

POST DISASTER ANALYSIS REPORT

ELGEYO MARAKWET LANDSLIDE

BY:

**JENGA FUTURE INITIATIVE AND
MARAKWET COUNCIL OF ELDERS**

March 2026



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Disaster

On the night of 31 October 2025, a catastrophic landslide struck Chesongoch in Marakwet East Sub-County, Elgeyo Marakwet County, Kenya. The event, the most severe on record in the county killed 39 people, displaced 151 households, destroyed critical road infrastructure, eliminated agricultural livelihoods, and caused extensive ecological damage to an already-degraded escarpment landscape. Of the confirmed fatalities, approximately 85 percent were women, children and elderly persons, a disproportionate toll that reflects the structural vulnerabilities of the most marginalized members of the affected community.

A preventable escalation

The 2025 landslide was not an isolated natural event. Elgeyo Marakwet County has experienced major landslide events in 1961, 2010, 2012, 2019, 2020, and 2025 a clear escalating pattern driven by the convergence of fragile escarpment terrain, accelerating deforestation, unsustainable agricultural practices, extractive activities, demographic pressure on high-risk slopes, and weakening institutional governance of natural resources. Government-commissioned recommendations following prior disasters were partially implemented and never evaluated for effectiveness. The 2025 disaster is, in part, a consequence of that institutional failure. Without integrated and sustained intervention, this trajectory will continue.

About The Organization

Jenga Future Initiative is a Kenya-registered Public Benefit Organization (**PBO No. OP:218/051/22-022/12578**), founded in 2022 and headquartered in Kenya's North Rift Region. Its mission: to empower vulnerable communities to adapt, thrive, and build sustainable livelihoods in the face of the climate change crisis. Since 2023, Jenga Future directly supported over 2,000 landslide-affected people through emergency response and recovery; distributed

more than 10,000 seedlings for agroforestry and land restoration; supported 500+ farmers with climate-resilient livelihoods.

Community-Led Response and Analysis

In March 2026, Jenga Future working in formal collaboration with the Marakwet Council of Elders, conducted a participatory post-disaster analysis with directly affected community members including women, youth, elders, and persons with disability. This methodology reflects Jenga Future's founding philosophy: communities are not beneficiaries of its work; they are co-designers of it. The Council of Elders' involvement provides cultural legitimacy, intergenerational knowledge, and an accountability structure that external assessments cannot replicate.

What is needed

The community consultation generated a five-pillar Comprehensive Integrated Landslide Risk Reduction and Community Resilience recommendations addressing both immediate humanitarian consequences and the structural drivers of recurring disaster: Pillar 1: Scientific Research and Evidence Generation; Pillar 2: Ecosystem Restoration and Forest Governance; Pillar 3 : Sustainable Livelihoods and Land Use; Pillar 4: Community-Based Early Warning and Disaster Preparedness; and Pillar 5: Community-Led Engagement.request

Contents

1.0	Background and Introduction	1
	Engagement Methodology	2
2.0	Findings from the Sessions	2
2.1	Context and Historical Trends	2
2.2	Community Situation Before, During, and After Landslide	4
2.2.1	Before the Landslide: Conditions That Created Vulnerability	4
2.2.2	During the Landslide: Immediate Impacts	4
2.2.3	After the Landslide: Emerging and Persistent Consequences	5
2.3	Assessment of Previous Response Measures	6
2.3.1	Cultural and Ritual Responses (1961)	6
2.3.2	Government Taskforce (Post-2010–2019)	6
2.4	Drivers of Landslide Risks	7
2.4.1	Natural (Geophysical and Climatic) Drivers	7
2.4.2	Human-Induced Drivers	7
2.4.3	Gold Mining — An Under-Investigated Driver	8
2.4.4	Governance and Policy Failure — A Cross-Cutting Driver	8
2.5	Impact Analysis	10
2.5.1	Humanitarian Impact	10
2.5.2	Livelihood and Economic Impact	10
2.5.3	Social and Protection Concerns	10
2.5.3	Risk and Vulnerability Analysis	11
3.0	Community-Proposed Solutions and Recommendations	12
Pillar 1:	Scientific Research and Evidence Generation	14
Pillar 2:	Ecosystem Restoration and Forest Governance	14
Pillar 3:	Sustainable Livelihoods and Land Use	15
Pillar 4:	Community-Based Early Warning and Disaster Preparedness	15
Pillar 5:	Community-Led Engagement	16

1.0 Background and Introduction

Elgeyo Marakwet County is located at the North-Western part of Kenya. It covers a total area of 3,029.6 km² with a population of 454,480 persons (Census 2019). It extends from latitude 0° 20' to 1° 30' to the North and longitude 35° 0' to 35° 45' to the East. It borders West Pokot County to the North, Baringo County to the East, Trans Nzoia County to the Northwest and Uasin Gishu County to the West.

The county has an elongated shape wedged between the Uasin Gishu Plateau to the West and the Kerio River to the East. Three topographical zones define the county: Highland to the West, Kerio Valley to the East, and Escarpment, constituting 49%, 40%, and 11% of the total area respectively. The Highlands are densely populated due to their fertile soils and reliable rainfall.

The Escarpment and the Kerio Valley are classified as ASAL and are prone to drought during dry seasons and landslides and flash floods during rainy seasons. The county is divided into four administrative sub-counties: Keiyo South, Keiyo North, Marakwet West, and Marakwet East, with 20 administrative wards.

Agriculture; both crop and livestock farming, constitutes the primary livelihood for the majority of the county's population. Over 60 percent of residents depend on informal or subsistence-based economic activities, creating high vulnerability to the agricultural disruption caused by landslide events.

Climate change has significantly increased rainfall variability and the frequency of extreme weather events, further exacerbating landslide risks in already fragile ecosystems. At the local level, unsustainable agricultural practices and settlement patterns along steep slopes have accelerated environmental degradation, increasing community exposure and vulnerability to landslides.

In recent years, Elgeyo Marakwet County has experienced recurrent landslide incidents resulting in loss of lives, destruction of property, and disruption of livelihoods. The most recent event in Chesongoch, which claimed 39 lives, highlights the increasing severity and frequency of such disasters and underscores the urgent need for integrated and sustainable risk reduction interventions.

Evidence from both local and global studies indicates that landslides in the region are driven by a complex interaction of natural and human-induced factors. Key natural drivers include intense rainfall, steep terrain, and fragile soil structures. These are further compounded by environmental degradation, particularly deforestation and unsustainable land-use practices, which significantly reduce slope

stability. Over the past two decades, loss of forest cover along the escarpment has been closely associated with increased landslide occurrence, emphasizing the importance of ecosystem restoration in disaster risk reduction.

The findings of this assessment confirm that Elgeyo Marakwet County constitutes a high-risk, multi-hazard environment in which recurring disasters are driven as much by structural failures of governance, land management, and forest protection as by natural forces. Addressing these risks demands an integrated response implemented with and through the communities most exposed to harm, combining ecosystem restoration, climate-smart agriculture, community-based early warning systems, and strengthened land-use governance within a coherent, community-owned programme framework.

Engagement Methodology

The post-disaster community engagement was facilitated by Jenga Future Initiative in collaboration with the Marakwet Council of Elders, and engaged 56 participants across 4 wards. Participants included women, youth and community elders, ensuring representation across the population groups most affected by the disaster. Sessions used a participatory rapid assessment methodology combining structured timeline analysis, community mapping, and focus group discussions disaggregated randomly. All findings were validated by the Marakwet Council of Elders prior to finalization, a governance step that is standard in all Jenga Future programming and ensures cultural accuracy and community accountability.

The community engagement was convened to serve three objectives:

- To document firsthand observations and lived experiences before, during, and after the disaster;
- To review the historical record of landslide events and evaluate the adequacy of past responses;
- To capture local knowledge on root causes and mobilize community-generated solutions.

2.0 Findings from the Sessions

2.1 Context and Historical Trends

Elgeyo Marakwet County has a long history of landslide occurrences, largely influenced by its geophysical characteristics and socio-economic dynamics, particularly along the steep escarpments

bordering the Kerio Valley. Major landslide events have been recorded in 1961, 2010, 2012, 2019, 2020, and most recently in 2025.

The 2010 landslide in Endo Ward (Marakwet East Sub-County) and the 2012 incident in Kaptarakwa Ward (Keiyo South Sub-County) resulted in significant loss of lives, destruction of property, and damage to agricultural assets. These events were primarily concentrated along riverine areas and steep terrains.

In 2020, landslides were reported across Marakwet East, Keiyo North, and Keiyo South sub-counties following above-normal rainfall during the March–May long rains, as forecasted by the Kenya Meteorological Department. Affected areas included Kaben, Marich, Kipchumwa, Kapchelal, Anin, Siroch, Ngopisi, Kaporol, and Kasegut, among others.

On the night of 31 October 2025, a catastrophic landslide struck Chesongoch villages in Marakwet East Sub-County. The event; the most severe on record in the county, affected 151 households, resulted in 39 confirmed fatalities, with other persons missing. The timing of the event (nighttime) significantly reduced communities' capacity to evacuate in advance of the landslide, contributing to the high casualty rate. In addition to the loss of life, the disaster caused widespread destruction of residential structures, farmland, road infrastructure, and water systems. The scale of displacement, casualties, and infrastructure damage rendered this event qualitatively different from prior incidents, prompting the participatory post-disaster analysis documented in this report.

Escalating trend — urgent attention required

The historical record reveals a pattern of increasing frequency and severity that demands urgent attention. Landslide events recorded approximately once per decade in the 1960s occurred multiple times within single years by the 2020s. This acceleration is consistent with regional climate projections indicating increasing rainfall intensity and variability across the East African Rift Valley escarpment zones. Critically, the geographic spread of events has also expanded: while the 1961 event affected specific locations in Marakwet East, the 2020 event was reported across Marakwet East, Keiyo North, and Keiyo South simultaneously, and 2025 affected multiple sub-counties. Without integrated structural interventions, this trajectory of increasing frequency, severity, and geographic spread will continue.

2.2 Community Situation Before, During, and After Landslide

Community members identified different situations before, during, and after the landslide documenting triggers, early signals, and the cascading impacts of the disaster across livelihoods, environment, families, children, women, and persons with disability.

2.2.1 Before the Landslide: Conditions That Created Vulnerability

Community members described the years preceding the 2025 disaster as a period of relative livelihood stability increasingly undermined by observable but unaddressed environmental deterioration. Agricultural land remained productive, food security was adequate, and social infrastructure, schools, health facilities, churches, markets was accessible. However, the foundational ecosystems upon which this stability depended were eroding year by year. Forests were thinning, slopes were losing their vegetative cover, and unsustainable land use practices were visibly intensifying. These trends were known to the community. They were not known to or acted upon by responsible authorities.

Unheeded Warning — Critical Institutional Failure

Community members consistently identified the progressive reduction of forest cover across the escarpment as visible and widely known in the years preceding the 2025 disaster. Forest fires, illegal logging, and the expansion of agriculture onto steep-slope areas were reported as regular, recurring phenomena — not exceptional events. None of these environmental signals were systematically monitored, formally reported to responsible county or national authorities, or acted upon as landslide risk indicators. The absence of an environmental monitoring and early warning mechanism represents a critical institutional failure. Had such a system been operational, communities could have taken anticipatory action — including staged voluntary relocation, slope stabilization measures, and livestock movement — before the night of 31 October 2025.

2.2.2 During the Landslide: Immediate Impacts

During the landslide, community members noted that the event caused rapid, severe, and multidimensional harm. The nighttime timing of the disaster significantly reduced communities' capacity to evacuate, contributing directly to the high casualty rate.

Human Casualties and Social Disruption:

- Loss of human life and major injuries were noted in families as they lost loved ones; some survivors became disabled due to the landslide.
- Mass displacement of people from their homes and communities.

- Family separations and severe psychosocial trauma across all population groups.
- Persons with disability were particularly affected due to limited mobility and evacuation capacity.

Physical and Economic Losses:

- Widespread destruction of property, including housing and household assets.
- Roads became impassable, cutting off communities from emergency services, medical care, and markets.
- Mass land erosion destroyed water channels and disrupted water access.
- Crops and livestock were lost, eliminating food sources and household income.
- Significant trees were swept away, further degrading the forest ecosystem.
- Increased household expenditure at a time of zero income created acute financial distress.

Services and Humanitarian Access:

- Health services became inaccessible due to road destruction and facility damage.
- Schools were closed, disrupting children's education.
- Tension within and between communities arose as competition for scarce resources intensified.

2.2.3 After the Landslide: Emerging and Persistent Consequences

The aftermath of the disaster revealed compounding humanitarian, social, and ecological consequences that continue to evolve:

Humanitarian and Social Consequences:

- Survivors transitioned to living in displacement camps, losing the security of their homes and land.
- Psychological distress was widespread, with community members reporting depression, grief, and anxiety.
- A marked increase in the number of persons with disability was observed as a direct consequence of the disaster.
- High rates of teenage pregnancy were noted in the displacement context (see Protection Concerns section below).
- Medical services remained absent or severely constrained in the post-disaster period.

Livelihoods and Economic Recovery:

- Livelihoods remained disrupted, with no immediate recovery of agricultural productivity.
- Humanitarian partners arrived to provide initial support, but long-term recovery pathways were not established.

Environmental and Ecological Damage:

- Deep gullies were created by the landslide, altering the terrain and increasing future erosion risk.
- Forest cover was further reduced, and low rates of natural forest regeneration were observed.
- Damaged land presented significant challenges for future agricultural or livelihood use.

Critical observation

The community's accounts reveal that the disaster was not an isolated natural event. It was the culmination of years of environmental degradation, weak governance of natural resources, and the absence of a functioning early warning and risk reduction system. Recovery without addressing these structural drivers will only set the stage for the next disaster.

2.3 Assessment of Previous Response Measures

To better understand gaps in response, the community provided key response structures and approaches deployed since the onset of landslides in the area.

2.3.1 Cultural and Ritual Responses (1961)

Following the 1961 event, cultural cleansing rituals were conducted, and communities were temporarily relocated. However, the return of communities to the affected area and the continuation of the same land use practices indicate that these measures, while culturally significant, did not translate into durable risk reduction. No structural interventions to address environmental degradation or land management were implemented alongside the cultural response.

2.3.2 Government Taskforce (Post-2010–2019)

Following the 2010–2019 incidents, the Government of Kenya established a multi-agency taskforce to assess landslide risk in Elgeyo Marakwet County and develop mitigation recommendations. While

the taskforce was constituted and produced a recommendations report, community participants in this post-disaster analysis reported that the outcomes of that process remain largely unknown at the community level.

None of the community members consulted could confirm which recommendations had been implemented, at what scale, or with what resources, a fundamental accountability gap that needs to be followed through. The community's experience with the taskforce illustrates a recurring pattern in disaster risk management in the region: recommendations are generated but not tracked; implementation is partial and unmonitored; communities are not informed of outcomes; and the structural conditions that generated the disaster remain unaddressed. Unless this cycle is broken through transparent accountability mechanisms, participatory monitoring, and community feedback loops as proposed in Pillar 5 of this framework future interventions risk replicating the same outcome.

2.4 Drivers of Landslide Risks

Findings from the community engagements indicate that landslide risks are driven by a combination of natural and human-induced factors:

2.4.1 Natural (Geophysical and Climatic) Drivers

Community members identified steep and unstable slopes as a primary risk factor. The county's location along the Rift Valley escarpment, characterized by fragile and highly erodible soils, significantly increases susceptibility to landslides. In addition, increasing rainfall intensity and variability, linked to climate change, were highlighted as major triggering factors. Mild seismic tremors and geological faulting were also identified, suggesting underlying tectonic instability that amplifies surface-level risk.

2.4.2 Human-Induced Drivers

Human activities were identified as critical contributors to increased landslide risk. Deforestation and vegetation loss reduce soil cohesion and slope stability. Expansion of agricultural activities into high-risk zones and encroachment into forested escarpment areas were reported as major risk factors, driven by land pressure and population growth. Settlement in landslide-prone areas further increases exposure, while inadequate soil and water conservation practices, lack of terracing, drainage systems, and gabions contribute to soil erosion and instability.

2.4.3 Gold Mining — An Under-Investigated Driver

Gold mining activities were identified by community members as a significant but under-investigated driver of landslide risk in the Kerio Valley escarpment area. Mining operations including artisanal and small-scale mining can destabilize slopes through subsurface excavation, alter natural drainage patterns through surface disturbance, contribute to surface fracturing, and accelerate soil erosion. The cumulative geophysical impact of mining activity on slope stability in the escarpment has not been formally assessed. This represents a critical evidence gap: without a geological survey investigating the relationship between mining and slope stability, regulatory authorities lack the technical basis for enforcement action. Pillar 1 specifically recommends commissioning this survey as a first programme activity, with findings made available to relevant regulatory authorities including the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) and the county government.

2.4.4 Governance and Policy Failure — A Cross-Cutting Driver

A critical cross-cutting driver of landslide risk is the failure of governance systems to enforce existing legal frameworks regulating land use, forest protection, and extractive activities in high-risk zones. Kenya's Forest Conservation and Management Act (2016) prohibit illegal logging and provides for the establishment and support of Community Forest Associations. The Physical and Land Use Planning Act (2019) empowers county governments to regulate settlement patterns and land use in hazard-prone areas. The National Disaster Risk Management Policy (2020) mandates integration of DRR into county development planning. Community accounts and the evidence of recurrent, escalating disaster events confirm that these frameworks are insufficiently enforced in Elgeyo Marakwet County. The absence of effective enforcement is itself a driver of risk enabling continued deforestation, slope encroachment, and mining in the very areas identified as highest-risk. Pillar 2 of the recommendations addresses this governance gap directly.

Table 3: Causes of Landslide as Identified by Community Members

<i>Category</i>	<i>Root Cause(s) Identified by Community</i>
<i>Geological / Geophysical</i>	<i>Mild seismic tremors; geological faulting. These suggest underlying tectonic instability that amplifies surface-level risk factors.</i>
<i>Extractive / Industrial Activity</i>	<i>Gold mining activities. Mining can destabilize slopes, alter drainage patterns, and trigger subsidence or surface fracturing.</i>
<i>Agricultural Practices</i>	<i>Overgrazing and overstocking; unsustainable farming practices. These strip vegetation cover and compact soils, reducing infiltration capacity and increasing run-off.</i>
<i>Forestry and Logging</i>	<i>Illegal logging; lack of adequate plant diversity inside the forest. Logging removes root systems that bind soils, while monoculture or degraded forests offer less slope stabilization.</i>
<i>Governance Failures</i>	<i>Poor forest governance. Weak enforcement of forest protection laws enables destructive practices to persist.</i>
<i>Demographic Pressure</i>	<i>Population pressure. Increasing demand for land drives encroachment into forest reserves and steep slope areas.</i>

Risk convergence — key message

The drivers of landslide risk in Elgeyo Marakwet County do not operate in isolation, they form a self-reinforcing risk system. Deforestation reduces slope stability and increases surface runoff; population pressure drives agricultural encroachment onto deforested slopes; unsustainable agricultural practices accelerate soil erosion; erosion blocks drainage channels and increases flood risk; climate change intensifies rainfall events that trigger landslides across this degraded landscape. Gold mining and seismic activity compound the underlying geophysical instability. This convergence means that single-sector interventions will be insufficient: only the integrated, multi-pillar approach proposed in the recommendations can address the full risk system.

2.5 Impact Analysis

2.5.1 Humanitarian Impact

The landslides have resulted in significant humanitarian impacts across affected communities. There has been considerable loss of life and injuries, with vulnerable groups including women, children, older persons, and persons with disabilities disproportionately affected.

Of the 39 confirmed fatalities in the October 2025 event, community participants in this post-disaster analysis identified that approximately 85 percent were members of vulnerable population groups including women, children, elderly persons, and persons with disabilities. This disproportionate toll reflects the intersection of physical vulnerability, limited mobility in a nighttime evacuation; social vulnerability, care responsibilities that prevented rapid self-evacuation; and structural vulnerability; the documented pattern of marginalized households occupying the most exposed terrain. Addressing this pattern requires protection-sensitive programme design that places these groups at the centre of early warning, evacuation planning, shelter, and recovery support.

The disasters have also led to widespread displacement, with affected households seeking refuge in temporary shelters that are often inadequate. Critical infrastructure, including roads, schools, and water systems, has been damaged, disrupting access to essential services. As a result, affected populations have become increasingly reliant on humanitarian assistance.

2.5.2 Livelihood and Economic Impact

Landslides have had a severe impact on livelihoods and the local economy. The destruction of agricultural land and loss of livestock have significantly undermined food security and household income. Productive assets, including farming tools and storage facilities, have also been lost. Damage to road networks has reduced market access, limiting opportunities for income generation. Consequently, households have resorted to negative coping strategies, including reliance on wild foods and external assistance.

2.5.3 Social and Protection Concerns

Landslides have exacerbated social vulnerabilities and protection risks within affected communities. Displacement has increased exposure to risks, particularly for women, children, and persons with

disabilities. The disasters have contributed to increased cases of orphanhood, widowhood, and long-term disability due to injuries. Psychosocial distress and trauma were widely reported, linked to loss of lives, livelihoods, and homes. In addition, community cohesion has been weakened, with increased competition over limited resources leading to tensions and social strain.

2.5.3 Risk and Vulnerability Analysis

The assessment reveals a deeply interconnected vulnerability profile in which geographical, environmental, and socio-economic factors reinforce one another to heighten disaster risk. Settlements along steep escarpments and in landslide-prone areas, combined with fragile and highly erodible soils, create a baseline of physical exposure. This is further exacerbated by environmental degradation, including deforestation, loss of vegetation cover, and encroachment into water catchment areas, which weakens natural slope stabilization systems. Poor land management practices accelerate soil erosion and disrupt natural drainage patterns, meaning that even moderate climatic shocks can trigger severe disaster events. These conditions reflect high environmental sensitivity and diminished ecological resilience.

Socio-economic vulnerabilities compound this exposure by limiting the capacity of households to anticipate, absorb, and recover from shocks. The heavy reliance on rain-fed subsistence agriculture ties livelihoods directly to climate variability, while limited diversification reduces adaptive flexibility. Many households lack savings, insurance, or alternative income sources, increasing dependence on external assistance during crises. At the same time, population pressure and land scarcity are driving communities to settle and cultivate in high-risk areas, further increasing exposure. This creates a cycle in which environmental degradation and economic necessity reinforce each other, deepening vulnerability over time.

Institutional and information-related vulnerabilities further constrain effective risk reduction and response. Although Kenya has established legal and policy frameworks—such as the Forest Conservation and Management Act, the Physical and Land Use Planning Act, and the National Disaster Risk Management Policy—implementation and enforcement remain limited, particularly at the county level where capacity, technical support, and budget allocations are insufficient. Disaster risk reduction has not been fully mainstreamed into local development planning, creating systemic governance gaps. Additionally, weaknesses in early warning systems—including limited awareness,

delayed dissemination, low trust, and lack of early action mechanisms—mean that even when risk information exists, it does not consistently translate into timely or effective community response. Together, these institutional and informational constraints amplify existing vulnerabilities and hinder the transition from reactive to proactive disaster risk management.

3.0 Community-Proposed Solutions and Recommendations

The community proposed solutions demonstrating a cultured understanding of the multidimensional nature of the problem and the need for integrated action:

Table 7: Proposed Solutions from Community Members

<i>Proposed Solution</i>	<i>Analysis and Significance</i>	<i>Recommendation Pillar</i>
<i>Scientific / Geological Research</i>	<i>Prioritized by the community as the first step. Critical for understanding fault lines, mining impacts, and slope stability.</i>	<i>Pillar 1</i>
<i>Tree Planting and Afforestation</i>	<i>Directly addresses the loss of vegetative cover. Most effective when paired with forest governance and community ownership.</i>	<i>Pillar 2</i>
<i>Public Participation for Relocation to Safer Areas</i>	<i>Acknowledges the need for planned resettlement while centering community consent and participation. Avoids forced displacement.</i>	<i>Pillar 3 / Pillar 5</i>
<i>Fencing of the Forest</i>	<i>A practical boundary enforcement measure to reduce encroachment. Requires complementary governance structures to sustain.</i>	<i>Pillar 2</i>
<i>Strengthening Community Forest Associations (CFAs) via Clans and Communities</i>	<i>Leverages existing social structures and indigenous governance systems. Critical for sustainability and community ownership.</i>	<i>Pillar 2 / Pillar 5</i>
<i>Relocation and Compensation of</i>	<i>Addresses the rights and needs of indigenous communities who may be living in high-risk</i>	<i>Pillar 2 / Pillar 3</i>

<i>Proposed Solution</i>	<i>Analysis and Significance</i>	<i>Recommendation Pillar</i>
<i>Indigenous Forest Dwellers</i>	<i>forest areas. Requires sensitivity, legal framework and equitable compensation.</i>	
<i>Conservation of Wetlands and Riparian Areas</i>	<i>Protects natural water regulation systems that reduce flood and landslide risk.</i>	<i>Pillar 2</i>
<i>Clear Demarcation and Gazettement of Forest Areas</i>	<i>Legal and physical demarcation provides a formal basis for enforcement and community accountability.</i>	<i>Pillar 2</i>
<i>Government Strengthening of Forest Governance</i>	<i>Calls for institutional accountability. The state must fulfil its mandate alongside community efforts.</i>	<i>Pillar 2 / Pillar 5</i>
<i>Taskforce to Redefine the Fate of Forest Dwellers</i>	<i>A specific call for policy resolution on the status of people living in or near the forest, including indigenous communities.</i>	<i>Pillar 2</i>
<i>Review of Spencer Lines</i>	<i>A localized administrative/boundary concern requiring technical and legal review relating to land demarcation and tenure.</i>	<i>Pillar 2</i>

Indigenous rights and free, prior and informed consent (fpic)

The community's call for a Taskforce to Redefine the Fate of Forest Dwellers reflects a recognized tension between forest conservation objectives and the rights of communities potentially including indigenous communities who have historically occupied the Cherangany Hills and escarpment forest areas. Any resettlement, relocation, or compensation process must comply with Kenya's constitutional land rights protections and the principle of Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) as recognized in Kenya's Constitution and international frameworks to which Kenya is a signatory. Jenga Future commits to a rights-based approach in all activities under Pillar 2, with the Marakwet Council of Elders playing a central oversight role in any process affecting the rights or tenure status of forest-adjacent communities.

Pillar 1: Scientific Research and Evidence Generation

Objective: Establish a robust scientific understanding of the geological, hydrological, and ecological drivers of landslide risk in the region.

Key Interventions:

- Commission a comprehensive geological and geophysical survey to map fault lines, slope stability zones, and seismic risk — including investigation of gold mining impacts on slope stability and underground water systems.
- Conduct hydrological studies to assess the impact of deforestation and land use change on drainage and flood risk.
- Develop a Risk Zonation Map identifying high, medium, and low risk areas for human settlement, agriculture, and forest use.
- Establish a long-term environmental monitoring programme with community-based data collection components.

Pillar 2: Ecosystem Restoration and Forest Governance

Objective: Restore degraded forest ecosystems and establish a robust, inclusive, and accountable governance framework for forest management.

Key Interventions:

- Implement large-scale afforestation and reforestation using native species, with a focus on riparian areas and steep slopes — building on Jenga Future's 2 established community nurseries and 10,000+ seedlings already distributed.
- Undertake formal gazettement and demarcation of forest boundaries in collaboration with county government.
- Operationalize and resource Community Forest Associations (CFAs) aligned with clan and community governance structures.
- Establish a legal framework for compensation and voluntary resettlement of indigenous forest dwellers, consistent with FPIC principles.
- Protect and restore wetlands and riparian corridors as natural buffers against flooding and landslides.

- Conduct a review of Spencer Lines to resolve land tenure ambiguities and establish clear governance boundaries.

Pillar 3: Sustainable Livelihoods and Land Use

Objective: Transition communities from destructive to sustainable land use practices while restoring and diversifying livelihoods.

Key Interventions:

- Provide technical training and incentives for climate-smart, sustainable agriculture that reduces erosion — expanding Jenga Future's existing Roots for Resilience agroforestry model.
- Support livestock management reforms, including stocking rate regulation and rotational grazing.
- Develop alternative livelihoods (apiculture, eco-tourism, non-timber forest products) for communities displaced from unsustainable activities.
- Establish community savings and loan groups to rebuild financial resilience post-disaster.
- Facilitate equitable and transparent compensation and voluntary resettlement for high-risk communities, prioritizing community participation and informed consent.

Pillar 4: Community-Based Early Warning and Disaster Preparedness

Objective: Build community capacity to detect, communicate, and respond to early landslide signals before catastrophic events occur.

Key Interventions:

- Establish a community-based early warning system aligned with traditional early warning systems, incorporating rainfall gauges, slope monitoring indicators, and community observer networks.
- Develop and disseminate culturally appropriate early warning protocols, including evacuation routes and assembly points.
- Train and develop community disaster response teams including Community Disaster Risk Reduction and Community Based Disaster Response Teams, with representation from women, youth, and persons with disability.

- Revise and operationalize the existing Taskforce, incorporating new scientific findings and broadening community representation.

Pillar 5: Community-Led Engagement

Objective: Contextualize and operationalize proposed solutions through community-led engagements, ensuring they translate into practical, locally appropriate actions for disaster risk reduction and resilience building.

Key Interventions:

- Validate proposed solutions with communities and local leadership ensuring they are relevant, acceptable, and aligned with local realities.
- Adapt and refine solutions into context-specific actions that respond to the unique environmental, social, and livelihood conditions of each affected area.
- Identify practical implementation pathways including roles, responsibilities, and resources required at community and stakeholder levels.
- Integrate local knowledge, indigenous practices, and lived experiences into the design and application of proposed solutions.
- Build community ownership and consensus around implementation priorities to enhance sustainability, accountability, and long-term resilience.

— *End of Report* —

Jenga Future Initiative | www.jengafuture.org | info@jengafuture.org

Table 1: Community Engagement, Group discussions

APPENDIX

