

**UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME – KENYA PROGRAMMES
SUMMARY BACK TO OFFICE REPORT**

Names of persons in the Mission: Rogers Dhliwayo - SPAU Faith Ogolah - Devolution Mary Njoroge - Devolution Julius Chokerah- SPAU Nicholas Kipyego-SPAU Kathra Saramo-Transport Athanas Malenje-Transport	Project. No. & Title Integrated Support Program to the Devolution Process in Kenya	Tel. No. Ext: 7624441	Travel Authorization #: Local TA
---	--	---------------------------------	--

Approved Mission Itinerary: Nairobi- Naivasha- Nairobi	List of Annexes: none
(From) Inclusive Travel From: 18 - To: 26 - March - March-2018 2018	Key counterpart (s) CEC Finance and Economic Planning, Chief Officers Planning and Economic Affairs, County Directors of Planning and Economic Affairs and County Directors Monitoring and Evaluation from 34 counties (see annex), UN Women, COG, NDMA, NDOC, NCPD, KNHCR, NACC, and UON

Purpose/Objective of Mission:

The overall objective of the retreat was to provide technical support to UNDP and CoG supported counties to address gaps in their 2018-2022 CIDP as they move towards finalization. This was a follow-up to a few other engagements with the counties including 2017 and 2018 workshops and ongoing in-county TA support. This would ensure that they incorporate internationally agreed protocols and obligations which includes mainstreaming SDGs, Gender, Agriculture and Food Security, Ending Drought Emergencies, Disaster Risk Management, Climate Change, Demographic Dividend, HIV/AIDS and Human Rights and aligned to national priorities (MTP III), Agenda 2063. This would also ensure compliance with the 2017 CIDP guidelines.

Brief Summary of Mission Findings: The County Governments are at the tail end of finalizing the development of the 2nd Generation County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) with most of the counties at the integration and validation stage. It was therefore important for these counties to present their Draft CIDP and get inputs from experts.

The CIDP II comprises of the following 6 chapters: (a) county situation analysis , (b) linkages with vision 2030 and other plans, (c) review of implementation of the previous CIDP, (d) county development priorities and strategies, (e) implementation framework, and (f) monitoring and evaluation framework. The following are the main steps in developing the CIDP II: The CIDP preparation process entails the following steps or phases: Data Collection and Analysis, Strategies (County works on finding solutions to the problems assessed in phase two), Programmes and Projects (County designs the content of programmes and projects identified during the strategies development Phase) Integration: (Once all programmes/projects have been formulated, the Secretariat in charge of CIDP development, should verify that they are consistent with the County Performance Management Framework, then it goes for approval, where Executive will table the draft CIDP to the County Assembly no later than December 31st 2017.

It was noted that many counties are having challenges in the formulation of the CIDP programmes, programme outcomes indicators as well as targets in chapter 4 of the CIDP. Chapter 4 is very critical as it

forms the cornerstone of the CIDP and provides the basis of development of the monitoring and evaluation framework of the CIDP in chapter 6. During the presentation, the following issues emerged:

Chapter one - There was generally lack of current data and counties were encouraged to work with KNBS and NCPD especially in chapter one since it is a situation analysis that will inform the strategy and programmes that will come in their CIDPS.

Chapter two there was no clear-cut linkages with other plans e.g the Sendai Framework, V2030, MTP III, Agenda 2063, Regional economic bloc, and governors' manifesto. Some counties have tried linking such frameworks but some have just mentioned them. There is therefore a need to provide further analysis in this chapter.

Chapter Three on review counties were not reviewing the previous CIDP but rather lifting sections of the reports. Some counties did their own review hence did not have an external expert to analyse their achievements, challenges and way forward. Counties are required to analyse the performance of the previous CIDP including revenue streams and performance of the programmes.

Chapter Four Most counties do not have spatial and sector plans.

Chapter Five on resource gaps counties do not have clear strategy on how they would mobilize additional required resources. There is need for counties to explore other means of generating own resource revenue. Counties to come up with a framework on how they are going to resource mobilize. Counties to explore the inter county relationships, what project can be done together and possibility of exploring regional blocs.

Chapter six M&E framework needs to be improved. There is evidence of weak M&E capacities in the counties, definition of results which then affects the issues of defining indicators and baselines. There was no measurement of cross cutting issues in the framework e.g Gender, SDGs, HIV and AIDs among others. Counties need to monitor which interventions are working and those not working. The counties have mixed the outcome indicators and output indicators. Programming is a challenge in almost all counties as they have indicated projects as programmes

During plenary counties were advised to follow the guidelines as much as possible to provide planners at the county level with a framework for the preparation of their CIDPs with a long-term perspective, provide a mechanism for linking county policy, planning and budgeting processes as required by the County Government Act and the PFM Act, provide norms and standards for ensuring harmony, effectiveness and efficiency by the County Governments in the provision of services to the citizens as enshrined in the constitution. The guidelines will also ensure that there is order in the management and operations of the devolved governments. This includes assessing the progress made in the achievement of the CIDP goals, objectives, programmes/projects and output.

Counties were encouraged to review all relevant articles of the Constitution of Kenya 2010 and sections of relevant legislations on establishment of County Governments which should include a brief on the specific county being reviewed including the Vision and Mission. On status of achievement, counties were required to give a summary of the overall achievement realized by the County in every sector and programmes and projects initiated by the county governments, indicate the effort being made in mainstreaming cross cutting issues such as; Gender, youth, climate change, HIV/AIDS, Drug abuse, SDGs, Poverty, DRR etc. The section should highlight the major cross cutting issues that affect development in the county. Under resource mobilization, counties were required to indicate strategies they had put in place to gather resources for funding its activities i.e. Internal Revenue, Grant (GoK), Commission for Revenue Allocation-

<p>Equalization Share and from donors.</p> <p>On SDGs, Counties were informed the importance of identifying among the 17 sustainable development goals and 169 targets that will cut across all major sectors and integrate them in their programmes. It was suggested that counties work with KNBS to ensure they prioritize data collection in line with SDGs indicators for reporting and monitoring progress.</p>	
<p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Counties with no draft CIDPs need to be supported by a team of experts one on one while other counties to request for support where UNDP and the COG will agree on the modalities 2) Experts to be responsive when called up to and not send representatives to continue guiding the counties since they already know the issues with the release of the KIHBS, counties to update their data sets 3) Capacity building is needed on M&E, data analysis, demographic dividend as it is a new concept which need more advocacy and integration in planning and development, integrating of cross cutting issues in the CIDPII. Hence need for an urgent workshop for counties to be assisted in Chapter 4 (Programmes/projects) and chapter 6 (M&E framework). 4) Involve the County Assembly to build their capacities to understand the CIDP document in totality since they have an oversight and approval authority. 5) Counties to also shoulder the responsibilities of taking care of the officers e.g DSA since they have the budget on CIDP 	<p>Distribution Copies to:</p> <p>DGU; Programme Colleagues</p>
<p>Annex 1</p> <p>Homa bay, Kajiado, Narok, Taita Taveta, Kisumu, Nyeri, Busia, Laikipia, Lamu, Vihiga, Garissa, Kilifi, Nakuru, Elgeyo Marakwet, Uasin Gishu, Kirinyaga, Marsabit, Migori, Baringo, Samburu, Bomet, Tana River, Embu, Isiolo, Kitui, West Pokot, Bungoma, Wajir, Mandera, Kwale, Kericho, Nakuru, Turkana, Kakamega.</p>	



