




One of the Largest Camps in Mainomoi in Baringo County

|                             |  |  |   |
|-----------------------------|--|--|---|
| Appeal:<br><b>MDRKE059</b>  | Total DREF Allocation:<br><b>CHF 499,381</b> | Crisis Category:<br><b>Yellow</b>          | Hazard:<br><b>Other</b>                       |
| Glide Number:<br>-          | People Affected:<br><b>172,270 people</b>    | People Targeted:<br><b>27,215 people</b>   | People Assisted:<br>-                         |
| Event Onset:<br><b>Slow</b> | Operation Start Date:<br><b>19-04-2024</b>   | Operational End Date:<br><b>31-10-2024</b> | Total Operating Timeframe:<br><b>6 months</b> |

Targeted Regions: **Baringo**

*The major donors and partners of the IFRC-DREF include the Red Cross Societies and governments of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Britain, China, Czech, Canada, Denmark, German, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Liechtenstein, Malta, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, and the Netherlands, as well as DG ECHO, Mondelez Foundation, and other corporate and private donors. The IFRC, on behalf of the National Society, would like to extend thanks to all for their generous contributions.*

# Description of the Event



A Map showing Kerio Valley Belt

## Date when the trigger was met

02-04-2024

## What happened, where and when?

By October 2024, the humanitarian situation in Kenya's Kerio Valley had significantly deteriorated, reaching critical levels. The number of displaced households in Baringo County increased from 2,951 in April to 4,454 HHs—representing 22,270 people (11,351 women and 10,919 men). This escalation reflected a deepening crisis driven by inter-communal conflict, displacement, and restricted access to basic services. As per historical trends, tensions remained concentrated in Baringo South (bordering Samburu) and Baringo North (adjacent to Turkana, West Pokot, and Elgeyo Marakwet), where localized violence continued to displace communities. In 2024, active displacement sites included Kagir (52 households) and Ngaratuko (22 households), while over 180 households sought refuge within host communities in Saimo Soi Ward.

Insecurity, poor road access, and prolonged rains (March–November 2024) led to partial closure of over 17 local markets, including Loruk and Nginyang'. The disruption of supply chains crippled livelihoods, while three health facilities (Yatya, Kapturo, Rondinin) operated at minimal capacity. Several schools—including Kagir, Ngaratuko, and Chemoe Primary—were converted into shelters, further impeding access to education. The displacement crisis exacerbated vulnerabilities, particularly for women and children, who faced increased risks of SGBV, family separation, child labor, and early pregnancies. Makeshift tents and overcrowded shelters heightened exposure to pneumonia and communicable diseases.

Over the months covered under this DREF and until closure, KRCS remained the primary responder in hard-to-reach areas, operating under enhanced security measures. In coordination with county and national governments, the response focused on: Immediate relief and clashes root cause mitigation, coordinating resources to enhance peacebuilding, resource conflict mediation, and early recovery support.

Despite these efforts, the crisis underscored the urgent need for sustainable solutions. The Baringo situation heavily contributed to the



collapse of Economic and Social Services in the affected localities, as well as rising of protection, food insecurity and health challenges. Recurrent droughts, floods, and inter-ethnic violence highlight the necessity for long-term peacebuilding and climate adaptation strategies to break the cycle of vulnerability in Baringo and neighboring counties. Therefore, mitigating the resource based unrest.



Kagir IDP camp next to Kagir Primary School in Saimo Soi Ward Baringo North

## Scope and Scale

- The Kerio Valley situation escalated significantly, surpassing thresholds seen in recent years. Displacement increased over the months from January to October, leading to increased concerns.
- Between January and March 2024 approximately 4,500 households were directly and indirectly affected by the unrest of which an estimated 2,951 households were displaced.
- By April 2024, the cumulative number of displaced households in Baringo was 4,454 HHs( 22,270 People)
- Two camps remained active: Kagir IDP camp, hosting 52 households, and Ngaratuko IDP camp, with 22 households. Over 180 families are integrated with host communities in Saimo Soi Ward, Baringo North Sub-County. Some displaced families rely on makeshift tents within host communities or seek refuge with relatives, increasing susceptibility to pneumonia and other communicable diseases. Schools such as Kagir, Ngaratuko, and Chemoe Primary hosted IDPs as of October 2024. The Moinonin IDP camp was closed.

The situation stemmed from social unrest among pastoralist communities, compounded by resource scarcity. The escalation was primarily attributed to conflicts among pastoral communities, as a result of experienced drought. but also Issues related to boundary delineation and cattle. The conflict, historically localized to the wards of Saimo Soi and Bartabwa in Baringo North, advanced from April 2024 progressively moved to three more sub-counties—Baringo South, Tiaty East, and Tiaty West—impacting an additional five wards: Mukutani, Mochongoi, Kolowa, Silale, and Ribkwo. Until the end of 2024, the Civil unrest was concentrated along the border areas of Baringo South (bordering Samburu) and Baringo North (bordering Turkana, West Pokot, and Elgeyo Marakwet Counties). These areas are classified as Arid and Semi-Arid Land (ASAL) Counties in the Country. Communities in these segments primarily practice Agro-Pastoralism, and due to droughts and floods in these areas, there is always competition for the limited resources, resulting in rampant unrest. The persistent social unrest occurrences pose a dynamic humanitarian crisis, making the situation complex, increase displacement, and vulnerability. The disruption of production, market, economic & health services have significantly contribute to increase tension over resources, food insecurity and protection concerns.

Displaced families facing challenges.

There are still poor family reunifications due to past separations, leaving vulnerable groups exposed to risks such as child labor, early pregnancies, and Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV). Current school closures could worsen these challenges. KRCS utilized volunteers who had been trained on safer access, and branding was enhanced to ensure safety, including the use of the Red Cross flag in high-risk zones.

Market Disruptions and Accessibility Challenges

Market functionality was disrupted in insecurity-affected areas, with over 17 shopping centers, including Loruk and Nginyang', severely impacted. Supplier access to deliver goods and services is minimal due to concerns over unstable peace, poor road conditions, and areas

cut off by the prolonged March-April-May rains, which extended through August-November 2024. Other humanitarian agencies also faced limited access due to security concerns.

#### Healthcare and Service Disruptions

Critical healthcare access remained hampered in facilities such as Yatya, Kapturo, and Rondinin, due to poor road conditions and staff shortages. This has further disrupted essential healthcare services for affected households.

The humanitarian situation in Baringo deteriorated further in recent years due to a combination of floods, drought, and social disruptions experienced in 2024. The complexity and severity of the crisis underscore the urgent need for continued attention and intervention. A joint response approach, led by the national and county governments in collaboration with the Kenya Red Cross Society (KRCS), delivered essential humanitarian aid, including food and Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) support, to 22500 people during the peak displacement period of 2024. KRCS played a pivotal role in addressing the root causes of social unrest by fostering dialogue, promoting social cohesion, and enhancing community protection. These efforts were vital in mitigating the crisis and creating conditions for recovery.

The approach not only supported life-saving interventions during the height of displacement but also encouraged behavior changes to reduce future vulnerabilities. In its leading role, KRCS actively mobilized resources and established partnerships with key stakeholders to effectively address the immediate and underlying factors of the crisis.

## Source Information

| Source Name                         | Source Link   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Samburu Conflict                 | <a href="https://www.the-star.co.ke/news/realtime/2024-03-20-residents-currender-firearm-to-police-amid-samburu-conflic">https://www.the-star.co.ke/news/realtime/2024-03-20-residents-currender-firearm-to-police-amid-samburu-conflic</a>   |
| 2. Security Briefing in Baringo     | <a href="https://twitter.com/NPSOfficial_KE/status/1775483744998117846">https://twitter.com/NPSOfficial_KE/status/1775483744998117846</a>   |
| 3. Flood Effects to Camps           | <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0dqblPoZ7z0&amp;pp=ygUbQmV0d2VlbiBiYW5kaXRzIGFuZCBmbG9vZHM6">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0dqblPoZ7z0&amp;pp=ygUbQmV0d2VlbiBiYW5kaXRzIGFuZCBmbG9vZHM6</a>   |
| 4. Schools Closed                   | <a href="https://twitter.com/citizenvkenya/status/1771590130895057378">https://twitter.com/citizenvkenya/status/1771590130895057378</a>   |
| 5. EOC Report                       | <a href="https://twitter.com/KenyaRedCross/status/1775399537802174940">https://twitter.com/KenyaRedCross/status/1775399537802174940</a>   |
| 6. School closed in Baringo         | <a href="https://youtu.be/DWURCj4TMQw?t=6">https://youtu.be/DWURCj4TMQw?t=6</a>   |
| 7. Situation remain dire in Baringo | <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HQlh9JRYcs&amp;pp=ygUWYmFyaW5nbyBjb25mbGljdCB0b2RheQ%3D%3D">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HQlh9JRYcs&amp;pp=ygUWYmFyaW5nbyBjb25mbGljdCB0b2RheQ%3D%3D</a>   |
| 8. Attack in West Pokot             | <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?">https://www.youtube.com/watch?</a>   |
| 9. DREF application and update 1    | <a href="https://www.ifrc.org/fr/appeals?date from=&amp;date to=&amp;search terms=&amp;search terms=&amp;appeal code=MDRKE059&amp;search terms=&amp;text=">https://www.ifrc.org/fr/appeals?date from=&amp;date to=&amp;search terms=&amp;search terms=&amp;appeal code=MDRKE059&amp;search terms=&amp;text=</a> |

## National Society Actions

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Have the National Society conducted any intervention additionally to those part of this DREF Operation? | Yes   |
| Please provide a brief description of those additional activities                                       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- With support from the Danish Red Cross (DRC), KRCS ensured that affected communities received Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) and counseling services. These interventions were conducted based on need, with the Ministry of Health facilitating referrals where necessary. A total of 101 people (47M, 54F) were reached through MHPSS in the conflict affected areas.</li> <li>- KRCS provided regular updates to its partners on the evolving crisis in the country. KRCS continue to engage with the relevant stakeholders for long-term solutions.</li> </ul> |



However, no partners had committed yet to additional support.

- Through a partnership with BLUETTI, KRCS distributed 150 solar lamps to conflict- and flood-affected families in camps and host communities, addressing lighting needs in remote areas without electricity.
- KRCS with support from the Blockchain Charity Foundation implemented a school feeding program to 40 vulnerable primary schools in 5 Sub-Counties including Baringo North, Mogotio, Baringo South, Tiaty East & Tiaty West within conflict affected areas of Baringo County. This feeding program aimed to improve learning outcomes while addressing malnutrition and related health risks caused by inadequate nutrition. The school feeding program supported total of 14,779 students (7,451 boys, 7,328 girls) inclusive of 55 students living with disability (38F, 17M) of age bracket 3-15 years old to 5 Sub-Counties of Baringo including Tiaty East (1910 girls, 1950 boys), Tiaty west (1438 girls, 1284 boys), Baringo South (1183 girls, 1186 boys), Mogotio (1577girls, 1707 boys) and Baringo North (1220 girls, 1324 boys).

## IFRC Network Actions Related To The Current Event

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Secretariat</b></p>                      | <p>The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) maintains an in-country presence in Kenya through its Africa Regional Office and the Nairobi Cluster Delegation, both of which are based in Nairobi. The IFRC Nairobi Cluster Delegation provided close technical support and guidance to KRCS during the development of a request for DREF allocation to bolster ongoing response efforts.</p>  |
| <p><b>Participating National Societies</b></p> | <p>KRCS regularly updated the ICRC on the evolving crisis through multiple coordination forums, engaging with several Partner National Societies (PNS), including the Danish Red Cross, Finnish Red Cross, American Red Cross, Italian Red Cross and Norwegian Red Cross.</p> <p>Throughout the response, KRCS maintained consistent communication with partners by providing regular updates on the situation. At the time of reporting, no in-country PNS had yet committed to providing direct operational support.</p> <p>KRCS continue to engage with the relevant stakeholders for long-term solutions. However, no partners had committed yet to additional support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- With support from the Danish Red Cross (DRC), KRCS ensured that affected communities received Mental Health and Psychosocial Support (MHPSS) and counseling services. These interventions were conducted based on need, with the Ministry of Health facilitating referrals where necessary. 101 people reached with MHPSS.</li> <li>- With support from the Hong Kong Red Cross, KRCS provided unconditional cash voucher assistance to 1,060 households, delivering Ksh 10,100 per month to help meet essential needs. While this support significantly contributed to addressing immediate household priorities, the continued disruption of livelihoods and local economic activities underscored the ongoing need to scale up multipurpose cash transfers to further support recovery and resilience.</li> </ul> |

## ICRC Actions Related To The Current Event

KRCS updated the ICRC on the unfolding situation through various coordination forums. The ICRC indicated that there would be discussions to determine whether they could support long-term programming.

## Other Actors Actions Related To The Current Event

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <p><b>Government has requested international assistance</b></p> | <p>Yes</p> |
|---|------------|



|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>National authorities</b> | The Baringo County government sustained its logistical support, consistently making available a truck for delivering food supplies to hard-to-reach communities. During the November 23rd distribution, relief items were successfully delivered to 350 vulnerable households. In parallel, county officials regularly updated KRCS on security developments through organised briefing sessions. KRCS worked in partnership with the Ministry of Health to enhance medical referral systems while delivering crucial psychosocial services to traumatised survivors of the conflict.   |
| <b>UN or other actors</b>   | <p>Coordinated actions and partnership in Baringo unrest situation</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Resource Mobilization and Planning<br/>KRCS initiated additional resource mobilization by developing program concepts and soliciting feedback from key donors, including UN agencies, to establish long-term programming in the region. No major funding from UN was achieved to support the response.</li> <li>2. Coordination and Leadership<br/><br/>KRCS coordinated response activities with multiple stakeholders, including national and county government agencies. Due to its extensive humanitarian experience, KRCS was designated as the lead response agency.</li> <li>3. Gaps in Partner Support<br/>Limited support reached vulnerable households in camps due to widespread resource constraints among partner organizations.</li> <li>4. Energy Assistance<br/>BLUETTI, provided 150 solar lamps to conflict- and flood-affected families in camps and host communities, addressing lighting needs in remote areas without electricity. This assistance was provided through KRCS.</li> <li>5. Health Services<br/>The Department of Health in Baringo maintained basic medical support through monthly mobile clinic visits to camps in Baringo North Sub-County.</li> </ol> |

**Are there major coordination mechanism in place?**

The County Government convened a County Steering Group meeting in response to emerging humanitarian needs. Chaired by the County Commissioner with KRCS participation as a key member, this coordination mechanism proved instrumental in:

1. Identifying critical response gaps
2. Strategically allocating available resources
3. Formulating requests for additional support during crises

## Needs (Gaps) Identified



### Shelter Housing And Settlements

The social unrest in Baringo County led to the displacement of over 4,454 households, with many families losing their homes due to vandalism or being forced to flee to safer areas. In response, KRCS provided emergency shelter kits and essential household items to 4,000 of the most vulnerable households (covering 22,000 people). Camp management and shelter design support were also implemented under this DREF operation.

However, despite this significant effort, shelter gaps remained. 52 families remained in inadequate makeshift tents, as they were unable to return to their vandalised homes and instead integrated with relatives. KRCS also supported 4 schools (Kagir, Ng'aratuko, Nyimbei, and Nosukro) with 100-seater tents to ensure learning continuity, although additional tents were needed due to a population influx from conflict- and flood-affected areas near the swelling Lake Baringo and Bogoria.

The response highlighted other persistent shelter needs for displaced families and identified challenges:

- Persistent displacement due to insecurity prevented full reintegration and home returns.
- Vandalized homes presented long-term reconstruction challenges requiring coordinated recovery efforts.
- Shelter needs were further compounded by limited resources and a growing number of IDPs in both formal and informal camp settings.





## Livelihoods And Basic Needs

During its intervention, KRCS provided two-week food hampers to 4,500 vulnerable households through procurement and donor support. However, 74 displaced households (52 at Kagir Primary School and 22 at Ngaratuko Primary School) remained in makeshift camps due to ongoing insecurity, requiring extended food assistance for at least three months as families struggled to meet basic needs, often prioritising meals for children, the elderly, and the sick while facing severely constrained purchasing power. The humanitarian situation was exacerbated by significant livelihood losses, including 7,200 livestock deaths, 6,000 cattle stolen, and 1,000 acres of farmland abandoned in Chepkesin-Bartabwa, Ng'aratuko, and Loruk-Saimo Soi Wards. While security improvements enabled the reopening of 13 markets (including Loruk and Nginyang) and Tiaty livestock markets, critical gaps remained in supporting agricultural recovery for displaced agro-pastoralists through seed subsidies and developing alternative, security-resilient livelihood options for vulnerable populations. The situation underscored the need for sustained multi-sectoral assistance to address both immediate food needs and longer-term economic recovery in the conflict-affected region.



## Multi purpose cash grants

The shopping centers in some areas had been affected, but those who were displaced had moved to safer grounds with functional markets. There was a need to provide the displaced with multipurpose cash so they could effectively and efficiently support their families with their emerging needs. MPC was assessed to be an enabler for flexibility for displaced families that could cover their most urgent needs as they arose, while simultaneously stimulating economic recovery in the area by boosting local market activity. However, it was really relying on market functionality, availability of financial service provider coverage

To support these vulnerable populations, KRCS was able to prioritize that approach through the support from Hong Kong Red Cross, reaching 1,060 households, with a Ksh 10,100 monthly instalment to help cover essential needs.

However, given the severe disruption to local livelihoods and economic activities, there remained a pressing need for multipurpose cash transfers.



## Health

The health situation in affected areas remained unstable, as several health facilities—including Yatia, Akoreyan, Sibilo, Kapindasum, Kasiela, Rondinin, and Koroto—lacked essential medical supplies, limiting treatment capacity. Critical services like nutrition, immunization, and non-communicable disease (NCD) clinics remained inaccessible, particularly in hard-to-reach areas such as Chemoe, Kagir, and Yatia. Reported health issues included a surge in malaria, acute respiratory infections, eye infections, migraines, tonsillitis, and diarrhea, disproportionately affecting vulnerable groups like children under five, the elderly, and pregnant and lactating women. The short rains from October to December further heightened health risks, especially for displaced populations living in tents.

Mental health emerged as a growing concern, with 8,953 individuals in Baringo North and South receiving counseling for depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) following armed attacks, displacement, and loss of livelihoods. While some non-local medics returned to work in Tiaty East and West, facilities in Bartabwa, Kipcherere, Barsemoi, Kambi Samaki, and Kibingor remained overwhelmed by displaced populations and faced severe shortages of medical supplies.

The community health assessment conducted in the Kagir, Kosile, Kesumet, and Chebarsiat communities revealed significant health challenges that require immediate attention. The assessment identified high rates of malaria, upper respiratory tract infections, diarrhea, and malnutrition among residents, indicating a substantial burden of disease affecting the overall health of the population. These findings underscore the urgent need for targeted interventions to improve health outcomes. Community health assessments were essential for identifying the specific health concerns and needs of a community. They establish a baseline for understanding the health status of the population and allow for tracking changes over time. These assessments not only reveal social determinants of health but also foster community engagement by involving residents, which helps cultivate a sense of ownership and encourages participation in health initiatives

Despite the implementation of several critical interventions by KRCS and partners, including WHO and WFP, substantial health gaps and persisting needs & gaps remain across key areas of service delivery. Include:

(i) Medical supplies: Restocking pharmaceuticals in high-demand facilities. In terms of medical supplies, emergency drug kits distributed during county health outreaches helped address immediate needs. However, many high-demand facilities have since reported stock depletion, highlighting the urgent need for restocking essential pharmaceuticals to ensure continuity of care in underserved and overstretched health centers.



(ii) Mental health: Providing sustained counseling to conflict-affected communities. At the end of the intervention, it was analyzed that while surge teams provided initial psychosocial care to trauma-affected individuals, the psychological toll of displacement, conflict, and livelihood loss continues to affect communities deeply. There is a pressing need for sustained counseling services and expanded community-based MHPSS support to address ongoing emotional and mental health challenges.

(iii) Nutrition: Replenishing MAM/RUTF stocks for vulnerable groups. Indeed, In the area of nutrition, WFP (through World Vision Kenya) prepositioned supplies of RUTF, RUSF, and CSB at Loruk Health Center. However, these stocks were rapidly depleted due to high demand. Replenishing these commodities is vital to meet the nutritional needs of vulnerable groups, including children under five and pregnant and lactating women, particularly as food insecurity worsens.

(iv) Epidemic readiness: Scaling RCAT coverage to mitigate outbreak risks. For epidemic preparedness, KRCS observation concluded that efforts such as RCAT training and the use of IFRC's Epidemics app have enhanced response capacity. Nevertheless, the scale of preparedness remains limited, and there is a need to expand training coverage and strengthen early warning and surveillance systems in high-risk areas.

(v) Finally, vector-borne and climate-sensitive diseases continue to pose risks, especially in flood-affected zones. While initiatives targeted tsetse fly control and addressed Rift Valley Fever (RVF) and malaria through community dialogues, further investment is needed in public health education, environmental hygiene, and sustained vector control measures.

The protracted nature of the crisis and recurrent impact of the climate hazards on the Health situation or capacity of health services demonstrated the need for interventions that can sustain health gains and safeguard vulnerable communities from deteriorating health outcomes. Seeking long-term plan; support to nutritional programs; work on sustainable behavior changes and to enhance the local capacity.



## Water, Sanitation And Hygiene

KRCS conducted Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) assessments in Baringo and Samburu counties, which revealed severe damage to water infrastructure caused by the combined effects of the March–May long rains and ongoing civil unrest. In Baringo, key findings included the destruction of boreholes and widespread contamination of household water sources, underscoring the urgent need for continuous disinfection of water points. To support future rehabilitation efforts, WASH engineers developed detailed bills of quantities for critical water infrastructure. Additionally, displaced families who left behind most of their belongings required dignity kits tailored to gender-specific needs. The County Government also identified an urgent need for body bags, following a rise in fatalities and reported incidents, including those documented in July 2024.

Persistent Challenges through the intervention and across Baringo, as the displacement did not end:

(i) Sanitation: Limited availability of construction materials and toilet slabs hindered latrine coverage

(ii) Hygiene: Shortages of soap and handwashing facilities persisted

(iii) Protection: Displaced families lacked gender-specific dignity kits

(iv) Emergency preparedness: The county government identified need for body bags following November 2024 incidents (1 death, 2 injuries in Saimo Soi Ward)

Key Recommendations:

(i) Scale up water point rehabilitation and disinfection

(ii) Expand community-led sanitation demonstrations using local materials

(iii) Sustain hygiene behavior change communication

(iv) Provide comprehensive dignity kits for displaced populations



## Protection, Gender And Inclusion

Recognizing the agro-pastoralist nature of these communities and their strong cultural traditions, KRCS implemented targeted sensitization programs on sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV/GBV) across four sub-counties: Baringo North, Baringo South, Tiaty East, and Tiaty West.

Key Achievements:

1. Community Engagement:

KRCS collaborated with local stakeholders to educate communities about:

(i) Best practices for SGBV prevention

(ii) Established referral pathways

(iii) Clear communication channels

(iv) Safe spaces for reporting and support

2. Capacity Building:

(i) Trained 173 individuals, including volunteers and key stakeholders

(ii) Strengthened referral systems to ensure:



Safe case handling

Prompt response to incidents

(iii) Enhanced community understanding of Protection, Gender, and Inclusion (PGI) principles

Sustainability Measures:

The initiative equipped local community members with the knowledge to continue advocating for PGI matters, ensuring a long-term impact beyond the immediate intervention.



## Education

Educational Disruptions and Response:

Schools were designated as safe locations for displacement camps, but this led to significant disruptions in learning activities. The concentration of displaced populations in these areas resulted in learners missing access to essential supplies, particularly food. In response:

(i) Affected schools received relief food and psychosocial support for both students and teachers.

(ii) Dignity kits were distributed to ensure uninterrupted learning for young girls and boys.

The conflict severely disrupted the region's education system, forcing the closure of 37 institutions in the first term, including:

(i) Two secondary schools

(ii) 17 primary schools

(iii) 18 Early Childhood Development (ECD) centers

The Baringo displacement situation has raised and deepened the challenges on education in these communities. It was learnt that:

(i) The use of schools as shelters, while necessary, came at the cost of access to education.

(ii) KRCS interventions (tents, food support, dignity kits) helped mitigate some disruptions.

(iii) Healthcare services deteriorated as medical staff fled unstable areas, worsening the humanitarian crisis.

While education was not the primary focus of the DREF allocation, the Kenya Red Cross Society (KRCS) implemented targeted interventions aimed at supporting damaged schools and addressing critical vulnerabilities that affected the education system. These actions contributed to mitigating the broader impacts of the crisis on learners and school infrastructure, particularly in the most affected areas.



## Community Engagement And Accountability

In the Baringo context, the community engagement remained an important element to ensure intervention was relevant, accepted, transparent and covered the adequate communication and feedback stream sensible in the context. The integration of Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA) activities was driven by several critical needs.

**Building Trust and Transparency:** The escalation of intercommunal conflicts, particularly among pastoral communities, required to foster social cohesion which could only be built in trust, effective communication between KRCS and the various affected communities.

The transparency and engagement with communities called for a consistent and adequate communication and Feedback Mechanisms that is adapted to the communities, sensitive of the context and maintains equal inclusion & representation to all groups. The volatile security situation necessitated robust two-way communication channels.

CEA facilitated the dissemination of timely and accurate information about available services and support, while also establishing feedback mechanisms that allowed communities to voice concerns, report issues, and contribute to decision-making processes.



## Environment Sustainability

Baringo has been suffering from the communities' clashes exacerbated by the impact of climate hazards on the scarcity of resources. The persisting drought and displacement have intensified environmental degradation in affected and host communities. There is a pressing need to promote environmental conservation through sustained tree planting initiatives in both drought-affected areas and host communities providing safe shelter. In response, KRCS was prioritizing to incorporate environmental management measures into its camp coordination and management activities, ensuring that living spaces remain clean, safe, and dignified through proper waste disposal practices.

To enhance safety and access to information, particularly in off-grid areas, the distribution of solar lamps with integrated radios is



recommended. This approach not only improves lighting and security but also facilitates access to timely, life-saving information.

Additionally, due to loss of livelihoods, many pastoralist households have increasingly resorted to charcoal production as a coping strategy, contributing to accelerated deforestation and long-term environmental harm. There is an urgent need to address this negative coping mechanism by promoting alternative, sustainable livelihoods and integrating environmental protection into the broader humanitarian response to safeguard both ecosystems and community resilience.

## Operational Strategy

### Overall objective of the operation

This DREF allocation aimed to support families affected by the social unrest in Baringo and neighboring counties, by providing shelter, WASH, cash, livelihood activities, environmental conservation, and health activities for six months. Since this was a resource-based social unrest, the most affected included displaced and non-displaced households. KRCS worked with the government and other agencies to ensure that the support through DREF was complemented with other resources. Initially aiming at reaching 4,500 households (22,500 people), the intervention extended the support to 5243 households through the WASH relief and services. Reaching overall 27,215 people.

### Operation strategy rationale

To address the immediate needs of the target population, this DREF provided an integrated response and sought further support to enhance prevention at the community level considering the forecasts for the coming weeks. Actions that were already underway were reported in "National Society Action" and were scaled up as summarized below:

#### 1) Migration

The overall sectoral response came as an integrated approach to address the humanitarian needs for relief support and protection that arose from the conflict in the area. Consequently, migration and displacement considerations remained at the center of the approach, and further assessments were planned to identify the best way forward for migration humanitarian assistance and social cohesion. While completing the assessment, NS ensured that:

For each priority sector with identified needs (shelter, health, WASH, etc.), the needs of the most vulnerable people on the move were addressed through direct assistance and protection.

Social cohesion between people on the move and host communities was enhanced, and KRCS actions contributed to maintaining that balance through strong and adequate CEA and PGI initiatives focused on reducing stigma, discrimination, and xenophobia. Risk communication and community engagements were constant, involving the scaling up of early warning measures following security information relayed by both the deployed team and communities. Communication was incorporated in terms of early warning, which involved the timely detection and dissemination of information regarding potential social unrest or resource-related tensions. The situation also recommended a strong promotion and communication strategy around inclusivity, cohesion, cultural tolerance, and security to be encouraged among communities in Baringo County. Trusted channels and awareness approaches were integrated into communication with communities.

The prioritized humanitarian services included the establishment of a referral system adapted to the context, which encompassed specialized referrals for mental health, child protection, and the prevention of sexual and gender-based violence as priorities. Assessments helped identify the extent of protection considerations and the needs for restoring family links (RFL).

#### 2) Integrated action for contribution to resilience & Sustainability of the efforts

In the intervention strategy put in place, informed by the community consultations, KRCS has framed its intervention as an integrated approach that contributed to the medium to long term impact on the protracted natures of the Baringo situation.

In response to emerging environmental challenges, KRCS executed a comprehensive conservation strategy. Tree-planting campaigns were sustained across displacement sites and host communities, while rigorous camp management maintained hygienic conditions through structured waste management. The innovative distribution of solar lamp-radios served the dual purposes of safety and communication. Simultaneously, the organization worked to counter destructive livelihood shifts, particularly the alarming trend of pastoralists turning to environmentally damaging charcoal production, by promoting sustainable alternatives.

Although this sector was not the primary focus of the DREF allocation, KRCS prioritized a set of interventions targeting damaged schools and addressing key vulnerabilities affecting the education system.

(i) Ng'aratuko Primary School was deliberately set on fire. KRCS provided tents to allow learning to continue.

(ii) Kosile Primary School and Kamenjo ECD suffered extensive damage and were among the schools that received food hampers to support continued education.



### Healthcare System Under Threat:

By the fourth quarter of 2024, healthcare infrastructure remained at risk due to ongoing insecurity. Key impacts included:

- (i) Facilities in Yatya, Sibilo, Kapturo, and Rondin were compromised.
- (ii) Clinics in Tiaty East and West faced potential closure as healthcare workers withdrew due to safety concerns.

Institutional engagement and advocacy was reinforced, seizing the opportunity of this DREF allocation. Evidence-based advocacy and humanitarian diplomacy were promoted by KRCS at both the branch and HQ levels. Continuous data collection and funded assessments contributed to that effort.

### 3) Shelter

The DREF supported 4,000 households (22,000 people) identified as the most vulnerable out of the 4,454 displaced households with emergency shelter and essential household items. The remaining 454 families were supported by the local government and/or host families. KRCS supported the operational costs for the distribution of the Emergency Shelter Kits. The DREF also supported camp management, shelter design, and the implementation of those services.

### 4) Livelihoods and basic needs - in-kind food.

The DREF supported 4,000 households (22,000 people) with in-kind food distribution for the whole of the affected area. As this was a social unrest situation, targeting covered both the most vulnerable displaced and non-displaced.

### 5) Health

A coordinated health response was implemented to address urgent medical needs and strengthen preparedness. Emergency drug kits were supplied to support county health outreaches, while malnutrition treatment supplies were prepositioned at key health centers. The DREF supported 4,500 households (22,500 people) through targeted first aid, psychosocial first aid/support, health promotion deployment of health kits, and surge teams. A referral system was put in place for mental health and emergencies. KRCS delivered integrated health services—including immunization, antenatal care, nutrition screening, MHPSS, and GBV support—alongside WASH interventions such as water treatment and hygiene kits. Surge teams reinforced overstretched facilities by providing critical care and trauma support. Epidemic preparedness was enhanced through RCAT training and deployment of digital surveillance tools. Vector control efforts targeted both tsetse-borne diseases and flood-related illnesses through community-based approaches.

Some conclusions and recommendations for long-term planning were also learnt or documented during this DREF. Some for the health intervention, livelihood support and overall approach to the Baringo situation. To ensure sustainable impact in the face of Baringo's protracted crisis and the recurrent effects of climate hazards on health systems, the following recommendations are proposed. First, improving hygiene and sanitation practices through community-led education initiatives is critical—particularly promoting proper handwashing and safe food handling—to reduce the risk of disease outbreaks. Enhancing long-term access to safe and clean water is equally vital. This requires investment in durable infrastructure such as boreholes, solar-powered water systems, and decentralized water treatment facilities to ensure year-round water security. In view of the chronic food insecurity and its impact on public health, nutrition-focused interventions should be scaled up. These include the development of community gardens, diversification of food sources, and regular nutrition education campaigns to promote healthy dietary practices. Taken together, these recommendations aim not only to address immediate health vulnerabilities but also to strengthen community resilience, preserve health gains, and reduce the strain on under-resourced health services—thereby contributing to more sustainable and adaptive health outcomes in the face of future climatic shocks.

### 6) WASH

The operation initially aimed to reach 4,500 households (approximately 22,500 people) with life-saving WASH assistance. However, due to the scale of needs and operational adjustments, the intervention was able to extend support to 5,243 households, ultimately reaching 27,215 people with essential WASH relief and services. Intervention covered targeted hygiene promotion, household water treatment, distribution of jerry cans, disinfection of shallow wells, and sanitation for the displaced population. In response to immediate needs at the household level, KRCS distributed water treatment chemicals to 5,243 households—providing coverage for at least one month—and supplied jerrycans to promote safe water storage. However, continued distributions were required due to the protracted nature of displacement, particularly among camp-based populations.

To address sanitation gaps, makeshift toilets were constructed using locally sourced materials and toilet slabs provided by KRCS, particularly in host communities. Despite these efforts, sanitation facilities remained insufficient, and additional toilet slabs were needed in underserved villages. Hygiene promotion activities, including handwashing demonstrations and the distribution of sanitary pads for adolescent girls, contributed to a measurable reduction in waterborne diseases in high-risk areas such as Baringo South and Noosukuro. Communities also adopted improved practices, including pit latrine construction, establishment of rubbish pits, and environmental hygiene through bush clearing. However, gaps persisted in the availability of soap and handwashing stations, necessitating ongoing sensitization and supply distribution.

Based on the request from the county government, KRCS also provided body bags and dignity kits to the most vulnerable individuals.



## 7) Integrated approach of the CEA

Overall, the incorporation of CEA in the MDRKE059 DREF operation was pivotal in ensuring that the humanitarian response was community-centered, transparent, and adaptable to the evolving context of social unrest in Baringo County. KRCS trained 50 staff and volunteers (17 male, 33 female) in Baringo on Community Engagement and Accountability (CEA), who subsequently conducted 7 community feedback meetings engaging 523 residents (257 male, 266 female) across conflict-affected sub-counties. The initiative established robust feedback mechanisms including hotlines and complaint desks, while validating the effectiveness of DREF interventions like food distributions, medical outreaches, cash transfers (Ksh 10,000/household), school feeding programs, and emergency shelters.

Key outcomes included improved food security, enhanced access to healthcare through mobile clinics, maintained educational continuity via temporary classrooms, and reduced disease transmission through water treatment and the use of mosquito nets. As the DREF period concluded, KRCS emphasized the need to sustain CEA activities, building on successful partnerships with government and faith-based organizations to transition from emergency response to longer-term recovery in Baringo County.

The CEA approach also greatly served the appropriation of the actions and integration at community level. The level of engagement, harmonization, and involvement of communities played a key role in the intended early actions, ensuring the understanding, acceptance, and contribution of community members to this plan. To address the needs of community members, the DREF enabled KRCS to conduct Community Engagement & Accountability activities in the affected areas. This included strengthening the KRCS feedback system and mechanisms; conducting Community Review Meetings in the affected areas; and carrying out community-based sensitization during social unrest using CEA approaches, such as mobile cinema and forum theatre.

PGI streamlined across all sectors & minimum standards alignment

In the targeting, the priority to vulnerable groups was considered. Particular attention was given to displaced households and families with vulnerable groups.

# Targeting Strategy

## Who was targeted by this operation?

KRCS implemented a community-led beneficiary targeting process in Baringo County that prioritized the most vulnerable populations while ensuring protection, gender sensitivity and inclusion. The selection criteria were developed in consultation with local leaders and project relief committees, with special consideration given to displaced families, households with children in supplementary or therapeutic feeding programs, pregnant and lactating women with acute malnutrition, persons with disabilities, elderly individuals, women and youth-headed households, and orphaned children. To guarantee equitable access, KRCS leveraged its extensive local presence and networks to reach marginalized communities in high-risk areas that were often inaccessible to other humanitarian actors. The process emphasized transparent and inclusive representation by actively involving at-risk groups in relief committees and registration activities. Schools serving affected learners were also included as key beneficiaries. This participatory approach not only strengthened accountability but also ensured that assistance reached those most in need, particularly in hard-to-reach locations where security challenges limited access by other organizations. Through this methodology, KRCS maintained its commitment to principled humanitarian action while addressing the specific needs of vulnerable groups affected by the crisis.

## Explain the selection criteria for the targeted population

KRCS prioritized support for 4,500 vulnerable households (22,500 individuals) affected by the crisis in Baringo, including both displaced and non-displaced populations. The selection process employed community-based targeting criteria, engaging local communities to identify those most severely impacted—particularly families who suffered loss of livelihoods and property due to ongoing instability. As for the WASH and health intervention, the assistance was able to support 5,243 households, ultimately reaching Approximately 27,215 people with essential WASH relief and services.

Beneficiary Selection Criteria:

- (i) Displacement status and level of damage to homes/livelihood assets
- (ii) Female-headed households
- (iii) Families with pregnant/lactating women and children under five
- (iv) Households caring for persons with disabilities or the elderly

This participatory approach ensured transparent, needs-based assistance while empowering communities in the decision-making process. By focusing on these high-risk groups, KRCS aimed to deliver equitable and effective aid to those facing the greatest hardships.



# Total Assisted Population

|                           |        |                                      |     |
|---------------------------|--------|--------------------------------------|-----|
| Assisted Women            | -      | Rural                                | 78% |
| Assisted Girls (under 18) | -      | Urban                                | 22% |
| Assisted Men              | -      | People with disabilities (estimated) | 2%  |
| Assisted Boys (under 18)  | -      |                                      |     |
| Total Assisted Population | -      |                                      |     |
| Total Targeted Population | 27,215 |                                      |     |

## Risk and Security Considerations (including "management")

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Does your National Society have anti-fraud and corruption policy?                   | Yes |
| Does your National Society have prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse policy? | Yes |
| Does your National Society have child protection/child safeguarding policy?         | Yes |
| Does your National Society have whistleblower protection policy?                    | Yes |
| Does your National Society have anti-sexual harassment policy?                      | Yes |

Please analyse and indicate potential risks for this operation, its root causes and mitigation actions.

| Risk   | Mitigation action  |
|--|--|
| The risk of interventions being halted due to the ongoing protest across the country                             | KRCS ensured that even during the unrest, it based its response on neutrality by supporting both parties impartially.  |
| The risk of community dependency on relief as their form of livelihood   | KRCS worked with the government and other non-government stakeholders to support long-term programming that would provide long-term solutions to these communities |
| Political interference   | KRCS operated with neutrality and within the seven fundamental movement principles.  |
| The risk of insufficient resources to support the affected considering KRCS is the lead agency in this operation | KRCS ensured continuous resource mobilization from locals, NGOs, and other agencies, including the government.   |
| Risk of accessibility due to blockage of areas by either the security or bandits in the area                     | KRCS ensured that persons involved in the response had undergone safer access training and practised safe access at all times.                                     |

Please indicate any security and safety concerns for this operation:

Throughout the response operation in Baringo County, KRCS successfully maintained the safety of its staff and volunteers despite operating in a high-risk environment of social unrest. The organisation's strong community acceptance and established relationships with local authorities proved crucial in preventing any security incidents against response teams. KRCS implemented comprehensive safety measures, including capacity building for staff on safer access principles, deployment of local volunteers familiar with the area,



and continuous security surveillance. Regular security briefings kept all personnel vigilant and informed about potential risks. The KRCS Security Unit played a crucial role by continually monitoring the security situation and providing timely advisories to field teams, enabling them to take appropriate mitigation measures when necessary. These proactive security measures, combined with KRCS's respected community presence and neutral humanitarian stance, allowed the organisation to implement all planned activities safely while maintaining access to affected populations. The successful security management during this operation demonstrated the effectiveness of KRCS's integrated approach, which combines community acceptance with robust security protocols.

Has the child safeguarding risk analysis assessment been completed?

No

## Implementation



### Shelter Housing And Settlements

**Budget:** CHF 111,863

**Targeted Persons:** 22,500

**Assisted Persons:** 22,000

**Targeted Male:** 10,780

**Targeted Female:** 11,220

### Indicators

| Title   | Target | Actual |
|---|--------|--------|
| # of households supported with complete emergency shelter kits        | 4,500  | 4,000  |
| # of assessment conducted in the affected areas                       | 10     | 9      |
| # of volunteers trained on shelter reconstruction and camp management | 90     | 70     |

### Narrative description of achievements

- The Baringo DREF supported 4,000 households (22,000 people) identified as the most vulnerable out of the 4,454 displaced households with emergency shelter and essential household items. The remaining 454 families were supported by the local government and/or host families. KRCS supported the operational costs for the distribution of the Emergency Shelter Kits. The DREF also supported camp management, shelter design, and the implementation of those services.

### Lessons Learnt

- KRCS's emergency shelter intervention provided immediate relief to 4,000 HHs, demonstrating the critical role of rapid response in disaster-affected areas. However, the fact that 52 households remain in makeshift tents highlights the need for sustained and long-term shelter support.
- Many affected families have integrated with relatives and neighbors due to the vandalization of their original homes. This underscores the need for community-based support mechanisms and reconstruction efforts to help families return to safe and dignified living conditions.

### Challenges

- Despite the intervention, 52 households in Kagir Saimo Soi Ward remain in makeshift shelters that do not provide adequate protection. The continued displacement highlights a gap in resources and the need for more permanent housing solutions.
- Some displaced families are unable to return to their homes due to vandalism and destruction. This poses additional challenges in reconstruction and reintegration efforts.





## Livelihoods And Basic Needs

**Budget:** CHF 158,913

**Targeted Persons:** 22,500

**Assisted Persons:** 25,200

**Targeted Male:** 12,474

**Targeted Female:** 12,726

### Indicators

| Title   | Target | Actual |
|---|--------|--------|
| # of households supported with food hampers.            | 4,000  | 4,500  |
| # of staff and volunteers involved in the distribution. | 200    | 103    |
| #of food items distributed per household.               | 7      | 6      |

### Narrative description of achievements

- KRCS distributed two-week food hampers to 4,500 vulnerable households (25,200 people) in Baringo County, utilising both procured supplies and donations from well-wishers. However, 74 households (52 in Kagir Primary School and 22 in Ngaratuko Primary School) remained in makeshift camps due to ongoing insecurity, requiring extended food support for at least three additional months. Food distribution was enabled by the support of 103 staff and volunteers.
- Food distribution exercise included the provision of 6 food items per household.

### Lessons Learnt

- Timely Humanitarian Support is Critical- KRCS successfully provided food support to 4,500HHs, ensuring short-term food security for two weeks. However, the continued displacement of 74 households in makeshift camps highlights the need for sustained food assistance to prevent hunger and malnutrition especially for children, elderly, and the sick.
- Need for Agricultural Support- Many displaced households in mixed farming zones e.g Chepkesin, require urgent agricultural inputs to restart farming. Provision of seeds and farming support will help affected communities recover and also mitigate long term food insecurity.

### Challenges

- The most affected populations are vulnerable groups, including children under five, the elderly, and pregnant and lactating mothers. The situation is likely to deteriorate further, particularly for those living in temporary shelters or tents, as the ongoing October-November-December (OND) short rains continue to pose additional risks.



## Health

**Budget:** CHF 74,064

**Targeted Persons:** 22,500

**Assisted Persons:** 27,215

**Targeted Male:** 13,471

**Targeted Female:** 13,744

### Indicators

| Title | Target | Actual |
|-------|--------|--------|
|-------|--------|--------|



|   |        |        |
|---|--------|--------|
| # of volunteers trained on ePiC                         | 30     | 33     |
| # of surge nurses deployed during the operation         | 3      | 3      |
| # of PPEs and identification materials distributed      | 500    | 500    |
| # of people reached with emergency health interventions | 22,500 | 27,215 |
| % of people referred for PSS or health emergencies      | 50     | 90     |
| # of Households supported with mosquito nets            | 2,000  | 2,000  |

## Narrative description of achievements

- WHO and KRCS provided emergency drug kits to the Baringo County Government to support health outreaches in flood-affected areas. WFP, through World Vision Kenya, prepositioned malnutrition treatment supplies (CSB and RUSF) at Loruk Health Center for children and pregnant/lactating women, though stockouts later occurred in Baringo North and South.
- To address severe acute malnutrition, 150 RUTF cartons were prepositioned at Loruk for outreach programs. KRCS delivered integrated health services during these outreaches, including immunization, treatment, nutrition support, antenatal care to 27,215 people, lab testing, mental health services, SRH care, and GBV response. These medical interventions were complemented by WASH activities, including the distribution of water treatment chemicals, jerricans, soap, and the establishment of handwashing facilities to improve hygiene and reduce disease transmission risks.
- 33 volunteers were trained on Epidemic Preparedness & Response while 3 surge nurses were deployed to support the operation.
- Additionally, 500 Personal Protective Equipment's(PPE'S) were distributed.
- Referral pathways were created to ensure continuity of health services in the affected areas.
- A total of 2000Hs were supported with mosquito nets in the conflict and flood affected areas. The distribution of mosquito nets was done jointly with ministry of health department of disease surveillance and local leaders. Distribution was done targeting households as follows in various sub counties; Baringo North 700Hhs, Baringo South 500Hhs, Tiaty West 400Hhs and Tiaty East 400Hhs.
- KRCS conducted active case findings, sanitation & vector control activities in the affected areas where a total of 425 cases were reported. Community dialogue on vector borne diseases was conducted in Sirata, Mukutani ward in Baringo South. A total of 38 stakeholders (M=28 and F=8) participated in the community dialogue session. The specific diseases that were of concern were Rift Valley Fever (RVF) and Malaria all risks associated with flooding. This provided a platform where community stakeholders gave feedback and consultatively assessed health risks that informed prioritization of risks and laid down actions plans to address the risks. Epidemic preparedness was enhanced through RCAT training and deployment of digital surveillance tools. Vector control efforts targeted both tsetse-borne diseases and flood-related illnesses through community-based approaches.
- Community health assessment and active case finding was conducted jointly with County departments of health that is Nutrition department, disease surveillances and medical services targeting areas of Baringo North (Ng'aratuko, Kagir, Kosile, Kesumet, Kosile and Chebarsiat) communities and revealed significant health challenges that required immediate attention. The assessment identified high rates of malnutrition, malaria, upper respiratory tract infections, diarrhea, and malnutrition among residents, indicating a substantial burden of disease affecting the overall health of the population. These findings underscore the urgent need for targeted interventions to improve health outcomes.

## Lessons Learnt

- Key lessons learned from the emergency response in Baringo County highlight the importance of timely prepositioning of essential supplies such as emergency drug kits, malnutrition treatment commodities, and Ready-to-Use Therapeutic Food (RUTF) to ensure uninterrupted service delivery during crises. Collaboration and coordination among partners, including WHO, WFP, WVK, and KRCS, were critical in enhancing the effectiveness of the response, particularly in integrating healthcare services with WASH interventions. However, the stockout of moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) supplies in some sub-counties underscored the need for improved supply chain management and regular monitoring of inventory levels.
- Additionally, the response demonstrated the value of providing a holistic package of services—combining health, nutrition, psychosocial support, and WASH—which significantly improved the resilience and well-being of affected communities. Finally, the need for continuous community engagement and awareness on health and hygiene practices was identified as essential in preventing disease outbreaks and ensuring sustainable recovery.



## Challenges

The most affected populations are vulnerable groups, including children under five, the elderly, and pregnant and lactating mothers. The situation is likely to deteriorate further, particularly for those living in temporary shelters or tents, as the ongoing October-November-December (OND) short rains continue to pose additional risks.



## Water, Sanitation And Hygiene

**Budget:** CHF 45,917

**Targeted Persons:** 22,500

**Assisted Persons:** 26,215

**Targeted Male:** 9,009

**Targeted Female:** 13,491

## Indicators

| Title                                      | Target | Actual |
|--|--------|--------|
| # of Shallow wells disinfected             | 20     | 10     |
| # of HHs receiving clean water             | 4,500  | 5,243  |
| # of HHs that received the 20ltr Jerricans | 2,000  | 2,000  |
| # of toilet slabs distributed              | 49     | 38     |
| # of body bags issued                      | 120    | 43     |

## Narrative description of achievements

- KRCS conducted Water Sanitation and Hygiene assessment in Baringo where it was established that due to the compounded effects of the March-April-May 2024 long rains and the civil unrest led to destruction of major water sources like the boreholes. The flood situation also resulted in the contamination of water for use at household level. The report highlighted the need to continuously disinfect these water points.
- KRCS provided water-treatment chemicals sufficient for one month to ensure access to safe drinking water and constructed makeshift toilets using slab materials for both the displaced and host communities, thereby improving sanitation and preventing waterborne diseases. 5,243 families were able to access safe water through the water treatment and the 10 wells disinfected against a target of 20 wells. This underachievement resulted from the fluid nature of the displaced population and security challenges, which meant only the accessible wells under utilisation could be disinfected and not all the wells captured during the assessment.
- Pit latrines, rubbish pits, and clearing of brush were among the best practices implemented in those areas. Communities were engaged to support, promote and sustain these sanitation exercises.  
A total of 5,243 HHs benefited from water treatment chemicals (PURR and Aquatabs), sanitary pads for girls, and jerricans for water storage. Instructions on their use were provided, taking into account different water treatment methods.
- Additionally, hand-washing demonstrations using soap and access to hand-washing facilities were frequently conducted in the communities visited. However, as no supply of soap was provided, this posed a challenge to the effectiveness of the demonstrations. Soap was not procured in time to support the community. This was rectified through prequalification and the signing of framework agreements with suppliers for Non-Food Items.
- KRCS supported the disinfection of 10 shallow wells to enhance access to clean, treated water. Additionally, 2000HHs received 20-litre water jerricans to support with water storage.
- KRCS distributed 43 body bags to support handling dead persons against a target of 120 body bags. This underachievement was a result of forecasted trends, which led to setting the target at 120 body bags. The remaining body bags were maintained at the county for future shocks/operations.
- KRCS supported the communities with 38 toilet slabs against a target of 49 slabs. This underachievement. As per the operational updates, the utilisation and distribution of toilet slabs were done only where large populations were settled. From the community security perspective, they could not be settled in a camp; as such, we only distributed the 38 latrine slabs in areas where a bigger population had settled. All unused stocks remain stored at the county level.



- Of the 120 body bags procured, 77 remained unused, while 11 out of the 49 toilet slabs procured were not utilized. The unused items remain the property of DREF and will be considered as pre-position stock and will require pre-authorization from the DREF team prior to deployment in future emergencies.

## Lessons Learnt

- While household-level sanitation behaviors remain commendably high, there is a critical need for ongoing sensitization on best practices to sustain and further improve these behaviors.
- Even though community hygiene practices have shown improvement; the availability of essential supplies, such as soap and hand-washing facilities, remains limited. That supply constraint at household and community level call for continuous sensitization efforts alongside the provision of necessary supplies to effectively reinforce hygiene practices.
- The county government recognized the need for body bags to manage fatalities as cases had increased in certain areas. However, some request came in November 2024, after the end of this intervention. Notably in Saimo Soi Ward where local authorities reported one death and two injuries, underscoring the importance of body bags.
- For instance, Displaced families, having left behind most of their belongings, required targeted support, including dignity kits tailored to meet the specific needs of each gender.
- Overall, both for effective behavior and practice changes and the management of dead body, one of the main learning was the high need for stocks as a preparedness measure and response scale-up to any intervention in the Baringo protracted situation.

## Challenges

- KRCS worked toward the Hygiene practices improvement but the community capacity and supply constraints such as soap and hand-washing facilities, dignity kits in these areas, continuously hindered the impact of the awareness on effective behavior changes.



## Protection, Gender And Inclusion

**Budget:** CHF 10,209

**Targeted Persons:** 150

**Assisted Persons:** 173

**Targeted Male:** 82

**Targeted Female:** 91

## Indicators

| Title   | Target | Actual |
|---|--------|--------|
| # of sensitization sessions conducted on SGBV             | 20     | 25     |
| # of debriefing sessions conducted in all the camps       | 30     | 31     |
| # of staff, volunteers and stakeholders sensitized on PGI | 150    | 173    |

## Narrative description of achievements

- Sensitization on SGBV: Given that these communities are agro-pastoralist with strong cultural practices, KRCS supported the sensitization of communities in targeted sub-counties (Baringo North, Baringo South, Tiaty East, and Tiaty West) through 25 sessions on Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV/GBV). In collaboration with other stakeholders, KRCS educated community members on best practices, referral pathways, clear communication channels, and safe spaces also through 30 debriefing sessions were undertaken in camps
- Capacity Building: KRCS successfully sensitized 173 persons, including volunteers and stakeholders and 15 staff on issues related to SGBV, GBV and PGI. Clear referral pathways were disseminated and strengthened to ensure the safe and prompt handling of cases. Additionally, the capacity of local community members reached through these sensitizations will continue to be enhanced in matters of Protection, Gender and Inclusion (PGI).



## Lessons Learnt

• Sensitization efforts in the agro-pastoralist communities of Baringo North, South, and Tiaty East and West highlight the importance of culturally sensitive approaches when addressing Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV). Engaging community members, volunteers, and stakeholders in SGBV awareness and best practices has been critical in fostering understanding and acceptance of referral pathways and safe spaces. Strengthening collaboration with local leaders and establishing clear communication lines have proven essential for timely reporting and effective case management. Additionally, the capacity-building of individuals on PGI emphasized the need for continuous sensitization and training on Protection, Gender, and Inclusion (PGI) to sustain community-based mechanisms for the safe and effective handling of SGBV cases. These efforts underscore the importance of ongoing community engagement to ensure long-term behavioral change and improved support systems for survivors.

## Challenges

- Despite sensitization efforts, there is still limited awareness of SGBV and its consequences. Survivors often face stigma, discouraging them from reporting cases. Strengthening continuous awareness and engagement with community leaders is necessary to foster an environment where survivors feel safe to seek help.
- While referral pathways have been disseminated, the sustainability of community-led SGBV response mechanisms needs further strengthening. Building local champions and peer support networks can help reinforce protection, gender, and inclusion (PGI) initiatives within these communities.



## Migration And Displacement

**Budget:** CHF 23,278

**Targeted Persons:** 22,500

**Assisted Persons:** 17,710

**Targeted Male:** 8,678

**Targeted Female:** 9,032

## Indicators

| Title   | Target | Actual |
|---|--------|--------|
| # coordination with partners on the migration situation   | 5      | 5      |
| # SITREP issued following data collection that inform decision and planning                             | 3      | 5      |
| #Volunteers engaged on social cohesion messages and promotion   | 60     | 80     |
| # of assessment conducted that inform the planning on the migration and displacement context in Baringo | 1      | 1      |

## Narrative description of achievements

• The overall sectoral response came as an integrated approach to address the humanitarian needs for relief support and protection that arose from the conflict in the area. Consequently, migration and displacement considerations remained at the center of the approach, and further assessments were planned to identify the best way forward for migration humanitarian assistance and social cohesion. While completing the assessment, NS ensured that:

For each priority sector with identified needs (shelter, health, WASH, etc.), the needs of the most vulnerable people on the move were addressed through direct assistance and protection.

Social cohesion between people on the move and host communities was enhanced, and KRCS actions contributed to maintaining that balance through strong and adequate CEA and PGI initiatives focused on reducing stigma, discrimination, and xenophobia. Risk communication and community engagements were constant, involving the scaling up of early warning measures following security information relayed by both the deployed team and communities. Communication was incorporated in terms of early warning, which involved the timely detection and dissemination of information regarding potential social unrest or resource-related tensions. The situation also recommended a strong promotion and communication strategy around inclusivity, cohesion, cultural tolerance, and



security to be encouraged among communities in Baringo County. Trusted channels and awareness approaches were integrated into communication with communities.

The prioritized humanitarian services included the establishment of a referral system adapted to the context, which encompassed specialized referrals for mental health, child protection, and the prevention of sexual and gender-based violence as priorities. Assessments helped identify the extent of protection considerations and the needs for restoring family links (RFL).

Evidence-based advocacy and humanitarian diplomacy were promoted by KRCS at both the branch and HQ levels. Continuous data collection and funded assessments contributed to that effort.

## Lessons Learnt

- Displacement-related challenges require continuous assessment and adaptation. The focus on migration considerations ensured that humanitarian interventions remained relevant and responsive to evolving needs.

## Challenges

- While immediate relief was provided, sustained humanitarian assistance for displaced populations in Baringo and host communities remains a challenge due to insufficient funds.
- Ongoing insecurity and the potential for social unrest made humanitarian operations challenging in parts of Baringo.



## Community Engagement And Accountability

**Budget:** CHF 5,477

**Targeted Persons:** 500

**Assisted Persons:** 573

**Targeted Male:** 274

**Targeted Female:** 299

## Indicators

| Title  | Target | Actual |
|--|--------|--------|
| # of volunteers trained on Community Engagement & Accountability   | 30     | 50     |
| # of community review meetings conducted                           | 18     | 15     |
| % of community feedback addressed                                  | 90     | 100    |
| # of persons reached through Community Engagement & Accountability | 500    | 573    |

## Narrative description of achievements

- KRCS trained 50 staff and volunteers (17 Male, 33 Female) on community engagement and Accountability in Baringo who were engaged in settling and supporting the communities with different needs, especially during registration and distribution of items. The training engaged participants from Marigat, Chemolingot, Kabarnet, and Eldama Ravine satellite offices.

After the training, the volunteers supported in conducting community review meetings in 7 villages affected by conflict and floods, under the DREF emergency response. These meetings, held in Baringo North and Baringo South sub-counties, focused on understanding the current conflict situation, the history and impact of the conflict, evaluating the emergency response, and documenting community feedback on the response.

A total of 573 community members (257 Males 266 Females) participated in the 15 community feedback meetings held. Outcomes of the community review meetings provided information on what is working well, what can be done better and key recommendations on the ongoing interventions in Baringo.

Among key recommendations from the CRMs include;

- To effectively mitigate food insecurity in the area, KRCS should increase the frequency and quantity of food distributions to ensure consistent support for large households. The food distributions should also include nutritious supplements such as milk and fruits for



children, pregnant women, lactating mothers, and the elderly.

- KRCS should work together with community members to understand the importance of hygiene and sanitation and eventually encourage construction of toilets using locally available materials.
- KRCS should work with other partners to support the government efforts by supplying school - going children with uniforms, stationery, and shoes to support their education.
- Unconditional cash voucher assistance programs could help community members address critical needs like healthcare, food, and education as they build resilience after an emergency situation.
- Provision of farming tools, seedlings and farming capacity building to build community resilience.
- There is need to increase the frequency of medical outreaches and mobile clinics to ensure consistent access to healthcare services, especially during outbreaks and emergencies.

KRCS through CEA documented community feedback at community level. The main feedback were capturing questions, suggestions, and appreciation related to the DREF interventions in the conflict affected areas.

## Lessons Learnt

- To effectively mitigate food insecurity in the area, KRCS should increase the frequency and quantity of food distributions to ensure consistent support for large households. The food distributions should also include nutritious supplements such as milk and fruits for children, pregnant women, lactating mothers, and the elderly.
- KRCS should work together with community members to understand the importance of hygiene and sanitation and eventually encourage construction of toilets using locally available materials.
- Unconditional cash voucher assistance programs could to help community members address critical needs like healthcare, food, and education as they build resilience after an emergency situation.
- There is need to increase the frequency of medical outreaches and mobile clinics to ensure consistent access to healthcare services, especially during outbreaks and emergencies.

## Challenges

- Language barrier during community engagement activities

Therefore, there is a need to continue with Community Engagement activities in the conflict areas especially now that the DREF is coming to an end. KRCS's comprehensive approach to community engagement, combined with effective partnerships and effective interventions, has been instrumental in addressing immediate needs of community members in Baringo.



## Secretariat Services

**Budget:** CHF 3,804

**Targeted Persons:** 5

**Assisted Persons:** 2

**Targeted Male:** 1

**Targeted Female:** 1

## Indicators

| Title   | Target | Actual |
|---|--------|--------|
| DREF procedures are applied during the implementation of the operation                      | 100    | 100    |
| Number of IFRC monitoring and support missions  | 1      | 0      |
| Movement coordination meetings organized, and updates are provided to the Movement partners | 3      | 1      |



## Narrative description of achievements

• DREF procedures were applied during the implementation of the operation. However, no monitoring & support missions were conducted by IFRC staff owing to security risks and advisory. Baringo County was designated as a red zone.

## Lessons Learnt

Need for coordinated planning and operations with other partners supporting interventions in Baringo County.

## Challenges

• Some affected areas e.g Tiaty are remote and prone to insecurity limiting the reach on implementation of field activities.



## National Society Strengthening

**Budget:** CHF 65,856

**Targeted Persons:** 499

**Assisted Persons:** 300

**Targeted Male:** 141

**Targeted Female:** 169

## Indicators

| Title   | Target | Actual |
|---|--------|--------|
| # of volunteers insured during the operation                | 500    | 310    |
| # of documentations produced during the operations          | 2      | 0      |
| # of staff and volunteers attending the after-action review | 45     | 45     |

## Narrative description of achievements

• KRCS successfully achieved the outlined activities in line with its commitments. Key accomplishments included covering internet costs and providing staff airtime to ensure seamless communication and coordination during the response. Additionally, 310 KRCS supported EOC volunteers, enabling them to carry out their duties effectively. Support supervision was provided to the response teams to enhance operational efficiency and ensure timely interventions. Public relations efforts, including communications and documentation, were also prioritized to keep stakeholders informed and maintain transparency. Administrative costs and bank charges were managed to facilitate smooth financial transactions, while volunteer insurance was provided to safeguard those involved in field activities. Lastly, KRCS organized an After-Action Review (AAR) workshop to evaluate the response, identify best practices, and highlight areas for improvement in future operations.

## Lessons Learnt

• Supervision of response teams reinforced the value of hands-on leadership and oversight to maintain quality and timely interventions. Additionally, effective public relations and documentation emphasized the importance of clear communication with stakeholders and the public during emergencies. Managing administrative costs and bank charges underscored the need for transparent and efficient financial processes, while providing volunteer insurance highlighted the critical role of safeguarding personnel involved in high-risk operations. The After-Action Review (AAR) workshop further demonstrated the necessity of continuous learning, allowing for the identification of best practices and areas for improvement to enhance future response efforts.

## Challenges

• No major challenges were experienced on National Society Strengthening.



# Financial Report

## DREF Operation

### FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

#### MDRKE059 - Kenya - Baringo Social unrest

Operating Timeframe: 19 Apr 2024 to 31 Oct 2024

| Selected Parameters |                 |           |          |
|---------------------|-----------------|-----------|----------|
| Reporting Timeframe | 2024/04-2025/05 | Operation | MDRKE059 |
| Budget Timeframe    | 2024/04-2024/10 | Budget    | APPROVED |

Prepared on 30/Jun/2025

All figures are in Swiss Francs (CHF)

### I. Summary

|                                 |                 |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Opening Balance</b>          | <b>0</b>        |
| <b>Funds &amp; Other Income</b> | <b>499,381</b>  |
| DREF Response Pillar            | 499,381         |
| <b>Expenditure</b>              | <b>-495,620</b> |
| <b>Closing Balance</b>          | <b>3,761</b>    |

### II. Expenditure by area of focus / strategies for implementation

| Description   | Budget         | Expenditure    | Variance     |
|---|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| AOF1 - Disaster risk reduction                        | 30,479         | 11             | 30,468       |
| AOF2 - Shelter  | 105,036        | 111,863        | -6,827       |
| AOF3 - Livelihoods and basic needs                    | 149,214        | 158,913        | -9,699       |
| AOF4 - Health   | 69,544         | 74,064         | -4,520       |
| AOF5 - Water, sanitation and hygiene                  | 43,114         | 45,916         | -2,802       |
| AOF6 - Protection, Gender & Inclusion                 | 9,586          | 10,209         | -623         |
| AOF7 - Migration                                      | 21,857         | 23,278         | -1,421       |
| <b>Area of focus Total</b>                            | <b>428,830</b> | <b>424,255</b> | <b>4,575</b> |
| SF11 - Strengthen National Societies                  | 66,980         | 71,334         | -4,354       |
| SF12 - Effective international disaster management    |                |                | 0            |
| SF13 - Influence others as leading strategic partners |                |                | 0            |
| SF14 - Ensure a strong IFRC                           | 3,571          | 32             | 3,539        |
| <b>Strategy for implementation Total</b>              | <b>70,551</b>  | <b>71,366</b>  | <b>-815</b>  |
| <b>Grand Total</b>                                    | <b>499,381</b> | <b>495,620</b> | <b>3,760</b> |

[Click here for the complete financial report](#)

## Please explain variances (if any)

CHF 320,507 was received for this intervention and implementation from 28 Jun 2024 to 30 Sep 2024, KRCS spent 99% of the budget. The balance of CHF 3,761 will be returned to the DREF pot. The balance is mainly resulting from currency exchange difference between KES (local currency) and CHF and unspent amount for monitoring visits. Financial report is attached with breakdown on the expenditure per cost category. The variances are explained below:

1. Field monitoring visits were not undertaken as most of the unrest was mainly experienced in Nairobi County and travel outside Nairobi to the counties was not possible.
2. Financial charges were underestimated.



# Contact Information

For further information, specifically related to this operation please contact:

**National Society contact:** Venant Ndighila, Head of Operations, ndighila.venant@redcross.or.ke, +254703114882

**IFRC Appeal Manager:** Naemi Heita, Head of Delegation, Somalia and Kenya, naemi.heita@ifrc.org

**IFRC Project Manager:** Patrick Elliot, Coordinator Operations, rooving, Africa Region, patrick.elliott@ifrc.org, +254 733 620 770

**IFRC focal point for the emergency:** Patrick Elliot, Roving Operations Coordinator, patrick.elliott@ifrc.org, +254 733 620 770

**Media Contact:** Susan Nzisa Mbalu, Communications Manager, susan.mbalu@ifrc.org, +254733827654

**National Societies' Integrity Focal Point:** Reuben Momanyi, Head of MEAL, momanyi.reuben@redcross.or.ke, +254725918054

**National Society Hotline:** 0800 720 577

[Click here for reference](#)



### 5.1 PROJECT PARTNER EXPENDITURE CERTIFICATION

PROJECT PARTNER NAME Kenya Red Cross Society  
 PROJECT NAME Kenya Baringo County Social Unrest  
 IFRC PROJECT CODE MDRKE059/PKE109/AP104  
 CURRENT REPORTING PERIOD 19/04/2024 to 31/10/2024

#### 5.1.1 BUDGET & EXPENSES BY PROJECT PARTNER ONLY PER PLANNED OPERATIONS & ENABLING APPROACH (Local Currency)

| Planned Operations / Enabling Approaches        | Budget Local Currency (A) | Prior Period Expenses Local Currency (B) | Current Period Expenses Local Currency (C) | Total (Year to date) Local Currency (D) (B+C) | Budget Balance Local Currency (E) (A-D) | Percentage budget spent (F) (D/A) | Explain implementation > 110% for Interim and Final Report and < 90% for Final Report only (G) |
|---|---------------------------|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Shelter and Basic Household Items               | 14,714,000                |  | 14,684,732                                 | 14,684,732                                    | 29,268                                  | 100%                              |  |
| Livelihoods                                     | 20,890,000                |  | 20,927,686                                 | 20,927,686                                    | -37,686                                 | 100%                              |  |
| Multi-purpose Cash                              |                           |  | 0  | 0   | 0                                       | 0%                                |  |
| Health  | 9,736,140                 |  | 9,746,349                                  | 9,746,349                                     | -10,209                                 | 100%                              |  |
| Water, Sanitation & Hygiene                     | 6,036,000                 |  | 6,009,496                                  | 6,009,496                                     | 26,504                                  | 100%                              |  |
| Protection, Gender and Inclusion                | 1,342,050                 |  | 1,342,452                                  | 1,342,452                                     | -402                                    | 100%                              |  |
| Education                                       |                           |  | 0  | 0   | 0                                       | 0%                                |  |
| Migration                                       | 3,060,000                 |  | 3,059,130                                  | 3,059,130                                     | 870                                     | 100%                              |  |
| Risk Reduction, Climate Adaptation and Recovery |                           |  | 0  | 0   | 0                                       | 0%                                |  |
| Community Engagement and Accountability         | 720,000                   |  | 718,824                                    | 718,824                                       | 1,176                                   | 100%                              |  |
| Environmental Sustainability                    |                           |  | 0  | 0   | 0                                       | 0%                                |  |
| Coordination and Partnerships                   |                           |  | 0  | 0   | 0                                       | 0%                                |  |
| Secretariat Services                            |                           |  | 0  | 0   | 0                                       | 0%                                |  |
| National Society Strengthening                  | 9,113,505                 |  | 9,123,369                                  | 9,123,369                                     | -9,864                                  | 100%                              |  |
| <b>Total</b>                                    | <b>65,611,695</b>         | <b>0</b>                                 | <b>65,612,038</b>                          | <b>65,612,038</b>                             | <b>-343</b>                             | <b>100%</b>                       |  |

#### 5.1.2 BUDGET & EXPENSES BY PROJECT PARTNER ONLY ACCORDING TO COST CATEGORIES (Local Currency)

| SP No | Cost Categories                             | Budget Local Currency (A) | Prior Period Expenses Local Currency (B) | Current Period Expenses Local Currency (C) | Total (Year to date) Local Currency (D) (B+C) | Budget Balance Local Currency (E) (A-D) | Percentage budget spent (F) (D/A) | Explain implementation > 110% for Interim and Final Report and < 90% for Final Report only (G) |
|-------|---|---------------------------|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|
|       | Personnel                                   | 6,405,000                 |  | 6,415,286                                  | 6,415,286                                     | -10,286                                 | 100%                              |  |
|       | Relief supplies, transportation and storage | 41,987,000                |  | 41,922,615                                 | 41,922,615                                    | 64,385                                  | 100%                              |  |
|       | Contributions to other organisations        |                           |  | 0  | 0   | 0                                       | 0%                                |  |
|       | Other direct costs                          | 12,957,783                |  | 13,012,225                                 | 13,012,225                                    | -54,442                                 | 100%                              |  |
|       | Indirect cost recovery                      | 4,261,912                 |  | 4,261,912                                  | 4,261,912                                     | 0                                       | 100%                              |  |
|       | <b>Total</b>                                | <b>65,611,695</b>         | <b>0</b>                                 | <b>65,612,038</b>                          | <b>65,612,038</b>                             | <b>-343</b>                             | <b>100%</b>                       |  |

#### 5.1.3 BUDGET & EXPENSES BY PROJECT PARTNER ONLY PER STRATEGIC PRIORITY & ENABLER (CHF)

| SP No | Strategic Priority & Enabler         | Budget CHF (A) | Prior Period Expenses CHF (B) | Current Period Expenses CHF (C) | Total (Year to date) CHF (D) (B+C) | Budget Balance CHF (E) (A-D) | Percentage budget spent (F) (D/A) | Explain implementation > 110% for Interim and Final Report and < 90% for Final Report only (G) |
|-------|--------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| SP1   | Climate and environmental crises     |                |                               | 0                               | 0                                  | 0                            | 0%                                |  |
| SP2   | Evolving crises and disasters        | 252,511        |                               | 252,506                         | 252,506                            | 4                            | 100%                              |  |
| SP3   | Growing gaps in health and wellbeing | 111,859        |                               | 111,889                         | 111,889                            | -30                          | 100%                              |  |
| SP4   | Migration and identity               | 21,702         |                               | 21,857                          | 21,857                             | -155                         | 101%                              |  |
| SP5   | Values, Power and Inclusion          | 9,518          |                               | 9,403                           | 9,403                              | 115                          | 99%                               |  |
| E6    | Engaged                              |                |                               | 0                               | 0                                  | 0                            | 0%                                |  |
| E7    | Accountable                          |                |                               | 0                               | 0                                  | 0                            | 0%                                |  |
| E8    | Trusted                              | 69,741         |                               | 69,678                          | 69,678                             | 63                           | 100%                              |  |
|       | <b>Total</b>                         | <b>465,331</b> | <b>0</b>                      | <b>465,334</b>                  | <b>465,334</b>                     | <b>-3</b>                    | <b>100%</b>                       |  |

#### 5.1.4 BUDGET & EXPENSES BY PROJECT PARTNER ONLY PER RESULT OR OBJECTIVE (CHF)

| Result No.  | Result or Objective        | Budget CHF (A) | Prior Period Expenses CHF (B) | Current Period Expenses CHF (C) | Total (Year to date) CHF (D) (B+C) | Budget Balance CHF (E) (A-D) | Percentage budget spent (F) (D/A) | Explain Implementation > 110% for Interim and Final Report and < 90% for Final Report only (G) |
|-------------|----------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| All results | Cost common to all results | 465,331        |                               | 465,334                         | 465,334                            | -3                           | 100%                              |  |
| R1          |                            |                |                               | 0                               | 0                                  | 0                            | 0%                                |  |
| R2          |                            |                |                               | 0                               | 0                                  | 0                            | 0%                                |  |
| R3          |                            |                |                               | 0                               | 0                                  | 0                            | 0%                                |  |
| R4          |                            |                |                               | 0                               | 0                                  | 0                            | 0%                                |  |
| R5          |                            |                |                               | 0                               | 0                                  | 0                            | 0%                                |  |
| R6          |                            |                |                               | 0                               | 0                                  | 0                            | 0%                                |  |
| R7          |                            |                |                               | 0                               | 0                                  | 0                            | 0%                                |  |
| R8          |                            |                |                               | 0                               | 0                                  | 0                            | 0%                                |  |
|             | <b>Total</b>               | <b>465,331</b> | <b>0</b>                      | <b>465,334</b>                  | <b>465,334</b>                     | <b>-3</b>                    | <b>100%</b>                       |  |

#### 5.1.5 CLOSING INCOME-EXPENSE BALANCE PROJECT PARTNER ONLY (CHF) - PER REPORTING PERIOD END DATE

|   | CHF         |
|---|-------------|
| Funds received to date                                  | 465,331     |
| Year to date expenses                                   | 465,334     |
| <b>Closing Balance</b>                                  | <b>-3</b>   |
| <b>Percentage reported vs. total amount transferred</b> | <b>100%</b> |

#### 5.1.6 CERTIFICATION

The undersigned authorized officer of the above mentioned project partner hereby certifies that:

- a) they have no knowledge of, nor suspicion of, any fraud and corruption connected in any way to the expenditures included in this report and that they have taken reasonable steps to minimise the risk of fraud and corruption
- b) they have taken reasonable steps to minimise the risk of error and mistake in this report. This includes, but is not limited to exercising the appropriate internal controls and employing competent staff
- c) Supporting documentation exists for the expenditure included in this report and shall be made available for examination when required and for a period of 8 years from the submission of this report
- d) Expenditures have been incurred in line with the agreed project plan and the signed Project Funding Agreement and in accordance with the Project Partners standard procedures and financial regulations, as assessed by the
- e) The planned expenditure figures and funds transfer request shown above represents estimated expenditures for the next two reporting periods in accordance with the agreed Project Plan

Date Submitted

30th November 2024

Name, Title & Signature of Project partner designated official

Caroline Bivott- Budget and Analysis Officer



For IFRC internal use

Approved by IFRC Project Manager

patrick elliot

Name & Title



patrick elliot (Feb 18, 2025 09:24 GMT+3)

Signature

elmelda mokaya

Name & Title



elmelda mokaya (Feb 24, 2025 09:34 GMT+3)

Signature

Validated by IFRC Finance officer













# Baringo Conflict Report Annex 5 Financial report and spot check report


Final Audit Report


2025-02-24


|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| Created:                     | 2025-02-18                                 |
| By:                          | japheth lubanda (japheth.lubanda@ifrc.org) |
| Status:                      | Signed                                     |
| Transaction ID:              | CBJCHBCAABAAfe7vAVsJnjfmJUCVkg6bRTPbtDUHZO |
| Number of Documents:         | 1  |
| Document page count:         | 8  |
| Number of supporting files:  | 0  |
| Supporting files page count: | 0  |


## "Baringo Conflict Report Annex 5 Financial report and spot check report" History

-  Document created by japheth lubanda (japheth.lubanda@ifrc.org)  
2025-02-18 - 5:14:02 AM GMT- IP address: 105.163.158.106
-  Document emailed to patrick elliott (patrick.elliott@ifrc.org) for signature  
2025-02-18 - 5:16:50 AM GMT
-  Email viewed by patrick elliott (patrick.elliott@ifrc.org)  
2025-02-18 - 6:24:01 AM GMT- IP address: 104.47.11.126
-  Agreement viewed by patrick elliott (patrick.elliott@ifrc.org)  
2025-02-18 - 6:24:02 AM GMT- IP address: 197.156.141.154
-  Document e-signed by patrick elliott (patrick.elliott@ifrc.org)  
Signature Date: 2025-02-18 - 6:24:18 AM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 197.156.141.154
-  Document emailed to japheth lubanda (japheth.lubanda@ifrc.org) for signature  
2025-02-18 - 6:24:20 AM GMT
-  Agreement viewed by japheth lubanda (japheth.lubanda@ifrc.org)  
2025-02-24 - 6:55:10 AM GMT- IP address: 197.156.141.154
-  Document e-signed by japheth lubanda (japheth.lubanda@ifrc.org)  
Signature Date: 2025-02-24 - 6:55:32 AM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 197.156.141.154

 Document emailed to elmelda mokaya (elmelda.mokaya@ifrc.org) for signature  
2025-02-24 - 6:55:41 AM GMT

 Agreement viewed by elmelda mokaya (elmelda.mokaya@ifrc.org)  
2025-02-24 - 2:27:55 PM GMT- IP address: 197.156.141.154

 Document e-signed by elmelda mokaya (elmelda.mokaya@ifrc.org)  
Signature Date: 2025-02-24 - 2:34:59 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 197.156.141.154

 Agreement completed.  
2025-02-24 - 2:34:59 PM GMT