RETHINKING THE CITY IN A MULTI-HAZARD RESILIENCE CONTEXT

NAME: MARK KUYO OJAL SUPERVISOR: PROF. MARK PELLING & PROF. CASSIDY JONHSON **INSTITUTE OF RISK AND DISASTER REDUCTION**

Institutional-Actor Relationships: Influences on inclusive disaster risk management in Urban Poor Settlements

The Challenge: More than 1 billion people in low-lying settlements face hazards such as sea level rise, subsiding coasts or flooding at high tides (IPCC, 2022). 350 million urban dwellers live with the threat of water scarcity at 1.5 C° & 410.7 million at 2° C (IPCC, 2022). An additional 2.5 billion people are expected to live in cities by 2050 (IPCC, 2022), approx. 1 billion in Africa (UNDESA, 2019). In Africa, urban growth is mainly in small cities and towns < 500,000 people (Pieterse & Parnell, 2014; Güneralp, et al., 2017).



The Opportunity: 60 percent of the urban footprint that will exist in 2030 still does not exist, and **75 percent** of the infrastructure that will exist then is yet to be built (SCBD, 2012; Muller, 2013; Seto, et al., 2012). Moreover, urbanisation offers a time-limited opportunity for widespread transformational adaptation & climate resilient development (IPCC, 2022), effectively addressing both development and risk issues (Pelling, 2019). However, in Sub-Saharan Africa, this opportunity window is constrained by limited knowledge; financial and institutional incapacities; weak governance at the city level to plan for and manage rapid urban growth and disaster risks (Leck et al., 2018; Satterthwaite, 2017; GFDRR, 2010; Turok, 2014; Barofsky et al, 2016; Fraser et al, 2017), and multilevel capture of city visioning.

Aim¹ To understand how relationships between institutions and actors in urban development influence inclusive disaster risk management in urban poor settlements.

Intellectual Puzzle

This study addresses is a processual puzzle, illuminating the processes of urban change, especially the ways in which urban development decision-making is negotiated, how institutions change, interact with organisations, agency and other institutions, the ways in which they contribute to risks, and how these become new inputs.



Demolition of urban poor settlements along Nairobi Rivers amid Floods in April-May 2024. Image © anfoz.com

Empirical context

The study site is Nairobi. Originally a swamp, Nairobi is the capital and the largest city in Kenya. The city has a population of 4.39 million (KNBS, 2019) and a growth rate of 4.1% per annum (UN DESA, 2016). 60% of residents live in urban poor settlements located in flood-prone areas. Persistent water scarcity and recurrent floods are a constant reminder of the origins of the city, its modernization journey, laisses fair attitude to urban development planning & decision-making, blindness to disaster risks posed by geographical setting, and continued lack of foresight

Research Questions

Central Q: How does decision-making in urban development influence inclusive disaster risk management in urban poor settlements?

Supporting Questions:

- 1. Who has the power to set the urban development policy agenda in Nairobi?
- 2. How are pro-poor urban development decision-making and implementation spaces in Nairobi produced?
- 3. What transformative practices were brought into pro-poor urban upgrading in Nairobi between 2015 to 2022?

Conceptual framework

Institutional bricolage



Inspired by De Koning, 2011

Methodology

Data collection: Document analysis & in-depth, semi-structured interviews.

Covered reports, plans, guidelines, and legislations policies on urban development, climate change, and disaster risk management at the global, national and city levels. There were 44 interviews with 46 national and city level policy actors, and community actors.

Data analysis: Text and thematic analyses.

NVIVO and manual qualitative data analysis were applied in coding, drawing patterns, and relating themes.

Preliminary findings

Widespread reliance on project-based forms of organising influences and co-constitutes the current visioning of pro-poor urban development in Nairobi.

This results into varying levels of vulnerabilities, exposure and capacity for risk reduction.

- The urban development decision-making and implementation space in the city is riddled with multi-level capture by powerful bricoleurs, constraining <u>agency of community and city-level policy actors to shape their urban futures</u>, define acceptable risk, and deciding on adaptation actions.
- Decision-making and action 'bubbles' compound distrust and are redefining relationships between national and city-level actors.
- Top-down politics enables transformation. However, transformative institutional processes and physical transformation do not align well, inhibiting largescale change.

	1. Dodman, D., Leck, H., Rusca, M. & Colenbrander, S., 2017. African Urbanisation and Urbanism: Implications for risk accumulation and reduction. International Journal Disaster Risk	https://www.urbanark.org/sites/default/files/resources/UrbanArk_briefing_24_web%5B1%5D.pdf [Accessed 23 October 2020].
Notahla	Reduction, Volume 26, pp. 7-15.	5. Seto, K. C., Güneralp, B. & Hutyra, L. R., 2012. Global forecasts of urban expansion to 2030 and direct impacts on biodiversity and carbon pools. Sustainability Science, 109(40), p.
notable	2. IPCC, 2022. Summary for Policymakers. In: H. Pörtner, et al. eds. Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth	16083–16088.
Citationau	Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.	6. Tomorrow's Cities, 2019. Our mission is to reduce disaster risk for the poor in tomorrow's cities. [Online] Available at: https://www.tomorrowscities.org/vision [Accessed 1 April 2020].
Citations:	3. Muller, S., 2013. The next Generation of Infrastructure. Scenario Journal, Issue 3: Rethinking Infrastructure.	7. UN-Habitat, 2020. World Cities Report 2020, Nairobi: UN-Habitat.
	4. Pelling, M., 2019. Reducing future risk in the city: An agenda for integrated risk management. [Online] Available at:	8. De Koning, J., 2011. Reshaping institutions: bricolage processes in small holder forestry in the amazon, Wagenigen university.