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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key data</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Institutional Development and Knowledge Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>July 2014 – June 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total budget</td>
<td>Kshs. 2,305 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall outcome</td>
<td>Robust ASAL institutions exist and support EDE investment, policy and programming decisions, based on critical evidence generated by solid knowledge management systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected results</td>
<td>1.1 Priority ASAL development institutions established and/or strengthened.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Management and accountability structures for the EDE operationalised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Evidence-based policy and legal reforms that facilitate achievement of the EDE goal secured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 EDE priorities appropriately mainstreamed within the Kenya Vision 2030 Medium Term Plan III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Evidence-based policy and investment choices made by EDE stakeholders at different levels supported, and the development of the EDE MTP III informed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Impact of Kenya’s progress towards the 10-year EDE goal assessed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Public and stakeholder awareness of, and identification with, the EDE increased, and wider understanding built of the conditions necessary to achieve drought resilience in Kenya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus area and population</td>
<td>Arid and semi-arid counties, approximately 15 million people (36% of the national population)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact details</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer National Drought Management Authority P.O. Box 53547-00200 Nairobi Kenya <a href="mailto:ceo@ndma.go.ke">ceo@ndma.go.ke</a> <a href="http://www.ndma.go.ke">www.ndma.go.ke</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Executive summary

This is the sixth of six common programme frameworks that have been developed to operationalise the Ending Drought Emergencies (EDE) Medium Term Plan, which is an integral part of the Kenya Vision 2030 Second Medium Term Plan for 2013-17.¹

A sustained, long-term and coordinated approach is a prerequisite for reducing vulnerability to drought. Drought management is a cross-cutting issue that requires collaborative and effective action by a wide range of state and non-state institutions at all levels. It also requires a strong base of evidence from which to make interventions that are timely, appropriate and relevant to the needs of drought-affected communities.

The aim of this framework is to ensure that there is a supportive enabling environment for implementation of all six EDE Common Programme Frameworks. It will supply the evidence base for decision-making, facilitate coordinated and high-quality interventions, promote synergy between the six pillars of the EDE, monitor and evaluate progress towards the goal of ending drought emergencies by 2022, ensure accountability to relevant public institutions, and provide oversight of the EDE as a whole.

This framework has two components: institutional development and knowledge management. The first will strengthen the institutions established to support development in arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) and to implement EDE commitments, ensuring that they have access to high quality technical expertise. The second will consolidate the evidence base for the EDE, and thus support investment choices, policy processes, public engagement and impact assessment.

Since this pillar provides technical and knowledge services to the other five, those implementing it will take a demand-driven approach which is responsive to stakeholder needs and priorities but balanced by active engagement with each pillar and its partners. Implementation will be led by the EDE Secretariat in the National Drought Management Authority (NDMA) and coordinated through two sub-groups of organisations with expertise in its two components. Membership of these sub-groups includes those with regional portfolios for the Horn of Africa who will thus ensure appropriate linkages with IGAD’s Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI).

This is a five-year framework with a budget of Kshs. 2,305 million.

¹ The others are on peace and security, climate-proofed infrastructure, human capital, sustainable livelihoods, and drought risk management.
2. **Situation analysis**

2.1 **Sector analysis**

2.1.1 **Institutional arrangements**

*The regional connection*

The decision to end drought emergences was taken by IGAD and East African Community (EAC) Heads of State and Government at a summit in Nairobi on 9 September 2011. The summit called for increased investment in dryland development by drought-affected countries and their partners. The IDDRSI strategy was developed after the summit, through an inclusive and participatory process, to address the causes and effects of drought and related shocks in a sustainable and holistic manner.

The IGAD Secretariat has established a Regional Platform to support implementation of the IDDRSI by IGAD member states and their partners. It coordinates the following:

1. *Resource mobilisation*: mobilising the human, physical and financial resources needed to deliver priority interventions at national and regional levels.
2. *Regional programming and monitoring and evaluation*: coordinating the identification, prioritisation and elaboration of national and regional interventions.
3. *Regional knowledge management, communication and outreach*: collecting, analysing and disseminating evidence-based information, good practice and lessons learnt, as well as advocacy and media engagement.
4. *Regional capacity development and learning*: strengthening the coherence and effectiveness of research and capacity building centres in the region, including the provision of institutional capacity services to IGAD member states.

Kenya has been identified as the lead country or champion for ending drought emergencies in the IGAD region. The experiences and lessons from Kenya are expected to guide other countries and inform the standards in use across the region, although this role has not yet been fully defined or resourced.

*The national setting*

Kenya aims to be a middle-income, rapidly industrialising country by 2030, offering all its citizens a high quality of life. The first Kenya Vision 2030 Medium Term Plan (MTP) was implemented between 2008 and 2012. The theme of the second MTP for 2013-17 is ‘Transforming Kenya: Pathway to Devolution, Socio-Economic Development, Equity and National Unity’, and it recognises EDE as one of the ‘foundations for national transformation’. The EDE sector plan was developed through extensive consultation between state and non-state actors and is now being operationalised through six common programme frameworks (of which this is the sixth). The NDMA in the Ministry of Devolution and
Planning is leading and coordinating efforts towards the goal of ending drought emergencies by 2022.

The National Policy for the Sustainable Development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands (the ASAL Policy), approved as Sessional Paper No. 8 of 2012, recognises the need for effective planning and coordination of development and acknowledges that this has been lacking. It therefore establishes a number of ASAL transformation structures through which state and non-state actors can plan, execute, monitor and coordinate their interventions more effectively (Figure 1). The new approach offered by this institutional framework increases the likelihood that the region’s potential will be harnessed both for the ASALs and for the nation as a whole. It also provides an enabling environment for delivery of EDE commitments. However, the framework is only partly in place and needs strengthening.

**Figure 1: ASAL Institutional Framework**

1. **Cabinet-level oversight** of the progress made across government in delivering the ASAL Policy.
2. **Specialist institutions** to ensure that the ASALs are given adequate attention within each sector.
3. **Stakeholder coordination** through the ASAL Stakeholder Forum (ASF) at both national and county levels.
4. **ASAL Secretariat**, to support the structures and ensure stronger integration of policies, institutions and practices for sustainable development in the ASALs.

In 2013 a Presidential Taskforce on Parastatal Reforms was charged with reviewing parastatals from the perspective of their viability and operational effectiveness, governance and ownership, and contribution to the national development agenda. Implementation of the Taskforce’s recommendations is ongoing and may affect some of the institutions within this framework.

**Devolution**

The introduction of devolution in March 2013 is the most significant change in governance since independence. Devolution empowers citizens to exercise their democratic rights in order to enhance social, political and economic development. According to the Constitution

---

2 Report of the Presidential Taskforce on Parastatal Reforms, October 2013
of Kenya 2010, the governments at the national and county levels are distinct and interdependent. With the exception of a few urban areas that are legally designated as ‘cities’, most urban areas are managed by boards that are responsible to the county governments and their legislatures. A Transition Authority is coordinating the transition process to devolved governance and has established four technical committees to that end: (i) capacity and capability building, (ii) functional analysis and competency assignment, (iii) legal and intergovernmental relations and planning, and (iv) budgeting and finance.

Devolution presents significant opportunities for achieving the EDE goal, including enhanced resource allocation to counties which were previously under-served by central governments, and the space to act in ways that are more attuned to local realities and priorities. EDE implementation is thus now a shared responsibility of the national and county governments and is of three kinds (Figure 2):

1. Interventions made by the national government through its sector plans.
2. Interventions made by the county governments through their County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs).
3. Interventions made by the NDMA and its partners which cut across sectors.

The CIDPs are supposed to be living documents, regularly updated as the operating and institutional contexts change. The NDMA has been working with the county governments to ensure that relevant EDE commitments are mainstreamed in these plans, although this process needs further reinforcement.

Figure 2: EDE linkages with national and county planning

2.1.2 Resource mobilisation

In the past, drought management took a predominantly humanitarian-led approach. The new focus on reducing vulnerability and risk requires strategies that employ humanitarian response when necessary but above all prioritise resilience.

There are three critical issues in financing the EDE:
1. Shifting the emphasis from (late) response to investment that reduces vulnerability, which requires sustainable streams of funding.

2. Ensuring timely response to emerging drought, well before an emergency is reached, and for which contingency finance is required. To that end, the government is establishing a National Drought Contingency Fund (NDCF) as a multi-donor facility with set-aside funds for timely response.

3. Ensuring better alignment and coordination of all investment, which is the purpose of the common programming.

One of the tools needed to support resource mobilisation is a comprehensive database of existing and potential investment. UN-OCHA has already designed an online tool, supported by FAO and the Technical Consortium, which makes investment data publicly available. This framework will further refine and maintain that tool. Its knowledge management component will also provide the evidence and justification for resource mobilisation activities.

### 2.1.3 Knowledge management

Knowledge management is understood as a process of identifying, gathering, synthesising and sharing knowledge and promoting its application. It is most effective when the key stakeholders, such as communities and county governments, are integrally involved in the process.\(^3\)

Kenya has a rich intellectual environment with significant capacities in research and analysis within both the public and the private sectors. At the end of June 2013 there were 22 public chartered universities and nine public university constituent colleges, as well as 17 private chartered universities and five private university constituent colleges.\(^4\) There are also numerous policy research institutions both within government (such as KIPPRA) and outside it (such as IPAR and IDS at the University of Nairobi). However there are two key challenges: first, there is limited ASAL focus within all this activity, with the exception of institutions such as the Centre for Sustainable Dryland Ecosystems and Societies at the University of Nairobi, and the dryland research programmes of organisations such as KARI. Second, research programmes are not coordinated, and research outputs are not adequately disseminated, shared or applied in ways that will ensure tangible and lasting impacts.

For ASAL and EDE institutions to function effectively, relevant information and knowledge must be generated and shared in a coordinated and timely manner. Decision-makers need evidence and analysis to prioritise and target investment appropriately and understand the anticipated return on that investment, as well as for the rational formulation of policies, regulatory frameworks and institutions.

However, there are significant information challenges, particularly in terms of quality, relevance and availability. These are discussed in more detail in section 2.2.6. While there is

---


\(^4\) [http://www.cue.or.ke/services/accreditation/status-of-universities](http://www.cue.or.ke/services/accreditation/status-of-universities)
still a high degree of fragmentation of effort in this area, some recent developments suggest a trend towards more collaborative working, including the Technical Consortium for Building Resilience in the Horn of Africa housed at ILRI, and the Resilience Analysis Unit led by IGAD and supported by four UN agencies (FAO, UNDP, UNICEF, and WFP).

2.2 Critical issues to address

2.2.1 Stronger institutions for ASAL development

As section 2.1.1 described, an institutional framework has been established to facilitate ASAL development and ensure that a coherent approach to this is sustained over time. One past weakness was the proliferation of approaches and institutions which were rarely sustained beyond the five-year lifespan of a government. This is important because the structural factors which lie at the root of poverty and vulnerability in the ASALs require generational change.

Once fully operational, the ASAL institutional framework will provide the overall enabling environment for the EDE. However, key parts of it require either establishing or strengthening. Table 1 summarises the status of each institution and the issues that need attention.⁵

Some of these institutions face particular challenges. First, they are in their formative stages and may lack even a minimum level of internal capacity to secure the resources they need. For example, the ASAL Stakeholder Forum (ASF) and the Pastoralist Parliamentary Group (PPG) are both membership organisations which need small secretariats to facilitate their work. Second, any institution working in the ASALs faces significant operational challenges, particularly the low levels of formal literacy and the difficulties of engaging with a membership dispersed across large geographical areas with poor transport and communications infrastructure.

Several of these institutions could be considered affirmative action measures which are needed only because the mainstream systems of government are not yet fully addressing ASAL-specific concerns. An example of this is the National Council on Nomadic Education in Kenya (NACONEK), which is required because the design of the education system does not meet the needs of children and adults in pastoralist areas. The process of institutional development therefore also involves working with the relevant sectors to ensure that ASAL interests are in due course absorbed as a normal part of their operations, and this is the task of the relevant EDE pillar.

⁵ It should be noted that Table 1 is not a comprehensive list of all ASAL institutions but rather those that make up the ASAL institutional framework in the ASAL Policy.
### Table 1: Status of ASAL institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Pillar interest</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Issues to address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASAL Cabinet Sub-Committee</td>
<td>All pillars</td>
<td>To provide high-level policy direction and accountability.</td>
<td>Constituted in December 2012 but not yet operationalised.</td>
<td>Review in light of the changed architecture of government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAL Secretariat</td>
<td>All pillars</td>
<td>To support and service the ASAL institutional framework, promote policy coherence in ASALs, and monitor delivery of the ASAL Policy.</td>
<td>Operating informally, but not yet formally constituted.</td>
<td>Formalise and strengthen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAL Stakeholder Forum</td>
<td>All pillars</td>
<td>To enhance networking and coordination between ASAL stakeholders, promote good practice, good governance and accountability, and advocate the interests of ASAL communities.</td>
<td>Operational: inaugurated in July 2012. County forums are now being established.</td>
<td>Establish a Secretariat and facilitate county forums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Drought Management Authority</td>
<td>Drought Risk Management</td>
<td>To provide leadership and coordination of Kenya’s management of drought risks and adaptation to climate change.</td>
<td>Operational: gazetted in November 2011. NDMA Bill to strengthen its powers is currently before Parliament.</td>
<td>Strengthen its legal status to lead and coordinate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Drought Contingency Fund</td>
<td>Drought Risk Management</td>
<td>To ensure timely response to drought by making set-aside funds available.</td>
<td>Pending: flagship project under Kenya Vision 2030 MTP II. Systems and procedures have been developed.</td>
<td>Engage with the National Treasury to facilitate its establishment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Kenya Investment Fund</td>
<td>All pillars</td>
<td>To expand private sector engagement in the region by making equity available through a new impact investment fund.</td>
<td>Pending: two out of three phases of design work have been completed.</td>
<td>Engage with potential investors to secure the Fund’s capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council on Nomadic Education in Kenya</td>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>To promote, coordinate and provide quality education and training for the sustainable development of Kenya’s nomadic communities.</td>
<td>Provided for within the Basic Education Act 2013. Its regulations, functions, structure and budget have been developed.</td>
<td>Engage with the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST) to finalise the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Kenya Education Trust</td>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>To expand access to quality education for students from arid and pastoralist counties.</td>
<td>Operational: an independent trust with a Memorandum of Understanding with the MoEST.</td>
<td>Review in light of the parastatal reform process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.2 Political leadership and sustainability of the EDE

The EDE has a ten-year goal to end drought emergencies by 2022. A critical challenge will be to sustain commitment to this goal between the current government and the next so that progress is not slowed or reversed by the political transition in 2017/18. This will require strong technical leadership by members of the relevant national and county executives, as well as advocacy work with the political aspirants during the next campaign.

Kenya’s constitutional dispensation gives Parliament significant powers to hold the Executive to account for its policy commitments. The PPG is a recognised group within Parliament which was formed to mainstream pastoralists’ agenda within the national political process. It is committed to ensuring full operationalisation of the ASAL Policy as part of its strategic plan for 2014-17, and will therefore be a key partner in mobilising support for ASAL institutions and the EDE as a whole. It can mobilise the county political leadership through the new Pastoralist Leaders Forum (where elected leaders at the national and county levels come together), as well as the larger group of ASAL parliamentarians.

2.2.3 Policy, legal and institutional frameworks for the EDE at the county level

One strategy to sustain commitment to the EDE will be to develop appropriate policy and legal frameworks at the county level. The county governments have the powers to legislate in this area. Issues that might be addressed by policy and legislation at this level include the integration of EDE commitments within CIDPs, the allocation of county budgets to the EDE, citizen participation and accountability, and inter-county collaboration, particularly concerning the management of shared resources and the movement of people and livestock. This work needs planning and supporting in a coordinated manner in order to avoid fragmentation and lack of coherence across counties.

2.2.4 Institutional development of county governments

The county governments are on the frontline of drought management. There are now substantial resources at the county level to finance investment in both risk reduction and timely drought response. County governments have already demonstrated that they are making a difference: the impact of the dry seasons in 2013/14 would have been much worse had counties not taken steps to maintain boreholes, truck water, and manage disease outbreaks. Several are also planning to establish funds at the county level for disaster management.

However, the devolution process has inevitable challenges, including the detailed interpretation of institutional mandates, limited public awareness of the new institutions, fledgling inter-sectoral and inter-agency coordination mechanisms, and financial and performance management systems that are not yet fully functional. Some of the more remote counties also face significant gaps in their establishments, an issue which is being addressed by the EDE pillar on human capital. The inter-governmental structures that will oversee EDE implementation provide a mechanism to address some of these challenges, and will also be
critical in ensuring that the principles of equal partnership and inter-dependence between the national and the county governments are applied.

There are also ASAL-specific challenges associated with devolution. For example, national planning methodologies need to be nuanced to the unique situation of dryland societies, particularly ensuring adequate participation of customary institutions and mobile groups. Inter-county and inter-country linkages are also critical, since neither the impacts of drought nor the social and economic relationships which are essential to sustainable livelihoods are contained within administrative boundaries.

Several agencies intend to support the counties in addressing these institutional challenges. However, their efforts are not yet well-coordinated, thus having the counter-productive effect of increasing pressures on the new governments.

2.2.5 Citizen and stakeholder engagement

The EDE reflects a paradigm shift in the approach to drought in Kenya. First, the promise to end drought emergencies echoes the constitutional commitment that every person has the right to be free from hunger (Article 43 (1) (c) in the Constitution of Kenya 2010). Second, the overall thrust of the EDE agenda is to reduce vulnerability to drought rather than simply respond to its effects. This needs innovation and new thinking, as well as strategic and sustained partnerships between the wide number and diversity of actors involved. As a result, expertise in external communication and public relations will be an important aspect of the institutional capacities required.

In terms of citizen participation with the EDE, a wide range of community institutions operate across the ASALs. These include formal structures (such as community-based organisations (CBOs), group ranches and conservancies), customary institutions (such as the dedha system of the Boran or Somali clans), and hybrids of the two (such as rangeland users associations, which apply traditional systems of natural resource management but engage effectively with formal governance structures). Customary institutions are critical to effective management of common property regimes. The principal entry point to the EDE for these groups will be at the county level, through the normal processes of county consultation and planning, and through the operations of the ASAL Stakeholder Forum (ASF). The ASF is a platform through which non-state actors working on any issue can engage with each other, with potential partners and supporters, and with both the national and the county governments. The ASF county forums, which are now being established, are an important vehicle for citizen and CBO engagement with the county governments and other stakeholders.

A critical constituency which has so far had limited involvement with the EDE process is the private sector. An important task under this framework will be to use the EDE institutions to reach out to potential private sector partners and integrate within the common programme frameworks a fuller understanding of drought’s impacts on the whole of society.
2.2.6 Data and information challenges

There are significant limitations in ASAL-related data. Some information is incomplete, outdated or conflicting, particularly the critical statistics needed for planning, such as human and livestock population numbers, or the proportion of households engaged in different livelihoods and how these are changing over time. Data may be collected on an irregular basis rendering it ineffective for decision-making. Gaps in the data may be partly due to the cost of collecting it in large areas with poor infrastructure.

However, another cause of these weaknesses lies in the nature of conventional survey methods. These are designed for populations which are sedentary and easily accessible but are often of limited value in situations where discontinuity is the norm, such as pastoralist areas. A serious attempt to develop official survey approaches and methods that fit the pastoralist context is long overdue. Some opportunities to do so include the plans for a new Hunger Safety Net Programme baseline in 2015, modifications to the NDMA’s early warning system, the analysis of data on household livestock holdings from the 2009 census by the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS), and preparations for the Kenya Census of Agriculture (KCA).

Some existing data is not well supported by robust evidence or practical experience. There is also a high degree of knowledge and data fragmentation across institutions, with no central space for sharing and consolidation. This includes a lack of mechanisms for government to engage effectively, and in a coordinated manner, with universities and research institutions. Further, data and information may not be used either because users lack the capacity to convert information into knowledge for particular contexts, or because there has been little opportunity to apply the knowledge in a coherent and meaningful way.

County governments have acute information needs, since they are only just getting established and are operating in environments where access to technical expertise and knowledge is more challenging. Further, citizens in ASAL counties face obstacles in accessing information. In some areas female literacy is less than 10 per cent, and vernacular radio and mobile coverage is lacking. Appropriate ways are needed to ensure that information reaches these communities.

Finally, impact evaluation of investment requires baseline data. At present there are few appropriate panel datasets over sufficient periods of time to be able to analyse how indicators respond to a shock. Data exists but may not be consistent in its resolution, indicator, geographical coverage or time series. There are also major challenges with the interoperability of data. This framework will carry out a robust scoping of available data, analyse gaps, examine novel ways of generating missing data, and compile baseline datasets for each pillar of the EDE.

---

6 This section draws on Tilstone et al, 2013.
8 Kenya Rural Development Programme (2012) ‘Strengthening information dissemination at community level’
2.3 Justification for the common programme

Effective coordination is fundamental to drought management and the EDE goal. Moreover, the EDE initiative is starting at a time of significant changes in governance and in the institutional arrangements for its delivery. Implementation of devolution will be lengthy and complex, particularly in counties where institutional capacity is comparatively low and the operating environment more challenging. Strong institutions will help to ensure that the ASAL and EDE agenda are not lost during this transition and are sustained throughout its ten-year timeframe.

With regard to knowledge management, several institutions and organisations are involved in research, capacity development and impact analysis in the ASALs but are operating in relative isolation from one another. This pillar will identify these actors and their objectives and introduce new information and knowledge sharing platforms to ensure a more concerted and collaborative approach.

2.4 Contribution to relevant policies

The overall legal framework for the EDE is the Constitution of Kenya 2010, and the overall policy framework is Kenya Vision 2030. Other relevant policy documents include the ASAL Policy, the National Land Policy, the African Union’s Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa, the draft National Disaster Management Policy, the National Livestock Policy, and the Policy Framework on Nomadic Education in Kenya.

Formulation of a policy and legal framework for pastoralism in Kenya, which secures pastoralist mobility and security and facilitates and recognises the cross-border trade and movement of livestock, will be prioritised under this framework and will domesticate the AU’s Policy Framework on Pastoralism. It may also contribute to the EAC Partner States Common Market Protocol, whose objective is to widen and deepen cooperation among partner states by removing restrictions on the movement of goods, persons, labour, services and capital and the rights of establishment and residence.

The knowledge management and accountability initiatives under this framework, particularly those that concern data and information, will contribute towards the constitutional commitment to the right of access to information (Article 35) and towards government efforts to ensure open data.

By establishing monitoring protocols and knowledge management systems, the framework will also contribute to the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) implemented by the Ministry of Devolution and Planning.
3 Programme framework

The overall purpose of this framework is to ensure that robust ASAL institutions exist and support EDE investment, policy and programming decisions, based on critical evidence generated by solid knowledge management systems.

The framework has two components, on institutional development and knowledge management, which are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2: Programme components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Institutional Development</th>
<th>Knowledge Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall outcome</td>
<td>Robust ASAL institutions exist and support EDE investment, policy and programming decisions, based on critical evidence generated by solid knowledge management systems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific objectives</td>
<td>1. To establish and/or strengthen priority ASAL development institutions</td>
<td>1. To support evidence-based policy and investment choices made by EDE stakeholders at different levels and to inform the development of the EDE MTP III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To operationalise the management and accountability structures for the EDE.</td>
<td>2. To assess the impact of Kenya’s progress towards the 10-year EDE goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. To secure evidence-based policy and legal reforms that facilitate achievement of the EDE goal.</td>
<td>3. To increase public and stakeholder awareness of, and identification with, the EDE, and build wider understanding of the conditions necessary to achieve drought resilience in Kenya.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. To ensure that EDE priorities are appropriately mainstreamed within the Kenya Vision 2030 Medium Term Plan III.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next sections describe the strategies and interventions that will be used to achieve the objectives of each component.
3.1 Institutional development

3.1.1 Establishing and/or strengthening priority ASAL development institutions

1. *Promote and coordinate the provision of institutional capacity development for ASAL institutions.* These include the ASAL Secretariat, the ASF, the PPG, the NDMA and its associated NDCF and EDE Secretariat, and the Northern Kenya Investment Fund (NKIF), and this support may include:
   a. The provision of personnel and other resources.
   b. Capacity development.
   c. Measures that institutionalise or legalise the institution, or finalise its design (such as the final work needed to establish the NKIF).
   d. Funds for the institution to implement their activities.

2. *Promote and coordinate the provision of institutional capacity development for county governments.* This may include capacity development and technical assistance in any area relevant to EDE priorities. Examples of planned interventions include the government’s efforts to institutionalise the EDE framework at the county level, the World Food Programme’s new initiative to enhance county preparedness and response capacities to address short-term and long-term hunger needs, UNDP’s work on disaster risk reduction frameworks, and initiatives to strengthen the capacity of County Planning Units, particularly in data and information management.

3. *Provide technical assistance to other EDE pillars which are assisting sector-specific ASAL institutions,* including NACONEK (human capital pillar), the Livestock Marketing Board or its equivalent (sustainable livelihoods), and the NDMA / NDCF and the proposed county disaster/drought funds (drought risk management).

3.1.2 Management and accountability structures for the EDE

1. *Establish an EDE Secretariat within the NDMA.* Its purpose will be to facilitate implementation of the EDE common programme frameworks in ways that enhance the alignment, coordination and technical quality of all interventions. The Secretariat will ensure the operationalisation of the structures described in section 6. It will also lead implementation of this framework.

2. *Develop and facilitate inter-county structures for the EDE* in collaboration with the county governments. Regular meetings between neighbouring counties on a cluster basis will provide a platform to address shared problems, manage joint assets, and support peer learning. The meetings will be attended by all County Executive members responsible for sectors relevant to the EDE pillars.

---

9 The EDE has been working through six clusters of counties: North Rift, South Rift, Upper Eastern, North Eastern, Coast, and Ukambani / Mt. Kenya.
3. **Maintain an overview of resource requirements for the EDE** and facilitate the mobilisation of resources in a coordinated manner, in partnership with the ASAL donor group and the private sector.

4. **Engage effectively with IGAD’s IDDRSI platform** in order to clarify Kenya’s regional role in championing EDE, contribute to regional objectives, and benefit from regional opportunities for learning, peer support and resource mobilisation.

### 3.1.3 Evidence-based policy and legal reforms that facilitate achievement of the EDE goal

1. **Provide coordinated technical assistance to the county governments in developing policy and legal frameworks for the EDE at the county level.** Further to the discussion in section 2.2.3, this work will be critical to the sustainability and impact of the EDE initiative. It will draw on available technical support, for example from UN agencies, and be implemented in close partnership with the county State Law Offices.

2. **Lead processes of policy and legal reform that are specific to the agenda of this framework or that concern the EDE as a whole.** Examples may include access to data, full implementation of the ASAL Policy, or the domestication of the African Union’s Policy Framework for Pastoralism in Africa.

3. **Pursue regional-level initiatives in collaboration with IGAD and other partners that address cross-border challenges and opportunities.** These may include policy and legal reforms that facilitate the movement of people, goods and livestock, the harmonisation of policy processes between countries, or the management of cross-border risks.

### 3.1.4 Mainstreaming of EDE within Kenya Vision 2030 MTP III.

1. **Develop the EDE MTP III** in a participatory way, incorporating lessons learned from implementation of the EDE MTP II, and ensuring that EDE commitments are appropriately mainstreamed within national planning and resource allocation for the 2018-22 period.

### 3.2 Knowledge management

#### 3.2.1 Supporting evidence-based policy and investment choices by EDE stakeholders, including communities, and informing the development of the EDE MTP III.

1. **Mapping and analysis of relevant projects and stakeholders.** The existing online tool developed by UN-OCHA will be finalised and made publicly accessible, including in an offline version for those with limited internet access. Its domestication to the county level will also be explored. The process of finalisation will include a review of the existing content to ensure tighter mapping of investment against the final results frameworks of each EDE pillar. It will also include collaboration with the ASAL Stakeholder Forum to rationalise mapping initiatives, particularly at the county level.
2. **Demand-driven action research programme to generate evidence for decision-makers.** A process of exploratory and consultative research, working closely with communities, will test critical assumptions regarding programming choices. Demand-driven research will generate evidence for decision-making, impact assessment and policy reform. Research programmes will analyse the role of investment not just within an individual pillar but in terms of its interaction with other pillars.

3. **Reviewing and informing existing national and regional surveys.** Existing surveys, such as the Population and Housing Census, the Demographic and Health Survey, the KCA, the Living Standards Measurement Survey, and county-based processes of data collection, will be reviewed with a view to improving their utility for the EDE and for ASAL development more broadly. The focus will be on factors that support resilience and will include:
   a. Identifying surveys routinely carried out at either national or regional levels to inform broader and large-scale development initiatives.
   b. Informing the data objectives and methodologies of such surveys and arranging to incorporate, or ensure the inclusion of, information relevant to the development of ASAL communities and supporting institutions.
   c. Promoting more appropriate indicators of measurement and data collection methodologies in ASAL areas.
   d. Ensuring that analysis is robust and disseminated widely.

4. **Develop EDE knowledge-sharing platforms and systems.** This framework will develop platforms and systems for use by the other EDE pillars and knowledge partners. It will include:
   a. Developing long-term partnerships between the various knowledge, research and scientific institutions and the EDE Secretariat so that the provision of knowledge services to the EDE is coordinated, harmonised and aligned and draws on the most up-to-date expertise.
   b. Creating a shared platform for all data held in the public domain, to increase efficiencies in data collection and widen access.
   c. Packaging research processes and products for use by all stakeholders, including communities, for informed decision-making.

5. **Develop and implement advocacy interventions that support policy and institutional reform.** The aim will be to strengthen the link between information and action by consolidating the evidence base and making this accessible to those formulating policies, regulatory frameworks and institutions. The results of this work will also contribute to regional analysis and policy change through the IDDRSI framework.

6. **Implement a capacity development strategy that supports achievement of the EDE goals.** This framework will help the other pillars identify individual or institutional capacity gaps that may constrain achievement of the EDE goals and strategies to address them. It will arrange for the provision of resource providers, training forums and capacity development, as required. The EDE Secretariat will monitor the capacity processes
underway and evaluate their impacts on both the quality of delivery of the common programme frameworks and the progress towards the EDE goal.

7. **Provide evidence and technical support to the development of the EDE MTP III**, particularly, for example, in consolidating lessons learnt, identifying critical changes in the operating context to which the EDE MTP III must respond, and reviewing the priorities and performance of the EDE pillars.

### 3.2.2 Impact assessment of Kenya’s progress towards the 10-year EDE goal.

1. **Participatory identification of resilience impact indicators, progress markers or intermediate development outcomes and impact pathways** for the EDE as a whole and for each of its pillars. The resource tools and methodologies could include RAU mixed methods and Community Based Resilience Analysis (CoBRA). The work will include tracking a combination of progress indicators, including the traditional quantitative statistics (such as those used by the MDGs and the HDI), as well as qualitative milestones established through outcome mapping or similar approaches.

2. **Scoping of data requirements for baseline indicators**, including the provision of baseline data catalogues for each EDE pillar. This work could also inform a status report on the HDI/MDGs in ASALs, which could be a useful advocacy tool to generate increased attention to under-served issues.

3. **Capacity development on impact pathway analysis and outcome mapping** for members of EDE pillar groups and relevant monitoring and evaluation (M&E) personnel. The approaches will be practical and able to accommodate unfolding changes (both positive and negative) identified by both the pillar groups and communities.

4. **Comprehensive EDE programme evaluation and impact assessment at appropriate intervals**, for example annual, bi-annual and/or at the end of programmes or phases, including identification of the resources required. This could be done for specific pillars or for the EDE as a whole.

5. **Develop and implement a management information system (MIS) for the EDE M&E**, which facilitates online reporting by counties into an integrated system.

6. **Facilitate joint M&E missions of EDE interventions**, carried out by the EDE Secretariat, the pillar working groups, and relevant stakeholders.

### 3.2.3 Public and stakeholder awareness and understanding.

1. **Design and implement a public relations strategy for the EDE** which broadens the range of stakeholder involvement, particularly from the private sector. A key outcome of the strategy should be a wider understanding of the conditions necessary to achieve drought resilience in Kenya.
2. **Develop a strategy for citizen engagement with the EDE**, building on lessons learned from relevant initiatives (such as the Kenya Rural Development Programme information campaign in Turkana), and working in close collaboration with the ASF county forums and the county governments in order to rationalise the various consultative processes which currently operate independently of each other.

3. **Carry out further sensitisation and outreach within the counties**, ensuring that all relevant sectors and officers are fully aware of their contributions to the EDE, particularly the county planners.

4  **Cross-cutting issues**

4.1  **Gender and diversity**

Equitable representation of different genders and social groups in the EDE institutional arrangements is critical to ensuring that the needs of the whole of society are factored into programming. Decision-making in the ASALs has largely been dominated by men, due to cultural orientation and the educational marginalisation of girls. The Constitution of Kenya 2010 contains measures to promote more equal gender representation in public life, as well as protection of the rights of minorities, and the same principles will apply to the ASAL and EDE institutions.

Institutional development strategies under this framework will be designed and implemented in ways which ensure that the rights and interests of different social groups are addressed. This may require special measures or innovative approaches to ensure that all groups are reached. It will also involve leveraging support from key partners, such as the PPG’s commitment to support women’s leadership and advance the interests of pastoralist women through the policy and legislative process. Capacity development in monitoring and evaluation carried out under this framework will include the integration of gendered indicators in EDE pillar results frameworks.

4.2  **Sustainability**

Sustainability is at the heart of this framework, since its focus is on the enabling environment for the EDE as a whole. The priority is to strengthen key institutions, including through the provision of the necessary legal frameworks, so that they can perform over the long term, including ensuring continuity through the political transition in 2017/18.

The actions under this framework to increase public engagement with the EDE may also be instrumental in ensuring sustainability if they result in greater demand from the public for investments by state and non-state actors which strengthen resilience.

Finance is a critical component of sustainability and needs attention in both government institutions (particularly those which are currently more dependent on donor support) and membership organisations (such as the PPG and the ASF) which require a certain level of
A contribution from their members in order to function and build credibility. The process of devolution, and the mainstreaming of EDE commitments within the CIDPs, will also leverage more resources at the county level.

Finally, the new approach represented by the common programming may reinforce sustainability, particularly if development partners follow through in aligning their resources against the EDE framework, and if stronger partnerships and synergies lead to more efficient and rational use of resources.

4.3 Links with other pillars of the EDE framework

Part of the purpose of this framework is to serve the other five pillars of the EDE. Each pillar has priorities with regard to both institutional development and knowledge management, illustrated below. The detail of the partnership between this pillar and the other pillars will be agreed within the first six months of implementation (by December 2014).

4.3.1 Institutional issues

*Peace and security*
A paradigm shift in how ‘security’ is conceptualised and managed by the mainstream security agencies is required, coupled with responsible and effective action by the political leadership. The PPG is planning some work on this, including development of a Code of Conduct. New institutions for peace building and conflict management will be established with implementation of the National Policy on Peace Building and Conflict Management.

*Climate proofed infrastructure*
Once established, the Northern Kenya Investment Fund could support this pillar, particularly areas with higher private sector involvement such as energy and ICTs. The scope of the NKIF is also relevant to the human capital and sustainable livelihoods pillars. The NKIF is not yet operational, but the final phase of its development is included in this framework.

*Human capital*
There are two key institutions under this pillar. The first is the National Council on Nomadic Education in Kenya (NACONEK), which was legalised by the Basic Education Act of 2013. Its objective is to promote access, retention and quality education for all nomadic communities, which is key to Kenya realising both the MDG and Education for All goals. The second is the proposed Health and Nutrition Council for ASALs, which will harmonise approaches and share good practices at both national and county level, and ensure the integration of ASAL priorities and concerns within the mainstream sector plans. A key partner for this pillar is the Northern Kenya Education Trust (NoKET), an independent trust that was registered in 2010 and whose goal is to help increase the pool of professional capacity available to the region.
**Sustainable livelihoods**
This pillar will support a number of institutions, including the County Land Management Boards, County Marketing Boards, livestock market management committees and community-level institutions.

**Drought risk reduction**
The key institution under this pillar is the NDMA. The proposed National Drought Contingency Fund (NDCF) is not yet established but is essential for effective and timely drought response. Some county governments are also establishing disaster / drought response funds and climate adaptation funds. This pillar also has an interest in the county policy and legal frameworks which will support achievement of the EDE goal.

4.3.2 **Knowledge management**
The knowledge services provided by this pillar will be demand-led. Nevertheless, examples of the kind of issues that may be addressed, based on the content of the other pillar framework documents, are as follows.

**Peace and security**: the development of methodologies to evaluate the economic cost of conflict on ASAL livelihoods.

**Climate-proofed infrastructure**: a scoping study of existing guidelines and good practice in climate-proofing of infrastructure investments.

**Human capital**: evaluating global experience of retaining professionals in difficult working environments, such as the models and incentives used, and of the contribution of para-professionals to service delivery. This pillar will also support inter-county and inter-community dialogue and exchange to facilitate the spread and adoption of innovative and effective practices.

**Sustainable livelihoods**: research into mechanisms that will improve the delivery of livestock insurance, methods of integrating indigenous knowledge in ecology, medicine and animal health, and training in the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security.

**Drought risk management**: testing and evaluating different approaches to scaling up services and programmes in response to stress, as well as a web-based knowledge platform for drought risk management.

4.4 **Quality control**
Quality control is broadly interpreted, i.e. being able to satisfy key constituencies that the work carried out under this framework is relevant, appropriate and of high quality. It may be considered from three angles:

1. **Technical quality**: interventions that apply internationally recognised good practice in dryland development, that use research and analytical methods of high quality and
consequently produce outputs that are trusted, and that are results-oriented and deliver impact.

2. **Political capital**: interventions that strengthen political ownership of the EDE at both national and county levels, fulfil the requirements of public accountability, and ensure wide support for the EDE at senior levels of government.

3. **Community-driven**: interventions that respond to the priorities and concerns of ASAL citizens and communities, with the necessary feedback mechanisms in place to ensure ongoing feedback and review.

Partnerships will be established with institutions relevant to each of these three areas to ensure that quality concerns are adequately addressed.

5 **Risk management**

The risks likely to be associated with this framework are discussed in Table 3.

*Table 3: Risks and mitigating measures*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Mitigating measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional risks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Government intention to rationalise institutions and the consequent loss of focus on the ASALs.</td>
<td>▪ Maximise support for ASAL institutions from all stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Develop an evidence-based case to ensure that ASAL focus is maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Insufficient resource allocation from the national and county governments.</td>
<td>▪ Ensure that dialogue is sustained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Draw on political support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Ensure that institutional options are efficient and results-oriented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. EDE is undermined by the inevitable teething problems of the devolution process.</td>
<td>▪ Ensure frequent and effective communication with all parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Identify opportunities to advance the EDE goals and champions to support it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Build and maintain support from the political leadership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Ensure participatory consultation on targeted goals, strategies and planned activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Work through authorised structures for inter-governmental negotiation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sustaining political commitment through and beyond the next elections.</td>
<td>▪ Integrate EDE targets and plans in ongoing development strategies (with both government and development partners).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Mitigating measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Engage the support of the private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Build public support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Knowledge risks**

1 Communication methods which are insufficiently responsive to the ASAL context (low levels of formal literacy; poor communications infrastructure).

   ▪ Develop and use a variety of communication tools and techniques.
   ▪ Work closely with the EDE human capital pillar and the ASAL Stakeholder Forum.

2 Cost and sustainability of data collection as a result of the ASAL context.

   ▪ Collaborative and coordinated data collection systems, achieved through this pillar, will be more cost-efficient.

3 Quality of data and standards, particularly as county governments build their capacity in this area.

   ▪ Make standard quality solutions available to counties which they can then tailor to their needs.

4 Weak links between data collection, decision-making, and long-term results.

   ▪ Use demand-driven approaches and applied methodologies.
   ▪ Link research outputs with forums for debate and dissemination.
   ▪ Develop user-friendly knowledge management systems that help users make decisions.

---

### 6 Institutional arrangements

#### 6.1 Programme management and implementation

The NDMA will lead and manage implementation of this framework, working in close collaboration with the co-chair of the pillar and with a wide range of state and non-state partners.

**Box 1: EDE Secretariat**

**Purpose:** To facilitate implementation of the EDE common programme frameworks in ways that enhance the alignment, coordination and technical quality of all investments and interventions.

**Functions:**

1. Service the Inter-Governmental Forum and Inter-Governmental Committee on EDE matters, and the national EDE Steering Committee.
2. Lead and oversee implementation of the sixth common programme framework on institutional development and knowledge management.
3. Work with the national and county governments and inter-governmental bodies (IGAD and the East African Community) to ensure that EDE commitments are appropriately integrated in planning and resource allocation at all levels, including in the Kenya Vision 2030 MTP III.
4. Document and share lessons from the EDE in relevant forums and networks, both within Kenya and internationally.
Implementation of the framework will be spearheaded by the EDE Secretariat, whose purpose and draft functions are in Box 1. The Secretariat is located in the NDMA since the Authority is the focal point in government for the EDE initiative.

Two sub-groups provide technical support to this pillar and will use their national and international networks to bring in other partners. One sub-group has expertise in institutional development and the other in knowledge management. Both sub-groups will meet regularly for joint monitoring of progress against the results framework. Table 4 lists the membership of each sub-group, which may be subject to change in the course of implementation. For the time being, CSO participation will be facilitated through the ASF county forums and through communities’ direct engagement with the county governments.

Table 4: Pillar 6 membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Co-Chair: National Drought Management Authority Drylands Learning and Capacity Building Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Institutional development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenor Membership</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASAL Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ASAL Stakeholder Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CARE Kenya (for the ASAL Alliance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Euro Africa Consult Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oxfam (for the ASAL Alliance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Coordination mechanisms

The coordination structures for this pillar of the EDE are shown in Figure 3. Some of the key elements include:

- **Inter-Governmental Forum**: this is the apex body, chaired by the President and attended by the Governors from drought-prone counties. It provides political direction to the EDE within the framework of the Intergovernmental Relations Act, 2012.

- **Inter-Governmental Committee**: this is chaired by the Cabinet Secretary with responsibility for drought management in Kenya and attended by Cabinet Secretaries from the national government and County Executive members with portfolios relevant to the EDE. It meets twice a year to ensure strategic coordination between the two governments.

- **National EDE Steering Committee**: this is chaired by the NDMA. Its members include the government chair and donor co-chair of each pillar, as well as other co-opted members. The government chairs ensure links to the relevant sectors and ministries. It meets every quarter to provide operational oversight of the EDE as a whole and ensure progress towards the 10-year goal. The national committee is replicated in purpose and membership by a parallel structure at the county level, whose precise title and modalities are determined by the Governors.
*Inter-county structures Attended by CEC members relevant to EDE pillars*

**Political level**

- **Council of Governors**
- **Inter-Governmental Forum Chaired by the President**
- **Inter-Governmental EDE Committee Chaired by the CS Devolution & Planning, attended by Cabinet Secretaries / CEC members**

**Implementation and coordination**

- **National EDE Steering Committee Chaired by NDMA, supported by EDE Secretariat & thematic committees, with state & non-state membership, & doubles as IDDRSI National Platform**

**Pillar Working Group**
- **Chaired by NDMA, co-chaired by DLCI**
  - Institutional development sub-group
  - Knowledge management sub-group
  - Implementing agencies (including ASF, NGOs, research institutions, universities, Technical Consortium, RAU)

**County EDE Steering Committee**
- **Chaired by Governor, supported by NDMA Secretariat & thematic committees**

**Sub-County structures Chaired by Governor’s representative**

**Ward structures**

**Inter-county structures Attended by CEC members relevant to EDE pillars**

**Implementing agencies: county departments, non-state actors**

**Key:**
- Rounded symbols: coordination
- Square symbols: implementation
- Oval symbols: oversight
- Orange arrows: Members/associates of pillar working group

**Figure 3: Coordination structures**

- Parliamentary oversight
- National Treasury External Auditors
- County Assembly
- Communities
- IGAD (IDDRSI)
Given the demand-driven nature of this framework, each of the other five pillars has a nominated focal point responsible for ensuring that the priorities of their pillar are integrated into this framework. The sub-groups will work with them to identify their specific support needs and develop strategies and activities to provide them, either bilaterally or through combined platforms. Institutional needs may include the modalities for developing, establishing, strengthening or coordinating institutions. Knowledge management needs may include research and/or evidence for policy and practice, capacity building, knowledge-sharing platforms, and monitoring and evaluation for learning and the promotion of good practices.

Both sub-groups will use their membership to ensure strong links between institutional development and knowledge management initiatives in Kenya and those planned at the regional level under the IDDRSI framework. The sub-groups will also actively explore opportunities for mutual learning directly with other IGAD member states.

An important task under this framework will be to operationalise the inter-county EDE structures which the county governments have identified as being important to achieving the EDE goal. At previous consultative meetings in November/December 2013 and April 2014 the county governments identified several areas where collaborative action across county boundaries would be beneficial.

Finally, since an important part of this framework involves capacity support to the counties, steps will be taken to link with the general coordination mechanisms which are harmonising technical assistance from the national government and development partners to the county governments.

6.3 Monitoring and evaluation

6.3.1 Monitoring and evaluation of this framework

The results framework for this pillar is in Annex 1. The EDE Secretariat is responsible for monitoring progress against the agreed indicators. The targets and timeframes for each indicator will be agreed with partners within the first six months of implementation. M&E of the institutional development component will assess organisational development, transformation and functionality. M&E of the knowledge management component will focus on the creation, capture, storage and dissemination of information, and the effectiveness of the information and knowledge management systems developed.

6.3.2 Monitoring and evaluation of the EDE as a whole

This pillar will support M&E of the EDE as a whole. It will track progress in implementing the common programme frameworks, identify gaps, improve coordination and alignment, match funds with priorities, and ensure proper resource utilisation, as well as carry out periodic evaluations of impact. The EDE M&E framework will also show how the common programme frameworks could contribute more effectively to national and county development through the identification of emerging challenges and opportunities.
A key challenge will be monitoring investments over longer temporal scales (ten-plus years) and their impact on ending drought emergencies. Some key questions that will need attention include: Will the investments, projects and interventions proposed within the EDE have an impact on ending drought emergencies, and if so, how will we know? Is it enough to reflect impact in terms of positive changes in sustainable development indicators (such as health, nutrition, education and living standards)? What does ‘ending drought emergencies’ mean to people living in Kenya, in terms of changes in their households and the systems that underpin their livelihoods?

Monitoring will take place at multiple levels, implemented and coordinated through the structures established by each pillar and according to procedures and protocols developed by the EDE Secretariat. Monitoring systems will be closely aligned with indicators and outcomes in relevant sector plans and CIDPs, and will be implemented in ways which reinforce the responsibilities and capacities of the county governments. Monitoring reports will be shared across the six pillars and with their various implementing partners in order to strengthen understanding and synergy across the EDE framework as a whole.

An evaluation plan will facilitate the assessment of impact. Outcomes will be reviewed and evaluated at agreed timelines. Evaluations will be planned and overseen by the relevant pillars, with this pillar providing technical support as required.

The monitoring and evaluation component will be implemented through the following steps:

1. **Review of pillar results frameworks**: there will be a participatory review of each pillar’s theory of change and its anticipated outcomes and associated indicators, which will also identify impact indicators, progress markers or intermediate development outcomes and impact pathways for the EDE and its constituent pillars.

2. **Baseline studies**: indicator evidence for each pillar will be gathered and consolidated, drawing on existing data and studies wherever possible.

3. **Capacity development**: strategically planned training of trainers for relevant NDMA officers, pillar M&E managers and county officials will be carried out on the appropriate combination of M&E approaches to track performance and progress for each pillar and for the EDE as a whole. This will be reinforced by subsequent capacity building forums and supervision of the implementation of agreed monitoring systems. This training and support will be embedded within existing institutions for sustainability, particularly the County Planning Units.

4. **Development and utilisation of an information and knowledge management system** that will service data collection, analysis and reporting for all pillars. This will involve:

   a. Working from a principle of open data, setting up reporting arrangements and infrastructure that will support the system. This will include the creation of a central repository or clearing house for data and information that is being collected by any research or development institution across the ASALs.
b. Using the impact pathway analysis and outcome mapping frameworks developed through the review of the pillar results frameworks, establish a monitoring system for tracking progress and lessons learnt, including cross-county and cross-pillar comparisons; develop and disseminate M&E procedures and protocols for use by all pillars and implementing partners; and identify the relevant actors responsible for data collection and their reporting responsibilities.

7 Resources

The total budget required to implement this framework is an estimated Kshs. 2,305 million over four years (2014-18). Of this, 74 per cent is for institutional development and 26 per cent for knowledge management. A summary budget is in Annex 2.

Of the total funds required, approximately eight per cent has already been secured. However, this figure is likely to rise significantly as the detailed mapping and alignment of existing programmes and projects is completed, and as pipeline funding proposals are approved.

This framework should be responsive to the needs of the other five pillars and the ASAL / EDE institutions. Funding requirements will therefore be reviewed during the first six months of implementation as detailed partnerships between this pillar and the others are agreed. By December 2014, i.e. after the first six months of implementation, a clearer picture of financing needs will have been established.
## Annex 1  Results framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVI</th>
<th>MOV</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL (BY 2022)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities in drought-prone areas are more resilient to drought</td>
<td>Number of people requiring food assistance as a result of drought</td>
<td>Investments made across all pillars of the EDE, and functional links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and other effects of climate change, and the impacts of drought</td>
<td>emergencies.</td>
<td>established between the pillars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are contained.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative sources of finance established and operational, such as the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NDCF and ARC, and scalability mechanisms in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of children under five stunted in each of the 23 most drought-</td>
<td>Adequate economic, political and climatic stability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>affected counties.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value of livestock lost in drought compared with previous drought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>episodes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya manages drought episodes without recourse to international</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>food assistance as a result of drought emergencies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| OVERALL PILLAR OUTCOME                                             |                                                                     |                                                                            |
| Robust ASAL institutions exist and support EDE investment, policy | Operational ASAL development institutions.                         | Government continues to maintain focus on ASALs and enhances support to   |
| and programming decisions, based on critical evidence generated  | EDE investments, policies and legal reforms facilitated and        | ASAL institutions.                                                        |
| by solid knowledge management systems.                            | appropriately mainstreamed within the Kenya Vision 2030 MTP III.   | Sufficient budgetary support and allocation from national and county     |
|                                                                     |                                                                     | governments maintained.                                                   |

| RESULTS                                                             |                                                                     |                                                                            |
| 1. ASAL institutions for EDE established, strengthened and         | Operational ASAL Secretariat, ASF, PPG, NDMA, NDCF, EDE Secretariat,| Sufficient budgetary support and allocation from national and county     |
| coordinated.                                                       | NACONEK, Northern Kenya Investment Fund, Northern Kenya Education   | governments maintained.                                                   |
|                                                                   | Trust, and Livestock Marketing Board.                               |                                                                            |
|                                                                   | Reports on operations of the institutions                          |                                                                            |
|                                                                   | Instruments (including legal) operationalising the institutions     |                                                                            |
| 2. Knowledge management for EDE evidence-based decision-making    | Endorsement by national and county political leadership of actions | Knowledge is effectively managed for evidence-based decision-making and   |
| and impact assessment in place.                                    | taken.                                                             | practice.                                                                  |
|                                                                   | Assessment reports                                                |                                                                            |
|                                                                   | Evaluation reports                                                 |                                                                            |
|                                                                   | Media monitoring                                                   |                                                                            |
## Result 1: ASAL institutions for EDE established, strengthened and coordinated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVI</th>
<th>MOV</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Priority ASAL development institutions established and/or strengthened.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.2 Management and accountability structures for the EDE operationalised.</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.3 Evidence-based policy and legal reforms that facilitate achievement of the EDE goal secured.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inter-county drought coordination structures set up and operational.</td>
<td>- EDE Secretariat established and operational.</td>
<td>- No. of county governments that approve policy and legal frameworks that support achievement of the EDE goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capacity of county governments on EDE (particularly drought contingency planning, drought risk reduction, resilience building, cross-border and inter-county issues) developed.</td>
<td>- No. of clusters holding EDE inter-county meetings at least once a year.</td>
<td>- No. of EDE-related policies and legal reforms carried out at the national level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Technical assistance available for use by EDE pillar groups.</td>
<td>- Increase in funds allocated to EDE by national government, county governments and development partners.</td>
<td>- Regional policies and legal reforms developed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ASAL Stakeholder Forum fully functional at the national level and in at least 14 counties.</td>
<td>- No. of invitations for regional IDDRSI meetings made by IGAD to the EDE team.</td>
<td>- Legal documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ASAL Secretariat operational.</td>
<td>- EDE Secretariat reports</td>
<td>- EDE-related policies finalised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Pastoralist Parliamentary Group Secretariat established and operational.</td>
<td>- EDE pillar annual reports</td>
<td>- EDE-related bills debated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- NKIF established and operational.</td>
<td>- EDE cluster inter-county reports</td>
<td>- Cross-border policies and legal frameworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ASAL coordination structures established and working effectively.</td>
<td>- IGAD invitation letters</td>
<td>- ASAL coordination structures established and working effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVI</td>
<td>MOV</td>
<td>ASSUMPTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.4 EDE priorities appropriately mainstreamed within the Kenya Vision 2030 MTP III. | • EDE MTP III developed and integrated into the Kenya Vision 2030 MTP III. | • EDE MTP II progress reports  
• EDE MTP III  
• CIDPs of the next County Governments | • EDE is appropriately integrated in planning and resource allocation processes at all levels. |

**Result 2: Knowledge management for EDE decision-making and impact assessment in place.**

| 2.1 Evidence-based policy and investment choices made by EDE stakeholders at different levels supported. | • Mapping tool developed, operationalised and regularly updated.  
• No. / proportion of projects and partners that support EDE implementation identified.  
• No. of counties and partners using the online mapping tool.  
• No. of EDE research projects underway.  
• No. of routine surveys that integrate EDE data and information.  
• No. of partners using EDE knowledge management platforms.  
• No. of individuals / institutions reached through capacity development programme.  
• No. of EDE strategies / plans implemented by drawing on new capacities.  
• No. of individuals / institutions using materials provided through this framework as evidence for advocacy. | • Existence of online mapping tool  
• Mapping tool reports  
• Research reports  
• Survey reports  
• Project documents  
• Evaluation reports  
• Advocacy reports | • Commitment of sectors, counties and development partners to make the necessary investments.  
• Stakeholders are committed to knowledge-sharing. |

| 2.2 Impact of Kenya’s progress towards the 10-year EDE goal assessed. | • EDE M&E framework and system (MIS) agreed and in place.  
• All the baseline data for the M&E framework provided.  
• No. of stakeholders able to carry out impact pathway analysis and outcome mapping. | • M&E reports  
• MIS reports  
• Progress reports | • M&E system in place. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVI</th>
<th>MOV</th>
<th>ASSUMPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ No. of EDE programme evaluation and impact assessments carried out.</td>
<td>▪ EDE public relations strategy document</td>
<td>▪ Sustained commitment to EDE goals through the political transition in 2017/18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ No. of EDE implementing partners making use of information generated through the M&amp;E framework.</td>
<td>▪ Document on the strategy for citizen engagement with EDE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ No. of published materials documenting EDE progress and lessons learned.</td>
<td>▪ Sensitisation materials such as brochures, and possibly EDE website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ No. of joint M&amp;E missions made</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Public and stakeholder awareness of, and identification with, the EDE agenda increased, and wider understanding built of the conditions necessary to achieve drought resilience in Kenya.

- Public relations strategy for EDE developed and implemented.
- A strategy for citizen engagement with the EDE developed and implemented.
- Sensitization on EDE carried out at national and county levels.
## Annex 2  Budget, 2014-18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>Brief description of programmes / activities</th>
<th>Total budget Kshs. m</th>
<th>Funds secured</th>
<th>Source of secured funds</th>
<th>Shortfall Kshs. m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.1: Priority ASAL development institutions established and/or strengthened.</strong></td>
<td>Coordinate capacity assessments and development for key ASAL institutions. ASF 20m pa; ASAL Sec 10m pa; PPG 10m pa; NDMA / NDCF 30m pa; completion of NKIF design 15m.</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>DFID, KRDP, PPG membership</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undertake capacity development of county governments for EDE and particularly in drought contingency planning, disaster risk reduction and response, resilience-building, inter-county and cross-border issues. Three trainings per county per year @ Kshs. 2.5m.</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>ECHO - DLCI, UNDP DDC, CARE*, WFP (pending)</td>
<td>627.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs-based technical assistance available to other pillars to access.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Output 1.2: Management and accountability structures for the EDE operationalised.</strong> | Equipping and providing operational funds for the EDE Secretariat, including two Technical Assistants. | 168 | 7 | EU KRDP | 161 |
| | Liaise with county governments to set up inter-county structures. Facilitate operations of the inter-county structures (clusters) - up to three cluster meetings per year. | 120 | 15 | EU SHARE (FAO), EU KRDP | 105 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief description of programmes / activities</th>
<th>Total budget Kshs. m</th>
<th>Funds secured</th>
<th>Source of secured funds</th>
<th>Shortfall Kshs. m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain an overview of resource requirements for the EDE and facilitate coordinated resource mobilisation.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engage effectively with IGAD’s IDDRSI platform.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>DLCI?</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.3: Evidence-based policy and legal reforms that facilitate achievement of the EDE goal secured.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide coordinated technical assistance to the county governments in developing policy &amp; legal frameworks for EDE at the county level.</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>CARE*, DLCI?</td>
<td>124.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead processes of policy and legal reform that are specific to the agenda of this framework or that concern the EDE as a whole.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>EU KRDP</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pursue regional-level initiatives in collaboration with IGAD and other partners that address cross-border challenges and opportunities.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>IGAD?</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 1.4: EDE priorities appropriately mainstreamed within the Kenya Vision 2030 MTP III.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop the EDE MTP III.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Institutional Development</strong></td>
<td>1,712</td>
<td>158.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,553.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output 2.1: Evidence-based policy and investment choices made by EDE stakeholders at different levels supported.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping &amp; analysis of relevant projects &amp; stakeholders</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EU SHARE (FAO)?</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief description of programmes / activities</td>
<td>Total budget Kshs. m</td>
<td>Funds secured</td>
<td>Source of secured funds</td>
<td>Shortfall Kshs. m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand-driven action research programme to generate evidence for decision-makers.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>DLCI; Technical Consortium; ADA Consortium?</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of research needs, carrying out of research and disseminating results in partnership with research institutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing and informing existing national and regional surveys.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct engagement with those responsible for surveys, largely done with existing staff time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop EDE knowledge-sharing platforms and systems.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge sharing platforms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement advocacy interventions that support policy and institutional reform.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>DLCI/USAID</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement a capacity development strategy that supports achievement of the EDE goals.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Met by other budget lines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide evidence and technical support to the development of the EDE MTP III</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical support for development of EDE MTP III, such as consolidation of evidence and lessons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output 2.2: Impact of Kenya’s progress towards the 10-year EDE goal assessed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory identification of resilience impact indicators, progress markers or intermediate development outcomes and impact pathways.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>ECHO, UNDP DDC?</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder consultative meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scoping of data requirements for baseline indicators.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>EU SHARE (FAO)?</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance to consolidate secondary data against the pillar results frameworks, and field surveys where necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity development on impact pathway analysis and outcome mapping.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ECHO, UNDP DDC?</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building and provision of necessary tools at national and county levels.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive EDE programme evaluation and impact assessment at appropriate intervals</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two evaluation exercises (mid-term and end-term).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief description of programmes / activities</td>
<td>Total budget Kshs. m</td>
<td>Funds secured</td>
<td>Source of secured funds</td>
<td>Shortfall Kshs. m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a MIS for the EDE M&amp;E.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ECHO, UNDP DDC?</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate joint M&amp;E missions of EDE interventions.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Output 2.3: Public and stakeholder awareness of, and identification with, the EDE agenda increased, and wider understanding built of the conditions necessary to achieve drought resilience in Kenya.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief description of programmes / activities</th>
<th>Total budget Kshs. m</th>
<th>Funds secured</th>
<th>Source of secured funds</th>
<th>Shortfall Kshs. m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and implement a public relations strategy for the EDE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Danida, DLCI, IGAD?</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a strategy for citizen engagement with the EDE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carry out further sensitisation and outreach within the counties</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>76.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-total Knowledge Management** 593 19.16 573.84

**TOTAL** 2,305 177.36 2,127.64

*DLCI / DFID: possibly Kshs. 54.3m over 3 years as part of Mercy Corps consortium.*

*CARE/USAID/DANIDA: Possibly Kshs. 57.1 m over 3 years through USAID and DANIDA funding ( * subject to confirmation of funding)*