COUNTY GOVERNMENT OF KIRINYAGA



KERUGOYA/KUTUS MUNICIPAL BOARD

MINUTES OF THE KERUGOYA KUTUS MUNICIPAL BOARD MEETING ON GENDER MAINSTREAMING AND SOCIAL INCLUSION FRAMEWORKS.

DATE: 18TH OCTOBER 2024

TIME: 10:00 A.M.

VENUE: BEKAM HOTEL

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- 1. Lucy K. Munyi Board Chairperson
- 2. Erick Muthii Kinyua Vice Chairperson
- 3. Dickson K. Ngari Board Member
- 4. Timothy Njeru Board Member
- 5. Rev. Grace Wambui Kamwagire Board Member
- 6. CPA Paul M. Muchira Municipal Manager/Secretary

IN ATTENDANCE

- 1. Murage Muraguli County Director of Planning
- 2. Sylvia Muli Municipal Accountant
- 3. Brian Gitei Municipal Economist
- 4. James Njiru W. County Roads Inspector

- 5. Antonio Gikonyo Environmental Safeguards Officer
- 6. Ian Ngugi Gakunyi KUSP Urban Planner
- 7. Christine Wangeci Municipal social safeguard Officer
- 8. Jemimah Mugo Municipal Strategy and Communications Officer
- 9. George Macharia County Social Safeguard Officer

MEMBERS ABSENT WITH APOLOGY:

- 1. Mary Muthoni Cooper Board Member
- 2. Kaara Muriithi County Environmental Specialist
- 3. Geoffrey Maina Municipal Civil Engineer
- 4. William Mutegi Zachary Senior Physical Planner
- 5. Isaiah Mwangi Municipal ICT Officer
- 6. Naphtary M. Muikia Municipal Budget Specialist
- 7. Fredrick Bundi- Board Member
- 8. Rev.Samuel Kanjobe Board Member

AGENDA ITEMS

- 1. Preliminaries
- 2. Municipal Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)
- 3. Municipal Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)
- 4. Municipal Social Inclusion Plan
- 5. Performance Contracting for Kerugoya-Kutus Municipality Board
- 6. Closing Remarks/AOB

MIN. 1/MUN/SEC/18/10/24: Preliminaries

The meeting commenced with opening remarks from **Paul Muchira**, the Municipal Manager, who welcomed all present members.

Jemimah Mugo, the Strategy and Communications Officer, led the opening prayer.

MIN. 2/MUN/SEC/18/10/24: Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)

Christine Wangeci, the municipal social safeguard Officer, welcomed all the board members to the meeting and proceeded to introduce the agenda for the session. The primary focus was the presentation of the **Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)** as part of the Kenya Urban Support Program (KUSP) Phase II. Christine emphasized that the GRM is a critical tool for ensuring transparency, accountability, and timely conflict resolution in municipal projects, particularly under the KUSP framework.

Christine outlined that the GRM is designed to handle disputes and complaints that arise during project implementation, especially in public infrastructure and urban development projects funded under KUSP Phase II. She highlighted that grievances might arise due to environmental impacts, social disputes, project delays, or other concerns raised by project beneficiaries or the general public.

Key Objectives of the GRM:

- Promote transparency and accountability among project stakeholders.
- Address grievances in a timely manner, ensuring fairness and inclusion of all affected parties.
- Enhance relationships between project executors, beneficiaries, and the public by providing an official channel for complaints.
- Provide solutions to social and environmental grievances to mitigate project risks and ensure smooth implementation.
- Guide public participation and ensure that communities can access information, provide feedback, and participate in municipal decision-making processes.

3.2 Scope and Principles of the GRM

Christine emphasized that the **Grievance Redress Mechanism** applies to all projects under the KUSP II program. She explained that while the GRM provides an accessible and formal mechanism for dispute resolution, it does not replace existing legal frameworks such as the courts and tribunals but complements them.

Key Principles Governing the GRM:

- Accessibility: The GRM should be easily accessible to all, with efforts made to address barriers such as language, literacy, cost, or fear of reprisal.
- Predictability: The process is time-bound, with specific timelines for receiving and resolving complaints.
- Fairness: Procedures are unbiased, and both complainants and stakeholders can access necessary information, ensuring fairness.
- Transparency and Accountability: The entire grievance process should be conducted in a transparent manner, ensuring accountability.
- Feedback Mechanism: The GRM provides citizens with a way to offer feedback on projects, thereby improving outcomes and ensuring citizens' voices are heard.

Kirinyaga County GRM Framework and Levels of Redress

Christine provided a detailed description of the GRM framework, which operates at two levels: The **Community Level** and the **County Level**.

1. First Level of Redress (Community Level):

- At the community level, three community leaders are designated and trained to handle complaints under the supervision of ward administrators. The project beneficiaries are informed of these designated individuals, who will manage the grievances and ensure they are addressed promptly.
- The leaders are responsible for receiving complaints, investigating them, and proposing solutions. Complaints are registered using a standardized form (KUSP II KIRINYAGA-GRM/001).

 If a grievance cannot be resolved at this level, it is escalated to the next level for further action.

2. Second Level of Redress (County Level):

- Complaints that are not resolved at the community level are escalated to the county level. Here, the Municipal Grievance Redress Mechanism Officer works in collaboration with the Municipal Manager, Ward Administrators, and other relevant stakeholders, including the County Program Coordination Team (CPCT), to resolve issues.
- The grievances are reviewed and addressed by the grievance handling team, and resolutions are proposed within the framework of the KUSP II program.

Channels for Submitting Complaints:

 Christine noted that complaints can be submitted through multiple channels, including verbal communication, written submissions, emails, phone calls, and the county's online grievance portal. Upon receipt of the complaint, an acknowledgment receipt is issued within 24 to 48 hours.

GRM Composition and Structure

Christine explained the composition of the GRM, which includes various stakeholders and technical officers who contribute to the effective management of complaints. These include:

- Municipal Manager
- · Grievance Redress Mechanism Officer
- Social Safeguards Specialist
- Environmental Safeguards Specialist
- Ward Administrators
- Project Officers

These officials are tasked with ensuring the complaints are processed efficiently, and resolutions are achieved in a timely manner.

General Procedure for Handling Grievances

Christine outlined the steps involved in processing grievances, ensuring a structured and consistent approach to resolving complaints:

1. Receiving and Logging Complaints:

Complaints are received through phone, letters, email, or in-person meetings. The complaint is logged into the GRM system using a standardized form (KUSP II KIRINYAGA-GRM/001).

2. Acknowledgment of Grievance:

An acknowledgment receipt is provided within 24 to 48 hours after the complaint is logged.

3. Assessment and Investigation:

The grievance handling team investigates the complaint, consulting with relevant parties and conducting site visits if necessary.

4. Resolution:

The team provides a resolution within 14 days after receiving the grievance. The complainant is informed of the outcome.

5. Sign-off and Monitoring:

Once the complaint is resolved, the issue is formally signed off, and follow-up monitoring is scheduled to ensure that the resolution is properly implemented.

Financial Resources for GRM

Christine stressed the importance of having dedicated financial resources for the effective operation of the GRM. She explained that these resources would be allocated through the KUSP II budget and work plans to ensure that grievance handling processes are adequately supported.

Legal Framework Supporting GRM

Christine referenced several legal frameworks that provide the foundation for the GRM, including sections from the County Government Act (2012). These sections empower citizens to petition the county government, hold public officials accountable, and ensure that grievances are addressed promptly and fairly.

Key legal provisions include:

- Section 88 (1): Citizens have the right to petition the county government on any issue.
- Section 89: County authorities must respond expeditiously to petitions and grievances from citizens.

GRM Communication Plan

The GRM communication plan was presented, outlining how information about the grievance process will be shared with various stakeholders. Christine explained that the communication plan aims to ensure all parties are informed about the GRM procedures throughout the project lifecycle.

Key Communication Channels:

- Print Media: Posters, flyers, and booklets will be used to inform the public.
- Social Media and ICT: Platforms like Facebook, WhatsApp, and the county website
 will be used to reach different audiences.
- Public Forums: Regular public forums will be held to discuss grievances and allow citizens to raise concerns.
- Training and Awareness: Training sessions will be held to educate community leaders, project officers, and ward administrators on how to handle complaints effectively.

Discussion and Resolutions

Project Delays:

The board discussed the impact of unresolved grievances on project timelines. It was agreed that delays in addressing grievances could result in project slowdowns, and timely resolution should be prioritized.

Public Awareness Campaign:

The board resolved to enhance public awareness about the GRM through increased communication efforts, including community outreach programs, media campaigns, and public forums.

Budget Allocation:

The board recommended ensuring that sufficient funds are allocated in the next fiscal year to support the GRM process, including the training of staff and community representatives.

Christine concluded the presentation by emphasizing the role of the GRM in fostering trust between the municipality and its residents. She urged the board to support the implementation of the GRM and ensure that it is used effectively to address the concerns of project beneficiaries.

The meeting was adjourned at 12 p.m. for a short break.

MIN. 3/MUN/SEC/18/10/24: Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)

Presentation by George Macharia County Social Safeguard Officer

George Macharia presented the SEP, outlining the key objectives and its importance in ensuring the successful implementation of KUSP II. The SEP aims to foster transparency, inclusiveness, and active stakeholder involvement throughout the project lifecycle.

Key points highlighted:

 Objective: The SEP ensures that all stakeholders are informed and involved in project decision-making processes. It emphasizes a systematic and structured approach to communication, allowing for timely feedback and grievance resolution. Program Description: KUSP II is designed to build upon KUSP I by enhancing urban
infrastructure, tenure regularization, and institutional capacity, with a focus on vulnerable
populations.

Stakeholder Identification and Analysis

Presenter identified and categorized the stakeholders involved in KUSP II, explaining their roles and how they would be engaged throughout the project.

Categories of Stakeholders:

- Primary Beneficiaries: Residents, business community, PWDs, women, youth, and marginalized groups.
- Other Interested Parties: County executive departments (Lands, Trade, Transport, Housing), CSOs, NGOs, national government agencies (NEMA, KURA), religious institutions, mobile network operators, and digital platforms.
- Vulnerable Groups: Particular attention to women, youth, persons with disabilities (PWDs), and minority groups to ensure equitable access and participation.

Methodology for Stakeholder Engagement:

- Open and Transparent Process: Consultations will be held throughout the project lifecycle, ensuring inclusivity and participation from all groups.
- Verifying Representatives: Special care to verify that representatives genuinely
 advocate for the communities they represent, particularly vulnerable groups.

Engagement Mechanisms and Tools

George Macharia discussed the tools and methods for stakeholder engagement during the project.

Methods and Tools:

- Community Meetings: Face-to-face meetings with community representatives, key informants, and focus groups to ensure participation from marginalized groups.
- ICT Platforms: Virtual meetings using tools such as Google Meet, Zoom, and Teams to provide updates and gather input.
- Social Media and Digital Platforms: Communication through the County's official social media, SMS, WhatsApp, and print media for timely dissemination of information.

 Surveys: Periodic surveys to collect feedback on stakeholder satisfaction and participation.

Key Topics for Engagement:

- Community Feedback: Allowing beneficiaries to prioritize interventions and form committees to oversee ward-level projects.
- Government Collaboration: Engagement with County departments for technical support and monitoring of projects.

Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM)

The Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM) was outlined as a key tool for addressing stakeholder concerns throughout the project.

GRM Objectives:

- To resolve grievances promptly, ensuring fairness and transparency.
- To provide multiple channels (email, phone, in-person meetings) for stakeholders to submit complaints.
- To avoid the need for judicial proceedings by offering amicable resolutions.

GRM Process:

- Grievance Logging: Complaints can be submitted via phone, email, or face-to-face meetings.
- Response Time: Complaints are acknowledged within 48 hours, assessed within 72 hours, and resolved within 14 days.
- **Monitoring**: Grievances are monitored, and quarterly reports are generated to track resolutions and maintain transparency.

Responsibilities:

The **Municipal Grievance Officer** and **Ward Administrators** are responsible for handling complaints. If unresolved, grievances can be escalated to the County Program Coordination Team (CPCT) and the Municipal Board.

Future of the Project and Monitoring

Presenter outlined the plan for ongoing stakeholder engagement and monitoring throughout the KUSP II project lifecycle.

Key Plans for the Future:

- Continuous Updates: Stakeholders will receive regular updates on the project's environmental and social performance.
- Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E): Regular updates to the SEP will be made based on project developments, ensuring stakeholders are kept informed and have opportunities to provide input.
- Capacity Development: The project team will continue to build the capacity of county
 government institutions to meet their urban governance and service delivery mandates.

MIN. 4/MUN/SEC/18/10/24: Performance Contracting for Kerugoya-Kutus Municipality Board

Presentation by Paul Muchira (Municipal Manager)

The Municipal Manager presented to the board members on the topic of performance contracting for the Kerugoya-Kutus Municipality. The Municipal Manager explained that the performance contract is an agreement between the board members and the County Executive Committee (CEC) member for Lands and Urban Development. The contract serves as a commitment to demonstrate the board's dedication to achieving the following:

- Municipal objectives
- County programmes
- National development programmes

The Municipal Manager emphasized the importance of the contract in aligning the board's operations with the strategic goals of both the county and national government.

MIN. 5/MUN/SEC/18/10/24: Closing Remarks

The Chairperson thanked George Macharia for the detailed presentation and opened the floor for questions and feedback from the board members. A few members emphasized the importance of continuous monitoring and community involvement to ensure the success of KUSP II.

The board members approved the Municipal Grievance Redress Mechanism (GRM), Municipal Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) and the Municipal Social Inclusion Plan documents

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m. with a commitment to keep all stakeholders updated on upcoming project meetings and developments.

Signed

Signed. Aulag

Date 8 Nov 2024

Date. 8.11. 24

Paul M. Muchira

Lucy K. Munyi

Secretary

Chairperson

ATTENDANCE REGISTER

No Name Title The Contracts Limit of 24112674 ST2440874 Mindles Limit of 24112674 ST2440874 Mindles Science State Mindles Mindles Science State Mindles Mindles Mindles Science State Mindles Mindles Mindles Science Mindles OFESSIS Mindles Mindles Mindles Mindles OFESSIS Mindles Mindles Mindles OFESSIS Mindles Mindles Mindles Mindles Mindles OFESSIS Mindles Mindle	1
Title Contacts Email OT24/112674 OT24/187/107 Jimayali OT24/1487-1107 OT10779056 Georgamin Municipal primer K-CP OT10779056 Georgamin Municipal primer K-CP OT10779056 Georgamin Municipal primer K-CP OT10779056 Georgamin Municipal primer Cfice CT222/188/18 Ministracy Municipal Red Member OT23265857 We remain Board Manber OT23265867 Jones His Spand Manber OT23265867 Jones His Cont Scall Roc May 0726287406 Georgamin Control Planing OT26287406 Georgamin Control Plani	Name Rand M. Morrow Thanks KINAU W. JAMES KINAU W. JAMES KINAU W. Sylvin Myng gakuny ANTONIO GIKONO KARIUKI JEMINANE K. MULLI JEMINANE K. MARIECHI CHRISTINE WANGECHI CHORRE MURANA MUrdage Muragno
Contacts Email Francis Email Francis Email Francis Contacts Fr	Tille Tille OT 2413634 Carry Ramer K
	Contacts Email THERMOT Jimmelling THERMOT Jimmelling THERMOT Jimmelling THERMOT Jimmelling THERMOT JIMMELT THERMOTOR TO THE LICTURE THERMOTOR THERMOTOR THERM

PHOTO GALLERY







