



ACC DAR Adapting to Climate Change in Coastal Dar es Salaam

**First International Workshop on
SUB-SAHARAN CITIES UNDER CLIMATE CHANGE
Dar es Salaam, 6-8 June 2012**

Concluding remarks on the first session Suggested questions for working groups

June 7, 2012



SAPIENZA
UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA



Silvia MACCHI

Sapienza University of Rome, Italy

Dept. of Civil, Building and Environmental Engineering

silvia.macchi@uniroma1.it

Clarification on the administration of questionnaires (household)

HH questionnaire:

It has been administered face to face by a team of interviewers who went house by house and selected 1 house out of 20 in order to have a 5% sample

Rate of response:

The target was to get 6000 HH interviewed. If a HH was not willing to respond, another one was selected. 150 out of 6000 were eliminated because incomplete or inconsistent

Clarification on the administration of questionnaires (local institutions)

Method:

It has been administered face to face by a team of interviewers to a sample of DCC and municipal personnel selected as follows: the head and 2 staff for each department. Unfortunately it was not possible to implement such a rule for all department.

Position of interviewees:

A wide range of positions was considered in order to have an extensive overview of personnel's concern of CC and awareness of the role that local institutions should play in adaptation.

Later on, a second questionnaire (3.1) was administered to heads of unit. The analysis of their responses is expected to provide information on the actual situation in competences owned and initiatives undertaken by local institutions with regard to CC adaptation.



Clarifications on administered questionnaires (both)

CC vs environmental change:

interviewees were asked to refer about changes they observed in environmental conditions – especially environmental stresses - and whether they attribute those changes to CC and/or other causes

CC vs Climate variability:

We focus on environmental stresses related both to climate change and variability (independently on their causes, which could be natural or human).

Time period for the observed changes:

“the last year” as for household

“the last years” as for institution



Clarifications on administered questionnaires (household)

Coastal plain boundaries:

the project team still has not reached a final decision on which criteria should be used to define the “coastal plain” in the frame of ACC DAR project. When that decision will be made, analysis of data from HH survey will be revised.

Spatial analysis of data:

Spatial analysis of HH responses is already planned. It will include information on environmental and physical assets (water bodies, infrastructures, settlements patterns, ...) that are being addressed in WP2. Decision on coastal plain boundaries will feed on it.

Clarifications on administered questionnaires (household)

Taxes versus Rent:

We were asking about taxes or fees rather than rent because we were addressing the amount of money paid to the government

Proportion in Adaptation profiles:

Exact proportion have not been calculated.

Approximately, we could say that they are half and half.

As for future strategies, the proportion of HH indicating flexible strategies are slightly more than those indicated resistance strategies

Opinions vs Matter of fact

Both HH and DCC questionnaires provide an overview of interviewees' opinions. This should be more clearly stated in the working papers and should inform the analysis as well as conclusive remarks and recommendations.

Yesterday it was suggested to compare those collected opinions with matter of fact. We discussed this issue among us and we came to the conclusion that such a comparison will not add value to the work we did.

Indeed, what seems crucial is never to forget that our “data” consist of “opinions”. The fact that those opinions might more or less diverge from “observable facts” do not make them less valuable as a kind of information we should consider in the process towards the design of adaptation initiatives to be undertaken by the local institutions



Observable facts

Besides the opinions collected through the 2 questionnaire surveys and the participatory theatre workshops (WP1), other kinds of investigation are being conducted under WP2.

Seawater intrusion in coastal watershed has been selected as the environmental change susceptible to accelerate under CC on which we will focus. A 100 boreholes monitoring campaign has just started while trends in urban sprawl have been assessed through remote sensing and GIS.

Findings from both WP1 and WP2 will feed into the capacity building programme and the conclusive design exercise planned for the 3rd year (WP3).

Remarks on HH survey

Perception of change / willingness to change:

The influence of factors (cultural, social, economic) different from “objectively observable changes” should be considered to better understand the reasons behind people’s change perception.

The same applies to the willingness to change.

Considering other factors that shape perception of and willingness to change will help in broadening the range of options for action (from supporting what seems to be people’s aspirations to widening their choice perspective by improving their capability set)

Remarks on HH survey

Perception of change on soil fertility:

Even if people are not directly involved in agriculture, it seems that they are aware of changes in soil fertility.

In fact, most of PU dwellers have “double life” and at least they know a neighbour or a relative involved in agriculture related activities.

Remarks on HH survey

HH vs collective behaviours:

HH survey only provides information on HH concerns, practices and aspirations. The role of social relationships in shaping them is supposed to be explored through the Participatory Theatre.

Quantitative vs qualitative analysis:

It was strongly suggested to undertake case studies. It will be done in the next months, after having identified the 3 or 4 neighbourhoods where the design exercise will be performed in the 3rd year

Working group session

2 working groups discussing both working papers

4 driving questions:

- I. What is missing in the methodology for the assessment of people's capacity to adapt to environmental changes and local institutions' capacity to support them?
- II. What needs to be strengthened or qualified?
- III. How should this methodology be modified in order to be utilized in other geographical context - e.g. sub-Saharan cities, peri-urban areas, etc.?
- IV. What could be used from these working papers for developing policies in other sectors than CC adaptation?

