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Executive summary

A workshop was held in Nairobi 16th-18th March 2016 with the complete Kenyan team at the Swedish Embassy in Nairobi, in order to operationalize the new Development Strategy approved by the Swedish government on 21st January 2016\(^1\). To achieve the given expected Results of the new Strategy, Sida’s Director General highlighted a number of priorities at a meeting held in Stockholm on the 24th of February 2016, including:

1. Well-balanced and focused development cooperation with Kenya, is necessary to reach expected results and ensure efficiency. The operationalization should determine clear priorities and strategic choices in order to ensure results through synergies between the focus areas and between results within each focus area.
2. Ensure that a conflict perspective, a gender perspective and an environment and climate perspective are applied throughout the operationalization.
3. Take into consideration, as stated in the Strategy, that an outlook beyond aid should be applied. Noting that that Kenya is one of the countries that the Swedish Government has selected to pilot how a transition from long-term development cooperation to broader and more trade related relations can be handled.

Additionally, Sida’s Africa Department requested that the following three points would be taken into consideration during the elaboration of the operationalization plan:

1. Concentrate the Kenyan portfolio and make strategic interventions that can contribute to several of the focus areas and results.
2. Focus the Kenyan portfolio and limit the number of contributions.
3. Analyse results achieved from the last strategy and build on the experiences from the implementation of the previous strategy.

Kenya, as a lower middle income country, has an important and growing regional role in East Africa and globally, particularly from a political and economic perspective. While Sweden’s development funding is a small proportion of overall development assistance, it is based on a strong foundation of long-term historical engagement in the country and aligned with Sweden’s comparative advantage as a development cooperation partner.

Sweden’s current portfolio contributions are relatively broad and wide ranging and the programme team recognises the need to consolidate and rationalise contributions to ensure that they are strategic and catalytic, especially considering the reduction of resources available over the life of the new strategy. The systems analysis workshop and this report therefore aims to support the programme team in the decision making process of rationalising and consolidating the programme, as part of the wider operationalisation process. **A full set of recommendations are available on pages 24 to 26**, with key points at a strategic level, summarised below:

\(^1\) http://www.regeringen.se/land--och-regionssstrategier/2016/02/strategi-for-sveriges-utvecklingssamarbete-med-kenya-2016-2020-samt-bemyndigande-att-nga-samarbetsavtal/
Strategy

1. Strengthen **dialogue and linkages** with government and other development cooperation partners;
2. Undertake a **conflict sensitivity** analysis;
3. Increase understanding of the contribution of **social capital** to poor people’s overall well-being in Kenya;
4. Strengthen the linkages with, and contribution of, Sweden’s **regional and global programmes** including Security Council Resolution 1325.

Result Areas

1. Undertake further **prioritisation of programmes in Result Area** two on the basis of recommended criteria;
2. Strengthen the **linkages between programmes** at national, County and community levels;
3. Ensure that the focus on **rights and gender equality in Result Area two** and the corresponding contributions also incorporate environmental and gender rights.

Portfolio contributions

1. Develop an **exit strategy** for the six programmes that do not appear to be making a significant contribution to the overall Kenya context;
2. Undertake **further analysis of 22 programmes**, on the basis of recommended criteria;
3. Strengthen **stakeholder mapping** with regard to individual portfolio contributions;
4. Further develop the **opportunities identified in Table 2** of this report;
5. Systematically make use of **clear criteria to prioritise portfolio contributions** as outlined on page 8 and the full recommendations of this report.
1.0 System analysis framework

The workshop aimed to support the operationalisation of the Kenya Strategy, 2016-2020 and to identify existing and emerging portfolio contributions to improve people’s overall wellbeing in the face of increasingly complex, interconnected and evolving risk landscapes and achieve the stated Result Area outcomes of the Strategy. Specifically, the workshop aimed to support the objectives of the operationalisation process by:

1. Building a shared understanding of the changing risk landscape in Kenya, the complexities and inter-linkages of different risks and how they interact with the stated aims of Sweden’s development cooperation strategy;
2. Identifying how the changing risk landscape impacts upon key components of people’s well-being at different ‘layers’ of society and how those multi-dimensional aspects of people’s well-being impact on the achievement of Sweden’s Result Areas;
3. Determining the extent to which current and emerging portfolio contributions per Result Area are relevant, effective and efficient in the face of these impacts;
4. Providing strategic recommendations for Sweden’s strategy, programmes and partnerships on the basis of an updated context analysis and an understanding of the impact of risks on key components of people’s wellbeing, including considerations for effectively integrating cross-cutting perspectives.

The review used a systems analysis framework, developed by the OECD, which follows a five-step process, as outlined below:

**figure 1: OECD systems analysis framework**

A key aspect of the analysis focused on building a common understanding of the complex risk environment in Kenya and how this inter-connected and multi-dimensional risk landscape impacts upon the key ‘assets’ that vulnerable communities use to manage risks and ensure their overall well-being. The OECD framework categorises these assets according to six inter-linked ‘capital groups’, based upon a sustainable livelihoods framework as per Figure 2, below:
The next step in the analysis involved the country team identifying what to do about the relative strength or weakness of these assets, and the degree to which Sweden’s portfolio contributions impact upon the capacity of different layers of Kenyan society – household, community, sub-national and national – to absorb or adapt to risks, or transform the system so that it is no longer exposed to critical risks. Consideration was given to how interventions at one layer of society impact upon the risks, stresses and capacities at other layers of society.

The country team assessed current portfolio contributions, their linkages across sectors and different layers of Kenyan society and highlighted where there might be gaps within the current portfolio to either further strengthen an asset that is already demonstrating some resilience in the face of identified risks, or to address the weakness of an asset, where it has been shown to react poorly to risk.

The final step in the analysis involved the country team identifying opportunities for Sweden’s development cooperation strategy for Kenya, based on the team’s own understanding of Sweden’s comparative advantage, previous programming experience and the Result Area outcomes they are aiming to achieve. Relevant portfolio contributions and emerging programme opportunities were then re-grouped according to the relevant Result Areas of the strategy, as represented in Table 1 of this report.

Full details of the outcomes of the analysis are included in Annex 1 of this report.
2.0 Context analysis

2.1 Overall context for Kenya

The East African nation of Kenya has a population estimated at 45.5 million, which increases by around one million a year. Of the total population around 45.5% live in poverty. Kenya ranks 0.541 on the Human Development Index, and have a life expectancy of 62 years. Kenya has made significant structural and economic reforms that have contributed to sustained economic growth in the past decade. Development challenges however, include poverty and inequality, and vulnerable of the economy to internal and external shocks. A new constitution was approved in 2010, which include a devolution dividing the country into 47 counties. This has transformative and has strengthened accountability and public service delivery at local levels.

The Kenya Vision 2030 is the national long-term development blue-print that aims to transform Kenya into a newly industrialising, middle-income country providing a high quality of life to all its citizens by 2030 in a clean and secure environment. The Vision comprises of three key pillars: Economic; Social; and Political. The Economic Pillar aims to achieve an average economic growth rate of 10 per cent per annum and sustaining the same until 2030. The Social Pillar seeks to engender just, cohesive and equitable social development in a clean and secure environment, while the Political Pillar aims to realise an issue-based, people-centred, result-oriented and accountable democratic system.

The government’s agenda is to deepen implementation of devolution and strengthen governance institutions, while addressing other challenges including land reforms and security to improve economic and social outcomes, accelerate growth and equity in distribution of resources, and reduce extreme poverty and youth employment. Kenya’s economy grew by an estimated 4.9% in the first quarter of 2015, compared to 4.7% in the same period in 2014, according to Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. Agriculture, infrastructure, financial services and ICT contributed to the growth, but manufacturing and tourism declined. The economy grew by 5.4% in 2014 and the World Bank, in its Kenya Economic Update for March 2015, projected the economy will grow by 6% in 2015, supported by lower energy costs, investment in infrastructure, agriculture, manufacturing and other industries. Kenya still needs to address challenges of poverty, inequality, gender-gaps, gender based violence, governance, corruption, low investments and low productivity in order to achieve sustained development goals that can transform the lives of ordinary citizens.

2.2 Identification of priority assets

Within this context, participants analysed key assets that they identified as critical for the well-being of the Kenyan society – the resources at household, community, sub-national (county) and national level that are important in helping the society to address and manage multi-dimensional risks and contribute to overall well-being. These assets were categorised according to capital groups, however it is important to note that many assets can contribute to a number of capital groups. For the purpose of this analysis, the country team classified the assets under their most relevant capital.

The results are synthesized on the following page in Figure 3.

---

http://www.ke.undp.org/content/kenya/en/home/countryinfo/
Figure 3: Key assets per capital group for Kenya

Well-being assets in Kenya

Human
- Skilled labour Force
- Relatively well-educated population
- Young and growing population
- Strong entrepreneurship
- Innovations
- Refugees

Physical
- Roads
- Airports
- Railway
- ICT infrastructure
- Water infrastructure
- Electrification
- Urbanization
- Education facilities
- Health facilities

Natural
- Agricultural land & soil
- Forests
- Water sources
- Biodiversity & wildlife
- Minerals
- Geo-thermal energy
- Wind & sun
- Fisheries & livestock

Financial
- Strong GDP Growth
- Strong financial system such as: banks, stock exchange
- International and regional trade
- Financial innovations
- Remittances – internal / external
- Savings and Credit Cooperative Societies (SACCO)
- Rapid urbanization
- Tourism

Social
- Clan system
- Chief system/Elders
- Alternative dispute resolution mechanisms
- Strong traditional social networks
- Religious congregations

Political
- Progressive constitution
- Regular multi-party Elections
- Vocal civil society/watchdog
- Regional economic integration
- Devolution process
- Institutional structures
- Rapid urbanization
- Vibrant media
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2.3 Critical risks in the Kenyan context

Having considered the key constructive assets that are important for well-being at different levels of Kenyan society, participants identified and mapped critical risks within the Kenya context that impact upon these key assets. For full details of the analysis, and specific details of how these risks impact on the identified assets, please see Annex I.

**FIGURE 4: CRITICAL RISKS IN THE KENYAN CONTEXT**
3.0 Findings from the analysis

The identification of key assets and critical risks was an important aspect of the analysis – both to ensure that the programme team had a common understanding of the current context and a shared understanding of the changes in the context since the development of Sweden’s previous Development Cooperation Strategy. In addition, it helped participants to identify Sweden’s contribution to strengthening well-being, in line with Sweden’s comparative advantage and the priorities set out within the new Results Strategy. It also helped to highlight the relevance of Sweden’s Programme Development Goals – poverty and rights; and its cross-cutting perspectives – gender equality and women’s empowerment, conflict sensitivity, and climate and environment within the Kenyan context.

On the basis of this shared contextual understanding, the programme team focused on identifying the relevance of existing portfolio contributions to the overall context and to the Result Areas of the new Strategy. This analysis built on a comprehensive portfolio analysis that should be considered an example of good practice within Sida that focused on:

1. Overarching objective of the current contributions;
2. Contribution to result as per new strategy in its current format and through possible amendments;
3. Synergies (link to other results in the same focus area/other focus areas/results in other focus areas);
4. Other motivation for Sweden funding the contribution;
5. Other donors active in the area/sector;
6. Which programmatic layer the contribution focuses on: Households; communities; provincial groupings and authorities; national level.

3.1 Relevance of current portfolio contributions to the 2016-2020 Kenya Results Strategy

3.1.1 Relevance to the risk-informed context analysis, Sweden’s comparative advantage and new results Strategy

A key aspect of this part of the analysis was to inform strategic choices regarding those portfolio contributions to take forward into the new strategy and to prioritise existing contributions. This was particularly important, considering the significant scope of the current portfolio, which includes 38 contributions. As highlighted in the portfolio analysis, it is worth noting that of these 38 contributions, the current Focus Area two receives 53 % of the agreed funds, with 24 of the current contributions, compared to 8 for Focus Area 1 and 6 for Focus Area 3.

Participants nevertheless found it difficult to prioritise contributions and, of the 38 existing contributions, only 5 did not feature significantly, if at all, when considering the relevance of the existing portfolio to the risk-informed context analysis, its alignment with Sweden’s comparative advantage and within that, their contribution to achieving the stated Results of Sweden’s new Strategy , as below:

3. OBA in Water Supply (Dec 2013-Dec 2018)
4. Data Warehouse and Business Intelligence (DWBI) (2014-2018)

While further investigation and validation is necessary, there is significant cause to question the relevance of the above contributions, and ensure that an exit strategy is in place for each.

Of the remaining 32 contributions, participants considered a number of further criteria to assist in further prioritising these contributions and to assess the respective ‘added value’ of contributions in addressing the issues highlighted in the context analysis and in contributing to the achievement of results within the new Strategy. These criteria included:

1. The extent to which the programmes made a contribution both across Result Areas and at different layers of Kenyan society;
2. Their contribution to Sweden’s Programme Development Goals of poverty and rights and cross-cutting perspectives – climate and environment, conflict sensitivity and gender equality and women’s rights, and;
3. Strategic linkages to Sweden’s global and regional initiatives and to the contributions of other development cooperation partners.

A brief summary of discussions against these criteria is included in the sections below, however, the programme team could develop this analysis further and this will be important for further prioritization and for informing decision-making within the framework of the new Strategy. Further analysis should include an assessment of the scope and scale of contributions to better understand which programmes aim to achieve substantive outcomes and which programmes are ‘catalytic’ in leveraging influence or investment. In addition, consideration should be given to undertaking a mapping exercise to ensure that the geographical coverage of contributions aligns to areas of high vulnerability within Kenya.

3.1.2 The contribution of existing programmes across Result Areas and at different layers of Kenyan society

The scope of the workshop did not allow for an in-depth analysis of the each of the 32 contributions and the extent to which they were mutually reinforcing across different layers of Kenyan society and across Result Areas. That said, participants identified some general observations, including that current contributions are ‘clustered’ at the national level. With some notable exceptions, such as the WSTF programme, there are relatively weak linkages between programmes at national, county and community levels when existing portfolio contributions are mapped across to the Result Areas of the new Strategy. There are also relatively few contributions at the County level in Kenya – especially with regard to Result Areas 1 and 3. Considering the on-going process of devolution in Kenya, there may therefore be opportunities to strengthen programming at this level.

Similarly, when analysing the contribution of existing programmes across Result Areas, participants identified opportunities to ensure that existing contributions contribute to achieving secondary outcomes across Result Areas, particularly with regard to the existing portfolio contributions that were mapped across to Result Area two of the new Strategy. This includes ensuring that the focus on rights and gender equality in Result Area two and the corresponding contributions also incorporate environmental and gender rights to improve access to renewal energy and environmental services and productive employment and decent working conditions for women and girls.
Those contributions that were highlighted as being well-integrated across different layers of Kenyan society and across Result Areas included:

1. NETFUND Phase 3 (2015-2019)
4. Support to Judiciary Reforms via German GIZ (2014-2016)

Of the remaining 22 contributions, further analysis should be undertaken to determine the extent to which these contributions are strategic and ‘catalytic’ in supporting the achievement of the Result Areas within the new Strategy. This will be particularly important, as many of these contributions also finish during 2016 and 2017 and there is therefore an opportunity to phase out initiatives that are neither well integrated and substantive nor strategic and catalytic.

### 3.1.3 Programme’s contribution to Sweden’s Programme Development Goals and cross-cutting perspectives

Throughout the analysis, participants were encouraged to incorporate a focus on Sweden’s Programme Development Goals of poverty and rights and to consider the relevance of Sweden’s cross-cutting perspectives. This included the appointment of ‘champions’ and regular reporting back on the extent to which these perspectives were being included in the analysis. While there were relatively few observations regarding the extent to which existing programmes contribute to these perspectives, reporting back throughout the workshop indicated that these perspectives had largely been taken into account and had been successfully ‘mainstreamed’ within contributions. In addition, the new Strategy’s Result Areas include a focus on climate and environment, human rights and opportunities for poor people, especially women and girls, thereby ensuring that contributions contribute to Sweden’s Programme Development Goals and cross-cutting perspectives. However, this will need to be given further emphasis throughout the operationalisation process.

That said, further consideration could be given to ensuring that conflict sensitivity is adequately taken into account in operationalising Sweden’s new strategy. This would include a more comprehensive conflict sensitivity assessment and a better understanding of the influence of different stakeholders at different levels of Kenyan society. As before, consideration should also be given to undertaking a mapping exercise to ensure that the geographical coverage of contributions aligns to areas of high vulnerability within Kenya.

### 3.1.4 Strategic linkages to Sweden’s global and regional initiatives and the contributions of other actors
Participants considered the extent to which global and regional programmes were contributing to the achievement of the Result Areas in the new Strategy. As per Table 1, the analysis suggested that regional programming in particular, especially with regard to Result Area 1 can make an important contribution to achieving stated outcomes. However these programmes were primarily contributing to outcomes at the national level and further consideration could be given to ensuring that global and regional programmes contribute at County and community levels, where appropriate in Kenya. In addition, many of the regional programmes that were identified have a technical focus and further consideration could be given to ensuring that Sweden’s global political engagements, particularly with regard to gender equality and peacebuilding are incorporated into the Kenya programme, including, for instance Sweden’s engagement with Security Council Resolution 1325.

The analysis emphasised Sweden’s relatively limited contribution to development within the wider Kenya context and the importance, therefore, of strengthening linkages with other actors including government at all levels and other development cooperation partners. This was also highlighted in the portfolio analysis which identified linkages with other donors per contribution. In addition, participants carried out an initial stakeholder mapping during the workshop – the results of which are included in section 3.3 of this report. Nevertheless, further analysis is required to map out the linkages between other actors and current portfolio contributions and this will be an important aspect of identifying contributions that are having a strategic and catalytic impact within the new strategy.

Table 1, following, shows the contribution of all existing portfolio contributions per Result Area and per Result at each layer of Kenyan society.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONAL LEVEL</th>
<th>R2. Strengthen democracy and gender equality, and greater respect for human rights</th>
<th>R3. Better opportunities and tools to enable poor people to improve their living conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1. A better environment, limited climate impact and greater resilience to environmental impacts, climate change and natural disasters</td>
<td>R2.1. Strengthening democratic institutions at national and local levels</td>
<td>R3.1. Increased productivity, sustainability and processing in small-scale agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R1.1. Strengthen management of natural resources and ecosystem services | • UNDP strengthening peace structure  
• IDEA elections  
• OAG increased possibilities for accountability, transparency  
• Judiciary support via GIZ  
• (LDGI advocating for constitution in regards to land)  
• Police reform support via UNODC and Swedish Police  
• Corrections reform support via SPPS  
• EISA election support  
• SCB statistics  
• UN Women strengthening independent commissions  
• KRA increased resource mobilisation  
• WB/UNDP Devolution  
• OHCHR | • ASDSP (Environment for private sector development in agriculture)  
• KCB + 3MFI guarantee  
• FSDK (policy/regulatory environment for Financial Inclusion) |
| REGIONAL/GLOBAL | • CIWA (Cooperation in International Waters in Africa), regional water resources management | REGIONAL/GLOBAL |
| • NRM facility  
• NETFUND  
• ASDSP | • Judicial reform via GIZ  
• Correctional services reform via SPPS  
• Correctional services reform via RWI  
• UN Women alternative mechanism for land issues  
• Police reform via UNODC and Swedish Police  
• Judicial institutional support strengthening ADR  
• DIAKONIA/CSO capacity | • FSDK (Financial Sector Deepening Kenya)  
• NETFUND  
• ASDSP (Conducive Environment for private sector development in agriculture) |
| R1.2. Better capacity of public institutions and other actors at national and local levels to contribute | R2.2. Strengthen rule of law | REGIONAL/GLOBAL |
| • NRM facility  
• NETFUND  
• ASDSP | • Judicial reform via GIZ  
• Correctional services reform via SPPS  
• Correctional services reform via RWI  
• UN Women alternative mechanism for land issues  
• Police reform via UNODC and Swedish Police  
• Judicial institutional support strengthening ADR  
• DIAKONIA/CSO capacity | • AECF |
| REGIONAL/GLOBAL | • African Risk Capacity, regional project  
• EAGC investments in agribusiness  
• Powering Agriculture  
• AECF |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1.3. Increased production of and improved access to renewable energy</th>
<th>R2.3. Strengthen media and CSOs capacity to promote democratic development and accountability</th>
<th>R3.3. Better access to social protection for peoples living in poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Akiira Geo-thermal  
• NETFund innovations in renewable energy  
SCALE UP  
• MFI (multiparty) – portfolio Guarantee (renewable component) | • Kenya water and sanitation CSO network (transparency through budget tracking & accountability at national level etc.)  
SCALE UP  
• IBP, PFM Public participation accountability  
• NRM Facility – media as a tool to advocate NRM  
• HRD support  
• Kenya dialogues project  
• Diakonia  
• Forum Syd  
• CSUDP –national urban policies and governance | • UNICEF  
• WFP – productive safety net and support to coordinate national social safety nets  
• FSDK (support to the safety net HSNP – Hunger Safety net programme) |

**REGIONAL/GLOBAL**

• REACT regional energy program  
• Connect access to financial capital  
• DemoEnvironment challenge Fund/ investment on innovations  
• Credit Guarantee  
• Powering agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1.4. Better access to environmentally sustainable basic services</th>
<th>R2.4. Strengthen capacity among public institutions and CSOs that promote gender equality and respect for human rights, with a focus on women and girls</th>
<th>R3.4. Strengthen conditions for free and fair trade and investments that benefit sustainable development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • SymbioCity Planning for investments in urban services  
• WSTF institutional capacity building | • UN Women – strengthen women’s political participation, WEE ad micro-business  
• Kenya Dialogue Project via SID  
• HRD support  
Diakonia  
• Forum Syd | • TRAPCA trade policy training institute  
• Trade Mark EA less red tape, increased physical access to markets |

**REGIONAL/GLOBAL**

• UN Women – strengthen women’s political participation, WEE ad micro-business  
• Kenya Dialogue Project via SID  
• HRD support  
Diakonia  
• Forum Syd  
• TRAPCA trade policy training institute  
• Trade Mark EA less red tape, increased physical access to markets
## COUNTY LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1. A better environment, limited climate impact and greater resilience to environmental impacts, climate change and natural disasters</th>
<th>R2. Strengthen democracy and gender equality, and greater respect for human rights</th>
<th>R3. Better opportunities and tools to enable poor people to improve their living conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.1. Strengthen management of natural resources and ecosystem services</strong></td>
<td><strong>R2.1. Strengthening democratic institutions at national and local levels</strong></td>
<td><strong>R3.1. Increased productivity, sustainability and processing in small-scale agriculture</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • ASDSP (mainstreaming role) | • UNDP strengthening peace structure  
• Judiciary support via GIZ  
• Police reform support via UNODC and Swedish Police  
• Correctional services reform via SPPS  
• WB/UNDP Devolution support capacity building of counties  
• UN Women strengthening independent commissions  
• URBAN financing & design (UNHABITAT)  
• OHCHR  
• CSUDP – Influence in formulation of national urban policies and design of urban governance | • ASDSP (county structures – Value Chain Platforms) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1.2. Better capacity of public institutions and other actors at national and local levels to contribute</th>
<th>R2.2. Strengthen rule of law</th>
<th>R3.2. Better opportunities – particular for women and youth – for productive employment with decent working conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • WB/UNDP Devolution support  
• WFP developing capacity at county level to respond to food security/nutrition emergencies | • Judicial reform – access to justice via GIZUN Women alternative mechanism for land issues  
• Police reform - via UNODC and Swedish Police  
• Correctional reform via SPPS  
• Correctional reform via RWI | • ASDSP (agribusiness/actors platform)  
• UNICEF – Adolescents  
• UN-WOMEN - WEE |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1.3. Increased production of and improved access to renewable energy</th>
<th>R2.3. Strengthen media and CSOs capacity to promote democratic development and accountability</th>
<th>R3.3. Better access to social protection for peoples living in poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| | • Forum Syd (alternative media) CBO cap.  
• Diakonia (alternative media, transparency and accountability, implementing Constitutions strengthening local CSO/CBO) | • UNICEF  
• WFP  
• UN-Women WEE  
• HiH |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1.4. Better access to environmentally sustainable basic community services</th>
<th>R2.4. Strengthen capacity among public institutions and CSOs that promote gender equality and respect for human rights, with a focus on women and girls</th>
<th>R3.4. Strengthen conditions for free and fair trade and investments that benefit sustainable development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • SymbioCity – participatory planning in 7 counties  
• Water OBA commercial financing in water sector, support to banks and companies  
• WSTF – support to counties to strengthening devolved structures in water and sanitation  
• ASDSP (facilitating actors platforms) | • Forum Syd – women participation  
• Diakonia  
• HRD support  
• UN Women – strengthen women’s political participation, GBV  
• CSUDP Participatory urban planning and governance | • ASDSP (Intra/inter-county) |
## COMMUNITY LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1. A better environment, limited climate impact and greater resilience to environmental impacts, climate change and natural disasters</th>
<th>R2. Strengthen democracy and gender equality, and greater respect for human rights</th>
<th>R3. Better opportunities and tools to enable poor people to improve their living conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.1. Strengthen management of natural resources and ecosystem services</strong></td>
<td><strong>R2.1. Strengthening democratic institutions at national and local levels</strong></td>
<td><strong>R3.1. Increased productivity, sustainability and processing in small-scale agriculture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WSTF (sustainable water resource management/conflict resolution/media)/gender</td>
<td>• UNDP strengthening peace structure</td>
<td>• Hand in Hand East Africa (strengthening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WFP soil/water conservation <strong>SCALE UP</strong></td>
<td>• CSUDP (CS urban development platform) participatory planning, urban governance, common organisation</td>
<td>• ASDSP (value chain development – producer groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NRM facility saving credits, water, agriculture and ecotourism</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Financial Sector Deepening Kenya (Support to SASRA, ROSCAs and SACCOS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ASDP (Sustainable Value Chain Development)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.2. Better capacity of public institutions and other actors at national and local levels to contribute</strong></td>
<td><strong>R2.2. Strengthen rule of law</strong></td>
<td><strong>R3.2. Better opportunities – particular for women and youth – for productive employment with decent working conditions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kenya Dialogue project</td>
<td>• DIAKONIA ADR</td>
<td>• Akiira– Decent work opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NETFUND innovations</td>
<td>• Police Reforms via UNODC and Swedish Police</td>
<td>• UN-Women WEE, refugee women entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WSTF – capacity building of WRUAs (Water Resources Users Associations)</td>
<td>• Judiciary reform, access to justice via GIZ</td>
<td>• NETFUND innovations, young people with great ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ASDSP (facilitative)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• UNICEF vocational training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.3. Increased production of and improved access to renewable energy</strong></td>
<td><strong>R2.3. Strengthen media and CSOs capacity to promote democratic development and accountability</strong></td>
<td><strong>R3.3. Better access to social protection for peoples living in poverty</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forum Syd (alternative media)</td>
<td>• WFP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diakonia (alternative media, transparency and accountability, implementing Constitutions strengthening local CSO/CBO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NRM Facility CSOs con advocate of environmental rights</td>
<td>• NRM Facility CSOs con advocate of environmental rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kenya water and sanitation CSO network, civic groups <strong>SCALE UP</strong></td>
<td>• Kenya water and sanitation CSO network, civic groups <strong>SCALE UP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• HRD support</td>
<td>• HRD support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**SCALE UP**

- Hand in Hand East Africa (strengthening)
- ASDSP (value chain development – producer groups)
- Financial Sector Deepening Kenya (Support to SASRA, ROSCAs and SACCOS)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1.4. Better access to environmentally sustainable basic community services</th>
<th>R2.4. Strengthen capacity among public institutions and CSOs that promote gender equality and respect for human rights, with a focus on women and girls</th>
<th>R3.4. Strengthen conditions for free and fair trade and investments that benefit sustainable development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • WSTF - water and sanitation for the poor and marginalised  
• NETFUND, innovation in W&S SCALE UP  
• NRM facility water resource systems in communities  
• CSUDP innovations in W&S SCALE UP  
• ASDSP (agricultural technology/extension/market at services) | • Forum Syd – women participation, seed grants  
• HRD support  
• UN Women – strengthen women’s pol participation, WEE ad micro-business  
• UNICEF bring children back when in conflict with the law  
• CSUDP strengthen participatory planning and governance  
• CSUDP – Local Urban Forums  
• Diakonia consular of elders | • ASDSP (aggregation of produce – intra/inter county) |
## HOUSEHOLD LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1. A better environment, limited climate impact and greater resilience to environmental impacts, climate change and natural disasters</th>
<th>R2. Strengthen democracy and gender equality, and greater respect for human rights</th>
<th>R3. Better opportunities and tools to enable poor people to improve their living conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.1. Strengthen management of natural resources and ecosystem services</strong></td>
<td><strong>R2.1. Strengthening democratic institutions at national and local levels</strong></td>
<td><strong>R3.1. Increased productivity, sustainability and processing in small-scale agriculture</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • ASDSP Climate-smart Agriculture | • UN-Women- GBV | • HIHEA (strengthening)  
• ASDSP (production unit level – households as members of value chain groups)  
• FSDK (access to finance) |
| **R1.2. Better capacity of public institutions and other actors at national and local levels to contribute** | **R2.2. Strengthen rule of law** | **R3.2. Better opportunities – particular for women and youth – for productive employment with decent working conditions** |
| | • HR defender protection of individuals | • CSUDP housing, safety  
• FSDK (financial inclusion)  
• HiH East Africa (micro-enterprise development) |
| **R1.3. Increased production of and improved access to renewable energy** | **R2.3. Strengthen media and CSOs capacity to promote democratic development and accountability** | **R3.3. Better access to social protection for peoples living in poverty** |
| • MFI Multiparty credit guarantee | | • WFP cash transfers  
• UNICEF |
| **R1.4. Better access to environmentally sustainable basic community services** | **R2.4. Strengthen capacity among public institutions and CSOs that promote gender equality and respect for human rights, with a focus on women and girls** | **R3.4. Strengthen conditions for free and fair trade and investments that benefit sustainable development** |
| | • Forum Syd – grants to girls from unprivileged areas for education/leadership  
• UNW | |
3.2 Gaps and emerging opportunities to achieve outcomes of the 2016-2020 Kenya Results Strategy

The next step of the analysis involved the programme team identifying gaps and further opportunities in achieving the stated objectives of the Result Areas of the new strategy, as set out in Table 2, below. The gaps and opportunities identified built on the risk-informed context analysis and focused on what further actions could be taken to strengthen key assets in Kenyan society and/or address the impact of risks in the Kenyan context to improve poor people’s overall well-being. In considering these components of well-being – the physical, financial, natural, human, political and social assets – participants identified relatively few contributions addressed the social and human aspects of the context analysis. In part, this might be explained by the focus of Sweden’s previous development cooperation strategy; however, Sweden’s development cooperation could be strengthened with a further understanding of, and consideration for how the strengthening of human and social assets could contribute to specific Result Areas and to Sweden’s cross-cutting perspectives, particularly gender equality and conflict sensitivity.

Within the scope of a two-and-a-half day workshop, the identified opportunities are necessarily ‘sketches’ of possible contributions, or rather gaps that Sweden should consider addressing within existing or future contributions. These opportunities are in line with Swedish comparative advantage but will need to be developed further during the operationalisation process for the new Strategy. It should be noted that many of those gaps and opportunities that were identified are related to the strengthening or scaling up of existing contributions to ensure that they contribute across Result areas and are integrated at different layers of Kenyan society.

**Table 2: Opportunities / Emerging Portfolio Contributions to Achieve Result Area Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NATIONAL LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1. A better environment, limited climate impact and greater resilience to environmental impacts etc.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.1. Strengthen management of natural resources and ecosystem services</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Payment for ecosystem services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ICT to support environmental management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Green enterprises/champions in private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R1.2. Better capacity of public institutions and other actors at national and local levels to contribute</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Analytical capacity to analyse gaps
- Support innovations in wind/sun/biomass/waste
- Swedish know-how in renewable energies

### Better link to demand and supply market
- Spin doctors, Accountability, peace committees
- Civic education
- Expanding public participation, women/youth

### Explore public private partnerships PPPs to crowd in finance
- Output-based Aid modality in the Water Sector
- Swedish know-how on waste management
- Financial investments/guarantees in sewerage infrastructure
- Guarantees/risk-sharing risks to improve investment

### R1.3. Increased production of and improved access to renewable energy
- Support innovations in wind/sun/biomass/waste
- Swedish know-how in renewable energies

### R2.3. Strengthen media and CSOs capacity to promote democratic development and accountability
- Spin doctors, Accountability, peace committees
- Civic education
- Expanding public participation, women/youth

### R3.3. Better access to social protection for peoples living in poverty
- Social protection/insurance

### R1.4. Better access to environmentally sustainable basic services
- Output-based Aid modality in the Water Sector
- Swedish know-how on waste management
- Financial investments/guarantees in sewerage infrastructure
- Guarantees/risk-sharing risks to improve investment

### R2.4. Strengthen capacity among public institutions and CSOs that promote gender equality, respect for human rights, with a focus on women
- Women participation (elected positions)

### R3.4. Strengthen conditions for free and fair trade and investments that benefit sustainable development
- Better cross border trade for the poor
- Cross border payments (ICT)
- Ease of doing business – one window system for foreign investors

### COUNTY LEVEL

#### R1. A better environment, limited climate impact and greater resilience to environmental impacts...
- ICT to support environmental management
- PES – payment for ecosystem services schemes
- Cross-sectoral coordination in environment/CC at county level

#### R2. Strengthen democracy and gender equality, and greater respect for human rights
- ICT to support environmental management
- PES – payment for ecosystem services schemes
- Cross-sectoral coordination in environment/CC at county level

#### R3. Better opportunities and tools to enable poor people to improve their living conditions
- ICT to support environmental management
- PES – payment for ecosystem services schemes
- Cross-sectoral coordination in environment/CC at county level

### R1.1. Strengthen management of natural resources and ecosystem services
- ICT to support environmental management
- PES – payment for ecosystem services schemes
- Cross-sectoral coordination in environment/CC at county level

#### R2.1. Strengthening democratic institutions at national and local levels
- ICT to support environmental management
- PES – payment for ecosystem services schemes
- Cross-sectoral coordination in environment/CC at county level

#### R3.1. Increased productivity, sustainability and processing in small-scale agriculture
- ICT to support environmental management
- PES – payment for ecosystem services schemes
- Cross-sectoral coordination in environment/CC at county level

### R1.2. Better capacity of public institutions and other actors at national and local levels to contribute
- ICT to support environmental management
- PES – payment for ecosystem services schemes
- Cross-sectoral coordination in environment/CC at county level

#### R2.2. Strengthen rule of law
- ICT to support environmental management
- PES – payment for ecosystem services schemes
- Cross-sectoral coordination in environment/CC at county level

#### R3.2. Better opportunities – particular for women and youth – for productive employment with decent working conditions
- ICT to support environmental management
- PES – payment for ecosystem services schemes
- Cross-sectoral coordination in environment/CC at county level

### County-level strategies
- Improved capacity at county level and improved coordination
- Dairy Hub with Tetra Laval
- UNICEF adolescent vocational training
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1.3. Increased production of and improved access to renewable energy</th>
<th>R2.3. Strengthen media and CSOs capacity to promote democratic development and accountability</th>
<th>R3.3. Better access to social protection for peoples living in poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• UN-Women-WEE</td>
<td>• Hand in Hand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1.4. Better access to environmentally sustainable basic community services</th>
<th>R2.4. Strengthen capacity among public institutions and CSOs that promote gender equality and respect for human rights, with a focus on women and girls</th>
<th>R3.4. Strengthen conditions for free and fair trade and investments that benefit sustainable development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Financial investment in sewerage infrastructure</td>
<td>• Guarantees in water and sanitation financing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PPPs</td>
<td>• Need for gender sensitive county planning and budgeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNITY LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1. A better environment, limited climate impact and greater resilience to environmental impacts etc</th>
<th>R2. Strengthen democracy and gender equality, and greater respect for human rights</th>
<th>R3. Better opportunities and tools to enable poor people to improve their living conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1.1. Strengthen management of natural resources and ecosystem services</td>
<td>R2.1. Strengthening democratic institutions at national and local levels</td>
<td>R3.1. Increased productivity, sustainability and processing in small-scale agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Payment for ecosystem services</td>
<td>• Peace building</td>
<td>• Capitalise organic smart farming opportunities for export and trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Champions for green solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased access to loans and guarantees for the poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ICT to support environmental management</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Facility to support innovations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1.2. Better capacity of public institutions and other actors at national and local levels to contribute</th>
<th>R2.2. Strengthen rule of law</th>
<th>R3.2. Better opportunities – particular for women and youth – for productive employment with decent working conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improved water storage and harvesting (roof catchments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for gender sensitive programming, increased capacity and awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Improved water storage and harvesting (roof catchments)

• Need for gender sensitive programming, increased capacity and awareness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1.3. Increased production of and improved access to renewable energy</th>
<th>R2.3. Strengthen media and CSOs capacity to promote democratic development and accountability</th>
<th>R3.3. Better access to social protection for peoples living in poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Incentives for social investors  
• Local solution for poor people  
• Harness renewable energy from waste  
• Cheap small scale energy solutions | • Peace committees  
• Civic education  
• Expanding public participation, women/youth | • Social protection/ insurance  
• UNICEF |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1.4. Better access to environmentally sustainable basic community services</th>
<th>R2.4. Strengthen capacity among public institutions and CSOs that promote gender equality and respect for human rights, with a focus on women and girls</th>
<th>R3.4. Strengthen conditions for free and fair trade and investments that benefit sustainable development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| | • Leadership programmes for youth  
• Gender equality perspectives  
• Masculinity  
• Gender in religious congregations | |

**HOUSEHOLD LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R1. A better environment, limited climate impact and greater resilience to environmental impacts, climate change and natural disasters</th>
<th>R2. Strengthen democracy and gender equality, and greater respect for human rights</th>
<th>R3. Better opportunities and tools to enable poor people to improve their living conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1.1. Strengthen management of natural resources and ecosystem services</td>
<td>R2.1. Strengthening democratic institutions at national and local levels</td>
<td>R3.1. Increased productivity, sustainability and processing in small-scale agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1.2. Better capacity of public institutions and other actors at national and local levels to contribute</td>
<td>R2.2. Strengthen rule of law</td>
<td>R3.2. Better opportunities – particular for women and youth – for productive employment with decent working conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • UN-Women - WEE  
• UNICEF - Vocational training | | |
| R1.3. Increased production of and improved access to renewable energy | R2.3. Strengthen media and CSOs capacity to promote democratic development and accountability | R3.3. Better access to social protection for peoples living in poverty |
| | | • Social protection/ insurance |
| R1.4. Better access to environmentally sustainable basic community services | R2.4. Strengthen capacity among public institutions | R3.4. Strengthen conditions for free and fair trade and investments that benefit sustainable development |
| sustainable basic community services | and CSOs that promote gender equality and respect for human rights, with a focus on women and girls | and investments that benefit sustainable development |
3.3 Key stakeholders and partnerships

During the analysis, participants carried out an initial mapping of stakeholders in Kenya. This analysis should be developed further and, in particular further consideration should be given as to the extent to which various stakeholders may contribute to, or limit, the effectiveness of Sweden achieving the stated outcomes of the Result Areas.

Stakeholder mapping at the national, sub-national and community levels is represented below in Figures 5, 6 and 7, below.

**FIGURE 5: NATIONAL LEVEL STAKEHOLDERS, KENYA**
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**FIGURE 6: COUNTY LEVEL STAKEHOLDERS, KENYA**
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FIGURE 7: COMMUNITY LEVEL STAKEHOLDERS, KENYA
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4.0 Summary and next steps

4.1 Summary

Kenya, as a lower middle income country, has an important and growing regional role in East Africa and globally, particularly from a political and economic perspective. Within this context, Official Development Assistance is a small and diminishing but, nevertheless, important source of resourcing, especially considering the key risks around governance, corruption and bureaucracy identified in the context analysis for the country.

Sweden’s current portfolio, in turn, is a small proportion of overall development assistance to Kenya but is based on a strong foundation of long-term historical engagement in the country and Sweden’s comparative advantage, including its perceived neutrality and flexibility as a development cooperation partner and its strong support for gender equality and women’s rights, as well as the opportunity to share institutional learning. In this context, the programme team recognises the need to ensure that portfolio contributions are strategic and catalytic and clearly prioritised to achieve stated outcomes in line with Result Areas and Sweden’s cross-cutting perspectives and comparative advantage.

This approach was reflected throughout the analysis which built on a comprehensive portfolio analysis that should be considered an example of good practice within Sida. Achieving the outcomes of the new Strategy will require a further consolidation and a rationalisation of current portfolio investments, which are currently relatively broad in scope, totalling 38 contributions, especially considering that reduction in funds available over the life of the new strategy. The following next steps aim to support the programme team in the decision making process of rationalising and consolidating the programme, as part of the wider operationalisation process.

4.2 Suggested next steps

As above, the systems analysis should be seen as a contribution to the process of operationalising Sweden’s Results Strategy for Kenya and this will require further analysis, building on the outputs from the Nairobi workshop. In particular, the workshop highlighted the following next steps that could be taken to ensure that Sweden’s portfolio contributions are balanced and informed by strategic choices that include synergies between and within Result Areas:

**Strategy**

1. Recognising Sweden’s relatively limited contribution to improving the well-being of poor people within the overall Kenyan context, allocate human and financial resources to strengthen dialogue and linkages with government and other development cooperation partners to leverage the potential impact of Sweden’s new Results Strategy for Kenya;

2. Undertake a conflict sensitivity analysis of the portfolio to ensure that the strategy contributes to Sweden’s cross-cutting perspective in this area;

3. Invest in further research to better understand the contribution of social capital to poor people’s overall well-being in Kenya. This should include a better understanding of the role of clan and
chiefly systems and their impact upon gender equality and conflict resolution and analysis of the contribution that strengthening social assets could make to achieving Result Area outcomes;

4. **Strengthen the linkages with, and contribution of, Sweden’s regional and global programmes** to the Results Strategy, in particular ensuring that these programmes contribute to Result outcomes at County and community levels;

5. Consider ways in which Sweden’s global political engagements, especially with regard to gender equality and peacebuilding are incorporated into the Kenya portfolio, including, for instance Sweden’s **engagement with and support for Security Council Resolution 1325**.

**Result Areas**

1. Recognising the significant scope and level of investment in Result Area two, **undertake further prioritisation of programmes in Result Area two** and/or ensure that the investments in this Result Area are making a strategic contribution to outcomes at all levels for Result Areas one and three;

2. Within each Result Area, **strengthen the linkages between programmes at national, County and community levels**, recognising the strategic opportunities that may exist with regard to Kenya’s devolution process;

3. **Ensure that the focus on rights and gender equality in Result Area two and the corresponding contributions also incorporate environmental and gender rights** to improve, for instance, access to renewal energy and environmental services and productive employment and decent working conditions for women and girls.

**Portfolio contributions**

1. Following further investigation and validation, **develop an exit strategy for the five programmes that do not appear to be making a significant contribution to the overall Kenya context** or the achievement of Sweden’s Results under the new Strategy, as detailed on page 6 of this report;

2. **Undertake further analysis of 22 programmes**, or those that are not highlighted on page 8 of this report, to determine the extent to which these contributions are strategic and are making a ‘catalytic’ contribution to Sweden’s Results Strategy for Kenya;

3. **Strengthen stakeholder mapping with regard to individual portfolio contributions** to better understand the influence of a wide range of stakeholders, at different levels of society, and their impact on the effectiveness of these contributions in achieving stated outcomes;

4. **Further develop the opportunities identified in Table 2 of this report**, with an emphasis on ensuring that these opportunities contribute to the strengthening or scaling up of existing contributions and are integrated at different layers of Kenyan society;

5. **Systematically make use of clear criteria to prioritise portfolio contributions** within each Result Area and across the Strategy as a whole. Portfolio contributions should be ranked according to the following elements:
a. The extent to which the programmes made a contribution both across Result Areas and at different layers of Kenyan society;
b. Their contribution to Sweden's Programme Development Goals of poverty and rights and cross-cutting perspectives – climate and environment, conflict sensitivity and gender equality and women's rights, and;
c. Strategic linkages to Sweden’s global and regional initiatives and to the contributions of other development cooperation partners.
d. The extent to which the geographical coverage of programmes corresponds with areas of high vulnerability within Kenya.
Annex 1: Risk and asset tables per capital

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Asset</th>
<th>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</th>
<th>Consequences (negative/positive)</th>
<th>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</th>
<th>Programmatic Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Progressive Constitution | • Corruption.  
• Lack of implementation.  
• Lack of political will.  
• Low knowledge of rights among citizens. | • Loss of faith in democracy  
• Frustration and increased insecurity.  
• Source of local mobilisation (positive) | • UNWomen strengthen women’s political particip.  
• FIAKONIA implementation of constitution/Public parties  
• FORUM SYD human rights awareness  
• LDGI advocating for chapter on land in constitutions  
• HRD Support  
• OHCHR  
• Kenyan Dialogue project strengthening dialogues on the premises of the Const.  
• Judiciary inst support | • Implementation of constitution through expanding public participation, women and civic education |
| • Regular Multi-party Elections | • Ethnic tensions/divisions.  
• Violence.  
• Fraud | • Decrease in party plurality  
• undermining social contract between citizens and state | • IDEA. Elections  
• EISA Electoral support  
• Judiciary support  
• HRD-support | |
| • Vocal Civil Society/Watchdogs  
• Empowered citizens | • Shrinking democratic space.  
• Risk for repressive legislation, | • Self-censorship  
• People less vocal,  
• Centralisation of power which could lead to further corruption | • PFM-IBP strengthening public parti + accountability  
• AG increases | • Spin doctors  
• Safty?  
• Political parties  
• Leadership programs for youth  
• NCIC  
• Women participation/Elective participation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Asset</th>
<th>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</th>
<th>Consequences (negative/positive)</th>
<th>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</th>
<th>Programmatic Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cut and paste from neighbours.</td>
<td>etc.</td>
<td>• possibility for accountability</td>
<td>• vocal about non-violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• arbitrarily arrest</td>
<td>• Reduced credibility in CSOs</td>
<td>• DIAKONIA transparency accountability PBO act</td>
<td>• Peace committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bad mouthing CSOs</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Forum Syd Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Kenya dialog project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• HRD-support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NRON facility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• MAUC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Kenya water and sanitation CSO network</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• OHCHR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• FOJO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Economic Integration (EAC)</td>
<td>• Corruption.</td>
<td>• Trade potential not realised.</td>
<td>• SCB/KNBS statistic support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unstable political situations in neighbouring countries</td>
<td>• Lower GDP growth.</td>
<td>• TMEA regional integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Uneven economic progress.</td>
<td>• Limited foreign direct investments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Politics of insecurity,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Red tape.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devolution Process</td>
<td>• Low institutional capacity.</td>
<td>• Decentralised corruption</td>
<td>• UNOP/ WB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Corruption</td>
<td>• Uneven development—rising</td>
<td>• DIAKONIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inequalities,</td>
<td>• HRM facility —legal framework for land reform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disparity</td>
<td>• ADSP Agric-sector country structures)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social upheaval</td>
<td>• WSTF strengthening structures in water</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inefficient administrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and use of resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Asset</td>
<td>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</td>
<td>Consequences (negative/positive)</td>
<td>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</td>
<td>Programmatic Gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Vibrant Media | • Shrinking democratic space.  
• Ownership of media.  
• Censorship. | • Self-censorship among journalists  
• Fewer alternatives voices  
• *Increase in alternative media on-line* | • Forum Syd/alternative media  
• DIAKONIA, alternative media  
• HRM Facility media as tool to advocacy HRM  
• Devolution support UNDP/WB  
• OHCHR | • Editors, non-violence messages |
| • Rapid Urbanization | • Unplanned urbanization,  
• Restive population a threat to social order  
• Weak governance framework | • Unemployment,  
• Expanded informal settlements,  
• Crime  
• Pollution  
• Traffic congestion,  
• Increased health risks,  
• Inequality  
• “New” de-tribalized citizens  
• Urban citizens have no direct say in governance | • KMP country and urban planning  
• Symbio City Participatory Planning  
• KSIP settlement planning & slum upgrading  
• CSUDP social planning urban governance | • Implementation urban areas and citizen act |
| • Institutional structure in place | • Low capacity  
• Red tape. | • Inefficiency  
• Corruption  
• Reduced investments.  
• Limited private sector development. | • KRA  
• Strengthen domestic resource mobilisation  
• UNWomen – strengthening independent commission  
• UNDP Strength peace structures  
• DIAKONIA  
• Devolu support UNDP/WB  
• Correction Reform | • Strengthening institutions at country level |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political Asset</th>
<th>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</th>
<th>Consequences (negative/positive)</th>
<th>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</th>
<th>Programmatic Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Judiciary reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Police reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HRM facility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Capital Asset</th>
<th>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</th>
<th>Consequences (negative/positive)</th>
<th>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</th>
<th>Programmatic Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clan system/Tribes</td>
<td>Political manipulation</td>
<td>Clan based violence,</td>
<td>UNDP using traditional conflict resolution mechanism</td>
<td>Linking with political capitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief system/ elders/ Tribes</td>
<td>Political manipulation, Obstacle for democratic development, Obstacle for enhanced gender equality</td>
<td>Cementing unequal structures</td>
<td>LDGI Using administrators and traditional institution to address land issues, Forum Syd /Women groups at country level</td>
<td>Masculinity awareness work, Gender equality, Change manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative dispute resolution mechanisms</td>
<td>Manipulation, circumvention of formal justice system</td>
<td>Impunity</td>
<td>Judiciary strengthening AD, DIAKONIA strengthening ADR, HRM facility, UNWOMEN alternative mechanism for land issues</td>
<td>Gender equality perspectives, Do more on GBV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong traditional social networks</td>
<td>Weaken the formal political system, Corruption, Patron –client system,</td>
<td>Peoples rights are not realised, People cannot reach their full potential</td>
<td>ASDSP formalising the net world / Strengthening assets, WFP community based targeting of beneficiaries for cash transfers using the social network at village level, HIHEA strengthening, CSUDP socio tenure domain model</td>
<td>Formalising social networks, Social insurance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social Capital Asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</th>
<th>Consequences (negative/positive)</th>
<th>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</th>
<th>Programmatic Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Religious congregations | • Manipulation for political gain  
   • Corruption | • Tension between religious groups,  
   • Cementing unequal structures  
   • Financial exploitation of poor people | | • UNICEF bring children back when in conflict with the law |
| | | | | • UNDP conflict resolution  
   • DIAKONIA religious groups  
   • LDG religious leaders to resolve land conflict |
| | | | | • Peace building conflict prevention  
   • Gender equality in religious congregations |

### Human Capital Asset

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</th>
<th>Consequences (negative/positive)</th>
<th>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</th>
<th>Programmatic Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Skilled Labour Force/relatively well-educated population | • Unemployment  
   • Unfulfilled expectations | • Discontent  
   • Radicalisation  
   • Crime  
   • If harnessed can spur development | | • UNICEF vocational training for youth  
   • UNDP issues on radicalisation/crime  
   • ASDSP value chains |
| | | | | • Better link demands and supply labour market  
   • Analytical cap to identify gaps  
   • Equity in education sector  
   • Improved quality of prim and second education  
   • Vocational training |
| • Young and growing population | • Unemployment | • Discontent  
   • Radicalisation  
   • Crime | | • ASDSP  
   • Method innovation/Supporting young innovative |
| | | | | • Family planning  
   • Enabling environment for private sector development  
   • Stable environments to |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Capital Asset</th>
<th>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</th>
<th>Consequences (negative/positive)</th>
<th>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</th>
<th>Programmatic Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong entrepreneurship / innovations</td>
<td>• Lack of investments</td>
<td>• Cannot reach the full potential</td>
<td>FDI and stimulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of legal frameworks for SME.</td>
<td>• GDP growth below its potential.</td>
<td>investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cannot reach the full potential</td>
<td>• Less employment opportunities</td>
<td>Budget programming and implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CSUDD; working on alt tech for housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• UNWomen microbusiness</td>
<td>Scale up existing programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Method innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ASDSP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TMEA less redtape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• EAGC Investments on agribands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• AECF investments on innovations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• REACT entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Refugees</td>
<td>• Exclusive migration policy.</td>
<td>• Low integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Continued conflicts in Somalia and South Sudan.</td>
<td>• No sense of belonging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Un-utilised human capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• UNWomen Refugees entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• EU trust fund support to integrate refugees and host communities in Kakoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Integration of refugees into local communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased legal and work opportunities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• KALOBEIYE a new town integrating refugees and local community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Capital Asset</td>
<td>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</td>
<td>Consequences (negative/positive)</td>
<td>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</td>
<td>Programming Gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Sources</td>
<td>• Weak governance</td>
<td>• Mal-functioning water systems (poor technical quality, poor sustainability)</td>
<td>• UNDP conflict prevention</td>
<td>• Payment for ecosystem services is an option</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Population growth,</td>
<td>• Social Conflicts for human and livestock consumption, displacement</td>
<td>• WFP increased drought resilience</td>
<td>• Impr coord to mainstream CC and Env at country level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pollution (industrial and human settlements),</td>
<td>• Water-borne disease – Health related problems</td>
<td>• NETFUND innovations EHV</td>
<td>• Improved capacity of country level Envi/CC and NRM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seasonality</td>
<td>• Increased school dropout for girls</td>
<td>• HRM facility EHV</td>
<td>• Need for gender sensitive programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unsustainable consumption and production patterns,</td>
<td>• Negative impact on livelihood options for the women fetching water</td>
<td>• WSTF sustainable water resource management, regulation/conflict resolution media included/gender mainstream</td>
<td>• Incentives (subsidies) for water efficient irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• urbanisation,</td>
<td>• Food insecurity and malnutrition</td>
<td>• UNDP devul programme building capacities of countries and DIKONIA public participation</td>
<td>• Improved water storage (roof containers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• climate change,</td>
<td>• Dwindling resources</td>
<td>• Method fund innovations</td>
<td>• Improved access to financial services for men and women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• over-abstraction,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved incentive structures for sustainable envir practices: in regards to tax/regulations/standards/pollution pay practises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• sand harvesting,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Land/Soil</td>
<td>• Low investments</td>
<td>• Reduced productivity</td>
<td>• UNDP conflict prevention</td>
<td>• Improved incentive structures for sustainable envir practices: in regards to tax/regulations/standards/pollution pay practises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Population growth,</td>
<td>• Food insecurity and malnutrition</td>
<td>• Method fund innovations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Poor land management. Drought.</td>
<td>• Declining soil fertility/health</td>
<td>• ASDSP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Over-grazing.</td>
<td>• Soil, land and water</td>
<td>• CSUDP urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Capital Asset</td>
<td>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</td>
<td>Consequences (negative/positive)</td>
<td>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</td>
<td>Programming Gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Natural disasters,</td>
<td>pollution</td>
<td>• agriculture</td>
<td>• Improved incentive structures for sustainable envir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unclear/Poor land tenure and land rights,</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Diakonia Public participation</td>
<td>• UNDP conflict prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unsustainable husbandry practices</td>
<td></td>
<td>• HRM Facility</td>
<td>• Method fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unsustainable consumption and production patterns.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Global CF</td>
<td>• Improved incentive structures for sustainable envir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forests</td>
<td>• weak governance,</td>
<td></td>
<td>• IFOAM in EA dev</td>
<td>• Improved incentive structures for sustainable envir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Population growth,</td>
<td></td>
<td>organic sector in EA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Illegal logging,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environmental degradation, erosion, poor water retention,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity</td>
<td>• weak governance,</td>
<td></td>
<td>• UNDP conflict prevention</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Population growth,</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Method fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Illegal logging,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Environmental degradation, erosion, poor water retention,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Capital Asset</td>
<td>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</td>
<td>Consequences (negative/positive)</td>
<td>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</td>
<td>Programming Gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wildlife</td>
<td>• charcoal production,</td>
<td>• Displacement</td>
<td>innovations</td>
<td>practices: in regards to tax/regulations/standards/ pollution pay practises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Invasive species</td>
<td>• Human encroachment</td>
<td>• ASDSP</td>
<td>• Awareness rising about forests and importance of forest for water and CC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Human/wildlife conflicts</td>
<td>• HRM facility</td>
<td>• Create incentives for other cooking methods/briquettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of biodiversity</td>
<td>• Diakonia public participation</td>
<td>• Reforestation payment for ecosystem services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased CO2-emission</td>
<td>• Innovations innovations</td>
<td>• Incentives for alternative livelihood instead of charcoal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• increases</td>
<td>• More resources into biodiversity use and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minerals</td>
<td>• Weak governance on extractive industry,</td>
<td>• Social conflicts</td>
<td>• UNDP conflict prevention</td>
<td>Improved incentive structures for sustainable envir practices: in regards to tax/regulations/standards/ pollution pay practises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unclear Land tenure and land allocation systems,</td>
<td>• Exploitation</td>
<td>• UNDP/WB devolution</td>
<td>• Improved transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• unsustainable extractive practices</td>
<td>• Pollution, health hazards</td>
<td>• Method fund innovations</td>
<td>• Awareness raising on mineral industry (exploitation, benefits, illegal extraction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Displacement, polluted soils, health hazards for humans,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Capital Asset</td>
<td>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</td>
<td>Consequences (negative/positive)</td>
<td>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</td>
<td>Programming Gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo-thermal energy</td>
<td>• Unclear land tenure, • displacement, • weak governance, • Not sufficient focus on environmental and social safeguards</td>
<td>• displacement, • environmental degradation • negative impact on fauna (birds and other wild life) • health hazards • more electricity on the grid also benefitting the poor,</td>
<td>• UNDP conflict prevention • UNDP/WB devolution • AKIIRA • HRM facility • Method fund innovations • GP Global innovations Fund</td>
<td>• Improved incentive structures for sustainable envir practices: in regards to tax/regulations/standards/pollution pay practises • A need to expand the grid to rural areas and for poor people • Need to make electricity affordable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind/Sun</td>
<td>• Unclear land tenure, • displacement, • weak governance</td>
<td>• negative impact on local fauna (birds) • noise pollution</td>
<td>• UNDP conflict prevention • WSTF Solar powered water pumps/strengthening asset/reducing CO2 • Credig guarantee/multiparty • UNDP/WB devolution • HRM facility • Method fund innovations • Energy power pools • GP demoenv renewable energy</td>
<td>• Improved incentive structures for sustainable envir practices: in regards to tax/regulations/standards/pollution pay practises • Support innovation sin wind/sun systems • Renewable energy • Provide incentive for use of solar/wind system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Capital Asset</td>
<td>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</td>
<td>Consequences (negative/positive)</td>
<td>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</td>
<td>Programming Gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>weak governance, Population growth and pressure on grazing land, poorly developed water resources, climate change, pollution, over-fishing,</td>
<td>Food insecurity, Low livestock productivity</td>
<td>UNDP conflict prevention, ASDP strengthening asset, WB/UNDP Devolution, HR facility EHV</td>
<td>Improved incentive structures for sustainable envir practises: in regards to tax/regulations/standards/ pollution pay practises, Improve access to insurance related to CC for small holder farmers, Providing alternative livelihoods for pastoralists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Capital Asset</th>
<th>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</th>
<th>Consequences (negative/positive)</th>
<th>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</th>
<th>Programmatic Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Not adequate maintenance, corruption, Weather related tear, Corruption, Security, Unused potential, Weak underfunded</td>
<td>Bad roads (with potholes etc.) impacting negatively on the transport sector as well as in road safety, Difficult to access: markets, health facilities, schools, jobs, Movement becomes limited, Potential target for terrorist attacks, Transport inefficiencies,</td>
<td>WFP feeder roads to markets, KRA resource mobilisation, OAG control of use of public funding, Trademark EA increased physical access to markets</td>
<td>Plan and budget for maintainmantec, Take into account eliminate diverge risks, Lack of investments in roads, Pa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Capital Asset</td>
<td>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</td>
<td>Consequences (negative/positive)</td>
<td>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</td>
<td>Programmatic Gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>state budget</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Trucks used instead – more pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT infrastructure</td>
<td>• Financial interest /demand in investing in ICT infrastructure in rural areas</td>
<td>• Low penetration in rural areas, • Unequal access, inequality</td>
<td>• KRA resource mobilisation • OAG control of use of public funding • MAVC</td>
<td>• Local solutions for poor people • Low national coverage • scale up Of ICT solutions is sow • ICT to support enviromental managment to avoid polution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water infrastructure</td>
<td>• Weak policy and regulatory framework, • Inadequate maintenance, • Low investment in rural areas and informal settlements</td>
<td>• Unequal access to water • spreading of waterborne diseases</td>
<td>• KRA resource mobilisation • OAG control of use of public funding • WSTF strengthening asset and inequality in access to water focus on women • Water suppl output based aid, strengthening access to water and sanitation pro poor focus • WFP strengthening assess water storage, small dams water infrastructure, irrigation • UNDP/WB support on capacity building of counties • HRM facility water resource system</td>
<td>• Closer to people, impact om women and girls • Gender sensitive public facitiies • Lack of investments • Take into account CC risks • Take into account conflict arising from water paints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Capital Asset</td>
<td>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</td>
<td>Consequences (negative/positive)</td>
<td>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</td>
<td>Programmatic Gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NETFUND innovations in Water and sanitation</td>
<td>Low coverage in rural areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KISCIP providing Water networks</td>
<td>Expensive to interest high interest rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSUDP innovations in W&amp;S</td>
<td>Opportunities MKOPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programmatic Gaps</td>
<td>Local solution for poor people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cheap small scale energy solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrification</td>
<td>Weak policy and regulatory framework,</td>
<td>Unequal access to electricity - effects education, health and agriculture.</td>
<td>KRA resource mobilisation</td>
<td>Improved urban planning with longer perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate maintenance,</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAG control of use of public funding</td>
<td>Make low-income housing schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skewed investments</td>
<td></td>
<td>HETFUND innovations in electric support</td>
<td>Land planning and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need to improve service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harness renewable energy from waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanization</td>
<td>Unplanned urbanization</td>
<td>Population concentration thus more efficient service delivery</td>
<td>KRA resource mobilisation</td>
<td>Closer to people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak policy, regulatory framework</td>
<td></td>
<td>OAG control of use of public funding</td>
<td>Well maintained facility health schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KMP urban policy &amp; planning</td>
<td>Take into account CC risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KISCIP roads and sewerage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WB/UNDP Devolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Health facilities</td>
<td>Poorly maintained and poorly equipped,</td>
<td>Compromises quality of education</td>
<td>KRA resource mobilisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large catchment areas</td>
<td>Less educated population</td>
<td>OAG control of use of public funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in health problems and mortality</td>
<td>WB/UNDP Devolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working on capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Capital Asset</td>
<td>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</td>
<td>Consequences (negative/positive)</td>
<td>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</td>
<td>Programmatic Gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Markets</td>
<td>• Poorly developed</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>• KRA resource mobilisation</td>
<td>• Closer to people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• OAG control of use of public funding</td>
<td>• No facilities in markets (toilets, water, waste)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• ASASP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Trade mark EA increased g access to markets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• counties plus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Capital Asset</td>
<td>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</td>
<td>Consequences (negative/positive)</td>
<td>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</td>
<td>Programmatic Gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GDP Growth</td>
<td>• Bureaucracy</td>
<td>• Poverty/Inequality</td>
<td>• KRIA mobilise resources</td>
<td>• Family planning programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Red tape</td>
<td>• Not reaching full potential</td>
<td>• WB/UNDP Devolution</td>
<td>• Health opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-inclusive growth/lack of redistribution systems.</td>
<td>• Tension.</td>
<td>• Forum Syd</td>
<td>• Access to education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• DIAKONIA Statistic support working on environ stats</td>
<td>• Progressive taxation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• TMEA less red tape</td>
<td>• Improve ways of doing business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong financial system (banks, stock exchange)</td>
<td>• Weak legal framework.</td>
<td>• Not reaching full potential</td>
<td>• Guarantee KCB and 3 MFIs</td>
<td>• Deconstruction of the monopolization of the economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bureaucracy</td>
<td>• GDP</td>
<td>• OAG transparency</td>
<td>• Missing middle financial inclusive loans and guarantees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Red tape</td>
<td>• Less employment opportunities</td>
<td>• FSAK strengthening asset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Difficulties to access credits</td>
<td>• High interest rates.</td>
<td>• TMEA less red tape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conglomeration of certain sectors</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Deconstruction of the monopolization of the economy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High interest rates.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Missing middle financial inclusive loans and guarantees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Capital Asset</td>
<td>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</td>
<td>Consequences (negative/positive)</td>
<td>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</td>
<td>Programmatic Gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • International and regional Trade | • Red tape  
• Bureaucracy. | • Cross border trade not reaching its potential, hammering growth and vision 2030 | • HRM facility agriculture value chains with Uganda  
• KRA address board tax issues  
• Water OBA – Commecircail finance in water sector  
• Support to companies to present project  
• Support banks to assess risk in water sector  
• Regional trade – trademark East Africa  
• TRAPCA trade policy training inst.  
• AVC harmonised trade rules amongst RECs  
• WCO world | • Diversification of economy (today only 2 mobile banks)  
• Access to micro-finance, how can you increase access to finance  
• Incentives for saving  
• Better cross-border trade for the poor  
• Better transparency  
• Scale up existing cross-border trade |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Capital Asset</th>
<th>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</th>
<th>Consequences (negative/positive)</th>
<th>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</th>
<th>Programmatic Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>customs organisation EAC authorised EEM operators</td>
<td>SIS Standardised capacity in EAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TMEA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Financial innovations</td>
<td>• Insecurity</td>
<td>• Fewer innovations and investment, increased unemployment.</td>
<td>• FSDK strengthening asset</td>
<td>Facilities and regulations to support fin innovation especially by and for the poor people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low level of investment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• GP connect access to financial capital</td>
<td>• More loans and guarantees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bureaucracy</td>
<td></td>
<td>• AECF</td>
<td>• Cheaper and better many transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Red tape</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Incentive for social investors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tourism</td>
<td>• Crime</td>
<td>• (might have to be placed somewhere else)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strengthening tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Terrorism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preservation conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved redistribution of renewal empl local population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gender perspective and poor people missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remittances – internal and external</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>• Remittance as source of capital for livelihoods and SME, strengthens resilience</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>Cheaper better money transfers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Framework to leverage remittances for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remittance as source of capital for livelihoods and SME, strengthens resilience.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Capital Asset</th>
<th>Risks/stress factors most affecting this asset</th>
<th>Consequences (negative/positive)</th>
<th>Current portfolio contributions relevant to the context</th>
<th>Programmatic Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Savings and Credit Cooperative Societies (SACCO) | • | • A collective way of accessing credit when individual credit worthiness is lacking. | • HRM facility supporting credits mechanism in agriculture and water  
• FSDJ strengthening asset  
• UNICEF – WEE  
• UNWomen WEE  
• CSUDP saving for housing | • Enlarge access to SACCO:s  
• Facilitations of regulations |
| • Rapid Urbanization | • High unemployment  
• Criminality/insecurity | • Economic agglomeration  
• Markets for rural products  
• Cheap labour | | • Creating more urban centre – clusters  
• Better planned urbanisation |
Annex 2: Portfolio Analysis

Portfolio Analysis Kenya 2016-2020

1. Introduction

This portfolio analysis was prepared as part of the operationalization of the new strategy for Kenya 2016-2020. Each programme officer was tasked with answering the following questions for each contribution (see section 2 below):
1. Overarching objective of the contribution;
2. Contribution to result as per new strategy i) in its current format and ii) through possible amendments;
3. Synergies (link to other results in the same focus area/other focus areas/results in other focus areas):
4. Other motivation for Sweden funding the contribution;
5. Other donors active in the area/sector;
6. Which programmatic layer does this contribution focus on; (i) households, ii) communities, iii) provincial groupings and iv) authorities or v) national).

When looking at the financial analysis of the portfolio and to what results the portfolio contributes to as displayed in the tables below, it is noteworthy that focus area two receives 53 % of the agreed funds and has by far the greatest number of contributions (24 compared to 8 for area 1 and 6 for area 3). It is also striking that results 1:3, 3:2 and 3:4 have no funding. Furthermore, there are other results that receive very little funding and/or where the funding is declining rapidly, e.g. results 1:1, 2:4 and 3:1. However, some projects/programmes contribute to several results as reflected in the second table below as “secondary” and this needs to be considered in the analysis on “orphan” areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreed funds per result and year</th>
<th>No. of contr. that contribute to a certain result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1:1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1:2</td>
<td>48 050 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1:3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1:4</td>
<td>15 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1 Tot.</td>
<td>63 050 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2:1</td>
<td>62 375 558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2:2</td>
<td>28 935 788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2:3</td>
<td>44 600 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2:4</td>
<td>20 250 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 Tot.</td>
<td>156 161 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3:1</td>
<td>40 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3:2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3:3</td>
<td>34 750 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3:4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3 Tot.</td>
<td>74 750 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gr. Tot.</td>
<td>293 961 346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegated</td>
<td>330 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unused</td>
<td>36 038 654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A more detailed list of the portfolio is attached, annex 1

In contrast, it is also worth noticing that almost 60 % (58) of the agreed amount for the period 2016-2018 is financing only three results (R1:2, R2:1 and R2:3).
When it comes to implementing partners, the agreed funds for 2016-2018 are channelled through the state 34%, multilaterals 29%, CSOs 26% and Swedish institutions 11%. There is an ongoing contribution via the private sector, using a guarantee as a funding modality, however the funds (subsidy) were disbursed in 2014 and it is therefore reported as “0” in table three above.

The broader financial picture tells us that the overall funding for the portfolio is close to exhausted for 2016 where almost 90% of the delegated funds are already agreed. This situation is changing though when some of the agreements expire and make room for new contributions. For 2017 the used part of the funds delegated is 67% and for 2018 it is down to 30%. Currently there are no agreed disbursements in 2019 - 2020.

An interesting aspect is also to consider the guarantee instrument and how much capital it mobilises. Currently, there is only one contribution using guarantees as mentioned above. Even though only 2 MSEK of the country allocation has been used for the subsidy, it is expected that the total amount that will be mobilised over the agreed 7 year period will amount to 232,7 MSEK.

In addition to the contributions reported on in section 2 below and in the tables above there are a number of supporting contributions e.g. for audits, studies and evaluations. The global amount for these small contributions sums up to approximately 5 MSEK per year.

## 2. Focus Areas

### 2.1. Focus Area 1: Improved environment, reduced climate impact and strengthening resilience to environmental, climate change and natural disasters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Number of contr. direct link</th>
<th>Indirect link</th>
<th>Volume 2016</th>
<th>Volume 2017</th>
<th>Volume 2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1:1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 000 000</td>
<td>5 000 000</td>
<td>10 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1:2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48 050 000</td>
<td>40 450 000</td>
<td>24 000 000</td>
<td>112 500 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1:3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1:4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15 000 000</td>
<td>15 000 000</td>
<td>15 000 000</td>
<td>45 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>63 050 000</td>
<td>60 450 000</td>
<td>44 000 000</td>
<td>167 500 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.1.1. Result 1: Strengthened management of natural resources and ecosystem services

##### 2.1.1.1. NETFUND Phase 3 (2015-2019)

The overall aim of the initiative is to promote green growth by supporting innovations that reduce the impact of climate and environmental change. Expected outcomes are to improve awareness of initiatives for green growth, ensure a favourable environment for the implementation of green growth companies, as well as support the development of green businesses. The activity period ends in 2019, the last disbursement is made in 2018. The support contributes to enhancing a better environment, sustainable use of natural resources, stronger resilience to environmental impact and climate change in developing countries through working with the various actors in the innovations sector in the environment field in Kenya. It will also lead contribute to empowering poor people to improve their living conditions.

The contribution links to Focus are 1, Result 1, 2, 3 and 4 and Focus are 3, results area 1, 3 and 4. This is because the programme cuts across environment and natural resources sectors, including agriculture value chain, water and sanitation.
The need for Sweden to support home grown solutions to local problems in the environment sector contributed to the thinking around this contribution. There are many Kenyans with ideas that if well nurtured can grow into cutting edge technologies. This is what the contribution is about, i.e. growing innovations in the agriculture and natural resources sector as well as water and sanitation.

The programme is jointly supported by the United Kingdom Government, the Netherlands and the African Development Bank.

The contribution focus is on communities.

2.1.2. Result 2: Enhanced capacity of public institutions and other actors at national and local levels to contribute to environmental sustainability, increased resilience to environmental, climate change and natural disasters, and reduced climate impact

2.1.2.1. Kenya Symbiocity Programme, 2014 - 2019

The Overarching objective of the programme is that urban development stakeholders have increased capacity and ability to guide Kenyan urban development in a more sustainable direction.

In its current format, the programme contributes to the result area directly by supporting the Council of Governors, Ministry of urban development, counties and other urban stakeholders to strengthen their capacities for urban planning and management with a focus on sustainable urban development.

The contribution may link to result four with its potential to connect municipal service delivery in waste management to production of clean energy at local level if focus is adjusted to also support solid waste management. It is also linked to focus area 2 by promoting participatory and democratic approaches to urban planning using the Symbiocity Approach. It is linked to focus area 3 through its promotion of private sector investments in urban improvements.

Sweden has long experience from working with urban development in the world and Kenya in particular. The Symbiocity Approach incorporates a mixture of Swedish and international experiences in sustainable urban development, including planning and management for which a pool of experts to support partners has been established.

Sweden, France and the World Bank are currently the main donors to the sector, but while the World Bank and France mainly provide infrastructure credit, Sweden’s grant mainly supports participation of the urban poor in urban processes.

The contribution focuses on national and county authorities through building of technical capacity and local stakeholders, such as communities, CSOs and private sector through participatory planning.

2.1.2.2. Kenya Municipal Programme, 2012 – 2017

The overarching objective of the KMP is to strengthen local governance and improve service delivery in selected municipalities.

In its current form, the programme contributes to achievement of this result through support to county institutional strengthening for municipal management, participatory strategic urban planning as well as infrastructure and service delivery. The project period expires in 2017 and thus there is no opportunity to revise the objectives or programme focus.

The contribution has links to result four through support to improved access to infrastructure and services.
Sweden has leveraged on World Bank funding to promote sustainability principles and participatory approaches in planning.

The programme is supported by Sweden and the World Bank.

The contribution focuses on national and county authorities.


The overarching objective is to improve living conditions in informal settlements in selected municipalities in Kenya.

In its current form, the project supports national and county governments to strengthen institutions for effective slum upgrading, enhance tenure security for residents of informal settlements and improve infrastructure and services in urban slums. The project period will expire in 2016 and thus there is no opportunity to amend it.

The project has links to result four through its focus on improved infrastructure and services and enhancing tenure security.

Sweden has long experience in land reforms and participatory slum upgrading, which are critical elements in the project. It is leveraging on loan funding from the World Bank and France.

The project is supported by Sweden, the World Bank and France.

The contribution focuses on national and county authorities as well as communities.

2.1.2.4. UN-HABITAT Empowering Partners for Sustainable Urban Development, 2015 - 2017

The overarching objective is an increased capacity of local and national governments to apply enabling norms and codes for improving urban extension, densification, urban planning and urban finance.

In its current form, the project is supporting capacity of national and county governments for sustainable urban development through policy reforms, formulation of county legislations and reform of urban planning approaches as well as strategies for urban renewal.

The project is not liked to other focus areas or results.

Sweden is a major partner to UN-Habitat. The project links UN-Habitat global experiences with its urban reforms in Kenya.

The contribution focuses on national and county authorities.

2.1.2.5. Enhanced Complementarity and Capacity for Sustainable Resilience Building in the Kenya’s Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (Dec 2014 - June 2018)

The aim of the project is to strengthen the foundation for an efficient, coordinated, government-led response to food insecurity in the ASALs by means of three building blocks: 1) to ensure complementarity of WFP’s programmes in the ASALs with the Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP) and other large-scale national safety net programmes, by means of building capacity of the national social protection secretariat; 2) transferring WFP’s analytical and logistics expertise to 4 county government (Samburu, Baringo, Wajir,
Marsabit) to enable them to monitor the food security situation, prepare for and respond to food security and nutrition-related shocks; and 3) strengthening WFP’s productive safety net programme (cash-for-assets activities that build resilience to drought) and positioning it for transition to government ownership. The activity period runs until December 2017.

The project contributes to strengthening the capacity of county level institutions to address primarily drought-related emergencies and shocks linked to R1:2, it also delivers results on R1:1 through the asset creation projects that focus on water resources management, water storage, soil protection, etc. In addition, the cash transfer building block delivers results on R3:3 on Social Protection as it hands out monthly conditional cash transfers (gender disaggregated data) in 6 semi-arid counties. The cash transfer component is actually the largest in terms of funding and is reported under 3.3. in table 1 in the introduction. The complementarity initiative under building block 1 also delivers results on R3:3 in terms of strategic coordination of Kenya’s national safety nets.

This project provides synergies between R1:1 and R1:2 as well as to R3:1 and R3:3. Important to look at synergies between this project and the agriculture sector support where the focus is small-holder farmers. The building block on cash transfers and asset creation is linked to R3:1 Increased productivity, sustainability and refinement in small-scale agriculture.

The justification for providing Swedish funding to this project: it provides a link between humanitarian assistance and long-term development cooperation by institutionalizing capacities at national level as well as at local level to deal with crises. It is foreseen to provide important learning on resilience practice to the whole of Sida. It is a very good example of a strong partnership between the national government, county governments and a UN body. The WFP project is in line with the government’s agenda and the national framework for Ending Drought Emergencies. It has the potential of becoming a flagship resilience project.

There are quite a few donors engaged in resilience programming given that it spans over multiples sectors from agriculture, water, health and education: USAID, EU, DFID, AusAid, GIZ, SDC, etc.

The different building blocks of the project focus on different layers: BB1: national authorities, BB2: local and national authorities, BB3: households, communities and authorities.

2.1.3. Result 3: Increased production and improved access to renewable energy

There are no contributions currently under this result however one is being prepared (Akiira).

2.1.4. Result 4: Improved access to environmentally sustainable basic services


The overarching objective is to contribute to equitable access to quality water, basic sanitation and enhanced water resources management for the underserved rural communities. Water and sanitation supply being a devolved function, this project has selected six counties (Narok, Kwale, Migori, Tharaka Nithi, Laikipia and Nandi) that will be supported to strengthen their capacity for improved water resources management and more sustainable and effective service provision of water supply and sanitation together with relevant actors at county level. The implementing partner is the national water institution Water Services Trust Fund, the project is a joint undertaking with Finland and the activity period stretches until December 2018.

The project contributes to more than one result under focal area 1 given that it both focuses on service delivery and the protection of the water resource: R1:4 Access to Environmentally Sustainable Basic
Services by means of providing sustainable water and sanitation services to rural communities in 6 counties, and R1:1 Strengthened management of Natural Resources and Ecosystem Services by means of support to Water Resources Users Associations for improved water resources management in 6 counties. (Given more funds to water supply it is placed under this result.) Given the ambitious approach to integrate gender and social inclusion across all project components it will also contribute to R2:4 Capacity of Public Institutions to promote gender equality.

The project provides synergies between different results of focal area 1, notably R1 and R4. It is also an important prerequisite for focal area 3 given that sustainable commercialization of agriculture depends to a great extent on robust water resources management, in addition, access to basic services is a prerequisite especially for women to be able to engage in income generating activities rather than dedicating time to fetch water. There are furthermore links to focal area 2 and the support to democratic institutions especially at county level. At project level the synergies with OBA Water Supply, KEWASNET Water Governance, ASDSP, CSUDP, Devolution support as well as NETFUND and WFP resilience programme are being/could be explored further.

Justifications for Swedish funding to the project: it has a pro-poor, as well as gender focus, it provides hands-on supports to the devolution process in a critical sector, it supports the crucial linkage between water supply and protection of the water resource, and it aims at making the investments in rural areas more sustainable and effective by strong focus on operations and management. The aim is to support WSTF in becoming a basket fund for both donors and private sector.

The other donors active in the rural water supply/sanitation and Water Resources Management are: Finland, Denmark, EU (through Water Services Trust Fund) and USAID, WB, NL and JICA. The donor coordination is fairly good thus minimizing overlaps. Some donors only focus on ASAL counties.

This project focuses primarily on authorities at county level (county government and county water companies) with the ultimate beneficiaries being rural communities. At the same time, the capacity of the national authority, Water Services Trust Fund, is also being developed.

2.1.4.2. OBA in Water Supply (Dec 2013-Dec 2018)

The project development objective is to increase the number of people in low income areas with access to improved water supply and sanitation services. This is realized by incentivizing urban water companies (Water Service Providers – WSPs) to invest in water supply and sanitation improvement sub-projects by applying one-off OBA subsidies (60% of the commercial loan) to make water and sanitation access affordable. The subsidy is paid out once outputs have been delivered and verified. Funds are channelled through WB Global Partnership on Output based Aid and is implemented by the national Water Institution Water Services Trust Fund. The end of the activity period is 30 June 2018. Swedish funding of 85 MSEK was disbursed as a lump sum in 2012.

The project contributes directly in its current form to the result on Improved Access to Environmentally Sustainable Basic services by means of the increased individual water connections, water kiosks and toilets built.

Synergies can be found with R1:1 given that improved sanitation implies that ecosystems are affected favourably, there is also a link to focal area 3 given that access to basic services is a prerequisite especially for women to be able to engage in income generating activities rather than dedicating time to fetch water. At project level, there are synergies with WSTF rural water and sanitation programme, CSUDP and KEWASNET.
Other factors justifying Swedish funding are the following: the project has a pro-poor focus, it paves the way for commercial financing in the water sector and it links disbursements to concrete results achieved. An added bonus is the possibility to link this project with the support to rural water and sanitation also through the Water Services Trust Fund.

In addition to the Swedish funding to GPOBA to this programme, other donors engaged in commercial financing in the water sector are: KfW (also through the Water Services Trust Fund), WB, USAID and NL.

The project focuses on delivering services to households and to build capacity of Water companies (owned by county governments) to become eligible for commercial loans from banks.

2.1.5. Gaps

Within the current projects and programmes gaps can be found in terms of delivering directly on the results R1:1 ‘Enhanced national resources management and ecosystem services’ and R1:2 ‘Enhanced capacity of public institutions and other actors at national and local levels to contribute to environmental sustainability, increased resilience to environmental, climate change and natural disasters, and reduced climate impact’. A number of contributions contribute to the result, however, for many it is not the main objective. There is a need to make strategic decisions in terms of what areas to priorities for NRM or geographic location (R1:1) and what institutions/actors or level to prioritise for capacity building of institutions/actors (R1:2). Current contributions only to some extent deliver on the renewable energy result. Also, there is no ongoing contribution focusing on R1:3 “Increased production and improved access to renewable energy” although one is being prepared (Akiira).

2.2. Focus Area 2: The strengthening of democracy and equality, and greater respect for human rights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Number of contr.</th>
<th>Indirect link</th>
<th>Volume 2016</th>
<th>Volume 2017</th>
<th>Volume 2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R2:1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62 375 558</td>
<td>60 664 719</td>
<td>33 000 000</td>
<td>156 040 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2:2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28 935 788</td>
<td>16 000 000</td>
<td>10 500 000</td>
<td>55 435 788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2:3</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44 600 000</td>
<td>43 660 950</td>
<td>6 750 000</td>
<td>95 010 950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2:4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20 250 000</td>
<td>8 000 000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28 250 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>156 161 346</td>
<td>128 325 669</td>
<td>50 250 000</td>
<td>334 737 015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One is not an official support and is not reported on here.

2.2.1. Result 1: Strengthen democratic institutions at national and local level

2.2.1.1. Support to Office of the Auditor General (2014-2016)

The overall objective is to promote and support accountability in the public sector, to enhance quality of audit reports, to transform the organisation for improved efficiency and effectiveness and to enhance capacity and systems at OAG. The activity period ends in April 2016.

The support contributes to the strengthening of democratic institutions primarily at the national level however with devolution, also at county level. A medium-term support (3-4 years) has been discussed and would be designed to focus on strengthening to promote and support accountability in the public sector, both at national and local level.

The contribution is linked to result 3 in the same focus area e.g. in that it enables media and civil society to base itself on the national and county audit reports in their work to hold the government to account for the use of public funds. It could also be considered to be linked to result 4 under focus area 3 in that greater accountability and transparency would stimulate economic development and attract investments.
Prior to 2013, Sweden provided broader support to the PFM reform strategy. However, when a prioritization had to be made, the audit function was selected as one of the key priorities for Sweden to support. The choice also fits well with the division of labour amongst the donors active in the PFM area.

Sweden and Denmark are the only donors providing core support to OAG. Germany (GIZ) and the World Bank provide technical support. The Swedish National Audit Office is also providing technical support which complements the Swedish core support.

The contribution focuses in the first instance on the authorities’ and national level.

2.2.1.2. Institutional Collaboration between Swedish Tax Agency (STA) and Kenya Revenue Authority (KRA) (2014-2018)

The overall objective of the institutional capacity development is to increase tax revenue, tax base and level of compliance with tax regulations through: i) improved data on and analysis of the taxpayers; ii) increased efficiency in the tax administration; iii) identification and treatment of risks; and iv) increased customer focus. These objectives are supported by Kenya’s National PFM Reform Strategy 2013-2018 as well as the KRA Fifth and Sixth Corporate Plan 2012/13-2014/15 and 2015/16-2017/18 respectively. The activity period ends 31 December 2017.

The support contributes to the strengthening of the tax authority in Kenya and is expected to lead to higher internal resource mobilization which is also one of the commitments made in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda as a means to increase the financing for development, see further below. KRA also collaborates with the counties to strengthen resource mobilization at the devolved level.

There are no direct synergies with any of the other results however increased resource mobilisation and possibilities for Kenya to increase e.g. development expenditures, should have a beneficial impact indirectly on the other results areas depending on how the public funds are being used.

The Addis Ababa Action Agenda, article 22 says “We recognize that significant additional domestic public resources, supplemented by international assistance as appropriate, will be critical to realizing sustainable development and achieve the SDGs. We commit to enhance revenue administration through modernized, progressive tax systems, improved tax policy and more efficient tax collection. We will work to improve the fairness, transparency, efficiency and effectiveness of our tax systems, including by broadening the tax base and continuing efforts to integrate the informal sector into the formal economy in line with country circumstances. In this regard, we will strengthen international cooperation to support efforts to build capacity in developing countries, including through enhanced official development assistance (ODA)”.

Sweden joined The Addis Tax Initiative, launched in a side event in Addis in July 2015, and has thereby committed to double the support to tax projects by 2020. Sida has a long history of supporting tax administrations in partner countries, often with the Swedish Tax Agency (Skatteverket) as the institutional partner. Regarding the specific Kenya case, as mentioned under the support to OAG, support to the tax authority and resource mobilisation was selected along with the support to the Supreme Audit Institution, OAG, as one of the key priorities for Sweden when a prioritization had to be made. The choice also fits well with the division of labour amongst the donors active in the PFM area.

Denmark is providing some support to KRA and IMF is doing technical assistance. Sweden is the main donor however.

The contribution focuses in the first instance on the authorities’ level and secondly on national level.

2.2.1.3. Data Warehouse and Business Intelligence (DWBI) (2014-2018)
This contribution is linked to the institutional collaboration between KRA and STA and has the same overall objective. It complements the institutional collaboration with the implementation of a functional Data Warehouse that provides a holistic view of the tax payer that will enhance compliance and support forecasting and decision-making processes at the enterprise level. The activity period ends 31 December 2017.

As for the institutional collaboration, the support to KRA and the DWBI solution contributes to the strengthening of the tax authority in Kenya and is expected to lead to higher internal resource mobilization which is also one of the commitments made in the Addis Ababa Action Agenda as a means to increase the financing for development as earlier discussed. KRA also collaborates with the counties to strengthen resource mobilization at the devolved level.

As with the institutional support, there are no direct synergies with any of the other results however increased resource mobilisation and possibilities for Kenya to increase e.g. development expenditures, should have a beneficial impact indirectly on the other results areas depending on how the public funds are being used.

As for the institutional collaboration, Sweden joined The Addis Tax Initiative, launched in a side event in Addis July 15, and has thereby committed to double the support to tax projects by 2020.

Denmark also provides funding for the DWBI solution.

The contribution focuses in the first instance on the authorities’ level.

2.2.1.4. World Bank Devolution Trust Fund (201504-201812)

The objectives of the contribution is to improve knowledge and capacity of national and county level stakeholders to implement a successful devolution process, and to help build the accountability relationship between the new county governments and Kenyan citizens for improved efficiency and development results. In addition, KADP aims to strengthen core governance systems including strengthening planning, budgeting, M&E, and citizen engagement in support of the devolution process, at both national and county level.

This is a capacity building contribution focusing on strengthening devolution related institutions both at the National and County levels.

The Contribution is linked to R2:3 since it will contribute to building accountability relationships between governments at both levels and the citizenry e.g. through participatory planning and budgeting instruments, M&E systems etc.

The critical role devolution will play in accelerating the achievement of development priorities, leveraging on the World Banks comparative advantage.

The World Bank Trust fund which implements the contribution has other donors which include Dfid, USAID, Finland, Denmark and the EU.

The focus is on authorities.

2.2.1.5. Statistics Support (agreement period 201412–201905)

The overall project objective is that KNBS and the National Statistical System (NSS) in Kenya have improved its institutional capacity to deliver relevant, reliable and timely statistical information. Furthermore that the system is working towards sound statistical methods and practices in line with international standards.
The contribution contributes to R2:1.

The contribution is supporting KNBS methodologically and institutionally as an organization to be able to produce timely and reliable statistics for decision making. Since the support is at methodological level, there might be no direct links but indirectly, timely and reliable statistics supports virtually sectors.

This is an institutional collaboration and Kenya is getting to that level of development cooperation.

Only Sweden is providing TA/Institutional collaboration support. Other donors active in other areas of programmatic support include the World Bank, USAID and UNFPA.

The focus is on authorities.

2.2.1.6. UNDP Devolution support (Agreement period 201412-201712)

The overall objective of the contribution is to support to the implementation of devolved government to achieve improved governance and socio-economic development in Kenya.

It contributes to R2:1 in the new strategy.

It has synergies with R2:3 and R2:4.

Sweden is leveraging on the convening power of UNDP to implement such a sensitive but important programme. Devolution is a key area for accelerating achievement of development results.

Other donors supporting the programme include: USAID, DFID and Norway.

The focus is on authorities.

2.2.1.7. IDEA Electoral Support (Agreement period 201507-201712)

The overall objective of this contribution is to support key democratic institutions’ role in guaranteeing a peaceful and levelled playing field in electoral contestation.

It contributes to R2:1 in the current strategy.

The contribution links to R2:3 and R2:4.

It was a strategic choice to work on elections through non-state actors, IDEA’s comparative advantage in electoral issues was the other motivation to work through them.

IDEA is supported only by Sweden but the elections area is supported by many other donors: EU, USAID, DFID, Denmark, Canada, and UNDP.

The contribution focuses on authorities.

2.2.1.8. UNDP Peace & Security – 2015-2018

The overarching objective is to develop institutional capacities for policy formulation and implementation, deepening structures for peacebuilding, cohesion and community security, reducing community security.
threat, improving response to conflicts, risks and disasters as well as mainstreaming peacebuilding, reconciliation and community security in national and country development agendas.

The result is relevant to the new strategy and it can be amended to take into consideration a focus on small arms and light weapons reduction. As current strategy has a small budget and focus on SALW’s.

This contribution is relevant to the 2,2,4 as it strengthens public institutions and civil society, 2,3,2 as it provides opportunities for improved conditions for women and young people alternative livelihoods and 2,1,2 on increasing resilience to climate change at national and local levels.

Other motivation for Sweden funding the contribution is that it’s a prerequisite for development and for all other results in the strategy.

Other donors active in the area/sector are: Dfid, NL, WB, USAID. Many of these donors focus on violent extremism.

The contribution focuses on all levels i.e.: i) households, ii) communities, iii) provincial groupings and iv) authorities and v) national).

2.2.1.9. Civil Society Urban Development Platform, 2015 -2019

The overarching objective: strengthened civic competencies for equitable and just urban society in selected Counties of Kenya.

In its current form, contribution responds to the result 1 by supporting social planning approaches in urban planning; community empowerment through civic education, and; social accountability mechanisms;

The contribution links to focus area 1, result 4 through pilot projects that respond to climate change induced shocks in informal settlements and focus area 3, result 2, through the contribution’s focus on enhancement of economic opportunities for women and youth in informal settlements.

Support to urban civil society is limited and fragmented. Sweden has sought to support structured and coordinated civil society engagement in the sector as a result of which civil society has greatly influenced recent policy and legislative reforms as well as practice in urban development.

There are few bilateral donors supporting civil society in the urban sector making Swedish a critical lifeline for civil society participation in sector reforms.

The contribution focuses on households, communities and provincial groupings.

2.2.2. Result 2: Strengthening the rule of law

2.2.2.1. Support to police reform basket fund via UNODC (2013-2016)

The overall objective is to support the Government of Kenya in its efforts to transform the National Police Service (NPS) into an effective, efficient and trusted security agency for Kenyans in line with the 2010 Constitution.

The support contributes to the strengthening of the rule of law – as well as democratic institutions (Result 2.2.1) - both at the national level and at the country level. i) The support is in line with the results set for the new strategy.
The results are, as just mentioned, linked to result 2.2.1 in the same result area and there will be strong synergies with result 2.2.3. The latter area includes support to a number of civil society organisations working with police reform, both in regard of advocacy and lobbying as well as service delivery. These synergies have been planned by the embassy.

Prime reason for this support is the urgent need for police reform. Not many donors are active in this area so in that sense it fits with donor role divisions. Sweden aims at supporting rule of law and the chain of justice – the police is a vital part of this chain. From the beginning this was a bilateral support via the Swedish police (which had been approached directly by the Kenyan police requesting support) which was later complemented by multilateral support via UNODC. Later Sweden decided to wrap up the bilateral support and only stay with the multilateral channel.

It is primarily the US and the UK who are active in this area. (Germany has got a police advisor but that person deals more with CVE-issues and not police reform. the EU is also actively participating in the donor group for police reform but has no support.)

This contribution focuses on authorities at national and county level and through the work with community policing, also on the community level.

2.2.2.2. Support to RWI Prisons Programme 2015-2017 (with possible extension of two years)

The main objective is to enhance compliance with international human rights standards in the management of Kenya’s correctional system, including through supporting more human rights responsive and coordinated approaches in the administration of justice in Kenya.

The contribution supports the results of the new strategy in its current format. The contribution supports result 2.2.1 (Strengthening institutions at national level), 2.2.2 Rule of Law and result 2.2.4 (Strengthened capacities of public institutions working to promote equality and respect for human rights, with a focus on women and girls”). It shall however be noted that RWI has certain gender components of its human rights work but the whole programme is not focused towards gender.

There are strong synergies with the Programme on prisons and probations reform managed by the Swedish Prison and Probation Service and the two programs even have joint sub-projects and a joint Steering structure. The SPPS-programme contributes to the same three results as the RWI-programme.

Other reasons for Sweden being engaged in this area: Divison of roles with other funders: No other bilateral funder is engaged in this area and since prisons and probation reform is an urgent area of reform, Sweden found it important to support such reform. Since Sweden prioritizes rule of law and the justice chain in its support to Kenya, as well as human rights work, prisons reform with a focus on human rights was felt to be an important area. RWI has also got good competence within this area which is an added value.

Apart from Sweden there are no other bilateral donors engaged in prisons- and probation reform. UNODC is engaged to a small extent, otherwise the donors in this sector tend to be small, often Christian, foundations and CSOs. Only smaller foundations and the like

Which programmatic layer does this contribution focus on: National government authority with its institutions out in the whole country.

2.2.2.3. Support to Judiciary Reforms via German GIZ (2014-2016)
The overall objective is to sustain and deepen the transformation of the Judiciary through accountable structures to enhance access to and delivery of justice.

This contribution contributes to all the four results under result area 2.2. It aims at supporting Judiciary reform within all its institutions out in the country as well as civil society organizations engaged in justice sector reform and other community structures such as the Court Users’ Committees at the court stations. It has quite strong gender components although this is not the overall focus of the programme. The programme supports the goals of the new strategy. It should be noted that this reform programme is part of a bigger anti-corruption programme managed by German GIZ – the latter is interested in getting Sweden on board for the bigger programme beyond 2016. The Embassy has not discussed this proposal yet.

There are many synergies between this programme and other contributions: There are strong links to the support to prisons reform but also to police reform. Several of the civil society organizations supported under result 2.2.3 work with justice sector reform and one of the partners, Legal resource Foundation, receives support both via GIZ and Swedish Diakonia. These synergies were planned for by the Embassy.

Judiciary reform is one of the most urgent areas of reform, which is why Sweden is engaged in this area. Through the partnership with GIZ comparative advantages have been achieved – Sweden has the bilateral clout while GIZ has the professional expertise. Since Sweden aims at support rle of law and the justice chain in Kenya, Judiciary is a vital part in this.

World Bank, US, UK, Netherlands, Denmark, UNDP, UNODC, IDLO, IJM

This programme focusses on the national authority with all its branches in the whole country as well as on communities’ access to justice.

2.2.4. Support to prisons and probations reform through the Swedish Prison and Probation Service/SPPS (2015-2018)

The two overall programme objectives are: 1) Improved capacity at the Kenya Prison Service (KPS) to use a needs-based approach in the rehabilitation of prisoners in a secure and humane environment; and 2) improved capacity of the Kenya Probation and Aftercare Service (KPAS) to develop a more efficient and professional alternative supervised sanction in Kenya.

This contribution supports the results of the new strategy and three of the four results under result area 2.2.2 are supported through this contribution, namely 2.2.1, 2.2. and 2.2.4. The programme has got strong gender components, as well as a strong focus on young people and vulnerable groups. This is the first phase of support – it is expected that there will be continued support beyond 2018 – it takes time to reform governmental institutions.

The programme has strong synergies with the RWI-contribution, both joint sub-projects as well as a joint Steering structure. A few of the civil society organizations supported under result 2.2.3 are dealing with prison reform so there will be synergies there.

The motivation for Sweden funding this area: See the comments under the RWI-contribution. SPPS also has a comparative advantage internationally in this field – together with Canada Sweden is regarded to be one of the most progressive countries in the world when it comes to reform of the correctional services.

There are no other bilateral donors engaged in this area. UNODC is engaged to a small extent, otherwise it tends to be smaller CSOs etc.
This contribution focuses on the national institutions with all its branches in the country (prisons and probation offices).

### 2.2.2.5. Seconded police advisor to UNODC (2015-2016)

See comments under the basket fund support via UNODC.

### 2.2.3. Result 3: Strengthened capacity of the media and civil society to promote democratic development and accountability

#### 2.2.3.1. EISA Support to the Electoral Process (201505-201708)

The objective of the programme is to achieve more progress towards consolidated democratic and participatory electoral processes with a particular focus on Political Parties and Participation of women in the electoral process.

It contributes to R2:3 and R2:4 in the new strategy.

Contributes to R2:4 through enhancing the participation of women in the electoral...

Motivation for Sweden’s funding; Consolidation of results achieved during phase1, Strategic choice to work through civil society in supporting elections as a lesson learnt from 2013.

Other donors supporting EISA include Denmark and Dfid

The focus is on authorities (programmatic layer).

#### 2.2.3.2. International Budget Partnership (2013-2016)

There are four overall goals: i) increase demand for budget transparency at national level throughout the budget cycle and the use of this information in public debate and public policy; ii): increase the supply of timely and accessible budget information at national level; iii) transparency and engagement at county level with an aim to ensure continuity and enhancement of local service delivery; and iv) supporting an effective, transparent and fair transition process in matters of public finance, with a focus on the distribution of funds across and among levels of government. The activity period ends in September 2016

The contribution fits well with the new strategy in that it strengthens the capacity of civil society to promote democratic development and accountability. It complements the support to OAG.

It is somewhat linked to result 1 under focus area two and indirectly to focus area 1 in that it assesses the use of public funds and the provision of basic social services.

The rationale for Sweden supporting IBP is as part of the prioritization process that was discussed under the support to OAG and KRA, given Sweden’s choice to focus on accountability and transparency. A complementary support to the PFM demand side through IBP was deemed relevant. Rather than continuing with a separate support to IBP beyond September 2016, there is an idea to integrate it into the Diakonia umbrella support which would also strengthen the umbrella support in the PFM area.

There are no other bilateral donors providing funding to IBP Kenya however IBP also gets funding from Bill and Melinda Gates and the Omidyar Foundations.

The contribution focuses in the first instance on the communities and national programmatic level.
2.2.3.3. Water Sector Governance Support programme – KEWASNET (Nov 2014-June 2018)

The overarching objective is to ensure that Kenyan citizens enjoy a better quality of life through effective and expanded access to basic WASH services and sustainable management of water resources and the environment. This change stems from better governance at both national and county level brought about by a strong and sustainable network of professionally capable civil society organizations pushing for change. The project is implemented by KEWASNET, Kenya Water and Sanitation CSO network, and the activity period ends in December 2017.

The project contributes to result R2:3 in terms of establishing participation and accountability mechanisms at county level, doing budget tracking at county level, R1:2 and somewhat to R1:1.

Synergies are very strong with the focal area 1, R1:1, R1:2 and R1:4 given that many issues related to poor management of environment, natural resources, and the negative impacts of climate change are rights-based. The focus on the governance in the water sector is therefore a crucial complement to the other partnerships in the water sector with government institutions at national and county level.

Swedish funding to the project is justified by the complementarity this CSO support provides to the other partnerships with government institutions in the water sector, in its watch-dog function, accountability at national and county level, participation mechanisms at county level, as well as in its role to coordinate the CSO sector in water. It is timely project given the devolution process and the opportunity to hold county governments accountable for delivery of water and sanitation services.

Few donors support organized CSOs networks in the water sector, GIZ and NL to a limited extent, as well as SDC and USAID.

The project focuses on different programmatic layers: mobilizing the participation of communities while holding county governments as well as relevant national authorities accountable for water supply and Water Resources Management.

2.2.3.4. Democracy and Human Rights Program - Diakonia (201506-201812)

The overall objective for the program is: Increased Respect for Human Rights, Gender Equality and strengthened Democratic Governance at national and local level. The Activity period ends in December 2017.

The support will contribute to: Improved access to justice through effective key institutions within the justice sector that respects human rights and the rule of law, and effective advocacy carried out by media and stakeholders in civil society at local and national level in order to strengthen democratic culture and increased accountability.

The program will contribute to the results (R2:3, R2:4) as stated in the new strategy in its current format.

This support is set up in such a way that it complements the support that Sweden has to the institutional work with the Police, Prisons and Probation and the Judiciary (R2:2).

This umbrella support reaches out to a large number of Kenyan CSO. The set-up allows for a rather quick response, if and when needs/opportunities arises.

There are no other donors to this newly started, however the set-up would facilitate other donors to join. Other donors in the sector are Netherlands, USAID, Finland.

The contribution focuses on CSOs, communities, provincial groupings and authorities.
2.2.3.5. Wajibu Wetu – Forum Syd (201510-201912)

Wajibu Wetu overall objective is: Strengthened demand for democratic culture, human rights and gender equality through the media and CSOs. The activity period ends December 2018. The support will contribute to: Empowered right holders proactively demand democratic culture, gender equality and human rights; Increased capacity of targeted CSOs/CBOs for effective use of innovative advocacy mechanisms to demand for democratic culture, gender equality and human rights (social media, satire, animation, artivism, short films, investigative journalism), and Improved coordination and cooperation among CSOs/CBOs in demanding for a democratic culture, gender equality and human rights.

The program will contribute to the results (R2:3, R2:4) as stated in the new strategy in its current format. Part of the funding is reported under 2:4.

The programme is newly started and it will seek synergies not only within Focus area 2, but also within the other two focus areas.

This umbrella support reaches out to a large number of Kenyan CSO and CBOs, both through grants and seed-grants which allows support to smaller less established organisations. The set-up allows for a rather quick response, if and when needs/opportunities arise.

There are no other donors to this newly started, however the set-up would facilitate other donors to join. Other donors in the sector are Netherlands, USAID, Henrich Boll.

The contribution focuses on individuals, CBOs, CSOs, communities, provincial groupings.

2.2.3.6. Action for Transparency - FOJO (201504-201912)

The overall objective is to contribute to strengthened democratic accountability and transparency in Kenya through citizen monitoring of government expenditure, in order to uncover suspected corruption and mismanagement of public funds. The activity period ends in March 2019.

The program will develop and implement a set of secure tools and methodologies for carrying out citizen monitoring of Kenyan government budgeting and expenditure. Journalists, community leaders, civil society activists and local civil servants will be empowered to monitor government funds and report suspected mismanagement in public administration, in order to defend their human rights to education and health care.

The program will contribute to the result R2:3 as stated in the new strategy in its current format.

Synergies will be sought with other results areas after the pilot phase is completed, allows for duplication in other counties and areas.

There are no other donors to this program. Other donors in the anti-corruption sector are GIZ, DFID, Finland and USAID.

The contribution focuses on individuals, media, CSOs, communities, and local authorities.

2.2.4. Result 4: Strengthened capacities of public institutions and civil society organizations working to promote equality and respect for human rights, with a focus on women and girls

2.2.4.1. Kenya Dialogues Project Phase 2 (agreement 201512-201806)
Overarching objective is “all Kenyans, especially the marginalized, experience and exercise the full power of the three constitutional promises of Integrity, Devolution and the Bill of rights”.

It contributes to R2:4 and has synergies with R2:1, R2:2, and R2:3.

It is considered a catalyst contribution. The results from phase 1 showed that there is a need for a CSO to work with directly on pressing issues of the day were the other motivation for Sweden.

Other Donors include: Norway, Netherlands, UNDP, Finland and Omidyar foundation.

The focus is on authorities.

2.2.4.2. Contribution UN Women 2014-2017

The overall goal of the programme is consolidating gender equality and women’s empowerment gains.

The intervention contributes to:
1) Women’s leadership and participation in governance
2) Economically empowered women benefiting from public procurement and agriculture value chains
3) Women and girls progressively living a life free from violence
4) Peace, security and humanitarian action are shaped by women’s leadership and participation
5) National and devolved planning fully reflects accountability for gender equality commitments and priorities.

The intervention is also linked to results 2.2.1 - strengthening democratic institutions at national and local level; 2.2.2 - strengthening the rule of law; 2.2.3 – Strengthened capacity of the media and civil society to promote democratic development and accountability; 2.3.1 increased productivity, sustainability and refinement in small-scale agriculture; 2.3.2 Improved conditions for especially women and young people in productive employment with decent working conditions.

Other motivation for Sweden funding the contribution is that it’s a cross-cutting issue and that is a priority area of the Swedish foreign policy for development cooperation.

Other donors active in the area/sector are Finland, Norway, USAID, and DfiD

Which programmatic layer does this contribution focus on (i) households, ii) communities, iii) provincial groupings and iv) authorities or v) national). All the above are relevant to this programme

2.2.4.3. OHCHR (201412-201712)

OHCHR’s thematic priorities for Kenya are: Widening Democratic Space, Combatting impunity and strengthening accountability and the rule of law, Strengthening the effectiveness of international human rights mechanisms and the progressive development of human rights law and standards, and Human Rights in development and in the economic sphere. Activity ends December 2016.

OHCHR are providing policy and technical advice to State Institutions, in the protection of Human Rights to ensure compliance of the legislation with international human rights standards. OHCHR a focus on technical assistance to establish a coordinated mechanism to ensure the implementation of the recommendations from all human rights mechanisms, including the UPR.

The program will contribute to the results (R2:2, R2:4) as stated in the new strategy in its current format.
OHCHR does not have other donors for the Kenya Office at the moment. Other donors in the sector are Netherlands, USAID, Norway, Finland and DFID.

The contribution supports institutions on local and national level, CSOs and UN.

2.2.5. Gaps

There are 24 contributions under focus area 2 and distributed between the 4 results although there are 9 contributions which directly targets result 2:1 whereas there are only 3 targeting result 2:4. Of these 24, only 15 contributions have forecasted disbursements in 2017 and 5 in 2018. The gaps in this area will therefore manifest starting next year, 2017, when the number of contributions and forecasted funding are being reduced. There is no funding currently foreseen for result 2:4 in 2018.

2.3. Focus Area 3: Improved opportunities and tools for poor people to improve their living conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Number of contr. direct link</th>
<th>Indirect link</th>
<th>Volume 2016</th>
<th>Volume 2017</th>
<th>Volume 2018</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3:1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40 000 000</td>
<td>15 059 217</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55 059 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3:2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3:3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34 750 000</td>
<td>30 250 000</td>
<td>11 000 000</td>
<td>76 000 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3:4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>74 750 000</td>
<td>45 309 217</td>
<td>11 000 000</td>
<td>131 059 217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.1. Result 1: Increased productivity, sustainability and refinement in small-scale agriculture

2.3.1.1. Agricultural Sector Support (ASDSP) (2012-2016)

The overall programme goal is to support the transformation of Kenya’s agricultural sector into an innovative, commercially oriented, competitive and modern industry that will contribute to poverty reduction, employment, and improved food security in rural and urban Kenya. It supports the Government of Kenya multiple goals of “an integrated form of commercialization and market-led growth (in agriculture), the pursuit of increased productivity, and strategies to address the special needs of vulnerable rural populations through resilience building.

This support contributes to the improved opportunities and tools for poor people to improve their living conditions through: Development and creation of an enabling legal, policy, and institutional environment required for the realization of smallholder farming transition from subsistence to commercial orientation; creation of long-term, viable commercialization of agricultural sector through critical value chains development; and promotion of long-term sustainable use of natural resource base for agricultural development as requisite to securing environmental services necessary for the realization of agricultural commercialization.

The programmatic layers targeted by this contribution are triple; i). The macro level which targets the national and county (sector coordination - institutional, legal and policy coordination); the Meso level (environmental resilience and social inclusion) which targets the counties institutions, and communities as well as households; iii). The Micro level (value chain development) targets both communities and households.

The support contributes to this result area (in the new strategy) by facilitating improved productivity, sustainability and refinement of small-scale agriculture through inculcation of inclusive business agriculture.
aimed at transforming subsistence farming. Further refinements will involve infusion of market driven technology based innovations and introduction of and establishment of quality standards to enhance agri-based trade.

Through increased sustainable agricultural productivity, this support also contributes in offering opportunities for productive employment for both women and the youth besides contributing immensely in building synergies with focus area 1 at the level of improved environmental resilience; reduced climate change impact; and production of renewable energy (Biogas, Biofuels).

Other motivation for Sweden funding the contribution: The majority of poor in Kenya derive their livelihood from agriculture and working with the poor to improve their conditions is at the core of Swedish policy. The farmer organizations and institutions developed through this contribution offer a big window for strengthening grassroots governance issues, democracy, equality and greater respect for human rights.

Other donors active in the area/sector: They include World Bank, Germany, EU, IFAD, AfDB, FAO

### 2.3.1.2. Financial Sector Deepening Kenya (FSDK) (2011-2015)

The contributions goal is development of financial markets for the poor with an aim to generate sustainable improvements in the livelihoods of lower-income households through reduced vulnerability to shocks, increased incomes and employment. Previous strategies (2006 – 2010 and 2011-2015) had a focus on development of a broad range of quality financial services provided by a stable and competitive financial system in a way which benefits the lives of the lower-income people in Kenya. The new strategy (2016-2020) will endeavour to develop a financial system which delivers real value to low-income people in Kenya.

This support contributes to development of the improved opportunities and tools for poor people to improve their living conditions through: Development and creation of an enabling legal, policy, and institutional environment as well as infrastructure required for improved access to financial services (financial inclusion). Besides the impact on many other sectors of the economy, the support has a high contribution necessary for refinement and commercialization of smallholder farming, the micro, and small agro-enterprises through facilitation to financial access. It offers solutions for challenge of access to finances necessary for transition from subsistence to commercial/business farming and development of viable agricultural value chains. The new strategy (2016-2020) is supportive of creating real value in the economy especially agriculture.

The contribution in its current form and the transition to the new strategic direction (FSD Strategy 2016-2020) serves well with emphasis on innovations which lead to creation of real value for the poor (linkage of financial access to the real economy).

This support has spinoff contributions and synergies with other results areas as it has benefits to the wider economy.

Other motivation for Sweden funding the contribution: a direct input in working with the poor to improve their conditions.

Other donors active in the area/sector: DFID, Gates Foundation, World Bank

Programmatic layer of focus: (i) households, ii) communities, iii) National and county.

### 2.3.1.3. Credit Guarantee Scheme (KCB and Multi-party – MFIs) (2012-2019)
The overarching objective of the contribution is to increase access to financial services to the actors in the agricultural sector through a risk sharing arrangement which leverages credit resources from the financial institutions. The aim is to expand financial institutions portfolio lending to the agricultural sector in support of the value chain development under ASDSP. A guarantee is used for this contribution. It is expected that the total mobilised capital over 7 years will amount to 232,7 MSEK.

This support has direct contribution to the result area as access to finances is a key challenge to development of Kenyan smallholder agriculture. This contributes directly as a tool for increased opportunities for poor smallholders to improve their conditions especially with respect to financing adoption of new agricultural technologies for increased productivity, sustainability and refinement of their farm activities.

The contribution serves the purpose in its current format but a possible refinement could be explored to include insurance into the guarantee scheme which would be an incentive for the financial institution to broaden their products offer.

Other motivation for Sweden funding the contribution: a direct input in working with the poor to improve their conditions.

Other donors active in the area/sector include USAID and EU

The programmatic layers of focus for this contribution include: (i) households, and ii) communities.

### 2.3.1.4. Hand in Hand Enterprise Development for Rural Families in Kenya Programme (EDRFK)

The overarching objective of this support is to contribute to poverty reduction and economic gender disparity in Kenya through a micro-enterprise creation approach based on self-help, providing training, skills and support to enable poor and underserved particularly women to build and sustain independent, market based economic activities.

The work of HiH EDRFK microenterprises development is anchored on agriculture and the offer is to prop up the underserved through training and access to credit resources to lift and transform them from subsistence production and be able to participate in higher value chain activities. This is augments higher value chain activities of ASDSP in mobilizing the social capital of the underserved communities in refinement of small-scale agriculture and serves to build resilience of the smallholders to undertake transformational steps towards improved sustainable agricultural productivity. With amendments, this contribution offers a window of opportunity to contribute to strengthened capacities of civil society organizations working to promote equality and respect for human rights, with a focus on women and girls.

Synergies and linkages are possible to result areas 1.2 and 2.4

Other motivation for Sweden funding the contribution: a direct input in working with the poor to improve their conditions.

Other donors active in the area/sector: DFID and USAID

Programmatic areas of focus for this contribution are both at the communities and household levels.

### 2.3.2. Result 2: Improved conditions for especially women and young people into productive employment with decent working conditions
There is no contribution having this result as the primary objective currently however 7 contributions link to is (secondary objective) and one is being planned (Tetra-Laval).

2.3.3. Result 3: Improved access to social safety nets for people living in poverty

2.3.3.1. UNICEF 2014-2018

The Overarching objective is to strengthen the protective environment for children through focusing on two areas Child and Social Protection systems for vulnerable children.

Contribution to result as per new strategy i) in its current format ii) through possible amendments - can be amended to include other resilience programme

Synergies (link to other results in the same focus area/other focus areas/results in other focus areas). The programme has synergies with the WFP programme – cash for assets and cash for food. Other motivation for Sweden funding the contribution: Social protection is also a key tool to support resilience of communities and households. The programme advocates for scale up of social protection to those households and communities experiencing the greatest vulnerability to strengthen their ability to withstand shocks, and will also support the establishment of scalable models for social protection to mitigate drought and respond to other shocks as appropriate including in urban set ups.

Other donors active in the area/sector: Dfid, World Bank,

This contribution focuses on the households, communities, and national level.

2.3.3.2. Enhanced Complementarity and Capacity for Sustainable Resilience Building in the Kenya’s Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (Dec 2014 - June 2018)

As reported on under 2.1.2.5, the component on the cash transfer building block delivers results on R3:3 on Social Protection as it hands out monthly conditional cash transfers (gender disaggregated data) in 6 semi-arid counties. The cash transfer component is actually the largest in terms of funding and is reported under 3.3. in table 1 in the introduction. The complementarity initiative under building block 1 also delivers results on R3:3 in terms of strategic coordination of Kenya’s national safety nets. The contribution is nevertheless accounted for as one single contribution and sorted under 1.2. although the funding has been split.

2.3.4. Result 4: Strengthened requirements for free and fair trade and investment for the benefit of sustainable development

There is no contribution having his result either as the primary objective or secondary objective.

2.3.5. Gaps

The gaps in this focus area are obvious only from looking at the number of contributions per result. Two of the four results, 3:2 and 3:4, do not have any contributions with that specific result as the primary objective. For result 3:2 there are 7 contributions linking to the result. Only for result 3:1 are there agreed funding for 2016-2017, there is only limited funding agreed currently addressing the focus area from 2018 and onwards.

3. Conclusions
A number of gaps have been identified. As regards 2016, almost all funds (89%) are already agreed and the number of contributions is many although there are a few results for which there is no contribution. For 2017 and 2018, the picture looks somewhat more scattered with clear discrepancies between the various results in terms of number of contributions and allocated funds. No contributions currently agreed extend to 2019-2020.

Focus area two consume 53% of the currently agreed funding with 24 contributions. Area one is allocated 26% of the funds already committed spread on eight contributions whereas the share for area three is 21% with six contributions. Hence, the current portfolio is heavier as regards democratic governance and human rights compared to the other focus areas, something that should be considered in the further analysis.

There are a number of contributions that have been introduced as “indicative” in the planning system. These as well as other contributions need to be assessed against a set of criteria to be developed taking into account i.a.
- the gaps’ analysis;
- measures to strengthen the synergies within focus areas and across focus areas;
- a stronger and more consistent consideration of the perspectives on multidimensional poverty and the priorities; environment and climate, conflict and gender;
- the assignment given by the Africa-department to the embassy.

A balance needs to be struck between contributing to the various results given in the strategy and decreasing the number of interventions. In other words, the challenge lies in utilising the limited financial allocation in a strategic way that has the most impact on the overarching objective of contributing to alleviating poverty.

One possible conclusion based on this portfolio analysis is that new commitments/contributions should be allocated to the results where there is no contribution or funds currently. This is particularly so for results under focus area 1 and 3. Also, various instruments need to be considered in the implementation as well as different actors.

Options such as extending the current agreements and spreading out activities with minimal additional funds could be considered. In addition, there are some contributions jointly being funded with other donors (e.g. World Bank Trust Fund for Devolution) where only the Swedish contribution is ending but the programmes will still be in place beyond 2018. In such cases, there is also the possibility of amending (extending) the agreements without any additional funds.

More precisely on the use of different instruments and taking into account the limited financial allocation provided to Kenya, guarantees is an interesting option. Below is a short analysis on that.

The use of guarantees is more relevant in some Result Areas as opposed to others. When analyzing the Kenyan portfolio and the Kenyan Result Strategy it is suggested to focus the use of guarantees in the results stated below. It is not always obvious to what extent the usage of guarantees is relevant or not, but when looking at the contributions under each result it is clearer that guarantees can be used more often instead of traditional grants.

Focus Area 1: Improved environment, reduced climate impact and strengthening resilience to environmental, climate change and natural disasters.

Result 1: Strengthened management of natural resources and ecosystem services.
In any contribution where there is focus on support to private sector in terms of innovations, green growth and business focusing on climate change and improvements in this area, then guarantees are applicable.
Guarantees can incentivize work towards a more green and resilient way of working by providing access to financing provided the business is green. Any investments in more green ways of working can be speeded up by the use of guarantees.

Result 2: Enhanced capacity to public institutions and other actors at national and local levels to contribute to environmental sustainability, increased resilience to environmental, climate change and natural disasters, and reduced climate impact.

Again many contributions in this area may be focused on capacity building, but as soon as we want to incentivize investments into more environmentally friendly areas we can do that via grants but also guarantees. The guarantees can be used to guarantee financing for certain investments, provided the investment reduces emission. When looking at contributions in a more detailed way there are probably other ways of using guarantees as well.

Result 3: Increased production and improved access to renewable energy
This is an area where guarantees are very relevant, especially in relation to production of energy. In relation to access to energy we need to focus more on what is preventing access, but often it is also linked to financing.

Result 4: Improved access to environmentally sustainable basic services
Regarding access to services it is very relevant to use guarantees, both on the investment side for production of services, but potentially also on the access side.

Focus area 2: The strengthening of democracy and equality, and greater respect for human rights.
Potentially guarantees can be used in some areas of this focus area as well, but it will be much more difficult. Considering this it may be more efficient to focus the usage of guarantees on the other focus areas. The support to media and other private sector entities can however be made with guarantees. It is also important to consider guarantees as a way to move some sectors from a pure grant based funding to something in between grant based and commercially financed business. Subsidised financing can be a way of moving from grant dependency to a more commercially based funding.

Focus area 3: Improved opportunities and tools for poor people to improve their living conditions

Result 1: Increased productivity, sustainability and refinement in small-scale agriculture
Here there are many opportunities to work with guarantees together with financial institutions or the organisations that we are working with in order to facilitate financing to certain groups. Financing in itself, is just an enabler and must usually be combined with funds for capacity building.

Result 2: Improved conditions for especially women and young people into productive employment with decent working conditions
In this areas there are also possibilities in relation to access to finance, but also by using different insurance schemes where guarantees also can be used.

Result 3: Improved access to social safety nets for people living in poverty
Possibly guarantees can incentives private sector to provide insurance in this sector.

Result 4: Strengthened requirement/possibilities for free and fair trade and investment for the benefit of the sustainable development
Potentially guarantees can be used here in relation to trade finance and export finance, which may improve the possibilities to trade. In addition guarantees can be used for financing of related infrastructure if that is viewed as necessary for the increase in trade and investments.
From the perspective of less funds available it is even more important to use more guarantees in order to free resources for the areas where grants are needed. Since we are also considering an outlook beyond aid it is even more important to always question to what extent a guarantee can be used instead of grants.
Annex 3: Workshop agenda

Systems analysis workshop

Operationalising Sweden’s development cooperation strategy for Kenya
16-18 March, Nairobi

### DAY ONE: Review of workshop aims; context analysis; and relevance of Sweden’s existing portfolio contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch, welcome and workshop aims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>Overview of Sweden’s current portfolio and the new development cooperation strategy for Kenya, highlighting areas of coherence or departure</td>
<td>Sida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-14:00</td>
<td>Introduction &amp; workshop objectives</td>
<td>OECD &amp; Sida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-14:30</td>
<td>Provide an overview of the OECD’s systems analysis framework and the steps over the next two and a half days; Clarify workshop agenda, objectives and outputs; Linkages to Sida processes and tools, including the emerging multidimensional poverty analysis and conflict sensitivity framework</td>
<td>OECD &amp; Sida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45-15:30</td>
<td>Risk-informed context analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45-15:30</td>
<td>Presentation and review of the work of the programme team on the context analysis; Building a common understanding of the rationale for the ‘risk informed’ context analysis and the focus on strengthening ‘assets’; Discussion on the relevance of the context analysis for Sweden’s strategy and theory of change</td>
<td>OECD &amp; Sida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:30</td>
<td>Relevance of existing portfolio contributions to the current context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:30</td>
<td>Overview of portfolio analysis / review; Mapping the relevance of existing portfolio contributions to strengthening ‘assets’, reducing risks and addressing the consequences and impacts of those risks in the Kenyan context</td>
<td>OECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-16:35</td>
<td>Summary of day one and outline of day two agenda</td>
<td>OECD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DAY TWO: Identifying portfolio contributions and stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome &amp; recap</td>
<td>Recap of day one; Clarification of day two objectives</td>
<td>OECD &amp; Sida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:30-08:45</td>
<td>On the basis of the day one analysis, identify which aspects of the Kenyan context are not being addressed by Sweden’s current portfolio contributions; Explore potential interventions that would address these gaps and thereby contribute to Kenya’s development outcomes</td>
<td>OECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:45-10:45</td>
<td>Assessing current contributions and opportunities for the Kenya strategy</td>
<td>OECD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coffee
### DAY THREE: Linkages, coherence, indicators & sequencing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 08:30-08:45   | Welcome & recap **Recap of day one**  
**Clarification of day three objectives**                                                                                       | Sida       |
| 08:45-10:00   | Identifying portfolio contributions across different ‘layers’ of Kenyan society **On the basis of the day two analysis, identify and validate the contribution of the programme portfolio across different ‘layers’ of Kenyan ‘society’ | OECD       |
| 10:30-12:00   | Coherence between result areas; development, humanitarian and political; and other programmes **Identify opportunities to strengthen linkages and coherence between result areas; Sweden’s humanitarian portfolio; and global, regional and national political and trade objectives ('beyond aid'); and other actors’ programming** | OECD       |
| 13:00-14:00   | Lunch                                                                                                                                     | OECD       |
| 14:15-15:45   | Identifying absorptive, adaptive and transformative capacities to inform the Monitoring Framework  
**Building a common understanding of how portfolio contributions can strengthen absorptive, adaptive and transformative capacities in the Kenyan context and how this analysis can help to inform the development of the Monitoring Framework for the strategy** | OECD       |
| 15:45-16:15   | Next steps  
**Consolidating the analysis and agreeing next steps to finalise the Operationalization Plan for the Kenya strategy** | OECD       |
| 16:15-16:30   | Summary and end of workshop  
**Summary of workshop**                                                                                                          | Sida       |
## Annex 4: Workshop participants

<table>
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<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
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</tr>
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<tbody>
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<td>1</td>
<td>Sandra Diesel</td>
<td>Counsellor, Head of Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Elisabeth Folkunger</td>
<td>Senior Programme Manager (Water), Deputy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Louise Bermşjö</td>
<td>Programme Manager (Democracy &amp; Human Rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lollo Darin</td>
<td>Economist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Martin Ejerfeldt</td>
<td>Controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nicholas Imbugwa</td>
<td>Programme Manager (Democratic Governance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Anne Ljung</td>
<td>Senior Programme Manager (Democracy &amp; Human Rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Patricia Maina</td>
<td>Programme Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Duncan Marigi</td>
<td>Programme Manager (Agriculture &amp; Rural Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Josephine Mwangi</td>
<td>Programme Manager (Civil Society, Gender and Child Rights)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>John Ndiritu</td>
<td>Senior Programme Manager (Urban Development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nicholas Ngece</td>
<td>Programme Manager (Environ. &amp; Climate change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Maria Stridsman</td>
<td>Senior Programme Manager (Power Africa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mathias Kruger</td>
<td>Senior Programme Manager (Humanitarian Support and Resilience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lena Berglöv</td>
<td>Adviser, Loans &amp; Guarantees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fuad Mohamed</td>
<td>Programme Officer (Private sector devt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Karin A Andersson</td>
<td>Head of Unit, Africa Department/Sida HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>True Schedvin</td>
<td>Chief Economy Team/ Sida HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Angelica Broman</td>
<td>ANASTRAT, Africa Department/Sida HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Hugh MacLeman</td>
<td>Policy Advisor/Conflict, fragility &amp; resilience, OCED-DAC (Facilitator)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>