Kenya Country Programme 2016–2020

Thematic Programme for Governance

Development Engagement Document

Support to Civil Society

(The URAIA Trust)

Dev. Engagement Gov.	Outcome	Outputs
Support to Civil Society	Increased participation, engagement and oversight by civil society in governance at the national and county level. Increased citizen participation and engagement in governance processes and in monitoring performance of county governments.	• Increased capacity of civil society organizations (CSOs) to participate in governance at county and national levels. • Secure and expanded national and county spaces (statutory and others) for civil society engagement. • Increased civic awareness on the Constitution of Kenya 2010 and the devolved system of government in the target counties • CSOs facilitating citizens including women, youth and minorities to carry out social accountability on governance processes at county level.
Budget	**DE partner**	
The Danish contribution is DKK 55 million to a total budget of DKK 200 million.	The URAIA Trust is a registered Kenyan civil society trust supporting Kenya's democratic transformation.	

Management arrangements

Denmark will provide basket funding to URAIA alongside other donors as has been the practice for the last 15 years. Current URAIA donors include Denmark, Finland, USAID, Canada and DFID. URAIA is managed by an executive Director who reports to a Board of Trustees of eminent personalities drawn from academia, civil society, private sector and faith based organizations and manages a programme and administration secretariat with field staff in the 47 counties of Kenya.

Description

URAIA is a Kiswahili word meaning "citizenship". URAIA will under this engagement manage funds for civil society that will include core budget support to three national strategic CSOs covering key thematic areas of environmental governance, human rights and public financial management and county-based civil society organisations whose capacity will be strengthened to hold county governments to account and enhance civic engagement of county citizens. URAIA will use its' unrivalled national grassroots presence and national network to facilitate country wide civic education on devolved governance and voter education approaching the 2017 general elections.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations

ACT	Act, Change, Transform
CIPD	County Integrated Development Plans
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
Danida	Danish International Development Assistance
DAI	Development Associates International
DAP	Direct Aid Program
DFID	Department for International Development
DG	Democratic Governance
DKK	Danish Kroner
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
IEA	Institute for Economic Affairs
ILEG	Institute for Law and Environmental Governance
IP	Implementing Partners
KES	Kenya Shillings
KHRC	Kenya Human Rights Commission
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
NCEP	National Civil Education Programme
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
PBO	Public Benefit Organisations
PWC	Price Waterhouse Coopers
TISA	The Institute for Social Accountability
UBI	Uchaguzi Bora Initiative
UDPK	United Disabilities Persons of Kenya
URAIA	Kiswahili word for 'Citizenship'
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Development Engagement Document: Support to Civil Society (The URAIA Trust)

1. Introduction

1.1 The present development engagement document details the objectives, expected results, implementation framework and management arrangements for the development cooperation concerning Support to Civil Society (2016–2020) as agreed between the parties specified below. The development engagement document is annexed to the Bilateral Agreement with The URAIA Trust and constitutes an integrated part hereof together with the documentation specified below. The Danish support is provided within the framework of the thematic programme on Governance, one of three thematic programmes under the Danish country programme for Kenya 2016–2020. This engagement document is also available to the External Grant Committee of Danida.

1.2 The development engagement entails Danish support in the form of basket funding to The URAIA Trust of DKK 55 million for activities within the URAIA Trust Strategic Plan 2011–2015 and the URAIA Trust Strategic Plan 2016–2020 currently under development. The support covers the period January 2016 to June 2020.

2. Parties

2.1 The Danish Embassy, Nairobi and the URAIA Trust.

2.2 Signatories will be the Danish Ambassador representing the Government of Denmark, and the Executive Director of the URAIA Trust.

3. Documentation

3.1 The URAIA Trust Strategic Plan 2011–2015

The URAIA Trust Strategic Plan 2016–2020

4. Brief description of the URAIA Trust and sub grantees

The URAIA Trust is a Kenyan civil society trust supporting Kenya's democratic transformation. The organisation works to facilitate the provision of 'quality civic education and practical mechanisms for citizen engagement in public affairs.'

URAIA is formerly known as the National Civic Education Programme (NCEP), established in 2000 in response to the need to form a national, non-partisan and well co-ordinated civic education programme. In 2010, URAIA began developing mechanisms to increase programme sustainability. The URAIA Trust, established in 2011, now allows for longer term planning and synergy. URAIA's interventions are guided by a five-year strategic plan 2011–2015 that is based on the implementation of the 2010 Kenyan Constitution.

URAIA currently has seven Trustees, whose role is to give policy leadership to the organisation. The Board of Trustees has Committees whose role is to give guidance and provide oversight to the work being undertaken by the Secretariat. The URAIA Secretariat is headed by an Executive Director, who is responsible for implementation of the Strategic plan of the Trust, and who is further supported by a team of senior level, middle level management and operations staff to ensure the Trusts plans are im-

plemented. This Secretariat team works under two departments; the Programmes department and the Finance and Support Services department, who carry out financial management and administrative work.

URAIA will act as the grant manager for providing core funding to three preselected strategic Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and for a number of smaller county level CSOs that will be selected during the implementation period through open requests for proposals. Selecting the sub grantees during the implementation period will allow due flexibility to accommodate coming needs and changes in the political landscape.

The three strategic national CSOs that, through their core mandates, cover Denmark's priority areas to achieve the right to a better life are:

The Kenya Human Rights Commission (KHRC): KHRC is the foremost civil society organisation focusing on human rights — the KHRC mission is to promote, protect and enhance the realisation of all human rights for all people. Thus, KHRC work towards the respect of all human rights for all individuals and groups. A two-pronged strategy informs this work: a) facilitating and supporting individuals, communities and groups to claim and defend their rights; and, b) holding state and non-state actors accountable for the protection and respect of all human rights for all Kenyans. KHRC has done ground breaking rights research and advocacy on labour, access to health, minorities, marginalised regions, extra-judicial killings and police brutality; and women's rights amongst others. KHRC has been a Danida grantee since 2005.

The Institute for Economic Affairs - Kenya (IEA): IEA Kenya is a public policy think tank and civic forum that seeks to promote pluralism of ideas through open, active and informed public debates on key policy issues, both economic and political, and to propose feasible policy alternatives in these areas. The IEA is considered an advantageous engagement partner because of their dual reach — to influence and inform the policy environment, and to educate and involve the public. These functions help to improve accountability and demand for civic public engagement. IEA's main work has been around accountability of leaders, mainly with respect to budgeting processes and public financial management.

The Institute for Law and Environmental Governance (ILEG): ILEG is an independent, non-profit public interest law and policy organisation focused on promoting sustainable development. They work with local communities, governments, private sector, and CSOs to ensure fair, balanced and equitable development policy choices to improve peoples' lives and protect the environment. The organisation uses governance tools and principles to foster sustainable equitable management of natural resources. ILEG works in focus areas; (i) Climate Change; (ii) Environment and Social Justice; (iii) Land and Natural Resources; and (iv) Science and Technology. Their main area of operation is in Kenya and the wider Eastern Africa region but they also have significant regional and global reach and influence. Their sole objective is to improve human wellbeing by seeking a shift in the way government make and implement laws and policies, the way businesses operate and the way people act in relation to the environment.

County Civil Society Organisations (County CSO): In consultation with the Danish Embassy a number of smaller county level civil society organisations will be selected for core funding through a competitive process, and based on how they can best support the objective of this engagement. Based on the selection process there might be a rollover from well performing organisations funded by Danida under the governance sector programme 2011–2015.

5. Background and Theory of Change

5.1 Context

The landscape and shape of civil society organisations have been transforming over time, growing both in number and complexity responding to the changes in both the political and broader environment.

Civil society has been a key player in pushing for democratic reforms in Kenya, even before the first multi-party elections in 1992 and continuously leading up to the development of the 2010 Constitution. The civil society was actively involved in shaping the Constitution, in which the right to public participation is now fully embedded. This has created new opportunities but also challenges as civil society transitions from being primarily a critic of the system to an active player in it.

Kenya has a vibrant civil society, with NGOs involved in all sectors of national development, notably in education, the environment, agriculture, health, governance and gender empowerment, and it plays a key role in Kenya's poverty alleviation strategy. In 2013, figures from the NGO Coordination Bureau showed that there were 8,260 registered NGOs in Kenya, and the sector grows with 500 organizations each year. The sector contributed a total of KES 80 billion in 2012 *(§1 Billion dollars in 2012)* to the national economy and the sector alone employed over 200,000 of which most were primarily Kenyan[1].

The 2010 Constitution seeks to address inequalities and bring decisions closer to the citizens. It has the potential to change the political, social and economic landscape of Kenya in the coming decades. It promises equal rights for all Kenyans and improved delivery of services to all citizens. Accountability of government to the people is embedded, and a comprehensive Bill of Rights gives Kenyans, as rights holders, a solid legal foundation to make the authorities accountable as duty bearers. The constitutional changes also introduced the counties as a new local level of government. With the introduction of devolution, a new need to work closely and regularly with county-based organisations that can engage with the county governments to ensure accountability and service delivery has emerged. They could benefit from enhanced capacity to ensure that county governments and the national government remain committed to the objectives of devolution. Furthermore for devolution to succeed it is essential that the public experiences that county governments can deliver on services. Civil society can support this by holding counties accountable and raising the voice of the people, including that of marginalised groups.

During the previous election in 2013, civil society played a key role in providing civic education to the public, and the upcoming 2017 elections might provide another space for civil society to actively influence the path of Kenya's development. However, while there is great hope that elections will go well, there are some new and serious challenges for civil society involved in democratic governance and peace and security in Kenya. The Public Benefits Organizations Act 2013 that was enacted two months before the 2013 general elections sought to change the regulatory framework of NGOs, increase accountability and provide an opportunity for state funding of NGOs, amongst other provisions. Several amendments proposed thereafter including restricting foreign funding to NGOs were resisted by civil society and a section of members of Parliament prompting the government to constitute a representative Task force to obtain public views on the law and proposed amendments. Tri-partite consultations between development partners, MPs and the civil society also took place. There is a general agreement that the larger part of the law is beneficial and should be implemented as is. Implementation of the Task Force report and drafting of regulations to the law are pending.

5.2   Justification including lessons learnt

The justification of this engagement is based on the relevance and need to support and enhance civil society, the Danish experiences from previous interventions, Danish development policies and the capacity of the selected engagement partner. **URAIA** is considered the best possible partner due to its solid track record as basket fund manager convening many donors and with an unrivalled national grassroots presence through support to civil society organizations based at the counties who hold county governments to account through empowering citizens to know their rights and responsibilities. URAIA is also a key partner in the electoral cycle and will be important in providing and supporting civic and voter education on the elections.

---

[1] „Current Challenges facing the civil society in Kenya" by Yves Niviragira, Executive director of Fahamu, February 2015

The support target three key strategic national civil society organizations who through URAIA will receive core funding to carry out their main mandate in public policy advocacy in areas of human rights and democracy, green growth, social progress and stability and protection that all correspond with the objectives of the country programme. These three organizations have been selected to provide demand side, rights-holders support to DANIDA's key focus areas of Human Rights (*strengthening the rights based approach to development by keeping duty bearers accountable on all aspects of rights*), Environmental Governance (*state obligations, business role and citizens engagement on environmendtal an natural resource management*) and Public Sector reform and Financial Management (*highlighting prudent fiscal management in state agencies and increasing knowledge and information amongst citizens on national and county budget processes.*)

The Kenya Human Rights Commission (KHRC) is the foremost civil society organisation in Kenya focusing on human rights and was founded in 1991. **The Institute for Economic Affairs - Kenya (IEA**) is a l e a d i n g public policy think tank and civic forum and is considered an advantageous engagement partner because of their dual reach — to influence and inform the policy environment through their respected research capacity by Treasury and other public sector ministries and agencies, and to educate and involve the public through their ability to distil budget and financial information into packages that are easy to understand and use for advocacy. IEA was founded in 1994 . **The Institute for Law and Environmental Governance (ILEG):** ILEG is an independent, non-profit public interest law and policy organisation focused on promoting sustainable development. Their work with local communities, governments, private sector, and CSOs e n s u r e s fair, balanced and equitable development policy choices to improve peoples' lives and protect the environment.ILEG was established in 2002 and has influenced key environmental policies in the cntry.

County level Civil Society Organisations will receive core funding so they can play a crucial role for right holders to hold duty bearers accountable and thereby make the devolution reform process work.

Contextually the implementation of the 2010 Constitution and the amendments to the PBO act provides opportunities and challenges for Kenyan civil society. The Constitution presents an opportunity for improved democratic practices and service delivery. However there are challenges in its implementation. While civil society can play a 'watchdog' role as agents of change, there are concerns that the space within which civil society can operate may diminish. A further challenge is both national and county government's capacity to ensure public participation in decision making processes, including public financial management. The duty bearers do not yet live up to the obligations of the constitution and the rights holders are not sufficiently empowered to take advantage of the opportunities provided.

The devolution process has the potential to bring the power and decisions closer to the people and thus to a greater extent enable right holders to hold duty bearers to account and ensure sufficient service delivery. If properly implemented and managed, the devolved system can become a strong vehicle for addressing the challenges of inequality, poverty, national cohesion and bring democratic decision making closer to the grassroots. A well organised civil society with strengthened capacity has the potential to be a key agent of change in this process.

Denmark has innovatively supported Kenyan civil society through the Kenya Governance Support Programme, KGSP (2011–2015). The key channels have been the Drivers of Accountability programme (DAP) funded jointly with DFID and managed by Development Alternatives Inc. (DAI) and a direct support to CSOs in the Coastal region with a capacity strengthening mechanism managed by PWC East Africa.

One of the gains of the programme is that significant improvement in the capacity of the CSOs in programme management and advocacy interventions has been delivered through clearly designed and embedded capacity building programmes. In particular the use of core funding to organisations enabled the organisations to focus on their key organisational objectives. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) has in-

tegrated lesson learning and strategic engagement with the Direct Aid Programme (DAP) CEO's forum, providing a good example of information exchange and high-level dialogue.

Furthermore URAIA's organisational experience in advocating for and implementing devolution allows the civil society engagement to build on existing gains. This, paired with URAIA's experience as a grant manager and in capacity development of CSOs, provides a solid foundation for the support URAIA will channel to its sub grantees. Most recently URAIA has also piloted a process for cooperation between the county government and civil society.

The engagement is also justified in the Danish policy priorities through Denmark's Development Cooperation strategy "The Right to a Better Life", that states that Denmark will support processes and institutions that promote human rights, and support civil society. Furthermore it is justified in the "Denmark-Kenya partnership policy 2015-2020" where the need for a strengthened civil society is clearly stated.

URAIA was selected based on a review of existing civil society funding mechanisms. As part of a review of civil society funding mechanisms undertaken by South Consulting in September-October 2014 for DANIDA's formulation process, various funding modalities were assessed, including basket funds, hybrid funds, combined funds and management funds. AMKENI (UNDP), ACT-Kenya, DAP and Uraia were the key modalities in focus. Fund management agencies are expensive but strong on capacity building in terms of financial reporting, M&E and general project management. On the other hand, the funds are found to be inflexible and demanding in terms of reporting. These and other lessons from the Embassy's previous civil society support will be incorporated by URAIA to take on board in their management. Amongst the decisive factors for selecting URAIA were its national profile, its tested capacity in managing other CSOs and because its core functions aligned with the objectives for the civil society engagement. The selection is supported by other donor assessments of URAIAs capacity, most recently by the Swedish Embassy, ActionAid International Kenya and Drivers of Accountability[2]. Furthermore the Danish supported Elections programme "Uchaguzi Bora Initiative (UBI)" received positive evaluations. URAIA employs the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) and all areas of its work are premised on human rights. It has worked to ensure participation of traditionally marginalised groups in Kenya and has ensured that its programme pays specific attention to youth, women and persons with disabilities[3].

5.3   Narrative for Theory of Change

For Kenya to achieve Vision 2030 and further its democratic processes it is key that rights holders improve their ability to claim and exercise their rights. For this change to happen, a key prerequisite is a strengthened and more organised civil society that can claim the rights of citizens and effectively challenge governments on state and county level on deliverance of services and the inclusiveness of political processes. Consequently, civil society organisations must become better organised and more effective. The support will be targeted towards organisations working in areas of claiming citizens' rights and civic democratic education. This engagement focuses on the demand side of civic and public engagement, and will be complimented on the supply side by the other engagements in the Thematic Programme on Governance.

The outcomes of this intervention are increased participation, engagement and oversight of civil society in governance at the national and county level and increased citizen participation and engagement in governance processes and in monitoring performance of county governments.

---

[2] Performed by Diakonia Sweden.

[3] For example URAIA is developing one of the first editions of the Constitution of Kenya in braille in collaboration with the United Disabled of Persons of Kenya (UDPK) which is an umbrella body for persons with disabilities.

To achieve the outcome of this Development Engagement, the following assumptions are made: (1) there is a supportive environment for CSOs to participate and engage with government (2) there will be goodwill within government at national and county level to engage with civil society with minimal suspicion (3) CSOs will be responsive to the need to change from instrumental participation to transformative participation both in character and action in terms of programming and implementation (4) CSOs will be able to adopt some flexibility to straddle the two spaces of engagement and disengagement with government when the need arises and, (5) there will be speedy assessment of partners and selection of the most suitable partner(s).

To move towards achieving the Development Engagement, the following interventions/activities must be implemented by the development engagement partner and the other partners to be identified: (1) offering technical assistance to CSOs to equip them with the skills to transition from instrumental participation to transformative participation (2) institutional strengthening support to the CSOs to make that change (3) raising awareness on the need to move towards civic action and engage in public participation as embedded in the constitution (4) creating and fostering linkages between CSOs and government at national and county level to enable CSOs contribute to inclusive and accountable governance (5) and offering technical assistance to CSOs to equip them with skills to engage with government at national and county level.

Support to civil society in Kenya will have a deliberate focus of a gender based approach geared towards the inclusion and mainstreaming of women in civil society. Specifically, interventions will focus on including women in leading positions, as well as supporting women in organising and voicing their needs as rights holders.

In this context URAIA will use a rights based approach in the implementation of the engagement. The focus of this approach is anchored on the four pillars of citizen participation, accountability, transparency and respect for the constitutional rights and fundamental freedoms of all citizens regardless of their gender, religion, culture, ethnic background and political affiliation. The Organisation will seek to mobilise and sensitise key segments of society including women, youth, and persons with disability, minorities and other marginalised groups.

Working with both the national strategic CSOs and the county CSOs, URAIA will promote the HRBA and ensure that the grantees follow the principles and inclusiveness of the approach. URAIA will especially ensure that in the selection of county level CSOs, organisations are chosen who support the rights of marginalised groups as stated above while at national level, the strategic partners will be capacitated to continue influencing policy.

6. Development Engagement Objectives

6.1 The overall vision for the partnership is to support the Government and people of Kenya in implementing their Vision 2030 to create 'a globally competitive and prosperous country with a high quality of life by 2030'.

6.2 The thematic Governance programme's strategic objective is to contribute to the implementation of the Constitution, consolidation of an accountable, inclusive and participatory democracy with increased stability'. The programme objective is operationalised by the following three focus areas: Increased Public Sector Efficiency, Improved Democratic Practises and Enhanced Peace, Security and Stability.

6.3 Outcomes:

The expected outcomes of this Development Engagement are:

"Increased participation, engagement and oversight by civil society in governance at the national and county level"; and,

"**Increased citizen participation and engagement in governance processes and in monitoring performance of county governments."**

6.4 Outputs:

Output 1: Increased capacity of CSOs to participate in governance at county and national levels.

Output 2: Secure and expanded national and county spaces (statutory and others) for civil society engagement.

Output 3: Increased civic awareness on the Constitution of Kenya 2010 and the devolved system of government in the target counties.

Output 4: CSOs facilitating citizens including women, youth and minorities to carry out social accountability on governance processes at county level.

7. Results Framework

7.1 URAIA is responsible for monitoring and reporting on the progress and achievements of the development engagement using its own results framework and M&E system as detailed in Section 12 below. The parties have, however, agreed that the Danish Embassy will use the results framework presented in the table below, with a limited number of outcome and output indicators, for the purpose of reporting back to the Danish constituency. Data to inform the reporting will be supplied by URAIA as part of the ordinary monitoring of the engagement.

7.2 The parties have agreed to measure progress and performance by the following key outcome and output indicators. Within the first six month of implementation URAIA will establish annual targets for these indicators.

7.3 The development engagement with the Danish Embassy is planned to reach a minimum of eight target counties. It will also work with four national partners.

7.4 URAIA will track changes in relation to the realisation of HRBA principles of Accountability and Rule of Law, Equality and Non-Discrimination Participation and Inclusion in public service delivery. The programme will seek evidence of fair and equal representation of all stakeholders including marginalised groups & communities (women, youth, people with disabilities and minority groups) in governance processes at the county government. This will be done through measuring the proportion of local communities including marginalised groups participating in governance processes by the end of the project.

7.5 URAIA will evaluate the impact citizen's participation and active citizenship, their capacity to claim their rights; whether there is improved access to information by citizens; and whether programmes have led to the enactment of legal reforms that strengthen the rights of marginalised groups. URAIA will also measure how counties are more responsive and accountable; their knowledge and respect for HRBA principles; and their capacity to develop and implement laws and policies in HRBA.

7.6 URAIA's indicators are informed by international and regional governance indicators (i.e. World Bank Governance Indicators and regional Mo –Ibrahim Foundation's Index of African Governance)

Outcome 1	Increased participation, engagement and oversight by civil society in governance at the national and county level.

Outcome indicator 1.1		No. of CSOs participating in governance processes (such as county planning and budget-ing, bills formulation, submission of memorandum, vetting and public hearings).	
Baseline	Year	2016	To be determined through baseline survey
Target	Year	2020	At least one CSO in each target county.
Outcome indicator 1.2		No. of oversight reports generated by CSO's and submitted to county governments (such as budget expenditure reports, budget tracking, and CIDP[4] implementation status.	
Baseline	Year	2014	1 CSO report as at December 2014 [5]
Target	Year	2020	At least two reports generated by each of the target CSOs URAIA's will be work-ing with every year.
Outcome 2		**Increased citizen participation and engagement in governance processes and in monitoring performance of county governments.**	
Outcome indicator 2.1		Percentage increase in number of local communities participating in county planning and budget making processes.	
Baseline	Year	2014	41 %[6]
Target	Year	2020	60 %
Outcome indicator 2.2		% increase in number of women in targeted communities that are participating in county planning and budget making processes.	
Baseline	Year	2016	To be determined through baseline survey[7]
Target	Year	2020	40 % increase from the baseline figure
Output 1.1		**Increased capacity of CSOs to participate in governance at county and national levels**	
Output indicator 1.1.1		80% of the target CSOs supported by URAIA redesign their governance programming and position themselves as change agents.	
Baseline	Year	2016	40 % of URAIA's current partners have redesigned their programmes
Target	Year	2020	80 % of URAIA's partners expected to have redesigned their programmes.
Output indicator 1.1.2		No. of CSOs participating in governance processes at national and county level (such as National policy reform initiatives, county planning and budgeting, bills formulation, sub-mission of memorandum, vetting and public hearings).	
Baseline	Year	2015	4
Target	Year	2020	12
Output 1.2		**Secure and expanded national and county spaces (statutory and others) for civil society engagement.**	
Output indicator 1.2.1		No. of local level platforms created and operationalised to allow for constructive engage-ment between CSOs and county governments structures.	
Baseline	Year	2016	2 platforms in two target counties
Target	Year	2020	8 platforms in the target counties (1 operational platform pr county)
Output 2.1		**Increased civic awareness on the Constitution of Kenya 2010 and the devolved system of government in the target counties**	
Output indicator 2.1.1		Percentage increase[8] in level of civic awareness.[9]	
Baseline	Year	2013	30 % [10]
Target	Year	2020	42 %
Output indicator		Percentage increase in number of women and minority groups who received knowledge	

---

[4] County Integrated Development Plans (CIPD) are mandatory documents without which county governments cannot receive their equitable share of revenue from the National government

[5] URAIA Annual report 2014
[6] National Democratic Institute 2014 All - county survey
[7] URAIA is currently conducting a survey on the participation of women in governance and decision making processes.
[8] Percentage increase will be measured using knowledge, attitude and practice (KAPs) survey
[9] Civic awareness is the foundation that makes a citizen be an active participant in the fabric of their community/society
[10] URAIA End-term Evaluation Report for the Uchaguzi Bora Initiative (2013)

2.1.2			and skills to participate in county governance and decision-making.
Baseline	Year	2016	Tbd during baseline[11]
Target	Year	2020	At least 50 % increase.
Output 2.2			**CSOs facilitating citizens including women, youth and minorities to carry out social accountability on governance processes at county level[12]**
Output indicator 2.2.1			Increase in number of citizens formations that are actively engaging in monitoring of government service delivery
Baseline	Year	2016	Two citizen accountability formations per target county
Target	Year	2020	Target: At 8 citizen accountability formations per target county
Output indicator 2.2.2			No. of county government services evaluated using civil society social accountability tools.
Baseline	Year	2016	Two county government services monitored in the target counties
Target	Year	2020	Target: at least four services per county per year.

---

[11] URAIA is currently conducting a survey on the participation of women in governance and decision making processes.

[12] Baseline data as per URAIA's 2015 mid-term report.

8. Risk Management

The ensuing risk matrix is based on foreseeable environmental factors that may affect the activities planned under this DED. The risk factors have been identified based on a realistic analysis of the contextual, programmatic and institutional operating environment within which URAIA, the implementing partners and target beneficiaries will operate.

Programmatic Risks						
Risk Factor	Likelihood	Background to Assessment of Likelihood	Impact	Background to Assessment of Potential Impact	Risk Response	Combined Residual Risk
Security incidences that affect implementing partners (IP) operations and program implementation	Unlikely	Some counties have previously experienced insecurity emanating from natural resources discovery, cattle rustling, border disagreements, inter clan conflicts etc. Limited cases experienced take the form of attacks and destruction of property	Major	In case of persistent insecurity, delivery of desired program objectives can be affected (although not directly affected the increased insecurity level may lead to preventive measures in terms of 'avoidance'). Security of beneficiaries is key to successful implementation. Conflicts might endanger safety of staff.	Mitigation/reduction: 1. Activity implementers to work closely with security authorities 2. Sensitise all program implementers on security concerns, possible security measures to take and conflict mitigation strategies 3. Security trends to be monitored regularly and information shared	Minor
Extraordinary climate conditions make access to remote areas even more challenging during the wet season	Likely	The geographical terrain is a challenge during normal weather conditions, and in the marginalised counties, access and physical infrastructure is lacking, making it difficult for program staff to access communities in these areas particularly during the wet seasons.	Minor	Vastness of geographical areas and poor infrastructure will lead to delays and program activities may not reach all target areas as desired. It will, however, not affect operations across the board and the program objectives will not be jeopardised.	Mitigation/reduction: 1. Complement CSO interventions with local civic educators 2. Lobby county authorities to ensure conducive reach in marginalised areas 3. Use of local media to reach more citizens in such areas	Minor
Competition/ duplication of efforts	Unlikely	Many CSOs may compete to implement in certain areas while avoiding others hence leading to duplication of efforts and 'orphan areas'.	Major	Such duplication of efforts and the existence of 'orphan areas' whose needs are not addressed, will have major impact on value for money and achieving the desired results.	Mitigation/reduction: 1. Proper mapping of activity areas and CSOs present in those areas 2. Joint implementers forums to avoid duplication of efforts	Minor

Programmatic Risks						
Risk Factor	Likelihood	Background to Assessment of Likelihood	Impact	Background to Assessment of Potential Impact	Risk Response	Combined Residual Risk
					3. Regular monitoring and learning	
Inadequate political will, attention, and county governments cooperation	Unlikely	In some instances, rivalries exist in county government, where county government officials in Executive and Assembly are involved in political rivalries for control of power and resources, and cooperation with CSOs by county government is limited.	Major	Such rivalries will have a major impact on successful implementation because they affect effective CSO and citizen participation.	Mitigation/reduction: 1. Sensitise citizens to guard against the likelihood of such occurrences and demand to participate 2. CSOs to play active role in mitigating and or resolving any disputes	Minor
Enthusiasm to participate (rights holder demand) does not occur as expected and/or structured participation space is not provided as required (by duty bearers)	Unlikely	In some instances where corruption is high, citizens develop apathy and participate less. In other situations, fewer opportunities are provided to citizens to participate actively on county management affairs.	Minor	Some disruption to attainment of results will occur if the targeted communities or citizens do not participate effectively in the program activities such as the oversight role to county governments.	Mitigation/reduction: 1. Mobilise citizens at all levels to participate 2. Monitor trends and adjust plans as necessary in order to increase citizen participation and provide advocacy with county governments if needed	Insignificant

Institutional Risks						
Risk Factor	Likelihood	Background to Assessment of Likelihood	Impact	Background to Assessment of Potential Impact	Risk Response	Combined Residual Risk
Weak internal governance structured within IPs that may lead to misuse of funds by CSOs. I.e fiduciary risk; that funds are not used for the intended purposes; do not achieve value for money; and/or are not	Rare	Some CSOs have weak governance structures. This may affect levels of accountability and transparency that are key to effective management of resources. There is thus slight possibility that funds may be used for ineligible purposes by IPs or frauds could occur.	Major	Would the event occur it would encompass a limited share of the budget, hence in terms of efficiency and value for money impact would be minor. However it implies high reputational consequences (reputational risk) to URAIA and the Danish Embassy that may have consequences for the operations, and hamper im-	Mitigation/reduction: 1. Good capacity assessments before deciding to on forward funds to sub-grantees 2. Enforcement of compliance procedures 3. Regular monitoring and review of governance improvement plans 4. Frequent reporting measures, resources to implementing CSOs will be disbursed in instalments against returns for reports 5. Adequate awareness on eligibility of	Minor

| properly accounted for | | | | plementation to an extent that affects achieving the objectives. | costs to be done at preaward level
6. Regular checks and reviews to be done to minimise such an occurrence
7. Timely review of reports
8. IPs to sign integrity / indemnity under-takings at contracting level | |

9. Inputs

9.1 Overall budget

Thematic Programme Governance	Disbursement budget in mio. DKK					
Engagement Objective: Support to Civil Society	**2016**	**2017**	**2018**	**2019**	**2020**	**Total**
Total Danida	**10**	**15**	**15**	**15**	**0**	**55**
Other Donor disbursements	22	34	20	24	41	**141**

Other donors are USAID, Finland and DFID.

URAIA will receive support from Danida and other development partners to support its Strategic Plan 2016 – 2020. Support from the Danida will contribute to approximately one third of the organisational budget of URAIA.

10. Management Arrangements

10.1   The overall principles for management of the present development engagement are described in the implementing Partner Agreement to which this Development Engagement Document is annexed.

10.2   The daily management of the present engagement is undertaken by URAIA. URAIA will take on the role of convener and manager of the civil society organisations. URAIA will act as the grant manager for providing core funding to a number of CSO "sub grantees" i.e. the three preselected strategic national CSOs (KHRC, IEA and ILEG) and for a number of smaller county level CSOs that will be selected during the implementation period through open requests for proposals. A few additional national CSOs may be selected in consultation with the Danish Embassy if deemed relevant to achieve the objective of this development engagement. Selecting the sub grantees during the implementation period will allow due flexibility to accommodate coming needs and changes in the political landscape.

10.3   In managing these grants, URAIA will be guided by its operating policies and guidelines, which are documented and include; Finance Procedures Manual, Implementing Partners Procedures Manual, Grants Manual, Human Resources Policy and Procurement Manual. URAI will ensure that the CSOs receiving Danida funding will have the necessary capacity for financial management.

10.4   A transparent selection process following URAIA's existing procedures will be used for selecting the county CSO's to receive core support. This process will include an open call for proposals for sub-grantees in the identified areas followed by an evaluation process of their proposals aimed at selecting the most suitable partners to implement the programme at target county levels. In determining the most suitable sub grantees, a capacity assessment is also undertaken for the shortlisted sub grantees after evaluation results. This process is overseen by the Board of Trustees of URAIA and thereafter the selected sub grantees are contracted after the Board's approval.

10.5   Funding Modality: URAIA's programmes are funded through a basket funding modality from various development partners. For this programme, a portion of funding will go to the three preselected strategic organisations at national level and the remainder to local county-based CSOs delivering on key strategic objectives. URAIA shall continue with this funding modality in its next 2016 – 2020 strategic plan.

10.6   In carrying out the selection process of the local CSOs, URAIA will use its existing partner selection procedures as described above in section 10.3. The organisation has worked with an average of 50 partners per programme in the last four years who were selected competitively. In selection of partners for this programme, one of the selection criteria will include assessing their experience in employing the HRBA principles in their work.

10.7   URAIA will be participate in the annual status meeting on the Country Programme organised by the Danish Embassy for all engagement partners.

10.8   The Embassy will also be part of URAIA's donor roundtable for strategic dialogue amongst URAIA's partners. URAIA invites all donors to regular roundtable meetings, minimum twice a year where they share progress and discuss strategic priorities or adjustments. Danida would, as a part of the proposed engagement, continue having a seat at this table which also provides an opportunity to continue working with like-minded donors. URAIA will also schedule interactions with the Embassy on a need basis to discuss other technical issues that may relate directly to the Embassy's programme. Donors already participating in this are: Finland, Denmark, USA and UK

10.9   Sustainability and Exit Strategy: URAIA's exit and sustainability of the programme will be achieved through the following (i) Empowerment of CSOs and local communities to organise and participate in county governance processes which will result in creation of social capital (ii) Creation of spaces for engagement between CSO, local communities and county government which will remain as community resources to be utilised in influencing development projects. (iii) Linkages with URAIA already established structure of local civic educators in the target counties who remain a community resource, and will continue to enhance civic awareness and engagement beyond the project's life. (iv) URAIA has also established implementers' forums which bring together all stakeholders promoting civic education and engagement initiatives in each of the counties. This will be used as a means for both internalising civic learning as well as galvanising for local communities' action beyond the life of this action.

11. Financial Management and Audit

11.1   Both parties will strive for full alignment of the Danish support to the implementing partner rules and procedures.

11.2   Accounting and auditing of the Danish funds will include accounting and auditing of the whole organisation and will be undertaken by URAIA in accordance with the "General Guidelines for Accounting and Auditing of Grants channelled through National NGOs" (http://amg.um.dk/en/technical-guidelines/financial-management/accounting-and-auditing   ). URAIA will conduct the audit on annual basis.

11.3   URAIA will maintain accounting records relating to the programme activities in accurate and complete form during implementation and for a minimum of three years after programme completion. Accounting records shall be available for control by the Embassy of Denmark, a representative appointed by the Embassy, or by the Danish Auditor General.

11.4   URAIA will prepare an annual narrative and financial progress report to be shared with the Embassy within 3 months after each financial year end. In addition to the annual reports, UARIA will prepare and submit regular quarterly reports to the Embassy within a month after completion of each quarter.

11.5   The Embassy will ensure adequate disbursement to URAIA based on the agreed upon annual budgets and workplans in order to facilitate smooth implementation of the programme. URAIA will request funds in two instalments each year with the disbursements based on the progress reported in the expenditure reports and cash expenditure forecasts

12. Monitoring and Evaluation

12.1   URAIA is responsible for monitoring and reporting on the progress and achievements of the development engagement using its own results framework and M&E system.

12.2   URAIA shall undertake monitoring and evaluation of the programme through its monitoring and evaluation framework that shall track the progress towards realisation of its goals and objectives. The monitoring is undertaken through monthly and or quarterly narrative and financial reports from the implementing partners and civic educators, verification of the reported progress through field visits, independent assessments and beneficiaries' feedback reports.

12.3   In addition to this URAIA shall use an indicator performance tracking tool that will monitor the quantitative indicators from the logical framework and continuously assess the progress being made in the attainment of the programme's outputs and outcomes. Through the monitoring tools URAIA shall be able to gauge budget absorption by each implementing partner and monitor resources utilisation which will demonstrate how resources are being used and also whether there is value for money or not. This will ensure tight resource control and as well as linking resources to attainment of specific results. Through its annual monitoring and reporting URAIA will be able to monitor the impact level. At this level URAIA will also be monitoring utilisation of resources and will rationalise budget variances against deviations in programme achievements and vice versa. The tool will document the sum total of the quarterly results. It will be seeking to ask the question of whether the results are culminating to some change. Deviations from expected change will be compared against indicators/impact. The tool will also assess lessons learnt and how they were applied to inform programming of the subsequent period.

12.4   Twice a year URAIA shall hold an implementer's forum which will bring together all the implementing partners to discuss progress, identify gaps, challenges and lessons learnt. Recommendations from these forums will inform the programming for the subsequent year.

12.5   URAIA shall undertake an end of term programme evaluation in the last quarter of the final year of the programme. The evaluation shall seek to assess the impact of URAIA's work in relation to its goals and objectives. The evaluation will identify key challenges, lessons learnt and make recommendations for future programmes.

12.6   The Danish Embassy shall have the right to carry out any technical or financial mission that is considered necessary to monitor the implementation of the programme.

12.7   The Danish Embassy will contract a strategic monitoring support for the entire country programme and all development engagement partners, including URAIA, will provide data needed to measure progress.

12.8   Danida Copenhagen will carry out Real Time Evaluation during the time of implementation period covered by this agreement and Danida will, also after the termination of the programme support, reserve the right to carry out additional evaluation in accordance with this article.

13. Signatures

On behalf of   On behalf of

URAIA TRUST   The Danish Embassy, Nairobi

_____   _____
Signature   Signature

_____   _____
Executive Director   Ambassador

_____   _____
Date   Date