A.4 Kenya - 2007-2008 - Election violence

Transitional shelter kits

Project type:
Pilot project providing transitional shelter kits
Technical support for building
Full construction for vulnerable households

Emergency:
Kenyan election crisis, 2007-2008

No. of people displaced:
125,000 - 250,000 IDPs found shelter in camps and similar settlements during the violence.
An estimated 300,000 moved in with relatives or friends and around 12,000 fled to Uganda.

Project target population:
481 transitional shelter kits provided as a pilot project (226 erected by the agency, 255 self-built)

Occupancy rate on handover:
86% - Those not occupying shelters wanted to wait until the shelter had been upgraded with stronger walls or until other family members returned. Both reasons related to ongoing feelings of insecurity.

Shelter size
18 m² (extendable, modular construction)

Summary
Provision of transitional shelter kits as a pilot project in the Rift Valley of Kenya, before upscaling to a national response. Shelters were designed to be adapted by beneficiaries into permanent homes and, except in the case of vulnerable households, were erected by the beneficiaries themselves.

Project timeline

Strengths and weaknesses
X Only viable project sites were selected, based on the security guarantees of the local administration, existence of peacebuilding initiatives and willingness of IDPs to return.
X Because it used local building technologies and local craftsmen’s knowledge, the design was readily accepted by the beneficiaries and easily built.
X Having construction teams of mixed ethnicity contributed to the peacebuilding process in an unplanned but positive way.

X Consideration was given to how the shelters could be upgraded in the future to permanent homes. This maximised the impact of the financial investment.
X Use of robust building components meant the shelters could be relocated. Some beneficiaries used plastic spacers when nailing the roof to make disassembly easier.
X Close involvement of the community and local administration in beneficiary selection meant that distributions ran smoothly and disputes were resolved.
X Linking the project with livelihoods interventions
Strengthened return

Occupancy was not as high as hoped for, with some IDPs not ready to move back.

Not all of the materials are available locally in sufficient quantities. Sourcing of materials needs to be reconsidered before the project can be upscaled.

Only those whose houses had been completely destroyed received the kit. Further attention needs to be given to those whose houses are partly damaged, as many roofs and doors had been looted.

The kit included spare sheets and plastic sheeting for the construction of latrines. These materials were often used to extend the roof instead.

Some beneficiaries stated that they would have preferred to have been given the cash value of the plastic so that they could buy local materials themselves to build the walls (cash grants are being considered for the post-pilot phase).

Situation before emergency

A number of the tensions related to the ethnic nature of political affiliation in Kenya, unresolved land issues, inequality of wealth distribution, high unemployment and conflict over natural resources led to violence following the December 2007 election.

The majority of those displaced from the Rift Valley province had lived in small timber pole-framed houses with timber or adobe wall cladding, thatch or iron-sheet roofs and compacted soil floors, strengthened with dung or cement.

After the emergency

The election crisis was compounded in April by food security problems, flooding in some areas and drought in the north. The pattern of displacement was complex. People were displaced from many different parts of the country as one ethnic group escaped the threat of violence from another.

Around half of IDPs found shelter in camps. The rest sought refuge with friends or relatives and some moved back to their ‘ancestral’ land where support services were limited.

A response plan was developed through the Cluster System, which would provide non-food items and tents to meet the need for emergency shelter while a transitional shelter design was developed to bridge the emergency and permanent shelter phases.

Selection of beneficiaries

The Shelter Cluster agreed that 481 transitional shelter kits would be distributed as a pilot project to test the design of the shelter and the response of beneficiaries.

It was important that the site chosen should be one where security was good, IDPs were willing to return to and the community they were returning to was ready to accept them.

Mtaragon, in the Kipkelion District, fitted the requirements.

The local administration had a record of all IDPs. Their assessment of the impact of the violence, correlated with the agency’s own assessment, showed that around 500 houses had been completely destroyed.

The following criteria were used to decide which of the 500 households who had no shelter to return to would be chosen to receive a kit. The selected beneficiaries:

- were registered as an IDP by the local administration;
- were willing and ready to return;
- had proof of land ownership.

Proof of land ownership was only required for this pilot project. It was anticipated that an appropriate response would later be developed by the Shelter Cluster to deal with those without formal titles to their property or whose houses were only partially damaged.

An ad hoc beneficiary selection committee was established by the local administration, with appropriate representation of women and IDPs, to select the final beneficiaries. This committee was monitored by the implementing agency.

The degree of vulnerability of the households was also assessed and was intended to be used as another filter in beneficiary selection. But as the number of shelters to be provided almost matched the number of houses completely destroyed, vulnerability criteria was used to determine the level of construction assistance a household required, rather than to select the beneficiaries themselves.

To qualify for construction assistance, the household had to be headed by a single parent or a child or have members who were elderly, disabled or had special health requirements.

The criteria for the upscaled project was modified from the Shelter Cluster’s Transitional Shelter Strategy developed in March 2008, following feedback from the pilot project.

Implementation

A prototype of the shelter was tested for structural quality and reviewed by IDPs for its suitability. At the same time as the final selection of beneficiaries was being made, a second prototype was built in a prominent location.
location in Mtaragon to sensitize beneficiaries as to what was being provided and to get feedback on the design.

Local craftsmen and unskilled labourers were recruited into ten teams and trained. Although not planned, the teams were a 50-50 mix from the ethnic group that had fled and the ethnic group that they felt threatened by. This side effect of the project had a positive impact on peacebuilding. The donor organisation directly procured the materials within Kenya and delivered them to the implementing agency’s warehouse in Nakuru.

The implementing agency then distributed the materials at three locations. Beneficiaries collected them and took them to their plots up to three kilometres away, using their own transportation (either by hand, by donkey, or by tractor and trailer).

The kits also included the basic tools necessary to build the shelter.

‘I’m over 60 and unable to get the materials to build on my own. Despite what happened, I have to continue staying here. Being my land I cannot run away. If everybody can be assisted in the way I was, that would be great. Plastic sheeting is OK, but I would have preferred timber, as it’s stronger and can’t be blown away’.- Beneficiary

Guidance was given by the local craftsmen on how to put the shelter together. The beneficiaries provided the labour themselves and the houses were normally completed within one or two days.

Over 45% of the beneficiaries met the vulnerability criteria and qualified to have their houses built by the construction teams.

Technical solutions

The structure had a covered space of 18m² (6m x 3m), was split into two rooms, and had good clearance above head height.

The frame was made up of 10cm diameter cedar poles, dug into the ground at a depth of around 60cm. The poles supported a timber ring beam, which in turn supported the timber rafters onto which an iron sheet was nailed.

Walls were clad in plastic sheeting and floors were compressed earth. The doors were flaps in the plastic sheeting and weighted with timber battens.

The design was based on the vernacular housing typically lived in by IDPs prior to their displacement. This enabled IDPs to upgrade their shelters incrementally using materials and methods that they were already familiar with. The walls could be clad with timber, adobe or even brick and cement. Cement could be used to increase the durability of the floor.

The use of plastic sheeting allowed shelters to be built and occupied very quickly, though some beneficiaries replaced the plastic sheeting walls immediately with adobe or reclaimed building parts, such as doors or timber. The plastic sheeting could then be sold or used for temporary house extensions, and provided waterproof storage for seeds and fertilisers.

The use of regular frame and roof sections made the construction modular – it could be easily extended or adapted. The choice of materials meant that there was no part of the building that could not be fixed or replaced locally.

Most beneficiaries erected their shelters on exactly the same site as their previous homes had been, so little site clearance or ground levelling was required.

Logistics and materials

Materials were sourced in Kenya, and chosen for their familiarity, durability and low cost. Timber was supplied by private forestries who were only considered if they had government-approved replanting projects in place. Plastic sheeting was made from recycled plastic. The total cost of materials and labour for one transitional shelter was US$ 350, not including transport and agency administrative costs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Materials</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedar posts 9&quot;, 4&quot; diameter</td>
<td>14 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walling-polythene sheeting-1000g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress timber 2x3&quot;, 6 x 2m, 3 x 2m</td>
<td>20 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary nails 4&quot;</td>
<td>2 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress timber 2x3&quot;, 2 x 10m, 3 x 3m, 1 x 8m</td>
<td>40 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypress timber 2x2&quot; 6.5 x 6m</td>
<td>41 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGI ridge covers-30g -1.5 m</td>
<td>4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGI sheets-30g 2 x 0.9m</td>
<td>20 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary nails, 2kg 4&quot;, 2kg 3&quot;, 1/2kg 2&quot;</td>
<td>4.5 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roofing nails</td>
<td>4 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron hoop</td>
<td>1 kg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley claw hammer</td>
<td>1 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley woodcutting saw</td>
<td>1 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panga knife</td>
<td>1 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoe and handle</td>
<td>1 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manila thread 30m (roll)</td>
<td>1 unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring tape</td>
<td>1 unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The prototypes built by local craftsmen in each project location enabled structures to be tested and important feedback from builders and beneficiaries to be incorporated into the final design.’– Engineering coordinator