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### ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAPD</td>
<td>Acquisition and Assistance Policy Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADS</td>
<td>Automated Directives System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDAR</td>
<td>Agency for International Development Acquisition Regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOR</td>
<td>Agreement Officer’s Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDCS</td>
<td>Country Development Cooperation Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Chief of Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COR</td>
<td>Contracting Officer’s Representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>Development Objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender-Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEEL</td>
<td>Growth, Enterprise, Employment and Livelihoods (program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE/FE</td>
<td>Gender Equality and Female Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE/WE</td>
<td>Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>Group Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIAP</td>
<td>Gender and Inclusion Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWG</td>
<td>Gender Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAWG</td>
<td>Inter-Agency Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementing Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>Intermediate Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEA</td>
<td>Kenya and East Africa (USAID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEAP</td>
<td>Kenya Electoral Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTI</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINKAGES</td>
<td>Linkages across the Continuum of HIV Services for Key Populations Affected by HIV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
M&E  Monitoring & Evaluation
MO  Mission Order
MSI  Management Systems International
NGO  Non-Governmental Organization
NRM  Natural Resource Management
OU  Operating Unit
PAD  Project Appraisal Document
PATRP  Power Africa Transactions and Reforms Program
PEPFAR  President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief
PoC  Point of Contact
PPR  Performance Plan and Report
RDCS  Regional Development Country Strategy
SOGI  Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity
SPA  Strategic Planning and Analysis
SSG  Strengthening Somali Governance (program)
TIS+  Transition Initiatives for Stabilization Plus
TO  Technical Office
TOR  Terms of Reference
UN  United Nations
USAID  United States Agency for International Development
USG  United States Government
WASH  Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WE  Women’s Empowerment
WPS  Women, Peace and Security
YALI  Young African Leadership Initiative
GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Disability

Disability: Persons with disabilities include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments that, in interaction with various barriers, may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others (Article 1 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities).

Accessible: A site, facility, work environment, service or program that is easy for persons with disabilities to approach, enter, operate, participate in and/or use safely, independently and with dignity.

Assistive tool: A device that aids completion of a task or other function that might otherwise be difficult or impossible for a person with a disability.

Braille: Writing system comprising raised dots; users are people who are blind or have low vision.

Disabled persons' organization: A civil society organization that is run by and for persons with disabilities.

Easy-to-read: Text where the content, language, illustrations and graphic layout are simplified for ease of use by persons with intellectual disabilities or non-native speakers of a language.

Inclusion: Persons with disabilities are involved in social, economic and political activities on an equal basis with other citizens, including leadership positions, rather than just having accommodations that might segregate persons with disabilities from other citizens.

Intellectual disability: Term used when a person has a limited ability to learn at an expected level and function in daily life without accommodations.

Mainstreaming: Process whereby persons with disabilities, or functional impairments in the activities of daily living, are integrated as equal participants and leaders in assistance programs and society.

Psychosocial disability: Conditions that affect cognition, emotion and behavior.

Reasonable accommodation: Provision of materials or environment that allow persons with disabilities to participate and contribute on an equal basis with others.

Twin-track approach: Includes mainstreaming disability throughout activities and policies, as well as providing disability-specific programming. This is USAID’s preferred approach to disability-inclusive development.

Universal design: All buildings, materials and processes are designed from their inception to be accessible for persons both with and without disabilities.

---

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI)²

**Ally:** Someone who is not part of the LGBTI community but supports that community.

**Asexual:** Having no sexual desire for persons of either sex.

**Bisexual:** Having emotional, romantic and/or sexual attraction, or any combination of these, to both men and women.

**Cisgender:** People whose gender identity aligns with social norms attached to their birth-assigned biological sex.

**Gay:** Having emotional, romantic and/or sexual attraction to people of the same gender.

**Gender expression:** Manifestation of one’s gender identity; how a person behaves, appears or presents with regard to societal expectations of gender. One’s gender expression may not necessarily match one’s gender identity or birth-assigned biological sex.

**Gender identity:** Personal sense of one’s gender, which may or may not align with norms attached to one’s birth-assigned biological sex (female or male).

**Gender non-conforming:** People who do not conform to social norms about how they should look or act based on their birth-assigned gender. “Gender queer” is sometimes used interchangeably with this term.

**Intersex:** Physical range of conditions including congenital discrepancy or incongruity between genetic (or chromosomal) and phenotypic (or physical appearance) sex or in secondary sexual characteristics.

**Lesbian:** A woman who is emotionally, romantically and/or sexually attracted to other women.

**LGBT:** An acronym for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender. There are many variations on this acronym that are used in different contexts, such as: LGBTI, which adds reference to intersex people; LBGTIQ which adds reference to queer and questioning; and, LGBTIQA which adds reference to asexuals and allies.

**Sexual orientation:** An emotional, romantic, sexual and relational attraction to another person; may be a same-sex orientation, opposite-sex orientation, bisexual orientation or asexual.

**SOGI:** Sexual orientation and gender identity.

**Straight:** Having emotional, romantic and/or sexual attraction is to people of the opposite sex.

**Transgender:** People who experience or express their gender differently from the social norms attached to their birth-assigned gender; an umbrella term that includes people who are transsexual, cross-dressers (individuals who wear clothing usually associated with the other sex) or otherwise gender non-conforming.

---

² Primary source: USAID’s LGBT Vision for Action – Promoting and Supporting the Inclusion of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Individuals.
Transsexual: A medical term describing people whose gender identity and birth-assigned biological sex do not line up, and who often seek medical treatment to bring their body and their gender identity into alignment.

Gender Equality/Female Empowerment³

Female: Refers to girls and women of all ages.

Female empowerment: When women and girls acquire the power to act freely, exercise their rights and fulfill their potential as full and equal members of society. Empowerment often comes from within and individuals can empower themselves, but cultures, societies and institutions create conditions that facilitate or undermine the possibilities for empowerment.

Gender advisor: Person with the technical skills, competencies and experience necessary to provide appropriate, in-depth guidance to technical and program staff to ensure that gender equality and female empowerment are integrated in meaningful ways across the program cycle, but especially in project and activity design. Gender advisors are appointed by USAID missions or Washington operating units (OUs) and possess an educational background or experience working on gender integration and female empowerment in one or more technical fields.

Gender analysis: An analytic, social science tool that assists with identifying, understanding, and explaining gaps between males and females that exist in households, communities and countries, as well as the relevance of gender norms and power relations in a specific context. Such analysis typically involves examining: differences in the statuses of women and men and their differential access to assets, resources, opportunities and services; the influence of gender roles and norms on the division of time between paid employment, unpaid work (including subsistence production and care for family members) and volunteer activities; the influence of gender roles and norms on leadership roles and decision-making; constraints, opportunities and entry points for narrowing gender gaps and empowering females; and potential differential impacts of development policies and programs on males and females, including unintended or negative consequences.

Gender-based violence (GBV): An umbrella term for any harmful threat or act directed at an individual or group based on actual or perceived biological sex, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation or lack of adherence to varying socially constructed norms around masculinity and femininity. The use or threat of physical, psychological, sexual, economic, legal, political, social and other forms of control or abuse typically characterizes this violence.

Gender equality: Concerns fundamental social transformation, working with men and boys as well as women and girls, to bring about changes in attitudes, behaviors, roles and responsibilities at home, in the workplace and in the community. Genuine equality means expanding freedoms and improving overall quality of life to achieve equality without sacrificing gains for either males or females.

Gender equality/women’s empowerment (GE/WE) – (primary): Includes projects and activities in which gender equality or women’s and girls’ empowerment is the explicit or primary goal and fundamental in the design, results framework and impact. If an activity passes the GE/WE-primary screen,

---

all funding should be attributed to this linked key issue. If all funding for a project/activity cannot be attributed to this linked key issue, then OUs should attribute the relevant portion as “secondary.”

**Gender equality/women’s empowerment (GE/WE) – (secondary):** Encompasses projects and activities in which gender equality or women’s and girls’ empowerment purposes, although important, are not among the principal reasons for the work.

**Gender integration:** Identifying and then addressing gender inequalities during strategy, project and activity design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. Since the roles and power relations between men and women affect the implementation of an activity, it is essential that project managers address these issues on an ongoing basis.

**Gender points of contact (PoCs):** People designated by missions and/or technical offices to serve as the liaison with USAID/Washington and/or program offices on issues related to implementing the suite of gender equality and female empowerment policies across the program cycle. PoCs may or may not have the technical skills of a gender advisor, but at a minimum they should take the Gender 101, 102 and 103 online courses.

**Gender-sensitive indicators:** These point out the extent to which, and in what ways, development programs and projects achieved results related to gender equality and whether/how reducing gaps between males/females and empowering women leads to better project/development outcomes.

**Women:** Refers to adult females.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

STUDY PURPOSE

The purpose of this study is to provide an assessment of how the United States Agency for International Development’s Kenya and East Africa Mission (USAID/KEA) complies with three USAID guidelines on social inclusion – the 2012 Gender Equality and Female Empowerment (GE/FE) Policy, the 2014 LGBT Vision for Action: Promoting and Supporting the Inclusion of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Individuals, and the 1997 Disability Policy – and to develop a Gender and Inclusion Action Plan (GIAP) to address the gaps identified by the study.

STUDY METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

This study team used qualitative data collection and analysis methods, triangulation across data collection methods, and stakeholder perspectives to assess emerging trends and themes and to ensure the reliability and validity of findings. Primary data collection took place in Nairobi intermittently from November 2017 through January 2018. The interviews with USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia staff took place during November 22–December 15. The interviews with implementing partners (IPs) took place during the same period, and again during January 8–19. The LGBTI survey was made available to USAID staff December 6–13 and January 8–17. The review of strategic planning documents and solicitations occurred in December 2017 and January 2018. Limitations included unavailability of some respondents for the interviews, resulting in a low response rate; selection bias in the recommended interviewees for the study; a low participation rate in the survey; and a small number of solicitations for review.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

STUDY QUESTION 1

What is the overall level of awareness of Mission staff/implementing partners of the GE/FE Policy (and the related ADS series 200 and ADS 205), USAID’s Disability Policy and the LGBT Vision for Action?

Interviewees self-reported on their level of awareness about the three policies and ADS Chapter 205, and on their capacity to implement social inclusion practices.

Overall, reported levels of awareness of and accessibility to all three policies are high among USAID staff. Regarding the GE/FE Policy, the only mandatory policy of the three, staff report high levels of awareness, accessibility, training and usage of additional gender-related resources, which indicates the successful integration of the message of gender equality and female empowerment as a key element in USAID core development programming. For the LGBT Vision for Action and Disability Policy, while awareness and accessibility are high, gaps are noted in training on disability and, to a lesser extent, on LGBTI, which indicates a need for capacity building in these areas. Staff are also aware of and use other resources related to disability and LGBTI inclusion, although not to the same extent as on gender.

4 The title of this guidance document is “LGBT Vision for Action.” However, since the document’s release in 2014, the term “LGBT” has been updated to “LGBTI.” Therefore, this study uses LGBTI throughout, except when referencing the 2014 policy’s title.
The IPs report high levels of awareness of and accessibility to the GE/FE Policy, demonstrating that USAID’s gender equality and women’s empowerment efforts have reached the implementation stage in the project cycle. This may be because the GE/FE Policy is mandatory and the IPs are required to adhere to it in their activities. Gaps are present in IP awareness and capacity for implementing USAID disability and LGBTI policies, but broader awareness of these issues seems to emanate from internal and other global (non-USAID) sources. It is encouraging to see that the IPs have, on their own initiative, turned to other resources that can help them improve their activities, despite the absence of mandatory requirements on disability and LGBTI inclusion in USAID guidance.

**STUDY QUESTION 2**

To what extent do Mission staff/implementing partners use the GE/FE policy, ADS 205, Disability Policy and LGBT Vision for Action, and with what results? How have these policies led to more inclusive, gender-equitable and responsive programming?

This question examined the extent to which the reported awareness of social inclusion policies and capacity to implement them translates into practice. The answer to this question is derived from two types of sources: 1) qualitative reporting by staff (from interviews and the LGBTI survey) and IPs (interviews), and 2) a review of Mission strategic planning documents and solicitations. It is difficult to attribute any quantifiable changes to the three policies, since no pre-policy baseline data is available, and the interview data from this study is based on subjective informant feedback.

Eighty-five percent of USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia staff report using the GE/FE Policy, while 57 percent say they use the Disability Policy and 47 percent acknowledge use of the LGBT Vision for Action. According to staff interviewed, the mandatory nature of gender guidance leads to its more frequent usage. Staff report changes resulting from the GE/FE Policy, mostly in requirements for gender analysis in program planning and monitoring and evaluation. This indicates that ADS 205, which outlines these requirements, has been a useful tool for staff.

Staff overwhelmingly state that the LGBT Vision for Action has not brought about change. The lower levels of perceived impact and higher levels of uncertainty about impact compared to the GE/FE Policy may result from the finding that less than half of the interview respondents report using the policy, making it difficult to gauge its impact on their jobs. On the positive side, some staff report observing an increase in awareness of LGBTI issues at the Mission internally, and more attention paid to the issue at the programming level. However, the IPs were not able to offer any examples of changes resulting from the LGBT Vision for Action.

The disconnect between LGBTI requirements and expectations – evidenced by the findings that only 25 percent of the IPs reported support from USAID on LGBTI issues and 38 percent of survey respondents reported never observing the IPs trying to include LGBTI in their programming – may be caused by inconsistent and inadequate communication between contracting or agreement officer’s representatives (CORS/AORs) and their IPs. Providing the IPs regular guidance and feedback on LGBTI inclusion in their program activities (e.g., in reporting, monitoring) is crucial to ensuring sustainable programming outcomes. Finally, despite not being mandatory, the Disability Policy has energized Mission staff to develop a Mission Disability Action Plan (pending approval by the Mission leadership). Similarly, the IPs seem to have embraced disability considerations in their activities, although only 33 percent report receiving concrete USAID support and guidance.
The review of the three strategy documents – USAID/Kenya Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS), USAID/East Africa Regional Development Country Strategy (RDCS), and the Strategic Framework for Somalia – found degrees of responsiveness to gender requirements of the GE/FE Policy and ADS 205. All three operating units (OUs) conducted gender analyses and used their findings to formulate strategies. Broadly speaking, key shortcomings in the gender analyses involve addressing how closing identified gender gaps will contribute to the three outcomes of the GE/FE Policy, as well as the need to develop a thorough approach to gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation.

The solicitation review revealed that use of the GE/FE Policy, ADS 205, Disability Policy, and LGBT Vision for Action by USAID mission staff in East Africa, Kenya and Somalia in developing solicitations remains limited; there is significant room for improvement by building on available technical guidance and identified good practices.

In sum, the impact of the three policies on inclusive programming cannot be considered in absolute terms, but must be viewed on a spectrum. The GE/FE Policy seems to have had the most impact on inclusive programming, followed by the Disability Policy and, finally, the LGBT Vision for Action.

STUDY QUESTION 3

What are the specific challenges and barriers that staff and implementing partners encounter while trying to implement the GE/FE Policy, Disability Policy and LGBT Vision for Action?

The obstacle most frequently cited by USAID staff that impedes the implementation of gender guidance is the lack of understanding of gender. Specifically, the challenge is how to think beyond “counting women” at a project or activity level. It is interesting that this issue remains an obstacle, despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of staff report that they have taken gender training and, depending on their length of service at USAID, have been exposed to various opportunities to learn about gender. Other obstacles in the implementation of GE/FE Policy identified by both by USAID staff and the IPs related to lack of capacity, interest and support of gender issues at the Mission.

External factors such as an inhospitable government (for example, legal criminalization of same-sex conduct) and the cultural environment are a key challenge for the implementation of the LGBT Vision for Action; this means that any LGBTI activities should be carried out with sensitivity and a “do no harm” approach. However, the study did not find any evidence that the Mission is an unfriendly environment for LGBTI people or for discussion of LGBTI issues; rather, the issue seems to be the lack of awareness about and exposure to LGBTI programming.

Both USAID staff and the IPs perceive disability to be a low priority for the Mission, which makes it difficult to promote disability concerns in a deliberate and sustainable fashion. The staff also mentioned high costs related to universal design as an obstacle; however, this seems to be a result of the lack of overall knowledge about the existing United States Government (USG) policy on meeting the needs of people with disabilities, rather than an actual challenge.

Ultimately, the practical application of social inclusion guidelines must reach the activity level. Strong Mission leadership, along with more capacity building and awareness raising on aspects of social inclusion among USAID staff, will go a long way in enabling the transfer of this guidance to the IP level.
STUDY QUESTION 4

Describe the factors that explain the success (or lack thereof) of the three policies studied. Factors that could be explored include leadership, staffing, resources, processes, staff capacity and others.

A key factor contributing to the successful implementation of all three policies identified by the staff is the Mission gender and inclusion advisor, who pushes all three agendas forward. The study team also identified two distinct and necessary enabling factors for the GE/FE Policy and Disability Policy. For the GE/FE Policy, it is the mandatory nature of the policy, and for the Disability Policy, it is the Mission staff’s demonstrated interest, coupled with national-level disability-friendly policies and legislation in areas such as education, that create accessible entry points for disability programming. Considering these enabling factors, elevating the disability agenda would be a fairly straightforward action, requiring only approval from the Mission leadership. The leadership, whether it is considered to be an obstacle or to be an enabling factor for policy implementation, plays a crucial role in determining how and to what extent social inclusion considerations will be integrated both internally at the Mission and externally in programming. The perceived lack of implementation success of the LGBT Vision for Action has made it difficult for the study team to identify one factor or set of factors associated with this policy.

However, both USAID staff and IPs identified high-level opportunities that could become enabling factors. They include: aligning USAID/KEA programming with Kenya’s progressive laws and policies, using them as building blocks and justification for social inclusion; leveraging USAID’s status as a leading aid agency to promote social inclusion; and applying social inclusion best practices and lessons learned from other missions, donors and local organizations for more inclusive programming.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations to USAID/KEA that follow are based on both study participant feedback and the study team’s observations and conclusions. They form the basis for the key outcome of the study – an action plan for USAID/KEA, provided in Annex 1. The Recommendations section of this report includes additional detail.

GENDER

- **Approve the Mission Order on Gender Integration** to bring the Mission in compliance with ADS 205, which requires that all missions, regional bureaus and country offices “Adopt or revise, and periodically update, a Mission Order (MO) on gender that describes how the Mission will implement the Agency’s Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy.”

- Identify entry points for additional gender expertise (e.g., formalize the gender points of contact [PoCs]; hire short- or long-term technical support) for USAID/Somalia to complement the Mission gender and inclusion advisor.

- Develop factsheets illustrating how to integrate gender in the program cycle for specific sectors/development objectives (DOs). These sector sheets should be shared with technical offices (TOs) and the IPs.
- **Rotate additional staff with gender expertise across teams.** Staff with additional expertise should be able to rotate between technical offices and OUs on a short-term basis (two weeks to one month) and to teach the staff how to apply ADS 205 requirements to their work.

- **Hold quarterly meetings with IP gender specialists (by sector/DO)** to strengthen the relationship between the Mission and the IPs on gender. This also would provide an opportunity for networking and collaboration on gender issues amongst the IPs.

- **Require as part of IP contracts and cooperative agreements that key staff take the Gender 101 online course.** AORs/CORs should require proof that all activity key personnel have taken the training.

- Hold IPs accountable to report on gender outcomes in their annual and final reports.

- CORs/AORs should enforce reporting requirements on GE/FE Policy outcomes in IP contracts and cooperative agreements. Making sure that IPs report this information will improve annual reporting.

- **Require gender clearance on all new procurements.** Including gender PoCs in the review process may also help to build their capacity.

- **Elevate gender inclusion language in solicitations,** such as in key personnel, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and selection criteria sections.

**LGBTI**

- **Elevate human resource (HR) and gender issues in relevant interagency working groups, both existing and new.** This will help bring LGBTI issues beyond USAID and clarify lines of responsibility and accountability that rest with senior leadership.

- **Facilitate relationships with LGBTI organizations in sectors where USAID is engaged on LGBTI issues, such as health and education.** These organizations are in the best position to help USAID develop locally acceptable LGBTI approaches and, as such, should be considered a key resource on social inclusion when developing new programs.

- Require basic training for technical officers and IP staff on non-discrimination policy for access to services for beneficiaries of Mission programs. The training should also be available for use by IPs.

- **Present an award to an IP that has demonstrated exemplary work on social inclusion.** This award could be presented during a “16 Days of Activism against Gender-Based Violence (GBV)” event and would showcase the appreciation the Mission has for programs that have, despite challenges, developed and implemented inclusive activities benefiting marginalized groups.

- **Develop sector-specific factsheets demonstrating how to integrate LGBTI considerations into the program cycle.** The factsheets should be distributed to TOs and IPs working in the relevant sectors to increase their awareness about the importance of LGBTI
inclusion in programming, especially emphasizing the contribution of inclusion to economic, social and sector development outcomes.

- Ensure that the language on “Nondiscrimination against End-Users of Supplies or Services” (AIDAR 48 CFR 752.7038) is included in all solicitations, and track adherence.

DISABILITY

- **Formalize a Disability PoC position.** This action will demonstrate the Mission’s commitment to disability issues. Disability PoCs should have terms of reference (TORs), just like gender PoCs.

- **Formalize the Disability Working Group.** As with the disability PoC, this group will be a reflection of the existing interest in disability among the Mission staff.

- **Provide sector-specific training on disability to TO staff.** IP staff should be allowed to participate in this training as well.

- **Require all program staff to take the Disability-Inclusive Development 101 e-learning course within the next year.** Considering that only 30 percent of staff report having been trained on disability, this will be an easy way for them to be introduced to disability-related considerations in development.

- Track compliance with inclusion of disability language per AAPD 05-07, AAPD 04-17, and “Nondiscrimination against End-Users of Supplies or Services” (AIDAR 48 CFR 752.7038) in all solicitations. Compliance with these Agency guidelines will clearly demonstrate the Mission’s commitment to disability inclusion.

- **Include disability requirements in contracts and cooperative agreements.** Grantees and contractors should be required to report on their progress on integrating the concerns of persons with disabilities in their activities and to collect disability-disaggregated data.

- Develop sector-specific factsheets demonstrating how to integrate disability considerations in the program cycle. The factsheets should be distributed to TOs and IPs.

- **Perform an access review related to programmatic and environmental accessibility for persons with disabilities.**

- Make a conscious effort to include narrative and visual depictions of people with disabilities in USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia materials – in factsheets, success stories, websites, etc. – to demonstrate that the Mission takes disability concerns seriously.

- **Present an annual award to an IP that has demonstrated exemplary work on disability.** This event should take place annually on the International Day of Persons with Disabilities Day (December 3). Another option would be to combine the Disability Award and the LGBTI Award in a joint event.
SOCIAL INCLUSION BROADLY

- **Include all three policies in an orientation package for new hires.** This will immediately introduce new hires to these policies, while also providing them with access to the policies and communicating the Mission’s commitment.

- **Develop an engaging orientation for new hires on gender, LGBTI and disability using video or interactive communication.** These media are more engaging than text and can create a more personal, impactful experience for new hires by showing people telling their own stories.

- **Develop a new GIAP for April 2019 – April 2020.** During portfolio reviews, TOs should discuss the status of the social inclusion activities they were in charge of accomplishing during the year and should develop new activities for the following year.

STUDY PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS

STUDY PURPOSE

The purpose of the study is to provide an assessment of compliance by the United States Agency for International Development’s Kenya and East Africa Mission (USAID/KEA) with the current USAID social inclusion guidance and to develop an action plan aimed at addressing the gaps found in the process. USAID/KEA requested that this assessment address the following:

**Objective 1:** Assessment of the extent to which considerations of gender equality, female empowerment, disability and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex (LGBTI) are adequately integrated in the development objectives (DOs) and their respective (and illustrative) projects and activities in the Kenya Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS), the East Africa Regional Development Cooperation Strategy (RDCS) and the Strategic Framework for Somalia 2016–2019.

**Objective 2:** Assessment and analysis of the knowledge, attitudes and awareness of Mission staff and of selected implementing partners regarding gender equality, female empowerment, disability and LGBTI integration into programming.

**Objective 3:** Examination of the documents, systems, procedures and processes of the Mission, including the Front Office, Strategic Planning and Analysis (SPA) office and other support offices, with respect to compliance with relevant Agency guidance, sensitivity and inclusion in programming, recruitment, promotion and training.

**Objective 4:** Development of a realistic and practical Gender and Inclusion Action Plan (GIAP) for USAID/KEA. This will occur in accordance with the current USAID guidance on inclusion outlined above and will propose specific activities that will contribute to the integration of gender equality, female empowerment, disability and LGBTI issues into programming by the three OUs. Completion of objectives 1-3 will inform GIAP’s development (Objective 4).
STUDY QUESTIONS

STUDY QUESTION 1

What is the overall level of awareness of Mission staff/implementing partners of the GE/FE [Gender Equality and Female Empowerment] Policy (and the related ADS series 200 and ADS 205), USAID’s Disability Policy and the LGBT Vision for Action?

Understanding the extent to which Mission staff and implementing partners (IPs) are aware of the existence and purpose of the current inclusion policies will help determine how well-equipped they are to integrate these issues into programming, at both the OU and activity levels. Ultimately, the knowledge that the Mission staff and IPs have of this guidance is an important factor that contributes to the implementation of these policies. The findings stemming from this question may inform GIAP activities related to capacity building, dissemination of inclusion guidance, and resource enhancement.

STUDY QUESTION 2

To what extent do Mission staff/implementing partners use the GE/FE Policy, ADS 205, Disability Policy and LGBT Vision for Action, and with what results? How have these policies led to more inclusive, gender-equitable and responsive programming?

Having assessed the level of awareness of the Mission staff and IPs about the USAID GE/FE Policy, Disability Policy and LGBT Vision for Action, the next logical step is to determine the extent to which each of these policies is used. The study will seek examples of concrete and deliberate efforts as well as “case studies” of best practices of social inclusion in programming at USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia.

Once the extent of usage of the inclusion guidance is determined, an analysis of the outcomes resulting from the use of the policies will follow. The study will seek to ascertain whether the compliance with these policies by the Mission staff and IPs has resulted in programming that has led to greater responsiveness for social inclusion. Since the study is not examining the pre- and post-policy environments (no baseline data exists on the pre-policy environment), changes determined to contribute to any of the three policies will be mostly subjective and based on informants’ perceptions (except in the case of document review). This question will assist in identifying gaps and recommending GIAP activities aimed at improving current levels of compliance.

STUDY QUESTION 3

What are the specific challenges and barriers that staff and implementing partners encounter while trying to implement the GE/FE Policy, Disability Policy and LGBT Vision for Action?

This question will help identify key challenges that hinder Mission staff’s and IPs’ efforts to comply with the GE/FE Policy, Disability Policy and LGBT Vision for Action. Considering that the levels of guidance for each of the categories (gender, disability and LGBTI) differ – with gender guidance being the most robust and the only one that is mandatory – challenges and barriers related to each may differ and will be examined separately. Specific examples provided by the respondents will be helpful in developing activities that can mitigate challenges.
STUDY QUESTION 4

Describe the factors that explain the success (or lack thereof) of the three policies studied. Factors that could be explored include leadership, staffing, resources, processes, staff capacity and others.

The study team will seek to identify the reasons why implementation of the GE/FE Policy, Disability Policy and LGBT Vision for Action has been successful in some instances but not others. These findings may identify factors that can mitigate challenges presented in Question 3, and contribute to the GIAP through investing in staff, resources, processes (including accountability mechanisms) and staff capacity.

STUDY METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

DATA COLLECTION METHODS AND SOURCES

This study used a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods to generate reliable evidence. The study team gathered data from sources that are both primary (key informant interviews [KIIs], group interviews [GIs] and an online survey) and secondary (document review) in response to the principle study questions. Data collection tools are detailed in Annex 2.

Desk Review

A desk review took stock of USAID tools, guidance and background information provided by USAID/KEA on gender, disability, LGBTI and social inclusion broadly (see Annex 3 for a list of documents reviewed). In addition, a review examined the following USAID/KEA operational documents to determine the extent to which they follow GE/FE Policy:

- **Strategic planning documents.** A review of the USAID/Kenya CDCS, USAID/East Africa RDCS and Strategic Framework for Somalia considered the extent to which each adheres to ADS 205 gender guidance.

- **USAID/KEA solicitations.** ADS 205.3.6 provides specific guidance on gender integration in solicitations. The Mission’s gender and inclusion advisor provided a list of current USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia activities, from which the team sampled 50 solicitations that were representative of all offices. However, the Mission was able to provide only nine solicitations, as some solicitations were issued by USAID/Washington; some were sole-sourced (a request for applications was not issued); and some requests for task order proposals were available only to indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity contract holders (not public). To replace these solicitations, the team obtained another 18 solicitations by searching those publicly available on [www.fbo.gov](http://www.fbo.gov) and [www.grants.gov](http://www.grants.gov). Twenty-six solicitations issued by USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia from 2013 to 2017 (i.e., post-2012, when the GE/FE Policy took effect) were examined and each solicitation was scored for gender, disability and LGBTI language. Additionally, solicitations issued after October 2016 were reviewed for language explicitly stating anti-discrimination in access to services for beneficiaries.5

---

5 On October 25, 2016, the Federal Register published a final rule to update the Agency for International Development Acquisition Regulation (AIDAR) to include a clause on “Nondiscrimination against End-Users of Supplies or Services.” This AIDAR clause (AIDAR 48 CFR 752.7038), which applies to all USAID contracts, explicitly articulates an inherent principle that all beneficiaries should be able to participate in USAID programs without discrimination. Additionally, in November 2016,
INTERVIEWS
The team conducted 38 interviews with 47 participants (30 women and 17 men).\(^6\) Thirty interviews took place in November/December 2017\(^7\) and eight in January 2018. Due to anonymity promised to interview subjects, the list of informants is not included in this report. The interview details are:

- **23 interviews with Mission staff (USAID/KEA and USAID Somalia).** The USAID/KEA gender and inclusion advisor provided a list of 39 Mission staff to interview, also identifying replacement names to interview when original staff were unavailable. The informants shared experiences and perceptions, helping the study team understand the Mission’s processes and outcomes around social inclusion.

- **Two group interviews with gender PoCs.** The first interview was with five gender PoCs and the second was with three (including the gender and inclusion advisor). All but one PoC participated.

- **12 interviews with IPs.** Implementing partners were sampled from the initial list of solicitations provided to the team by the Mission gender and inclusion advisor. Interviews took place with senior management teams such as chiefs of party and managers and staff responsible for key activity components, including gender. Due to a low IP response (four) to interview requests during the initial weeks of data collection, USAID/KEA extended data collection by two weeks in January 2018 (January 8–19).

- **One interview with a subject matter expert.** The team met with Anthony Cotton, USAID’s senior LGBTI coordinator from Washington.

SURVEY
To gauge understanding of LGBTI guidance and overall attitudes and perceptions of challenges and opportunities for implementing it, the study team conducted an online survey of Mission staff using the Survey Gizmo tool. Given the reported cultural sensitivity surrounding LGBTI, the survey was anonymous in order to elicit open and honest responses. The survey had 23 questions and took less than 15 minutes. Thirty-three staff members (slightly over 10 percent) took the survey in December. Due to the low response rate, the team extended the survey through January 17, resulting in another 41 complete responses, for a total of 74 complete responses\(^8\) (48 female and 26 male) – approximately a quarter of all staff. Survey results were triangulated with responses on this topic from KII and GIs. Survey results (complete responses only) are provided in Annex 4.

DATA ANALYSIS METHODS
The team analyzed information from all data sources to identify common trends and themes related to gender and social inclusion guidance at USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia. Preliminary data analysis began

---

\(^6\) There were more respondents than interviews because some were group interviews; additionally, some IP interviews had two individuals present representing one activity.

\(^7\) The original schedule of two weeks for data collection was expanded due to lack of responsiveness and availability of informants during that period.

\(^8\) Twenty-seven incomplete responses were not included in the data analyzed for this report.
during the data collection phase to ensure that the team was capturing the information necessary to fully address the study questions.

During data collection, the team held daily debriefings to identify common themes among interviewees by study question. The team refined these themes as it progressed through data collection. To complement the data collection, the team reviewed all interview notes and identified key themes. With coding completed, the team analyzed the interview data using content analysis and pattern analysis to assist with comparing the perspectives of various respondents. The team used Microsoft Excel to summarize and code the collected interview data, as well as to conduct content and pattern analysis of key themes. This approach captures the frequency of key themes and underlying evidence from the interview notes.

Not all respondents answered all of the questions. For example, respondents who have not been at the Mission long were not able to answer questions related to observed changes resulting from guidance under each of the policies, or were not always in a position to provide examples of usage.

Consequently, the study analyzed the information collected in light of the extent of each source’s experience with these three policies. As such, percentages or precise numbers could be misleading, so the report focuses on substantive significance rather than quantitative figures.

LIMITATIONS

This study was designed to support a multi-tiered triangulation process to ensure a final set of findings and corresponding conclusions that are reliable and exhibit a high degree of validity. However, the study team encountered several data collection limitations, not all of which were predicted in the inception report:

1. **Lack of responsiveness of interview informants.** This was the key limitation in the data collection process: of the original 39 USAID/KEA staff on the list, 18 were unavailable to participate in the process (although some were replaced or added). Similarly, only four IPs responded to interview requests. The low IP response rate was remedied via an extension to the interview timeframe to include January 8-19.

2. **Low response rates to the survey.** As with interviews, the initial survey response rate was extremely low at slightly over 10 percent. The study team planned for Mission leadership to introduce the survey to staff so the team could administer it from November 27 through December 1, to coincide with the 16 Days of Activism against GBV campaign (November 25–December 10), when there is an anticipated higher focus on inclusion issues. However, the survey was not released until December 6, allowing the staff until December 13 to respond to the survey, well into team’s data analysis week. Ultimately, USAID requested that the team extend the survey through January 17, which led to additional responses. In the end, 74 individuals participated in the survey.

3. **Bias in informant selection.** The key USAID informants were selected by USAID/KEA, which could have resulted in bias. This list was revised due to the lack of response from the original individuals selected, but potential bias remained since USAID/KEA also chose the replacement informants.

4. **Loss of interview days.** During the three weeks of data collection in November and December, the team lost three days of work due to holidays (November 23, U.S. Thanksgiving; November 28, Kenya’s Presidential Inauguration Day; and December 12, Jamhuri Day in Kenya).
The most effective approach for combating biases was using multiple layers of triangulation. By combining information in documents and from interviews from multiple sources, any single piece of biased data did not unduly skew the analysis.

**USAID GUIDANCE ON SOCIAL INCLUSION**

Numerous policies, memoranda, executive orders, and white papers guide USAID, providing a framework for inclusive, long-term, and sustainable development policy. This study focuses on three such pieces of guidance: the Gender Equality and Female Empowerment (GE/FE) Policy, the LGBT Vision for Action and the Disability Policy. For additional USAID guidance, tools and resources on these three topics, see Annex 5. For a discussion on how social inclusion contributes to international aid effectiveness, see Annex 6.

**GENDER EQUALITY AND FEMALE EMPOWERMENT POLICY (2012)**

---

**SEVEN GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF THE GE/FE POLICY**

1. Integrate gender equality and female empowerment throughout the Agency’s program cycle.

2. Pursue an inclusive approach to foster equality with regard to women and men and girls and boys, regardless of age, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability status, religion, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, geographic area, migratory status, forced displacement or HIV/AIDS status.

3. Build partnerships across a wide range of stakeholders (host governments, civil society, the private sector and other donors) to ensure that USAID efforts are coordinated and non-duplicative, build on the skills and initiatives of local actors and reflect country priorities.

4. Harness science, technology and innovation to reduce gender gaps and empower women and girls to wield greater influence in society.

5. Address the unique challenges in crisis- and conflict-affected environments to address the different needs and priorities of women and men.

6. Serve as a thought leader and a learning community that draws from successes and failures and disseminates best practices on gender integration throughout the Agency.

7. Hold the Agency accountable by ensuring that gender equality and female empowerment is a shared responsibility among all staff, with particular emphasis on senior managers and Mission directors.

---

The GE/FE Policy updates the Agency’s commitment to addressing gender issues in line with fundamental global changes since the issuance of the 1982 Policy Paper on Women in Development. The goal of the policy is to improve the lives of citizens around the world by advancing equality between females and males, and empowering women and girls to participate fully in and benefit from the development of their societies. For information on national/regional gender equality frameworks, see Annex 7. Under the policy, USAID investments aim to achieve the following three outcomes, which have to be adapted and translated into specific results with associated targets and indicators:
1. Reduce gender disparities in access to, control over and benefit from resources, wealth, opportunities and services – economic, social, political and cultural;

2. Reduce gender-based violence and mitigate its harmful effects on individuals and communities; and

3. Increase the capability of women and girls to realize their rights, determine their life outcomes and influence decision-making in households, communities and societies.

**ADS CHAPTER 205: INTEGRATING GENDER EQUALITY AND FEMALE EMPOWERMENT IN USAID’S PROGRAM CYCLE**

The GE/FE Policy is operationalized through the Automated Directives System (ADS) Chapter 205: “Comprehensive and interlinked policies and strategies to reduce gender inequality and to enable girls and women to realize their rights, determine their life outcomes, influence decision-making and become change agents in households, communities and societies.”

ADS 205 requires bureaus, missions and country offices to:

1. Adopt or revise, and periodically update, a mission order (MO) on gender and inclusion;
2. Integrate gender analysis findings and recommendations into CDCSs and project designs;
3. Hold implementing partners responsible for integrating gender into programming;
4. Ensure that partners consistently report to USAID on results related to GE/FE;
5. Provide data to relevant USAID mechanisms to incorporate into regional reports on gender attributions in operational plans (OPs), performance plans and reports (PPRs) and other required reporting;
6. Appoint or hire a Mission gender advisor; and
7. Be accountable, through the Mission director, for implementation of the GE/FE Policy.

**LGBT VISION FOR ACTION (2014)**

**USAID LGBT VISION FOR ACTION PRIORITIES**

1. Increase capacity for inclusive development at USAID by developing training and other tools and resources.
2. Exercise selectivity and focus in integration to address key entry points in sectors where action is urgently needed and where the Agency has the deepest level of prior experience.
3. Build capacity of local organizations and leaders so that LGBTI persons have capable organizations that can advocate and provide for their needs.
4. Ensure Agency accountability for non-discrimination in communities, workplaces and access to USAID programs and services.

---

9 USAID 2017, ADS 205 – Integrating Gender Equality and Female Empowerment in USAID's Program Cycle, effective date 04/27/2017, p. 4. The list of and links to relevant policies and strategies are on pages 4 and 5.
5. Learn through sharing knowledge and closing information gaps on LGBTI inclusion by tapping into existing data, gathering more robust baseline data, supporting research, testing new and innovative ideas and by subjecting USAID programming to rigorous evaluation.

According to USAID’s LGBT Vision for Action, USAID’s LGBT vision is “a world in which the human rights of LGBTI persons are respected and they are able to live with dignity, free from discrimination, persecution and violence.” Developed with input from LGBTI, civil society and faith-based organizations from around the world, the vision requires the inclusion, protection and empowerment of LGBTI individuals to generate more effective, comprehensive and sustainable development. It notes that the challenges facing LGBTI populations revolve around violence and hate speech; lack of participation in civil society and democratic processes; obstacles to accessing health care; and negative impact of discrimination on livelihoods. Based on the 2011 Presidential Memorandum, key principles of the vision are: 1) sensitivity to country and cultural contexts; 2) ensuring openness and safe space for dialogue; 3) integrating LGBTI issues into USAID’s work; 4) supporting and mobilizing LGBTI communities; and 5) building partnerships and creating allies and champions.

The Vision for Action is not mandatory, but is designed to inspire and encourage missions to address LGBTI issues within their own contexts and abilities. It provides illustrative examples of proactive approaches to LGBTI inclusion across USAID missions, such as a mission order on LGBT inclusion issued by USAID/Nicaragua and an inclusive development annex to the CDCS issued by USAID/Malawi.

**DISABILITY POLICY (1997)**

**USAID DISABILITY POLICY OBJECTIVES**

1. Advance U.S. foreign assistance program goals by promoting the participation and equalization of opportunities for people with disabilities in USAID policy, country and sector strategies, activity designs and implementation;

2. Increase awareness of disability issues within USAID programs and in host countries;

3. Engage other U.S. Government agencies, host-country counterparts, governments, implementing organizations and other donors in fostering a climate of nondiscrimination against people with disabilities; and

4. Support international advocacy for people with disabilities.

The USAID Disability Policy promotes the inclusion of people with disabilities both within USAID programs and in host countries where it operates. While it is applicable only to Agency program funds, it states that “One of the best means of raising awareness in programs is to actively pursue those personnel procedures so that Agency staffing patterns reflect the intention of Agency programs.” The policy contains an action plan that is designed to direct its implementation and is applicable only to program activities. It does not require additional resources for implementation; rather, it is designed for use within the existing level of resources.

Additional guidance has been developed to strengthen USAID’s institutional commitment to inclusive development in the form of two acquisition and assistance policy directives (AAPDs). The 2004 AAPD
04-17, Supporting USAID’s Disability Policy in Contracts, Grants and Cooperative Agreements, requires that a contractor/recipient does not discriminate against people with disabilities in the implementation of USAID programs and prescribes language that all solicitations and resulting awards for contracts, grants and cooperative agreements must include. The 2005 AAPD 05-07, Supporting USAID’s Standards for Accessibility for the Disabled in Contracts, Grants and Cooperative Agreements, requires compliance with standards of accessibility for people with disabilities in all new or renovated structures, buildings or facilities and prescribes language that solicitations and subsequent contracts, as well as assistance awards, must include. Most recently, in October 2016, the requirements for disability language inclusion dictated by AAPD 05-07 and AAPD 04-17 were further strengthened via the Agency for International Development Acquisition Regulation (AIDAR) clause on “Nondiscrimination against End-Users of Supplies or Services” (AIDAR 48 CFR 752.7038). This clause applies to all USAID contracts, explicitly articulates an inherent principle that all beneficiaries should be able to participate in USAID programs without discrimination. Additionally, in November 2016, USAID approved corresponding changes to the standard provisions for USAID-funded grants and cooperative agreements. The revisions have been implemented through internal Agency policies found in ADS Chapter 303.10

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

This section outlines findings related to the four study questions.

QUESTION 1

WHAT IS THE OVERALL LEVEL OF AWARENESS OF MISSION STAFF/IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS OF THE GE/FE POLICY (AND THE RELATED ADS SERIES 200 AND ADS 205), USAID’S DISABILITY POLICY AND THE LGBT VISION FOR ACTION?

In answering this question, the study team asked interview participants directly about the level of their awareness of, access to and capacity to use the three policies, ADS Chapter 205, as well as other resources on social inclusion to complement the three policies.

---

FINDINGS

KEY FINDINGS:

- Of the three policies, GE/FE – the only mandatory policy – has the highest levels of awareness and accessibility among USAID staff and IPs.

- Gaps exist in IPs’ awareness of and capacity for implementing USAID’s Disability and LGBTI policies, but broader awareness of these issues seems to emanate from internal and other global (non-USAID) sources.

Gender

The Mission staff reports a high level of awareness (91 percent) of the GE/FE Policy and ADS 205 (87 percent). Similarly, 91 percent of interviewed IP respondents report being aware of the policy. Ninety-one percent of Mission staff and 83 percent of IP respondents report having access to the policy. Furthermore, 96 percent of USAID staff report having taken gender training – most frequently the mandatory Gender 101 online course, which is also available to the IPs. As a result of this training, 78 percent of USAID staff and 75 percent of IP respondents assess their technical skills to implement the policy as “very good” or “excellent.” Staff enhance their high awareness and capacity by using a variety of resources, including those available from the Mission gender and inclusion advisor, IPs, and other agencies/donors, lessons learned and best practices from other USAID programs, academic articles, internal USAID mailing lists, bulletins, the Agency intranet, and information from the Government of Kenya. They also draw on personal experience and knowledge from previous jobs. The IPs also report using their organizations’ internal policies and guidelines, as well as national (e.g., the Kenyan Constitution) and global equality frameworks.

LGBTI

As with the GE/FE Policy, Mission staff report high overall awareness of the LGBT Vision for Action; 83 percent of staff interviewed and just over 78 percent of those completing the survey said they are aware of the LGBT Vision for Action. Eighty-three percent of the Mission staff interviewed report having access to the policy, while 58 percent of IPs report awareness of it and 41 percent report having access to it.

I took [the] LGBT 101 online course, but that was the end of it. No follow-up on what I was supposed to do next! — Survey participant

Sixty-five percent of interviewees and 45 percent of survey respondents said they received training on LGBTI, primarily the LGBTI 101 online course. The town hall training led by USAID/Washington LGBTI advisors with participation of local LGBTI individuals and activists was also frequently mentioned.

11 The respondents were asked to rate their knowledge to implement the policy on a scale of 1-5 as follows: 1- poor; 2-fair; 3-good; 4-very good; and 5-excellent
Self-assessment of the ability to implement the policy is somewhat lower than with the GE/FE Policy, with 61 percent of USAID staff assessing their skills as “good” or higher. In the survey, the respondents’ confidence in their skills is noticeably lower, with only about a third rating their skills as “good” or “very good.” Fifty percent of the IP respondents consider their skills to be “poor.”

The interviewed staff also report using alternative resources on LGBTI inclusion, including obtaining information from the Mission gender and inclusion advisor, mailing lists and bulletins within the Agency, local civil society organizations (CSOs), partners, the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), and Agency intranet. While just over 20 percent of survey respondents identified the Mission gender and inclusion advisor as their “go-to” resource on LGBTI issues, 43 percent say they have never sought such assistance and nearly 30 percent state that they have never had questions related to LGBTI. IPs do not seem to turn to other resources on LGBTI, except one organization that has developed and follows its own internal guidance on the topic.

Disability

As with the other two policies, the Disability Policy has wide recognition among Mission staff; 91 percent report high awareness of it, and 87 percent report having access to it. IPs, on the other hand, report just 66 percent awareness of the policy, with 58 percent reporting that they have access to it.

Sixty-five percent of USAID staff consider their skills to be “good” or better; however, only 30 percent report having received training on disability, making it difficult to link training with self-assessed skills. Fifty-eight percent of IP respondents believe their policy implementation skills are “good” or better.

Several informants mentioned a disability PoC as a resource on disability – however, no official designate serves this role at the Mission. Two Strategic Planning and Analysis (SPA) staff members have shown interest and initiative in disability work; as a result, they are at times mistaken for a Mission-appointed disability PoC. Other disability resources reportedly utilized by USAID staff include external experts, IP staff, and lessons learned from other USAID programs and offices (elections and education). More than one IP reported referring to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, as well as to their own internal policies.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Overall, reported levels of awareness of and accessibility to all three policies are high among USAID staff. Regarding the GE/FE Policy, the only mandatory policy of the three, staff report high levels of awareness, accessibility, training and usage of additional gender-related resources, which indicates successful integration of the message of gender equality and female empowerment as a key element in USAID core development programming. For the LGBT Vision for Action and the Disability Policy, awareness and accessibility are high, but gaps exist in training on disability and, to a lesser extent, LGBTI, indicating a need for capacity building in these areas. The staff are also aware of and use other resources on disability and LGBTI, although not to the same extent as on gender.

The IPs report high levels of awareness of and accessibility to the GE/FE Policy, demonstrating that USAID’s gender equality and women’s empowerment efforts have reached the implementation stage of the project cycle. This may be because the GE/FE Policy is mandatory and IPs are required to adhere to it in their activities. Gaps are present in IPs’ awareness of and capacity for implementing USAID’s Disability and LGBTI policies, but broader awareness of these issues seems to be emanating from internal and other
global (non-USAID) sources. It is encouraging to see that the IPs have, on their own initiative, turned to
other resources that can help them improve their activities, despite the absence of mandatory
requirements on disability and LGBTI inclusion in USAID guidance.

QUESTION 2

TO WHAT EXTENT DO MISSION STAFF/IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS USE THE GE/FE
POLICY, ADS 205, DISABILITY POLICY AND LGBT VISION FOR ACTION, AND WITH
WHAT RESULTS? HOW HAVE THESE POLICIES LED TO MORE INCLUSIVE, GENDER-
EQUITABLE AND RESPONSIVE PROGRAMMING?

This question examined the extent to which the reported awareness of social inclusion policies and
capacity to implement them translates into practice. The answer to this question comes from two types
of sources: 1) qualitative reporting by staff (from interviews and the LGBTI survey) and IPs (interviews);
and 2) review of Mission strategic framework documents and solicitations. For illustrative examples of
translating the gender, LGBTI and disability inclusion policies into practice at the programming level, see
Annex 8.

FINDINGS: INTERVIEWS AND LGBTI SURVEY

KEY FINDINGS:

- A high proportion of USAID staff consults the GE/FE Policy and ADS 205 when
developing project appraisal documents (PADs), solicitations, operational planning,
annual PPR reporting, performance monitoring and program implementation.

- The IPs attributed two key changes in how they carry out their work to the GE/FE
Policy: 1) requirements for an activity-level gender analysis, gender policy, strategy or
gender action plan built into contracts and cooperative agreements, and 2) requirements for collection of and reporting on sex-disaggregated data.

- A minority of staff believe that the LGBT Vision for Action has led to more inclusive
programming and to an environment where it has become more acceptable to discuss
LGBTI issues among the Mission staff.

- Compared to the other two policies, the Disability Policy fares lowest on the
perceived impact by USAID staff, despite efforts by several USAID staff members to
promote the issue.

Gender

Eighty-five percent of interviewed USAID staff report using the GE/FE Policy. The policy and ADS 205 are
both reportedly consulted when developing project appraisal documents (PADs) and solicitations, and as
part of operational planning, annual PPR reporting, performance monitoring and program implementation.
In fact, over half (56 percent) of staff report that the GE/FE Policy has affected the ways they carry out
their duties, although a significant proportion (22 percent) said they did not know whether their jobs had
changed due to the policy. These reported changes are largely attributed to the mandatory nature of the GE/FE Policy and ADS 205, which require gender analysis during program design, and in development of PADs, as well as disaggregation by sex of people-level data in program implementation.

Likewise, the IPs repeatedly attributed two key changes to the GE/FE Policy: 1) requirements for an activity-level gender analysis, gender policy, strategy or gender action plan built into contracts and cooperative agreements, and 2) requirements for collection of and reporting on sex-disaggregated data. The interviewed IPs expressed mixed feelings about the adequacy of USAID support with practical applications of policy requirements. Just over half were complimentary about USAID’s involvement and guidance, while the rest found it lacking. Examples of USAID support provided to partners on gender issues include:

- USAID policies, guidance and other resources are shared or are available online for partners;
- USAID funding is available for work on the three themes;
- Human resources provided by USAID are available for consultation (gender advisor, AORs, consultants); and
- USAID provides advice through field visits and public forums.

LGBTI

The policy [LGBT Vision for Action] is not effectively pursued. LGBTI is a difficult conversation because there is resistance – hence compliance is difficult. — USAID staff interview respondent

The LGBT Vision for Action is reportedly used the least of the three policies – by less than half (47%) of USAID staff. In the survey, nearly 90 percent of respondents report not using the policy in the past year. Only about eight percent of respondents provided examples of its usage in program designs/PADs, solicitations and/or program implementation.

Only 22 percent of interview respondents said they think that the LGBT Vision for Action has had an impact on the way they carry out their duties, while over a third (35 percent) said they did not know if this was the case. Similarly, in the survey, over half of respondents (58 percent) cited no changes as a result of the policy. Additionally, the respondents noted that since this policy is not mandatory, USAID has not provided a checklist of requirements for LGBTI integration; as such, changes – real or perceived – are likely to be noted in passing, rather than with an intent. Albeit only a minority of survey respondents noted it, two types of change resulting from the LGBT Vision for Action were reported:

- It has become more acceptable to discuss LGBTI issues among the Mission staff, with reduced stigma around LGBTI issues at USAID/KEA. Examples include creating awareness by holding town hall meetings and inviting the LGBTI community to talk with Mission staff.
- **LGBTI issues are given more attention in programming.** This is evidenced in USAID staff discussing LGBTI issues with IPs and in the innovative work undertaken by programs such as Linkages across the Continuum of HIV Services for Key Populations Affected by HIV.
LINKAGES) and the Young African Leadership Initiative (YALI), and in the work of local partners such as Astraea.

The IPs were not able to offer any examples of changes resulting from the policy. Only approximately 25 percent of IPs said they find USAID support for implementation of LGBT Vision for Action to be sufficient. At the same time, 38 percent of respondents to the LGBTI survey stated that they have never observed IPs trying to include LGBTI in their programming.

**Disability**

Over half (57 percent) of interviewed USAID staff report using the Disability Policy. The examples of usage include in program designs/PADs, solicitations, program implementation and recruitment.

Forty-three percent of respondents reported a resolute “no” when asked if the Disability Policy has affected how they carry out their jobs; 39 percent said they did not know if this was the case. Compared to the other two policies, the Disability Policy fares the lowest on perceived impact, which is in line with the finding that only a little over half of respondents report using the policy (this number is not as low as for the LGBT Vision for Action), and only 30 percent report that they have received training on disability. Discussions around disability in the interviews organically gravitated toward human resources issues such as recruitment and accessibility for people with disabilities, rather than to disability inclusion in programming. There is evidence that the Mission employs USAID’s twin-track approach to disability-inclusive development, which includes both disability-specific programs to address targeted needs (e.g., the Disability Livelihood Project) and integrating disability into programs (e.g., Tusome, YALI). However, this approach does not seem to be the result of strategic design, as it is not explicitly outlined in USAID/KEA or USAID/Somalia strategy documents. In fact, previous efforts to develop a strategic approach to disability inclusion programming by several motivated staff members have come to a standstill. The disability action plan, developed by these individuals and dated September 2016, still awaits approval by the senior Mission leadership at the time of writing of this report.

About a third of the IPs report USAID support in implementing the policy, providing multiple examples of how the Disability Policy has guided disability integration in their activities in education; democracy and governance; water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH); and infrastructure. One IP even reports having hired a disability advisor “to help better understand and implement [disability] issues.”

---

FINDINGS: STRATEGIC PLANNING DOCUMENT REVIEW

KEY FINDINGS:

- The USAID/Kenya CDCS, USAID/East Africa RDCS, and the Strategic Framework for Somalia were in compliance with ADS 205.3.3 (Gender Analysis and Integration in the CDCS process).

- Key shortcomings show the need to address how closing identified gender gaps will contribute to the three outcomes of the GE/FE Policy, as well as the need to develop a thorough approach to gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation.

The study team reviewed USAID/Kenya CDCS, USAID/East Africa RDCS and the Strategic Framework for Somalia for compliance with ADS 205. ADS 205.3.3 (Gender Analysis and Integration in the CDCS Process) provides concrete guidance to Missions on how to integrate gender in development of their CDCSs.13

Country-level gender analysis is a mandatory step in the CDCS process. ADS 205 states that gender analysis findings should be applied and integrated into the draft of the full CDCS and that it must provide country-level quantitative and qualitative information on the key gender gaps14 in sectors where Mission resources are likely to be concentrated. All three strategy documents reviewed included a gender analysis. Each analysis identified and addressed gender gaps at the country/regional and sector levels. The analyses developed include: USAID/Kenya Gender Analysis and Action Plan (August 2012) for the CDCS; USAID/KEA Gender Analysis for Regional Development Cooperation Strategy 2016-2020: Gender Analysis Report (January 2016) for the RDCS; and USAID/Somalia Gender Assessment: Navigating Gender Roles and Status to Benefit Men and Women Equally (March 2014) for the Strategic Framework for Somalia. The 2012 Gender Analysis and Action Plan provides significant discussion of disadvantaged groups that have significant unmet needs for empowerment — LGBTI and people with disabilities — and provides recommendations for their inclusion in future programming. Nonetheless, the CDCS only briefly mentions people with disabilities within the context of DO 2 (Health and Human Capacity Strengthened) and is silent on the issues of the LGBTI population. The other two gender analyses do not discuss LGBTI or people with disabilities. The RDCS mentions ensuring “more equality in the fulfillment of their mandates by engaging with and meeting the needs of marginalized or vulnerable populations, such as women, youth, people with disabilities and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex (LGBTI) persons,” but provides no details on how to accomplish this. The Strategic Framework for Somalia does not mention people with disabilities or LGBTI issues.

All three documents utilize the findings from their respective gender analyses and, in different ways, discuss gender gaps and propose activities to address them across the DOs. The CDCS provides the most comprehensive details across DO sections, followed by the Strategic Framework for Somalia and then the

---

13 ADS Chapter 201: Strategic planning is the process through which USAID determines the best strategic approach in a given country or region based on U.S. development policy priorities, individual country and/or regional priorities and USAID’s comparative advantage and available foreign assistance resources, among other factors. The Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) or Regional Development Cooperation Strategy (RDCS) describes the strategic approach. This chapter refers to the CDCS and RDCS collectively as a CDCS.

14 The domains of analysis include: laws, policies, regulations and institutional practices; cultural norms and beliefs; gender roles, responsibilities and time use; access to and control over assets and resources; and patterns of power and decision-making.
RDCS. However, none of the three strategy documents meets the ADS requirement of explicitly discussing how they will contribute to the three outcomes of the GE/FE Policy: 1) Reduce gender disparities in access to, control over and benefit from resources, wealth, opportunities and services – economic, social, political and cultural; 2) Reduce gender-based violence and mitigate its harmful effects on individuals and communities; and 3) Increase the capability of women and girls to realize their rights, determine their life outcomes and influence decision-making in households, communities and societies.

Of the three documents, the RDCS most successfully identifies and discusses gender gaps in descriptions of the development context, challenges and opportunities, and provides sex-disaggregated statistics. The Strategic Framework for Somalia does not have a challenges and opportunities section, and the CDCS discusses challenges and opportunities within the context of each DO. Of the three documents, the Strategic Framework for Somalia best addresses the requirement for providing a brief profile of the status of women and men in terms of their leadership roles in society and the gender norms that should be taken into account.

The development hypotheses and results framework of the RDCS discuss gender gaps in regional institutions, stating that “Significant gaps exist in institutional gender policies among regional institutions. USAID/KEA will work with these institutions to improve sex-disaggregated data collection and analyses relevant to improved gender policy development and decision-making.” However, the RDCS DO and intermediate result (IR) narratives, while making references to gender, do not identify specific gender gaps relevant to individual DOs/IRs; and do not discuss how to close those gaps. The Strategic Framework for Somalia development hypotheses and results framework is silent on gender issues, but transitional objectives and IR narratives do identify gender gaps relevant to respective TOs and discuss how to address those gaps. The CDCS does not have an overarching development hypothesis; rather, each of the three DOs has its own hypothesis, with gender explicitly mentioned only within the context of DO 3. However, the IR narratives of all three CDCS DOs provide a discussion of gender gaps and how to close them.

The strategy documents take different approaches when discussing indicators that track progress in closing gender gaps and achieving female empowerment objectives. In the CDCS, each DO has at least one illustrative gender-sensitive indicator. Examples include: Number of women and youth involved in political party leadership and eventually as candidates and elected officials (DO 1); Percent change of Kenyans (disaggregated by sex) who report positively on how the national government is handling basic health services, addressing educational needs and combating HIV/AIDS (Afrobarometer) (DO 2); and Number of people benefiting from improved natural resource management (disaggregated by sex and age) (DO 3). Interestingly, the only two people-level indicators requiring disaggregation by sex are the examples listed above for DOs 2 and 3. The document does not recognize the GE/FE Policy requirement for sex-disaggregating all people-level indicators, but it does have a broad statement about M&E efforts focusing on “Identifying programming gaps and lessons for gender equality and female empowerment.” The RDCS states that “USAID/KEA will implement a robust gender-sensitive monitoring, evaluation and learning system as part of the RDCS,” but does not elaborate; in fact, the RDCS contains no illustrative gender-sensitive indicators or people-level indicators that specify sex-disaggregation. Similarly, the Strategic Framework for Somalia does not include illustrative indicators in its TO narratives. The section on M&E, albeit comprehensive, does not offer any insight on gendered aspects of monitoring and evaluation.
FINDINGS: SOLICITATION REVIEW

KEY FINDINGS:

- A review of 22 USAID/Kenya and East Africa solicitations shows that the first couple of sections of the document (i.e., background, statement of work, statement of objectives, performance work statement) are most likely to contain gender considerations; sections regarding the resources and actions required of an IP to integrate inclusion concretely (i.e., solicitation sections on monitoring and evaluation; reporting; key personnel; past experience and capacities) are lacking in gender requirements.

- Only 10 of 26 solicitations reviewed from USAID/East Africa, Kenya and Somalia explicitly required disability inclusion in program design and planning.

- Only two of 26 reviewed solicitations required concrete LGBTI inclusion in program design and planning.

To obtain evidence of social inclusion integration at USAID/Kenya and East Africa, the study team developed a scoring tool to assess solicitations that the East Africa, Kenya and Somalia missions issued between January 2013 and December 2017. The scoring tool is provided in Annex 9. This exercise allowed for quantification of the extent of gender, LGBTI and disability inclusion across solicitations at the design and planning stages of the program cycle. The study team scored 26 solicitations issued between January 2013 and December 2017. USAID/KEA provided eight solicitations for review and the team collected 18 further solicitations through exhaustive searches in public databases on the websites grants.gov and fbo.gov.

The scores indicate limited gender, LGBTI and disability integration in solicitations from the USAID missions participating in the assessment. Within the small sample of 22 solicitations reviewed from USAID/KEA, a slight possible downward overall trend in average scores from 2013 through 2017 emerged. However, this finding may not represent the trend for all solicitations that USAID/KEA issued over this period.

The reviewed solicitations illustrate examples of good practices that may be highlighted and built upon in future solicitation development, program design and planning. The highest scores attained using the scoring tool were 35 out of a total possible of 49, while the lowest was zero. The average score was 19 with a median of 20 points. For a complete listing of scores, see Annex 10. For an example of a well-performing solicitation, see Annex 11, featuring the Kenya Electoral Assistance Program (KEAP).

---

15 The scoring tool was adapted from the “Solicitations Scorecard” in Encompass LLC (2016), Assessment of the USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy. United States Agency for International Development, pp. 36-37.
16 Of the 26 solicitations, 11 were issued by the combined USAID/Kenya and East Africa Mission, nine by USAID/East Africa, two by USAID/Kenya and four by USAID/Somalia. Technical offices represented in this sample of solicitations included Democracy, Governance and Conflict (eight solicitations), Health, Population and Nutrition (seven), Economic Growth (seven), Education and Youth (three) and Environment (one). The numbers of solicitations reviewed by year in the sample are: five for 2017, five for 2016, two for 2015, six for 2014, and eight for 2013.
17 The USAID/Somalia solicitations reviewed for this study are excluded from this statement, as only four solicitations in the sample were from this mission.
### TABLE 1: SOLICITATIONS SCORING 30 OR HIGHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solicitations scored 30+ points</th>
<th>Technical sector</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gender sub-score (43 possible)</th>
<th>LGBTI sub-score (3 possible)</th>
<th>Disability sub-score (3 possible)</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE (49 possible)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-15-000003 Growth, Enterprise, Employment and Livelihoods (GEEL)</td>
<td>OEG</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 615-16-000001 Kenya Electoral Assistance Program (KEAP)</td>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-14-000023 Transition Initiatives for Stabilization Plus (TIS+)</td>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 615-17-000002 HIV Service Delivery Support Activity</td>
<td>HPN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-14-000015 Strengthening Somali Governance (SSG)</td>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-14-000001 Power Africa Transactions and Reforms Program (PATRP)</td>
<td>OEG</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall patterns in scores across the 22 solicitations reviewed from USAID/Kenya and East Africa\(^\text{18}\) show that the most points were earned in the first couple of sections of the document (i.e., background, statement of work, statement of objectives, performance work statement). These sections contained general rhetoric on gender integration, but contained few explicit technical requirements. The solicitations earned the fewest points in later sections where IPs are required to outline resources and actions to integrate inclusion concretely (i.e., solicitation sections on monitoring and evaluation; reporting; key personnel; past experience and capacities) in compliance with available technical guidance on gender, LGBTI and disability inclusion. Accordingly, only 13 of the 22 USAID/Kenya and East Africa solicitations scored listed explicit requirements on gender integration in M&E planning. Reporting requirements on gender integration were explicit in only 12 of 22 reviewed solicitations. Further, despite a preponderance of evidence showing that having a gender technical expert among key personnel is vital to the quality of gender integration across the program cycle, only three solicitations required a gender expert as key personnel. Finally, only six of 26 solicitations reviewed from USAID/Kenya and East Africa explicitly stated that proposals would be weighed considering the technical quality of gender integration throughout the proposal.

\(^\text{18}\) A larger sample of solicitations from USAID/Somalia would be needed to assess similar trends in scores on gender, LGBTI and disability inclusion across the standard sections of each solicitation.
To assess disability and LGBTI inclusion, the scoring exercise assigned a possible maximum of three points:

- zero points for no language on disability (or LGBTI) inclusion;
- one point for minimal disability (or LGBTI) inclusion language;
- two points for disability (or LGBTI) inclusion not only mentioned, but encouraged; and
- three points if disability (or LGBTI) inclusion was not simply encouraged, but required.

Scores on disability inclusion suggest mixed and limited achievement within the reviewed solicitations. Only 10 of 26 solicitations reviewed from USAID/East Africa, Kenya and Somalia explicitly required disability inclusion in program design and planning. Among the remaining 16 solicitations, five encouraged disability inclusion without requiring it, five included minimal language on disability inclusion with no requirements and six contained no language on disability inclusion. Solicitations that included only the clausal language, “752.7038 Nondiscrimination Against End-Users of Supplies or Services (Oct 2016),” earned two points if disability inclusion in planning and reporting was not otherwise explicitly required. Scores on LGBTI inclusion were the lowest, with only two of 26 reviewed solicitations requiring concrete LGBTI inclusion in program design and planning.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Eighty-five percent of USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia staff report using the GE/FE Policy, 57 percent the Disability Policy, and 47 percent the LGBT Vision for Action. According to interviewed staff, the mandatory nature of gender guidance leads to more frequent usage. The staff report changes resulting from the GE/FE Policy mostly in requirements for gender analysis in program planning, and monitoring and evaluation. This indicates that ADS 205, which outlines these requirements, has been a useful tool for staff.

USAID staff overwhelmingly state that the LGBT Vision for Action has not brought about change. The lower levels of perceived impact and higher levels of uncertainty about impact in comparison to the GE/FE Policy may result from the finding that less than half of the interview respondents reported that they use the policy, making it difficult to gauge its impact on their jobs. On the positive side, some staff report observing an increase in awareness of LGBTI issues at the Mission internally, as well as more attention paid to the issue at the programming level. The IPs were not able to offer any examples of changes resulting from the LGBT Vision for Action. The disconnect about LGBTI requirements and expectations – evidenced by the findings that only 25 percent of IPs reported support from USAID on LGBTI and 38 percent of survey respondents reported never observing the IPs trying to include LGBTI in their programming – may be caused by inconsistent and inadequate communication between CORs/AORs and their IPs. Providing the IPs with regular guidance and feedback on LGBTI inclusion in their program activities (in reporting, monitoring, etc.) is crucial to ensuring sustainable programming outcomes.

Finally, despite not being mandatory, the Disability Policy has energized Mission staff to develop a disability action plan (pending approval by the Mission leadership). Similarly, the IPs seem to have embraced disability considerations in their activities, despite only 33 percent reporting that they received concrete USAID support and guidance on this issue.

The review of the three strategy documents found degrees of responsiveness to gender requirements of the GE/FE Policy and ADS 205. All three OUs conducted gender analyses and used their findings to formulate strategies. Broadly speaking, key shortcomings relate to addressing how closing identified gender gaps will contribute to the three outcomes of the GE/FE Policy, as well as to the need for developing a thorough approach to gender-sensitive monitoring and evaluation.

As for solicitation review, the extent to which USAID/East Africa, Kenya and Somalia mission staff use the GE/FE, ADS 205, the Disability Policy and the LGBT Vision for Action in developing solicitations remains limited, with significant room to improve by building on available technical guidance and identified good practices.

In sum, the impact of the three policies on inclusive programming cannot be considered in absolute terms, but rather on a spectrum. The GE/FE Policy seems to have had the most impact on inclusive programming, followed by Disability Policy and then the LGBT Vision for Action.
QUESTION 3

WHAT ARE THE SPECIFIC CHALLENGES AND BARRIERS THAT STAFF AND IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS ENCOUNTER WHILE TRYING TO IMPLEMENT THE GE/FE POLICY, DISABILITY POLICY AND LGBT VISION FOR ACTION?

USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia staff report challenges in the implementation of all three policies, with a majority of respondents citing challenges related to implementation of social inclusion guidance, rather than in relation to a specific policy. The IPs report challenges similar to those identified by USAID staff.

FINDINGS

KEY FINDINGS:

- The most frequently cited obstacle that impedes the implementation of gender guidance is the lack of understanding among USAID and IP staff of “gender.”

- External factors, such as inhospitable governments (for example, legal criminalization of same-sex conduct) and the cultural environment, are a key challenge for the implementation of the LGBT Vision for Action.

- Perceived low priority for disability inclusion at the Mission is an obstacle for the implementation of the Disability Policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2: KEY CHALLENGES FOR POLICY IMPLEMENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia Staff19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding of “gender” (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of technical capacity at the Mission (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Mission leadership’s support (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural barriers (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender advisor does not clear project designs and solicitations (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of resources (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success is leadership-dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No gender focus on HR policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 The number in parenthesis by each entry signifies how many respondents mentioned that specific factor. For gender and disability, the number refers to KIIs, while for LGBTI the number is a sum of KIIs and survey data points. Some of the KII and survey participants could be the same person, which would lead to double counting in the data.
## Gender

- Gender considered an imposition – an additional task to be done
- Gender PoCs are largely female

## LGBTI

- IPs are resistant
- Difficult to balance program effectiveness against stigmatization
- “Compliance mentality” – force-feeding people gender and LGBTI is not effective
- Not a key development issues for Kenya
- Lack of clarity on how to communicate publicly on USAID LGBTI position

## Disability

- Disability is not a public priority (2)
- Lack of access to opportunities for PWDs (2)
- Disability is not USAID priority
- Culture/religion
- Lack of data on people with disabilities who participate in programs

### Implementing Partners

- USAID is not interested in gender (6)
- Culture (3)
- Leadership is male-dominated (3)
- Inadequate resources (2)
- Equating “gender” with “women”
- Inhospitalite external environment for LGBTI due to violence, insufficient legal protection, cultural, religious and other sensitivities (43)
- Inadequate awareness of LGBTI special needs by service providers (26)
- Inadequate IP capacity (21)
- Lack of guidance/requirements from USAID (16)
- Low levels of community awareness about human rights

The discussion below highlights obstacles cited most often by respondents and identified by the study team as being particularly significant.

**Gender**

| “Attention is not paid to boys and men even when they are disadvantaged because conventional thinking is that gender refers to females.” | — USAID staff interview respondent |
| “Not as many resources here as in other Missions, for example, there is no GWG [gender working group] here. Not sufficent attention is being paid to gender.” | — USAID staff interview respondent |

- **Lack of understanding of “gender.”** Reducing gender to simply counting the number of female beneficiaries seems to be the common way of “addressing” gender integration. However, it is encouraging to see that 30 percent of the interviewed USAID/KEA staff have enough awareness to identify this myopic approach as hindering both efforts and results in programming.

- **Lack of gender technical capacity at the Mission.** Despite Mission staff undergoing gender training and an overall high level of self-assessment on gender skills, lack of technical capacity is

---

20 The challenges listed here come from IPs themselves for all three policies as well as from USAID survey participants’ feedback on IP challenges related to the LGBT Vision for Action.
the second most frequently cited obstacle to the implementation of the GE/FE Policy. The key technical gender resource is the Mission gender and inclusion advisor, who was identified by almost all respondents, and even some IPs, as the driving force for gender integration. However, the majority of interviewees recognize that one person is not able to meet the various gender needs of over 150 activities as well as the internal requirements of the Mission. While gender PoCs are assigned for eight TOs, some staff are unaware that such a position exists.

- **Lack of interest/support on gender.** The staff recognize that it is crucial to have Mission leadership’s support in order to successfully implement the GE/FE Policy. According to one informant, “If the initiative doesn’t come from the Mission leadership, it does not happen. [The] gender advisor has power, but in terms of behavior change, it won’t happen unless the leadership says so.” However, reportedly this support is missing, which affects how staff address gender integration in interactions with the activities they are managing. Despite the overall high level of engagement with the GE/FE Policy and familiarity with ADS 205 at the IP level, 25 percent of the IPs were categorical in saying that USAID support on gender is either completely absent or negligible (in that there is hardly any engagement or follow-up from USAID during implementation). One IP respondent stated that their project’s COR has not discussed gender issues in the past year and a half.

**LGBTI**

“I think champions are needed – people who are interested in ensuring that stigma is erased and that LGBT are perceived as normal as any other person.”

— USAID staff survey respondent

- **Cultural and religious barriers.** While culture is mentioned as an obstacle in the context of all three areas, it is particularly significant in the LGBTI discourse. There is an overall perception among Mission staff and IPs that LGBTI issues are not easy to address due to cultural and religion-based resistance coming from the local staff. In fact, a few respondents shared with the study team their personal lack of comfort in dealing with these issues not only in the workplace, but also at home. Yet, well over half of survey respondents (55 percent) believe that, despite cultural and traditional factors in Kenya, USAID/KEA should actively promote the LGBTI agenda. Thirty percent feel neutral about the Mission promoting LGBTI, and just under 15 percent believe that USAID should not promote this agenda. Additionally, nearly half (48 percent) of interviewed USAID/KEA staff think that the environment at the Mission is inclusive, and 43 percent believe that the Mission HR policies are inclusive.

- **In hospitable external environment due to government-led anti-LGBTI sentiments.** While there are multiple, documented challenges to working on LGBTI issues in Kenya, “….drawing strengths from regional and international networks, Kenya’s LGBTI activists are making critical strides, improving the capacity of organizations and coalitions to engage the public and policymakers in campaigns for social change.”^{21} USAID staff themselves identified opportunities that can be expanded further in areas where the government has already made

---

room to address LGBTI issues, such as in the health sector where the Ministry of Health is considering LGBTI as a technical, rather than a moral issue.

**Disability**

- **High costs associated with accessibility issues.** Interviewees frequently raised issues around work environment and recruitment of people with disabilities, citing the cost of building ramps, installing special toilets and doors, and hiring sign language interpreters as obstacles to the participation of people with disabilities – both as employees and program beneficiaries. There is already existing USG guidance on addressing some of these issues which the staff may be unaware of – for example, both ADS Chapter 111: Procedures for Providing Reasonable Accommodation for Individuals with Disabilities and EEOC directives prescribing the process for employees with targeted disabilities to obtain Personal Assistance Services (PAS) provide guidance on accommodating people with disabilities.

- **Disability is not a priority for the Mission.** Over 20 percent of staff perceive the Mission’s lack of prioritization of disability-related issues as a significant obstacle. Factors contributing to this perception may include: the 2016 Disability Action Plan still awaiting approval; no officially appointed disability PoC; and no requirements for tracking disability in award reporting in templates.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

The obstacle most frequently cited by USAID staff that impedes the implementation of gender guidance is the lack of understanding of “gender.” Specifically, the challenge is how to think beyond “counting women” at the project or activity level. It is interesting that this issue remains an obstacle, despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of staff report having taken gender training and, depending on their length of service at USAID, have been exposed to various opportunities for learning about gender. Other obstacles in the implementation of GE/FE Policy, identified by both USAID staff and the IPs, revolve around lack of capacity, interest and support of gender issues at the Mission.

External factors, such as inhospitable governments (for example, legal criminalization of same-sex conduct) and the cultural environment, are a key challenge for the implementation of LGBT Vision for Action; this means that any LGBTI activities should be carried out with sensitivity and a “do no harm” approach. However, the study did not find any evidence that the Mission is an unfriendly LGBTI environment; rather, the issue seems to be the lack of awareness of and exposure to LGBTI issues.

Both USAID staff and the IPs perceive disability to be a low priority for the Mission, which makes it difficult to promote disability concerns in a deliberate and sustainable fashion. The staff also mentioned high costs related to universal design as an obstacle, though this seems to be the result of a lack of overall knowledge about the existing USG policy on meeting the needs of people with disabilities rather than an actual challenge.

Ultimately, the practical application of social inclusion guidelines must reach the activity level. Strong Mission leadership, along with more capacity building and awareness raising on aspects of social inclusion among USAID staff, will go a long way in enabling the transfer of this guidance to the IP level.
QUESTION 4

DESCRIBE THE FACTORS THAT EXPLAIN THE SUCCESS (OR LACK THEREOF) OF THE THREE POLICIES STUDIED. FACTORS THAT COULD BE EXPLORED INCLUDE LEADERSHIP, STAFFING, RESOURCES, PROCESSES, STAFF CAPACITY AND OTHERS.

FINDINGS

KEY FINDINGS:

- A key factor contributing to the success of implementation of all three policies identified by staff is the Mission gender and inclusion advisor.

- The Mission leadership, regardless of whether it is considered an obstacle or an enabling factor for policy implementation, plays a crucial role in determining how and to what extent social inclusion considerations will be integrated, both internally at the Mission and externally in programming.

Gender

“The GE/FE Policy has forced us to become more deliberate.” — USAID staff interview respondent

The study found that a key enabling element for successful implementation of the GE/FE Policy is the fact that it is mandatory. Additional enabling factors identified by staff include the Mission gender and inclusion advisor, gender PoCs and the Mission leadership. Staff have mixed feedback on gender PoCs, regarding them both as an asset and as a liability due to the perceived lack of relevant gender skills and knowledge they possess. In other words, the PoCs are regarded as a useful resource by some staff members, while others believe that they lack the necessary skills to provide gender guidance. The PoCs themselves also say that they require additional training in order to raise their skill level and to be able to serve as a knowledgeable resource for their colleagues. Likewise, the Mission leadership is seen as both hampering and supporting the policy implementation.

LGBTI

Key enabling factors aiding the implementation of the LGBT Vision for Action mentioned in the interviews include the Mission gender and inclusion advisor, Mission leadership, and additional guidelines on social inclusion. The top three factors identified in the survey that contribute to the successes of LGBT Vision for Action’s implementation are the Mission leadership (54 percent); capacity building on LGBTI issues (42 percent); and a Mission-wide network of LGBTI champions (31 percent) – the lack of which has been also identified as an obstacle. Although just over a quarter of survey respondents believe that the LGBT Vision for Action has not been implemented successfully, the study did not identify any key factors that could be explain the failure of its implementation.
Disability

The staff were able to name a small number of factors contributing to the successful implementation of the Disability Policy, including the gender and inclusion advisor and the disability PoC. The assessment identified additional enabling factors including interest in disability issues exhibited by USAID staff, activity-level efforts spearheaded by the IPs themselves, and a seemingly disability-friendly Kenyan national policy environment.

Opportunities

Both USAID staff and the IPs identified the following high-level opportunities which could, if acted upon, further strengthen the Mission’s social inclusion efforts:

- **Aligning programming with Kenya’s laws and policies.** Progressive legislation, such as the Constitution of Kenya (which includes provisions on gender and disability inclusion); national policies on health and nutrition that address LGBTI populations; and the Persons with Disabilities Act can be building blocks and justification for social inclusion in USAID programming, which could otherwise be construed as a “Western import” and therefore not appropriate for the Kenyan context.

- **Leveraging its status as a leading aid agency to promote social inclusion.** USAID’s status as a leading aid agency gives it clout in bilateral conversations. Demonstrating unwavering commitment and dedication to social inclusion as a proven strategy for aid effectiveness can help propel USAID’s status as a leader on this front.

- **Learning from others.** Multiple respondents have noted the need to learn from other missions, local non-governmental organizations (NGOs), IPs, other donors, etc. Applying social inclusion best practices and lessons learned to future program design will help develop more effective activities.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

A key factor identified by the staff contributing to the success of implementation of all three policies is the Mission gender and inclusion advisor, who pushes all three agendas forward. The study team also identified two distinct yet necessary enabling factors for successful implementation of the GE/FE Policy and Disability Policy. For the GE/FE Policy, this is its mandatory nature. For the Disability Policy, the enabling factors are the Mission staff’s demonstrated interest, coupled with national-level disability-friendly policies and legislation in areas such as education which create accessible entry points for disability programming. Considering these enabling factors, elevating the disability agenda would be a fairly straightforward action, only requiring approval for action from the Mission leadership. The Mission leadership, regardless of whether it is considered an obstacle or an enabling factor for policy implementation, plays a crucial role in determining how and to what extent social inclusion considerations will be integrated both internally at the Mission and externally in programming.

---

22 Two of the agendas (gender and disability) are part of the PD; however, disability is a shared ad hoc task amongst different functions/positions.
CONCLUSIONS

Given the differing stages of cultural acceptance, awareness, policy and mandatory requirements, each of the three areas – gender, LGBTI and disability – have their own challenges and opportunities, and advancing them requires different approaches and strategies. The implementation of gender inclusion has certainly been helped by the mandatory status of the GE/FE Policy and its operationalization in ADS 205. The non-mandatory nature of the other two policies provides an opportunity for creative and innovative social inclusion approaches in the local context. Strong leadership and consistent mobilization of technical, human and financial resources within and across sectors are required to materialize much needed gains in gender, LGBTI and disability inclusion for aid effectiveness and sustainable development outcomes.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This section outlines recommendations to increase social inclusion practices, programming and results within USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia. Recommendations reflect a compilation of suggestions from study participants, experience of the study team, and recommendations from gender analyses conducted in 2012, 2014 and 2016, many of which have not been implemented. Recommendations are further translated into practical, time-bound activities in the USAID/KEA Gender and Inclusion Action Plan (see Annex 1).

GENDER

- **Approve Mission Order on Gender Integration.** This will bring the Mission in compliance with ADS 205, which requires all missions, regional bureaus and country offices to “Adopt or revise, and periodically update, a mission order (MO) on gender that describes how the Mission will implement the Agency’s Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy.” Subsequent to approval of the mission order, the following activities should be conducted:

  - **Hold appropriate sessions to inform staff about the MO approval.** These sessions, which could include various forums, such as Town Hall meetings, should provide an overview of the MO and emphasize the duties of specific offices, as well as individuals’ roles and responsibilities, in order to be in compliance with the MO.

  - **Formalize a Gender Working Group (GWG).** The draft MO calls for the formation of a GWG comprised of members from technical and support offices who represent “U.S. direct hire, third-country national and Foreign Service national staff to attain diversity and enrich teamwork skills, and will include women and men with a wide and diverse range of technical and sector expertise.” The group members may or may not be gender PoCs.

  - **Develop Terms of Reference (TORs) for the GWG.** The TORs should include information about the goals and objectives of the GWG, the group internal structure, schedule of meetings, etc.

  - **Develop TORs for gender PoCs.** Gender PoCs should have official descriptions of their roles and responsibilities in the support of gender integration. They should also have gender integration responsibilities built into their work objectives, an annual performance evaluation review, or both.
- **Support opportunities for gender PoCs to participate in sectoral gender training.** The gender PoCs report not having enough knowledge in their own sector to be useful to their colleagues. Investments to build the capacity of gender PoCs will help overcome the obstacle of limited gender expertise now available at the Mission. This may be a short-term inconvenience, as the PoC would be away from her/his other responsibilities during the training, but this investment should result in significant long-term benefits.

- Identify entry points for additional gender expertise (e.g., formalize the gender PoC; hire short- or long-term technical support) for USAID/Somalia to complement the Mission's gender and inclusion advisor.

- One gender and inclusion advisor is not able to thoroughly address all gender needs at USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia. A Somalia-specific gender advisor will be able to focus on gender issues that are particular to that country's context. Additionally, more technical expertise at the Mission would also be available to assist partners through hands-on guidance, supervision, monitoring and advice.

- Develop sector-specific factsheets illustrating how to integrate gender in the program cycle. These sector sheets should be shared with TOs and the IPs.

- **Rotate staff with additional gender expertise across teams.** Staff with additional expertise should be able to rotate between technical offices and OUs on a short-term basis (two weeks to one month) and to teach the staff how to apply ADS 205 requirements to their work. This action, while perhaps unusual, will enable the Mission to specifically address the identified challenge of lack of technical capacity.

- **Hold quarterly meetings with IP gender specialists (by sector/DO).** Led by the Mission gender and inclusion advisor and relevant PoCs, this forum should allow the IPs to share their successes and challenges, while allowing the Mission to inform the IPs about the latest developments related to gender. This activity will strengthen the relationship between the Mission and the IPs on gender, and will provide an opportunity for networking and collaboration on gender issues among the IPs.

- **Require as part of IP contracts and cooperative agreements that key staff take the Gender 101 online course.** AORs/CORs should require proof that all activity key personnel have taken the training. Interacting on this issue also may help improve communications related to gender between CORs/AORs and the IPs, which some IP respondents have deemed insufficient.

- Hold IPs accountable to report on gender outcomes in their annual and final reports.

- A shortcoming of annual reporting is that it asks only for categorization of activities by gender key issue and does not explain how each OU contributes to the realization of the three GE/FE Policy outcomes. IPs should also be required to track at least two gender-related indicators in their activities; these should be tracked quarterly. If IPs cannot identify any F gender indicators

23 There are four Gender Key Issue categories: Gender Equality/Women’s Empowerment (GE/WE) – Primary; Gender Equality/Women’s Empowerment (GE/WE) – Secondary; Gender-Based Violence (GBV); and Women, Peace, and Security (WPS).
directly related to their scope, they should be encouraged to formulate relevant custom indicators.

- Require as part of IP contracts and cooperative agreements reporting on GE/FE Policy outcomes. Requiring this information from IPs will feed into annual reporting.

- Require gender clearance on all new procurements. Despite the additional step in the clearance process, it is clear that without someone with expertise in social inclusion having specific responsibility and accountability, solicitations are unlikely to include language or requirements for social inclusion. Including gender PoCs in the review may also help build their capacity.

- Elevate gender inclusion language in solicitations.
  - **Require inclusion of a gender expert, as well as gender inclusion experience among other key personnel, in solicitations.** Each solicitation with three or more key staff should stipulate the inclusion of a gender expert as a key staff member. Demonstrable experience with gender analysis and reporting should be a requirement of monitoring and evaluation specialist personnel.
  
  - **Require gender integration in monitoring and evaluation sections of solicitations.** Bidders should be required to: explain how they plan to track progress and report on gender gaps identified through gender analysis during the program design and planning stage; include gender-specific outcomes indicators to assess progress on closing critical gender gaps; detail how monitoring will be conducted to ensure gender sensitivity; and specify how data will be analyzed and reported with sex disaggregation.

  - Clearly require, and then weigh, evidence of gender integration in concrete program design ideas and plans, as well as gender inclusion experience of IPs and partners, in the selection criteria outlined in solicitations. A critical omission in a majority of reviewed solicitations was the explicit requirement of gender inclusion as one of the selection criteria. Mere rhetoric on gender inclusion in the background section or a simple stand-alone paragraph on gender (possibly inserted by one gender advisor who was not afforded the opportunity to review the entire solicitation) is insufficient for eliciting proposals or applications that integrate gender considerations to an acceptable technical standard.

**LGBTI**

- **Form an inter-agency working group (IAWG) on inclusion or human rights.** This will help elevate LGBTI issues beyond USAID and acknowledge clear lines of responsibility/accountability among senior leadership. TORs should be developed to present the membership structure, objectives, goals, schedule of meetings, etc.

- Facilitate relationships with LGBTI organizations in sectors where USAID is engaged on LGBTI issues, such as health and education. These organizations are in the best position to help USAID develop locally acceptable LGBTI approaches and should be a key resource on social inclusion when developing new programs. The representatives of these organizations should be consulted during the program design stage, and asked to share their experiences at Mission-wide events.
• Require basic training for technical officers and IP staff on non-discrimination policy for access to services for beneficiaries of Mission programs. The purpose of the training is to raise awareness about Agency non-discrimination policy. The training should also be available to IPs.

• **Present an award to an IP who has demonstrated exemplary work on social inclusion.** This award could be presented during a 16 Days of Activism against GBV event and would showcase the appreciation the Mission has for programs that have, despite challenges, developed and implemented inclusive activities benefiting marginalized groups.

• **Develop sector-specific factsheets demonstrating how to integrate LGBTI considerations in the program cycle.** The factsheets should be distributed to TOs and IPs in the relevant sectors to raise their awareness of the importance of LGBTI inclusion in programming, and how LGBTI inclusion helps to achieve economic, social and sector development outcomes.

• Ensure that the language per “Nondiscrimination against End-Users of Supplies or Services” (AIDAR 48 CFR 752.7038) appears in all solicitations, and track adherence. The clause is as follows:

> USAID policy requires that the contractor not discriminate against any end-user of the contract supplies or services (i.e., the beneficiaries of the supplies or services) in implementation of this award, such as, but not limited to, by withholding, adversely impacting, or denying equitable access to the supplies or services (benefits) provided through this contract on the basis of any factor not expressly stated in the award. This includes, for example, race, color, religion, sex (including gender identity, sexual orientation, and pregnancy), national origin, disability, age, genetic information, marital status, parental status, political affiliation, or veteran’s status. Nothing in this clause is intended to limit the ability of the contractor to target activities toward the assistance needs of certain populations as defined in the contract.

**DISABILITY**

• **Formalize disability PoC position.** This action will demonstrate the Mission’s commitment to disability issues. Disability PoCs should have TORs, just like gender PoCs do.

• **Formalize a disability working group.** As with a disability PoC, the group will reflect the existing interest in disability among the Mission staff. The members of this group will serve as advocates for disability programming and will be involved with the implementation and monitoring of the disability portion of the GIAP.

• **Provide sector-specific training on disability to TOs.** An external consultant or relevant expert from USAID/Washington should conduct this training. IPs should be allowed to participate in this training as well.

• **Require all program staff to take the Disability Inclusive Development 101 e-learning course within the next year.** Considering that only 30 percent of staff report taking training on disability, this is an easy way to introduce them to disability-related considerations in development.
• Track compliance with inclusion of disability language per AAPD 05-07, AAPD 04-17, and “Nondiscrimination against End-Users of Supplies or Services” (AIDAR 48 CFR 752.7038) in all solicitations. Compliance with these Agency guidelines will clearly demonstrate the Mission’s commitment to disability inclusion.

• **Include disability requirements in contracts and cooperative agreements.** Grantees and contractors should be required to report on their progress on integrating the concerns of persons with disabilities in their activities, and to collect disability-disaggregated data.

• Develop sector-specific factsheets demonstrating how to integrate disability considerations in the program cycle. The factsheets should be distributed to TOs and IPs.

• **Perform an access review related to programmatic and environmental accessibility for persons with disabilities.** The questions the review should consider include: Is the Mission’s website meeting accessibility standards? Are physical structures at the Mission accessible to people with disabilities? How many people with disabilities are participating in existing programs? What are the methods to monitor all new construction/renovations for accessibility? Are opportunities available for people with disabilities to be recruited for employment at USAID?

• Make a conscious effort to include narrative and visual depictions of people with disabilities in USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia materials – factsheets, success stories, websites, etc. This would further demonstrate that the Mission takes disability concerns seriously.

• **Present an annual award to an IP that has demonstrated exemplary work on disability.** This event could be annual, held on the International Day of Persons with Disabilities Day (December 3). Another option is combining the Disability Award and the LGBTI Award in a joint event.

**SOCIAL INCLUSION BROADLY**

• **Include all three policies in an orientation package for new hires.** This will introduce new hires to these policies, provide access to the policies and communicate the Mission’s commitment.

• **Develop an engaging orientation for new hires on gender, LGBTI and disability inclusion using video or interactive communication.** Video and interactive communication are more engaging media compared to text, and can create a more personal, impactful experience for new hires through people telling their stories. This approach is likely to create a higher level of awareness of social inclusion (compared to written communication) and will signal commitment by the Mission.

• **Develop a new GIAP for April 2019 – April 2020.** During portfolio reviews, TOs should discuss the status of the social inclusion activities they were in charge of accomplishing during the past year, and develop new activities for the following year. This should also be an opportunity to analyze gender or other social inclusion indicators and reflect on their performance.
ANNEX I. USAID/KEA GENDER AND INCLUSION ACTION PLAN (MARCH 2018-MARCH 2019) (DRAFT)

Introduction

This Gender and Inclusion Action Plan (GIAP) creates a roadmap for the practical implementation of USAID/KEA’s commitments to meet USAID’s requirements for gender, LGBTI and disability integration. GIAP provides the overarching high-level social inclusion entry points across the Mission. This action plan is for the next year and should be updated on an annual basis with new activities towards the goal of supporting social inclusion in the Kenyan context. This action plan is based on USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia staff’s input and feedback. The activities outlined in the plan are fully achievable by March 2019.

GIAP Categories

All GIAP activities can be categorized under at least one of the following high-level categories:

1. **Programming:** This category encompasses resources and reporting requirements for inclusive program development and implementation.

2. **Process:** Examples in this category include ways that streamline gender and social inclusion considerations in Mission internal and programming processes, such as MO, language in solicitations, instruments, clearance, tracking compliance in solicitations, etc.

3. **People:** This category encompasses all capacity building activities – both for staff and IPs.

4. **Partnerships:** This includes building and fostering of internal and external relationships, e.g. Community of Practice (working groups), LGBTI; Disability communities; and leveraging intersectoral partnerships.

5. **Purse (Resources):** This category reflects activities which concretely address budgetary elements of gender and social inclusion programming.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Timeline/ deadline for completion</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Approve Mission Order on Gender Integration.</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>Mission Director</td>
<td>Mission in compliance with ADS 205.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Hold appropriate sessions to disseminate the MO approval and staff responsibilities under the MO.</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>Mission leadership, Gender and Inclusion Advisor</td>
<td>Staff is aware of the MO and understands their role in following it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Formalize Gender Working Group. Develop ToRs for GWG.</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Gender and Inclusion Advisor</td>
<td>GWG is in existence and has defined purpose and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People, Partnerships</td>
<td>GWG meets once a quarter to share information and review progress of the GIAP.</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>GWG, Gender and Inclusion Advisor</td>
<td>GWG meets quarterly and becomes a useful tool to disseminate gender information and educate on gender issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Develop ToRs for Gender PoCs.</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>Gender and Inclusion Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Develop gender/sectoral training schedule for PoCs.</td>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>PoCs in concert with their supervisors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Each gender PoC attends training in their sector.</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Gender PoCs</td>
<td>All PoCs trained in gender integration in their sector and can now fully serve as useful resources on gender to their colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Develop sector-specific factsheets illustrating how to integrate gender in the program cycle.</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Gender and Inclusion</td>
<td>These factsheets are meant to make strategic contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Timeline/ deadline for completion</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Share the factsheets with relevant TOs, CORs/AORs and IPs.</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>Advisor, external expert</td>
<td>to the already existing resource library on gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Provide additional short or long term technical expertise for USAID/Somalia.</td>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>HR, Mission leadership</td>
<td>Recipients of factsheets increase practical knowledge on gender integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Rotate additional gender expertise among technical offices and OUs to teach the staff HOW to apply ADS 205 requirements to their work.</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Gender and Inclusion Advisor</td>
<td>Mission Gender and Inclusion Advisor will be able to concentrate more on USAID/KEA activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Require gender clearance for all new procurements.</td>
<td>May 2018</td>
<td>OAA</td>
<td>Gender will be integrated in all parts of a solicitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Hold quarterly meetings with IP gender specialists (by sector/DO).</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Gender Advisor, relevant Gender PoCs</td>
<td>Providing support to IPs and building their capacity will have positive impact at the activity level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Include requirements in cooperative agreements and contracts for IP reporting on three GE/FE Policy outcomes. – see my comment about this in the executive summary</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>CORs/AORs</td>
<td>IPs compliance will contribute to more effective reporting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Include requirement in cooperative agreements and contracts for IPs to take the Gender 101 e-course.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>CORs/AORs</td>
<td>IPs capacity has increased and they are better equipped to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Timeline/ deadline for completion</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Include language on how each OU is meeting the three GE/FE Policy objectives in annual reporting.</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>SPA Office</td>
<td>Strengthened reporting on gender outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Ensure and track that all solicitations have gender requirements for key personnel, M&amp;E and selection criteria.</td>
<td>Ongoing (each solicitation)</td>
<td>Cos/OAA</td>
<td>Solicitation writing teams are more equipped to require gender compliance, resulting in more inclusive proposals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LGBTI**

<p>| People | Require basic training on nondiscrimination policy for access to services for beneficiaries for Mission program and technical officers, and IPs. | Annually | Gender Advisor, USAID Senior LGBTI Advisor | Staff trained on nondiscrimination policy. |
| People | Present an award to an IP who has demonstrated exemplary work on social inclusion, to be presented during a 16 Days of Activism against GBV event. | December 2018 | TOs, Gender and Inclusion Advisor | Awareness will be raised about work in Kenya on social inclusion among various stakeholders. |
| Partnerships | Identify LGBTI organizations in sectors where USAID is engaged – health, education, etc. | December 2018 | CORs/AORs (via Ips) | Network of LGBTI organizations |
| People, Partnerships | Invite LGBT organizations to speak at Mission Town Hall Meetings and share their experiences. | Monthly | Gender and Inclusion Advisor in coordination with relevant TOs | Awareness will be raised about work in Kenya on social inclusion among various stakeholders. |
| Partnerships | Form Inter-Agency Working group (IAWG) on inclusion or human rights. | September 2018 | Mission Leadership | LGBTI issues will be elevated, indicating... |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Timeline/ deadline for completion</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Develop sector-specific factsheets on how to integrate LGBTI considerations in the program cycle.</td>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>Gender and Inclusion Advisor (with assistance from LGBTI Coordinator in DC and/or external assistance)</td>
<td>These factsheets are meant to strengthen available resources on LGBTI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Distribute factsheets to all IPs working in their sectors.</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>TOs, AORs/CORs</td>
<td>Recipients of factsheets increase practical knowledge on LGBTI integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Ensure and track that all solicitations contain language per “Nondiscrimination against End-Users of Supplies or Services” (AIDAR 48 CFR 752.7038)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>COs</td>
<td>Solicitations will be in compliance with Agency requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Formalize disability PoC position.</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>Mission Leadership</td>
<td>Disability issues are on the Mission agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People, Partnerships</td>
<td>Formalize Disability Working Group.</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>Mission Leadership</td>
<td>Support of this important resource on disability will demonstrate leadership's commitment to disability issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 The proposed activities for disability are based on study's findings; and USAID template for Mission level Disability Inclusion Plans available here: [https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/distable.pdf](https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/distable.pdf); and activities presented in USAID/KEA draft disability action plan. The draft disability action plan has additional worthwhile activities which should be considered as well; however, in order not to overwhelm the Mission with the number of activities presented here which are to be accomplished over the next year, this plan does not include all of them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Timeline/ deadline for completion</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Develop ToRs for Disability PoC.</td>
<td>April 2018</td>
<td>Gender and Inclusion Advisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Provide sector-specific training on disability to program officers.</td>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>Disability PoC, external consultant</td>
<td>Increase in internal disability capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>All program staff takes <em>Disability Inclusive Development 101</em> e-learning course.</td>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>TOs</td>
<td>Increase in internal disability capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Ensure and track that all future solicitations contain disability language per AAPD 05-07, AAPD 04-17, and “Nondiscrimination against End-Users of Supplies or Services” (AIDAR 48 CFR 752.7038)</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>COs</td>
<td>Solicitations are in compliance with Agency disability requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Provide updates to be included in the Disability Report on the Implementation of the Disability Policy prepared by USAID/Washington.</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Disability PoC</td>
<td>I think this is a great activity and it was also included in the draft Disability Action Plan developed by the Mission. However, the latest one of these disability reports I was able to find goes back to 2008, so I am not sure if these reports are still happening – I have not been able to find any more recent information about this. The Mission should check with the disability coordinator in DC to find out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Include in contracts and cooperative agreements language requiring that grantees and contractors report on their progress in integrating the concerns of persons with disabilities and collect disability disaggregated data.</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Disability PoC, AORs/CORs</td>
<td>IPs will put more effort into designing activities mindful of the needs of people with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Timeline/ deadline for completion</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Perform an access review related to programmatic and environmental accessibility for persons with disabilities.</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>Disability PoC, external disability consultant</td>
<td>Overall stocktaking on disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Develop sector-specific factsheets demonstrating how to integrate disability considerations in the program cycle.</td>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>Gender and Inclusion Advisor, Disability PoC</td>
<td>These</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Distribute factsheets to all IPs working in their sectors.</td>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>TOs, AORs/CORs</td>
<td>Recipients of factsheets increase practical knowledge on disability integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Organize a Town Hall Meeting to share the findings, recommendations and plan of action to address deficiencies found in the access review, if any, with all USAID staff.</td>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>Disability PoC, external disability consultant, Mission Leadership</td>
<td>The Mission plans actions to address identified deficiencies accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Make a conscious effort to include narrative and visual depictions of people with disabilities in USAID materials – factsheets, success stories, website, etc.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>TOs, Disability PoC,</td>
<td>USAID/KEA and USAID/Somalia websites and publications feature people with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Present an annual award to an IP who has demonstrated exemplary work on disability during an event on the International Day of Persons with Disabilities Day (December 3) (this event may be combined with the LGBTI award)</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>TOs, Disability PoC</td>
<td>Staff and IPs are aware of organizations working on disability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOCIAL INCLUSION BROADLY**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Timeline/ deadline for completion</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Include all three policies in orientation package for new hires.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>New hires are aware of the three policies as soon as they start employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Develop an engaging orientation for new hires on gender, LGBTI and disability using video or interactive communication.</td>
<td>December 2018</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Staff are cognizant of diversity issues at the Mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purse</td>
<td>Provide annual budget briefs on how much the mission is spending on gender and social inclusion</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Staff are informed of Mission's overall commitment to gender and social inclusion (in dollars), which can help with planning of future programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Develop new GIAP for April 2019-April 2020.</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>TOs with feedback from their Gender PoCs, Gender and Inclusion Advisor and Disability PoC</td>
<td>Each TO has increased their capacity to develop and implement social inclusion activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 2. DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

KII (USAID)

1. Are you aware of the following policies?
   a. USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy (ADS 205)
   b. USAID LGBT Vision for Action
   c. USAID Disability Policy

2. Do you have access to these policies?
   a. USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy
   b. USAID LGBT Vision for Action
   c. USAID Disability Policy

3. Do you use these policies?
   a. USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy
   b. USAID LGBT Vision for Action
   c. USAID Disability Policy

   Please provide examples of how you have used each policy.

4. If not, why not? (If answer is “no”, skip question 5)

5. How often?
   a. USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy
   b. USAID LGBT Vision for Action
   c. USAID Disability Policy

6. Are you aware of ADS Chapter 205? If yes, please describe instances when you have referred to it for guidance.

7. Are there alternative resources/tools you refer to for information or guidance on gender/disability/LGBTI? (prompts - gender advisor, govt policy, other policies, ADS, Mission order on gender)

8. How would you rate your own capacity to implement these policies?
   a. USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy
   b. USAID LGBT Vision for Action
   c. USAID Disability Policy

   Scale for each policy: 1-5 (1-poor, 2-fair, 3-good, 4-very good, 5-excellent)

9. Have you participated in any training on gender/disability/LGBTI?

   If yes, please provide details.
11. Have there been any changes in how the OU staff carry-out their job responsibilities as a result of the three policies:
   
a. USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy
b. USAID LGBT Vision for Action
c. USAID Disability Policy

Please provide details.

12. What does compliance with these three policies require of your position specifically, and of your office more broadly?
   
a. USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy
b. USAID LGBT Vision for Action
c. USAID Disability Policy

13. What resources, processes and structures are in place at the Mission to support the implementation of these policies? (i.e. enabling environment) (prompts: Mission leadership, gender advisor, financial resources, etc.)
   
a. USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy
b. USAID LGBT Vision for Action
c. USAID Disability Policy

14. In your opinion, is the USAD/KEA Mission work environment inclusive? Please explain what “inclusive” means to you.

15. Based on your knowledge, are Mission’s HR policies (recruitment, promotion, training) inclusive? Please explain and provide examples.

16. Has OUs programming been more responsive to the needs of vulnerable populations as a result of these policies?
   
a. USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy
b. USAID LGBT Vision for Action
c. USAID Disability Policy

If yes, please provide examples.

17. What challenges and barriers have staff and implementing partners encountered in the implementation of the three policies specifically, and in social inclusion compliance more broadly? Please provide details for both staff and IPs.

18. How have these policies contributed to changes in the way implementing partners carry out their work? Please provide examples.

19. Do you have any specific recommendations how USAID/KEA can improve the implementation of the three policies – either at the organizational level (internally) or programatically?
20. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

21. Do you have any questions for us?

**KIIts (IPs)**

1. Are you aware of the following USAID policies?
   a. USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy
   b. USAID LGBT Vision for Action
   c. USAID Disability Policy

2. Do you know how to access these policies?

3. When responding to USAID requests for proposals, do you refer to these documents? If yes, please provide examples.

4. How would you rate your own capacity to implement these policies?
   Scale for each policy: 1-5 (1-poor, 2-fair, 3-good, 4-very good, 5-excellent)

5. Are there alternative resources/tools you refer to for information or guidance on gender/disability/LGBTI? (prompts - gender advisor, govt policy, other donors)

6. Provide examples of how the three policies have contributed to changes in the way you carry out your work on inclusion.

7. What are the positive outcomes of USAID’s guidance on inclusive programming?

8. Do you feel well supported by USAID in the implementation of these policies? If so, cite specific examples. If not, please explain.

9. What challenges/barriers does your organization/program face in the implementation of inclusive programming? Please provide examples (gender, disability, LGBTI).

10. Do you have any specific recommendations how USAID/KEA can improve the implementation of the three policies programatically?

11. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

12. Do you have any questions for us?

**Gls (Gender PoCs)**

1. Please share with us your knowledge and experiences with USAID guidance on social inclusion (gender, disability, LGBTI).

2. Besides USAID guidance, what other alternative resources/tools do you refer to for information or guidance on gender/disability/LGBTI? (Prompts - gender advisor, govt policy, other policies, ADS, Mission order on gender).

3. What resources, processes and structures are in place at the Mission/your organization to support the implementation of these policies? (i.e. enabling environment) (prompts: leadership, gender advisor, financial resources, etc.)
4. What is your assessment of the adequacy of the support?

5. How have these policies contributed to changes in the way you work and outcomes on inclusion?

6. In your opinion, is the work environment at the Mission/your organization inclusive? Please explain what “inclusive” means to you. (Prompts: structures, processes and policies). Please elaborate and provide examples. If not, what are the inadequacies?

7. What challenges and barriers have you faced in attempts to implement the three policies specifically, and social inclusion guidance more broadly?

8. Do you have any recommendations how USAID/KEA can improve compliance with and implementation of the three policies – either at the organizational level (internally) or programmatically? [only ask USAID respondents about internal recommendations]

9. Is there anything else you would like to share with us?

10. Do you have any questions for us?

LGBTI Survey

I. Background Information

1. How long have you worked at USAID?
   a. Less than a year
   b. 1-4 years
   c. 5-10 years
   d. 10+ years

2. How old are you?
   a. 20-30
   b. 31-40
   c. 41-50
   d. 51+

3. What is your sex?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Other
   d. Prefer not to answer

4. What is your current employment status?
   a. Foreign Service Officer (FSO)
   b. Civil Servant (GS)
   c. Foreign Service National (FSN)
   d. Third Country National (TCN)
   e. Contract Employee (PSC)
   f. Other (please specify): __________

5. Which OU do you support?
   a. Kenya
   b. East Africa
6. In what office do you work?
   a. DG
   b. Education and Youth
   c. Health, Population and Nutrition
   d. Economic Growth
   e. Environment
   f. Regional Integration
   g. Resilience
   h. Other (please specify): _______________

II. Staff awareness and usage of USAID LGBTI guidance

   a. Never heard of it
   b. Aware of it, but never looked at it
   c. Have taken a look at it
   d. Have read it carefully

8. How many times in the last year have you used LGBT Vision for Action for guidance in your work?
   a. Never
   b. Once or twice
   c. More than 5 times
   d. More than 10 times
   *Provide examples of usage.*

9. How would you rate your personal capacity to implement LGBT Vision for Action?
   a. Poor
   b. Fair
   c. Good
   d. Very good
   e. Excellent
   f. Not applicable

10. Have you ever received any type of training/capacity building on LGBT Vision for Action or general guidance on LGBTI? (check any that apply)
    a. LGBTI 101 online course
    b. LGBTI 102 online course
    c. Other (please specify): _____________________
    d. I have never received any LGBTI-related capacity building at USAID/KEA.

III. Enabling Environment at USAKD/KEA for LGBTI

11. When you have had questions related to LGBT Vision for Action, or LGBTI guidance in general, where have you sought assistance?
    a. Mission Gender Advisor
b. Other (please specify): _______________

c. I have never sought guidance on this topic.

d. I don’t know where to go for such assistance.

12. What are the main contributors to the successes of LGBT Vision for Action’s implementation at USAID/KEA? (mark all that apply)
   a. Support from senior Mission leadership
   b. Network of LGBTI champions
   c. Training on LGBTI issues
   d. Financial resources
   e. Other (please specify): __________________
   f. I don’t think the Policy is implemented successfully.

13. What positive changes, if any, have you observed at USAID/KEA as a result of LGBT Vision for Action? (mark all that apply)
   a. It has become more acceptable to discuss LGBTI issues among staff
   b. LGBTI issues are given more attention in programming
   c. Reduced stigma around LGBTI at USAID/KEA
   d. More resources (training, information, etc.) are made available for LGBTI issues
   e. Other (please specify): __________________
   f. I have not observed any positive changes.

14. Are there any innovative approaches that have been used by USAID/KEA to promote LGBTI inclusion, either at the Mission or programmatically?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   If yes, provide examples.

15. Please rate your level of agreement with this statement: USAID/KEA is an inclusive work environment supportive of LGBTI employees.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree

16. Please rate your level of agreement with this statement: Despite cultural and traditional factors in Kenya, I think that USAID/KEA should actively promote the LGBTI agenda.
   a. Strongly Disagree
   b. Disagree
   c. Neither agree nor disagree
   d. Agree
   e. Strongly Agree
17. What challenges have you encountered in implementing the LGBT Vision for Action in your current position at USAID/KEA? (mark top three)
   a. Lack of support from top mission leadership
   b. Lack of dedicated staff on LGBTI issues
   c. Lack of champions on LGBTI rights at the Mission
   d. Inadequate capacity building on the LGBT Vision for Action
   e. Limited financial resources
   f. Intolerance of LGBTI issues at the Mission resulting from cultural, religious, and other sensitivities
   g. In hospitable external environment due to legal discrimination, violence against LGBTI individuals, stigmatization
   h. Other (please specify): __________________________
   i. None

18. In your experience, what types of challenges do implementing partners face in their attempts to be inclusive of LGBTI population in their programming? (mark top three)
   a. Lack of guidance and requirements from USAID/Kenya
   b. Lack of LGBTI champions
   c. Inadequate capacity
   d. Limited financial resources
   e. In hospitable external environment for LGBTI individuals due to violence, insufficient legal protection, cultural, religious, and other sensitivities
   f. Inadequate awareness of the special needs of LGBTI individuals by service providers/partners (for example, health sector, government structures, faith based organizations (FBOs)).
   g. Other (please specify): __________________________
   h. None

19. Please provide up to three specific, actionable and measurable recommendations for a more inclusive approach to work environment and programming. Please specify who the recommendations are for (USAID/KEA, specific OU, specific TO, etc.)

   Recommendation 1: ______________________________
   Recommendation 2: ______________________________
   Recommendation 3: ______________________________
ANNEX 3. DOCUMENTS REVIEWED


Disability Communications Tips. Washington: USAID.


Mission Order: Gender Integration. Nairobi: USAID/KEA.


ANNEX 4. SURVEY RESULTS

REPORT FOR USAID/KEA SURVEY: LGBT VISION FOR ACTION

*Data only for complete surveys

Response Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disqualified</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How long have you worked at USAID?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than a year</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 years</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How old are you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51+</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What is your sex?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What is your current employment status?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Service Officer (FSO)</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Servant (GS)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Service National (FSN)</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Employee (PSC)</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Write In (Required)</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Which OU do you support?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Kenya and East Africa</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. In what office do you work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Youth</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health, Population and Nutrition</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Economic Growth</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REI</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXO</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OAA</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Write In (Required)</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never heard of it</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of it, but never looked at it</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have taken a look at it</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have read it carefully</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. How many times in the last year have you used LGBT Vision for Action for guidance in your work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>89.7%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 times</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. How would you rate your personal capacity to implement LGBT Vision for Action?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Have you ever received any type of training/capacity building on LGBT Vision of Action or general guidance on LGBTI? (check any that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LGBTI 101 online course</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTI 102 online course</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Write In (Required)</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never received any LGBTI related capacity building at USAID/KEA</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have received LGBTI related capacity building elsewhere.</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. When you have had questions related to LGBT Vision for Action, or LGBTI guidance in general, where have you sought assistance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission Gender and LGBTI Advisor</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Write In (Required)</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never sought such assistance.</td>
<td>43.2%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know where to go for such assistance.</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never had questions related to LGBTI.</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. What are the main contributors to the successes of LGBT Vision for Action’s implementation at USAID/KEA? (check the top three)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support from senior Mission leadership</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission-wide network of LGBTI champions</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building on LGBTI issues</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Write In (Required)</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think the Policy is implemented</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. What positive changes have you observed at USAID/KEA as a result of LGBT Vision for Action? (check the top three)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It has become more acceptable to discuss LGBTI issues among the Mission staff.</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTI issues are given more attention in programming.</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced stigma around LGBTI issues at USAID/KEA</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More resources (training, information, etc.) are made available for LGBTI issues.</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Write In (Required)</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have not observed any changes.</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Have you observed any innovative approaches used by USAID/KEA to promote LGBTI inclusion, either internally at the Mission or programmatically?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement: USAID/KEA is an inclusive work environment supportive of LGBTI employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Please rate your level of agreement with the following statement: Despite cultural and traditional factors in Kenya, I think that USAID/KEA should actively promote the LGBTI agenda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. What challenges have you encountered in implementing the LGBT Vision for Action in your current position at USAID/KEA? (check the top three)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of support from top Mission leadership</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of dedicated LGBTI expert staff</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of champions on LGBTI rights at the Mission</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate capacity building on LGBT Vision for Action</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited financial resources</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerance of LGBTI issues at the Mission resulting from cultural, religious, and other sensitivities</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhospitable external environment due to legal discrimination, violence against LGBTI individuals and stigmatization</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Write In (Required)</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. In your experience, what types of challenges do implementing partners face in their attempts to be inclusive of LGBTI population in their programming? (check the top three)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of guidance and requirements from USAID/KEA</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of LGBTI champions</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate capacity</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited financial resources</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inhospitable environment for LGBTI individuals due to violence, insufficient legal protection, cultural, religious and other sensitivities</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate awareness of the special needs of LGBTI individuals by service providers/partners (for example, health sector, government structures, faith based organizations (FBOs))</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other - Write In (Required)</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never observed IPs trying to include LGBTI in their programming.</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 5. ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE ON SOCIAL INCLUSION

Mission Documents

5. USAID/Somalia. Somalia Gender Assessment: Navigating Gender Roles and Status to Benefit Men and Women Equally (pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00JS11.pdf)

Internal USAID Guidance

2. ADS Chapter 201 Planning Acquisitions (http://ghpro.dexisonline.com/sites/default/files/USAID%20ADS%20201%20Planning%202015.pdf)
   ● 205.3.1 What is Gender Analysis, including the official definition of the “domains of analysis”.
   ● 205.3.2 Gender Integration Throughout the Program Cycle
   ● 205.3.3 Gender Analysis in the CDCS Process
   ● 205.3.4 Gender Analysis in Project Design
   ● 205.3.5 Gender Analysis in Solicitations
   ● 205.3.6 (Gender Analysis) in Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning
   ● 205.3.6.1 (Gender Analysis) in Performance Monitoring
10. USAID Counter Trafficking in Persons Field Guide
   (https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/2496/C-
   TIP_Field_Guide_Final_April%205%202013.pdf)
   (http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pdact175.pdf)
12. The USAID Vision for Ending Child Marriage and Meeting the Needs of Married Children
   02012.pdf)
   Mandatory Reference for ADS Chapter 200
14. USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy, 2012
15. United States Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-based Violence Globally, 2012
   (http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/196468.pdf)

USAID Tips, Toolkits and Courses

1. How-To Note: Engendering Evaluation at USAID Office of Gender Equality and Women’s
   Empowerment (GenDev) ProgramNet
   (https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/How-
   To_Note_Gender_and_PPRs_2013_0719.pdf)
2. Tips for Integrating Gender Into USAID Agricultural Sector Solicitations
   (http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnadu833.pdf)
3. Tips for Integrating Gender Into USAID Education Sector Solicitations
   (http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pnadm805.pdf)
4. Tips for Conducting a Gender Analysis at the Activity or Project Level: Additional Help for ADS,
5. The how-to note on gender integration in MRRS and OPs-Operational Plans
   (https://usaidlearninglab.org/sites/default/files/resource/files/How-
   To_Note_Gender_and.OPs_and_MRRs_2013_0718_final.pdf)
6. Toolkit for Compliance With USAID Policy on Gender Equality: Guidance for USAID /Lebanon and
   Implementing Mechanisms https://encompassworld.com/download/file/fid/705
7. Towards Gender Equality and Female Empowerment in Lebanon: A Gender Analysis Toolkit for
   Implementing Mechanisms (http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00KGM1.pdf)
8. USAID Online Introductory Course: Gender 101 (http://usaidlearninglab.org/library/gender-101-
   gender-equality-usaid)
9. USAID University-Online Training Courses: Gender 101; 102; LGBTI 101;102, Disability 101
10. USAID C-TIP policy (http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pdact111.pdf)
11. USAID C-TIP Field Guide (TIP_Field_Guide_Final_April%205%202013.pdf)
Gender Assessment/Analysis Reports


USAID References on LGBT


Other References on LGBT


### USAID References on Disability


### Other References on Disability
1. African Youth with Disabilities Network (http://aywdn.wordpress.com/).
2. European Disability Forum (http://www.edf-feph.org/).

**USAID References on Social Inclusion Broadly**

1. Nondiscrimination against End-Users of Supplies or Services, Agency for International Development Acquisition Regulation (AIDAR), Section 752.7038, a Mandatory Reference for ADS 302 Assistance Awards (i.e. Grants, Cooperative Agreements) (https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1868/304.pdf)
5. Mission Order - Gender Integration for ADS Chapter 303

**Regional Economic Community Documents**


One of the guiding principles of long-term and sustainable development is that social inclusion leads to more effective development outcomes. In other words, considering how program outcomes will affect women and men, people with disabilities, LGBTI, or any other minority group contributes to overall aid effectiveness.

Gender gaps in economic empowerment, leadership and political participation, peace and security, humanitarian action, violence against women and girls, HIV and AIDs, and governance and national planning have been documented. The costs of gender inequality further have been shown to negatively affect the socioeconomic development of entire populations. The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (2005) sought to reform aid delivery for development translating donor government commitments into improved and proved practice, results and development outcomes. It inherently implied that gender equality and gender integration mechanisms, processes and technical guidance are required for significant and sustained social, economic and political development. It has been widely recognized among international institutions, agencies and donors that human development is only possible with gender equality and women’s empowerment.

The 2008 Accra Agenda for Action, which was designed to accelerate and deepen implementation of the Paris Declaration, reaffirms the need for commitments to gender equality and women’s empowerment, stating that:

“Developing countries and donors will ensure that their respective development policies and programmes are designed and implemented in ways consistent with their agreed international commitments on gender equality, human rights, disability and environmental sustainability”

While the Accra Agenda for Action mentioned disability, it was the 2011 Busan outcomes document that further sought to entrench disability inclusive development as integral to aid effectiveness through raising awareness and mobilizing support for its integration in development cooperation. In 2016, the draft declaration, “Nairobi Outcome Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation Towards an Inclusive and Accelerated Implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development,” stated that principles of aid effectiveness - ownership of development priorities by recipient countries; focus on results; inclusive development partnerships; harmonization and coordination; mutual accountability; and transparency -are underpinned by existing international commitments on human rights, decent work, gender equality, environmental sustainability and disability.”

In 2016, the World Bank appointed its first adviser to address discrimination based specifically on sexual orientation. Jim Yong Kim, the World Bank President, stated, “Discrimination against any group is not only morally wrong, it stands in the way of sustained, balanced, and inclusive economic growth. […] We

---

need to strengthen our case for economic inclusion [of LGBTI persons].” On LGBTI inclusion and aid effectiveness, USAID released not only the Vision for Action, which states that “Better integration of LGBT issues within USAID field missions’ portfolios will result in comprehensive and sustainable development outcomes and the full participation of LGBT persons in development programming,” but also supporting documents stating that, “equal access to foreign aid is not only a matter of human rights, but also critical to holistic, comprehensive and inclusive development.”

A 2014 report of USAID and the Williams Institute, “The Relationship between LGBT Inclusion and Economic Development: An Analysis of Emerging Economies,” found evidence that discrimination against LGBTI people in the sample countries led to economic harms at micro-level and a strong positive correlation between gross domestic product (GDP) per capita and the anti-discrimination laws concerning sexual orientation and gender identity.

In sum, for aid effectiveness, international development policies and programs must be designed, planned, monitored, and evaluated from a perspective that considers gender, disability and LGBTI inclusion—with the required technical, human and financial resources at every step.

---

## ANNEX 7. NATIONAL AND REGIONAL POLICY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORKS ON GENDER EQUALITY AND FEMALE EMPOWERMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument/Mechanism</th>
<th>Focus/Provisions on GE/FE</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Offences Act (2006)</td>
<td>Protects all persons from harm from unlawful sexual acts; harmonizes law on sexual violence into a single law; provides a comprehensive definition of rape; introduces minimum sentences; criminalizes sexual harassment; expands sexual offences to include gang rape, deliberate infection with sexually transmitted diseases, trafficking for sexual exploitation and child pornography.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kenyalawreport.co.ke/Downloads/Acts/Sexual%20Offences%20Act%20(%203%20of%202006)%202009.pdf">http://www.kenyalawreport.co.ke/Downloads/Acts/Sexual%20Offences%20Act%20(%203%20of%202006)%202009.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Act 2007</td>
<td>Criminalises sexual harassment &amp; requires employers with more than 20 employees to have sexual harassment policies; outlaws discrimination on bases of sex, pregnancy and HIV status; provides for affirmative action to eliminate inequality; mandates equal remuneration for work of equal value; provides three months maternity leave and two weeks paternity leave; and entitles relevant Minister to prescribe conditions for the employment of women, young persons or children in any specified trade or occupation.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kenyalaw.org/kl/fileadmin/pdfdownloads/Acts/EmploymentAct_Cap226-No11of2007_01.pdf">http://www.kenyalaw.org/kl/fileadmin/pdfdownloads/Acts/EmploymentAct_Cap226-No11of2007_01.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya’s Vision 2030</td>
<td>Requires: increase in the participation of women in all decision-making processes; improved access for all disadvantaged groups to business opportunities, health and development.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.sidint.net/sites/www.sidint.net/files/docs/Kenya%20Vision%202030%20Complete.pdf">https://www.sidint.net/sites/www.sidint.net/files/docs/Kenya%20Vision%202030%20Complete.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument/Mechanism</td>
<td>Focus/Provisions on GE/FE</td>
<td>Web Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Parties Act 2011</td>
<td>Requires all political parties to comply with the requirement that at least one third of their officials are of either gender.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.parliament.am/library/Political%20parties/qenia.pdf">http://www.parliament.am/library/Political%20parties/qenia.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrimonial Properties Act 2013</td>
<td>Provides for the rights and responsibilities of spouses in relation to matrimonial property.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kenyalaw.org/lex/actview.xql?actid=No.%2049%20of%202013">http://www.kenyalaw.org/lex/actview.xql?actid=No.%2049%20of%202013</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Basic Education (Amendment) Act 2017</td>
<td>Obliges the government to provide sanitary towels to girls who have reached puberty in all basic education facilities.</td>
<td><a href="http://kenyalaw.org/kl/fileadmin/pdfdownloads/AmendmentActs/2017/BasicEducation_Amendment_Act_17of2017.pdf">http://kenyalaw.org/kl/fileadmin/pdfdownloads/AmendmentActs/2017/BasicEducation_Amendment_Act_17of2017.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Government Procurement Opportunities Policy</td>
<td>Reserves 30% of all government procurements and tenders to women, youth and persons living with disability.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument/Mechanism</td>
<td>Focus/Provisions on GE/FE</td>
<td>Web Link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Public Service, Youth and Gender Affairs</td>
<td>Mandated to promote gender equality and ensure women’s empowerment.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.psyg.go.ke">http://www.psyg.go.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Enterprise Fund</td>
<td>National fund that advances financial capital to women for entrepreneurship.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wef.co.ke/">http://www.wef.co.ke/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uwezo Fund</td>
<td>National fund that advances financial capital to women, youth and people living with disability for entrepreneurship and youth</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uwezo.go.ke">http://www.uwezo.go.ke</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Somalia**

The Federal Republic of Somalia: Provisional Constitution 2012

Outlaws discrimination on the basis of gender, among other variables, gives women a special right of protection from sexual abuse, segregation and discrimination in the work place and requires inclusion of women in all national institutions. [http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/research/Somalia-Constitution2012.pdf](http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/research/Somalia-Constitution2012.pdf)

**Regional and Continental**

Common Markets for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) Gender Policy 2002

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument/Mechanism</th>
<th>Focus/Provisions on GE/FE</th>
<th>Web Link</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
ANNEX 8. ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES OF BEST PRACTICES IN SOCIAL INCLUSION AT USAID/KEA

Kenya Electoral Assistance Program (KEAP)

The Kenya Electoral Assistance Program (KEAP) supported Kenyan government initiatives to promote credibility, non-violence and inclusion in its 2017 elections. A core KEAP program component focused on enabling women, youth and traditionally marginalized groups to participate as voters, candidates and advocates for positive political, social and economic change.

KEAP advocated specifically for inclusion of PWDs, having designed an election observation toolkit on inclusion of PWDs, used quotas to recruit PWDs as election observers, and conducted voter outreach targeting women and men living with disabilities. Throughout, the program considered the intersectionality of disability and gender and supported capacity development of women and men with disabilities. The program worked through the United Disabled Persons of Kenya (UDPK) to:

1. Review the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC) website for accessibility to PWDs;
2. Include a Quick Reference Guide for Poll Workers on Disability in IEBC’s e-learning platform;
3. Train election observers and IEBC officials; and
4. Develop voter education materials that illustrated women and men PWDs’ active and respected participation in the electoral process.

KEAP further worked with the National Democratic Institute (NDI) to identify and train PWDs aspiring to run as candidates for political office. All video advertisements were inclusive and accessible to the hearing and visually impaired. Best practice advertisements are showcased on www.electionaccess.org. KEAP disaggregated data on the number of voters by disability and by constituency in all the 47 counties during the 2017 general elections.

Women running for political office faced several barriers, including: Pre-determined party nominee registers; non-enforcement of constitutional requirements on gender parity; inadequate financial resources; blackmail to intimidate them into withdrawing their candidacy; and physical violence. In response, KEAP conducted an online, social media advocacy campaign with the International Federation for Electoral Systems (IFES) on the costs of violence against women in Kenyan elections, and developed the Better Than This campaign with a hotline to report cases of elections-related violence against women.

Tusome

Tusome (“Let’s Read” in Kiswahili) is a Kenyan national literacy program targeting teachers, schools and 5.4 million Class 1 and 2 pupils for improvement in literacy instruction and early grade outcomes. Launched in 2015, the program covers all public primary schools and 1,000 low cost alternative basic education institutions serving urban settlements nationwide. Tusome is implemented by the Research Triangle Initiative (RTI) with the support of local partners.
Each pupil receives her or his own textbook. Materials for special needs learners include textbooks in Braille for visually impaired and sign language for hearing impaired teachers and pupils. As a result of the program, Kenya’s Ministry of Education appointed a Director in charge of, improving primary education for pupils with functional impairments that affect learning how to read. Tusome textbook illustrations further depict boys and girls in non-traditional gender roles.

A 2017 external midline evaluation of Tusome found that, “teachers’ gender had an influence on the ORF [oral reading fluency] scores; the scores by the pupils who were taught by female teachers were higher than those taught by male teachers.”32 Related to this, the evaluation found that ORF scores were higher for teachers who reported participating more frequently in Tusome training sessions, suggesting that the program so far may contributing positively to the development of early grade reading skills. The evaluation team disaggregated results by school type and gender, finding that girls had so far scored slightly higher than boys.33

**Agile and Harmonized Assistance for Devolved Institutions (AHADI)**

The Agile and Harmonized Assistance for Devolved Institutions (AHADI), implemented by The State University of New York, Center for International Development (SUNY/CID), is a support program that works to delegate authority and duties of government institutions from the national level and to the county level in 22 counties. AHADI aims to, “assist Kenya achieve the promise of devolution: a governance system that is more transparent, accountable, effective in service delivery and responsive to empowered citizens.”34

In 2015, AHADI hired a gender integration expert, who worked to develop a gender and inclusion strategy and toolkit for county governments.35 Investment in gender expertise sought to identify gender gaps, particularly concerning the participation of women in county government, and mainstream gender inclusion in the policies, plans and guidelines that AHADI supports counties to develop and implement. The gender and inclusion strategy required that the design of all AHADI initiatives take into account the recommendations of this strategy, and all training and mentoring activities work to strengthen gender integration in county governments’ capacities to engage in key target sectors, such as agriculture, livestock, environment, and natural resource management. For instance, AHADI mentor teams working on developing County Integrated Development Plans have included gender experts and consequently, some county governments (e.g. Turkana and Kiambu) have committed to incorporating gender analysis and inclusion in their sectoral policies and plans.

AHADI established a mechanism for collecting, analyzing and reporting sex-disaggregated data from all program activities in quarterly and annual reports. Data in all AHADI progress reports are disaggregated by sex and data analysis, and includes reporting on the participation of persons living with disability. Progress reports further list organizations supporting PWDs among those engaging with Kenyan

33 Ibid, p. 20.
government as a result of USG assistance. AHADI also supported the MOE to revise the 2009 Special Needs Education (SNE) Policy to align it with the Constitution of Kenya.36

AHADI continues to leverage its influence and provide technical support on inclusion to work toward greater participation of women, and disability inclusion in leadership at the county government levels.

**Kenya Youth Employment and Skills (K-YES) Program**

The Kenya Youth Employment and Skills Program (K-YES) is a five-year $21.9 (USD) million activity implemented by RTI International and a consortium of partners to enhance employment opportunities for unemployed and underemployed youth (aged 18–35) who have not completed secondary education. Objective 5 commits the program to work toward “gender equitable approaches to employment.”

The K-YES activity contract states that gender equity is a key principle and cross-cutting objective in the overall technical approach. The contract requires the contractor to work toward concrete targets in reducing gender gaps for all objectives, especially completion of training, access to information and mentoring, and access to financial services. The contractor is also required to address gender-specific barriers and implement flexible delivery modalities relevant for the different barriers that young women and men face in employment and skills building. In its monitoring and evaluation plans, the program outlines measures to comply with the USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy, including disaggregating quantitative program data by gender.

In fiscal year 2016, K-YES program reported the following progress on gender inclusion:

1. Developed a framework for integration of gender;
2. Developed a gender-training handbook;
3. Identified and trained gender resource persons;
4. Assessed gender issues affecting youth with disabilities in five counties;
5. Mapped county-level organizations offering gender related services to youth; and
6. Conducted a baseline survey on youth without school certificates participating in various courses.37

**LINKAGES**

LINKAGES Across the Continuum of HIV Services for Key Populations Affected by HIV is a centrally funded USAID program (meaning it is present in several countries, including Kenya), and the first US government program focused solely on key populations (men who have sex with men, female sex workers, and people who inject drugs). In Kenya, LINKAGES focuses primarily on MSM and FSW. LINKAGES provides a comprehensive package of services that includes HIV testing and counselling, STI testing and treatment, violence prevention and response, peer education and outreach, and referral and linkage to HIV treatment.

LINKAGES’ Impact on Key Populations:

- Access to better quality, more integrated HIV prevention, care and treatment services in welcoming settings that protect the privacy of key populations
- Support from trained peers who can help key populations access HIV testing and counseling and other HIV services, legal aid, mental health and nutrition support and economic opportunities
- Healthcare workers who understand and address their needs in a non-stigmatizing way
- Safer communities with stronger crisis response systems and reduced gender-based and other forms of violence
- Meaningful opportunities to have key populations community members’ input in how services are delivered, improved and evaluated
- Evidence-based information that empowers key populations to make decisions that lead to better health
- Reduced threat of criminal prosecution under discriminatory laws
# ANNEX 9. SOLICITATION SCORING TOOL

**Solicitation Title:**

**Solicitation Date:**

**Technical Office:**

**Solicitation Type:**

**Reviewed by:**

**Date reviewed:**

**Total Score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Scoring scale</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Page reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Section A – Gender Inclusion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Does the solicitation spell out the specific gaps that exist between males and females with respect to the problem that is being addressed and relevant to project outcomes?</td>
<td>0=No 1=Yes, to a limited extent 2=Yes, to a moderate extent 3=Yes, strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Does it indicate what opportunities there are to promote women’s leadership and empowerment as a result of the project?</td>
<td>0=No 1=Yes, to a limited extent 2=Yes, to a moderate extent 3=Yes, strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Does the solicitation explain or indicate potential causes of the identified gaps?</td>
<td>0=No 1=Yes, to a limited extent 2=Yes, to a moderate extent 3=Yes, strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Is the Implementing Partner required to conduct a more detailed gender analysis prior to or at an early stage of project implementation?</td>
<td>0=No 2=Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Does the SOW require the contractor to develop standalone or integrated activities to ensure that projects are reducing the gaps between males and females that were identified in the gender analysis that was carried out in the context of project design and addressing the unique needs and interests of males and females?</td>
<td>0=No 2=Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Is the Implementing Partner required to develop a gender action plan or gender strategy</td>
<td>0=No 2=Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong></td>
<td>Does the SOW specify that the contractor must track the differential impacts on male and female participants in all activities?</td>
<td>0=No 2=Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.</strong></td>
<td>Does the Program Description sufficiently articulate how the proposed activity is expected to reduce gender gaps or address the unique needs and interests of males and females (consistent with those that were identified in the gender analysis carried out in the context of the project design)?</td>
<td>0=No 1= Yes, to a limited extent 2=Yes, to a moderate extent 3=Yes, strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9.</strong></td>
<td>Does the solicitation include specific gender-sensitive indicators that the Implementing Partner is expected to use?</td>
<td>0=No 2=Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.</strong></td>
<td>Are Implementing Partners encouraged to use one or more of the nine standard indicators on gender?</td>
<td>0=No 2=Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.</strong></td>
<td>Are there strategies in place to monitor unintended consequences (such as gender-based violence)?</td>
<td>0=No 1= Yes, to a limited extent 2=Yes, to a moderate extent 3=Yes, strongly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12.</strong></td>
<td>Does the solicitation specify that reporting requirements include information on:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12a.</strong></td>
<td>To what extent and how were relevant gaps between males and females closed?</td>
<td>0=No 2=Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12b.</strong></td>
<td>What new opportunities for women and men were created?</td>
<td>0=No 2=Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12c.</strong></td>
<td>What differential negative impacts on males/females (such as increasing the risk of gender-based violence) were addressed or avoided?</td>
<td>0=No 2=Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12d.</strong></td>
<td>What needs and gender inequalities emerged or remain?</td>
<td>0=No 2=Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13.</strong></td>
<td>Does the solicitation request a technical expert who has experience with gender integration in project design and is knowledgeable about how to address gender disparities and create opportunities for women’s leadership and participation within the particular sectoral context, if such an expert is important for ensuring optimal project results?</td>
<td>0=No 2=Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14.</strong></td>
<td>Does the solicitation stipulate that Implementing Partners highlight their capability to address gender gaps and to empower females?</td>
<td>0=No 2=Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Does the solicitation request that Implementing Partners illustrate how their organization is structured to ensure that gender disparities will be deliberately and adequately addressed in their programming? | 0=No  
2=Yes |
|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| 15. | Does the solicitation state that Implementing Partners will be evaluated on how well the proposal addresses gender integration as described in the SOW/PD and other sections of the solicitation, as appropriate? | 0=No  
2=Yes |

**Section B – LGBTI Inclusion**

|   | Is there LGBTI inclusion language in the solicitation? | 0=No language  
1= Yes, to a limited extent (minimal language only)  
2=Yes, to a moderate extent (LGBTI inclusion encouraged but not required)  
3=Yes, strongly (LGBTI inclusion a required program component) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section C – Disability Inclusion**

|   | Is there disability inclusion language in the solicitation? | 0=No language  
1= Yes, to a limited extent (minimal language only)  
2=Yes, to a moderate extent (Disability inclusion encouraged but not required)  
3=Yes, strongly (Disability inclusion a required program component) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender inclusion score (out of 43 possible points)**

**LGBTI inclusion score (out of 3 possible points)**

**Disability inclusion score (out of 3 possible points)**
## ANNEX 10. SOLICITATION SCORES

### SOLICITATIONS AND SCORES BY YEAR IN DESCENDING ORDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solicitations scored</th>
<th>Issuing Unit</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gender sub-score</th>
<th>LGBTI sub-score</th>
<th>Disability sub-score</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RFA 615-17-000002 Afya County and National Support Program</td>
<td>KEA</td>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 615-17-000002 HIV Service Delivery Support Activity</td>
<td>KEA</td>
<td>HPN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA 615-17-000005 County Measurements, Learning and Accountability Program II</td>
<td>KEA</td>
<td>HPN</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA 615-17-000006 Kenya Feed the Future – Crops and Dairy Market Systems Development Activity</td>
<td>KEA</td>
<td>OEG</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 615-17-000006 Kenya Investment Mechanism (KIM) Activity</td>
<td>KEA</td>
<td>OEG</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 615-16-000001 Kenya Electoral Assistance Program (KEAP)</td>
<td>KEA</td>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-16-000001 Engaging Somalia in Peaceful Political Processes (ES3P)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOFO 615-16-000033 Support for Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC) in Kenya</td>
<td>KEA</td>
<td>EYO</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA 615-16-000008 Human Resources for Health (HRH) Kenya Program</td>
<td>KEA</td>
<td>HPN</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA 615-16-000009 Health Informatics Governance and Data Analytics (HIGDA)</td>
<td>KEA</td>
<td>HPN</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-15-000004 To support the Go to School (GTS) initiative adopted by the Federal Government of Somalia (FGS) in 2012</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>EYO</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitations scored</td>
<td>Issuing Unit</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Gender sub-score</td>
<td>LGBTI sub-score</td>
<td>Disability sub-score</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-14-000023 Transition Initiatives for Stabilization Plus (TIS+)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-14-000015 Strengthening Somali Governance (SSG) program</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA 615-14-000006 Support for Orphans and Vulnerable Children in Nairobi and Coast Counties of Kenya</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>EYO</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-14-000001 Power Africa Transactions and Reforms Program (PATRP)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>OEG</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-14-000009 Trade and Investment Hub (TIH)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>OEG</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-14-000002 The Resilience Learning Project</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>OEG</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA 660-13-000002 The Tomikotisa Program in the Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 615-13-000012 The USAID Kenya Agile and Harmonized Assistance for Devolved Institutions (AHADI) Project</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-13-000008 Peace III</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>DGC</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA 660-13-000001 Central Africa Forest Ecosystems Conservation (CAFEC)</td>
<td>KEA</td>
<td>ENV</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-13-000007 Burundi Integrated Health Project</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>HPN</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA 615-16-000007 Enhanced Access to and Utilization of Quality Family Planning/Reproductive Maternal, Newborn, Child and Adolescent Health (FP/RMNCAH) Services in</td>
<td>KEA</td>
<td>HPN</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitations scored</td>
<td>Issuing Unit</td>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Gender sub-score</td>
<td>LGBTI sub-score</td>
<td>Disability sub-score</td>
<td>TOTAL SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Counties and Sub-counties, Kenya – (AFYA FP/RMNCAH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA 615-13-000003 Accelerating Progress Against TB in Kenya (APA-K)</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>HPN</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOL 623-13-000017 Trade Mark East Africa Infrastructure Project (TMEA IP)</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>OEG</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 11. KEAP SOLICITATION EXAMPLE

The 2016 Kenya Electoral Assistance Program (KEAP) solicitation (SOL 615-16-000001) from the Democracy, Governance and Conflict technical sector shows in its Scope of Work that the contractor is required to develop activities to ensure that projects are reducing gaps between men and women identified in a gender analysis as part of project design and planning. Further, the solicitation requires that the implementing partner develop a gender action plan or gender strategy describing how gender will be integrated into all phases of work.

“KEAP 2017 offers important opportunities to have a positive impact on gender knowledge, attitudes, and practices in political decision-making and will also track any unintended negative results, including any challenges that arise when addressing gender equality and female empowerment. Integrating gender considerations into the activity involves identifying, and then addressing, gender inequalities during design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. It requires integrating gender into the activity results framework, benchmarks, and indicators, and ensuring that life-of-project work plan integrates gendered activities – activities that alleviate gender related constraints and capitalize on gender related opportunities, such as under political activity, legislation and policies, in all areas and at all levels.” (p. 26)

- The solicitation makes explicit that the contractor must track the differential impacts on male and female participants in all activities. The Program Description is required to sufficiently articulate how the proposed activity may be expected to reduce gender gaps or address the unique needs and interests of men and women consistent with those identified in a gender analysis carried out as part of project design and planning.
- The KEAP solicitation requires that the Implementing Partner use specific gender-sensitive indicators, with encouragement to use one or more of the nine standard indicators on gender (pp. 18-19). As a rare good example, the KEAP solicitation also includes, although to a limited extent, some discussion eliciting description from Implementing Partners how they would monitor unintended consequences (p. 26).
- As a proven good practice, the KEAP solicitation requires a technical expert with gender integration experience in project design within the particular sectoral context (p. 25).
- The solicitation requests Implementing Partners to illustrate their capability to address gender gaps and empower women (p. 11).
- The KEAP solicitation both encourages and requires that the proposal integrate gender and people with disabilities:
  - “The inclusion of the cross-cutting themes [including Gender, Persons Living with Disabilities] within the applicant’s application for all components will be evaluated favorably.” (p. 25)
  - “Proposed costed activities defined by the applicant must showcase taking gender into account.” (p. 26)

---
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