

MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE EU TRUST FUND REGIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT AND PROTECTION PROGRAMME IN KENYA:  
SUPPORT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF KALOBEYEI



Executive Summary

December 2018



## KALOBYEI: A NEW WAY OF WORKING IN THEORY AND IN PRACTICE

---

In 2016, the Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan (KISED P) was devised. Funded by the European Union, it is part of a broader regional effort called the EU Regional Development and Protection Programme (RDPP) in the Horn of Africa, led by the Netherlands, to improve protection and enhance development prospects for all – the displaced and local communities.

**The Kalobeyei intervention is a flagship initiative and a pre-cursor to the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) and global efforts aimed at area-based approaches in refugee hosting areas. It sets a new way of working for partners on the ground and a transformative approach for the way refugee assistance is delivered. The EUTF support is a first investment and the most significant contribution to the integrated approach so far.**

Kalobeyei is a first of its kind, and the evaluation should therefore be read in this light, as a contribution to learning not only for Kalobeyei, but for similar efforts globally.

Plans for Kalobeyei were drawn rapidly. With this mid-term evaluation, it is hoped that partners and donors can take a step back to reflect on the difficulties to date, adjust logframes to better plan and measure the overall action, and better adapt to the reality on the ground to achieve the overall aim of building community self-reliance for refugee and host community populations.

There are differences between the aims of Kalobeyei, on paper, and the context on the ground. While Kalobeyei was supposed to be home to protracted refugees from Kakuma, those living in the settlement and interviewed are recent arrivals, from a range of countries – South Sudan, Burundi, DRC and Ethiopia. The fact that the profiles are those of new arrivals has an impact on activities geared towards self-reliance – whether from the perspective of education or livelihoods. The fact that some result areas – like health – do not have an integrated water and sanitation component is a reflection of a weak design from the start. These are among some contextual elements that show how difficult the set-up is for UN agencies and implementing partners to succeed. This is furthermore taking place in the context of Turkana, a marginalized county, where all – refugees and hosts alike - are in need of protection, livelihoods, and support to achieve self-reliance.

This EUTF project is composed of inclusive education and health services, targeted protection services particularly for children, and support to foster long term food and nutrition security, and economic opportunities in and around the Kalobeyei settlement. This review assesses whether objectives have been achieved, and where obstacles and opportunities exist to inform future iterations of the project.

The mid-term review was conducted between July and November 2018 through a consultative process. It provides quantitative and qualitative data unavailable to date, with 618 surveys completed with hosts and refugees, as well as extensive consultations (39 focus group discussions, 64 key informant interviews, and partnership monitoring workshops with implementing partners on the ground). It adopts the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

## A PROJECT THAT REQUIRES MORE WORK ON THE HUMANITARIAN-DEVELOPMENT NEXUS

This mid-term review reveals that, while the EUTF intervention aims for development work, the context still requires humanitarian aid. The review underlines the need for improved implementation of the humanitarian-development nexus in Kalobeyei. Different sectors will require development and humanitarian support at different times during the project cycle. For example, livelihoods is currently undertaken with a development approach while other sectors, such as education, require humanitarian interventions. Shocks experienced, such as cholera outbreaks, require flexibility and adaptation, underlining the importance of long-term planning combined with strategic humanitarian injections. The concerning trends (orange/red in Table 1) illustrate the tension in catering to the pressing humanitarian and development needs locally.

A 5-point rating system uses colors to assess the state of progress: **red** (poor), **orange** (deficient), **light green** (good), dark green (excellent) and grey (inconclusive / lack of data at the mid-term stage) in each of the projects 6 result areas. This scoring needs to be interpreted with the following in mind: Firstly, the mid-term nature as well as the lack of a quantitative baseline makes the assessment of impact difficult at this stage. The overall timeframe of the 14-year KISED P programme must be borne in mind, especially when considering impact and sustainability. The assessment of impact will be more conclusive with the end-line evaluation. Secondly, gaps in overall project design and the lack of financial data and actual implementation budgets means that effectiveness is ranked as average, given that transparency and information sharing on budgets and finances is a precursor for effective programming. Thirdly, where at least two DAC criteria are marked as poor, the whole rating for the specific result is considered poor.

Table 1 Traffic light rating – Mid Term Review, Kalobeyei

DAC EVALUATION CRITERIA	HEALTH	FOOD AND NUTRITION SECURITY	EDUCATION	CHILD PROTECTION	ECONOMIC WELL-BEING	STAKEHOLDER BUY-IN	OVERALL BY DAC CRITERIA
RELEVANCE	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green	Light Green
EFFECTIVENESS	Orange	Orange	Red	Red	Orange	Grey	Orange
EFFICIENCY	Orange	Orange	Red	Red	Orange	Grey	Orange
IMPACT	Grey	Orange	Grey	Orange	Grey	Orange	Grey
SUSTAINABILITY	Red	Orange	Grey	Orange	Red	Red	Red
OVERALL	Orange	Orange	Red	Red	Orange	Orange	

The overwhelming presence of orange (deficient) ratings and the lack of any dark green (excellent) signals the need for improvement under all dimensions and criteria, requiring adjustments by partners and donors. It also calls for a revised approach to stakeholder buy-in, in part, through a dedicated coordination structure bringing together government, development and humanitarian actors, and a stronger focus on streamlined community participation to address gaps across result areas.

## A CONTEXT THAT REQUIRES MORE PLANNING AND RESOURCES

---

Further analysis through a scoring system shows that the gap between hosts and refugees is small on many of the results, indicating a **global context of need and level of deprivation recorded in Kalobeyei**. The context of Kalobeyei is one where hosts and refugees alike are in need of protection, livelihoods, and support to achieve self-reliance. Sustainability is concerning overall and most at risk under health, economic well-being and stakeholder buy-in. The county government is overstretched in meeting all sectoral needs and requires more support in terms of resources and capacity. Without planning and better coordination, the overall impact and sustainability of the Kalobeyei intervention will be limited.

**Planning requires time and a collective effort to address challenges to date.** The European Union's support to the "one UN model" is commendable, and an example of the recognition of the different skills which specific UN agencies institutionally offer the Kalobeyei model. In order to realise the "one UN" vision in Kalobeyei, a set of 10 macro recommendations are put forward for all Kalobeyei stakeholders (see Table 2). Additional actor-specific recommendations are proposed in this review under each result.

**The Government of Kenya**, at a national level, will need to commit to passing the legislative framework and to finalise sectoral policies, in line with global commitments under the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF). The commitments of the Government to work towards more inclusive policies (e.g. CRRF implementation, education sector and particularly at the level of Turkana County) are commendable. However, the review finds that delays in key legislative frameworks (such as the passing of the Refugee Bill, the CRRF roadmap or the Refugee Education Policy) have constrained progress on the ground. At county and sub-county levels, authorities can convene a workshop to jointly develop the Kalobeyei Theory of Change. Being part of this development from the onset will ensure that the government engages structurally in the process, and obtains clarity on areas of responsibility. Strides have been made and achieved at county level through the Agency/government partnership, despite central level government policy delays. The development of a joint Kalobeyei Theory of change is an opportunity for all stakeholders to obtain more information and clarity on processes in Lodwar to support sub-county authorities, and further reinforce the calls for support towards county financing, financial planning and technical support (notably in the health sector).

**Development and humanitarian donors** need to coordinate funding streams to bridge the current gaps and to agree on dedicated funding – notably for institution building and for the integration of a learning partner as of 2019. This can support the transition of coordination models. Development donors, who are new to the refugee space, can also pro-actively share lessons learned from their planning practices and the wider development portfolio in Kenya to bring new processes and actors to support the KISEDIP vision. Donors are encouraged to be more flexible, through the inclusion of contingency funding for emergencies, as well as stricter in their funding requirements, making funding contingent upon data sharing and financial transparency. Without it, the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of the Kalobeyei model cannot be assessed at a time when Kalobeyei can serve to inform global initiatives.

**UN agencies can** realise the "one UN" vision in Kalobeyei. To do so, this review suggests that UN agencies lead within their technical sector, in collaboration with the government, with a transformation at three levels:

1. Leadership needs to be shared and divided by thematic areas of expertise with overall coordination and information sharing across sectors.
2. A new coordination model can be designed to bring together humanitarian, development, government and displacement-affected communities. At a global level OCHA and UNDP provide an example of the transition of coordination models that could be replicated in Kalobeyei.
3. Current gaps in monitoring can be addressed by adopting a revised logframe (see Annex 2).

It is recommended that UNHCR focuses on its protection mandate and coordination role in Kalobeyei as protection needs are present in all sectors and will continue to require a protection-mandated agency.

**All actors can work towards more balanced host/refugee investments through sharing of practices and processes.** While the county authorities are new in their engagement with refugees, refugee-sector actors are also largely new to comprehensive host community engagement. Involving local institutions can help reach a balance.

*Table 2 10 Macro-Level Recommendations – Mid Term Review, Kalobeyei*

#	10-POINT PLAN: MACRO-LEVEL RECOMMENDATIONS
<b>STRATEGIC</b>	
1	Adopt a common theory of change
2	Bring humanitarian funding to meet basic needs while planning for longer-term needs
<b>PLANNING</b>	
3	Develop a comprehensive multi-annual joint implementation plan
4	Engage with women and mainstream gender analyses
<b>COORDINATION</b>	
5	Adapt coordination structures
6	Bring financial transparency to improve coordination and planning
<b>IMPLEMENTATION</b>	
7	Develop and adopt data sharing protocols at all levels
8	Strengthen bilateral funding to partners on the ground
9	Strengthen institutions and systems
10	Strengthen targeting: increase support to Villages 2 and 3 and the host community

## HOW TO USE THIS REPORT

This report reviews the six results under the EUTF Kalobeyei project to provide an assessment of the overall action undertaken. It is not an evaluation of outputs, or of each agency's project-related activities but rather asks whether the lives of people in Kalobeyei has changed through this collective effort. **The essence of this evaluation is to shed light on the level of contribution, not of attribution:** how are activities on the ground contributing to results, which in turn contribute to self-reliance for hosts and refugees alike? What can be learned from the Kalobeyei project to improve future rounds of funding?

While the project is coming to a close in 2019, it is the hope of this evaluation that it offers an understanding of improvements to be made in the EU Action in Kalobeyei in its next round. This is done through a consultative evaluation process based on agreed upon OECD-DAC criteria and an evaluation matrix, up-to-date empirical evidence, and recommendations to revise a logframe to incorporate outcome and impact indicators.

In order to do so this report offers a review of each result area under the overall action. Each result has a dedicated chapter combining quantitative and qualitative findings under one analysis of needs, progress and challenges. Each chapter is given the same structure, with i) a presentation of the EUTF result and its associated activities, ii) a scoring and rating system, iii) an analysis by OECD DAC criteria showcasing the most pertinent findings from the field, and iv) result-based recommendations for a way forward.

A conclusion frames the main recommendations of the mid-term review and is geared towards all stakeholders. It offers immediate/short term recommendations as well as more forward-looking proposals for the next stages of the KISED P.

**The review acknowledges that the design of the EU funded Kalobeyei project did not allow for effective planning in certain key sectors.** For instance, the fact that the health component did not include due consideration to water and sanitation has limited the impact that partners working in the health sector can achieve.

**The review confirms the relevance of continuing the investment in Kalobeyei. It is recommended for Phase 2 that certain key sectors be covered through humanitarian funding, while EUTF focuses development funding specifically on livelihoods, food security and capacity building.** This report can therefore be used by UN agencies and implementing partners as part of their funding strategy, coordination and accountability efforts, and by donors and the government to plan on the basis of lessons drawn and recommendations made.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

The evaluation team extends its appreciation to all of the key informants and agencies on the ground, who worked tirelessly to facilitate the team's access to the field, to the target populations and to their own knowledge and information. Special thanks go first and foremost to the government for authorising this important evaluation, and to representatives of the county government for their engagement in the field, to UNHCR, FAO, UNICEF, WFP, as well as NGOs and civil society organisations consulted throughout the duration and locations of this research. We are grateful for their support to the evaluation while agencies still had to address pressing day-to-day responsibilities in the field.

Teachers, medical staff, nurses, farmers all shared their insights to highlight the practical meaning of the Kalobeyei Action on the lives of refugees and host communities alike. Community committees welcomed us, women spoke about their protection needs, and children welcomed us in their classrooms. It is in the hope that this evaluation can pave the way for more support to their goals and aspirations, to facilitate more effective humanitarian and development support, greater advocacy, more adapted design and effective planning.

Nairobi, December 2018

**Samuel Hall** is a social enterprise that conducts research in countries affected by issues of migration and displacement. Our mandate is to produce research that delivers a contribution to knowledge with an impact on policies, programmes and people.

Samuel Hall has offices in Afghanistan and Kenya, and a presence in Germany and the United Arab Emirates. For more information, please visit [www.samuelhall.org](http://www.samuelhall.org)



#### Disclaimer

This publication was produced with the financial support of the European Union. Its contents are the sole responsibility of Samuel Hall and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Union.