

**THE 2014-2018 KENYA UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT  
ASSISTANCE FRAMEWORK**

**FINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**Submitted by  
Dr. Annette Ittig  
and  
Dr. Michael Karanja**

**19 December 2017**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am pleased to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the many people who facilitated the research and logistical support for this final evaluation of the 2014-2018 Kenya UNDAF.

I am grateful to members of the UNDAF National Steering Committee Secretariat, including Mr. Moses K. Kanagi, Deputy Director and Head, External Resources Department, Ministry of Finance and Treasury, and Ms. Penina Mukami, Deputy Head of the UN Desk, Ministry of Finance and Treasury, as well as Mr. Tom Mokaya, Head of the UN Desk, Ministry of Finance and Treasury, for their availability for meetings and for their insights into UNDAF processes and programmes. Many thanks are also due to H.E. the Hon. Josephat Nanok, Chairman, Council of Governors and Governor of Turkana, and H. E. the Hon. Mohamed Guled, Chairman, Frontier Counties Development Council Secretariat, for sharing their perspectives on current and proposed activities and partnerships with the UN. I am also indebted to Ambassador Victor C. Ronneberg, Embassy of Norway and Permanent Representative to UNEP and UN-HABITAT; Mr. Hubert Perr, Head of Cooperation, European Union Delegation to Kenya; and Dr. Gandham N. V. Ramana, Program Leader Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda, and Eritrea Country Development, World Bank, for their overviews of the local development assistance context and Development Partner activities.

I would like to thank Mr. Siddharth Chatterjee, the United Nations Resident Coordinator in Kenya, the members of the UN Country Team and the Programme Management Team who provided insights and information about programme partnerships, achievements and challenges; as well as the Resident Coordinator Office, particularly Ms. Jane Oteba, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, for assistance in facilitating key informant interviews and focus group discussions with the UNDAF Strategic Results Area Working Groups and the UN Technical Working Groups, and for providing programme documentation and other UNDAF-related information.

Special thanks are also due to Mr. Arif Neky, Advisor, SDG Partnership Platform, UN Resident Coordinator Office, for information and insights into current and planned UN partnerships with philanthropies and the private sector; and for all of his efforts to arrange meetings with key philanthropic, corporate and civil society stakeholders. In this connection, I also very much appreciate the time given to the evaluators by Mr. Mamdouh Biteye, Executive Director Africa, Rockefeller Foundation; Mr. Irungu Houghton, Executive Director, Chapter One; Dr. Bahaa Eddine Sarroukh, Head of Research Africa, Philips East Africa Ltd.; Mr. Maurice Makaloo, Regional Director, East Africa, Ford Foundation; and Mr. Sriram Bharatam, Founder, Kuza Biashara.

I would particularly like to thank Dr. Michael Karanja, the national consultant for this evaluation, for his production both of the minutes of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> October UN debriefing sessions (see Annexes 5 and 6, below) and of section 2.2.2 in this report, “Key Achievements by Strategic Result Area” (see pp. 25-32, below). Many thanks are also due to Mr. William Elias for his proofreading of and comments on the final draft evaluation report.

I am as well indebted to each of the other UN staff and national, civil society and private sector stakeholders who took time to share information about their expectations of the 2014-2018 UNDAF, their support towards its achievements, and their recommendations for the next UNDAF cycle.

Dr. Annette Ittig  
International Consultant

## ACRONYMS

ABP	Area Based Programming
AIDS	Acquired Immuno-Deficiency Syndrome
AG	Attorney General
AGPO	Access to Government Procurement Opportunities
ANC	Ante-natal Care
ASAL	Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
ASRH	Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health
BOS	Business Operations Strategy
CBF	Common Budgetary Framework
CCA	Common Country Analysis
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CIDP	County Integrated Development Plan
CIMES	County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System
CSO	Civil Society Organizations
CPD	Country Programme Document
CO	Country Office
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DaO	Delivering as One
DP	Development Partner
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DVET	Department of Vocational Education Training
EC	European Commission
ECD	Early Childhood Development
EDE	Ending Drought Emergencies
EFA	Education for All
ESAP	Electoral Security Arrangement Programme
ESD	Education for Sustainable Development
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FFD	Financing for Development
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GER	Gross Enrolment Rate
GESIP	Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan
GFATM	Global Fund for Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria
GoK	Government of Kenya
GRI	Global Reporting Initiative
GTWG	Gender Working Technical Group
HACT	Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers
HDR	Human Development Report
HOA	Head of Agency
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
ICT	Information Communication and Technology
IEBC	Independent and Electoral Boundaries Commission
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development

IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
ILO	International Labour Organization
IOM	International Organization on Migration
IP	Implementing Partner
IPSTC	International Peace Support Training Center
JP	Joint Programme
KASF	Kenya AIDS Strategic Framework
KCEP-CRAL	Kenya Cereal Enhancement Program– Climate Resilience Agricultural Livelihood
KM	Knowledge Management
KNAP	Kenya National Action Plan
KNCCI	Kenya National Chamber of Commerce and Industry
LMIC	Lower Middle Income Country
LMIS	Labour Market Information System
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MEWNR	Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources
MIC	Middle Income Country
MoDP	Ministry of Devolution and Planning
MOEST	Ministry of Education, Science and Technology
MSEA	Micro and Small Enterprise Authority
MSMEs	Medium and Small Micro-enterprises
MTP	Medium Term Plan
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGEC	National Gender and Equality Commission
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NITA	National Industrial Training Authority
NIMES	County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System
NPS	National Police Service
NSC	National Steering Committee
NUDP	National Urban Development Policy
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development
OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
OMT	Operations Management Team
ORPP	Office of Registrar of Political Parties
PLHIV	People Living with HIV and AIDs
PMT	Programme Management Team
PMOG	Programme Management Oversight Group
PMTCT	Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission
PPADA	Public Procurement and Disposal Act
PPP	Public Private Partnership
PWD	People with Disabilities
RBM	Results-Based Management
RC	Resident Coordinator
RMNCAH	Reproductive, maternal, neonatal, child and adolescent health
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal

SG	Secretary General
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SRA	Strategic Result Area
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN Women	United Nations
UNAIDS	United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
UNCG	United Nations Communications Group
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDOCO	United Nations Development Operations Coordination Office
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDS	United Nations Development System
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UN-HABITAT	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for Refugees
UNIC	United Nations Information Centre
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNON	United Nations Office in Nairobi
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
UNRCO	United Nations Resident Coordinator Office
UNSCR	United Nations Security Council Resolution
UNV	United Nations Volunteers
UPR	Universal Periodic Review
USD	United States Dollar
WASH	Water Sanitation and Health
WBE	Women Based Enterprises
WFP	World Food Programme
WG	Working Group
WHO	World Health Organization
YEDF	Youth Enterprise Development Fund

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	2
<b>ACRONYMS</b> .....	3
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	7
<b>1.INTRODUCTION</b> .....	13
1.1 The Kenya Context and National Development Priorities .....	13
1.2 The 2014-2018 Kenya UNDAF.....	15
1.3 Kenya UNDAF Final Evaluation .....	17
<b>2. MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE KENYA UNDAF EVALUATION</b> .....	19
2.1 Relevance of the UNDAF.....	19
2.1.1 UNDAF Design and Alignment with National Priorities .....	19
2.1.2 Integration of the MDGs in the UNDAF.....	21
2.1.3. Integration of Programming Principles in the UNDAF .....	21
2.1.4 Additional Cross-cutting Issues .....	22
2.2 Effectiveness of the UNDAF .....	23
2.2.1 Overall Assessment .....	23
2.2.2 Key Achievements by Outcome Area .....	23
2.2.3 Flagship Programmes .....	31
2.2.4 Coordination.....	32
2.2.5Monitoring and Evaluation.....	35
2.2.6 Partnerships .....	36
2.2.7 Financing .....	36
2.3 Efficiency of the UNDAF.....	39
2.4 Sustainability.....	40
2.5 UN Comparative Advantage .....	40
2.6 DaO Coherence .....	41
<b>3. LESSONS LEARNED</b> .....	44
<b>4. CONCLUSION</b> .....	45
<b>5.RECOMMENDATIONS</b> .....	46
<b>SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	50
<b>ANNEXES</b> .....	52
1 Terms of Reference	
2 Evaluators' Profiles	
3 Schedule of Meetings and Deliverables	
4 List of Persons Interviewed	
5 Summary Minutes UNCT Debriefing Session 19 October 2017	
6 Summary Minutes of UN Technical Staff Debriefing Session 18 October 2017	

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*The Kenya Context and National Development Priorities.* As stated in its long term development plan, the Vision 2030, Kenya intends to graduate from its current lower middle-income country (LMIC) classification to a middle-income country (MIC) by 2030. To date the country has made notable progress towards its MIC goal. It has a dynamic private sector, particularly in the ICT and construction sectors; and its standing in the World Bank's 2017 *Ease of Doing Business* index has risen to the rank of 80 globally, up from 92 in 2016 and 113 in 2015<sup>1</sup>.

Kenya has also confirmed its commitment to the realization of the global 2030 Agenda and to its inclusive, multi-stakeholder partnership approach for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The time line for Kenya's Vision 2030 coincides with the 2030 Agenda, and it thus presents a unique opportunity for the country to blend its progress towards the achievement of its national development priorities with its efforts to realize the SDGs.

In 2016 over 42% of Kenya's estimated 48.5 million population was under the age of 15<sup>2</sup>; and the country's young population could play a key role in the achievement both of the SDGs and of the goals of its Vision 2030. Given current population trends, Kenya should be able to benefit from its youth-based demographic dividend until at least 2050<sup>3</sup>, if the skills taught in school align with those required by the marketplace.

However, Kenya still faces significant development challenges, including its vulnerability to climate change-induced hazards such as drought and floods. Moreover, economic growth has not been inclusive, and it is estimated that nearly 43% of Kenyans still live below the national poverty line of \$1.25/day.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, the rate of unemployment remains high, particularly among women and youth. Finally, gender inequality is still pervasive in the country, although this situation is slowly changing.

The country's achievement of LMIC status also has implications for donor funding, as it is assumed that middle income host countries are able to finance their own development priorities.

One of Kenya's most urgent national development priorities therefore is investment in sustainable solutions for more inclusive and rapid economic growth, including increasing employment and livelihood opportunities for youth, women and the disabled, with the aim of reducing poverty and inequality nationwide. These and other development priorities are presented as outcomes to be achieved within the three Pillars - Political, Social and Economic – of the Government's Vision 2030 and in its current five-year plan, the 2013-2017 Medium Term Plan II.

*The United Nations System in Kenya and the 2014-2018 UNDAF.* The United Nations has had a presence in Kenya since 1996. During the 2014-2018 UNDAF cycle, the UN System (UNS) in Kenya included twenty-

---

<sup>1</sup>Mike Njoroge, "Kenya ranked 3rd in World Bank Ease of Doing Business report", Citizen News, 1 November 2017: <https://citizentv.co.ke/news/kenya-ranked-3rd-in-world-bank-ease-of-doing-business-report-180529/>

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.demographicdividend.org/country\\_highlights/kenya/](http://www.demographicdividend.org/country_highlights/kenya/) However, the country's fertility rate declined from 6.1 children in 1990 to 4.4 children per woman in 2015: op. cit., ibid.

<sup>3</sup> [http://www.demographicdividend.org/country\\_highlights/kenya/](http://www.demographicdividend.org/country_highlights/kenya/)

<sup>4</sup>United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 2016*, p. 218.

three agencies<sup>5</sup>. Beyond the Kenya United Nations Country Team (UNCT), the UNS in Nairobi also includes twelve regional and two global agency headquarters.

The Government of Kenya (GoK) and the UNCT in Kenya launched the 2014-2018 United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in 2014 with the aim of supporting the achievement of national development priorities as well as of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The Kenya UNDAF presents the United Nations System's intended areas of collaboration with national, sub-national and local stakeholders for this period. It is the fourth generation UNDAF in Kenya, and it is the first UNDAF in that country to adopt the Delivering as One (DaO) approach. As of 2017, the total funding requirement for the 2014-2018 UNDAF was US \$ 1,157,059,463.00, of which US \$ 552,733,548.80, had been mobilized as of June 2017.

*The 2014-2018 Kenya UNDAF Final Evaluation.* The 2014-2018 Kenya UNDAF Final Evaluation was commissioned by the UNCT, and technical support was provided by the UN Resident Coordinator's Office (UNRCO). The objective of this consultancy was to conduct the final evaluation of the 2014-2018 Kenya UNDAF based on the detailed Terms of Reference (ToR) presented in **Annex 1**. The Evaluation considers the UNDAF's relevance, its achievements and progress against planned results, the sustainability of its results, and its effectiveness as a coordination and partnership framework and as a resource mobilization mechanism. The findings and recommendations from the 2014-2018 UNDAF evaluation are also intended to inform UN programming, coordination and financing in the next UNDAF cycle (2018-2022).

The primary audiences for whom the evaluation is intended are the UNCT and key GoK counterparts, as well as other Development Partners (DPs), including donors, the private sector, NGOs and civil society.

*Evaluation Scope and Limitations.* The turnover of staff in both UN agencies and in GoK offices since the inception of the current UNDAF hindered the collection of background information on its formulation and early implementation phase. In addition, the inclusion in the UNDAF of several output indicators which were either poorly defined or which lacked baseline data hampered the assessment of its current progress against plan. Moreover, the evaluation period coincided with the preparation period for the 26th October re-run of Kenya's 8th August 2017 presidential election. Some of the GoK partners were therefore not available for consultation during the evaluation period.

*Major Findings of the 2014-2018 Kenya UNDAF Final Evaluation* include:

- **Relevance.** The 2014-2018 UNDAF is both relevant and appropriate to the Kenya context: the UNDAF outcomes are aligned with national development priorities presented in the GoK's MTP II and in the country's Vision 2030 goals; and they also address several contextual development challenges identified in the 2013 *Complementary Country Analysis (CCA)*. The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) have been well integrated into the UNDAF outcome areas, and the UN has leveraged its comparative advantage to advocate for their realization. The most visible MDG accomplishment in Kenya during this UNDAF has been in universal primary education, where there is an achievement rate of 98%. However, the mainstreaming of the Programming Principles, with the exception of capacity building, has been incomplete. Furthermore, despite Kenya's multi-hazard vulnerability, the humanitarian-development nexus has also not been well-considered.

---

<sup>5</sup> The twenty-three agencies represented in the Kenya United Nations Country Team are: 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



- **Design.** The results framework for the current UNDAF is output-based, and it features a large number of outcomes and outputs. Moreover, several of the indicators lack baselines or are poorly defined, and measurement of actual results achieved in some areas is therefore problematic. Furthermore, an output level results framework does not allow for the adjustment of activities in the event of a humanitarian emergency or crisis. Given Kenya's vulnerability to climate change-related disasters, an outcome level UNDAF would allow for greater programmatic flexibility in this country context.
- **Effectiveness.** Under the UNDAF, the UN's advocacy and high level technical expertise has been demonstrated in each of its strategic results areas at both the service delivery and policy levels. However, progress toward the achievement of its planned outcomes is mixed: 33.3% of outcomes have been achieved; 34.8% have been partially achieved; and 31.8% have not been achieved. The constraints to progress most frequently cited by UN respondents were funding shortfalls and the paucity of current, accurate data. The UNDAF's actual achievements have also been under-reported due to a results matrix which incompletely captures outcomes.
- **Efficiency.** Beyond the cost-saving measures carried out under the Operations Management Team (OMT), there is little evidence that the UNDAF has decreased transaction costs. For example, as resource mobilization was primarily conducted for agency-specific activities and not as Delivering as One (DaO), transaction costs were increased for UN agencies, the GoK and donors in terms of greater staff time required for UNDAF-related work.
- **Resource Mobilization.** The UNDAF's effectiveness as a platform for the resource mobilization has been uneven. Significant amounts have been raised for large joint programming initiatives such as elections support and nutrition response, as well as through the finalization of a grant for \$ 290 million from the Global Fund for Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM) for the Kenya HIV response. However, over half of the 2014-2018 UNDAF remains unfunded; the most dramatic funding gap is for activities under SRA 3, "Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth". The traditional resource mobilization strategies relied upon for funding the current UNDAF have clearly not been adequate.
- **Delivering as One.** The Kenya UNCT operationalized DaO in the 2014-2018 UNDAF, and DaO cohesion has been partially developed during this cycle. However, there is still an incomplete understanding of this approach among the UN Kenya team; and only one of the five DaO SOPs have been fully achieved.
- **Sustainability.** The fact that UN advocacy for human rights, access to justice, gender equality and other issues has been institutionalized through the enactment of relevant national policies and legislation suggests that UNDAF results in those areas will be maintained. Moreover, considerable institutional and human capacity building has been undertaken by UN agencies in each of the SRAs in order to increase the sustainability of outcomes. Additionally, there are significant county level resources for development activities as a result of the devolution process, and that also increases the possibility that results achieved to date could be sustained.

*Lessons Learned.* There are several key lessons learned from the 2014-2018 UNDAF which can inform programme planning, financing, coordination, partnerships and implementation in the next UNDAF cycle. These include:

- **Coordination.** Effective programme coordination requires time, funding and commitment to an overarching theory of change. Both the Turkana and the Marsabit Joint Programmes demonstrate that the preparation and inception periods for joint programmes can be lengthy; and that the initial investments of staff time as well as the funding required to establish joint administration and financing mechanisms carry high transaction costs.
- **Comparative Advantage.** A critical self-assessment by the UN of its comparative advantage is essential for realistic programme planning, financing, implementation and sustainable results. The significant funding shortfall in SRA 3 indicates not only the need to revise the financing strategy for this outcome. It also suggests that funders considered other implementing partners had more of a comparative advantage in this area than the UN. However, it is notable that all of the evaluation respondents agreed that the UN had a great comparative advantage over other Development Partners (DPs) in regard to normative work.
- **Gender.** As at least half of the UNDAF's intended beneficiaries are female, gender must be fully integrated into its activities in order to achieve the results anticipated. This will require a strategic approach to the integration of the Gender Programming Principle across all of the UNDAF outcome areas.
- **Private Sector Partnerships.** Identifying, brokering and establishing partnerships requires time, networking skills and perseverance, as well as an alignment of potential partners' expectations. As the UN-private sector partnership in the Joint Programme (JP) Reproductive, Maternal, Neonatal, Child and Adolescent Health (RMNCAH) demonstrates, business should not be considered as a "new donor" for funding projects. Clarity on partnership roles and responsibilities and alignment of both aid and corporate actors' expectations are essential for brokering and sustaining productive partnerships.
- **Financing for Development (FfD).** As the UN is moving from mobilizing grants for project funding to building multi-stakeholder partnerships to finance development investments, navigating the private sector and innovative development financing ecosystems will require raising the UNCT's awareness of the new financing possibilities, e.g. impact investment, social enterprise and "Robin Hood" taxes, among others, in order to choose the funding vehicle(s) most appropriate for the agency, the initiative and the beneficiaries targeted.
- **Devolution.** The devolution process in Kenya has now been realized, and the UN is adjusting to supporting activities at the subnational level in a coherent manner. In this connection, strengthening subnational capacities to manage, implement and report on the services and resources which have been transferred to them must remain a priority during the next UNDAF cycle.

*Conclusion and Recommendations.* The 2014-2018 UNDAF is both relevant and appropriate to the Kenya context: its outcomes are aligned with national development priorities presented in the GoK's MTP II and in the country's Vision 2030 goals; and they also address several contextual development challenges identified in the 2013 *Complementary Country Analysis*. Moreover, the MDGs and other international norms and standards which guide the UN's work are well-integrated into the UNDAF.

In this UNDAF, the UN has effectively leveraged its comparative advantages as an honest broker with strong convening power, as a provider of high level technical expertise; and as an advocate for the MDGs,

the SDGs and for other normative values, to contribute to significant development gains in Kenya in the areas of human development, inclusive economic growth, governance and environmental sustainability.

However, the 2014-2018 UNDAF's actual versus intended achievements have been uneven. UNDAF progress has been constrained by various design, operational and coordination bottlenecks, as well as by funding shortfalls. Moreover, UNDAF achievements have also been under-reported due to a results matrix which incompletely captures outcomes.

The 2014-2018 UNDAF offers several emerging results and lessons learned which can inform programme planning, coordination, communication, financing and implementation in the next UNDAF. In this connection, the select recommendations below<sup>6</sup> have been categorized either as priorities to be undertaken immediately or for implementation over the next twelve to twenty-four months:

#### Recommendations to be undertaken as priorities for the next UNDAF cycle

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
UNDAF Design	Formulate an outcome-based results framework for the 2018-2022 UNDAF to allow greater programmatic flexibility in the event of a humanitarian emergency or crisis, given Kenya' multi-hazard vulnerability.	PMT, M&E TWG, SRA WGs
UNDAF Enablers – OMT	1) Support the Operations Management Team (OMT) with a dedicated budget in order to fulfill its function as an UNDAF enabler 2) Include OMT in UNDAF design process	UNCT, OMT
UNDAF Enablers – UNCG	1) Support the United Nations Communications Group (UNCG) as an UNDAF enabler with a dedicated budget for communications on the UNDAF 2) Include UNCG in UNDAF design process	UNCT, UNCG
Financing; Partnerships	1) Develop a joint UNDAF financing and partnership strategy in collaboration with the GoK through Treasury, including forms of development financing beyond traditional multilateral aid such as non- Development Assistance Committee (DAC) donor funding and blended financing options 2) Include a protocol for agencies on appropriate approaches to donors and other funders and partners in this strategy.	UNCT, Treasury-External Resources Department; SDG Partnership Platform; consultant
Programming – Resilience	1. Ensure that Resilience features prominently in the new UNDAF in a Strategic Results Area 2. Formulate a Joint Programme with a Resilience-building theme, drawing on the collective experience and expertise of the Kenya UNDS, including collaboration with the Global Policy Centre on Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification, among others.	UNCT, PMT, SRA WGs

<sup>6</sup> The complete list of recommendations is presented below in section 5, "Recommendations".

### Recommendations to be implemented during 2018

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
Gender	Develop a UNCT-wide gender strategy to articulate a consistent approach for its integration, monitoring and measurement in all of the SRAs in the next UNDAF cycle	UNCT, Gender Technical Working Group (GTWG), consultant
Development Financing	Convene a day long workshop by an accredited institution for the UNCT to provide them with an intermediate level of understanding on impact investment and other blended financing options and how they can support the achievement of the SDGs.	UNCT; accredited institution
Programming – Turkana Flagship	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Conduct a needs assessment to inform a new project document</li> <li>2) Ensure its alignment with the priorities expressed in the new Turkana County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP) 2018-2023; and with relevant areas of the 2018-2022 UNDAF, and with activities by other Development Partners (DPs) active in Turkana</li> <li>3) Engage a senior Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) to ensure strong programming and reporting coordination of all of the partners working in this Joint Programme</li> <li>4) Propose alternative funding modalities to donors who currently support the Turkana JP agencies' activities and who do not want to channel their future support through the Programme's Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF)</li> <li>5) Include the National Steering Committee (NSC) Secretariat in these processes</li> </ol>	UNRCO, PMT, Turkana Joint Programme agencies, funders, county, NSC Secretariat, consultant

### Recommendations to be implemented during 2018 and 2019

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
Capacity Building; working in a devolved context	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Conduct an UNDAF-wide assessment of institutional and individual capacity building support to the GoK during the 2014-2018 UNDAF to determine its outcomes and to identify any gaps in it</li> <li>2) Based on this assessment, and in liaison with other DPs, develop an UNDAF-wide strategy for national and subnational institutional capacity building, in order to increase the sustainability of UNDAF outcomes, as well as to reduce duplication of other DPs' initiatives</li> </ol>	PMT, M&E WG, SRA WGs, consultant

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Overview of the Kenya Context and National Development Priorities.

The East African nation of Kenya is that region's largest and most diversified economy. As stated in its long-term development plan, the Vision 2030, Kenya intends to graduate from its current lower middle-income country (LMIC) classification<sup>7</sup> to a middle-income country (MIC) by 2030. To achieve MIC status by that year, Kenya has targeted a ten percent annual economic growth rate in its 2013-2017 Medium Term Plan (MTP) II, which is its current five-year plan under the Vision 2030.

Kenya has confirmed its commitment to the achievement of the global 2030 Agenda and to its inclusive, multi-stakeholder partnership approach for the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The time line for Kenya's Vision 2030 coincides with the 2030 Agenda, and it thus presents a unique opportunity for the country to blend its progress towards the achievement of its national development priorities with its efforts to realize the SDGs.

To date Kenya has made notable progress towards its MIC goal. It has a dynamic private sector, particularly in the ICT and construction sectors;<sup>8</sup> and its standing in the World Bank's 2017 *Ease of Doing Business* index has risen to the rank of 80 globally, up from 92 in 2016 and 113 in 2015<sup>9</sup>.

The country's economy is primarily service-based. Although agriculture is its main export earner and employer, with approximately 60% of the population employed directly or indirectly in this sector<sup>10</sup>, it contributes only some 20% of Kenya's real gross domestic product (GDP)<sup>11</sup>. The industrial sector accounts for approximately 16%, and services more than 63%, of real GDP.<sup>12</sup>

In 2016 over 42% of Kenya's estimated 48.5 million population was under the age of 15<sup>13</sup>; and the country's young population could play a key role in the achievement both of the SDGs and of the goals of its Vision 2030. Given current population trends, Kenya should be able to benefit from its youth-based demographic dividend<sup>14</sup> until at least 2050<sup>15</sup>, if the skills taught in school align with the skills required by the marketplace.

---

<sup>7</sup> Kenya was reclassified as a lower middle income country in September 2014 when, as a result of the statistical re-basing exercise, its per capita GDP was calculated to have increased from \$994 to \$1,256, which is above the World Bank threshold for middle income status: World Bank, *Kenya: A Bigger, Better Economy*, 30 September 2014: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2014/09/30/kenya-a-bigger-better-economy>

<sup>8</sup> Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, *Kenya Economic Survey 2017*, Nairobi, 2017, pp. 24, 28-29, 259, 271

<sup>9</sup> Mike Njoroge, "Kenya ranked 3rd in World Bank Ease of Doing Business report", Citizen News, 1 November 2017: <https://citizentv.co.ke/news/kenya-ranked-3rd-in-world-bank-ease-of-doing-business-report-180529/>

<sup>10</sup> Ministry of Devolution and Planning, Government of Kenya, *Millennium Development Goals Status Report for Kenya 2013*, p.1

<sup>11</sup> African Development Bank Group, *Kenya Country Strategy Paper 2014-2018*, February 2014, p. 2: [https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/2014-2018\\_-\\_Kenya\\_Country\\_Strategy\\_Paper.pdf](https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/2014-2018_-_Kenya_Country_Strategy_Paper.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> Op. cit., ibid.

<sup>13</sup> [http://www.demographicdividend.org/country\\_highlights/kenya/](http://www.demographicdividend.org/country_highlights/kenya/) However, the country's fertility rate declined from 6.1 children in 1990 to 4.4 children per woman in 2015: op. cit., ibid.

<sup>14</sup> Rapid economic growth caused by an increase in the proportion of the working-age population relative to the dependent population<sup>14</sup>

<sup>15</sup> [http://www.demographicdividend.org/country\\_highlights/kenya/](http://www.demographicdividend.org/country_highlights/kenya/)

Kenya is a presidential republic with a unicameral legislature. The country's current President is Uhuru Kenyatta, who was re-elected for a second term on 26 October 2017 in a re-run of the nullified 8 August presidential election. In 2013 the country commenced a comprehensive devolution process<sup>16</sup> which should facilitate enhanced service delivery at the subnational level as well as potentially elevate millions of its people out of poverty.

However, Kenya's development gains could be dramatically reversed by various internal as well as external threats, for example, the challenges associated with corruption and weak governance, or the climate change-induced hazards to which the country is particularly prone such as drought and floods. Recently, political tensions increased in advance of August presidential and parliamentary elections; with the subsequent annulment of the presidential results by the Kenya Supreme Court; and with the October election re-run.

Kenya's graduation from LMIC to MIC status by 2030 will therefore require prioritized and sustained efforts to build resilience<sup>17</sup> at national, sub-national and local levels in order to minimize both human and economic loss from man-made crises and disaster and climate change-related events.

There are also other significant development challenges. Economic growth has not been inclusive, and it is estimated that nearly 43% of Kenyans still live below the national poverty line of \$1.25/day.<sup>18</sup> Moreover, the rate of unemployment remains high, particularly among women and youth<sup>19</sup>. Tourism, one of Kenya's largest foreign exchange earners, contracted due to security concerns following the 2013 Westgate attack. While this sector showed signs of recovery in early 2017, it has again declined due election-related issues.<sup>20</sup> Additionally, the country's achievement of LMIC status has implications for donor funding, as it is assumed that middle income host countries are able to finance their own development priorities.

Finally, gender inequality is still pervasive in the country, although this situation is slowly changing. According to the 2016 *Human Development Report*, Kenya has a Gender Inequality Index rating of

---

<sup>16</sup> The devolution process was presented in the 2010 Kenyan Constitution as well as in the County Government Act of 2012: it assigns service delivery in key sectors such as water, health care and agriculture to county governments, and it also grants them the power to levy taxes and fees. Devolution was officially launched in March 2013, and it included elections for 47 new county assemblies and county governors: Oxford Business Group, op. cit.

<sup>17</sup> "The ability of a system, community or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate, adapt to, transform and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions through risk management": United Nations General Assembly A/71/644, *Draft Report of the Open-ended intergovernmental expert working group on indicators and terminology relating to disaster risk reduction*, December 2016, p.21

<sup>18</sup> United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 2016*, p. 218.

<sup>19</sup> Kenya's 2010 National Constitution categorizes youth as those between the ages of 18 and 35; however, according to the United Nations and other internationally accepted definitions, youth are considered to be those persons aged 15–24 years. According to the HDR 2016, the youth unemployment rate in Kenya is 17.6%: p. 240.; but other estimates are higher: "...youth unemployment is estimated as high as 35%, compared to the overall national unemployment rate of 9.2%; and with 80% of unemployed Kenyans below 35 years old.": *UNDAF Annual Report July 2016-June 2017*, p. 12

<sup>20</sup> "...security threats and travel advisories issued regarding the country led to an 11.1% y-o-y drop in international arrivals in 2014, according to official data released in May 2015. A further contraction of 16.9% for the first 9 months of the year was posted in 2015. Oxford Business Group, *The Report: Kenya 2016*: <https://www.oxfordbusinessgroup.com/overview/rising-star-economy-growing-and-moving-full-speed-ahead>

0.565, with a ranking of 135 out of the 188 countries listed in the HDR<sup>21</sup>; and women and girls' access to healthcare, education, land and productive resources remains less than men's, due to discriminatory practices and cultural bias.

One of Kenya's most urgent national development priorities is therefore investment in sustainable solutions for more inclusive and rapid economic growth, including increasing employment and livelihood opportunities for youth, women and the disabled, with the aim of reducing poverty and inequality nationwide. These and other development priorities are presented as outcomes to be achieved within three Pillars - Political, Social and Economic – of the Government's Vision 2030 and of its current five-year plan, the 2013-2017 MTP II.

## **1.2 The 2014-2018 UNDAF**

With the aim of supporting the achievement of the GoK's development priorities, the Government and the United Nations Country Team Kenya (UNCT) launched the 2014-2018 Kenya United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) in 2014. The Kenya UNDAF presents the United Nations System's intended areas of collaboration with national, sub-national and local stakeholders for this period. It is the fourth generation UNDAF in Kenya, and it is the first in that country to adopt the Delivering as One (DaO) approach.

The 2014-2018 Kenya UNDAF was designed to align with the GoK's national development priorities, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and with other key internationally agreed development goals and principles. The Kenya UNDAF provides a common operational framework for development activities upon which UN organisations can formulate their programmes, either as individual agencies or jointly. In addition, although the Kenya UNDAF does not capture all UN agencies' activities,<sup>22</sup> it is expected that its results matrix will include most of the UN system's interventions there.<sup>23</sup>

The 2014-2018 UNDAF presents four interrelated thematic areas through which the UN system can respond most effectively to Kenya's development priorities:

1. Transformational Governance
2. Human Capital Development
3. Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth
4. Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security

The four UNDAF SRAs include thirteen outcomes and twenty-three outputs.

The UNDAF SRAs are intended to align with the three Pillars - Political, Social and Economic - of the Government's Vision 2030 and with its current five-year plan, the 2013-2017 MTP II. Selection of the UNDAF SRA outcomes was also informed by the contextual development challenges identified in the

---

<sup>21</sup> UNDP, *Human Development Report*, 2016, p. 216

<sup>22</sup>The UNDAF does not capture all UN agencies' activities as some agencies, including WFP, UNHCR, and UNIDO, have undertaken projects outside of it.

<sup>23</sup> "The UNDAF results matrix should contain the majority of the UN system's interventions in a country, all of which should contribute to the achievement of UNDAF strategic priorities in support of national sustainable development goals. When an organization undertakes specific activities that do not fit under any strategic priority, they should be detailed here only under exceptional circumstances. An example is the antimicrobial resistance work of the World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Organization for Animal Health, which is not always possible to integrate under a specific outcome." UNDG, *UNDAF Guidance 2017*, footnote 27.

2013 *Complementary Country Analysis (2013 CCA)*<sup>24</sup>, and by the comparative advantages of the UN presented in a pre-UNDAF assessment<sup>25</sup>. The extent to which the UNDAF addressed challenges presented in the 2013 CCA is considered below, under 2.2.2, “Key Achievements by Strategic Results Area”. The UN’s comparative advantage is discussed further under 2.5, “UN Comparative Advantage”.

A Working Group (WG) was established for each of the four UNDAF SRAs. Each SRA WG is co-chaired by the lead UN agency’s Head of Agency (HoA) and by the Permanent Secretary of the lead GoK ministry for that outcome:

SRA	UN Co-Chairs	GoK Co-Chair
Transformational Governance	Lead: United Nations Development Program Co-Leads: United Nations Office of Drug Control and UN Women	Ministry of Devolution and Planning
Human Capital Development	Lead: United Nations Children’s Fund Co-Leads: World Health Organization and World Food Program	Ministry of Health & Ministry of Education, Science and Technology
Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth	Lead: United Nations Industrial Development Organization , Co-Leads: International Labour Organization (ILO) & Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	Ministry of Industrialization and Enterprise Development
Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security	Lead: United Nations Environment Program Co-Leads: UNHABITAT and United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization (UNESCO)	Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources

The SRA WGs are responsible for the operationalization of the UNDAF; and they report to the UNCT, which has overall responsibility for the delivery of UNDAF results. The implementation of the UNDAF is guided by two-year rolling work plans which outline the detailed activities, budgets and partners responsible for implementation.

The resources required for the 2014-2018 UNDAF were originally estimated at US \$ 1.2 billion.<sup>26</sup> As this UNDAF was formulated in 2013, a year in which there was a severe, widespread drought, it is not surprising that the largest portion of its planned budget was accounted for by Outcome 4.2, *Community Security and Resilience*, which includes Disaster Risk Reduction and Management.

<sup>24</sup> Kenya UNCT, *Complementary Country Analysis*, 2013. The objective of the 2013 CCA was to identify areas upon which the UNCT could focus and prioritize its interventions in Kenya, and thereby to provide the evidence base for the formulation of the 2014-2018 UNDAF. The fourteen areas identified in the analysis were: Rights and Gender Mainstreaming; Inclusiveness and Reaching the Most Vulnerable; Infrastructure Development; Risk Reduction and Climate Change; Social Protection and Safety Nets; Physical Security; Land Reform and Conflict Resolution; Corruption and Procurement Reform; Economic Development; Devolution; Capacity Building; Partnerships and Coordination; Data, Monitoring and Evaluation; Funding Alignment: pp. 64-66

<sup>25</sup> C. Soriano, *Future UN Comparative Advantage Kenya*, Nairobi, May 2013.

<sup>26</sup> 2014-2018 Kenya UNDAF; UNDAF Annual Report, 2017, p. 5



### **1.3. The 2014-2018 Kenya UNDAF Final Evaluation**

#### **1.3.1 Evaluation objectives and scope**

The final evaluation of the 2014-2018 Kenya UNDAF was jointly commissioned by the UNCT and the Government of Kenya. It was conducted in collaboration with the UNDAF NSC and the United Nations Resident Coordinators Office (UNRCO). The objective of this assignment was to conduct the final evaluation of the 2014-2018 Kenya UNDAF based on the detailed terms of reference (ToR) presented in **Annex 1<sup>27</sup>**.

The evaluation has taken into consideration the UNDAF's continued relevance as well as its achievements against planned results; efficiency, the sustainability of its results; its effectiveness as a coordination and partnership framework and a resource mobilization mechanism. The evaluation is intended to provide lessons learned and actionable, forward-looking recommendations to the UNCT, and to inform the design and implementation of the next UNDAF cycle. As both a midterm review of the 2014-2018 UNDAF (UNDAF MTR 2016) and the UNDAF Annual Report for July 2016-July 2017 provide recent information on UNDAF activities and outputs, this final evaluation is meant to be a macro-level, summative assessment with a light programme review.

The evaluation has considered both overall strategic issues related to the UNDAF and to the UN system in Kenya, in addition to progress towards planned UNDAF outcomes. It has two main components: the analysis of development results and the strategic positioning of the UNCT. For each component, findings and assessment are presented according to the set criteria provided in the methodology.

The primary audiences for whom the evaluation is intended are the UNCT and key GoK counterparts, as well as Development Partners, NGOs, civil society and the private sector.

The UNRCO has supported the evaluation at the technical level, including the provision of UNDAF-related documentation and the facilitation of meetings with key UN and GoK staff, Development Partners and civil society and private sector stakeholders.

#### **1.3.2 Evaluation Methodologies – Document Reviews, Key Informant Interviews, Focus Group Discussions, UN Debriefing Sessions.**

The evaluation has employed an inclusive, participatory approach; and it follows the United Nations Development Group's (UNDG) *Guidelines for UNDAF Evaluations* as well as the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria. It also complies with the United Nations Evaluation Group's *Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation* principles. Moreover, the evaluation has followed a human rights-based approach through consultations with both duty bearers and rights holders.

The evaluation has been informed by a literature review, key informant interviews, focus group discussions (FGDs), and in-house debriefing presentations for the UNCT and for UN technical staff. This mixed methodological approach has allowed triangulation of qualitative and quantitative data. Broader stakeholder validation of the evaluation has been undertaken through comments received on the draft evaluation report.

---

<sup>27</sup> Although the current UNDAF cycle will not be completed until June 2018, this final evaluation of the 2018-2022 Kenya UNDAF, which was conducted from 6 September – 19 October 2017, assesses activities only up to that date.

The consultants interviewed 85 persons for the 2014-2018 UNDAF final evaluation. The list of UN, GoK, donor, civil society and private sector stakeholders interviewed is presented below in **Annex 3, “List of Persons Interviewed”**. Summary minutes from the two internal debriefing sessions, including names of the participants, are given below in **Annex 5, “Summary Minutes from 18<sup>th</sup> October Debriefing”** and **Annex 6, “Summary Minutes from 19<sup>th</sup> October Debriefing”**. Feedback from the debriefings has also been included in this report.

A systematic purposive sampling approach was used to select the persons to be interviewed. The selection was based on the stakeholder mapping undertaken during the inception phase of the evaluation by the consultants. This selection was further refined during the course of the evaluation, depending upon respondents’ accessibility and availability.

### **1.3.3 Evaluation Scope and Limitations**

The turnover of staff in both UN agencies and in GoK offices since the inception of the current UNDAF hindered the collection of background information on its formulation and early implementation phase. In addition, the inclusion in the UNDAF of several output indicators which were either poorly defined or which lacked baseline data hampered the assessment of its current progress against plan. Moreover, the evaluation period coincided with the preparation period for the 26th October re-run of Kenya’s 8th August 2017 presidential election. Some of the GoK partners were therefore not available for consultation during the evaluation period. Security restrictions on travel within downtown Nairobi due to pre-election demonstrations also curtailed some of the interviews planned with GoK stakeholders.

Finally, the attribution of outcomes to the UNDAF, including “... the *impact* of UNDAF on the lives of the poor, i.e. ... whether there is any major change ... that can reasonably be attributed to or be associated with UNDAF...”<sup>28</sup>, is complicated by the fact that the UNDAF captures only initiatives conducted by or on behalf of the UN; it excludes activities carried out by other development partners which could have also contributed to results. The UNDAF also does not include all UN agency activities<sup>29</sup>. In addition, there is a lack of counterfactual evidence that would indicate what development results might have been achieved in the absence of the UNDAF.

---

<sup>28</sup> Annex 1, TOR, section 2.1 (f), below.

<sup>29</sup> E.g. WFP estimates that some 50% of its work is humanitarian, and this is not reflected in the UNDAF: UN respondent interview, 15 September 2017

## 2. MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE UNDAF EVALUATION

### 2.1 Relevance

- How well is the UNDAF aligned to National Development Priorities?
- How well is the UNDAF aligned with international goals and treaties?

#### 2.1.1 The UNDAF Design and Its Alignment with National Priorities

Although the formulation of the 2014-2018 UNDAF was completed prior to the finalization of the MTP II, its four SRAs are broadly in alignment with MTP Pillars and/or sub-Pillars<sup>30</sup>, as indicated in the table below:

**UNDAF Alignment with National Development Priorities**

MTP II Pillars and Relevant Sub-Pillar Thematic Areas	UNDAF SRAs	SRA and MTP II Pillar/Sub Pillar Alignment
<b>I – Economic</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tourism</li> <li>2. Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries</li> <li>3. Trade</li> <li>4. Manufacturing</li> <li>5. Business Process Outsourcing and IT-Enabled Services</li> <li>6. Financial Services</li> <li>7. Oil and other Mineral Resources</li> </ol>	<b>I - Transformational Governance</b>	
	1. Policy and Institutional Frameworks	III.1, III.2
	2. Democratic participation, Human Rights	III.2
	3. Devolution and accountability	III.1
	4. Evidence and Rights-based Decision Making	III.2
<b>II – Social</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Education and Training</li> <li>2. Health</li> <li>3. Environment Water and Sanitation</li> <li>4. Population, Urbanisation and Housing</li> <li>5. Gender, Vulnerable Groups and Youth</li> <li>6. Sports, Culture and Arts</li> </ol>	<b>II - Human Capital Development</b>	
	1. Education and Learning	II.1
	2. WASH, Nutrition, Health	II.2
	3. HIV and AIDS	II.2
	4. Social Protection	II.5
<b>III – Political</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Devolution</li> <li>2. Governance and Rule of Law</li> </ol>	<b>III - Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth</b>	
	1. Productive and business environment	I.2
	2. Productive sectors and trade	I.2, I.3

<sup>30</sup> Although the UNDAF was initiated before the Kenya Aids Strategic Framework was announced in 2015, the relevant parts of the UNDAF were aligned with this policy shortly afterwards.

	IV-Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security	
	1. Policy and Legal Frameworks	II.3, II.4
	2. Community Security, Resilience	II.3, II.4, III.2

As the 2018-2022 UNDAF will be formulated after the final drafting of the GoK’s 2018-2023 Medium Term Plan III, it is expected that it will be better aligned to the national development priorities outlined in the new five-year plan.

In terms of its design, the results framework for the current UNDAF is output-based, and it features a large number of outcomes and outputs. Moreover, several of the indicators lack baselines or are poorly defined, and measurement of actual results achieved in some areas is therefore problematic.

The large number of indicators is in part related to the fact that some agencies<sup>31</sup> had already developed their Country Programme Documents (CPDs) before the formulation of the UNDAF; and they subsequently needed to reflect, or retrofit, those priorities in the results matrix. The large number of indicators may have also raised expectations about the extent of the UN’s support to development results, particularly at the county level.<sup>32</sup> Rather than an output level framework, the 2017 UNDAF *Guidance* recommends that the new generation of UNDAFs utilize an outcome-based results matrix.<sup>33</sup>

An outcome level UNDAF would also allow for greater programmatic flexibility and the adjustment of outputs and activities in the event of a humanitarian emergency or crisis, given Kenya’s multi-hazard vulnerability. The current UNDAF has not proved flexible on humanitarian-related activities, and opportunities to integrate transitional, recovery, disaster risk reduction (DRR) and disaster risk management (DRM) activities have been missed. Management of the humanitarian-development nexus is a global concern for the United Nations System, and the ways in which it has been handled elsewhere could inform how this is handled in the 2018-2022 UNDAF (see also below, section 2.1.4, “Cross-cutting issues: Resilience”).<sup>34</sup>

<sup>31</sup> For example, for UNDP, WFP, UNICEF and UNFPA, the so-called Ex-Board agencies - the usual deadlines for the submission of draft CPDs to their respective Boards are in February and March of the last year of the UNDAF cycle. The draft CPDs are presented to the Boards for consideration in June, with their final approval in September. This timeline does not, however, always align with the formulation of the new UNDAF.

<sup>32</sup> Telephone interviews with subnational DPs, 13 and 19 October 2017

<sup>33</sup> **“Minimum Requirements of UNDAFs.....Decide on the UNDAF strategic priorities, based on the 6 and UN Vision 2030**, and supported by an overarching UNDAF theory of change, a corresponding results matrix at the **outcome level** and the medium-term Common Budgetary Framework (CBF). The UNDAF outcomes are the basis for aligning specific organizational programming documents with the UNDAF. The UNDAF outcome indicators, baselines and targets are linked to other intergovernmental reporting processes such as SDG reports and human rights mechanisms.”: UNDG, *Guidance UNDAF 2017*, p. 19

<sup>34</sup> See, for example, the Nepal UNDAF 2018-2022 results framework outcome for “Resilience, DRR, Climate Change”: By 2022, environmental management, sustainable recovery and reconstruction, and resilience to climate change and natural disaster are strengthened at all levels: [http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Executive%20Board/2017/Second-regular-session/DPDCPNPL3\\_UNDAF%20Result%20Framework\\_2018-2022.pdf](http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Executive%20Board/2017/Second-regular-session/DPDCPNPL3_UNDAF%20Result%20Framework_2018-2022.pdf)

Moreover, the SRAs vary in cohesion and coherence. For example, SRA 4 includes quite diverse sectors and components. The linkage between them is not always clear, and it appears that this part of the results framework was formulated from a collection of separate agency work plans without an overarching logic or theory of change.

Finally, as the strategic framework for the UN's work in Kenya, the UNDAF should also link with other DPs' country strategies, e.g. with the World Bank's country strategy for Kenya, among others. However, duplication of activities in certain sectors by the UN with those of other DPs, for example, in the area of capacity building, indicates that this kind of ecosystem approach was not fully utilized in the design of the 2014-2018 UNDAF.

### **2.1.2 Integration of the MDGs in the UNDAF**

The MDGs and their achievement are referenced in each of the 2014-2018 UNDAF SRAs. The most visible MDG outcome in Kenya during this UNDAF cycle has been in the area of universal primary education, where there is an achievement rate of 98%.

The Agenda 2030, the international post-2015 aid agenda, was introduced during the course of the current UNDAF; and there was a transition from the MDGs to the SDGs. Although the 2018-2022 UNDAF will be Kenya's first post-MDGs, SDG-focused UNDAF, an assessment undertaken in the 2016 UNDAF MTR found that the 2014-2018 UNDAF SRAs were already well aligned to the SDGs.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, the UN SDG Technical Working Group (TWG) is already supporting Government to develop its road map for SDG achievement, including SDG localization and integration into national and subnational development plans through, respectively, the Ministry of Devolution and Planning (MoDP) and the Council of Governors.

### **2.1.3 Integration of UN Programming Principles into the UNDAF**

The five UN Programming Principles of Capacity Development, Results-based Management (RBM), Environmental Sustainability, Gender Equality and Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) are intended to guide UNDAF planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation (M&E), as well as to focus the UN's support to national development priorities.

The Programming Principle which features most prominently in the 2014-2018 UNDAF is capacity building. Capacity building is referenced in each SRA at the enabling environment level, through support to the development of legislation and policies; at the organizational level and at the individual level, through training activities. Capacity building activities under this UNDAF have, however, been project-specific. Their outcomes across the SRAs have not yet been assessed, nor has how they synergized with capacity building by other DPs, for example, the World Bank's capacity building support to the development of County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs).

The other Programming Principles of Gender Equality, HRBA, RBM and Environmental Sustainability are less visible in the 2014-2018 UNDAF. For example, gender is not fully desegregated in either the indicators or the results, e.g. among others, SRA outcome 2.1, *Education and Learning*, Output 5. *# of out of school children (age 6-18:)* Baseline 1.010m (2013); Target TBD (2018); MoV: NIEMIS /MICS/UIS. In addition, HRBA, which features prominently in SRA 1, is less explicit and less measurable in the other SRAs.

---

<sup>35</sup> 2016 UNDAF Midterm Review, Annex 5, "Alignment of UNDAF SRAs to Sustainable Development Goals", pp. 124-133.

The incomplete mainstreaming of the programming principles into the current UNDAF and the difficulty in measuring their outcomes is related to the lack of SMART indicators through which the degree of the improvements anticipated from their integration could be assessed. Reporting by the SRA WGs has therefore focused more on individual programming principles within a single activity rather than as cross-cutting UNDAF themes.

A thorough review of the forthcoming 2018-2022 UNDAF document by the GTWG, M&E TWG, the OHCHR and other relevant subject specialists could inform greater mainstreaming and measurement of the modified Integrated Programming Principles which feature in the post-2015 UNDAFs.<sup>36</sup>

#### **2.1.4 Additional Cross-cutting Issues**

In addition to the Programming Principles, which are intended to be cross-cutting, there are other themes which are of overarching for development programming in the current Kenya context. It will therefore be critical to incorporate them into the outcome levels of the next UNDAF in order to support the achievement of the GoK's national development priorities. These are:

- **Resilience.** The formulation and early implementation of the 2014-2018 UNDAF coincided with the winding down of the UN's architecture for humanitarian coordination. Partly as result of this, the humanitarian-development nexus has not been well-considered in the current UNDAF; and most of the UN agencies' humanitarian-related activities are undertaken outside of the UNDAF. For example, the UNHCR-led Kenya Comprehensive Refugee Programme, which has cost approximately US\$300 million per year, is the largest UN joint programming initiative in Kenya; but it was not included in the current UNDAF. Given Kenya's multi-hazard vulnerability, humanitarian preparedness must be integrated into longer term disaster risk reduction strategies and programmes. Resilience-building is an issue which must therefore feature prominently in new UNDAF at the outcome level, beyond its inclusion in all post-2015 UNDAFs as an element of the Integrated Programming Principles.<sup>37</sup>
- **Youth.** Although both the MTP II and the UNDAF identify youth as critical targets, and youth feature as beneficiaries in each of the SRAs, there is no clear strategy for mainstreaming youth employment readiness and job creation in the UNDAF. Given the urgency of creating jobs and other income streams for the ever-increasing numbers of youth entering the employment market annually in Kenya, it will be crucial for Government, in partnership with all DPs and the private sector, to intensify their efforts in this area in order to realize its demographic dividend potential.
- **Devolution.** Although the devolution process was rolled out in 2013, further strengthening subnational capacities to manage, implement and report on devolved services and resources remains a priority. This will require that the UN reconsider how to support activities at the subnational level in a coherent manner, including whether some of the area-based

---

<sup>36</sup> The five pre-2015 UNDAF Programming Principles continue to be key cross-cutting issues in the new generation of post-2015 UNDAFs: four have been modified into the Integrated Programming Principles of leave no one behind; human rights, gender equality and women's empowerment; sustainability and resilience; and accountability. The fifth, capacity building, is included in post-2015 UNDAFs as one of the approaches for delivering the Integrated Programming Principles<sup>36</sup>. It will therefore also remain an important theme in future UNDAF interventions

<sup>37</sup> See UNDAF *Guidance* 2017, pp. 11-12:

programming approaches which have successfully been applied nationally in other devolved contexts<sup>38</sup> could be replicated nationwide in Kenya.

## **2.2 Effectiveness of the UNDAF**

In this section, the evaluation considers

- The extent to which planned UNDAF outcomes have been achieved
- To what extent has the UNDAF supported National Development Priorities

### **2.2.1 Overall Assessment**

At the end of penultimate year of this UNDAF cycle, the UN's technical and policy advice, advocacy and capacity building interventions have contributed to significant development gains in Kenya in the areas of human development, inclusive economic growth, governance and environmental sustainability. Progress towards the achievement of its outcomes, however, is mixed: 33.3% have been achieved; 34.8% have been partially achieved; and 31.8% have not been achieved. These results are summarized in the table below.

As discussed above in section 2.1.1, "UNDAF Design and Its Alignment with National Priorities", the less than anticipated rate of progress towards planned UNDAF results is due in part to several indicators that were either not well-defined or that lacked baselines. Their current state of achievement therefore cannot be measured. Consequently, not all of the UNDAF's actual achievements have been captured.

The constraints to progress that were most frequently cited by UN actors were funding shortfalls and the paucity of current, accurate data. Factors related to funding gaps are considered below, in 2.2.6, "Financing"; and issues related to data quality are discussed in 2.2.4, "Monitoring and Evaluation".

### **2.2.2 2014-2018 UNDAF Results by Strategic Results Areas\*\***

Percentages were derived mainly from analysis of pre-assessments of outcome indicators by Strategic Results Area teams and Mid-Term Review (MTR) findings, progress reports and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with SRAs representatives. There was a total of 13 outcome areas and 66 outcome indicators which were assessed and results are as shown in the following Table. Some of the indicators identified in 2016 UNDAF MTR as 'not used in assessment' were used during this evaluation and they indicate some progress made in those areas since the MTR; and they also support qualitative data from interviews conducted by the consultants for the final evaluation.

---

<sup>38</sup> E.g., the National Area Based Development Programme (NABDP) in Afghanistan which was initiated in 2002 as a joint UNDP-Ministry of Rural Rehabilitation and Development intervention. The NABDP is operative in all 34 provinces of Afghanistan, and its third implementation phase ended in 2015: <http://www.af.undp.org/content/afghanistan/en/home/library/ProjectSummaires/NABDP.html>

\*\* I am indebted to Michael Karanja, the National Consultant, for his production of Section 2.2.2, "Key Achievements by Strategic Results Area", on pp. 23-31 of this report, including the table on p. 24: Annette Ittig, Team Leader, Kenya UNDAF final evaluation

Results area	Progress of Outcome indicators		
SRA/Outcome Area	% Achieved	% Partially Achieved	% Not used in Assessment
SRA 1 - Transformational Governance			
1.1 Policy and Institutional Framework	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%
1.2 Democratic participation and human rights	40.0%	20.0%	40.0%
1.3 Devolution and accountability	100%	0.0%	0.0%
1.4 Evidence and Rights Based Decision Making	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%
SRA 2 – Human Capital Development			
2.1 Education and Learning	66.7%	16.7%	16.7%
2.2 WASH, Nutrition & Health	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%
2.3 HIV & AIDS	0.0%	40.0%	60.0%
2.4 Social Protection	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%
SRA 3 - Inclusive and sustainable economic growth			
3.1 Productive and business environment	40.0%	40.0%	20.0%
3.2 Productive sectors and trade	0.0%	44.4%	55.6%
3.3 Inclusive and sustainable economic growth	20.0%	20.0%	60.0%
SRA 4 - Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security			
4.1 Policy and Legal Frameworks	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%
4.2 Community Security and Resilience	33.3%	50.0%	16.7%
Overall achievement	33.3%	34.8%	31.8%



### **SRA 1. Transformational Governance (GoK Lead: MoDP; Lead UN Agency: UNDP)**

The 2013 Complementary Country Analysis (CCA) identified various transformational governance challenges including devolutions challenges<sup>39</sup>, lack of protection of interests of women and other marginalized groups, lack of inclusive participation in governance and poor institutional capacity for implementation. It relates to Medium Term Plan political pillar which focuses on devolution and Governance and the rule of law, and also the social pillar on gender and vulnerable groups. There have been major UN achievements in this area that include enhancement<sup>40</sup> of Kenya's policy and institutional framework for governance. The key policies/laws include: National Human Rights Policy Sessional Paper No 3 of 2014; National Policy and Action Plan for Human Rights in 2015; Gender and Development Policy; Legal Aid Act of 2016; Small Claims Court Act of 2016; National Policy on Prevention and Response to Gender Based Violence; Gender and Development Policy; Over 30 policies and guidelines by the National Police Service (NPS); Prevention of Torture Act; Community Land Act; Land Laws Amendment Act; Election Laws (Amendment) Act 2016; Electoral Offences Act 2016; seven (7) electoral process legislations: Political Parties Amendment Act 2016, Election Laws Amendment Act 2016 and Elections Offences Act 2016; Qualifications and requirements for candidates; Presidential Petition Rules; Election Petition Rules; Political Party nomination rules and National Public Participation Guidelines. The policies/laws have facilitated respect for human rights, access to justice, response to Gender Based Violence and international standards on gender practices<sup>41</sup>, police reforms and preparations for the 2017 general election.<sup>42</sup> There was enhanced public participation and inclusion of youth, women and the marginalized in policy making, among other gains.

Empowering devolved institutions is well on track and gains have been reported from UN technical capacity support, for instance all 47 counties had their county Government budgets approved by the Controller of Budget as they were compliant with legal and constitutional requirements.<sup>43</sup> Human Rights work in UN has mainly focused on programs and advocacy, with achievements in Human Rights policy and police reforms, UN support has included strengthening capacities of strategic human rights and gender equality institutions through: placement of gender advisors at Council of Governors and other institutions to mainstream Gender and Women empowerment, training personnel aimed at increasing their key competencies<sup>44</sup>. Through UN advocacy, government through Attorney General (AG) has accepted and included gaps in Human Rights in Universal Periodic review (UPR)<sup>45</sup>, necessary for Human Rights programming. Despite the gains, there are still gaps in addressing the shrinking civil society space, media and freedoms of expression, death penalty, indigenous rights, economic and social rights.

UN support to the National Police Service has resulted in a milestone achieved in Police Reforms where a new curriculum for training of recruits was developed and implemented in 2017, with over 1000 officers trained in over 30 policies developed. Although this is a small portion in general relative to the size of the Service, it is a huge achievement as it is the first time this has occurred, and with UN support. UN also

---

<sup>39</sup> Some devolution challenges included limited knowledge on devolution, lack of co-ordination between county and national governments, overlapping mandates, lack of data, low funding, tight implementation timelines among others.

<sup>40</sup> Enhancement in terms of improvement of policies/laws through either enactment, signing, enactment or review.

<sup>41</sup> Other institutions where gender advisors were placed include The Parliament, National Gender and Equality Commission (NGEC); Ministry of Mines; and Joint UN Team in Turkana.

<sup>42</sup> SRA 1 pre-evaluation Assessment report 14 Sep 2017 p.4

<sup>43</sup> Outcome indicator 1.3.1. % Of county Government budgets approved by the Controller of Budget compliant with legal and constitutional requirements; Baseline: 24 (2013/14 Budget); Target: 47 (2014/2015)

<sup>44</sup> SRA 1 pre-evaluation Assessment report 14 September 2017 p.4

<sup>45</sup> Interview with UN Agency Respondent 21 September 2017

supported devolved institutions on resource management,<sup>46</sup> and formulation of policies and laws to support devolution<sup>47</sup> and also offered technical support to some counties such as Turkana and Marsabit in developing County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs).<sup>48</sup> Technical and financial support to the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC) to prepare for the 2017 elections resulted in total of 17 policies, procedures and systems of IEBC and Office of the Registrar of Political Parties (ORPP) strengthened with a resultant 58% increase in voter registration. UN also enhanced judiciary capacity to handle electoral disputes and enhanced electoral security through trainings under Electoral Security Arrangement Programme (ESAP). Other achievements include supporting development of County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (CIMES) guidelines, and national Monitoring and Evaluation Policy<sup>49</sup> and alignment of the SDGs indicators to fit the country context and strengthening capacities for drought early warning systems' data collection, analysis and reporting for climate change resilience building.<sup>50</sup>

Some constraints reported under this SRA include low interlinkage between agencies on Human Rights (HR) activities, non-passage of the two thirds gender rule, little human capacity and resources to address integration of Human Rights (HR) issues,<sup>51</sup> weak links with other legislative arms such as county assembly, inadequate knowledge management and cross learning from other UN program experiences.

## **SRA 2. Human Capital Development (GoK Lead: MOH/MOESD; Lead UN Agency: UNICEF)**

Human capital development challenges identified in the CCA included inequity in access to services such as education and health, inadequate social protection and safety nets, managing the youth budge, low access to water and sanitation services, poor Early Childhood Development (ECD), poor primary and secondary education quality, HIV and AIDS burden among others. The results area relates to the social pillar in areas of education and training, health, environment water and sanitation. UN support resulted in development and enactment of policies, frameworks and legislation in education, health, water and sanitation, HIV/AIDS and social protection sectors that are all-inclusive and rights and gender focused. These include; Policy on Education for Sustainable Development (ESD); Integrated Early Childhood Development (ECD) policy, standards and guidelines; Ministerial statement on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4; Special Needs Education Policy Framework; National Education For All (EFA) review process for Kenya; Literacy Assessment Framework; Home Grown School Meals guidelines; School Meals and Nutrition strategy; Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health (ASRH) policy; Prevention of Mother to Child (PMTCT) Guidelines; Kenya AIDS Strategic Framework (KASF); County specific plans aligned to KASF; Social Protection bill and strategy; Child Labour Policy and a draft children's bill<sup>52</sup> to replace the 2001 Children Act. 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 HIV AIDS Joint Program<sup>53</sup> has been instrumental in supporting national and county AIDS response as defined in the KASF and 15 counties have been

---

<sup>46</sup> The report by the Office of Controller of Budget for the financial year 2014/2015 noted that counties have adopted the Integrated Financial Management Information System (IFMIS).

<sup>47</sup> 51 county model laws developed. UNDAF Kenya 2014-2018 MTR p.18

<sup>48</sup> Interview with UN Agency Respondent 15 September 2017

<sup>49</sup> UNDAF Annual Report 2016-2017 p.18

<sup>50</sup> UNDAF Annual Report 2016-2017 p.19

<sup>51</sup> Interview with UN Agency Respondent 21 Sep 2017

<sup>52</sup> The bill is undergoing stakeholder participation and expected to be finalized before end of 2017

<sup>53</sup> HIV AIDS joint program is implemented by UNAIDS as lead with UNICEF, UNFPA, FAO, UN Women, FAO, UNHCR, WFP, UNDP, UNESCO, UNHABITAT, UNOPS, UNIDO, UNODC, World Bank, OCHA, IOM, WHO, ILO and UNON

supported to align, allocate resources and implement the HIV response, thus reinforcing the devolution of health system service delivery.

The UN has played an important role in strengthening institutional systems that are transforming education data management and curriculum reforms<sup>54</sup>, school feeding programs and education in Arid and Semi-Arid Lands. UN support in capacity building and service delivery has improved Early Childhood Development (ECD),<sup>55</sup> improved school environment, and response to emergencies in crisis affected areas, with enhanced Gross Enrolment Rates (GER) in the country<sup>56</sup> including Arid and Semi-Arid Land (ASAL) counties<sup>57</sup>. To bridge the gender gap in science related courses, a UN supported mentorship program for school girls has reached 1000 secondary schools girls in 110 schools in 33 counties, mentoring them in science, technology, engineering and mathematics. In health, UN has provided support for institutional, personnel and systems strengthening for robust response and management of the health sector with joint programs such as Reproductive Maternal Neonatal Child and Adolescent Health (RMNCAH)<sup>58</sup> in six counties. Dedicated support from the Joint Programme on HIV and AIDS has seen Kenya adopt the latest WHO guidelines, including Test and Treat, Differentiated care and Updated Paediatric Treatment Guidelines. Kenya has also embraced HIV self-testing as a national strategy and has initiated roll-out throughout the country. As a result, 64% (1,018,905) of all Persons Living with HIV (PLHIV) are on treatment against a target of 81%. There has also been increase in testing, where 53% of women and 46% of men know their status from a baseline of 29% and 23% of men<sup>59</sup>. Prevention programs have seen a reduction of 11.9% between 2014 and 2016 in new infections among adolescents aged 10 to 19 years, 37% reduction among adults, 53% among young adults and overall 25% reduction of AIDS related deaths.<sup>60</sup> A three-year Joint Program on gender based violence<sup>61</sup> was also launched in April 2017, designed under the leadership of the State Department of Gender Affairs, UN Women and UNFPA. There has been construction of more health facilities increasing access to health. Partnership with private sector such as Philips and other development partners has unlocked resources and technical assistance increasing

---

<sup>54</sup> UNDAF Kenya Mid-Term Review 2014-2019 p.29 and SRA 2 pre-assessment. UN provided technical support to MoE/KICD in curriculum reforms and developing the draft monitoring and evaluation framework for the new competency based curriculum.

<sup>55</sup> UN has supported development of Integrated ECD policy, standards and guidelines finalized, awaiting printing and dissemination at national and county level. An ECD Directorate established at MOE for improved quality and delivery of education services to ECD children including the impoverished.

<sup>56</sup> SRA 2 pre-assessment tool 7 September 2017. The gross enrolment rate (GER) in pre-primary increased from 57.6% in 2004 to 76.5% in 2015; in primary the GER has increased from 88.7% in 2000 to 103.6% in 2015, and in secondary from 28.8% in 2005 to 63.3% in 2015 (MOEST, 2016).

<sup>57</sup> SRA 2 pre-assessment 7 September 2017. Intensified and expanded partnerships with MoE and county governments has seen overall, 77,693 children (36,801 girls, 40,892 boys) against the target of 105,000 most vulnerable Out-Of-School Children (OOSC) gaining access to education services in nine most deprived ASAL counties. The cross sectoral strategies used to bring these OOSC into schools included WASH, communication strategies and renovation of classrooms in schools.

<sup>58</sup> RMNCAH is implemented jointly by UNFPA, WHO, UNICEF in Mandera, Wajir, Marsabit, Isiolo, Lamu and Migori counties

<sup>59</sup> SRA 2 pre-assessment 7 September 2017 report an increase from 755,226 PLWA under treatment to 1,018,905 during the UNDAF period.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid. Outcome indicator 2.3.1. % reduction of new infections among adults and children. From increased access to age appropriate, comprehensive information on HIV and sexual and reproductive health for adolescents and young people through the inclusion in the curriculum reform enhanced peer led approaches, social media and sports. UN has also leveraged high level political commitment and leadership in preventing HIV infections

<sup>61</sup> The program has not had firm funding commitments in terms of resources but UNFPA, the lead agency is supporting joint programming with other agencies such as UN Women as they mobilize resources

accessibility and almost doubling the demand<sup>62</sup> for RMNCAH services such as skilled deliveries, ante natal care (ANC), emergency obstetric and new born care in hard to reach areas. Under UNDAF, Kenya has made progress in building a larger, more effective and nationally-owned social protection system. UNDAF supported development of the single registry is proving to be key in improving coordination and efficiency, contributing to a saving of USD 2 Million per month<sup>63</sup>. UN has supported Government in formulating strategic reforms towards a harmonized and integrated social protection system. Achievements in the sector include significant expansion of core social assistance schemes that now reach 12% households. Financing of the sector is increasingly government-led, increasing tax-financed social transfers to 0.4% Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Evidence generated through support of UN partners contributed to a Government policy decision to implement a senior citizen's universal pension for every Kenya aged 70 years and above, effective from January 2018. This significant achievement has placed Kenya within the international sphere of countries that have measures in place that guarantee a minimum income for their citizens.

Some constraints include inadequate emergency response programming in the current UNDAF, drought<sup>64</sup>, inadequate integration and harmonization of social protection programs due to human and infrastructure capacity gaps and low uptake of social security programs by persons working in the informal sector<sup>65</sup>. Other constraints are inadequate data and consistent Means of Verification in Water Sanitation and Health (WASH) interventions and poor disaggregation of results for better utility in programming for 'leaving no one behind'<sup>66</sup>.

### **SRA 3. Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth (GoK Lead: Ministry of Industrialization and Enterprise Development; Lead UN Agency: UNIDO)**

The 2013 CCA identified lack of inclusive economic growth in Kenya, where growth was concentrated in urban and arable areas, and in the formal sector issues. The CCA identified issues such as youth unemployment, inadequate income generation for disadvantaged groups such as women, youth and people living with disabilities and low agricultural productivity among others which are addressed under this results area. The SRA relates not only to the MTP economic pillar focusing on issues on agriculture, livestock and fisheries, trade, oil and other mineral resources, but also to social pillar on gender, vulnerable groups and youth for inclusive growth. Key achievements through UNDAF support include development of various policy frameworks and regulations to stimulate inclusive and environmentally friendly economic growth including; Mining Bill 2015 and Mining Act 2016; 16 mining regulations; Community Liaison Framework (Extractives); Four agricultural policies and two agricultural bills; Overarching Agriculture Policy; The Youth in Agriculture strategy; The National Livestock policy; National Policy on Prevention and Containment of Antimicrobial Resistance; National Action Plan on Prevention and Containment of Antimicrobial Resistance; Community Lands Act; Kenya Climate Smart Agriculture Strategy; The Ending Drought Emergencies (EDE) Common Programming Framework; The National Nutrition Action Plan; The National Food and Nutrition Security Policy Implementation Framework; The Agriculture Growth and Transformation Strategy (ongoing); Public Procurement and Disposal Act (PPADA) 2015; PPADA 2015 regulations; The Food Security Bill, 2016; Credit reference bureau; Deposit bonds frameworks and Draft Youth Entrepreneurship Strategy.

---

<sup>62</sup> RMNCAH Closure Report by UNFPA, 5 April 2017 p.4

<sup>63</sup> UNDAF 2014-16 MTR p.44

<sup>64</sup> Interview with UN Agency Respondent, 24 September 2017

<sup>65</sup> UNDAF SRA 2 progress report June 2016 to June 2017

<sup>66</sup> SRA 2 FGD held at Magna Hotel and Suites 14 September 2017

In capacity development, collaborative interventions between UN and government have seen benefits such as Labour law compliance and self-regulation and accountability mechanisms in the public transport industry<sup>67</sup> offering gainful employment for youths, establishment of the National Labour Market Information System report (LMIS)<sup>68</sup> and business management, micro-learning skills building initiatives in Biashara Centres<sup>69</sup>. Various interventions saw at least 841,600 new jobs created mainly in the informal economy in 2015 (Economic Survey 2016) against an annual target of 1,000,000 new jobs.<sup>70</sup> UN support to 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) has been enhanced to support Medium and Small Micro-enterprises (MSMEs).<sup>71</sup> Introduction of Credit Reference Bureau has allowed financial institutions to access credit worthiness of firms and individuals. UN has supported the Development of Special Economic Zones, Industrial, SME, Technology and Science Parks, renewable energy<sup>72</sup> and economic empowerment of farmers through climate smart agricultural production models, for instance the Joint Initiative “Kenya Cereal Enhancement Program– Climate Resilience Agricultural Livelihood window- KCEP-CRAL”<sup>73</sup> that builds on initial program results on enhancing resilience of communities in ASALs. Other achievements with significant UN contributions include improved fishing technology and access to markets. As a result, fish production has increased with over 24 million fingerlings produced from 2015 to date. In addition, over 181 Farmer Organizations with a total membership of 35,000 small holder farmers in 17 counties have received capacity support to ensure improved access and profitable engagement in domestic grain markets. A key result from these is that 12,300 metric tons of grain has been sold by 80 farmer organizations directly to various markets. Other achievements include engendering the extractive industry, and development and Local Production of Essential Generic Drugs in Kenya. Strong partnerships between the GOK and UN have led to sustained investment in expanding economic opportunities for women-owned enterprises pegged on the 30% tender rule,<sup>74</sup> where UN through UN women played a key role in advocacy, equipping women led MSMEs to do business with government entities, facilitating Access to Government Procurement Opportunities (AGPO) uptake monitoring and linking Women Based Enterprises (WBEs) with financial institutions for funding opportunities. UN has also worked with private sector actors to sign on to the UN Global Compact Women’s Empowerment Principle No. 5. Through UN advocacy, 14 Kenyan Companies have signed the CEO Statement of Support for the Women

---

<sup>67</sup> SRA 3 FGD held at NSSF 14 September 2017. This focused on Matatu and bus companies

<sup>68</sup> Ibid

<sup>69</sup> County Business Development Centres (CBDCs, also referred to as Biashara Centres) have been established in 4 counties, Kwale, Marsabit, Turkana and Taita Taveta (UNDAF 2014 – 2018 MTR p. 49)

<sup>70</sup> SRA 3 pre assessment report. Outcome Indicator 3.3.1 # of jobs created in the formal and informal sector. Baseline: 999,100 new jobs in 2012; Target: 1,000,000 new jobs per year (2018)

<sup>71</sup> KNCCI was supported in institutional capacity assessment that led to it’s re-organization and formulation of a Strategic Plan, now guiding operations of the institution

<sup>72</sup> Examples include UNIDO’s Micro hydro power project in Mwea and FAO’s 10 charcoal producer groups to producing sustainable charcoal in Turkana

<sup>73</sup> Implemented by the three Rome Based UN Agencies; FAO, IFAD and WFP, 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. Conservation agriculture adopted by approximately 27,600 farmers (56% women) in 8 counties (Makueni, Machakos, Kitui, Meru, Laikipia, Tharaka Nithi, Kwale and Kilifi). Promotion of farm forestry among 456 producers (51% female) in Nakuru and Likipia counties under FAO

<sup>74</sup> Under this rule, 30% of procurement opportunities in government are reserved for women, people living with disabilities and youth

Empowerment Principles, signaling their support for gender equality and the guidance provided by the Principles and listed at UN Global Compact database.

Some constraints experienced include high community expectations in the extractive sector, low business capacities among MSMEs, low availability of key inputs, inadequate innovation and business incubation. The 30% procurement quota for women, youth and People with Disabilities (PWDs) is short of the target, as youth unemployment has intensified and remains a serious challenge to the country. In addition, although enabling policies and infrastructure have been set up to encourage production, cost of energy is too high and renewable energy has not worked as initial cost is too high.

#### **SRA 4. Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security (GoK Lead: MEWNR, UN Lead Agency: UNEP)**

Issues of environmental degradation, increasing pressure on shared natural resources and resultant conflicts, issues related to climate change, disaster risk, refugees, poor urban planning and insecurity were raised in the 2013 CCA and well-integrated in this results area. The SRA aligns to the social pillar especially water, sanitation and environment, population, urbanization and housing and the political pillar on Governance and rule of law. The UN provided policy advisory support to the national government for various policy and legal frameworks that include: Land Policy of 2015; National irrigation and Drainage policy (2015); National irrigation Bill 2016; Water Harvesting and Storage Policy 2016; Climate Change Act 2016; The Slum Upgrading and Prevention Policy 2016; Community Land bill; Policy on Harmonization of Small Arms and Light Weapons; National Peace building and Conflict Management Bill; Six laws on Citizenship and Registration of Persons; Gender policies for Ministry of Defense and International Peace Support Training Center (IPSTC); Refugee Bill; Disaster Risk Management (DRM) Policy and Bill; Climate change management Bill; DRM Policy and Bill; Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan (GESIP) 2016; National Climate Finance Policy; National Urban Development Policy (NUDP); County Spatial Planning guidelines; and Narok County Environment Act. These bills, policies have been developed, some at county level to guide operations in environment, land and human security.<sup>75</sup> Impacts include contributing to sustained arms control and management with destruction of over 5,000 illicit firearms, mainstreaming gender in Ministry of Defense and IPSTC Policies<sup>76</sup>, and supporting Kenya take lead among top African countries in climate change resilience agenda, from the new climate change Act 2016, ratification of the Paris agreement and finalization of the National Adaptation Plan 2016, the Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan (GESIP) 2016; among a host of other critical policies<sup>77</sup>. A joint program on strengthening in the border communities of Turkana led by International Organization on Migration (IOM)<sup>78</sup> achieved a major positive change in community peace building process and diversified livelihoods.

Other capacity building contributions under the Results area included development and implementation of joint UN Government drought and elections contingency plans. The UN, in collaboration with key partners supported Peace and Security Management for 2017 General Elections including the UWIANO strategy for increased strategic partnerships, participation, enhanced coordination and response to conflict.<sup>79</sup> Twenty-three (23) peace structures and six county Secretariats/offices responsible for peace and cohesion and two early warning hubs were established and peacebuilding, cohesion and conflict

---

<sup>75</sup> Mid-term evaluation report of Kenya UNDAF 2014-2018 p.64

<sup>76</sup> SRA 4 Self-Assessment Tool 24 October 2017

<sup>77</sup> UNDAF Annual Report 2016-17 p.29

<sup>78</sup> The Human Security Joint Program was implemented by IOM, FAO, ILO, UNDP, UNICEF and WHO, and in collaboration with county and national government, community based organizations and partners.

<sup>79</sup> UNDAF Annual Report 2016-17 p.13

sensitive programming mainstreamed into CIDPs in 15 counties through UN's technical support. Women leadership in the peace architecture more than doubled, for instance in 2014, women constituted 18% of the Sub-County Peace Committees and by July 2017, women made up 39% of the peace structures at the county level. To respond to impact of floods and droughts, the Government of Kenya jointly with the UN also put in place a flood/El Nino contingency plans including funds. A UN-GoK joint task force led the response to cyclic multiple outbreaks of Cholera and other health conditions such as Dengue fever and Chikungunya brought about by adverse weather conditions, poor hygiene and sanitation practices.

Positive linkages between peace building and land development agenda have been realized with 30,000 Hectares of degraded lands and eco-systems being brought back to productive use in Turkana and Garissa counties, reducing conflicts and tensions associated with environmental resources<sup>80</sup>. There is also support in environmental conservation and energy sector through technical support on sustainable land management (SLM) and private sector engagement to enhance access to clean energy.<sup>81</sup> UN supported the domestication of the Kenya National Action Plan (KNAP) on UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325, capacity building of Kenya Defense Forces, peace building, disaster risk reduction, recovery /resilience building activities under the GoK/WFP Asset Creation Programme, targeting thirteen counties in the Arid and Semi-Arid lands, small scale irrigation and soil and water conservation measures and Integrated Spatial Planning Framework for Kalobeyei, Turkana county and LIMS for Mathare slums and Turkana refugee settlements.

Some constraints include the gap in integrating emergency and development and co-ordination of emergency support<sup>82</sup>, insecurity in the North affecting programming, the large size of SRA 4 affecting coordination and issues of policy development related to land in counties.

### 2.2.3 Flagship Programmes

The 2014-2018 UNDAF also features two multi-agency Flagship Programmes:

- **The Cross-Border Integrated Programme For Sustainable Peace and Socioeconomic Transformation: Marsabit County, Kenya and Borana and Liben Zones, Ethiopia** (the "Marsabit Programme"). In 2015, the UNCT, in collaboration with the Governments of Ethiopia and Kenya, IGAD and other DPs, initiated efforts for a cross-border, multi-sector programme which aims to strengthen social cohesion and bring sustainable peace and development in the region. The programme is aligned with the initiative launched in October 2014 by the UN Secretary General, IGAD Council of Ministers, and the World Bank President, which aims to boost economic growth, reduce poverty and promote trade in the Horn of Africa through cross-border cooperation. The Marsabit Programme includes 18 UN agencies and will feature a wide range of capacity building, CCA and livelihood interventions, among others. The Marsabit project document was signed June 2017, and a MPTF for it was established in September 2017<sup>83</sup>. The programme is managed by a senior CTA based within the UNRCO. Although some activities are already under implementation, such as the Biashara Centre in Marsabit, it is still premature to assess it. It is also notable that, although the Marsabit Programme has been endorsed by the highest levels of government in both Kenya and Ethiopia, the evaluators were informed that the UNDAF NSC Secretariat had not been consulted on its formulation.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> Mid Term evaluation report of Kenya UNDAF 2014-2018 p.66

<sup>81</sup> Collaboration between Kenya Renewable Energy Association (KERA) with UNDP: UNDAF Annual report 2016-17 p 30

<sup>82</sup> SRA 4 FGD 18 September 2017 at UN Habitat

<sup>83</sup> CTA, Marsabit Programme, communication to evaluators.

<sup>84</sup> Interviews with government stakeholders on September and October 2017.

- **The Turkana County Joint Integrated Programme**, which was launched in 2015 and which includes 12 agencies, was conceived as a “mini-UNDAF” which would feature all four UNDAF SRAs, but which would be delivered as an area-based programme (ABP)<sup>85</sup>. It includes a very wide range of livelihood, capacity building, health and other activities. It also incorporates some of the UN’s pre-existing Turkana activities, including the innovative Kalobei project which supports the economic integration of refugees into this host community. An MPTF was established for the Turkana Programme in September 2017. An unusual financing feature is that a significant portion, \$30 million of its \$210 million budget, is expected to come from Turkana County.

Although liaison between the One UN Turkana office and the county appears on track, coordination with the UN agencies is more challenging. This is due in part to the Programme’s somewhat awkward design: while an UNDAF is intended to encompass all of the UN’s efforts in country, an ABP has a narrower scope tailored to the specific needs of a subnational project site. Moreover, some agencies with pre-existing donor funding are reluctant to have that support re-routed through the MPTF. In addition, some donors also prefer a parallel rather than a pooled funding modality in order to more easily track the results of their support. These concerns can be addressed in JPs by using more than one funding modality, although parallel funding can hinder a DaO approach.<sup>86</sup>

The current phase of the Turkana Programme will be completed in March 2018. At that time, a new project document should be developed; and it should be informed by an updated assessment of Turkana’s needs, and aligned with the priorities expressed in the new Turkana CIDP 2018-2023 and with relevant areas of the new 2018-2022 UNDAF. It should also be synergistic with the activities of other DPs in the county. The management modality for this large, complex Programme should also be reviewed at that time.

Finally, the evaluators were informed that the NSC secretariat was not consulted on formulation of the Turkana programme. The secretariat also queried why the UN had concentrated so much of its investment there, as this seemed contrary to the organization’s stated equity approach.

#### 2.2.4 Coordination

- How effectively has the UNDAF been managed?

#### High Level UNDAF Governance and Coordination Structures

---

<sup>85</sup> “**An area-based approach** takes a small, homogenous, socially cohesive territory, often characterised by common traditions, a local identity, a sense of belonging or common needs and expectations, as the target area for policy implementation. Having such an area as a reference facilitates the recognition of local strengths and weaknesses, threats and opportunities, endogenous potential and the identification of major bottlenecks for sustainable development...Area-based essentially means local.”: European LEADER Association for Rural Development, *The area based approach*: [http://www.elard.eu/en\\_GB/the-area-based-approach](http://www.elard.eu/en_GB/the-area-based-approach)

<sup>86</sup> While donors may be able to track their support more easily through a parallel rather than a pooled modality, parallel funding may also hinder procurement and activity sequencing: see for example, A. Ittig and P. Agyare-Kwabi, *Midterm Evaluation of the United Nations Joint Programme on Human Security in Northern Ghana*, May 2012, pp. 9, 16. 24: <http://www.erc.undp.org/evaluationadmin/downloaddocument.html?docid=5888>



Strategic decisions on UNDAF-related issues are made at the highest level jointly by the Office of the President and the UNCT, which is the highest level inter-agency coordination and decision-making body in Kenya and which is led by the UN Resident Coordinator (UN RC).

A National Steering Committee (NSC), which is co-chaired by two Cabinet Secretaries, one for Devolution and Planning and the other for Treasury, together with the UN RC on behalf of the UNCT, was established to provide overall coordination between the UN system and the GoK for the realization of the UNDAF.

The NSC secretariat, which is based in the External Resources Division at Ministry of Finance and Treasury, provides the day to day oversight management of the UNDAF. The NSC secretariat liaises both formally and informally frequently with the UNRCO, and communication between GoK and the UN at this level is good.

The general membership of the NSC is comprised of representatives from Government, the UN, donors, civil society, the private sector and philanthropies. The full NSC membership meets on an annual basis.

### **UN System Support to the UNDAF**

Within the UN system, the UNCT has overall responsibility for the delivery of UNDAF results. The Programme Management Team (the PMT, formerly the Programme Management Oversight Group), the Operations Management Team (OMT) and the UN Communications Group (UNCG) also support UNDAF coordination and cohesion. Each of these groups reports directly to the UNCT. The OMT and UNCG provide the foundations for the “One Office” and “One Voice” Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) of the DaO, respectively, and they are therefore both intended to be UNDAF enablers.<sup>87</sup>

The table below summarizes the membership and meeting frequency of the UNCT, PMT, OMT and UNCG:

Management Tier	Membership	Meeting Frequency
UNCT	Heads of UN Agencies, Funds and Programmes accredited in Kenya	Monthly
PMT	Deputy Country representatives and/or heads of programmes/senior programme staff, UNRCO advisors and the chairs of the M&E WG, UNCG and OMT	Monthly
OMT	Heads of Administration Operations and/or alternatives designated by the HoAs of the UN Agencies resident in Kenya	Monthly
UNCG	Communication Officers of UN agencies	Does not meet on a regular basis

<sup>87</sup> The GWTG, SDG TWG, M&E TWG and Devolution TWG support activities under the UNDAF in Kenya but are not specifically part of the global DaO SOPs/UNDAF enablers. These groups are referenced separately under sections 2.1.3. “Programming Principles”, 2.1.4, “Crosscutting Issues”, and 2.2.4, “Monitoring and Evaluation”.

**The PMT** is intended to have a quality assurance role. It was established to provide policy advice to the UNCT, including guidance on and recommendations for resource mobilization, as well as technical guidance to the SRA WGs to ensure that planned interventions align to the UNDAF's expected results.<sup>88</sup> The PMT is also tasked with facilitating UNDAF implementation and reporting, with support from the M&E TWG, the UNCG, the DTWG and the SDG TWG.

**The OMT** was established in 2014 by the UNCT with the aim of increasing the efficiency and reducing the transaction costs associated with the implementation of the UNDAF, including the preparation of the BOS.<sup>89</sup> Since its inception, the OMT has realized cost savings in the procurement of common services with United Nations Office in Nairobi (UNON) and in the area of ICT through the use of a common data server managed by UNON. It has also initiated the Harmonization of Cash Transfers (HACT) process, which is intended to build the capacities of national partners; and a macro-assessment of national IPs has already been conducted. Although the OMT has developed a Business Operations System (BOS), no budget has yet been allocated to assess it in order to operationalize it<sup>90</sup>.

OMT's support will be key for the development of the Common Budget Framework planned for the 2018-2022 UNDAF. It will therefore be essential for the OMT to be included in the UNDAF formulation process.

**The UNCG** is intended to act as the focal point for communication within the UN system. It is also intended to provide coherent messaging on the UN and the UNDAF to Government and other external Development Partners as well as to the general public. However, the extent to which the UNCG is able to function as the One Voice of the United Nations Development System (UNDS) is hindered by the fact that several UN agencies have their own communications officers who act independently of it. As a result, some individual agencies and their projects have higher visibility among external stakeholders than the larger UN system and its overarching programmes and themes.

The UNCG is also intended to support resource mobilization and partnership efforts by communicating on UNDAF results and thereby raising the visibility of the UN system. Although the Kenya UNCG has developed an UNDAF communications strategy, it has not yet been operationalized as no budget has yet been allocated for it.

**The UNRCO** is intended to serve as a One Stop Shop for information about the UNDAF. It also supports UNDAF coordination as the liaison between the UNCT, the GoK, civil society, traditional funders and the private sector. UNRCO staffing currently consists of a Head of UNRCO; an M&E Specialist and two analysts; as well as the CTA for the Marsabit Programme; the Coordinator of the Turkana Programme and the Advisor for the SDG Philanthropy Platform.

The UNRCO does conduct some UNDAF related M&E functions, e.g. it provided oversight to the 2016 UNDAF MTR and to this final evaluation of the UNDAF, although the UN M&E TWG, which is responsible for UNDAF monitoring and monitoring tools, is led by UNFPA. The UNRCO support to UNDAF knowledge management (KM) includes recording and archiving the minutes of meetings of the UNCT and PMT. However, it does not record or archive the minutes of the SRA WGs – these are produced by the SRA WGs'

---

<sup>88</sup> The PMT has continued to use the 2014 PMOG TOR: United Nations Kenya Programme Management Oversight Group Terms of Reference, 10 June 2014, p. 1

<sup>89</sup> United Nations Kenya, *Operations Management Team Terms of Reference (draft)*, n.d., p.1

<sup>90</sup> Approximately \$6,000 is needed for this assessment: Interview with UN respondent, 18 September.

co-chairs - or the minutes of the NSC secretariat meetings. Collecting these and other UNDAF-related documents would provide a valuable KM function for the UNCT and other UNDAF-associated groups.

### **Meso-Level UNDAF Coordination Structures**

At the meso level, a Working Group (WG) was established for each of the four UNDAF SRAs. The SRA WGs are intended to be responsible for the operationalization of the UNDAF. Each SRA WG is co-chaired by the lead UN agency's Head of Agency (HoA) and by the Permanent Secretary of the lead GoK ministry for that outcome. During the current UNDAF cycle, the SRA WGs were not harmonized with the 28 MPT II sector WGs, although there are strong areas of mutual interest and activities with several of them: see, e.g. the table "Alignment of the UNDAF to the MTP II" above, p. 10.

The evaluators also found that while the understanding of UNDAF mechanisms and processes was good among GoK macro level stakeholders as was their participation in UNDAF activities, it was uneven among GoK line ministry staff. National counterparts' variable understanding of and participation in UNDAF-related activities is at least partially due to a high rate of GoK staff turnover, and summary briefings for GoK staff on UNDAF processes at the beginning of each quarterly WG meeting to address this has not been provided by their UN counterparts.

### **2.2.5 Monitoring and Evaluation**

- Was there appropriate monitoring and evaluation mechanism put in place to monitor progress?

A Joint UN-GoK M&E Group was established to lead the UNDAF M&E strategy, including programme monitoring and reporting for each of the SRAs as well as the development of monitoring tools. In addition to the joint UN-Government M&E Group, there is also a UN M&E TWG. The M&E TWG developed the M&E strategy for the UNDAF. However, the strategy was not fully implemented; and monitoring of activities in the 2014-2018 UNDAF was not conducted by all of the SRA WGs on as regular a basis as planned. As a result, there are gaps in progress reporting. Moreover, where such reports do exist, they may not be easily accessible: as the RCO does not collect and archive all UNDAF-related reports, there is no central repository for them.

Among its other tasks, the M&E TWG also led the process of incorporating SDG targets into the UNDAF results framework. Additionally, it revised the M&E framework for SRA2, outcome 2.3, "HIV/AIDS", in order to align it to the national priorities expressed in the Kenya Aids Strategic Framework, which was introduced after the launch of the UNDAF

As noted above in section 2.1, "Overall Assessment", the paucity of timely, accurate data hinders the establishment of baselines as well as the reporting of results. Where there are existing data sets which have been produced by the GoK, they should be used, as this would minimize agencies' generation of data through separate surveys and research independent of, for example, the work undertaken by the Kenya Central Bureau for Statistics.

As also noted above, the UNDAF results matrix features a high percentage of indicators that are not SMART; and this hinders the accurate reporting of results as well as the measurement of the integration of the Programming Principles. Moreover, the UNDAF indicators are not yet aligned with those used in the National Monitoring and Information System (NMIES). Further efforts to strengthen the NIMES concurrently with the formulation of the results matrix for the new UNDAF would improve efficiency and coherence in reporting for both.

Efforts to link the subnational M&E systems with the central NIMES are ongoing, including strengthening the capacities of subnational partners to lead and manage those systems at the county level.

Finally, as the UN Kenya intends to increase its multi-stakeholder partnerships in the new UNDAF, there will also be a requirement to measure the extent to which those partnerships are aligned, as well as to assess their impacts. The current UNDAF M&E system does not have any indicators or other standards through which partnerships can be explicitly measured. Systems used by the private sector such as the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) could inform the development of partnership indicators in the new UNDAF.

### **2.2.6 Partnerships**

Partners in the UNDAF process in Kenya include the UN, the GoK, DPs, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and the private sector. According to the UNDG *Guidelines*, it is expected that national ownership in the UNDAF will be ensured during its formulation through the inclusion and participation of all of these stakeholders. The current UNDAF NSC membership does include representation from all of these groups. However, it appears that civil society involvement in the UNDAF's implementation has primarily been as contractors rather than as partners, and private sector engagement in the current UNDAF has been nominal. This could be improved through the inclusion of representatives from both the private sector and from civil society in relevant SRA WGs in the upcoming UNDAF.

The partnership between the UN and the GoK has been considered above, in 2.2.4, "Coordination".

The UN's partnership with the private sector is considered below, in 2.2.7, "Financing."

### **2.2.7 Financing**

- To what extent has the UNDAF been an effective platform for the mobilization of resources?

Although the current UNDAF does not include details on its financing, the 2016 UNDAF MTR references a Resource Mobilization Strategy for the 2014-2018 UNDAF<sup>91</sup>. During this cycle, the UNDAF has proved effective as a platform for the mobilization of funding for elections support (\$24 million);<sup>92</sup> for nutrition response (\$16 million)<sup>93</sup>; and for the JP RMNCAH (\$6 million)<sup>94</sup>, among others; and in the finalization of a grant for \$ 290 million from the GFATM for the Kenya HIV response.<sup>95</sup>

Much of the resource mobilization for other activities under the UNDAF has been agency-driven, and the evaluators were informed by several respondents that the UN agencies often do not "present as One"

---

<sup>91</sup> *UN in Kenya; Aware, Agile, Aligned. Section 2 of the Resource Mobilization Strategy for UNDAF:* cited in the 2016 UNDAF MTR, p. 90, footnote 21; this document could not be located for review for the UNDAF final evaluation.

<sup>92</sup>

[http://www.ke.undp.org/content/kenya/en/home/operations/projects/democratic\\_governance/electoralreforms.html](http://www.ke.undp.org/content/kenya/en/home/operations/projects/democratic_governance/electoralreforms.html) SEPK basket fund managed by UNDP and co-implemented with UN Women. Other UN agencies supporting the project includes UNHCHR and UNODC.

<sup>93</sup> UNDAF *Annual Review* July 2016-June 2017, p. 46

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 45

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*

when meeting with DPs about financing.<sup>96</sup> Moreover, a significant percentage of some agencies' interventions are funded outside of the UNDAF<sup>97</sup>.

As of June 2017, the total financing requirement for the 2014-2018 UNDAF was \$1.19 billion, of which \$569 million had been mobilized.<sup>98</sup> It is not known what percentage of the UNDAF budget was mobilized from DPs and what percentage was raised internally through agencies' core funding.

During the 2014-2018 UNDAF cycle, the budget information for UN programming was collected by individual agency rather than by UNDAF outcome area. The collection of UNDAF financing and budget figures by outcome would support both communication and resource mobilization efforts with DPs; and it is understood that this will be done in the next UNDAF cycle.

The table below summarizes the UNDAF budget, resources raised and funding gaps by SRA:

**Budget and Funding Gaps as of June 2017  
(In USD)**

UNDAF SRA	Budget	Actual	Gap	Gap as % of Budget
1. Transformational Governance	71,611,273.69	43,860,666.10	27,750,607.59	39%
2. Human Capital Development	275,094,708.00	151,403,851.80	123,690,856.10	45%
3. Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth	287,196,027.20	68,435,623.59	218,760,403.60	76%
4. Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security	523,157,453.70	288,984,863.60	234,172,590.20	45%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,157,059,463.00</b>	<b>552,733,548.80</b>	<b>604,325,913.70</b>	<b>52%</b>

According to these figures, the funding gap for the UNDAF is approximately 52%. As noted above, (2.2 "Effectiveness"), one of the major constraints to implementation cited by UN respondents was insufficient financing. The 76% shortfall for SRA 3, "Inclusion Economic Growth", is of particular concern, and it underscores not only the urgency for the UN overall to broaden its financing base beyond its traditional funding approach of mobilizing and spending multilateral grant resources for projects. It also suggests that although funders continue to invest in agriculture and other areas of economic development, they did not see any comparative advantage to working in this area with the UN, in comparison with other implementing partners<sup>99</sup>.

<sup>96</sup>DP interviews.

<sup>97</sup> DP interviews, 15 September and 10 October 2017.

<sup>98</sup> More recent figures were not available for this evaluation.

<sup>99</sup> Although the 2016 UNDAF MTR states that the funding gap for SRA 3.2 is due to a declining donor investment in agriculture: *2016 UNDAF MTR*, p. 54, the evaluation findings suggest otherwise: for example, USAID's \$21.9 million Kenya Youth Employment and Skills programme which is implemented through RTI and IRC, among others: <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1860/K-YES%20March%202016%20Fact%20sheet.pdf> ; see also the significant investments by Mastercard Foundation and the Buffett foundation in smallholder farmer agriculture.

In contrast, the largest portion of the UNDAF's planned and realized budget was accounted for by Outcome 4.2, *Community Security and Resilience*, which focuses on i) Peace building; ii) Disaster Risk Reduction/ Management and iii) Border Management and Community Policing. This indicates that these are areas in which funders do see a comparative advantage to partnering with the UN.

One of the factors related to funding shortfalls for development generally is a greater donor focus on and funding for high profile emergencies in the Middle East and elsewhere, resulting in an increase in humanitarian aid over funding for development programming<sup>100</sup>. While discussion of the macroeconomic factors affecting aid financing is beyond the scope of this evaluation, they have been considered in detail elsewhere.<sup>101</sup> . Moreover, there is a greater range of actors in the aid ecosystem now than a decade ago, including social entrepreneurs and social impact investors; and they compete with the UN for resources. In addition, several of the UN staff interviewed stated that Kenya's attainment of LMIC status was already affecting UNDAF financing, although funders advised the evaluators that their commitments to the current UNDAF had not be affected by this.<sup>102</sup>

As Kenya is a DaO country, the One Fund modality, in which un-earmarked donor funds are pooled, could be introduced and used to support unfunded UNDAF activities. However, given the increase in donor funding which is now earmarked, it may prove challenging to mobilize significant un-earmarked funding at this time.

As part of its global effort to widen its financing base beyond traditional multilateral aid, the UNDS has initiated a number of innovative projects and platforms to identify and catalyze multi-stakeholder partnerships for traditional as well as blended financing options<sup>103</sup>. One of these, the SDG Philanthropy Platform, which is a multi-country UNDP project implemented in collaboration with Rockefeller Philanthropy Advisors and the Foundation Center, and which is funded globally by several philanthropies, was launched in 2014. The Kenya SDG Philanthropy Platform was launched in 2015, and it is currently housed in the UNRCO.

The Kenya SDG Philanthropy Platform aims to broker partnerships with philanthropies and other potential funders to finance SDG achievement. The Platform's match-making efforts are intended to expand the number and types of development financing options, beyond primarily multilateral DAC donor grants, for the UN's work with the GoK towards the realization of the SDGs. Innovative financing options like impact investment and public-private partnerships (PPP) are among the kinds of blended finance<sup>104</sup> which have

---

<sup>100</sup> Trends in the increase of donor funding for humanitarian response over development programming is summarized in United Nations Development Programme Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office and Dag Hammarskjold Foundation, *Financing the UN Development System -Pathways to Reposition for Agenda 2030*, New York, September 2017, pp. 23-26

<sup>101</sup> United Nations Development Programme Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office and Dag Hammarskjold Foundation, *Financing the UN Development System -Pathways to Reposition for Agenda 2030*, New York, September 2017 : [http://www.daghammarskjold.se/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Financing-UNDS-2017\\_2oct.pdf](http://www.daghammarskjold.se/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Financing-UNDS-2017_2oct.pdf)

<sup>102</sup> DP interviews

<sup>103</sup> Although a detailed discussion of this issue is beyond the scope of this evaluation, the challenges and options for UN financing globally are well captured in United Nations Development Programme Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office and Dag Hammarskjold Foundation, *Financing the UN Development System -Pathways to Reposition for Agenda 2030*, New York, September 2017 : [http://www.daghammarskjold.se/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Financing-UNDS-2017\\_2oct.pdf](http://www.daghammarskjold.se/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Financing-UNDS-2017_2oct.pdf)

<sup>104</sup> **Blended finance** refers broadly to the mixing of funds from public and private sources

proved productive in other UN Country Offices<sup>105</sup> and which the Kenya Platform is also exploring. Under the current UNDAF, initial partnerships with the private sector such as those in the JP RMNACH indicate that PPPs could be a very promising financing option for the Kenya UNDS. Towards this objective, efforts by the SDG Philanthropy Platform have resulted in the launch of an SDG Partnership Platform project, including the establishment of an MPTF, in September 2017<sup>106</sup>. The Partnership Platform, which has received seed funding from Philips for its startup activities, is currently in the process of brokering PPPs for projects in the health sector (SDG 3). Financing for those projects would be subsequently disbursed through the MPTF.

As PPPs would be a key focus for the Kenya SDG Partnership Platform, clarity on the country's PPP frameworks and mechanisms is essential not only for its success, but also to ensure that there is no financial or reputational risk for the UN. Kenya's 2013 PPP legislation requires further clarification in areas such as dispute resolution in the case of international investors. Moreover, much of the Platform's PPPs would be implemented at the subnational level; and the 2016 amendment to the 2013 PPP legislation, which focuses on subnational PPPs and which would therefore guide the Platform and the UN in those partnerships, has yet to be enacted.<sup>107</sup>

### 2.3 Efficiency

- To what extent has the UNDAF reduced transaction costs?<sup>108</sup>
- How well has the UNDAF promoted joint programming between UN agencies?

During the current UNDAF cycle, because resource mobilization and programme implementation were largely carried out as agency-specific activities and not as DaO, transaction costs were not reduced for UN agencies, the GoK or donors in terms of the staff time required for UNDAF-related work.

The lack of harmonization of the business processes followed by different UN agencies has also reduced efficiency and increased transaction costs. This is a headquarters-related issue, and until it is resolved at that level, it will remain a major constraint to the efficiency of joint programming under the UNDAF. This is one of the operational bottlenecks that should be addressed in the forthcoming report by the UN Secretary General on the restructuring of the UNDS<sup>109</sup>.

---

<sup>105</sup> For example, UNDP Armenia has been involved in impact investment; the Indonesia CO has established mechanisms to source zakat funding: United Nations Development Programme Armenia, *Impact Investment for Development Summit 2017*, 22 March 2017: <http://www.am.undp.org/content/armenia/en/home/presscenter/pressreleases/2017/03/22/impact-investment-for-development-summit-2017.html>

<sup>106</sup> Additional details on the SDG Partnership Platform MPTF project, with initial oversight from the UNDAF NSC, and with the RCO and UNFPA as IPs, and UNDP as AA, in support of SDG 3. are presented on the MPTF site: <http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/KEN00>

<sup>107</sup> The evaluators are indebted to a Nairobi lawyer for this information.

<sup>108</sup> Transaction costs are defined as "...the cost associated with the processes and activities that the UN development system engages in, to deliver its programmes at the country level, and which are internal to the UN agencies, as well as those that are incurred by its national partners and donors when interacting with the UN development system: United Nations Development Group, *Definition, Identification and Measurement of In-country Transaction Costs in the Context of 'Delivering as One' Pilot Countries*, New York, 3 October 2010, p. 17: [https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/UNDG\\_incountry\\_transaction\\_costs\\_FINAL3.pdf](https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/UNDG_incountry_transaction_costs_FINAL3.pdf)

<sup>109</sup> The report is scheduled to be released in December 2017.

The preference of some multilateral donors for parallel funding also increases transaction costs in terms of the additional staff time required to manage it. Moreover, it also hinders the DaO approach.

As noted above, the OMT has already realized cost savings in ICT and through procurement of common services with UNON, as well as through partial operationalization of the HACT. It has also developed a Business Operations Strategy, but this remains to be operationalized pending resources for its assessment. As funds are allocated mainly according to individual agency mandates, a key step towards strengthening efficiency and the overall DaO approach for the Kenya UNDS during the next UNDAF cycle will therefore be to operationalize the BOS as well as to develop and implement a Common Budgetary Framework (CBF).

## **2.4 Sustainability**

- How sustainable are UNDAF-supported results and strategies as a contribution to national development?

UNDAF results could be sustained where they align with national and subnational partners' priorities and policies, and where the counterpart organizations have the staff and institutional capacities required. The fact that UN advocacy for human rights, access to justice, gender equality and other issues has been institutionalized through the enactment of relevant national policies and legislation (see above, section 2.2, "Key Achievements by SRA") also suggests that UNDAF outcomes in those areas will be maintained.

Moreover, significant institutional and human capacity building has been undertaken by UN agencies in each of the SRAs in order to increase the sustainability of results. Additionally, there are significant county level resources for development activities as a result of the devolution process, and that also increases the possibility that results achieved to date could be sustained.

## **2.5 UN Comparative Advantages<sup>110</sup>**

- How valid are the stated comparative advantages of the UN System?

Prior to the formulation of the 2014-2018 UNDAF, an independent study undertaken for the UNCT noted ten comparative advantages (CAs) of the UN in Kenya, based on interviews with UN and Government stakeholders and with the UN's traditional Development Partners<sup>111</sup>. This final evaluation of the 2014-2018 UNDAF identified the four CAs described below. The difference in pre- and post- UNDAF perceptions of the UN's CAs may be due in part to the fact that the persons interviewed for the final evaluation were drawn from a wider range of respondents, including non-traditional funders and private sector and civil society stakeholders.

### **Technical Expertise and Policy Support**

The UN's wide-ranging, high level technical expertise is evident in each of the UNDAF strategic results areas, including governance, gender equality, human rights, health, education, agriculture and environment, as noted above in section 2.2, "Key Achievements". Moreover, throughout the 2014-2018

---

<sup>110</sup> "Comparative advantage includes the mandate to act, the capacity to act and the positioning to act", UNDG, *UNDAF Guidance 2017*, p. 25

<sup>111</sup> C. Soriano, *Future UN Comparative Advantages Kenya*, May 2013, pp. 20-36



UNDAF cycle, UN agencies have supported the strengthening of institutional as well as individual capacities across all of the SRAs at both the policy and service delivery levels.

The UN's global and regional presence in Nairobi, in addition to the Kenya Country Office team there, has facilitated access to this extensive source of knowledge and skills.

### **Advocacy for and Support to the Achievement of the MDGs**

The UN has leveraged its comparative advantage in support of the realization of the MDGs in Kenya. The results of these efforts are particularly visible in the area of universal primary education where there has been a 98% achievement rate. Since the launch of the 2030 Agenda in 2015 and the transition from the MDGs, the UN has focused on the SDGs; and the United Nations UN SDG TWG is currently supporting the GoK to localize the SDGs and to integrate them into national and subnational development plans through, respectively, the Ministry of Devolution and Planning (MoDP) and the Council of Governors. The UN has also worked with Government to develop the road map for SDG achievement in Kenya.

### **Advocacy on sensitive issues**

The UN has proven its ability to advocate strongly and consistently on sensitive issues like human rights and gender equality and empowerment with positive results in the enactment of new legislation and policies such as the National Policy and Action Plan for Human Rights in 2015; the Gender and Development Policy and the National Policy on Prevention and Response to Gender Based Violence, among others.

### **As a Convener**

The UN is considered by Government and other stakeholders to be an honest broker with strong convening power. Under the current UNDAF the UN has well-leveraged its convening role to engage and bring together a broad range of stakeholders to support programming planning, implementation and financing, for example, in the establishment and launch of the multi-stakeholder SDG Philanthropy and SDG Partnership Platforms.

## **2.6 DaO Coherence**

At the request of the Government, the UN system in Kenya operationalized self-starter DaO status in the 2014-2018 UNDAF. The DaO approach is an integral part of the UN reform agenda. DaO is intended to ensure Government ownership and to facilitate coherence and cohesion between agencies, as well as to reduce transaction costs for governments and development partners. The five DaO components, or Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), are One Leader, One Programme, One Common Premise, One Budgetary Framework (including One Fund) and One Voice.

As the scorecard below indicates, DaO has been only partially realized under the current UNDAF:

## Delivering as One Scorecard for the Kenya UNCT<sup>112</sup>

Pillar	No.	SOPs Core Element	Achieved		
			Yes	No	Partia l
Overarching Prerequisite for DaO: Government Ownership	1	Joint oversight and ownership agreed between Government and UN and outlined in agreed terms of reference for a National/UN joint steering committee	X		
	2	Annual reporting on joint UN results in the UN country results report	X		
One Programme	1	Signed UNDAF at the outcome level with legal text as appropriate			X <sup>113</sup>
	2	Joint Work Plans (of results groups) aligned with the UNDAF and signed by involved UN entities	X		
	3	Results groups (chaired by Heads of Agencies) focused on strategic policy and Programme content established and aligned with national coordination mechanisms (Partial)			X <sup>114</sup>
Common Budgetary Framework (including One Fund)	4	A medium term Common Budgetary Framework aligned to the UNDAF/one programme as a results oriented resourcing framework for UN resources		X	
	5	Annual Common Budgetary Frameworks (as a part of the joint frameworks) updated annually with transparent data on financial resources required, available, expected and to be mobilized		X	
	6	A joint Resource Mobilization Strategy as appropriate to the country context (with the option of one fund duly considered) approved by UNCT and monitored and reported against in the UN country Results Report			X <sup>115</sup>
One Leader	7	Strong commitments and incentives of the UNCT to work towards common results and accountability through full implementation of the management and Accountability system and the UNCT conduct and working arrangements.	X		
	8	Empowered UNCT to make joint decisions relating to programming activities and financial matters	X		
Operating as One (One Office)	9	Business Operations Strategy endorsed by UNCT is highly recommended, adapted to local needs and capacities to enhance operational oneness processes eliminating duplication of common processes to leverage efficiencies and maximize economies of scale			X <sup>116</sup>

<sup>112</sup> I have based the format of this scorecard on the model DaO scorecard in United Nations Development Operations Coordination Office, *'Delivering as One' and the UNDG Standard Operating Procedures*, p. 2: Annette Ittig, Team Leader, UNDAF final evaluation

<sup>113</sup> The 2014-2018 UNDAF results framework has been prepared at the output, rather than the outcome, level.

<sup>114</sup> SRA WGs which are co-chaired by UN HoAs and GoK ministry have been established, but they do not align with the 28 GoK sector working groups.

<sup>115</sup> Re the Joint Resource Mobilization Strategy, see above, footnote 77.

<sup>116</sup> The BOS has been formulated, but it is not yet in place.

	10	Empowered <sup>117</sup> operations management team (chaired by a Head of Agency)		X	
	11	Operations Cost and Budget integrated in the medium-term Common Budgetary Framework		X	
Communicating as One (One Voice)	12	A Joint Communication Strategy appropriate to the country context approved by the UNCT and monitored and reported against in the UN Country Results Framework			X <sup>118</sup>
	13	Country Communications Group (Chaired a Head of Agency) and supported by regional and HQ levels, as necessary			X
Total (out of a possible 13)			3 = 23.07 %	4 = 30.76 %	6 = 46.15 %

It is notable that the achievement of the One Office, One Voice and One Fund SOPs have been hampered in part by a lack of funding.

While harmonization measures at the operational level have contributed to greater efficiency and cost savings (see above, section 2.2.3. “Coordination - OMT”), business processes are not yet harmonized across all of UN agencies, and multiple reporting requirements increase transaction costs. Harmonization is primarily a headquarter level issue, and it should be addressed in the forthcoming report by the UN Secretary General on the restructuring of the UNDS.<sup>119</sup>

Some agencies implemented projects outside of the current UNDAF. Moreover, much of the resource mobilization efforts under the UNDAF were agency-driven rather than DaO. Indeed, individual agency financing may be the greatest obstacle to DaO. The preference of some donors for working with individual UN agencies through parallel rather than pooled funds in order to more easily track results also impedes DaO. As funding is primarily disbursed according to individual agency mandates, agencies are constantly challenged to balance their headquarters’ demands for the mobilization of resources with the DaO approach. An essential step towards realizing DaO by the Kenya UNDS during the next UNDAF cycle will therefore be to develop and implement a Common Budget Framework.

Finally, the evaluation found that the understanding of DaO and its implications for operations, programming, resource mobilization and partnership was uneven among respondents. Beyond training for all UN staff on this approach, imbedding a Theory of Change (ToC) into the DaO approach could also provide a focus for their purposeful collaboration.

<sup>117</sup> “‘Empowered’ in this context refers to the elevation in stature (and corresponding accountability) of the Operations Management Team in the “Delivering as One” context to the equivalent of a One Programme Results Group, to be chaired by one of the UN Country Team members (who must be a Head of Agency), and ensuring that sufficient financial, political and human resources are available to effectively implement the Business Operations Strategy.”: United Nations Development Group, *Standard Operating Procedures For Countries Adopting The “Delivering As One” Approach*, August 2014, footnote 33.

<sup>118</sup> There is an UNDAF communications strategy, but there is no budget for its implementation

<sup>119</sup> The report is scheduled for release in December 2017.

### 3 LESSONS LEARNED

There are several key lessons learned from the 2014-2018 UNDAF which can inform programme planning, financing, coordination, partnerships and implementation in the next UNDAF cycle. These include:

- **Coordination.** Effective programme coordination requires time, funding and commitment to an overarching theory of change. Both the Turkana and the Marsabit Joint Programmes demonstrate that the preparation and inception periods for joint programmes can be lengthy; and that the initial investments of staff time as well as the funding required to establish joint administration and financing mechanisms carry high transaction costs. Moreover, coordination in the Turkana JP has proved challenging, due in part to agencies' pre-existing activities and funding modalities and the lack of a shared, well-articulated Theory of Change. In contrast, coordination of the 18 agencies participating in the JP on HIV/AIDS has been more effective due to a dedicated, paid Secretariat as well as to a common vision and a shared, focused Theory of Change.
- **Comparative Advantage.** The realistic self-assessment of comparative advantages and the articulation of their value-added is essential for effective programme planning, financing, implementation and sustainability of results. The significant funding shortfall in SRA 3 indicates not only the need to revise the financing strategy for this outcome. As inclusive economic growth programming, including agriculture, is still an investment focus for both bilateral and multilateral funders, it also indicates that other implementing partners were perceived to have more of a comparative advantage than the UN in this area. However, it is notable that all of the evaluation respondents agreed that the UN had a great comparative advantage over other DPs in regard to normative work.
- **Gender.** As at least half of the UNDAF's intended beneficiaries are female, gender must be fully integrated into its activities in order to achieve the results anticipated. This will require a strategic approach to the integration of the Gender Programming Principle across all of the UNDAF outcome areas. This would be in addition to the gender scorecard currently used by the UNCT which rates the current status of, but does not outline a strategy for gender mainstreaming.
- **Private Sector Partnerships.** Identifying, brokering and establishing partnerships requires time, networking skills and perseverance, as well as an alignment of potential partners' expectations. As the UN-private sector partnership in the JP RMNCAH demonstrates, business should not be considered as a "new donor" that will fund projects. Rather, unlike traditional OECD/DAC donors, the motivation for the corporate sector to invest human and other resources in development activities may include penetration of or expansion into bottom of the pyramid markets, as well as an interest in both social and financial returns. Alignment of both aid and corporate actors' expectations are therefore essential for brokering and sustaining productive partnerships
- **Financing for Development (FfD).** Navigating the private sector and innovative development financing ecosystems requires an awareness of the new financing possibilities, e.g. impact investment, social enterprise and "Robin Hood" taxes, among others, in order to choose the funding vehicle(s) most appropriate for the agency, the initiative and the beneficiaries targeted. As FfD is a new area for most of the Kenya UN team, it will be necessary to increase their level of understanding on impact investment and other blended financing options and how they can support SDG achievement.

- **Devolution.** The devolution process in Kenya has now been realized, and the UN is adjusting to supporting activities at the subnational level in a coherent manner. In this connection, strengthening subnational capacities to manage, implement and report on the services and resources which have been transferred to them will remain a priority during the next UNDAF cycle. Lessons learned on ABP as a nationwide programming modality in other decentralized contexts such as Afghanistan<sup>120</sup> could inform consideration of replicating this approach on a regional/county block or national level in Kenya.

#### 4 CONCLUSION

The evaluation findings and its conclusions are summarized below.

- **Relevance.** The 2014-2018 UNDAF is both relevant and appropriate to the Kenya context: the UNDAF outcomes are aligned with national development priorities presented in the GoK's MTP II and in the country's Vision 2030 goals; and they also address several contextual development challenges identified in the 2013 CCA. Moreover, the MDGs and other international norms and standards which guide the UN's work are well-integrated into the UNDAF. However, the mainstreaming of the Programming Principles, with the exception of capacity building, has been incomplete. Furthermore, despite Kenya's multi-hazard vulnerability, the humanitarian-development nexus has also not been well-considered. Resilience-building is therefore an issue which must therefore feature prominently in next UNDAF.

Given the country's "youth bulge" and the urgency of creating jobs and other income streams for the ever-increasing numbers of youth entering the employment market annually in Kenya, youth employment readiness and job creation must also be a priority intervention area in the next UNDAF cycle. Finally, although the devolution process was rolled out in 2013, further strengthening subnational capacities to manage, implement and report on devolved services and resources must also remain a priority in the next UNDAF.

- **Effectiveness.** Under the UNDAF, the UN's advocacy and high level technical expertise has been demonstrated in each of its strategic results areas at both the service delivery and policy levels. Unfortunately, UNDAF achievements have been under-reported due to a results matrix which incompletely captures outcomes. As a result, progress against plan assessed through this matrix is mixed: 33.3% of outcomes have been achieved; 34.8% have been partially achieved; and 31.8% have not been achieved.

The UNDAF's effectiveness as a platform for the resource mobilization has been uneven. Significant amounts have been raised for large joint programming initiatives such as elections support and nutrition response, as well as through the finalization of a grant for \$ 290 million from the GFATM for the Kenya HIV response. However, over half of the 2014-2018 UNDAF remains unfunded; the most dramatic funding gap is for activities under SRA 3. Clearly, the traditional resource mobilization strategies relied upon for funding the current UNDAF have not been adequate.

As the UNDS moves from project funding into financing for development, it will be crucial for the Kenya UNCT to have at least an intermediate level understanding of innovative, blended finance options, to enable them to choose the vehicle(s) best suited to the agency, the initiative, and the type of beneficiary targeted. As the brokerage of PPPs will be a primary focus of the new SDG Partnership

---

<sup>120</sup>E.g. the National Area-Based Development Programme (NABDP) in Afghanistan; see above, footnote 48

Platform, awareness of Kenya’s PPP legislation and its constraints will also be needed in order to guide partnership parameters, and to avoid financial and reputational risks for the UN.

- **Efficiency.** Beyond the cost-saving measures carried out under the OMT, there is little evidence that the UNDAF has decreased transaction costs. For example, as resource mobilization was primarily conducted for agency-specific activities and not as DaO, transaction costs were increased for UN agencies, the GoK and donors in terms of greater staff time required for UNDAF-related work.
- **Sustainability.** UNDAF results could be sustained where they align with national and subnational partners’ priorities and policies, and where the counterpart organizations have the staff and institutional capacities required. The fact that UN advocacy for human rights, access to justice, gender equality and other issues has been institutionalized through the enactment of relevant national policies and legislation also suggests that UNDAF outcomes in those areas will be maintained. Moreover, considerable institutional and human capacity building has been undertaken by UN agencies in each of the SRAs in order to increase the sustainability of results. Additionally, there are significant county level resources for development activities as a result of the devolution process, and that also increases the possibility that results achieved to date could be sustained.
- **DaO.** The Kenya UNCT operationalized DaO in the 2014-2018 UNDAF, and DaO cohesion has been partially developed during this cycle. However, there is still an incomplete understanding of this approach among the UN Kenya team; and only one of the five DaO SOPs have been fully achieved. Training for all UN Kenya staff on this approach and on its implications for operations, planning, programming, resource mobilization and partnership, will be an essential step towards DaO achievement there. In addition, embedding a ToC into the DaO approach could also provide a focus for the Kenya UN team’s purposeful collaboration.
- **UN Comparative Advantage.** The UN has well-leveraged its comparative advantage as an honest broker with strong convening power, as a provider of high level technical expertise; and as an advocate for the MDGs, the SDGs and for other normative values, to support the achievement of Kenya’s development priorities. However, given the increasing number of actors in the aid ecosystem from whom funders can select implementing partners, a critical self-assessment by the UN of its comparative advantage will be essential in order to identify, plan, finance and implement realistic, sustainable development interventions in the next UNDAF.

## 5 RECOMMENDATIONS

The 2014-2018 UNDAF offers several emerging results and lessons learned which can inform coordination, communication, financing and implementation in the forthcoming UNDAF.

The recommendations presented below are categorized either as priorities to be undertaken immediately or for implementation over the next twelve to twenty-four months:

### Recommendations to be undertaken as priorities for the next UNDAF cycle

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
UNDAF Design	Given Kenya’s multi-hazard vulnerability, formulate an outcome-based results framework for the 2018-2022 UNDAF to allow greater programmatic flexibility in the event of a humanitarian emergency or crisis.	PMT, M&E TWG, SRA WGs

UNDAF Enablers – OMT	1) Support OMT with a dedicated budget in order to fulfill its function as an UNDAF enabler, including funding for the assessment of the BOS 2) include OMT in UNDAF design process	UNCT, OMT
UNDAF Enablers – UNCG	1) Support UNCG as an UNDAF enabler with a dedicated budget for communications on the UNDAF 2) Include UNCG in UNDAF design process	UNCT, UNCG
Financing; Partnerships	1) Develop a joint UNDAF financing and partnership strategy in collaboration with the GoK through Treasury, including forms of development financing beyond traditional multilateral aid such as non-DAC donor funding and blended financing options 2) The strategy should include a protocol for agencies on appropriate approaches to donors and other funders and partners	UNCT, Treasury-External Resources Department; SDG Partnership Platform; consultant
Programming – Resilience	1. Ensure that Resilience features prominently in the new UNDAF in a Strategic Results Area 2. Formulate a Joint Programme with a Resilience-building theme, drawing on the collective experience and expertise of the Kenya UNDS, including collaboration with the Global Policy Centre on Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification, among others.	UNCT, PMT, SRA WGs
Programming – Youth Learning for Employability	Formulate a Joint Programme on youth learning for employability, building on gains from current UNDAF youth-focused activities, including the micro-learning skills building initiative in Bashara Centre, Marsabit	UNCT, PMT, SRA WGs

### Recommendations to be implemented during 2018

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
Gender	Develop a UNCT-wide gender strategy to articulate a consistent approach for its integration, monitoring and measurement in all of the SRAs in the next UNDAF cycle	UNCT, GTWG, consultant
Programming Principles: Gender and Human Rights	To improve the integration of gender and human rights as a single Programming Principle in the new UNDAF, 1) Use the alliance between OHCHR and GTWG to ensure that an expert on gender and HR is included in each SRA WG 2) Articulate and use SMART indicators to monitor and assess the integration of gender, HR and other programming principles in the 2018-2022 UNDAF	M&E TWG, Gender TWG, OHCHR
UNCG - Communications Strategy	Operationalize the communications strategy to increase the awareness of the GOK and other stakeholders and funders on the UNDAF and its value-added for the achievement both of national development priorities and of the SDGs	UNCG

Development Financing	Convene a day long workshop by an accredited institution for the UNCT to provide them with an intermediate level of understanding on impact investment and other blended financing options and how they can support the achievement of the SDGs.	UNCT; accredited institution
Partnerships for Development Financing	Convene a workshop on the proposed amendment to the 2013 PPP legislation, which will guide the PPPs that the UN plans to catalyze the subnational level, with relevant GoK, regional, county and Development Partners and private sector stakeholders, with the aim of accelerating its enactment <sup>121</sup>	UNCT, Treasury and other relevant GoK, regional and country stakeholders; SDG Partnership Platform; Development Partners Group; private sector partners
Programming – Turkana Flagship	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Conduct a needs assessment to inform a new project document</li> <li>2) Ensure its alignment with the priorities expressed in the new Turkana CIDP 2018-2023; and with relevant areas of the 2018-2022 UNDAF, as well as with activities by other DPs active in Turkana</li> <li>3) Engage a senior CTA to ensure strong programming and reporting coordination of all of the partners working in this JP</li> <li>4) Propose alternative funding modalities to donors who currently support the Turkana JP agencies' programmatic activities and who do not want to channel their future support through the Programme's MPTF</li> <li>5) Include the NSC Secretariat in these processes</li> </ol>	UNRCO, PMT, JP agencies, funders, county, NSC Secretariat, consultant

### Recommendations to be implemented on a continuous basis from 2018 onwards

Knowledge Management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Ensure that SRA WG minutes and joint monitoring reports and any other documents resulting from these activities are archived with the UNRCO, to strengthen UNDAF knowledge management</li> <li>2) Upload these materials, as appropriate, on the UN INFO site once it is launched in Kenya</li> </ol>	UNRCO, SRA WGs
Monitoring & Evaluation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Utilize existing data sets produced by GoK and other organizations where needed</li> <li>2) Formulate the M&amp;E plan concurrently with formulation of new UNDAF</li> <li>3) Strengthen subnational partners' M&amp;E capacities: see below, "Recommendations: Capacity Building"</li> </ol>	UNCT; PMT; M&E TWG; SRA WGs

<sup>121</sup> <http://www.businessdailyafrica.com/news/Treasury-role-on-county-projects/539546-3891836-format-xhtml-2dekvc/index.html> Business Daily, "Treasure Seeks Role on County Projects by Private Investors", 16 April 2017



SDG Partnership Platform	<p>1) Update the UNCT and PMT on a regular basis on purpose and activities of the Platform and its brokerage of catalytic partnerships</p> <p>2) Include any other agency staff responsible for resource mobilization in these sessions</p>	SDG Partnership Platform, UNCT, PMT
--------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

### Recommendations to be implemented during 2018 and 2019

Area	Recommendation	Parties Responsible
Capacity Building; working in a devolved context	<p>1) Conduct an UNDAF-wide assessment of institutional and individual capacity building support to the GoK during the 2014-2018 UNDAF to determine its outcomes and to identify any gaps in it</p> <p>2) Based on this assessment, and in liaison with other DPs, develop an UNDAF-wide strategy for national and subnational institutional capacity building, in order to increase the sustainability of UNDAF outcomes, as well as to reduce duplication of other DPs' initiatives</p>	PMT, M&E TWG, SRA WGs, consultant
Programming – ABP; working in a devolved context	Review lessons learned on ABP as a nationwide programming modality in other decentralized contexts to determine its appropriateness for UN programming in Kenya	PMT, consultant

## SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Unpublished Sources

United Nations Kenya Operations Management Team, *Terms of Reference*, October 2014

United Nations Kenya Programme Management Team, *Terms of Reference*, 14 June 2014

United Nations Kenya Strategic Result Area 2 Working Group, *Minutes of Meetings*, 24 November 2016 and 18 April 2017.

United Nations Kenya Sustainable Development Goals Technical Working Group, *Terms of Reference*, 7 October 2015

### Published Sources

African Development Bank Group, *Kenya Country Strategy Paper 2014-2018*, February 2014: [https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/2014-2018 - Kenya Country Strategy Paper.pdf](https://www.afdb.org/fileadmin/uploads/afdb/Documents/Project-and-Operations/2014-2018_-_Kenya_Country_Strategy_Paper.pdf)

Balogun, Paul, *The relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF): A report prepared for the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs*, New York, May 2012.

Economic Intelligence Unit, *Country Report: Kenya*, 20 September 2017: [www.eiu.com](http://www.eiu.com)

European LEADER Association for Rural Development, *The area based approach*: [http://www.elard.eu/en\\_GB/the-area-based-approach](http://www.elard.eu/en_GB/the-area-based-approach)

Government of Kenya Ministry of Devolution and Planning, *Medium Term Plan II (2013-2017): Transforming Kenya: Pathway to Devolution, Socio-economic Development, Equity and National Unity*, Nairobi, 2013.

Financial Times, *The Africa Investment Report 2017*, London, 2017.

Government of Kenya Ministry of Devolution and Planning and the United Nations Development Programme, *Kenya National Human Development Report: Climate Change and Human Development – Harnessing Emerging Opportunities*, Nairobi, December, 2013: [http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/knhd\\_report\\_2013.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/knhd_report_2013.pdf)

Government of Kenya Ministry of Devolution and Planning, *Millennium Development Goals: Status Report for Kenya*, Nairobi, 2013.

INSEAD, Adecco and Human Capital Leadership Institute, *The Global Talent Competitive Index 2017: Talent and Technology*, Fontainebleau, December 2016.

Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, *Kenya Economic Survey 2017*, Nairobi, 2017: <http://bcckkenya.org/assets/documents/Economic%20Survey%202017.pdf>

Soriano, Clark, *Future UN Comparative Advantage Kenya*, Nairobi, May 2013.

United Nations, *Report of the Secretary-General on Funding* (E/2017/4): <http://undocs.org/E/2017/4>

United Nations, *Development Goals and Advancing the United Nations Development Agenda Beyond 2015, A report by the Secretary-General*, New York, 26 July 2013.

United Nations Development Group, *United Nations Development Assistance Guidance*, New York, May 2017: [https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/2017-UNDAF\\_Guidance\\_01-May-2017.pdf](https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/2017-UNDAF_Guidance_01-May-2017.pdf)

United Nations Development Group, *Funding to Finance UNDAF Companion Guidance*, New York, 2017.

United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 2015*, New York, 2016.

United Nations Development Programme, *Converging Interests: Philanthropy-Government Collaboration to Achieve the Sustainable Development Goals*, 2016: [http://www.academia.edu/27337555/Converging\\_interests\\_Philanthropy-government\\_collaboration\\_to\\_achieve\\_the\\_Sustainable\\_Development\\_Goals](http://www.academia.edu/27337555/Converging_interests_Philanthropy-government_collaboration_to_achieve_the_Sustainable_Development_Goals)

United Nations Development Programme Armenia, *Impact Investment for Development Summit 2017*, 22 March 2017: <http://www.am.undp.org/content/armenia/en/home/presscenter/pressreleases/2017/03/22/impact-investment-for-development-summit-2017.html>

United Nations Development Programme Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office and Dag Hammerskjold Foundation, *Financing the UN Development System -Pathways to Reposition for Agenda 2030*, New York, September 2017: [http://www.daghammarskjold.se/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Financing-UNDS-2017\\_2oct.pdf](http://www.daghammarskjold.se/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Financing-UNDS-2017_2oct.pdf)

United Nations Evaluation Group, *Guidance Note on the Application of Programming Principles to the UNDAF*, New York, 2010.

United Nations Kenya, *2014-2018 Kenya United Nations Development Assistance Framework*, Nairobi, 2013.

United Nations Kenya, *UNDAF Annual Report July 2016-June 2017*: [http://ke.one.un.org/content/dam/unct/kenya/docs/UNDAF\\_Annual\\_Report\\_2016-17.pdf](http://ke.one.un.org/content/dam/unct/kenya/docs/UNDAF_Annual_Report_2016-17.pdf)

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, *Kenya Flash Appeal*, September 2017.

World Bank Group, *Kenya Country Partnership Strategy 2014-2018*, Washington, D.C., 5 June 2014.

World Bank Group, *Kenya Overview*, 4 October 2016: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/Kenya/overview>

## **ANNEX 1**

### **TERMS OF REFERENCE**

#### **1.BACKGROUND**

##### **Development context**

The 2017 Economic Survey indicates that Kenya's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is estimated to have expanded by 5.8 per cent in 2016 compared to a revised growth of 5.7 per cent in 2015. Accommodation and food services recorded improved growth of 13.3 per cent in the year under review compared to a contraction of 1.3 per cent in 2015. The other sectors that registered significant improved performance in economic activities were in the information and communication; real estate; and transport and storage. Persistent drought hampered growth in the fourth quarter of 2016 impacting negatively on agriculture and electricity supply. On the other hand, growth in construction; mining and quarrying; and financial and insurance activities decelerated in 2016. From the demand side, growth was buoyed by consumption in both the public and private sector.

Annual average inflation eased to 6.3 per cent in 2016 compared to an average of 6.6 percent in 2015. This was mainly due to decline in prices of transportation; housing and utilities; and communication. The Shilling strengthened against the Pound Sterling, South African Rand, Ugandan Shilling, Tanzanian Shilling and the Rwandan Franc but weakened against the US Dollar, Euro, and the Yen in 2016. The capping of interest rates to a maximum of 4.0 per cent above the Central Bank Rate (CBR) resulted in a significant decline in interest rates during the month of September to 13.84 per cent compared to 16.75 in a similar month in 2015. Domestic credit slowed from a growth of 20.8 per cent in 2015 to 6.4 per cent in 2016 mainly because a decline in credit to the private sector. The current account deficit narrowed to KSh 370.8 billion in 2016 from a deficit of KSh 421.1 billion in 2015. The fiscal deficit in 2016/17 as a percentage of GDP is expected to rise to 9.9 per cent compared to 8.6 per cent in 2015/16.

Kenya continues with implementation of its transformative agenda as outlined in the country's long-term development blueprint under the Kenya Vision 2030. The overarching goal of the Vision is to create "a globally competitive and prosperous country with a high quality of life by 2030". It aims to transform Kenya into "a newly industrialized, middle income country providing a high quality of life to all its citizens in a clean and secure environment". Simultaneously, the Vision aimed to achieve the MDGs for Kenyans by 2015 and now the SDGs. The Vision is anchored on three key pillars: economic; social; and political, implemented through a series of successive five-year medium-term plans (MTPs). The theme of MTP is "transforming Kenya: pathway to devolution, socio-economic development, equity and national unity". The Government of Kenya is in the process of developing its Third Medium Term Plan III which will be informed by findings, lessons, conclusions and key recommendations of final review of MTP II and the manifesto of newly elected government after the August 4 2017

elections. The third MTP will as outlined in the initial concept note, endeavor to move the economy towards a high growth trajectory to achieve 10 percent economic growth rate target by the end of the Plan period. It will prioritize policies, programmes and projects which generate broad based inclusive economic growth, as well as faster job creation, reduction of poverty and inequality, consider climate change impacts, and meeting the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the goals of African Union Agenda 2063.

### **The UNDAF in Kenya**

The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF 2014- 2018) is the fourth generation Programme of UN support to Kenya. The UNDAF was developed per 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 programmes 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 3535
- 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 Programme implementation and reporting and the One Budgetary Framework. The current UNDAF comes to an end in 2018 June, the process of developing the next UNDAF 2018-2022, has commenced and will be largely informed by the proposed evaluation.

## **2. Evaluation of UNDAF 2014-2018**

The UNCT in Kenya, in collaboration with the Government of Kenya plans to undertake an evaluation of the UNDAF which will largely inform the planning process of the next UNDAF and the UN agencies’ Country Programmes. The Evaluation will adopt a participatory and consultative approach building on the Mid Term Review of the UNDAF undertaken in June 2016 and Annual reports developed by the Strategic Result Area Groups. The UNDAF will be guided by the UNEG guidelines and criteria of evaluation. Government counterparts of the UN will be the major partners in the evaluation, contributing both through data from national systems and validation of the UNDAF evaluation results.

The main users of the UNDAF Evaluation will be the UN Country Team and its partners, i.e. the Government, development partners, civil society and relevant stakeholders participating in the UN supported programmes.

### **2.1 Evaluation purpose, objectives and scope**

#### **Purpose of the Evaluation:**

The purpose of the evaluation is threefold:

- a) To assess outcomes achieved through the UNDAF framework, the effectiveness and efficiency by which the outcomes have been achieved, their sustainability and relevance towards contribution of national priorities and goals
- b) To determine how the UNDAF has supported UN agencies to contribute more effectively and efficiently to national development efforts and capacity building and
- c) To support learning from experiences of the current programming cycle, and identify issues and opportunities emerging from implementation of the current UNDAF (2014-218), specifically informing design and coordination of the next UNDAF programme cycle.

### **Objectives of the Evaluation:**

The general objective of the evaluation is to assess relevance of the UNDAF, its design and focus, results achieved, the processes that has led to results or non-achievement of results and the collective comparative advantage of the UN system in country. Given the UN mandates on human rights and gender equality and their inclusion as key programming principles for UNDAF, a main objective of the evaluation will be an assessment of the Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA), including gender equality, within its key objective as well as the other programming principles: Results Based Management (RBM), environmental sustainability and capacity development. Special focus will be on vulnerable groups toward realization of leave no one behind.

Specifically, the UNDAF evaluation will:

- Assess how UNDAF strategic intent, has been taken forward by UN agencies in Kenya and outline the factors that have affected the UN agencies working together
- Assess contribution made by the UN in the framework of the UNDAF to national development priorities and results
- Identify the factors that have affected UNCT's contribution outlining enabling factors and bottlenecks and
- Generate a set of clear, forward-looking and actionable recommendations logically linked to the findings and conclusions, and identify lessons learnt to improve the strategies, implementation mechanism, and management of the next UNDAF.

The objectives will be guided by a set of evaluations questions outlined below. The evaluation questions will be further analyzed and finalized at inception phase of the evaluation.

- a) Assess the *role* and *relevance* of the UNDAF (I) in relation to the issues and their underlying causes, and challenges identified by the country assessment undertaken at the beginning of the UNDAF programme cycle and in the context of national development priorities as outlined in Kenya's vision 2030 and Medium Term Plan 2 and (ii) as a reflection of the internationally agreed goals, particularly those in the Millennium Declaration sustainable Development goals, and international norms and standards guiding the work of agencies of the UN system and adopted by UN member states:
  - Do the UNDAF outcomes address key issues, their underlying causes, and challenges identified by the Common Country Assessment? Were new issues and their causes as well as challenges that arose during the UNDAF cycle adequately addressed?

- Has the UNDAF results framework been sufficiently flexible to adjust to evolving national policies and strategies such as the County Development Plans, the principles of devolution as outlined in the 2010 constitution of Kenya and the SDGs road map among other reforms during the current programme cycle?
  - Have the UNDAF outcomes been relevant in terms of internationally agreed goals and commitments, norms and standards guiding the work of agencies of the UN system (including the Millennium Declaration MDGs, SDGs UN human rights treaties, including CEDAW among others)?
- b) Assess *design* and *focus* of the UNDAF, i.e. the quality of and formulation of results at different levels, i.e. the results framework:
- To what extent is the current UNDAF designed as a results-oriented, coherent and focused framework?
  - To what extent have the Country Programmes and projects and programme strategies 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 during implementation?
  - Do the Country Programmes and the UNDAF respond to the challenges of national capacity development and do they promote ownership of programmes 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 Programmes? 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?
- c) Assess the validity of the stated collective *comparative advantage* of the UN System:
- ☑ 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)?



- d) Assess the *effectiveness* of the UNDAF in terms of progress towards agreed UNDAF outcomes
- What progress has been made towards the realization of UNDAF outcomes as a contribution to the achievement of MDGs and in terms of indicators as reflected in the UNDAF M&E Plan? To what extent and in what ways was special emphasis placed on strengthening of national capacities, building partnerships, promoting innovations, and the realization of human rights and promoting gender equity and equality?
  - Which are the main factors that contributed to the realization or non-realization of the outcomes? How were risks and assumptions addressed during the implementation of programmes and projects?
  - To what extent and in what ways did UN support promote national execution of programmes and / or the use of national expertise and technologies?
- e) 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 programmes of UN agencies?
  - Has the UNDAF enhanced joint programming by agencies and /or resulted in specific joint programmes? Were the strategies employed by agencies complementary and synergistic? ☐ Has agency supported programmes been mutually reinforcing in helping to achieve UNDAF outcomes? Has the effectiveness or programme support by individual agencies been enhanced because of joint programming?
  - Did UNDAF promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the main UNDAF outcome areas (e.g. national partners including Civil Society, Private sector and philanthropists International Financial Institutions among other external support agencies)?
- f) 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.
- g) Assess efficiency of the, the extent to which UNDAF results have been achieved with the appropriate amount of resources and minimum transaction cost in terms of money, expertise, staff time, administrative costs.

In addition to the above criteria, the evaluation will refer to:

1. UN Coordination and Value Addition of Delivering as One - The extent to which UN Coordination and DaO has created or encouraged synergies among agencies, optimal results and avoidance of duplication? The extent to which harmonization measures at the operational level contribute to improved efficiency and results? Factors that facilitated or adversely impacted upon implementation and commitment to the DaO approach.
2. UN Programming Principles - To what extent have the UNDAF programming principles (human rights-based approach, gender equality, environmental sustainability, results-based management, capacity development) been considered and mainstreamed in the chain of results? Have any shortcomings been realized due to a failure to take account of programming principles during implementation? Were adequate resources allocated to enable the application and implementation of UNDAF programming principles and related results?
3. How well has the UN used its partnerships (with civil society/private sector/local government/parliament/national human rights institutions/gender equality advocates/international development partners) to improve performance?
4. Did the UN undertake appropriate risk analysis and take appropriate actions to ensure that results to which it contributed are not lost?
5. Responsiveness - How adequately has the UN during planning and implementation of the UNDAF responded to changes in national priorities and to additional requests from national counterparts, as well as to shifts caused by major external factors and evolving country context (e.g. natural disaster, elections)?
6. To what extent did the UNDAF coordination mechanism promote or challenge delivery

**Scope of the evaluation:**

Considering that the UNDAF represents the UN approach and framework for supporting national development priorities in Kenya, the evaluation will focus on the UNDAF outcomes as outlined in each of the 4 UNDAF Strategic Result Areas as well as the low-level outputs. While the relevance and efficiency criterion will cover the whole UNDAF approach, the criteria of effectiveness and sustainability will focus on the UNDAF Outcomes and outputs.

As most of the UN agencies CPs have been implemented under the umbrella of the UNDAF, the UN agencies undertaking evaluations of their country programmes will where possible coordinate their CP evaluations with the UNDAF evaluation. The UNDAF evaluation will also use results of these CP evaluations to highlight the UN agencies contribution to the UNDAF and establish the link between results at output and outcome levels. The UNDAF Mid Term review and annual reviews undertaken in 2016 will inform the UNDAF in allaying achievement at mid- term level. While the evaluation will be undertaken in Nairobi, at least 2 field visits will be included.

## **2.2 Proposed evaluation methodology and process Methodology:**

The UNDAF Evaluation will be jointly commissioned and managed by the UNCT and the National Government. The UNDAF Evaluation will be conducted in close collaboration with the UNDAF National Steering Committee Secretariat (NSC), the UN Resident Coordinator's Office, the UN Monitoring and Evaluation Technical Working Group and the Evaluation Reference Group. Stakeholder participation will be sought from the beginning of the process through a series of meetings and validation workshop that will take place towards the end of the UNDAF Evaluation process. The purpose of the workshop will be to validate and provide further input to the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The overall approach of the evaluation will be participatory and orientated towards learning. A mixed method approach of data collection which will involve 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 programme monitoring as well as field visits will be adopted throughout the evaluation. Reviews or evaluations of agency supported programmes will feed into the UNDAF evaluation. All findings will be supported with evidence. Triangulation will be used to ensure that the information and data collected are valid.

### **Process:**

The evaluation will be conducted in three phases:

#### ***Phase 1- Preparation:***

- i. Establishment of the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) comprising of members from government, key stakeholders and UN. The main task of the reference group will be to guide the evaluation process at the design, implementation and report stages.
- ii. Collection of reference materials: The Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist in the UN RC Office, in close consultation with UNDAF Outcome groups, UNCT members and the UN M&E Technical Working Group (UN METWG), will compile a list of background materials, documents, and reports relevant to the UNDAF evaluation.
- iii. A self-assessment of progress made by Strategic Result Area (SRAs) groups will be prepared and administered by the UN METWG, and consolidated by the Chairs of the UNDAF Strategic Result Area Groups (SRAs). UN agencies will also be expected to provide input prior to the UNDAF Evaluation, and its results will be used by the Evaluation Team as a basis for their assessment and discussions with UNDAF SRA groups. Through the self-assessment, information will be collected on the progress towards UNDAF outcomes made by each agency/SRA and the evidence that exists to highlight the latter, thereby improving evaluability of the UNDAF. An assessment tool like the one used during the UNDAF Mid Term Review (MTR) will be used for the self-assessment exercise- prior to the evaluation.

- iv. Identification and selection of the evaluation team/consultants: The UN RC Office, in collaboration with the UN METWG, will take lead in long listing CVs of consultants for the positions of UNDAF Evaluation Team Leader and team member. A panel composed of Program Management Team (PMT) members will do final selection of the evaluation team.
- v. Once the evaluation team have been identified, a preparatory meeting will take place with the UN METWG, to ensure clarity on the expectations, scope and the evaluation questions. This informal meeting is different from the inception meeting.
- vi. Towards the end of the preparation phase, before start of the field mission, the Evaluation Team will share a draft inception report with the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), the PMT and the UN METWG, who will provide comments on the proposed methodology. The inception report should include a stakeholder mapping, the final list of evaluation questions, the evaluation matrix, the overall evaluation design and methodology, a detailed description of the data collection plan for the field phase, and the specific responsibilities of each of the team members.

***Phase 2 –Data collection and the preparation of the evaluation reports:***

- i. Desk review of reference material: The evaluation team will be responsible for reviewing the reference documents, reports and any other data and information provided by the UN RC Office under the direction of the UNDAF Evaluation Team Leader.
- ii. Main data collection mission: The Evaluation team will conduct agreed-upon interviews/group discussions/meetings with stakeholders and field visits.
- iii. At the end of the data collection mission, the evaluation team will provide the ERG, SRA chairs, UNDAF technical working groups the UNCT and the UN METWG with a debriefing presentation, to validate preliminary findings, conclusions and/or recommendations.
- iv. Data analysis and reporting: The UNDAF Evaluation will conduct further data analysis based on all information collected, and prepare a draft evaluation report within two weeks upon completion of their mission. The Evaluation Team Leader will submit the draft report to the ERG. The draft and final UNDAF Evaluation Reports will be written in accordance with these Terms of Reference, and the UNEG standards.
- v. Review of the draft report and finalization of the report: The draft UNDAF Evaluation Report will be submitted for factual correction and feedback to the ERG and key stakeholders, who will provide feedback. A validation workshop with the key stakeholders will be organized, to present the final UNDAF evaluation results and discuss way forward.

***Phase 3 - Follow-up:***

The UNCT, together with the UNRC Office, will conduct follow-up activities, as guided by their respective processes and mandates.

1. Evaluation findings and recommendations will be disseminated in collaboration with the UN communications Group (UNCG)
2. Implementation of a follow-up plan and management response, focusing on the design of a new UNDAF will be developed. The follow-up plan will determine a process for ensuring that lessons learned are incorporated into the next UNDAF programming cycle.

### 2.3 Management Roles and responsibilities

The UNDAF Evaluation will be commissioned and overseen by the UNCT and the government. Day-to-day evaluation management will be ensured by the UNRCO Monitor and Evaluation Specialist Manager working closely with the UNDAF NSC secretariat, the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) and the UN Monitoring and Evaluation Technical Working Group.

#### Management roles and responsibilities

Key Actors	Roles and Responsibilities
<b>UNCT/PMT</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ensure decisions are made on time</li> <li>▪ Approve TOR and final report</li> <li>▪ Commission and oversee the evaluation</li> <li>▪ Provide all the document information sources the evaluation team requires</li> <li>▪ Clarify questions raised during the evaluation</li> <li>▪ Develop a follow-up plan and management response to the evaluation and ensure the implementation of committed actions</li> </ul>
<b>GOK/UNDAF National Secretariat/UNDAF CO-chairs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Work closely with UNCT/UNRCO to make decisions regarding the process</li> <li>▪ Approve final TOR and final report</li> <li>▪ Recruitment and selection of Evaluation Team/consultants</li> <li>▪ Support coordination of interviews/debriefing meetings for GOK officers</li> </ul>

<b>RCOffice</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Facilitate procurement, selection and recruitment of the evaluation team members.</li> <li>▪ Establish the Evaluation Reference Group</li> <li>▪ Day-to-day management, in close coordination with the UN METWG</li> <li>▪ Ensure close communication with the evaluation team during the whole evaluation process.</li> <li>▪ Facilitate communication between the evaluation team and the UNCT/ERG/NSC among others</li> <li>▪ Arrange the travel to the project site and other logistic issues.</li> <li>▪ Consolidate the feedback on the UNDAF self-assessment reports, and send it to the Evaluation team</li> <li>▪ Compile documents for desk review</li> <li>▪ Facilitate dissemination of evaluation reports to stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>UN M&amp;ETWG Working Group</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Prepare TOR for the evaluation</li> <li>▪ Longlist and shortlist CVs</li> <li>▪ Provide technical advice to the process</li> <li>▪ Guide the evaluation process at the design, implementation and reporting stages</li> <li>▪ Review draft reports and provide technical input</li> <li>▪ Clarify questions raised during the evaluation</li> <li>▪ Support the UNCT/PMT in the development of a management response</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation Reference Group (ERG)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contribute to the final selection of evaluation questions</li> <li>▪ Participate in the review of the evaluation methodology and provide comments to the evaluation team.</li> <li>▪ Help identify the projects to be visited</li> <li>▪ Provide technical inputs and comments on the main deliverables of the evaluation, including the design, draft, and final reports,</li> <li>▪ Safeguard the independence of the evaluation exercise and ensure quality of evaluations</li> <li>▪ Advise on the quality of the work done by the evaluation team,</li> <li>▪ Assist in the integration of the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation into future programme design and implementation.</li> <li>▪ Approve final report</li> </ul>
<b>Evaluation Team Leader/ International consultant</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Lead the evaluation process in a timely manner</li> <li>☐ Supervise and work closely with the evaluation team</li> <li>☐ Produce the inception report, including any agreed inputs from</li> <li>☐ national consultant</li> </ul>

	<p>In charge of the meta-analysis and the overall assessment of the relevance criteria, but is encouraged to work closely with the team members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Overall responsibility for producing the UNDAF Evaluation Report and for quality and timely submission of the report to the ERG, UN RC office and the UNCT/PMT.</li> <li>☐ Communicate with UN whenever it is needed</li> <li>☐ Conduct field visits to the project sites identified and collect data, if needed</li> <li>☐ Primary author of the final report, including agreed text inputs from the national consultant</li> </ul>
<p><b>Evaluation Team member/National consultant</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☐ Provide substantive inputs to the inception report,</li> <li>☐ Share responsibilities for conducting desk review and interviews. Contribute to the whole evaluation process substantively</li> <li>☐ Conduct field visits to the project sites identified and collect data</li> <li>☐ Provide substantive text and data inputs to the draft and final reports.</li> <li>☐ Co-responsible for the quality of the evaluation and of the report</li> </ul>

**3. Composition and qualifications of the consultant and expected deliverables** The Consultancy Team will be composed of 2 consultants, one Senior Consultant, who will be assigned the responsibility of Team Leader. The duration of the consultancy is **30 consecutive working days for the team Leader-International Consultant (10 days will be homebased)** and 25 days for the local National consultant as outlined in the time frame. The assignment is expected to commence in Mid-August 2017.

**3.1a Qualifications Team Leader**

- Post-graduate degree in development studies/international development, international relations, political science, governance and public policy, social sciences, or any other related field
- Minimum 10 years’ experience in evaluation in developing countries
- Documented experience in managing and leading complex UNDAF evaluations, and a solid understanding on the use of evaluation methodologies

- Substantive knowledge of development issues, especially related to Governance and Equitable Growth/Poverty Reduction, addressed by the UNDAF and understanding of the development challenges and sensitivity in Kenya
- Substantive knowledge of Gender and Human Rights issues addressed by the UNDAF; including strong skills and experience in applying with human-rights based and gender mainstreaming approaches.
- Demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking, problem solving and policy advice
- Previous experience working in Kenya or similar settings in the region is an advantage
- Strong inter-personal, teamwork and organizational skills
- Excellent presentation and drafting skills, especially writing evaluation reports (Sample reports done from previous evaluations is a mandatory requirement) ☐  
Fluency in written and spoken English is essential

### **3.1b Qualifications of the National Consultant**

- Post-graduate degree in gender or human rights studies, social sciences, international relations, political science, evaluation, international development or a related subject
- Minimum 7 years' experience in evaluation in developing countries
- Documented previous experience in undertaking evaluations in the UN system, and a solid understanding on the use of evaluation methodologies, experience in evaluation of UNDAF is an added advantage
- Substantive knowledge of development issues, especially related to Governance and Equitable Growth/Poverty Reduction, addressed by the UNDAF and understanding of the development challenges and sensitivity in Kenya
- Proven experience in understanding of development issues in Kenya; including good understanding of national development priorities
- Substantive knowledge of Gender and Human Rights issues addressed by the UNDAF; including strong skills and experience in applying with human-rights based and gender mainstreaming approaches.
- Strong inter-personal, teamwork and organizational skills
- Excellent presentation and drafting skills, especially writing evaluation reports (Sample reports done from previous evaluations is a mandatory requirement)
- Fluency in written and spoken English is essential



### 3.2 Deliverables

1. **Inception Report which should include** should include a stakeholder mapping, the final list of evaluation questions, the evaluation matrix, the overall evaluation design and methodology, a detailed description of the data collection plan and a description of the roles and responsibilities of the individual team members. The inception report should be submitted to the UNRCO and Evaluation Reference Group at least 5 days before the start of the field phase of the evaluation. The evaluation team are responsible for final product, but overall responsibility of the output lies with the team leader.
2. **Debriefing presentation** to be presented and discussed with the ERG and the UNCT and **Power point presentation for and during Stakeholders validation**. The evaluation team are responsible for final product, but overall responsibility of the output lies with the team leader.
3. **The evaluation report**, which should be based on two draft evaluation reports and one final draft preceding the final report, considering potential comments from the Evaluation Reference Group (ERG), UNCT and input from the stakeholder's validation workshop. The evaluation report should comprise a set of clear, forward-looking and actionable recommendations logically linked to the findings and conclusions, and identify lessons learnt. The evaluation team are responsible for final product, but overall responsibility of the output lies with the team leader.

All deliverables will be drafted in English, and will be considered the property of the UN.

## **ANNEX 2**

### **EVALUATORS' PROFILES**

Dr. Annette Ittig is the Team Leader for the final evaluation of the 2014-2018 Kenya UNDAF. Dr. Ittig is an evaluation and partnership expert with extensive experience in both staff and contractor roles in donor, UN agency and private sector assignments, including with the World Bank, UNDP, UNICEF, ILO, WFP, DPKO, UN-Habitat and the MasterCard Foundation in Kenya, Ghana, Zimbabwe, the Gambia, South Sudan, Somalia, Iraq, Afghanistan, the UAE and elsewhere. Her UNDAF experience includes the 2014 evaluation of the 2012-2015 Zimbabwe UNDAF and the 2016 final evaluation of the 2012-2016 Gambia UNDAF, as well as the narrative for the 2018-2022 Nepal UNDAF document. Dr. Ittig received her doctorate from the University of Oxford, England.

Dr. Michael Karanja is the National Consultant for the final evaluation of the 2014-2018 Kenya UNDAF. Dr. Karanja has over 10 years working experience in Kenya and the region working for Save the Children, International Rescue Committee and PACT, among other NGOs, providing support to programs in various development sectors including natural resource management, democracy and governance, education, health, HIV/AIDS, drug supply chain management, education, peace and conflict among other programs. His experience includes program formulation, developing performance management plans, curriculum development, policy development, capacity development and undertaking evaluations. Dr. Karanja received his doctorate in Education Research and Evaluation from the Catholic University of Eastern Africa.

### ANNEX 3

#### SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS AND DELIVERABLES

Date	Time	Name/Group/Institution	Location	Persons Met
Tuesday, 5 September -7 September	Home-based document review			
Tuesday, 5 September	19.00 – 20.00	Introductory Skype call evaluation team		
Friday, 8 September	19:00-20:00	Skype re schedule and team	Dubai	Annette, Jane Oteba, M&E UNRCO
Tuesday, 12 September	International Consultant arrives in Nairobi			
Wednesday, 13 September	11:00	Courtesy Call	UNRCO	Mr. Siddharth Chatterjee, UN Resident Coordinator; Jane Oteba, Annette
	11:30	Security Briefing	UNDP	Ms. Flora Njogu, Country Security Associate, UNDP; Annette
	14:00	M&E WG	UNDP	M&E WG attendees ( <i>To insert list</i> ); Jane, M&E RCO; Annette
	16.30	Human Rights	OHCHR	Ms. Marcella Favretto, Senior Human Rights Advisor, OHCHR; Annette
	17:00-17.30	Evaluation Schedule	UNRCO	Jane, M&E UNRCO; Annette
Thursday, 14 September	09:00-10:00	SRA2	NSSF	SRA 2 representatives: Betty Bakari, UNIDO UNDAF Support; Stephen Gichuki, UNIDO Coordinator; Stephen Githaiga, Beatrice Teya, UN Women Program specialist; Catherine Abate, FAO M&E; Bano Khan, UN Women Program specialist; Victor Magelo, Ministry of Industry UNDAF Focal person; Anne Chale, FAO Policy; Hellen Amakobe, ILO Nutrition Program Coordinator; Annette, Michael
	11:30-13:00	SRA 3	Magna Hotel	SRA 3 attendees: Monica Chizororo, UNICEF Research and Evaluation Specialist; Agnes Ngonyo, UNICEF Education Specialist; John Gacigi, Social Protection Secretariat; David Kamau, WFP Programme officer; Consolata Ntoburi, WFP Snr Programme Asst M&E; David Mugo, UN Women Programme Analyst; Grainne

				Moloney, UNICEF Chief of Nutrition; Henry Damisoni, UNAIDS Senior Strategic Information Adviser; Joyce Lavussa, WHO National Professional Officer RMNH and Gender Equity Focal Point WHO/Kenya; Hillary Kipruto, WHO National professional Officer/Health Systems Strengthening WHO/KCO; Esther Waters-Crane, UNICEF Chief of PME; Rudi Eggers, WHO Representative Kenya; Werner Schultink, UNICEF KCO Representative; Annette, Michael
	14:00-14:30	UNDP Procurement – contractual matters	UNDP Procurement	Jane Oteba, UNRCO M&E Specialist; Christine Kiura, UNDP Procurement Associate; Margaret Mbugua, UNDP Procurement; Annette, Michael,
	14:30-14:45	UNRCO – interview schedule; UNDAF formulation workshop	UNRCO	Jane Oteba, M&E UNRCO; Annette, Michael
	15:00-15:30	Meeting summary; division of evaluation tasks	UNON Block M	Annette, Michael
Friday, 15 September	08:00-09:00	PMT	WFP Kenya	Mr. Paul Turnbull, Deputy Country Director, WFP Kenya; Annette, Michael
	10:30-12:00	Devolution WG	UNON garden	Mr. Tim Colby, UNDP Devolution Advisor, Chair, Devolution WG, UNDP; Annette, Michael
	12:00-13:30	SDG TWG	UNON garden	Mr. Rodgers Dhliwayo, SDG TWG; Mr. Julius Chokera, SGD TWG; Annette, Michael
Monday, 18 September	09:00-10:00	SRA 1	UN WOMEN	Tim, UNDP Devolution Advisor; Marcella Favretto, OHCHR Human Rights Advisor; James Wagalla, UNDP M&E Officer; Francis Mwangi, UNDP M&E Specialist; David Maina, UNDP Governance specialist; Zebib Kavuma, UN Women Country Director; Jeptum Bargolia, UNODC Project Officer; Joyce Deloge, UNDP

				Program Analyst; Lucy Mathenge, UN Women Program Associate; Maureen Gitonga, UN Women Program Analyst; Annette, Michael
	10:00-11:00	SRA 4	UN Habitat	Idil Absiye, UN Women Peace & Security Specialist; Robert Sangori, Ministry of Transport Ag Chief Research Officer; Beatrice Teya, UN Women Humanitarian and DRR Specialist; Marko Lesukat, UNFPA Humanitarian Specialist; Olga Konko, Project Ass. M&E Focal Point; Francis Matheka, UNDP Livelihood Specialist; Jeremia Ougo, UN Habitat National Officer Kenya, Regional Office for Africa; Annette, Michael
	14:00-15:00	OMT	UNFPA	Mr. Charles Owe, international Operations manager UNFPA and OMT Chair; Annette
Tuesday, 19 September	10:00-11:00	NSC	Treasury	Tom Mokaya Head of UN Desk; Penina Mukami Deputy Head of UN Desk; Pacifica Ogolla, Ministry of Environment Climate Change program coordinator; Chrisantus Okioma, Ministry of Finance, Macroplanning; Jane Oteba, M&E RCO; Michael, Annette
	14.00-15.00	SRA1	DCD UN Women	Karin Feug, UN Women Deputy Director KCO, Michael
Wednesday, 20 September	14:30	MTP 2 and 3	UNDP	Rogers Dhliwayo, Economic Advisor, Julius Chokera, Economist; Annette
Thursday, 21 September	12.30	Human Rights/Programming Principle/SRA	OHCHR	Marcella Favretto, OHCHR Human Rights Advisor; Michael, Annette

	14.30	SRA 3	UNIDO	Emmanuel Kalezi, UNIDO representative to Kenya, Eritrea and South Sudan; Stephen Gicuki, SRA 3 Coordinator; Michael, Annette
Friday, 22 September		Inception Report Preparation		
Monday, 25 September	10.00 – 11.00	Humanitarian affairs	UNOCHA	Quacquarella Giovanni, Humanitarian Affairs Office, Michael, Annette
	14.30	UNCG	UNIC	Newton Kalema, Deputy Director UNIC, Michael, Annette
Tuesday, 26 September	10.00-11.00	Marsabit Moyale Flagship	UNRCO	Dr Asfaw Kumasa, Chief technical Advisor Kenya – Ethiopia Area Based Cross-border integrated program, Annette, Michael
	11.00-12.00	SDG Platform	UNRCO	Arif Neki, Advisor, UN strategic partnerships Kenya Co-coordinator SDG Philanthropy platform, Annette, Michael
Wednesday, 27 September	9.00 – 10.00	Marsabit Moyale Flagship project	Java House	Hussein Adan, Economic advisor to Governor Marsabit; Dr Asfaw Kumasa, Annette, Michael
	Submission of <b>Inception Report</b> by International Consultant			
Monday, 2 October	9.00 – 10.00	Turkana program	UN Habitat	Yuka Tarada, Program management officer (Human settlement); Oana Baloi, Associate Urban manager, Michael, Annette
Tuesday, 3 October	11.00- 12.00	Donors	Norwegian embassy	Victor Ronneberg, Ambassador, Permanent Representative to UNEP and UN-HABITAT; Guvnor Skakne, Counsellor, Head of Development; Annette, Michael
	14.30 – 15.20	SDG Philanthropy Platform	Rockefeller Foundation	Mamdouh Biteye, Executive Director Africa, Rockefeller Foundation; Annette, Michael
	15.30	Donors	World Bank Group	Dr Gandham Ramana, Program Leader Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda, and Eritrea

				Country Development, Africa Region; Annette, Michael
Wednesday, 4 October	11.00 - 11.45	Civil Society	Chapter one	Irungu Houghton, Executive Director Chapter one; Annette, Michael
	12.00 – 13.00	Private sector/RMNCAH	Philips East Africa	Dr Eddine Sarroukh, Head of Research Africa, Philips East Africa Ltd, Annette, Michael
Thursday, 5 October	9.00	Donors	European Union	Hubert, Minister Counsellor, Head of Cooperation; Annette, Michael
	13.00- 14.00	Private sector/SDG platform	By Skype	Sriram Bharatum, Founder and Chief mentor Kuza Biashara; Annette, Michael
	16.30	Additional UNCT, other interviews	By telephone	Per Knutsson, Head of UNRCO; Annette
Friday, 6 October	12.00-1.30	UNDAF programmes, partnerships	UNON	Siddharth Chatterjee, UN Resident Coordinator; Annette
Monday, 9 October	11.00	SDG Platform	UNON	Arif Nkey, Annette
Tuesday, 10 October	12.00	Multi-stakeholder partnerships; private sector	KPMG	Julio Garrido-Mirapeix, Head/Director International Development Advisory Services (IDAS), Annette, Michael
	10.00	Turkana project	UNHCR	Ivana Unluova, Assistant Representative (Programme) Carmeline Mwenja, Associate Programme Officer, Mazyar Alexander, Senior Development Adviser, Annette, Michael
	14.30	SDG platform	Ford Foundation	Maurice Makoloo, Regional Director Ford Foundation - East Africa, Annette, Michael
Wednesday, 11 October	8.00 – 9.00	SRA 2 co lead	UNON cafe	Dr Rudi Egger, WHO Country Director, Annette
	11.00 – 11.30	Turkana implementing partner; civil society	By telephone	Abbas Gulett, Secretary General, Kenya Red Cross Society, Annette, Michael
Thursday, 12 October	9.00 - 10.00	NSC	External Resources Department Treasury	Moses Kanagi, Treasury Deputy Director and Head, Europe Division, Penina Mukami, Deputy Head of UN Desk, Annette, Michael

Friday, 13 October	9.00 – 9.30	FCDC	By telephone	Hon Mohamed, Chairman FCDC secretariat, Annette, Michael
	11.30 – 12.30	RMNCAH	UNFPA	Gift Maluga, Deputy Representative, UNFPA Dr Bashir Issak, Programme co-ordinator, Zipporah Gathiti, M&E Specialist, Annette, Michael
Monday, 16 October	<b>Debriefing PPT presentation preparation – International Consultant</b>			
Tuesday, 17 October	10.00 – 11.00	Joint Program on cereal enhancement/Resilient Agriculture	FAO	Tito Arunga, Head of Unit, Agribusiness, Annette, Michael
	11.00 – 12.30	Joint Program on AIDS	UNAIDS	Jantine Jacobi, Country Director Mumtaz Mia, Senior Policy and Strategy Advisor, Michael, Annette
	16.30- 17.00	Resilience Programming	By Skype	Anne Juepner, Director, Global Policy Centre on Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification; Yuko Kurauchi, Global Policy Centre; Annette
Wednesday, 18 Oct	9.00-10.30	SRA Technical Working Groups Debrief	UNICEF Conference Room	See attached list
Thursday, 19 Oct	8.30 – 9.30	UNCT Debrief	Conference Room 14	See attached list
	11.30 – 12.00	Turkana Programme	By telephone	Hon Josephat Nanok, Chairman COG and Governor of Turkana, Michael, Annette
	14.00 – 15.00	GWG	UNESCO	Alice Ochanda, Chair Gender TWG, Annette
Monday, 23 October		Turkana Programme	By email	Erastus Ethecon, Coordinator, Turkana Programme
Wednesday, 25 October	Consultants receive consolidated comments from UNCT and TWGs debriefs from UNRCO to inform evaluation draft 1			
	12.30`	SDG Platform debrief feedback	By telephone	Arif Neki, Advisor, UN strategic partnerships Kenya; Annette
Thursday, 2 November	Evaluation Draft 1 submitted to UNRCO			
Friday, 10 November	Consultants receive consolidated stakeholder comments on draft 1 from UNRCO			
Monday, 13 November	Evaluation Draft 2 submitted to UNRCO			
Friday, 24 November	Consultants receive consolidated stakeholder comments on draft 2 from UNRCO			
Monday, 27 November	Final Evaluation Report submitted to UNRCO			



## ANNEX 4

### LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

Institution	Name	Title
<b>Government</b>		
Ministry of Finance and National Treasury	Mr. Alagie Fadera	Director, Development Planning
Ministry of Industry, Trade and cooperatives	Victor Magelo	UNDAF Focal person
Ministry of EAC, Labour and Social protection	John Gacigi	Social Protection Secretariat
Ministry of Transport, Infrastructure, Housing and Urban Development	Robert O. A Sangori	Ag Chief Research Officer
Ministry of Finance and National Treasury	Tom Mokaya	Head of UN Desk
Ministry of Finance and National Treasury	Penina Mukami	Deputy Head of UN desk
Ministry of Finance and National Treasury	Okioma Chrisantus	Macro planning
Ministry of Finance and National Treasury	Moses K Kanagi	Deputy Director and Head, Europe I Division, Resource Mobilization Department
Ministry of Environment and Natural resources	Pacifica Ogolla	Coordinator Climate Change program
Marsabit County	Hussein Adan	Economic Advisor to Marsabit Governor
Turkana County/COG	Josephat Nanok	Governor, Turkana County and Chairman, Council of Governors
<b>UN Agencies</b>		
UNRCO	Mr. Siddharth Chatterjee,	UN RC
UNRCO	Ms. Jane Oteba	M&E, UNRCO
UNICEF	Werner Schultink	KCO Representative
UNI CEF	Grainne Moloney	Chief of Nutrition
UNICEF	Esther Waters-Crane	Chief of PME
UNICEF	Monica Chizororo	Research and Evaluation Specialist
UNICEF	Agnes Ngonyo	Education Specialist
WFP	David Kamau	Programme officer
WFP	Consolata Ntoburi	Snr Programme Asst M&E
WFP	Paul Turnbull	Deputy Country Director
UN Women	David Mugo	Programme Analyst
UN Women	Stephen Githaiga	Program specialist
UN Women	Bano Khan	Program specialist
UN Women	Idil Absiye	Peace & Security Specialist
UN Women	Beatrice Teya	Humanitarian and DRR Specialist
UN Women	Zebib Kavuma	Country Director
UN Women	Lucy Mathenge	Program Associate
UN Women	Maureen Gitonga	Program Analyst
Un Women	Karin Feog	UN Women Deputy Director KCO
UNODC	Jeptum Bargolia	Project Officer

OHCHR	Marcella Favretto	Human Rights Advisor
UNIDO	Betty Bakari	UNDAF Support
UNIDO	Stephen Gichuki	Coordinator
UNIDO	Emmanuel Kalenzi	UNIDO representative to Kenya, Eritrea and South Sudan
UNAIDS	Henry Damisoni	Senior Strategic Information Adviser
UNAIDS	Jantine Jacobi	Country Director
UNAIDS	Mumtaz Mia	Senior Policy and Strategy Advisor
WHO	Dr Joyce Lavussa	National Professional Officer RMNH and Gender Equity Focal Point WHO/Kenya
WHO	Dr Hillary Kipruto	National professional Officer/Health Systems Strengthening WHO/KCO
WHO	Dr Rudi Eggers	WHO Representative Kenya
FAO	Anne Chale	Policy
FAO	Catherine Abate	M&E
FAO	Tito Arunga	Head of Unit, Agribusiness
ILO	Hellen Magutu Amakobe	Nutrition program Co-coordinator
UNDP	Francis Matheka	Livelihood specialist
UNDP	Francis Mwangi	M&E Specialist
UNDP	Tim Colby	Devolution Advisor
UNDP	James Wagalla	M&E Officer
UNDP	David Maina	Governance
UNDP	Joyce Deloge	Program Analyst
UNDP	Rodgers	SDGs TWG
UNDP	Julius	SDGs TWG
UNDP	Anne Juepner	Director, Global Policy Centre for Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification
UNDP	Yuko	Global Policy Centre for Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification
UN HABITAT	Jeremia Atho Ougo	National Officer Kenya, Regional Office for Africa
UN HABITAT	Olga Konko	Project Ass. M&E Focal Point
UN HABITAT	Yuka Tarada	Program management officer (Human settlement)
UN HABITAT	Oana Baloi	Associate Urban manager
UNFPA	Mr. Charles Owe	OMT
UNFPA	Marko Lesukat	Humanitarian Specialist
UNFPA	Gift Maluga	Deputy Representative, UNFPA
UNFPA	Dr Bashir Issak	Programme co-ordinator RMNCAH
UNFPA	Zipporah Gathiti	M&E Specialist RMNCAH
UNOCHA	Quacquarella Giovanni	Humanitarian Affairs Officer
UNRCO	Arif Neky	Advisor, UN strategic partnerships Kenya Co-coordinator SDG Philanthropy platform
UNRCO	Asfaw Kumasa	Chief technical Advisor Kenya – Ethiopia Area Based Cross-border integrated program
UNRCO	Erastus Ethakon	Coordinator, Turkana Programme
UNIC	Newton Kalema	Deputy Director UNIC
UNHCR	Ivana Unluova,	Assistant Representative (Programme)

UNHCR	Carmeline W. Mwenja	Associate Programme Officer
UNHCR	Mazyar Alexander Rostami	Senior Development Adviser
UNESCO	Alice Ochanda	Chair, Gender TWG
<b>NGOs</b>		
Kenya Red Cross Society	Abbas Gulett	Secretary General
Chapter One	Irungu Houghton	Executive Director
<b>Private Sector</b>		
KPMG	Julio Garrido-Mirapeix,	Head/Director International Development Advisory Services (IDAS)
<b>Donors</b>		
World Bank Group	Dr Gandham N.V. Ramana	Program Leader Kenya, Rwanda, Uganda, and Eritrea Country Development, Africa Region
European Union	Hubert Perr	Minister Counsellor, Head of Cooperation, European Union Delegation to the Republic of Kenya
Norwegian Embassy	Victor C. Ronneberg	Ambassador, Permanent Representative to UNEP and UN-HABITAT
Norwegian Embassy	Guvnor W. Skanke	Counsellor, Head of Development
<b>SDG Platform Members</b>		
Rockefeller Foundation	Mamadou Biteye	Africa Managing Director
Philips	Dr Bahaa Eddine Sarroukh	Head of Research Africa, Philips East Africa Ltd
Kuza Biashara	Sriram Bharatam	Founder and Chief Mentor
FORD Foundation	Maurice Makoloo	Regional Director, East Africa

## **ANNEX 5**

### **SUMMARY MINUTES OF UNDAF FINAL EVALUATION DEBRIEFING FOR UNCT UNON CONFERENCE ROOM 14**

**19<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 2017<sup>122</sup>**

**ATTENDANCE:** Siddharth Chatterjee, UN Resident Coordinator; Aminul Islan, UNICEF Child protection Specialist; Douglas Nagewan, UNICEF Chief of Operations; Raove Mazou, UNHCR Representative; Marcella Favretto, OHCHR Senior Human Rights Advisor; Rodgers Dhliwayo, UNDP Economic Advisor; Paul Turnbull WFP Deputy CD; Etsuko Inove, IOM Program manager; Sheila Ngatia, UNDP HOP; Jane Oteba. UNRCO, M&E; Jantine Jacobi, UNAIDS Country Director; Victor Oluoch, UNCT Communications; Jane Likimani – Gachanja, UNRCO Coordination Analyst, Dr Annette Ittig, International Evaluation Consultant, Dr Michael Karanja, National Evaluation Consultant.

#### **Welcome Remarks/ Opening Statements**

The meeting was chaired by the UN Resident Coordinator Mr Siddharth Chatterjee. He welcomed all the participants to the meetings and asked the international consultant to introduce herself. Annette introduced herself with a short bio on her previous UNDAF evaluation experience and noted that she and Dr Karanja had been working on the evaluation for the last one month. Thereafter, all the participants introduced themselves.

#### **Presentation of Evaluation Findings by International Evaluation consultant**

Dr. Annette Ittig, the International Consultant, presented the evaluation findings and recommendations. She said the debriefing was only a short review of the process and findings and details will be contained in the first draft to be circulated next week. The final draft is expected to be submitted towards end of November.

Dr. Ittig used 55 power point slides to present details based on the following talking Points: Evaluation Objectives and Methodologies, Evaluation Constraints, Contexts, Findings (Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability), Best Practices, Lessons Learned and Recommendations.

She said the evaluation was more at strategic level, since outcomes and outputs had been exhaustively dealt with during the mid-term evaluation. She said the evaluation followed the OECD DAC criteria and included document review, key informant interviews and Focus Group Discussions with a variety of respondents from UN, GOK, CSOs, funders, private sector and development partner representatives were consulted including the Governor of Turkana who is also the Chairman, Council of Governors.

There were constraints including lack of baselines, the timing of the evaluation which was during heightened political tension and security concerns as a result of fresh presidential elections ordered by the Kenyan Supreme Court, and absence of self-assessment reports on strategic Results Area 4.

Annette explained that the UNDAF was implemented in the backdrop of prevailing country contexts including promotion of Kenya to Lower Middle Income Country (LMIC) status in 2014, devolution, drought, young population with demographic dividend potential, Vision 2030 and MPT II. There was also the contexts arising from modifications in international aid agenda and UN programming including post 2015

---

<sup>122</sup> I am indebted to Michael Karanja, the National Consultant, for his recording and write-up of these minutes: Annette Ittig, Team Leader, Kenya UNDAF final evaluation

aid agenda, SDGs, DaO approach (this being Kenya's first), winding down UN Humanitarian coordination architecture, moving from project funding to financing for development and UNDS reform, all having an impact on the next UNDAF formulation. Annette explained the 2014-2018 UNDAF and its 4 Results areas: Transformative Governance; Human Capital Development; Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth and Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security.

Findings concerning the design stage of UNDAF 2014-2018 indicate that the formulation of the 2014-2018 UNDAF and that of the MTP II were not synchronized. There was good alignment in some areas such as education while others such as HIV were aligned later after launch of the KASF in 2015. The UNDAF supports MDG Integration in each result area, and MDGs feature in outcome areas and cross cutting issues. MDGs have been replaced by SDGs and the alignment is good. She noted that alignment should be more clear in new UNDAF as final draft of MTP III has been produced prior to the new UNDAF formulation.

In terms of relevance to UNDAF programming principles, Capacity building was the most visible programming principle undertaken for each SRA at enabling environment level (legislation, regulations), organisational level (strengthening systems and procedures, developing standards), and individual level (training). However, capacity building activities were not yet assessed. Integration of gender, HR, other programming principles in the 2014-2018 UNDAF is incomplete. She gave an example of indicator 2.1 under education and learning where data is not disaggregated by gender or location.

The current UNDAF 2014-2015 was relevant in terms of cross-cutting issues such as resilience and working in a devolved context, but the humanitarian/development nexus was not well-considered in current UNDAF and opportunities for transitional, DRP, DRR, DRM activities were missed. Youth agenda was well integrated with some interesting aspects such as Biashara centres but more could be done on demographic dividend aspect.

In terms of effectiveness, the level of achievements of the results was between 30 to 33% but a proper analysis will be done once results for SRA 4 are in. There is also a challenge in the many non-SMART indicators which do not allow capture of actual achievement in areas such as gender equality.

In terms of relevance of UNDAF design, it is output based, thus awkward, and some results areas encompass too many sectors for instance SRA 4. It did not take an ecosystem approach; it was not flexible regarding humanitarian response and not well aligned to MTP II, and results were difficult to measure due to lack of baselines and numerous 'non-SMART' indicators. Nonetheless, there are key achievements for instance in policy development, joint programs such as RMNCAH, AIDS, GBV, flagship programs such as Marsabit and Turkana. She however noted that there could be more synergies between the joint programs e.g. RMNCAH and AIDS. In terms of efficiency in M&E there was lack of joint M&E plan, retrofitting of activities and indicators from already developed CPDs, too many indicators creating much expectations and non-SMART indicators.

With regards effectiveness, in terms of coordination, information on aid financing, coordination, accountability is divided among different Government entities. At highest level strategic decisions on UNDAF are being made jointly by UNCT, represented by RC, Treasury and MoDP. Internal UN Support to UNDAF is being done through PMT, OMT, UNCG, RCO, GWG, SDG WG and Devolution WG. She noted that OMT and UNCG though key enablers do not have a budget under UNDAF. RCO provides coordination, secretariat support to UNCT, PMT, M&E guidance; it should be One Stop Shop for UNDAF and is intended to have the knowledge management (KM) function.

During the 2014-2018 UNDAF, DaO approach was mixed and only two of the five DAO SOPs were met. Generally, UN agencies do not present as one to Government of Kenya, Development Partners and Private sector. At least 45% UN activities are implemented outside UNDAF. Single agency financing or fund raising/resource mobilization seems to be the biggest cause of fragmentation.

Effectiveness in terms of partnerships, there is great potential for exploration by the UN of additional partnerships and collaborations, e.g. non-traditional funders, philanthropies, private sector, for innovative development financing, such as impact investments and other vehicles. There are efforts for instance SDG Partnership Platform - an MPTF project with RCO, UNFPA. There are also others UN agency efforts for financing SDGs including UNEP Positive Impact Initiative: but a PPP legislation is pending, thus partnership policy guidelines for these kinds of UN-private sector partnerships are lacking.

In terms of effectiveness in terms of Partnerships and Resource Mobilization, no UNCT Joint Partnership and Resource Mobilization strategy exists. There are funding gaps in each of the SRAs, with the highest gap being in SRA 3 on inclusive and sustainable growth.

On UN comparative advantages, non-UN sources agree on UN's wide range of technical skills and expertise support in, for example, policy making, health, education and other sectors; Advocacy, support to the achievement of the MDGs, and now SDGs, in Kenya and; Advocacy on human rights among other sensitive issues. Convening power was not agreed upon by all. Several constraints were cited by GOK partners including 2014-2018 UNDAF design process not being inclusive, not being consulted at initial stages on flagship programs, UN processes, procedures being too cumbersome, delays in planning, implementation, fund disbursement and duplication of activities and requests by UN agencies, for instance data requests. UN agencies also cited some constraints such as GOK staff turnover, no joint M&E, funding shortfalls and lack of accurate data for programming.

A lot has been done in building both institutional and human capacity which lays good foundation for sustainability and availability of devolved funds at counties will also contribute to sustainability.

Some of the lessons learned include the fact that effective programme coordination requires time, funding and commitment and that realistic self-assessment of comparative advantages and articulation of their value-added is necessary for effective planning, programming, sustainability of results and that private sector is not a 'new donor'.

In terms of recommendations, among others;

- Assess results of UN's capacity building support in 2014-2018
- Based on assessment and mapping of UN and other support, develop UNDAF-wide strategy for institutional capacity building and human capital development.
- Building on findings of recommended gap assessment,
- Determine where/how UN can best support, strengthen individual, institutional capacities, policies at the county level to deliver services to ensure "no one is left behind"
- Support OMT and UNCG as UNDAF enablers with sufficient funds and include them in UNDAF design process

- The UNCT should utilize the new UNinfo website once it is available in Kenya as an essential tool for updates on and communication about the UNDAF, including minutes of meetings, through an intranet addition to the site
- As Gender & HR are combined as one Programming Principle in post-2015 UNDAFs, use alliance between OHCHR and GWG to ensure that experts on gender and HR are included in each SRA and a roving Gender/HR WG expert should move between WGs to ensure inclusion of gender, HR in programming and M&E
- Articulate and use SMART indicators to assess gender, HR and other programming principles in UNDAF; ensure full review of UNDAF document by GWG for complete gender mainstreaming, and GEWE as a programming principle.
- Effectiveness of resource mobilization - joint resource mobilization and partnership strategy should be developed in collaboration with the **GoK** through Treasury,
- Fund mobilization strategy should include protocol on approaches to donors and other funders
- Financing - UNCT should do a brief on purpose, funding of the Platform, e.g. the MPTF supports the Platform to identify and catalyse partnerships
- UNDS reform, convene a day long workshop for the UNCT towards an intermediate level of understanding on impact investment/blended financing and how they can support the achievement of the SDGs.
- Partnership - Convene workshop on national PPP legislation with Treasury, Attorney General, other appropriate national and county representatives, private sector to accelerate enactment of PPP bill
- Resilience must feature prominently in new UNDAF in an outcome/SRA
- Consider whether ABP approach could be applied nationally
- Improvements in Turkana flagship coordination
- Joint programming on youth learning for employability
- Design an Outcome-based UNDAF framework

## Discussions

Generally, responses from the floor were received in the form of comments, clarifications and suggestions:

- Points raised in the evaluation are spot on, providing opportunities and challenges. Humanitarian activities needed to be in current UNDAF as their was joint response by UN which worked efficiently, and the government saw UN Delivering as One in the humanitarian sector. In this regards, consultations are ongoing with government on the new UNDAF structure and expectations
- There is need for close UN working relationship with government in defining the outcome levels. In that case outcome balancing is required for clarity purposes – example SRA 4 had so many sectors put together.
- The presentation provides a balanced story on the UNDAF – both strong and weak points. HIV sector is going to provided more comments separately
- It was a great presentation. On Turkana, the program targets refugee integration and care, health, education, water. UNHCR is working with Red Cross and other stakeholders on the water reservoir worth 12 to 15 million USD and there are potential donors. It will provide lots of livelihood opportunities for Turkana.

- What is the better option to an output based Results framework, given that outputs unpack outcomes and SRAs? (Annette responded that one can do an outcome UNDAF to overcome issues of timing, financing, emerging situations etc. We can make references to other existing ones which have used outcome approach. Outputs can go into annexes)
- Policy and legislation has been key in supporting the devolution process, with reforms in different sectors. Thus we need to highlight or list all policies and legislation that were developed under the current UNDAF. This will be done in the narrative report
- What has worked on not worked in the current DaO? Are we being idealistic in developing a DaO at the local level when it is not the case at the headquarters?
- Can there be a transition period in the DaO process, from a UNDAF to a DaO UNDAF? Implementation is supposed to be progressive due to culture issues. Lack of a high score in DaO approach should not be seen as a failure but as a challenge in the transition process
- IOM had a project in Turkana (10m USD) up to 2015 under UNTrust Fund for Human Security. There is an evaluation report that will be shared
- We will make use of this evaluation to integrate Human Rights issues in the next UNDAF
- Due to deep cultural aspects related to DaO, we need a change management initiative and leadership towards DaO. What the December UN report might say on DaO might not be the reality on the ground.



## ANNEX 6

### Summary Minutes of Debriefing to UN Technical Staff 18<sup>th</sup> October 2017 UNICEF Conference Hall, 9:00 am<sup>123</sup>

#### ATTENDANCE:

Paul Turnbull (Deputy Country Director, WFP); Ms. Jane Oteba (RCO M&E, UNRCO); Sophia Chnichei (Coordination, UNRCO); Jane Likimani (Analyst, UNRCO); Mumtaz Mia (Senior Policy Advisor, UNAIDS); Alice Ochanda (Program Specialist, UNESCO and Chair Gender TWG); Virginia Mumo (National Programme Officer, UNESCO); Saba Bochari (Education, UNESCO); Ang Jia Cong (Urban Design Officer, UN HABITAT); Jeremiah Ougo (National Officer KCO, UN NABITAT); Sheila Ngatia (HOP, UNDP); Rodgers Dhliwayo, Economic Advisor, UNDP); Julius Chokera Economist, UNDP); Zeinabu Khalifu (Program Analyst, UNDP); Joyce Deloge (Program Analyst, UNDP); David Githaiga (TL, UNDP); Asfaw Kumasa (Chief technical Advisor, UNRCO); Carmeline W. Mwenja (Associate Programme Officer, UNHCR); Richard Banda (MO/HW, WHO); Hillary Kipruto (National Professional Officer (NPO), WHO); Martin C. Joseph (NPO, WHO); Nathan Bakayita (MAL Specialist, WHO); Betty Bakari, CS, UNIDO); Lisa Maina (Program Assistant, UN Women); Karen Giathi (Program Associate, UN Women); Nyambura Ngugi (Program Specialist, UN Women); Alice Mwaisaka (NPO, ILO); Trisha DiGiovani (Deputy Country Rep; UNICEF); Evelyn Ongige (Gender and Environment Specialist, UNEP); Damaris Mungai (Gender and Youth Specialist, UNEP); Annette Ittig (International Evaluation Consultant), Michael Karanja, National Evaluation Consultant).

#### **Welcome Remarks/ Opening Statements**

The meeting was chaired by the deputy country Director, World Food Programme Paul Turnbull, He welcomed the participants and invited them to listen to the 2014-2018 UNDAF Final evaluation findings presentation and provide feedback to help improve on the report.

#### **Presentation of Evaluation Findings by International Evaluation consultant**

Dr. Annette Ittig, the International Consultant, presented the evaluation findings and recommendations. She said the process was still on and the debriefing was to initiate discussions and additional inputs into the evaluation. She also thanked the representatives of the partner institutions for their response to the invitation to the debriefing meeting. She said the evaluation was more at strategic level, since outcomes and outputs had been exhaustively dealt with during the mid-term evaluation.

Dr. Ittig used 54 power point slides to present details based on the following talking Points: Evaluation Objectives and Methodologies, Contexts, Constraints, Findings, Best Practices, Lessons Learned and Recommendations.

Some constraints faced included lack of baselines for some indicators and the timing of the evaluation which was during a period of heightened political tension and security concerns as a result of fresh presidential elections ordered by the Kenyan Supreme Court. Also, absence of self-assessment reports on strategic Results Area 4 delayed the analysis of findings.

Annette explained that the UNDAF was implemented in the backdrop of prevailing country contexts including promotion of Kenya to Lower Middle Income Country (LMIC) status in 2014, devolution, drought,

---

<sup>123</sup> \*\*I am indebted to Michael Karanja, the National Consultant, for his recording and write-up of these minutes: Annette Ittig, Team Leader, Kenya UNDAF final evaluation

young population with demographic dividend potential, Vision 2030 and MPT II. There was also the contexts arising from modifications in international aid agenda and UN programming including post 2015 aid agenda, SDGs, DaO approach (this being Kenya's first), winding down UN Humanitarian coordination architecture, moving from project funding to financing for development and UNDS reform, all having an impact on the next UNDAF formulation. Annette explained the 2014-2018 UNDAF and its 4 Results areas: Transformative Governance; Human Capital Development; Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth and Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security.

Findings concerning the design stage of UNDAF 2014-2018 indicate that the formulation of the 2014-2018 UNDAF and that of the MPT II were not synchronized. There was good alignment in some areas such as education while others such as HIV were aligned later after launch of the KASF in 2015. The UNDAF supports MDG Integration in each result area, and MDGs feature in outcome areas and cross cutting issues. MDGs have been replaced by SDGs and the alignment is good. She noted that alignment with MPT III should be more clear in new UNDAF as final draft of MPT III has been produced prior to the new UNDAF formulation.

In terms of relevance to UNDAF programming principles, Capacity building was the most visible programming principle undertaken for each SRA at enabling environment level (legislation, regulations), organisational level (strengthening systems and procedures, developing standards), and individual level (training). However, capacity building activities were not yet assessed. Integration of gender, HR, other programming principles in the 2014-2018 UNDAF is incomplete. She gave an example of indicator 2.1 under education and learning where data is not disaggregated by gender or location.

The current UNDAF 2014-2015 was relevant in terms of cross-cutting issues such as resilience and working in a devolved context, but the humanitarian/development nexus was not well-considered in current UNDAF and opportunities for transitional, DRP, DRR, DRM activities were missed. Youth agenda was well integrated with some interesting aspects such as Biashara centres but more could be done on the demographic dividend aspect.

In terms of effectiveness in terms of the level of achievements of the results was estimated to be between 30 to 33% but a proper analysis will be done once results for SRA 4 are in. There is also a challenge of the many non-SMART indicators which do not allow capture of actual achievement in areas such as gender equality.

In terms of relevance of UNDAF design, it is output based, thus awkward, and some results areas for instance SRA 4 encompass too many sectors. The UNDAF design did not take an ecosystem approach; was not flexible regarding humanitarian response; not well aligned to MPT II, and results were difficult to measure due to lack of baselines and numerous 'non-SMART' indicators. Nonetheless, there are key achievements for instance in policy development, joint programs such as RMNCAH, AIDS, GBV and flagship programs such as Marsabit and Turkana. She however noted that there could be more synergies between the joint programs e.g. RMNCAH and AIDS. In terms of efficiency in M&E there was lack of joint M&E plan, retrofitting of activities and indicators from already developed CPDs, too many indicators creating much expectations and non-SMART indicators.

With regards effectiveness in terms of coordination, information on aid financing, coordination, accountability is divided among different Government entities. At the highest level strategic decisions on UNDAF are being made jointly by UNCT, represented by RC, Treasury and MoDP. Internal UN Support to UNDAF is being done through PMT, OMT, UNCG, UNRCO, GWG, SDG WG and Devolution WG. She noted

that OMT and UNCG though key enablers do not have a budget under UNDAF. UNRCO provides coordination, secretariat support to UNCT, PMT, M&E guidance. It should be One Stop Shop for UNDAF and is intended to have the knowledge management (KM) function.

During the 2014-2018 UNDAF, DaO approach was mixed and only two of the five DAO SOPs were met. Generally UN agencies do not present as one to Government of Kenya, Development Partners and Private sector. At least 45% UN activities are implemented outside UNDAF. Single agency financing or fund raising/resource mobilization seems to be the biggest cause of fragmentation.

On effectiveness in terms of partnerships, there is great potential for exploration by the UN of additional partnerships and collaborations, for instance non-traditional funders, philanthropies and private sector for innovative development financing such as impact investments and other vehicles. There are efforts for instance SDG Partnership Platform - an MPTF project with UNRCO, UNFPA. There are also other UN agency efforts for financing SDGs including UNEP Positive Impact Initiative: but an amended PPP legislation is pending, thus partnership policy guidelines for these kinds of UN-private sector partnerships are lacking.

In terms of effectiveness in terms of Partnerships and Resource Mobilization, no UNCT Joint Partnership and Resource Mobilization strategy exists. There are funding gaps in each of the SRAs, with the highest gap being in SRA 3 on inclusive and sustainable growth.

On UN comparative advantages, non UN sources agree on UN's wide range of technical skills and expertise support in, for example, Policy making, health, education and other sectors; Advocacy and support to the achievement of the MDGs, and now SDGs, in Kenya and; Advocacy on human rights among other sensitive issues. Convening power was not agreed upon by all.

Several constraints were cited by GOK partners including 2014-2018 UNDAF design process not being inclusive and not being consulted at initial stages on flagship programs. The UN processes and procedures were said to be too cumbersome and there were delays in planning, implementation and fund disbursement. There was duplication of activities and requests by UN agencies, for instance data requests. UN agencies also cited some constraints such as GOK staff turnover, no joint M&E, funding shortfalls and lack of accurate data for programming.

A lot has been done in building both institutional and human capacity which lays good foundation for sustainability and availability of devolved funds at counties will also contribute to sustainability.

Some of the lessons learned include the fact that effective programme coordination requires time, funding and commitment and that realistic self-assessment of comparative advantages and articulation of their value-added is necessary for effective planning, programming, sustainability of results and that private sector is not a 'new donor'.

In terms of recommendations, among others;

- Assess results of UN's capacity building support in 2014-2018
- Based on assessment and mapping of UN and other support, develop UNDAF-wide strategy for institutional capacity building and human capital development.

- Building on findings of recommended gap assessment, determine where/how UN can best support, strengthen individual, institutional capacities, policies at the county level to deliver services to ensure “no one is left behind”.
- Support OMT and UNCG as UNDAF enablers with sufficient funds and include them in UNDAF design process
- The UNCT should utilize the new UNinfo website as an essential tool for updates on and communication about the UNDAF, including minutes of meetings, through an intranet addition to the site
- As Gender & HR are combined as one Programming Principle in post-2015 UNDAFs, use alliance between OHCHR and GWG to ensure that experts on gender and HR are included in each SRA and a roving Gender/HR WG expert should move between WGs to ensure inclusion of gender, HR in programming and M&E
- Articulate and use SMART indicators to assess gender, HR and other programming principles in UNDAF; ensure full review of UNDAF document by GWG for complete gender mainstreaming, and GEWE as a programming principle.
- Effectiveness of resource mobilization - joint resource mobilization and partnership strategy should be developed in collaboration with the **GoK** through Treasury,
- Fund mobilization strategy should include protocol on approaches to donors and other funders
- On Financing, UNCT should do a brief on purpose and design of the Platform
- On UNDS reform, convene a day long workshop for the UNCT towards an intermediate level of understanding on impact investment/blended financing and how they can support the achievement of the SDGs.
- On Partnerships - Convene workshop on national PPP legislation with Treasury, Attorney General, other appropriate national and county representatives, private sector to accelerate enactment of the amended PPP bill pending in Senate
- Resilience must feature prominently in new UNDAF in an outcome/SRA
- Consider whether ABP approach could be applied nationally
- Improvements in Turkana flagship coordination
- Joint programming on youth learning for employability
- Design an Outcome-based UNDAF framework
- Strengthen sub-national M&E capacities

## **Discussions**

Generally, responses from the floor were received in the form of comments and suggestions:

- Results of Strategic Result Area 4 on Environmental, Land management and Human security team will be provided to the consultants
- Turkana county has already signed an MPTF and is awaiting fund on the same to implement planned activities
- The discussions on funding modalities suggested for the next UNDAF link well with the UN secretary general’s speech. Private sector investment and SDG financing innovations will be key in the coming periods. There was a question on what the SDG platform entailed. Annette explained that the SDG platform is not a funding mechanism but a platform to catalyze funding from private sector and philanthropy.

- The change of status of Kenya to a Lower Middle Income Country has implications for UN presence and country funding. UN's role in capacity building, especially where government staff seem well capacitated will need to be assessed for best fit. It will be important to undertake an assessment of implications of the change of the country status for better positioning of UN in the country.
- Given the change of status of Kenya to LMIC, UN needs to focus more on supporting development of policy frameworks at national and county level, capacity building activities, CIDP formulation in counties and matters of environment which needs to feature prominently due to the climate change phenomenon and its effects in the country. Thus, the environment sector needs to be well highlighted in the next UNDAF
- UNHCR has a joint program in Kalobeyi with several UN agency partners. The World Bank funding to Kenya is not targeted at refugees but rather host communities who live in the area affected by refugee influx, around Dadaab, Garissa county and Kakuma, Turkana county in terms of environmental degradation. The refugee bill which is in the legislation process looks at social integration not citizenship.
- It is estimated that about 30% of activities are on track. However, the performance figures will be analyzed and presented when all the self-assessment results are received specifically SRA 4 results. That way we will have a better picture of % of activities that are on track.
- UNAIDS shows a best practice in effective co-ordination of agencies. This is partly due to commitment and passion of the agency lead, something other agencies need to learn from.
- Participants who have some comments as well as useful materials/documents will share with Jane (M&E UNRCO) who will in turn share with the evaluators.

In his final remarks, Mr. Turnbull noted that the current UNDAF had not included humanitarian work which is key in UN bodies such as WFP and UNICEF. He said the next UNDAF will be more inclusive reflecting a wider range of UN activities including humanitarian. The M&E specialist, Jane Oteba said a draft report will be circulated for comments before a final evaluation report is produced.