Report on Consultation workshop on SDG Indicator 17.14.1: The case of Kenya

9th of January, Nairobi

Contents

1. Background

In September 2015, the United Nations Sustainable Development Summit adopted a new framework to guide development efforts between 2015 and 2030, entitled "Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for sustainable development". The 2030 Agenda contains 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), divided into 169 targets, which are informed by 244 Indicators. Sustainable Development Goal 17 covers partnerships and means of implementation to achieve the goals. In this respect, mechanisms for policy coherence are identified as an important aspect of means of implementation with **Indicator 17.14.1** measuring the **"number of countries with mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence of sustainable development".**

The development of indicators takes place under the umbrella of the Inter-agency and Expert Group on Sustainable Development Goal Indicators (IAEG-SDGs), which currently classifies indicator 17.14.1 as a Tier III indicator, which means it does not yet have an internationally recognized methodology. The Indicator is under the custodianship of UN Environment Programme (UNEP). As part of this responsibility as custodian agency, it is tasked with leading the methodological development of the indicator, as well as overseeing the data collection and reporting process up to 2030.

To support the development of the methodology, UNEP established an International Expert Group, comprised of experts from relevant UN entities, national governments, research organisations, and academia/individual experts. The Group has developed a draft methodology for the indicator which attempts to capture the various types of policy coherence mechanisms. The main types of policy coherence mechanisms identified by the group are captured in the following table:
Table One: SDG 17.14. Indicator Framework

1. Institutionalization of Political Commitment	3. Inter-ministerial and cross-sectoral coordination	5. Policy linkages	7. Monitoring and reporting for policy coherence
The country has institutionalized its commitment towards policy coherence for sustainable development at the highest political level.	The country has an institutional mechanism in place that periodically brings together relevant ministries and governmental entities to enhance coherence across sustainable development related policies including sectoral policies.	The country has mechanisms in place to integrate the three dimensions of sustainable development and systematically assess the policy effects and cross-sectoral linkages throughout the policy and planning processes.	The country has mechanisms in place to systematically monitor and evaluate the effects of policies on the various dimensions of sustainable development as well as cross-sectoral impacts, and to report and inform adaptive action.
2. Long-term considerations in decision-making	**4. Participatory processes**	**6. Alignment across government levels**	**8. Financing for policy coherence**
The country has mechanisms in place to ensure that long-term considerations are integrated into decision-making, policy development and planning	The country has mechanisms in place to ensure that laws, policies, plans, programmes, and major development projects at different levels of government and including at the overarching/general, sectoral and local level are developed through participatory processes that involve relevant stakeholders.	The country has mechanisms in place for aligning priorities, policies and plans between various levels of government.	The country has mechanisms in place to promote the alignment of private and public finance to policy coherence objectives and to track related expenditures

The methodology attempts to capture the main types of policy coherence mechanisms, so that governments may assess and report on the mechanisms already in place and aim to establish any that are missing that they deem useful to further enhance policy coherence. A guidance note on each type of mechanism provides guidance in doing so, presenting examples of existing mechanisms put in place by member states globally as inspiration of the kinds of mechanisms that have proved successful, and that may serve as useful models for others. The Expert Group also identified elements that contribute to the effectiveness of each mechanisms, and a weighted scoring system for reporting towards Indicator 17.14.1.

The next step for the methodology development is to test the draft with a sample of members states to receive feedback on its acceptability, applicability, and any feedback to incorporate before its finalization and submission to the IAEG-SDGs.

2. Consultations with Kenya

A consultation workshop full day was organized in collaboration with the National Environment Management Authority (NEMA) in order to present the draft methodology and attempt to apply it to the national case in order to:

- Receive general feedback on the indicator framework as a whole as well as specific feedback on the different sub indicators
- Identify the various policy coherence mechanisms that exist nationally, and how/whether they fit into the list of 8 types of mechanisms identified by the International Expert Group
- Assess whether any types of policy coherence mechanisms are missing from the methodology, or whether the methodology is unable to account for existing policy coherence mechanisms
- Apply the value system in practice and determine its suitability and usefulness to member states

- Examine the usefulness of the guidance notes
- Identify any challenges for member states in applying the methodology

2.1. Background documents prior to the workshop:

Prior to the workshop the following documents had been shared with the participants. These documents formed the basis of the discussions during the workshop:

- A concept note explaining the work that has already been done by UNEP on this Indicator
- Zero draft methodology (including Indicator framework and the guidance notes of every sub indicator)
- A pre-workshop survey containing guiding questions for the feedback in general and per sub indicator

2.2. Participation:

The session was attended by a range of national institutions:

- Ministry of Devolution and Planning
- Ministry of East African Community & Regional Development
- Ministry of Environment and Forestry
- Ministry of Health
- State Department for Livestock
- State Department for Wildlife
- State Department of Correctional Services
- State Department of Devolution & Planning
- State Department of Energy
- State Department of Fisheries, Aquaculture & the Blue Economy
- State Department of ICT
- State Department of Immigration
- State Department of Industrialization
- State Department of Sports
- Nairobi City County
- National Environment Management Authority (NEMA)
- Caritas
- Council of Governors
- Ecosave Africa
- Kenya Forestry Research Institute
- Kenyan Association of Manufacturers (representing Private Sector)
- Kiambu County Government

2.3. General Feedback on the zero-draft methodology

Participants welcomed the overall approach of the methodology and found it clear, comprehensive and useful in supporting them to evaluate their policy coherence mechanisms and their effectiveness. Participants welcomed the types of mechanisms discussed, which supported their understanding of the methodology although more initial guidance would be welcome.

Language: During the discussion, the participants suggested providing a glossary of terms for the indicator framework. They stated that it would be essential to be more specific and clarify what the term "policy coherence" for sustainable development means and clarify on the wording when it comes to politics and policies.

Policy Coherence: Participants had questions on how the concept of "policy coherence" should be interpreted. Besides the idea to add a guiding document including some definitions of the concepts used in the methodology, the participants especially suggested that the definition of policy coherence should be broadened to other but similar concepts such as policy coordination, integrated approaches and whole of government approach. Questions were answered by the facilitator on the scope of sustainable development and the effectiveness of the mechanisms.

Value system:

Participants were supportive of the approach of awarding a value to the various mechanisms. They suggested that if no points are scored in the first component of a sub-indicator, it should still be possible to score points in the additional elements of the sub-indicator. Questions were raised on the option to have a progressive scoring within one element to measure it more precisely although this would increase the reporting burden.

Similar to the previous consultation workshops in Burkina Faso and Guyana, an exercise was done to determine which of the sub indicators should have the most weight, in case it was to be decided to install a weighing mechanism. This resulted in high scores for the following sub indicators (see table below):

1.Institutionalised Political Commitment

3. Inter-ministerial and cross-sectoral coordination

8. Financial resources and tools

Table Two: Weighing the Sub-Indicators: More value to sub indicators 1, 3 and 8

Sub Indicators	Total
1. Institutionalised political commitment	***20***
2. Long-term considerations	*6*
3. Inter-ministerial and cross-sectoral coordination	***19***
4. Participatory processes	*8*
5. Integration of the three dimensions of Sustainable Development, assessment of policy effects and linkages	*14*
6. Consultation and coordination across government levels	*4*
7. Monitoring and reporting for policy coherence	*15*
8. Financial resources and tools	***17***

- The Ministry of Finance was suggested as the national institution best suited to lead on SDG 17.14.1.

2.4. Feedback per sub indicator including application to the case of Kenya:

Following the detailed presentation of the methodology, the 8 sub indicators were examined, with reference to the detailed description as well as the values system of each. The participants discussed which elements of each mechanisms Kenya had in place.

1. *Institutionalised political commitment*

Description: The institutionalization of political commitment at the highest political level can be expressed through an explicit commitment towards enhancing policy coherence for sustainable development in the public institutions and their working modalities contained in a legal framework or official policy, strategy, vision or action plan or other government document on sustainable development.

Although many institutions work on the SDGs, and there is a clear commitment towards Sustainable Development as many programmes and policies are aligned to the SDGs, Kenya has not institutionalized its commitment to policy coherence for sustainable development. There are specific institutional arrangements for the SDGs in Kenya per sector, for example those on water and energy, but no explicit written commitment by the government at a national level has been made by the government of Kenya.

Value:0[1]

Value of the sub indicator 1

Political commitment expressed/endorsed by the highest level of government at national level applying to the whole government. (5 points).
Additional points relate to the presence of elements contributing to the effectiveness of the mechanism. A stronger degree of commitment could be demonstrated if the political commitment expressed by the country was complemented by:

- *Set timelines for the achievement of policy coherence objectives (1 point);*
- *A dedicated budget (1 point);*
- *Defined roles and responsibilities (1 point);*
- *A requirement for a regular reporting mechanism (parliament, central office of the government, public, etc.) (1 point);*
- *Explicit consideration of international commitments (1 point).*

2. *Long-term considerations underpin decision-making on sustainable development*

Description: This sub-indicator identifies whether the country has mechanisms in place to ensure that decision-making, policy development and planning follow objectives that are long-term, i.e. span beyond the current electoral cycle, and consider the interests of future generations.
This can be expressed through a combination of having long-term goals and the interests of future generations embedded in national legal or strategic frameworks that apply to the whole of government,

[1] Every chapter on the specific sub indicator ends with the value summary of the sub indicator. The green part of each of these are the elements that are in place in Kenya

with assessment and oversight mechanisms that aim to ensure that these goals and interests are considered in decision making and planning.

In 2007 the Government of Kenya approved the Vision 2030[2] which aims to lay out the long-term development blueprint for the country up to 2030. This is a good example of the basic element of this sub indicator. Since then, this vision has been translated into Medium Term Plans. Currently the government is implementing the Third Medium Term Plan (MTP3 2018-2022)[3]. The Medium-Term Plans are aligned with the SDGs, and the next plan will run from 2022 to 2026.

Some confusion arose regarding the last elements on impact assessment, as the impact assessments envisioned in this sub indicator cannot be limited to environmental impact assessments alone. Although Kenya conducts environmental impact assessments, impact assessments against the three dimensions of sustainable development which covers the impact on future generations are not (systematically) conducted.

The constitution of Kenya does mention future generations when it comes to the environment stating that “Every person has the right to a clean and healthy environment, which includes the right (a) to have the environment protected for the benefit of present and future generations through legislative and other measures”[4]. It also foresees the interests of future generations when it comes to Public Finance as one of the principles: “the burdens and benefits of the use of resources and public borrowing shall be shared equitably between present and future generations.”[5] Additionally, it was noted that the difference between youth and future generations must be clarified. The future generations considered in this sub indicator are not limited to the young people living today but should include the generations to come that have not been born yet.

The discussion concluded by awarding 5 points for the basic component of this sub indicator.

- ⇨ **Value**: 5

Value of the sub indicator 2

Long-term objectives going beyond the current electoral cycle, and the interests of future generations embedded in the national sustainable development strategy or policy framework. (5 points)

Additional points relate to the presence of mechanisms that could further instill a culture of long termism and intergenerational equity in decision-making. These could include the following (non-exhaustive list) (5 points for one or a combination of the following)

- *A commissioner or ombudsperson for future generations;*
- *Other mechanisms of scrutiny or oversight over the possible effects on future generations of policies or legislation (e.g. auditing mechanisms);*

[2] 2007, *Kenya Vision 2030: A Globally Competitive and Prosperous Kenya*
[3] 2018, *Third Medium Term Plan 2018-2022* http://vision2030.go.ke/publication/third-medium-term-plan-2018-2022/
[4] 2010, Kenya’s Constitution of 2010, art. 42 a., p. 29
[5] 2010, Kenya’s Constitution of 2010, art. 201 c., p. 106

- *Mechanisms for regular appraisal of policies to ensure that unanticipated effects are integrated over time;*
- *Impact assessment mechanisms that take into account intergenerational effects of major infrastructural developments.*

3. Inter-ministerial and cross-sectoral coordination

Description: This sub-indicator aims to assess whether the country has in place a mechanism to facilitate inter-sectoral dialogue to ensure coherence across the three dimensions of sustainable development (economic, social and environmental) in all policy-making and planning, by:

- *bringing together ministries or other governmental entities that are the most relevant to sustainable development at national level on a regular basis and/or at crucial policy-making and planning stages; or*
- *having a specific central coordination body mandated with sustainable development.*

Although State Department is supposed to mainstream the SDGs, some of the participants stated that mechanisms for regular coordination are weak or absent. An inter-agency technical working group on sustainable development was established in early 2015. It is composed of key ministries, the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics and National Council for Population and Development, civil society and the private sector. The counties are represented as well. The main role is to catalyse the implementation of the SDGs, mainstream them in planning documents, and report on SDG progress. It also acts as a forum to share information where necessary.[6] The inter-agency technical working group is composed of technical officers nominated by the permanent secretaries of the line ministries and therefore the mechanism only represents one level instead of two. The group theoretically meets every six months (Terms of Reference), although there is also an ad hoc spirit to meet for a certain task. Hence the inter-agency working group will meet more often in 2020 as it is preparing the new VNR that will be presented by Kenya at the High-level Political Forum in July 2020.

When it comes to horizontal coherence, participants noted that the governance structure of a devolved state as Kenya requires not only the consideration of inter-ministerial coordination but also inter-governmental coordination at, for example, the county level. One of the mechanisms discussed that could ensure this horizontal coherence between counties is the Council of Governors, which was established under Section 19 of the Intergovernmental Relations Act (IGRA 2012). The Council of Governors comprises the Governors of the forty-seven counties. The main functions are the promotion of visionary leadership; sharing of best practices and to; offer a collective voice on policy issues; promote inter – county consultations; encourage and initiate information sharing on the performance of County Governments with regard to the execution of their functions; hold collective consultation on matters of interest to County Governments.

Additionally, there are other working groups which meet quarterly at the national level on health, climate change, energy etc. composed of technical officers nominated by a Secretariat. They usually

[6] 2017, Voluntary National Review Kenya 2017, p. 12.

meet for specific tasks; while counties also participate in these meetings, they do not discuss policy coherence from a whole of government perspective and therefore would not qualify in this sub-indicator.

The discussion concluded by awarding 5 points for the basic component of this sub indicator.

⇨ **Value**: 5

Value of the sub indicator 3

Mechanism for regular coordination established at the national level and bringing together governmental entities and [ideally] other stakeholders such as civil society, academia and private sector representatives, to facilitate information sharing and consultation among different ministries/sectors (5 points).

Elements that would strengthen the mechanism by contributing to its effectiveness:

- *A mandate to make decisions regarding trade-offs (2 points);*
- *Convened by a centralized government body such as the Office of the Prime Minister or President or other central national governmental entity. (1 point);*
- *Representation and coordination at both political/strategic level and technical level, to ensure political commitment as well as its translation into action and alignment between the two levels (1 point);*
- *A mandate to promote alignment of internal and external policies including through the involvement of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (or equivalent bodies) (1 point);*
- *Other nationally relevant mechanism (1 point).*

4. Participatory processes

Description: The country has mechanisms in place to ensure that laws, policies, plans, programmes and major development projects at different levels of government and including at the overarching/general, sectoral and local level are developed through participatory processes that involve relevant stakeholders.

Citizen participation is vaguely embedded in Kenya's Constitution as a principle and national value in Article 10 but more clearly in Section 196 on *Public participation and county assembly powers*.

This has been translated in the County Governments Act of 2012. The County Governments Act[7] requires public participation (citizen participation) in county planning processes and sections 87-91, 94-96 prescribe the principles and processes for country government authorities, including the right to petition (88), the duty to respond to petitions (89) and the mandatory establishment of platforms for citizen participation (91). Additionally, it prescribes that "to promote public participation, non-state actors shall be incorporated in the planning processes by all authorities (104.4)" and that "Public participation in the county planning processes shall be mandatory (115)."

In 2018 the Public Participation Bill was passed, providing "a general framework for effective public participation; to give effect to the constitutional principles of democracy and participation of the

[7] 2012, The County governments Act, 2012THE COUNTY GOVERNMENTS ACT, 2012 http://constitutionnet.org/sites/default/files/the_county_government_act_2012.pdf

people.[8]" Among others, this act guides the counties to develop "appropriate feedback mechanisms" (4.e). When it comes to disclosing the rationale for taking or not taking into account the inputs from consultations (the 2nd additional element of the sub indicator), participants mentioned that this was a recommendation towards strengthening the public participation process in Kenya that should come into the law clearly. Currently, institutions do not necessarily disclose why they chose to select certain views and not others from the public participation process.

The Public Finance Management Act equally provides the requirement and guidance to ensure that the budget processes take place in a participatory way (section10.2; 36; 37; 125, 175 and especially in section 207). [9]

Questions were raised what "effective" participation concretely means (how many actors should participate, and in what way should the actors participate). This shows that additional guidance on how the indicator will be reported on is needed.

➔**Value**: 8

Value of the sub indicator 4

Requirement that relevant stakeholders are consulted at the early stages of development of laws, policies, plans, programmes and major development projects at different levels of government and including at the overarching/general, sectoral and local level, accompanied with the requirement for a reasonable timeframe for information and participation of relevant stakeholders and other procedural standards to make participation effective (5 points).

Elements that would strengthen the mechanism by contributing to its effectiveness:

- ***Consultations mandated to take place at various stages of the policy cycle, i.e. not only during policy development but also at implementation, evaluation, and revision stages (1 point);***
- *Institutions are required to disclose the rationale for taking or not taking into account inputs from consultations (2 points)*
- ***An accountability mechanism that allows public intervention such as petitioning and subsequent review regarding sustainable development related policies (2 points).***

5. Policy Linkages: Integrating the three dimensions of Sustainable Development

Description: The country has mechanisms in place that allow relevant public institutions to integrate the three dimensions of sustainable development and systematically assess the policy effects and cross-sectoral linkages throughout the policy and planning processes.

Participants found this sub-indicator to lack some clarity. The element on the full cost-benefit analysis of policy impacts across all sectors included as part of the ex -ante assessments related to new policies or plans) was considered difficult to measure. The discussions showed that it was not always clear that the elements of this subindicator were to consider the three dimensions of Sustainable Development.

[8] 2018, *Public Participation Bill,* http://kenyalaw.org/kl/fileadmin/pdfdownloads/bills/2018/PublicParticipationBill_2018.pdf

[9] 2012, *The Public Finance Management Act*, https://www.treasury.go.ke/tax/acts.html?download=603:the-public-finance-management-act-2012-1-1

However, the Kenyan government is working to establish an example of a mechanism that would fit in this indicator. The Draft version of the Guidelines for Preparation Of County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPS) from the Ministry of Devolution and Planning will ensure that the programmes of the counties "will also be reviewed based on cross-Sectoral considerations, both in terms of potential negative impact and of harnessing synergies across County Government sectors, across levels of government and with non-governmental stakeholders."[10] These CIDPS are implemented through Performance Contracts.

Every year, the National Treasury prepares guidelines for the budget. In the preparations of sectoral plans, it is required to indicate what the linkages of the programmes are with others.[11]

➔Value: 5

Value of the sub indicator

Either or a combination of the following (5 points):

- ***A requirement (including planning templates and checklists) that every new policy includes or is accompanied by an ex-ante assessment of its contribution to the three dimensions of sustainable development and of its cross-sectoral impacts;***
- *A system for the ex-post assessment of the contribution of policies or plans to the three dimensions of sustainable development and cross-sectoral impacts to inform future policy making;*
- *A permanent mechanism bringing together relevant sectoral representatives (e.g. a cross-sectoral task force) to regularly review the potential or actual effects of given policies and plans and advise on corrective action.*

Additional points related to elements that would strengthen the effectiveness of the mechanism:

- *The application of the above mechanisms at all levels of government, i.e. national and subnational (1 point);*
- *The establishment/existence of an indicator framework related to the implementation of policies or plans that track progress towards all three dimensions of sustainable development and the implementation of mitigation measures (1 point);*
- *A full cost-benefit analysis of policy impacts across all sectors included as part of the ex -ante assessments related to new policies or plans (1 point);*
- *The identification of measures to mitigate potentially negative effects and to optimize synergies as part of policy and planning (1 point);*
- *The consideration of international spill-overs, such as cross-border and international impacts (1 point);*
- *Other nationally relevant mechanism (1 point).*

6. Aligning across Government levels

Description: Either of the following mechanism or a combination of them:

[10] 2017, The Guidelines For Preparation Of County Integrated Development Plans, p. 8 https://roggkenya.org/wp-content/uploads/CIDP-GUIDELINES-REVISED-SEPTEMBER-2017.pdf

[11] 2016 : Guidelines for Preparation of the 2016/17 -2018/19 Medium Term Budget, Section E, 17. Vii) and Annex: 8 Sector Report Format: Chapter 4: Cross-Sector Linkages and emerging issues/challenges

- *Consultation and coordination mechanisms to systematically collect the inputs of sub-national government entities and the consideration of their priorities in national policy, strategy formulation and planning processes and to integrate national priorities into the subnational policies, plans and programmes;*
- *Contractual or other institutional arrangements for regular formal exchange between central government and subnational levels of government for systematic consultation, collaboration, and alignment of efforts;*
- *Mechanisms to ensure substantive coherence such as policy or planning and budgeting templates or checklists that require demonstration of alignment between sub-national and national level policies before validation and budget allocation;*
- *Planning cycle timeframes that facilitate the alignment of national and sub-national plans, or systems that allow for the regular review of plans, policies, regulations and programmes to facilitate such alignment*

The Inter-governmental Relations Act of 2012 established the intergovernmental structures in Kenya. The structure established by this Act that fits as a mechanism for this sub-indicator is the National and County Government Co-ordinating Summit, established in section 9 and which is chaired by the president. The summit meets at least twice a year and brings together the national government and the 47 counties in Kenya. The summit provides a forum for among others, consultation and co-operation between the national and county governments, promotion of national cohesion and unity, co-ordinating and harmonizing the development of county and national government policies.

The Public Finance Management Act of 2012 on the other hand established the Intergovernmental Budget and Economic Council which brings together the national government and the counties on budget related matters[12] and is chaired by the Vice-President. According to section 187.2 "the purpose of the Council is to provide a forum for consultation and cooperation between the national government and county governments" on budget related matters and meets at least twice a year.

The County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) have a 10-year span, that is being reviewed every 5 years. Their timing aligns with the timing of the MTPs as indicated by the County Government Act[13]. The CIDPs mirror the priorities of the MTPs at the sub national level and therefore will ensure the SDGs and Africa Agenda 2063 mainstreamed at the sub national level[14]. The CIDPS aim to "co-ordinate the work of both levels of the government in a coherent plan"[15].

Participants was also mentioned that at county level committees existed per sector bringing together different stakeholders including the national government, although this seems to be more of an organic practice than set up by official guidelines.

➔ **Value**: 10

[12] 2012, Public Finance Management Act, section 187,
[13] 2012 , The County Governments Act, section 112. 3) b)
[14] 2017, VNR 2017, p. 13.
[15]Website Council of Governors, http://cog.go.ke/about-us/20-the-council-of-governors/484-county-integrated-development-plans%C2%A0

Value of the sub indicator 6

Either of the following mechanism (5 points) or a combination of them (10 points):

- **Consultation and coordination mechanisms to systematically collect the inputs of sub-national government entities and the consideration of their priorities in national policy, strategy formulation and planning processes and to integrate national priorities into the subnational policies, plans and programmes;**
- Contractual or other institutional arrangements for regular formal exchange between central government and subnational levels of government for systematic consultation, collaboration, and alignment of efforts;
- **Mechanisms to enhance substantive coherence such as policy or planning and budgeting templates or checklists that require demonstration of alignment between sub-national and national level policies before validation and budget allocation;**
- **Planning cycle timeframes that facilitate the alignment of national and sub-national plans, or systems that allow for the regular review of plans, policies, regulations and programmes to facilitate such alignment.**

7. Monitoring and Reporting for Policy Coherence

Description: This mechanism could be expressed through a requirement that the effects of policies on the various dimensions of sustainable development and cross-sectoral impacts are monitored and evaluated on a regular basis using specific indicators and that the findings are used to inform adaptive action to ensure that such action is coherent. Such a mechanism would be strengthened by the requirement that aspects of policy coherence are integrated into reporting of government entities to the Parliament and to the public.

A national Monitoring & Evaluation policy has been established in Kenya in 2019 but is currently in a draft-phase and has not been approved yet by parliament. This draft is currently being used as inspiration for several institutions when developing their own M&E policies. The Monitoring and Evaluation systems in Kenya are at the project and programme level, not at the policy level.

At national level, the government is "rolling out a National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) and fast-tracking implementation of electronic Project Monitoring Information System (E-ProMIS) to provide a non-stop information portal where information is easily and readily available".[16]

The Electronic Project Monitoring Information system (E-ProMIS) is an information system for monitoring projects development and implementation. It is meant to capture information on projects implemented by ministries, state corporations and counties. All government organisations are encouraged (no obligation) to have their projects in the system and have them updated regularly. The objectives of this tool, among others, are to increase coordination by serving as a decision-support tool for the government to coordinate development efforts in the country and alignment by assessing the alignment of development projects with national/international strategies and priorities.[17]

At county level, the County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (CIMES) is the reporting system currently in place that should function as an observation system for the county and verifies

[16] VNR 2017, p. 46.
[17] http://e-promis.treasury.go.ke/portal/about/

whether the activities of each county's priority project or programme are happening according to planning timelines and targets presented in the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP).

Steps have been taken for the mechanisms indicated in the elements 1 and 3 for this sub indicator working towards general M & E frameworks, but these are not focused or do not contain specific aspects on the three dimensions of Sustainable Development. Additionally, there is no mechanism that monitors and/or reports on policy coherence for sustainable development itself.

The SDG coordination committee in the Ministry of Devolution and Planning is mandated to monitor SDG progress. This involves the preparation and collection of data for the VNR. The Kenyan National Bureau of statistics is the custodian of the official statistics through their National SDG Framework[18]

➔ **Value**: 0

Value of the sub indicator 7

- *An institutional or regulatory framework ensuring that the effects of policies on the various dimensions of sustainable development and cross-sectoral impacts are monitored and evaluated on a regular basis using specific indicators and that the findings are used to inform adaptive action to ensure that such action is coherent (5 points);*
- *Requirement that aspects of policy coherence for sustainable development are integrated into reporting of government entities to the Parliament and to the public (2 points);*
- *Existence and usage of tools and information management systems that facilitate availability, accessibility and comparability of centralized and harmonized data on sustainable development (3 points).*

8. Financing for Policy coherence

Description: Mechanisms may take several forms, including:

- *Check-lists to ensure that plans and budgets reflect aspects of policy coherence for sustainable development before validation and budget allocation, at all government levels;*
- *Integrated financial information systems, including the use of budget codes, to facilitate tracking, reporting and informed decisions on resource allocation at all levels of government or public expenditure reviews that are tagged to the various dimensions of sustainable development;*
- *A requirement that cooperation funds are aligned with national policies and priorities of both donors and recipients.*

The Public Finance Management Act states that the county government budgets should integrate development planning process which shall include both long term and medium-term planning.

The Integrated Financial Management Information System (IFMIS) was one of the tools mentioned related to this sub-indicator. The IFMIS aims to implement Section 12 (1) (e) of the Public Finance Management Act (2012) that calls on the National Treasury to "design and prescribe an efficient financial management system for the national and county governments to ensure transparent financial management and standard financial reporting."[19] Although this is an interesting tool, it is limited to

[18] https://www.knbs.or.ke/?wpdmpro=sdgs-national-indicator-framework-june-2019

[19] 2012, Public Finance Management Act, section 12, 1 (e),

procurement and does not give an integrated overview of resource allocation at all levels of government as indicated in the second element of this sub indicator. Moreover, it is not linked to the three dimensions of sustainable development. It was mentioned that the requirement that cooperation funds ("grants by development partners") to align with national policies and priorities is met by the fact that donor funds goes directly through the Treasury and thus the funds are automatically integrated into the budget and aligned with the national priorities. Additionally, the Public Finance Management Act states that the national government or a national government entity may receive a grant or donation from a development partner with the approval of the Cabinet Secretary and that a county government or county government entity may receive a grant or donation from a development partner with the approval of the County Executive Committee member for finance. This mechanism should ensure coherence between the cooperation funds and the national policies and priorities

→ Value: 5

Value of the sub indicator 8

One or a combination of the following (5 points):

- Check-lists to ensure that plans and budgets reflect aspects of policy coherence for sustainable development before validation and budget allocation, at all government levels;
- Integrated financial information systems, including the use of budget codes, to facilitate tracking, reporting and informed decisions on resource allocation at all levels of government or public expenditure reviews that are tagged to the various dimensions of sustainable development
- **Mechanisms to ensure that cooperation funds are aligned with national policies and priorities of both donors and recipients.**

3. Summary of established mechanisms, areas of improvement and potential solutions:

Total DRAFT Value for SDG-indicator 17.14.1: 43/80 → 54%

This is total DRAFT value of the SDG-indicator 17.14.1. Above you will see in green the elements of the sub indicators that apply to Kenya.

Sub Indicators	
1. Institutionalized political commitment	0
2. Long-term considerations	5
3. Inter-ministerial and cross-sectoral coordination	5
4. Participatory processes	8
5. Integration of the three dimensions of Sustainable Development, assessment of policy effects and linkages	5
6. Consultation and coordination across government levels	10
7. Monitoring and reporting for policy coherence	0
8. Financial resources and tools	5
TOTAL	43
Mechanisms in place to enhance policy coherence for sustainable development (%)	54%

The Kenyan government has not institutionalized its political commitment to policy coherence for sustainable development as assessed by **sub indicator 1** yet, despite the political commitment towards sustainable development. The vision 2030 which aims to lay out the long-term development blueprint for the country up to 2030 is a good example of a mechanism fitting the basic component of **sub indicator 2**. This vision has been translated into Medium Term Plans and the Kenyan government is currently implementing the Third Medium Term Plan (MTP 3 2018-2022). Despite the prominence of the future generations in the Constitution, the government has not established an institution as reflected in the first additional element of this indicator.

An inter-agency technical working group on sustainable development was established in early 2015 in line with the basic component of **sub indicator 3**. It is composed of key ministries, the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics and National Council for Population and Development, civil society and the private sector. The counties are represented as well. The main roles are to catalyse the implementation of the SDGs, mainstream them in planning documents, and report on SDG progress and acts as a forum to share information where necessary. When it comes to horizontal coherence, participants noted that the governance structure of a devolved state as Kenya requires not only the consideration of inter-ministerial coordination but also inter-governmental coordination at, for example, the county level. One of the mechanisms discussed that could ensure this horizontal coherence between counties is the Council of Governors which consists of the Governors of the forty-seven counties.

Regarding **sub indicator 4** Citizen participation is vaguely embedded in Kenya's Constitution as a principle and national value and has been translated in the County Governments Act of 2012. The County Governments Act requires public participation in county planning processes. In 2018 the Public Participation Bill was passed which among others guides the counties to develop "appropriate feedback mechanisms" and includes provisions to disclose the rationale for taking or not taking into account the inputs from consultations. The Public Finance Management Act equally provides the requirement and guidance to ensure that the budget processes take place in a participatory way.

When it comes to policy linkages, the Kenyan government is working to establish a mechanism that would fit in this **sub indicator 5.** The draft version of the Guidelines for Preparation Of County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPS) from the Ministry of Devolution and Planning will ensure that the programmes of the counties "will also be reviewed based on cross-Sectoral considerations, both in terms of potential negative impact and of harnessing synergies across County Government sectors, across levels of government and with non-governmental stakeholders" while every year, the National Treasury prepares guidelines for the budget for the preparations of sectoral plans which require to indicate what the linkages of the programmes are with other programmes. The National and County Government Co-ordinating Summit chaired by the president meets at least twice a year and brings together the national government and the 47 counties in Kenya. The summit, a good example for mechanisms falling under **sub indicator 6,** provides a forum for among others, consultation and co-operation between the national and county governments, promotion of national cohesion and unity, coordinating and harmonizing the development of county and national government policies. Additionally, the Intergovernmental Budget and Economic Council, chaired by the Vice-President brings together the national government and the counties on budget related matters.

The County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) have a 10-year span, that is being reviewed every 5 years which makes their timing align with the timing of the MTPs. Steps have been taken to establish mechanisms as set out in the elements 1 and 3 for this **sub indicator 7** working towards general M & E frameworks, but these are not focused or do not contain specific aspects on all dimensions of Sustainable Development. Kenya has established a requirement that cooperation funds ("grants by development partners") need to align with national policies and priorities through the approval of the Cabinet Secretary for grants and donations from a development partner to the national government (entity) and the approval of the County Executive Committee for grants and donations for county government (entity). The other elements of sub indicator 8 were not in place yet.