishment and strengthening of CCUs within each of the REC secretariats. The proposed CCUs would take the form of an institutionalised department – with a stronger mandate than a cross-sectoral working group – that would interact with all existing directorates on climate change issues. Ideally, these units would report directly to the Executive Secretary or to a person chosen by the REC's governing body. This strategy is currently being pursued by Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), East Africa Community

(EAC)¹ and Southern African Development Community (SADC). However, delays have been caused by the absence of agreement on this among the member states. The EAC and its technical arm, the Lake Victoria Basin Commission, are both currently developing internal structures to accommodate their climate change initiatives.

2. *Establishing a Climate Policy Advisory in the Executive Secretary's Office*

This would apply to heads of RECs – the executive secretaries – which could create appropriate institutions for policy advice on climate change within their secretariats.

3. *Building institutional capacities to attract climate change investments*

RECs are more likely to attract investment in their flagship climate change programmes if their secretariats are functional: trained officers and negotiators, innovative adaptation programs and effective advisory/engagement with member states. However, providing the capacity building necessary to achieve this functionality requires resources. Obtaining these resources may require an increase in budgets or stronger collaboration and linkages with other institutions.

Denton et al. (2016: 13) emphasise that essential for the success of all of these models is the removal of institutional and structural barriers, such as limited qualified human resources and lack of legitimacy. These can be addressed by, for instance, building human and financial capacity and ensuring legitimacy by encouraging active buy-in from member states. A further limitation is the inadequate regional-level policy and regulatory frameworks for governing the climate-sensitive trans-boundary natural resources traversing the sub-Saharan African landscape. Lack of coordination between the countries is one of the more tangible reasons for this limitation. RECs have also been criticised for their lack of appropriate networks and linkages to national, subnational and international initiatives. One recurrent criticism has been that regional institutions are mainly political and their objectives and programmes are developed with a top-down approach, without adequate participation from the local and national levels. This communication and participation gap needs to be filled in order to gain full buy-in, as well as legitimacy to optimise regional development potential and aspirations.

The East Africa Community (EAC)

Re-established in 1999, the East African Community (EAC) has undertaken ambitious efforts to bring Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda under one political federation, as well as establish a Common Market and a Monetary Union (Elowson and Lins de Albuquerque, 2016: 1). In October 1998, even before the EAC was re-established, the initial three Partner States created a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to govern cooperation in matters relating to environmental management (Jarso, 2012: 19). Upon re-establishment of the EAC, the Treaty preserved this *ad hoc* arrangement. Further, the Treaty allowed Partner States to enact new Protocols to promote the Treaty's mandate. In April 2006, the EAC's Council of Ministers adopted the Protocol on Environment and Natural Resources Management, formalising the MoU. The purpose of the Protocol is to promote "cooperation [among the Partner States] in the

¹ In 2010, a Climate Change Coordination Unit (CCCU) was established under the EAC Secretariat (Jarso, 2012), but there are reports that this unit was closed down in 2016 due to a lack of funding. However, this is not clear. Further reports in March 2018 reported that the unit would soon be re-established (<http://www.thecitizen.co.tz/News/EAC-climate-unit-back-in-operation/1840340-4328004-1cvnxnz/index.html>).

management of the environment and natural resources within their jurisdiction.” It applies to the management of transboundary resources, biodiversity, forest and tree resources, water resources, wetland resources, coastal and marine resources, energy resources, mountain ecosystems, and rangelands. Its application also extends to fight desertification and mitigation of the effects of droughts, and to mitigation of the effects of climate change (Jarso, 2012: 19). However, despite Kenya and Uganda having ratified the protocol, Tanzania has not; therefore, the protocol is not yet in force (Ligot, 2016: 17).

A review undertaken for the AfDB into economic integration in Africa in the context of climate change, highlights that some RECS, including the EAC, display higher awareness of risks associated with climate change than others do (Ligot, 2016: 17). The EAC’s Climate Change Policy notes ‘infrastructure needs to be climate-proofed to secure the high cost of installation. This involves incorporating accepted risk limits in building and construction standards based on the expected return periods of natural hazards, including severe winds, heavy rainfall and storm surges. [...] Possible adaptation measures would include revision of structural and building codes and standards, taking into account the expected changes in climate’ (Ligot, 2016: 17). Jarso (2012) argues that climate change has, to a large extent, been mainstreamed in all programmes of the EAC. However, Ligot (2016) notes that although most RECs (notably EAC), have issued policy papers presenting their strategy on climate change, most of those documents rarely translate into regulatory principles such as norms, protocols, or standards.

IUCN-Global Water Partnership (2015) analysed regional and national policies and strategies in environment and natural resources management in East Africa and identified challenges, opportunities and actions required to integrate climate change adaptation approaches into trans-boundary ecosystem management in the region. Their policy brief is based on a case study by IUCN/USAID on implementing a resilience framework to support climate change adaptation in the Mt Elgon region of Lake Victoria Basin in Kenya and Uganda. The study suggests that the EAC provides a good opportunity to strengthen cooperation among countries for trans-boundary ecosystem management and climate change adaptation through its protocols, policies and strategies on environment and natural resources management.

A regional East African Climate Change Technical Working Group (CCTWG) meeting was held in June 2018, convened by the EAC secretariat with support from the GIZ Global Carbon Markets Programme and the UNFCCC Regional Collaboration Centre Kampala. The meeting aimed to discuss the progress on the implementation of the East African regional climate change adaptation and mitigation actions. The meeting also deliberated on the EAC’s Climate Change Alliance on carbon markets and climate finance that is aimed to strengthen regional collaboration in the implementation of the Paris Agreement (Namande, 2018). A major outcome from the discussion was that the EAC Secretariat and Partner States shall explore the possibilities of establishing the EAC Climate Change Partnership platform that will host climate change initiatives including the alliance on carbon markets and climate finance, Monitoring Reporting and Verification (MRV) alliance and NDC Partnership. The CCTWG meeting also discussed the EAC climate finance sustainability plan that shall serve as a tool and road map for helping the EAC partner states coordinate climate finance efforts, track progress, and focus on priorities for effective climate resource mobilisation, including efforts towards accreditation of the EAC as a Regional Implementing Entity (RIE) of the Green Climate Fund and the Adaptation Fund (Namande, 2018).

The Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD)

The Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD), established in its present form in 1996, has eight member states: Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan, South Sudan, Somalia and Uganda (Elowson and Lins de Albuquerque, 2016: 1). IGAD is structured into four divisions, in accordance with the organisation's vision and objectives: (a) the Agriculture and Environment division, (b) the Peace and Security division, (c) the Economic Cooperation division, and (d) the Social Development division. Besides these main divisions, IGAD has several specialised institutions and programmes hosted by member states. These include the Conflict Early Warning and Response Mechanism (CEWARN) and the IGAD Climate Prediction and Application Centre (ICPAC), both of which deal with climate-related security risks (Krampe et al., 2018: 14).

ICPAC's mission is to foster, through a set of programmes, sub-regional and national capacity for climate information, prediction products and services, and early warnings and related applications, as a contribution to sustainable development in the IGAD sub-region (Denton et al., 2016: 4). Although climate change and drought are at the core of IGAD's agenda, the organisation only created a specific climate change strategy in 2015 (the IGAD Regional Climate Change Strategy for 2016–2030). This strategy provided a comprehensive policy framework for the organisation and was subsequently expanded into the IGAD Strategy and Implementation Plan for 2016–20². Krampe et al. (2018: 15) highlight that the intergovernmental nature of IGAD means that all climate policies have to be implemented at the state level, leaving IGAD with the task of coordinating and harmonising state policies. However, this coordination is limited as tensions between member states and regional bureaucracy often arise, with the result that many treaties and regional projects are yet to be implemented. IGAD is also very dependent on international donors for its resources, with only 5-10% of programme funding coming from member states (Krampe et al., 2018: 15). Krampe et al. (2018: 16) elaborate that like other regional organisations, IGAD is constrained by state sovereignty and the norm of non-intervention. Interregional issues between states and near continuous civil wars and communal conflicts have limited IGAD's influence and its ability to build trust. From their expert interviews, they highlight that while it is widely acknowledged that IGAD has limited implementation capacity, some experts argue that it should set norms rather than implement policy. Currently, the Secretariat maintains that it can both set norms and implement policies, primarily because it allows IGAD to mobilise external financing. Krampe et al. (2018) recommend that looking forward, IGAD needs to strengthen the coordination of its programmes.

COMESA-EAC-SADC Tripartite Climate Change Programme

One ambitious joint initiative to respond to climate change in eastern and southern Africa was a tripartite programme on climate change adaptation and mitigation initiated by COMESA, EAC and SADC (SADC, 2017). The programme's overall purpose was: COMESA-EAC-SADC Member States are enabled to increase investments in climate-resilient and carbon-efficient agriculture and its linkages to forestry, land use and energy practices by 2016 (Scanteam, 2016: 1). The programme was a five-year initiative that started in 2010 funded by Norway, DFID and the European Union. COMESA was the signatory for the project, as prior to this Programme (which commenced in 2012), COMESA had built up some internal capacity on the subject of

² Further information on funding for ICPAC is in the *Weather and Climate Information Services for Africa – East Africa – East Africa* section below.

climate change through a previous programme whilst the other RECs had limited exposure to climate change work at that point (Scanteam, 2016: 7).

In a final evaluation of the programme assessing programme progress and effectiveness, a number of insights into the realities of an integrated regional programme on climate change were highlighted (Scanteam, 2016). There were a number of key issues in programme implementation relating to what procedures to use, management and coordination, the distribution of the Programme funding as well as of roles. EAC and SADC came on board late in the process and there was limited engagement from their side in the planning and inception phase, they also had problems using COMESA's procedures for procurement, financial report and staffing and it was decided they could use their own procedures further complicating the programme implementation. Overall, the evaluation concludes that given a number of challenges, such as a late start up, and delays and cuts in the total funding base, the programme may not have reached its full potential. The evaluation comments on regional coordination and finds that the idea of a joint programme for COMESA, EAC and SADC was ambitious, but good, providing an opportunity to draw on the different strengths the RECs have (Scanteam, 2016). The evaluation puts forward some recommendations for improved future regional coordination based on lessons learned from the programme (Scanteam, 2016: 2-3):

- Establish a programme steering committee for future collaborative programmes
- Have one programme management unit only in one of the RECs. The other partners may have programme focal points in a programme coordination group.
- Agree on roles and funding before the programme starts.
- Look into well thought through funding modalities, and make sure the modalities are clear and understood by all partners before the programme starts. Link the funding to the planned activities.
- Explore opportunities to loosen up the procurement regulations to ensure collaboration for the local partners.

3. National governments

National policy coherence

Most African countries have developed national climate-related policies, plans, and actions. 'Policy coherence' is widely recognised as necessary for effective climate change responses by governments, but its meaning can change depending on the context (Curran et al., 2018: 2). At its simplest, it is the need for a logical consistency across all dimensions of policy development and implementation. The need for coherent action through mutually supportive policies is integral to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and implied throughout. Considerable efforts and progress have been made to incorporate climate change into national and sectoral policies globally, as part of drives to mainstream climate change concerns (Nachmany and Setzer, 2018 cited in Curran et al., 2018: 2). However, much of this progress has focussed on vertical integration, aiming to mainstream climate change issues and actions into particular sectors and the different policy levels and scales within them, rather than horizontal, cross-sectoral linkages (Runhaar et al., 2018 cited in Curran et al., 2018: 2). Horizontal coherence places a focus on interactions between sectors and institutions that operate at the same level of responsibility (regional, national or local). Because of the many different institutional structures, challenges and country contexts, there is no single way to ensure policy coherence. It is up to each country to adopt, develop or design the processes that are best suited to its circumstances.

Southern Africa

Across Malawi, Tanzania and Zambia there are signs of progress on mainstreaming climate change issues arising from broader strategic policies into some sectoral policies and plans (vertical coherence). Using the cases of Malawi, Tanzania and Zambia, England, Dougill et al. (2018) investigate the extent of coherence in national policies across the water and agriculture sectors and to climate change adaptation goals outlined in national development plans. Findings show that sector policies have differing degrees of coherence on climate change adaptation, currently being strongest in Zambia and weakest in Tanzania. They also found that sectoral policies remain more coherent in addressing immediate-term disaster management issues of floods and droughts rather than longer-term strategies for climate adaptation. Coherence between sector and climate policies and strategies is strongest when the latter has been more recently developed. However to date, this has largely been achieved by repackaging of existing sectoral policy statements into climate policies drafted by external consultants to meet international reporting needs and not by the establishment of new connections between national sectoral planning processes. They recommend that for more effective mainstreaming of climate change adaptation, governments need to actively embrace longer-term cross-sectoral planning through cross-Ministerial structures, such as initiated through Zambia's Interim Climate Change Secretariat, to foster greater policy coherence and integrated adaptation planning. There are typically higher levels of coherence between National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPA) and national climate change policies and also between some sectoral policies: for example, there are high levels of vertical coherence between Malawi's NAPA and agriculture policy, and between Zambia's NAPA and water policy. However, the state of horizontal coherence between sectoral water, energy and food policies is either partial or weak (England, Dougill et al., 2018). This weak coherence is also evident at national level between long-term development strategies such as national development plans and national level climate-related policies such as Nationally Determined Contributions and national climate strategies. For example, there is limited coherence between the water and agriculture policies in Tanzania, and between the agriculture policy and NDC in Zambia.

England, Stringer et al. (2018) looks at national sector policies in southern Africa (Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe) in relation to climate compatible development (CCD). In particular, it assesses policies from the water, agriculture, energy and forestry sectors and examines their potential to move towards CCD by analysing their alignment with CCD's three component parts: adaptation, mitigation and development. They highlight that different sectors of national policy making can address the priorities for adaptation, mitigation and development in different ways. Understanding how different sectors handle the components of CCD is important in identifying scope for conflicts and mutual benefits between policy areas, as well as opportunities for harnessing benefits capable of supporting shifts towards enhanced climate adaptation, mitigation and development, within and across sectors.

England, Stringer et al. (2018) demonstrate that the ten southern African countries' sector policies as yet only partially align towards a CCD trajectory, with approaches that both complement and detract from CCD being prioritised by national governments. In general, the water sector remains largely adaptation focussed, whilst the energy and forestry sectors are more aligned with mitigation activities. For the energy sector, their findings corroborate previous studies in displaying the significant challenge in convincing governments to move away from a primary focus on fossil fuel based energy generation. Agriculture offers the greatest number of viable

'triple win with no regrets' approaches to achieve CCD across the southern African region, particularly through climate smart agriculture initiatives around agroforestry and conservation agriculture. A major finding that emerged is that agriculture provides by far the most viable pathway to CCD in accounting for both adaptation (66%) and mitigation (43%) potential wins. Consequently, government and other actors should support this core sector in order to move towards CCD (England, Stringer et al., 2018). England, Stringer et al. (2018) consider their findings to have policy relevance, but recognise integrating climate concerns in development efforts faces a plethora of implementation challenges. One such implementation challenge stems from the countries' varying domestic political economy and governance arrangements. Another implementation challenge is caused to a large extent by the fact that government ministries and departments often operate in relative isolation of each other, characterised by a lack of communication, information sharing and collaboration.

Legal frameworks for extractive resources

Luoga (2016) suggests that the trend in the East African countries whereby the governments have embarked upon developing policies and regulatory institutions for the governance of the recently discovered extractive resources is ill fated. He argues that it is essential to have in place an effective legal framework to secure democratic governance over natural resources. Luoga (2016) surmises that the legal frameworks that emerged after the discoveries of extractives in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda are not yet well suited to secure effective and democratic governance over natural resources. This is attested by the continued existence of the following concerns:

- Governments have continued to negotiate contracts for the extractives in secret and without accountability.
- Harmful ministerial competitions continue to make the terrain for aspiring investors uncertain and costly. This is because there is no authorising environment whereby decisions regarding extractives are made conclusively by the governments at high levels and bind all the ministers.
- There are no clear rules aimed at stamping out asymmetry in information and ensuring that all geological information is brought under the ownership of the governments.
- Apart from Tanzania, the other two countries (Kenya and Uganda) do not have clear rules to secure the use of revenues from the extractives for unlocking the economies and creating wealth for the future generations.

Collaborative outcomes in complex governance systems

Hamilton and Lubell (2018) examine two related questions that are key for understanding collaborative outcomes in complex governance systems. The first is the extent to which collaboration among policy actors depends upon their joint participation in policy forums. The second is how the scales at which these forums operate conditionally affect the likelihood of collaboration. They empirically examine these questions in the context of climate change adaptation governance in the Lake Victoria region, in East Africa, in which diverse sets of policy actors participate in numerous policy forums to address climate change issues such as the adaptive capacity of cropping and pastoral systems, as well as small-scale fisheries. The overall Lake Victoria region climate change adaptation policy process may be conceptualised as a network of policy actors interacting with one another and jointly contributing to decision-making processes sponsored by policy forums.

Hamilton and Lubell (2018: 239) conclude that like most other governance systems throughout the world, climate adaptation in Lake Victoria features complex sets of linkages among actors and policy forums operating at multiple institutional and spatial levels. In these settings, actors contribute to the design and implementation of policy through their participation in forums as well as through collaborative activities with other actors. They argue that the overall literature on environmental governance rests on the largely untested hypotheses about a positive relationship between institutions and collaboration, and the importance of scale (see Brondizio, Ostrom, & Young, 2009; Lubell, Henry, & McCoy, 2010 cited in Hamilton and Lubell, 2018). Hamilton and Lubell's (2018) results demonstrate that, on average, joint participation in policy forums is associated with collaborative relationships between actors. However, collaboration between actors that jointly participate in the same policy forums is conditional on the spatial and institutional levels at which those forums operate. Actors are substantially more likely to collaborate if the forum in which they jointly participate operates at a more local level, even after controlling for geographic homophily³. This finding is consistent with their argument that scale-dependent transaction costs shape the prospective payoffs of collaboration in complex institutional settings.

Another dimension of scale concerns the institutional level of decision making that forums sponsor. Results supported the hypothesis that actors would be more likely to collaborate if they jointly participate in lower-level operational choice forums compared with higher-level collective choice forums. Patterns of collaboration reveal actor strategies and have implications for governance outcomes. In particular, if actors find it harder to collaborate with joint participants of higher level forums, they may prioritise lower level forums (Hamilton and Lubell, 2018: 240).

Integrated Water Resources Management

In the 1990s, governments in East Africa officially recognised the water challenges faced by the region and embarked on a process of water sector reforms to adopt an integrated approach to water resources management, which was seen as the means of managing limited resources efficiently, equitably, and sustainably (Global Water Partnership, 2015: 7). All East African countries adopted the 'Dublin Principles', but each government has taken a different path to adopting integrated water resources management (IWRM), which reflects the unique nature of their available natural resources and stages of socio-economic development. They are now at different stages of reforms targeting policy, and legal and institutional frameworks; developing strategies and action plans; and setting up management and governance instruments. A key promoter of reforms continues to be the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI). However, despite these commitments, fragile countries like Somalia and South Sudan are still lagging behind.

A paper by the Global Water Partnership (2015) builds on the findings of the 2008–2009 and 2012 IWRM surveys which were done as part of the global UN-Water status report on IWRM published in 2012. It considers data provided by the UN World Water Development Report 2015 and is complemented with further insights on the progress achieved towards adopting IWRM using four case studies (from Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, and Uganda). These illustrate the different approaches being taken and how each country has interpreted the IWRM principles to meet the unique water resource management challenges it faces. Additionally, the case studies reflect that in Eastern Africa there is an urgent need to build the capacity of institutions as well as

³ The tendency of individuals to associate and bond with similar others,

personnel that focuses on pragmatic solutions and understands the realities of IWRM in the region, while putting into practice the principles of equity, efficiency, and ecology.

4. Other regional programmes

Eastern Africa Climate Smart Agriculture Platform (EACSAP)

The Eastern Africa Climate Smart Agriculture Platform (EACSAP) was established in 2014 and officially launched in 2015 to promote and scale up climate smart agricultural practices in the sub-region in order to increase agricultural productivity and incomes, adapt and build resilience to climate change, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.⁴ The FAO Sub-regional Office for Eastern Africa (FAOSFE) and platform members held a workshop in July 2018 aimed at reviving and operationalising the EACSAP. The workshop also aimed at resolving the organisational, institutional and technical issues affecting the platform, and agreeing on the implementation plan for the year 2018/2019.

Participants included representatives from ministries of agriculture in Eastern Africa, regional economic communities (EAC and IGAD), East Africa Farmers Federation (EAFF), African Conservation Tillage Network (ACT), research institutions, and development partners working on climate smart agriculture. Some of the major recommendations of the workshop include the need to transform the EACSAP into the Eastern Africa Climate Smart Agriculture Alliance (EACSAA) for more effective coordination and promotion of climate smart agriculture activities in the sub-region. Participants agreed that important actions to be undertaken in the short term include the drafting and validation of the EACSAA Strategy and Implementation Plan to allow for clear understanding of the alliance's goals, objectives, modus operandi, as well as programme of work and budget. High-level consultations between IGAD and EAC are envisaged regarding co-chairing of the EACSAA, while FAOSFE and UN Economic Commission for Africa (UN-ECA) are to discuss modalities for co-facilitation of EACSAA.⁵

Sweden's strategy for regional development cooperation in sub-Saharan Africa

Within Sweden's strategy for regional development cooperation in sub-Saharan Africa, Sweden is expected to contribute to "A better environment, sustainable use of natural resources, reduced climate impact and strengthened resilience to environmental impact, climate change and natural disasters" (Ministry of Foreign Affairs Sweden, 2016: 3). Contributing to:

- Strengthened capacity of regional actors to work towards sustainable management and use of common ecosystem services and natural resources
- Strengthened capacity of regional actors to work towards increased resilience against climate change and natural disasters, including capacity for food security

⁴ See FAOSFE, July 2018 press release (<http://www.fao.org/africa/news/detail-news/en/c/1147075/>)

⁵ The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs has recently approved funding for the Climate Smart Agriculture - East Africa (CSA-EA) programme (2018 - 2022), which aims to increase the availability of climate smart foods for the growing population in Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda (see <http://www.snv.org/project/climate-smart-agriculture-east-africa-csa-ea>).

- Increased production of, and access to, renewable energy

Within the framework Sweden emphasises that its activities are mainly to be carried out in cooperation with regional actors. They highlight the AU, its commission and the eight Regional Economic Communities in sub-Saharan Africa as the most prominent intergovernmental actors for regional collaboration and integration (Ministry of Foreign Affairs Sweden, 2016: 10). Sweden is to contribute to strengthened regional capacity for sustainable use and sustainable management of common ecosystem services and natural resources, with a focus on land and forests, water and marine resources (Ministry of Foreign Affairs Sweden, 2016: 11).

USAID: Planning for Resilience in East Africa through Policy, Adaptation, Research, and Economic Development (PREPARED)⁶

USAID's East Africa Regional Mission previously funded the PREPARED programme, aimed at mainstreaming climate-resilient development planning and program implementation into the East African Community and its partner states' development agendas. As a central component of the PREPARED Programme, this project targeted key development areas such as climate change adaptation, biodiversity conservation, and sustainable access to water supply, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) and worked to strengthen the resiliency and sustainability of Eastern Africa Institutions. The programme ran from December 2012 until April 2018. The programme worked with the EAC Secretariat and its Partner States; Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC); ICPAC; Famine Early Warning System Network (FEWS NET); and Regional Centre for Mapping Resources for Development (RCMRD). USAID saw the EAC Secretariat as being well positioned to partner on the PREPARED project, as it is a growing regional political and economic bloc that encouraged considerable regional cooperation on climate change, food security, biodiversity conservation, and water resource management at the policy and planning levels (USAID | Kenya and East Africa, 2016: 3). ICPAC was also a partner on the PREPARED project and it worked with the organisation to support and improve climate information management and coordination for regional and national institutions within the EAC region (USAID | Kenya and East Africa, 2016: 3).

DFID: Weather and Climate Information Services for Africa – East Africa (WISER_EA)

The WISER programme's mission is to deliver transformational change in the quality, accessibility and use of weather and climate information services at all levels of decision making for sustainable development in Africa (WISER, 2017). The Met Office was commissioned by DFID to act as fund manager for the East Africa component of Phase 2 of the programme (WISER_EA), focussing on the Lake Victoria Basin and surrounding region (Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda) and running from July 2017 to March 2020. This component aims to improve the quality and relevance of weather and climate information and support its uptake and use. Key to WISER-EA is the co-production process which involves users and producers, partnerships between institutions, governments and national hydrological and meteorological services (NMHSs) and other stakeholders. The co-production process is expected to generate the five outputs that are essential to the achievement of improved use of weather and climate information, one of these is *strengthened global-regional-national networks*

⁶ See <https://www.climatelinks.org/content/policy-adaptation-research-and-economic-development-prepared>

and partnerships to support the improved generation, uptake and use of climate information (WISER, 2017: 7).

The transformational change aims of WISER include regional transformation, aimed at strengthening of regional meteorological services networks and coordination structures to ensure the coherence and quality of pan-African meteorological services. Working at a regional level will have a higher priority for WISER during Phase 2 than in the initial year (WISER, 2017: 17). However, national programmes will remain important in ensuring WISER outcomes are met, but these will increasingly need to link with regional initiatives and other in-country projects. The overall approach for WISER-EA Phase 2 will consist of a combination of regional projects covering all timescales and flexible national projects aimed at supporting NMHS development, underpinned by a focus on co-production of services and user engagement.

HIGHWAY project

A core regional project that will form part of WISER-EA Phase 2 is *HIGHWAY (High Impact Weather Lake System)*. This is a 30-month project led by the World Meteorological Organisation (WMO). The aim will be to develop, in cooperation with mandated international, regional and national bodies, a fully functioning and sustainable regional system for early warning for the Lake Victoria Basin. It will coordinate and enhance the resources of the national meteorological agencies of the countries in the region - particularly, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda - in order to improve the forecasting of severe weather events up to five days in advance - and with the East African Community to develop regional institutional structures for an effective service.

ICPAC Support

This regional project will focus on improving the development, uptake and use of sub seasonal, seasonal and long term timescale products and services for regional application and cascading down to the national level. Future WISER-EA funding will support ICPAC's 2016-2020 Strategy and particularly the recommendations of the 'Capacity Needs Assessment of ICPAC to provide Entry Points for Technical Support and Services Intervention' produced with WISER funding in Year 1. This will be done through building on the achievements of the SC�PEA and ENACTS projects but extending the scope of work to longer-term timescales, expanding the geographical reach, a greater focus on co-production, bringing in new partners (including users) and coordinating better with other initiatives.

5. References

Curran, P., Dougill, A., Pardoe, J., & Vincent, K. (2018). *Policy coherence for sustainable development in sub-Saharan Africa*. Policy brief. London: Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment. http://www.lse.ac.uk/GranthamInstitute/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Policy-coherence-for-sustainable-development-in-sub-saharan-Africa_Curran-et-al.pdf

Denton, F., Kituyi, E., Lo, H. & Wouapi, H. (2016). *Regional Economic Communities and Climate Change Adaptation in Africa*. CARIAA Working Paper no. 4. International Development Research Centre, Ottawa, Canada and UK Aid, London, United Kingdom. <https://idl-bnc-idrc.dspacedirect.org/bitstream/handle/10625/55663/IDL-55663.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

- Elowson, C., & Lins de Albuquerque, A. (2016). Challenges to Peace and Security in Eastern Africa: The role of IGAD, EAC and EASF. *Studies in African Security*. Swedish Defence Research Agency. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2015.v6n3p257>
- England, M.I., Stringer, L.C., Dougill, A.J. & Afionis, S. (2018). How do sectoral policies support climate compatible development? An empirical analysis focusing on southern Africa, *Environmental Science & Policy*, 79, 9-15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2017.10.009>.
- England, M. I., Dougill, A. J., Stringer, L. C., Vincent, K. E., Pardoe, J., Kalaba, F. K., Mkwambisi, D.D., Namaganda, E. & Afionis, S. (2018). Climate change adaptation and cross-sectoral policy coherence in southern Africa, *Regional Environmental Change*, 18, 2059–2071. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-018-1283-0>
- Esche, S., & Jabril, S. (2017). African Union: Climate Change Adaptation in Agriculture. GIZ. <https://www.giz.de/en/downloads/giz2017-en-climate.pdf>
- Faiyetole, A. A., & Adesina, F. A. (2017). International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management Article information : *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, 9(6), 730–748. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCCSM-02-2017-0033>
- Global Water Partnership. (2015). *Integrated Water Resource Management in Eastern Africa: Coping with 'complex' hydrology*. GWP Technical Focus Paper. Sweden: Elanders. https://www.gwp.org/globalassets/global/toolbox/publications/technical-focus-papers/p1238_gwp_tfp_ea_121015_web.pdf
- Hamilton, M., & Lubell, M. (2018). Collaborative governance of climate change adaptation across spatial and institutional scales. *Policy Studies Journal*, 46(2), 222-247. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/psj.12224>
- IUCN-Global Water Partnership. (2015). Strategy and Guidelines for Integrating Climate Change Adaptation Approaches in Trans-boundary Ecosystem Management in East Africa. USAID. http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/briefing_note_ea_new_1.pdf
- Jarso, J. F. (2012). The East African Community and the Climate Change Agenda: An Inventory of the Progress, Hurdles, and Prospects. *Sustainable Development Law & Policy*, 12(2), 6. <https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://scholar.google.co.uk/&httpsredir=1&article=1510&context=sdlp>
- Krampe, F., Scassa, R. & Mitrotta, G. (2018). Responses to climate-related security risks : Regional organizations in Asia and Africa. Stockholm: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:uu:diva-359450>
- Ligot, J. (2016) *Regional Integration in the Context of Climate Change*. African Development Bank Group & NEPAD, Regional Integration and Trade of Department. <http://www.climate-energysolutions.com/images/fichiers/REGIONAL%20INTEGRATION%20IN%20THE%20CONTEXT%20OF%20CLIMATE%20CHANGE.pdf>
- Luoga, F.D.A.M. (2016). Challenges in Setting up Legal Frameworks for Natural Resources Governance in the East African Countries. *African Review*, 43(2). 1-16. <http://journals.udsm.ac.tz/index.php/ar/article/view/448>

Maupin, A. (2017). The SDG13 to combat climate change: an opportunity for Africa to become a trailblazer?, *African Geographical Review*, 36:2, 131-145, DOI: [10.1080/19376812.2016.1171156](https://doi.org/10.1080/19376812.2016.1171156)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs Sweden. (2016). Strategy for Sweden's regional development cooperation in Sub-Saharan Africa 2016–2021. Stockholm: Government Offices of Sweden. <https://www.government.se/49ef7d/contentassets/ffdc62994ae640a19aa6e2952bf44174/strategy-for-swedens-regional-development-cooperation-in-sub-saharan-africa-2016-2021.pdf>

Namande, G. (2018). *East Africa holds a Regional climate change technical working group meeting (11-13 June 2018, Nairobi, Kenya)*. GIZ Global Carbon Markets Programme Uganda/East Africa. <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/RCC%20newsletter%20article-EAC%20CCTWG%20meeting%20%28002%29.pdf>

SADC. (2017). *Programme on climate change adaptation and mitigation in eastern and southern Africa (COMESA-EAC-SADC)*. <https://www.sadc.int/sadc-secretariat/directorates/office-deputy-executive-secretary-regional-integration/food-agriculture-natural-resources/tripartite-programme-climate-change-adaptation-and-mitigation/>

Scanteam. (2016). *End review of the tripartite COMESA-EAC-SADC climate change programme. June–October 2016*. On behalf of Royal Norwegian Embassy, Lusaka. Oslo: Scanteam. https://www.scanteam.no/images/scanteam/pdfs/reports2016/2016_1627.pdf

USAID | Kenya and East Africa. (2016). *Planning for Resilience in East Africa through Policy, Adaptation, Research and Economic Development (PREPARED) Project*. Fact Sheet. USAID. https://www.climatelinks.org/sites/default/files/asset/document/2016_USAID-PREPARED_Project-Factsheet.pdf

WISER. (2017). *Weather and Climate Information Services for Africa (WISER) – East Africa: Phase 2 Summary*. UKAID. <https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/binaries/content/assets/mohippo/pdf/international/wiser/wiser---phase-2-technical-summary-21092017.pdf>

Acknowledgements

We thank the following experts who voluntarily provided suggestions for relevant literature or other advice to the author to support the preparation of this report. The content of the report does not necessarily reflect the opinions of any of the experts consulted.

- Lars Otto Naess, Institute of Development Studies
- Professor Lindsay Stringer, School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds

Suggested citation

Price, R.A. (2018). *Shared governance of climate change and natural resources issues in East Africa*. K4D Helpdesk Report 450. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.

About this report

This report is based on six days of desk-based research. The K4D research helpdesk provides rapid syntheses of a selection of recent relevant literature and international expert thinking in response to specific questions relating to international development. For any enquiries, contact helpdesk@k4d.info.

K4D services are provided by a consortium of leading organisations working in international development, led by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), with Education Development Trust, Itad, University of Leeds Nuffield Centre for International Health and Development, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM), University of Birmingham International Development Department (IDD) and the University of Manchester Humanitarian and Conflict Response Institute (HCRI).

This report was prepared for the UK Government's Department for International Development (DFID) and its partners in support of pro-poor programmes. It is licensed for non-commercial purposes only. K4D cannot be held responsible for errors or any consequences arising from the use of information contained in this report. Any views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, K4D or any other contributing organisation. © DFID - Crown copyright 2018.

