

## **Joint Denmark-UNHCR Evaluation of the Integrated Solutions Model in and around Kalobeyei, Turkana, Kenya Management response and follow-up note**

This note summarises the main findings, conclusions and recommendations from the evaluation report and includes comments from Evaluation Department (EVAL) of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The evaluation was commissioned by EVAL and managed jointly by EVAL and UNHCR Evaluation Service (ES) and conducted by an independent evaluation team of international consultants from ADE.

### **1. Background**

In 2018, EVAL set out in its Evaluation programme an ambition to strengthen the focus on evaluating Danish humanitarian assistance as well as to seek to engage in joint evaluative work with multilateral partners within topics of specific Danish interest. The programme also endeavoured to pilot new approaches to joint evaluations with multilateral partners, while at the same time respecting our partners' own reporting and evaluation mechanisms.

In line with the above, discussions were undertaken with the Evaluation Service (ES) of UNHCR with the objective of conducting a joint evaluation between Denmark and UNHCR, in an effort to learn collectively from new, comprehensive, development-oriented models of providing protection, assistance and solutions to refugees and host communities. In collaboration with HMC, an evaluation was agreed and prepared jointly by UNHCR and EVAL focusing on the 'Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Programme (KISED P)', a comprehensive response to displacement in Turkana County, in the north-western part of Kenya. KISED P was formulated in 2016 with the objective of providing protection to refugees while at the same time addressing the development needs of impoverished host communities in the county.

The evaluation was framed as a forward-looking, learning-focused evaluation, with emphasis on the key lessons to be learned from the KISED P as a relatively unique model of collaboration between a range of humanitarian and development partners.

### **2. Executive Summary (by Consultant)**

The Evaluation Service of UNHCR and the Evaluation Department in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark have commissioned ADE with the evaluation of the Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan (KISED P). KISED P is a multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder development programme that contributes to transforming the humanitarian model of assistance for refugees towards development-oriented approaches that enhance the self-reliance of refugees and development of host communities in the Turkana West sub-County of Kenya. The evaluation scope includes refugees resident in both Kakuma camp and Kalobeyei settlement – as well as the host communities of Turkana West sub-county, over the period 2016 - 2018. This is a forward-looking evaluation aimed at lesson learning.

The KISED P plan emerged over three years with significant evolution in the objectives, leadership, scope and approach over the course of development. The current KISED P plan was approved in December 2018 and is closely aligned to the County Integrated Development Plan for 2018-2022CIDP. Assistance for on-going humanitarian and emergency assistance, including food assistance, and parts of international protection work, remained largely outside of the KISED P plan.<sup>1</sup>

The evaluation drew on interviews with national and international stakeholders, the views of affected populations and a desk review of documents and data – with data gathered and analysed in the first half of 2019. The analysis and synthesis phase included periodic consultations with the Evaluation Reference Group and other stakeholders. The main evaluation limitation was limited access to Government Ministries at national level.

Kenya has been hosting refugees since 1970 with the numbers increasing significantly from 1990 due to refugee influxes from Somalia and South Sudan. Approximately 190,000 refugees are resident in Kakuma camp (established in 1992) and the Kalobeyei settlement (established in 2015) in Turkana County, located in the North-West near the border with South Sudan – which represents 40% of all refugees in Kenya.

Turkana County remains economically, politically and socially marginalised from the main markets and population centres and with poor infrastructure provision, despite decades of development assistance to Turkana. The economy is principally reliant on pastoralism and data suggests that many refugees in Kakuma camp are better off than their Turkana hosts.<sup>2</sup>

## **The KISED P Model**

A global consensus has emerged on the need to respond to the needs of refugees and asylum seekers with innovative and more developmentally aligned approaches. The New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants (NYD) and the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), which the UN General Assembly endorsed in 2016, represented a significant commitment for greater international responsibility sharing and support to refugee hosting countries. In line with the objectives of comprehensive refugee responses, they called conducive laws and policies that enable refugee self-reliance, as well as the overall development of refugee hosting areas in line with national and sub-national planning priorities. This entails that refugee camps should be the exception and refugees should be allowed to live among host communities to reduce the risk of protracted stays and lessen refugees' dependence on humanitarian aid.

The KISED P plan was found to be highly coherent with the NYD and the CRRF, with the latter now being embedded as an integral part of the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR) affirmed in December 2018. It is unclear whether the GCR has yet influenced the KISED P design, and it is noted that the GCR was affirmed after launch of the KISED P.

Efforts have been made to adapt the legal and policy environment towards Kenya's commitments in line with comprehensive refugee responses, such as the commitments Kenya made at the 2016 Leaders' Summit and in the 2017 Nairobi Declaration and Plan of Action that set in motion the regional CRRF application in the East and Horn of Africa. Through the commitments made at these fora, and in line with the government's decision to become a CRRF rollout country in autumn 2017, the Government

---

<sup>1</sup> Aspects of international protection work that will remain outside of the scope of KISED P include overseeing access to territory, registration, prevention of refoulement, advocating for rights, and ensuring access to justice and the rule of law.

<sup>2</sup> For example, see Turkana County Government, UNHABITAT & UNHCR (2016) KISED P Socio-Economic and Mapping Baseline Survey Report.

of Kenya (GoK) committed to enhance refugees' self-reliance and inclusion in Kenya, through the development of the Kalobeyi Integrated Settlement.

However, further national policy reforms, including the approval of the CRRF roadmap and Refugee Bill, have stalled. These delays are associated with domestic policy concerns on maintaining security and the priority placed on job creation for citizens over refugees. At the County level there has been increasing alignment between KISED P and the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), with an extremely close, and still evolving, alignment at the time of the evaluation.

While donors are also committed to the NYD/CRRF and the GCR at the global level, this has been unevenly translated into donor strategies and priorities for bilateral development assistance at the national level. For some donors this has been crowded out by other priorities or not yet incorporated due to long-term (typically five-year) planning cycles for development cooperation. Support has been most evident where it is aligned with the strategic interest in improving the management of informal migration or seen as a mechanism to reduce long-term humanitarian support to refugees. There is little, and decreasing, appetite amongst donors to support the resettlement of refugees both globally and specifically refugees granted asylum in Kenya, leaving the main responsibility and hosting burden on Kenyan authorities.

Other development agencies – including the UN agencies and the World Bank Group – have increasingly included refugee and migration objectives within their development strategies. This is driven by the recognition of the importance of improved refugee responses to achieving their core mission of poverty reduction.

UNHCR has been central to initiating and facilitating the development of the KISED P plan. This required a major shift in organisational approach and individual mind sets. UNHCR internal leadership at global, country and field levels have been critical in moving to a developmental approach and the rate of progress is clearly linked to changes in staff. Change has also been supported by evolving corporate policies and processes.

While all stakeholders appreciated UNHCR's role as an advocate and facilitator, the KISED P planning exercise would have benefited from stronger engagement of key development agencies in a leadership role, who have established expertise in development planning. While World Bank and IFC studies were used to inform the plan, KISED P would have benefitted from stronger engagement of key development partners in the core planning process from the outset, including UNDP and donors.

Government authorities at both national and local level have been central actors in moving the KISED P planning process forward. At the national level the traditional UNHCR counterpart have been the Refugee Affairs Secretariat. However, the success of KISED P depends on establishing additional direct relationships with a wider range of counterpart Ministries – such as the Ministries in charge of education, planning, financing and local administration – and the Executive where responsibility for major policy decisions rests.

The County Governor is credited with being a leading force in the development of the approach that has evolved into KISED P. A critical factor, which enabled the political leadership to take this position, was a change in perception of refugees from vulnerable people requiring external assistance, to productive members of a broader community. Integrating the KISED P as part of the CIDP provided a critical opportunity to integrate refugees within a nationally owned development framework. However, a major constraint to the full participation of the County Government in KISED P planning is related to human capacity constraints.

Despite a strong commitment to community involvement and empowerment as part of the planning process, the focus group discussions indicated that many individual refugees did not feel consulted and community leaders had limited effectiveness in disseminating information and acting as a bridge to

community consultation. The County Government took the innovative decision to include refugees in CIDP consultations and these consultations were positively evaluated and referenced as a best practice.

## **Architecture for Delivery**

KISEDIP has succeeded in involving a diverse range, and growing number, of partners in implementation, including greater participation by development (as opposed to humanitarian) agencies and from the private sector. The roles and responsibilities of the different partners are still evolving, driven by considerations of mandate, comparative advantage and capacity.

As the owner of the CIDP/KISEDIP the County Government has the lead responsibility for core functions of planning, coordination and accountability. However, existing efforts in building its own capacity, significant gaps still remain. Until a point at which the County Government has the capacity to take full responsibility for these functions, UNHCR is providing secretariat staff to reinforce and support coordination, monitoring and evaluation functions. While UNHCR acted in a timely way to fill a gap by leading support to planning and coordination, other agencies may offer comparative advantages in this role.

UNHCR has played critical roles in facilitating and encouraging the entry of a range of stakeholders by “opening up the refugees’ space”, establishing MoUs with some UN agencies and through the organisation of thematic planning workshops from 2014 onwards. Improved availability of funding has also been important. Consequently, a wide range of UN agencies have played an increasingly prominent role in Turkana West, in line with their organisational mandates. However, there has been a weak relationship between UNHCR and both UNDP and the Resident Coordinator’s Office for undetermined reasons.

In line with changes under KISEDIP, INGO and NGO partners are adapting towards more inclusive and market-oriented solutions. Diverse roles have been identified for the private sector. The IFC Challenge Fund for Kakuma and Kalobeyei is a core strategy for supporting the development of the private sector in Turkana West. However, with KISEDIP implementation only starting there was limited evidence at this point on the effectiveness of NGOs or the private sector in filling these new roles.

Significant progress has been made in establishing KISEDIP coordination structures, which have grown out of existing UNHCR operational coordination and the original KISEDIP planning workshops. However, the new implementation phase requires more regular, structured and strategic processes of coordination and increased County Government leadership. Coordination of the different development initiatives in Turkana West, which complement KISEDIP, remains fragmented.

UNHCR has recognised some of the needs of the next phase of coordination with its proposed new structure. Stakeholders perceive that the KISEDIP plan includes insufficient detail on how the complex processes of change envisioned in KISEDIP will occur and how they will be addressed in the new coordination structures. This included changes from international humanitarian assistance to government leadership, adopting market-based approaches, the inclusion of host communities in an area based approach, moving from blanket assistance to targeted assistance and from direct service provision to cash-based approaches. Given this, the specific coordination challenges in KISEDIP include defining the evolving roles of partners, laying out the pathway towards changes in financing of services and inclusion of refugees and host communities in services and plans to build capacity of government to take on its increased leadership role.

The first amalgamated, multi-partner and multi-year budget for KISEDIP was presented in December 2018, and continues to be a dynamic document with more detailed planning underway. However, there are significant exclusions from the KISEDIP budget, including the majority of humanitarian funding

needs, protection activities such as advocacy for freedom of movement or an estimate of the number of refugees expected to become self-reliant. Consequently, the budget does not provide a comprehensive overview of financing needs, gaps and potential financial impact of the plan.

There are some new sources of external support coming into Turkana West associated with KISED, notably from the World Bank and EU Trust Funds. However, the volume of additional financing falls far short of needs. While the budget includes significant contributions from the GoK, but there are very different opinions on how these total costs should be proportioned with donors.

A collective funding and fund-raising plan for KISED is missing and there is no means to track funding and gaps – however this may be addressed as one of the tasks of the new secretariat. Funding KISED through the new UNDP Multi-Party Trust Fund for Turkana – possibly as a separate envelope – offers potential advantages in terms of efficiency, balanced support and a clearer picture of contributions and funding gaps, but donor interest is currently limited due to focussing on selected priorities within the overall KISED plan and concerns on accountability.

Robust monitoring and learning systems are critical functions to support a continual process of reflection and programme adjustment as KISED evolves. Effective reporting is also required to maintain donor support and buy-in. However, the monitoring system for KISED is at a very early stage of development and in need of significant investment.

Key priorities for M&E development include a) the building of County Government capacity to track progress against CIDP objectives as well as b) more strategic level monitoring of KISED against its goal and strategic objectives as well as process indicators of changes in relation to moves towards self-reliance and the buy-in of different stakeholders. There are currently a number of parallel initiatives being established to monitor different aspects of programme and different initiatives progress in Turkana West. Currently, these systems are not yet brought together.

## **Inclusion and Equality of Access**

The KISED seeks to transition refugees from basic services provided through parallel humanitarian systems to receiving services through Government systems and extend improved basic service provision to the host community. There has been significant progress towards the inclusion of refugees in national services, so far mainly at the policy level for education and health.

The transition has been heavily influenced by the comparative quality of government and humanitarian services. In some cases, the specific needs of refugees – such as the disproportionate levels of trauma and deprivation – justify continued assistance for refugees above national norms or through parallel services. Given the anticipated protracted relief needs of refugees, the opportunities to include refugees within targeted national social protection schemes should be explored. There is also an emerging role for the private sector in service delivery for both refugees and host communities.

As an interim measure, the host community has been afforded access to humanitarian services, but this has limited coverage and risks adding to tensions when these are phased out in favour of chargeable national services. Limited progress has so far been made in expanding government service provision to areas of Turkana West, which cannot access facilities shared with refugees.

A major change introduced by KISED is the goal to increase the self-reliance of refugees. One strand of this has been encouraging private sector investment to expand employment opportunities for both refugees and host populations. However, the remoteness and poorly developed infrastructure in Turkana are structural barriers to private sector investment, compounded by legal restrictions that largely restrict refugees to poorly regulated informal employment opportunities.

Consequently, the more viable route to develop refugee livelihoods may lie through self-employment. There is considerable interest in expanding agricultural livelihoods for refugees and host communities alike – but inadequate infrastructure, including water supplies for irrigation and livestock use, are a major limitation. KISED P required the strong participation of a much more experienced development actor to conduct a rigorous and robust economic analysis of such investment opportunities, rather than the lighter analyses typically conducted to support humanitarian intervention.

The increased use of cash transfers has increased the circulation of cash in the local economy, which has promoted small-scale local businesses with positive effects on self-reliance. However, a restrictive policy and legal environment was a major obstacle to business development, especially as these challenges are exacerbated by the vulnerability of refugees to rent seeking behaviour and little is being done to mitigate these heightened risks.

In the specific context of Turkana West there are serious challenges to the underlying assumption of increased self-reliance amongst refugees. While some refugees may find jobs and others may be able to run small businesses, in the absence of greater freedoms for refugees, many more are expected to continue to struggle over long periods and require continued social assistance.

## **Conclusions and recommendations**

A key KISED P achievement has been the systematic inclusion of refugees in the Kenyan owned CIDP planning process. This has supported a progressive transition in the primary responsibility for providing assistance and services to refugees falling on the Kenyan authorities, rather than the international humanitarian community and as a developmental priority. However, the KISED P plan only conveys a part of the overall picture as the large continuing humanitarian part of the refugee response, aspects of international protection and private sector involvement, and partially devolved sectors such as education and health are incompletely incorporated. This lack of clarity is compounded by the changing nature of the plan.

### ***Recommendation 1: Review and revise the KISED P planning process and documents***

- a) *Move to fully align the scope of the KISED P plan within the Turkana CIDP by removing activities that are additional to the responsibilities of the County Government. The rationale for this change is to clarify and promote the full ownership and accountability of the County Government on development matters pertaining to refugee hosting areas.*
- b) *Supplement the CIDP/KISED P document with a document summarising the overall strategy and response including CIDP/KISED P development plan, the sectors supported at national level, the UNHCR led humanitarian and emergency response and other relevant international protection elements, and (if possible) elements of the private sector response. This comprehensive document should include an analysis of the interrelationships between these different elements.*
- c) *Future plans should include strengthened community engagement in the planning process, enhanced analysis of the links to durable solutions and complementary pathways and a risk analysis and mitigation plan.*
- d) *Develop a comprehensive communication strategy to communicate the overall approach to partners at all level, including refugee and host communities and Nairobi based stakeholders and update them on a regular basis. An overall objective would be to seek broadened and sustainable stakeholder engagement and mobilization of support.*

While there has been political support from the GoK to the NYD/CRRF and GCR at the global level, there has also been ambivalence in implementation. Further national policy reforms are needed to fully realise the CRRF ambitions of allowing refugees to live among host communities, gaining access to

education and labour markets, and becoming self-reliant. Realising KISED P needs to reconcile competing domestic policy goals – such as maintaining security and prioritising local employment creation – with the CRRF agenda.

***Recommendation 2: Initiate a high-level political dialogue in Kenya between the GOK and donors.***

*Initiate a political dialogue at the highest possible level between donors (preferably at the ambassadorial level) and the National Government (preferably within the Office of the president) to focus on the collective response to refugees in Turkana. The agenda for this dialogue would include (1) discussion on the various legal and bureaucratic restrictions on the rights of refugees to work, (2) mechanisms for responsibility- and burden-sharing arrangements in Kenya, and (3) opportunities for solutions, such as through voluntary repatriation and resettlement, building on the four interdependent and interlinked objectives of the GCR and comprehensive refugee responses.*

The County Government has provided exceptional leadership and political commitment to KISED P and this has been essential to the whole KISED P process. This required significant political courage. The challenge is to build on this high-level political support by strengthening the ownership of the process across the County Government. Strengthened capacities for coordination and accountability have been identified as clear priorities for reinforced government capacity.

***Recommendation 3: Strengthen the capacity of the County Government to coordinate, monitor and report against the KISED P results.***

*Development partners, including UNHCR, the World Bank (DRDIP) and UNDP, should pool resources to support the establishment and operation of the proposed Secretariat housed within the County Government.*

UNHCR played a leading role in initiating a process of change, underpinned by progressive leadership, new staffing profiles, a supportive policy environment, with a willingness to pilot new approaches. However, it is appropriate that overtime progressively greater responsibility for refugees should be taken on by other development actors as part of the SDG agenda and commitments. While partnerships in support of KISED P have greatly expanded, some notable gaps remain – including the choice of UNDP not to engage substantively.

***Recommendation 4: Strengthen support to KISED P by technical development agencies.***

*Review and improve the specificity of UNHCR MoU with other development partners (including UNDP) to reinforce the predictability of the participation of other agencies in CRRF settings. This may include establishing formal stand-by arrangements to assist in areas such as development planning, coordination and monitoring.*

KISED P is aligned with the CRRF goal of allowing refugees to benefit from national services. Credible pathways have been established to integrate refugees within government systems of service provision in sectors such as education and health. However, weaknesses of government delivery systems in sectors such as household water, mean management of national systems will have to be improved prior to the inclusion of refugees. Furthermore, as the specific needs of refugees differ from the host population, the continuation of some parallel services, including protection, are justified.

As most government services involve charges or an element of cost recovery, including education and health. The best way of meeting this is through the adapted inclusion of refugees within national social protection systems – something that is yet to be explored under KISED P.

***Recommendation 5: Explore the inclusion of refugees within national social protection mechanisms.***

- a) Review the relevance and feasibility of incorporating refugees within national social protection mechanisms. This may require examination and discussion of whether the targeting criteria applied to refugees, and the levels of assistance provided, should vary from those used for host communities.*
- b) Analyse the comparative cost effectiveness of delivery of basic services through government and humanitarian delivery channels.*

Overall, progress towards creating livelihood opportunities has been very challenging. Turkana is a particularly challenging environment for business and entrepreneurship given its remoteness, limited resources, poor communications and weak internal market. Decades of development assistance have done little to transform the situation. Furthermore, the significant legal constraints, including issues of identity, freedom of movement, financial inclusion, land ownership and work permits compound the situation. It would clearly have been preferable to develop refugee self-reliance in an environment with suitable land and water resources – and is a lesson for future consideration.

In the current situation, there are two main options for accelerating progress in employment creation. Firstly, negotiation is needed with the GoK on establishing a more supportive policy and legal environment for refugees. Secondly, investment in infrastructure could improve livelihoods opportunities. Large-scale investment in water supply has been identified as an important pathway to enhance refugee self-reliance. However, this is capital intensive and requires close analysis of the costs and benefits – financial, economic, environmental and social – prior to an investment decision.

***Recommendation 6: Strengthen pathways to self-reliance***

- a) Develop an evidenced and shared view of scenarios of the rate at which self-reliance may be developed and an estimate of the requirement for continued direct assistance.*
- b) Undertake a robust cost-benefit analysis of the proposed dam to support agriculture livelihoods in Kalobeyei.*
- c) Explore the possibility of piloting alternative approaches that may facilitate improved prospects of self-reliance for refugees. For example, this might include the controlled settlement of limited numbers of refugees in other areas of Turkana or other counties.*

KISED P was supported by a range of some new and more appropriate sources of financing including contributions from multi-year and development budgets. However, it is apparent that there is so far very limited additional investment by either GoK or donors and funding is far short of the budget requirements.

Underlying this situation is the near absence of dialogue on burden- and responsibility-sharing. There is a dangerous assumption by donors that inclusion of refugees in national systems equated to a willingness on the side of the GoK to assume full financial responsibility, despite the NYD commitment to shared international responsibilities borne equitably. The GCR and programme of

action that followed the NYD/CRRF has so far had little observable impact on clarifying arrangements for burden- and responsibility-sharing – as was its intent.

### ***Recommendation 7: Strengthen fund raising strategies***

- a) Develop a collective fund-raising plan for KISED P and means to track funding and gaps (KISED P/CIDP Secretariat)*
- b) Explore the potential and appetite for funding KISED P through the new UNDP Multi-Party Trust Fund for Turkana*
- c) Consider including refugees as target group as part of the education budget support provide to GoK (donors)*
- d) At global level the GCR stakeholders should clarify the principles and mechanisms for responsibility- and burden-sharing arrangements.*

*KISED P is still in the early stages and so conclusions are necessarily preliminary. However, it is clear that KISED P represents a serious and promising attempt to support a protracted refugee crisis in a new and more appropriate manner. The GoK, at both national and county levels, has provided leadership and refugees are now being included in national development plans. Other actors, with UNHCR to the fore, are fundamentally adapting their approach.*

Moving forward the evaluation identifies both challenges and opportunities. Overall KISED P holds the potential for providing a good example of how to implement the CRRF. However, in order to realise this potential continued commitment and support will be required by all agencies and levels of Government.

### **3. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs' comments to the evaluation (HMC, APD & EVAL)**

As the evaluation has been carried out as a joint evaluation with the ambition of assessing the KISED P model, and given the partnership spirit between Denmark and UNHCR, the evaluation was intended to assess the overall approach and processes, rather than the specific sectoral results under the programme. This was partly due to the novelty of the programme and the resulting lack of outcome-level results at this early stage but it also reflected the strategic interest in learning from the KISED P model as by far the most important platform for rolling out the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework in Kenya. Of specific interest to Denmark has been to understand opportunities and challenges in the envisioned collaboration across a broad range of humanitarian and development actors together with local and national authorities in order to learn from the model and apply lessons learned in Kenya and elsewhere. As such, the evaluation does not assess outcomes towards a specific Danish engagement, but rather a strategically important model to address forced displacement in order to generate learning for donors, humanitarian and development actors as well as host countries' governments.

Denmark supports the KISED P through a contribution within the framework of the framework partnership agreement with UNHCR

As the KISED P is a multi-year, multi-stakeholder programme, the management of which falls way beyond the MFA, the recommendations of the evaluation aim at a larger audience of humanitarian actors, development partners and the Kenyan government. In view of this, the current document presents a set of overall comments rather than a traditional management response

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs welcomes the evaluation, its findings and conclusions as well as the recommendations provided by the evaluation team.

The evaluation raises a range of important issues related to multi-year, multi-stakeholder responses to displacement and as such, it is a valuable contribution to the ongoing debate on how best to operationalise the 'humanitarian-development nexus' thinking.

The evaluation concludes that the KISED P provides a relevant framework for comprehensive responses to displacement. It highlights the leadership demonstrated by the Kenyan government, at national as well as county level. Moreover, the evaluation emphasises the critical role UNHCR has played in facilitating and encouraging the participation of a wide range of stakeholders in developing and implementing the programme. However, the evaluation also identifies a number of challenges and shortcomings that hampers the full implementation of the programme.

First, while the evaluation finds that the KISED P contains important and innovative elements in support of refugee self-reliance, e.g. through private sector engagement, it also notes that this is seriously challenged by Kakuma being located in a desolate, impoverished and marginal part of Kenya. This is further exacerbated by the absence of an enabling policy environment; refugees are, for instance, not allowed to travel freely in the country, meaning that their ability to engage successfully in business development and other gainful activities are severely hampered. The MFA recognises the difficulties in providing protection assistance and socio-economic development in such a setting.

Secondly, the evaluation finds that while humanitarian actors have adapted to and engaged in the development and implementation of KISED P in a rather remarkable fashion, development actors, including UN agencies, the EU and bilateral donors are not nearly as engaged. In order for the model to succeed, significant advances need to be made in this regard. The MFA takes note of the finding and will work to integrate and coordinate Danish development contributions with humanitarian funding.

Based on these core findings, the evaluation recommends that a dialogue on concrete burden and responsibility sharing arrangements in line with the Global Compact on Refugees is initiated between the international community and the Kenyan government at the earliest. This needs to reflect clear long-term commitments by donors to deliver additional development assistance for refugees and host communities in exchange for a more conducive policy environment for refugee self-reliance.

While the evaluation does not specifically and in detail address Denmark's role in the KISED P, it points to a number of structural barriers for development actors – among them, Denmark – which need to be overcome. It highlights that while Denmark has been a vocal and strong supporter of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework and the Global Compact on Refugees, it is among the actors in Kenya that have failed to adapt its approach to development cooperation accordingly. The MFA takes note of this finding and the subsequent recommendation focusing on development actors' incentives. The MFA will explore how to best facilitate the coordination and alignment of development and humanitarian priorities in the new Kenya country programme, building upon the 'Doing Development Differently' initiative at the MFA, aiming to ensure a wider coherence between the range of Danish instruments in priority countries. The coordination and coherence will likewise be sought elsewhere where Denmark has both development and humanitarian engagements.

The findings and recommendations also point to the need for a common approach in the MFA on how to support comprehensive approaches to refugee protection and host community development through Danish long-term development financing, thereby providing the KISED P and other similar models a foundation for achieving results. This should be considered in ongoing discussions on how to engage further in hum-dev nexus thinking across the ministry's funding channels. This includes considerations on how different modalities across the humanitarian-development nexus can mutually reinforce each other.

The evaluation was commissioned and managed jointly by UNHCR ES and the Department of Evaluation and Research (EVAL), Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark the two evaluation departments have worked closely together throughout the entire evaluation process from shaping the ToRs, to co-facilitating the quality assurance through the Evaluation Reference Group.

The purpose of the joint management process was for the two evaluation departments to learn from each other and together explore how to evaluate programmes unfolding in the humanitarian-development nexus. Most significant among the main lessons are the importance of a thorough context analysis and stakeholder mapping and an understanding of the different funding streams inherent to humanitarian and development assistance and how they could be brought together and synergized. Furthermore, this evaluation gave a valuable insight into the challenges for an organisation when transitioning into the engagement of more comprehensive responses to displacement.

While the evaluation provides a number of useful recommendations to a broad range of actors, the evaluation does not provide concrete and actionable inputs to how development actors and bilateral donors can play a more proactive role in the rollout of an integrated approach model such as the KISEDIP. The Evaluation Department has therefore decided to conduct a follow-up study to the evaluation with a specific emphasis on how development actors can provide support and what concrete steps need to be taken in order to do so. This study will be finalised early 2020.

The collaboration has been carried out in a positive and constructive spirit, and both evaluation departments are very satisfied with the joint evaluation process.

The joint-evaluation model provides a flexible and non-binding way of collaborating with multilateral partners and gaining insight into a multilateral partners' M&E work and results reporting. As the percentage of Danish ODA contributed to multilateral organisations is increasing, understanding the M&E of our partners become even more pertinent. EVAL will continue to explore ways of collaborating with interested multilateral partners on evaluative work going forward, with a specific focus on learning collaboratively. The results of the evaluation will be presented at the Global Refugee Forum in December.