



# **SECOND ROUND OF MONITORING OF THE GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP: VALIDATION WORKSHOP AT THE KENYATTA INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION CENTRE**

AID EFFECTIVENESS SECRETARIAT  
RESOURCE MOBILIZATION DEPARTMENT  
NATIONAL TREASURY  
7<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2016

# Background: Monitoring Development Co-operation Commitments

- **Paris Surveys (2006-2011)**

- ✓ 3 surveys - Monitored progress against commitments made in the Paris Declaration, and subsequent Accra Agenda for Action (2010 targets)
- ✓ Monitoring coordinated by the OECD (Working Party of Aid Effectiveness (WP-EFF))



## **GPEDC monitoring (2012-today)**

- ✓ The Busan HLM (2011) called for the creation of a selective and relevant set of indicators to monitor progress against the commitments agreed in Busan, alongside with those set out in Paris and in Accra (2015 targets)
- ✓ Monitoring coordinated by the OECD-UNDP Joint Support Team of the newly established GPEDC, following a “global-light, country-focused approach”
- ✓ Establishment of the GPEDC monitoring framework in 2012 (PBIG)
- ✓ 2013-14 First monitoring round → Progress Report for the Mexico HLM (2014)
- ✓ 2015-16 Second monitoring round → Progress Report for the Kenya HLM (2016)



- **Future of the GPEDC monitoring**

- ✓ Increase relevance of the framework to the post 2030 agenda context (incl. SSC)
- ✓ Revisions to the monitoring framework (incl. targets) to be agreed at the HLM2
- ✓ Building on experience from the 2015-16 round + Monitoring Advisory Group recommendations



# DATA RECEIVED

- ❖ The National Treasury received and consolidated data from 19 providers out of 35.
- ❖ Providers who did not respond are: **Belgium, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Abu Dhabi, BADEA, OPEC, South Korea, UNIDO, UNEP, WFP, GAVI, Ford Foundation, Global Fund, IFAD, China and India,**
- ❖ The civil society organizations, private sector actors and foundations provided qualitative information for indicators 2 & 3
- ❖ Relevant government Ministries also provided quantitative & qualitative information for indicators .
- ❖ Multi-stakeholder dialogue meetings were held with stakeholders to agree and clarify on responses i.e for Indicator 2 at the Embassy of Sweden
- ❖ Data for FY 2014/2015 was assessed

# INDICATORS

## **Global Indicators – data collected by the Joint Support Team (JST)**

The JST is coordinating the data consolidation and will share findings with relevant stakeholders (providers and other stakeholders) for the following indicators:

- ❑ **Indicator 3 (Module 1):** The legal and regulatory context for Public-Private Dialogue
- ❑ **Indicator 4:** Transparency: information on development co-operation is publicly available (IATI and OECD-DAC)
- ❑ **Indicator 9a-** Quality of developing country Public Financial Management systems (CPIA)
- ❑ **Indicator 10:** Aid is untied (OECD-DAC )

# INDICATORS

## Indicators using national sources of information

Data on the following indicators was collected at the country level:

- ❑ **Indicator 1-** Development Cooperation is focused on results that meet developing countries' priorities
- ❑ **Indicator 2-** Civil society operates within an environment that maximizes its engagement in and contribution to development
- ❑ **Indicator 3-** Engagement and contribution of the private sector to development (Open Budget Survey and World Wide governance indices)
- ❑ **Indicator 5 (a &b)-** Development co-operation is more predictable (annual and medium-term respectively)
- ❑ **Indicator 6 –** Aid is on budgets which are subject to parliamentary scrutiny
- ❑ **Indicator 7 -** Mutual Accountability strengthened through inclusive reviews (Country-led UNDESA survey on mutual accountability)
- ❑ **Indicator 8:** Gender equality and women's empowerment (Country-led UN Women )
- ❑ **Indicator 9b –** Use of developing country PFM and procurement systems

# **DISCUSSION OF RESULTS FOR INDICATORS 1,2,3,5 (a& b), 6, 9b, 7 and 8**

## INDICATOR 1

### *Ownership and results*

**Extent of use of country-owned results frameworks by providers of development co-operation**



Aid Effectiveness Kenya



- **Objectives of the indicator**

- ✓ Paris, Accra and Busan called for **relying on partner country results frameworks and M&E systems** in order to “increase the focus on development results that meet developing countries’ priorities”.

- **Underpinning commitments**

- ✓ **2011** - Busan commitment called for the adoption of transparent, country-led results frameworks as a common tool among all concerned actors to assess performance of development cooperation efforts, using indicators drawn from the country’s development priorities and goals.
- ✓ Development cooperation providers also agreed to “minimize the use of additional frameworks, refraining from requesting the introduction of performance indicators that were not consistent with countries’ national development strategies”



## INDICATOR 1

### Global target for 2015

All providers of development co-operation use country-owned results frameworks in preparing their interventions

### Responses from the monitoring exercise

**Q<sup>g</sup>1.** What is the share of new interventions that draw their objectives/development focus from government-led results frameworks, plans and strategies?

❖ **A total of 80 new programmes in 2015 with budgets of USD 1,000,000.00 and above were reported by providers**

❖ **Fifty-three (53) or 66.25% of the new programmes use country-owned results frameworks in preparing their interventions(were approved by both government and providers)**

❖ **The rest of the programmes twenty-seven (27) or 33.75% are therefore not aligned to the country-owned results framework.**

**Q<sup>g</sup>2.** What is the share of results indicators included in the interventions' results framework/logical framework that draw on results indicators from existing government-led results frameworks, plans and strategies?

**Response :** The share of results indicators which make use of Country Owned Results Frameworks stands at 54 %

## INDICATOR 1

**Q<sup>3</sup>.** What is the share of results indicators that rely on sources of data provided by existing country-led monitoring systems or statistics?

**Response :** The share of results indicators which rely on sources of data provided by country- led monitoring systems is 41%

**Q<sup>4</sup>.** What is the share of new interventions that plan a final (ex-post) evaluation supported by the government?

**Response :** The share of new interventions that plan a final evaluation that is supported by government is 81%

## INDICATOR 1

### Description of the Kenya's results framework

- ❖ Kenya has domesticated the African Community of Practice (AfCoP) on managing for development results i.e. The Kenya Community of Practice (KCoP) on managing for development results.
- ❖ KCoP was established in 2010
- ❖ AfCoP was established in 2007 with a commitment to efficiency in delivery by using: managing for results (MfDR) practices; and Mainstreaming MfDR capacity in country support institutional reforms for sustainable change and better service delivery.

## INDICATOR 1

### Description of the Kenya's results framework... Cont'd

- ❖ The Africa for Results (AfriK4R) Initiative assesses MfDR based on six pillars namely:
  - ✓ Leadership for results- Legal framework i.e. Constitution of Kenya, Relevant Acts of Parliament (PFM, Division of Revenue etc)
  - ✓ Planning for results-Vision 2030, MTPs, CIDPs, Sector Plans, CFSP,
  - ✓ Budgeting for results/ results –based budgeting- PBB, MTEF,
  - ✓ Institutional capacity to deliver goods and services- Performance contract , capacity building/hiring, competitive and transparent recruitment
  - ✓ Information systems, statistical capacity and monitoring & evaluation- IFMIS, e-ProMIS, e-Procurement, NIMES
  - ✓ Accountability and partnership - Audit reports, Annual Progress Reports, Mid-term Review, End Term Evaluation, Aid Effectiveness Group, Development Partnership Forum

## INDICATOR 2

### ***CSO Enabling Environment and Development Effectiveness***

**Extent to which:**

- (a) governments and providers contribute to an enabling environment for CSOs**
- (b) CSOs are implementing development effectiveness principles in their own operations**



## INDICATOR 2

*Note: This is a new indicator. The methodology was refined in close collaboration with the Task team on CSO DE and EE (incl. CPDE), and light tested in El Salvador and Rwanda.*

- **Global target for 2015**

Continued progress over time

- **Objectives of the indicator**

- ✓ Assess the extent to which governments and providers contribute to an enabling environment for CSOs and to which CSOs are in alignment with development effectiveness principles.
- ✓ Collect **qualitative information at country level**, to inform a global snapshot on the state of play of CSO EE and CSO DE (2016 progress report)
- ✓ **Spark multi-stakeholder dialogue** (engaging governments, CSOs, providers, parliamentarians) at country, regional and global levels
- ✓ **Incentivize behaviour change** of all stakeholders for effective implementation of Busan commitments

- **Underpinning commitments**

- ✓ **2011 - Busan** commitment to enable CSOs to exercise their roles as independent development actors, with a particular focus on EE (§22a) and to encourage CSOs to implement practices that strengthen their accountability and their contribution to (§22b)



Aid Effectiveness Kenya



## INDICATOR 2

### Discussion of Results

The national coordinator reported on the following questions, in consultation with representatives from providers and CSOs.

#### **MODULE 1. Space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on national development policies**

- ✓ **Q<sup>g+1</sup>**. Are CSOs consulted by the government in the design, implementation and monitoring of national development policies?

**Response: Yes. As evidenced by:**

- ❖ **Principles of public participation and transparency as enshrined in the Constitution of Kenya and in the PBO Act**
- ❖ **Government mechanisms for consultation with CSOs in the planning, budgeting and execution of national development policies exist at varying levels**
- ❖ **Marginalized groups are recognized in the policy making process and program implementation albeit through affirmative actions.**

#### **Challenges:**

- ❖ **Due to delays in implementation of the PBO Act (2013) a much more structured operational framework for CSO's consultation is lacking.**
- ❖ **Feedback mechanisms to demonstrate the extent of uptake of CSOs inputs are lacking.**

## INDICATOR 2

### Discussion of Results ...Continued

✓ **Q<sup>9</sup>+2.** Do CSOs have the right to access government information?

**Response: Yes-**

- ❖ **Article 35 (1a and 3) of the Constitution guarantees access to information.**
- ❖ **The government information can be accessed through: Websites of MDAs and Counties**
- ❖ **The public can purchase various publications and reports from the government printer**
- ❖ **Public and privately owned media, Task and special teams' reports and Parliamentary proceedings.**

### Challenges

- ❖ **Absence of the Information Act is a hindrance to full accessibility to public information**
- ❖ **Some of the information is not availed on timely basis and at times may not be relevant**
- ❖ **Some aspects of the information provided are too technical for the general public consumption**



## INDICATOR 2

### Discussion of Results ...Continued

- ✓ **Q9+3.** Are there resources and/or training opportunities for addressing capacity building of all stakeholders (including government, CSOs and co-operation providers) to engage meaningfully in multi-stakeholder dialogue?

**Response: Yes**

- ❖ **The Government in consultation with stakeholders has developed and are implementing the**
  - ✓ **National Capacity Building Framework that addresses their capacity gaps.**
  - ✓ **Training needs assessment at the national level**
- ❖ **The frameworks do not incorporate all stakeholders**
- ❖ **Development Partners provide resources to both the government and CSOs in support of training initiatives.**

### Recommendations

- ❖ **Develop an all inclusive and comprehensive framework of capacity building/training**

### Discussion of Results ...Continued

#### MODULE 2: CSO development effectiveness: accountability and transparency

- ✓ **Q9+4.** In practice, are there CSO-managed processes in place to address transparency and multiple accountabilities in CSO operations?

#### Response

##### Yes

- ❖ Issues of accountability by individual CSOs are guided by respective government legal frameworks/ constitutions /program contracts.
- ❖ At the macro level, a few CSOs have initiated frameworks for self-regulation e.g. VIWANGO and the CSO Reference Group.

#### Challenge

- ❖ Government has not recognized such mechanisms as the guiding law (PBO Act) is yet to take effect.

## INDICATOR 2

### Discussion of Results ...Continued

- ✓ **Q9+5.** Do CSO-initiated coordination processes exist to facilitate consolidated and inclusive CSO representation in policy dialogue (e.g. umbrella organisation, CSO network, consultation practices)?

#### Response

Yes

- ❖ There are Initiated Coordination processes that facilitate CSO representation.
- ❖ At the macro level, there are coalitions such as the NGO Council and the NGO congress.
- ❖ At thematic level, there are networks which bring together CSOs within specific policy areas e.g. Health Network (HENNET), Kenya Water and Sanitation network (KEWASNET), and PEACENET

#### Challenges

- ❖ These efforts face numerous challenges including financial, political interference and weak structures.
- ✓ **Q9+6.** Do mechanisms exist to facilitate coordination on programming among CSOs (collaboration to optimise impact and avoid duplication), and with other development actors?

Yes

- ❖ **VIWANGO** has created a benchmark against which CSOs can measure their own performance and compare with other organizations
- ❖ CSO of the year awards to promote CSO excellence.

#### Recommendation

Initiatives need to cover more CSOs and not limit to members of a coalition as is the position currently.

## INDICATOR 2

### Discussion of Results ...Continued

- ✓ **Q<sup>9+7</sup>**. Are there other significant initiatives related to CSO development effectiveness principles being implemented at the country level?

#### Response

##### No

- ❖ **However, there are trainings that have been initiated in partnership with the Treasury to commence the domestication of the Istanbul Principles.**
- ✓ **Q<sup>9+8</sup>**. Do CSOs report annually to government on the basic finances, sectors of support, and main geographic areas of involvement in development?

#### Response

##### Yes

- ❖ **CSOs registered by the NGO Coordination Board compile returns to the board**

## INDICATOR 2

### Discussion of Results ...Continued

#### MODULE 3. Official development co-operation with CSOs

- ✓ **Q9+9.** Do providers of development co-operation consult with CSOs on their development policy/programming in a systematic way?

#### **Response**

##### **No**

- ❖ **At policy level- Country Assistance Strategies are developed and approved by the provider headquarters leaving little room for consultation with the Kenyan CSOs**
- ❖ **However at programmatic level , providers regularly consult civil society on strategy and program implementation.**
- ❖ **Consultation are mostly exclusive - 1). Take place at Embassy offices and on invitation 2). Main aim is to ensure that CSOs align to provider objectives 3). Grassroots stakeholders rarely invited**

#### **Recommendation**

**Need for institutionalized structures and systems to guide inclusive consultations and feedback**

## INDICATOR 2

### Discussion of Results ...Continued

- ✓ **Q9+10.** Are providers promoting a CSO enabling environment in their co-operation with civil society?

#### Response

##### Yes – By:

- ❖ Having in place clearly articulated policies and guidelines for engaging with CSOs which are guided by national development policies and each development partner's priorities
- ❖ Having in place standardized administrative requirements
- ❖ Offering a mix of funding mechanisms including basket funds where smaller grants are given e.g. the Amkeni facility

#### Challenges

- ❖ Volatility in funding due to other factors e.g. political changes/ priorities
- ❖ Guidelines and requirements to access the funds are restrictive and therefore not accessible to all.

## INDICATOR 2

### Discussion of Results ...Continued

- ✓ **Q9+11.** Is the promotion of a CSO enabling environment an agenda item in providers' policy dialogue with partner governments?

#### Response

##### Yes- Through :

- ❖ **Platforms such as Public Benefits Organization taskforce.**
- ❖ **Individual providers engaging the government by raising specific issues related to CSO enabling environment.**
- ❖ **Direct support to CSO initiatives including the CSO reference group on enabling environment.**
- ✓ **Q9+12:** Do providers share information on their CSO support with the government?

#### Response

##### Yes-However not in a systematic or coordinated manner.

- ❖ **Some providers use the open reporting system and the UN uses UNDAF**
- ❖ **Providers also respond to periodic requests from national and county governments in relation to support for CSOs**
- ❖ **Providers are also aware of the e-PROMIS system which could be useful in systematic information sharing**

#### Challenge

- ❖ **Most providers do not use the e-ProMIS to capture funds channeled through CSOs.**

## INDICATOR 2

### Discussion of Results ...Continued

#### MODULE 4: Legal and regulatory environment

- ✓ **Q<sup>9</sup>+13.** Is there a recognition of and respect for CSO freedom (association, assembly and expression), in the Constitution and more broadly in policy, law and regulation?

**Yes- As evidenced by :**

- ❖ **Inclusion of freedoms in the Constitution in Chapter 4 on Bill of Rights under articles 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 & 37**
- ❖ **The NGO Sessional Paper No. 1 2006 recognizes the above freedoms at the policy level.**
- ❖ **Specific court judgments have reinforced these freedoms, for example the courts throwing out the provisions of the amendments of the Constitution.**

#### Challenges

- ❖ **In practice the enjoyment of such rights is dependent on the programmes of the CSOs.**
- ❖ **Amendments to the PBO Act, Security Laws Amendment Act 2014 could affect these freedoms**



## INDICATOR 2

### Discussion of Results ...Continued

#### MODULE 4: Legal and regulatory environment..continued

- ✓ **Q9+14.** Is the legal and regulatory environment enabling for CSO formation, registration and operation?

**Yes-Kenya has a vibrant civil society and space to operate.**

- ❖ **There are movements that exist and have been recognized by the government through joint activities with groups such as the CSO-Reference Group, National Civil Society Congress, Bunge la Mwananchi.**
- ❖ **Some groups encounter difficulties at registration without clear legal basis e.g. atheist associations or sexual minorities.**
- ❖ **NGO Registration has to go through security vetting by the National Intelligence Service**

#### Recommendation

- ❖ **Operationalizing the PBO Act will provide guidelines on self regulation and complaint management i.e. National Federation of PBOs**
- ❖ **The NGO Council needs to be strengthened to be able to perform its regulatory functions effectively**

### Discussion of Results ...Continued

- ✓ **Q<sup>g</sup>+15.** Does the legal and regulatory environment facilitate access to resources for CSOs?

#### Response

**Yes-Currently** there are no restrictions on accessing resources

- ❖ **Operationalizing the PBO Act will facilitate guidelines on tax exceptions from the CSOs that qualify and also open up opportunities for Government funding and capacity building**

#### Challenges

- ❖ **Attempts have however been made to amend the PBO Act to limit foreign support to 15% of annual budget.**
- ❖ **In addition there are no incentives to promote local philanthropy through contributions by the local businesses.**
- ❖ **Some source of funding are unreliability and inaccessibility**
- ✓ **Q<sup>g</sup>+16.** Does the legal and regulatory environment marginalise certain groups?

#### Response

**Yes**

- ❖ **The current interpretation of NGO laws and regulations as well as the constitution does not facilitate the registration CSOs that deal with**
  - a). Sexual minorities rights**
  - b).Some aspects of rights of Muslims**
  - c). Indigenous peoples' organizations and**
  - d). Land rights groups**

## INDICATOR 3

# *Engagement of Private Sector in Development*

## **Quality of Public Private Dialogue**

*Global target for 2015: Continued progress over time*



Aid Effectiveness Kenya



## INDICATOR 3      Background

### Objectives of the indicator

- ✓ Assess the **quality of PPD** at the country level (quality of PPD as a proxy to capture private sector engagement in improving public policies)

### Underpinning commitments

- ✓ **2011 - Busan** commitment to enable the participation of the private sector in the design and implementation of development policies and strategies to foster sustainable growth and poverty reduction (§32b)

### Has three modules namely

*Module 1- The legal and regulatory context for PPD-Global Source*

*Module 2- The country's readiness to host, create or sustain a dialogue process-nationally sourced*

*Module 3- The organisational effectiveness of a given PPD platform-Optional (constrained with time)*

- This indicator builds on tools developed by the **World Bank**



## INDICATOR 3

### Discussion of Results

#### **MODULE 2 – The country's readiness to host, create or sustain a dialogue process**

- ✓ **Q<sup>9+17</sup>. Is the private sector ready and willing to engage and interact with the government?**
- ❖ **Since, 2008 , the private sector under the umbrella and coordination of KEPSA has been proactive in engaging the government.**
- ❖ **Intensive public-private dialogue with government on policy, legislative and regulatory reforms aimed at**
  - ✓ **Improving the business environment and country's competitiveness and**
  - ✓ **Create opportunities for private sector growth.**
- ❖ **KEPSA has developed a National Business Agenda (NBA) -a five year advocacy strategy and action plan**
- ❖ **There are opportunities for improvement**
- ✓ **Q<sup>9+18</sup>. Is the government ready and willing to engage and interact with the private sector?**
- ❖ **Political will evident since 2003: Drive to form KEPSA was government initiated - desire to only engage in a more structured way.**
- ❖ **With each Ministry, there is established a Ministerial Stakeholders' Forum (MSF) being Chaired and co-Chaired respectively by the Minister and head of a corresponding Sector Boards at KEPSA.**
- ❖ **Engagement with the Legislature takes place under the platform known as Speakers' Roundtable (SRT) and with the Judiciary is the Judiciary Forum.**

## INDICATOR 3

### Discussion of Results.....Continued

- **Q9+19.** Is there a potential champion who can facilitate the dialogue process, activate political will and reduce the trust gap between public and private sector stakeholders?
- ❖ **KEPSA is the legitimate champion of the private sector in Kenya,**
- ❖ **In the last 10 years, KEPSA has led the formation of over 10 public-private dialogue platforms- have been sustained**

#### Challenge

- ❖ **High costs (financial and human capital) of organizing the forums.**
- ✓ **Q9+20.** Are logistical, financing and capacity building instruments available to support PPD?
- ❖ **The Vision 2030 and attendant MTPs provide a guideline on the kind of investment projects**

#### Recommendation

- ❖ **The government should step up efforts in putting in place mechanisms to attract private capital investments.**

## INDICATOR 5

### *Annual and medium-term Predictability*

**This indicator measured the proportion of development co-operation funding:**

**5a. Disbursed within the fiscal year within which it was scheduled by providers of development co-operation**

**5b. Covered by indicative forward spending plans provided at country level**

## INDICATOR 5a

### Annual Predictability

#### Global target for 2015:

- ❖ **5a.** Halve the gap – halve the gap between aid scheduled for the next year and aid actually disbursed (Baseline year 2010)

#### Kenya's Performance in the Second Monitoring Round

- ❖ Funding disbursed as scheduled for the government sector in the FY 2014/2015 was **90 %** while **2 %** of the total was over disbursed
- ❖ This represents a positive trend compared to the global average of **84%** and Kenya's **51 %** in the First Monitoring Round in 2013
- ❖ Ten (10) of the nineteen (19) providers who submitted responses reported 100% disbursement.
- ❖ The World Bank and UNICEF reported over-disbursements over the period
- ❖ None of the providers reported below **50 %**. This represents a significant improvement from the First Monitoring Round where at least four (4) providers reported less



## INDICATOR 5b

### *Medium Term Predictability*

#### Global Target for 2015

- ❖ 5b. Halve the gap – Halve the proportion of development co-operation not covered by indicative forward spending plans (baseline 2013)
- ❖ To achieve the 2015 target of halving the proportion of funding not covered by indicative forward-spending plans, providers need to collectively ensure that by 2015 forward expenditure plans cover 92% of estimated funding for 2016, 85% for 2017 and 79% for 2018.

#### Kenya's Performance in the Second Monitoring Round

- ❖ Proportion of total funding covered by forward spending plans Year 2016- **98 %**, Year 2017-**98 %**, Year 2018-**94%**
- ❖ Kenya's average is **96%** representing a positive trend from **73%** the First Monitoring Round in 2013

## INDICATOR 6

### Aid on Budget

**Percentage of development co-operation funding scheduled for disbursement that is recorded in the annual budgets approved by the legislatures of developing countries**



## INDICATOR 6

### Global target for 2015:

- ❖ Halve the gap – halve the proportion of development co-operation flows to the government sector not reported on government's budget(s) (with at least 85% reported on budget) (Baseline year 2010)
- ❖ In 2013, **64%** of scheduled development co-operation funding for the government sector was reflected in developing countries national budgets. This represents a positive trend compared with 2010 (57%), but remains far from the target of 85%.

### Kenya's Performance in the Second Monitoring Round

- ❖ **76 %** of total funding scheduled for disbursement by providers was captured on government budget. This is higher than the global average of 2013 but below the 2015 target
- ❖ For Kenya this is a negative trend from the First Monitoring Round which recorded **82 %**
- ❖ Seven (7) providers reported more than what was had scheduled for government annual budget
- ❖ There are notable differences between funds recorded in government annual budget and those reported by providers as scheduled for disbursement through government. This figure is captured as **66%** beyond the total scheduled funding

## INDICATOR 9

### *Use and strengthening of country systems*

**9a. Quality of PFM systems-Data sourced globally through the World Bank Country Policy and Institutional Assessment (CPIA)**

**9b. Use of developing country PFM and procurement systems**

## INDICATOR 9b

### Use of developing country PFM and procurement systems

#### Global target for 2015

In 2013, across all reporting countries, **49%** of disbursement for the government sector used PFM and procurement systems (the most used component being budget execution)

#### Kenya's Performance in the Second Monitoring Round

- ❖ Analysis is based on responses by providers on questions whether they use Government's Budget execution, financial reporting, auditing and procurement systems
- ❖ 2010 baseline: 53%
- ❖ **61% of providers use country systems compared to 66% in the First Monitoring Round**
- ❖ Four (4) out of the nineteen (19) providers who responded do not use all the aspects of government systems
- ❖ Major reforms have been done in the PFM systems but still some providers do not use the system

## INDICATOR 7

### ***Mutual accountability***

**Percentage of countries that undertake inclusive mutual assessments of progress in implementing agreed commitments**



## INDICATOR 7      Background

- **Objectives of the indicator**

- ✓ Measure progress made by developing countries in undertaking mutual assessment reviews
- ✓ Incentivise (1) stronger and more inclusive accountability mechanisms at country level; (2) participation of all stakeholders in mutual assessment of progress.

- **Underpinning commitments**

- ✓ **2005 - Paris** commitment to jointly assess mutual progress in implementing aid effectiveness commitments (PD §50).
  - ✓ **2008 - Accra** commitment to ensure mutual assessment reviews in place in all countries, with stronger parliamentary scrutiny and citizen engagement (AAA §24b).
  - ✓ **2011 - Busan** commitment to encourage participation of all development co-operation actors in these processes (§18d); agree country-led frameworks to monitor progress and promote mutual accountability (§35a).
- The indicator draws on questions from the **UN-DESA National Mutual Accountability survey**.

## INDICATOR 7

### Discussion of Results

#### Global target for 2015:

**All developing countries have inclusive mutual assessment reviews in place**

**The national coordinator reported on the following 5 questions:**

- ✓ **Q<sup>9</sup>9.** Is there an aid or partnership policy or strategy in place defining a country's development co-operation priorities?

#### **Response- Yes**

- ❖ **The Kenya External Resources Policy (KERP) provides guidance in the sourcing and management of Official Development Assistance (ODA) at the two levels of government and the Non-State Actors**
- ❖ **Developed following thorough consultations among relevant stakeholders.**
- ❖ **Leadership role of the Government emphasized in the entire project cycle**
- ✓ **Q<sup>9</sup>10.** Are there specific country-level targets for effective development co-operation for both the developing country government and providers of development co-operation?

**Response Yes- Aid Effectiveness principles are integrated in the MTP II**



## INDICATOR 7

### Discussion of Results...continued

**Q<sup>9</sup>11.** Has an assessment towards these targets been undertaken jointly by the developing country government and providers at senior level in the past two years?

**Response-Yes: SWG, AEG meetings /retreats, Pre-DPF and DPF**

✓ **Q<sup>9</sup>12.** Have non-executive stakeholders (e.g. CSOs, Parliaments, private sector) and local government been actively involved in such reviews?

**Response-Yes (As Above)**

✓ **Q<sup>9</sup>13.** Have comprehensive results of such exercises been made public in a timely manner?

**Response- No**

## INDICATOR 8

### ***Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment***

**Percentage of countries with systems that track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment**



## INDICATOR 8 Background

- **Objectives of the indicator**

- ✓ To measure government efforts to track & make public allocations for gender equality
- ✓ Incentivize (1) further efforts to collect, disseminate and harmonize data disaggregated by sex; (2) use of the data to inform policy decisions and guide investments; (3) targeting of public expenditures appropriately to benefit both women and men.

- **Underpinning commitments**

- ✓ **2011 - Busan** commitment to accelerate and deepen efforts to collect, disseminate, harmonize and make full use of data disaggregated by sex to inform policy decision and guide investments, ensuring that public expenditures are targeted appropriately to benefit both women and men.
- This indicator has been developed by **UN WOMEN**, in collaboration with the **OECD-DAC Network on Gender Equality (GENDERNET)**



## INDICATOR 8

### Discussion of Responses

***Global target for 2015:*** All developing countries have systems that track and make public allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment

In consultation with the Ministry of Devolution & Planning (State Department of Gender ) and the UN Women, the responses to the following 4 questions all 'Yes':

- ❖ **Q<sup>9</sup>14.** Is there an official government statement on a system for tracking allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment?
- ❖ **Q<sup>9</sup>15.** Are allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment systematically tracked?
- ❖ **Q<sup>9</sup>16.** Is there leadership and oversight of the tracking system by the central government unit in charge of public expenditures?
- ❖ **Q<sup>9</sup>17.** Is gender equality focussed budget information publically available (e.g. through Parliamentary oversight and civil society scrutiny, publications, websites or other means)?

## INDICATOR 8

### Discussion....Continued

***Responding 'Yes' to the above questions illustrates that Kenya has a system for tracking allocations for gender equality and women's empowerment***

Additionally, Kenya was expected (albeit optional) to respond to the following questions:

#### **Optional 1**

**Are gender-specific indicators and data disaggregated by sex used to inform budget allocation decisions at sectoral and/or local/district level?**

#### **Response -Yes**

- ❖ Adherence to Gender Responsive Budgeting guidelines
- ❖ Gender data sheet produced every two years in which indicators are disaggregated by sex at sectoral level to guide gender Policy Planning and allocation of budget
- ❖ Research and dissemination of gender data and resource allocation by various institutions in Kenya on a regular basis

## INDICATOR 8

### Discussion....Continued

#### Optional 2

**Are regular impact assessments of budgets and expenditures conducted which address how women and men benefit respectively from government expenditures?**

**Response-Yes. As evidenced by:**

- ❖ Gender Responsive Budgeting Guidelines developed by government which provide a framework for ensuring that the budgeting process is responsive to the needs and priorities of women, men, girls and boys.
- ❖ The Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) and Medium Term Plan guidelines and their monitoring frameworks
- ❖ Existence of Performance Management tools including Public Expenditure reviews and Performance Contracting guidelines have indicators for tracking gender and women empowerment interventions
- ❖ Strong leadership on Gender Responsive Budgeting by State Department of Gender in consultation with The National Treasury and Office of the Controller of Budget and continually encouraging Public Finance Reforms which incorporate gender concerns
- ❖ Gender equality focused budget information is publically available

## CONCLUSION

- ❖ Participation by providers still average- 19 out of 35 providers
- ❖ Indicator 1- A significant number of new programmes do not involve government and are off-budget
- ❖ Implementation of PBO Act critical- inclusive multi-stakeholder dialogue, transparency and accountability among CSOs and other stakeholders
- ❖ Multi-stakeholder dialogue very important for realization of sustainable development
- ❖ Use of country systems still low/inconsistent –shows a reversal
- ❖ GoK should continually improve the linkage between the MTEF and MTP processes for positive trends

**Thank you**

তোমাকে

ধন্যবাদ

ありがとう

*Gracias*

*Dankjewel*

*Hvala*

*Asante*

*Merci*

مننه

*Obrigado*

شکرا

*Salamat*



**Global  
Partnership**  
for Effective Development  
Co-operation