

# DECENT WORK FOR WOMEN

Kenya Case Study

End-Term Evaluation of the  
Citizen Agency Consortium  
Decent Work for Women Program



**END-TERM EVALUATION CITIZEN  
AGENCY CONSORTIUM – DECENT  
WORK FOR WOMEN  
COUNTRY REPORT – KENYA-FINAL VERSION**

**Team of consultants:**

Geert Phlix (ACE Europe, Belgium)

Moses Nyabila (national consultant, Kenya)

**July 11 2020**

## ACRONYMS

AWCFS	African Women and Children feature Service
CSR	Corporate Social responsibility
DMEL	Derived Minimal Effect Level
ETI	Ethical Trade Initiative
FEMNET	African Women's Development and Communication Network
FIC	Forum for International Cooperation
FTA	Fair Trade Africa
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HCD	Horticulture Crops Directorate
HEBI	Horticulture Ethical Business Initiative
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
KFC	Kenya Flower Council
KHRC	Kenyan Human Rights Commission
KPAWU	Kenya Plantation & Agriculture Workers Union
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
NAP	National Action Plan
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNWGBHR	United Nations Working Group on Business and Human Rights
W@W	Women at Work
WRW	Workers Rights Watch

## **Executive summary**

The Citizen Agency Consortium (CAC), consisting of Hivos, the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and Article 19, commissioned an end term evaluation (ETE) as part of the five-year CAC strategic partnership with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs under the Dialogue and Dissent framework (2016-2020). The Decent Work for Women (DW4W) project is being implemented in Eastern and Southern Africa (Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Zimbabwe, Malawi and Zambia) and in the Netherlands. The programme focuses on fair wages, safety and security at the workplace, good working conditions and participation in decision-making, in particular targeting women, in the horticulture sector.

The objective of the evaluation was to assess the effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and efficiency of the program as it relates to changes in capacities for Lobby and Advocacy (L&A), changes in agendas, policies and practices of government and market actors depending on the specific theory of change (ToC) of the programme. In line with the programme's focus on capacity development, the evaluation was designed to maximize learning. It facilitated learning by actively involving partners and project teams throughout the evaluation process. It is expected that the CAC member organisations as well as partner organisations will be able to use it for strengthening their future advocacy efforts. The CAC will also use the findings of the evaluation to account for the implementation of its programme both upwards to the donor agency (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) as to programme stakeholders.

This evaluation reports presents the findings of the evaluation visit to Kenya, which was one of the three countries selected for primary data-collection. The DW4W programme in Kenya was implemented by seven partners, namely WRW, KHRC, Ufadhili Trust, FIDA Kenya, AWCFS, Haki Mashinani, FEMNET, complemented by a regional trade union capacity strengthening project implemented by FIC. The evaluation visit was conducted in February 2020, being the last year of the programme implementation period. A combination of qualitative methodologies was used: workshops, semi-structured interviews (individual and group), focus group discussions with women workers and visits to horticulture farms. On a selection of outcomes, a contribution analysis was applied.

The DW4W programme in Kenya aimed at awareness raising of women's rights as a way to promote equal opportunities for women in the workplace and address the behaviours and customs that negatively affect women's ability to equitably contribute and participate in society. The programme was implemented through seven projects: (i) Social Performance Project, (ii) Result Based Social Certification Project, (iii) Workplace Policies project, (iv) Access to Justice, (v) Trade Union capacity development project, (vi) Media and Communication, (vii) Women's leadership project.

### **Effectiveness**

The DW4W programme has been highly effective in realising the planned project outputs in the different outcome domains, and important changes were obtained at the level of commercial farms, sector actors and women workers. The strongest results in terms of effective improvement of working conditions have been obtained through the individual or group litigations, handled by KHRC (but

less visible but most probably also obtained through the (alternative) conflict mediation and legal support provided by Haki Mashinani and FIDA Kenya). These results evidently make a huge difference for the workers at stake, but contribute less to sector reform. There was no proof of a leverage effect of these litigation cases in obtaining commitment or changed attitudes from other horticulture farms.

Strong results have been obtained in supporting farm management in developing sexual harassment workplace policies and strengthening gender committees in addressing sexual harassment at the workplace. This resulted in an evolution in knowledge and awareness on sexual harassment among women workers and farm management, the installation of complaint mechanisms and reduced number of sexual harassment cases in the targeted farms. However, in as much progress has been made so far in a limited number of farms, more efforts are needed to install holistic safeguarding frameworks, including prevention measures. Although several CSOs, trade unions and farm management are also providing training to workers, W@W partners excellent in their explicit focus on women workers and their hands-on approach and accompaniment of the gender committees, complemented by the female leadership training. The contribution to this outcome is assessed as high. An upscaling strategy is needed, in depth and breadth. Elements of an upscaling strategy have been taken forward by the campaign partners, through the L&A interventions on the NAP on Business and Human Rights and the collaboration with national and international certification bodies.

Hivos, KHRC and WRW have been successfully advocating the Kenyan Flower Council, Fair Trade Africa, the Horticulture Crops Directorate and the national steering group that is responsible for developing the NAP, to include social indicators (incl. labour rights and attention for women workers rights) in their regulatory frameworks. The changes obtained at the level of KFC and FTA were assessed as being a direct result of the W@W campaign interventions (high contribution). The changes obtained at government level (NAP, HCD) were a result of the contribution of several actors, with a meaningful contribution of KHRC, in terms of technical support. The impact of these changes is assessed to be moderate. There are several challenges in implementation of these different standards and regulatory frameworks, not at least because of the limited financial and human resources of these institutions (HCD, labour inspection, KFC) to monitor implementation but also because of bottlenecks in the auditing process (KFC, FTA). The latter justifies the implementation of the Result Based Social Certification project, which has not delivered yet on the desired outcome.

The CSR-Africa portal is helpful for horticulture farms who are interested to know the effect of their workplace policies and practices on the working conditions of their workers. Mainly ‘soft’ themes that result from the scan are taken forward (e.g. investing in training on sexual harassment) but to a much lesser extent or not the ‘hard’ themes such as wage. There are still several challenges in upscaling the portal. Piloted farms have not seen yet the benefits of the portal in the extent that they are motivated to promote actively the portal.

A good case is presented on linking national and international level L&A, in the outcome of the UN working group on business and human rights to include gender sensitive indicators in their guiding principles. Apart from other actors, W@W campaign partners contributed highly by triggering the debate and providing evidence and technical support. The contribution to the desired impact is low

as there still is a long way to go towards national governments translating these gender sensitive principles in their NAP. In Kenya, KHRC, being a member of the national steering group that is developing the NAP, is in the position to monitor such integration.

The W@W campaign has also contributed to strengthening knowledge, competencies and capabilities of staff of the implementing partners in conducting L&A interventions in the horticulture sector. This has not always resulted in enhanced L&A capacity at organisational level.

### **Relevance**

The DW4W programme and the obtained results remain very relevant in the context of Kenya. A second phase is needed to bring the first results to scale and to consolidate policy changes and policy implementation. The decisions taken, concerning focus and implementation, were inspired by the general programme ToC. This ToC was not translated into a country ToC. Intermediary steps or milestones towards the envisaged changes with regard to the different domains of change were not made explicit, which complicated monitoring thereof, the search for synergies and coherence between the different W@W projects. This can explain the lack of synergy and complementarity between the different projects and partners during programme implementation.

Appropriate choices have been taken in L&A strategies, engagement with private sector actors and in the choice of implementing partners. Mainly insider A&L strategies have been applied, looking for dialogue with private actors and providing advisory support to government actors, which are working well. The W@W campaign has been balancing between insider and outsider approaches, but both approaches were not fully aligned to each other or adapted to specific target groups or type of commercial farmers (foreign owned farms vs nationally owned farms; certified farms vs non certified farms). Similarly, opportunities to align interventions at national level with the global L&A were not fully explored.

Relevant capacity development support was provided to enhance L&A capacity, though the focus was merely on enhancing knowledge and competencies of individual staff members (training, exchange visits, exposure to international L&A fora) to the detriment of the organisational development support (in relation to L&A organisational capacity). More attention could have been given to supporting double and triple loop learning.

### **Sustainability**

The level of institutional sustainability of the changes realised at commercial farms is moderate. Some project results will be helpful in sustaining the observed changes or to accelerate policy implementation, such as the integration of social indicators in the KFC, FTA and HCD standards and the gender lens on labour rights in NAP BHR. Integration of sexual harassment policies in the CBA processes might contribute to enhanced institutional sustainability.

Implementation of improved policies stimulating social performance of the horticulture sector is hampered by the lack of financial means, at the level of farms and at the level of the government. A more prominent use of the business case on sexual harassment policies might convince farm managers to invest in developing sexual harassment workplace policies and developing holistic safeguarding systems. More lobby trajectories will be needed targeting the government to secure

sufficient resource allocation, including attention to strengthening capacities of government institutions in implementing the policies and controlling the compliance with the revised standards.

Institutional sustainability of the changes at the level of the implementing partners is moderate. Partners have been well chosen and demonstrated relevant expertise and a track record with regard to the intervention domains of the W@W campaign. The extent acquired knowledge and competencies are being shared at organisational level, however, is not clear and will be dependent on personal initiative. Few organisational capacity development support strategies have been applied in the W@W campaign. Financial sustainability of the majority of the implementing partners to implement L&A interventions with regard to the decent work in the horticulture sector is fragile.

### **Efficiency**

The campaign was well managed and efficiency considerations were integral part of the monitoring of the projects. Implementation of the different projects was confronted with some delays, explained by both challenges at the side of Hivos (due diligence assessment system put in place) and at the side of the partners (slow response on questions for clarification, weak financial management). Efficiency of the campaign could be improved through the evolution towards more concerted and coordinated actions between the campaign partners and a more flexible project management approach.

### **Recommendations**

*With regard to design and implementation:* A more concerted action between W@W campaign partners will enhance effectiveness and efficiency of the campaign. The ToC approach could be one instrument in supporting the discussions on a joint programmatic approach at country level. A ToC approach also enables the identification of other interventions and stakeholders and the identification of possibilities for cooperation or alignment.

*With regard to L&A strategies (targeting private and/or public sector):* Incremental L&A plans (describing the ultimate goal but leaving room for adopting the way towards this goal, describing the minimum and maximum change to be expected) can support the implementation of L&A interventions, and enable monitoring thereof.

It can be discussed whether or not a value chain approach can be adopted, for example through the facilitation of multi-stakeholder processes, or the facilitation of ‘labs’. If there is no ‘traction’ for this kind of processes among the value chain actors, or several bottlenecks for a sector-based cooperation exist, round tables can be an appropriate alternative, but ambitions need to be lowered in that scenario.

In future projects, one can consider to look for collaboration with human resource professionals or business professionals, so to develop business cases, populated with hard data, applying a business language that is complementing the human rights discourse adopted by the current campaign partners.

Linkages with the global level L&A of the W@W campaign can be strengthened in a possible next phase, in particular with regard to the evolutions of the discussions with the certification bodies in Europa and living wage discussions.

*With regard to women empowerment:* The women's leadership programme and training provided by W@W campaign partners on leadership, sexual harassment and labour rights have yielded important results but require refresher trainings and upscaling. Collaboration can be looked for with other (institutional) partners that can provide these trainings.

*With regard to sexual harassment workplace policies:* The evaluators fully agree with the recommendations formulated in the study of Haki Mashinani (2019), demanding for (i) Improving legislation and policy implementation; (ii) Improved certification auditing processes; (iii) the need for a concerted value chain ambition and collaboration at sector level; and (iv) development of holistic safeguarding frameworks to promote a culture of protection for workers from harassment. W@W partners and Hivos are implementing interventions regarding the lobby of government and certification bodies. A concrete upscaling strategy on how to realise that all horticulture farms install holistic safeguarding frameworks (that go beyond the development of sexual harassment workplace policies) needs to be developed.



## Table of Content

1. Introduction.....	10
1.1. Context and subject of the evaluation.....	10
1.2. Objectives of the evaluation .....	10
1.3. Approach and methodology of the field visit .....	10
1.4. Limitations of the evaluation.....	11
2. Description of the DW4W programme in Kenya .....	12
2.1. Brief context description.....	12
2.2. Projects implemented in Kenya .....	15
2.3. Presentation of partners involved .....	17
3. Analysis of effectiveness .....	20
3.1. Changes in agendas, policies and practices of commercial horticulture farms .....	22
3.2. Changes in agendas, policies and practices of government.....	31
3.3. Women empowerment.....	34
3.4. Changes in the L&A capacities of participating organisations .....	39
3.5. Conclusion .....	42
4. Relevance.....	44
4.1. Relevance of the changes, compared to the baseline study, and programmes' responsiveness to evolutions in the context.....	44
4.2. Relevant L&A strategies.....	47
4.3. Capacity development .....	49
4.4. Conclusions.....	51
5. Analysis of sustainability.....	51
5.1. Changes at the level of private and public actors targeted .....	52
5.2. Changes at the level of L&A capacity of participating organisations.....	54
5.3. Environmental considerations .....	54

5.4. Conclusions.....	55
6. Analysis of efficiency .....	55
7. Role of the CAC consortium members, partner organisations and the MFA/EKN in contributing to the observed changes .....	61
7.1. Role of the implementing partners and HIVOS and their relationships.....	61
7.2. Role of EKN .....	62
8. Conclusions and recommendations .....	63
8.1. Conclusions.....	63
8.2. Reflection on learning questions and some of the assumptions .....	64
8.3. Recommendations for the W@W programme in Zimbabwe .....	65
9. Annexes .....	68
9.1. Evaluation framework .....	68
9.2. Chronogram of the visit .....	75
9.3. List of people consulted.....	77
9.4. List of documents consulted .....	80

## 1. INTRODUCTION

---

### 1.1. Context and subject of the evaluation

The Citizen Agency Consortium (CAC), consisting of Hivos, the International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) and Article 19, has commissioned an external end-term evaluation (ETE) of the five- year CAC strategic partnership with the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs under the Dialogue and Dissent framework (2016-2020). The evaluation of the Decent Work for Women programme (DW4W) is part of this ETE. The Decent Work for Women (DW4W) programme is implemented in Eastern and Southern Africa (Kenya, Uganda, Rwanda, Tanzania, Ethiopia, Zimbabwe, Malawi and Zambia) and in the Netherlands. The programme focuses on fair wages, safety and security at the workplace and good working conditions, in particular targeting women, in the horticulture sector. This evaluation report concerns the evaluation of the DW4W programme in Kenya.

### 1.2. Objectives of the evaluation

The ETE is organised in line with the Partnership Agreement between the Citizen Agency Consortium and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands. The responsibility for this evaluation lies with the Citizen Agency Consortium and is commissioned by Hivos.

This evaluation will seek a balance between Learning and Accountability purposes. In line with the programme's focus on capacity development the evaluation is designed to maximize learning. It will facilitate learning by actively involving partners and project teams throughout the evaluation process. It is expected that the CAC member organisations as well as partner organisations will be able to use it for strengthening their future advocacy efforts. The CAC will also use the findings of the evaluation to account for the implementation of its programme both upwards to the donor agency (Ministry of Foreign Affairs) as to programme stakeholders.

The objective of the evaluation is to assess the effectiveness, relevance, sustainability and efficiency of the program. These evaluation criteria relate to the changes the programme has contributed to:

- in capacities for Lobby and Advocacy of (Southern) partner organisations,
- in agendas, policies and practices of government and market actors (and possibly other actors, depending on the specific ToC of the programme).

The review process goes through different stages: (a) Inception stage during which a full-fledged review plan (Inception Report) was developed; (b) desk research; (c) primary data collection through 4 country studies; (d) consolidated analysis, reporting and debriefing.

### 1.3. Approach and methodology of the field visit

**Creative workshops:** programme actors have participated in a full-day workshop at the start of the country visit to (a) prepare the contribution analysis for a selected number of outcomes, (b) to assess relevance, quality and effectiveness of the capacity development support provided by the programme

and (c) discuss efficiency issues related to programme implementation. At the end of the evaluation visit, a half-day restitution workshop was organised with representatives of Hivos and implementing partners to discuss the preliminary findings and recommendations.

**Bilateral visits** of a half-day to four of the five partner organisations to (1) discuss their involvement in the programme (2) develop a timeline of the (A&L) activities implemented. Interviews with staff involved in project implementation and with leadership.

In addition, **semi-structured interviews** were organised with (other) actors and external stakeholders, relevant for the outcomes selected. Resource persons included local partners, human resource or CSR managers of horticulture farms, sector and export organisations in the horticulture sector, employers' associations, government officials, and some external resource persons with knowledge of the issues at stake like journalists, professors/researchers, etc. A list of people consulted is added in annex.

**Focus group discussions** were organised for depicting key programme-related processes, exploring outcomes of the programme interventions and assessing the programme's contribution to stated outcomes. Different FGD were organised at the level of the commercial farms visited, involving farm management, women workers committees and workers committees.

#### **1.4. Limitations of the evaluation**

The lack of a consolidated report at country programme level, complicated the assessment of the progress of implementation and its results. No specific outcome indicators were formulated at country level (other than the general indicators used to account to the Ministry of Foreign affairs). Specific output indicators are included in the project contracts and project reports of each of the different implementing partners, but a consolidated overview at country programme level does not exist. Furthermore, the baseline study does not provide hard data on the working conditions in the horticulture farms, which made it difficult to assess progress against the baseline data.

The programme has focused more on lobbying private sector actors, fewer specific projects were targeting government actors but lobbying government was included in the core business of several campaign partners. For several reasons (practical, willingness) it appeared difficult to arrange interviews with sufficient external stakeholders that could give an external view on the campaign and validate the contribution claims. The evaluators managed to have some additional interviews after the field visit. By consequence, not all planned contribution analyses could be fully conducted.

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE DW4W PROGRAMME IN KENYA

---

### 2.1. Brief context description

Kenya is the lead exporter of roses to the European Union (EU) with a market share of about 38%. Approximately 60% of exported flowers are sold through the Dutch Auctions, although direct sales are growing. Kenya flowers are sold in more than 60 countries.

The industry continues to attract new, local and foreign investors due to what Kenya Flower Council refers to as a solid infrastructure, inbuilt knowledge of prerequisites for successful flower farming and marketing, favourable, climate, global-positioning of Kenya as a cut-flower producing country, and a productive local workforce.

The flower industry contributes around 1.06 per cent to Kenya's Gross Domestic Product (GDP). It's also one of the largest employers in the country, providing employment to over 100,000 people directly and an estimated 2 million people indirectly.

The floriculture sub sector has recorded the highest growth in volume and value of cut flowers exported over the years, with Kenya attaining the lead supplier status to the EU against competitors. The industry has grown from zero in the 1970s to a major exporter to the European Union. About 38% of all cut flower imports into the EU comes from Kenya. The main European Union markets are Holland, United Kingdom, Germany, France, and Switzerland. Share of exports to the UK has also increased considerably, in response to a growing market especially on mixed bouquets, and more direct sales as compared to the auction system.

The current Kenya Flower Council membership is responsible for close to 80% of the national volumes of flowers exported. The main production areas are around Lake Naivasha, Mt. Kenya, Nairobi, Thika, Kiambu, Athi River, Kitale, Nakuru, Kericho, Nyandarua, Transzoia, Uasin Gichu and Eastern Kenya.

A well-developed and dynamic private sector has profitably marketed many products to international markets. Government intervention has been minimal, mainly facilitating the sectoral growth through infrastructure development, incentives, and support services. Structural and macroeconomic reforms and introduction of a more liberal trading environment has also provided a major boost to the country's horticultural prospects. The tremendous performance of the horticulture sub-sector presents an ideal opportunity for investors.

Since 1990, Kenya's export volume has recorded the highest growth in volume and value of cut flowers exported every year from 10,946 tons in 1988 compared to 86,480 tons in 2006, 120,220 tons in 2010, 136, 601 tons in 2014, 122,825 tons in 2015, 133,658 tons in 2016 and 159,961 tons in 2017. According to Horticultural Crop Directorate (HCD) provisional statistics in 2017, the floriculture industry earned Kenya Shillings 82.25 billion. According to the Fresh Produce Exporters Association (FPEAK), horticulture accounts for 33% of the country's gross domestic agricultural product and 38% of national export earnings, making it one of the leading generators of the country's foreign exchange (2016).

The DW4W programme in Kenya focused on cut flowers and vegetable production (especially French beans), two of the most crucial horticulture export commodities in Kenya.

Eastern Africa was involved in the first phase of the WW campaign, that was conducted in the period 2011-2015 under a different subsidy framework. In that phase, focus was more on the global L&A, with involvement of a limited number of southern organisations. The experience of W@W campaign in Kenya in the first phase identified key labour challenges for women in the horticulture sector. These included: low wages, inadequate provision of maternal health and child care facilities, poor workers' representation, diminished decision-making roles, exposure to unsafe working conditions, and sexual harassment. Labour violations have been attributed to: poor structures of accountability at the workplace, poor legal and non-legal regulatory frameworks, and overbearing patriarchal attitudes and practices by society.<sup>1</sup>

Formed in 1996 by growers and exporters of cut-flowers and ornamental, the Kenya Flower Council has a significant influence on conduct of thousands of men and women who grow, sell and buy cut flowers. The association has about 124 producer members and 80 Associate Members, who provide essential services to the sector. KFC offers a range of services including ensuring compliance to industry standards, lobbying and promotions. The council encourages commitment to quality and innovation within the industry, promoting and pursuing equitable trading practices through the Flowers and Ornamental Sustainability Standard (F.O.S.S) – an Accredited Quality System Regulations based on environmental and socio-economic principles which ensure certified producers foster sustainable, responsible and safe production of cut flowers and ornamentals. FOSS covers governance, good agricultural practice, human resource management and workers' welfare, health & safety, environmental protection & conservation, and post-harvest.

Sustainability certifications including, KFC Flowers and Ornamentals Sustainability Standards (FOSS), Fairtrade, and MPS, over the years they have worked towards promoting the welfare of women by laying down rules of engagement. The National Horticulture Policy and the HCDA Code of Conduct regulates contract farming and helps improve conditions of work. However, there are structural defects that hinder the effective regulation of labour practices through certification.

The Constitution of Kenya highlights significant gains for the promotion of decent working conditions for women. It is strengthened by a strong body of laws, including the Employment Act; the Labour Relations Act; Occupational Safety and Health Act; and the Workplace Injuries and Benefits Act. However, enforcement and implementation of the law remains very weak.

A 2012 study conducted by Workers Rights Watch and Women Working Worldwide, with support from Hivos, established that sexual harassment was quite rampant in the cut flower industry in Kenya. It observed that sexual harassment cases were only sometimes reported or largely ignored. It further noted that very little was done to resolve reported cases of sexual harassment to a satisfactory conclusion especially those that involved supervisors and managers. Policies prohibiting sexual harassment existed but failed to reflect the reality of issues. This called for the formulation of an all-inclusive and comprehensive policy that would address all the issues that affected workers either at the workplace or within the farms.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hivos (2016) CAC Inception report.



## **2.2. Projects implemented in Kenya**

The DW4W programme is implemented through a project-based approach. In Kenya, following projects are being implemented.

### **1) Social performance project**

Through the CSR Africa portal, the campaign provides horticulture firms with insights into the sector's social performance, detailed and business positive improvement advice and connections to service providers for implementation of improvements. The portal also helps companies in the sector to see where they stand from a CSR perspective. The CSR Africa portal is developed by True Price/the Impact Institute and tested in Kenya by Ufadhili trust. The initial idea was to conduct social performance audits in Kenya and Uganda, but the promotion of the portal is currently only taken place in Kenya.

### **2) Result Based Social certification project**

While an audit inspection in a flower farm is supposed to reflect both strength and weakness of the systems of the flower farms, the reality is different. Testimonies collected during the first phase of the W@W campaign indicated that the contents of the audit reports might not be a true reflection of the situation at the farm. Farm workers are often forewarned ahead of the audits and asked to appraise the flower farm or else they will lose their jobs. Or when an issue is raised, it eventually does not feature in the final audit report. The W@W campaign launched a Result Based Social Certification project to raise awareness among certification standards, flower farms, trade unions and workers in general and to look for solutions. This project was implemented by KHRC in Kenya.

### **3) Workplace Policies Project**

This project takes on a business case approach to institutionalising Gender based Violence Prevention, Prohibition and Redress mechanisms within Kenya's floriculture sector. Haki Mashinani and WRW develop projects to train HR managers, supervisors, gender committees and workers' committees on sexual harassment.

### **4) Capacity development of trade unions**

In Kenya, collaboration with the trade union in the horticulture sector (KPAWU) appeared difficult. No institutional collaboration could be established, though at branch level, trade union officers participated in project activities (e.g. training on labour rights, gender). In 2018, the W@W campaign decided to invest in capacity development of trade unions. A baseline study was done, which was validated in 2018. In 2019, W@W engaged Forum for International Cooperation to implement a specific trade union-based capacity development programme.

### **5) Access to Justice Project (incl. access to justice)**

This project advocates for effective implementation of labour laws, seeks to develop capacities of judges and magistrates to effectively address cases of women's labour rights violations and increase labour rights among women working in the horticultural zones in Kenya. This project also includes the provision of legal aid and labour rights training for workers, and is implemented by FIDA and KHRC.



## **6) Media and communication**

Collaboration with media partners to get stories in print and online media and train W@W partners on media campaigning. In Kenya, AWCFS was identified as the media-partner.

## **7) Women's Leadership programme**

The Women's Leadership programme is implemented in Uganda, Kenya and Rwanda. The project objective is to advance women's leadership and representation in decision making processes in the horticulture sector in East Africa by addressing both strategic and practical issues that hinder women's social and economic progress. This is realised through: (i) strengthening leadership capacities of women workers and their representatives, and that of management staff, (ii) promotion of gender responsive workplace policies for better recognition and respect for women workers' rights and improvement of working conditions, (iii) strengthening the collective voice of women in trade union and (iv) influencing national, regional and international processes on gender equality and decent work (e.g. SDG 5 and SDG 8). The Women's leadership training is coordinated by Akina Mama Afrika (AMwA) in Uganda, African Women's Development and Communication Network (FEMNET) in Kenya and Rwanda Women's Network in Rwanda.

All partners are contributing towards gender responsive policies: Sexual harassment workplace policies by WRW & Haki Mashinani, gendered CSR policies by Ufadhili; Gender policy / mainstreaming of gender in other institutional policies by FEMNET; FIDA gender sensitive approach to administration of justice etc. Albeit at different levels with horticulture farms for some; others both with horticulture farms and at national level e.g. lobbying adoption of ILO convention on harassment and violence in 2018/2019 - and now for its ratification.

Identification of campaign partners was done through different approaches:

- 1) Co-created programmes where strategic partners were identified during a baseline study process, and an implementation plan was developed based on who is best placed to take the lead in certain aspects: e.g. RBSC (KHRC/WRW); Women Leadership project in 3 countries (FEMNET – with a number of overall coordinating deliverables taken up by AMwA in Uganda such as development of materials for use in 3 countries); CSR Social Performance (Ufadhili); and Capacity Strengthening of unions (FIC) following initial Hivos' engagement for capacity assessment exercises among trade unions in Eastern Africa.
- 2) Continuing programmes from Phase 1, such as the Model Workplaces project (WRW), for which WRW was invited to send a proposal for its engagement.
- 3) Access to Justice programme: for which a call for concept proposals was issued (FIDA Kenya and Haki Mashinani).

### 2.3. Presentation of partners involved

The W@W campaign brought together 7 partners (+1; FIC added in 2019) that generally complement each other in the task of campaigning for an equal, safer and fairer workplace for women. A partnership that brought together actors from mainstream and niche media, seasoned national and grass root human rights campaigners, women's rights organisations, labour rights activists and labour unions, which made for a particularly potent mix when it came to effecting change in an industry that thrives on a reputation in a rapidly changing market, demanding quality and fairness in the supply chain.

**Workers' Rights Watch (WRW)** is a worker 'rights advocacy NGO that draws its membership primarily from shop stewards and workers in the plantations and estate farms that include tea, coffee, flowers, export processing zones. WRW also collaborates with Women Working World Wide. WRW supports workers in negotiations for CBAs, complementing the interventions of the trade unions. This is done primarily through advocacy and training of shop stewards and worker representatives. WRW holds expertise in workplace lobbying and advocacy, capacity building, research and awareness creation on labour rights. WRW has built national workplace networks for directly influencing workplace policies. *WRW implements W@W projects on ending sexual harassment at the workplace.*

**Kenyan Human Rights Commission (KHRC)** is a national CSO with significant experience and capacity in defending and promoting human rights. The KHRC boasts competencies relating to: technical knowledge and knowhow of human rights concepts and situations; institutional stability and sustainability; community linkages for advocacy; international and transnational advocacy experience (including observer status with various international fora); and, a strong brand. *KHRC is involved in the result based social certification project under W@W and in the Human Rights Compliance in the Horticulture Sector project (litigation, lobby and advocacy at national and international level).*

**Ufadhili Trust** is an East-African CSO created in 2001 that operates as a trust (seed capital of the Ford Foundation) that implements interventions in four thematic areas, aimed at promoting sustainable, responsible practices: responsible businesses, responsible governments, active citizenship a voluntarism and philanthropy. Ufadhili is well embedded in the business community and provides CSR consultancy services to the private sector. *Ufadhili implements the Africa-CSR portal project (social performance project).*

**Africa Woman and Child Feature Service (AWCFS)** is a media advocacy NGO that specialises on women and children's rights. AWC range of activities include: publication of an online magazine Kenya Woman, training and supporting activist journalists and media houses. Under the W@W campaign AWC partnered with Citizen radio, The Star Newspaper, NTV, Nation Newspaper and the Standard newspaper to write and air feature stories and interviews on Kenya's cut flower industry with regard to workers and women's rights. AWC also provided training to 100 correspondences on labour rights. *AWC provided support to W@W partners in giving their projects visibility in the media, documenting good practices and training partners on how to report on the issues of the campaign.*

*Funds were also made available for investigative journalism, enabling some journalist to enter farms and do research.*

**FIDA-Kenya** is a Federation of Lawyers that offers free legal aid to women and their children, established in 1985 during the 3rd UN Conference on Women held in Nairobi and registered in 1987. FIDA-Kenya is a membership organisation with over 1,400 women advocates, lawyers, and law students in Kenya.

*FIDA has been contracted to build capacity of institutions to engage in gender workplace rights through training of trade unions, judges and magistrates, assisting KPAWU with negotiating and registering Collective Bargaining Agreements and development of strategic plans. FIDA conducts interventions under the Access to Justice Project a.o. training of para-legal women workers, training on labour rights of women workers and training of juridical staff on challenges women are facing in horticulture farms. FIDA also provides legal aid to women and has been experimenting with supporting alternative livelihoods to cushion women engaged in litigation with their employers.*

**Haki Mashinani** is a CSO that supports communities to access justice through litigation and awareness creation. It is a relatively young organisation (2015), that seeks to give legal and socio-economic empowerment to communities at grassroot level in order to improve their lives and well-being. The organisation has experience in looking for solutions with regard to basic identification documents, widow rights, children rights and labour rights. Haki Mashinani operates through field offices, also based in the Naivasha flower belt. *Haki Mashinani is involved in the Workplace Policies project and provides training on sexual harassment workplace policies, labour rights and provided legal aid to women workers.*

**African Women's Development and Communication Network (FEMNET)** is a pan-African membership-based feminist women's right network based in Nairobi, with over 800 membership across 46 African countries. Since its inception in 1988, FEMNET has played a leading role in building the women's movement in Africa and ensuring that women and girls' voices are amplified, and their needs, priorities and aspirations are prioritized in key policy dialogues and outcomes that have direct and indirect impact on their lives. *Within the W@W campaign FEMNET implements the Women's Leadership programme in Kenya.*

**Forum for International Cooperation (FIC)** is an international NGO operating in Denmark, Europe and East Africa (Tanzania and Kenya) since 1995. FIC's projects are focused on the area of life-long education, improvement of working conditions and labour rights, youth and senior employment, integration of emigrants, inclusion of women in the labour market, intercultural dialogue in Denmark, Europe and Africa, and raise awareness of these issues on the national and international level. FIC has a particular interest in enhancing capacity of social partners so to improve the quality of the social dialogue. *FIC has become engaged in the W@W campaign only in 2019 and was approached to provide capacity development support to the trade unions involved in the various countries of the W@W campaign. A baseline study was finalised at the moment of the evaluation visit.*

Remark for the reader: two names are used to point to the programme: DW4W programme and Women@Work campaign (W@W). Both names are used in the report.

### 3. ANALYSIS OF EFFECTIVENESS

In this chapter we analyse the results according to the different domains of change of the ToC, starting with the changes at the level of the commercial farms (Good growers and fair market share) and changes at the level of women workers (powerful women workers). These are followed by changes at government level (Responsible government). The chapter is completed with the changes at the level of the civil society actors (strong civil society).

An important tool for monitoring the changes of the programme was outcome harvesting. The evaluators analysed the whole set of reported outcomes so to gain insight in the types of changes brought about by the programme. Reported outcomes were ordered along the different outcome domains of the ToC. Further, for a number of outcomes, selected during the inception phase, a contribution analysis was applied to provide evidence for the stated outcomes (three colours were used for the final contribution statement: green for high contribution, yellow for moderate contribution and orange for limited contribution). The evaluators also were attentive for capturing unreported or unintended effects of the programme. The findings are described in this chapter on effectiveness.

By 2019, 22 outcomes were harvested during programme implementation in Kenya, from the implementing partners and the Hivos team. 11 of these outcomes were validated through the substantiation exercise. These provide indications of the type of results realised by the programme, as shown in the table below. The outcomes selected for contribution analysis are put in *Italic*.

ToC domain of change	Harvested outcomes	Significance for all type of interventions/projects of the Kenya programme
Women Workers	1. In 2016-2017, 70 women workers in 3 farms in Naivasha town sought legal advice on different issues, like unlawful termination of contracts, exposure to harmful chemicals, injuries obtained during work. Through engagement with HR managers solutions were found to these problems. (Haki Mashinani)	<i>Human Rights Compliance in the Horticulture Sector project</i> FIDA, WRW and Haki Mashinani have trained women workers on their labour rights, CBA processes; provided legal advice and support during negotiations at the workplace. KHRC provided legal support to (women) workers litigating their employers
	2. In 2016, 130 flower farms out of 160 in Kenya reviewed their selection and formation of gender committees' standards to enhance the handling of gender related issues (fair election and representativeness) (WRW)	<i>Model Workplace projects and women leadership project</i> The establishment of gender committees was not an explicit project in W@W Kenya, but support was provided by W@W partners to these gender committees (WRW), to discuss among other sexual harassment at the workplace and some of the members could benefit from the women's leadership programme (FEMNET).
Improved business	3. <i>In December 2016, Fairtrade Africa and Kenya Flower Council began revising their certification auditing</i>	<i>Social certification</i> This is an achievement resulting from the first phase of W@W (2012-2015) and the HEBI initiative

	<i>indicators to embrace a more results-based methodology for auditing business compliance with gender protection at the workplace (Hivos/WRW)</i>	(2005-2009), with involvement of Hivos, EKN and WRW (training, shadow reporting of auditing processes, research on the functioning of gender committees and implementation of SH workplace policies.
	4. In August 2016, The Kenya Flower Council (KFC) and Fairtrade Africa, adopted the Model Sexual Harassment Policy as the standard framework for addressing sexual harassment in the Kenyan flower farms (Hivos)	<i>Sexual Harassment Workplace policy</i> Hivos has facilitated multi-stakeholder dialogues involving W@W partners, KFC and FTA in discussing various topics of the W@W campaign. Evidence provided by the work in farms by WRW and Haki Mashinani. Haki Mashinani, for example, reached 823 workers (663 females and 160 males) with legal advice. WRW has large hands-on expertise in developing SH workplace policies at the flower farms.
	5. 2 Flower farms being Goodwill ambassadors for CSR portal, 2017 (Ufadhili)	<i>Social performance – CSR Africa portal</i> Ufadhili has implemented the CSR Africa portal project, in collaboration with Hivos and True Price.
	6. RA cancelled certification of the Kakuzi farm for violation of labour rights (KHRC)	<i>Social certification project</i> In Kenya a combination of dialogue and dissent strategies has been used. KHRC had received specific funding for handling a number of litigation cases, in cases of manifest violations of labour rights
	7. In a multi-stakeholder meeting in Naivasha region (15 November 2017), 14 key stakeholders <sup>2</sup> enhanced their cooperation to strengthen women's labour rights in practices and compliance with women's labour laws in Naivasha region (FIDA)	<i>Human Rights Compliance in the Horticulture Sector project</i> Part of the access to justice project, implemented by FIDA, consisted in the provision of training of a variety of stakeholder on labour laws
	8. On 7 <sup>th</sup> January 2017, Flamingo Horticulture Kenya signed a pledge that raised the minimum price of fine beans supplied by 348 farmers in Meru and Lewa regions from 55 to 61 Kenya shillings (KHRC)	<i>Human Rights Compliance in the Horticulture Sector project</i> KHRC receiving funds for handling a number of litigation cases
Improved laws and policies	9. UN Working group on Business and Human Rights adopting a gender lens to the UN guiding principles on Business and Human Rights, 2018-2019 (KHRC)	<i>International L&amp;A (target international mechanisms)</i> KHRC has been involved in the international L&A targeting the UN working group on BHR
	10. April 2016, Development of the NAP on Business and Human Rights started and KHRC invited to be a member of the national steering committee that leads the process (KHRC and Hivos)	<i>National L&amp;A (target national governments)</i> W@W provided funding (staff time) for KHRC to participate in this steering group. Evidence from research and projects implemented in the W@W campaign used in discussions
Public	11. Issues affecting women workers in flower farms given visibility in 7 radio	<i>Media campaigns</i> Several social media campaigns were developed, under coordination of Hivos (e.g. valentines' day,

<sup>2</sup> The Ministry of Agriculture, Nakuru County, Kenya Flower Council, Fairtrade Africa, Federation of Kenyan Employers, Directorate of Culture & Gender- Nakuru County, Kenya Export Floriculture, Horticulture & Allied Workers Union, Maridadi Flowers, Subati Group, James Finlay, Oserian and Ol Njorowa

	shows, with listenership of 3 million people, in 2018 (AWCFS)	mothers' day). W@W also organised a competition to give an award recognising good practice (2020). AWCFS collaborated with journalists to get media exposure in print media, radio and television. AWCFS provided media advice to W@W partners.
--	---	---

No outcomes in the outcome harvesting substantiation exercise were related to the women's leadership programme or the L&A interventions targeting the government as implemented by Haki Mashinani and FEMNET. Though, after this substantiation exercise had taken place, another outcome was identified that highlights the contribution of FEMNET to the unanimous adoption by the Kenyan government of ILO convention 190 on the elimination of violence and harassment at the world of work in 2019.

### 3.1. Changes in agendas, policies and practices of commercial horticulture farms

**Sexual Harassment at the Workplace** – Important results have been achieved in developing sexual harassment policies at the workplace. This project was mainly driven by WRW, who has gained easy access to horticulture farms, through their good collaboration with the Kenya Flower Council and through previous projects involving horticulture farms (since 2009). During the first phase of the W@W campaign in Kenya (2012-2015), WRW was already involved in addressing sexual harassment at the workplace. Together with KFC, WRW had developed a model sexual harassment policy and 7 farms showed interest in participating in a pilot project to implement the sexual harassment policy. A comprehensive approach was developed combining training of the gender committees and the workers committees, the HR managers and supervisors, a follow-up visit after 6 months and a refresher training. A checklist for collecting evidence on sexual harassment cases at farms was developed. This evidence was shared with KFC and FTA. The current phase of the W@W campaign enabled scaling up of the project, from the initial 7 farms, 4 continued to collaborate and 6 new farms were added.

According to the Impact report<sup>3</sup> of 7-years of interventions of WRW in addressing sexual harassment at the workplace, 40 horticulture farms have adopted a sexual harassment policy at the workplace. However, the study conducted by Haki Mashinani in 2019 concluded that *“Few farms have been able to leverage sexual harassment policies for the development of effective workplace safeguarding systems; less still, have managed to nurture an enduring culture of protection of workers from sexual and gender-based discrimination and violence. While there is marked improvement by farms in addressing harassment at the workplace, the translation of policy statements into sustainable systems and cultures that protect workers from harassment remains largely elusive.”*<sup>4</sup> The study compared the situation in 4 of the 10 farms that had participated in the WRW project with 3 non-piloted farms. The 4 pilot project farms demonstrated more commitment towards eradicating sexual harassment,

<sup>3</sup> Lwanergy Infiniti Media (2019) Impact report. Women's Freedom to Work: Unmasking Sexual Harassment at Workplace. Workers' Rights Watch. April 2012-July 2019.

<sup>4</sup> Haki Mashinani (September 2019) Late Blossoms! Time to move beyond policy statements to a safeguarding culture. A baseline study on the implementation of the model sexual harassment policy in the cut flower sector of Kenya – experience, lessons and the business case.

and their gender committees were trained whereas training in the non-piloted farms was irregular. As a result, workers in the 4 pilot project farms demonstrated a clearer understanding of sexual harassment and the associated complaints handling system.

The evaluation team has visited 4 of the 10 horticulture pilot farms (not the same as in the study of Haki Mashinani). All four of them had an active sexual harassment workplace policy in place (many of them also gender policies, human rights policies), members of the gender committees were well aware of the reporting procedures and able to handle sexual harassment cases (examples given of the rigorous procedure of accepting, investigating and reporting the SH claim, see annex).

Sexual harassment workplace policies have been included in the KFC standard (see further contribution analysis) and other standards such as FTA and Global Gap also require gender policies or sexual harassment workplace policies. This requirement alone does not guarantee an active sexual harassment policy. Farm owners interviewed confirmed that they welcomed the project as it came with training and information. All gender committees had already been existing for several years (many since 2008) but appeared not to be very active. Investing in training of these committees, by farm management, was usually very limited or non-existing.

**Social Performance: CSR Africa portal** - The CSR Africa portal provides horticulture companies cutting edge insights, sector statistics, tools and case studies, and an online social performance quick scan to measure and manage their social performance and identify areas for improvement. The portal focuses on seven key social areas for improvement by horticultural companies: gender equality, harassment; wages and social security, health and safety, overtime, freedom of association and water use. Beside the online quick scan available at the portal, Ufadhili also provides a more comprehensive CSR audit, applying a longer checklist for workers and employers. Data collected at farms are currently still being sent to True Price/the Impact Institute (NL) for further data-analysis. Whenever there are gaps identified during the assessment process, Ufadhili Trust and other W@W partners are ready to offer technical support in addressing the issues identified.

The CSR Africa portal was developed by True Price/The Impact Institute (who also supported Ufadhili during implementation) and was launched in 2018 during the International Floriculture Trade Expo in Nairobi, Kenya. Implementation of the project suffered several delays because of project management challenges at Ufadhili and the slow upscaling process, Ufadhili facing challenges in access commercial farms (see further under efficiency). In 2017, two farms engaged to pilot the portal (see contribution analysis). At the moment of the evaluation, Ufadhili Trust had audited (or was in process of) the CSR policies of 9 additional farms in Kenya, of which 3 are small growers, and a marketing strategy to set the portal in the market was being developed.

There is not yet much experience among the targeted farms in using the portal. Farms are interested in the portal as it provides more robust data (i.e. quantitative data) compared to the qualitative data obtained during the KFC auditing process (though not all farms also provide their financial data), and it is helpful in identifying areas for improvement. As one farms owner testified: *“We have good policies in place but we wanted to know to what extent they are being implemented and what the impact is”*. Farm management interviewed referred to some challenges: (i) the survey requires substantial time investment which was now being paid by the W@W campaign, but unlikely to be



paid by the owners as the audit is not required for the certification standards, which are already many. To respond to this challenge, a quick scan was added to the portal, though this does not deliver the hard data that is seen as the added value of the portal. (ii) only summaries of the survey are provided but farm management is also interested in obtaining more detailed results. (iii) It is not clear for farm management whether the benchmark at the portal are sufficiently contextualised. From Ufadhili it is learned that the data from the surveys conducted at Equinox and Tambuzi farms is currently used as a benchmark, which is continuously being updated with the ongoing data-collection at other farms in Kenya.

The two front runners who had done the full scan, were able to identify challenges at the workplace. Not all identified gaps could be addressed by farm management. E.g. At Tambuzi farm, the audit gave indications for the need to improve the measures taken to address sexual harassment at the workplace, which was taken forward by farm management. At Equinox farm the audit showed gaps in living wage, which was not taken up by farm management as considered to be not feasible.

**Social Certification** – Changing practices of certification bodies is one of the domains of change in the general ToC. In Kenya, several interventions or projects have been implemented to that regard. KHRC has implemented the Result Based Social Certification project. This project consisted in a baseline study and awareness raising of workers and communities. The baseline study has documented the practices of the certification auditing processes in several flower farms, based on testimonies of workers. A first baseline study report was contested by the industry players, including KFC and several growers, present at the report validation meeting, because of the applied methodology,<sup>5</sup> which also shows the sensitivity of the issue. The redesigned baseline study was just finished at the moment of the evaluation and still needed to be validated by the horticulture sector (farms and certification standards), foreseen first quarter 2020. During the discussions with the certification standards on the study, several of the standards agreed to set up a working group to further collaborate on the matter (MPS, RA, FTA). The study provides evidence of the fact that the social audit reports do not reflect the real situation at the farms and that workers are not genuinely involved in the auditing process. The study comes with a set of recommendations pointing out to the need for training of workers and involvement of workers and trade unions in the auditing process. The project had started in 2016, but experienced several delays (see under efficiency).

Already during the first phase of the W@W campaign (and even before), WRW has been lobbying the Kenyan Flower Council and Fair-Trade Africa to include social indicators in their certification standards. A result that was obtained during the first year of the current phase of the W@W campaign (see contribution analysis). During the current phase of W@W, KFC, WRW, Ufadhili Trust, Haki Mashinani partnered to pilot an anti-sexual harassment programme that influenced the Sexual Harassment Policy of the Department of Labour and KFC Flowers and Ornamental Sustainability Standard (FOSS) Sustainability Certification. FOSS and Sexual Harassment Policy is applicable to all exporting farms including 124 producers who are members of KFC.

---

<sup>5</sup> KHRC not having access to the farms, consulted workers outside the farms without providing evidence that these workers actually were employed by the criticised farms.

Ongoing dialogue with certification standards and other sector actors - During the first phase of the W@W campaign (2012-2015), Hivos had started roundtables and multi-stakeholder dialogues with a variety of stakeholders, what was called the ‘Blooming Conversations’, to discuss the situation of women workers in the flower farms. These conversations have been the start of developing relationships between the commercial farms, sector organisations, certification standards, trade unions and CSOs. Also, in the second phase of the campaign, dialogue with sector actors continued. Sometimes, Hivos took up a ‘convening role’, for example in collaboration with KHRC a round table was organised to discuss the Result Based Social Certification baseline report. These dialogues have not resulted yet in more concrete action or changed practices, except the example that was given by the Hivos team with regard to the reviewed MPS-SQ<sup>6</sup> social standards: KHRC had presented 29 recommendations on the review of Milieu Project Sierteelt (MPS-SQ) social standard, a globally recognised standard of wide application in the horticulture sector, which were eventually adopted. The recommendations / revisions steered by KHRC aimed at strengthening the protection of labour rights in Kenya as the standard is applied by more than 70 flower farms in the country. The proposals were mainly on correct categorisation of clauses, with recommendations to graduate more than 20 indicators from major-musts (persuasive requirements) to mandatory compliance requirements, in line with existing laws. Key among the adopted recommendations was that employers should provide employees, working in spray departments, copies of their medical reports after the regular medical tests undertaken in flower farms, and that the reports should be in a language that is understood by the workers.

**Access to Justice Project** - the W@W campaign also advocated for effective implementation of labour laws, developed the capacity of judges and magistrates to effectively address cases of women’s labour rights violations and provided funding for training para-legals and for bringing a limited number of cases to court. These interventions are however scattered and limited in outreach; e.g. FIDA partnered with the Judicial Training Institute to train judicial officers including magistrates, Kadhis and Judges on ‘Enhancing Gender Sensitive Approach to Administration of Justice’ that resulted in 50 magistrates and 12 judges trained in 2 cohorts, though on a project based approach, with not much follow-up on the extent gained knowledge is translated into practice. FIDA and Haki Mashinani trained over 98 workers and organised 20 ToT on labour laws. These organisations also provide legal support and socio-economic assistance to communities. FIDA, e.g. is developing an alternative livelihoods fund to cushion women engaged in litigation with their employers. FIDA, in collaboration with Haki Mashinani and WRW is developing an Information Booklet on labour Laws, to be distributed among (women) workers.

KHRC has received funding to bring 5 cases of severe violations of labour rights to court in case negotiations at farm level could not solve the dispute, ranging from individual cases to group cases. KHRC argues that the law is clear and needs to be respected. Cases are still in process. One of these cases targets the trade union KPAWU and the Agriculture Employers Association (AEA), for having agreed upon a CBA that is not conform the law (CBA 2019, a wage increase was agreed upon but increase was calculated on the minimum wage and not on the actual wage). This threat of litigation

---

<sup>6</sup> Milieu Project Sierteelt

might have an influence on the collaboration within the W@W campaign, that has KPAWU among its partners and engages with AEA.

KHRC also has been advocating the Rainforest Alliance to withdraw the certification of the Kakuzi farm, where KHRC could document severe violations of labour rights (see contribution analysis). KHRC is a reputable and well-known institute in Kenya, and victims of human rights violations know they can rely on KHRC. KHRC has a specific economic and social justice programme that handles complaints of labour rights violations.

### Contribution analysis

For three of the harvested outcomes referring to changes at the level of the commercial farms, a contribution analysis was done. Results are presented in following tables.

See description of the <b>CSR Africa portal</b> in the above	
<p><b>Outcome:</b> In 2017, 2 Flower farms (Tambuzi Roses and Equinox Flower) signed a business partnership with Ufadhili Trust to act as a Goodwill ambassador for the CSR portal, making both farms early adopters of the CSR portal that advocates for improved social performance in the horticulture sector in Kenya.</p> <p><b>Causal question:</b> Did the engagement of Ufadhili Trust with two farms, Tambuzi Roses and Equinox Flower, resulted in obtaining good will ambassadors for the CRS Portal?</p>	
Explanatory mechanisms and factors	Evidence
1. Ufadhili having a track record on CSR dialogues with farms and trust among farm owners (Contributing factor)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- History of Ufadhili Trust in engaging with private sector (since 2001), proven by organisational leaflets and interview Ufadhili</li> <li>- KFC being one of the clients, facilitating access to flower farms (interviews Ufadhili and Andrew, former W@W programme manager)</li> <li>- Many farms not willing to collaborate because of the negative public W@W campaign of 2017 (interviews all W@W partners, 4 farms visited)</li> </ul>
2. Collaboration between Ufadhili and the two flower farms in 2017 (meetings, training, survey, etc.) (Primary explanation – high contribution)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consultative meetings, training, collecting data among workers and employers, sharing report through the portal, MoU for implementing improvement plans (confirmed in interviews Ufadhili and two farms)</li> <li>- Signed business partnerships (April 25, 2017 with Tambuzi; May 6, 2017 with Equinox)</li> </ul>

3. Farms feeling international pressure to mainstream CSR and sustainability in their policies (Rival explanation – meaningful contribution)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- KFC and FTA have included social indicators in their certification requirements (Tambuzi is among other certificates also Fair Trade and KFC labelled, Equinox not FT but having KFC gold) (pictures of labels at entrance of farms, interviews with farm management)</li> <li>- KFC promoting the W@W projects in a meeting with flower farms (interviews KFC, two farms, Ufadhili)</li> </ul>
4. Large flower farms, willingness to improve working conditions, previous collaboration in W@W campaign (Contributing factor)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Tambuzi already participated in a video of Hivos in 2013 (focus on equal wages for men and women) and in 2017 (to promote good practices), collaborated with WRW on SH workplace policies in 2015 (interviews Tambuzi, Ufadhili, WRW)</li> <li>- Equinox had been involved in several KFC guided projects to improve the working conditions at farm level, has KFC gold standard and was also included in the Hivos documentary of 2017.</li> </ul>
5. 2 farms acting as Goodwill ambassador (no evidence)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 farms are not actively promoting the CSR portal. (interview Ufadhili, contradicted by the two farms), though one farm (Red Lands Count) was referred to Ufadhili by Tambuzi farm</li> <li>- Tambuzi stated they might promote the portal once benefits are clear and remaining questions answered.</li> <li>- Equinox has not shared its experience within the group of flower farms, only has given two farms when Hivos asked for introduction in other farms.</li> </ul>

**Concluding statement on contribution to the harvested outcome:**

This is a direct outcome of the campaign intervention, namely without the W@W campaign and the work of Ufadhili Trust, there would not have been a portal to be piloted. The statement however is on the promotion of the portal by the two farms. This statement could not be evidenced.

The fact that the two farms can be seen as early adopters is explained by the fact that these two farms are among the farms showing good practices in terms of working conditions, with management willing to keep on improving. The two farms are certified by multiple standards, among them KFC Gold and Fair Trade (the latter only Tambuzi). The requirements of these certification standards can be seen as rival explanations that are necessary for creating the goodwill of the farm owners to join the project, but not sufficient for promoting the portal as a relevant tool to monitor and improve working conditions at the farm. The farm management and owners still need to be convinced of the benefits of the tool and the costs that come with it. The tool demands a lot of work and remains voluntary as it is not linked formally to a certification process. Currently the tool – and the data-collection process- was provided for free. There is no evidence that the two farm owners/management are actively promoting the tool. They do not mention the experience with the CSR

portal in their contacts with other farm managers/owners and they do not actively promote the tool. As such, they are still rather 'passive' Goodwill ambassadors.

### **Kakuzi case**

KHRC received complaints of Kakuzi (tea, avocado, ...) workers on labour rights violations, such as sexual harassment, victimization of trade union representatives, unattainable production targets, low wages because of the lack of meeting the targets. In July 2017, KHRC together with Ndula Resource centre, embarked on a fact-finding mission to document the causes and nature of the violations reported by the Kakuzi host community. The report of this mission was shared with RA, which certifies the farms' produce, but no action was taken. SOMO equally had been documenting the labour rights violations at Kakuzi farm. The pressure put on RA by SOMO and by KHRC led to the commissioning of an audit on the labour practices by RA in March 2018. Their findings disapproved the concerns raised by KHRC and Ndula Resource Centre. In April 2018, KHRC, Ndula resource centre and SOMO raised their concerns on their lack of confidence in the independence of the auditor. This led to RA commissioning another audit, which yielded similar results as the first one. KHRC, Ndula Resource centre and SOMO continued asking RA to commission an independent and unannounced audit to Kakuzi, July 2018. This audit confirmed the KHRC fact-finding report.

When RA withdrew its certification, Kakuzi farm management took some measures for improvement of working conditions and obtained a new RA certification in 2019, but violations of labour rights were still being reported to KHRC. KHRC approached ETI and shared documents with evidence, including e.g. medical records of 3 female workers who had suffered occupational accidents. ETI shared this evidence with its members who source produce from Kakuzi farm. This led to a new verification mission to Kakuzi, conducted by ETSA on July 2019. KHRC and Ndula resource centre have put ETSA in contact with workers and host communities that had suffered harm. ETSA wrote to Kakuzi asking them to provide a written response to the findings and to join the ETI in exploring the next steps to address the issues identified.

**Outcome:** On September 9, 2018, the Rainforest Alliance, through its certification body AfriCert, cancelled the certificate of Kakuzi PLC, for irregularities and on-compliance with the standards set under the AfriCert Code (AFRI-F-100-860). The cancellation has promoted the farm to urgently address the labour rights violations.

**Causal question:** Did continuous pressure of KHRC on RA regarding the violation of human rights at Kakuzi farm resulted in Kakuzi farm taking initiative to improve the working conditions?

<b>Explanatory mechanisms and factors</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
1) Fact-finding mission by KHRC and Ndula resource centre resulting in a report shared with RA (Primary explanation – low contribution)	- KHRC report describing violations of labour rights
2) Continuous pressure on RA by KHRC, SOMO and Ndula Resource Centre to commission an independent and unannounced audit at Kakuzi farm (Commingled explanation – High contribution)	- Email communications between KHRC, RA, Ndula Resource centre and SOMO (confidential)
3) UN working group on Business and HR convened a meeting with victims of HR violations at Kakuzi, in 2017, upon request of KHRC	- Info obtained during interview KHRC

(Commingled explanation – contribution could not be estimated)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- KHRC and Hivos' letters to the UN Working Group</li> <li>- Request of UN Working Group to KHRC and Hivos to assist in organising a visit to flowers works and to KHRC for having a workers meeting.</li> <li>- Report of the UN Working Group of the visit</li> </ul>
4) Kakuzi still violating HR, KHRC sharing evidence with ETI and demanding action, ETI sharing evidence with its members, who demand a new investigation (Primary explanation – meaningful contribution)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Email communication between KHRC and ETI</li> <li>- Letter developed by KHRC outlining violations in Kakuzi shared with ETI</li> <li>- Interview KHRC</li> </ul>

**Concluding statement on contribution to the harvested outcome:**

The evaluation concludes that the contribution of KHRC in putting pressure on Kakuzi farm was necessary but not sufficient. The role of KHRC was mainly the role of 'accelerator' and 'facilitator of meetings'. KHRC needed the support from SOMO to put pressure on the RA, who eventually withdraw the RA certification of Kakuzi farm. This did not result yet in Kakuzi farm taking sufficient remediating actions. New HR violations were still being reported. KHRC mobilised the support from ETI to continue putting pressure on Kakuzi farm. Kakuzi still continues violating labour rights and no solutions or negotiations with farm management have taken place so far.

**Social certification**

In the period 2005-2009, DfID and the EKN contributed to the funding of the Horticulture Ethical Business Initiative (HEBI), a multi-stakeholder group that agreed to develop a Code of Conduct for the flower sector. KFC and FTA participated in this initiative and have tested the first set of social indicators. In 2009 WRW continued to monitor the implementation of this Code of Conduct (shadow reporting of the auditing process). In the period 2012-2015, WRW received indirect funding from Hivos, via Women Working World-wide, for the implementation of sexual harassment workplace policies. In that period, HR managers and staff of KFC were trained by WRW on sexual harassment policies. Together with KFC a sector wide sexual harassment policy was developed by WRW. KFC was committed to revise its indicators and include indicators related to sexual harassment, to ensure that KFC members would adopt the policy and train the auditors. In 2014, FTA joined the initiative (because of pressure on FTA via ETI and Fair Trade International). In 2016, FTA was also committed to revise their indicators and started to train their auditors. In that period the second phase of the W@W campaign had started. Hivos East-Africa developed a strategy to promote a results-based social certification model for the horticultural sector in Kenya, in 2016. Through meetings, Hivos East Africa and WRW, canvassed this strategy with horticulture sector stakeholders, including Fairtrade Africa and Kenya Flower Council, with the aim of collaboratively develop a framework for meeting these aspirations.

**Outcome:** In December 2016, FTA and KFC have integrated social indicators with regard to gender protection and sexual harassment at the workplace in their certification indicators.

<b>Causal question:</b> Did the project of sexual harassment workplace policies, the training provided to FTA and KFC and round tables organised by Hivos East Africa contribute to FTA and KFC adopting their indicators?	
<b>Explanatory mechanisms and factors</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
1. Good relationships built between WRW, KFC and FTA (Contributing factor)	- Interviews WRW, KFC and FTA
2. The HEBI project opening up the dialogue in the sector on social indicators (rival explanation – high contribution)	- Interviews WRW, KFC and FTA - Pictures from the training involving FTA and KFC
3. Pressure from ETI and FT International on FTA (Rival explanation – contribution could not be estimated)	- Interview WRW - Not more evidence could be collected
4. Training provided by WRW (Primary explanation – high contribution)	- Training programme - Interviews WRW, KFC and FTA - Impact study report WRW
5. Round tables organised by Hivos and W@W partners on social certification; and Hivos and W@W partners invited by KFC/FTA to validate revised indicators (Primary explanation – contribution could not be estimated)	- Only interviews WRW and Hivos
<b>Concluding statement on contribution to the harvested outcome:</b> The evaluators were not able to collect sufficient evidence for these statements and rely mainly on the interview with WRW, and KFC. It is most likely that the W@W programme contributed highly in realising the integration of social indicators in the KFC standard and the FTA indicator list, though the W@W campaign was not the initiator of this process and other stakeholders also have put pressure on KFC and FTA. As such, the contribution of W@W was necessary but not sufficient. The contribution of the campaign, and in particular of WRW can be perceived as ‘triggering’ KFC and FTA, by drawing attention to the need to develop sexual harassment workplace policies and providing technical support through training of staff and development of model workplace policies.	

### 3.2. Changes in agendas, policies and practices of government

The baseline study (2016) described that Kenya has good policies and regulatory frameworks (like the constitution of Kenya (2010), The Employment Act (2007) in place to adequately address the welfare of women workers, however, not all laws are being enforced. The government lacks capacity to monitor policy implementation, because of understaffing of the ministries, lack of financial resources, weak inter-ministerial cooperation, resulting in enterprises capitalizing on the lack of government pro-activeness.<sup>7</sup> With regard to sexual harassment workplace policies, the Employment Act requires employers to establish sexual harassment workplace policies however, no specific or practical guidance is provided on the threshold frameworks that employers should establish for effective safeguarding of workers.<sup>8</sup> Furthermore, the government, through the Ministry of labour, had launched an initiative to regulate the floriculture sector, in partnership with the Kenya flower Council, though the baseline study pointed out that these initiatives were limited in their gender analysis.

Within this policy context, the W@W campaign in Kenya focused on advocating for effective policy implementation, with a focus on advocating the horticulture farms and enhancing human rights compliance in the horticulture sector. A combination of dialogue and dissent approaches was applied (see in the above). Advocacy towards the Kenyan government was mainly conducted by KHRC and Hivos and concerned following interventions: (i) KHRC contributing to the strengthening of the Horticulture Crops Directorate, (ii) KHRC participating in the national steering group to develop the NAP on Business and Human Rights and (iii) KHRC and Hivos contributing to the working group on gender of the UN Working group on Business and Human Rights. AWCFS also contributed to advocating government, supporting investigative journalism resulting in critical articles in national newspapers and bringing stories in radio shows, demanding reactions from policy makers.

**Horticulture Crops Directorate (HCD):** within the Result Based Social Certification project, KHRC also engaged with the HCD, the government institution that is responsible for giving licenses to growers and developing national standards (licenses are a prerequisite for export). HCD invited KHRC and Hivos to review the HCD KS 1758 standard, which regulates the horticulture sector but was only focusing on technical issues, to include more attention to labour rights and include social indicators (e.g. protective clothing, application of labour laws, medical care, use of chemical sprayers). The revised standard will become operational from June 2020 onwards. Furthermore, HCD invited KHRC to participate in their working group compliance and conformity, to train and accompany their officers on labour rights and to conduct shadow reporting during side visits. The relationship between KHRC and HCD was established during a previous three-year Kenya horticulture project on enhancing the rights of smallholder producers of French beans.

**Development of the NAP on Business and Human Rights:** In 2011, the Human Rights Council member states adopted the UNGPs. KHRC had participated in a side event on the development of

---

<sup>7</sup> Okore, M. (June 2016) Decent Work for Women Programme, Kenya Baseline Study report.

<sup>8</sup> Haki Mashinani (September 2019) Late Blossoms! Time to move beyond policy statements to a safeguarding culture. A baseline study on the implementation of the model sexual harassment policy on the cut flower sector of Kenya – experiences, lessons and the business case.



National Action Plans, during the conference of the UN working group on Business and Human Rights Forum in 2014. In February 2015, KHRC requested for a meeting with the Department of Justice to discuss the need for the government to embark on the process of developing a National Action Plan on Business and Human Rights, following a recommendation by the UN Human Rights Council to Kenya during the Universal Peer Review in 2014. In this meeting, KHRC presented the Concept Paper on the need for a NAP in Kenya to the Department of Justice. In 2016, the Kenyan government started to develop the National Action Plan.

In March 2016, KHRC in partnership with the Danish Institute of Human Rights conducted a National Baseline Assessment to inform and guide the development of the NAP. The NBA is a methodology for analysing the legal, policy, and regulatory framework of the State of Kenya with the intention of identifying gaps in law, policy and initiatives by the State to prevent negative human rights impacts by companies. In the same period KHRC developed the 'Kenya Country Guide on Business and Human Rights' to provide guidance geared towards supporting companies to respect human rights in the course of their business/activities. In 2016 a public announcement was made by the Kenyan government on their commitment to start developing the NAP and invited stakeholders from the private and public sector and the civil society to participate in this process. KHRC is participating in the labour and governance thematic group of the national steering committee that is responsible for the development of the NAP.

No contribution analysis could be done as it was not possible for the evaluators to have interviews with the president of the thematic working group or other members of this working group to collect evidence on the contribution of KHRC and Hivos to this process. Based on the interviews with KHRC, it can be assumed that KHRC played the role of 'trigger', accelerating the start of the development process of the NAP and further took up a supportive role in providing technical advice.

**International level:** Hivos and KHRC (and other W@W partners such as FIDA Uganda) have been actively engaging with the UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights. In November 2017, KHRC and Hivos participated and shaped the discussions during the first consultations on applying a gender lens to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights, a side event during the conference. Hivos had presented a concept note on the subject. The subject gained importance and Hivos was asked to moderate the discussion. In 2018, KHRC and Hivos in partnership with the UNWG, the Centre for Applied Legal Studies, African Coalition for Corporate Accountability (ACCA) and the Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights (Kenya office) led in convening the Africa Gender Consultation on the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights. The Consultation was convened in Nairobi, Kenya on 12th October 2018. KHRC, Hivos and FIDA-Uganda submitted a concept note on 'Strengthening Gender Focus through National Action Plans on Business and Human Rights' to the secretariat of the UN Forum on Business and Human Rights. The submission of the concept culminated to an invitation by the UN Working group to Hivos and KHRC to lead in the convening of a Gender Café on 'women experiences of accessing effective remedies and defending rights' during the Gender Roundtable at the UN Forum in November 2018. In December 2018, the UN Working Group invited the KHRC and Hivos to participate in a technical meeting on the development of a Guidance on Applying a gender lens to the UN guiding principles

on Business and Human Rights, which was convened in Geneva on January 31 and February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019. (see further on contribution analysis)

Furthermore, Hivos and partners are active in international advocacy spaces, like Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) and the African Regional Forum on Sustainable development (focus on SDG 8), through active participation in side events. Hivos and partners also conducted international and national lobby campaigns through different lobby platforms and mediums targeting the government, trade unions and employer associations seeking adoption of the ILO convention 190 on Ending violence and harassment in the world of work as well as through a joint online media campaign rolled out between May 17<sup>th</sup> and June 22<sup>nd</sup> 2019. In particularly FEMNET engaged in this process through an online petition, official letters and policy brief sent to the minister of labour in Kenya; Hivos authored an article on the topics.

### Contribution analysis

For one of the harvested outcomes, a contribution analysis was done, though not much evidence could be collected (lack of interviews with external stakeholders). As such, no rival explanations could be identified. The case however is presented here as it is a good example of linking national and international L&A.

<b>Lobbying the UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights (UNWGBHR)</b>	
In the period 2017-2019, Hivos and KHRC have been pro-actively engaging with the UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights on putting a gender lens on the UN Guiding Principles on BHR. Hivos and KHRC succeeded to put the topic on the agenda and were invited to facilitate events during the conferences of the UNWGBHR. Hivos and KHRC were the first actors that could bring a UN mission to Kenya to assess the situation in the horticulture farms. This resulted in a statement profiling the situation of women workers in the horticulture farms in Kenya and the organisation of an African consultation on the UN Guiding Principle on Business and Human Rights in Kenya. The consultation provided the Africa context and positions, which feed into the development of the Guidance on applying a gender lens to UNGPBHR.	
<b>Outcome:</b> <i>UN Working group on Business and Human Rights adopting a gender lens to the UN guiding principles on Business and Human Rights, 2018-2019 (KHRC)</i>	
<b>Causal question:</b> Did the engagement of Hivos and KHRC with the UN WG BHR had an influence on getting gender higher on the agenda of the working group and influence the policy development process to realise a gender lens in the UN guiding principles on Business and Human Rights?	
<b>Explanatory mechanisms and factors</b>	<b>Evidence</b>
Hivos concept paper presented for the UN WG BHR conference of 2017 putting gender on the agenda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interviews KHRC and Hivos</li> <li>- Concept note for Africa Consultations</li> <li>- Report by the UNWGBHR on summary of discussions of the Africa Gender Consultation on the gender Lens to the UNGPBHR</li> </ul>
Hivos and KHRC presenting submissions on the violation of labour rights in horticulture sector, and request that affected areas would be visited by the UN delegation (May 2018)	
Preparatory meeting with Kenya National Commission on Human Rights and United Nations Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights, to prepare for the UN WG visit to Kenya (June 21, 2018)	

UN WG organising an African consultation, visiting Kenya, support provided by Hivos and KHRC to horticulture sector, resulting in a statement profiling the situation of women workers in horticulture (July 2018)	
Africa Gender Consultation on the UN GP BH, in Nairobi, October 12, 2018 on applying a gender lens on the UNGPBHR	
Hivos, KHRC and FIDA Uganda submitted concept note to the secretariat of the UN Forum on BHR, resulting in the invitation to lead the gender café during the Gender Roundtable at the UN forum November 2018	
Hivos and KHRC invited to participate in a technical meeting on the development of Guidance on Applying a Gender Lens to UNGPBHR (December 20, 2018), a meeting that was convened Jan 31 and Febr 1 2019	-
<b>Concluding statement on contribution to the harvested outcome:</b> The evaluators were not able to collect sufficient evidence for these statements and rely mainly on the interview with Hivos and KHRC and the documentation of the lobby process. It is most likely that the W@W programme contributed highly in realising the results. Hivos and KHRC have put gender on the agenda of the working group (trigger) and conducted formal and informal lobby activities towards the members of the UNWGBHR (could not be validated). HIVOS and KHRC also provided technical support in the organisation of the African consultation, in collaboration with other organisations and in the facilitation of sessions at the working group in Geneva. The contribution is assessed as necessary and sufficient in obtaining the claimed outcome.	

### 3.3. Women empowerment

One of the outcome domains from the ToC relates to women empowerment with the aim of strengthening women to enable them to strive and defend their rights. W@W partners contribute to this domain by enhancing women's leadership, increasing participation in decision making and by making gender committees more effective. In the East Africa region this is operationalised through the Women Leadership programme (FEMNET) and the Workplace Policies Project (WRW, Haki Mashinani). Also, FIDA-Kenya has contributed to this by training women on their labour rights and training of para-legals. In total 21 farms have been reached through the W@W campaign and a total of 198 women (98 workers, 50 trainers through a ToT and 80 women leaders) were trained by FIDA and FEMNET, in partnership with Haki Mashinani and WRW. There are not many outcome data available on the changes at the level of the gender committees and of the leadership programme. FEMNET states having recorded behavioural changes for both women and men trained on Women's Leadership. Trained workers' representatives and supervisors have reported attitudinal and behavioural changes through learning, unlearning and relearning leadership and power, gender and sexuality, patriarchy and feminism, emotional intelligence, gender equality, gender stereotypes, gender roles and financial literacy among other leadership components.

**More effective gender committees:** This has received a bigger focus during the previous phase of the W@W campaign. The gender committees are essential in the flower farms since they play the role of addressing and investigating all women abuses at the workplace (and their presence at farm level is required by law). WRW, who was involved in the first phase of the W@W campaign, included in their training of the gender committees (focus on sexual harassment) also attention to the formation and functioning of these gender committees (In 2015, HR managers from 130 flower farms and 250 gender committees have been trained by WRW, in collaboration with KFC).<sup>9</sup> Attention was paid to having well-defined election systems at the farms that ensure fair representation of all workers. Additionally, workers were trained to communicate efficiently the specific needs of their respective groups to the management. There are no monitoring data available on the functioning of these gender committees. Furthermore, during the first phase, 7 farms were engaged in a pilot project, with WRW providing on-site training and support in the development of Sexual Harassment Workplace Policies. In the second phase of W@W, partners continued providing training and support at an additional number of 10 farms. In the second phase, also Haki Mashinani provided training to members of these gender committees, and representatives of the gender committees were included in the Female Leadership programme. In 2019 only, 2484 women workers and managers were trained on sexual harassment a, and mentored on leadership aspects. Apart from the interventions of WRW, most trainings were organised off-farm as partners faced difficulties in accessing the farms, reaching out to a representatives of gender committees and shop stewards. WRW also supported farm management in developing and implementing sexual harassment workplace policies (see 3.1.), FEMNET collaborated with AMwA to develop a model gender policy to aid the farm management in instituting, revising and implementing gender policies<sup>10</sup> (3 farms supported).

At the farms visited, farm management and owners testified that the gender committees had been rather passive in the past and as such welcomed very much the training provided by W@W campaign. Gender committees visited in four farms during the evaluation showed a lot of dynamism, records demonstrated that they meet regularly (quarterly and more when needed), women had a good understanding of the sexual harassment workplace policies and of their duties and responsibilities. The gender committees seem to be mainly active in raising awareness of co-workers (and the community) on sexual harassment and gender issues in general, and in handling cases of sexual harassment. They have an important role in the complaint procedure as the committees receive and investigate the complaints and try to mediate the conflict, before the complaint-if not resolved - is shared with the HR manager. Older gender committees (Maher, Tropiflora, Tambuzi farms) appeared more active than the newly established one (Equinox farm). In the four farms visited sexual harassment policies and gender policies existed, were displayed to the workers and known by the workers interviewed.

The baseline study conducted by Haki Mashinani in September 2019 (see also section 3.1.) already provided evidence of the added value and effectiveness of the hands-on training and accompaniment of the gender committees as provided by the W@W campaign, shown by the difference in dynamism

---

<sup>9</sup> Lwanergy Infiniti Media (2019) Impact Report. Women's Freedom to Work: Unmasking Sexual Harassment at Workplace. April 2012-July 2019

<sup>10</sup> These policies include Equal Pay for Equal Work, Minimum wage, Hours of work, leave and holidays, Sexual Harassment, Fair treatment and Protection of workers

and knowledge between gender committees of the project farms and non-project farms. As the W@W campaign only reached out to a limited number of farms, up-scaling is the challenge. The study formulated a set of relevant recommendations for upscaling the project results: (i) *Improving legislation and policy implementation*: lobbying for the ratification of ILO convention 190 and recommendation 206 (elimination of violence and harassment in the world of work) and lobbying the NAP on Business and Human Rights to include social impacts, lobbying the government to develop specific actions for policy implementation of gender related laws and policies; (ii) *Role of certification bodies*: promote result based social certification; (iii) *Commitment from business actors*: develop a business case for progressive social performance and the need for a concerted value chain ambition and collaboration at sector level; and (iv) development of holistic safeguarding frameworks to promote a culture of protection for workers from harassment. W@W partners and Hivos are implementing interventions regarding the lobby of government and certification bodies. A concrete upscaling strategy on how to realise that all horticulture farms install holistic safeguarding frameworks (that go beyond the development of sexual harassment workplace policies) was not yet developed.

**Women's Leadership programme:** Complementary to trainings provided by WRW, Haki Mashinani and FIDA Kenya, a specific women's leadership training programme was implemented. The women's leadership programme was not specifically evaluated during the Kenya visit. Anecdotic evidence of the results of the programme was provided during the inception workshop and FGD with 4 gender committees, such as women gaining more self-confidence, enhanced knowledge on their rights and able to set personal goals. One of the outcomes harvested by FEMNET is illustrative of the outcomes of the programme (see box). The outcome documented at Equinox farm could be validated during the evaluation visit.

#### **Female leadership**

Between January and May 2018, Ms Queen Peters a woman leader at KHE (Kenya Horticultural Exporters) farm and Ms Purity Kahungura the chairperson of the Gender Committee at Equinox farm in Kenya talked to their supervisors to assign both women and men workers irrigation and scouting roles, which were previously assigned to men only. The outcome is important because it is an example of women horticulture workers speaking out against discrimination and in favour of equal treatment of women and men on the farm. The Equinox example was confirmed during the evaluation visit to Equinox.

The two women leaders participated in a FEMNET Training of Trainers in Uganda and Kenya, in October and November 2017, respectively. This training brought together 32 women and 15 men farm workers who are leading in various committees and unions in 14 different farms in Uganda and Kenya. These farms include: Four farms in Uganda (UgaRose, Royal van Zante, RoseBud and Fiduga) and ten farms in Kenya (Kenya Horticultural Exporters Ontilili Farm, Tambuzi, Equinox, Nini farm, Karuturi, Flamingo, Van den Berg, Wildfire, Kingfisher and Florensis).

The women's leadership programme is implemented through a Training of Trainers approach. So far, the ToTs are reported to have trained 98 workers. Women leaders trained are required to transfer the acquired knowledge and competencies to their co-workers. This was based on a mutual agreement and take-aways from the trainings, where the trained leaders felt empowered to cascade the information to the rest of the workers. The active monitoring would then take place after Stawisha, an intensive training of women leaders who would then be equipped with technical support and

facilitated to roll out the knowledge to the rest of the workers the extent to which this is effectively happening yet, and the results, are not monitored. This transfer of content of the ToT appeared to be rather limited in the gender committees interviewed, but further research to that end is needed.

### ***Changes at the level of women workers***

The following is based on four focus group discussions organised during the evaluation visit, which give indications of the effect of the interventions on women and of the possibilities and constraints of citizen agency in this context, and on the results from the studies done by WRW and Haki Mashinani on the status of the protection from sexual harassment in the Kenyan cut-flower sector (respectively 2018 and 2019).

The women's leadership programme addresses different dimensions of power<sup>11</sup> and strengthens women's leadership at the personal level. Women interviewed testified how they had grown on personal level, e.g. as voiced by a member of the gender committee at Mahee farm *"I know now what my rights are, and I have learned to set my personal goals in life."* WRW adopts a group approach, entering the farm and giving training to the larger groups of workers, including management and/or members of the gender committees. Participants acquire more knowledge about sexual harassment, learn to set their boundaries (power to) and learn how to organise themselves to handle complaints of sexual harassment (power with). Testimonies from the WRW Impact study (2019) like the following *"WRW challenged my approach to life and exposed my leadership potential. I have been able to apply the skills and knowledge to empower myself and advance my family. WRW emancipated and enhanced capacities of women and even male workers enabling them to be free. It rejuvenated the spirit of confidence and self-reliance, which had initially been lost"* were also identified during the evaluation visit.

FGD at the farms visited demonstrated the ability of workers to raise their voice, not only in addressing cases of sexual harassment but also in negotiating for better working conditions. Examples were given of successful negotiations regarding wage increase (Tropiflora Ltd), decreasing overtime and obtaining proper sanitation (Mahee and Tambuzi farms), obtaining separate bathrooms for men and women, sanitary pads and a day care centre (Equinox farm). These kinds of results are more visible at farms where there is a good bargaining environment. According to the W@W partners, the farms visited have evolved a lot over the years, and can be seen as 'frontrunners'. This is not the situation in all flower farms, as demonstrated by the labour rights violation claims that are identified and being addressed by KHRC and FIDA Kenya. A 'quick and dirty' analysis shows that there are several variables that have an influence on the bargaining environment, like the presence of a CBA at the farm, openness and commitment of farm management and owner, the strength of the gender committee and dynamism of other farm committees like the welfare committee, if existing, the presence of active trade union delegation, etc. It must also be stated that W@W partners are not

---

<sup>11</sup> **Power with:** includes the ability to take decisions, participate in decision making, to influence decision making or control persons that take decision on behalf of someone else. Another element is the possibility to organise in order to influence decision making. Mosedale refers in this respect to 'collective action, recognizing that more can be achieved by a group acting together than by individuals alone. **Power to** refers to enhanced practical knowledge and/or skills, including leadership skills, and the ability to analyse and reason as well as the ability to convert such knowledge and skills into concrete action or means. Based on Kabeer (2005) and Mosedale (2005) as cited in: IOB (April 2015) Evaluation of the MDG3 Fund. The Netherlands: Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

the only training providers of workers. In the farms visited, workers also had been trained by other NGOs, trade union, Fair Trade Africa, the Agricultural Employers Association, or by farm management themselves. Addressing sexual harassment however, is mainly targeted by W@W partners.

The studies of WRW and Haki Mashinani show that in the targeted farms there is a reduced number of cases of sexual harassment (not proven by hard data but based on testimonies)<sup>12</sup> but that there are still significant gaps in knowledge, skills, competencies and practices that need to be tackled. The baseline study conducted by Haki Mashinani concluded that across the pilot- and non-piloted farms, there is a low rate of reporting incidents of sexual harassment at the workplace, which proves that safeguarding systems at the workplace have been faulted for lacking sufficient mechanisms for protecting victims and survivors, whistle-blowers and witnesses. The requisite confidentiality is not always guaranteed. Social norms and cultural positions that normalise sexual harassment in the community and the vulnerable socio-economic position of women also spur violations and the culture of impunity. The various power dimensions are summarised in following table.

<b>Power Dimension</b>	<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Observations</b>
'Power within'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Self-confidence,</li> <li>- Self-image,</li> <li>- Ability to make choices concerning one's future</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Self-confidence and self-image improved as testified by participants of the female leadership programme and women trained by WRW.</li> </ul>
'Power to'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Economic power,</li> <li>- Access to and control over income, land, means, transport, etc.</li> <li>- Knowledge and leadership skills</li> <li>- Ability to convert knowledge and skills into concrete actions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enhanced knowledge in labour rights and sexual harassment among members of the gender committee trained by W@W partners</li> <li>- Multiple dimensions of leadership addressed in the training</li> <li>- Ability to use improved negotiation skills depending on bargaining environment</li> <li>- KPAWU branch officers testifying that workers show interest in becoming engaged within the trade union after the trainings provided by W@W partners and FIDA Kenya</li> </ul>
'Power with'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Social and political power,</li> <li>- Ability to decide for one self or for someone else and to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strong gender committees in targeted farms, able to participate in decision making</li> </ul>

<sup>12</sup> During farm visits, WRW documents rigorously what cases were resolved successfully and what cases not (applying a Sexual harassment Self-Audit Checklist).

	participate in decision making - Ability to organise in order to influence decision making and collective action	- Ability to organise and to influence decision making was seen in the four farms visited
--	---	---

### 3.4. Changes in the L&A capacities of participating organisations

One of the objectives of the DW4W programme is to support strengthening lobbying and advocacy capacities of the participating partners. This strengthening often takes place “by doing”, followed by reflection time through partners meetings (national and international) where peer-to-peer learning was facilitated. In some occasions specific capacity development activities have taken place, like training and mentorship. Attending (international) events is also considered as a learning opportunity to interact with high-level advocacy targets and to learn from others. Capacity development needs were identified through capacity self-assessment exercises conducted by the partners (initially inspired by the 5C model but later on dropped as considered to be too conceptual and not user friendly). Based on these assessments, priority needs were identified. Evolutions in L&A capacity were monitored bi-annually based on a self-assessment form, describing what capacities for L&A had been strengthened and what challenges remain, and further discussed in a dialogue between the partner and Hivos.

From the interviews with the implementing partners, it can be learned that capacity development mainly took place through ‘learning by doing’ and through the participation in the national and international partner meetings, where capacity development sessions were part of the agenda. During the workshop and interviews organised during the evaluation, partners did not remember having completed any capacity assessment form, though there exist monitoring reports on changes in L&A capacity for each of the partners. It might be possible that this monitoring is seen as an administrative requirement by the partners and part of project management, and not as a tool to give shape to endogenous capacity development processes.

During the inception workshop and the visits to the partners, a number of evolutions in L&A capacity could be identified. Following table summarizes these evolutions, applying the 5C framework.<sup>13</sup> In italic, evolutions in L&A capacity are added that were described in the Hivos capacity development monitoring- format, but not explicitly mentioned during the workshop or visits.

Capability to act and commit	- Leadership structure – succession plan (FIDA) - <i>Putting more focus on women workers and decent work (Haki Mashinani)</i>
------------------------------	--

<sup>13</sup> The 5C model is not always an appropriate tool for capacity needs assessments, but can nevertheless be used as a tool for analysis and reporting.



Capability to deliver on campaign objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How to carry out a social media campaign + targeted messaging (FIDA)</li> <li>- Expand our knowledge base in regards to issues affecting women in the flower industry (AWCFS)</li> <li>- Learnt new ways to conduct M&amp;E (Haki Mashinani)</li> <li>- M&amp;E – Outcome harvest (KHRC)</li> <li>- Policy advocacy that safeguard women workers (WRW)</li> <li>- Enhanced expertise and tools for social impact assessments for floriculture, better understanding and measurement of social indicators (Ufadhili)</li> <li>- Media engagement (WRW)</li> <li>- Empower women (WRW)</li> <li>- Digital platform – influence (FEMNET)</li> <li>- M&amp;E outcome harvest (FEMNET)</li> <li>- Communication skills – social media (KHRC)</li> <li>- <i>Identifying issues that require L&amp;A and conduct evidence-based lobbying and advocacy (Haki Mashinani)</i></li> <li>- <i>Understanding the horticultural value chains (FEMNET)</i></li> <li>- <i>Appropriate messaging and framing of issues affecting women (AWCFS)</i></li> <li>- <i>Conduct research on advocacy issues and engaging constituencies in discussing findings of research (WRW)</i></li> <li>- <i>Understanding of international frameworks that can be used for national L&amp;A (WRW)</i></li> <li>- <i>Increased use of social media (Ufadhili)</i></li> <li>- <i>Knowledge on conducting a stakeholder mapping (FIDA Kenya)</i></li> </ul>
Capability to relate to external stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Co-creation with partners (FIDA)</li> <li>- Dialogue with communities and partners (AWCFS)</li> <li>- Network and relate, so to have access to farms (AWCFS)</li> <li>- Collaboration (Haki Mashinani)</li> <li>- Ability to engage (Haki Mashinani)</li> <li>- Build trust and partnership, relationships and dialogue (WRW)</li> <li>- Collaboration and partnership, networking (Ufadhili)</li> <li>- Expand network (FEMNET)</li> <li>- Partnership and networking (FIC)</li> <li>- Networking &amp; collaboration (KHRC)</li> <li>- <i>Awareness of platforms and strategies for engaging in regional and international advocacy (WRW)</i></li> <li>- <i>Applying the Utafiti Sera Model (KHRC, AWCFS)</i></li> </ul>
Capability to adapt and self-renew	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Outcome harvesting (FIDA)</li> <li>- Cross-sector learning (FIDA)</li> <li>- Baseline research (HM)</li> <li>- Research (WRW)</li> <li>- Knowledge and learning (FIC)</li> <li>- M&amp;E – reporting tools, risk analysis (FIC)</li> <li>- Evidence based decision making – research (FIC)</li> <li>- <i>Use investigative stories to monitor and report on human and labour rights (AWCFS)</i></li> </ul>

	- <i>Monitoring legislation and potential impact on campaign issues (WRW)</i>
Capability to balance diversity and achieve coherence	- Aligned Vision and strategy (HM)

Like in many other capacity development programmes, evolutions are mainly obtained in relation to three capabilities, (i) to deliver, (ii) to relate and (iii) to adapt and self-renew. Changes are mainly situated at the level of individual acquired knowledge, competencies and capabilities and not at the level of (organisational) capacity.<sup>14</sup>

- Capability to deliver on campaign objectives:
  - o Increased knowledge on the horticulture sector, Corporate social responsibility and social impact measurement and on international frameworks that can be used to strengthen national level L&A
  - o Enhanced skills and competencies with regard to lobbying government policies (like stakeholder analysis, targeted messaging), M&E of advocacy and lobby
  - o Enhanced capability for social media campaigning and evidence-based lobby (involving constituencies).
- Capability to relate:
  - o Increased knowledge on international advocacy fora and on the importance of engaging in multi-stakeholder dialogues (called 'Utafiti Sera')
  - o Enhanced capability with regards to networking, collaboration, co-creation, building relationships of trust, mainly between the W@W partners; and the ability to gain access to commercial farms.
- Capability to adapt and self-renew:
  - o Enhanced competencies regarding outcome harvesting, monitoring policy changes and impact of campaigning
  - o Increased capability to conduct research

It is observed that these evolutions do not always result in enhanced L&A capacity at organisational level. Focus was put on enhancing knowledge and competencies of individual staff members, and to a certain extent on institutional development (enhancing linkages of organisations with government actors and international lobby fora). In some cases, also organisational development support was provided, such as, e.g. the development of a strategic plan for WRW, or the provision of laptops. In some cases, financial management needed to be enhanced, like the case of WRW in Kenya (also hampering WRW's access to direct funding of Hivos).<sup>15</sup> It was a deliberate choice of Hivos to not

<sup>14</sup> Capacity is referred to as the overall ability of an organisation or system to create value for others. Capabilities are the collective ability of a group or a system to do something either inside or outside the system. The collective skills involved may be technical, logistical, managerial or generative (i.e. the ability to earn legitimacy, to adapt, to create meaning, etc). Competencies are the energies, skills and abilities of individuals

<sup>15</sup> Action plan was developed to strengthen this aspects by learning from a stronger organisation on the same (KHRC) for a period of 1 year, to a level that the grantee could receive direct funding (2016 – 2017). The role of KHRC in this was to support strengthening financial management systems and structures including policies; and in supporting strengthening project management including concept development etc.

invest in organisational development processes,<sup>16</sup> although organisational factors can have an influence on the extent individuals can apply acquired knowledge and competencies in their daily practice and the extent knowledge and skills can be transferred to the organisational level. During the capacity assessments several organisations challenges were identified, such as staff turn-over, governance issues, weak management structures, weak prioritisation of activities, fragile financial situation and institutional sustainability, etc. Organisational challenges and staff turn-over have had a negative impact on the implementation of the specific W@W projects.

Partners are very positive about the capacity development support provided by the programme, particularly on the quality of the trainings and the international partner meetings and the fact that the capacity development support was demand driven. Partners mainly regret the lack of support to organisational development processes. Reference is given to the need for strengthening financial management, resource mobilisation and fundraising strategies, strategic planning, project management, etc. The training on outcome harvesting, as a monitoring tool, was highly appreciated and the methodology is being integrated in other projects within several partners, such as at AWCFS, KHRC and FIDA Kenya.

### 3.5. Conclusion

Following table summarises the results obtained by the W@W campaign in Kenya.

Level of Impact	high			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Individual (and group) litigation cases successfully solved (or in process)</li> <li>RA cancelling certification Kakuzi farm</li> </ul>
	moderate		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NAP Kenya developed</li> <li>Labour issues added to HCD standard 1758</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gender committees strengthened to report on cases of SH</li> <li>KFC – FTA adopting social indicators in their certification standards</li> </ul>
	low			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flower farms ambassadors CSR portal</li> <li>Gender sensitive business and HR principles endorsed by UN working group</li> </ul>
		Low	moderate	high
Level of Contribution				

The DW4W programme has been highly effective in realising the planned project outputs in the different outcome domains, and important changes were obtained at the level of commercial farms, sector actors and women workers. The table above shows the link between the level of contribution

<sup>16</sup> The Strategic Partnership framework was not very clear on whether or not focus could be on organisational capacity development support processes. From interviews it is learned that at the start of the strategic partnership, focus had to be on L&A competencies. Later on, the MFA agreed that strengthening L&A competencies could also involve a more broader perspective on organisational capacity development support.

of the programme and the level of impact, i.e. improvement in working conditions of women workers.

The strongest results in terms of effective improvement of working conditions have been obtained through the individual or group litigations, handled by KHRC (but less visible but most probably also obtained through the (alternative) conflict mediation and legal support provided by Haki Mashinani and FIDA Kenya). These results evidently make a huge difference for the workers at stake, but contribute less to sector reform. There was no proof of a leverage effect of these litigation cases in obtaining commitment or changed attitudes from other horticulture farms. Moreover, a connotation of W@W partners with KHRC could result in a refusal of collaboration from commercial farms.

Also, strong results have been obtained in supporting farm management in developing sexual harassment workplace policies and strengthening gender committees in addressing sexual harassment at the workplace. This resulted in an evolution in knowledge and awareness on sexual harassment among women workers and farm management, the installation of complaint mechanisms and reduced number of sexual harassment cases in the targeted farms. However, in as much progress has been made so far in a limited number of farms, more efforts are needed to install holistic safeguarding frameworks, including prevention measures. Although several CSOs, trade unions and farm management are also providing training to workers, W@W partners excellent in their explicit focus on women workers and their hands-on approach and accompaniment of the gender committees, complemented by the female leadership training. The contribution to this outcome is assessed as high. An upscaling strategy is needed, in depth and breadth. Elements of an upscaling strategy have been taken forward by the campaign partners, through the L&A interventions on the NAP on Business and Human Rights and the collaboration with national and international certification bodies.

Hivos, KHRC and WRW have been successfully advocating the Kenyan Flower Council, Fair Trade Africa, the Horticulture Crops Directorate and the national steering group that is responsible for developing the NAP, to include social indicators (incl. labour rights and attention for women workers rights) in their regulatory frameworks. The changes obtained at the level of KFC and FTA were assessed as being a direct result of the W@W campaign interventions (high contribution). The changes obtained at government level (NAP, HCD) were a result of the contribution of several actors, with a meaningful contribution of KHRC, in terms of technical support. The impact of these changes is assessed to be moderate. There are several challenges in implementation of these different standards and regulatory frameworks, not at least because of the limited financial and human resources of these institutions (HCD, labour inspection, KFC) to monitor implementation but also because of bottlenecks in the auditing process (KFC, FTA). The latter justifies the implementation of the Result Based Social Certification project, which has not delivered yet on the desired outcome.

The CSR-Africa portal was piloted in Kenya in 9 farms, although with considerable delays. The portal is helpful for horticulture farms who are interested to know the effect of their workplace policies and practices on the working conditions of their workers. Mainly ‘soft’ themes that result from the scan are taken forward (e.g. investing in training on sexual harassment) but to a much lesser extent or not the ‘hard’ themes such as wage. There are still several challenges in upscaling the portal.

Piloted farms have not seen yet the benefits of the portal in the extent that they are motivated to promote actively the portal.

A good case is presented on linking national and international level L&A, in the outcome of the UN working group on business and human rights to include gender sensitive indicators in their guiding principles. Apart from other actors, W@W campaign partners contributed highly by triggering the debate and providing evidence and technical support. The contribution to the desired impact is low as there still is a long way to go towards national governments translating these gender sensitive principles in their NAP. In Kenya, KHRC, being a member of the national steering group that is developing the NAP, is in the position to monitor such integration.

The W@W campaign has also contributed to strengthening knowledge, competencies and capabilities of staff of the implementing partners in conducting L&A interventions in the horticulture sector. This has not always resulted in enhanced L&A capacity at organisational level.

## 4. RELEVANCE

---

In line with the ToR, relevance is understood to be about the importance of the observed changes (i.e. their significance for longer term changes), in the context in which the program is operating, and in comparison, to the situation described in the baseline study. During inception phase, three criteria were identified to assess relevance, which are elaborated in this chapter: (1) relevance of the changes and programme's responsiveness to evolutions in the context, (2) relevance of the applied L&A strategies and (3) relevance of applied strategies for strengthening capacities of CSOs and in supporting women workers to act as key agents of change (civic agency).

### 4.1. **Relevance of the changes, compared to the baseline study, and programmes' responsiveness to evolutions in the context**

#### *Baseline study*

The baseline study conducted in 2016 was informative for setting the scene, presenting a general description of the economic importance of the horticulture sector, the situation of women workers and type of workers' rights violations, as such justifying the importance of a Decent Work for Women programme. The study gave relevant indications of type of organisations that could be involved in the programme. The study highlighted that the policy process of improving the situation of women workers is on-going, pointing out to existing policies and regulatory frameworks and the discussions the government was undertaking with the KFC and the Agriculture Employers Association (AEA) with a view of regulating the floriculture sector. It was noted that these initiatives were well intended but limited in their gender analyses.

The baseline study did not pay attention to the achievements and on-going discussions that had started under the first phase of the W@W campaign (2011-2015), from which lessons could have been drawn, nor did the study include the results of the baseline study conducted in 2012 by WRW (and their experiences) on the prevalence of sexual harassment at the workplace. Sexual harassment is only mentioned twice in the baseline study report (but does not come with an analysis). The baseline study lacks a political-economy analysis (PEA) to enable the Hivos team to identify where the ‘traction’ is for specific government or business-oriented lobby trajectories. Some interviewees acknowledged that several opportunities were missed to lobby the national government and seize specific moments or opportunities, especially in the first years of the programme. Furthermore, taking into account that the W@W campaign had a component related to engaging with certification standards and organisations, it is surprising that this topic is not elaborated in the baseline study.

The baseline study also faced challenges in collecting primary data, confronted with the difficulties of having access to farms (a challenge that was also experienced by the implementing partners) and the lack of gender-disaggregated official data from e.g. The Kenya Bureau of Statistics. The baseline study was useful in justifying the need for a decent work for women programme, but less useful for comparing obtained results, as the level of analysis remained general and hard data are lacking. However, the evaluators can conclude, based on the studies conducted during the programme<sup>17</sup> that it is clear that the need for a decent work for women programme still is justified. Moreover, these studies provide more evidence on the real situation at farm level and point out to the lack of policy implementation. The studies come with relevant recommendations, that are relevant for a next phase of the W@W campaign.

It is not fully clear to what extent the baseline study had been guiding in further developing the Kenya W@W campaign. It seems that the general ToC has been dominant in making strategic choices. The overall ToC was not translated into a country ToC. The TOC was presented in each annual partners’ meeting, to track of achievements under each of the domains of change and to discuss challenges in progress. These discussions contributed to annual review and revisions on aspects of the TOC between 2016 – 2019. Based on these ToC revisions, new project needs were identified such as strengthening the capacities of union for quicker realisation of decent work. The reports of these partner meetings do not show to what extent intermediary steps or milestones towards the envisaged changes with regard to the different domains of change were made explicit and the strategic discussion thereof (with regard to women leadership, improved laws and policies, improved business, improved certification), which complicates monitoring thereof, the search for synergies and coherence between the different W@W projects. This can explain the lack of synergy and complementarity between the different projects and partners during programme implementation.

Assumptions behind the ToC were not sufficiently explicit or explored; several assumptions appeared to be not correct. Some examples:

---

<sup>17</sup> Studies: WRW and Haki Mashinani on sexual harassment at the workplace; FEMNET on the promotion of gender equality and decent work in the horticulture sector in Kenya; FIC on the capacity needs of trade unions; KHRC on the results based social certification process and FIDA Kenya on Violation of Labour rights in Horticulture’ in 2017.

- 1) *Willingness of farm managers to collaborate and facilitate access to their farms*: all implementing partners were facing difficulties in accessing the farms. Beside the fact that horticulture farms are very sensitive for their image, also the more ‘aggressive’ media campaign conducted by Hivos in 2018, made farm managers and owners deny access to their farms for campaign partners. WRW, who had built relevant expertise in engaging with farms, among others through their cooperation with KFC, only was engaged rather late in the campaign (mid-2018) and did not receive a pivotal role to coordinate the actions in farms and enable access for campaign partners (which eventually happened).
- 2) *Willingness of certification standards to engage with the campaign partners*: at the start of the Result Based Certification Project it was assumed that certification bodies would be interested in this project. Eventually, a lot of advocacy work needed to be done by Hivos and KHRC to gain their interest and have the organisations on board. The L&A work with certification bodies is very technical and campaign partners lacked a thorough understanding of the certification processes, government regulation, the actors, the issues at stake, etc.
- 3) *Wage increase*: workers were trained to strengthen their negotiation skills, and for several topics, improvement of working conditions could be negotiated at farm level. Wage increases, however, are being negotiated in the social dialogue, in which the social partners play a crucial role. No analysis was done of the quality of the social dialogue and opportunities for improvement. The campaign partners did not engage much with the Agriculture Employers Association (AEA was sometimes consulted and participated in some campaign activities) or with the trade unions. The latter only is included recently in the programme, through the FIC capacity development project. There were several challenges identified with regard to a possible collaboration with KPAWU, the dominant trade union in the horticulture sector, though at branch level, opportunities existed, which were partially grasped by FIDA (providing training to branch officers) and FEMNET (including members of union branches in the women’s leadership training).

#### *Responsiveness to changes in the context*

The evaluators did not have the opportunity to talk to government officers or external stakeholders to assess evolutions in the context or access programme documents with information to that end. The few external stakeholders interviewed confirm that there are some opportunities for local or national level L&A, such as the rolling-out of the new HCD standard 1758, the process of ratification of ILO convention 190, the on-going review of the Employment Act that presents an opportunity to enhance the legal and policy framework governing harassment at the workplace, etc. Some of the W@W campaign partners have the potential to engage with government institutions on these matters, like KHRC, FEMNET and Haki Mashinani, and these topics certainly were put on the agenda of the campaign, but it is not clear to what extent appropriate strategies have been developed within the W@W campaign.

A characteristic of the W@W campaign as implemented in Kenya is the incremental development of the strategies, partners facing several bottlenecks and adapting their strategies accordingly: (1) KHRC adapting the research approach of the result based certification study, (2) evolution towards bringing also positive stories of farms, demonstrating actions of farm managers regarding the improvement of working conditions of women, (3) WRW collaborating with other W@W partners to enable access to the farms, (4) Hivos engaging FIC to invest specifically in enhancing

organisational capacity of trade unions, (5) Development of the social performance portal to measure impacts of business practices ( this was not part of the initial CSR project strategy but an adaptation in the 1st year of engagement).

#### 4.2. Relevant L&A strategies

*Engagement with private sector:* Engagement in a dialogue with the farm owners/managers is a prominent strategy in the programme. The experience of WRW gained through the pilot sexual harassment project implemented in the previous phase of the W@W campaign, shows the added value of collaborating with a sector organisation, i.e. Kenya Flower Council. It is only through the engagement of KFC in the project that KFC members were showing interest to collaborate with WRW, and later on with other W@W campaign partners.

Both insider and outsider strategies have been used. Outsiders strategies were used to visualise labour rights violations at farms (e.g. films), to create awareness about the situation in the flower farms among the general public and among policy makers in particular (media campaigns, articles) or by threatening of litigation. Insider strategies relate to the dialogue that is looked for with farm managers and owners who give permission to organise training for their workers and/or request campaign partners' advice and support to develop workplace policies (sexual harassment, gender). During the campaign, both strategies were not fully aligned to each other. Mainly in the first years of the campaign, outsider approaches had taken place, which had a negative impact on the willingness of farms to collaborate with campaign partners. Campaign partners that looked for the dialogue (Ufadhili Trust, WRW, Haki Mashinani, FEMNET) were often denied access to the farms and it took a period to convince farms of the positive and constructive approach adopted by the W@W partners.

The strategic use of insider and outsider approaches has been discussed during partner meetings, but has not resulted in a smart use of these approaches, or in concerted action, combining approaches and adopted to different types of commercial farms. Eventually, the campaign opted for a 'softer' approach, looking for the dialogue, bringing positive stories (also in press) so to create goodwill and enable access to farms. It appeared to be difficult to implement a campaign combining both strategies. The W@W campaign seems not having considered to look for collaboration with other campaigns (if any), researchers or activists, that can take on a more 'activist' role (e.g. knowledge sharing, indicating cases, bringing on testimonies, etc.) and complement the W@W interventions.

The campaign reached mainly farms owned by a foreigner, which are -according to interviewees - already more controlled compared to the Kenyan' owned farms (where labour rights violations are more rampant) and which are already showing goodwill to advance women workers rights (picking low hanging fruit?). The question is what leverage effect these "frontrunners" can have on the sector. The W@W campaign could not deliver evidence to that end. It was furthermore observed that the campaign focuses on so-called 'softer' topics, like developing sexual harassment workplace policies or female leadership training, topics farm management is already supposed to invest in (to comply with national labour laws and international certification standards), which is now provided by the campaign at low or no cost.



Implementation of the sexual harassment workplace policies remains a challenge, as documented by the studies of WRW and Haki Mashinani, pointing to - among other issues - the lack of comprehensive safeguarding regulatory frameworks, the weak capacity of the labour inspection services and failing auditing practices. These topics are taken forward by the campaign partners but require long-term lobby trajectories (see further lobbying government).

Changing working conditions, like underpayment, low wages, overtime, etc. are evidently more difficult but essential in improving working conditions at large. The campaign applied mainly a bottom-up approach, through enhancing knowledge and negotiation skills of (women) workers and their committees. There was less investment in enhancing the social dialogue, where the debates on these issues are taking place. The CBAs however set the boundaries for negotiations at farm level. There was not much engagement of the campaign with the trade unions or the employer's associations.

*Engagement with government:* lobbying the government was conducted by Haki Mashinani, FIDA, FEMNET and KHRC. Mainly insider approaches were applied, through the provision of training to judicial staff (FIDA), participation in working groups and the provision of technical expertise (e.g. KHRC), provided by reputable NGOs that are often solicited by government institutions. Also, these processes require a long-term trajectory.

With the involvement of AWCFS, also outsider approaches were applied, i.e. putting pressure on the minister of social affairs or the minister of labour by bringing cases on a radio show and requesting a response from the minister (e.g. violation of maternity leave, case of overwork). Interviewees reported that some of these cases were put on the agenda of the national assembly, however, the campaign did not deploy a concerted action so to seize the moment and conduct follow-up policy influencing work.

It could not be assessed to what extent outsider approaches (media campaigns, articles, radio) have had an influence on accelerating or leveraging the insider approaches. From the interviews with journalists it can be learned that through the training of the W@W campaign, more attention was given to the situation in the flower farms than before. One can assume that this enhanced visibility will have an influence on the public and policy debate in the long term. Some interviewees claimed that the spotlights in the media pushed the employers to improve the CBAs. This claim, however, could not be checked. Furthermore, the lobby trajectories conducted by Haki Mashinani and FEMNET are outside of the scope of the evaluators. The evaluators have not seen L&A action plans, monitoring data or outcomes harvested referring to specific lobby results, which makes it difficult to assess.

*Linking national and international L&A:* All partners received training on the different regional and international advocacy spaces and corporate accountability mechanisms and how these platforms can be used. Partners were encouraged to contribute concept notes for side events. In some cases, the international advocacy supported national level advocacy. The example was given of AWCFS that simultaneously brought stories of human rights violations of women in the local news media and

during sessions at CSW and the UNfBHR. Another example is described in the chapter on effectiveness, lobbying the UN Working Group on Business and Human Rights, is a good example of collaboration between the national W@W campaign and the international lobbying, mainly involving the Hivos regional and international teams and KHRC. Through the W@W campaign, and the presence of Hivos and partners in the horticulture sector in Kenya, it was possible to invite a UN delegation to visit the horticulture sector in Kenya. Hivos and KHRC, together with other local organisations, mobilised, prepared the workers and the communities around affected areas and provided translation services.

The link between the international L&A and local L&A might have been stronger if a more integrated programme approach had been applied (see further under efficiency). Partners were not always well aware of what was taken place at international level, unless they had participated themselves in the international conference.

#### 4.3. Capacity development

In East-Africa self-assessment formats were systematically used to assess the L&A capacities of the implementing partners and to identify capacity needs. Capacity assessments were done in 2016 and 2017; monitoring capacity evolutions done in 2018 or 2019. The first capacity assessment format (applied in 2016 and 2017) was based on the 5C framework and included a set of relevant questions that point to L&A competencies and capabilities that represent the state of the art regarding L&A capacity.<sup>18</sup> However, these questionnaires appeared not to be sufficiently guiding the self-assessments, which remained rather superficial but enabled nevertheless identification of capacity development support needs. Acknowledging the difficulties of the use of the 5C framework, the monitoring of capacity development processes was based on a qualitative assessment of experienced capacity changes, which provided partial information on capacity evolutions but remained rather general and superficial. From the interviews with the implementing partners, it is learned that these capacity assessments were not perceived as contributing to the reflection on the L&A capacity of the organisation but rather seen as an administrative requirement and a tool to identify specific questions for capacity development support.

Despite the fact that no L&A capacity assessment was carried out with regard to the teams of Hivos itself, Hivos embarked in a joint learning process together with the partners (though no L&A capacity assessment was done of the Hivos teams), through a learning by doing approach and a focus on peer learning. This approach was very much appreciated by the partners. However, this approach comes with some risks.

- *Capacity development trajectories*: It was a deliberate choice to not develop formal capacity development action plans or trajectories at partner level, which complicates monitoring of the results and the management of expectation. e.g. KHRC had mentioned the need to receive a training on the legal framework governing the horticulture sector in Kenya and across East Africa and to gain understanding of the sourcing practices of the UK and Dutch markets and

---

<sup>18</sup> Elements from several L&A framework are included such as described by Start and Hovland (2004)

possible entry points for lobby and advocacy by CSOs. These two topics remained unaddressed.<sup>19</sup> Other implementing partners referred to the need for organisational capacity development support or support in resource mobilisation, which were not or partially addressed by the campaign. In case of a capacity development action trajectory, there would have been more transparency to that regard. A capacity development trajectory would also enable identification of the contribution of the W@W campaign to enhancing L&A capacity, of other actors and endogenous approaches.

- *L&A capacity*: There was no systematic reflection among the W@W partners on what competencies, collective capabilities and capacity are required for L&A, for engaging with government and private sector. For example, no or not much attention was given to competencies and collective capabilities such as (i) enhancing knowledge of policy cycles and political decision making processes, (ii) conducting a political economy analysis, (iii) how to involve women workers in L&A processes, (iv) expertise that is needed to monitor implementation of policy changes, etc. It is not clear for the evaluators to what extent implementing partners disposed of these specific competencies and capabilities. No capacity evolutions to that regard have been mentioned. One example: reflection on the conducive environment for advancing women workers' rights was done applying the PESTEL approach.<sup>20</sup> However, as experienced during the international partner meeting in Zimbabwe (2020), this kind of analysis remained rather superficial and did not identify opportunities or traction to guide the adaptation of L&A strategies, which might result, for example, from a Political Economy Analysis.
- *L&A capacity at campaign level*: all implementing partners refer to the enhanced cooperation between the partners in the campaign. However, there are several examples that reflection on what joint campaigning entails was rather limited. The campaign was implemented through a project-based approach, but a joint reflection on how each of these projects would mutually reinforce has not taken place. Examples were given of discussions at campaign level on how to balance insider and outsider approaches, which were not supported by a thorough analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of each of these approaches, the comparative advantage and what this would mean for the campaign interventions, the search for synergy and coherence. Challenges were mentioned regarding the development of joint position papers that were presented at national or international advocacy fora (only involving directly involved partners), the difficulties in developing and applying joint campaign messages.

Learning by doing and peer learning are certainly appropriate strategies for strengthening L&A capacities and the learning thereof. In view of the fact that L&A trajectories are at least complicated (cause and effect detectable but separated over time and space), but normally complex (cause and effect understandable in retrospect) or chaotic (cause and effect not detectable) trajectories in nature,

---

<sup>19</sup> KHRC capacity assessment monitoring (2019) In 2020, during the discussion on this evaluation report, Hivos informed the evaluators that Hivos has developed a research TOR for an action research on the effects of purchasing practices of Dutch buyers, so to provide strategies for CSOs to respond

<sup>20</sup> Political, Economic, Social, Technical, Environmental, Legal

sharing of information and knowledge only is not sufficient. It is extremely important to have frequent well-facilitated (by partner organisations that work at the ‘coal front’ and/or Hivos) joint learning sessions in place, in which not only attention is being paid to the question ‘Are we doing the things right?’ (single loop learning) but as well to the question “Are we doing the right things?”. (i.e. double and triple loop learning questions about assumptions and beliefs; up to what degree do we need to adjust the design of the programme?; Up to what degree are learning in the right manner?). The joint learning could have been strengthened if more frequent and systematic exchange would have taken place and e.g. during partner meetings, more attention would have been given to double and triple loop learning.

#### **4.4. Conclusions**

The DW4W programme and the obtained results remain very relevant in the context of Kenya. A second phase is needed to bring the first results to scale and to consolidate policy changes and policy implementation. The decisions taken, concerning focus and implementation, were inspired by the general programme ToC. This ToC was not translated into a country ToC. Intermediary steps or milestones towards the envisaged changes with regard to the different domains of change were not made explicit, which complicated monitoring thereof, the search for synergies and coherence between the different W@W projects. This can explain the lack of synergy and complementarity between the different projects and partners during programme implementation.

Appropriate choices have been taken in L&A strategies, engagement with private sector actors and in the choice of implementing partners. Mainly insider A&L strategies have been applied, looking for dialogue with private actors and providing advisory support to government actors, which are working well. The W@W campaign has been balancing between insider and outsider approaches, but both approaches were not fully aligned to each other or adapted to specific target groups or type of commercial farmers (foreign owned farms vs nationally owned farms; certified farms vs non certified farms). Similarly, opportunities to align interventions at national level with the global L&A were not fully explored.

Relevant capacity development support was provided to enhance L&A capacity, though the focus was merely on enhancing knowledge and competencies of individual staff members (training, exchange visits, exposure to international L&A fora) to the detriment of the organisational development support (in relation to L&A organisational capacity). Dominantly a learning by doing approach was adopted, which was relevant but not sufficient. More attention could have been given to supporting double and triple loop learning.

### **5. ANALYSIS OF SUSTAINABILITY**

---

The extent to which changes can or will be sustained is in principle related to ability of key actors to consolidate over time what has been achieved in terms of capacity development or in policy development and implementation related that contribute to decent work for women in the horticulture sector. Therefore, the assessment of sustainability is focused on actor-groups, notably government

actors, market actors and civil society. Where applicable for the above-mentioned groups, sustainability is assessed along different dimensions such as social, institutional, and financial.

## **5.1. Changes at the level of private and public actors targeted**

### **Changes at the level of the horticulture farms**

*Institutional sustainability:* The commercial farms are complying with decent work conditions as far as defined and audited by the national labour law and the (inter)national certification schemes. W@W campaign partners have been able to include a gender lens and women rights in these labour laws and certification standards (see achievements with the Kenyan Flower Council, Fair Trade Africa, HCD standard, NAP on Business and Human Rights). Enforcement of these laws remains a bottleneck. The studies on the status of sexual harassment workplace policies (WRW and Haki Mashinani) demonstrate that having workplace policies is not sufficient. There still is a need for more training and refresher trainings of human resource and compliance managers at the farms and of labour inspectors of the government and KFC/FTA auditors; the need for the development and implementation of holistic safeguarding frameworks to promote a culture of protection for workers from harassment. The impact study conducted by WRW (2018) demonstrates that gender committees require refresher training and continuous support, which – according to the law – needs to be provided by the farm, which is most often not guaranteed. The NAP on BHR might have the potential to accelerate initiatives that are needed to secure continuous training and the development of appropriate holistic safeguarding frameworks against sexual harassment.

The CSR-Africa portal might be an instrument to support horticulture farms in analysing their CSR policies and practice and identify areas for improvement. The portal is not institutionalised yet. One option could be the integration of the CSR-portal in the service portfolio of KFC, but the discussions to that end still need to take place with the KFC members. From the interviews it is learned that there is no willingness among farm owners - at this moment - to invest in this portal.

Through the campaign, institutional relations have been built between some of the W@W partners and KFC, that will last beyond the programme. KFC can mobilise the expertise of the W@W partners to provide trainings to KFC/FTA members.

*Financial sustainability:* In the farms visited, who are the frontrunner, there was commitment from management and farm owners to invest in awareness raising of workers, to establish and train the gender and other workers' committees and facilitate the operations of these committees (time off, provision of venue, etc.). However, horticulture farms are going through an economic crisis, facing decreasing profit margins, which can jeopardize the implementation of the different workplace policies. Farm managers criticized the low prices per flower stem. The financial capacity of farms sets the boundaries for negotiations with the workers' committees.

A good business case on the added value of having good sexual harassment workplace policies was not actively promoted by the campaign partners, but evidence is being collected and some good cases are shared through the CSR Portal. For example, human resource managers interviewed at Tropiflora

observed more productive workers, decreased absenteeism, targets that are regularly met, reduced waste and lower product defects, higher customer certification. Employee turnover was less than 2% compared to over 15% for the sector, and management – worker harmony was higher. This resulted in higher profits for the farm owner and investors and increased benefits to workers. Such a business case, populated with hard data, can convince other farm owners to invest in decent working conditions. It is not clear to what extent campaign partners or KFC are using these business cases to convince KFC members in developing sexual harassment workplace policies. *“There is a need to enhance the capacity of the value chain stakeholders for investigating and demonstrating the business case for progressive social performance, in quantifiable, even, monetarized terms, in order to spur CSR.”* (Haki Mashinani study, 2019)

The CSR Africa portal was perceived by the frontrunners as an interesting tool, but there is hesitation with regard to its financing. Farms managers pointed out to the multiple certification standards and auditing processes that are costly and suggested a merger of the auditing approaches, with a possible integration of the CSR portal tool.

*Social sustainability:* The attitude towards upholding human rights is largely driven by certification standards and European market entry requirements. As such, the support provided to develop sexual harassment policies was welcomed as supporting compliance of the farm with some of the certification standards. The studies of WRW and Haki Mashinani described the low rate of reporting on incidents of sexual harassment at the workplace. Changing social norms is a lengthy process. Several systemic factors contribute to harassment at the workplace.

**Changes at the level of government actors:** L&A interventions targeting the government institutions have not been assessed thoroughly. W@W campaign partners have contributed to several changes at government level, such as the inclusion of gender and labour rights in the revised KS 1758 standard of the HCD, that is applicable to all businesses; and the inclusion of gender and labour rights in the NAP on Business and Human Rights. These are important results. Interviewees confirmed that government institutions face challenges in implementation due to lack of officers with sufficient knowledge on gender and labour rights, and lack of financial resources for enforcement of the law.

## 5.2. Changes at the level of L&A capacity of participating organisations

**Institutional sustainability:** The DW4W programme aligns to the vision, mission and ambitions of the implementing partners. Implementing partners are well chosen, all of them showing a relevant track record with regard to the topics of the W@W campaign. Through their involvement in the campaign their knowledge on gender and labour rights, CSR, horticulture value chain, certification standards and auditing processes, sexual harassment workplace policies, etc. has improved (see chapter 3.4). The extent to which this knowledge has been shared at organisational level could not be fully assessed, but there are indications that this knowledge transfer is rather limited.

Enhanced collaboration between campaign partners is another result of the programme. It is not clear to what extent this collaboration will sustain. It was not the objective of the campaign to create new structures and invest in network building, the collaboration was instrumental in realising the campaign results. The W@W campaign was implemented through a project-based approach, under coordination of Hivos.

**Financial sustainability:** several of the implementing partners visited face financial challenges. WRW, Ufadhili Trust and AWCFS are the most vulnerable ones. Although these organisations can rely partially on membership fees and sell consultancy services, they depend highly on external donor funding. WRW and Ufadhili Trust have been dependant on the Hivos funding. With the ending of the campaign, continuation of their operations is at risk. Also, AWCFS will face problems in continuing investing in investigative journalism and bringing stories in the media. AWCFS indicated that they will need to rely on a network of women workers and leaders of trade unions to bring their stories (and CSOs collaborating with women workers and trade union leaders). A system to bring these stories from the farms to AWCFS needs to be developed.

Other organisations, like FIDA, FEMNET and KHRC, have access to a variety of external donors, but depend on project-based funding. The continuation (and upscaling) of trainings provided by FIDA and FEMNET is as such at risk.

The W@W campaign did not invest in strengthening capacity for resource mobilisations of the implementing partners. Only recently attention is being paid to accessing (inter)national donor funding. This process is guided by Hivos. Implementing partners are not trained to develop joint proposals to participate in international tender procedures.

## 5.3. Environmental considerations

Some attention was paid by the W@W campaign on environmental challenges the horticulture sector is facing. Environmental indicators are included in the CSR-Africa portal and the consequences of climate change on women are highlighted in the African consultation on applying a gender lens to the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.

## 5.4. Conclusions

Levels of sustainability of changes at	Commercial farms	Government	CSO
Institutional	Moderate	High	Moderate
Financial	Low	Low	Low
Social	Low	Low	n.a. <sup>21</sup>

The level of institutional sustainability of the changes realised at commercial farms is moderate. Some project results will be helpful in sustaining the observed changes or to accelerate policy implementation, such as the integration of social indicators in the KFC, FTA and HCD standards and the gender lens on labour rights in NAP BHR. Integration of sexual harassment policies in the CBA processes might contribute to enhanced institutional sustainability.

Implementation of improved policies stimulating social performance of the horticulture sector is hampered by the lack of financial means, at the level of farms and at the level of the government. A more prominent use of the business case on sexual harassment policies might convince farm managers to invest in developing sexual harassment workplace policies and developing holistic safeguarding systems. More lobby trajectories will be needed targeting the government to secure sufficient resource allocation, including attention to strengthening capacities of government institutions in implementing the policies and controlling the compliance with the revised standards.

Institutional sustainability of the changes at the level of the implementing partners is moderate. Partners have been well chosen and demonstrated relevant expertise and a track record with regard to the intervention domains of the W@W campaign. The extent acquired knowledge and competencies are being shared at organisational level, however, is not clear and will be dependent on personal initiative. No organisational capacity development support strategies have been applied in the W@W campaign. Financial sustainability of the majority of the implementing partners to implement L&A interventions with regard to the decent work in the horticulture sector is fragile. Partners depend on external donor funding. There was no investment in enhancing financial or project management capacity (if needed, except for one partner) or (joint) resource mobilisation capacity.

---

<sup>21</sup> Not assessed



## 6. ANALYSIS OF EFFICIENCY

---

### Organisational efficiency

The DW4W programme operates through a decentralised governance structure, with a coordination team, consisting of the general programme manager based in the Netherlands and two regional managers (Eastern Africa and Southern Africa) who manage staff teams at head office, in the Eastern Africa hub and the Southern Africa hub. At each level, staff includes an advocacy officer, a project officer and a project assistant, a communication officer, a financial officer and a DMEL officer. Staff amounts to 18 persons (not all VTE).

The Hivos team that manages the programme in East-Africa is located at the regional Hivos office in Nairobi, is responsible for the five East-African countries. No staff is positioned in these countries, except in Nairobi. Roles and responsibilities are perceived as clear, but all staff interviewed testified of high workloads.

The DW4W programme is operationalised through a project-based approach. The baseline study had formulated suggestions of types of implementing partners that could be engaged by the programme. Hivos operated through a tender procedure to ask interested organisations to present concept notes (e.g. WRW) or approached organisations to ask them to participate in the programme (e.g. Ufadhili Trust, AWCFS, FEMNET). Some of the implementing partners had already been involved in the first phase of the campaign, like WRW and KHRC. The project-based approach as applied in Kenya had faced several challenges:

- *Managerial challenges:* several projects were designed in co-creation, which was highly appreciated by the implementing partners, including the flexibility for adaptations. In some of the projects, Hivos took a coordinating or leading role during project development (e.g. CSR portal, RBSC project, Women's Leadership programme). Implementation faced several bottlenecks as assumptions appeared not to be met. e.g. It was assumed that commercial farms and certification bodies would be interested in and willing to collaborate in the CSR portal project and the RBSC project, which appeared not to be the case. Ufadhili and KHRC had difficulties in gaining access to the farms. Partners were mostly given a long-term project contract, with a funding disbursement scheme based on short term contracts allowing for flexible adaptations of project design and budget. Because of the pre-grant and programmatic due diligence assessment system, established at the regional Hivos office, there was a lot back and forth on the review of proposals (and revised proposals), which costs delays and interruptions in implementation. Partners complain about the slow response of the Hivos team on the approval of projects or of redesigned projects, and with regard to feedback provided on quarterly reports. Partners interviewed mentioned funding came often late, delaying the effective start of the project (or new project phase).<sup>22</sup> Other factors causing

---

<sup>22</sup> Examples: **KHRC-RBSC project:** info from KHRC: redesigned project approved late 2018, funding arrived May 2019. Delayed feedback on report second quarter 2019, Funding for second quarter arrived in November 2019; info from Hivos: KHRC RBSC grant timelines were 02/06/2017 – 30/06/2020 with annual project reviews and extensions on basis of reworked plan. Year 1 hit a snag due to lack of buy-in by sector players targeted. Redesign discussions commenced with partner between October - March 2020 – and the extension approved in March 2020. **WRW:** info from WRW: proposal sent 2017, funding arrived June 2018 (2,5 later than the end of the first phase of the Sexual harassment Workplace policy project, implement during the first phase of the W@W campaign, through indirect funding of WRW via Women Workers

delays in implementation were related to project management problems at the side of the implementing partners, e.g. problems with financial management (Ufadhili, KHRC and WRW). These delays and interruptions in implementation turned the project approach in a 'stop and go' project-based approach, further negatively affected by the challenges in sustainability (see chapter 5).

- *Programmatic challenges:* the project-based approach resulted in a scattered approach in programme implementation. Design of projects happened independently and were not aligned to each other. Partners often did not know how other projects were progressing, although regional exchange and linking forums were convened in 2016 – 2020 to reflect on contributions of different partners / projects to the broad TOC for W@W; a national level L&L session was convened in 2019 for similar reflections at country level. However, partners also stated that they met once or twice a year in capacity development sessions and through these encounters, relationships were built and collaboration enhanced. The evaluators learned that collaboration and alignment between partners might also have been hampered by inter-personal or cultural differences.

This lack of coordinated action had a negative effect on the efficient use of human and financial resources, specifically during the first years of the programme. Example (1) Whereas WRW had good relationships with KFC and access to many farms, their network was initially not used by the other partners to gain access to farms, till one realised that partners (like FIDA, Ufadhili, FEMNET) could benefit from a cooperation with WRW to gain access to farms. Moreover, partners intervened in the same farms that were already supported by WRW (some of them already for a long period). More outreach could have been possible when potential farms would have been distributed among WRW and Haki Mashinani, both of them implementing similar interventions. The lack of alignment between programme partners can also complicate the work of some of the partners. For example, WRW and FEMNET organise off-farm trainings for workers of similar farms, with FEMNET paying KSH 500 for transportation costs and WRW only able to pay 300 KSH. Example (2) AWCFS could move things among policy makers or members of parliament, through publications of articles or radio shows. These moments, however, were not seized by the other partners involved in lobbying, for example approaching members of parliament of ministers that had reacted on cases of labour rights violations or cases of sexual harassment. Example (3) There is some duplication in studies that have been conducted by the programme partners. WRW and Haki Mashinani both have conducted a study on the status of the protection from sexual harassment in the Kenyan cut-flower sector, respectively in 2018 (WRW studying the impact of the piloted sexual harassment model policy in their 8 farms) and 2019 (Haki Mashinani comparing the situation in piloted farms and non-piloted farms).

---

Worldwide). Info from Hivos: WRW grant preparatory process concluded and contract approved for August 1, 2018 start (not June 2018) date to 31/07/2019.

*Overview of grants assigned and disbursed to the W@W campaign partners*

Partner	Project contract periods	Budget assigned (all amounts in Euro)	Budget spent / disbursed by Hivos
AWCFS	01/08/2017 – 31/07/2020	149,929	110,328
FEMNET	21/07/2017 – 30/06/2020	292,183	210,825
FIC <sup>23</sup>	15/07/2019 – 30/06/2020	210,404	147,975
FIDA Kenya	01/05/2017 – 31/05/2020	116,617	110,017
Haki Mashinani	01/05/2017 – 31/05/2020	190,384	185,383
KHRC	01/05/2017 – 30/06/2020	322,970	297,907
Ufadhili Trust	01/10/2016 – 30/06/2019	175,247	166,588
WRW	01/08/2019 – 30/06/2019 Consultancy contract for refresher training (October 2019 – December 2019) <sup>24</sup>	58,841	Spent under this grant which is already closed: 36,187

Project management procedures are clear for the implementing partners. Partners report quarterly to Hivos, formats and reporting requirements are lean and mean.

### **Comparative assessment of different types of interventions applied**

The approach used for learning on programme efficiency was inspired by the Multi-Attribute Decision Making (MADM) method and basically let implementing partners assess the ‘usefulness’ of a number of interventions in realising milestones to achieving programme outcomes (from the ToC) against the amount of resources (time, money, effort, energy) needed to implement said outcomes. This assessment was done during a joint session with all implementing partners during the inception workshop. In the efficiency assessment session, participants first identified different interventions that were assessed on their ‘usefulness’ against a set of intermediary milestones

<sup>23</sup> FIC grant is under a new programme developed in 2019 on capacity strengthening of unions for effective representation – and involves work with KPAWU, UHISPAWU in Uganda, CESTRAR in Rwanda and TPAWU in Tanzania.

<sup>24</sup> Initially (June 2017 – May 2018) WRW had a sub grant arrangement under KHRC due to their low financial management capacity identified during the WRW pre-grant due diligence assessment, and hence for the initial year WRW was a sub-grantee of KHRC for a total amount of 28,302 EUR. A direct grant with Hivos was concluded for August 2018 to June 2019, which was again problematic to meet minimum financial grant management expectations. On that basis, WRW engagement translated to a consultancy engagement, which is devoid of heavy reporting obligations.

(criteria) needed to realise the outcomes. The group then assigned weights to the different criteria, reflecting an intuitive ranking of the relative importance of the corresponding milestones. The ‘cost’ of each intervention was taken as a comparative estimate of the resource intensity of the different interventions, that is: the total use of resources in an admittedly intuitive total of financial costs, time and effort to prepare and carry out the stated interventions. In terms of outcome of the analysis one can distinguish two levels, a first one that is called weighted score of effectiveness and reflects the perceived (average weighted) ‘usefulness’ of each intervention as against the stated outcome-related criteria. The second outcome is efficiency ratio and provides a reflection of the perceived effect of each intervention per unit ‘cost’, or in other words the return on investment in terms of effectiveness.

The main interventions identified for the Kenya programme were: (i) training (of farm management and workers), provided by WRW, FIDA, Haki Mashinani and FEMNET, on or off-farm; (ii) L&A interventions (see under relevance), mainly implemented by Hivos, KHRC, Haki Mashinani and FEMNET; (iii) Community dialogues, complementing training of workers, mainly implemented by Haki Mashinani and FIDA, (iv) research, documentation and dissemination, conducted by Haki Mashinani and WRW on sexual harassment at the workplace and by KHRC on Result Based Certification, (v) Litigation, KHRC receiving funding for handling cases, FIDA and Haki Mashinani providing legal support, (vi) media campaign, visibility of the campaign in print media and radio shows (supported by AWCFS) and social media campaigns (coordinated by Hivos), (vii) Partnership and linkages, between W@W campaign partners but also with important lobby targets like KFC, FTA, ministry of labour, judicial department, etc., (viii) Participation in (inter)national conferences like CSW, ILO, ARFSD, HLPF (FEMNET), UNBHR but also the Living Wage conference organised in the Netherlands in 2018 by Hivos.

The criteria identified in relation to the envisaged outcomes (and intermediary milestones) refer to different

levels of L&A changes:<sup>25</sup> (i) creating awareness and sensitivity on sexual harassment and labour rights, (ii) enhanced capacity of gender committees, in terms of increased understanding, acquired (negotiation) skills and performance, (iii) social accountability of farm management (behaviour change), (iv) changed policies at the level of government and farms, (v) enhanced internal and external pressure on farms, certification bodies and government institutions, (vi) Higher standards, in terms of integration of social indicators (labour rights, gender, sexual harassment) in standards, (vii) Improved compliance to standards, laws and regulations of commercial farms, (viii) Self-regulation of commercial farms through the implementation of workplace policies, voluntary audits like CSR-audit, (ix) Workers’ empowerment so to claim their rights and raise their voice (individual or group level).

Following tables presents the result of the discussion.

---

<sup>25</sup> These intermediary steps can be part of pathways of change from the ToC, but never have been made explicit

Methods	Training	Lobby & advocacy	Community Dialogue	Research, documentation, dissemination	Litigation	Media campaigns	Partnerships & linkages	Conferences	
1 = low 5 = high									
Criteria									Weight
Awareness raising	5	2	1	5	1	3	1	2	10%
Capacity building	4	1	2	4	1	2	3	3	10%
Social accountability	5	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	10%
Change of policy	2	5	1	4	3	2	4	2	20%
Internal and external pressure	5	1	3	2	1	4	3	1	10%
Higher standards	4	3	1	1	3	3	3	1	10%
Improve compliance to standards, laws & regulations	4	2	1	3	4	3	2	2	15%
Self-regulation	3	4	1	2	1	2	3	1	5%
Worker empowerment	5	4	3	2	3	2	3	2	10%
<b>Weighted Score</b>	<b>3,95</b>	<b>3,00</b>	<b>1,70</b>	<b>3,15</b>	<b>2,55</b>	<b>2,65</b>	<b>2,85</b>	<b>1,95</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Cost 1= low / 5 = high</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	
<b>Efficiency ratio (effect per unit cost)</b>	<b>1,32</b>	<b>1,50</b>	<b>0,57</b>	<b>0,79</b>	<b>0,51</b>	<b>0,88</b>	<b>1,43</b>	<b>0,49</b>	

With regard to the weight of the different milestones, slightly more importance was given to policy change (20%) and improved compliance to standards, laws and regulations of commercial farms (practice change), self-regulation was given the lowest weight. The weighted score gives an indication of the level of effectiveness. Training, L&A and research were considered to be the most effective strategies in realising the envisaged change (Decent Work for Women).

The estimated cost for the different interventions varies between 2 (rather low), for L&A and partnerships, to 5 (high) for litigation and rather high (4) for research and participation in conferences. One should note that not only economic resources were calculated but also time and energy. Cost is estimated qualitatively by consensus through the group discussion. *Training* was considered being implemented at medium costs as cost-efficiency was continuously looked for, e.g. making use of community venues like churches, schools or at the farm, collaborating with local service providers (e.g. meals). Cost of *L&A* was considered to be relatively low, because the average was taken on lobbying farms, certification bodies and government. Costs for lobbying government institutions were considered to be higher (expenses need to be paid for meetings at more expensive venues, compensation of fuel costs and per diems) compared to lobbying certification bodies (meetings at their office, no per diem required). As the programme had more invested in lobbying farm managers and certification bodies, compared to government institutions, the average cost was estimated at level 2. Research and participation in international conferences are estimated to be expensive. Litigation is assessed as the most expensive, as this demands high financial investments in hiring lawyers, paying court costs and requires a lot of time and energy to communicate with victims of labour rights violations, investigate the allegations, try to mediate, etc.

Calculating the efficiency ratio (weighted score on effectiveness divided by costs), it resulted that L&A and partnerships were the most efficient, followed by training, or the combination of a top-down and bottom-up approach. The less efficient appeared to be the participation in conferences and litigation. Both interventions are very costly and have less contribution to effectiveness. Participation in conferences evidently only has a long-term effect on the desired outcome, litigation has mainly an effect on individual cases and/or individual farms, and as described under effectiveness, did not have a leverage effect towards achieving change at larger scale.

## **7. ROLE OF THE CAC CONSORTIUM MEMBERS, PARTNER ORGANISATIONS AND THE MFA/EKN IN CONTRIBUTING TO THE OBSERVED CHANGES**

---

### **7.1. Role of the implementing partners and HIVOS and their relationships**

*Valorising complementarity:* as described under chapter 4 on relevance, relevant implementing partners have been identified for the programme in Kenya. However, as described under efficiency (chapter 6), complementarity of these partners was insufficiently valorised, due to the scattered project-based approach and lack of alignment between projects and partners.

*Roles and responsibilities:* Hivos assume multiple roles in the programme, such as project management and -coordination, but also the role of co-implementer (Hivos taking the lead in some of the projects) and convener of roundtables with sector actors, and the role of facilitator of capacity development processes. Furthermore, Hivos profiles itself as a partner in programme implementation, doing and learning together. Partners are contracted to implement specific projects and have to account to the results and financed stipulated in the contract. Although all people interviewed stated that roles and responsibilities are clear, the evaluators were able to observe that there was some tension with regard to this division of roles and responsibilities or how each partner has assumed its role.

- Project management and coordination: The Hivos team was appreciated for its commitment, knowledge and quality support provided. Critique was formulated regarding the communication on the problems related to financial management of partners, referring to rigid measurements taken.
- Hivos as implementor: Based on the experience of Hivos in the previous W@W campaign phase, among others in organising the blooming conversations which brought different stakeholders together, Hivos continued to assume the role of convener of roundtables with government and sector actors. This was not always experienced by programme partners as appropriate. Assigning a convener role, or role of co-host to partners would have contributed more to enhancing partners' legitimacy with regard to the sector actors. Now, implementing partners were acting as guest or contributor in these events. Some partners interviewed stated that Hivos implemented activities that could have been implemented by partners.

- Facilitator of capacity development processes: according to the evaluators, the Hivos team took on a traditional, technocratic-managerial approach to capacity development support (capacity assessments, identification of needs, learning from best practices, training, carrying-out studies, providing equipment). In the dialogues with partners, little attention was given to internal and external factors that have an influence on capacity development. The reports do not give proof of a genuine dialogue on the capacity development process, the objectives envisaged by the organisation and the strategy to gradually evolve towards more appropriate capacity development. This is in contradiction with the overall strategy of the W@W campaign regarding capacity development support, mainly visible at the international partner meetings, where a strategy was applied that combines experimentation, facilitation, securing freedom to explore ways forward. As described by Baser (2009), adopting a complex adaptive system approach, capacity emerges from multiple interdependencies and multiple causal connections. The international partner meetings were an appropriate forum to facilitate such processes. Follow-up at country and at partner level was however lacking.

## 7.2. Role of EKN

There was a limited collaboration with the Embassy of the Netherlands (EKN), apart from the regular institutional dialogues that take place between the Hivos regional office and the embassy. Hivos participated in the information sharing on the Strategic Partnerships, convened by the liaison officer at the embassy in Kenya. The liaison officer participated in some of the W@W activities, where there was opportunity for partners to highlight challenges, they face in project implementation. Collaboration was affected by staff changes at the embassy, with officers showing varying degrees of interest in the W@W programme.

Implementing partners perceive the Dutch embassy as a defender of the growers and protecting the export market. It was mentioned that several growers had complained to the embassy about the W@W campaign. The exploration of a possible role of the embassy in the W@W campaign has not taken place, nor from the side of the embassy or Hivos. Though some collaboration has taken place, such as: (i) Owing to sensitivity of the horticulture sector, a risk mitigation plan was developed and discussed with the embassy; (ii) Hivos provided the embassy with quarterly briefs of achievements realised, shared plans for preceding quarters and the challenges including how the embassy can potentially intervene; (iii) In Kenya specifically, following discussions between the regional director and the Ambassador on the programme, the DW4W offered trainings on Sexual Harassment for embassy staff and advised on how to revise their internal sexual harassment policy.

## 8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

### 8.1. Conclusions

The W@W campaign was successful in putting decent work for women in the horticulture sector on the agenda of sector organisations, certification bodies and the government. Also, in the public space (e.g. media campaigns) there is more visibility of the situation of women in the flower farms. The campaign was successful in influencing the various stakeholders in adopting social indicators and a gender lens on labour rights. Whereas at the start of the campaign, a lot of tension existed between various sector players and the campaign partners, the campaign resulted in bringing these stakeholders together and engage in a dialogue. These are long-term processes that evidently require follow-up. Appropriate strategies are currently being implemented to support the various stakeholders in the implementation of changed policies, e.g. study on result based certification aimed at improving the auditing processes so that certification standards effectively will benefit the workers; support provided to train labour inspectors and judicial staff, and the continuous lobby towards the government, KFC/FTA and the standard organisations.

At farm level, important results have been achieved with regard to the development and implementation of sexual harassment workplace policies, strengthening of gender committees and female leadership. Upscaling of these results is a challenge. W@W campaign partners could mainly access the so-called frontrunners, commercial farms that are mostly internationally certified, having silver or golden KFC standard, and as such already respecting labour laws and complying with certification requirements, which demonstrates the relevance of including a gender lens in these standards and labour laws. Presence at farm level demonstrates the challenges with regard to policy implementation and changed practices. Having workplace policies is not a guarantee for safeguarding workers conditions. Genuine implementation and monitoring thereof are challenging. To that regards, the result based social certification project and the CSR-Africa portal are relevant instruments to effectively measure the real changes and challenges at farm level.

A value chain approach is needed that brings together all relevant actors, so to address social performance challenges at horticulture farms and discuss and experiment with solutions. A real value chain approach seems currently too ambitious (lack of traction, leadership, economic crisis, ...). Though, the W@W campaign succeeded in gaining trust among different stakeholders and organised several round-tables where topics and experiences were shared and discussed (sexual harassment, living wage, CSR-Portal, ...). The challenge is to obtain also the genuine involvement of stakeholders that were less actively involved in the campaign, such as the Agriculture Employers Association, FPEAK, the trade union KPAWU, etc. to leverage the good practices demonstrated by the campaign (and to reach out to all commercial farms, also those locally owned).

The W@W campaign contributed to strengthening knowledge, competencies and collective capabilities of staff of implementing partners in conducting L&A interventions in the horticulture sector. This has not always resulted in enhanced L&A capacity at organisational level, as no



organisational capacity development approach was applied. Sustainability is at risk in case of staff turn-over.

Efficiency of the campaign could be improved through the evolution towards more concerted and coordinated actions between the campaign partners and a more flexible project management approach.

## 8.2. Reflection on learning questions and some of the assumptions

*CSO dialogue with private sector:* In Kenya it became clear that the dissent approach was counter-productive in gaining access to farms and engaging in a dialogue with sector organisations like KFC. The media campaigns in press and the in-flight magazine of Kenya Airways had caused a lot of tension with farm owners and KFC. Relationships have been restored, when adopting a more positive approach, showing good practices of some frontrunner farms (e.g. film featuring Tambuzi and Equinox farms). KHRC that is perceived as an activist organisation (also threatening with litigation) still faces difficulties in conducting research at farm level. A relevant question is to reflect on the combination of dialogue and dissent approaches and the profile of the campaign. For example, in Kenya an option could be to adopt a dialogue approach by the W@W campaign and collaborate with other campaigns or activist that adopt a more aggressive approach.

Interviewees referred to the assumption that collaboration with flower farms would be easy and that Hivos and campaign partners did not anticipate on the lengthy process it eventually took. The campaign in Kenya shows the added value of collaborating with sector organisations. It is only through the collaboration with and support of KFC and FTA that W@W partners gained access to farms, benefiting from the long-term relationship between WRW and KFC and FTA. It was WRW who facilitated access to the farms for Haki Mashinani, FEMNET and Ufadhili Trust.

A similar assumption was formulated regarding the collaboration with certification bodies. It was assumed that they would show a genuine interest in the Result Based Social Certification project. It was learned that also these certification bodies operate through a business model, with several interests at stake. In both cases (KFC, certification bodies), building relationships also depends on personalities. Staff changes appeared to open new opportunities for collaboration.

The experience in Kenya also shows the importance of identifying a good entry point for the dialogue with the certification bodies. This requires a good understanding of how these certification organisations operate, who the actors and what the issues are, so to come with a clear message and approach. Furthermore, it was experienced that an investment in building capacity on gender and compliance indicators of staff of KFC and FTA was needed.

*Role of export organisations:* these were not much involved in the campaign. The Export Promotion Council is not very active. Main stakeholder involved in the campaign was the KFC, which is relevant as KFC members need to obtain KFC silver or gold standard to be able to export.

*Role of business case and role of frontrunners:* There is no evidence of the role of frontrunners in convincing other farms to improve social performance. Collaboration with frontrunners appeared above all to be relevant in getting evidence on how to implement sexual harassment workplace policies or strengthen gender committees for example, info that is used in the further lobby interventions.

A business case on adopting sexual harassment workplace policies existed but not yet populated with hard data, as formulated by Haki Mashinani: *"There is a need to enhance the capacity of the value chain stakeholders for investigating and demonstrating the business case for progressive social performance, in quantifiable, even, monetarised terms, in order to spur CSR."* The sector actors need hard data, whereas NGOs often adopt a human rights-based approach, which seems less convincing.

*Lobbying government and experiences with round tables:* The W@W campaign has been able to organise several round tables, bringing different stakeholders together to share and discuss specific topics and/or findings of research. These round tables have been initiated and facilitated by Hivos. A learning question can be whether or not Hivos should play a prominent role in convening these round table or assign this role to one or more W@W campaign partners (in perspective of enhancing legitimacy and L&A capacity development).

Round tables have also their limitations (voluntary, short term objectives, no commitment, ...). Several studies conducted during the programme point out to the need of a value chain approach or a more systemic approach. It can be explored to what extent the campaign can be in the position of initiator of a multi-stakeholder process to find solutions for the challenges regarding social performance in the horticulture sector. In Uganda and Malawi Hivos has experimented with the lab approach, which might also have an added value compared to round tables. It was assessed for Kenya that a convening power to implement a lab approach was not yet present with KFC.

### 8.3. **Recommendations for the W@W programme in Kenya**

#### **With regard to design and implementation**

A more concerted action between W@W campaign partners will enhance effectiveness and efficiency of the campaign. Partners implemented strategies linked to one or several domains of change, but interlinkages have not been explicitly explored (where do the different strategies cross and what opportunities are there for collaboration or alignment). The ToC approach could be one instrument in supporting the discussions on a joint programmatic approach at country level. A ToC approach also enables the identification of other interventions and stakeholders and the identification of possibilities for cooperation or alignment. For example, the W@W campaign seems not having considered to look for collaboration with other campaigns (if any), researchers or activists, that can take on a more 'activist' role and complement the W@W interventions (e.g. knowledge sharing, indicating cases, bringing on testimonies, etc.). Some examples of collaboration with 'activists' are the collaboration with independent journalists (through AWCFS) that brought investigative stories in the news, with positive outcomes. This kind of collaboration can be further explored.

### **With regard to L&A strategies (targeting private and/or public sector)**

There is a need to evaluate and capitalise on political economy dynamics so to develop targeted L&A interventions, and seize opportunities, beyond the usual lobby fora. The strategic use of evidence and research needs to be assessed as well. Incremental L&A plans (describing the ultimate goal but leaving room for adopting the way towards this goal, describing the minimum and maximum change to be expected) can support the implementation of L&A interventions, and enable monitoring thereof.

It can be discussed whether or not a value chain approach can be adopted, for example through the facilitation of multi-stakeholder processes, or the facilitation of ‘labs’. If there is no ‘traction’ for this kind of processes among the value chain actors, or several bottlenecks for a sector-based cooperation exist, round tables can be an appropriate alternative, but ambitions need to be lowered in that scenario.

In future projects, one can consider to look for collaboration with human resource professionals or business professionals, so to develop business cases, populated with hard data, applying a business language that is complementing the human rights discourse adopted by the current campaign partners.

Linkages with the global level L&A of the W@W campaign can be strengthened in a possible next phase, in particular with regard to the evolutions of the discussions with the certification bodies in Europa and living wage discussions. Most of the partners were only informed on the results of the global level L&A during international partner meetings, but these interventions were mostly not linked to national level. W@W campaign partners can be more involved in global level advocacy, for example through the development of shared position papers.

### **With regard to women empowerment**

The women’s leadership programme and training provided by W@W campaign partners on leadership, sexual harassment and labour rights have yielded important results but require refresher trainings and upscaling. Collaboration can be looked for with other (institutional) partners that can provide these trainings.

The gender committees show varying dynamics and different levels of collaboration with shop stewards. Gender committees are often not involved in the negotiations at farm level. If the programme continues to focus on improving working conditions of women (other than preventing sexual harassment), a more comprehensive approach is needed to strengthen women leaders. There is also a need to enhance participation of women in the trade union structures, starting at farm level.

### **With regard to sexual harassment workplace policies**

The evaluators fully agree with the recommendations formulated in the study of Haki Mashinani (2019), demanding for (i) Improving legislation and policy implementation; (ii) Improved certification auditing processes; (iii) the need for a concerted value chain ambition and collaboration at sector level; and (iv) development of holistic safeguarding frameworks to promote a culture of protection for workers from harassment. W@W partners and Hivos are implementing interventions regarding the lobby of government and certification bodies. A concrete upscaling strategy on how to

realise that all horticulture farms install holistic safeguarding frameworks (that go beyond the development of sexual harassment workplace policies) needs to be developed.

## 9. Annexes

### 9.1. Evaluation framework

#### EQ 1: Which changes have occurred in agendas, policies and practices of targeted social actors and in the L&A capacities of participating organisations (effectiveness)?

##### *Rationale*

This evaluation question relates to the changes the programme has contributed to with regard to: (1) changes in capacities for lobby and advocacy of (Southern) partner organisations, (2) changes in agendas, policies and practices of government and market actors. With this 1<sup>st</sup> question we explore the degree to which these changes took place and the contribution of the programme to these changes.

The DW4W programme aims at realising decent work for women working in the horticulture sector. The programme prioritised security at the workplace (sexual harassment policies), living wage and participation in decision making (other aspects of decent work have also been addressed but less prominently). Pressure is put on companies to respect the UN guiding principles of business and human rights. Government is targeted to create the conditions for achieving this. To achieve improvement of working conditions for women, five domains of change have been identified, in which results need to be realised: women empowerment, improved laws and policies, improved business practice, improved certified bodies and more certified farms. Effectiveness will be assessed for each of these domains and their contribution to improving women workers labour conditions. Not only planned results will be analysed but also unplanned and unforeseen results.

In addition to looking at what changes took place and the contribution of the programme to these changes the evaluation will explore contributing factors and processes that are at the heart of the programme's strategy and approach. More specifically, in answering this first question, the team will therefore also pay specific attention to:

- **Civic agency** enables citizens and their organisations to be agents of change, actively helping to transform business practices. DW4W strives to organise women workers and support them in claiming for their rights, supports trade unions and CSOs to become more gender sensitive and strengthen them to improve their advocacy and lobby capacity to claim rights for and with women workers.
- **Multi-Stakeholder Platforms:** the programme also seeks to translate activism into lasting change by opening spaces for multi-stakeholder dialogue, bringing together a wide range of actors to talk and share their points of view, generate new ideas and solutions to shared problems and work towards a common advocacy goal.

This evaluation question also includes the question regarding inclusiveness as formulated in the ToR. Inclusiveness of women evidently is at the heart of the programme. The contribution of the programme to women empowerment and female leadership will be assessed. The ToR also demand to analyse the attention given by the programme to inclusion of disabled people.

Judgement criteria	Indicators/sub-questions
1.1. Changes at the level of government actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Agenda setting</li> <li>o Engagement in critical dialogue with CSO and MSP</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Political will</li> <li>○ Policy change</li> <li>○ Practice change</li> <li>- Evidence of the role of civic agency and its influence on public actors in the observed policy development processes and procedures</li> <li>- Evidence of effects on civic space, and especially spaces for citizen to effectively influence agendas, policies and practices related to women labour rights, gender-based violence, business and human rights</li> <li>- Contributing factors (internal and external)</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>
1.2. Changes at the level of private companies and sector organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Evidence of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Agenda setting</li> <li>○ Engagement in critical dialogue with CSO and MSP</li> <li>○ Entrepreneurial attitude/will in favour of envisaged changes</li> <li>○ Policy change</li> <li>○ Practice change</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Evidence of the role of civic agency and its influence on market actors in the observed policy development processes and procedures</li> <li>- Evidence of effects on civic space, and especially spaces for citizen to effectively influence agendas, policies and practices related to women labour rights and CSR</li> <li>- Other contributing factors (internal and external)</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>
1.3. Changes at the level of participating organisations (CSOs and women/gender committees) – the power of Civic Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Observed initiatives of and developments in Civic Agency in relation to L&amp;A on agendas, policies and practices</li> <li>- Evidence of whether and how capacity development also affected or strengthened role and influence of Civic Agency</li> <li>- Was capacity building through the programme sufficiently geared towards creating conditions that allow effective citizen agency in L&amp;A on DW4W issues?</li> <li>- Appreciation of quality and relevance of capacity development support</li> <li>- Contributing factors (internal and external)</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>
1.4. Changes at the level of specific (marginalized) groups (inclusiveness)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changes related to empowerment of women (power over, power in, power within, power with) in the context of DW4W</li> <li>- Evidence of increased participation of women and youth in social dialogue, negotiation committees, in trade union structures, L&amp;A processes and related MSPs</li> <li>- Partners approaching gender and inclusion in their lobby and advocacy</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GEDI<sup>26</sup> being addressed in capacity development interventions</li> <li>- Use of GEDI lens in initial design, in evidence generation, agenda setting, policy dialogue, policy development and practice</li> <li>- Contributing factors (internal and external)</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>
Information sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Study of documents (programme and project proposals, annual plans, monitoring reports, policy documents of partners, reports of joint activities that have taken place)</li> <li>- Workshops with country-based partners with timeline and process tracing / contribution analysis</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews with partners in The Netherlands and partner countries</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders and external stakeholders</li> <li>- Sense-making workshop in-country (restitution workshop) and consolidated at programme level with DW4W programme team</li> </ul>	

## EQ. 2. How relevant are the changes in the context in which the programme is operating?

Rationale: The question of relevance is closely linked with Civic Agency as central feature and principle of programme design and implementation. The evaluation will look at the way in which Civic Agency is embedded in the programme dynamics and interventions. Civic Agency has multiple dimensions (see chapter 3 for in-depth reflections). The core of the matter is how the programme supports communities to act as key agents of change who drive their own processes of development, set their own goals, claim their rights and fulfil their responsibilities. Hence the emphasis ought to be on organising communities (rather than mobilising them) and supporting them in dialogue and dissent via Civic Agency. The relevance of the programme will be stronger the more the various aspects of L&A agenda and policy influencing (such as agenda setting, generation of evidence, engagement in policy dialogue, and so on) are firmly grounded in the reality of citizen's aspirations and their claims to rights, but equally so in fulfilling their obligations. This will be prime areas for exploration and assessment in the evaluation.	
Judgement criteria	Indicators/sub-questions
2.1. Programme is rooted in agency of citizens. L&A agenda is based on legitimate and representative voices and claims to rights of low-income citizen.	Evidence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- of co-creation of L&amp;A strategies and approaches led by citizens aspirations, their claims to rights as well as implications of fulfilment of their obligations</li> <li>- how the programme embedded citizen agency in the research agenda setting, research planning and implementation</li> <li>- of generation and use of evidence by citizens with support of programme actors (in research, communication, etc.)</li> <li>- of functional multi-stakeholder engagement in development and implementation of L&amp;A strategies (dialogue, collaboration and synchronisation with actors)</li> </ul>

<sup>26</sup> Gender and Disability

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- that partner CSOs are rooted in and/or aligned with the action of citizens</li> </ul>
2.2. Strategies are relevant in contributing to the envisaged objectives of L&A at different institutional levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Smart mix of L&amp;A strategies (insider–outsider / dialogue-dissent) implemented</li> <li>- Evidence of gradual shift from mobilising to organising communities in L&amp;A trajectories</li> <li>- Role and influence of multi-stakeholder platforms and processes in L&amp;A</li> <li>- Demand driven capacity development strategies that reinforces Civic Agency for L&amp;A</li> <li>- What mechanisms are in place to establish local – national -international linkages e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Do outcomes and achievements based on (localised) Civic Agency find its “way up” into policy processes at higher levels? Or</li> <li>o Are different levels <i>activated</i> simultaneously with linkages enabled by lead agencies and partners?</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Other mechanisms?</li> </ul>
2.3. Programme takes into account the opportunities and bottlenecks of the context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- to what extent Civic Agency in programme activities engages actors from different sectors (state, market, civil society, family)</li> <li>- intermittent adaptations to programme ToC and country strategies, and subsequent changes in L&amp;A strategies or implementation plans as indicator of responsiveness to external developments</li> </ul>
<p>Information sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Study of documents (programme and project proposals, annual plans, monitoring reports, policy documents of partners, reports of joint activities that have taken place)</li> <li>- Workshops with country-based partners</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews with partners in The Netherlands and partner countries</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders and external stakeholders</li> <li>- Sense-making workshop in-country (restitution) and consolidated at programme level with DW4W programme team</li> </ul>	

### EQ.3. To what degree are these changes sustainable?

#### *Rationale*

In line with the overall objectives, the sustainability of changes will also be assessed along two levels:

- Sustainability of the changes in L&A capacity of partners and citizens – the latter is critical to assess lasting power of Civic Agency in influencing policies and their implementation,
- Sustainability of the changes in agenda, policies and practices.

The extent to which changes can or will be sustained is in principle related to ability of key actors to consolidate over time what has been achieved in terms of capacity development or in policy development



and implementation related that contribute to decent work for women in the horticulture sector. Therefore, the assessment of sustainability is focused on actor-groups, notably government actors, market actors and civil society. Where applicable for the above-mentioned groups, sustainability will be assessed along different dimensions such social, institutional, and financial. In addition, it will be assessed what factors may affect sustainability and how risks of diminished sustainability are mitigated, with specific attention to risk mitigation in the face of climate change.

Judgement criteria	Indicators/sub-questions
3.1. Changes at the level of government actors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Institutional changes: evidence of the willingness of public actors to adhere to and implement new or revised policies, procedures, or regulations that contribute to respecting business and human rights</li> <li>- Financial changes: evidence of adequate resource allocation (in terms of investment and/or recurrent public budget allocation) to adhere to and implement new or revised policies (fully-resourced policies),</li> <li>- Social: proof of supporting policy discourse and pro-active attitude of policy makers in favour of envisioned objectives (DW4W)</li> </ul>
3.2. Changes at the level of private sector organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Institutional changes: private sector pro-active engagement in multi-actor platforms and other initiatives for the development and implementation of policies and regulations regarding business and human rights</li> <li>- Financial changes: private sector investments enable implementing of CSR policies and business and human rights principles</li> <li>- Social: positive discourse and attitude of entrepreneurs in favour of adopting business and human rights in their practice</li> </ul>
3.3. Changes at the level of participating organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Institutional – formal CSOs: support from leadership, adequate HR to follow up policy changes and lobby for policy implementation, L&amp;A policy embedded in organisational set-up and strategy, coherence between L&amp;A practice and other strategies of the organisation,</li> <li>- Institutional – women groups, gender committees. Proof of programme support that has shifted from mobilising communities to organising citizen groups as agents of change (with lead agencies and partners acting as facilitators and enablers rather than implementers)</li> <li>- Programmatic – whether functioning and impact of Civic Agency stretches beyond the programme logic (not affected by ‘Stop &amp; Go mechanisms) and <i>stays alive</i> past the present programme cycle</li> <li>- Financial: CSOs have sufficient financial resources available to continue implementing L&amp;A strategies.</li> <li>- Financial: citizen initiatives increasingly funded through local resource mobilisation and/or diversification of funding base</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Social: shared vision, strategies and values regarding L&amp;A at organisational level</li> </ul>
3.4 Risk mitigation including environmental issues / climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identification and assessments of risks in terms of impact and probability and assessment if and how programme has considered and/or realised mitigating measures</li> <li>- Sensitivity and responsiveness of implementing partners and other actors (including citizens) to take on climate-change-related concerns into related policy debate and development</li> </ul>
<p>Information sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Programme documents (programme and project proposal, annual reports, monitoring reports, etc)</li> <li>- Findings and observations collected in case study research</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews with senior programme staff at Hivos and regional/country Hivos programme teams</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews with few associated partners</li> <li>- Workshops with country-based partners</li> </ul>	

#### EQ. 4. What has the programme done to ensure a proper use of available/limited resources (efficiency)?

##### **Rationale**

In addressing the efficiency question distinction<sup>27</sup>, can be made between organisational efficiency and programme efficiency.<sup>28</sup>

Assessing **organisational efficiency** would involve looking at strategies and norms that the CAC consortium has been using to maximise (returns on) their resources. Hillhorst (et.al) labelled this approach the ‘Theory of Efficiency’. It comprises a description and qualitative assessment of relevant features embedded in the organisation (consortium) and how these were translated into or integrated in organisational procedures and systems aimed at ensuring efficiency of programme interventions and those meant to monitor efficiency. This type of assessment takes place at organisational level and could be a component of the planned evaluation of the internal organisation of the Civic Agency Consortium, which will be organised after the thematic evaluations. While this dimension of efficiency thus falls beyond the scope of this evaluation, we will collect some evidence on measures and procedures taken by the programme management to address the efficiency question and optimise use of available resources. .

In **programme efficiency**, on other hand, a link is established between programme effects and the costs incurred. It is unlikely that a level 2 analysis that compares efficiency of the entire programme with alternative options or benchmarks will be feasible because of limited availability of comparative data and of time and resource limitations within this evaluation. However, it is proposed to carry out a multi-criteria analysis on efficiency of different programme interventions that will shed a light on the perceived efficiency of different process approaches used by the programme in a comparative cost-effectiveness assessment.

<sup>27</sup> Reference is made to The Spindle Efficiency Lab of PARTOS (<https://thespindle.org/project/efficiency-2/>) for background information on efficiency analysis – see also *The Efficiency Lab: Lessons Learned. A guide to analysing efficiency of development interventions. Published by The Spindle, the innovation platform of Partos, the Netherlands.*

<sup>28</sup> IOB also made this distinction in its initial communication & guidance on the upcoming evaluations

Judgment criteria	Judgment criteria
4.1. Organisational Efficiency:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Programme management procedures and accountability requirements are clear, lean and respected and pay attention to efficiency considerations</li> <li>- Evidence of efficiency considerations in decision making</li> <li>- Mechanisms to monitor efficiency of interventions in place</li> <li>- Evidence of compliance or deviation from procedures and how deviations were handled (new or adapted procedures?)</li> </ul>
4.2. Assessing programme efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Comparative assessment of different types of interventions applied in the programme using MADM-like analysis – see section 3 methodology .</li> </ul>
Information sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Programme documents (programme and project proposals, annual reports, monitoring reports, etc)</li> <li>- Findings and observations collected in case study research</li> <li>- Semi-structured interviews with senior programme staff at Hivos and regional/country Hivos programme teams</li> <li>- Workshops with country-based partners</li> </ul>	

**EQ. 5. What has been the role of the CAC consortium members, partner organisations and the MFA/EKN in contributing to the observed changes?**

<p><i>Rationale</i></p> <p>The subject of assessment is the role of and relations between the Hivos, partners in the South and donor agency (Ministry and EKN). The success of partnership relations has to do with the quality of interaction, ownership of approach, cooperation &amp; co-creation, information sharing, mutual accountability, and commitment of autonomous partners to a common goal. The creation of added value from partnership is crucial for success. The phrasing ‘for and by’ partners refers to the dual perspective of creation of added value, i.e. successful partnership adds value to the joint programme (e.g. in terms of effectiveness) while added value is also created for partners themselves (e.g. from collaborating with others and sharing and learning from them). The latter is particularly relevant with respect to capacity development which in order to be successful, is expected to be characterised by mutuality and complementarity in the relation between the lead agency and CSOs but equally (or even more decisively) so for the relations between formal CSOs and citizens groups and/or multi-stakeholder groups.</p> <p>From the CAC consortium members, only Hivos is involved in the DW4W programme. So an assessment of relationships with other CAC consortium members is not relevant.</p>	
Judgement criteria	Indicators/sub-questions
5.1. Role of implementing partners and Hivos and the relationship between implementing partners and Hivos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roles and responsibilities are clear to all</li> <li>- Complementarity of roles in contributing to observed changes</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Appreciation of the relevance and quality of the support provided by the CAC members and their added value (by the implementing partners)</li> <li>- Assessment of the quality of the partnership relationships between Hivos and implementing partners</li> <li>- To what extent is design of DMEL system and organisational learning of the lead agency and partners inspired by endogenous knowledge and practices?</li> <li>- Concrete actions that have leveraged strengths and capacities of Southern partners</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>
5.3. Role of MFA/EKN and the relationship with Hivos and implementing partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Roles and responsibilities are clear to all</li> <li>- Complementarity of roles in contributing to observed changes</li> <li>- Assessment of the partnership relationships between MFA/EKN, CAC members and implementing partners (by all)</li> <li>- ...</li> </ul>
<p>Information sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Programme documents (programme and project proposals, annual reports, monitoring reports, etc)</li> <li>- Findings and observations collected in case study research</li> <li>- Interviews with senior programme staff at Hivos</li> <li>- Interviews with associated partners and with representatives of NL Government (Ministry and/or EKNs)</li> <li>- Workshops with country-based partners</li> </ul>	

## 9.2. Chronogram of the visit

Date	Stakeholder	Activity
Monday, February 3	Meeting DW4W programme team	Presentation and group interview
Tuesday, February 4	Inception workshop involving all implementing partners: WRW, Ufadhili Trust, KHRC, FIDA Kenya, Haki Mashinani, FEMNET, FIC	Workshop
Wednesday, February 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- AWCFS</li> <li>- Two journalists collaborating with AWCFS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interview director and W@W project officer</li> <li>- interview</li> </ul>
Thursday, February 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- WRW</li> <li>- Ufadhili Trust</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interview director</li> <li>- Interview programme team</li> </ul>
Friday, February 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FIDA Uganda</li> <li>- KHRC</li> <li>- KPAWU Branch officers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interview programme team</li> <li>- FGD participants of training</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interview programme team</li> <li>- Interview Branch officers</li> </ul>
Saturday, February 8	Visit to Tropi-Flora farm, Kiambu county	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interview management</li> <li>- FGD gender committee</li> </ul>
Sunday, February 9	free	
Monday, February 10	Visit to Mahee Flower farm, Nakuru county	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interview management</li> <li>- FGD gender committee</li> </ul>
Tuesday, February 11	Visit to Tambuzi Flower farm, Naivasha county  Visit to Equinox Flower farm, Naivasha county	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interview management</li> <li>- FGD gender committee</li> <li>- Interview management</li> <li>- FGD gender committee</li> </ul>
Wednesday, February 12	Sense-making workshop with implementing partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- workshop</li> </ul>
After the mission, interviews by phone or skype: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Former W@W programme manager (February 14)</li> <li>- Fair Trade Africa (February 14)</li> <li>- Kenya Flower Council</li> <li>- HCD</li> </ul>		

### 9.3. List of people consulted

#### Hivos team

Virginia Munyua	W@W regional programme manager East Africa
Henri Wera	W@W project manager East Africa
Mary Kuira	W@W M&E officer East Africa
Caroline	W@W communication officer

#### Implementing partners

Eunice Waweru	Secretary General Workers Right Watch (WRW)
Ruth Omukhango	Programme manager AWC
Arthur Okwemba	Executive Director AWC
Mary Kambo	Programme advisor KHRC
Nasanga Aki	Project officer KHRC
Janet Onyango	FIDA
	FIDA
Maina Wambugu	Programme manager Ufadhili Trust
Diana	Administrative officer and accountant Ufadhili Trust
Salome Odera	Haki Mashinani
Thaddeus Nyandika	Haki Mashinani
Dorothy Otieno	Project Coordinator, FEMNET
Caspar Peto	FIC
x	FIC
x	FIC

#### External stakeholders

Victor Otieno Juma	Head of radio – Ramogi FM
John Muchangi	Science Editor and Writer at the Star Newspaper
x	Journalist Editor Media house
David Wanyonyi	Branch Secretary KPAWU – Thika
Ferdinand Juma	Branch Secretary KPAWU - Naivasha
Justerian Imilida	Chair lady Branch Naivasha, chief shop steward
Mr Benjamin	Horticulture Crops Directorate
Claris Oganga	Judicial department
Clement Tulezi	Kenya Flower Council
Richard Kiprotich	Fair Trade Africa
Andrew Charles Odete	Former W@W coordinator
Mariëtte Van Huijstee	SOMO

### **Tropi-Flora farm – management**

Dondi Anchena	HR Manager
Purity Thigwu	Farm Manager
Veroncia Mwaniki	Production Manager
Precious Pauline	HR Assistant

### **Tropi-Flora farm – FGD gender committee + representatives trade union**

Magdalena Nduva
Josephine Wanja
Caroline Wanja
Lucy Makokha
Jospeh Kakai
John
Daniel Elowom
Joseph Mutunga
Jackson Imbayi
Phylis Eboso
Leila Muga
Absalom Bouz

### **Mahee flower farm - management**

Purity Thingira	Farm manager
Veronica Mwaniki	Production manager
Pauline Mukami	HR assistant

### **Mahee flower farm – FGD gender committee + representatives trade union**

Eunice Kiambui
Ruth Kiamwbui
Naomi Njoki
Florence Bosibori
Rose Kerubu
Teresiah Wangeri
Jerusha Wangeri
Mrs Orito
Teresiah Waithira
Agusia Murithi
Miriam Njoki
Josephat Macharia
Margaret Wamgui

### **Tambuzi Flower farm - management**

Mr. Kelvin Ngari-	Partnerships Officer
X	Finance Manager

### **Tambuzi Flower farm – FGD gender committee + representatives trade union**

Teresiah Chomba
Beatrice Waniiru
Martha Mukemi
Milah Cattoni
Serah Kiriuo
May Nata
Edward Waniyiri

### **Equinox Flower farm - management**

Mr. Rod Jones	CEO
Ms. Loise Ngunjiri,	HR Manager

### **Equinox flower farm – FGD gender committee + representatives trade union**

Jane Nwendwa
Mrs Wangcchi
Peter Kimathi
Douglas Coituma
Gerishon Kiriya
Julios Kamulla
Charles Weru



#### 9.4. List of documents consulted

##### Programme documents

- DW4W (February 2019) Capacity development in Decent Work for Women.
- Hivos and International Institute for Environment and Development [IIED], Article 19, Citizen Agency Consortium – Inception Report, (September, 2016).
- Hivos and International Institute for Environment and Development [IIED], Article 19, Citizen Agency Consortium Programme Document, (July, 2015).
- Hivos (2018) Annual narrative progress report 2017.
- Hivos (March 2019) Annual narrative progress report 2018.
- Hivos. Proposed highlights themes Hivos annual report 2018. East Africa
- Hivos. Women at Work (Kenya). Report first semester 2019.
- Hivos. Capacity Self- assessment forms Kenya partners
- Hivos. Feedback East-African partners capacity self-assessments
- Hivos. Summary East-African capacity self-assessments
- Hivos Women@Work Campaign. Theory of Change.
- Hivos. Women@Work Campaign. Blooming Workplaces and Communities Project.
- Hivos Women@Work Campaign. Women Leadership Project. Promoting gender equality and decent work in horticulture sector in East Africa.
- Okore, M. (June 2016) Kenya Baseline Study Report. Decent Work for Women Programme. Kenya: TDS Africa

##### Reports produced by implementing partners

- Haki Mashinani (September 2019) Late Blossoms! Time to move beyond policy statements to a safeguarding culture. A baseline study on the implementation of the model sexual harassment policy in the cut flower sector of Kenya – experiences, lessons and the business case.
- Kenya Flower Council (June 2019) SC1.0 Flowers & ornaments sustainable standard – silver audit checklist.
- Lwanergy Infiniti Media (2019) Impact Report. Women's Freedom to Work: Unmasking Sexual Harassment at Workplace. April 2012-July 2019
- Njoroge (March 2020) Audits in flower farms: belying the truth
- s.n. (2018) Report on the status of protection from sexual harassment in the Kenya cut-flower subsector. Commissioned by WRW in partnership with the Kenya Flower Council and Fair Trade.
- Ufadhili Trust profile
- Ufadhili Trust & The Impact Institute. Grow a better business. Get more insights into your social performance..
- Workers Rights Watch (December 2019) Sexual harassment policy. Refresher training report.

## **External documents**

- Murdoch, H. (January 2019) Adapting commercial practices and enhancing smallholders and workers in Kenya. Report on the “Kenya horticulture – A fair Deal for Smallholder Farmers and Workers” project implemented by the Kenya Human Rights Commission, Marks and Spencer, Flamingo Horticulture and Traidcraft Exchange.
- Start D and Hovland I (2004), Tools for Policy Impact: A Handbook for Researchers, Research and Policy in Development Programme, Overseas Development Institute, London. Retrieved from <http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/194.pdf>

## **Websites, consulted at various moments**

[www. Womenatworkcampaign.org](http://www.Womenatworkcampaign.org)

[www.kenyaflowercouncil.org](http://www.kenyaflowercouncil.org)

[www.fairtradeafrica.net](http://www.fairtradeafrica.net)

[www.tambuzi.co.ke](http://www.tambuzi.co.ke)

[www.equinoxflowers.com](http://www.equinoxflowers.com)

[www.khrc.or.ke](http://www.khrc.or.ke)

[www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications](http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Publications)

[www.rainforest-alliance.org/business/certification](http://www.rainforest-alliance.org/business/certification)