**USAID NAWIRI**

**Turkana/Samburu Political Economy Analysis**

**Scope of Work (SOW)**

1. **Program Background**

USAID's Office of Food for Peace recently awarded funding to a Mercy Corps-led consortium of Kenyan and international partners for a 5-year Development Food Security Activity (DFSA) in Turkana and Samburu Counties. Through an approach that emphasizes evidence gap analysis, as well as partnership, learning, and co-creation with government, civil society, communities, and the private sector, the program aims to drive sustained reductions in acute malnutrition in both counties. Mercy Corps’ USAID NAWIRI consortium brings together the global leadership, research capacity, technical expertise, and implementation experience necessary to partner with local institutions to ***test, adapt, and scale evidence-based solutions.*** The program requires a robust county-centered design with government leadership, active engagement from communities, the private sector, and civil society. Together we will ***sustainably reduce persistent acute malnutrition*** for vulnerable populations in Turkana and Samburu counties.

The Institutional and Local Systems Strengthening (ILSS) component of USAID NAWIRI will coordinate its activities across technical sectors and program components to support the overall enabling environment for healthy and prosperous communities. The ILSS component will lead strategic interactions with the Samburu or Turkana County Government, civil society, and community structures, institutions, and associations. Within USAID NAWIRI, it will strengthen institutional and local governance systems capacity and mobilize communities to create opportunities for accountable and inclusive governance, and to build more food secure and healthy communities and support systemic change in the governance and enabling environment with relation to the existing policies and laws.

It is against this background, that Mercy Corps seeks a consultant or firm to conduct a political economy analysis (PEA) of Samburu and Turkana counties in northern Kenya. Previous interventions in dealing with the challenge of malnutrition have mostly focus on curative measures through the health sector and direct interventions at the community level. USAID NAWIRI appreciates the fact that there are many possible drivers of persistent acute malnutrition (PAM) and that a sustainable and effective approach to addressing the problem requires a multisector approach involving all sectors including education, health, agriculture, livestock, transport and infrastructure, gender, youth and social services, finance and planning. Strengthening the capability of the county government to respond to the systemic drivers is also critical to addressing the problem in the long term and in line with USAID’s principle of *Journey To Self-Reliance* (J2SR). It will therefore be important to understand the role that formal and informal economic, political and social pressure and institutions play in shaping human interaction and competition for power and resources. The PEA will offer the opportunity to examine broad issues of political economy, internal and external factors to each county but will purposefully link those interconnected factors back to how they influence nutrition in these counties. This PEA will also need to include a review of county governments (Turkana & Samburu) capacity and practices in line with NAWIRI objectives.

The work will need to move forward taking into account and respecting restrictions imposed by the Ministry of Health (MOH). Aggressive steps have been instituted to discourage travel, promote social distancing, and encourage prevention measures for COVID-19. The Consultant or Firm must comply with all government directives and measures to limit the spread of COVID-19.

1. **Objectives**

The objective of this analysis is to answer the question: *What political economy factors influence policy, institutions, and community decision making dynamics for development and resilience, governing food security, nutrition, and health for communities in Samburu and Turkana counties?* This analysis will:

* inform the USAID NAWIRI consortium’s program design and strategies, and influence its approach with partner governments and other stakeholders;
* identify the underlying cause of the problem in each of the counties, and recommend suitable interventions including opportunities that already exist;
* explore the dynamics of how decisions are made and pursued, in the various relevant technical areas in which USAID NAWIRI will work; and
* identify the factors that will promote or inhibit change, reform, and progress in these sectors.

The analysis will also serve to provide a foundational understanding of the major performance strengths, institutional and systemic capacity gaps of the Turkana and Samburu county governments, and their relationships to sub-county structures and communities.

1. **Scope of Inquiry**

PEA Levels of Analysis

* County-Level PEA: An analysis of the county-level political and economic dynamics that affect the prospects for successful development. This analysis will cover county dynamics, as well as relations and influence to/from neighboring counties.
* Sector PEA: The analysis will delve into relevant sectors for USAID NAWIRI, including, Health, Agriculture and Livestock, Trade, Environment and Natural Resources, Water, Gender, Youth and Social Services, Energy, Infrastructure, Finance and Planning among others outlining the structures, institutions, and stakeholders that shape these sectors in each County.[[1]](#footnote-1)
* ASAL Region: An analysis of specific factors that differentiate the region and affect prospects for successful development of the sector.
* Problem and opportunity analysis: Identification of bottlenecks and opportunities related to political economy for raising community well-being, especially institutional aspects and power dynamics.

*Note: The length and the page limit of the final report will be agreed upon submission and review of the draft report with proposed outline.*

Detailed PEA Scope

1. Structural/Enabling Environment: Long-term contextual factors relevant to county development trajectory, which are unlikely to be readily influenced, either because of the time scale needed, or because they are determined outside the country and/or region. These may include economic and social structures and norms, geo-strategic position, natural resource endowment, demographic shifts, climate change, and conflict or post-conflict context.
2. Political Economy: The role that formal and informal economic, political and social institutions (e.g. rule of law; elections; social, political, gender and cultural norms, values and ideas; markets) play in shaping human interaction and competition for power and resources. This should also include a review of county government capacity, organizational culture and practices, and the political interests that influence how that has formed.
3. Power Analysis: Who has power and influence in society (County/Community/Local actors e.g. Church/Private Sector, etc.) and how is that manifested in how decisions are made? How do gender and power dynamics impact the level of influence that men, women, youth and persons with disabilities have?
   1. Identify the most influential actors, what are their interests and incentives, and how do these shape overall dynamics of the sectors, including the feasibility of policy reforms in the sectors.
   2. Explore how best to engage the influential actors/power brokers including the best points.
4. County Government Institutional Capacity Assessment: What are the strengths and weaknesses of each County government and their departments in terms of performance and capacity? What is functioning well and what needs investment and improvements? Detail aspects of general county planning, budgeting, and implementation (service delivery), but also coordination of sectoral plans and programs relevant to broader county development plans. This assessment will also determine the levels of political commitment, technical capacity and accountability for gender mainstreaming within the county government and their departments as they relate to NAWIRI thematic areas.
5. Natural Resource Management: How are the key principles of NRM applied in the Counties i.e. legitimacy, transparency, accountability, inclusiveness, fairness, integration, capability, and adaptability.
   1. Identify bottlenecks and constraints of effective NRM both at government and community level.
   2. Analyze who among the actors in the county represents obstacles to inclusive and citizen based land reforms?
   3. Identify examples of good practice where these exist and make pertinent recommendation drawn on lessons for contextual application or propose good practice
   4. What formal and informal institutions exist for the purpose of NRM? Do they have a clearly defined and recognized mandate? What is their relationship with each other (community and government), neighbors?

The analysis should go beyond a static description and take into account the changing context and internal dynamics. It should consider new risks and opportunities.

Priority PEA Questions

**Below are specific questions to be answered in conducting this analysis. Please note that these issues are not exhaustive; the team will want to modify or add to them.**

* **Institutions, Ideologies and Values:** What are the main institutions, norms, relationships, values and ideas that shape policy and development outcomes? To what extent may these serve to constrain change?
  + Updated assessment of the devolution process and national, county, and local perspective on it. What has been devolved effectively? What is not working? Who wins and losses from devolution proceeding, on paper? In reality?
    - What is the status of county staffing levels, training, and performance? Are there considerable staffing gaps? Gender diversity? Competence gaps? (How is staff performance measured?) What do sub-county level outreach and coordination staffing structures look like in reality? On paper?
  + How does the county approach planning, budgeting and management?
    - Are sectoral development plans in place, and aligned with the CIDP? Is the county budget aligned with the CIDP? To what extent has a gender responsive approach informed the plans and budgets?
    - How were the CIDP or other relevant plans developed? Are there formal planning units? Who is involved in the planning process and how is it done? - within the government, from communities?
    - What types of monitoring and evaluation, and reporting systems are used by the county? How are these systems harmonized? Are there platforms for data review and use of data at all levels? What are the strengths and gaps in available systems to inform \ and evaluate government performance and decision making? In service delivery, as public officials/staff?
  + Analysis of public participation dynamics, beyond the legal requirements - history of engagement, public perceptions of participation and government engagement, and potential opportunities or avenues to mobilize or motivate participation.
    - What citizen engagement mechanisms are in place, at the county and sub-county level? Which are sponsored by the county, or supported by the county? Which are instigated by community-level forces or groups? How effective are they?
    - How are all voices (especially those most often marginalized, including women, youth, or the disabled) included in public consultation processes?
* **Decision-Making:** How are decisions made at different levels of government? Who is party to decision-making processes? How do groups and individuals seek to influence policy and who is included and excluded from decision-making?
  + How are decisions made at different levels of community / informal / traditional structures?
  + Who are the most active civic actors (both formal and informal CSOs) in each county? What aspects of decision making do they seek to influence? Are they successful?
  + Once made, are decisions implemented? Where are the key bottlenecks in the system? Is failure to implement due to political-economy reasons?
  + How do these processes look different across the different technical areas in which the government must make decisions?
* **Service Delivery:** Who are the primary beneficiaries of service-delivery? Are particular social, regional or ethnic groups, or genders, included/excluded? Are subsidies provided, and which groups benefit most from these?
  + What is the current status of service delivery, across the devolved functions?
  + Which services are being provided and which are lacking? Which are the focus of each governor, and how does that translate to the distribution of human and financial resources within the county government?
  + Which services generate local revenue?  Is that revenue reinvested into the service or the community?
  + What is the status of service delivery across sectors of interest? (Health & nutrition, food security, agriculture and livestock, trade, gender, youth, culture and social services, environment, water) What do staffing structures and levels look like across sectors? How do each perform (how is that performance measured)? Do government staff versus community groups/citizens have different opinions on this question?
  + What mechanisms exist for accountability in performance measurement? To what extent have they improved service delivery? Is gender a core component of performance measurement and accountability?
* **Power Relations:** How are power and wealth distributed in each county? To what extent is power vested in the hands of specific individuals/groups? How do different interest groups seek to influence policy? Which policies, industries and actors are prioritized, and why?
  + Analyze the power dynamics related to each county’s governor in detail. What are the priorities of each? Who are their allies, and who is in opposition?
  + Are there competing interests vying for power in either county? Are there economic actors that challenge the power of the governor outside politics?
  + What is the impact and cause of frequent reshuffling of political appointed positions (CEC and Chief Officers) on program implementation and Service delivery?
  + What may be the effect of the forthcoming elections on implementation of the USAID NAWIRI program? How may political transition during elections affect ongoing government initiatives?
* **Ownership Structure and Financing:** What is the balance between public and private ownership? How are public and private work financed (e.g. private capital, taxes, donor support)?
  + What types of investment and industry exist? Provide a survey of major economic actors and influences.
  + Describe dynamics of land rights and ownership. What are the current or prospective conflict dynamics related to this issue? How are women’s rights to land affected by these dynamics?
  + What are the existing NRM & CM structures – horizontal and vertical in the counties and their capacities?
  + What is the state of public financial management and own-source revenue in each county? Are the PFM systems including procurement working effectively in the county?
* **Corruption and rent-seeking:** Is there a perception of significant corruption and rent-seeking in the counties? Where is this most prevalent (e.g. at point of delivery; procurement; licensing)? Or where is the most suspicion? Is the perception of corruption related to individuals or systemic factors? Who does or would benefit most? How is patronage being used?
* **Potential for Reform:** Who are likely to be the “winners” and “losers” from particular reforms? Are there any key reform champions within the sectors of interest? Who is likely to resist reforms and why? Are there “second best” reforms which might overcome this opposition?
  + Other pending reform issues for these counties?
  + Are there viable avenues for advocacy on issues with regards to these reform(s)?
  + As above, analysis for the devolution process.
* **Historical legacies:** What is the relevant history of the county that informs development decisions, including previous reform initiatives? How does this influence current stakeholder perceptions?
* **Regional and international factors**. These may include:
  + economic and political arrangements (e.g. The 2 Counties are members of the Frontier County Development Council (FCDC), the Pastoralist Parliamentary Group (PPG), and potentially others)
  + Relations or conflict with neighbo ring counties, and countries in border areas
  + Licit and illicit cross-border trade in high value commodities
  + The role of development agencies (including donors) and their developmental, commercial and geo-strategic interests – Journey To Self-Reliance (J2SR); Explore the impact of the tension between relief and development organizations.

1. **Proposed Deliverables, Work plan, & Timeline**

Proposed deliverables, workplan and timeline must present and take into account any existing restrictions imposed by the Ministry of Health (MOH) to limit the spread of COVID-19.

Deliverables

1. Inception Report -
   1. Executive Summary
   2. Outline methodology and workplan
   3. Refine and confirm scope of inquiry and guiding questions
   4. Outline sections of final report
2. Draft PEA Report, to be refined and finalized following comments.
3. One or more presentations of findings to USAID NAWIRI consortium members and Donor.

*Note: The length and the page limit of the final report will be agreed upon submission and review of the draft report with proposed outline.*

Workplan

The consultant(s) will work closely with Mercy Corps staff, report to the ILSS component lead, and coordinate day-to-day activities with Mercy Corps USAID NAWIRI’s Government Engagement Managers that re based in the Counties.

At a minimum there will be an initial briefing during the first week, as well as coordination sessions every week / two weeks.

The consultant(s) will outline the methodology and workplan for the PEA in an Inception Report that is realistic and adapted to Covid-19 realities.

The analysis will utilize a combination of desk based research and field work, making full use of existing literature sources. Desk based research to review the available literature related to the political economy of Samburu and Turkana counties.

Meet with (individually and/or in groups) a range of actors in both County, and select Sub-county and Wards in different locations. **Group meetings may be discouraged in light of government directives and measures to limit the spread of COVID-19**. Meetings would include but not limited to:

* County government representatives
  + Governor's office
  + Elected representatives
  + Technical officers including Agriculture Extension Officers, CHVs, CHEW, County Nutrition Officers, Gender and Youth Officers, etc.
* Relevant city/municipal councils/boards
* Ward development planning committees
* Private-sector including major businesses working in the county.
* Civil society including women’s organizations/groups - county and ward level
* Development agency programs
* As possible, conduct focus groups with citizens in key locations

Timeline

Subject to initial discussions and awarding, the work should commence by 1st July 2020 and all deliverables to be completed by September 11, 2020:

* Inception report: within two week of awarding no later than July 17
* Interim Progress reporting meetings: Weekly
* Draft report: within two weeks prior to completion no later than August 28
* Presentation(s) to NAWIRI Consortium & Donor: week of August 31st
* Final report: September 11

*Note: The timelines provided are indicative and may change according to how the COVID-19 situation evolves.*

1. Recognizing the multisector approach of NAWIRI, analyzing these interrelated sectors will be key. However, sector specific report will not be required for all sec [↑](#footnote-ref-1)