



Oxford Policy Management



Australian Government

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

Kenya's Single Registry: Panel Discussion Points

Richard Chirchir

29th March 2016

Six Lessons from Kenya's Single Registry Model



1. We should construe 'Single Registries' more broadly as a policy tool.

- Kenya's SP policy underscored need for Single Registry and envisioned set up of individual programmes with functional MISs populating the Single Registry.

2. We should Invest in quality Single Registry design.

- The fact that SP policies call for Single Registries is not grounds to jump into design. It is necessary to invest in **feasibility studies**. Kenya's was developed in 2012. Key issues that were addressed included:
 - ✦ *Objectives;*
 - ✦ *Scope and rationale;*
 - ✦ *Potential positive supply and demand impacts;*
 - ✦ *Potential negative impacts;*
 - ✦ *Potential for integration with other sector systems and civil registration systems;*
 - ✦ *Intended users;*
 - ✦ *Potential models;*
 - ✦ *Broader costs;*
 - ✦ *Conclusions and recommendations.*



Six Lessons from Kenya's Single Registry Model

3. We need champions (at both policy and technical levels).

This has not been an issue in Kenya. The following factors have propelled its development:

- The Single Registry has been in the **Cabinet Secretary's Performance Contract** at the **Ministry of Labour and East African Affairs**;
- **SP Secretariat** has seen it as their “baby” and have **lobbied resources** for its enhancements from within government and among donors;
- **MIS working group** has been fully supportive providing sign offs at different stages of development;
- **Donors** have done their part (i) **DFID** provided initial financing (ii) **World Bank** made it a disbursement linked indicator (iii) **WFP** supported the current phase with broader enhancements, documentation, branding, decentralisation and electronic registration.



Six Lessons from Kenya's Single Registry Model

4. We should develop and implement Capacity Strategies.

- A **Capacity Needs Assessment** is important for the long term **sustainability** of a Single Registry. Kenya did this during the second phase: recommendations will be implemented with the intention of handing over the project fully to government.

5. We should pay close attention to technical implementation issues.

- These include:
 - ✦ *Data Security, access, and sharing protocols*
 - ✦ *Sizing and Performance (number of transactions that can managed by databases, ability to scale up as programmes expand);*
 - ✦ *Hardware and software specifications (licenses for proprietary software, adequate hardware);*
 - ✦ *Data Backup and Recovery strategies;*
 - ✦ *Technology platform (capability to operate on web platform)*
 - ✦ *Source Code. Should be handed over to the government*



Six Lessons from Kenya's Single Registry Model

6. We should phase the development of a Single Registry.

- Phasing helps ensure:
 - ✦ Ease of **managing project sub-components** (enhancing programme MISs, replication strategies, linkages with civil registration systems etc.)
 - ✦ **Lessons** from previous phases can be incorporated in next phases
 - ✦ **Less risk of failure** especially when there are a number of competing projects being implemented by the government
 - ✦ Capacity to operate and administer integrated SP MISs is normally weak. A “big bang” approach may **overwhelm capacity**.
 - ✦ Social protection policies and programmes in many developing countries are still at a relatively **early stage** of development and are still evolving;
 - ✦ Individual social protection programmes require significant **strengthening of business processes and M&E systems**