

**TITLE**

**Integrated Flood Risk Management in Slums - Applying 1D Modelling in Kibera, Nairobi**

**Authors**

Joe Mulligan CEng MICE ACGI LEED AP BD+C

Associate Director, Kounkuey Design Initiative ([www.kounkuey.org](http://www.kounkuey.org))

Industrial PhD Student, KTH Royal Institute of Technology

Nilani Venn MSci MSc C.WEM CEnv MCIWEM

Senior Engineer, Cities - Water, BuroHappold Engineering ([www.burohappold.com](http://www.burohappold.com))

Rodoula Gregoriou MEng

Engineer, Cities - Water, BuroHappold Engineering

Duncan Ker-Reid MEng CEng MICE ACGI

Associate, Cities - Water, BuroHappold Engineering

Alan Travers CEng, BSc, MICE, MCIWEM

Partner, BuroHappold Engineering

**Contact details**

[joe@kounkuey.org](mailto:joe@kounkuey.org)

+46 (0)73 073 2109

[www.kounkuey.org](http://www.kounkuey.org)

## **ABSTRACT**

In cities in the developing world, rapid urbanization and climate change are combining to dramatically increase exposure to flood risk among the poorest and most vulnerable. Half of Nairobi's three million residents live in informal areas, which are consistently located on the city's major watercourses. Kibera, Nairobi's largest slum, located on the Ngong River, is subject to significant flood risk with over 50% of residents reporting their houses flooded in the 2015 'long-rains'.

In 2015-2016 Kounkuey Design Initiative and BuroHappold Engineering delivered an action-research program to model the fluvial flood risk in Kibera, integrating 1D hydraulic modelling with resident-collected data. In a 'first-of-its-kind' experiment in this context the outputs were applied in the development of flood risk awareness exercises and built projects in the settlement. This paper discusses the rationale and process of developing the model; the collection of field data in challenging environments, model validation using community collected data and application at various scales of project design. Recommendations are made for the application of this type of tool in other urban-informal contexts, integration with existing city infrastructure planning and the potential for knowledge transfer using accessible modelling software.

## **Abbreviations**

DRM - Disaster Risk Management  
DTM - Digital Terrain Model  
FRM - Flood Risk Management  
GIS – Geographic Information System  
KMD - Kenya Meteorological Department  
KDI – Kounkuey Design Initiative  
NRBP – Nairobi River Basin Project  
NCC – Nairobi City County  
ODK - Open Data Kit

## **Keywords**

Developing Countries, Design methods & aids, Floods & floodworks, Hydraulics & hydrodynamics, Risk & probability analysis, River engineering, Sustainability

1 **1. Introduction**

2 Floods are the most frequent of all natural disasters (Jha et al, 2012). In cities in the developing  
3 world, rapid urbanization and climate change are combining to dramatically increase exposure to  
4 flood risk among the poorest and most vulnerable (ibid).

5 The informal settlements of Nairobi are consistently located on the city's major watercourses  
6 (Karisa, 2010). Kibera, Nairobi's largest informal settlement, is subject to significant flood risk due  
7 to poor drainage and its location adjacent to the Ngong River, with over 50% of residents (from a  
8 963 household panel survey) reporting their houses flooded in the 2015 March-April-May so-  
9 called 'long- rains' (Mulligan et al, 2016). The issue was brought to the attention of a broad cross-  
10 section of Nairobi residents during the same period when a severe rainfall event (116mm  
11 recorded in 24 hours (KMD, 2015) affected the whole of the city.

12 Flood risk management capacity in Kenya is evolving and has historically focused on rural areas.  
13 Limited government data, access and interface with informal urban areas makes flood awareness,  
14 preparedness and planning processes difficult, while regulatory and political constraints limit  
15 larger infrastructural interventions. At the same time, the Kenya Flood Mitigation Strategy  
16 (MOWI, 2009) looks to introduce Integrated Flood Management. At the County level local  
17 authorities are seeking to address this issue, which is at the top of the agenda for many residents  
18 in both formal and informal parts of the city.

19 In order to investigate some of these challenges in the informal context the Nairobi-based non-  
20 governmental organisation Kounkuey Design Initiative (KDI) and UK-based BuroHappold  
21 Engineering delivered an action-research program in 2015-2016 to model fluvial flood risk in  
22 Kibera and to integrate the hydraulic modelling with resident-collected data on vulnerability and  
23 risk. The outputs of the modelling process were applied in the development of flood risk  
24 awareness exercises as well as built projects in the settlement in 2016. The model was handed  
25 over to KDI in early 2017.

26 This paper discusses the specific challenges in Kibera and other informal areas within the Kenyan  
27 and international policy context. It then goes on to describe the rationale and process of developing  
28 the model; the collection of field data in Kibera; model validation using community collected data  
29 and its application at various scales of project design. Graphic outputs from the modelling process  
30 are presented. Finally, recommendations are made for the application of this type of tool in other  
31 urban-informal contexts, integration with existing city infrastructure planning and the potential for  
32 knowledge transfer using accessible modelling software.

33 Data sources for this study include:

34 1) a 963 survey of households in high-exposure areas in Kibera delivered by KDI pre- and post the  
35 long-rains by KDI between March and June 2015;

36 2) thirteen Key Respondent Interviews undertaken between June 2015 and May 2016 by KDI with  
37 representatives from different institutions whose work relates to FRM and DRM (results at KDI,  
38 2017);

39 3) BuroHappold project documentation from the delivery of the hydraulic model.

40

41 **2. Urban Flood Risk Management in Kenya**

42 The FRM policy context is evolving as national governance structure changes and as international  
43 practice influences policy. As in many other countries the trans-boundary and trans-ministry nature  
44 of flood management is a challenge - one government respondent noted: 'At the moment FRM is  
45 a cross cutting issue, and when it is everyone's business it is no-one's business'.

46 The most recent Kenya Flood Mitigation Strategy (MOWI, 2009) is based on the concept of  
47 Integrated Flood Management. While there has been some success in integrated projects in the  
48 rural areas (for example in the Western Kenya Community Driven Development and Flood  
49 Mitigation Project in Budalangi) there is limited evidence of the use of integrated flood  
50 management in urban contexts in Kenya. Cities such as Nairobi with large numbers of residents  
51 living in riparian zones present particular challenges. There are a number of policies in place to  
52 address rivers and riparian zone conservation, namely: The Water Act Cap 372 (2002), The Physical  
53 Planning Act CAP 286 (1996), and the Survey Act 299 (2009). These acts prescribe the dimensions  
54 distance from river's edge of riparian buffer zones and the activities that are excluded. According  
55 to The Water Act Cap 372 (2002) - which is most applicable - the riparian reserve has a range of 6-  
56 30 metres within which all structures are deemed illegal.

57  
58 Although these laws exist, they do not by themselves address the specific conditions of urban  
59 riparian zones. In addition, there have been areas of overlap of mandatory roles that have resulted  
60 in duplication of, and sometimes conflicting, activities across institutions (Karisa, 2010). In the  
61 worst cases, the riparian zone policy created tensions between residents and implementing  
62 agencies, it resulted in significant protest and proved unenforceable (AIP, 2009). Many  
63 policymakers and practitioners have recommended that governments look for ways to work more  
64 closely with communities, in recognition of the fact that historical "top-down" approaches have  
65 failed. A number of respondents identified the need for a more nuanced understanding of flood  
66 extents and housing patterns to allow for responsive and cost-effective plans for adaptation  
67 interventions and re-housing where necessary.

## 68 69 **2.1 Flooding in Nairobi**

70  
71 Until 12<sup>th</sup> May 2015, when the city of Nairobi was brought to a near standstill by a 24 hour rainfall  
72 event, flooding in Kenya had been perceived as a predominantly rural problem. The May 2015  
73 event highlighted the impacts of climate change and rapid urbanisation and elevated urban flood  
74 risk as a significant issue in the public consciousness in cities like Mombasa and Nairobi. In urban  
75 environments such as these, where population densities are higher, the economic costs and  
76 infrastructure losses resulting from flooding are also higher (Jha et al, 2012). As noted by  
77 respondents impunity has also affected flooding as residents from every socio-economic bracket  
78 encroach into riparian zones in the Nairobi River Basin.

79 These issues are expected to get worse. By 2025 Nairobi's urban population is projected to double  
80 (KNBS, 2008), with the majority of the new arrivals expected to be housed in informal settlements.  
81 This will increase riparian encroachment and further reduce pervious surfaces throughout the city,  
82 increasing surface runoff. Climate change scenarios point to an increase in mean precipitation rates  
83 and intensity of high rainfall events in East Africa (Shongwe et al, 2011; Cook and Vizy, 2013).  
84 Nairobi experienced record rainfall and flooding in 2015 and 2016.

85  
86 Although challenges and missed opportunities exist in Nairobi, there is a growing level of interest  
87 and engagement in the issues of flooding, climate and appropriate policy responses. This is clear  
88 from recent initiatives such as the Nairobi River Basin Program, the Urban Rivers Rehabilitation  
89 Programme and the Taskforce for the Rehabilitation of the Nairobi Dam as well as the evolving  
90 Stormwater Masterplan and the Nairobi 2030 plan. The severe flooding of May 2015 and the recent

91 El Niño period have sharpened governmental mobilisation and the recent devolution of power to  
92 the county level puts Nairobi in a favourable position to drive collaboration across relevant  
93 departments. As one of the "100 Resilient Cities" (100RC, 2017) the city has signalled an intent to  
94 work on these cross-cutting issues.

## 95 **2.2 Flooding in Kibera**

96 Kibera, the most populous informal settlement in Nairobi, covers 225 hectares adjacent to the  
97 Ngong River and its tributaries and has a population of approximately 300,000 (UN-Habitat, 2006).  
98 The Ngong River is one of three major river systems in the Nairobi River Basin, with an upstream  
99 catchment of 4,500 hectares. Immediately downstream of Kibera lies the Nairobi Dam and 5km  
100 further is Nairobi's Central Business District. Organic pollution levels driven by the unchecked  
101 disposal of solid and human waste from the settlement can be at the level of raw sewage (NRBP,  
102 2008). The residents of Kibera face many challenges including high levels of economic poverty, high  
103 rates of crime and unemployment, and insufficient water and sanitation infrastructure.

104 The authors' estimate that over 22,000 people live within 30m of the Ngong River in Kibera (based  
105 on extraction of compound areas from January 2015 LiDAR and average household numbers from  
106 the 2015 survey). Every year, residents in Kibera face the risk of flooding, which causes death,  
107 disease and destruction of property. 6% of residents were forced to relocate due to flooding in the  
108 2015 March-April-May 'long-rains'. Rents are cheaper along rivers and streams where flood risk is  
109 higher, attracting the poorest and most vulnerable residents who are willing to risk their lives and  
110 assets to stay in the city. While flooding is one specific climate-related risk in Kibera it also ties to a  
111 much broader set of vulnerability issues (waterborne disease, public health, livelihoods, urban  
112 fragility). For a recent review of flood impacts and local adaptation measures in Kibera see Mulligan  
113 et al (2016).

114

## 115 **3. Rationale for "Building Urban Flood Resilience" Study and Modelling Process**

### 116 **3.1 Study Objectives and Components**

117 The challenges introduced in Section 2 were at the basis of a two-year action-research study in  
118 2015 and 2016 developed by a team, consisting of KDI and BuroHappold Engineering and  
119 supported by the Swiss RE Foundation entitled "Building Urban Flood Resilience: Integrating  
120 Community Perspectives".

121 Kibera was selected as an example of a large informal area facing significant flood and drainage  
122 challenges consistent with other settlements in Nairobi as well as in other cities. The study sought  
123 to address the following overarching needs (KDI, 2015):

124 1) The need to develop an approach to flood modelling and risk-mapping that is  
125 applicable in the informal context and integrates community-level information on  
126 multiple hazards and risks;

127 2) The need to demonstrate the validity of a broader menu of flood risk management  
128 options that focus on building social cohesion and resilience, alongside appropriate  
129 infrastructural and policy measures;

130 3) The need to identify and implement social resilience projects (e.g. early warning  
131 systems, flood management committees, emergency response centres) that demonstrate  
132 the low-cost, high-benefit value of these approaches;

133 4) The need to build the capacity of institutional stakeholders to undertake integrated  
134 flood risk management and implement flood management options in a consultative and  
135 collaborative fashion that incorporates conflict-sensitivity and the social dimensions of  
136 resilience.

137 The development of a hydraulic model for the Ngong River was seen as a key step towards  
138 developing an integrated approach to flood risk management in the Ngong catchment and was a  
139 fundamental task in the overall study. A conceptual framework for how the hydraulic model fits  
140 into the wider study to address some of the core issues is given in *Figure 1*. The model relates the  
141 challenges identified and the proposed solution to “the 5 characteristics of integrated flood risk  
142 management” as described in Samuels et al. (2010). The process of developing the hydraulic  
143 model is described in more detail in the remainder of this paper.

#### 144 **4. Hydraulic Modelling Process**

##### 145 **4.1 Objectives** 146

147 One of the key objectives of the modelling process was to develop a ‘live’ model (tool) that could  
148 be utilised immediately, but updated as more information became available. The model is not  
149 intended to be a flood forecasting tool, but used for design and planning purposes. It was  
150 important to create a modelling tool that produced outputs easily understood and interpreted by  
151 the local community. This would help inform design projects proposed in the area.

152 Therefore, at an early stage, the team defined that the strategy for the analysis should be based  
153 on an open-source and free-to-use basis. Whilst this would reduce the impact of software costs  
154 on the project budget, it was also considered that open-source and free-to-use software would  
155 maximise the potential for adoption of the approach by potential institutional partners on the  
156 project and in future initiatives.

##### 157 **4.2 The Flood Modelling Process**

158 Mapping and analysis of catchment data was carried out using Quantum GIS software and the  
159 model build was carried out using 1D Flood Modeller, which is free-to-use for models with fewer  
160 than 250 computational nodes. The geographic flood model extents was defined as the Kibera  
161 settlement and surrounding neighbourhoods (2,100 ha). The total upstream catchment draining  
162 to the Nairobi dam is 4,500 hectares and upstream of Kibera consists mainly of undeveloped  
163 forested areas (the Ngong Forest). Hydraulic modelling best practice used in the UK formed the  
164 benchmark in building the model. The process of the model build is shown in *Figure 2*.

165 A number of context-specific challenges to developing and applying the model in the local  
166 context and are described as follows:

- 167 - *Historical rainfall and future climate change*
  - 168 ● Within Nairobi and Kenya in general, there is little, if any, rainfall, flow and water  
169 level data available. This makes estimating flood flows very challenging. The most  
170 relevant and robust information found has been Intensity-Duration-Frequency  
171 curves developed by the Kenyan Ministry of Water Development (*Rainfall  
172 Frequency Atlas for Kenya, 1978*), for 48 stations within Kenya. The curves  
173 provide estimated rainfall depths for durations from 10 minutes to 24 hours and  
174 return periods up to 100 years. The Rainfall Frequency Atlas for Kenya data was  
175 compared with rainfall data from other sources and papers to assess its

176 suitability.

177 ● It is anticipated that climate change will result to a wetter climate with higher

178 intensity events in East Africa (Shongwe et al., 2011) and increased extreme wet

179 days (Cook and Vizy, 2013). Based on a review of the available literature,

180 potential climate change impacts were represented as a 25 % increase of rainfall

181 depths, resulting in higher flows, flood depths and larger flood extents.

182

183 - *Establishing representative flood flow routes*

184 ● *Acquisition of LiDAR elevation data* – freely available 30m resolution satellite

185 elevation data (ASTER GDEM) was used for the upstream catchment areas. For

186 the Kibera settlement and surrounding area a 5m resolution DTM extracted from

187 LiDAR data was procured to ensure that the flood model represented the flow

188 routes as accurately as possible. The resolution was based on a compromise

189 between data quality/accuracy and cost funded by the project.

190 ● *Acquisition of aerial photography* – to help identify how flood flow routes may be

191 altered by structures such as culverts and roads, high-resolution photography

192 from 2015 was used. This also aided the process of delineating and verifying the

193 catchment watershed boundaries.

194

195 - *Appropriate representation of hydraulic structures*

196 ● KDI field staff surveyed 64 key hydraulic structures and obstructions along the

197 main watercourses of Kibera and classified, dimensioned, photographed and geo-

198 referenced using handheld Android devices and the Open Data Kit application.

199 This enabled rapid and accurate recording of location and dimensions of

200 structures.

201

202 - *Appropriate representation of watercourse channel profiles*

203 ● KDI field staff together with volunteers from Engineers Without Borders UK

204 surveyed river cross-sections using an engineering level at five site locations

205 through the 2015 ‘long-rain’ season. The sites were chosen based on relevance

206 for information to the model, ease of access and safety.

207

208 - *Verification against historical flood information and community data*

209 ● In May 2016 KDI ran workshops with residents in the Andolo area (a high-

210 exposure area) where participants were given aerial maps to identify specific

211 common areas and locations and subsequently the extents of historical events.

212 These were overlaid with the flood extents generated from the model to verify

213 the accuracy/overlap of the model and local information, and to raise awareness

214 of flood-risk in the area (see **Figure 3**).

215

216 - *Model calibration*

217 ● Local community operatives were trained by KDI staff to record water level

218 measurements at the cross section locations, during and after the 2015 ‘long-

219 rain’ events. The cross-sectional surveys and river level measurements were

220 subsequently used to calibrate the flood-model and also check that the

221 topography of the river that’s being generated from the remote sensing data is

222 consistent with what is being measured at a finer level of detail on the ground.

223 ● Storm drainage network information and potential surface water flood flow

224 routes were not included in the model. However, surface water flooding is a  
225 known issue and therefore this limitation had to be clearly communicated to  
226 stakeholders when presenting the results, as a caveat in the flood extents  
227 mapping for consideration in any detailed planning, and in any community  
228 awareness programs.

229 The outputs of the model are discussed in the following section.

## 230 **5. Outputs, Application and Hand Over**

### 231 **5.1 Model Outputs - Flood Depths and Extents**

232 The 1D Flood Modeller software simulates the several input storm scenarios and produces  
233 outputs at all cross section locations. The model calculates the flood flow, stage (level of water),  
234 and velocity at the centre of the channel for each cross-section and interpolates between the  
235 sections, approximately every 100m. The stage information was used in conjunction with the  
236 LiDAR topographic surface to estimate flood depths and create flood depth and flood extent  
237 maps, as shown in **Figure 4**.

238 The 'live' nature of the model enables constant refinement and calibration to represent localities  
239 more accurately, as more data becomes available. Model interrogation and refinement can be  
240 carried out in locations of interest as was performed in the Pilot projects described below.

241 The potential impacts of an extreme 'not-experienced in a lifetime' flood event were assessed by  
242 modelling the 1 in 100 year flood event (the event that has a 1% probability of occurrence in any  
243 given year). Climate change was included as described earlier in the paper, and the resulting flood  
244 extents were illustrated as an overlay to the aerial photography of Kibera. Similarly, more  
245 frequent events such as the 1 in 25 year flood event were also illustrated with the intention to be  
246 compared with extents of impact areas from recent floods.

247 The flood extent maps have been prepared at a range of scales to support stakeholder  
248 consultations, major and minor infrastructure planning as well as detailed design.

249  
250

### 251 **5.2 Model Outputs - Overlay of Community Risk Data**

252

253 Overlaying the household level data with the flood extent information produces a broader  
254 understanding of a range of risks and allows for linkages to be identified between flood exposure  
255 and impact, as well as to socio-economic and demographic issues. For example, the flood extents  
256 and survey information revealed the correlation between severe flood risk and other issues in the  
257 Andolo community. Here the highest reported household flooding (59% of households were  
258 flooded in the 2015 'long-rains') corresponds with the lowest residency (3.8 years average per  
259 household), the cheapest rents in the settlement (1,800 average Kes/month) and related rates of  
260 crime, insecurity, and limited social cohesion and social contract. Rates of diarrhoea in children  
261 under 5 in the previous 2 weeks is at 28% (from June 2015), twice the national urban average  
262 from the latest DHS survey. Overlay of flood extents data with household level data is shown in  
263 **Figure 5**.

264  
265

### 266 **5.3 Proposed Applications**

267 One key objective of the model build and development, was to produce a tool that could be used  
268 by different local stakeholders. An essential element in meeting this objective was the  
269 preparation of handover document in early 2017 which is intended to enable the use of the

270 model by a range of potential users, tiered in 4 levels:

- 271 I. **Community users** such as local communities, CBOs, NGOs, humanitarian organisations  
272 who will have the ability to interpret the flood extent maps to inform local community  
273 projects and develop flood awareness and preparedness;
- 274 II. **County Government** users who support implementation of a variety of scale of projects  
275 at a local level;
- 276 III. **National Users** such as national ministries who support scaling out (and up) of the model  
277 through policy development and adoption. These users will have a good understanding of  
278 model assumptions and hold instructions for model modifications;
- 279 IV. **The Research Community** (such as universities and research centres) who could enhance  
280 and improve the capabilities of the tool according to changing demands and conditions,.  
281

282 Final hand over documentation was produced in early 2017 though significant elements were  
283 tested in 2016 through the applications described in the following sections.

284

## 285 **5.4 Application in Planning, Design and Construction**

### 286 *Pilot Projects*

287 In 2015 and 2016, the KDI field team used the flood extent maps combined with the household  
288 survey data to identify areas vulnerable and prone to flooding. Two areas were identified in  
289 November 2015 as potential sites for pilot project interventions funded under the program:  
290 Andolo neighbourhood and Gifted Hands School. The intention of these pilot projects was to  
291 demonstrate the use and applicability of the model in a real project development process.  
292 Considerations in selecting the areas included choosing projects that would be most impactful in  
293 terms of targeting high-exposure areas as well as communicating the value of the technical  
294 (modelling) and community-based approach of project development. Further detail on the  
295 projects selected and developed and how the model was used in each is given below.

### 296 *Pilot Project 1 – Andolo neighbourhood*

297 The first project was in one of the consultation areas which has proved particularly vulnerable  
298 and prone to flooding – the Andolo area of Lindi Village just 300m upstream of the Nairobi Dam.  
299 Andolo is perhaps the most vulnerable area in Kibera as detailed in Section 5.2. Many of the  
300 households in Andolo are located within the 1 in 100 year flood extents as well as the  
301 government-designated 30m riparian zone. The flood maps shown in **Figure 6** were used to  
302 identify how the proposed area for development could be affected by extreme flood events.

303 As a result of using the maps, the following actions were made possible:

- 304 ● *Local model refinement* - Site surveys close to the location of interest involved inspection  
305 of upstream and downstream structures and identification of drainage paths to the river  
306 and its tributaries. This information was then interpreted and adjusted in the model to  
307 represent the local hydraulic characteristics more accurately.
- 308 ● *Validation of the model* - Flood extent maps for the 1 in 25 year flood event were  
309 compared both with flood extent information provided by local residents, as well as  
310 debris or repair work marks on the household walls following the recent flood event in  
311 May 2015 (estimated to be in the order of 1 in 20 year event). The modelled flood extents  
312 provided a good comparison with the May 2015 extents, adding confidence to the use of  
313 the model to predict extents for higher order flood events.

- 314       ● *Understanding the design life flood risk (extreme event)* - the map showing the 1 in 100  
315       year flood event (including allowance for climate change) indicated that the entire site is  
316       potentially at risk from flooding in the future to depths between 0.2m up to 2m.  
317       ● *Recommendations for allocation of appropriate uses within the development site* -  
318       ensuring that uses that could pose a contamination risk to the river or be detrimentally  
319       affected by flood flows were avoided.

320       Through community workshops performed by KDI and EWB-UK volunteers in summer of 2016 a  
321       drainage and access project was developed and implemented in the autumn of 2016 using the  
322       flood risk information developed from the model.

### 323       *Pilot Project 2 – Gifted Hands School*

324  
325       The existing Gifted Hands School in Gatwekera area of Kibera lies on one of the major tributaries  
326       to River Ngong. The site suffers from the combined effect of fluvial flooding on its low lying edge  
327       and pluvial flooding from upstream catchment flows crossing through the site and ponding in  
328       local depressions. The large open spaces that exist in this site provide an opportunity for  
329       Sustainable Drainage System development and showcasing as a demonstration project.

330  
331       The flood map extents were used to enable masterplan development at the Gifted Hands  
332       Productive Learning Space.

- 333  
334       ● *Validation of the model* - Water level measurements from the river were taken during  
335       March-May 2016 (estimated to be in the order of the 1 in 17 year event) and compared  
336       with flood model depths for the 1 in 25 year event.  
337       ● *Constraints mapping* - The extents have been mapped on a constraints base map of the  
338       site, used during community design workshops to enable community and Design team  
339       understanding of the site and its surroundings (see **Figure 7**).  
340       ● *Land vulnerability* - Land allocation for the school masterplan has taken into  
341       consideration the potential flood extents from the adjacent tributary as well as the  
342       government-designated buffer zone. Open green spaces and playing areas are proposed  
343       at the low lying areas whereas vulnerable uses such as classrooms, kitchen and dining  
344       areas have been placed further away and at higher elevations.

345  
346       The model simulation of different flood events highlighted that the flood risk to the site is  
347       reduced by the upstream railway embankment and culvert which restricts fluvial flood flows  
348       adjacent to the site. This provided increased understanding of the fluvial flood mechanism at the  
349       site. This demonstrated that the main flood risk to the site is from surface water and therefore  
350       enabled communication for strategies focused on surface water flood mitigation.

### 351 352       **5.5 Other Applications - Public Infrastructure Planning**

353  
354       Through KDI's ongoing work with local authorities in Kibera, in particular, the Nairobi County  
355       Council (NCC) Department of Roads and Public Works, there have been multiple opportunities to  
356       apply the flood model in various planning exercises in 2016. These included the planning stages of  
357       the design of a new road planned to pass through Kibera and over the Ngong River and the  
358       assessment of the reasons behind the surcharging of a new public sewer line through Kibera.  
359       The flood mapping can be seen to be an effective advocacy tool to allow consideration of flood  
360       risk not previously possible. Flood extent information was readily understood at the various  
361       governmental levels from both political and technical staff suggesting this is a good format for  
362       working with municipal partners. It is notable that this type of analysis has not been produced  
363       previously in the planning of major development or infrastructure, whether in the form or pre-

364 existing flood maps, or in the development of flood risk assessments for the specific projects.

365

## 366 **6. Learning and Further Application**

### 367 **6.1 Benefits of a 'live' model**

368 By creating a hydraulic flood model that could be adopted by the relevant stakeholders, the  
369 model can be updated to meet the needs of the specific user. The following outlines examples of  
370 some of the potential ways the model can be manipulated:

- 371 ● Local design initiatives – although the model was designed to give an overview of the  
372 flood risk at the settlement scale, using a 5m elevation resolution, if more detailed  
373 topographic information is available at identified sites for potential development, this  
374 information can be incorporated into the model and run.
- 375 ● Government planning – by adopting and maintaining a model that incorporates new  
376 structures, changes to land use and updates in available hydrological data, the model can  
377 be considered as 'cumulative', always up-to-date and assessing the current situation. This  
378 helps for planning purposes and is particularly important for settlements such as Kibera  
379 where tenants can consistently reclaim land within the riparian zone, and where  
380 authorities may be required to displace residents to build large scale infrastructure  
381 projects.

### 382 **6.2 Challenges of a 'live' model**

383 There are three main challenges envisaged with handing over the hydraulic model and its results:

384 i) the modelled flood extents are taken as absolute areas of flood risk, without considering the  
385 impact of other sources of flooding, such as overland surface water flood routes;

386 ii) the model could be adopted by different parties and updated at different times by different  
387 people. This can prevent appropriate tracking of the model and effective maintenance and QA,  
388 potentially making it redundant in the future;

389 iii) if inexperienced stakeholders use the model, they may interpret the results incorrectly or not  
390 update a particular parameter when making a change to another.

391 These are just some of the challenges identified at this stage; more may become evident over  
392 time. To overcome some of these, it is proposed in this instance that KDI, based in Nairobi,  
393 become the custodians (gatekeeper) of the model. In this way its distribution can be monitored  
394 and tracked appropriately.

### 395 **6.3 Transferability and Scaling**

396

397 The process has shown potential for application in other informal areas in Nairobi. Working  
398 closely with the Nairobi City County in the development of this project has shown its value as an  
399 entry point for macro planning discussions on identifying risk. Often the lack of data and access to  
400 the informal areas for County officials means the first questions are often around identifying  
401 "hotspots", areas of high exposure and risk, to people and infrastructure. The level of resolution  
402 of the 1D model is appropriate for identifying these areas and starting a conversation with County  
403 officials around potential interventions.

404 In terms of model development perhaps the greatest challenge as compared to a “conventional”

405 modeling process is the collection of field data. Though the government partners on the project  
406 were able to interpret and use the outputs of the flood extents maps they were less conversant in  
407 local risk data collection which is critical to improving government engagement and the  
408 responsiveness of programs. This requires a local partner with access and legitimacy in the  
409 targeted communities.

410 One constraint for transferring the process could be the cost of high quality remote sensing data  
411 to enable detailed modelling. Further analysis is required to understand the difference in results  
412 provided between the LiDAR (purchased) and ASTER-GDEM (freely available) satellite data to  
413 understand the impact of the different resolution data. Following this study, a case could be put  
414 forward to different institutions for the need for funding for high resolution data at an early stage  
415 in a project, if found to be important.

## 416 **7. Conclusions**

417 Flooding occurs several times a year in many informal settlements, interrupting economic  
418 activity, contaminating water supply, leading to disease outbreaks, destroying the limited assets  
419 of poor households and often displacing residents (Douglas et al, 2008). With the projected  
420 growth of low-income areas in African cities (United Nations, 2014) and climate change  
421 projections for extreme rainfall events (IPCC, 2014) these issues will continue to grow and be of  
422 pressing concern to residents and city authorities.

423  
424 The work touches directly upon several key “gaps in evidence” identified by IIED (2013) in  
425 particular: “How can local knowledge be used alongside scientific data to help shape city  
426 decisions in planning for risk reduction and disaster preparedness?”. Providing easy to develop  
427 and use flood risk modelling is one practical step to quantify and characterise the scale and  
428 spatial distribution of risk. Engaging residents in data collection related to model development  
429 and in discussion of the results with relation to historical events raises awareness of flood risk  
430 locally and may lead to behaviour change. Flood maps are also useful in engaging local and  
431 regional authorities in local flooding challenges and in providing an entry point for discussing  
432 issues in low-income areas. The overlay of community level data can be a powerful advocacy tool  
433 in communicating the linkages between flooding and a broad range of public health and  
434 livelihoods impacts.

435 At the same time the process raises questions on who and how this process could be developed  
436 in the future in similar contexts. Local authorities would ideally be able to develop and apply  
437 similar types of tools internally, or to be able to better scope services to engage local consultants  
438 to produce similar tools or assessments, to ensure ownership and control over the process, and  
439 to align more directly to government implemented development initiatives.

440  
441 Through the process we find evidence that community-involvement in data collection can enable  
442 closer community engagement and understanding of proposed interventions. To enable field  
443 data collection and improved participation a well-trusted intermediary may be required in certain  
444 areas to close the gap between formal city processes and the informal neighbourhoods. It is  
445 hoped that the partnership between engineers, civil society organisations and local authorities  
446 demonstrated by this project can be encouraging and instructive for more integrated and  
447 responsive practices in Nairobi as well as in other cities in Kenya.



## Acknowledgements

Thanks to the Swiss Re Foundation for their continued support of KDI and for funding the research on which this paper is based in part. Thanks also to the Institution of Civil Engineers for supporting a BuroHappold engineer to perform site visits and model validation through the QUEST travel award. Special thanks to Bukunola Ngobi for leading the Key Respondent Interviews and Institutional Mapping process which is referred to throughout this paper, and to all those who took part. Deepest thanks and respect to the KDI Kenya office, in particular to Jamilla Harper, Pascal Kipkemboi, Amos Wandera and Ibrahim Maina for delivering the household survey and community sessions. Also thanks to Vera Bukachi (University College London), Engineers Without Borders-UK for contributing to field data collection.

## References

Action Aid (2006) *Unjust waters: Climate change, flooding and the protection of poor urban communities: experiences from six African cities*, Action Aid International, Johannesburg, South Africa.

AIP (Amnesty International Publications) (2009). *Kenya The Unseen Majority: Nairobi's Two Million Slum-Dwellers*. Index: AFR 32/005/2009.

Baker J (2012) *Climate Change, Disaster Risk, and the Urban Poor - Cities Building Resilience for a Changing World*, The World Bank, Urban Development Series.

Cook KH and Vizy EK (2013) Projected Changes in East African Rainy Seasons. *Climate* **26**: 5931–5948. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JCLI-D-12-00455.1>

DHS (Kenya Demographic Health Survey) (2015) *KENYA DEMOGRAPHIC AND HEALTH SURVEY 2014*, Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, Nairobi, Kenya. December 2014.

Government of Kenya, Ministry of State for Special Programmes, Office of the President. 2009. *Draft National Policy for Disaster Management in Kenya* [Online]. Available: <http://www.ifrc.org/docs/idrl/765EN.pdf> [Accessed 29 November 2016].

IIED (2013) *Discussion Paper "Understanding the nature and scale of urban risk in low- and middle income countries"*.

IPCC (2014). *Summary for policymakers*. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK and New York, USA

Jha AK, Bloch R, and Lamond J (2012) *Cities and Flooding. A Guide to Integrated Urban Flood Risk Management for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*, The World Bank, ISBN: 978-0-8213-8866-2.

Kenya Meteorological Department (2015) *2015 daily rainfall data from weather station rainfall gauges at Wilson Airport and Dagoretti Corner*. 116mm recorded at Dagoretti Corner on May 12<sup>th</sup> 2015.

KDI (2015) *Consultation and Data Collection Methodology for the Building Urban Flood Resilience in Kibera Project*. Kounkuey Design Initiative, Los Angeles, CA, USA. See <http://www.kounkuey.org/150323%20KDI%20Urban%20Flooding%20Consultation%20and%20Data%20Collection%20Methodology%20REV01.pdf> (accessed 19/05/2016).

KDI (2017) *THE INSTITUTIONAL AND REGULATORY CONTEXT FOR FLOOD RISK REDUCTION IN NAIROBI, KENYA*, Final Briefing Paper. KDI, 2017. [http://www.kounkuey.org/Kibera\\_UrbanFlooding.html](http://www.kounkuey.org/Kibera_UrbanFlooding.html)

KNBS (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics) (2008) Kenya National Bureau of Statistics Population projection. See <http://www.knbs.or.ke/>.

Ministry of Water and Irrigation. 2009. *Flood Mitigation Strategy 2009*. Nairobi: Ministry of Water and Irrigation .

Ministry of Water Development. (1978). *Rainfall Frequency Atlas of Kenya (for durations from 10 minutes to 24 hours)*, Nairobi: Ministry of Water Development.

Mulligan J., Harper J., Kipkemboi P., Ngobi B. and Collins A. (2016), "Community-responsive adaptation to flooding in Kibera, Kenya" *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, Engineering Sustainability* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1680/jensu.15.00060>

NRBP (2008) "Nairobi River Basin Programme Phase III, Resource Booklet on Pollution Monitoring Activities", IUCN, NETWAS, UNEP.

Parikh P, Parikh H, and McRobie A (2012) "The role of infrastructure in improving human settlements", *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers, Urban Design and Planning, Volume 164 Issue 2, June 2011*, pp. 61-73.

Physical Planning Act CAP 286 (1996)

Samuel PG, Morris MW, Sayers P, Creutin J-D, Kortenhaus A, Klijn F, Mosselman E, Van Os A, Schanze J (2010) *A framework for integrated flood risk management. 1st IAHR European Division Congress, May 2010, Edinburgh, UK*

Shongwe ME, van Oldenborgh GJ, van den Hurk B, and van Aalst M (2011) *Projected changes in mean and extreme precipitation in Africa under global warming. Part II: East Africa. J. Climate* **24**: 3718–3733.

Survey Act 299 (2009)

United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2014). *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2014 Revision, Highlights (ST/ESA/SER.A/352)*.

UN-HABITAT. (2006) *Nairobi Urban Sector Profile*, Nairobi: United Nations Human Settlements Programme.

UNISDR (2011b) *Hyogo Framework for Action 2005–2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters. Mid-Term Review, 2010–2011*. Geneva: United Nations.

Water Act Cap 372 (2002)

100 RC, 2017. "Nairobi's Resilience Challenge" See [http://www.100resilientcities.org/cities/entry/nairobi-resilience-challenge#/\\_/](http://www.100resilientcities.org/cities/entry/nairobi-resilience-challenge#/_/) (accessed 31st March 2017)

## Figure Captions:

Figure 1: Conceptual framework of Integrated Flood Risk Management in the Kibera context and project response

Figure 2: The hydraulic modelling process

Figure 3: Workshop in Andolo neighbourhood to check flood extents and household survey data against historical flood information

Figure 4: Flood depth map for the 1 in 100 year event including 25% allowance for climate change. Existing structures such as bridges and culverts along the tributary are also marked on the map.

Figure 5: Flood extents overlay with reported flooding from post-rains household survey.

Figure 6: Andolo site development boundary and flood extents for 1 in 25 and 1 in 100 year plus Climate Change scenarios.

Figure 7: Left - Flood depths for the 1 in 25 year event (similar to the May 2015 event). Right - Flood depths for the 1 in 100 year event including 25% allowance for climate change (Design Flood Event)