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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction and Background

This report presents results of the mid-term review (MTR) of the Kenya United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) covering the period 2014-2018. The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF 2014-18) for Kenya was developed through a participatory process involving key government ministries, development partners and UN agencies in Kenya within the context of delivering as one. The UNDAF 2014-18, was launched by The President of Kenya Hon. Uhuru Kenyatta in May 2014. It aims to support the government in realising the long-term national development goals contained in the Vision 2030 transformative agenda, particularly in "creating a globally competitive and prosperous nation with a high quality of life by 2030." The UNDAF is fully aligned to priorities identified in the Medium-Term 11 Plan. The UNDAF is built around four Strategic Results Areas (SRAs) and 13 outcomes: The four Strategic Results Areas (SRAs) are: i) Transformative Governance; ii) Human Capital Development; iii) Inclusive Sustainable Economic Growth and; Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and iv) Human Security. Approximately US$1.2 billion (for both humanitarian and development assistance) will be needed over the 2014-2018 four-year period to achieve the 13 UNDAF outcomes. This includes core financial resources available to the UN agencies and funds to be mobilized from external sources. The Government of Kenya and the UN System are committed to working together in the spirit of Delivering as One to implement the UNDAF, as contribution towards achievement of national development goals and aspirations. The National Steering Committee, co-chaired by Cabinet Secretary for Devolution and Planning and the UN Resident Coordinator provides overall guidance to the UNDAF implementation, coordination and reporting. Implementation of the UNDAF spans across two important global development agendas for which the GOK is signatory. These are: The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Purpose Objectives and Scope of UNDAF MTR

The purpose of the UNDAF MTR was: to provide an overall assessment of progress and achievements made against planned results; document challenges and lessons learned over the past two and a half years and assess significant developments that have taken place in the programming environment including the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The main objective of the review was to assess relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and, sustainability of delivery of the UNDAF; determine effectiveness and efficiency of the “Delivering as One” modality and explore extent to which the five UNDAF core programming principles have been mainstreamed in UNDAF.

The MTR was informed by an analytical framework as outlined in figure 2. The framework has three components which include: i) component 1- analysis of focus areas (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and design focus); ii) component 2- analysis of strategic positioning and; iii) component 3-assessment of core programming principles.

Methods and Tools for data collection and analysis

Mixed Method Approach: A variety of data collection and analysis methods were used, these include: review of documents; key informant interviews, stakeholder’s self-assessment and field visits. The assessment used three key methods. The first method used the performance of planned outputs (Results chain principle) to
determine performance of outcomes. UNDAF key stakeholders contributed to the self-assessment of outcomes using the 'Outcome and Output Performance Assessment Tool' (see sample tool in Annex 6) based on available evidence. The second method assessed performance of outcome indicators in the UNDAF results framework supported by national data sources. The third was independent opinion of the MTR team informed by assessment of available data, documents review and individual interviews. Ratings on performance of the outcomes were classified as: "On Track" (Good progress on planned results at mid-term 50%-75% or more), "Partially On Track" (performance lagging slightly below the 50% mark of planned results for mid-term but lower than 45% mark) and "Off Track" (Performance below 35% mark of planned results and there is evidence that the results are unlikely to be achieved by 2018).

Triangulation of tools and methods ensured enough rigor to guarantee validity of the MTR findings and recommendations. The UNDAF MTR process was highly participatory. A total of 161 persons were reached through in-depth interviews while 200 persons participated in Joint SRA consultative meetings. An additional 120 stakeholders were reached through stakeholder Validation Consultations.

**Findings on Performance of the UNDAF**

**Relevance:** The UNDAF (2014-2018) is aligned to national priorities and needs, and has put in place strategies to respond to new emerging priorities such as Middle Income Country (MIC) status and SDGs. The UNDAF responds to the programmatic intentions of the Second Medium Term Plan (MTP II) 2013-17 and Vision 2030 around the three pillars: Economic, Social and Political. The UN is perceived and recognized by the Government of Kenya (GOK) as a relevant and trusted partner. Though the UNDAF remains aligned on emerging issues such as SDGs and MIC status, deliberate and strategic efforts for programming and delivery of targeted initiatives aimed at addressing key specific issues such as the demographic dividend, issues of inequality, funding priorities among others must be put in place. Kenya is now a Middle Income Country (MIC) therefore, there is need for the UN to strategically package its support to the GOK. Some of the areas that are of key priority include support for high level upstream policy and legal issues, development of knowledge management products for the GOK given the new role the country will play within the region, enhancing South-South and triangulation cooperation and county to county learning, and consolidation of flagship programs to draw replicable development products.

**Effectiveness of the UNDAF Design and Results Framework:** The UNDAF results framework is a crucial tool for assessment of performance of the UNDAF. An assessment of the quality and validity of the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework observed that 42% of the UNDAF outcome indicators (see Annex 6) could not be used in the MTR (Not Used in Assessment- NUIA), signaling an urgent need for the review of the UNDAF M&E Framework.

**Effectiveness of SRA 1 - Transformative Governance:** The key achievements in this SRA include a strong gender responsive policy and legal framework and strong capacities built for institutions, and communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA 1: Transformative Governance Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.1: On Policy and Institutional Framework</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.2: On Democratic participation and Human Rights</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.3: On Devolution and Accountability</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.4: On Evidence and Rights based Decision Making</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall SRA Position</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following are highlights of emerging outcome results for SRA1:

i. A policy and legal framework for increased access to justice exists;

ii. Capacity of national institutions to provide services for increased access to justice by disadvantaged groups;

iii. Mediation is now an alternative form of dispute resolution (ADR) in the judiciary;

iv. Within 6 weeks of the start of the UNDAF, laws and legal frameworks for electoral processes were in place;

v. Significant progress has been made in strengthening institutional capacity for Gender and Human Rights Mainstreaming;

vi. There has been evidence of increased access to justice;

vii. Institutional capacity to manage credible elections has been enhanced albeit with room for improvement with respect to: what constitutes Principle Voter Register, enforcement of 2011 Elections Act, and stakeholder dialogue and engagement mechanisms to anticipate and address challenges related to elections by the IEBC;

viii. The UN has supported relevant commissions, ministries and departments to solidify operational planning for protection of civilians during the electoral period, and sustain the dialogue, analysis and capacity building in readiness for the 2017 elections;

ix. The UN has supported IEBC and other strategic institutions with innovative approaches to mobilize women, youth, People with Disabilities (PWDs) and other marginalized groups to participate as voters. However, more work is needed to support these groups to participate as candidates for elections;

x. The institutional capacity of IEBC to hold credible elections has been enhanced. The UN has supported the processes and promoted dialogue as an alternative form of dispute resolution, particularly around governance issues;

xi. Strategic oversight institutions for devolution have been strengthened;

xii. National level frameworks to guide devolved counties are in place and contributing to take off of the devolution process;

xiii. The pending national M&E policy if adopted will potentially change the face of M&E in the country providing for M&E resources and enhancing personnel capacities across sectors and within institutions and

xiv. Capacity of women politicians for advocacy has been enhanced resulting in them tabling and pushing for gender responsive legislations.

Despite the positive outcomes, noted challenges for SRA 1 include: failure of the two thirds gender rule to go through parliament has been a huge drawback to efforts towards improved participation of women in political decision making processes. However, there is still room for further negotiation.
Effectiveness of SRA 2: Human Capital: Good progress has been observed in this SRA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA 2: Human Capital Development</th>
<th>Outcome Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.1: On Education and Learning</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.2: On WASH, Environmental Preservation, Food, Nutrition &amp; Health</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.3: On Multi-sectoral HIV response</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.4: On Social Protection</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall SRA Position</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant outcome results have been noted in SRA 2 as follows:

i. Support has been provided for an enabling environment at national and county levels through development of sound policies, strategies and legislative frameworks in education and health sectors that are all-inclusive, rights and gender focused;

ii. The government and UN have played an important role in strengthening institutional systems that are transforming data collection, monitoring and management which are expected to improve quality of learning and support curriculum reforms and deliver;

iii. Education systems have been strengthened for efficiency and effectiveness in service delivery;

iv. Capacity development approach that has been applied in the education sector has clearly been linked to improving performance in a number of interventions. Capacity to manage the school feeding program has been strengthened and contributed to significant improvement in enrolment of disadvantaged children;

v. The government, UN and partners have been effective in paying attention to the people-centred and universal nature of the 2030 Agenda, with an emphasis on leaving no one behind by reaching the furthest communities in the Arid and Semi-Arid Land (ASAL) areas;

vi. Support has been provided for institutional, personnel and systems strengthening for robust response and management of the health sector;

vii. The Joint Program on Reproductive Maternal Neonatal Child and Adolescent Health (RMNCAH) has led to notable progress on coherence, service delivery, partnerships and strengthened accountability by county governments. Partnership with private sector and development partners has unlocked significant resources and technical assistance to deliver results on RMNCAH;

viii. Significant progress has been registered in key health indicators. These include: reduction in maternal mortality; reduction in infant mortality; reduction in under 5 stunting from 35% to 26% against an UNDAF target of 14% by 2018 among others. A record high of 1.2 million children (93%) under 5 years in 32 counties have been vaccinated for polio in 2015;

ix. Tremendous headway has been recorded in strengthening community led interventions aimed at improving the quality of life through increased number of people accessing improved sanitation facilities;
x. The Joint UN Team on HIV and AIDS has played a pivotal role in development of key related policies and guidelines. Resources to support HIV and AIDS through the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (GAVI) and about USD 290 Million from the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM) have contributed to achievement of key results. The First Lady’s “Beyond Zero Campaign” has been rolled out in 46 counties. There has been increased strategic focus, accountability and programmatic action to end AIDS among adolescents following the Global “All in” campaign launched by the President. Accountability for HIV results has been strengthened through development of ‘Maisha’ certification;

xi. Single registry is proving to be key in improving coordination and efficiency of the Social Protection sector. Experiences shared during the MTR revealed that the system has contributed to saving USD 2 Million per month;

xii. Increased numbers of workers in the informal sector accessing social security has been realised and

xiii. Support to institutions of Social Protection have contributed to increased access of disadvantaged children to social protection.

Noted challenges across SRA 2 include: insecurity situation in the North and governance issues have affected education programming. Another challenge is increase in non-communicable diseases. High levels of stigma for people affected by HIV may affect effective national HIV response. About 20,000 children are trafficked in Kenya each year raising further concerns for the social protection program. There is also an estimated 300,000 Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) who form part of a residual and emerging case load and in need of protection and durable solutions. Pastoralists and nomadic communities in the ASAL areas are targeted under respective County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs), however, they still form a specific and vulnerable segment of the population that consistently require humanitarian assistance but not in isolation from the wider development planning that will ultimately break the cycle of vulnerability and contribute to human capital development in Kenya.

Effectiveness of SRA 3: Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA 3: Inclusive and sustainable economic growth</th>
<th>Outcome Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3.1: On Productive Business Environment</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3.2: On Productive Sector and Trade</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3.3: On Job creation, Skills and Working conditions</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall SRA Position</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SRA 3 has registered significant results in development of policies and legal frameworks to support the drive towards a prosperous society that is characteristic of skilled people, safe employment opportunities and the ease of doing business. Key promising outcome results include:

i. Conducive environment for doing business has been established. Ease of doing business in Kenya improved from 119 in 2013 to 108 in 2016 and is likely to surpass the UNDAF targets ranking of 100 by the year 2018;
ii. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) inflows increased from Ksh49.9 billion in 2013 to Ksh97.8 billion in 2016, a 95% increase;

iii. Biashara Centres established at county levels are providing breakthroughs for service delivery and enhanced capacity on business management and business start-ups;

iv. The UN has supported the GOK in development and enactment of the Mining Act 2016. The Act is critical for providing a policy foundation and institutional framework for managing the extractive sector to ensure that people and communities benefit. Managing expectations of vulnerable communities on the extractive sector has been accorded high priority to minimize potential conflict;

v. Capacity of communities in the productive sector and trade has been enhanced;

vi. Lives of farmers at county level have been transformed through use of climate change smart agricultural production models, improved fishing technology and access to markets;

vii. Engagement of Youth in agriculture and productive sector through up scaling aquaculture and mariculture is transforming the lives of the youth;

viii. The UNDAF partners have supported development of supportive policies and legal frameworks for job creation, skills development and working conditions;

ix. Collaborative interventions between the government, private sector, the UN and the Matatu (public transport) industry/bus companies has led to transformation of the Matatu/bus Companies through enforcement of regulatory environment, compliance to labour laws with profound benefits;

x. The government and UN has strengthened capacity for systems improvement in the labour sector, through establishment of the National Labour Market Information System report (LMIS);

xi. Though the UNDAF target of 1,000,000 new jobs created per year in the formal and informal sector has not been achieved, at least 841,600 new jobs were created in 2015 (Economic Survey 2016);

xii. Significant progress has been made to promote professional experiences and skills of young people for the labour market through internship programs for the youth;

xiii. Good progress has been registered in efforts towards creation of a One Stop Investment Centre (OSIC) for investors; and

xiv. Strong partnerships between the GOK and UN have led to sustained investment in expanding economic opportunities for women-owned enterprises in the public procurement sector both at national and county levels. However, the government policy to award at least 30% of all procurement opportunities to the youth, women and people with disabilities has not been fully exploited.

Despite the good progress, key challenges were noted: considering the size of Kenya’s economy, the improvements in FDI registered is still low. As extractive sectors are located in communities that are poorly resourced, there is growing need to continuously manage extractive sector expectations for poor communities because these communities are located in areas that historically suffer from underdevelopment and chronic emergencies.
Effectiveness of SRA 4: Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA 4: Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security</th>
<th>Outcome Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4.1: On Policy and Legal Frameworks</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4.2: On Community Security and Resilience</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall SRA Position</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SRA 4 has made good progress in strengthening capacity of GOK to address issues related to policy and legal frameworks and improving institutions responsible for driving the development agenda of the SRA. The following are highlights of achievements:

i. Positive linkages between peace building and land development agenda noted at county levels;

ii. The UN Agencies supported the GOK to develop the National Action Plan on Security Council Resolution (SCR) 1325 in 2015;

iii. A cross country Joint initiative by the UN “Reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation in developing countries (UN-REDD), provides promising results for environment sub-sector;

iv. Rome based UN Agencies have put together a joint Cereal initiative, the Kenya Cereal Enhancement Program (KCEP) that builds on initial program results towards enhancing resilience of communities in ASALs;

v. With GOK support, the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) has been localized and the National and County DRR Action Plan has been developed;

vi. With UN support, the GOK developed a National Social Cohesion Index (NSCI) with immense potential for addressing issues of exclusion of minority groups and peace building;

vii. There is a growing paradigm shift from communities demanding relief aid to resilience building;

viii. Revision and advocacy for parliamentary adoption of the National Disaster Management Policy;

ix. Effective evolution of stand-alone humanitarian response into the wider framework of development. Key actions include scaling up humanitarian tools such as Emergency Humanitarian Response Plan and establishment of the Kenya Humanitarian Private sector platform, which is a multi-sector platform for the coordination of humanitarian action within the framework of national development;

x. Integrating regional and sub-national tools such as the Index for Risk Management (INFORM) for the assessment of risk for humanitarian crises into national development planning and

xi. Inter-Sector planning for 2017 Elections preparedness and contingency planning under the humanitarian, mass casualty, conflict early warning and security pillars.

**Joint and flagship Programs**

Flagship programs have adopted an area-based programming approach that has enabled the UN to provide targeted technical, financial and institutional support in a coordinated manner to Turkana and Marsabit counties. The planning processes have been highly participatory through consultations with the communities, county
governments and UN. The GOK and UN have generated evidence-based information for programming. Long term programs have been developed and negotiations for funding continue with donors.

Core Programming Principles in the Delivery of UNDAF

The MTR review noted good results in addressing all the 5 core programming principles of UNDAF, namely; gender equality and women’s empowerment, Human Rights, Results Based Management (RBM) and Capacity Building with room for improvement in respect to integration of Environment and Climate change.

Alignment of UNDAF to Sustainable Development Goals

Although the UNDAF was designed before the SDGs were launched, an analysis of alignment of the UNDAF SRAs to SDGs shows positive results (On a scale of strong, moderate and weak). SRA 1 is moderately aligned to the SDGs while SRA 2 is strongly as a result of well-chosen output results that relate strongly to the key elements of SDG 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. SRA 3 is also strongly aligned to the SDGs. Outcome 3.1 shows strong alignment while outcomes 3.2 and 3.3 shows moderate alignment to SDGs. SRA 4 is strongly aligned to the SDGs with output results significantly responding to key elements of SDG 2, 5, 7, 13 and 16. Across all the SRAs, there are sound policies and legal frameworks that are strongly aligned to the SDGs in general. All SRAs also respond well to the policy and programming requirements for SDG 5.

Efficiency

Significant progress has been made by the UN Operations Management Team (OMT) in working towards the Business Operations Strategy (BOS). Initial results include: a needs assessment for BOS which has already indicated a Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) net saving of USD 606,008 for travel, USD 1,009,611 for conferences and USD 23,341 for communications in the next 2 years. UN in Kenya has made good progress in using Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) with outstanding results: A Macro Assessment of the Public Management System (PFM) was undertaken in 2015, and 150 Implementing Partners (IPs) across the UN HACT implementing agencies had their Micro-Assessments completed. The UNDAF has strong coordination structures that ensure programmatic efficiency albeit with room for improvement: At the Apex, the UNDAF is coordinated by the National Steering Committee (NSC), Co-chaired by two GOK Cabinet Secretaries for Devolution and Planning and Treasury and on the UN Side by the Resident Coordinator. There are SRA Groups which coordinate and monitor implementation of Annual Work Plans (AWPs) across the four pillars of the UNDAF. The current UNDAF’s M&E framework is functional but can be strengthened for comprehensiveness, smarter results and stronger linkages to the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES). While excellent results are noted in addressing programming principles of gender equality and human rights across all SRAs, the UNDAF should consider putting in place transparent mechanisms for allocation and tracking resource flows and utilization for the core programming principles.

Efficiency of Joint Programs

The UNDAF MTR observed that increasingly UN Agencies are implementing Joint Programs across SRAs which have potential for increasing program efficiency: Ongoing Joint Monitoring has put programming efficiency at an even higher pedestal.
Sustainability

Across all SRAs, there is evidence indicating a high degree of potential for continuity of program benefits. The UNDAF coincides with a phase when there is growing demand by GOK for strong policies and legal frameworks that respond not only to the 2010 constitutional requirements but also policy demands to support the devolution process. The UN has worked with the host government to ensure strong ownership and leadership of the program both at national and county level. This ownership is strong and creates an unquestionable level of durability of the effects. The strong leadership and ownership is a key barometer for reasonable handover to the host country.

Partnerships

The GOK, 23 UN agencies, the World Bank and the IMF are the main partners in delivery of the UNDAF. At the design of the UNDAF 2014-2018, there was a deliberate strategy to partner with private sector, philanthropy and CSOs to deliver programming for UNDAF. A number of initiatives have been put in place to strengthen partnerships especially with the private sector and philanthropy. The strategy for working with Private Sector focuses on four areas i) resource transfer, ii) technology transfer; iii) facilitating or brokering innovative private investments, and iv) value chain linkages of “inclusive business” approaches. A mapping of private sector partners has been undertaken under SRA3 though only a few have engaged in the implementation process. SRA2 has successfully engaged a few private sector partners with notable success. The UNDAF resource mobilization strategy has outlined the need for strengthening understanding of avenues for engaging the private sector and sharing experiences with the private sector on how the UN and Private Sector have partnered in other countries. At mid-term of UNDAF, opportunities have presented themselves for such partnerships. Establishment of the Kenya SDG Platform (one of the 4 Global country pilots) has presented immense opportunities for the UN and GOK to work closely with the sector to deliver on national development priorities especially working towards the realization of the SDG targets. On the other hand, the CSOs, in Kenya are keen to collaborate with the GOK and the UN to enhance their legitimacy to development efforts. Partnerships with this non-traditional “development Partners” is likely to unlock additional resources for the SDGs.

Strategic Positioning

The current UNDAF transitions between the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The UN has to strategically position itself to play a key role in supporting the GOK to mainstream SDGS in planning instruments both at national and county levels. There is also need to critically analyze the changing scenarios currently facing the country including the MIC status and challenges that could face the country under this status to inform current and future programming. The UNDAF MTR observed that the UNDAF, which is development focused, did not articulate effectively humanitarian issues that prevail within the Kenya context. As such humanitarian issues need to be strategically mainstreamed within the framework of delivering the UNDAF across SRAs. This integration of humanitarian into development frameworks requires articulation at output and outcome level in order to measure results.

Lessons Learnt

The first half of UNDAF implementation has generated knowledge and new partnerships, which offer opportunities for upscaling, replication and adjustments for positive future.
Conclusion and Recommendations

The UNDAF is relevant to GOK development blue prints. The UNDAF is overall “On Track” in accomplishing the planned results at mid-term with only 16% of Outcomes across all SRAs considered not likely to accomplish set targets for 2018. The 16% is based on those indicators that could be measured. Overall the UNDAF MTR show remarkable performance of the UNDAF at Midterm. There are good results for efficiency with room for improvement in reducing transactional costs when dealing with the GOK as well as strengthening coordination mechanisms for UNDAF at the highest levels. Key recommendations moving forward are:

**Recommendation 1:** Review of UNDAF M&E Results Framework: Under leadership of the UNDAF M&E Working Group, there is urgent need for GOK and UNCT to jointly review the current UNDAF results framework. The review should focus on development of (Specific, Measureable, Attainable, Realistic and Time bound/Trackable (SMART) outcome indicators and related baselines and targets. The review will also address the need for incorporation of SDG targets in the results framework. Inclusion of HIV and AIDS results framework to the new revised UNDAF M&E framework will contribute toward alignment of SRA 2 work to national priorities in this sector.

**Recommendation 2:** Election Preparedness and Conflict Risk Management: The current UN support to elections may need to be reviewed, with respect to the ongoing Parliamentary process that may call for extensive legal reforms touching on key electoral elements including cleaning of the principal voter register, application of ICT for elections and enforcement of the electoral legal framework. Key potential areas of focus include electoral legal frameworks, electoral dialogue and conflict management, and ongoing concerns by stakeholders on credibility of elections around issues of the Principle Voter Register; quality of election electronic mechanisms including back up measures, and enforcement of the 2011 Election Act.

**Recommendation 3:** Tracking UNDAF Resources Flows and Utilization: The MTR recommends the need to modify the resource tracking tool used during the MTR and urgently conduct a comprehensive assessment of UNDAF resource flow and utilization. Resource tracking should be a regular activity to be done at least every 6 months to inform the overall UNDAF progress. The review for UNDAF resource flow should be done urgently to inform the next UNDAF annual review.

**Recommendation 4:** Strategic Positioning Priorities: The UNCT should consider addressing strategic alignments with priorities that include taking a leadership role to operationalize Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Program support for SDGs Considering strengthening the role of UN in MIC is also key. The UN should consolidate efforts in the flagship programs in Turkana and Marsabit for long term and sustainable transformative change. Development of knowledge management products around the flagship models should be the focus of the next phase of the UNDAF.

**Recommendation 5:** SRA 2 aligning to National HIV strategic Framework: The KASF was launched in November 2014 after commencement of the UNDAF in July 2014, hence it is not aligned with the current UNDAF. The KASF contains 8 strategic results areas clearly articulated by thematic focus (HIV prevention, treatment and care) while the UNDAF results focus on capacity strengthening (planning, and coordination, resource mobilization). This presents a challenge in demonstrating UNs contribution to the national HIV and AIDS response as articulated in the KASF hence the need to prioritize alignment of the UNDAF results framework to the KASF.

**Recommendation 6:** UNCT DaO Accountability: There is need to strengthen coordination mechanisms not only between UN and GOK but also within and among the SRAs to apply the principles of DaO. Area’s requiring attention include: joint communication and operationalization of the communication strategy; Improving
Recommendation 7: Strengthening Coordination of UNDAF: While the MTR observed good structures for coordination of the UNDAF, there is need for UN and GOK to agree on sustainable mechanisms for strengthening coordination efficiency of the UNDAF secretariat. There is also need to strengthen intra and inter outcome linkages to enhance synergy and strengthen convergence of results. Creating linkages within core elements of outcomes and across outcomes need to be explored to strengthen programmatic approach to results.

Recommendation 8: Tapping on Private Sector and the SDG Philanthropy Platform to Unlock Financing for UNDAF: The UN and the GOK should consider developing strategic frameworks and deepening their own understanding for unlocking potential development resources through the private sector and the SDG Philanthropy Platform in Kenya. Unpacking and simplifying the SDGs around SRAs for philanthropy and private sector consumption to design innovative programming initiatives could go a long way to national development priorities and the accomplishment of SDGs. Organizing programming initiatives around the UNDAF SRAs could potentially contribute to attainment of easy to track outcome results.

Recommendation 9: Clarity on Partnership Strategy for Involvement of CSOs and Private Sector in Delivery of UNDAF: The UN and GOK should consider a deliberate partnership strategy with CSOs, Philanthropy and private sector within the framework of Kenya’s MIC status. Such partnerships should consider greater focus on addressing inequalities often inherent in MIC countries.

Recommendation 10: Priority Areas for GOK Capacity Strengthening for Remaining Period of UNDAF: The UNDAF review has noted outstanding accomplishments in development of policies and legislative frameworks to support the UNDAF 13 outcome areas. Capacities around relevant GOK institutions, systems and human capital have been well documented. Against this background, the review recommends greater analysis of the policy and legal frameworks for potential harmonization to avoid duplication of efforts. Key capacities should focus on i) development of innovative programming support for addressing corruption at both national and county levels; ii) strengthening M&E functions at county and national levels; iii) scaling up public and civic participation through operationalizing of the recently developed guidelines and iv) capacities for clarification of role and function of national and County Governments to ensure a smooth implementation of the devolution framework.

Recommendation 11: Incorporation of humanitarian-into-development action as an integral aspect of the UNDAF using the extensive interventions and strategies adopted by relevant government ministries and UN agencies, to address sudden onset and protracted crises in certain counties in Kenya is key. There are key actions and interventions that can be woven across the four SRAs that demonstrate the efficacy of strategic humanitarian assistance within the wider framework of development. Key government ministries, UN agencies, non-governmental and private sector actors have undertaken targeted humanitarian action under the umbrella of the KHPT focusing on health, nutrition, education, livelihoods, environment, climate-related events and the wider themes of DRR, early warning and protection. Important to capture is the extensive analysis and contingency planning for 2017 Elections where preparedness is key to the prevention of violence and the ability to systematically respond where populations are at risk.

Recommendation 12: Active involvement of CSOs in the UNDAF: There is need for the UN and GOK to consider innovative strategies of engagement with CSOs to contribute towards national development priorities. Possible areas of engagement with CSOs include harnessing the potential and capacity of CSOs in realization of key provisions of national development blueprints and the SDGs among others.
Financial Report

Approximately US$1.2 billion (for both humanitarian and development assistance) will be needed over the 2014-2018 four-year period to achieve the 13 UNDAF outcomes. This includes core financial resources available to the UN agencies and funds to be mobilized from external sources. Total committed budget for the 4 strategic results areas was Kenya Shillings 52,990,506,178 for the first two years (2014 June-2016 June). Total expenditure for the two years was Kenya Shillings 37,698,803,745 indicating a delivery rate of 71% as at June 2016. The assumption is that with extension of the SRA work plans to December 2016, the 29% gap will be realized by December 2016. Expenditure for SRA 2 has increased by slightly over 200% which is mainly attributed to improved delivering as one, with better synergy and alignment among the UN agencies and GOK. This is expected to continue over the remaining period of the UNDAF as more UN agencies further align their interventions and mandates to the UNDAF SRAs. The MTR review recommends that the next generation work plans (2017-2018) be informed by this projection for more realistic planning. It is also recommended that financial input from the GOK, is factored in the financial analysis and reporting as part of the delivering as one principles.

Budget and Expenditure for YR 2014/2015/2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRA1</td>
<td>3,023,262,000</td>
<td>2,878,609,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA2</td>
<td>5,389,407,367</td>
<td>12,466,144,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA3</td>
<td>18,510,439,950</td>
<td>4,423,578,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA4</td>
<td>26,067,396,870</td>
<td>17,925,471,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>52,990,506,178</td>
<td>37,698,803,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 UNDAF at a Glance

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF 2014-2018) is the fourth generation Program of UN support to Kenya. It was launched by The President of Kenya Hon. Uhuru Kenyatta in May 2014. The UNDAF was developed according to the principles of UN Delivering as One (DaO), aimed at ensuring government ownership, demonstrated through UNDAF’s full alignment to government priorities as defined in the Vision 2030 and Medium-Term Plan 2013-2017 and planning cycles, as well as internal coherence among UN agencies and programs operating in Kenya. The UNDAF contributes to the overall goal of Kenya’s Vision 2030 of: “Creating a globally competitive and prosperous nation with a high quality of life by 2030, that aims to transform Kenya into a newly industrializing, middle-income country for all citizens in a clean and secure environment.”

The UNDAF reflects the efforts of all UN agencies and key partners working in Kenya. The design of the UNDAF was informed by several strategic discussions both within the UN and with stakeholders, to determine how the UN System is best suited to support the national development goals. Accordingly, the Government of Kenya and the UN System are committed to working together in the spirit of partnership to implement the UNDAF, as a contribution to the achievement of national development goals and aspirations. Shaped by the five UNDG programming principles (a Human Rights-based approach, Gender equality, Environmental sustainability, Results-based management, and Capacity development) the UNDAF has a broad-based Results Framework, developed in collaboration with Government, Civil Society, donors and other partners. The UNDAF has four Strategic Results Areas and 13 outcomes (figure 1):

1. Transformational Governance encompassing Policy and Institutional Frameworks; Democratic Participation and Human Rights; Devolution and Accountability; and Evidence-based Decision-making;

2. Human Capital Development comprised of Education and Learning; Health, including Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), Environmental Preservation, Food Availability and Nutrition; Multi-sectoral HIV and AIDS Response; and Social Protection;
3. Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth, with Improving the Business Environment; Strengthening
Productive Sectors and Trade; and Promoting Job Creation, Skills Development and Improved Working
Conditions, and

4. Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security including Policy and Legal Framework
Development; and Peace, Community Security and Resilience. The UNDAF Results Areas are aligned with
the three Pillars (Political, Social and Economic) of the Government’s Vision 2030 transformational agenda.

The four SRAs have 13 outcome areas with 66 Outcome indicators for tracking results. 46 output results contribute
to the outcomes. Approximately US$1.2 billion (for both humanitarian and development assistance) will be
needed over the 2014-2018 four-year period to achieve the 13 UNDAF outcomes. This includes core financial
resources available to the UN agencies and the funds to be mobilized from external sources. The budget
envelope is broken down as outlined in table 1.

Table 1: Estimated Total Budget by Strategic Result Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Result Area</th>
<th>Budget (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. Transformative Governance</td>
<td>173.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Human Capital</td>
<td>334.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Inclusive and Sustainable Growth</td>
<td>270.3 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security</td>
<td>406.5 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: UNDAF Strategic Result Areas
The UN Country Team (UNCT), under the leadership of the UN Resident Coordinator, is responsible for implementation of the UNDAF 2014-2018. Under the DaO “One Leader” approach the Resident Coordinator and the UNCT are responsible for oversight of the Strategic Results Groups, the Operations Management Team and the Country Communications Group. The National Steering Committee (NSC) oversees the Programme implementation and reporting. The Strategic Results Groups, chaired by a Head of Agency, have with the responsibility for providing overall programme coordination. A Programme Management and Oversight Group (PMOG) ensures programme coherence, coordination of implementation and reporting with the support of the Monitoring & Evaluation Technical Working Group (M&E TWG). The Strategic Results Groups are organized to contribute to the four sets of UNDAF strategic results areas through coordinated and collaborative planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Each Strategic Results Group has rolling joint work-plans to articulate short-term outputs (annual or biannual) that will contribute to the achievement of the UNDAF outcomes, and budgetary requirements using the same results-based management tools and standards. To reduce transaction costs for all involved partners, the Strategic Results Groups’ joint work-plans are the only work planning instruments, replacing agency-specific plans, except where other arrangements are agreed upon through the UNCT.

Table 2 Summarizes the SRA leadership responsibilities.

Table 2: Leads and Co-Leads for the Strategic Results Areas for the UNDAF 2014-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Result Area</th>
<th>UN Lead Agency</th>
<th>Government Lead Ministry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transformative Governance</td>
<td><strong>Lead:</strong> United Nations Development Program</td>
<td>Ministry of Devolution and Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Co-Leads:</strong> United Nations Office of Drug Control and UN Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital Development</td>
<td><strong>Lead:</strong> United Nations Children Fund</td>
<td>Ministry of Health &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Co-Leads:</strong> World Health Organization and World Food Program</td>
<td>Ministry of Education, Science and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Sustainable Economic Growth</td>
<td><strong>Lead:</strong> United Nations Industrial Development Organization</td>
<td>Ministry of Industrialization &amp; Enterprise Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Co-Leads:</strong> International Labor Organization &amp; Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sustainability, land Management &amp; Human Security</td>
<td><strong>Lead:</strong> United Nations Environment Program</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment, Water Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Co-Leads:</strong> UNHABITAT &amp; United Nations Educational Cultural and Scientific Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Implementation of the Kenya UNDAF spans across two important global development agendas which the GOK is a signatory. These are the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

1.2 Structure of the Report

This report is structured in six sections. Section one focuses on introduction and background of UNDAF and an overview of the mid-term review (MTR). Section two focuses on key findings by highlighting issues of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Section three outlines the UNDAF strategic partnerships while section four outlines strategic positioning of the UNDAF to the changing context. Section five presents an analysis of lessons learned for upscaling and replicability. The final section 7 outlines the financial analysis and report.
1.3 The UNDAF Mid-Term Review

1.3.1 Purpose, Objectives and Scope of the UNDAF Mid-Term Review

The purpose of the UNDAF Mid Term Review which was undertaken jointly by the Government of Kenya (GOK) and the UN Country Team (UNCT) is to provide an overall assessment of progress and achievements made against planned results as well as assess and document challenges and lessons learnt over the past first two and a half years of the UNDAF cycle (Annex 1: TOR of the UNDAF MTR). The review also focused on significant developments that have taken place in the programming environment which include the post 2015 agenda and the sustainable development goals that will impact on implementation of the UNDAF development agenda and realization of program results. The review also reflected on how the UN agencies and government through the strategic result area groups (SRAs) have supported UNDAF goals and identify areas requiring additional support either in program management or new implementation strategies.

Specific objectives of the UNDAF MTR were: to assess relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the UNDAF; assess the extent to which the UN has been responsive to address emerging issues; determine effectiveness of the “Delivering as One” modality in supporting achievements of the UNDAF results in line with the national vision 2030 and medium term goals; assess the effectiveness of mechanisms put in place to enhance coordination and harmonization among all UN agencies and the government; explore extent to which the five core programming principles: human rights gender equality, environmental sustainability; capacity development and results-based management (RBM) have been mainstreamed throughout the UNDAF implementation cycle; where possible make an assessment of UNDAF resources utilization in the past two years; and assess the degree to which humanitarian programming has been a part of the UNDAF.

The MTR was informed by an analytical framework as outlined in figure 2 below. The framework has three components which include: i) component 1- analysis of focus areas (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and design focus); ii) component 2- analysis of strategic positioning and; iii) component 3-assessment of core programming principles.
Figure 2: UNDAF Analytical Review Framework

Component 1: Analysis of the focus area

**Relevance:** The MTR focused on assessment of the extent to which the UNDAF program is relevant and appropriate in addressing the country’s needs and priorities. The assessment also examined the extent to which the UNDAF is aligned to key national development frameworks (Vision 2030 and MTP II).

**Effectiveness:** This was assessed at two levels: The first level looked at the extent to which planned outcome and output results have been accomplished including extent of alignment with the SDGs. The second level focused on effectiveness of UNDAF coordination and partnership framework.

**Efficiency:** This component focused on the optimal use of UNDAF resources (human and financial) and the extent to which operational procedures have been harmonized and are coherent.

**Sustainability:** Sustainability focused on benefits and ownership of UNDAF interventions; what sustainability mechanisms have been put in place and extent to which implementation mechanisms can be sustained over time.

Quality and evaluability of the UNDAF design:
The focus was on the extent to which the current UNDAF is designed as a results-oriented, coherent and focused framework; whether the indicators are Specific, Measureable, Attainable, Realistic and Time bound/Trackable (SMART).

Component 2: Analysis of Strategic Positioning.

**Strategic Alignment:** The focus of this component was on how the current UNDAF is aligned to key development frameworks such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), SDGs, Agenda 2030, Vision 2030 and MTP II as well as alignment with UNDG Guidance on UNDAF programming.

**Responsiveness:** This component analysed the extent to which UNDAF is and has responded to significant changes in the national development context and emerging issues.

**Added Value:** The review focused on what is the added value of UNDAF as a development framework. Analysis was on the unique contributions that the UNDAF offers which other development partners do not offer.
Component 3: This component analyzed how the core programming principles (normative principles: human rights, gender equality, and environmental sustainability; and enabling principles: capacity development and results-based management) have been integrated into UNDAF program design and implementation.

1.3.2 Methods and Tools

Mixed Method Approach: A variety of data collection methods were used including: desk of relevant documents; key informant/in-depth interviews, stakeholder’s self-assessment and field visits. The assessment used three key approaches to collect data. The first method was a self-assessment on performance of planned outputs and outcomes (Results chain principle) to determine performance of outcomes and outputs using the Outcome and Output Performance Assessment Tool (see sample tool in Annex 2). Performance was based on an analysis of available evidence as presented by the stakeholders. The second method assessed performance of outcome indicators in the UNDAF results framework by reviewing data sources at national level as means of verification. The third method was the independent opinion of the MTR team informed by assessment of available data, documents review and individual interviews. The UNDAF process was participatory and inclusive. A total of 161 persons were reached through one-on-one in-depth interviews while 200 participated in Joint SRA or Outcome consultative meetings. An additional 120 stakeholders were reached through stakeholder Validation Consultations.

Sources of data/information included: Desk review of key UN and government documents was one of the key methods that informed the design of the UNDAF MTR (Annex 2: outlines the documents reviewed).

In-depth Key Informant interviews: In-depth key informant interviews were conducted with UNDAF stakeholders who included GOK, UN agencies, private sector, CSOs, and development partners (Annex 3: list of persons interviewed). The stakeholders interviewed provided useful information on performance of the UNDAF. Consultative meetings and interviews were also held with the UNDAF MTR Reference Group, the Resident Coordinator’s Office (RCO), Program Management Oversight Group (PMOG), Chairs and Co-Chairs of SRA Groups, the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Group, Gender Working Group (GTWG), The Operations Management Team (OMT), and The Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) Working Group. The consultations were critical for providing insights to key areas for consideration within the broad UNDAF MTR.

Joint GOK and UN review meetings: In order to draw inputs from both GOK and UN agencies and build consensus on performance of the UNDAF especially at outcome level, joint consultative meetings were organized across SRA groups. The Joint review meetings started with the team of consultants providing guidance on ‘how to assess performance using the outcome/output tool and how to rate the performance of UNDAF Outcomes’. Using this tool across the four SRA groups, the joint teams contributed to the rating of performance of UNDAF Outcomes. The joint review meetings were very instrumental in mobilizing UN agencies and respective GOK stakeholders to participate in the UNDAF review. These review meetings also strengthened ownership of the program and the results by both Government and UN. The GOK in most cases chaired the meetings and also shared, through presentations, new sets of information on results that had not been captured through the standard quarterly updates of the UNDAF. 200 individuals participated in these consultations.

Field Visit: Turkana was purposefully selected for field visit as it is home to the UNDAF flagship program by UN agencies. The field visit lasted 2 days, Table 3 below provides highlights of key activities within the framework of the field visit.
Table 3: Highlights of Turkana Field Visit Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Activities</th>
<th>Groups Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consultation with UN agencies</td>
<td>7 UN agencies Resident in Turkana were jointly consulted on their programs. UN agencies represented included: RCO, UNDP, UNICEF, UN Habitat, WFP, UN Women and FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tour of Lodwar County Hospital and One Stop Center for GBV</td>
<td>Accompanied by one of the UN agencies on the Ground, visited mainly the maternity Wing and One Stop Center and interacted with health service providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Visited the Nadapal Irrigation Scheme</td>
<td>Met representatives of Nadapal Women Farmer Group of 30 members. Consulted with Women and also toured the Women Farmer Groups Assets (Store, grinding mills, office and others) accompanied by UN agencies and 1 CSO group supporting the initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consultation with the County Team</td>
<td>Jointly met with the Secretary of the County and the Finance and Economic Adviser.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Analysis and Presentation of Results: Content analysis of all the data collected through various methods to derive results on the performance of the UNDAF was undertaken. The outcome/output tool was used to aggregate and analyze the extent to which the outcomes and outputs have been achieved. A draft report of the findings was shared with all stakeholders at a validation workshop. The validation workshop which was attended by 155 key stakeholders of the UNDAF (GOK, Development Partners, Private Sector and Philanthropists, Civil Society Organizations, Academia and the UN Agencies) was a powerful method for validating results and providing further input for further analysis of the findings. Key recommendations from the validation workshop were incorporated into the final report.

Analysis of ratings for the performance of outcomes were classified as: “On Track” (Good progress on planned results at mid-term 50%- 75% or better), “Partially On Track” (performance lagging slightly below the 50% mark of planned results for mid-term but lower than 45% mark) and “Off Track” (Performance below 35% mark of planned results and there is evidence that the results are unlikely to be achieved by 2018). A triangulation of methods and results ensured adequate rigor to guarantee the validity of the MTR findings.

1.3.3 Limitations of the Review

There were three major limitations to the MTR process. While the review had adequate time for data collection, the timing of the review came at a busy time for government partners whose financial year ends in June, and were, therefore over-committed with preparations for the start of a new financial year. As a result, it was difficult to reach some of the key government strategic stakeholders. A second limitation was that SRA 4 was particularly difficult to coordinate because stakeholders had not been meeting regularly. As such, analysis of data for SRA 4 was informed by a number of tools individually completed by agencies as opposed to a one single tool jointly agreed by GOK and UN agencies. A third limitation was delay in responding to request for data on resource tracking by majority of UN agencies. The resource tracking tool was intended to provide information on financial contribution (both expenditures and disbursements) by the UN agencies to the UNDAF programs from June 2014 when the UNDAF program commenced to June 2016. However, these limitations did not present a major challenge in the overall position of the results of the MTR. The multiplicity of data sources and data collection methods mitigated the impact of these limitations.
2. FINDINGS ON PERFORMANCE OF THE UNDAF AT MID-TERM

2.1 RELEVANCE

The UNDAF is clearly aligned to national priorities and needs and has put in place strategies to respond to new emerging priorities such as Middle Income Country (MIC) status and the SDGs. The UNDAF is seen by the government as a strategic vehicle for delivering Kenya’s development priorities, manifested by the high degree of ownership and co-leadership. UNDAF has ensured that UN activities and interventions are closely aligned with the countries’ national plans and strategies for improving the status of MDGs and now SDGs. Kenya’s national priorities and strategies are outlined in Vision 2030, MTP I and MTP II, and sectoral policies and strategies. The fundamental principles of human rights and gender equality are firmly embedded in the 2010 Constitution. Despite Kenya’s progressive Constitution introduced in 2010, the establishment of key watchdog institutions and the government formal commitment to human rights, significant human rights challenges persist and remain priority for UNDAF. Table 4 below presents the linkages between the UNDAF and MTP II pillars.

Table 4: Alignment of UNDAF with MTP II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTP II Pillars</th>
<th>UNDAF SRA</th>
<th>UNDAF OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political: Political and issue-based, people-centered, results-oriented and democratic political system</td>
<td>Strategic Result 1 - Transformational Governance</td>
<td>1.1 Policy and institutional Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Democratic Participation and human rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Devolution and Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Evidence and rights based decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social: A social and cohesive society enjoying equitable social development in a clean and secure environment</td>
<td>Strategic Result 2 – Human capital</td>
<td>2.1 Education and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 WASH environmental preserves/ Food availability - nutrition/health.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Multi-sectoral HIV and AIDS Response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Social Protection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The focus of UNDAF on upstream policy formulation and capacity development particularly at devolved structures remains a key priority. Its critical to note that, at national level, new policies, frameworks and strategies have been developed in 2014 and 2015 that may require some SRAs/Outcomes to adjust programming in order to remain relevant and address the shift in current priorities. One such example is outcome 2.3 which requires to realign with the new Kenya AIDs Strategic framework of 2015-2019. Service delivery will be more relevant as the UN focuses attention on strengthening devolved structures of governance to improve service delivery at county level.

Other key changes that may affect the relevance of the UNDAF include elevation of Kenya to the status of a lower middle income country (MIC) status. When least developed countries reach middle-income status, development aid tends to decrease due to changing donor assumptions on affordability of host countries to finance their own development priorities. Interviews with development partners in Kenya indicate that for a number of them, long term development for Kenya (to 2019) is already determined hence aid flow is unlikely to be affected till then. This will be a trend to watch during the remaining period of UNDAF. As the economic status of the country improves towards Middle Income, there is a likelihood of decreased traditional funding, increase in responsibilities and demands on domestic funding. The GOK and UN is cognizant of these implications and a number of strategies have been put in place. These include Flagship programs focusing on innovative area-based programming approaches initially in Turkana County and Marsabit County Southern Ethiopia Cross Border program. The Demographic Dividend is also a key emerging priority that requires urgent innovative and strategic programing.

Another key change is the transitioning towards SDGs. The current UNDAF program design is responsive to addressing unfinished business of the MDGs with program delivery strongly addressing issues of maternal and child mortality issues, stunting and HIV and AIDS programming. An analysis of the current UNDAF shows relatively strong alignment to the SDGs across all the 4 strategic result areas (Annex 4: Assessment of UNDAF alignment to the SDGs). However, the 17 SDGs will largely change development priorities and expectations hence the need to
review the current UNDAF to better align it to the SDGs and also mobilize additional resources to cater for new areas and priorities. Financing beyond traditional partners, expanding domestic resources and intensifying DaO are key options to consider moving forward. Engaging the private sector and philanthropists for scale up and deepening impact is an area that will be more relevant particularly in addressing SDGs. There is also need to give more attention to resource optimization and how available resources could be better utilized. The role of South-to-South Cooperation also becomes more important and relevant.

The United Nations Development Group (UNDG) has outlined new guidelines on UNDAF programming. To remain relevant, it’s critical that the UN starts engaging the government during the current UNDAF on new programming principles in the following areas: i) Human rights, gender equality and women's empowerment; ii) Sustainable development and resilience; iii) Leave no one behind; iv) Accountability and v) integration of humanitarian support with the developmental agenda. Although at the design of UNDAF there were no deliberate efforts to address the principles of leave no-one behind, a quick review of UNDAF programming noted positive efforts in addressing marginalized groups and engaging non-traditional stakeholders (private sector and Philanthropists) in the delivery of the UNDAF programming.

The new UNDG guidelines makes the Common Country Analysis (CCA) mandatory and requires visioning (Vision 2030) as a new mandatory exercise. The UN will need to prioritize this during the current UNDAF as preparatory to the new UNDAF so that the UNDAF design is informed by an assessment and analysis of data needs, availability, gaps and capacities at the country level, in line with the findings of the CCA. This should be accompanied by a theory of change, that outlines a clear pathway for managing for impact within a constantly changing environment. The UN also needs to further explore strategies for strengthening humanitarian and development linkages during the second half of UNDAF implementation and ultimately in the design of the subsequent UNDAF.

2.2 EFFECTIVENESS

The MTR analyzed results at outcome level, using a three pronged approach: i) assessment of performance of outcomes through review of performance of outcome indicators; ii) assessment of the performance of outputs under each outcome and how this has contributed to performance of outcomes and iii) MTR team opinion based on overall information analyzed around outcomes.

2.2.1 Effectiveness of the UNDAF Design and Results Framework

The strategic results areas (SRAs) were well designed to respond to national development priorities. A stakeholder’s approach was used to design and align the UNDAF results framework to national key priorities as outlined in MTP II. An analysis of the SRAs observed a number of areas that need further improvement:

i. **Potential duplication of programs noted in SRA 3 and SRA 4:** The UNDAF MTR noted potential duplication on issues of environment and sustainable agriculture. SRA 3 Output 3.2.2 focuses on issues of climate change and sustainable agriculture, while SRA 4 Output 4.1.2 also deals with issues of sustainable and resilient agriculture and environmental issues. There is also need to harmonize output 3.2.1 on sustainable energy for all with priorities under outcome 4.1 to avoid duplication. A merger of the foregoing areas will be more effective in consolidating results.
ii. **Electoral Process:** The UNDAF MTR noted that issues of elections are key for any given country. They are processes requiring continuous capacity throughout the cycle of election preparation. The analysis noted that “electoral process” has been presented in the UNDAF design only as an output result 1.2.3. Given the importance of elections for SRA 1 focus, this area of UNDAF program delivery should have been pitched at the outcome level.

iii. **Governance and accountability:** Addressing corruption and accountability is often a key responsibility of the government. The UNDAF review noted that though the government is giving key priority to these areas, there is still a lot to be done given that corruption is a major development challenge both at national and county levels. The UN has very specialized agencies that could provide support to the GOK in enhancing capacities for addressing corruption. This will further enhance the options for accomplishing “Transformative Governance”.

iv. **The UNDAF Results Framework:** The results framework for the UNDAF has been partially adequate to track progress of UNDAF programming. Using the SMART (Specific, Measureable, Attainable, Realistic and Time bound/Trackable) principles, a good number of outcome indicators failed to pass the test (see Annex 5: for detailed analysis and assessment of all indicators). The percentage of Indicators that could not be used for the MTR (NUIA- Not Used in Assessment) is significantly high at 42% signalling an urgent need to review the UNDAF Results framework. Most indicators did not have sufficient data for baselines or targets. Details of each of the outcome indicators is provided in Annex 6.

v. **Baselines and targets:** Indicators in a number of result areas lack baselines or have inadequate baseline data, targets or data to monitor progress (Annex 6). Another challenge is that the data sources/means of verification used for a number of the indicators are surveys that the programs have no control over, and have high probability of having unavailable data to measure effectiveness of the programs especially at midterm and end term evaluation.

vi. **UNDAF output indicators could do with simplification:** An analysis of the UNDAF indicators notes that a significant proportion of indicators (examples % rate of public confidence in IEBC; % of population living below the poverty line) could be simplified to track quantities, coverage and sum of interventions of set outputs. On the contrary, there are a number of output indicators that were properly articulated (examples; Number of county governments that have developed County Education Sector Support Plans, Number of technical partnership agreements developed).
The UNDAF MTR therefore recommends an urgent review of the UNDAF Results framework to create an enabling programming environment where the joint stakeholders can use the M&E results framework as a solid tool for tracking results across all SRAs.

vii. **Outcome 1.4** is too ambitious, especially the performance target for devolved counties which are in their formative phases. There is also a mismatch of outcome indicators to output results. The theory of change or results chain principle was not adequately applied to this outcome. The MTR observed that the outcome indicators are too dependent on the existence of an M&E Policy or an ACT that is not within the control of UNDAF programming cycle. The assumption has been that, by 2015 an M&E Act/policy would have been in place. Other indicators relating to existence of at least one qualified M&E officer (1.4.5) or proportion of resources being allocated to M&E (1.4.4) are also tied to existence of the M&E policy.

viii. **Outcome 3.2**: The review noted with concern that some outcome and output indicators were set at unrealistically high levels, particularly targets for 2018 that could only show UN’s minimal contribution as change progresses from output to outcome. In a number of examples, both at outcome and output level, there are no targets for 2018, those that were available are too high for government and UN interventions to achieve by 2018.

For example, improvement in agriculture at national level is the product of a complex web of forces including weather changes and cannot be achieved by participating UN agencies or government Institutions alone. UN’s intervention is just one element in the number of factors that influence change on national agriculture indicators, therefore requires that realistic targets be set. The UN is only a small lever of change. Collective contribution of all players will lead to the achievement of the high level indicators. The outcome indicator of “% Annual contribution to GDP of Oil and Other Mineral Resources” with a Baseline of 1% (2013); Target: 3% (2018) might not be achieved because the most recent estimates show that oil production will start in 2020-2022 and production of natural gas is estimated to start in 2025. The targets require adjustment for what is achievable within the remaining UNDAF period. On sustainable energy for all, the UNDAF has been overambitious and set output targets at outcome target level subjecting the UNDAF to risk of low delivery by 2018. The UN is currently moving away from infrastructure projects with more focus on policy and technical support, there is therefore need to review targets for output 3.2.1. The output indicators are good but the targets are beyond the reach of current UNDAF. The targets for irrigation look unachievable posing risk of failure by 2018.
2.2.2 Effectiveness of SRA1: Transformative Governance

Transformative Governance seeks to contribute to rule of law aspirations as outlined in the MTP II. SRA1 has 4 outcomes which are: Outcome 1.1: Policy and legislative frameworks; Outcome 1.2: Attainment of a democratic society; Outcome 1.3: Achieving a participatory devolved process in line with constitutional provisions and subsequent Acts; and Outcome 1.4: Evidence-based decision making. The overarching visionary outcome results for transformative governance reads:

By 2030 Kenya enjoys a state of governance anchored in the rule of law that guarantees human rights and equitable access to justice, underpinned by a democratic culture that is open, participatory, effective, inclusive, credible and transparent, with institutions and systems that are fully devolved, responsive, and results oriented.

The Office of the Attorney General (AG) is the lead department for the SRA 1 and provides policy oversight. The Judiciary is the arm of government responsible for law enforcement. The discussion on performance of SRA1 is presented under two main sub headings: I) Contribution to Policy and Legal Frameworks; and ii) Contribution to capacity building. Due to the close linkages between outcome 1 and outcome 2 and given that programs were done jointly, the discussions on performance of these two areas have been combined, while the performance of outcomes 1.3 and 1.4 has been presented separately.

2.2.2.1 Assessment of Performance of Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2

Outcome 1.1: By 2016, the constitutionally mandated policy and institutional framework is fully operationalized: national laws meet international standards particularly with regard to the protection of human rights; the judiciary and justice system are responsive, effective accessible and independent; and law enforcement system is reformed, people oriented and anchored in integrity

Outcome 1.2: By 2017 Kenya has a democracy in which human rights and gender equality are respected; elected officials are responsive and accountable; citizens and civil society are empowered, responsible and politically/socially engaged; equitable representation is achieved through affirmative action and the electoral processes are free, fair, transparent and peaceful.

The thrust of outcomes 1.1 and 1.2 is to work towards establishing an enabling environment with policy and legal frameworks that guarantee: I) upholding of human rights principles including gender equality and women’s empowerment; ii) increased access to justice; iii) good governance within the framework of electoral processes; and iv) democratic participation including civic engagement.

Contribution to Policies and Legislative Frameworks:

A strong policy and legal framework for realization and enjoyment of human rights is now in place with positive signs of utilization of policy provisions in the early years. Kenya now has a National Human Rights Policy Sessional Paper No. 3 of 2014. The country has an instrument that can be used to start operationalizing various laws and guidelines that deal with human rights. The National Policy and Action Plan for Human Rights was adopted in 2015. Since its adoption, arms of government have started applying its provisions in their work. A case in
UN agencies have supported strengthening capacities of strategic human rights and gender equality institutions through:
placement of gender advisors in institutions;
key competencies of personnel in institutions;
and support to the development of institutions for gender and human rights and related policies. Strategic institutions where gender advisors were placed include: The Parliament, National Gender and Equality Commission (NGEC); Council of Governors; Ministry of Mines; and Joint UN Team in Turkana. UN agencies supported technical working groups working with NGEC on advocacy for two-thirds rule on Gender Equality Bill; a legislation which, if passed would increase the representation of women in parliament. The NGEC in collaboration with Directorate of Gender designed a monitoring tool on mainstreaming gender in public sector performance contracting.

**Contribution to National Capacities:**

**UN agencies have supported strengthening capacities of strategic human rights and gender equality institutions through:** placement of gender advisors in institutions; key competencies of personnel in institutions; and support to the development of institutions for gender and human rights and related policies. Strategic institutions where gender advisors were placed include: The Parliament, National Gender and Equality Commission (NGEC); Council of Governors; Ministry of Mines; and Joint UN Team in Turkana. UN agencies supported technical working groups working with NGEC on advocacy for two-thirds rule on Gender Equality Bill; a legislation which, if passed would increase the representation of women in parliament. The NGEC in collaboration with Directorate of Gender designed a monitoring tool on mainstreaming gender in public sector performance contracting.

**Noted Achievements of Outcome 1.1 and 1.2**

The National Police Service has received support towards ensuring ethics and Integrity are entrenched in the institution: Towards this, the National Police Service was supported to develop an Anti-Corruption Strategy and Code of Conducts and Ethics. To support Policy and institutional framework, there has been advancement in the police reform programme whereby the National Police Service Standing Orders, Strategic and Communication Plans as well as the vetting process have been established. In addition, capacity of the Independent Policing Oversight Authority (IPOA) staff in Complaints Management, Investigations and Inspections of police premises has been improved; this has been done through ongoing training from international experts. Furthermore, the Authority has developed its Strategic Plan 2014-2018, whose implementation is guided by a Performance Management Framework manual that is in place. The National Police Service Commission has progressed with the vetting of officers; they have completed this process for senior ranking officers. The Commission further finalized development of its Strategic Plan, which is now being utilized. Over the last two years there has been
been recruitment of an additional 10,000 police officers - including a new Inspector General of Police. Strategies and Policies for the National Police Service were also developed; including the Service's Strategic Plan 2014-2018 which articulates strategies that are being deployed for a holistic transformation of the Service during a period of four years. In addition, the National Police Service was supported in developing their Human Rights and Gender Mainstreaming Strategy. This will guide the service in ensuring gender parity and equity, as well as in ensuring that Human Rights are observed in line with international standards and norms.

**A policy and legal framework for increased access to justice exists:** Through partnership between the government and UN, the country now boasts of a supportive policy framework for access to justice. The UNDAF MTR noted that the passing of the Legal Aid Act, 2016 is improving access to justice. The Small Claims Court Act of 2016 required the judiciary to set up courts at the constituencies to reinforce timely and affordable informal resolution of disputes with commercial disputes on claims of less than Ksh.100,000 in accordance with the principle of Law and Natural Justice.

**Capacity of national institutions to provide services for increased access to justice by previously disadvantaged groups has been huge:** Over the years (2010 to 2011), the country's capacity to guarantee its citizens increased access to justice has been generally low. Speaking on national capacities of the judiciary system, this is what a judiciary expert had to say:

"We found an institution so frail in its structures, so thin on resources, so low on its confidence, so deficient in integrity, so weak in public support that, to have expected it to deliver justice was to be wildly optimist." *Justice Official 2011.*

Significant progress has been made in reducing the backlog on court cases. UN agencies partnered with the High Court on the Justice at Last Initiative (Old Cases Clearance initiative) where, before newly appointed judges were deployed, they were assigned to facilitate the clearance of close to 15,494 old cases within five days. The new judges were deployed to High Court stations with the highest backlog namely, Nairobi, Meru, Mombasa, Kisumu, Kakamega, Nakuru and Nyeri. The Court of Appeal has also been decentralized from its previous seat in Nairobi to Malindi, Kisumu and Nyeri.

**Box 1: Strategies Used to Increase Access to Justice**

- ICT as an enabler of justice (use of laptops, court video-visual transcription systems, e-diaries, adoption of e-financial and e-procurement systems);
- Performance management as a measurement framework established.
- Performance contracts signed to measure work outputs.
- Service weeks entrenched in judiciary as an acceptable short term measure.

Outstanding outcome results were recorded, these include: a case backlog reduction from one million cases in 2011 to 426,508 by 2016; an increase in budget allocation to the judiciary from Ksh3 billion in 2011 to Ksh17.7 billion in the 2015/16 budget and; courts revenue increase from Ksh500 million in 2011 to Ksh2.1 billion in 2015. Table 5 shows results of increased access to the Justice System from 2011 and 2016.

**Table 5: Increased Access to the Justice System Comparison of 2011 and 2016**

---

Mediation is now an alternative form of dispute resolution (ADR) in the Judiciary: The Constitution of Kenya, Article 159 (2) (c), recognizes mediation and encourages it as a form of dispute resolution to be applied by courts. The judiciary in 2016 approved the implementation of court-annexed mediation within the High Court’s Family and Commercial Divisions in Nairobi. The GOK gazetted the Mediation Accreditation Committee, as provided for under the Civil Procedure Rules. The use of mediation now provides that once an agreement is reached during mediation, it will be filed with the Mediation Deputy Registrar and will be adopted and enforced as a judgment or order of the court.2

Within six months of the start of the UNDAF, laws and legal provision for the electoral processes were enacted: With support from the UN system, the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC) have developed a long term strategic plan for the period 2015-2020. Further, with UN support, the IEBC derived from the strategic plan, its 2017 Elections Operation Plan, setting out its proposed schedule of work towards the August 2017 elections.

Significant progress has been made in strengthening institutional capacity for Gender and Human Rights Mainstreaming: The institutional capacity of the Attorney General’s Office to develop a framework for implementation of the two-thirds gender rule has been strengthened through NGEC. The Bill proposed by the AGs’ appointed Technical Working Group on not more than two-thirds gender failed to be adopted by parliament. The Parliament extended the two-thirds gender Bill by one year as a result of lobbying and advocacy efforts by the women’s movement and NGEC but it failed to be approved.

In December 2015, Parliament adopted the National Policy and Action Plan on Human Rights. The government has adopted a plan that will help in the implementation and monitoring of the accepted recommendations during the UPR review. The plan provides a framework for both the UN and the GOK to work towards promotion of human rights especially through UNDAF and the MTP II. The institutional capacity of the Oversight Agencies to produce timely reports has been enhanced. The UN supported the GOK in the submission of the 8th Periodic Convention on Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) Report and the UPR review recommendations, in line with international requirements.

The capacity of women politicians to lobby is yielding promising results: The UNDAF MTR notes that the mentorship of over 74 new members of The Kenya Women Parliamentary Association (KEWOPA) and women Members of Constitutional Assembly (MCAs) to effectively execute their legislation, representative, and oversight role has been enhanced. This resulted in increased participation of debates in Parliament and County Assemblies from 2% to 12% and up to 50% by the UNDAF mid-term. KEWOPA members had tabled at least 10 Bills by end of July-September 2015. In Kisumu and Homabay, women MCAs participation in the Assembly has increased, with the tabling of over 30 motions in the assembly and the Standing Orders in Homabay County Assembly have been amended to address women members’ needs. There has been an increase in participation and lobbying for budgets in the Nairobi County with the Women MCA Caucus getting Ksh.3 million for the purchase and distribution of sanitary towels. In Baringo, the women MCAs are advocating for engendering of committees and over 50 young women have been mentored on political leadership.

---

2 Feedback from consultations with key stakeholders especially OHCHR
Elections preparedness and risk management: One of the result areas for the UNDAF at output level (1.2.3) is support to the IEBC to ensure equitable representation, free and fair; credible; transparent and peaceful elections. The UN responded with a program intervention to enhance capacity of IEBC towards management of free, fair and credible election in Kenya. The UN support to elections has the following 5 Outcome areas:

1. Strengthened legal and institutional framework for elections;
2. Strengthened, secured, and more informed participation in the electoral process;
3. More efficient, transparent, and peaceful elections;
4. Strengthened electoral justice;
5. Effective mechanism established for technical assistance and programme management;

*Highlights of progress towards set targets for elections preparedness*: Significant progress has been registered on the election legal frameworks with Bills tabled for the Election Act Amendment, IEBC Act Amendment and Political Parties Act amendment. The Election Operations Plan was launched in January 2016. The plan provides guidance on 2017 General elections covering key areas for ensuring free, fair and credible elections. It is informed by the IEBC Strategic Plan (2015-2020) and builds upon lessons learnt from the 2013 general elections and subsequent by-elections.

Institutional capacity strengthening has been supported through provision of technical assistance in the areas of Communication, warehouse and logistics management, procurement and institutional transformation. Reports have indicated that good progress has been recorded in preparation for effective communication, warehouse and logistic planning.

The competencies of IEBC personnel have been reportedly enhanced with all staff signing performance based contracts. For elections dispute resolution and conflict prevention strategy a chief technical advisor for elections has been provided to IEBC.

The technical assistance has been instrumental in improving project planning, review and work planning and also streamlining relationship with national partners and other development partners (donors). Progress has been made with respect to dialogue among political parties, the religious leaders and development partners. A mass voter registration exercise in the first quarter of 2016 only registered 1.4 million new Kenyan voters against a target of 4 million additional voters constituting only 34% of the target. Consultations with IEBC indicated possible good results from the planned second phase voter registration, mainly due to additional resources by the government amongst other reasons.

Inclusivity in electoral processes has also been enhanced: With Respect to participation of women, youths and marginalized groups, UN supported IEBC and other strategic institutions to include NGEC with innovative approaches to mobilize women, youth and PWDs as voters. Through UN technical support, five manuals and training curriculum in the Office of the Registrar of Political Parties (ORPP) were reviewed to engender them. The ORPP capacities enhanced the election preparedness of political parties' chairperson, leaders, persons with disabilities, and general leadership. The review notes that more could be done to mobilize the same groups as potential candidates for elections. UN agencies also supported the IEBC to address issues of gender responsive reporting on election issues and process, signing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Media Council of Kenya to address capacity issues for media gender responsive reporting.

**Outstanding concerns by the public at UNDAF mid-term on elections preparedness and support:** Consultations with IEBC gave assurance that the IEBC will before the elections time, address issues related to free, fair, representative and credible elections. Review of available literature and stakeholder consultation however indicated concerns with capacity of IEBC to guarantee free, fair and credible elections. These concerns were also echoed by religious leaders of Kenya. Key areas of concern include:

i. Concern on what specifically IEBC hold as Principle Voter Register?

ii. Robustness of the ICT infrastructure and readiness for full deployment during the 2017 elections while learning lessons from 2013 elections;

iii. Full operationalization of the electoral legal framework, in advance of the 2017 general elections and;

iv. There is growing concern for transparency and stakeholder involvement and engagement in addressing what are viewed as potential areas which could contribute to disputes if not adequately addressed. At mid-term, the mood for the next general elections in 2017 is gearing up. The IEBC credibility is questioned by some. The forthcoming elections could pose risks in a number of ways. Nineteen counties have been identified as possible election violence hot spots in 2017. Government is monitoring and watching these hot spots. Counties with perennial border conflicts are among those on the watch list. The country could see a slowdown in growth momentum for two reasons; first is the risk that investors defer investment decisions until after the elections; second, that election related expenditure delays the much needed fiscal consolidation and/or see a cut back in infrastructure spending.

**Noted Challenges for Outcome 1.1 and 1.2**

Despite concerted efforts on strengthening advocacy capacity for the two-thirds Gender Rule Bill, failure of the bill to pass through parliament has been a major blow to the fight for gender equality. Unless Kenya passes the two-thirds Gender Rule, the country will not be able to meet the regional requirement for gender equality and participation of women in decision making. However, consultations with stakeholders indicated that the efforts are not lost, as there are other options to push the same agenda. The only major concern is the timing, given that the next elections are planned for 2017- hence there is inadequate time to further the negotiations.

GOK has to work towards addressing outstanding human rights issues: Outstanding human rights issues include; impunity and corruption, improvement of police and judiciary systems, lack of accountability for oversight public officials, limited awareness by the public on human rights issues, limited access

---

4 Internal report at the National Cohesion and Integration Commission quoted on the Star Newspaper, 26th April 2016.
5 World Bank, Kenya Economic Update, march 2016
to enjoyment of human rights by prisoners, weak mechanisms for addressing post-election violence. Others areas of concern that the government needs to address include: issues of death penalty and extra judicial killings.6

GOK has a policy and capacity gap for addressing corruption: There is growing concern on the level of corruption at national and county levels which negatively affects transformative governance. There is need for the UN through the DaO approach to design an innovative program on governance and accountability while scaling up and replicating best practices from other African Countries that have successfully implemented programs on Zero tolerance to corruption.

The current voter registration figures fall short of the expected 80% of eligible voters. To date the Commission has registered an additional 1.4 million voters against a target of 4. million additional targets, constituting 34% planned target for mass voter for continuous voter registration including the second mass voter registration campaign prior to the 2017 elections.

**Key Recommendations for Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2**

The analysis noted that the GOK does not have a challenge in financing for the election process. This is also confirmed by donor’s contributions for the last elections. According to some donors interviewed during the MTR, during the 2013 elections, only 12% of funding came from donors, with bulk of the funds coming from GOK. The UNDAF MTR review also noted that there is adequate time to address the stakeholder concerns on holding credible elections. Key recommendations include:

i. The IEBC to consider a well-planned second phase of voter registration and work towards meeting the target for registration of voters;

ii. The UN agencies and GOK to consider alternative and innovative approaches to work towards legislation addressing the two-thirds gender rule;

iii. The UN and GOK to consider engaging the regional and Global UN bodies to address the existing concerns with IEBC and

iv. The UN needs to strengthen GOK accountability structures to reduce the high level of corruption.

**Performance Rating of the SRA 1 Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2**

The overall rating of the Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2 at mid-term is “On Track” as outlined in the tables below:

**Table 6: Assessment on Performance of outcome 1.1 using the Output Performance Analysis Tool**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.1: On Policy and Institutional Frameworks</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Human Rights Focused Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 Alignment to constitutional and Int. standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Judicial Reforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.4 Ethics and Integrity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome performance based on Outputs</strong></td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table 7: Overall rating of the performance of Outcome 1.1 Using Triangulation of Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Outcome Results by triangulation of three methodologies</th>
<th>Rating.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the output performance assessment</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Assessment of performance of Outcome indicator (see Annex 1.1)</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Consultant judgment informed by analysis of the key findings</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final position of the Outcome 1.1 Performance</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Assessment on Performance of Outcome 1.2 Using the Output Performance Analysis Tool

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.2: On Democratic participation and human rights</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output Result Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 On HR and Gender Mainstreaming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 On Citizen engagement and participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3 On Electoral Process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome performance based on outputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Assessment of Performance of Outcome 1.2 Using the Triangulation of Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Outcome Results by triangulation of three methodologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the output performance assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Assessment of performance of Outcome indicator (see Annex 1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Consultant judgment informed by analysis of the key findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final position of the Outcome 1.2 Performance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2.2 Assessment of Performance of Outcome 1.3

With the adoption of the 2010 Constitution, Kenya positioned itself on an ambitious path towards devolution, introducing a new system of governance that included 47 county governments with governors and legislatures. Devolution contributes to transformative governance characterized by deepened democracy, accountability as well as setting the stage for greater inclusiveness, stronger rule of law and a more effective government. The thrust of the UN agencies on devolution and accountability processes has been in the following areas: i) policies, laws and institutional reforms for effective implementation of the Constitution at national and county levels; ii) strengthening of institutional and human capacities at national and county level; iii) strengthened citizen participation mechanisms and processes to ensure effective; and equitable service delivery, transparent and accountable use of resources; iv) policies, laws and institutional reforms for effective implementation of the Constitution at national and county levels and v) strengthening of institutional and human capacities at national and county level; and iii) strengthened citizen participation mechanisms and processes to ensure effective; and equitable service delivery, transparent and accountable use of resources.

UN support to the Devolution and Accountability Program has been anchored on the National Capacity Building Framework (NCBF) adopted in November 2013 by the national and county governments and development partners. Support has been provided at the national level to strengthen policy and legislative frameworks and strengthen capacities of strategic institutions. Through the Council of Governors (CoG) targeted support has been provided to all the 47 counties in a number of areas which include: High Level Forums (Governor’s forums) to discuss strategic issues, Economic Regional blocs, Devolution Conference (2014, 2015 and 2016), County Executive Committees (CECs) Pre-Conference Workshops, technical support to counties through United...
Nations volunteering in different expertise including monitoring and evaluation, public financial management, statistics, human resource, governance and geographic information system/special planning among others. In addition, greater focus has been on support to 21 counties (Kwale, Kilifi, TaitaTaveta, Marsabit, Kitui, Homabay, Turkana, Samburu, Laikipia, Vihiga, Bungoma, Kisumu, Nyeri, Embu, Kirinyaga, Elgeyo Marakwet, Nakuru, Narok, Kajiado and Kericho and Busia). Other development partners working in devolution include: USAID AHADI Project; EU's IDEAS and the World Bank. As such while the bulk of the results shared under outcome 1.3 are derived from UN agencies support, some aspects of the results could be a spill-over of support from other development partners.

**Contribution to Policies and Legislative Frameworks:**

UN agencies have supported development of devolution related policies at both national and county levels: Key achievements include: support to development of the devolution policy, implementation of the devolution policy in selected counties and finalization of the public to draft legislative instruments at county levels. The Transition Authority (TA) and the Commission on Revenue Allocation (CRA) finalized the costing of government functions; CRA developed the second generation revenue sharing formula, which has since been accented into law; the Ministry of Devolution and Planning (MoDP) disseminated 14 county model laws to all 47 county governments and has developed the Devolution Policy. MoDP has also developed and disseminated the civic education curriculum and is currently finalizing the civic engagement framework and the National monitoring and evaluation framework. The Council of Governors (CoG) supported the development of five bills and two regulations in four counties (Kiambu, Kirinyaga, Kakamega and Nyamira), while staff from six counties i.e. Kilifi, Kitui, Nyeri, Taita Taveta, Samburu and Turkana were trained on legislative drafting. The Controller of Budget approved 46 County Budgets and CRA conducted training for Members of County Assemblies (MCAs) from all 47 counties on the budgeting process and adherence to the budget ceilings. In addition, the UN through the UN Volunteers in Kenya provided support to development of a National Volunteerism policy and adoption by the Cabinet.

**Contribution to National Capacities:**

**Strengthened capacities of strategic institutions for devolution processes:** Outstanding achievements include: establishment of a functional and effective secretariat for the Council of Governors; setting up of an inter-regional relations and technical committee and county inter-governmental fora. The UN provided support to the Ministry of Devolution and planning including placement of 39 UN Volunteers providing support in Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E), statistics and public finance management. As a result of technical assistance on planning for counties, all the 47 complied with guidelines for receiving funding from national government. Previously, in 2014/15 period only 10 out of 47 counties had complied. The Kenya School of Government (KSG) has strengthened capacity to design and deliver training programs including mainstreaming gender in key devolution curriculum M&E and planning training to counties. Through UN seconded Gender Adviser, the capacity of Council of Governors to address gender equality principles in their strategies and other institutional processes including guidance to counties has been strengthened. A Gender Advisor has also been placed in Turkana County. The UN supported the National Police Service with the development of an anti-corruption strategy and the code of conduct.

The Kenya School of Government (KSG) finalized development of five curricula under the NCBF and trained 208 ToTs (157 males and 51 females) on the curriculum components to facilitate its rollout; human resources, skills audit and workload analysis was conducted in Homa Bay County; Kwale County has developed a capacity building framework; recruitment and placement of 39 United Nations Volunteers (UNVs) in 37 counties, training of 3,521 staff from various counties on legislative drafting, M&E, Performance Management Systems (PMS),
leadership, record management, financial oversight, etc. Nine counties (Kisumu, Homabay, Kilifi, Bungoma, Turkana, Samburu, Kitui, Nyeri and Taita Taveta) were supported to develop performance contracts. The Intergovernmental Budget and Economic Council (IBEC) sensitized 37 County Executive Committees (CECs) on strengthening their role through the integration of various processes related to public finance management (PFM) at county level. Through this process, a forum was established for CECs in charge of finance to engage the National Treasury on matters related to finance.

**Noted Achievements of Outcome 1.3**

**Strategic oversight institutions for devolution were strengthened:** Key oversight institutions such as the Council of Governors, County Assemblies and Parliaments have improved capacity on gender responsive budgeting tools for budget oversight, with greater focus on improving county budget efficiency. The UNDAF MTR noted that county governments have developed gender and inclusion indicators in County Development Plans. The capacity of 47 County Youth and Gender Officers on the MTP II gender indicators and the development of work plans on the utilization of the indicators were enhanced.

The UNDAF MTR notes an improvement of staff accountability on gender equality and women’s empowerment in Kisumu as reported in the MTR of the Performance Contracts 2014/15.

**National level frameworks to guide devolved counties were developed and are in use.** With support from the UN agencies, the following noted results have been realized: The national civil education frameworks; national civil education curriculum; national civil education training; national public participation guidelines have been developed, adopted and disseminated. However, it should be noted that the civic education and public participation frameworks are not fully applied at county levels.

**Counties have put in place solid systems as a basis for devolution process:** All the 47 counties have County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) to provide the basis for development planning. However, the MTR noted that some CIDPs require revisions to strengthen the human rights and gender integration and also align to SDGs.

**Box 2: Inclusivity: Leave No One Behind for Outcome 1.3**

Analysis of the contribution of outcome 1.3 to transformative governance has observed good efforts in operationalizing the principle of inclusivity. Good practices include conscious efforts to mainstream gender equality and human rights principles in policies, systems, planning tools including application of gender responsive budgeting at both national and county levels. Model Biashara centers that address the needs of youths especially are commendable. Creation of youth and women fund for development is applauded.

**CoG has with UN support, established various fora of exchange of information for replication and scaling up of good practices:** The CoG has successfully established the following: i) Information sharing avenues especially for legislation; ii) Knowledge sharing centers; and iii) organizing devolution conferences. The information sharing fora have generated avenues for sharing good practices. Makuene County is reported to have a good model of an approved public participation framework. Kericho County has a model ICT centers while various counties including Turkana, Bungoma, Kajiado, have established women youth funds.7

---

7 Joint GOK and UN UNDAF MTR Consultative Breakfast Meetings.
**Noted Challenges for Outcome 1.3**

**Inadequate capacity to implement IFMIS at county level:** IFMIS has been introduced to the counties, however there are gaps relating to technical and financial capacities to roll out IFMIS at county level.

**Existing approaches on information sharing for good practices among counties are not adequate for sustained knowledge exchange and scaling up of good practices:** While exchange visits for learning are good approaches, there were observations that question their effectiveness and efficiency. In some cases, study tours are conducted in areas where the context is inappropriate to the Kenyan or county context. The Controller of Budget and Auditor General reports have questioned the cost-effectiveness of this approach to new learning.

**Inadequate attention on programming to address corruption and impunity:** Stakeholders including those who attended the UNDAF MTR validation meeting noted that there is a gap in effective programming to deal with high levels of corruption and impunity. In 2016, Kenya has maintained a poor score in the global Corruption Perception Index (CPI). Kenya scored 25 on a scale of zero to 100 (with zero perceived to be highly corrupt, and 100 very clean), the same score was recorded in 2014.

Kenya is ranked at position 139 out of 168 countries and territories included in the 21st edition of the CPI. Kenya’s score is below the global average of 43 and Sub Saharan Africa’s mean of 33.

**Public participation and civic engagement has not reached the expected levels:** The constitutional and other legal provisions for devolution calls for civic engagement and participation. The review noted that there is limited participation of the public in county business. The delayed development and dissemination of guidelines for civic engagement could be a key factor to the delay. The guidelines were only disseminated in May /June 2016.

**Key Recommendations for Outcome 1.3**

i. The UN should support counties in utilizing the newly disseminated civic engagement guidelines and curriculum to scale up citizen participation and engagement at county levels.

ii. UNDAF programmatic support should consider scaling up inter-county learning/exchange visits which may give counties hands-on experience and more sustainable learning. UNDAF support should enable counties to systematically identify and document successful business and innovative models to inform the county-to-county learning and knowledge sharing for replication and up-scaling such models.

---

iii. In the spirit of enhancing “Transformative Governance” the M&E review team to consider including an outcome indicator to track performance of county’s on issues of good governance and accountability.

iv. Given that there are many agencies contributing to strengthening capacities of the devolved counties, the UN should consider identifying a joint.

v. There is need for UN and GOK to consider providing technical capacity at county levels, to link county IFMIS systems with sub counties.

vi. Given that Counties now have mandates to implement activities in almost every sector that UN Agencies program in and while UNDAF was developed at a time when the significance of this could not have been predicted, the MTR recommends that the planned evaluation of the devolution program focus on an analysis of the impact of devolution in sectors such as education (TIVET, ECD), agriculture, health, HIV among others. In line with this, the next UNDAF should deliberately engage counties in development of the next UNDAF

**Overall Performance Rating of SRA 1 Outcome 1.3**
Outcome 1.3 on devolution is “On Track” as outlined from the tables below:

**Table 10: Performance Rating for Outcome 1.3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.3: On Devolution and Accountability</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1 On Capacity of Strategic Institutions for Devolution Transition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.2 Service deliver: Regulatory Frameworks, national &amp; Counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.3 County Good Governance Model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3.4 Learning and Innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Performance After Computing Output ratings</strong></td>
<td><strong>On Track</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11: Assessment of Outcome 1.3 using Triangulation of Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Outcome Results by triangulation of three methodologies</th>
<th>On Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the output performance assessment</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Assessment of Performance of Outcome indicator (see Annex1.3)</td>
<td>Partially On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Consultant judgment informed by analysis of the key findings</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Position of the Outcome 1.3 Performance**

**On Track**

**2.2.2.3 Assessment of the Performance of Outcome 1.4**

**Outcome 1.4:** By 2018 Development Planning and Decision Making are evidence and rights based, supported by a well-established and strong research monitoring and evaluation culture that guarantees the independency, credibility, timeliness and disaggregation of data broadly accessible to intended audiences.
Outcome 1.4 on Evidence Based Decision Making seeks to ensure that: (i) development planning and decision making are evidence based; (ii) a strong culture of research, monitoring and evaluation is built; and (iii) institutions responsible for M&E provide credible and timely disaggregated data.

**Contributions to Policies and Legislative Frameworks:**

The draft M&E Policy has been revised with the potential for making positive changes in the area of M&E: The M&E policy has been revised, awaiting adoption and launch before Community M&E Committees (COMEcs) which have already been established in a few counties. Finalization of this policy is critical for informing development of county level M&E policies where demand for data to inform evidence based development planning is high.

**Contribution to National Capacities:**

Significant progress has been made in improving technological capacities for M&E systems. Technical capacity for M&E has been strengthened through a wide range of interventions which include revitalization of retrieval of Data for Small areas by micro-computer (REDATAM) based integrated multi-sectoral information system (IMIS). The IMIS has been updated and launched on the Website: http://statistics.knbs.or.ke/imisken/. Nairobi and Homabay Counties were oriented on use of County Information Management System (CIMES). The UN has supported GOK to strengthen use of Electronic Program Management Information System (e-PROMIS) to capture databases for all government projects across the country. e-PROMIS provides data on projects start date, resource allocation, funding partners, and project completion date. With technical support from UN agencies and development partners, the Monitoring and Evaluation Department (MED) is at an advanced stage in finalization and roll out of the Electronic Monitoring and Evaluation System which will use the concept of traffic lights as a basis for reporting. There will be four traffic lights, blue for exceeding targets, green for achieved target, yellow for below target, and red for very below target. Key implementing partners including the UN will be trained on use of the electronic system.

**Noted Achievements of Outcome 1.4**

Significant progress has been made in institutionalization of M&E capacities within strategic institutions and agencies to enhance the culture of research and M&E: With technical support from UN agencies and other partners, M&E capacities, focusing mainly on research, monitoring and evaluation have been enhanced. Institutions targeted with these capacity strengthening interventions include: local universities, county officials, and government departments, Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS), Population Studies and Research Institute (PSRI), National Council for Population and Development (NCPD) and government officials. Technical support was specifically provided to KNBS officers on Census and Survey Processing Systems (CSPro) and Android for immediate users. In addition, a total of 714 birth and death registration agents comprising of health personnel and administration officers drawn from Kilifi and Migori counties were trained in research and M&E. To support implementation of UNDAF, technical M&E specialists were placed in strategic institutions of RCO’s office and Ministry of Devolution and Planning.
Research and baseline studies conducted in health and agriculture to support evidence-based planning.
The UN supported the 2015 Health Facility and Emergency Obstetric and Newborn Care (EmoNC) Baseline Assessment for Reproductive, Maternal Newborn Child and Adolescent Health (RMNCAH) covering Migori, Mandera, Isiolo, Lamu, Marsabit and Wajir counties. The Maternal Mortality Survey has been conducted in Kilifi, Nairobi and Homabay to enhance understanding of the factors that contribute to maternal deaths in the three counties. In 2014, the UN and other development partners provided support to the Kenya Demographic Health Survey which was launched in 2015. In the agricultural sector, the UN in 2015, supported the long rains assessment in 23 Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs) counties. Such research and development data is important to programming planning.

Noted Challenges for Outcome 1.4

Linking NIMES with County M&E framework presents a huge challenge. While NIMES has been strengthened significantly at national level since UNDAF inception in 2014, county Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (CIMES) remains relatively weak at county levels. The major challenge for a coordinated M&E system is how to link the national M&E system with the county M&E system. However, it should be noted that to date, guidelines for CIMES have been developed. The coordinated linkages of the M&E system calls for a huge investment in strengthening County M&E capacities and generation of evidence based data for planning and budgeting. The Ministry of Devolution and Planning is working on MTR of CIDPs which will assist in ascertaining the levels and capacities of M&E at the devolved counties.

Demand for M&E capacities at county levels is high, requiring an innovative strategy as a matter of urgency. While some efforts to reach all 47 counties with basic M&E training have been made, this is not adequate compared to the huge demand for evidence based data to inform development planning at county level. With support from the UN agencies, only 5 out of 47 counties (Nairobi, Kilifi, Homabay, Turkana and Migori) have received in-depth M&E training, hence there is need to fast track the trainings to other counties. It should also be noted that it takes time to translate new knowledge to usable capacity and skills. M&E capacity needs at county levels will with time go beyond training to capacities for establishing functional and effective systems, this should be factored in the capacity building plan.

Key Recommendations for Outcome 1.4

i. The M&E results framework requires urgent revisions to improve the results chain, baseline and target information and adding new outcome indicators for comprehensiveness. The urgency is driven by the need for the next half of the UNDAF to be guided by a robust and complete M&E results framework.

ii. There is need to continue supporting review and roll-out of national and county M&E systems such as NIMES, CIMES and e-promise which are critical in availing data for evidence based programming and prioritization.

iii. There is need for active engagement with the GOK as it reviews the current MPT II and development the next MTP III. The UN to consider supporting the GOK to undertake a Common County Assessment (CCA) which will be a rich source for M&E information especially for the next UNDAF.
Performance Rating for SRA 1 Outcome 1.4

The outcome is “On track” as outlined below:

Table 12: Assessment of Performance of Outcome 1.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.4: On evidence and rights-based decision making</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1 M&amp;E Policy for National and Devolved levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.2 Functional, coordinated M&amp;E System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.3 M&amp;E capacities at national and devolved levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.4 Relevant MDAs and KNBS generate dev data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome performance based on Outputs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Partially on Track</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Overall Rating of Performance of Outcome 1.4 by Triangulation of Methods

Assessment of Outcome Results by triangulation of three methodologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Outcome Results by triangulation of three methodologies</th>
<th>Partially on Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the output performance assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Assessment of Performance of Outcome indicator (see Annex 1.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Consultant judgment informed by analysis of the key findings</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Position of the Outcome 1.4 Performance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Partially on Track</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance of SRA 1 at a glance

Table 14: Overall Performance of SRA 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformative Governance Outcomes</th>
<th>Outcome Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.1: On Policy and Institutional Framework</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.2: On Democratic participation and Human Rights</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.3: On Devolution and Accountability</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.4: On Evidence and Right based Decision Making</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall SRA Position</strong></td>
<td><strong>On Track</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.3 Effectiveness of SRA 2: Human Capital

The UNDAF intends to achieve results under the human capital strategic results area through four broad outcomes. Outcome 2.1 seeks to improve education to a sector that equips citizens with knowledge and technical skills, which are relevant and responsive to job market demand and emerging national development needs. Outcome 2.2 seeks to achieve reduced morbidity and mortality in Kenya through WASH, environmental preservation, food availability – nutrition and improved health. Outcome 2.3 seeks to have reduced socio-economic impact of HIV. Outcome 2.4 seeks to have social protection policy and strategies that ensure government’s effective leadership role. The scope of the SRA is quite wide. The overarching visionary outcome results for Human Capital reads:

**Human capital:** By 2030 Kenya’s development is led and driven by a healthy, highly skilled, innovative, resourceful and motivated human capital in an empowered, resilient and inclusive society that is reconciled, peaceful, cohesive, gender responsive and with integrity.
2.2.3.1 Assessment of Performance of Outcome 2.1

**Outcome 2.1: Education and learning:** By 2018 Kenya has an education sector that equips citizens with knowledge and technical skills, which are relevant and responsive to job market demand and emerging national development needs; an education system that is adequately resourced, effective, efficient, devolved and inclusive; and an education governance and financial management system which is evidence based, transparent, efficient, human rights, gender responsive and participatory.

The thrust of outcome 2.1 is to work towards ensuring that Kenya has an education sector that delivers on the following: i) a society with knowledge and technical skills that are relevant and responsive to job market needs; ii) an education system that is well resourced, effective, efficient, devolved and inclusive; iii) and an educational governance and financial management system which is evidence based, transparent efficient, human rights and gender responsive.

**Contribution to Policies and Legislative Frameworks:**
Support has been provided for an enabling environment at national and county level through development of sound policies, strategies and legislative frameworks that are all-inclusive, rights and gender focused: a national curriculum reform policy and education curriculum framework has been developed; leadership and coordination of partnerships by the government has been strengthened in the education sector to leverage resources (human, financial and technical) and results; there has been roll out of the implementation of NESSP for basic, Technical Vocational Education and Training Authority (TVETA) and higher education; and devolved education function at ECDE and VET for increased access to education and training. All 47 counties have developed County Education Strategic Plans (CESP). However, there are pointers that CESP implementation in a number of counties is still lagging behind. The ongoing national education reforms will strengthen the governance and accountability structure of the education system to facilitate coordination and effective delivery of education services at national and county level. A study report on addressing gender based violence prevention and response has been finalized and validated by the stakeholders and a gender and education policy has been completed.
**Contributions to National Capacities:**

The UN agencies in collaboration with other partners continue to provide technical support to ensure that policies, strategies and plans are human rights-based, inclusive and gender responsive. The UN support to GOK has been instrumental in strengthening institutions at national and county levels, these include; the National Council for Nomadic Education in Kenya (NACONEK); National Education Board, Education Standards and Quality Assurance Council (ESQAC) and County Education Boards to improve governance, equity and quality of education.

The government and UN have played an important role in strengthening institutional systems that are transforming data collection, monitoring and management which is expected to improve quality of learning and support curriculum reforms and delivery. Support has been provided in strengthening the Education Management Information System (EMIS). The EMIS has as a result facilitated submission of a proposal to the Global Partnership for Education (GPE) securing a US$88.4 million grant towards improvement of education. In addition, data generated through EMIS has been used to promote equity-based approaches in the design and implementation of the National Education Sector Plan (NESP). A Systems approach for Better Education Result (SABER) of the School Feeding in Kenya has also been developed building an investment case for the school feeding programme.

**Capacity development approach applied in the education sector has been linked to improving performance in a number of interventions.** Individual competencies developed have responded to needs such as improving the school feeding programs mostly in ASAL areas where over 1,500 MOE/County officers, teachers and School Meal Plan (SMP) management committee members in Nairobi, Turkana, Mandera, Wajir, and Garissa counties are now able to better manage the School feeding program. Competencies developed at county level in Marsabit, Mandera, Wajir and Garissa on management of the feeding program for ECD centres is enabling the counties to implement and monitor the program. Competency based curriculum developed for 125 curriculum developers from the Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development (KICD) and 60 publishers/authors improved support for the ongoing curriculums reform. The comprehensive mentorship program in 18 primary and 6 secondary schools in ASAL led by women mobilizers and community leaders has benefitted over 280 girls (180 primary girls & 100 secondary schools).

**Box 3: Transformative Change brought about by the EMIS:**

There is notable transformative change at institution level (Ministry of Education) through strengthened system of Education Management Information System (EMIS) that led to 2014 Education year book being launched and 2015 booklet completed through timely collection of 2015 EMIS data for education planning and management. EMIS is a system for collection, integration, processing, maintenance, dissemination of data and information to support planning, monitoring and management of programs at all levels of education system. The strengthened EMIS facilitated submission of a proposal to the Global Partnership for Education (GPE). In addition, the data generated through EMIS has been used in promoting equity based approaches in the design and implementation of the National Education Sector Plan (NESP).
Noted Achievements of Outcome 2.1

Increased financial investment into the education sector in the past 2 years has contributed to positive education outcomes: Evidence based policy and advocacy dialogue has resulted in an increase of 8.8% in the education budget for 2015 fiscal year. The 2016 financial year has seen an increase in budgetary investment focusing on the digital literacy program. Additional Support to the tune of USD 1,085,292, has been provided to 247 primary schools to support the school feeding program.

Capacity to manage the school feeding program has been strengthened and contributed to significant improvement in enrolment of disadvantaged children: Over 1.6 million children were reached through the school feeding program that is partially supported by humanitarian funds especially in the ASALs. Access to meals has been disaggregated by gender to monitor and ensure that no one gender is left behind. Short term hunger has been alleviated for more than 1.5 million primary and pre-school children through daily school meals, improving their concentration and ability to learn.

Box 4: Inclusiveness - Leave No One Behind for Outcome 2.1

The government, UN and partners have been effective in paying attention to the people-centered and universal nature of the 2030 Agenda, with an emphasis on leaving no one behind by reaching the furthest communities in ASAL. Interventions have improved Access and Equity in terms of enrolment. Enrolment and attendance drives conducted have led to improvement of the Gross enrolment rates in ECDE and primary level. The Gross enrollment rates in ECDE, primary and secondary have all surpassed the targets at mid-term with ECDE at 73.6%, primary 103.5% and secondary 58.2% (EMIS 2015). These achievements have potential for mainstreaming SDG Goal 4: Target 4.1 By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys complete free, equitable and quality primary and secondary education leading to relevant and effective learning outcomes and target 4.2 By 2030, ensure that all girls and boys have access to quality early childhood development, care and pre-primary education so that they are ready for primary education. Although additional 2,000 out-of-school children were enrolled back to school, it is not clear what the total was at mid-term compared to the 600,000 target set for UNDAF in 2018. Through implementation of the Child Friendly Framework in Schools, a total 189,120 children (106,050 boys and 83,070 girls) were provided with better learning environments. The interventions on school meal programs have been effective in improving access and equity by including children who would have otherwise been left behind. In addition, interventions have focused on the most vulnerable and hard to reach populations to improve environmental sustainability especially in the Water and Sanitation Hygiene program in schools. Additionally, establishment, launch and operationalization of key institutional frameworks such as the NACONEK will advance equitable access to reduce disparities in terms of access to equitable quality education for the marginalized, hard to reach and vulnerable groups particularly in the ASALs.

Key enablers for success of Outcome 2.1: Policy enabling environment, high level commitment and leadership by the government and partners is a great enabler. The ongoing national education reforms will strengthen the governance structure and accountability of the education system to facilitate coordination and effective delivery of education services at national and county level. Leadership and coordination of partnerships by the government has been strengthened in the education sector to leverage resources (human, financial and technical) and results. The government continues to have substantial budget provisions for education.
The GOK has a strong collaborative partnership with the Education Development Partners Group (EDPCG), a key contributing factor towards supporting coordination and implementation of programs aimed at contributing to realization of envisaged results of the National Education Sector Plan (NESP). Another notable partnership is the Global Partnership for Education (GPE), a joint collaboration between GOK and development partners including the World Bank that aims at improving the literacy and numeracy levels in the country. The initiative dubbed "operation come-to-school", a joint collaboration between Educate a Child (EAC), the UN and Ministry of Education is one of the financing partnership arrangements that has been launched, to bring about 300,000 out-of-school children back to school in 7 counties in the ASAL regions. Another enabler has been South–South collaboration with other African Countries, best practices have contributed to a review of the Kenya’s education assessment system and also a review of the harmonized learning assessment framework. Kenya’s delegation of educationists to Sudan led to development of guidelines highlighting the need to reform the curriculum to address specific needs of nomadic children across the country as well as strengthen the teacher training strategy.

**Noted Challenges for Outcome 2.1**

**Challenge of Data Availability:** Data has not been readily available for some national indicators such as percentage of students in standard 3 having mastered basic learning competencies in literacy and numeracy. However, a study by UWEZO (2015)\(^9\) found out that literacy and numeracy skills are low and static. For example, the number of children aged 7-13 years who could solve class two numeracy and literacy problems was 40 in 100 (2011) compared to 39 in 100 children (2014).

**Insecurity Situation in the North and Governance Issues in Schools:** Heightened instances of insecurity and conflict particularly in the ASAL regions have greatly hampered program implementation. Barriers to education in terms of access for girls and children in hard to reach areas remains a huge challenge. A significant proportion of children in conflict related areas are out of school due to attacks on their learning environment, their institutions and personnel which is a barrier to accessing quality education. Increased closure of schools in the affected areas, reduced school attendance, with teachers also failing to report for duty on time and reduced enrolment in the affected schools affects access to quality education. A recent threat to secure learning environment is the burning of school facilities by students mostly in secondary schools.

**Key Recommendations for Outcome 2.1**

i. Prioritize capacity for implementation of policies, legislation and strategies: Key priority areas include finalization of ongoing curriculum reforms as it will have huge impact on implementation of programs in relation to improvement of access to quality education and training. In addition, there is need to prioritize review of policies, strategies, frameworks and plans that will support on-going curriculum reforms at national and county level.

ii. Strengthen support for Early Childhood Development Education, which is not fully devolved. There is need to support review of the ECD policy and development of standards and guidelines to strengthen coordination and effective delivery of ECD services.

iii. Continue investment towards capacity development: capacity development remains a priority area at national level, for example, to implement the Global Partnership for Education (GPE).

---

\(^9\) UWEZO Fund is a specific Go intervention for women, youth and persons with disabilities and a flagship for Kenya’s vision 2030
iv. Multiplicity of barriers and vulnerabilities remain a challenge to education in terms of access for boys and girls and children in hard-to-reach areas. Innovative approaches to addressing the barriers aimed at expanding opportunities for girls in hard-to-reach areas need to be explored.

v. Strengthen Coordination of the Education sector at county level: Devolution remains a challenge in terms of coordination between the national and county governments. Capacity development at county level remains a priority area for improvement. This could be strengthened by organizing annual Joint Education Sector Reviews (JRES) led and organized by MoE with participation from all County governments.

vi. Provide safe and secure learning environment: Support towards the ongoing process by the GOK to develop guidelines for schools to ensure and secure safety of children, teachers and communities should be enhanced.

**Performance Rating for SRA 2 Outcome 2.1**

Overall, at mid-term the outcome is on track. The government and partners including the UN have laid solid and relevant foundation for education in the country with support focused on policy, strategy, capacity development for systems strengthening and improving individual performance.

**Table 15: Assessment of Performance of Outcome 2.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 2.1: Education and learning</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1: Legislative &amp; policy framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2: Partnership &amp; accountability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3: Access, equity, quality &amp; relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Performance based on Outputs</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 16: Overall Rating of Performance of Output 2.1 by Triangulation of methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Outcome Results by triangulation of three methodologies</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the output performance assessment</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Assessment of performance of Outcome indicator (see Vol 2 Annex 1)</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using MTR team judgment informed by analysis of the key findings</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.2.3.2 Assessment on the Performance of Outcome 2.2**

**Outcome 2.2:** WASH Environmental preservation/food availability-nutrition/health: By 2018 morbidity and mortality in Kenya are sustainably reduced, with improved maternal and child survival, reduced malnutrition & incidents of major endemic diseases (malaria, tuberculosis) and stabilized population growth underpinned by a universally accessible, quality and responsive health system

Outcome 2.2 focuses on the following key areas: i) sustainable reduction of morbidity and mortality; ii) improved maternal, neonatal and child survival; iii) reduced malnutrition and incidents of major endemic diseases (malaria, tuberculosis) and; iv) stabilized population growth supported by universal accessible, quality and responsive health systems.
**Contribution to Policies and Legislative Frameworks:**

The UN has supported development of policy and related frameworks both at national and county level to inform programming in the health sector: Key achievements include: Kenya Health Sector Strategic and Investment Plan; Annual Health Sector Performance Report, 2013/14; National Human Resources for Health (HRH) Norms and Standards; the National Public Private Partnership for Health Strategy; Report on Impact of Free Maternity Services; the National Health Accounts 2013/14 report; the Health Financing Strategy; the Health Strategy; County Specific Human Resources for Health Management and Development Plans in five counties targeting a response to high maternal mortality and under five child mortality; revision of Malaria Strategy; the National Public Private Partnership for Health (PPPH) Strategy; E-Health Strategy and County Specific Human Resources and Health Management and Development Plans; National guidelines for healthy diets; national infant feeding complementary recipes guidelines and job aid; Advocacy Communication and Social Mobilization Strategy for Nutrition Sector; Guideline for health workers on Micronutrient powders (MNP) for children 6-23 months; the TB strategy; development of policy documents for alcohol prevention and control strategy; physical activity manuals; alcoholic drinks control bill; amendment of traffic act to include child safety on the roads; the Kenya AIDS Strategic Framework. Kenya’s HIV Prevention Revolution Roadmap is the first of its kind to pursue a population and location based approach. The MTR notes that there is need to step up implementation of the numerous policies, plans and strategies for effective realization of targeted results.

Reforms in the Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health (ASRH) policy have provided a platform for programming to bring adolescent sexual and reproductive health and rights issues into the country’s health and development agenda. The ASRH policy finalized in September 2015, will pave way for development of other strategic documents such as ASRH implementation framework and ASRH guidelines to be used by partners and counties to improve quality of care for the young and adolescent population.

**Contributions to National Capacities:**

The UN has supported capacity for institutional and systems strengthening as well as personnel capabilities for robust response and management of the health sector.

**Key achievements in Institutional Capacity:** Provision of 33 ambulances to strengthen referral services in 11 counties; institutional support at national and county levels to enhance El-Nino preparedness and cholera management in counties with acute cases; capacities of communities to implement County Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) programs and interventions aimed at increasing Open Defecation Free villages.
Key achievements in Infrastructure and systems strengthening: national referral health services recording and reporting tools; health management systems at both national and county levels; incorporation of ICD-10 into medical colleges resulting in trained coders and certifiers in 5 counties; continuous cold chain temperatures monitoring devices introduced in all the 47 counties to ensure quality and efficiency of vaccines and 390 health facilities supplied with the devices; capacity to gather data on non-communicable conditions, and development of POA 2015 for Guinea worm certification committee and Roadmap for GW certification and neglected Tropical Diseases mapped at national level.

Key achievements in Human Capacities: Strengthening leadership, management and governance capacities for health officers and directors of health facilities in all 47 counties; technical capacities of personnel from academia, research institutes, Ministry of Health and MOALF on Food Composition Tables (FCTs). In addition, capacities of 8 Universities to mainstream nutrition education in the curriculum of under graduates were strengthened. Capacity and skills of health workers to cover high impact interventions such as emergency obstetric and new-born care, provision of long acting and reversible contraceptives, Kangaroo mother care has also been strengthened.

Noted Achievements of Outcome 2.2

Improved progress of health indicators: There is evidence of significant reduction in maternal mortality (from national average of 488/100,000 in 2008/8 to 362/100,000 in 2014), infant mortality rates and under five mortality rates (from 74/1,000 in 2008/9 to 52/1,000 live births by 2014). There has also been reduction in under 5 stunting (from 35.3% to 26% against an MTP II target of 14 % by 2018). Births attended by skilled health personnel increased nationally from 44 per cent in 2013 to 62 per cent in 2015. On Nutrition: at the national level, there is progress in reduced malnutrition with reduction in under 5 stunting from 35.3% to 26% (KDHS) against a target of 14% (2018) for MTP II. However, county disparity remains. For example, stunting ranges from 15% in Kiambu County to 46% in West Pokot County. The collective interventions by the government, UN and other partners has focused on development of guidelines, systems strengthening and integration of nutrition activities including strengthening capacities of Counties to coordinate, deliver and monitor nutrition specific as well as nutrition sensitive interventions through a variety of strategies such as joint planning and use of relevant school entry strategies for example, through pastoral field schools advocacy and at national level through technical support provided on integration of nutrition into school curriculum. Implementation of Maternal and Child Nutrition Resilience Program in 13 ASAL counties focusing on community behavior change, health systems strengthening and advocacy has also been supported.

Box 5: A Visit to a Health Centre in Turkana:

UN agencies supported the maternity wings of the Lodwar Country Hospital to improve access to attended child birth. Strengthening systems to address high levels of maternal mortality include culturally sensitive innovation (introduction of the birth stools) that attract more mothers to the health centers. A separate wing has been dedicated to address low child birth through provision of incubators which has contributed to reduced infant mortality. The wing admits babies with low birth weight of between 800 grams and 1.2 Kg. UN agencies have also supported a one stop center for sexually abused women and children, where they receive comprehensive services. From the field visit the MTR team learnt that an additional 10 health centers have been upgraded with similar facilities, including ambulances. Of significant, is ownership of the program by one of the local nurses who appeared to be e confident of her work and the program – during the field visit by the MTR team.
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The Kenya First Lady Initiative targets improvement of health indicators in disadvantaged Counties:
There is positive political will which has been translated into increased financial resource allocation and programming to address issues of maternal, Neo-natal and child health. The beyond zero campaign by the First Lady; the maternal and child Nutrition program targeting nine of the ASAL counties to support nutrition resilience in these highly vulnerable counties are key examples. The Scaling Up Nutrition symposium held in February 2015 provided a forum for advocacy on the right to nutrition and bringing stakeholders to commit towards improving nutritional status of children and women.11

A UN Joint Program on RMNCAH has led to notable progress on coherence, service delivery, partnerships and strengthened accountability by county governments: The UN Joint program on RMNCAH aims to reduce maternal and new-born mortality by increasing utilization and quality of MNH, PMTCT/ART and Family Planning (FP) services. The programme targets six, poorly serviced and hard to reach areas. Through the program, the UN supported a national assessment on availability of selected maternal medicines and family planning commodities at service delivery points - public, private and faith based facilities. In addition, assorted RMNCAH equipment were also procured and distributed to various health facilities in 12 counties 5 of which became model centers of excellence for EmONC services. The Joint Program had also supported establishment of two Community Units in Lamu. The joint program on RMNCAH has the potential to include groups of people who would otherwise be left behind due to low uptake of reproductive health interventions partly attributed to cultural, religious barriers, myths and misconceptions. The RMNCAH 6 County Initiative strongly supports the mission of Kenya’s First Lady beyond Zero Campaign. The Beyond Zero Campaign Launch in Mandera in 2015 where for the first time in Kenya’s history a First Lady visited Mandera, shows Kenya Government’s strong ownership and commitment to the spirit of the Sustainable Development Goals – leaving no-one-behind.

Through the Joint program, the government and UN has strengthened partnerships with the private sector and development partners in support of delivering results for RMNCAH: Following the Global launch of “Every Woman, Child and Adolescent Health Strategy” in New York, private sector players (Safaricom, MSD, Philips, GlaxoSmithKline (GSK) and Huawei) and the UN supported the RMNCAH initiative in six counties. The UN has leveraged significant resources from DANIDA (US$6.1 million) and secondment of a RMNCAH Technical Specialist by SIDA for a period of two years in support of implementation of the RMNCAH program. The World Economic Forum “Leapfrogging health systems in emerging economies” initiative and World Bank Global Financing Facility (GFF) team have been mobilized in support of the RMNCAH with a road map developed for concrete private sector engagement in alignment with the GFF rollout in Kenya. This has been done in consultation with the six county governments and private sector partners. Through this strategy the counties have technical working groups whose capacities are being enhanced to improve coordination, resource mobilization and programming for RMNCAH.

Increasing number of people are accessing improved sanitation facilities: The proportion of open defecation villages in Kenya has reduced by 5% between 2014 and 2015. The support has enhanced Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) programs and interventions aimed at increasing open-defecation-free (ODF) villages. The National Sanitation Hub completed country-wide micro-planning for CLTS. Villages have reported that ODF doubled from 3,958 in 2014 to 7,024 in 2015 increasing access to sanitation facilities to an additional 1.2 million people. In addition, interventions enhanced implementation of WASH in School package (WinS) in 15 counties.

The modeling of the WinS program supported Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM) in 212 schools through the provision of gender-sensitive toilets and bathrooms and sanitary towels. Notable achievements include:

- Support was provided to 5 counties (Kisumu, Siaya, Busia, Kitui, and Homabay) to develop WASH Sector Strategic Plans.

- Considerable effort was being put on advocacy (sensitization workshops) in Turkana and Homabay counties with the aim of convincing County Assembly sub-committees to increase budget allocation for drinking water supply. In Homabay an increase from KES 95m in the 2013-14 fiscal year to KES 350m in 2015-16; in Turkana the water sector capacity budget was increased from KES 2.7m to almost KES 50m in 2016.

- In 2015 more than 80% of the total of 2,138 villages certified Open Defecation Free (ODF).

- In 2015, Busia became the first county to be declared ODF.

- An important contribution was made to monitoring through the publication. In 2014 and 2015 national Community Led Total Sanitation (CLTS) status with disaggregated data for counties and districts was produced. This publication has also been useful as a planning and advocacy tool. It shows that annual progress, in terms of numbers of villages certified, was 3 times more in 2014-2015 than the gain made in 2013-2014. Furthermore, the CLTS approach has now been adopted by 41 out of the 47 counties.

- In order to develop a model for child friendly schools and strengthening girl’s education, around 220 schools located across 15 counties have received a package of WASH interventions that has benefited a total of 132,000 children.

- County WASH platform forums were strengthened in 14 counties, with intensive training in 4 counties.

- WASH contributed to cholera emergency response in various counties and in Dadaab refugee camp by strengthening coordination at the national level; training of Public Health Officials in affected counties and support towards mitigation measures through provision of water treatment; hygiene promotion benefitting 310,000 persons in the counties, 345,000 persons in Dadaab refugee camp and 24,000 school children.
Box 6: Inclusiveness - Leave No One Behind for Outcome 2.2:

Significant progress has been noted on improved immunization coverage. About 6 million (93% coverage) of children under five years in 32 counties were vaccinated during the 2015 polio campaign. 79% of children ages 12-23 months have received all basic vaccinations compared to 77% in 2008/09. UN support enabled procurement of 732,200 doses of Injectable Polio Vaccine (IPV) and its successful introduction in the Dada refugee camp. A key success in “leave no one behind” has been through the Nomadic Strategy, where 298 children in Turkana were immunized with the full range of vaccines for the first time. In addition, fourteen immunization champions/advocates (most of them polio survivors) from some of the hardest-to-reach counties with low immunization coverage were trained and deployed during the December 2015 polio campaign.

Another aspect of inclusivity has been support towards enhanced accessibility of health services to the very poor and marginalized women and children who have no easy access to health facilities. 4600 very poor and marginalized women and children have benefited from an integrated outreach program conducted in 6 counties. Some of the services provided through this program include; immunization, antenatal, postnatal, family planning and other child welfare interventions including nutrition.

Improved indicators on nutrition: Out of 74 countries assessed, Kenya is the only one on track to reach all the 6 World Health Assembly targets for maternal and child nutrition by 2025 - Exclusive Breastfeeding Rates > 50%, Wasting <5%, Stunting (40% reduction), Anaemia (50% reduction in women of reproductive age), Childhood Overweight (no increase) and Low birth weight (30% reduction) (GNR 2015).

UN support has unlocked additional resources for HIV, TB and Malaria: Support was provided to develop the Global Fund Concept Note. Additional resources were mobilized from the Global Alliances for Vaccines and Immunizations (GAVI) for introducing measles and Rubella Vaccines and from the Global Polio eradication initiative to support polio eradication.

Beyond Zero campaign has been able to yield positive outcomes: The Launch of the First Lady’s Beyond Zero Campaign including launch of county mobile clinics in 46 counties has resulted in at least 30,000 Kenyans benefiting from the facilities. The mobile clinics continue to address social inequalities for essential health services by reaching the rural poor and marginalized populations in Kenya.

Noted Challenges for Outcome 2.2

i. Disparities in maternal mortality: Maternal mortality continues to be high in a number of counties. Maternal mortality for Elgeyo Marakwet for example, is around 189/100,000 while in Mandera, Marsabit, Wajir and Turkana it is over 1,000/100,000. This requires concerted and more targeted approaches to reduce mortality in these counties.

ii. Funding challenges and absorption capacity: Though both the GOK and the UN outlined that there is limited funding to enable delivery of outcome 2.2, the challenge of weak planning and financial management affects capacity of counties to absorb funds. Challenges related to disbursement of funds from national to county level also need to be addressed to ensure that counties have adequate financial and human resources for effective delivery of services. Lack of capacity and high turnover among government staff has been recognized as major barrier to progress.
iii. Outbreak of disease such as cholera outbreaks (Wajir, Mandera and Migori counties) and polio vaccination campaigns have hindered implementation of the planned interventions for maternal and child health.

iv. To achieve key outcomes, the UN has intended to focus on innovative, effective, efficient, equitably, accessible and quality health care models to improve health systems at county level. However, investment towards these innovative approaches has been minimal. Progress has mainly been made in strengthening health information management systems by identifying by promoting existing data management practices and building innovative foundations using mobile phone platforms to enable flow of real-time data hence improving delivery of health, nutrition, water and sanitation services in two selected counties.

Key Recommendations for Outcome 2.2

i. Prioritize capacity for implementation of policies, legislation and strategies: Strengthening capacity at national and county level to implement the numerous policies, laws and strategies developed over the last two years is critical. In the next work UNDAF work plans, there is need to focus on implementation of a few policies, laws and strategic/action plans by prioritizing costing of Action Plans for implementation of policies, strategies, legislation and establishment of monitoring mechanism and reporting on progress and working on fund raising/allocation of resources for implementation.

ii. Continue investment in capacity development for improved service delivery: capacity development should focus on thematic and customized trainings as well as assessment of effective application of skills and use of tools. There is also need to identify key areas that would benefit from South-South collaboration and strengthen this aspect. Deploying UN Volunteers to help implement community-based health interventions is also recommended.

iii. Strengthen gender mainstreaming and women’s and girls’ empowerment: There has been a necessary gender targeted approach on women and girls to bridge the gap in inequalities in maternal health. However, gender analysis is needed to mainstream women and girl’s empowerment across all output areas and identify any male-based gender issues that make men and boys vulnerable, and engage men and boys to promote and support increased gender equality and in essence address, ‘leaving no one behind’

iv. Strengthening gender mainstreaming. For example, incorporate gender analysis as part of the regular nutrition analysis, and use the data in program design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Possible interventions include building a pool of gender and nutrition expertise from government, NGOs and academia, and use this expertise in program design, implementation and gender analysis of policies and strategies.

v. Improve existing indicators to include for example, births attended by some skilled health personnel disaggregated by age and sex to cater for the 15-19 age group; Proportion of pregnant women attending ANC receiving PMTCT package by age; antiretroviral treatment (ART) among eligible adolescent girls and boys aged 10-19 years; number of girls and boys impacted by sanitation in schools and % access to sanitation and clean water, by sex among others.

vi. Monitor, capture and report results on the gender responsive indicators: for example, on communicable and non-communicable diseases, % of targeted pregnant women provided with LLITN’s and % Women of Reproductive age screened for cervical cancer.

vii. Put in place realistic strategy to strengthen integrated adolescent’s component of RMNCAH:
Analysis of progress shows that adolescent health is lagging behind. To realize expected results, a broader multi sectoral approach that links HIV, Health, Education, Child Protection, WASH, Menstrual Hygiene Management and Social Protection is recommended.

viii. This will require consolidation and interlinkages of related outputs. This may include: promoting adolescent health by ensuring that policies integrate adolescent health with gender differentiated indicators; linkages in ensuring access to water, sanitation and hygiene; promoting puberty education and menstrual hygiene management; and also with access to HIV and AIDS treatment, care, prevention and protection services among others. This consolidation and interlinkages will provide a more integrated and holistic response in addressing adolescents health.

ix. Strengthen advocacy to address cultural barriers hindering access and provision of health services by engaging cultural and religious leaders to create dialogue and advocate for increased uptake of reproductive health services that improve the health of women and children especially in the six counties targeted for RMNCAH.

Performance Rating of the SRA 2 Outcome 2.2
Overall, the performance of outcome 2.2 is good and on track as outlined below:

Table 17: Assessment of Performance of Outcome 2.2 Using Output Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2.2: WASH Environmental preservation / food availability – nutrition / health</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Health systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 WASH-Env preservation/food availability/nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3 RMNCAH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4 Communicable and non-communicable conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outcome Performance After Computing Output ratings On Track

Table 18: Overall Performance of Outcome 2.2 Using Triangulation Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 18: Overall Performance of Outcome 2.2 Using Triangulation Method</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the output performance assessment</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Assessment of Performance of Outcome indicator (see Annex 1.6)</td>
<td>Partially On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Consultant judgment informed by analysis of the key findings</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Position of the Outcome 2.2 Performance</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.3.3 Assessment on the Performance of Outcomes 2.3

Outcome 2.3 on Multi-Sectoral HIV and AIDS Response focuses on HIV and AIDS with a thrust on: (i) strategic planning and funding; (ii) partnership and coordination; (iii) health sector mainstreaming and; (iv) social response. This outcome is implemented as a Joint UN Program on HIV and AIDS.

Outcome 2.3: Multi Sectoral HIV and AIDS: By 2018 Kenya has reduced socio-economic impact of HIV that is realized through a well-coordinated, effective, efficient and adequately resourced multi-sectoral response.
Contributions to Policies and Legislative Frameworks:
The Joint UN Team on HIV and AIDS has played a pivotal role in development of key national policies and guidelines: The UN provided strategic guidance and support towards development, launch and roll-out of the Kenya AIDS Strategic Framework (KASF) of 2014/15 to 2018, that is aligned with MTP II and Kenya Vision 2030. The development of the Kenya HIV Prevention Revolution Roadmap is noted as the first of its kind, which pursues a population and location based approach to HIV prevention while leveraging high level political commitment and leadership. To this end the country is viewed as a leader in this strategic and innovative approach to HIV prevention.

Support has also been provided in development of guidelines for mainstreaming HIV. Key guidelines include: Early infant male circumcision; HIV testing and counseling; Integration of GBV and HIV standard operational procedures for Prepex device for medical male circumcision; Rapid advice on STI Treatment; Nutrition and HIV toolkit for service providers and clinical ART mentorship tools. The UN has also provided support for implementation of the HIV and AIDS Equity Tribunal Strategic Plan 2013-2017.

Contribution to National Capacities:
The Joint UN Team has contributed to strengthening of capacities for Institutions, systems and networks to fast track response to HIV and AIDS:

Key Achievement for Institutional Capacity: Institutional strengthening has been provided to National AIDS Coordination Authority (NACC) and the National AIDS and STI Control Program (NASCOP) for a streamlined response in the context of devolution. County governments have also strengthened their political commitment for effective county responses to HIV. The UN supported the Kenya Curriculum Development Centre to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment for ART to inform the curriculum reform process. Skills of Court User Committees (CUCs) on linking SGBV and HIV have also been enhanced while a Governors Spouses Forum on HIV and Maternal New Born Child Health has been established.

Key Achievement for Infrastructure and Systems Strengthening: Through UN support, “Maisha” certification has been introduced as a strategy for inclusion and mainstreaming of HIV and AIDS response at county and sub-county levels which is now as a key performance indicator in the performance contracts for all public service institutions at county and sub-county levels. Support has also been provided for introduction of a program on ART for HIV pregnant and breast feeding women (Option B+) in 8 counties. The UN supported roll out of point of care diagnosis in 23 counties which led to generation of strategic information on Drug resistance. Methadone substitution therapy has been introduced for people who inject drugs, making Kenya the third country in Africa to use this therapy. Implementation of the HIV and AIDS Equity Tribunal Strategic Plan 2013-2017 among national level judge has commenced. Through UN support, the GOK has started securing funds through the national resources envelop to accelerate reduction of HIV stigma and discrimination and enhance access to justice. Finalization of the M&E framework and research agenda including generation of new disaggregated HIV data at national and county level, notably the 2015 HIV estimates is a key achievement. In order to accelerate HIV response, the Joint UN team continues to support the education sector to play a key role in providing access to care, treatment and support for teachers and staff.

Key achievements in Human Capacities: Capacity of county workplace and community representatives (educationists, public health personnel, social workers) from 40 counties has been strengthened on issues of youth and drug use. The UN has also supported capacity strengthening of 121 curriculum developers on the need for inclusion of age appropriate sexuality education in the curriculum which coincided with the curriculum reform.
Noted Achievements for Outcome 2.3

UN Support has unlocked resources for HIV: The UN played a critical role in finalization of the GFATM grant for Kenya leading to approval of a new grant of more than USD 290 million for the Kenya HIV response. The High level side-event chaired by HE President Uhuru Kenyatta to Fast Track End of AIDS for Young People has resulted in the GOK committing greater investment to improve health service delivery and put Kenya on track in ending the AIDS epidemic by 2030.

The First Lady’s Beyond Zero Campaign has been rolled out in 46 Counties: The First lady initiated the Beyond Zero Campaign aimed at ending AIDS and improving health outcomes. The campaign is reported to having contributed to massive improvement in the health infrastructure especially at county level.

Accountability for HIV results has been strengthened through development of ‘Maisha’ certification. This certification is contributing to active engagement with all Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) in implementing policies and activities to tackle prevention and management of HIV and AIDS in Kenya. Establishment of the Governors’ Spouses Forum on HIV, Maternal, New-born and Child Health has enabled sharing of experiences and Launch of the Governors Spouses’ Strategic framework to support the AIDS response at the county level.

The UN has continued to strengthen meaningful engagement of adolescents. A network for adolescents and young people living with HIV, called ‘SautiSkika (Amplifying Voices) has been expanded in Kenya through UN support. The network has led to strengthened capacity, visibility and participation of young people and adolescents in HIV planning and programming at national level. Young people and adolescents were involved as members of the Kenya delegation to the High Level Meeting on HIV. There is increased strategic focus, accountability and programmatic action to end AIDS among adolescents following the Global ‘All in’ campaign launched by Kenya’s President. Recognizing the lack of progress in reducing new HIV infection, particularly among 15-24-year-old young people, the UN has provided strategic support in data analytics, advice in more effective testing approaches, while contributing to scale up of voluntary medical male circumcision.

Subsequently, a national Fast Track Plan to end HIV and AIDS among adolescents and young people has been developed. At the County level, the UN Joint Team has been working with county governments to enhance political commitment for effective response.

Enabling Factors to the Success of Outcome 2.3

The current UN Joint Program on HIV is anchored on the UN ‘Delivering as One.’ The UN Joint Program on HIV provides a platform for 17 UN agencies and other development partners to support national response to HIV. Joint planning, implementation and review has resulted in ownership of the program by the stakeholders. The joint team meets regularly to monitor progress of implementation and make recommendations on areas for improvement. Establishment of the HIV Situation Room has contributed to effective monitoring of the fast track targets to ending AIDS in Kenya.

Box 7: Inclusivity- Leaving No One Behind for Outcome 2.3: There is increased strategic focus, accountability and programmatic action to end AIDS among adolescents following the Global ‘All in’ campaign launched Kenya’s President. Recognizing slow progress in reducing new HIV infection, particularly among 15-24-year-old young people, the UN has provided strategic support in data analytics, advice in more effective testing approaches, while contributing to the scale up of voluntary medical male circumcision.
Noted Challenges for Outcome 2.3

Quality and Scale of HIV Services for Young People and Adolescence is Inadequate: Although adolescents are being reached with services, these services are yet to reach the levels of quality and scale required to address the high incidence and prevalence of HIV amongst this sub-population. Persistent gender inequalities remain, manifesting in high levels of HIV amongst young girls and women. Stigma and discrimination continues to be a major problem with wide-range of consequences, affecting adolescents and young people especially key populations, such as sex workers, men who have sex with men and injecting drug users.

The UNDAF is not Aligned to the KASF: The KASF was launched in November 2014 after commencement of the UNDAF in July 2014, hence it is not aligned with the current UNDAF. The KASF contains 8 strategic results areas clearly articulated by thematic focus (HIV prevention, treatment and care) while the UNDAF results focus on capacity strengthening (planning, and coordination, resource mobilization). This presents a challenge in demonstrating UN’s contribution to the national HIV and AIDS response as articulated in the KASF.

Varied Capacity and Participation of UN Agencies in the UN Joint Program-HIV: Although structures of the UN the joint team are well established, the level of engagement and participation by some of the UN agencies is varied based on availability and competing priorities within the agencies. Gaps in human resources expertise among the UN agencies has also partly weakened technical leadership to provide response.

Delayed Roll out of KASF to Counties: Comprehensive rollout of KASF at county level has been hampered by institutional and technical capacities, hence not all the counties have been able to develop comprehensive plans anchored on the KASF.

Key Recommendations for Outcome 2.3

i. In order for the UN to comprehensively demonstrate its contribution to the national HIV and AIDS response, there is urgent need to realign outcome 2.3 of the UNDAF to fully respond to the 8 KASF strategic directions and prioritization of the fast track initiatives in the work plan. This will enable the UN to effectively contribute to national and global objectives to end AIDS by 2030 and prioritize completion of county level response plans that are aligned to national priorities/KASF.

ii. Create strong linkages with the integrated adolescent program recommended under outcome 2.2 to ensure that HIV Prevention among adolescents and young people is prioritized.
iii. Support roll out implementation of the self-testing guidelines to ensure that more people access testing services and are linked to health facilities to access treatment, care and support services.

iv. Leverage funds, from government, UN and other partners including private sector to ensure sustainable financing of HIV and AIDS response, including utilising new avenues for mobilising domestic resources.

Performance Rating of the SRA 2 Outcome 2.3

Table 19: Assessment of Performance of Outcome 2.3 Using Output Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2.3: Multi-sectoral HIV and AIDS response</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 Strategic planning and funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2 Partnership and coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3 Health sector mainstreaming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4 Social response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Performance After Computing Output ratings</strong></td>
<td><strong>On Track</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Overall Performance of Outcome 2.3 Using Triangulation Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Outcome Results by triangulation of three methodologies</th>
<th>On Track</th>
<th>Partially On Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the output performance assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Assessment of Performance of Outcome indicator (see Annex 1.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Consultant judgment informed by analysis of the key findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Position of the Outcome 2.3 Performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Partially On Track</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.3.4 Assessment on Performance of Outcome 2.4

**Outcome 2.4: Social Protection:** By 2018 social protection policy and strategies ensure Government’s effective leadership role, sustainability of achievement, and promotion of innovation and learning; and the social protection systems are adequately resourced, devolved, well-coordinated, effective, efficient and sustainable.

Outcome 2.4 on Social Protection focuses on the following key areas: i) social protection policy and strategies ensure government’ effective leadership role; ii) sustainability of achievement and promotion of innovation and learning; and iii) social protection systems are adequately resourced, devolved, well-coordinated, effective, efficient and sustainable.

**Contribution to Policies and Legislative Frameworks:**

The country has witnessed high levels of advocacy around legislation for Social protection. The Social Protection Bill (Drafted in 2012) is being revised and updated. The previously proposed 2014 Children’s Act Amendment Bill included extensive changes to the existing Act and prompted the Constitutional Implementation Commission (CIC) to request a new Bill. The UN supported incorporation of basic labor laws (including enrolment of workers in social protection schemes) in the proposed Private Security Regulation Bill 2014, which has recently been signed into Law as the Private Security Regulation Act No. 13 of 2016. The Children’s Act (2002) is under review with the aim of drafting a new Act. Kenya is at that planning stages of developing two migration policies: i) the Migration Policy and ii) the National Labour Migration Policy.
A National Diaspora Policy was adopted on 20 January 2015. In addition, amendments have been proposed to the Employment Act and National Guidelines for Alternative Family Care of Children in Kenya which were published in October 2014.

Box 8: Transformative change through Single Registry:

A UN official shares experience on how they Saved USD 2 Million through Single Registry last year (2015):

“We analyzed data from the Single Registry and other program databases which revealed that the National Safety Net Program coverage had increased to the extent that relief assistance could be reduced by more than USD 2 Million per month. This realignment of food assistance has been implemented in line with aspirations of the National Social Protection Policy to reduce overlaps and program fragmentation. As a result, relief activities were phased out in Marsabit, Turkana, Mandera, and Wajir. The government both at the national and county levels were instrumental during the process, helping to inform communities and ensure open communication, accountability and transparency. Engagement with the UN in strategic coordination at the national level and with the government’s social protection programs helped ensure this transition.

Shared by A UN staff During the UNDAF MTR/2016

Contribution to National Capacities:

Institutional Capacity Strengthening: The GOK has a dedicated Principal Secretary (PS) responsible for state departments of Social Protection within the Ministry of East African Community, Labour and Social Protection (previously 1 PS covered the entire labor and social security portfolio).

Single Registry is key to coordination and efficiency in the Social Protection Sector: Key stakeholders have contributed to development and operationalization of the Single Registry system which provides a single point of reference for information on who is receiving what type of social assistance at national and county level. It presents data from the Inua Jamii Program alongside WFP’s “Asset-Creation Program”.

Child Protection Information System (CPIMS): The Department of children’s services has been engaged in the process of establishing a functional national CPIMS which aids in coordination, planning, implementation and monitoring of child protection programs.

Human Capacities: In preparation for the new Bill on Social Protection, capacities of the core team drafting the bill has been strengthened through South-to-South Cooperation which included exchange visits to Bangladesh, Zambia, Sudan and Ethiopia and to the High Level Multi Ministerial study visit to Brazil. This has enable the gain new skills on an integrated approach to social protection policy in Kenya.

Noted Achievements of Outcome 2.4

Single Registry System is proving to be key in improved coordination and efficiency of GOK Social Protection: Feedback from UNDAF stakeholders’ indicated that coordination and efficiency across the sector had improved considerably as a result of the government’s Social Protection Single Registry. The system is also linked to the Integrated Population Registration system. Analysis supported by data in the system has been used in 2015, to inform UN expansion plans, and to realign food assistance programs, increasing efficiency and coverage across sectors. Child data in the Single Registry has provided crucial information on coverage of vulnerable children in the safety net programme. The Social Protection Single Registry provides the link between the right holders and duty-bearers by enhancing national and county capacities of duty-bearers to deliver on their obligations and of right-holders to realize and enjoy their rights. However, the MTR notes that the system could be used effectively to disaggregate coverage of the National Safety Net Program (Inua Jamii) by age and sex, provide information on whether programs
are targeting households and what % of beneficiary households are female headed? Male-headed? among others.

**An increased number of Informal Sector Workers access Social Security:** More informal sector workers are accessing social security and health insurance. Health insurance cushions informal workers and their dependents against devastating costs of illness and injury. In addition, social security provides the workers with an opportunity to save for pension, essential during old age, hence reducing the number of old persons living in poverty and requiring assistance through the safety net program. Awareness raising programs reached more than 5,200 workers from the Matatu and Beauty industries. A follow-up audit of the workshops concluded that most of these workers have subsequently registered and are now covered by NSSF and NHIF. Compliance with labor laws in the Matatu industry has been of key focus to ensure that drivers and conductors are registered with NHIF and NSSF through their Savings and Credit Cooperative Societies (SACCOS).

**Increased access of disadvantaged children to social protection:** Through UN support, the Department of Children Services manages three child protection centers (Garissa, Malindi and Nakuru) offering comprehensive services to children and families. Nakuru Child Protection Centre (CPC) became operational in February 2015. The number of children accessing child protection services each year has increased. 8,777 girls and 12,271 boys were provided with direct child protection services, in the three Child Protection centers. Coverage of households receiving benefits under Inua Jamii has increased dramatically from 671, 298 in 2014 to 792,070 by mid-2016 for households receiving benefits under Inua Jamii.

**Budget for social protection continues to rise:** Budget allocation for social protection over the period have continued to rise and National Safety Net Program (Inua Jamii) has significantly increased coverage. Progress has been made possible through stronger budgetary commitments and steady expansion of key programs targeting vulnerable children, older persons, and persons with severe disabilities.

Of the planned budget of USD18.6 million for the 2-year period (2014 – 2016), 61% (USD11.3 million) have been mobilized and 62% (USD7.1 million) of the mobilized resources overall had been spent by the end of the period (June 2016).

**The key enablers for effectiveness of outcome 2.4**

Key enablers for realization of outcome 2.4 achievements include; legislation, intensive advocacy, optimal use of resources, leveraging multi-stakeholder partnerships and participation that has strengthened national ownership and leadership at the highest political level, such as, the first Kenyan Social Protection Conference Week held in January 2015 attended by the president. Existence of a dedicated secretariat and improved coordination at national level among sectors has also contributed to the success. In addition, the first 2 years of UNDAF have seen consolidation of existing partnerships between UN agencies and other development partners active in the social protection sector. The UN worked with SIDA, USAID, ECHO, DFID and World Bank to strengthen and consolidate the National Safety Net Program to achieve efficiency and effectiveness. The UN strengthened partnership with the Communications Authority of Kenya to address online child abuse and exploitation in Kenya.

**Noted Challenges for Outcome 2.4**

**About 20,000 children are trafficked in Kenya:** A situation analysis informed by a study of migration trends in Kenya in early 2016 revealed that 20,000 children are trafficked in Kenya every year, and that forced migration and internal displacement continue to be a key challenge. The migration policy is still in its infancy stages.

**Social Protection Programs Not Integrated:** Social cash transfer programs implemented by Ministry of East African Community, Labour and Social Protection are not well integrated with social protection programs implemented by most other ministries such as agriculture, health and education, nor are they fully integrated with national social security and health insurance programs.
Weak Legislation on Social Protection: In the absence of a Social Protection Bill, a revised childrens’ Act, a child labor policy, and migration policies, investments in social protection remain vulnerable to changes in the political context.

**Key Recommendations for Outcome 2.4**

i. Strengthen integration of social protection programs across sectors and institutions to maximize results, for example, social cash transfer programs implemented by the Ministry of East Africa Community, Labour and Social Protection are not yet well integrated with social protection programs implemented by most other Ministries (such as Agriculture, Health and Education), nor are they fully integrated with national social security and health insurance programs.

ii. There is need for continued advocacy and strengthening capacity for drafting and enactment of pending bills and support the implementation of legislation

iii. Consistently discuss and ensure that sustainability mechanisms are in place both for the systems developed and staff trained

iv. Assistance and services for protecting older persons from abuse remains a challenge due to inadequate resources, given the high prevalence of abuse of older persons in Kenya, which constitutes a breach of human rights. It also undermines the potential impact of one of the government’s strongest and largest safety net programs: The Cash Transfers to Older Persons, which is a cornerstone of Inua Jamii, and a program that the government aspires to expand to universal coverage.

**Performance Rating of the SRA 2 Outcome 2.4**

Overall, the outcome is “On Track” at mid-term as outline below.

**Table 21: Assessment of Performance of Outcome 2.4 Using the Output Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2.4: Social Protection</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1: National ownership and leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2: Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3: Program implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Performance After Computing Output Ratings</strong></td>
<td><strong>On Track</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 22: Overall Performance of Outcome 2.4 Using Triangulation Method**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Outcome Results by triangulation of three methodologies</th>
<th>Final Position of the Outcome 2.4 Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the output performance assessment</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Assessment of Performance of Outcome indicator (see Annex 1.8)</td>
<td>Partially On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Consultant judgment informed by analysis of the key findings</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Position of the Outcome 2.4 Performance</strong></td>
<td><strong>On Track</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23: Overall Performance of SRA 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA 2: Human Capital Development</th>
<th>Outcome Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.1: On Education and Learning</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.2: On WASH, Environmental Preservation, Food, Nutrition &amp; Health</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.3: On Multi-sectoral HIV Response</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.4: On Social Protection</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall SRA Position</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2.4 Effectiveness of SRA 3: Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth

SRA3 seeks to contribute to Vision 2030 and MTP II development objectives through working towards an inclusive and sustained economic growth. The UNDAF intends to achieve results under the inclusive and sustainable economic growth through three broad outcomes: Outcome 3.1 seeks to improve productive and business environment, Outcome 3.2 seeks to ensure that productive sectors and trade that are private sector and SME-driven, Outcome 3.3 seeks to accelerate job creation, enterprise development and skills development and improved working conditions. The government and the UN recognized that relevance involved addressing the constraints to growth by delving into the specific issues in each subsector. Inclusive growth is to be spread across sectors: in services, which have high poverty elasticity, but also in agriculture, where most of Kenya’s poor are located. Under the 2010 constitution, significant service delivery functions including agriculture have been devolved from the central government to the counties.

**Strategic Result Area 3:** Kenya becomes an industrialized middle income country with a modern, equitable, diversified and 24-hour green economy in which growth is inclusive and achieves sustainable development, trade is modernized, balanced, competitive and regionally-integrated, and employment matches demand, is stable, SME-driven, decent, accessible (particularly to youth, women and vulnerable groups) and Human Rights.

### 2.2.4.1 Assessment on the Performance of Outcome 3.1

**Outcome 3.1:** Productive and business environment: By 2018 Kenya’s productive and business environment are reformed to effectively nurture local capacities, attract internal and external investments and promote ownership, innovation and entrepreneurship.

**Contribution to Policies and Legislative Frameworks:**

The UN has supported development of enabling policy and legal frameworks for the business environment. Support has been provided to both policy formulation and implementation focusing on an enabling environment for growth of business and ease of doing business. Key results include: (i) review/formulation of ten business friendly and effective policies, strategies and regulatory frameworks (Mining Bill 2015 and Mining Act 2016, 4 agricultural policies and 2 agricultural bills; 1 National Youth Employment Strategy; 1 Public Procurement and Disposal Act 2015, 1 MSEA Strategic plan (2013-2017); (ii) Strategic Plan for the Kenya National Chamber of
Commerce and Industry; (iii) Drafted National Competency Standards and Progression Pathways in collaboration with the private sector for 5 trade areas ensuring alignment with and responsiveness to industry focus and (iv) curriculum for 4 trade areas revised and now responsive to market demands and needs. Other policy and regulatory reforms include: Credit reference bureaus, allowing financial institutions to access credit worthiness of firms and individual; Deposit bonds frameworks and Draft Youth Entrepreneurship Strategy.

**Contribution to National Capacities:**

**Institutional Capacities:** Technical and managerial capacities of key national and county institutions involved in entrepreneurship such as County Biashara (Business) Centers, National Industrial Training Authority (NITA), Department of Vocational Education Training (DVET), Micro and Small Enterprise Authority (MSEA), Youth Enterprise Development Fund (YEDF) and the Kenya National Chamber of Commerce and Industry (KNCCI) have been enhanced to support MSMEs. The institutional capacity assessment for KNCCI has led to re-organization of KNCCI and also supported formulation of a Strategic Plan for KNCCI, now guiding operations of the institution.

**Key Achievement for Infrastructure and Systems Strengthening include:**

Systems for monitoring government tenders under the 30% preference and reservation scheme have been automated.

**Key achievements on strengthening human capacities:** Capacities of entrepreneurs, MSMEs to adopt best practices in business management and their ability to access contracts to supply goods and services to lead firms has been enhanced through targeted training. The second MSME handbook has been launched to increase awareness about MSMEs.

**Capacity has been strengthened on integration of gender in the business environment:** The UN placement of a Gender Advisor to provide technical assistance to mainstream gender in the regulatory and gender frameworks within the Ministry of Mining is strategic and yielding results. There has been progress in the mining policy and several regulations that promote transparency and inclusion of women in the mining sector. Capacity of the private sector actors in Kenya to implement the UN Global Compact Network Women’s Empowerment Principles12 has been strengthened leading to increased enrolment of private sector companies to 21 that have become Women’s Empowerment Principle signatories. It was not clear during the MTR whether engagement has contributed to higher level results beyond just being

---

12 This is a joint initiative of UN Global Compact and UN on how business can advance gender equality and women’s empowerment: Principle 1: Establish high-level corporate leadership for gender equality; Principle 2: Treat all women and men fairly at work – respect and support human rights and non-discrimination; Principle 3: Ensure the health, safety and well-being of all women and men worker; Principle 4: Promote education, training and professional development for women; Principle 5: Implement enterprise development, supply chain and marketing practices that empower women; Principle 6: Promote equality through community initiatives and advocacy; Principle 7: Measure and publicly report on progress to achieve gender equality.

---

Although adolescents are being reached with services, these services are yet to reach the levels of quality and scale required to address the high incidence and prevalence of HIV amongst this subpopulation.
signatories. Support has also been provided towards legislation on Matrimonial Property Act which ensures spouses’ equal rights to productive inputs including land and credit has been. Its critical to systematically monitor progress and achievements realized towards ensuring equal opportunities for both genders as stipulated by under the Act.

Noted Achievements of Outcome 3.1

Kenya is likely to reach the 100 target set in UNDAF by 2018 for ease of doing business if current momentum is sustained: At the start of UNDAF in 2014, Kenya ranked, 129 out of 189 countries. In the 2016 ease of doing business report issued by the World Bank, Kenya ranks 108th, a gain of 21 places compared to 2014. The key enablers that have eased doing business include interventions aimed at unlocking bottlenecks for business environment with launch of, “Buy Kenya Build Kenya” policy: the regulatory and policies put in place; an Inter-agency Business Environment Delivery Unit has been constituted and tasked with the mandate of coordinating the business processes re-engineering for 6 out of 10 World Bank Doing Business Indicators and introduction of Credit Reference Bureau allowing financial institutions to access credit worthiness of firms and individuals. The government has reduced electricity connection procedures and cost of connection and invested heavily in street lighting in major cities and towns. Reforms have also been made in improving the area of stamp duty reducing the number of days it takes to register business from 30 to 26 days.

The ease of doing business should contribute to greater investment. Kenya's investment-to-GDP ratio, at 19.5% in 2014 (IMF reports), is targeted to rise to 31% by 2018 in the MTP II, an ambitious increase of 11% points from the 2013 level. The UNDAF target of 32% is above the MTP II target by just one point.

Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) inflows have increased from Ksh49.9 billion in 2013 to Ksh97.8 billion in 2016, an increase of 95%. The FDI rise is related to investments, mainly in the mining and hydrocarbon sectors. The MTR observed that Foreign Direct Investment Net flows increased form USD 335,249,888 in 2011 to 944,827,305. There were no targets for 2018 set in the M&E framework. However, this looks like a steady growth in Foreign Direct Investment. Key reports and key informants indicate that the government considers FDI essential for stimulating economic growth and development hence trigger Kenya's adoption of new and more advanced technologies leading to spillover effects that help increase levels of competitiveness of the domestic sector.

The Biashara Centers established at county level are improving service delivery and enhancing capacity for business management and business startup:

In partnership with the county governments and the private sector, the UN has provided both technical and financial support for establishment and operationalization of County Business Development Centres (CBDCs, also referred to as Biashara Centres) in 4 counties, Kwale, Marsabit, Turkana and Taita Taveta. CBDCs are serving as one-stop-shop facilities for existing MSMEs, women and youth entrepreneurs, helping improve their capacities in enterprise development and other innovative ways of doing business. The CBDCs are one stop training centers for training entrepreneurs on business initiation process, business management skills, marketing, issuance of licenses, youth mentorship, amongst other areas of interest for the youth. The UN provided short term technical support in form of UN Volunteers to provide expertise to the county governments in coordination and increasing outreach and access to business development services. Some of the benefits from Biashara Centers include, formal registration of businesses which brings many benefits, such as better access to services and institutions (such as courts), lower burden from inspections and other government officials, as well as limited liability of the owner vis-à-vis the firm. In partnership with the Ministry of Devolution and Planning, Ministry of Public Service,
Youth and Gender Affairs; County Governments and the Youth Enterprise Development Fund, a total of 767 youth have been capacitated to access the 30% government procurement opportunities through the Access to Government Procurement Opportunities (AGPO) training in partnership with the Ministry of Devolution and Planning (Taita Taveta County 476; Turkana County 76; Kwale County 73; Embu County 74; Marsabit County 24; and Nakuru County 44).

Noted Challenges for Outcome 3.1

High Cost of Doing Business: In order to create more and better jobs, it is imperative that the cost of doing business which is necessary for a robust private sector in Kenya is reduced. Kenya's economic freedom remains mostly unfree in 2016. Economic freedom rank worsened from 115 in 2016, worse than 114 in 2013 and way below 2018 target of 100 set in the UNDAF document. There are high transaction costs for doing business at county levels. Many counties are introducing, or increasing county-level fees and charges which include business permits, health inspection and transport licenses, rents, and rentals for billboard adverts.

Multiple challenges in doing business: Despite a number of positive regulatory reforms, development of the business sector and establishment of favorable investment climate, there are gaps which included: i) corruption and weak enforcement of regulations continuing to affect the cost of investment and doing business; ii) weak capacities of the MSMEs and low entrepreneurial spirit; iii) insufficient knowledge about investment opportunities including lack of capacities at the County level for investment promotion and insecurity that undermine development and iv) limited availability of key inputs (such as electricity, technical assistance, skilled labor, application of innovations and use of new technologies).

The SRA 3 does not adequately address aspects of Innovation and incubation: The GOK/UN partnership does not seem to strongly address aspects of innovation and incubation of innovative ideas which are part of outcome 3.1. However, the MTR notes efforts in conducting a baseline survey to determine support needed by Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) and rural financial service institutions to enhance outreach of financial innovations and technologies.

Key Recommendations for Outcome 3.1

i. The indicators with data not available at mid-term and is unlikely to be available during the UNDAF period should be considered for exclusion, such as ‘number of companies publishing sustainability reports.’

ii. The MSME sector should remain part of Kenya’s economic engine of growth even as the country moves towards being classified as an upper-middle-income country by 2030. Going forward, focus should be on improving productivity of the MSMEs. MSMEs face difficulties with access to finance and access to utilities (including land), among others, which in turn stunts their growth. Public policies should focus on enabling the MSMEs to prosper in addition to removing constraints for formal businesses.

iii. Against the background that a solid policy and legal framework has been established, the remaining period of UNDAF should focus on policy operationalization and communication on content of policy expectations to business owners. MSME is an important aspect of reforms that should not be neglected.

iv. There is need for county governments to review the potential negative impact on local-level business costs, especially for small business operators and ease of doing business at county level.

v. UN should support the government to develop measures for balanced and equitable investments across counties. A number of counties have held investment conferences as means of attracting investors albeit with limited success.

vi. There is a need to promote foreign investment flows into productive sectors and to provide comprehensive investment guidelines consistent with the country’s development priorities and strategies in order generate more employment.

**Performance rating of SRA 3 Outcome 3.1**

Outcome 3.1 is “On Track” for attaining the UNDAF 2018 targets. The outcome indicators are set at very high levels but performance at mid-term of UNDAF indicate very good progress and the indicators set for the outcome are likely to be achieved by 2018.

**Table 24: Assessment of Performance of Outcome 3.1 Using Performance of Output**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 3.1: Productive and business environment</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1.1: Regulatory frameworks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.2: Equitable access to opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1.3: Policy operationalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome Performance After Computing Output ratings** On Track

**Table 25: Overall Performance of Outcome 3.1 Using Triangulation Method**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 25: Overall Performance of Outcome 3.1 Using Triangulation Method</th>
<th>On Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the output performance assessment</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Assessment of Performance of Outcome indicator (see Annex 1.9)</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Consultant judgment informed by analysis of the key findings</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Position of the Outcome 3.1 Performance</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.4.2 **Assessment of Performance of Outcome 3.2**

**Outcome 3.2: Productive sectors and trade** By 2018 productive sectors (agriculture, manufacturing, extractive industry) trade and their value chains are private sector and SME-driven, sustainable, diversified, technologically innovative, commercially oriented and competitive on national regional and global markets.

The outcome brings together five different complex sectors with a number of subsectors including, sustainable energy, agriculture (productivity and commercialization, irrigation, fishing, financing), access to trade and markets, extractive industries and technological innovations. There are varied level of results within each sector contributing towards the outcome.

**Contribution to Policies and Legislative Frameworks:**

In the mining sector–UN has supported the GOK in development and enactment of the Mining Act 2016 and also provided technical expertise in drafting and reviewing 16 legislations for operationalizing the Mining Act 2016. The Act is critical for providing a policy foundation and institutional framework for managing the extractive sector to ensure that people and communities benefit. In addition, the UN has supported development of an arbitration mechanism to promote dialogue between communities and investors in mining locations. The government and the UN are generating evidence based information to strengthen communication and inform policy and programming in the extractive sector. In the agriculture sector–contribution has been towards
development of agricultural policy that will provide strategic direction to the sector at national and county levels. The UN has supported a study on Assessment of the Enabling Environment for Achievement of Food and Nutrition Security, Sustainable Agriculture and Social Protection in Kenya (FNSSA/SP) which focused on policy, legal frameworks and institutional environment of FNSSA/SP.

**Gender Mainstreaming:** Progress has been made to support gender responsive mining. This is critical because policies that are not gender responsive put women in a disadvantaged position and limit their opportunities to graduate from livelihood-level support to wealth-creation through small, medium-sized, and large-scale operations. The UN bridged the gap by placement of a Gender Advisor in the Ministry of Mining to provide technical assistance to mainstream gender in the ministry’s regulatory and gender frameworks.

**Contribution to National Capacities:**

**Technical advisers to the Ministry of Mining:** The UN supported the Ministry of Mining through establishment of a Strategic Advisory Facility and placement of Technical Advisors in the extractive industry. The areas supported included: geotechnical operations, concession management and revenue optimization, sector policy strategy and institutional reform, strategic communications and sector liaison, budget and resources effectiveness. Measures have been put in place to transfer skills from the Advisors to the Ministry staff through “pairing” and thus a deliberate approach to capacity building and retention of skills.

**Institutional capacity of stakeholders in the extractive sector has been strengthened:** The UN has supported enhancement of community engagement in Kenya’s Extractive sector through the participation of all stakeholders including: national and county governments, journalists’ parliament, CSOs, private companies and academia. Linked to the growth of extractive sector is capacity building of Micro and Small Enterprises to in Kwale and Taita Taveta. The County government and UN have provided capacity for MSEs to access information.

Support has been provided to communities’/women groups to improve supply, value chain and quality assurance in the mining sector. This has led to improved pre-sale quality at local level for Mazeras slates mined in Kwale and hence increased revenue received by producers. Another achievement has been improved pre-sale quality of silica sand to make glass where local producers are now capacitated to separate the different qualities of sand for maximum prices.

**Noted Achievements of Outcome 3.2**

**Managing expectations of vulnerable communities from the extractive sector has been enhanced to minimize potential conflict:** Minerals are being extracted in Kenya’s poorest and conflict-prone regions. Addressing the economic and social needs of communities in mining areas is critical to avoid conflict. Expectations regarding new found wealth could easily transform into resentment, suspicion, and public anger over a short time period. This is more likely to happen when expectations are not managed, transparency not established, and relevant information is not readily available. To address this challenge, the UN has enhanced the capacity of journalists and editors to ensure objective and factual reporting to help manage expectations from the communities regarding benefits from extractives, including oil and gas. The UN is committed to supporting establishment of a community liaison department at the Ministry of Mining to link national and county levels. In addition, currently AfDB with support from the UN, Australia and UK have Information Resource Centre on Extractives see http://www.afdb.org/en/topics-and-sectors/initiatives-partnerships/information-centre-for-the-extractives-sector

Lives of farmers at County level have been transformed through use of climate smart agricultural production models, improved fishing technologies and access to markets and finance. The GOK/UN-supported interventions have led to transformative change that have
resulted in increased use of climate smart agricultural production models which include: water harvesting technologies, irrigation and Good Agricultural Practices (GAP) and Conservation Agriculture (CA) as well as innovative low cost processing transformation technologies that have been developed and adopted at a number of counties. Knowledge and skills on Conservation Agriculture (CA) has been imparted to an estimated 51,832 farmers (36,152 females and 15,680 male), 1,828 farmer groups and 1,050 Training of Trainers conducted on conservation agriculture, efficient water utilization technologies, high value crops and livestock and Conservation agriculture were introduced to farmers as well as improved access to financial services. These has led to: 1,315 Hectares put under irrigation in West Pokot. The target for UNDAF is to reach 404,800ha more by 2018. This is unlikely to be achieved.

209,000 fingerlings (tilapia in Masinga, Kiambere and Kamburu dams and trout in rivers Maara, Koitabus, and Thika) have been stocked in various dams contributing not only to job creation but also food production and source of income. Through the aquaculture program, a total of 30 grow-out fish farm models were supported to increase fish production.

Engagement of Youth in agriculture productive sector through the Aquaculture and Blue Growth programs is transforming and up scaling aquaculture and mariculture in the country to a more commercially oriented and competitive enterprise through production of good feed and seeds, credit and insurance, innovative production and handling practices, strengthened extension and information services.

**Box 9: Transformative Change: GOK and UN transforming the lives of Farmers through access to markets:**

The GOK and UN interventions have opened up opportunities for farmers to access financial services: The UN facilitated signing of agreements between farmer groups and buyer’s worth over USD 24 million. Based on these agreements, farmer groups were able to access loans from Rabo Bank worth USD 1 million. The financial linkages created with Rabo bank have also enabled these farmers to access loans they otherwise would not have. Another is the rehabilitated and co-managed livestock markets which, have facilitated aggregation of other trading activities and more organized trading in the areas where they have been established. The markets are revenue collection points for the County governments. In addition, the GOK and UN interventions enabled horticultural producers to meet export market requirements and hence access international markets. Agribusiness development services centers have been established to act as hubs for producer groups, marketing information and training to build agribusiness capacity in Machakos, Tharaka Nithi, Makueni and Kitui. E-platforms have been strengthened to facilitate exchange of market information and prices of nine value chains. Over 181 Farmer Organizations with a total membership of 35,000 small holder farmers in 17 counties received capacity support to ensure improved access and profitable engagement in domestic grain markets. Consequently, 12,300MT of grain has been sold by 80 farmer organizations directly to various markets. In addition, strategies to link small holder farmers to public procurement opportunities have been included in the national marketing strategy. With regards to productive processing - support provided to 22 farmer organizations in various counties through provision of hammer mills and training on milling and business management led to two farmer groups milled 186mt grain for the school feeding program in Kakuma refugee camp and another two groups have been supported and trained to undertake small grain fortification on a pilot basis. One women group in Taita Taveta has been supported to access local and regional market for Aloe Vera products.
The GOK and UN effectiveness to improve on agriculture sector has been boosted by a combination of good policies, modern communication for development channels and materials. Cohesive National agricultural strategy focused on increasing Investments in agricultural inputs, land consolidation, and infrastructure and devolution of agricultural services to the Counties that have allowed effective engagement of County level officials and farmers have contributed to success of the GOK/UN interventions. Public awareness materials such as newsletters and websites, including chat blogs have been developed. Scaling-up of radio-based training on livestock production and animal health in four local vernacular dialects through 20 producer groups as well as enhanced disease reporting using e-surveillance platform has been enhanced. Functional e-agriculture platform is being utilized among small holder farmer groups with 7,109 female and 2,774 male farmers practicing GAP or CA. A training of trainer’s manual for good hygiene practices, good veterinary practices and good transport practices have been developed for the dairy sector and a training manual on sanitary requirements and residual monitoring plan for aquaculture sector has been developed.

Cost-efficient bio-energy, solar and mini-hydro power generation that feeds into the general energy grid and the utilization of energy saving technologies with two turbines installed in Mwea and the utilization of energy saving jikos have been piloted in three counties.

Capacity building has also been undertaken for communities’/women groups to improve supply and value chain and quality assurance. This has led to improved pre-sale quality at local level for Mazeras slates mined in Kwale and hence increased revenue received by producers. Another has been improved pre-sale quality of silica sand to make glass where local producers are now capacitated to separate the different qualities of sand for maximum prices.

Noted Challenges for Outcome 3.2

A declining donor investment in agriculture: In November 2014, Kenya was categorized as a low middle income country. Although key informants from the donor community indicated that the classification does not affect their investment priorities in Kenya, there appears to be less focus on investments in agriculture and more on infrastructure and security (mostly related to Kenya’s challenge of insecurity in the recent past). An example is the target amount of resources that UN planned to raise for food and agriculture sector over the UNDAF period is USD 150 million. To date only USD 33 million has been raised, indicating a significant gap.

Insufficient financial resources hampers progress towards results for outcome 3.2: Areas lagging behind due to unavailability of funds are: (i) Resources available for extension officers in the counties are insufficient. This affects their outreach activities; (ii) The slow adoption of sustainable farming methods such as Conservation Agriculture due to limited finances at farmer or household level. For instance, use of agro-inputs has been a challenge among farmers; (iii) Support for rehabilitation and expansion of irrigated land to improve productive capacity and reduce risk of medium and small-scale producers has been delayed due to lack of funding; (iv) support for access to and use of innovations, agricultural knowledge and expertise to drive holistic agricultural growth not accomplished due to limitation of funds and (v) Youth empowerment programs did not take off due to lack of funding. These areas remain priority for the current UNDAF period.

National verses devolution challenges: Financial disbursement process from national to county government delays county implementation of their CIDP. Allocations are effectively made on paper but disbursements are delayed. Inadequate consultation in the Agricultural sector, particularly between the National and County governments affects implementation of UNDAF activities.
The UNDAF interventions are to a large extent are implemented at county level but UNDAF reporting places the responsibility on the national government. This has led to double-reporting or mis-reporting progress. Delivering as One (DaO) under this circumstance becomes a big challenge, due to the devolved functions. Inadequate coordination between the national and county governments has led to inconsistencies and, in some cases, duplication of effort. This calls for need to strengthen functions and responsibilities at different levels: (i) between government and UN at National level; (ii) between county government and UN; (iii) among UN agencies and (iv) among Government sectors at both national and county levels.

**The results for Outcome 3.2 remain partially achieved because of delayed implementation of the Mining Act (2016).** Development of key regulations and policies in the mining sector is still work in progress. The outdated 60-year-old Mining Act of 1940 cannot accommodate ongoing technological and economic advancement in the mining sector.

**Absence of transparent accounting systems in the extractive sector:** Inadequate systems to ensure transparency and accountability for revenue collection has made it difficult to quantify the exact amount of revenue collected from the extractives. In addition, revenue collection by the government at national level has not been harmonized with the county government revenue collection mechanisms leading to overburdening of tax payers.

**Key Recommendations for Outcome 3.2**

The following recommendations are for all sectors:

i. Additional financial resources are need for timely delivery of key targets and results for 2018. The UN needs to support the government to strengthen financial management and speed up disbursements and absorption by counties.

ii. There is need to review the results framework especially at output level to ensure that the targets.

iii. Focus on the youth continues to a key priority that needs to be scaled up.

**Recommendations for Agriculture Sector**

i. Engagement in development of improved policies and strategies for agriculture within the context of a devolved system of government should be key priority for remainder of UNDAF. This will guide donor and partner investment decisions for county level planning and implementation.

ii. Maintain priority focus areas in agriculture and food security while maintaining strong linkages with other UNDAF outcome areas such as outcome 3.2 that focuses on creating jobs in the agriculture sector for the youth or how the mining industry interacts with land for agriculture as well as linkages to health/food/nutrition under outcome 2.2 with more emphasis placed on technological innovations and systems strengthening at county level. Continue investing in irrigated agriculture to build resilience in the economy and also improve food security but adjust targets that are realistic for UNDAF by 2018.

iii. Strengthen the Agriculture Sector Intergovernmental Secretariat. The Secretariat should be more involved in coordinating the national and county governments, especially in terms of flow of information, cascading policies and increasing private sector participation.

iv. Find a mechanism that supports the National level to capture results from country level. There is currently inadequate coordination between national- and County-level actors hampering efficient reporting of results achieved under the agriculture sector. A strong National Secretariat for UNDAF can be a possible mechanism for engaging with the council of Governors to bridge the gap in consolidating progress. Another possible mechanism is to have strong linkages between the NIMES at both national and county levels.
v. Build capacity of institutions in charge of agriculture and rural development at the national and county levels through reviews, assessments, formal training, on-the-job training, mentoring, study tours and exchange of experience. These as some of the interventions that the UN should continue supporting. Particular focus on capacity development for the ministry in charge of agriculture and rural development at devolved structures is critical.

**Recommendations for the Extractive Sector**

i. The extractive sector interacts with a number of other development sectors, hence the need to support ongoing discussions and efforts towards developing a Joint program for the extractive sector.

ii. Fast tracking implementation of the Mining Act regulation and Policy is a key priority.

iii. Consistently broker dialogue and establish a communication strategy to manage expectations by providing information in a timely and reliable manner to all relevant stakeholders.

iv. Invest on South to South corporation to learn from experience especially on implementing and “do no harm” principles in the extractive industry.

**To mainstream gender equality and human rights the following are recommended:**

i. Consistently have pro-active presence in review and development of regulatory frameworks for all sectors to ensure they are gender responsive.

ii. Consolidate UN technical advisory work in the extractive sector and share regional and global experiences to strengthen advocacy on the social, environmental and human rights dimensions of the extractive sector.

iii. Address human rights aspects. While gender equality has been addressed, the human rights component has not been adequately addressed.

**Performance Rating of the SRA 3 Outcome 3.2**

Overall, the Outcome performance is rated as “On Track” as outlined below:

**Table 26: Assessment of the Performance of Outcome 3.2 Using Output Performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 3.2: Productive sectors and trade</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1 Sustainable energy for all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2 Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.3 Extractive Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.4 Productive Processing and Transformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Performance After Computing Output ratings</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27: Overall Performance of Outcome 3.2 Using Triangulation Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Outcome Results by triangulation of three methodologies</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the output performance assessment</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Assessment of Performance of Outcome indicator (see Annex 1.10)</td>
<td>Partially On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Consultant judgment informed by analysis of the key findings</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final Position of the Outcome 3.2 Performance: On Track

2.2.4.3 Assessment on Performance of Outcome 3.3

Three critical and interlinked areas addressed under outcome 3.3 are employment creation and enterprise development; skills development; and improving working conditions. The outcome remains relevant in addressing a national priority for the country. Kenya’s working-age population is projected to be 39.2 million in 2030, compared to 25.5 million in 2015. A large share of youth has been jobless and thus continues to be dependent although the youth are of working age. The share of the working-age population was 56% in 2014, and by 2050 it is expected to be 62%. This opportunity for a demographic dividend, a boost in GDP growth caused by the increasing share of working-age relative to dependent population will be reaped only if the new potential workers are able to find jobs. (Kenya Country Economic Memorandum, March 2016, World Bank).

Outcome 3.3: Job Creation Skills development and Working Condition: By 2018 formal and informal sectors in urban and rural economies create employment that is safe, healthy, secure, productive, gainful and that is equitably accessible for women, youth and vulnerable groups and workers have adequate skills to match market demand

The thrust of the outcome is: i) creation of safe employment through formal and informal sectors; ii) equitable access to employment opportunities to include women, youth and vulnerable groups and iii) workers have adequate skills that match market demand.

Contribution to Policies and Legislative Frameworks:
The UNDAF partners have supported development of policies and legal frameworks for job creation, skills development and working conditions: Key Achievements include: Development of a National Youth Empowerment Strategy (NYES) and Action Plan. This strategy is a flagship project of Vision 2030 / Medium Term Plan (MTP II), 2013-2017 (where the major focus of the Kenya Government is to integrate attitudinal, structural and cultural processes through which young people gain ability, authority and agency to make decisions, implement change in their own lives and the lives of other people, including peers and adults); finalization and submission of the Sessional Paper on the National Policy on Elimination of Child Labour to Parliament; development of a draft National Wages and Remuneration Policy to provide a framework for determination and management of wages in both public and private sectors; the Labour Institutions Bill 2014 and Labour Relations Bill 2014 were prepared to facilitate and operationalise the establishment of the National Conciliation and Mediation Commission; the draft Women Empowerment Strategy and the Ratification of the ILO Convention 189 on
Decent Work for Domestic Servants; Public Procurement and Asset Disposal Act; Contributions towards the enforcement of some of the policy, the labor law compliance has been piloted with 3,361 labor inspectors. These achievements in policy and legal frameworks have provided conducive environment for programming in this sector. These policies have potential to promote fundamental rights at work and ensure improved workplace safety, reduced health risks and enjoyment by workers of decent earnings, equitable pension and effective union representation.

In addition, the UN has supported implementation of the Micro Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) Strategic Plan 2013-2017. Specifically, a revised MSME Handbook – setting clear guidelines for MSME regulation has been finalized and led to entrepreneurs/MSMEs adopting best practices in business management as well as increased knowledge of how to access Government led Procurement Opportunities and ability to access contracts to supply goods and services. The MSEA’s MSME Handbook presents informed opportunities for SME development in Kenya. The updated second edition of the MSME Handbook reflects current dynamics of the ever growing information needs by small business owners in Kenya. The handbook also gives special attention to the devolved services.

**Contribution to National Capacities:** The GOK and the UN has contributed to the strengthening of institutional capacities, systems and standards and human capacities across sectors.

**Institutional Capacities:** UN Agencies collaborated with 10 public institutions, private sector organizations MSEA, KIE, EKE, WEF, Ministry of Industrialization and Enterprise Development, Kenya National Chamber of Commerce and Industry, YEDF, FEWA, Equity Bank, APTDC, VSO, and provided technical and financial support to provide Business Development Services to MSMEs. Other institutional strengthening achievements include: reconstruction of National Labour Boards; capacities of GOK personnel enhanced; institutional capacity for MSMEs sector through development of the Small and Micro Enterprise Strategic Plan and rural financial services meant to improve outreach of financial innovation and technology; the Kenya National Labour Market Information System (LMIS) software developed and quarterly LMIS reports for 2015/15 financial year were produced. The UN is currently working with the Kenya Investment Authority (KenInvest) to establish and operationalize a One Stop Investment Centre (OSIC) for investors to ensure efficient and effective facilitation of new investment proposals by reducing the time taken by investors to obtain licences and permits from different government.

**Infrastructure and Systems Strengthening include:** Systems for monitoring government tenders under the 30% preference and reservation scheme were automated.
Strengthening Human Capacities: Capacities of entrepreneurs, MSMEs to adopt best practices in business management and their ability to access contracts to supply goods and services to lead firms have been enhanced through training. The second MSME handbook has been launched to increase awareness on MSMEs. UN Agencies have focused on entrepreneurship training for youth and women, providing technical and financial support through the Biashara Business Centers.

Noted Achievements for Outcome 3.3

GOK and UN have strengthened capacity for systems improvement through establishment of the National Labour Market Information System report (LMIS) which has potential to transform the labor market in the country. The LMIS will facilitate collection of primary data on key labor market indicators on a regular basis. The labor market information platform will also enhance access to e-business advisory and job-guidance/ career guidance services for the youth in the labor market. The purpose of these services is to increase efficiency in the job matching process; these services include among others, provision of information on available jobs and employment offers training and education opportunities. However, location of such a platform should be at a very stable institution that is not subject to frequent changes on staff and experts. A National Technical Committee for management of the LMIS has been established to address any possible instability that could arise due to transfer of staff. Capacity building has been undertaken of staff in the Ministry of East African Community, Labour and Social Protection on requirements of the LMIS. Through GOK and UN support, Labour law compliance in the informal sector has significantly improved with interventions targeting the transport sector (See Box 9).

Significant progress has been made on strengthening professional experience and skills of young people for the labor market. One of the indicators for outcome 3.3 is % of young people engaged in volunteer programs gain additional professional experience and skills, disaggregated by gender. It is not clear what the % is to be compared with but the Sessional Paper No. 2 of 2013 on the National Industrial Training and Attachment Policy was approved by Parliament in July, 2015; 72,809 persons were trained in relevant industrial skills and 35,260 trainees placed on industrial attachment under the Presidential Digital Talent initiative. The MTR finds no evidence of what method will be used to track or establish how many of the trainees on attachment or internship eventually secured employment or became self-employed or continued to be unemployed. This needs to be tracked through the recently established National Labour Market Information System (LMIS).

UN support to GOK has strengthened capacity for skills improvement that is yielding results. There is increased access to business development services which are resulting to improved service delivery for MSMEs (youth & women); enhanced partnerships are leading to increased number of youth successfully accessing internships, apprenticeships, jobs, mentorships and online learning through the linkages with the Microsoft “Tukoworks” Portal. Through the Business Skills and Enterprise Development (BSED) training program, youth have been trained, had their skills enhanced, have developed business plans and currently running successful businesses in Kwale County.
Box 10: Transformative change in transport sector through SACCOs:

Collaborative interventions among the government, private sector, the UN and the Matatu (public transport) industry/bus companies have led to transformation of the Matatu/bus company through enforcement of regulatory environment, compliance to labor laws with profound benefits for the Matatu/bus owners, workers and users in terms of improved working conditions, reduced costs, increased investments and strength in numbers offered by SACCOs to minimize risks and boost savings. There are 70,000 Matatus in Kenya owned by approximately 65,000 investors, employing approximately 210,000 employees and generate about Kshs.73.5 Billion annually which is 6% of the Kenyan GDP. The training provided to Matatu/bus company owners and employees with a motto, 'there is strength in unity' enabled them to streamline their operations, improved their profitability and empowered them to deal with the police and other relevant arms of government and generally adhere to the rules regulating the transport sector. The Matatu and some bus owners, after being sensitized through training supported by the UN on the importance of vehicle inspection, made it mandatory that all their buses be inspected in industrial area, the government's inspection yard. This is because they appreciate the importance of their buses being road-worthy. The transformation turned the unconducive operating environment to a regulated sector with huge benefits in terms of retention of employees. Drivers now have employment contracts, and are covered through the national hospital insurance fund as well as contribute to national social security fund. Drivers cannot walk away since they are bound by contracts. There are reduced costs to the owners (as bribery is reduced when the drivers and owners understand the law and comply). Drivers and crew discipline has improved hence less accidents, lower costs to vehicle maintenance; better working conditions as well as respect for rights of passengers. There are increased returns on investments – with savings in SACCOs the drivers and owners are able to borrow and invest into more assets including more Matatus, land and in the money markets. The formation of Matatu SACCOs spread the risks and strengthened collective accountability. Today, a driver cannot leave a SACCO without clearance from the SACCO he or she previously belongs to. The drivers now have employment contracts and cannot just walk away from their job nor can the employer just sack them without justifiable reason. After training support by the UN to the sector, the previously high costs of insurance have been brought under manageable control; there has been increased savings by Matatu and bus employees and employers that opened up opportunities for access to credit and further investments.

In one story of transformation, Directors of OMA services limited, a bus company founded in 2013 owned by eight directors who have invested in the transport sector, concur that the UN interventions have helped make their business more profitable. “Our net worth is even better than those of some SACCO. Each of us (eight directors) saves ksh. 4,500 per week. Therefore, OMA Company saves ksh. 144,000 per month,” says Githinji. This makes it easy for the company to secure loans from banks for development. Their investments include shares in INVESCO insurance company and jointly owned land bought through a loan secured from a SACCO, to which they are members. The directors get dividends from INVESCO yearly. As INVESCO agents, OMA also receives commissions on businesses it transacts on behalf of the insurance company.

The key enablers/strategies for success include the training of trainers on labor laws and business management. The training used simplified labor laws and developed simplified popular version of the labor laws including a phone application for ease of reference. The regulatory impact assessment in the sector led to reform proposals which were included in the bills that were enacted into law; social dialogue between the stakeholders in the sector, the regulators, employers and workers, county governments, on matters relating to business environment and working conditions in the sector; The formation of SACCOs and enrolment of Matatu owners and employees into SACCOs. The UN training created space that developed social dialogue pathways for small businesses where workers often times do not have the capacity or the capacity to discuss their rights with their employers.
The UNDAF target of 1,000,000 new jobs created per year in the formal and informal sector is below expected target with 841,600 new jobs created in 2015 (Economic Survey 2016). Employment in the modern and informal sectors went up by 5.9 per cent from 14,319.2 thousand in 2014 to 15,160.8 thousand in 2015 creating 841,600. The share of private sector employment in modern sector wage employment was 71.0 per cent in 2015, slightly higher than 70.4 per cent recorded in 2014. There was a turn-around in agriculture, forestry and fishing industry, which recorded a 1.2 per cent growth in 2015 compared to a decline of 3.1 per cent registered in 2014. The education sector registered the highest growth of 13.4 per cent in 2015. This was followed by mining and quarrying industry, which recorded an increase of 13.1% to 13.8% thousand persons employed in the sector in 2015. This was however, a deceleration compared to a growth of 40.2 per cent realized in 2014.

**Green Jobs Initiative Piloted:** Green jobs initiatives in the construction value chain has created 89 green jobs, introduced green entrepreneurship training curriculum, training of trainers and training of entrepreneurs in green jobs.

**Good progress has been registered by UN agencies in efforts towards creation of a One Stop Investment Centre (OSIC) for investors:** The UN has supported creation of OSIC to ensure efficient and effective facilitation of new investment proposals, and cost effective operations to existing investment while reducing the taken by investors to obtain licences, and permits from different government units. Through this work, over 500 women entrepreneurs have been reached.

**Strengthened partnerships:** Collaboration between the UN, private sector among other stakeholders, led by the Kenya National Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and the national and county governments that has contributed to effective enterprise development. Strong intra UN agency collaboration through DaO and partnership with the government and private sector (MSEA, KIE, FKE, WEF, Ministry of Industrialisation and Enterprise Development, YEDF, FEWA, Equity Bank, APTDC, VSO, UN) enabled provision of Business Development Services to MSMEs.

**Strong partnerships between the GOK and UN have led to sustained investment in expanding economic opportunities for women-owned enterprises in the public procurement sector both at National and County level.** However, the Government policy to award at least 30% of all procurement opportunities to the youth, women and people with disabilities is a key enabler that is not fully exploited: Over 100 (Figure of total contracts not available) women owned MSMEs have won government tenders during this period. This has been as a result of training 1,963 women led MSMEs countrywide to access government tenders. Kenya Shillings 20 million worth of tenders were awarded to youth, women and persons with disabilities in 2015. Enabling factors for access to tenders include: Strong collaboration among key stakeholders involved in the public procurement sector, including the National Treasury, Public Procurement Regulatory Authority (PPRA), Kenya Institute of Supplies Management (KISM), State Department of Gender (Ministry of Public Service, Youth Affairs and Gender; financial support to two CSOs towards creating awareness on the 30% affirmative action quota reserved for women, youth and PWDs as well as capacity building of target group on tendering for government contracts and an annual stakeholder’s consultative forum in 2015 which brought together over 300 participants with a focus on the Preference and Reservations Scheme and has been a critical platform for stakeholders to provide input to the on-going procurement reforms including review of the Public Procurement Act.

The systems for monitoring of government tenders under the 30% preference and reservation scheme through IFMIS have also been automated.
**Noted Challenges for Outcome 3.3**

The **30% quota for women, youth and people with disabilities to procure from government falls short of the target**: The total government public procurement spending is approximately USD 6.3 billion annually, as such 30% of public procurement earmarked exclusively for women/youth should translate to approximately USD 2 billion yet the review noted that by end 2015, only 20 million Kenya Shillings were allocated for procurement for this population group. Bottlenecks that hinder uptake of procurement opportunities by these vulnerable groups include: (i) Low levels of awareness amongst the target group, particularly at the County Levels calling for innovative approaches such as the use of social media for messaging and a training of trainers Approach; (ii) Lack of gender disaggregated data on the uptake of procurement tenders; (iii) Failure by national and county governments to submit quarterly reports as stipulated by law; (iv) Lack of a standardized approach for strengthen capacity of women, youth and PWDs on Access to Government Procurement Opportunities often resulting in duplication of efforts and limited outreach. (v) The PPADA Act was enacted in January 2016 but the Regulations are not yet ready. Lack of proper regulations/guidelines can negatively impact implementation of the Law. There is also urgent need to sensitize key staff from Public Entities on the new PPADA Act.

**Effectiveness of coordination:** Reshuffling of ministries has contributed to challenges in coordinating implementation and monitoring the process remains disjointed. There have not been regular meetings for the Strategic Result Area 3 and outcome levels for purposes of reporting and monitoring implementation. Although outcomes and outputs are substantially large, implementation, monitoring and reporting has not been strengthened at outcome and Output level.

**Effectiveness of Reporting:** Reporting systems for government are different from those of UN posing challenges for both partners. Ministry departments report to the Ministry of Planning which consolidates government achievements of reporting cycles, divergent with those of the UN agencies. The UN report on calendar year which does not match government reporting cycle, which is end of June. This poses challenges of synchronisation of reports.

**Financial Resources:** Although figures on funding short falls have not been tracked, inadequate financial resources have constrained performance on a number of results such as rollout of training and enterprise development services to the grass roots and addressing the immense need for entrepreneurial capacity building. The general fear of credit amongst the poor and vulnerable groups in Kenya has led to slow uptake of credit facilities available. MSMEs: Growth of this segment continues to be hindered by inadequate capital, limited market access, poor infrastructure, inadequate knowledge and skills, rapid changes in technology and sometimes unfriendly laws and regulations continue to hamper the growth of MSMEs in Kenya.

**Capacity development:** The culture of “tokens” inhibits efforts of government and the UN efforts to train youth, where most youth would not readily avail themselves to training opportunities unless they are given allowances during the training.

**Data management:** There is generally inadequate data analysis skills amongst implementers and users of the LMIS, compounded by inadequate and outdated data from institutions in the labour market; and lack of a framework to facilitate collection and sharing of information by key labour market institutions.

**Gender issues and concerns:** On the Women’s Economic Opportunity Index (EII)\(^{16}\) the UNDAF set a target of 60.0 (2017). Kenya ranked 90 with value of 41.3 in 2010 and 47.5 (2012) an increase by 5.3. No new data have been available in 2016.

\(^{16}\) The Women’s Economic Opportunity Index is a dynamic quantitative and qualitative scoring model, constructed from 26 indicators, that measures specific attributes of the environment for women employees and entrepreneurs in 113 economies. Five category scores are calculated from the unweighted mean of underlying indicators and scaled from 0-100, where 100=most favorable. These categories are: Labour policy and practice (which comprises two sub-categories: Labour policy and Labour practice); Access to finance; Education and training; Women’s legal and social status; and the General business environment.
**Green jobs:** The indicator for ‘framework for the promotion of green jobs at the national level established;’ is at preliminary stages of start up.

**Key Recommendations for Outcome 3.3**

i. **Inclusivity:** Consider and prioritize the design of a joint program on youth and employment. Youth employment is a critical need hence the need for the UN to scale up its current interventions and outreach. Options include strengthening public and/or private capacity to increase youth employment. Provide strategic support for national and county governments’ plans for youth employment. It may be appropriate to invest in research on possible and appropriate opportunities and sectors to harness youth employment, strengthening youth labor marketability through enhanced investment in volunteer programs on professional skills and development is also critical.

ii. **Private Sector:** Determine entry points for meaningful engagement with the private sector: Although a mapping of partners for SRA3 identified critical partnerships with the private sector, their participation has not been fully realised. There is an urgent need to strengthen Kenya's private sector as the main engine of economic growth and to make this growth more inclusive than it has been, by generating employment opportunities, especially for the youth. To achieve this, it is necessary to continue the pathway of stimulating private-sector initiatives through establishment of conducive business environment, while enhancing the skills of Kenya's workforce to respond to the demands of the emerging labour market of a transforming economy. The UN needs to continue supporting the private sector to mainstream SDGs into their operations to ensure ‘leave no one behind’.

iii. **Business development:** Maintain priority focus on support to the MSMEs as a source of employment for women and youth at national and county level. Put in place measures to address bottlenecks for MSME growth such as inadequate capital, limited market access, poor infrastructure, inadequate knowledge and skills, rapid changes in technology, and unfriendly laws and regulations. There is need to ensure that at county level, MSMEs and businesses are not only seen as sources of Revenue for the counties but mainly as sources of job creation. Developing skills for MSMEs to increase their productivity will significantly boost Kenya's GDP, thereby generating employment opportunities. There is need for counties to set clear regulations consistent with national level policies and which do not overburden MSMEs. Biashara Centres is a good model that needs to be expanded to reach to at least 18 Counties as planned in the UNDAF. There is need to ensure that the Centres respond to the unique needs and demands of each county. The Business Skills and Enterprise Development (BSED) training program is an effective model that should be expanded to other Counties. There is need for completion of unfinished priorities such as completion of the development of Special Economic Zones and revamping textile sector.

iv. **Financial resources:** Expand the number of women/youth entrepreneurs targeted to benefit from procurement opportunities and address the bottlenecks that hinder their progress and access.

v. **Capacity development:** Strengthen the LMIS as a framework to facilitate collection and sharing of information with key institutions in the labour market with a focus on capacity for specifications and standardisation of data. Improve working conditions by strengthening capacity of the National Labour Board and capacity of the Labour Inspectorate. Regularly monitor with set targets, skills transfer where advisory support is provided.
Performance Rating of the SRA 3 Outcome 3.3

The overall rating for the performance of Outcome 3.3 is “Partially On Track” as outlined below:

Table 28: Assessment of the Performance of Outcome 3.3 Using Output Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 3.3: Job creation, skills development and working conditions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output Results Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.1: Employment creation and enterprise development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.2: Skills development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3.3: Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Performance After Computing Output ratings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Overall Performance of Outcome 3.3 Using Triangulation Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Outcome Results by triangulation of three methodologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the output performance assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Assessment of Performance of Outcome indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see Annex 1.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Consultant judgment informed by analysis of the key findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Performance of SRA 3 at a Glance

Table 30: Overall Performance of SRA 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA 3: Inclusive and sustainable economic growth</th>
<th>Outcome Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3.1: On Productive Business Environment</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3.2: On Productive Sector and Trade</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3.3: On Job creation, Skills and working conditions</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall SRA Position</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.5 Effectiveness of SRA 4: Environmental Sustainability, Land Management & Human Security

This strategic result area supports and contributes to the overarching national development priorities: “A sustained economic growth of 10% p.a. over the next 25 years”. The strategic result area contributes to the following national aspiration:

By 2030 Kenya is prosperous, underpinned by efficient management of natural resources and equitable access of Kenyans to development assets including: land, water, and other renewable resources and achievement and sustainability of national cohesion and resilience that guarantees long term peace and prosperity.
2.2.5.1 Assessment of the Performance of Outcome 4.1

Outcome 4.1: By 2016 Kenya has robust policies and legal frameworks linking issues of environmental sustainability, climate change and land management to human security and resilience thereby requiring an integrated and coordinated response at all phases.

The thrust of outcomes 4.1 is on the following: i) Policy: capacity of public and private institutions to develop coherent policies responsive to inter linkages of environment and sustainable use of land and natural resources; ii) Land Use: capacity of public and private sectors including county governments to develop and implement equitable land use models to inform national land reform strategies and; iii) Policy Implementation: Public and private sector and county government have capacities for peace building for development.

Contribution to Policies and Legislative Frameworks:
A solid policy environment to guide management of land, natural resources and environment exits: With support from the UN, the GOK has developed institutional, legal and policy frameworks that govern conservation and natural resources management including those for land, wildlife management, climate change, environment management and tourism. These frameworks, supported by the constitutional provisions, have changed the sphere in which civil society organizations and communities can engage in biodiversity, forest conservation and natural resource management. Key policy and legal frameworks supported in the past 2 years include: Land Policy of 2015 launched in 2016; National irrigation and Drainage policy (2015); National irrigation Bill 2016; Water Harvesting and Storage Policy 2016; Climate Change Act 2016 and The Slump Upgrading and Prevention Policy 2016, (awaiting Parliament adoption). The Community Land Bill (2015) is undergoing consultations and citizen participation. The UN also supported the GOK in development of the Kenya NAP in 2015. The NAP takes into account the existing and robust women peace and security architecture that includes UNSC Resolutions 1820, 1888, 1889, 1960, 2106 and 2122. Kenya NAP is anchored on the values of gender equality and women’s empowerment as enshrined in the Country’s Vision 2030.

At county level, there are pockets of good practices where counties were supported in the development of policies and legal frameworks including guidance in the sector. This includes support towards drafting of the Tana River Control and Grazing Bill that awaits civic participation to get consent on the public and also establishment of LIMS in Turkana under land registration Act.

Contribution to National Capacities:
Significant Capacities were enhanced for relevant institutions in areas of land, natural resources, and climate change at both national and selected county levels: UN supported public sector officials to appreciate the linkages between policy provisions and application of such policy at the operational levels. Capacity has been enhanced among public service officials from various ministries on Voluntary Guidance on Responsible Governance of Tenure (VGRGT). Support has also been provided in development of Land Administration Manual and a Facilitators’ guide that is useful in guiding CLMBs. At county level, capacity has been enhanced for the Count Land Officials “County Land Management Board” of Tana River to enhance their capacity to fulfill their mandate. UN supported 12 Producer Organizations in Laikipia and Nakuru counties through the Forest and Farm Facility. The main objective of the initiative is to encourage farm forestry and increase forest cover while developing business plans to increase sales and production. Ministry of Lands in Turkana and Tana River were
Knowledge Information Management has been a great investment to capacities. This has included assessment studies, awareness raising products which have improved knowledge levels and practices.

**Noted Achievements for Outcome 4.1**

**Positive linkages between peace building and land development agenda noted at County levels:** Capacities gained by peace building institutions in Turkana have enabled successful land reclamation in volatile areas such as Kapeto. Hectares of degraded lands and eco-systems brought back to productive use in Turkana and Garissa can be estimated at 30,000 Hectors. Due to capacities built on peace for communities, cattle raids are detected by local’s and reported to the nearby police using communication gadgets supported by the UN Agencies. In the process, lives, and livestock have been saved. Restoration and reclamation of degraded lands in Garissa and Turkana ASALs have also enhanced the livelihoods and food security of the host communities, thereby reducing conflicts and tensions associated with environmental resources.

**Significant Progress on Implementation of the UN REDD Program:** Kenya is in the process of implementing its Readiness Preparation Proposal (RPP) following its approval in 2010 by the Participants Committee of the Forest Carbon Partnership Fund. Kenya is also a partner country of the UN-REDD program. The early phases of the UN-REDD+ initiative have already started to provide interesting results that are contributing to UNDAF results especially SRA 4. What follows are key highlights of emerging results of UN-REDD initiative:

i. The initiation plan supports establishment of national REDD+ processes which promotes

ii. informed and meaningful involvement of all stakeholders, including indigenous peoples, forest dependent and local communities in national REDD+ implementation

iii. National Stakeholder Engagement and Free Prior and Informed Consent Guidelines were developed. The guidelines will be used in the development of forest carbon related projects by all project proponents

iv. REDD+ initiative contributed towards strengthening governance, essential to enabling the institutional and legal changes being proposed under the REDD+ framework

v. The country advanced the design and governance of the national REDD+ fund management systems, towards robust and credible fiduciary arrangements through a finance management study.

UN has supported implementation of the Micro Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) Strategic Plan 2013-2017. Specifically, a revised MSME Handbook – setting clear guidelines for MSME regulation has been finalized and led to entrepreneurs/MSMEs adopting best practices in business management as well as increased knowledge of how to access Government led Procurement Opportunities and ability to access contracts to supply goods and services supported with plotter printers and mobile phones for geo-referencing.
This impacted on informing the country to integrate REDD+ considerations into the national climate change finance policy and the draft climate change policy and recently enacted Climate Change Act (2016)

vi. Kenya Forest Service’s adopted the REDD+ reviewed Kenya Forest Service Code of Conduct to improve forest resource governance that is being rolled out at the county level as part of devolution and

vii. The enactment of the Climate Change Act (2016) plays a very strong foundation for REDD+ process in Kenya, contributing to integration of REDD+ policy actions and measures with clear mitigation and adaptation measures.

Rome Based (HQ) UN Agencies\textsuperscript{17} put together a Joint Initiative “Kenya Cereal Enhancement Program–Climate Resilience Agricultural Livelihood window- KCEL-CRAL” that builds on initial program results on enhancing resilience of communities in ASALs: The KCEP_CRAL Joint UN Initiative aims to support GOK in graduation of farmers in the semi-arid marginal agricultural counties from food insecurity to market oriented farming, through good agricultural practices, sustainable natural resource management and resilience to climate change in an increasingly fragile ecosystem. The Joint UN program builds on synergic collaboration efforts of three UN Agencies with Headquarters in Rome, each building on its comparative advantage to provide the relevant technical skills, knowledge and expertise to contribute towards resilience of the farmers. Mainstreaming of natural resource management and climate change resilience at household, community and county levels, is central to the KCEP-CRAL approach.

To protect their investment, targeted small holders will be supported to identifying and adopting climate resilient agricultural practices based on improved and more efficient water management, while county governments and communities will be empowered to sustainably and consensually manage their natural resources. The KCEP-CRAL’s approach features an innovative scheme to allow farmers to move form subsistence to financial services for market oriented agricultures. Figure 3 below shows the cycle according to the Cereal Initiative. The UN Cereal Initiative is still in its infancy stage and is planned to kick off before the end of the year.\textsuperscript{18}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
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\caption{UN Cereal Initiative}
\end{figure}

\textbf{Noted Challenges for Outcome 4.1}

A complex Nexus between Land and Natural Resources Rights and Security exits, requiring innovative inclusive approach to address the challenge: Land and natural resource ownership and rights are a potential source for conflict, mainly in newly devolved counties, especially when programming objectives are not always in line with county government land agenda (for example, the counties prefer to work on urban land planning

\textsuperscript{17} FAO, IFAD and WFP
while overall land programming covers rural land development). This challenge has also been witnessed in areas of policy development related to land. Reviews of land related policies or legal frameworks are political and to some extent, a way of perpetuating power. A good example of this challenge is the case of Turkana County, where land use models were not successfully operationalized because the models recommended for Turkana were not adopted due to their potential clash with realities of dynamism of pastoralism. There were strong differences between county methodologies for addressing issues of pastoralism with those recommended by UN Agencies.

The current indicators for Outcome 4.1 are not robust enough to cover the scope of work under the outcome: The issues on environment and climate change were not adequately addressed by the indicators.

Insecurity in the North often affect programming: Given that programming delivery for the outcome 4.1 is mainly in the ASALs, the insecurity situation is reported to affect effective delivery of the planned interventions.

Slow take off of planned Joint Programs for Cereals: Consultations with UN agencies indicated a relatively slow pace in getting Joint programs operational.

**Key Recommendations for outcome 4.1**

i. Working in the area of land tenure and natural resource management is relatively sensitive, given the strong linkages to issues of security and political influence. As such, there may be need to work with MCAs to enhance their appreciation in these issues particularly the importance of addressing inequalities and reinforce good governance in this sector.

ii. Greater involvement of and inclusiveness of key stakeholders at county levels and communities in development of sensitive policies is critical for enhancing better appreciation of rationale for policies, thereby creating community ownership, buy-in and sustainability in the implementation of such policies. A Bottom Up approach becomes fundamental.

iii. There is growing need at national level to harmonize NLCs and Ministry of Lands Plans and recommending for land use planning while at the county level, promote people centered approach based on the national government plans.

**Performance Rating for SRA 4 Outcome 4.1**

At UNDAF mid-term, the performance of Outcome 4.1 is rated as “Partially on Track”.

**Table 31: Performance Rating for Outcome 4.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 4.1: On Policy and legal frameworks linking issues of environmental sustainability, climate change and land management to human security and resilience</th>
<th>Output Results Focus</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1.1 Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.2 Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1.3 Policy Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome Performance After Computing Output ratings** | Partially on Track
Table 32: Assessment of Outcome 4.1 by Triangulation of Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Outcome Results by triangulation of three methodologies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the output performance assessment</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Assessment of Performance of Outcome indicator (see Annex 12)</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Consultant judgment informed by analysis of the key findings</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Position of the Outcome 4.1 Performance</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.5.2 Assessment of the Performance of Outcome 4.2

Outcome 4.2: By 2018 counties and communities are able to anticipate, prevent and respond effectively to disaster and emergencies.

The thrust of outcomes 4.2 is: i) Peace building: Public institution, county government, civil society and capacities to coordinate and implement national peace and strategies and interventions; ii) Disaster Risk Reduction/Management: National disaster management and counties have inclusive responsive system to deal with disasters and emergencies; iii) Border Management and Community Policing: Law enforcement agencies, border authorities and selected county have governments, have capacities for gender and human rights responsive management of boarder participatory community policing.

Contribution to Policies and Legislative Frameworks:

UN Agencies supported policy oversight institutions and strategic national bodies in the development of national security policies: At parliamentary level, UN Agencies provided immense support to implementation of the constitution with respect to security matters, particularly targeting the Parliamentary Committee on Peace and security. The strengthened committee has impacted quality of policies generated and reviewed. The National Security Policy has been influenced by the capacities gained. Support has been provided by the UN towards development of the Bill on Disaster and Risk Management of 2016. The focus of the new bill is to unify coordination of separate entities and provide guidance to devolved units and once passed into law it will allow for allocation of resources for DRR at county levels. Through the process of supporting development of these sector policies, the UN ensures that gender and human rights were systematically mainstreamed in the policy and legal frameworks. Asked to share what they view as the greatest achievements on UN support to policy and legal frames, one UN officer had this to say:

“The enactment of the NDMA Act a few weeks ago has been a journey that the UN Agencies have walked with the National Drought Management Authority. This change of status will help the NDMA enhance coordination, implementation and monitoring of ending Drought Emergencies Program” UN Agency Official.

Kenya achievement is a signatory to the Sendai Global Framework on DRR/M (2015-2030) adopted by 187 countries. The goal of the framework is “substantial reduction of disaster risk and losses in lives, livelihood and health”. It is about forward looking strategies for building resilience of nations and communities to disasters. The National and County DRR Action Plan is reported to be holistic, inclusive and gender and human rights responsive. Human capacities of strategic personnel from the public sector, CSO and other UN agencies has been strengthened on the provisions and implication of the Global Sendai DRR framer on Kenya.
Addressing normative value of the UN, capacity has also been built in the implications of relevant SDGs and climate change issues on the new DRR framework. With support from the UN Agencies, the country developed the National Security and Cohesion Index. The index constitutes the following dimensions: Peace, Trust, Equity, Diversity, prosperity and identity. The SCI stands at 56% (national average) with lowest index recorded in Wajir County and the highest in Kiambu County. Over the last two years the UN Agencies have supported counties in conducting NCI audits. If results of SCI audits could be incorporated into development planning and interventions, it could change the face of governance in the country. Other policy and legal frameworks generated with support of the UN include: A Gender Policy for the International Peace Security Training Center (IPSTC) and a 3 Strategic Platform for Kenya Association of Women in Police.

Contribution to National Capacities:

**Capacities of strategic national and county institutions for national security have been strengthened.**

With support from the UN, capacity of key institutions involved in national security National Drought Management Agency – NDMA; National Integration and Cohesion Commission, International Security Peace and Training Center (ISPTC) and the NDOC, have been strengthened to deliver on their mandates. Support has been provided to the GOK to address issues of terrorism and violence with the establishment of the National Counter Terrorism Center contributed to this end. Kenya's Peace architecture began the process of alignment to the devolution process, coordinated by the joint institutional mechanism of the National Directorate for Peace Building in the Ministry of Interior and the Independent National Cohesion and Integration Commission. The process has nurtured a vibrant civil society that alerts and advocates policy interventions to mitigate abuses and an inter-governmental coordinated mechanism among all relevant government institutions on early warning and response processes. This was exemplified during the 2015 El-Nino planning, preparedness and response through the KHPT modality, which brought together a wide range of actors to plan for this weather event with the ultimate result of preventing injury, loss of life and property through disaster mitigation. Support has been provided to development of a Disaster Risk management (DRR) website that is managed by NDMA. The donor mapping activity also contributes to more efficient resource management.

**Noted Achievements of Outcome 4.2**

**Decentralization of the Peace architecture has been achieved and this has also contributed to national ownership:** The new devolved governments have begun to appreciate and utilize the capacity and knowledge transfer provided through the established and decentralized peace and security infrastructure. Over 45% of emerging young professionals and graduates deployed as Peace Officers; Research Analysts and Governance Coordinators through the UN Volunteer modality, got absorbed in the newly devolved government institutions in public service. There has been a subsequent increase in budgetary allocation by county governments to peace building in 2015 and 2016. Through a peace mechanism called UUYANO, established through coordinated UUYANO cohesion platforms for peace, decentralized systems for responding to insecurity have been built. The platforms are very inclusive and have the capacity to predict insecurity and put in place relevant mechanisms for a preventative response.

**The East Africa Humanitarian Private Sector Partnership Platform (EA HPPP) launched in March 2016,** in Nairobi formalizes and facilitates interactions between private sector, humanitarian practitioners, government representatives, local businesses and business associations to address disaster risk reduction, emergency preparedness and response. The EA HPPP has established a sub-working group with its stakeholders engaged on sensitization and advocacy messages on election preparedness in Kenya.

**Capacities of national stakeholders on the priorities contained in the Global Sendai DRR framework built:** The UN has contributed to the enhanced capacities for strategic personnel in the national peace and
security sector. As part of the package on appreciating provisions of the global Sendai framework, UN agencies have also addressed normative values (SDG, gender, climate change) in the context of the new DRR framework. Due to increased awareness of the national Action plan on DRR, national actors have been able to contextualize priorities for and align them in the DRR work in Kenya. GOK with support of UN agencies have developed systems and mechanism for addressing resilience particularly in the ASAL regions. Predictive Early Warning Systems has been developed for monitoring vegetation and strategic water points in ASALs. The model is an improvement from previous methods. It gives 60-180-day advance warning with linkage to NDMA contingency funding. The system developed an additional forage of indicators used in determination of contingency allocation. A Rift Valley Fever (RVF) contingency plan and decision support framework were updated. In addition, the contingency plans were disseminated in hot spot counties for RVF. Community sensitization on RVF has been largely done through radio broadcast. Furthermore, Standard Operation Procedures (SOPs) for the management of RVF were developed. Capacity of private and public service providers has been enhanced on the control of Maize Lethal Necrosis Disease. The county governments have taken central role as first responders during emergencies. Most ASAL counties have multi-hazard maps and contingency plans that can be activities in case of a shock or hazard.

There is a growing paradigm shift from communities demanding relief aid to resilience building: The population of those in need of food assistance has also gone down in the last 2 years (from as much as 1.5 million to as low as around 600,000) and focus is reported to have shifted from relief to resilience building. Consultations with UN Agencies and GOK stakeholders noted increasing numbers of people participating in productive safety nets programs and a corresponding reduction in general food distribution caseload. This expansion has mostly been in the arid counties where hitherto high dependency on free food has been the order of the day. These counties are now demanding for resilience building and productive safety nets.

Box 11: A visit to Irrigation Scheme in Turkana

The visit confirms a growing demand for Resilience. As part of the UNDAF MTR the consultants visited Turkana. Here a group of 30 women, wives of pastoralists with support from a local CSO also supported by one of the UN Agencies, showed determination to improve their livelihood. The former pastoralists and former recipients to food aid were now producing different types of grain in their irrigation plots. They constructed a store to keep their grain before marketing. They would buy grain from other small producers to increased stock before sales. They had a ready market for their grain through private sector market linkages initiatives. The women shared change making stories of how their lives had been positively impacted by participating in sustainable livelihood initiatives. They shared how they now had extra cash income they used for the education of their children, and better standards of lives in terms of household diets. Surprisingly they also shared how the extra cash income from their marketing of grain had given their husband a break to sell their goats for cash to support families, thereby improving production of their goat herd.

Support to Knowledge Management and South to South Cooperation within the Peace Architecture within the region contributes to sharing of good practices: Knowledge management has been part of the peace architecture in Kenya. Since the launch of Devolution in 2014, the National Directorate of Peace Building and Conflict Prevention (NDPBCP) has continued to provide guidance to counties on analysis of conflict trends and stakeholder response, coordination mechanisms through the local Peace and Security Committees. In September 2015, the Directorate hosted Malawi and Zimbabwe governments and civil society officials, who sought the Kenyan experience, in order to inform the building of their own national peace infrastructure.
A national Peace Institution (International Peace Support Training Centre) born out of the Peace Building program has been transformed into a Regional Center of Excellency. At the peak of the new insurgency in South Sudan in 2015, The IPSTC served as a hub for mediation and training of the response teams that were deployed for humanitarian and protection support.

Visible and concerted efforts have been made in integrating gender and human rights into the peace and national security architecture by UN Agencies and this has made a huge mark in addressing the gender and human dimension in policy, legal framework of operations: The UN Agencies made a conscious and well calculated strategy to mainstream gender and human rights considerations into the peace and national security frameworks. At the regional level, the UN Agencies worked closely with Interpol Regional Bureau for East Africa and provided technical support to gender mainstreaming within their programs and interventions, thereby impacting on peace processes not only in Kenya but in the regional. To this end the lead UN institution has been accepted as cooperation partners of Eastern African Police Chiefs Cooperation Organization. In Kenya, UN agencies have ensured that gender and human rights issues are systematically addressed in key policy and legal frameworks. In line with the United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1,325, support has been provided to the Ministry of Defense to address gender and human rights in the security sector.

UN Agencies built the capacity of women involved in peace structures in the two UN flagship counties which have high demand for peace settlements, given the fact that the two counties share borders with neighboring countries whose communities are mainly migrant pastoralists. An interview with the Turkana County Leadership Team, on issues of security, the feedback has been very positive on efforts towards peace.

“We share country boundaries with three counties South Sudan, Ethiopia and Uganda. The support given to county structures which include female peace mediators has changed the face of peace along these boundaries. For the first time, we are experiencing a new form of peace, never experienced before, among the pastoralist communities, along the county boundaries. From both sides of the border the pastoralist moves their livestock and intermixes. The results for peace are phenomenal” Senior Official Turkana County- UNDAF MTR Consultations.

**Box 12: Inclusion: Leave No One Behind for Outcome 4.2**

Outcome 4.2 has contributed significantly to the principles of inclusion of marginalized group. An effort for addressing resilience and risk reduction has been targeted at the ASALs most affected by disasters. Capacity of women to contribute to peace structures has been built. Gender and human right principles were mainstreamed in policies, legal frameworks and programs for the peace architecture. On the negative side the current assessment of degree of Social Cohesion Index in the country points to the needs to address inequalities and marginalization of disadvantaged groups in society. The SCI is a tool that counties could use to work towards closing the inequality gaps and contribute to a stronger peaceful society.

Support has been provided in the development of a gender and human right friendly Sendai National Action Plan. Support has also been provided to the development of training manuals on GBV in emergencies which seek to enhance capacities related to gender and gender based violence in humanitarian setting.

**Noted Challenges for Outcome 4.2**

**Coordination of emergency support, remain an area requiring more support:** In the ASALs counties, due to growing insecurity, coordination of stakeholders for emergency support becomes a major challenge to
achieve set goals. When emergencies occur, they are not planned for as part of normal program planning. As such resource mobilization often is a challenge to address emergencies.

**Key Recommendations for Outcome 4.2**

As the UNDAF stakeholders work on the revision of the M&E results framework for the remaining phase of the UNDAF program, consider inclusion of outcome indicators that can easily be informed by the National Social Cohesion Index. To this end consider establishment of a social cohesion data and information system and ensuring regular data and information collection. This would ensure effective monitoring of social cohesion.

**Performance Rating for SRA 4 Outcome 4.2**

Outcome 4.2 is “Partially on Track”.

**Table 33: Assessment of Performance of Outcome 4.2 on Disaster and Emergencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 4.2: On Communities’ capacity to anticipate, prevent and respond to disaster and emergencies:</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Partially Achieved</th>
<th>Not Achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1 Peace building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2 DRR/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.3 Boarder Management and Community policing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 34: Assessment of Outcome Result 4.2 by Triangulation of Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Outcome Results by triangulation of three methodologies</th>
<th>Partially on Track</th>
<th>On Track</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the output performance assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the Assessment of Performance of Outcome indicator (Annex 1.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Consultant judgment informed by analysis of the key findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Position of the Outcome 4.2 Performance**

Partially on Track

**Performance of SRA 4 at a Glance**

**Table 35: Overall Performance of SRA 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA 4: Environmental Sustainability, Land Management &amp; Human Security</th>
<th>Outcome Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4.1: On Policy and Legal Frameworks</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4.2: On Community Security and Resilience</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall SRA Position</td>
<td>Partially On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.2.6 Effectiveness of Joint Programs**

In the spirit of DaO, the UN runs a number of joint programs. These are: i) the Joint program on HIV and AIDS; ii) The Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health; iii) the Flagship Area-based Cross Border Integrated Program for Sustainable Peace and Socio-Economic Transformation, Kenya-Ethiopia; iv) the Flagship Area-based Turkana County & UN Joint Program and; and v) The Kenya Cereal Enhancement Program—Climate Resilience Agricultural Livelihood window- KCEL-CRAL. The two area based flagship programs are bringing Delivering as One to the devolved levels.
Notable Achievements

The achievements, challenges and recommendations for the three joint programs have been captured under outcome 2.2, 2.3 and 4.1. This section highlights only the flagship programs. The use of area based programming approach has enabled the UN to provide targeted technical, financial and institutional support in a coordinated approach, to Turkana and Marsabit counties. Both programs have been launched by national and county governments and take a comprehensive, delivering as One approach to areas of the country where poverty indicators and human development indicators are worse off. In Turkana, joint work plans between the County and the UN have been signed off and implementation started. In Marsabit, Biashara Centers have been established, a business model whose objective is to promote inclusive economic growth and job creation.

The planning processes have been highly participatory, joint and consultative at the level of communities, county governments. A notable achievement is the innovative and unique programme by the UNCT of Ethiopia and Kenya, in partnership with the Governments of Ethiopia and Kenya, IGAD and other development partners, who have initiated a cross-border and area-based development project for Marsabit County and Southern Ethiopia. The result has been development of this cross-border and area-based programme, whose main objective in the short-run, is to reduce vulnerability and increase resilience of communities affected by conflict in the border region through identification and promotion of sustainable livelihood projects and conflict management strategies. In the long-run, the programme aims to economically empower the communities through a judicious mix of socio-economic transformative programmes that include infrastructure development, industrial and agricultural development projects, and the development of health and educational facilities. The objectives of the project are in line with a recent initiative, which was launched in October 2014 by the UN Secretary General and the World Bank President, and IGAD aimed at boosting economic growth, reducing poverty and promoting business activities in the Horn of Africa through, among other strategies, cross-border cooperation.

In 2015, the Turkana County government and the UN entered into a Framework Coordination and Partnership Arrangement for “Delivering as One”.

In 2015, the Turkana County government and the UN entered into a Framework Coordination and Partnership Arrangement for “Delivering as One”. The DaO approach aims to promote collaboration and cooperation between the County Government, the United Nations, the international development partners, the private sector and philanthropic organizations for the achievement of the development agenda in the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP) 2013-2017). This novel approach at the sub-national level is being tested in for Turkana County for the first time and hopefully the successes of this experiment will be replicated in other counties and regions of the world.
The GOK and UN have supported generation of evidence based information for programming: In Turkana county, the UN has supported as part of the Joint Program the SHARED (Stakeholder Approach to Risk Informed and Evidence Based Decision Making) approach that aims to provide a guided framework to assist the county government in resilience programming. The SHARED partnership with National Drought Management Authority, Turkana County, IGRAF and UN has developed a comprehensive resilience diagnostic and decision making tool. In Marsabit, a GIS exercise and Participatory Action Research has been undertaken in both Marsabit County, Kenya and Borana Zone, Ethiopia to collect spatial data and identify the causes, drivers, dynamics and impacts of conflict as well as the socioeconomic opportunities and challenges in region. Revision of the County Integrated Development Plans has been undertaken, through which the UN supported county government on the Kenyan side to integrate some of the 17 SDGs. A long term program has been developed and negotiations for funding has started with some donors. The “Biashara” Business Centre” opened in Marsabit County to promote a one-stop-shop facility for empowering Small and Micro Enterprises in the County.

Notable Challenges for Flagship Programs

While flagship programs have shown that they give the UN greater coherence, opportunity costs are very high. Negotiating a design across borders is time-consuming, and progress has been slow. Working across borders poses challenges for effective management of the programs and engagement of all key stakeholders. Resource mobilization will continue to be a key factor for the successful implementation of the Joint Programs.

Recommendations for Flagship Programs

i. Fast track approval of Joint Work plans, program documents, Multi-donor-trust Funds to accelerate the implementation for achievement of the UNDAF outputs and outcomes.

ii. There is need for consistent RBM systems to measure and report impact on a regular basis and document and share lessons learned.

iii. Put in place resource mobilization strategies to accelerate program results.

iv. As there is opportunity to replicate the flagship programs to other counties, the UNCT should put in place clear criteria for selection of counties for future flagships

2.2.7 Core Programming Principles in Delivery of UNDAF

The review noted good results in addressing programming principles of gender equality and women’s empowerment, Human Rights, Results Based Management (RBM) and Capacity Building with more room for improvement with respect to integration of Environment and Climate change.

The UNDAF five programming principles featured prominently in UNDAF programming at the design and implementation level. While the objective has been to mainstream all the principles in all outcomes, human rights based approach, environmental sustainability, were clearly identified with SRA 1 and SRA4 respectively. Apart from WASH, environmental sustainability indicators were evidently missing in SRA1 and 2. Capacity building has been addressed across all the 4 SRAs.

Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment: A deliberate effort has been made to mainstream gender equality and women’s empowerment principles into the UNDAF results framework. About 40% (25/63) of UNDAF results have strong GEWE indicators. It is possible to track GEWE results using these indicators. The remaining 60% of indicators would require innovation from gender focal persons in the SRAs to integrate
GEWE principles in the results. Gender and empowerment of women adopted both a gender targeted approach (maternal health and adolescent’s health) and mainstreamed approach across all the SRAs. Gender programming has been prominent in all SRAs with significant results. Gender programming has also been embedded in the UN’s Flagship programs in Turkana and Marsabit cross-border program. Notably significant, has been the work with non-traditional sectors such as Mining. One key issue that emerged during the interviews is the abundance of information on how to mainstream gender in UNDAF but inadequate awareness and use of the National Policy and Action Plan on Human Rights to mainstream human rights in UNDAF at all programming stages The National Gender Equality Commission (NGEC) has also been supported to develop and disseminate the Duty Bearers Handbook which details the role of each duty bearer in responding and preventing GBV. UN support has reached 4 counties; NGEC has leveraged funds for rolling this out to further 9 counties. All this is in the context of NGEC’s Keeping the Promise Campaign to end GBV which has a strong focus on strengthening action and accountability by state and non-state actors on their mandate in relation to GBV work.

Building from the initial gender competency capacities across UN Agencies gained through Implementing Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE) joint program, the UN established a Gender Working Group drawn from gender focal persons from UN Agencies. The GEWE evaluation noted the comparative advantage of mainstreaming gender and human rights through working with topical thematic issues and innovatively finding entry points for gender mainstreaming. Other facilitating factors have been the well planned involvement of respective UN agencies at the design of UNDAF where concerted efforts were put in ensuring that UNDAF results were gender responsive. Gender Advisers were also strategically placed in key institutions at national level to influence policy and programming. Mainstreaming gender in the new crop of policies and legal frameworks has been critical in ensuring potential room for continuity of addressing gender in programming. Relevant lead gender UN agencies have strategically participated in the all the four SRAs leaving no room for not addressing gender and human rights. Finally, the design of the SRA 1 has been rich in delivery for gender and human rights agenda.

**Human Rights Based Approach to programming:** There is no systematic approach in UNDAF to mainstream Human Rights Based Approach to Programming (HRBAP). UNDAF responded well to the priorities in human rights generally through support of human rights bodies and instruments, both under the framework of the SRA1 – transformational governance. However, in the other SRAs, outcome indicators, acted as proxies for measuring the level of enjoyment of rights (e.g. literacy rates relate to education, malnutrition rates to food, primary education as part of the right to education, maternal health as part of the right to health, disease prevalence rates or maternal mortality rates right to health). Social protection programs addressed the rights and wellbeing standards of the most vulnerable social groups including children, women, those who live in poverty, the elderly and the disabled. However, more work is needed to disaggregate indicators according to the prohibited grounds of discrimination where possible to identify groups that are not enjoying a right to the same level as the general population or who are not accessing a good or service needed. Relevance of the HRBA is also noted with regards to UNDAF prioritizing vulnerable groups and marginalized communities in ASAL areas including special focus on six ASAL Counties most at risk in terms of not reaching MDGs goal of reducing Maternal mortality. In SRA 4, innovative programming addressing the human rights of refugees with respect to participation in livelihoods activities and broadened options for access to food and services, were noted as good practices. Other vulnerable groups were also clearly identified such as, people living with HIV, adolescents, unemployed youth and women.

---

19 Feedback from the Gender Technical Working Group.
Results Based Management: UNDAF 2014-2018 has been designed according to the Results-based Management (RBM) approach. Capacity in application of RBM principles was to be continuously reinforced throughout the UNDAF period. However, the MTR found out that RBM training has been provided too late after the work plans were developed and implementation work started.

Capacity Building: The review notes good progress made in enhancing capacities of UNDAF stakeholders GOK institutions, Counties, community groups, women, youth and vulnerable groups to effectively participate in contributing to UNDAF results across all SRAs.

Integration of Environment and Climate change in programming: Issues of climate change and environmental sustainability have not been adequately addressed in the UNDAF program delivery. While these issues are well covered under SRA 4, there has not been a well thought out strategy on how the issues can systematically be incorporated in programming. There may be need to developing guidance on mainstreaming climate change, environments and youth issue in development planning and implementations. SRA 4 can lead on this as stakeholder’s work on the final leg of UNDAF delivery.

2.2.8 Alignment of UNDAF to Sustainable Development Goals

This section presents an analysis of the degree to which the UNDAF results are effectively aligned to the Sustainable Development Goals. The analysis focuses on the four SRAs, while closely assessing the degree to which SRA outcomes and output results are linked to SDG focus areas and indicators. It is important to read this section while closely making reference to the Annex 5 of this report which provides a detailed analysis of alignment of the UNDAF to SDGs. The analysis of degree of SRA alignment to SDGs used three rating categories (highly aligned, moderately aligned and weakly aligned).

SRA 1 Transformative Governance: The UNDAF MTR notes that to a large extent, SRA 1 on transformative governance is moderately aligned to relevant SDGs which include SDG5, on achievement of gender equality within and countries; SDG 10 whose focus is on reduction of inequalities within countries, SDG 16 on promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, provision of access to justice for all and building effective accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels. The thrust of outcomes 1.1 and 1.2 is very strong on development of human rights based and gender equality and women’s empowerment related policies (SDG Indicators 5.1, and 5.c.) The outputs as discussed in the effective chapter had strong interventions for addressing gender equality and women’s participation on politics and decision making. The 2/3 gender rule advocacy work contributed to SDG target 5.5 on women’s full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all level. However, more work could be done under SRA 1 to address SDG 5 target 5.4 which focuses on shared responsibilities within households. Outcome 1.3 on devolution is closely linked to SDG 10 on reduced inequalities within countries. The Devolution program is strong on addressing issues promoting economic and social inclusion. The devolution process is just unfolding and more work is expected to address inequalities and sustained growth for the bottom 40% and addressing inequalities of outcomes. While the outcome areas for SRA 1 are strongly aligned to the relevant SDGs, the UNDAF stakeholders should consider including output results that could address the areas of the SDG indicators not adequately addressed in the current UNDAF design. Of note are SDG targets 5.4 on shared responsibilities with households and 16.5 on the need to substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all its forms.
SRA 2 Human Capital: The analysis of SRA 2 on Human Capital, indicates a relatively strong alignment of the UNDAF program to the SDGs (see Annex 2.2). All four outcome areas were responsive to the relevant SDGs. The UNDAF outcome 2.1 on Education and Learning links well with SDG 4 on inclusive and equitable education and promotion of life-long opportunities. Relevant SDG targets include 4.1; 4.2; and 4.5 on equitable and quality primary and education, pre-primary education and elimination of gender disparities in education including attention to People with Disabilities (PWD), minorities and those in vulnerable situations. The UNDAF outputs have focused on these SDG focus areas. Outcome 2.2 on WASH Environmental preservation, food availability, nutrition and health is aligned to SDGs Goals 2, 3 and 6. Goal 2 focuses on ending all forms of malnutrition, Goal 3 focuses on healthy lives and well-being, while Goal 6 focuses on ensuring availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation. The UNDAF program design has output results (Health systems, RMNCAH, WASH Environmental food availability, nutrition, communicable and non-communicable conditions, health sector mainstreaming) which are closely aligned to the SDG targets. Relevant SDG targets include 2.2 on ending all forms of malnutrition, SDG target 3.1 on ending global maternal rations to less than 70 per 100,000, target 3.2 on ending preventable death of new born and children under 5 years, target 3.7 on ensuring universal access to sexual and reproductive health care; SDG targets 6.2 on achieving adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all with involvement of communities. UNDAF outcome 2.3 on Multi-sectoral HIV and AIDS responses, link well with SDG Goal 3 on Healthy lives and well-being. The relevant SDG indicator is 3.3 on ending the epidemic of AIDS, TB, malaria and water borne diseases. SDG Goal 5 is also relevant to UNDAF SRA 2. The SDG targets address issues of gender equality for access to ECD, primary and secondary education. Target 5.1 highlights the importance of ending all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere, while SDG target 5.6 requires countries to ensure universal access to sexual and reproductive health rights. UNDAF Outcome 2.4 on Social protection is aligned to SDG Goals, 1, 5, and 10. Relevant SDG targets include 1.3 on implementation of appropriate social protection systems and measures, target 5.2 on elimination of all forms of violence against women and girls in the public and private spheres, target 5.4 on value of unpaid care and domestic work, social protection policies; target 10.4 on adopting policies, wage and social protection policies and progressively achieving greater equality.

SRA 3 on Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth: Overall rating for SRA 3 with respect to alignment to SDGs is strong (see Annex 2.3). UNDAF Outcome 1.3 on productive and business environment has significant work accomplished on solid supportive policies that are human rights and gender responsive. The UNDAF outcome is aligned to SDGs 1, 5, 8 and 9. Relevant SDG targets include: target 1.5 on building resilience of the poor and vulnerable; target 1b on sound pro-poor and gender supportive policies; target 8.1 on sustaining per capita economic growth; target 9.3 on access to small and medium industries and other entrepreneurs. UNDAF Outcome 3.2 on productive sector and trade is aligned to SDGs 2, 5, 7, 8 and 10. Relevant SDG targets include: target 2.4 on sustainable food production systems; target 5.1 on ending all forms of discrimination against women and girls; target 7.1 on ensuring access to affordable reliable and modern energy services; target 8.1 on promoting development related policies to support decent work, job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity, innovation and SMEs and target 8.3 on promoting development oriented policies supporting productive activities. Outcome 3.3 on job creation, skills development and working conditions is aligned to SDGs 4, 8 and 5. The respective UNDAF outputs strongly aligned to the SDG relevant targets 4.3, 4.4, 8.3 and 8.5. The UNDAF MTR notes that while the UNDAF design at both outcome and output levels were significantly aligned to the SDGs, more work appears to have been accomplished at the policy level. The policies are also noted to be human rights based and gender responsive. More could be done on the programming around the good policies. Annex 2.3 also indicates aspects of the SDGs which are not well aligned in the design of
the UNDAF. These are also areas at mid-term which may require greater attention. Key areas requiring greater alignment to SDG include: reforms to ensure women and vulnerable groups access productive resources including land, doubling agricultural production, strengthening adaptation to climate change, measures to end forced labor and modern forms of slavery. The review also noted the need for greater alignment to SDG through paying attention to youth employment issues in UNDAF programming.

UNDAF outcomes 3.2 and 3.3 can be rated as having a “Medium” alignment to relevant SDGs.

SRA 4 on Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security: Analysis of UNDAF programs design indicates a relatively “high” alignment to SDGs (Annex 5). The UNDAF program design is aligned to SDG 2 on ending hunger and promotion of sustainable agriculture, SDG 7 on access to affordable and reliable modern energy and SDG 13 on action to combat climate change. UNDAF outcome 4.1 on policy and legal frameworks (on issues of DRR/M, human security, land use, natural resources, and tenure system) is aligned to a number of SDG targets to include: target 2.3 on doubling agricultural productivity and incomes of small scale food producers, particularly women, pastoralists and accessing services such as linking small farmer groups to markets; target 2.4 on implementing resilient agriculture and strengthening adaptation to climate change; target 13.1 on strengthening resilience and adaptive capacity to climate related hazards and natural disasters in all countries; target 7.1 on ensuring access to affordable, reliable and modern energy services; target 7.2 on renewable energy. UNDAF outcome 4.2 on community security and resilience is linked to SDG 16 on promotion of inclusive and peaceful societies for sustainable development.

Noted areas for greater focus of UNDAF programming in order to adequately align with the SDG for this SRA include: target 2.5 on genetic diversity of seeds, farmed and domesticated animals; target 13.2 on integrating climate change measures into policies, strategies and planning across all sectors; target 13.3 and 13.b on human and institutional capacity for climate change, mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning.

2.3 EFFICIENCY

This section analyses the extent to which the current UNDAF and the DaO modality at mid-term has enhanced efficiency at both operational and programmatic levels.

2.3.1 Efficiency at Operational level

Significant progress has been made by OMT and UNCT Kenya in working towards the Business Operations Strategy (BOS) with some initial results already evident: The BOS strategy 2016-2018 is already in place and clearly articulates the key areas of focus for the next 2 years. A needs assessment was conducted which provided a basis for the development of the BOS. The Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) for the next 2 years including monetary and labor net saving is US$ 607,004 for Travel, US$ 1,009,611 for Conference Services and US$ 323,341 for communications in the next 2 years. The BOS has clear outcome areas that encompass an M&E results framework, governance arrangement and resource requirements.

The OMT has already raised funding to the tune of $ 198,000 to strengthen collaborative procurement at county level and an additional $ 47,000 to strengthen gender responsive procurement and ICT technology for greater efficiency in capturing relevant information and measuring efficiency. Against the backdrop that OMT has only been in existence since 2014, the shared results demonstrate very good progress in operationalizing Standard Operational Procedures (SOPs) and BOS for increased efficiency of administrative function.
At mid-term of UNDAF, UN Kenya has made good progress in using HACT as a tool for programming efficiency: The GOK and the UN jointly conducted a Macro Assessment of the country’s Public Finance Management Systems (PFM) systems in 2015. This assessment is a key requirement for the UN to use HACT as a modality for funding Implementing Partners. The assessment provides UN Agencies with adequate appreciation of the PFM environment in which the UN system is operating, and it also serves as a basis for planning capacity strengthening of Implementing Partners (IPs). The PFM system has been noted to be relatively strong, facilitated by a conducive policy environment that benefited from the following: 2010 constitutional provisions; PFM Act of 2012 and PFM strategy of 2014-20, Public Disposal Act and introduction of IFMIS and the establishment of statutory bodies responsible for PFM systems. The UN HACT Implementing Agencies have made good progress on micro-assessments for IPs. Table 46 presents status of micro-assessments to date:

Table 36: Status of Micro-Assessments for IP working with UN Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Micro-Assessment</th>
<th>UNICEF</th>
<th>UNDP</th>
<th>UNFPA</th>
<th>WFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed Assess</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Going Assessment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft Issued, Not Finalized</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of IP</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The UN HACT Implementing Agencies have 27 shared IPs mainly drawn from government ministries and a few CSOs. Long Term Agreement (LTA) established by one of the UN agencies and used by different UN agencies resulted in cost saving, and also avoided duplication of efforts and facilitated more effective and professional assessment of risks through micro-assessments. UN agencies are reported to be joining the HACT platform to improve programming efficiencies. There are also plans for UN agencies to start by 2017 to use HACT Joint Assurance and Audit to further improve coordination and efficiency.

2.3.2 Coordination for Delivering as One

The UNDAF has strong coordination structures that ensure programmatic efficiency albeit with room for improvement. At the apex the UNDAF is coordinated by the National Steering Committee (NSC), Co-chaired by two GOK Cabinet Secretaries for Devolution and Planning and Treasury and on the UN Side by the Resident Coordinator (RC). There is joint leadership uniquely characterized by strong country ownership. The NSC ensures that the UNDAF, which is noted to mirror MTP II priorities, continues to serve that purpose of contributing to the attainment of national development priorities. The NSC has been effective in providing leadership and oversight for delivery of UNDAF. During the review period, the NSC has successfully coordinated Annual Reviews of the UNDAF in 2015 which has been supported by strong political commitment at the highest level. Capacity gaps noted with NSC include absence of a dedicated secretariat team to do the day-to-day coordination and planning for UNDAF.

Technical working groups: Technical working groups established within the UN have provided support to the UNDAF although greater responsibility is required in some of them. They include the Program Management Oversight Group (PMOG), which consists of Agency Deputies. PMOG has been instrumental in providing oversight for the UNDAF. The Monitoring and Evaluation Joint Technical Working Group (M&ETWG) consists of M&E specialists from the GOK and the UN. The M&E technical working group is expected to play a critical role in implementation of the UNDAF. However, a number of interviewees indicated that the M&E guidance has not been strongly felt except during preparation of UNDAF reports. Furthermore, it has been the concern of interviewees that the M&E TWG should provide more feedback and guidance on a continuous basis on the Results
Framework particularly on aspects where indicators are not SMART. The MTR finds inadequate use of the M&E plan for each SRA and there has been no formal review of the two-year rolling work plan. The UN Communication Group (UNCG) has provided coordination and implementation to the UNCT Communications Strategy. However, it emerged during the MTR that there is inadequate communication on UNDAF to the Country. It has been noted by donors and private sector and a number of government officials that communication on the UNDAF tended to be more during planning phases and during reviews, particularly, the State House reviews or during launch of a flagship programs or launch of other events. This has potential for sharing knowledge, good practices and gaining additional resources. A number of government officials met by the MTR team seem to be more conversant with individual UN agencies’ country programs than the UNDAF as whole or the particular UNDAF SRAs within which those programs are being implemented. The UNCG need to build an effective communication strategy for the various UNDAF SRAs and SDGs and share important programmatic and operational results with partners. Majority of stakeholders are for Social media rather than ‘tons’ of paper documents currently produced by the UN. The MTR notes that there should be systematic distillation and dissemination of lessons learned throughout the UNDAF process and not be left to the MTR or evaluation stage. The Communication team have a role to ensure this happens in a continuous basis.

**Strategic Result Area Groups:** There SRA Groups coordinate and monitor implementation of AWPs across the four pillars of the UNDAF. The groups are co-chaired by both the GOK (Principal Secretary of the relevant Ministry) and UN (Head of an Agency). Pitching leadership of SRA groups at this level has ensured effective coordination of stakeholders who are part of the SRA groups. The review observed that in cases where the UNDAF key results of the SRA coincided with the mandate of SRA lead Agencies; such SRAs are very well coordinated and managed. The personalities of the SRA leads also contributed to the quality of leadership, with strong motivated leaders providing strong leadership to the SRA groups. This has been the case with SRA 1, SRA 2 and SRA 3. While SRA 4 started very well leading in completion of AWPs, the SRA then never met for the whole of the second year. Coordination of key players at both ends (GOK and UN) has been extremely limited especially during the second year of the UNDAF. The change in leadership at the government side which also shifted leadership of SRAs also partially contributed to the performance of some of the SRAs especially SRA 4. While overall the SRA groups have been very strong to monitor performance of the UNDAF at SRA levels, there was an observation that there has been greater focus on tracking activities and outputs rather than systematically tracking progress around the outcome results using indicators.

Based on progress made, an assessment of the strengths of the current UNDAF in relation to the UNDAF Standard Operating Procedures is presented in Table 37:
### Table 37: UN Kenya – Status of Delivering as One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivering as One advantages</th>
<th>Status at MTR (Excellent, Good, Weak)</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas for Improvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving the UN system’s focus on working together towards achieving national development results</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Strategic Result Areas <strong>planning</strong> and reporting jointly Joint Programs/Flagships strengthening DAO</td>
<td>SRAs/outcomes need to strengthen implementing jointly and creating synergies Minimize individual agencies flying own flag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aligning UN activities with national priorities and avoiding duplication.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Strong linkages with vision 2013, MTP II and sectoral policies, strategies (Education, Health, employment). Strong linkages with SDGs.</td>
<td>Strengthen linkages of SDGs with CIDP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making best use of the mandates and expertise of the entire UN system to deliver results.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Making best use of UN mandates in Turkana and Marsabit flagship programs and joint programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating integrated policy solutions and responses needed to address multidimensional challenges.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Turkana integrated support Marsabit integrated support Joint Programs (HIV and AIDS; RMNCAH)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting the values, norms and standards of the UN in a coherent and consistent manner.</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Five programming principles effectively integrated in UNDAF</td>
<td>Integrate environmental sustainability Have minimum standards for integrating HRBA; Improve on RBM indicators Continuously monitor implementation of the programming principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the transparency, predictability and accountability of the UN system.</td>
<td></td>
<td>High level National Steering Committee in place. High level annual review with GOK and UN. Development results for annual reports are jointly reported by the government and the UN</td>
<td>Poor transparency on financial resources expenditures and mobilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the convening role of the UN to facilitate the inclusion of all relevant stakeholders, including global and regional practitioners and non-state actors.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Turkana integrated support Marsabit integrated support Convening Private sector/Philanthropy around SDGs</td>
<td>Strengthen engagement with CSOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing transaction costs for governments, development partners and, based on the new Standard Operating Procedures, also for UN Country Teams.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Business Operations Strategy in place. Common services support for security services, medical services, office facilities transport and IT are in place.</td>
<td>Document results of transaction costs reduced.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.3 Monitoring and Evaluation

The current Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for UNDAF is Functional but can be strengthened for comprehensiveness, smarter results chain and stronger linkages to the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System. The current M&E system has enabled SRA Groups to report against the key target results for the UNDAF. While the UNDAF MTR review acknowledges that the outcome indicators are generally satisfactory, it notes room for improvement in respect of baseline and end program targets, removal of few indicators that are not likely to be assessed by end 2018 and possibly adding a few indicators to be comprehensive in tracking results. There is need for the UN Agencies to continue strengthening the NIMES to the extent that the UNDAF M&E indicators can just be picked from NIMES directly thereby enhancing efficiency in reporting for results. The capacity of the M&E Technical working has been enhanced through training in specific skills.

The UNDAF MTR recommends the need for an urgent review of the M&E results framework to address noted gaps working closely with SRA teams and M&E Technical Working Group. Such a review could guide efficient monitoring of UNDAF results for next phase of UNDAF. There is also need to consider reporting periods at 6 months’ intervals to manage potential reporting fatigue and to allow capturing of emerging results as opposed to activities. SRA Groups, Outcome Leads, UN Agencies and Joint Programs, should consider commissioning an outcome evaluation that could inform end term evaluation of the UNDAF.

2.3.4 Efficiency of Joint Programs

The UNDAF MTR observed that increasingly UN Agencies are implementing Joint Programs across SRAs which have the potential for increasing program efficiency. The joint programs jointly implemented with GOK and UN agencies across the SRAs are at different stages of implementation (design stage, infancy in programming among others). An analysis of these programs outline that joint programs bring with them several advantages which enhance program efficiency. They benefit synergic collaborative efforts among UN agencies and GOK partners; they also contribute to efficient use of resources. From the perspective of the host government, joint programs contribute to reduction of transactional costs. Joint monitoring of the programs being implemented at sub-national levels conducted with the participation of all stakeholders involved (GOK UUN, Development
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Partners and sometimes CSOs) have been reported to contribute to improved harmonization, efficiency and improved coordination. Commenting on observations on two UN agencies working together in the sector of refugees, and the benefits of joint monitoring, one development partners had this to say:

*The two UN agencies have demonstrated good practices in working together. They have used their technical expertise and UN neutrality status to deal with some of the most sensitive development issues on refugees, no other partners could. On issues of rights of refugees, the UN Agencies with their historic relationship with the Government of Kenya have leveraged on this unique relationship to deliver amazing outcome results.*

**Development Partner Response.**

The development partner shared at least two case scenarios of joint monitoring that they have witnessed and participated in within the timeframe of this UNDAF and joint monitoring has been conducted in Turkana, involving about 15 development partners drawn from the government, UN Agencies and “Donors”. The exercise involved monitoring close to 200 schools in Turkana over a two-day period.

There were immediate efficiency benefits realized on the spot, these include: development partners seeing for themselves the value for money in investing in education, there has been reduction of transactional costs through pooled transport, opportunities to share as a team as opposed to individual agencies reporting to the government. Also decisions could be taken on the spot as key decision makers were all present. Another shared experience of joint monitoring involved 2 UN agencies working with refugees. The mission was to view the impact of biometric registration technology (in itself an efficiency intervention) for refugees and impact of cash transfers. This particular joint monitoring exercise is reported to have demonstrated excellency on harmonization, and efficient program delivery. Often reports from Implementing Partners come annually, creating an unfair information gap. The joint monitoring provided real-time M&E.

The Joint DaO Flagship initiatives in Turkana and Marsabit show a number of efficient and innovative practices. Of the two, Turkana is more advanced. UN agencies have worked with the county government to develop the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP). From the same CIDP a Joint Program (UN and County Government) similar to the approach for UNDAF has been developed under similar Strategic Results Areas. There is strong county government leadership, and a coordination mechanism is slowly forming. The Joint Program secretariat is in place with more technical staff expected to join. Good progress has been made towards common services including office accommodation. The county is at an advanced stage in establishing a common fund, the Multi-Partner Trust. The proposed government led fund is at an advanced stage too, and Local Project Appraisal Committee (LPAC) will be held in August 2016.

### 2.3.5 UNDAF Resource allocation and Tracking

The UNDAF M&E should put in place transparent measures for tracking flow of resources for UNDAF in a transparent manner, in line with the principles of Mutual Accountability: Findings from the MTR indicated delays in implementation of some of the planned activities. One of the reasons for the delay was attributed to financing modalities such as direct execution which was viewed by a number of respondents as inflexible. Another reason is inadequate monitoring and tracking of UNDAF finances to ascertain availability of resources, disbursements, expenditures and gaps. In the absence of these information, planning and resourcing for activities becomes a challenge leading to delay in implementation and of activities. As part of the review process, a resource tracking tool to establish disbursements and expenditures from 2014 June to 2016 June was introduced. Each of the UN agencies was expected to use the tool to report on disbursements and expenditures for
UNDAF related activities. Reports from individual agencies were aggregated to analyze disbursements and expenditures at SRA level, outcome level and Output level. Section 7 of this report outlines the financial analysis.

2.4 SUSTAINABILITY OF THE UNDAF

The MTR, assessed Sustainability of the UNDAF based on the following parameters: i) the extent to which UNDAF Program benefits are likely to continue beyond end of the this UNDAF cycle; ii) the degree to which the UN has been able to support its host country partners in developing capacities and mechanisms to ensure the durability of effects; and iii) assessment of the degree to which UNDAF programs were designed to ensure a reasonable handover to host country partners.

Continuity of UNDAF Program Benefits: An analysis of UNDAF program across the four SRAs points to a very high degree of potential for continuity of program benefits. Across all the four SRAs, support to development and review of gender responsive and inclusive policy and legal frameworks will become the rock bed for future development and service delivery. The UNDAF 2014-2018 coincided with a phase within which, the GOK is required respond to a growing demand for a strong policy and legal framework that responds not only to the 2010 constitutional requirements but also supports the policy and legal framework requirements for the devolution process. The ground has been more than fertile for the UN to offer this support. Once enacted, policies and legal instruments will be used for a long time albeit with room for review to remain relevant. The subordination of UNDAF to the GOK Vision 2030 and MTP II is a critical measure of guaranteeing sustainability of the outcomes and GOK-UN Cooperation.

Partner Capacities and Durability of Effects: The UN through the UNDAF has contributed to enhancement of capacities across the four SRAs both at national and sub-national level with more support provided to national institutions. UN has strategically targeted the most critical institutions within strategic results areas. Systems, guidelines, technical knowledge are the basis for sustainability. The most impressive results on capacities is the unique manner in which the UN worked with the host government to ensure strong country ownership and leadership across the board. This ownership is so strong that it creates an unquestionable level of durability of effects. The only major gap noted through the MTR is the uneven pattern of capacity strengthening at county levels. There is need for a clearer and innovative strategy of how the UN will contribute towards more equitable approach to support to counties. There is potential danger that some counties will move faster than others in enhancing their capacities to offer services. While the flagship approach for Turkana and Marsabit are good for the UN to perfect the DaO
model and develop potential knowledge management products for use by the host government, the approach may potentially lead to concentration of capacities in fewer counties at the expense of others.

Program Design for Reasonable Handover to host country: The strong leadership and ownership across all SRAs is a key barometer for reasonable handover to the GOK. Some developmental initiatives within UNDAF have been wholly handed over to government such as the school feeding program. Even at county level, there are signs of support and handover mechanisms which are very healthy. The MTR team during a field visit to Turkana observed how UN Agencies had supported the county government to improve health infrastructure aimed at addressing the high levels of maternal and child mortality. The ability of UN agencies to build capacities in an innovative manner that is also culturally sensitive, are elements that will ensure continued use of such services. In SRA 4 greater focus on strengthening sustainable livelihoods and resilience among communities is key for handover of programs to host country. There is very high potential for handover of programs to locals in the environment sector. Most of the work by and large is not done by external people but by nationals who are already embedded in strategic institutions.
This section analyses how the UNDAF has leveraged on key partnerships.

**GOK and UN Partnership**
The UN has leveraged on key partnerships with the government to put in place policies, legislation and institutional structures. The GOK, the UN system and donors are working together in partnership to implement the UNDAF as a contribution to the achievement of national development goals and aspirations. There are 23 UN agencies: FAO, ILO, IFAD, IOM, UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, UN Women, UNESCO, UNIDO, UNODC, UNHCR, UNAIDS, UNOPS, UN HABITAT, WHO, UNISDR, UNIC, IMO, UNEP, OCHA, UNV, and WFP. The two non UN agencies are the World Bank and the IMF. The UNDAF is jointly coordinated through the GOK represented by National Treasury and the Ministry of Devolution and Planning and the UN Resident Coordinator (UNRC).

**Philanthropy and Private Sector**
The SDGs weave together social, economic, and environmental challenges and solutions, and their creation and endorsement by all the world’s governments represents the efforts and voices of millions of people globally. It is clear that achieving the ambitious SDG agenda requires a purposeful effort to identify, understand and effectively engage all development stakeholders including traditional and non-traditional partners to have any prospects of successfully achieving these goals and related targets in national development. The UN in Kenya has been strategic in embracing an innovative mechanism to foster understanding and pathways for engagement and collaboration with Philanthropy – the SDG Philanthropy Platform (SDGPP). The UN in Kenya has made a strategic decision to embed the Platform within the UN Resident Coordinator’s Office for optimal leverage and visibility across a range of sectors, agencies, partners and networks.

The SDGPP informs and catalyzes collaboration through building awareness and connections between those working in the philanthropy sector and beyond. The Platform helps to build stronger linkages by encouraging philanthropy, the UN, Government, the private sector and civil society organizations to collaborate in contributing to international, regional and national development priorities. It also advocates for the importance of collecting, understanding and sharing credible data to achieve SDGs and promote accountability.

At the global level, the SDG Philanthropy Platform (SDGPP) was established in 2014 as a collaboration between philanthropy and the wider international development community led by United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisers and Foundation Centre, and supported by the Conrad N. Hilton Foundation, Ford Foundation and the MasterCard Foundation.
The Platform in Kenya was the first country level launch in November 2014, followed by additional pilot countries (Ghana, Indonesia and Colombia with Zambia to be launched soon and additional countries including India, China and USA anticipated as well in the near future).

**Key Achievements for Kenya:** In Kenya, SDGPP has been instrumental in co-creating the Kenya Philanthropy Forum with local Philanthropy leaders, a consortium of foundations and Trusts brought together with the purpose of having a single, cohesive voice for philanthropy to coordinate, engage and collaborate within the sector and with other stakeholders including government and the private sector in order to accelerate uptake and implementation of the SDGs. This is in direct support to SDG Goal 17 on establishing partnerships across traditional and non-traditional stakeholders to maximize the opportunity of achieving the goals collectively. The net effect of advocating for a greater role of philanthropy in contributing to the SDGs has been its explicit acknowledgement in the outcome document of the UN Sustainable Development Summit for the adoption of the Post-2015 Development Agenda, which cites the role of the diverse private sector, including philanthropic organizations, as necessary for the implementation of the new agenda.

Since the launch of SDGPP in Kenya, opportunities and pathways for engagement across sectors have been fostered. For example, for the first time, Philanthropy and private sector have been participants in the last 3 UNDAF NSC meetings in Kwale, State House and Machakos respectively. At the State House meeting, President Kenyatta publicly acknowledged the role of philanthropy and private sector in National Development. A number of events have taken place to better connect philanthropy to national development processes and dialogues in Kenya and to the SDG process at the global level. Some have been stand-alone meetings to discuss philanthropy’s potential role in achieving the SDGs, while others have been sessions convened either by foundations or by the UN led SDGPP. In the past, tracking progress on diverse development indicators was enormously challenging due to gaps in data across countries. SDGPP, together with local and international partners, has been improving data knowledge and capacity in order to use data as a driver for philanthropic investments for more effective development impact.

SDGPP jointly with the Kenya Philanthropy Forum (KPF) Education Sub-Committee facilitated a first ever inaugural meeting between KPF members and the Ministry of Education in May 2016 with over 80 participants drawn from GOK, philanthropy and the UN. Key outcomes for the meeting included: i) Agreement on creating a joint working group between MoE and the KPF Education Group to work towards integrating philanthropy into national frameworks, by identifying opportunities for collaboration; ii) agreement to commence on the development of an MOU and iii) Fostering concrete collaboration on thematic focus area for ECD, basic education, adult education and technical and vocational training.
Box 13: Innovative Partnerships and Initiatives:

Maisha Campaign: This is an initiative to reach 10 million youth with HIV and AIDS awareness targeting 1 million youth for HIV testing within a timeframe of 6 months. The initiative uses edutainment (Football Matches) to attract youths. It is a partnership UNAIDS, NACA, Football Association of Kenya, county governments and Council of Governors and including private sector (fostered by SDGPP with Kuza Biashara on data tracking), with opportunity to reach all 47 counties. The initiative was launched during the UNDAF MTR. Football matched with HIV and AIDS awareness campaigns including testing of youth has already started at county levels and will culminate in finals for successful teams in November 2016. Within a short space of time, results can easily be tracked.

Initiative to Address Employment for Marginalized Groups: The second innovative public-private-philanthropy-UN initiative targets employment of youth, women and marginalized groups through Biashara Centers initiated by County Governments and UNDP in the UNDAF Flagship Counties of Marsabit and Turkana. This is a partnership between UNDP, county government, Kuza Biashara, SDGPP and Housing Finance (HF) Foundation (who aspire to reach 1 million Artisans in building and construction). The initiative (TVET consortium) aims to reach youth in remote areas with limited access to classroom learning, by using mobile phones as the learning platform. “TVET on wheels”, a strategy to reach and provide groups in remote areas with services, will extend rural penetration and offer youth the opportunities to learn vocational and technical skills.

As indicated in earlier sections, some private sector players are involved in the delivery of the program in SRA 3 and SRA 4. The Philanthropy and Private sector group led by the Enterprises Organizations in Africa, have been able to develop innovative initiatives that would provide “Quick Wins” in contribution to empowerment of youth, women and other marginalized groups in a short timeframe since its introduction to the UN SDG Philanthropy coordinator. At the time of the UNDAF MTR in June/July, two solid innovative development initiatives addressing HIV and AIDS knowledge among youths and employment opportunities for youth, women and other marginalized groups had been developed, launched and is being implemented. The UNDAF MTR notes that this non-traditional “Development” partner is a huge resource of untapped reserves that can unlock alternative forms of financing for development. Consultations with the Kenya social private sector group, demonstrated how linkages between the GOK and UN on one hand and the private sector on the other can unlock a huge reserve from philanthropy for development. The UN with its convening role can play a key function of simplification of SDGs thrust and targets for the private sector together with Philanthropy to design innovative programs targeting various development sectors within the realm of the 17 SDGs. The UNDAF MTR notes that “Quick Wins” can be accomplished for development programming for youth, women and marginalized groups.

The East Africa Humanitarian Private Sector Partnership Platform (EA HPPP) was launched in March 2016, in Nairobi. The platform formalizes and facilitates interactions between private sector, humanitarian practitioners, government representatives, local businesses and business associations to address disaster risk reduction, emergency preparedness and response. One of the activities being pursued by the EA HPPP is a pilot project in the integrated refugee and host community settlement site in Turkana County. A joint humanitarian–private sector scoping mission was undertaken in February 2016 to identify areas where the EA HPPP stakeholders could partner to facilitate market-linked forms of humanitarian assistance through co-creation.
of products and services with local businesses and entrepreneurs in Kalobeyei. The EA HPPP has also established a sub-working group with its stakeholders engaged on sensitization and advocacy messages on election preparedness in Kenya.

**Areas for Improvement:** Against the backdrop that some SRAs indicated limited funding as one of the challenges, such promising initiatives and partnerships could be used by UNDAF stakeholders to unlock more non-traditional funding for development initiative with clear results to track. This therefore calls for the need for the UN to continue working with the GOK to localize the SDG agenda and clearly setting the SDG priority targets and national priorities to guide the work on this kind of partnerships. Except for SRA3 that substantively identified a role of private sector in some of its outcomes and undertook clear mapping of private sector actors, the design of the UNDAF did not outline a deliberate strategy to work with non-traditional partners such as Private Sector, Philanthropy and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in the delivery of UNDAF programming. However, a separate UNDAF resource mobilization strategy makes mention of the need for UN to engage Private Sector and Philanthropic Foundations. The strategy for working with Private Sector covers 4 types of partnerships; i) resource transfer, ii) technology transfer; iii) facilitating or brokering innovative private investments, and iv) value chain linkages of “inclusive business” approaches. The resource mobilization strategy also calls for strengthening UN understanding of avenues for engaging the private sector and exposing the private sector to how the UN and Private Sector have partnered in other countries. While such partnerships exist, a clear strategy could have been outlined as part of the UNDAF implementation arrangements. The omission of a stakeholder strategy of engagement, especially for Philanthropies and Private Sector has also been apparent at the Global level in the past two decades. Private Sector, Philanthropy and CSOs were not part of the development of the global development frameworks, from 2000 with MGDs and 2005 with the Paris Declaration and aid effectiveness agenda. This chapter presents the experience of Kenya in the involvement of non-traditional partners for development in contributing to national development priorities.

**Engagement with Civil Society (CSO)**

The new economic status for Kenya as a low MIC is likely to affect resource mobilization for the CSO sector. CSOs play a strategic role in reaching the difficult to reach communities and are noted for their flexibility and swiftness in service delivery. At mid-term review of the UNDAF, the absence of a deliberate strategy to engage CSOs in contributing to UNDAF results has been noted. A review of IPs receiving funding support from the UN (UN agencies using HACT) indicated that majority of IPs are GOK institutions. There are also some CSOs working with UN agencies to deliver programs but the proportion may not be as huge. In other countries, CSOs are a key stakeholder in contributing to UNDAF results and receiving funding support through UN modalities such as HACT. CSOs at the UNDAF Validation meeting indicated their keen interest to join in the implementation of UNDAF programs. They echoed the need for them to appreciate UNDAF results that they can contribute to and track progress.

“**What can we focus on that gives us credibility for contributing to development? How can CSOs position themselves to contribute towards the national development priorities around outcome areas?**” A CSO Representative at UNDAF MTR Validation Meeting.

The CSOs are keen to have a better appreciation of key outcome results from UNDAF that they can rally around. It was clear from the UNDAF MTR validation discussions that GOK with support from the UN could develop modalities for CSOs to effectively participate in UNDAF.
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Development Partners

Development partners (DPs) consulted during the UNDAF MTR preferred basket funding for strategic areas, (for example the election funding basket). The review also noted that the DPs prefer directly funding individual agencies because it is easier to track results at individual level rather than at UNDAF level. Furthermore, the current practice has been resource mobilization by specific agencies’ programs and not as representative of UNDAF, and has often led to competition rather than collaboration for resources. Some of the reasons why DPs channel funds to UN is because the UN is a trusted partner with adequate human resources capacity. The UN is also preferred as a DP funding partner because of its noted neutral role, which makes it possible to address programming in what may appear as sensitive development areas.

The UNDAF MTR noted that Most DPs already have long term funding commitment to Kenya to the year 2019/2020 and there are some opportunities for new partnerships at mid-term of the UNDAF. DPs interviewed during the MTR indicated that though Kenya is now as low Middle Income Country (MIC), this is unlikely to affect funding flow to Kenya in the next two years or beyond. The DPs were of the view that the country’s income status is not the strongest predictor of their funding but other factors such as poverty levels and inequalities. On the other hand, the Public Finance Management Act (2015) has had effects on DPs that have no bilateral assistance with the government. One such DP noted that, aid to Kenya has been cut by USD6 million as negotiations continue on bilateral agreements. The government has tightened aid flow modalities to improve accountability for funds not included in the budget.
A. Operationalization of Kenya’s Road Map for Sustainable Development Goals: Kenya played a key role in adoption of the SDGs, and as such it is expected to effectively localize the SDG. The MTR noted that the country has in consultation with key stakeholders including GOK, UN, Development partners, CSO, Private Sector, and Academia developed a roadmap for mainstreaming SDGs in its development initiatives. To support this process, key recommendations for the UN include:

i. Consider popularizing the tools such as Mainstreaming Accelerating and Policy support (MAPs) for mainstreaming SDGs into priority development results areas

ii. Continue efforts to enhance capacities of all stakeholder including the UN on the SDGs

iii. Consider using the UN Joint Communication as a powerful tool for popularizing MAPs in the country

iv. Consider taping on the SDG Philanthropy Platform at all levels global, regional and country to design innovative initiatives that can enable the private sector to effectively contribute to accomplishment of the SDGs within their respective sector areas. Engaging with the group to design innovative initiatives responding to SDGs would be catalytic for the UN and

v. Enhance capacities of SRA groups to align SGD at outcome and output level and

B. Development of Robust Resource Mobilization Tracking and Mechanisms for the UNDAF: The MTR observed that the UNDAF had a clear budget that supports implementation of the planned programs. The review also noted that in some cases, planned activities outlines in the SRA work plans were delayed due to lack of resources. In addition, tracking disbursements, expenditures and resource gaps is a key challenge. In the absence of adequate tracking mechanisms, its becomes a challenge to monitor what activities in the work plan are well resourced and determine resource gaps. The MTR used a resource tracking tool to enable all the UN agencies used to track and report on disbursements and expenditures for UNDAF related activities from 2014 June when the UNDAF was launched to 2016 June. The financial analysis and report is outlined in section 7 of this report. Key recommendations moving forward include:

i. The UN resource mobilization technical working group should urgently commission an exercise for mapping resource flows to the UNDAF budget informed by the budget figures per agency. The resource mapping should be done every 6 months using simplified tools to inform planning and improve efficiency and effectiveness of the UNDAF
ii. UNDAF work plans should go beyond outlining budgetary figures to be contributed by each agency and develop financial codes aligned to specific agency financial reporting mechanisms for easy in reporting and tracking and

iii. Mechanisms to harmonize financial reporting systems with GOK should be further explored and established to further streamline Delivery as One. Given that UNDAF results are achieved jointly with the government, it’s of essence that financial reporting outlines GOK contribution and UN contribution.

C. UN strategic role in supporting the Country as a MIC: The MTR noted that, the UN in Kenya through its current UNDAF is largely responding to the needs and priorities of the country as a MIC. Key recommendations to ensure that the UN is strategically positioned and responsive include:

i. Greater innovation is required in design of UNDAF programs to respond to changing conditions and expectations especially in relation to possibility of reduced funding form donors and core funds from HQ for programming. The need for UN to engage with civil society, private sector and other non-state actors to realize UNDAF results becomes pivotal in this regard. Flag ship programmes implemented within the current UNDAF are examples of such innovative practices hence the need to consolidate and document key lessons for scale up and replication

ii. Strengthening South-South Cooperation to catalyse development processes through experiential learning from other MICs is a strategic area that UN should consider supporting

iii. The UN should continue engaging on issues related to the Demographic Dividend (DD) which is critical for the Country as a MIC.

D. Engaging Private sector and Philanthropy

Utilize existing and new networks facilitated by private sector and philanthropists such as the SDG Philanthropy Platform to design innovative initiatives and foster collaborations in implementation of the UNDAF. As outlined in goal 17 of the SDGs, utilizing wealth and experience from non-traditional partners in specific themes, has potential to increase impact and efficiency of development programmes.

E. Humanitarian Action for Development

Kenya is experiencing steady economic growth, social cohesion, peace and stability; unlike some of its neighbors in the greater Horn of Africa.
Nevertheless, Kenya is still vulnerable to emergencies. During the course of this UNDAF, there have been key humanitarian crises - primarily in northern Kenya - as follows: Insecurity, conflict and displacement; Chronic food insecurity and high levels of malnutrition; Protracted IDP case load; Regional conflicts triggering population movement into Kenya (South Sudan); Measles, cholera and chikungunya outbreaks affecting 29 counties; with cross border implications; El-Nino and other weather events including drought. These humanitarian challenges are driven and exacerbated by increased inter-communal conflicts over access to natural resources and recurrent drought and floods resulting in continuous internal displacement. The areas most affected are the 23 ASAL counties, largely inhabited by pastoralists, agro pastoralists and marginal mixed farmers. All these events have required mitigation and response in order to preserve and promote development gains. Humanitarian analysis has further informed aspects of the flagship programs, which are rolling out in historically marginalized regions where development actors may have experienced access challenges. It is in these regions that humanitarian actor is found consistently providing assistance to marginalized communities. With the upcoming 2017 elections (referred to in SRA 1), the KHPT is actively engaged in the development of a Contingency Plan that will be multi-sector and coordinated via strategic “hubs” throughout the country. This builds on the model developed in 2012 for the 2013 elections.

The current UNDAF embodies the movement of Kenya into MIC status with clear programs and strategies that minimize reliance on humanitarian aid and assistance. This bold step away from emergencies has been solidified through the UN’s departure from the “HC” modality in favor of the “RC” approach that incorporates but does not centralize humanitarian action as Kenya’s core business. The UN agency responsible for coordinating humanitarian affairs proactively scaled down the country office in 2013 in favor of a lean “desk” within the Regional Office. Additionally, the EHRP annual publication that provided the national framework for CERF planning and resource allocation was brought to an end in 2013 as the needs arising from the 2007 - 2008 post elections violence had been responded to. Furthermore, the 2010 constitutional referendum and the 2013 elections were undertaken with minimal violence and displacement. With devolution and CIDPs in place from 2013, previously historically marginalized regions of the country could finally begin to enjoy closer access to development instruments and funds to move away from the cycle of emergencies and humanitarian aid dependency.

The 2014 - 2018 UNDAF planning did not actively incorporate humanitarian outputs and outcomes as a catalytic process to trigger and entrench longer-term development. Additionally, humanitarian principles and actions are not classified as normative by the UNDG alongside gender, climate change and human rights. Therefore, it has been a challenge to incorporate and illustrate the continued importance of humanitarian funding and interventions as an important vehicle to stabilize and prepare communities for longer term development. Other key UN agencies are engaged in humanitarian action and have embedded outputs and outcome within the UNDAF SRAs. However, these outputs are not necessarily distinguishable. With the end of EHRP and the absence of a country office to coordinate humanitarian affairs, the humanitarian community has continued to remain robust through KHPT as chaired by the Cabinet Secretary in the Ministry of Interior and National Coordination and co-chaired by the RC. Through this forum, the KRCS maintains “first response” mandate. There are numerous tools including the HNO and Kenya Inter-Agency Rapid Assessment, as well as coordination mechanisms such as the ISWG that are used to review developments and ascertain the need for a humanitarian intervention. With more than USD 28 million released by CERF during the UNDAF period, and an estimated annual injection of USD 250,000 for humanitarian coordination and capacity building, it is clear that there is still a need to respond to emergencies in Kenya.
Box 14: The Kenya Humanitarian Partnership Team (KHPT):

The Kenya Humanitarian Partnership Team (KHPT) was established in 2008 following the Post Elections Violence of 2007/8. It was initially designed as a forum to bring UN and NGO actors together to share information and coordinate humanitarian action and agree on an annual Emergency Humanitarian Response Plan (EHRP), which informed the Emergency Humanitarian Response Fund (EHRF) and allocation. In February 2015, the KHPT was redesigned based on inputs from the GOK during the Kwale UNDAF review to reflect the following:

i. KHPT as the main body that will bring humanitarian actors together under the UNDAF
ii. KHPT Chair and Co-Chair at Cabinet Secretary and Resident Coordinator level
iii. KHPT to maintain technical coordination between actors through the Inter Sector Working Group
iv. KHPT membership to include: GOK line ministries, UN, KRCS, INGOs, NGOs, Council of Governors, and Private Sector and Philanthropies
v. KHPT to meet quarterly for strategic input from principals, and monthly meetings at technical level
vi. KHPT to integrate cross-cutting issues such as protection and normative frameworks of gender, human rights and environment
vii. KHPT secretariat will be run by UNOCHA with guidance from the UNRCO

The KHPT will continue to model itself on the principles of the SDGs and seek proactive solutions to bridge the divide between humanitarian and development action.

There are numerous operational and programmatic advantages to a more systematic symbiosis between development and humanitarian imperatives that will accelerate the paradigm shift from dependency to sustainability. To this end, the following are the recommendations from this MTR:

i. Ensure the establishment of humanitarian action as a cross cutting theme throughout the SRAs.

ii. Strengthen SRA 4 as the output/outcome “home” for humanitarian interventions to include mapping and tracking of humanitarian funds that ultimately strengthens the overall goals of the UNDAF.

iii. Continue building capacities of the GOK at central and county levels to effectively prepare for and respond to humanitarian emergencies.

iv. Support policies that systematize and regularize humanitarian interventions. Specifically, the National Disaster Management policy.

v. Engage with regional and inter-governmental bodies such as IGAD and the AU to ensure that humanitarian action is not only national but also regional and synergized in terms of data, analysis, outlook, advocacy and information management.

vi. Ensure the full capacity of the GOK and UNCT to understand the humanitarian - development continuum so as to integrate approaches into traditional development programs; and vice versa.

vii. Strengthen the role and capacity of the KHPT to become the penultimate cross-sector partnership for humanitarian action in Kenya.
LESSONS LEARNT

The first half of UNDAF implementation has generated knowledge and new partnerships, which offer opportunities for scale-up, replication and adjustments. Key lessons include:

Accountability to DaO often competes with UN Agencies accountability to their HQs. There is no mechanism to hold specific UN agencies accountable to the UNDAF in relation to the level of accountability they hold in regard to their agency work plans and commitments in addition, though the NSC provides oversight and leadership to monitoring implementation and accountability of the UNDAF there is no mechanism to hold the UN accountable to the UNDAF commitment. While findings of the MTR show good progress in operationalizing DaO, a number of UN agencies continue to be individualist in the way they relate with the host country. Some UN Agencies indicated that they had two accountability lines, one to their HQ and the other to the UN team. Accountability to their HQs appeared to be stronger than the latter. Feedback from the Government indicated that working directly with individual UN agencies is not an efficient way of doing business and has been contrary the principles enshrined in the UNDAF. On the other hand, discussions with development partners indicated that they preferred working with individual UN agencies to finance their mandates since it is easier for them to track results as opposed to tracking results from pooled funds. There is need for the UN to identify sustainable incentive and add value mechanisms that will motivate agencies to remain accountable and committed to the UNDAF. Experiential learning from UN countries that have successfully implemented DaO remain worthwhile.

Delivering as One provides conducive environment for joint and flagship programs. DaO has been instrumental in enhancing efficiency, innovativeness and effectiveness of joint and flagship programs as evidenced by results of the ongoing programs.

Joint Programs across SRAs ensure efficiency in programming: Joint programs are efficient in terms of optimal utilization of resources, joint monitoring, reduction of transactional costs, improved resource mobilization for program delivery and increased transparency in use of development resources.

Leadership of SRAs at UN level, should not be on voluntary basis and left to individual/personal initiative and interest. The potential for coherence and coordination is maximized when the capacity, capability and empowerment of the lead entity is analyzed and an accountability mechanism put in place to review performance and non-performance. Leadership of SRAs/Outcome groups should be based on commitment and accountability by the lead agency to ensure successful implementation and coordination of the UNDAF coordination.
Strong structures for the coordination of UNDAF have contributed to both effectiveness and efficiency in the delivery of UNDAF: Existence of coordination structures which include National Steering Committee, SRA Groups, M&E Technical Working Group, Gender Working Group and the OMT have contributed to good performance of the UNDAF at mid-term. There is need to ensure that the technical working groups remain motivated and committed to the UNDAF course, given that some of the technical working groups are poorly represented and often lack quorum to make decisions.

In order to achieve results for the normative development issues, there is need to have a deliberate strategy for integration across all SRAs: At design stages of the UNDAF, human rights and gender equality and women’s empowerment were incorporated in the results framework. There has been a deliberate strategy for enhancing gender and human rights competencies for institutions and stakeholders. Advocacy for these normative issues were visible in program delivery. This was not the same for climate change and environmental sustainability.
6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusion

The UNDAF MTR outlines the following as key conclusions:

Relevance: There has been overwhelming consensus that the UNDAF is relevant. The UNDAF program design is informed by the GOK development priorities outlined in the MTP II, a blueprint that contributes to the realization of the Vision 2030 and the MDGs. The UN remains a trusted partner of the GOK. However, with respect to SRA2 there is need to realign the new KASF guidelines.

Effectiveness: The UNDAF has four SRAs, Transformative Governance (SRA1); Human Capital Development (SRA2); Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth (SRA3) and Environmental sustainability, Land Management and Human Security (SRA4). The 4 SRAs have contributed towards development of supportive policy and legal framework in their respective sectors. The MTR review noted that the UNDAF is On Track in accomplishment of set outcomes and set targets for 2018 with only 16% of outcomes not likely to be realized. The UNDAF MTR also noted that there is need to review the M&E framework to ensure that it provides a robust framework for monitoring progress of the UNDAF. About 42% of UNDAF Outcome Indicators could not be used to assess progress at mid-term. However other complementary tools were used to inform progress of the UNDAF at mid-term.

Alignment of the UNDAF to SDGs at mid-term: An analysis of extent to which the UNDAF is aligned to the SDGs indicates that the SRAs are strongly to moderately aligned. SRA 1 is moderately aligned to the SDGs while SRA 2 is strongly aligned to SDGs. The strong alignment of SRA 2 is attributed to the output results which are aligned to key elements of SDG 4, 2, 6, 3, and 5. SRA 3 is moderately aligned to the SDGs, with outcome 3.1 being strongly aligned while outcomes 3.2 and 3.3 shows moderate alignment to the SDGs. SRA 4 is strongly aligned to the SDGs with output results significantly responding to key elements of SDG 2, 13, 7, 16 and 5. Support to policy and legal frameworks across all the SRAs is relevant to the SDGs. Ongoing work across the 5 programming principles is also relevant to the UNDAF.
Efficiency: Efforts towards implementation of the Business Operations Strategy developed in 2016 are progressive. Initial results at the mid-term of UNDAF include: a needs assessment for BOS which has already indicated a Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) net saving of USD 606,008 for travel, USD 1,009,611 for conferences and USD 23,341 for communications in the next 2 years. Efficiency at program is attributed to the coordination structures that support Delivery as One both among the UN agencies and GOK. There is however need to strengthen these structures even further to ensure that there is continuity, stability, ownership and sustainability. Though functional, the UNDAF M&E needs to be revised to ensure that it provides a robust framework to assess operational and programmatic performance or the UNDAF, that it is for comprehensiveness, smarter results and stronger linkages to the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System.

UN in Kenya is making good progress in using HACT as a tool for program efficiency. Macro Assessment of Public Management System (PFM) was conducted in 2015 and close to 150 Implementing Partners (IPs) across UN HACT implementing agencies had their Micro-Assessments completed. Increasingly UN agencies are implementing Joint Programs across SRAs to increase program efficiency and coordination.

Sustainability: The 4 UNDAF SRAs are aligned to the key development priorities of the country, this not only makes the UNDAF relevant to address the needs, aspirations and priorities of the country but also ensures ownership and continuity of the interventions by the host government. Support towards strengthening the policy and legal framework responds not only to the 2010 constitutional requirements but also supports the legal and policy needs for the devolution process. Working closely with the government while maintaining high level leadership, the UNDAF in Kenya creates an unquestionable level of durability of effects. The strong leadership and ownership is a key barometer for reasonable handover to the host country.

Strategic Positioning: The strive to remain a key and strategic partner of the Government is a key priority of the UN in Kenya while implementing the UNDAF. A key is of focus is the transition from MDGs to SDGs, where the UN has to strategically position itself to play a key role in supporting the GOK to mainstream SDGs in planning and program delivery both national and county levels. The other key is of focus is the paradigm shift, given that Kenya is now a Middle Income country. The demands of financing and the need to engage with the private sector and other non-traditional is also a reality that the UN must address. Though Kenya is not a typical humanitarian country, there is still need to address emerging issues that require humanitarian support.

6.2 Recommendations

The Mid – Term review has outlined specific recommendations that need to be considered under each of the outcome areas. General recommendations are outlined below.

Recommendation 1: Review of UNDAF M&E Results Framework: Under leadership of the UNDAF M&E Working Group, there is urgent need for GOK and UN to jointly review the current UNDAF results framework. The review should focus on development of (Specific, Measureable, Attainable, Realistic and Time bound/Trackable (SMART) outcome indicators and related baselines and targets. The review will also address the need to incorporation of SDG targets in the results framework. Inclusion of HIV and AIDS results framework to the new revised UNDAF M&E framework will contribute toward alignment of SRA 2 work to national priorities in this sector.

Recommendations 2: Election Preparedness and Conflict Risk Management: The current UN support to elections may need to be reviewed, with respect to the ongoing Parliamentary process that may call for extensive legal reforms touching on key electoral elements including cleaning of the principal voter
register, application of ICT for elections and enforcement of the electoral legal framework. Key potential areas of focus include electoral legal frameworks, electoral dialogue and conflict management, and ongoing concerns by stakeholders on credibility of elections around issues of the Principle Voter Register; quality of election electronic mechanisms including back up measures, and enforcement of the 2011 Election Act.

**Recommendation 3: Tracking UNDAF Resources Flows and Utilization:** The MTR recommends the need to modify the resource tracking tool used during the MTR and urgently conduct a comprehensive assessment of UNDAF resource flow and utilization. Resource tracking should be a regular activity to be done at least every 6 months to inform the overall UNDAF progress. The review for UNDAF resource flow should be done urgently to inform the next UNDAF annual review.

**Recommendation 4: Strategic Positioning Priorities:** The UNCT should consider addressing strategic alignments with priorities that include taking a leadership role to operationalize Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Program support for SDGs. Considering strengthening the role of UN in MIC is also key. The UN should consolidate efforts in the flagship programs in Turkana and Marsabit for long term and sustainable transformative change. Development of knowledge management products around the flagship models should be the focus of the next phase of the UNDAF.

**Recommendation 5: SRA 2 aligning to National HIV strategic Framework:** The KASF was launched in November 2014 after commencement of the UNDAF in July 2014, hence it is not aligned with the current UNDAF. The KASF contains 8 strategic results areas clearly articulated by thematic focus (HIV prevention, treatment and care) while the UNDAF results focus on capacity strengthening (planning, and coordination, resource mobilization). This presents a challenge in demonstrating UN’s contribution to the national HIV and AIDS response as articulated in the KASF hence the need to prioritize alignment of the UNDAF results framework to the KASF.

**Recommendations 6: UNCT DaO Accountability:** There is need to strengthen coordination mechanisms not only between UN and GOK but also within and among the SRAs to apply the principles of DaO. Areas requiring attention include: joint communication and operationalization of the communication strategy; improving transparency on resource flows to the UNDAF and further enhancing the good practice on joint monitoring of programs across all SRAs.

**Recommendation 7: Strengthening Coordination of UNDAF:** While the MTR observed good structures for coordination of the UNDAF, there is need for UN and GOK to agree on sustainable mechanisms for strengthening coordination efficiency of the UNDAF secretariat. There is also need to strengthen intra and inter outcome linkages to enhance synergy and strengthen convergence.
of results. Creating linkages within core elements of outcomes and across outcomes need to be explored to strengthen programmatic approach to results.

**Recommendation 8:** Tapping on Private Sector and the SDG Philanthropy Platform to Unlock Financing for UNDAF: The UN and the GOK should consider developing strategic frameworks and deepening their own understanding for unlocking potential development resources through the private sector and the SDG Philanthropy Platform in Kenya. Unpacking and simplifying the SDGs around SRAs for philanthropy and private sector consumption to design innovative programming initiatives could go a long way to national development priorities and the accomplishment of SDGs. Organizing programming initiatives around the UNDAF SRAs could potentially contribute to attainment of easy to track outcome results.

**Recommendation 9:** Clarity on Partnership Strategy for Involvement of CSOs and Private Sector in Delivery of UNDAF: The UN and GOK should consider a deliberate partnership strategy with CSOs, Philanthropy and private sector within the framework of Kenya’s MIC status. Such partnerships should consider greater focus on addressing inequalities often inherent in MIC countries.

**Recommendation 10:** Priority Areas for GOK Capacity Strengthening for Remaining Period of UNDAF: The UNDAF review has noted outstanding accomplishments in development of policies and legislative frameworks to support the UNDAF 13 outcome areas. Capacities around relevant GOK institutions, systems and human capital have been well documented. Against this background, the review recommends greater analysis of the policy and legal frameworks for potential harmonization to avoid duplication of efforts. Key capacities should focus on i) development of innovative programming support for addressing corruption at both national and county levels; ii) strengthening M&E functions at county and national levels; iii) scaling up public and civic participation through operationalizing of the recently developed guidelines and iv) capacities for clarification of role and function of national and County Governments to ensure a smooth implementation of the devolution framework.

**Recommendation 11:** Incorporation of humanitarian into-development action as an integral aspect of the UNDAF using the extensive interventions and strategies adopted by relevant government ministries and UN agencies, to address sudden onset and protracted crises in certain counties in Kenya is key. There are key actions and interventions that can be woven across the four SRAs that demonstrate the efficacy of strategic humanitarian assistance within the wider framework of development. Key government ministries, UN agencies, non-governmental and private sector actors have undertaken targeted humanitarian action under the umbrella of the KhPT focusing on health, nutrition, education, livelihoods, environment, climate-related events and the wider themes of DRR, early warning and protection. Important to capture is the extensive analysis and contingency planning for 2017 Elections where preparedness is key to the prevention of violence and the ability to systematically respond where populations are at risk.

**Recommendation 12:** Active involvement of CSOs in the UNDAF: There is need for the UN and GOK to consider innovative strategies of engagement with CSOs to contribute towards national development priorities. Possible areas of engagement with CSOs include harnessing the potential and capacity of CSOs in realization of key provisions of national development blueprints and the SDGs among others.
7. Financial Report and analysis

7.1 Expenditure for 2014 June-2016-June

Approximately US$1.2 billion (for both humanitarian and development assistance) will be needed over the 2014-2018 four-year period to achieve the 13 UNDAF outcomes. This includes core financial resources available to the UN agencies and funds to be mobilized from external sources. Total committed budget for the 4 strategic results areas was Kenya Shillings 52,990,506,178 for the first two years (2014 June-2016 June). Total expenditure for the two years was Kenya Shillings 37,698,803,745 indicating a delivery rate of 71% as at June 2016 as outlined in table 38 below and figure 3 and 4 below. The assumption is that with extension of the SRA work plans to December 2016, the 29% gap will be realized by December 2016. Expenditure for SRA 2 has increased by slightly over 200% which is mainly attributed to improved delivering as one, with better synergy and alignment among the UN agencies and GOK contributing to key the outcome areas. This is expected to continue over the remaining period of the UNDAF as more UN agencies further align their interventions and mandates to the UNDAF SRAs. The MTR review recommends that the next generation work plans (2017-2018) be informed by this projection for more realistic planning. It is also recommended that financial input from the GOK, is factored in the financial analysis and reporting as part of the delivering as one principles.

This analysis was informed by financial reports from each UN agency, using the resource tracking tool for UNDAF related activities under each of the outcomes and related outputs. Using the resource tracking tool, each agency was expected to report on the expenditures. The expenditures were then aggregated at SRA and outcome level.

Table 38: Budget and expenditure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA</th>
<th>Committed Budget YR 2014/2015/2016 (Ksh)</th>
<th>Total Expenditure YR 2014/2015/2016 (Ksh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRA1</td>
<td>3,023,262,000</td>
<td>2,878,609,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA2</td>
<td>5,389,407,367</td>
<td>12,466,144,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA3</td>
<td>18,510,439,950</td>
<td>4,423,578,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA4</td>
<td>26,067,396,870</td>
<td>17,925,471,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>52,990,506,178 (Ksh)</td>
<td>37,698,803,745 (Ksh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2 Expenditure for 2014 June-2016-June at SRA level

The highest expenditure was recorded by Strategic Result Area 4 as outlined in figure 4 above, figure 5 below and table 38. The committed budget for two years (2014-2016) work plans was also highest for SRA 4.

Expenditure has increased over the years, with highest expenditure recorded in year two which is a full Year compared to the half year expenditures of 2014 and 2016 (as outlined in table 39 and figure 6). The expenditures are analyzed using the UN financial calendar of January – December, the MTR recommends that future planning, financial analysis and reporting is harmonized and aligned with the GOK fiscal planning calendar of June–June.
Table 39: Annual SRA expenditures (Using UN annual calendar January-December)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA</th>
<th>YR 2014 (June-December)</th>
<th>YR 2015 (January-December)</th>
<th>YR 2016 (January-June)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRA1</td>
<td>7,818,653.81</td>
<td>12,157,532.67</td>
<td>8,524,896.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA2</td>
<td>39,429,095.71</td>
<td>54,868,582.33</td>
<td>29,129,496.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA3</td>
<td>15,085,918.00</td>
<td>18,915,141.90</td>
<td>9,796,748.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA4</td>
<td>39,469,378.82</td>
<td>84,080,107.98</td>
<td>53,930,424.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>101,803,046.34 (USD$)</td>
<td>170,021,364.88 (USD$)</td>
<td>17,172,157,853 (Ksh)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6: Annual SRA expenditures (Using UN annual calendar January-December)

7.3 Expenditure for 2014 June-2016-June at outcome level

Table 40 below and figure 6 below outlines expenditures at outcome level. Outcome 4.2 on community security and resilience has the highest expenditure of over the 2-year planning period.

Table 40: Annual Expenditures at outcome level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>YR 2014 (June-December)</th>
<th>YR 2015 (January-December)</th>
<th>YR 2016 (January-June)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Policy and institutional frameworks for transformative governance</td>
<td>991,013.67</td>
<td>2,302,802.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Democratic participation and human rights</td>
<td>4,759,552.35</td>
<td>3,329,377.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Total Outcome Expenditure (USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>YR 2014 (June-December)</th>
<th>YR 2015 (January-December)</th>
<th>YR 2016 (January-June)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Devolution and accountability</td>
<td>1,102,982.70</td>
<td>5,003,058.50</td>
<td>3,709,351.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Evidence and Rights Based Decision Making</td>
<td>965,105.09</td>
<td>1,522,293.59</td>
<td>630,336.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Education and Learning</td>
<td>14,458,520.50</td>
<td>23,078,912.00</td>
<td>11,060,086.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Wash, Food security &amp; Nutrition, Health</td>
<td>22,278,434.46</td>
<td>27,900,206.89</td>
<td>16,138,976.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 HIV</td>
<td>1,457,937.21</td>
<td>2,411,113.10</td>
<td>564,625.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Social Protection</td>
<td>1,234,203.54</td>
<td>1,478,350.34</td>
<td>1,365,809.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Productive and Business Environment</td>
<td>439,870.00</td>
<td>428,768.00</td>
<td>520,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Productive sector and Trade</td>
<td>12,736,234.00</td>
<td>16,370,098.90</td>
<td>8,263,266.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Job creation, skills development and working conditions</td>
<td>1,909,814.00</td>
<td>2,116,275.00</td>
<td>1,013,482.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Policy and legal framework for Environmental Stainability, Land Management and Human Security</td>
<td>5,916,955.29</td>
<td>9,916,389.67</td>
<td>3,129,352.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Community Security and Resilience</td>
<td>33,552,423.53</td>
<td>74,163,718.31</td>
<td>50,801,071.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>101,803,046.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>170,021,364.88</strong></td>
<td><strong>101,381,566.46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 1: Terms of Reference of the UNDAF MTR

1. Introduction

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF 2014-2018) is the fourth generation Program of UN support to Kenya. The UNDAF was developed according to the principles of UN Delivering as One (DaO), aimed at ensuring Government ownership, demonstrated through UNDAF’s full alignment to Government priorities as defined in the Vision 2030 and Medium-Term Plan 2013-2017 and planning cycles, as well as internal coherence among UN agencies and programs operating in Kenya. The UNDAF contributes to the overall goal of Kenya’s Vision 2030 of:

“Creating a globally competitive and prosperous nation with a high quality of life by 2030, that aims to transform Kenya into a newly industrializing, middle-income country for all citizens in a clean and secure environment.”

The UNDAF reflects the efforts of all UN agencies and key partners working in Kenya. The design of the UNDAF was informed by several strategic discussions both within the UN and with stakeholders, to determine how the UN System is best suited to support the national development goals. Accordingly, the Government of Kenya and the UN System are committed to working together in the spirit of partnership to implement the UNDAF, as a contribution to the achievement of national development goals and aspirations. Shaped by the five UNDG programming principles (a Human Rights-based approach, Gender equality, Environmental sustainability, Results-based management, and Capacity development) the UNDAF has a broad-based Results Framework, developed in collaboration with Government, Civil Society, donors and other partners. The UNDAF has four Strategic Results Areas:

- Transformational Governance encompassing Policy and Institutional Frameworks; Democratic Participation and Human Rights; Devolution and Accountability; and Evidence-based Decision-making,

- Human Capital Development comprised of Education and Learning; Health, including Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), Environmental Preservation, Food Availability and Nutrition; Multi-sectoral HIV and AIDS Response; and Social Protection;
• Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth, with Improving the Business Environment; Strengthening Productive Sectors and Trade; and Promoting Job Creation, Skills Development and Improved Working Conditions, and

• Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security including Policy and Legal Framework Development; and Peace, Community Security and Resilience. The UNDAF Results Areas are aligned with the three Pillars (Political, Social and Economic) of the Government’s Vision 2030 transformational agenda.

The UN Country Team (UNCT), under the leadership of the UN Resident Coordinator, is responsible for implementation of the UNDAF 2014-2018. Under the DaO “One Leader” approach the Resident Coordinator and the UNCT are responsible for oversight of the Strategic Results Groups, the Operations Management Team and the Country Communications Group. The National Steering Committee (NSC) oversees the Program implementation and reporting and the One Budgetary Framework.

2. Purpose of the Mid-Term Review

The Government of Kenya and the UN Country Team proposes to undertake a mid-term (MTR) of the UNDAF in June 2016. The review will provide an overall assessment of progress and achievements made against planned results as well as assess and document challenges and lessons learnt over the past first two and a half years of the UNDAF cycle. The review will also focus on significant developments that have taken place in the programming environment which include the post 2015 agenda and the sustainable development goals that will impact on implementation of the UNDAF development agenda and realization of program results. The review will in addition reflect on how the UN agencies and government through the strategic result area groups (SRAs) have supported UNDAF goals and identify areas requiring additional support either in program management or new implementation strategies.

The expected outcome is consensus on findings of the review and agreement on the options suggested for reinforcing efficiencies and effectiveness of development results including deliberations on new and emerging challenges beyond the current UNDAF.

3. Objectives and scope of the Mid Term Review

The UNDAF Mid-Term Review is a joint UN/ Government of Kenya review that will be conducted in close collaboration with UN agencies, national and development partners. The main objective of the UNDAF mid-Term Review is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the program, including the extent to which cross cutting and have been mainstreamed. In addition, the review will assess the extent to which the program has been responsive to address emerging issues. The MTR will determine effectiveness of the Delivering as One modality in supporting achievements of the program in line with the national vision 2013 and medium term goals. The review will also assess the mechanisms put in place to enhance coordination and harmonization among all UN agencies and the government through the strategic result area groups.

The Mid-Term Review will explore extent to which five UNDAF programming principles human rights and HRBA, gender equality, environmental sustainability; capacity development and results-based management have been mainstreamed throughout the UNDAF and recommendations delivered accordingly.
4. Mid Term Review Criteria and Review Questions

The Mid Term Review will specifically focus on:

- Assessing achievements and progress made against planned results (2 year rolling work-plan), as well as assess challenges and lessons learnt over the past two and a half years of the UNDAF.

- Assessing how the emerging issues not reflected in the current UNDAF such as sustainable development goals (SDGs) among others impact on outcomes and make recommendations and suggestions for future programming to realign UN assistance to these new priorities to achieve greater development impact.

- Reviewing effectiveness of the UNDAF results framework specifically the indicators, baselines and targets assessing how realistic/relevant and measurable they are and make recommendations for improvement.

- Reviewing coherence in delivery of the overall UN program and recommend ways in which the strategic result area groups and technical groups (namely M&E technical working group, Operation and management technical (OMT) working group, Program Management Oversight Group (PMOG), Resource mobilization group, communications group, the National Steering Committee (NSC) and the UN Country Team (UNCT) among others may increase its effectiveness of program delivery in the remaining period of the current cycle.

- Assess how effectively the current UNDAF is compatible with national development priorities (Vision 2030, Medium term program goals among others).

- Assess effectiveness towards attainment of results and reflect on how each agency both UN and GOK has contributed to the UNDAF results through the implementation of programs and projects.

- Assess effectiveness of and advantage of the use of the Joint Programs modality as a mechanism for fostering UN coherence and delivering as one such as HIV/AIDS Mars bit- Moyle program and the Turkana joint programs

- Document lessons learnt, challenges and future opportunities, and provide recommendations for improvements or adjustments in strategy, design and/or implementation arrangements.

The key criteria and questions for the mid -term review are:

1. **Relevance** -responsiveness of implementation mechanisms to the rights and capabilities of the rights-holders and duty-bearers of the program (including national institutions, communities, and the related policy framework).

   - Do the set of UNDAF Results address a) the rights of the communities being targeted; b) the relevant sectorial priorities identified at a national level; and therefore, c) the objectives of the MTP11 and Vision 2030? Are the stated UNDAF objectives consistent with the requirements of rights-holders, in particular, the requirements of most vulnerable populations? To what extent does the UNDAF respond to devolution at national and county relevant, what changes need to be done?

   - How relevant and appropriate is the UNDAF to the devolved levels of Government.
• Are all the target groups appropriately covered by the stated UNDAF Results?

• Is there a participatory approach in programming?

• To what extent does the UN ensure that gender equality is enjoyed by all especially the most vulnerable women and girls?

• Are human rights adequately addressed throughout the UNDAF? To what extent human rights based approach is applied in programming and planning processes; To what extent is the UN strengthening rights-holder's participation and duty-bearer's accountability; ensuring that the most vulnerable populations know, demand and enjoy their human rights and reinforcing capacities of duty bearers to respect, protect and guarantee these rights.

2. Effectiveness – the extent to which program results are being achieved.

• To what extent has the UNDAF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programs and UN agencies?

• To what extent has the costed 2 year rolling work-plan contributed to effective implementation of the UNDAF?

• To what extent are the UNDAF Outcomes being achieved to date? What is the likelihood of their being achieved by 2018?

• To what extent have effective partnerships and strategic alliances (e.g. national partners, development partners and other external support agencies) been promoted around the UNDAF Outcomes?

3. Efficiency – Is the implementation mechanism the most cost effective way of delivering this program?

• Have adequate financial resources been mobilized for the Program?

• Is there a discernible common or collaborative funds mobilization strategy?

• To what extent have administrative procedures been harmonized?

• Are there any apparent cost-minimizing strategies that should be encouraged?

• Are the implementation mechanisms – Strategic Result Area (SRAs), technical working groups –M&E, PMOG, UNCT, Resource mobilization and communications effective in managing the Program?

• Progress in establishing the NSC secretariat and its functionality

• How are joint programs being designed and implemented?

• How efficiently resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been converted to UNDAF results at output level?
• To what extent and in what ways have the comparative advantages of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context (including universality, neutrality, voluntary and grant-nature of contributions, multilateralism, and the special mandates of UN agencies)?

• Are there any indications of leakages and how effective is use of domestic resources?

• Are there challenges in effective use of resources, given by development partners (DPs) restrictions on funding for example some donors not willing to support through government (GOK)?

4. **Sustainability** – the extent to which these implementation mechanisms can be sustained over time

5. **Assess design and focus** of the UNDAF, the quality of the formulation of results at different levels, i.e. the results chain:

• To what extent is the current UNDAF designed as a results-oriented, coherent and focused framework?

• To what extent are the indicators and targets relevant, realistic and measurable? Are the indicators in line with the sustainable development goals (SDGs) and what changes need to be done? Are the baselines up to date -do they need adjusting?

• Is it likely that the planned Country Programs and projects and program strategies will lead to the expected UNDAF results?

• Are expected outcomes realistic given the UNDAF timeframe and resources?

• To what extent and in what ways have risks and assumptions been addressed in UNDAF design?

• Is the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different UNDAF partners well defined, facilitated in the achievement of results and have the arrangements been respected in the course of implementation?

• Do the Country Programs and the UNDAF respond to the challenges of national capacity development and do they promote ownership of programs by the national partners?

• To what extent have human rights principles and standards been reflected or promoted in the UNDAF and, as relevant, in the Country Programs? To what extent and in what ways has a human rights approach been reflected as one possible method for integrating human rights concerns into the UNDAF?

• To what extent and in what ways are the concepts of gender equity and equality and other cross-cutting issues reflected in programming? Were specific goals and targets set? Was there effort to produce sex disaggregated data and indicators to assess progress in gender equity and equality? To what extent and how is special attention given to girls’ and women’s rights and empowerment? What needs to be done to further integrate these dimensions?

• Bridging humanitarian responses and long term development/resilience; what are our lessons learnt, change of business?
6. **Assess the effectiveness of the UNDAF** as a coordination and partnership framework:

- To what extent and in what ways has UNDAF contributed to achieving better synergies among the programs of UN agencies?

- Has the UNDAF enhanced joint programming by agencies and/or resulted in specific joint programs? Were the strategies employed by agencies complementary and synergistic?

- Has agency supported programs been mutually reinforcing in helping to achieve UNDAF outcomes? Has the effectiveness or program support by individual agencies been enhanced as a result of joint programming?

- Did UNDAF promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the main UNDAF outcome areas (e.g. national partners, International Financial Institutions and other external support agencies)?

7. **Assess Impact:** To the extent possible, assess the impact of UNDAF on the lives of the poor, i.e. determine whether there is any major change in UNDAF indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or be associated with UNDAF, notably in the realization of MDGs, National Development Goals and the national implementation of internationally agreed commitments and UN Conventions and Treaties.

5. **Methods and process**

The UNDAF MTR will be an external, participatory, and iterative learning exercise, which should be completed within a timeframe of two months. It will take place from March –May of 2016 and will build on the previous UNDAF Annual Reviews as well as the quarterly reviews. The MTR will be jointly commissioned and managed by the UNCT (heads of agencies) and national government. The evaluation will also involve stakeholders such as UN staff, their counterparts in the government as well as NGOs and other international actors. Stakeholder participation is essential and will be sought from the beginning of the process through a series of meetings and possibly through the organization of an UNDAF Evaluation Workshop that will take place towards the end of the MTR process. The purpose of the workshop will be to validate and refine findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

In order to determine the scope of the MTR the government and the UNCT will initiate the evaluation process by assessing how the UNDAF can be evaluated in a reliable and credible manner given the data and resources. This assessment will include a review of the documentation available on the UNDAF design and implementation process.

Methods to assess UNDAF outcomes and impact will include open and semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, a comprehensive review of documents (both from the government on national policies and strategies as well as from the UN agencies), a synthesis and analysis of data from regular program monitoring as well as field visits. Interviews with beneficiaries and local partners using participatory review and evaluation methodologies will be strongly encouraged, Reviews or evaluations of agency supported programs will feed into the MTR.
6. Management and organization

The UNDAF Evaluation will be commissioned and overseen by the UNCT and the Government. The responsibility to provide oversight and direction to the UNDAF MTR process will rest with the National Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is co-chaired by the National treasury, Ministry of Devolution and planning and the UN Resident Coordinator, with additional members being drawn from other Government Ministries, UN agencies and the UNCT.

A reference group which will serve as the MTR Technical Committee comprised of about 12 members from various national and international stakeholders (including the UNCT and GOK) will be established. The main task of the reference group will be to guide the evaluation process at the design, implementation and report stages. The reference group will also participate in the UNDAF Evaluation workshop. Appointed by the Government and the UNCT/RC will be established to backstop the work of the MTR consultancy team. The reference group will be chaired by a senior UN staff identified by the RC. It will facilitate the preparation of a substantive program of consultations, discussions and interviews and it ensures quality control of the process.

The Resident Coordinator’s Office will be responsible for the day-to-day support of the MTR consultancy team, maintaining a close liaison with the Technical Committee and coordination among participating agencies throughout the duration of the UNDAF MTR process. The team will work closely with and report to the RCO Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist. Availability of background documents will be ensured by the RCO. Likewise, facilitation for meetings setting and scheduling is to be provided by the RCO. Necessary technical expertise from UN agencies will be availed as appropriate. On the Government side, The National Treasury and ministry of devolution and planning will coordinate the participation of key ministries and other institutions in the Technical Committee. The One UN M&E Technical Working Group will provide technical guidance to the UNDAF MTR process.

An external Consultancy Team composed of one Senior International Consultant and one National Consultant selected by mutual agreement between the UNCT and the government through a transparent thorough selection process will conduct the MTR while facilitating the self-evaluation process within the UN (UN Country Team) and the government.

The Team will analyses the information gathered, interview key partners, working with thematic groups, the RC Office and other stakeholders to ensure the impartiality, consistency and coherence of the evaluation and provide recommendations on any necessary actions to adjust the current UNDAF.

The Resident coordinator’s office will manage and provide all the logistical and administration support required during the evaluation. These includes making appointments and schedules for interviews, workshops and meetings and providing transport to the field. All costs related to travel, workshops and transport to the field and attending meetings will be taken care of by RCO.
7. **Time Frame**

Proposed Time Frame is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>Desk Review (Home based) and development of inception report (which included the detail evaluation design) (Week 1-2) -2 weeks</td>
<td>MTR/Reference Committee/and RCO to brief the evaluation team and provide initial guidance to the process. RCO to make all relevant documents available for home based desk review at commencement of consultancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Week 3 to WEEK 6: - 4 weeks in country – presentation of the evaluation design to the reference group, consultations, interviews and first draft report writing Consultancy Team supported by the RCO. Schedule of meetings and logistics arranged by the RCO. At the request of the Team Leader Reference group to approve the evaluation design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Week 7-9: - 2 weeks in country – Analysis of data, report writing – draft report presented to the Technical Committee and Outcome Working Groups/UNCT/RC/SRAs for comments incorporation of comments Week 10: - in country - presentation of the second draft report to the Steering Committee via validation workshop Stakeholders/ NSC/GOK/s RCO, Consultancy Team,/ M&amp;E Working Group/SRAs Week 11: UNCT/ DaO /NSC Steering Committee - home based - Incorporation of comments and submission of final report to the RC.</td>
<td>UNCT/NSC Steering Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Composition and qualifications of the consultancy team Consultant’s**

8.1 **Composition of the consultancy team**

The Consultancy Team will be composed of one Senior International Consultant, who will be assigned the responsibility of Team Leader, and one National Consultant. The duration of the consultancy is 60 consecutive working days (11 weeks of 5 working days and 5 days for travel- in country) for each consultant as outlined in the time frame above. The International Consultant is expected to spend seven consecutive weeks in Kenya and the other three weeks will be home based. The Team should have proven record of experience in conducting complex evaluations.

8.2 **Roles and responsibilities of the Consultancy Team**

The team will undertake the following roles and responsibilities:

- Organizing the work and preparing an evaluation plan for the team;
- Conducting briefing and debriefing; and facilitating productive working relationships among the team members
• Consulting with MTR Technical Committee and related partners to ensure the progress and the key evaluation questions are covered

• Assuring the draft and final reports are prepared in accordance with the Terms of Reference, Facilitating the meeting to present the main findings and recommendations of MTR, and discussing the proposed action plan to implement recommendations including changes in contents and direction of the program.

8.2.1 Specific tasks of the team leader

The team leader will undertake the following tasks:

• Taking the lead in contacting MTR Technical Committee regarding MTR-related issues and ensure that the process is as participatory as possible

• Organizing the team meetings, assigning specific roles and tasks of the team members and closely monitor their work

• Supervising data collection and analysis

• Consolidating draft and final MTR reports, and a proposed action plan with the support provided by team members

• Completing the final MTR report, which incorporated comments of the Technical Committee and key stakeholders,

• Submitting the draft and final MTR report and a proposed action plan to MTR Technical Committee and the RCO, on schedule

• Presenting MTR results and facilitating the meeting

8.2.2 Specific tasks of the National consultant

The National consultant will:

• Follow the tasks assigned by the team leader meeting the MTR working timetable

• Data collection and analysis

• Providing written and verbal inputs to the Team Leader for the development of the MTR reports – drafts and final

• Participating in all meetings as per guidance provided by the Team Leader

• Collecting all comments on the MTR report and participating in the report revision process
Annex 2: MTR Outcome and Output Assessment Tool

(Using outcome 3.1 as sample)

**Strategic area 3: Inclusive and sustainable economic growth:** By 2030 Kenya is an industrialized middle income country with a modern, inclusive, diversified and 24-hour economy; growth is inclusive and achieves sustainable development; trade is modernized, balanced, competitive and regionally integrated and employment matches the demand, is stable, private sector and SME-driven, decent, equitably accessible particularly to youth, women and vulnerable groups and human rights compliant;

**A. Assessment of SRA3. Overarching Outcome Indicators**

**Key: SRA 3 Overarching Outcome ratings** *(3. On track=Good Performance at June 2016, 2. Partially on track=Lagging behind expected performance; 1. Off track, -Likely not to achieve the outcome by 2018)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA Overarching Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target 2018</th>
<th>Status by June 2016</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Outcome rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

A2. Indicate the status of the indicator to date on the table.

A3. Provide sources of data, where possible share data sources with team of consultants by email (GOKonji@gmail.com or hard copies or share relevant websites.

A4. Rate the performance of the indicators (1-On Track; 2- Partially on Track or 3- Off Track)

**B. Assessment of SRA 3 Outcome 3.1**

Outcome 3.1: Productive and business environment:

By 2015

i. Kenya’s productive and business environment are reformed

ii. Effectively nurture local capacities,

iii. Attract internal and external investments

iv. Promote ownership, innovation and entrepreneurship
B1. Overall Assessment of SRA3 Outcome 3.1

B1a. To Date (June 2016), how would you describe the Country’s performance in working towards SRA 3 Outcome 3.1 Results?

3. On Track  2. Partially on Track  1. Off Track

Kenya’s productive and business environment are reformed

Effectively nurture local capacities

Attract internal and external investments

Promote ownership, innovation and entrepreneurship

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA1 Outcome 3.1 Indicators</th>
<th>Indicator Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2018</th>
<th>Status by June 2016</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Outcome rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall rating for outcome 3.1 informed by performance of Outcome indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C1. Informed by your knowledge of the sector, what would be a realistic target for outcomes Indicators 2 (information has been missing in the results framework) by 2018? Give your justification for your choices.

C2. Indicate the status of the indicator to date on the table.

C3. Provide sources of date, where possible share data sources with team of consultants by email GOKonji@gmail.com or hard copies or share relevant websites.

C4. Rate the performance of the indicators (3-On Track; 2- Partially on Track or 1- Off Track)

D. Assessment of Performance of Outcome 3.1 Output results

Output rating: 3. Achieved- Planned activities in 2 Year rolling work plans accomplished 2. Partially Achieved- Less than 75% of planned activities for output accomplished 1. Not Achieved- 0-25% of planned output activities accomplished.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output Result</th>
<th>Degree of accomplishment of Outputs as of 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 3.1.1: Regulatory frameworks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D 3.1.1 (a) Provide a write up of key activities so far done towards achievement of this output and the major successes and factors facilitating achievements.

D 3.1.1 (b) Indicate the challenges or inhibiting factors for activities not completed to date.

D 3.1.1 (c) Are there planned activities in the 2 year rolling work plans that were not done? Detail those activities for

D 3.1.1 (d) Informed by your knowledge of this sector, detail key activities that are a must for inclusion in the development of the next 2 year rolling work plans if this output is to be successfully accomplished by 2018 and give justification.

E. Outcome 3.1: Significant Transformative Change Results

From your work around SRA 3 Outcome 3.1, Can you share what you can view as a unique significant transformative change results which were a result of UNDAF program interventions.

Guidelines

i. Change must be at outcome (behavioural) level

ii. Transformative results should be clearly linked to UNDAF program intervention with no doubts on attribution

iii. Where possible should be supported by unquestionable evidence

iv. A very clear Before and After Picture
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## Mid Term Review of the Kenya United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

<table>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nicholas Oloo</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>Rumbidzai Adebayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeptum Bargoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOCHA</td>
<td>Jerotich Houlding</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idil Absiye</td>
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## Institution People Met

### Development partners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>People Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Pete Vowles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Horjen Stein Erik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIDA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5. Alignment of UNDAF SRAs to Sustainable Development Goals

2.1: SRA 1 on Transformative Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRAs</th>
<th>Relevant SDGs (From of 17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRA 1: TRANSFORMATIVE GOVERNANCE</td>
<td>SDG 5: Achieve Gender Inequality Within and Among Countries. SDG 16: On Promotion of peaceful and inclusive for sustainable development, provide access to Justice for all and build effective accountable and inclusive institutions at all levels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thrust of UNDAF Outcomes</th>
<th>Thrust of Outputs for Outcomes</th>
<th>SDG Indicators addressed by UNDAF Design and Programming</th>
<th>Areas for UNDAF Program Design to Put Greater Emphasis On</th>
<th>Rating of Alignment to SDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 on Policy and Institutional Framework 1.2 Democratic participation and human rights 1.3 Devolution and accountability 1.4 Evidence and rights based decision making</td>
<td>- Human right focused policies - Alignment to constitutional and international standards - Judicial reforms - Ethics and integrity - HR and Gender mainstreaming - Citizen engagement and participation - Devolution transition - Service delivery capacity County Good governance models - Learning and innovation - M&amp;E policy - M&amp;E systems -M&amp;E capacities -Population and socio-economic development data</td>
<td>5.1 ending forms of discrimination against women and girls 5.c On Sound legal provision on promotion of GEWE 5.5 on women participation and leadership and decision making at all levels 16.3 ensure equal access to justice for all 10.2 on empowering and promoting social economic inclusion of all</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 on ending forms of violence including trafficking 5.4 on shared responsibilities responsibility within households 5.a. On women access to equal opportunities including access to land, and national resources. 16.5 Substantially reduce corruption and bribery in all its forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2</td>
<td>Medium (other elements of equality mainstreamed in other SRAs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRAs</td>
<td>Relevant SDGs (From of 17)</td>
<td>Thrust of UNDAF Outcomes</td>
<td>Thrust of Outputs for Outcomes</td>
<td>SDG Indicators addressed by UNDAF Design and Programming</td>
<td>Areas for UNDAF Program Design to Put Greater Emphasis On--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA 1: TRANSFORMATIVE GOVERNANCE</td>
<td>SDG 10: Reduced inequality within Countries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1 Achieving and sustaining growth of the bottom 40% of population 10.3 On greater focus on reduction of inequalities of outcomes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rating of SRA 1 on Alignment of two Sustainable Development Goals**  
Medium
## 2.2: SRA 2 on Human Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRAs</th>
<th>Relevant SDGs (From of 17)</th>
<th>Thrust of UNDAF Outcomes</th>
<th>Thrust of Outputs for Outcomes</th>
<th>SDG Indicators addressed by UNDAF Design and Programming</th>
<th>Areas for UNDAF Program Design to Put Greater Emphasis On---</th>
<th>Rating of Alignment to SDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRA 2 HUMAN CAPITAL</td>
<td>SDG 2: On ending all forms of malnutrition achieving internationally agreed targets on stunting SDG 6: Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all. SDG 3 On Health lives and wellbeing for all at all ages</td>
<td>2.1 Education and learning 2.2. WASH Environmental preservation/food availability/nutrition and health 2.3 Multi-sectoral HIV and AIDS response 2.4 On Social Protection.</td>
<td>- Legislative and policy frameworks - Partnership and accountability - Access, Equity, Quality and Relevance - Health Systems - WASH- Env preservation/food availability/nutrition - RMNCAH - Communicable and non-communicable conditions - Strategic Planning and funding - partnership and coordination - Health sector mainstreaming -Social Response -Education Sector -National ownership and leadership - Coordination - Program implementation</td>
<td>4.1 on equitable &amp; quality primary and secondary education 4.2 On equitable ECD and pre-primary education 4.5 on elimination of gender disparities in education Including PWD, minorities and people in vulnerable situation 2.2 on ending all forms of malnutrition, including 2025 agreed targets on stunting 6.2 &amp; 6.b. On achieving adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all &amp; ending open defecation</td>
<td>4.3 gender equity in access to quality technical, vocational and tertiary education 3.8 On achieving universal health coverage, including financial risk protection, access to quality essentials, health care services and access to safe, effective, quality and affordable essential medicines and vaccines for all. 3.9. 3c. On substantially increasing health financing and recruitment, development, training and retention of health workforce in developing countries</td>
<td>Outcome 2.1, 2.2, 2.3. and 2.4 Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall Rating of SRA 2 on alignment to Sustainable Development Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRAs</th>
<th>Relevant SDGs (From of 17)</th>
<th>Thrust of UNDAF Outcomes</th>
<th>Thrust of Outputs for Outcomes</th>
<th>SDG Indicators addressed by UNDAF Design and Programming</th>
<th>Areas for UNDAF Program Design to Put Greater Emphasis On--</th>
<th>Rating of Alignment to SDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRA 2: HUMAN CAPITAL</td>
<td>SDG 5: Achieve Gender Inequality Within and Among Counties</td>
<td>On addressing Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women in UNDAF programming</td>
<td>Gender equality and women’s empowerment</td>
<td>5.1 End all forms of discrimination against all women and girls everywhere 5.6 On ensuring universal access to sexual and reproductive health rights</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Rating of SRA 2 on alignment to Sustainable Development Goals

Strong
2.3: SRA 3 on Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRAs</th>
<th>Relevant SDGs (From of 17)</th>
<th>Thrust of UNDAF Outcomes</th>
<th>Thrust of Outputs for Outcomes</th>
<th>SDG Indicators addressed by UNDAF Design and Programming</th>
<th>Areas for UNDAF Program Design to Put Greater Emphasis On</th>
<th>Rating of Alignment to SDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRA 3: INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH</td>
<td>SDG 1. End Poverty in all its forms everywhere</td>
<td>3.1 Productive and business environment</td>
<td>- Regulatory framework (legal and regulatory frameworks that are human rights and gender responsive) - Equitable access to opportunities (MDAs and NGEC have adequate capacity to operationalize matrimonial property Act (2013))</td>
<td>Target 1.5: on building the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations—and reduce their exposure to economic shocks and disasters</td>
<td>5.a. On reforms to give women equal rights to economic resources as well as equal access to land and other forms of property, inheritance natural resources in accordance with national laws</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG 5. On achieving gender and equality and empowering all women and girls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA 3: INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH</td>
<td>SDG 8: On sustainable, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and productive employment and decent work for all</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Policy operationalization. Public, private sector and county governments have capacity to collaborate, coordinate, monitor and evaluate implementation of policies &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome 3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDG 9: On building resilient infrastructure, promotion of inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target 1b. On creating sound policy frameworks at national levels based on pro poor and gender sensitive development strategies to support accelerated investment in poverty eradication actions.

Target 8.1 On sustaining per capita economic growth

Target 9.3 on increasing access to small scale industrial and other enterprises.

Target 10.2 On empowering and promotion of social and economic inclusion for all
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRAs</th>
<th>Relevant SDGs (From of 17)</th>
<th>Thrust of UNDAF Outcomes</th>
<th>Thrust of Outputs for Outcomes</th>
<th>SDG Indicators addressed by UNDAF Design and Programming</th>
<th>Areas for UNDAF Program Design to Put Greater Emphasis On--</th>
<th>Rating of Alignment to SDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRA 3: INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH</td>
<td>SDG 2. On ending hunger, achieving food security, and improved nutrition and promotion of sustainable agriculture. SDG 5. On achieving gender and equality and empowering all women and girls SDG 8: On sustainable, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and productive employment and decent work for all SDG 7. On affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all SDG 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries</td>
<td>Sustainable energy for all: technology and skills transfer for energy sector to develop cost effective bio-energy, solar, geothermal electricity, mini hydro and wind power - Agriculture: MDAs and county governments have capacity to implement agriculture development models that achieve gender equality in access to productive inputs and promote climate smart agriculture -Extractive Industry: Strengthened sector, through South–south and triangular cooperation, apply measures for generation of employment especially for women, youth marginalized groups, protect environment</td>
<td>Target 2.4: On sustainable food production systems and implementing resilient agriculture practices. Target 5.1 On ending all forms of discrimination against women and girls everywhere. Target 7.1 On ensuring universal access to affordable reliable and modern energy services. Target 8.1: On sustaining per capita economic growth Target 8.3: On promotion of development-oriented policies to support; decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and SMEs Target 10.2. On supporting economic inclusion for all.</td>
<td>Target 2.3: on doubling the agricultural productivity and incomes of small scale food producers in particular women, pastoralists, including secure and equal access to land, other productive resources, markets, value addition and non- farm employment. Target 2.4 On strengthening adaptation to climate change extreme weather, drought flooding.</td>
<td>Outcome 3.2 Strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall SRA rating on alignment to SDGs Strong
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRAs</th>
<th>Relevant SDGs (From of 17)</th>
<th>Thrust of UNDAF Outcomes</th>
<th>Thrust of Outputs for Outcomes</th>
<th>SDG Indicators addressed by UNDAF Design and Programming</th>
<th>Areas for UNDAF Program Design to Put Greater Emphasis On---</th>
<th>Rating of Alignment to SDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRA 3: INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH</td>
<td>SDG 2. On ending hunger, achieving food security, and improved nutrition and promotion of sustainable agriculture.</td>
<td>3.2 Productive Sectors and Trade: (agriculture, manufacturing, extractive industry) trade and their value chains are private sector and SME-driven, sustainable, diversified, technologically innovative, commercially oriented and competitive on national regional and global markets.</td>
<td>- Sustainable energy for all: technology and skills transfer for energy sector to develop cost effective bio-energy, solar, geothermal electricity, mini hydro and wind power - Agriculture: MDAs and county governments have capacity to implement agriculture development models that achieve gender equality in access to productive inputs and promote climate smart agriculture - Extractive Industry: Strengthened sector, through South - south and triangular cooperation, apply measures for generation of employment especially for women, youth marginalized groups., protect environment</td>
<td>Target 2.4: On sustainable food production systems and implementing resilient agriculture practices. Target 5.1 On ending all forms of discrimination against women and girls everywhere. Target 7.1 On ensuring universal access to affordable reliable and modern energy services. Target 8.1: On sustaining per capita economic growth Target 8.3: On promotion of development-oriented policies to support: decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and SMEs Target 10.2. On supporting economic inclusion for all.</td>
<td>Target 2.3: on doubling the agricultural productivity and incomes of small scale food producers in particular women, pastoralists, including secure and equal access to land, other productive resources, markets, value addition and non-farm employment. Target 2.4 On strengthening adaptation to climate change extreme weather, drought flooding. Target 5.b On enhancing use of enhancing technology to promote empowerment of women Target 8b. On supporting domestic technology development, research and innovation.</td>
<td>Outcome 3.2 Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mid Term Review of the Kenya United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRAs</th>
<th>Relevant SDGs (From of 17)</th>
<th>Thrust of UNDAF Outcomes</th>
<th>Thrust of Outputs for Outcomes</th>
<th>SDG Indicators addressed by UNDAF Design and Programming</th>
<th>Areas for UNDAF Program Design to Put Greater Emphasis On--</th>
<th>Rating of Alignment to SDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRA 3: INCLUSIVE AND SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH</td>
<td>SDG 1: On ending poverty in all its forms everywhere. SDG 4: On ensuring inclusive and equitable quality education and promotion of life-long learning opportunities for all. SDG 5: On achieving gender and equality and empowering all women and girls SDG 8: On sustainable, inclusive and sustainable economic growth and productive employment and decent work for all SDG 9: On building resilient infrastructure, promotion of inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation SDG 10: Reduce inequality within and among countries</td>
<td>3.3 Job Creation, skills Development and working conditions: By 2018, formal and informal sectors in urban and rural areas economies create employment that is safe, healthy, secure, and productive gainful &amp; that is equitably accessible for women, youth and vulnerable groups. Workers have adequate skills to match demand.</td>
<td>- Employment Creation and Enterprise development: public and private sector with capacity for to develop and adapt sustainable enterprises that are resource efficient, technologically innovative, competitive and create job opportunities - Skills Development: Support capacities on technical and entrepreneurial, implement apprenticeships, vocational and on job training, technology transfer programs for productive labor force that is efficient, motivated, and competitive and march market demand. -Employment: Capacities for promoting fundamental rights at work and ensure improved workplace safety, reduced health risks and enjoyment by workers of decent earnings, equitable pension and effective union representation.</td>
<td>Target 4.3 On equal access by men, women, to affordable and quality technical and vocational and tertiary education Target 4.4: On increasing the number of youth and adults to relevant skills including technical and vocational skills for employment, decent jobs and entrepreneurship. Target 8.3: On promoting development related policies and activities for decent job creation, entrepreneurship, creativity and innovation, and formulation of SMEs, including access to financial resources. Target 8.5: On achieving full and productive employment and decent work for women and men including for PWDs and equal pay for equal value Target 8.8: On promoting labor rights, safe and secure working conditions</td>
<td>Target 1.4 On ensuring that men, women, poor and vulnerable have equal rights to economic resources, as well as access to basic services, ownership and control over land. Target 8.6. Substantially reduce the proportion of youth not in employment. Target 8.7: On measures to eradicate forced labor and modern slavery and human trafficking and elimination of worst forms of child labor. Target 8.b. On developing a global strategy for youth employment and implementing the global Jobs Pact. Target 9.3 On access to small scale industrial and other enterprises.</td>
<td>Outcome 3.3 Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Rating of SRA 3 on Alignment to Sustainable Development Goals**

| Moderate |
### 2.4: SRA 4 on Environmental Sustainability, land Management and Human Capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRAs</th>
<th>Relevant SDGs (From of 17)</th>
<th>Thrust of UNDAF Outcomes</th>
<th>Thrust of Outputs for Outcomes</th>
<th>SDG Indicators addressed by UNDAF Design and Programming</th>
<th>Areas for UNDAF Program Design to Put Greater Emphasis On--</th>
<th>Rating of Alignment to SDGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRA 4</td>
<td>SDG: 2: End hunger, achieve food security and promote sustainable agriculture. SDG 13: On Action to combat climate change and its impact SDG 7: On access to affordable reliable sustainable and modern energy SDG 16: On promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development— SDG 5: On achieving gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls.</td>
<td>4.1 Policy and Legal Frameworks</td>
<td>- Policy (DRR, Human Security, Peace building) - Land Use (equitable land use models, natural resources, tenure systems, land conflict hot spots) - Policy implementation (human rights and gender responsive environmental challenges and disasters and emergencies)</td>
<td>2.3 on doubling the agriculture productivity and incomes of small-scale food producers particularly women, -- pastoralists and other services like markets opportunities for value addition 2.4 on implementing resilient agriculture and strengthening adaptability to climate change 13.1 strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate change 7.1 On universal access to affordable reliable and modern energy services 7.2 On renewable energy</td>
<td>2.5 On genetic diversity of seeds, farmed and domesticated animals and their related wild life 13.2 On integrating climate change measures into national policies, strategies, and planning 13.3 and 13. b on human and institutional capacity of climate change mitigation, adaptation, impact reduction and early warning</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SRA 1: TRANSFORMATIVE GOVERNANCE

**Relevant SDGs** (From of 17)

- SDG 16: On promotion of peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development----
- SDG 5: On achieving gender equality and empowerment of all women and girls.

**Thrust of UNDAF Outcomes**

- Peace building:
- DRR/M
- Boarder management and Community policing;
- HR based and gender responsive strategies for boarder management

**Thrust of Outputs for Outcomes**

- 16.1 On reducing all forms of violence and related deaths rates everywhere
- 5.1 On ending all forms of discrimination against women
- 5.c on adoption and of sound gender responsive policies and legislation

**SDG Indicators addressed by UNDAF Design and Programming**

- 5.6 On reforms to give women access to equal rights to ---access to ownership and control over land. And natural resources in accordance to national laws

**Areas for UNDAF Program Design to Put Greater Emphasis On**

- 5.6 On reforms to give women access to equal rights to ---access to ownership and control over land. And natural resources in accordance to national laws

**Rating of Alignment to SDGs**

*Overall rating of alignment of SRA 4 to Sustainable Development Goals.* | Medium
Annex 6: Assessment of the Performance of UNDAF Outcomes 1-13
1.1: Outcome 1.1 Indicators Assessment

Outcome 1.1: Policy and Institutional Framework: By 2016 constitutional mandated policy and institutional framework is fully operationalizes. National Laws meets international standards particularly with regards to the protection of human rights, the judiciary and justice system and responsive, effective, accessible and independent and law enforcement systems is reformed, people oriented and anchored on integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>C. Status</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Percent of newly enacted laws, which are HR/GE- compliant</td>
<td>N/A (2014)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>NUJA</td>
<td>NUJA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proportion of gender &amp; child related bills and policies enacted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75% (8)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Off Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Percent of GOK Judiciary Funding Gap</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Almost 0%</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Percent of court cases clearance rates</td>
<td>190 000</td>
<td>290 000</td>
<td>Good Performance</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating of Performance of Outcome</td>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating of Performance of Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: NUJA - Not Used in Assessment

Highlights on Comments on Indicators

Indicator 1: had no baseline. Target was in percentage. Indicator ambitious not feasible to access all newly elected laws across sectors. This Indicators will not be Used in this Assessment

Indicator 2: Indicator Is ok except it had a mixture of numbers and percentages. Despite that anomaly the indicator will be used for assessment with adjustment for a target of 8 bills and policies. Result: There are still 4 gender and child related bills (Children Act, Disability Act, 2/3 Gender Rule Bill, Gender Policy. It must also be noted that a lot of good work has been done on advocacy for 2/3 gender rule. It is work in progress. Often it is difficult to set indicators on processes which whose pace is determined by legislators. To this end there is need to consider review of this indicator

Indicator 3: Indicator is ok. Result: As indicated in there has been significant improvement in budget allocation with budget allocation rising from 3billion in 2011 to 16.7 billion in 2015/16. Impressive results on this indicator.

Indicator 4: The baseline and target poorly set at very low levels. Results: However, there have been good results on reducing court case backlogs as shared in the text. Indicator has good results.

Indicator 5: This indicator has neither baseline nor target. The essence of what the indicator is looking for is great. There is need for potential qualitative capacity indicators for it. Results: However, with respect to content of the indicators, there are good results around institutional capacity on technical areas, policies and good governance (vetting).

4 out 5 Indicators were used in the assessment

Quality of Indicators: There is need to review all indicators for precision.

Overall rating for the outcome results is – On Track
1.2: Outcome 1.2 Indicator Assessment

Outcome 1.2: Democratic Participation. By 2017 Kenya has a democracy in which human rights and gender equality are respected, elected officials are responsive and accountable, citizens and civil society are empowered, responsible and politically/socially engaged; equitable representation is achieved through affirmative action and the electoral processes are free, fair, transparent and peaceful.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>C. Status</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proportion of cases reported to Article 59 Constitutional Commission appropriately addressed; MOV: NCAJ, KNCHR, NGEC Annual Reports</td>
<td>Baseline 1.398/4 062, 1,896 (83.5%) (2018)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. % of citizens satisfied with public service delivery</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69.7% (2015)</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Rate of vote electoral turnout</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Not Yet</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evidence of a strong and coordinated movement targeting women and marginalized communities.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Existence of a legal and policy framework for achievement of not more 2/3 gender principle</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Off Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall rating of Performance of Outcome | Partially on

Key: NUIA- Not used in Assessment

Highlights on Comments on Indicators

Only 3 out of 5 Indicators could be used

**Indicator 1:** has content which is very good to track access to justice and enjoyment of HR. However, the baseline and target indicators are very unclear and it appears there are multiple indicators in 1 making it difficult to track the indicators. As such this indicator will not be used for this assessment. It can be reviewed according and indicator split by institutions for easy of tracking.

**Indicator 2:** A good indicator. Result: An info track survey released in April 2015 indicated that 69.7% of Kenyans feel that services are better than before. Approval rating for implementation of successful devolution was 78% (2015) Recommendation: Consider indicator on public perception on service deliver under outcome 1.3.

**Indicator 3:** This indicator generally is good. It does not have a target for 2018. It can be used after 2017 election. Results. There is also possibility of introducing another indicator on registered voters. The information is that baseline was 14 million registered and a target of about 20 million to have been registered. The stand is about 15.5 below target. However, if phase two MVR is successful the target can be met.

**Indicator 4:** The indicator is good. Results: Several movements advocating for women’s rights: My dress my choice on GBV; County GBV awareness; JoWo-with the table banking on economic empowerment; rallying around 2/3 gender rule. Indicator has good results and should be recorded as on track.

**Indicator 5:** 4 out 5 Indicators were used in the assessment

Quality of Indicators: There is need to review all indicators for precision. Also need for additional relevant indicators.

Overall rating for the outcome results is – On Track
1.3: Outcome 1.3 Indicator Assessment

Outcome 1.3: Devolution and Accountability: By 2017 Kenya has a participatory devolution process that is well understood by stakeholders, adequately coordinated and equitably resources for the delivery of accessible and quality services; devolved institutions are legally and technically empowered, well managed, effective and accountable; resource management is transparent, equitable, effective and efficient at all times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>C. Status</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. % of county budgets approved by the Controller of budgets compliant with legal and constitutional requirements.</td>
<td>24 out of 47 (2013/14 Budget)</td>
<td>47 counties</td>
<td>All 47 counties</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proportion of public that perceive that they fully understand the devolved government system:</td>
<td>51% (2013)</td>
<td>60% (2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall rating of Performance of Outcome: YES On Track

Key: NUIA- Not used in Assessment

Highlights on Comments on Indicators

Three (3) out of 3 Indicators could be used

**Indicator 1:** Good performance of indicator. All 47 county government have budget approved by Controller of Budgets. They do not receive their share form national budget unless they are compliant.

**Indicator 2:** While quantitative data is still not available, based on UNDAF MTR qualitative information gathered, the rating is “On track”

**Indicator 3:** This indicator is generally good but appears to have very low estimate targets. By 2018 it would be expected that all County governments are implementing their county CIDP. The results from the field is that all 47 counties have CIDP but the quality may not be to their expected standards. As capacities of counties grow more see the need to revise their CIDP so that they can meaningfully guide their work. This is positive development in terms of counties noting the need for quality CIDPs.

Other observations: This outcome could do with additional indicators to measure progress on civic participation and engagement within the processes of devolutions, it could also track issues of inclusivity, participation of minority group.
1.4: Outcome 1.4 Indicator Assessment

Outcome 1.4: Evidence and Rights Based decision making. By 2018 development planning and decision making are evidence based and rights based, supported by a well-established and strong research monitoring and evaluation culture that guarantees the independency, credibility, timeliness and disaggregation of data, broadly accessible to the intended audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>C. Status</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Existence if a strong and robust National integrated monitoring and evaluation system (NIMES) within a devolved governance structure</td>
<td>Exists with weaknesses (2013)</td>
<td>Robust NIMES (2018)</td>
<td>NIMES strengthened considerably</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of counties utilizing evidence based planning and budgeting</td>
<td>N/A (2013)</td>
<td>47 (2018)</td>
<td>Some Not Enough Evidence</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No of MDA and CG budget and policy statements that utilizes sex and other disaggregated data</td>
<td>TBA (2013)</td>
<td>All MDA and 47 Counties</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Number of MDA and counties with at least one qualifies M&amp;E staff</td>
<td>TBD (2013)</td>
<td>All (2016)</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall rating of Performance of Outcome | Partially on Track |

**Key:** NUIA - Not used in Assessment

Highlights on Comments on Indicators

Only 3 out of 6 Indicators could be used

**Indicator 1:** A good indicator which is measurable. **Results:** Capacity has been provided at national level to develop M&E tools at national and county levels. Guidelines for NIMES developed. There are several evaluations that have been published. The main challenge is linking county and national level M&E Framework. There is benefit in developing additional indicator with a focus on County capacities for M&E Information management systems.

**Indicator 2:** Indicator generally good. **Result:** Not accurate evidence although there are reports some counties are using evidence based data for planning. Need for a quick baseline to be done. COG could be an easier route to check this baseline data.

**Indicator 3:** Indicator not good enough, often policy statement not include disaggregated data. It could better to develop an indicator which speaks to gender responsive indicators for the counties.

NUIA

**Indicator 4:** This indicator generally is good but lacked baseline and targets. In such cases qualitative indicators could also do. Despite absence of supportive data, the indicator will be used for assessment with recommendation for improvement of the indicator for precision. **Results**. There is evidence that resources are being mobilized for M&E. Both MDAs and counties are reported to be mobilizing resources for M&E. M&E is increasingly of interest to MDAs and Counties. It should however be noted that effective performance of this indicators is dependent on existence of the M&E Policy and Act.

Indicators 5 &6: Not assessed for MTR. Dependent on existence of the Policy and Act.
### 1.5: Outcome 2.1 Indicators Assessment

**Outcome 2.1: Education and learning:** By 2018 Kenya has an education sector that equips citizens with knowledge and technical skills, which are relevant and responsive to job market demand and emerging national development needs; an education system that is adequately resourced, effective, efficient, devolved and inclusive; and an education governance and financial management system which is evidence based, transparent, efficient, human rights, gender responsive and participatory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>C. Status</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. % GDP allocation to Education</td>
<td>6.4% (2012)</td>
<td>8% (2018)</td>
<td>7.3%22</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No of counties that are effectively implementing County Education Strategic Plans.</td>
<td>47.7-literacy; 51.7-numeracy (2010)</td>
<td>60% (2018)</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. No of counties undertaking harmonized learning assessments.</td>
<td>1.010m (2013)</td>
<td>900,000 (2018)</td>
<td>1,292,675 Million, EMIS 2014</td>
<td>Off Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. % Of students in standard 3 having mastered basic learning competencies in literacy and numeracy.</td>
<td>47.7-literacy; 51.7-numeracy (2010)</td>
<td>60% (2018)</td>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No of out-of-school children (age 6 to 18)</td>
<td>1.010m (2013)</td>
<td>900,000 (2018)</td>
<td>1,292,675 Million, EMIS 2014</td>
<td>Off Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Transition rates from (a) ECDE to primary; (b) primary to secondary/youth polytechnics; and (c) secondary to higher or tertiary education.</td>
<td>(a) ECDE to primary 104.3%; (b) primary to secondary 76.6% (2012) primary to youth polytechnics TBD; (c) secondary to higher or tertiary education 6.5% (2012).</td>
<td>(a) ECDE to primary 80%; (b) primary to secondary 100%; primary to youth polytechnics TBD (c) secondary to higher or tertiary education 30% (2018).</td>
<td>ECDE-Primary: 102.1% Primary to Secondary: 79.6%</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall rating of Performance of Outcome 2.1** On Track

Key: NUIA- Not Used in Assessment

**Highlights on Comments on Indicators**

- **Indicator 1:** Target likely to be achieved by 2018 if current trend is maintained.
- **Indicator 2:** Indicator has been achieved at Mid-term - counties have developed a county strategic plan which forms the basis for budgetary allocation at the county level.
- **Indicator 3:** Indicator has been achieved at Mid-term - 47 counties Harmonized summative national assessment test.
- **Indicator 4:** Data not available – KNALS III scheduled to take place in 2017.
- **Indicator 5:** This indicator is off track. The number of children out of school continue to be a challenge particularly in the ASAL areas where insecurity led to drop out rates.
- **Indicator 6:** This indicator has been achieved. Transition rates from (a) ECDE to primary is surpassed and (b) primary to secondary is on track at Mid-term. Indicators 5 & 6: Not assessed for MTR. Dependent
1.6: Outcome 2.2 Indicators Assessment

**Outcome 2.2: WASH Environmental preservation / food availability – nutrition / health:** By 2018 morbidity and mortality in Kenya are sustainably reduced, with improved maternal, neonatal and child survival, reduced malnutrition and incidence of major endemic diseases (malaria, tuberculosis) and stabilized population growth underpinned by a universally accessible, quality and responsive health system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA1 Outcome 2.2 Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2018</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total annual number of deaths (per 100,000 population).</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>80 (2018)</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Mortality Rate.</td>
<td>488/100,000 (2008/9)</td>
<td>150/100,000 (2018)</td>
<td>362 (KDHS 2014)</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under five mortality rate.</td>
<td>74/1000 (2008/9);</td>
<td>35/1000 (2018)</td>
<td>52 (KDHS 2014)</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client satisfaction index.</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>New data not available</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National population growth rate.</td>
<td>2.9% (2009)</td>
<td>2.7 (2018)</td>
<td>2.69 (World Bank Estimate 2014)</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** NUIA- Not Used in Assessment

**Highlights on Comments on Indicators**

**Indicator 1:** It is not clear what which deaths are being monitored. Whether target will be achieved is not known because source of data is not indicated. The information will most likely be available in 2019 with population census. This indicator should be dropped at mid-term.

**Indicator 2:** On track. Great investment has been made on reducing maternal mortality with positive results including in ASAL areas.

**Indicator 3:** On track. Progress has been made and indicator is likely to be achieved in 2018.

**Indicator 4:** On track with great progress but improvement of neo natal off track.

**Indicator 5:** Data on this indicator is not available and it is not known when it will be done. This indicator should be dropped at mid-term.

Indicator 6: This indicator is on track but actual data will only be available after 2019 population census.

Although analysis is at outcome level, the outcome also set some output level indicators that are national in nature with targets that might not be achieved by 2018. Reflection and adjustment is required.

**Output 2.2.1** - % of population accessing services within 5kms of a health facility.

**Output 2.2.2** - % of population consuming adequate diet.

% of health facilities with regular water and electricity.
1.7: Outcome 2.3 Indicators Assessment

**Outcome 2.3: Multi-sectoral HIV and AIDS response:** By 2018, Kenya has reduced socio-economic impact of HIV that is realized through a well-coordinated, effective, efficient and adequately resourced multi-sectoral response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA1 Outcome 2.3 Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2018</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. % rate of national productivity lost as a result of change in quality of life for HIV + people</td>
<td>4.6% of national productivity reduced as a result of HIV (2006)</td>
<td>3.2% (2018)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. National budget by source (a) allocated and (b) % disbursed to the total costed NSP IV for HIV</td>
<td>TBD (2014)</td>
<td>TBD (2018)</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. % of new HIV infections among young women aged 15-24 years</td>
<td>30% (2012)</td>
<td>TBD (2018)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall rating for outcome 2.3 informed by performance of Outcome indicators: Not rated

Key: NUIA- Not Used in Assessment

Highlights on Comments on Indicators

It has not been possible for the MTR team to establish the status of four out of five outcome indicators due to unavailability of data either for the baseline or target or current status. This is an outcome that has outputs disconnected from the outcome indicators because performance based on output rating has been partially achieved. All outcome indicators to be amended in line with KASF M&E framework.

**Indicator 1:** No data is available for indicator 1. The indicator has been proposed for revision by key informants to make it aligned with the KASF M&E framework.

**Indicator 2:** No data is available for indicator 2 on the resources at the moment due to the fact that the National AIDS Spending Assessment (NASA) will be conducted by NACC in 2017.

**Indicator 3:** The Target for 2018 has not yet been known at Mid-term.

**Indicators 4:** While indicator 4 is partially on track, it is unlikely to be achieved by 2018. MTCT rate is 15% at midterm compared to 15% in 2012 and 5% set for 2018. The reason for this is an increase in the number of people living with HIV, who are on treatment as a result of the successful rollout of the ART program. New infections are also not decreasing at the expected rate.

**Indicator 5:** Data not available for 2016.
1.8: Outcome 2.4 Indicators Assessment

**Outcome 2.4: Social Protection**: By 2018 social protection policy and strategies ensure government’s effective leadership role, sustainability of achievement, and promotion of innovation and learning; and the social protection systems are adequately resourced, devolved, well-coordinated, effective, efficient and sustainable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRA1 Outcome 2.4 Indicators</th>
<th>Indicator Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2018</th>
<th>Status by June 2016 and source</th>
<th>Outcome rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Existence of Social protection legislation and Social Protection Strategy.</td>
<td>No (2013);</td>
<td>Social Protection Act and Social Protection Strategy (2015);</td>
<td>1 completed 2 to be completed in 2017</td>
<td>Partially on track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Proportion of poor households accessing social protection.</td>
<td>Social transfers 14%; Social health insurance 26%; Social security 12%; (2010).</td>
<td>50% social transfers; 10% social health insurance; 40% social security 40%</td>
<td>Not yet due</td>
<td>(NUIA) Not applicable at mid-term review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Response time of social protection interventions during and following emergencies.</td>
<td>3 months (2011)</td>
<td>1 month (2017)</td>
<td>No emergencies were declared during the period.</td>
<td>(NUIA) Not applicable at mid-term review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. No. of children accessing child protection services per year, disaggregated by gender and age.</td>
<td>5,000 (2012)</td>
<td>Target 50 000 (2018)</td>
<td>More than 50,000</td>
<td>On track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall rating for outcome 2.4 informed by performance of Outcome indicators: partially on Track.

Key: NUJA- Not Used in Assessment

Highlights on Comments on Indicators

Only two indicators were measured at mid-term

**Indicator 1**: The indicator partially on track with policy processes started but slow. Expected to be completed in 2017.

**Indicator 2**: The indicator is not yet due. Will be accomplished in 2017.

**Indicator 3**: The indicator is not yet due. Will be accomplished in 2017.

**Indicator 4**: The indicator is planned for unforeseen event which might never take place or might take place. This indicator should be dropped at mid-term.

**Indicators 5**: surpassed - 8,777 girls and 12,271 boys 25,035 refugee children in Kakuma (15,175 boys/9,863 girls), and 6,024 conflict affected children (4,105 boys/1,919 girls) in Mandera.

In Kakuma, 5,542 households with 47,718 (25,646 Male and 22,072 female) children were visited for child protection follow up. (Source: CPC data, Wellness Centre data, KRCS data and CPIMS Kavuma).
### 1.9: Outcome 3.1 Indicators Assessment

**Outcome 3.1:** Productive and business environment: By 2018 Kenya's productive and business environment are reformed to effectively nurture local capacities, attract internal and external investments and promote ownership, innovation and entrepreneurship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 3.1 Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2018</th>
<th>Current status</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ratio of Investment to GDP</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>19.565 (2014)</td>
<td>Partially on track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall rating for outcome 3.1 informed by performance of Outcome indicators-partially on track

**Key:** NUIA- Not Used in Assessment

**Highlights on Comments on Indicators**

**Indicator 1:** The indicator is progressing well

**Indicator 2:** Although the target has not been indicated, the amount from baseline increased by 280%. However, the figures available are for 2014.

**Indicator 3:** The indicator is likely to be achieved by 2018

**Indicator 4:** The indicator is worse than when the UNDAF started and will barely be achieved in two years.

**Indicator 5:** No data for measurement. The indicator should be dropped at Mid Term.
1.9: Outcome 3.1 Indicators Assessment

**Outcome 3.2**: Productive sectors and trade: By 2018 productive sectors (agriculture, manufacturing, extractive industry) trade and their value chains are private sector and SME-driven, sustainable, diversified, technologically innovative, commercially oriented and competitive on national regional and global market.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2018</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ratio Current Account Balance to GDP</td>
<td>-7.0 (2009)</td>
<td>-5.0</td>
<td>-10.4</td>
<td>Off Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public spending on agriculture as % of GDP</td>
<td>5.2% (2013)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Value Added (% of GDP)</td>
<td>5.2% (2013)</td>
<td>TBD (2017)</td>
<td>5.6 (2015)</td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Of MSEs that have more than 10 employees</td>
<td>1% (1999)</td>
<td>8% (2017)</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Annual contribution to GDP of Oil and Other Mineral Resources</td>
<td>1% (2013)</td>
<td>3% (2018)</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Annual Export earnings of Oil and Other Mineral Resources</td>
<td>3% (2013)</td>
<td>5% (2018)</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in terms of trade</td>
<td>90.7 (2011, 2000=100)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall rating for outcome 3.1 informed by performance of Outcome indicators-partially on track**

**Key: NUIA- Not Used in Assessment**

Highlights on Comments on Indicators

Indicators in a number of result areas suffer from lack of baselines, targets or data to monitor progress. Another challenge has been that the data sources used for some of the indicators were surveys that the program had no control over and whose data had the possibility of not being available at the end of the program to measure its effectiveness because the collection cycles did not overlap with the program cycle.

Indicator 1 to 9 all need to be adjusted in line with progress made and availability of data by 2018. Those for which data is unlikely should be dropped.

Although analysis is at outcome level, it is important to bring attention to the output indicators which are also at national level and might pose the risk of the UN being seen as failing to reach target. This is true of output 3.2.1 and output 3.2.2 (Food production Index; % change in Consumer Price Index; and target area under irrigation.)
### 1.11: Outcome 3.3 Indicators Assessment

**Outcome 3.3:** Outcome 3.3. Job creation, skills development and working conditions: By 2018 formal and informal sectors in urban and rural economies create employment that is safe, healthy, secure, productive, gainful and that is equitably accessible for women, youth and vulnerable groups; workers have adequate skills to match market demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 3.3 Indicators</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target 2018</th>
<th>Current Status</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No. of jobs created in the formal and informal sector</td>
<td>999,100 new jobs in 2012.</td>
<td>1,000,000 new jobs per year (2018)</td>
<td>841,600 new jobs in 2015</td>
<td>Partially on track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. % Of young people engaged in volunteer programs to gain additional professional experience and skills, disaggregated by gender</td>
<td>Baseline: n/a (2014);</td>
<td>2% (2017)</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Share of women employed in the non-agricultural sector as a percentage of total employment in the non-agricultural sector</td>
<td>36.4% (2012)</td>
<td>70% (2017)</td>
<td>Data not available</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall rating for outcome 3.3 informed by performance of Outcome indicators: Not measured due to lack of data

Key: NUIA- Not Used in Assessment

**Highlights on Comments on Indicators**

**Indicator 1:** The indicator will be retained. It is on track and likely to be achieved by 2018

**Indicator 2:** The baseline data was for 2010. The new figure of 47.5 (2012) should be the new baseline not the target. No available data after 2014. No outputs were undertaken that contributed to this indicator. The indicator and targets should be adjusted.

**Indicator 3:** The indicator is possible to achieve as scheduled. Should be retained

**Indicator 4:** The indicator is on track but no monitoring is being done. The data can be captured by the LMIS.

**Indicator 5:** No data available and unlikely to be achieved by 2018
1.12: Outcome 4.1 Indicator Assessment

**Outcome 4.1:** Policy and Legal Frameworks. By 2016 Kenya has robust policies and legal frameworks linking issues of environment sustainability, climate change and land management to human security and resilience thereby requiring and integrated and coordinated response at all phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>C. Status</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of integrated operational action plans developed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Single integrated Action Plan by 2015</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Partially on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No of reported land and natural resource use conflicts and disaster incidence prone counties</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>30% reduction</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall rating of Performance of Outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partially on Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: NUIA- Not used in Assessment

Highlights on Comments on Indicators

Only 1 out of 2 Indicators could be used

**Indicator 1:** Indicator could have been more explicit and there is also a huge question why the indicator had a time frame of 2015. However, based on the level of work done in the policy areas for Outcome 4.1, this indicator has been used for assessment but with greater focus on the potential for policies recently produces 2015 and 2016, to have Action plans developed.

Indicator 2: This indicator has not been used in the Assessment. It has two indicators in one making it difficult to assess. Also the indicator did not have baseline data.

Overall, outcome indicator for these output were not well thought through. The current outcome indicators do not cover the scope of work under this outcome. There is need to rethink these outcomes and redo them.
1.13: Outcome 4.2 Indicator Assessment

**Outcome 4.2:** Community security and Resilience. By 2018, counties and communities are able to anticipate, prevent and respond effectively to disaster and immerges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>C. Status</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of selected counties that have operational a) risk reduction and b) emergency responses and c) conflict early warning and response information management system</td>
<td>None (2013)</td>
<td>No of counties (2015)</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
<td>NUIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No. of displacements resulting from disaster emergencies:</td>
<td>97,626 natural disasters, 116,074 due to conflict</td>
<td>30% reduction</td>
<td>Data not found yet</td>
<td>On Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of households requiring disaster related food and cash assistance</td>
<td>1.5 ml</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>639,600 (2016)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** NUIA - Not used in Assessment

**Highlights on Comments on Indicators**

Only 3 out of 4 Indicators could be used

**Indicator 1:** The indicator had three separate indicators in one making it difficult to assess. This is despite that he fact that the content of the combined indicators is good. The target is also very unclear. It is set at the output level indicator which looks at numbers. A smart indicator would have looked at actual targets for each element of indicators.

**Indicator 2:** Indicator is good. However, there was no data to inform the target. However, MTR information pointed to the well management of the Elmina which potentially contributed to the management of a potential disaster.

**Indicator 3:** Good indicator. Status data informed by the 2015 Short season Assessment Report. Indicator is on Track. Additional data form UN agencies pointed to a drastic reduction on people requiring food aid. Instead most people prefer resiliency related support.

**Indicator 4:** This indicator was not very well structured. The content is good but there was need to provide quantitative figures in terms of number for the baseline. When percentages are then used, it becomes easier to estimate and calculate form a given baseline. For instance, while statistics point to a 4.49% increase in 2015, it is difficult to appreciate the scale of the increase in the absence of actual statistics.

**Other Observations:** There is need to review some of the statistics for precision, accuracy and compliance to the results chains (RBM).