

EVALUATION SUMMARY

KENYA

GENDER AND GOVERNANCE
PROGRAMME (GGP III) 2009 -
2013



FINAL EVALUATION
KENYA
GENDER AND GOVER-
NANCE PROGRAMME (GGP
III) 2009 - 2013



**EVALUATION REPORT PREPARED BY:
DANA PEEBLES, AWUOR PONGE,
JACINTA K. NDAMBUKI**

EVALUATION DATE: DECEMBER 2013

**EDITED BY: UN WOMEN EASTERN AND
SOUTHERN AFRICA REGIONAL OFFICE**



PROJECT SUMMARY

Country: Kenya

Thematic area: Gender & Governance

Implementing Partners: UNIFEM served as Pro-gramme Finance and Management Agency, Donors included: Norway, Finland, Denmark, Netherlands, Sweden, Spain, UK, Canada. Four key Government institutions including Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development, The Independent Electoral Boundaries Commission, The National Gender Equality Commission, The National Cohesion and Integration Commission. Civil Society Organiza-tions.

Duration of Project: 2009 - 2013

Budget: The GGP program has a budget of 12.1 M USD. Funded by the Governments of Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden, Finland, Spain, the UK and Canada using a joint financing ar-rangement.

I. Background

The Gender and Governance Programme III (GGPIII) is a highly complex programme that evolved since 2002. Its foundation lay with the Engendering Political Participation Process and subsequently continued through GGPs I and II, each of which built on the work of the previous pro-gramme and set the groundwork for the implementation of GGP III. While the programme must be understood within this longer-term context, this evaluation only per-tains to GGP III that ran from 2009 to 2013.

II. Program Purpose and Goals

The programme both grew from the work of these prior phases and was a response to the need for strong action, advocacy and support of women's leadership in the politi-cal arena generated by Kenya's adoption of a new consti-tution in 2010 and the 2013 national election. It also fo-cused on continuing work on development and adoption of gender-sensitive government policies and leg-islative frameworks. Within these two contexts, GGP III worked from a Theory of Change that was

based both on evolu-tionary shifts in the political landscape and the prior phas-es of the programme and a response to the more trans-formative/radical change brought about by the 2013 elec-tion and the adoption of the 2010 Constitution.

The Goal of GGP III was "to ensure that Kenyan women and men are able to access services and opportunities and exercise their rights equally". The programme outcomes were:

Outcome 1: Increased number of Kenyan legal frame-works, laws and policies at national and local levels pro-mote and protect women's human rights.

Outcome 2: Women participate in governance and deci-sion- making processes at national and local levels and engage in active advocacy on women's issues.

These outcomes were closely related to both **MDG 3:** Promote Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment and **UN Women's Goals (Strategic Plan 2012- 2013)** of:

Outcome 2: Increase in numbers of constitution and legal frameworks and processes that promote and protect the human rights of women and eliminate gender inequality.

Outcome 5: Gender equality experts, advocates and their organizations and networks enhance their capacity and influence to ensure strong gender equality dimensions in national laws, policies and strategies.

To achieve these outcomes, UN Women worked with 46 different implementing partners (women's organizations, civil society, development partners, national women's machineries and the Government of Kenya) on a variety of initiatives to consolidate gains in gender equality and women's empowerment made in the new Constitution. The programme focused on two governance areas: devel-opment of gender-sensitive policy and legislative frame-works; and working to increase women's participation at all levels of the electoral and governance process.

III. Evaluation Objectives and Scope

Evaluation Purpose:

1. To assess the relevance of the Program in regard to con-sistency, ownership and congruency, technical

adequacy, and complementarity of program with other initiatives.

2. To determine the effectiveness of the program in achievement of results, highlighting reasons for achievement and non-achievement of results and factors contributing/hindering achievement of the results.

3. To assess the sustainability of the program including the participation of partners in planning and implementation of interventions, as well as assessing the measures taken to ensure that activities initiated by the Program will be completed and continued on cessation of donor support.

4. To document the impact of the program highlighting what were the intended and unintended, positive and negative, long term effects of the program.

5. To provide the best practices/recommendations that may be used in the future programming.

Data, Sources, Collection and Analysis Methods:

The four main means of data collection used were:

1. Document review – implementing partner (IPs) progress reports, evaluation reports, supporting documentation from IPs and from UN Women.

2. Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) from a representative sample of government and civil society partners.

3. Peer review focus group discussions with donors and as many CSO partners that could attend that had not already been included in the KIIs.

4. FGDs with a representative sample of community mobilizers referred to as TOTs (Trainer of Trainers) who were engaged to train other community members regarding women's political participation and engagement.

Evaluation Methodology:

To assess the degree to which GGP III achieved these objectives a team of three evaluation and gender specialists (one international, two international) conducted Key Informant interviews and Focus Group Discussions with 124 people across several regions of Kenya: Nairobi; Coast - Kwale and Mombasa; and Nyanza - Siaya, Ringiti Island,

Kisumu. Eighty per cent of the government and 75% of civil society organization implementing partners were included in the evaluation sample, as well as 52 Trainers of Trainers (TOTs) and community mobilizers, 5 donors and 7 UN women staff.

IV. Findings

For Outcome 1, attribution is not always direct. UN Women clearly contributed to drafting of several legislative frameworks, not the least of which are the affirmative action articles in the 2010 Constitution, including the representation of no more than 2/3's of any one gender in elected positions' articles. While UN Women was by no means the only actor in this process, it is clear their contribution made a real difference. GGP III's CSO partners also cited a number of other legislative frameworks to which UN Women contributed or on which it helped facilitate debate once tabled in parliament such as the Marriage Act. The MoGCSD also noted that UN Women hired a consultant to help draft Affirmative Action legislation but were unhappy with quality of the draft. UN Women had greater success with the support it provided the Government of Kenya (GoK) on development of its National Action Plan for UN Security Resolution 1325 on GBV in conflict contexts. This draft has been finalized, is waiting for adoption and is seen positively by different stakeholders.

For Outcome 2, GGP III helped contribute to the following results:

1. A significant decrease in diverse types of EGBV.
2. 1168 women aspirants ran for office (for all levels of government combined)
3. Including the 303 women who competed for the 47 Women's County Representative seats and the 152 women who ran for mainstream positions there was a 279% increase in the number of women candidates from the 2007 election at the National Assembly level.
4. An increase in women's representation in the National Assembly of 11.9% from 2007 – i.e., from 9.8% to 21.7% (this is due largely to the creation of the Women's County Representative seats).

5. Increased voter awareness of the value of women's political leadership.
6. An increase in women's elected representation at the county assembly level. The evaluation team unable to ascertain exact numbers for the entire country, but many of the CSOs interviewed indicated that some of the women who had been trained through GGP III had won an elected seat within the County Assemblies.
7. There are now 8 positions reserved for female and male youth within each county assembly, with 63 nominated overall in the 47 counties to represent the disability category.
8. There are also now 16 reserved positions for women representatives in the Senate as well as for one female youth.
9. The President picked 6 women out of 18 cabinet positions to stand as Ministers. This represents 33% and breaks the pattern in 2007 where women MPs had little or no influence in key policy-making areas.

What the programme **was not able to influence** was an increase in the number of elected MPs in the National Assembly. This remained the same as in 2007. Due to the seats increasing from 210 to 290, this means the proportion of women as MPs in regular MP positions (as opposed to women elected to the Women's County Representative positions) actually decreased. However, overall due to the affirmative action provisions of the 2010 Constitution, women's representation in local assemblies and the National Assembly has doubled from 2007. It is close to 1/3 at the County Assembly level (with some counties are still disputing the nomination of additional women County Assembly representatives) and stands at 21.7% within the National Assembly. This represents roughly a 100% increase over representation levels in 2007.

There is also now a small cadre of trained community mobilisers (including significant numbers of men) in place who are continuing to advocate for women's leadership at the community and County Assembly levels. Based on feedback from multiple CSOs and other stakeholders this model appears to have been effective and could be scaled up across the country in the years leading up to the next election. The joint work of the IEBC and the Institute for

Culture and Ecology in the development of standard messages and campaign materials to be used by other CSOs and the community mobilisers and their work on gender, youth and disability-sensitive civic education training also could be scaled up effectively.

i. Programme Design: The programme design followed the principle of linking activities and approaches at the community level to national level advocacy and policy development. This served to provide some degree of coherence within a highly complex programme with multiple actors. The large number of actors did make GGP III somewhat unwieldy from an administrative standpoint and required significant administrative and technical inputs from UN Women to make it work. As such, it does not represent the most efficient means of programme delivery.

ii. Relevance & Sustainability: The programme was highly relevant to all of the stakeholders involved. Most, although not all, were consulted on the programme design and many will be continuing some form of the approaches introduced during GGP III. Limited funding remains a bit of a constraint, but there was clear commitment to the process, particularly on the part of the CSO partners. UN Women staff noted the need to have included an exit strategy in the programme's design.

iii. Effectiveness: Most of the approaches used were highly effective. However, some need to be viewed from the perspective of aspects of GGP III being a pilot trying out new and innovative ways of doing things. The approaches that worked now need to be scaled up. The reach of the programme was quite large given the resources available (approximately \$2 million for each year of the programme). The challenge, perhaps, was that the programme was spread a bit too thinly – attempting to cover 27 counties and multiple government institutions and policies. Coordinating this process took a great deal of time. It is to UN Women's credit they managed to pull it off.

The CSO community level work was more visible than that of the GoK. Policy work is generally harder to measure and attribute directly. However, UN Women also had clear contracts with the CSOs which outlined explicit deliverables and expectations. The technical assistance approach with the

government likely contributed as much but was not as well documented.

UN Women was cited by almost all CSOs interviewed as having provided high quality training and technical accompaniment related to project and financial management, particularly with regard to the application of RBM principles to reporting and management. As such, GGP III has left behind a significant group of CSOs that work in gender and governance with a much stronger capacity than prior to the programme's implementation.

The programme was also effective at being inclusive of youth and women with disabilities. This was in keeping with the affirmative action articles in the new Constitution, GGP III and UN Women helped contribute to the implementation of these articles in a very real and concrete way, leading to 200 women with disabilities joining political parties and one being elected and appointed to Cabinet and formal female youth representation at the County Assembly level.

Where the programme was less effective was in maintaining momentum after the 2013 election and in ensuring there was consistent and widespread training of newly elected women MPs and Members of County Assemblies. It also faced challenges in that women candidates tended to vie more for the Women's County Representative positions than regular MP roles and that some elected MPs from 2007 choose to run for these seats instead of their former wards.

iv. Efficiency: The general consensus is that it would make more sense for the CSO component of future related programming to be done through other CSOs as opposed to by the PFMA. For GGP III some government institutions and CSOs were of the opinion that UN Women acted more as an implementing agency than a PFMA. There were also a number of administrative challenges stemming from the 10% holdback of project funding for CSOs until they had completed all their activities, delays in disbursement due to external processes instituted by UN Women HQ and the demand to compress two quarters work into one to end the programme a quarter early. These administrative delays led to the cancellation of some pre-election activities planned.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall GGP III was successful. Kenyan political culture regarding women's leadership is starting to shift, stemming in part from the work GGP III did at both policy and grassroots/ community levels. To achieve this change is an enormous task. It will take more time and continuous effort to translate this into a real increase in elected positions for women at the national level in the next election, but the process has already started at the County Assembly level. The groundwork for further change has also been laid with the doubling of women's representation at the national and county levels since 2007 and the testing of some solid strategies for achieving even greater involvement of women in the next election. Considering the starting point, this is a major achievement. We need to do even more now we have seen it is possible.

Key Recommendations

1. Facilitate the development a response to the Supreme Court ruling on what mechanisms will be used to ensure a minimum 1/3 level of representation of women at the national level, as well as to ensure that nominated MCAs are not excluded from appointments to County Assembly.
2. Future programming needs to add work in the areas of: i) greater attention to work with the media to profile both women aspirants and gender equality issues related to devolution and women's leadership; ii) early identification and training of potential women leaders in diverse areas of leadership at the county level; and building women aspirants' capacity to mobilize electoral financing; iii) support for both capacity-building of women MCAs and MPs (whether elected or nominated) to carry out their roles effectively and visibly to these proven strategies; and find systematic ways to work with traditional leaders at the community level to promote women's leadership and that of youth. iv) expand the peace building work with women and youth conducted with the NCIC across more counties
3. Expansion of the Training of Trainers and Training of Facilitators (TOT/ToF) approach to provide coverage in all 47 counties; ensure there is a retainer fee for the TOTs and the TOFs, and solid contracts in

place for them along with ongoing training over a 3 to 4 year programme period to continue building their skills.

4. Support review and revision of the Co-operative Act to facilitate more women leaders coming up through the ranks of the co-operative movement. This would both strengthen women's leadership in co-operatives and provide a potential pool of experienced women leaders who already have a community base who could stand for election in 2017 and beyond.

5. Future programming needs to seriously consider a joint programming approach in which UNDP would also be a key player and which would involve other UN agencies. There is a need to mainstream gender and governance into UNDP's approach to democratic governance in Kenya to capitalize on their further reach and size as well as influence at the policy level while still taking advantage of UN Women's specialized technical expertise and established relationships in this field as well as that of other UN agencies that operate in Kenya.

6. There is a need to identify which organizations/bodies will serve as the primary coordinating bodies for future programming. If the plan is to continue with such a complex and comprehensive programme that encompasses both government and civil society under the same umbrella, there needs to be a coordinating body that can bridge the two sectors.

7. The exact nature of technical assistance to Government needs to be outlined explicitly in formal MOUs or agreements with each government body concerned, with clear deliverable, a defined plan for skills transfers and indicators for measuring results as opposed to engaging in a more reactive, ad hoc approach.

8. For the CSOs, funding arrangements need to cover longer periods of time (between 3 to 5 years depending upon when a new programme starts), even for the sub-projects with smaller CSOs.

9. Reporting on results for both government and CSOs should be on a six-month basis to reinforce the need to report on results as opposed to primarily on activities and to reduce the administrative burden on programme partners.

10. Develop a more workable alternative to the 10% hold-back procedure, at the very least for the smaller CSOs. This policy interfered with programme implementation. One option might be to reduce the holdback to 5% per reporting period, and not hold back the full amount until the end of each sub-project.

VI. Lessons

There are now some processes in place to facilitate state institutions implementing gender-responsive policies and laws. This includes strengthening of the government Gender Focal Point system; establishment of NGEN and the shift of the MoGCSD to the Planning section of the new Ministry of Devolution. Some argue that this latter move places the former Ministry in a stronger position to influence a systematic approach to gender-responsive policies and laws. Others are of the opinion that it reflects a loss of status from being a separate ministry. At this stage, the evaluation concluded it is too soon to tell, but thinks there is potential for the Gender Directorate to use their position within the Ministry of Devolution to effect widespread change in the future. Overall, however, the GoK is still more at the beginning stages of developing a more systematic approach to integrating gender into its policy and legal frameworks.

GGP III has some outstanding successes as well as some areas where approaches could have been strengthened. The funding, institutional and policy environment have all changed significantly over the past four years given the adoption of the 2010 Constitution, creation of UN Women and changes in donor funding priorities. UN Women has stated that there will be no GGP IV, but rather that stakeholders need to examine the most effective ways to guide future related programming.

The overriding message that came from diverse stakeholders is that there is a need to mobilise resources to continue and initiate new related activities within the next year at the latest. This will allow sufficient time for them to build the capacities of the potential aspirants and build a solid electoral base prior to election year. The recommendations which follow are made within this context as well as that of the lessons learned from the GGP III process.

Programmatic Issues

The diverse strategies GGP III used were quite effective at both the community and policy levels. With the push to devolution there is an even greater need to maintain a link between the two processes and use what happens at one level to inform evidence-based policy development at both the county and national levels. GGP III developed a number of winning “formulas” and approaches that it makes sense to continue at the community level. These include (but are not limited to), the use of community mobilisers/ TOTs to create awareness at the community level, use of media to profile women aspirants, a diversity approach to target groups that is inclusive of youth and women with disabilities, facilitating partnerships between IEBC and CSOs to deliver civic education using promotion materials with common messages, etc.

For further details of key findings under each area, please see the full mid-term evaluation report, available at:

<http://gate.unwomen.org/evaluationadmin/manageevaluation/viewevaluationdetail.html?evalid=4752>

