**Tabulated Response to Comments on the Draft CPD Kenya (2018-202)**

| **Comment by Member State: Ireland** | **Changes to CPD** | **CO Remarks** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **We expected to see more on support to the electoral reform process given that it will cover the period 2018-22 leading up to the next elections. 2017 was a difficult year for Kenya in relation to the Presidential elections and it has been recommended by observation missions that some sort of national stocktaking exercise should be conducted in order to develop and implement key electoral reforms well in advance of the 2022 election.** **Given that the UNDP CPD covers 2018 to 2022, and in light of UNDP’s mandate with respect to leading democratic governance assistance at country level, we would welcome/expect some support to any such stocktaking and lesson learning exercise. Output 2.4 indicates that electoral management bodies will be supported with ‘technical and financial capacities’ but this could really be more detailed and at the very least, should reflect that it will be based on lessons learned from the 2017 elections.** | Para 28. Based on lessons learned from the 2017 electoral support and leading to the 2022 elections, UNDP will leverage existing bilateral partnerships with inter alia, USAID, DFID, Sweden, Norway, Netherlands, Denmark, Italy, EU, Germany and Ireland to implement early conflict mitigation measures, civic and voter education, political party regulation and judicial capacity to adjudicate electoral disputes. **Output 2.4**: Electoral management bodies have technical, financial and operational capacities to conduct free, fair, credible and inclusive peaceful elections, and also based on lessons learned from the 2017 elections.  | A very valid point raised by Ireland on the criticality of a stocktaking and lessons learning exercise. We agree with this. It should be noted that UNDP Kenya is Not waiting for the new CPD 2018 - 2022 to be approved, but is already supporting this process of comprehensive stocktaking. Funding is available to undertake this in a comprehensive, accountable and inclusive, rights based process.UNDP through its Electoral project, *‘****Strengthening Electoral Processes in Kenya’* project (SEPK**) is under the 2018 Annual Work Plan, **currently facilitating in-depth reflection and lesson-learning by EMBs and stakeholders;****Specific focus is on**:1. Technical support for the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC’s) Post-election evaluation
2. Institutional support for electoral management bodies and key stakeholders to engage with Parliament on issues arising from the post-election evaluations
3. Technical support to IEBC to evaluate impact of voter education and engagement of stakeholders on post-election evaluation outcomes
4. Thematic evaluations of participation of women and special interest groups in 2017 electoral cycle
5. Thematic evaluation on role of Media Council of Kenya (MCK) in 2017 electoral cycle
6. Technical support for thematic evaluations of 2017 electoral cycle- Electoral technology & domestic observation
7. Technical support for thematic evaluation of electoral security arrangements programme and related human rights dimensions, and residual institutional strengthening of key stakeholders for accountability over human rights violations
8. Technical support for thematic evaluations on electoral dispute resolution

**The UNDP ‘***‘****Strengthening Electoral Processes in Kenya’* project is currently funded by USAID, DFID, the** **EU, Ireland, Italy and Germany. UNDP is working with OHCHR and UN Women in this project and in close consultation with DPA.** Given the word count constraint, it was not possible to list all the interventions around the stocktaking and lessons learning reflections on the 2017 elections, as this is ongoing under the current CPD, but no doubt this is critical to inform any future work on electoral support and reforms in the lead up to 2022 elections to address challenges and gaps, and based on the electoral cycle approach.  |

| **Comment by Member State: Germany**  | **Changes to CPD**  | **CO Remarks**  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **The UNDP draft country programme document has unfortunately not been shared with other EDPs in Kenya – not in the Development Partners Group and not bilaterally (at least not with Germany).** | n/a | The technical officers of UNDP consulted bilaterally with state, non-state and donor partners beginning with the ending CPD evaluation, culminating in a workshop Chaired by the RR/RC and with participation from management and programme/operations staff. All partners were invited. Thereafter, on 8 November 2017; the Country Director convened a half day consultation on draft zero of the CPD, which was presented to all stakeholders (including representatives from donor countries), and feedback incorporated into the draft submitted to NY. Following feedback from HQ, a further iteration was shared with all partners for comment prior to a final HQ review 30 January. It may be the colleagues from Germany were inadvertently missed from the invitation list, or were unable to participate.  |
| **The Kenyan Medium Term Plan III (2018-2022) and the UNDAF (2018-2022) are still work in progress. We therefore do not understand why the UNDP country programme has already been done? It would be better if it would be aligned with the overall planning documents as soon as they are out.** | n/a | The UNDP has been a key interlocutor in the GoK consultations on the MTPIII, and as Pillar co-chair for the UNDAF. The current CPD is informed and fully aligned with the MTPIII and UNDAF. The UNDP CPD development process requires formulation, review and submission 6 months prior to consideration of the Executive Board. As such, the Country Office has ensured that technical level discussions consider the already available MTPIII and UNDAF drafts, and inform each other in an iterative manner.  Please note that the Results and Resource Framework outcome statements are required to be and are verbatim taken from the draft UNDAF agreed with GoK.  The GoK issued a MTP III Concept Note which outlined the contours of the MTP III and to guide Sector Working Groups and that UNDP participated in workshops to refine MTP III through mainstreaming the SDGs and The Big 5 Plan   |
| **UNDP Kenya does not participate in the meetings of the Development Partners Group (DPG). UNDP is also not active in the Joint Sector Working Groups. It would be most welcomed if they could consider doing** | n/a | This is not accurate. The Development Partners Group is co-chaired by the UNDP Resident Representative, which convenes at principal’s level. The Country Director has participated, on invitation, specific to election related discussion. UNDP co-chairs the Democratic Governance Donor Group (DGDG). UNDP technical staff participate in the DG on Elections, TVET and the PFM Group; the Conflict and Security Donor Group, and chairs the Devolution Sector Working Group. We are active in the Climate Change Donor Coordination Group (DCG), the Wildlife DCG and the Forestry DG. UNDP also participates in the Kenyan Humanitarian Partnership Group and Kenya Food Security Steering Group. The current focus has been to engage with the groups where we have active and emerging programmes. We will endeavor where we have sufficient technical capacity engage with further groups as necessary |
| **The poverty data mentioned in the country programme are not known to us. There are no official data from Government or from World Bank yet. Where does the data quoted by UNDP come from?**  | n/a | All data cited is referenced in the footnotes and verified. This is a requirement for all CPDs |
| **The document states that poverty and inequality are high (para 2 and 3) and promises (para 29) that the programme will support poverty reduction interventions.**  | n/a | The overall national poverty headcount rate (proportion of poor individuals) dropped from 46.6 per cent in 2005/06 to 36.1 per cent in 2015/16 (Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey, 2015/2016). Spatially, across the 47 counties, overall headcount poverty (proportion of poor individuals) widely ranges from a low of 16.7 per cent in Nairobi City County to a high of 79.4 per cent in Turkana County. In 2015/16, the poorest four counties were Turkana (79.4%), Mandera (77.6%), Samburu (75.8%) and Busia (69.3%). Conversely, the four counties with least poverty include Nairobi (16.7%), Nyeri (19.3%), Meru (19.4%) and Kirinyaga (20.0%) (ibid).**On inequality**, please see below: * The 2015/2016 KIHBS results show that nationally, more than half (55.9 %) of total expenditure is controlled by the top most quintile (Q5) while the bottom quintile (Q1) controls the least share of 4.1 per cent.
* Also on feminized poverty we will add this latest from the KIHBS below:
* Households headed by females are likely to be poorer than those headed by males. Female-headed households account for 32.4 per cent of all households. The results reveal that 30.2 per cent of female headed households are poor compared to 26.0 per cent of their male counterparts
 |
| **Against this background it is not directly apparent why the UNDP country programme does not focus on the reduction of poverty and inequality**. | n/a | **The CPD proposes 3 areas of work**: I) Governance, Peace and Security; II) Inclusive Growth and Structural Transformation; and III) Environmental Sustainability, Climate Change and Resilience. Aligned to SDG 1 No Poverty; and based on the CPD and UNDAF MTEs, national and regional development frameworks, UNDAF 2018-2022, *our theory of change is to support equitable poverty alleviation by facilitating structural, institutional policy, production and service delivery capacities to accelerate inclusive growth; enable resilience to cyclical shocks; and, contribute to transparent and accountable governance by facilitating reduction of socio-economic marginalization which contributes to the socio-political cleavages and fault lines that underpin political, natural resource and other conflicts*. |
|  |  |  |
| The focus on governance and devolution is most welcome. We would appreciate strengthening the justification for how UNDP will address corruption. | n/a | **Corruption is cited 8 times in the CPD including a description of the challenges and impact of corruption, particularly at subnational levels, and citing the Transparency Index rankings** – **which are included in the RRF. In line with the MTPII the programme proposes several approaches** including: “*The devolution programme aims to accelerate fiscal and administrative decentralization including local revenue generation through subnational support for planning and budgeting, accountability and anti-corruption initiatives, in line with UN Convention on Anti-Corruption (UNCAC) (REF: page 5); “Furthermore, UNDP will continue working with the National Human Rights Institutions, state and non-state anticorruption actors, OHCHR, UNODC and Governments of Sweden, Denmark, Netherlands, UK, US, and the EU, to expand support for human rights advocacy and reporting and to increase public voice and participation in the process of accountability.* |
| The focus on job creation (para 29 ff) and environmental sustainability and climate change (para 33 ff) are also most welcome. It would be highly appreciated if UNDP could coordinate with others working in these sectors (i.a. Germany).” (REF: page 6); and  | n/a | The invitation to collaborate is welcome. |
| The results and resources framework (annex) does not reflect the priorities set out in the text. Most outputs are process-related. There are no outputs regarding the reduction of poverty and inequality. The numerous new policies and frameworks (output 3.2) are not a good indicator. | n/a | The CPD draft including RRF has benefitted from independent review by the HQ technical teams and is in line with standards with respect to attribution and accountability. With respect to indicators – they have been aligned to the MTPII indicators. Regarding poverty reduction, the UNDP aims to support GoK and other stakeholders to establish processes and implement programmatic interventions that contribute to poverty alleviation.At output level, UNDP has focused on results directly attributable to our interventions; thus, a national level reduction in poverty or inequality is a whole of government outcome with support from various actors including the whole UNCT. |