KENYA'S HORIZONTAL REVENUE SHARING

LEVERAGING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION DATA FOR OPTIMAL EFFICIENCY

Case by Leonard Francis Vibbi, MAS 2023, MIT GOV/LAB Research Affiliate
Editing by Will Sullivan, Independent Editor, and Carlos Centeno, Associate Director of Innovation

What are the challenges, opportunities, and decision making tradeoffs that bureaucrats face when designing public sector innovations within resource-constrained governments? Over the winter 2022 and summer 2023, MIT GOV/LAB's Governance Innovation Initiative worked with six graduate student fellows and various public sector innovation labs, agencies, and other actors in the Global South to co-produce practitioner-friendly case studies that illuminate context-specific innovations. The first pilot case was researched by Mariama N'Diaye, as part of her Morningside Design Academy Fellowship with the MIT GOV/LAB, while the first cohort of summer research fellows were launched in collaboration with Priscilla King Gray Public Service Center (PKG) and MIT International Science and Technology Initiatives (MISTI).

Table of Contents

/ Executive Summary 1
/ Methodology 2
/ Learning Case 2
/ Conclusion 11
/ References 12

Executive Summary

In the wake of Kenya's 2010 constitution, the country has seen significant strides in fiscal decentralization and revenue sharing, guided by the Commission on Revenue Allocation (CRA) and underscored by a strong emphasis on public participation. Pre-2010 efforts like the Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF) and Constituency Development Fund (CDF) laid the groundwork, albeit with challenges in fairness and accountability. Since then, the CRA has developed three revenue sharing models, each improving upon its predecessor, with the latest model notably incorporating public participation data to address issues such as allocation ambiguity and demographic considerations. However, challenges persist, particularly in gathering quality public participation data, due to factors like political disengagement and inadequate civic education. This highlights the ongoing need for enhanced civic awareness and active engagement strategies to ensure the effectiveness and equity of revenue sharing models in Kenya.

Methodology

This study employed a qualitative approach, incorporating a review of articles and featured a key expert interview with a former Commission on Revenue Allocation senior staff member, who significantly contributed to developing Kenya's third revenue sharing formula. Conducted in Nairobi, the semi-structured interview, focused on the role of public participation data in creating this model. The conversation with the former staff member (who will be referred to as Senior Staff member in this study) offered insights into the intricacies of Kenya's revenue sharing strategies and the importance of public involvement in fiscal decentralization. It highlighted the negative impact of limited public participation and how lessons from previous models informed the third formula's development. This study, combining the expert interview and literature review, provides an analysis of public participation data and its role in shaping effective revenue distribution in Kenya.

Kiambu government offices in Kenya. Photo by Nat Rabb.

Learning Case

Kenya's Fiscal Renaissance: Navigating Traditional Challenges to Modern Innovations
Kenya's innovative approach to fiscal decentralization and revenue sharing was established under the 2010 constitution. It replaced a pre-2010 fiscal system that was riddled with loopholes and inefficiencies, leading to unfair revenue distribution across various regions. Prior to the implementation of the 2010 constitution, a series of fiscal instruments had been enacted to support local development. For example, in 2000, Kenya introduced the Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF), replacing the fiscal system that had been discontinued during the post-colonial centralization of governance. Initially, LATF accounted for about 12 % of the revenues for local governments. Over time, its contribution expanded to 18-82 % of their revenues, although this varied significantly across different regions. Primarily allocated for development, LATF tended to favor urban areas, leaving local governments to supplement their income through a variety of local fees, licenses, and other minor revenue sources.[1] Three years after the rollout of LATF, Kenya's parliament established the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) alongside existing provincial-district and local government systems to combat poverty and improve basic services. This was a departure from reforming the existing systems furnished by LATF, subsequently offering an alternative channel for local service distribution that was more aligned with political interests. The Constituency Development Fund (CDF), differing from the Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF), favored rural areas. It allocated funds through rural electoral districts, each represented and managed by a Member of Parliament, in contrast to the urban and regional focus of the LATF. This emphasis on rural constituencies, overseen by MPs, made the accountability processes for citizens more complex. Firstly, the involvement of MPs in fund management challenges the separation of powers, risking corruption and conflicts of interest due to insufficient oversight. Secondly, the claim that CDFs empower community decision-making is undermined by limited public awareness and involvement, coupled with MPs' excessive control. This lack of participation and transparency hinders community accountability and the potential benefits of grassroots-level fund allocation.[2]

Summarizing the revenue distribution situation before the 2010 constitution, the Senior Staff member describes that era as one where the executive, judicial, and legislative branches had substantial centralized power. This centralization favored political and financial interests, often at the expense of fair and equitable distribution of revenue across regions. Former revenue authority senior staff observes:

> / "The history of the executive and legislative, judicial branch controlling revenue distribution led to a political elite dominating these decisions. Advocacy for fairness was often suppressed by the judiciary. There was antagonism between the political class and the judiciary, particularly when the executive disagreed with judicial decisions. Essentially, revenue allocation was manipulated as a tool to serve purely political interests."

As a response to the challenges highlighted above with respect to fiscal accountability and fairness, chapter 12 of Kenya's 2010 constitution introduces a series of devolved systems of governance that promoted accountability and fairness, strongly noting public participation as a key process to achieve equitable fiscal decentralization. Specifically, article 201 sets out the guiding principles for the republic's finances, explicitly emphasizing the need for "openness and accountability, including public participation in financial matters."[3] Adhering to these principles is crucial for fulfilling article 202(1), which mandates that "Revenue raised nationally shall be shared equitably among national and county governments".[4] To facilitate fiscal decentralization, the constitution established various independent entities, including county governments, county assemblies, the senate, the controller of budget, and the CRA. As a new fiscal arrangement replacing the old fiscal infrastructure and marking a key innovative turnaround in revenue distribution, the constitution mandates that a minimum of 15 % of nationally raised revenue be allocated for distribution among the lower county governments.[5] Further solidifying this process, the Public Financial Management Act (PFMA) enacted in 2012 stipulated high-level public participation in budgetary processes.[6] The Senior Staff member asserts that the financial mechanisms established by Kenya's new constitution are designed to support a structured and equitable approach to revenue distribution across counties. He emphasizes that these "financial arms" of the devolved governance system are aligned with their mandates to ensure fair and systematic allocation of resources among the counties.

> / "The constitutional narrative focuses on balancing actual experiences against the ideals set forth in the constitution. This involves ensuring equitable distribution, so each individual receives a fair portion of the nation's wealth, often referred to as the 'national cake.' Our goal is to foster uniform development across the country ...These funds are crucial for elevating less developed regions to the same level as more developed counties, promoting nationwide equality."

Fiscal Evolution: Tracing the CRA's Journey in the Landscape of Decentralization

The CRA's main function is to advise the national assembly on the fair distribution of revenues raised nationally, ensuring a balanced allocation between the national government and county governments — a responsibility that centers on guaranteeing an equitable and just revenue distribution process on vertical and horizontal equity sharing axis.[7] Vertical equity relates to how revenue is divided between the national government and county governments. Horizontal revenue distribution, the primary focus of this case study, concerns the distribution of at least 15% of the revenue among the county governments, employs a formulaic approach for distributing funds, which considers several key factors. These include the financial needs and

develop necessities of all counties, the economic disparities between them, each county's fiscal capacity, and the need for stability and predictability in the allocation of revenue shared among the counties.[8] This systematic approach aims to secure a fair and equitable distribution of funds among the counties. This is particularly important given the growing demand for public services in an economy that is expanding rapidly. The Senior Staff member, drawing on his experience, emphasizes that:

> "The national government collects these funds, and our role at the commission is to recommend how this money should be distributed in a way that aligns with the aspirations of Kenya. This is the core of our work: determining how to distribute these funds effectively, deciding on the amounts to be allocated, and ensuring that the distribution process is efficient and impactful. We have an economy valued at around 28 trillion shillings, but managing it with a population of 50 million is challenging. It's essential to find ways to enlarge the 'national cake,' making sure that the fair distribution of resources has a significant impact."

This concept is not only a fundamental principle of governance but also a primary objective of devolution in Kenya. It advocates for self-governance and active citizen participation in state decision-making processes, as highlighted in Article 174c of the Kenyan Constitution.

To develop a nationally representative revenue sharing recommendation, the CRA is mandated by the constitution and the Public Financial Management Act (PFMA) to conduct a series of public participation exercises across all counties in Kenya. The Global Initiative for Fiscal Transparency (GIFT) characterizes public participation as the diverse interactions between the public and government authorities in crafting, executing, and assessing policies. The forms of public involvement range from occasional interactions to more structured relationships that provide information access to citizens. Depending on the desired level of engagement, various methods are used in public participation. These include public meetings and hearings, involvement in advisory committees, workshops, seminars, interviews, surveys, focus groups, and other techniques.[9] These methods serve to inform the public, solicit their input, and occasionally foster consensus and agreement; allowing individuals and groups to be involved in government and community matters, ensuring their opinions influence decisions impacting their lives. This concept is not only a fundamental principle of governance but also a primary objective of devolution in Kenya. It advocates for self-governance and active citizen participation in state decision-making processes, as highlighted in Article 174c of the Kenyan Constitution. Kenya's implementation of public participation in revenue sharing among counties aligns with global best practices, underscoring the importance of grassroots participatory processes for successful decentralization.[10] In Kenya's Civic Education Trainers Manual Participants Handout, the importance of public participation in ensuring fair revenue distribution lies in its ability to support informed decision-making.[11] This is achieved through several key methods:

1. Data Collection and Service Improvement: Public participation gathers valuable data through surveys and focus group discussions. This information is crucial for improving the services provided by public officials. It also strengthens the credibility and trust between public officers and the community, especially regarding significant issues and services.
2. Building Community Belonging and Trust: Interactions between citizens and public servants enhance a sense of belonging and trust within the community. Such participation allows citizens to engage in meaningful conversations with their leaders about their needs, fostering a stronger connection with local government.
3. Diverse Contributions to Public Debate: Public participation provides a platform for a wide range of citizens to contribute to public debates and decision-making processes. This involvement ensures that community concerns are focused, prioritized, and addressed constructively by public officials. It also cultivates more community-aware citizens who better understand how the government responds to their needs.

Abandoned infrastructure in Kenya. Photo by Nat Rabb.

The Senior Staff member, emphasized the importance of using data from public engagements, which played a key role in shaping an equitable revenue sharing formula during his tenure as commissioner. He conducted a nationwide tour, visiting all counties to engage with local communities. These engagements, conducted through town hall meetings known as 'bazaba' in Kiswahili, were instrumental in collecting public opinions and discussions. This valuable data was then used to inform and guide the development of the revenue sharing formula and recommended to the government for sharing of revenues among the counties. Over the years, this approach has contributed to achieving tangible and equitable revenue allocation strategies for developments across various counties. The Senior Staff member says:

/ "...There are areas in Nairobi that previously had no businesses but now thrive with commerce. There were locations where petrol stations were nonexistent but now have them. Furthermore, given the administration of Kenya's new revenue sharing basis, there are regions with growing small-scale manufacturing businesses, like welding and public transportation, that have emerged in places where it was once absent."

Revolutionizing the Flow: Charting Kenya's Progressive Leap in Revenue Sharing Dynamics

Since the adoption of Kenya's 2010 constitution, the CRA has proposed three iterations of revenue sharing. The initial revenue sharing model, known as the first basis, was sanctioned in November 2012. It was implemented for revenue distribution in the last quarter of the 2012/13 fiscal year and continued through the 2013/14 to 2016/17 fiscal years. Subsequently, the second basis for revenue sharing received parliamentary approval in June 2016 and was applied for the fiscal years 2017/18, 2018/19, and 2019/20.12 In addition, the third basis, set to distribute revenue among county governments for five fiscal years, extends from FY 2020/21 to 2024/25.13 Each basis has involved the commission using a set formula for distributing revenue. The formulas have followed a clearly defined process, using specific parameters to ensure the method is transparent and predictable. While developing these bases, the commission adhered to the principles outlined in article 201(a) of the constitution, emphasizing openness, accountability, and public involvement in financial matters. In relation to the above, before finalizing their recommendations, the commission examined submissions from independent bodies and county governments, conducted focus group discussions with county officials and experts, and analyzed data from surveys conducted at the county level.

The criteria for formulating the revenue sharing basis further consider an assessment of key elements that pinpoint vital areas underpinning equity in horizontal revenue allocation among county governments. With respect to the above, both the first and second revenue sharing bases employed similar parameters, such as population, basic equal share[1], poverty, land area, and fiscal effort[2], with development factors added only on the second basis. These parameters (see table 1) were selected by the commission, which considered how well they reflect counties' expenditure needs, their independence from other variables in the framework, and the availability of current data from credible, independent sources. Supporting the aforementioned revenue sharing principles, the Senior Staff member stated that upon establishing these factors, the commission assigned various weights based on international best practices, local conditions, simulations, and extensive consultations. The commission's development of revenue sharing parameters is fundamentally driven by a constitutional requirement to incorporate public participation. Essential to this process is the use of data and feedback gathered from public engagement to determine the most appropriate parameters for allocating revenue across counties.

The subsequent section underscores the crucial importance of public involvement and data analysis in helping the commission understand citizen perspectives on key public services, which are at the heart of the revenue sharing formula.

Table 1: First and Second Bases for Revenue Sharing

No.	Parameter	First Basis Weight (%)	Second Basis Weight (%)
1	Population	45	45
2	Basic Equal Share	25	26
3	Poverty	20	18
4	Land Area	8	8
5	Fiscal Effort	2	2
6	Development Factor	-	1
	Total	100	100

Source: CRA, 2020

Unlocking Citizen Voices for Development: The Pivotal Role of Public Participation Data

Article 201(a) of the constitution holds public involvement in financial matters as a key element of fair fiscal decentralization. Public participation refers to the act of people collectively engaging in the governance process. This involves deliberation, joint action, and interaction within various interests, institutions, and networks. It helps in building a civic identity and actively involves individuals in the procedures of governance. 14 Public participation has several benefits when it comes to developing a revenue sharing basis. For instance, public participation fosters increased trust between officials and the community, enhancing citizens' sense of belonging and trust in their leaders. More importantly, it brings diverse views into public debates, making citizens better informed about government projects and proposals. This involvement through the collection of views and opinions forms public participation data that helps prioritize community concerns, showcases citizens' unique skills, and assists in setting priorities. As a result, the former revenue authority senior staff justified that public participation contributes to more effective decisions to be made, essentially enabling the public to become more aware of

1 *In Kenya, the basic equal share is 25%. This is the minimum share allocated to all counties to establish administrative structures and coordinate community participation in county planning and governance.*

2 *The fiscal effort index measures a county's effort to raise its own source revenues from the economic activities within the county. The fiscal prudence parameter is a composite index that measures county's fiscal responsibility.*

community issues and assess government responses more accurately, and in turn support officials to gain a deeper understanding of community needs, and respond to identified needs more effectively.

Initially, the first two versions of the revenue sharing basis were developed with limited public input, leading to a formula that didn't adequately cater to the needs of local counties. Recognizing this s hortfall, the Senior Staff member and his fellow commissioners worked towards creating a more effective formula, one that heavily relies on public participation data. The Senior Staff member emphasized the importance of this approach, underscoring how incorporating public input can lead to a formula that more effectively serves community needs:

> "Let me provide some context about the third base revenue sharing model. When we assumed our roles as commissioners, we were tasked with adapting the existing formula. In order to create a more impactful approach, we decided to focus on gathering public participation data to understand the current situation better. This data collection aimed to identify and address the issues clogging the decentralization pipeline that existed during the first and second revenue sharing basis."

In retrospect, the limited public participation data in developing the first two revenue sharing model created overly generalized parameters that fail to address the specific public service needs of counties.

In retrospect, the limited public participation data in developing the first two revenue sharing model created overly generalized parameters that fail to address the specific public service needs of counties. This is particularly problematic when allocating resources, as balancing different factors is essential, and public input can be a key determinant in this process. Additionally, when transferring responsibilities and resources to county governments, it's vital to evaluate not only the costs of services, but also the capacity of the counties to effectively deliver these services. Therefore, when distributing funds, a move away from broad, one-size-fits-all strategies towards a focus on the specific costs of services managed by county governments is necessary. This approach requires a detailed analysis of data to understand the varying costs of service delivery in different counties, ensuring a more targeted and effective allocation of resources. Building on the aforementioned challenges, the Senior Staff member highlights that these issues, which undermined the effectiveness of the first two revenue sharing models, were a key influence in the decision to prioritize public participation data in the design of the third revenue sharing basis during his tenure on the commission:

> "The importance of citizen experiences became evident, especially considering how the lack of effective citizen engagement contributed to the shortcomings of the first and second revenue sharing formulas. Armed with this understanding, we aimed to delve into the underlying issues. Therefore, our approach for the third revenue sharing basis was to be data-driven, focusing on the stories and experiences of the citizens."

The Birth of the Third Revenue Basis

The third revenue sharing basis, which the Senior Staff member refers to as the "most progressive" in Kenya, stands out from its predecessors. The commissions took a new approach to public engagement unlike the first two revenue sharing formulas, leading to the addition of new parameters (see table 2). These additions radically innovated the revenue sharing basis, making it more detailed and effective in allocating a fair share of the national revenue to lower-level counties, thereby supporting them in performing their devolved functions. According to a technical report that the Senior Staff member and other commissioners compiled, the shortcomings that the newest revenue basis addresses include:

1. **Limitations in Measuring Expenditure Needs**
   The first and second revenue bases used proxies for expenditure needs, but these proxies' effectiveness in determining service demand was not objectively measurable, impacting the assessment of devolution's impact on service delivery in lower counties.
2. **Allocation Ambiguity**
   The transfer framework did not clearly specify how allocations met various objectives, complicating the evaluation of revenue adequacy, especially for the second basis's success across counties.
3. **Population vs. Expenditure Needs**
   Assuming counties with larger populations have greater expenditures is flawed, as counties with similar populations may have different health care costs. This overlooks demographic differences affecting public service demands in various counties.
4. **Inequitable Administrative Expenditure**
   Not all county governments have equal administrative expenditure needs, making the 26% allocation to this parameter on the second basis excessive for some counties with fewer administrative units.
5. **Poverty Gap Variability**
   The use of poverty gap measures for revenue sharing is volatile and influenced by factors beyond public policy. Similarly poor populations across counties can have different poverty gaps.
6. **Land Area as Inadequate Proxy**
   Land area, used as a proxy for administrative and infrastructural needs, ignored factors like population density and topography and incorrectly assumed larger counties always incur higher service costs.
7. **Ignoring Urban Needs**
   The first and second bases overlooked the unique needs of urban areas in revenue allocation, neglecting the importance of nurturing industrial clusters and balanced rural-urban development.

The introduction of new parameters for the third basis such as health services, agricultural services, urban services, and roads, alongside corresponding indicators to calculate expenditures for each parameter, further explain why the third revenue sharing basis is regarded as more

innovative than the former ones. In designing the third revenue basis, the commission conducted public consultations. They incorporated public data with the aim of refining the allocation process, ensuring a more comprehensive and focused distribution of national revenue. The Senior Staff member notes that this enhanced and inclusive methodology facilitates better and more robust fiscal support to key public sectors in lower-level counties — a significantly missing component in the previous formulae:

> "Upon assuming our roles as commissioners, we started with the existing first two formulas and aimed to improve its effectiveness. We recognized the importance of gathering and analyzing extensive public participation data to gain a clear understanding of the situation. This led us to focus on what the data revealed, understanding that it would shape our perspectives and decisions."

The horizontal revenue sharing model could be an opportunity for Kenyans from all walks of life. Photo by Nat Rabb.

Table 2: Third revenue sharing parameter

Objective	Parameter	Indicator of Expenditure	Assigned Weight (%)
To enhance service delivery	Health services	Health index	17
	Agriculture services	Agricultural Index	10
	Population	Population index	18
	Urban services	Urban services index	5
	Basic share	Basic share index	20
To promote balanced development	Land	Land area index	8
	Roads	Rural access index	4
	Poverty Level	Poverty head count index	14
Incentivize revenue collection	Fiscal effort	Fiscal effort index	2
Incentivize fiscal prudence	Fiscal prudence	Fiscal prudence index	2

Source: CRA, 2020

Overcoming Hurdles: Navagating the Complex Terrain of Public Participation Data

The third revenue sharing models stands out from its predecessors due to its innovative approach of incorporating a high volume of public participation data. This strategy enabled the development of revenue sharing parameters that more accurately address the diverse public service needs of lower county governments. However, during this process, there were significant obstacles in obtaining quality public participation data - highlighted below.

Political Disengagement

Political disengagement is a widespread issue across Kenya. The Senior Staff member notes that the CRA observed a lack of engagement in every county during public consultations for the third basis. He further explains that significant factor contributing to the decline in citizen engagement, especially among the youth, in discussions about revenue sharing, is a deep-rooted sense of disillusionment.

Many young people are skeptical about the impact of their opinions, suspecting that political leaders will prioritize their own agendas over the public interest, similar to the behavior observed during the post-colonial era with the CDF. They often feel that their views will be overlooked or disregarded in political decision-making processes . The perceived self-interest of political leaders worsens the gap between them and the citizens they serve, leading to a decline in public trust. This is partly because citizens, despite providing input, continue to experience subpar public services. Consequently, citizen participation in revenue sharing consultations diminishes, as people prioritize dealing with their own daily challenges over engaging in a process that seems to rarely result in noticeable improvements in public services. The Senior Staff member further illustrates his experience with an example of how political disengagement contributes to diminished public participation:

/ "Imagine calling a community meeting where a significant number of attendees might be battling hunger or may have an ailing child at home. In such situations, citizens' pressing personal challenges naturally eclipse the perceived urgency of public discussions on revenue sharing formula formulation. Indeed, if someone is grappling with health issues or hunger, their capacity to engage actively in civic matters is greatly diminished. For instance, when we inquired about their involvement in the previous year's budgeting processes, many expressed more immediate concerns like needing food or immediate solutions, rather than deliberating on fiscal policies."

Weak Civic Education

Achieving the objectives set for civic engagement, especially in governance matters, remains elusive in Kenya. This lack of civic education significantly hampers citizen involvement in discussions about revenue sharing models, primarily due to a widespread lack of awareness among the general populace regarding their civic rights. The benefit of civic education is that it enhances citizens' knowledge of a country's governance system and their responsibilities within it.15 The Senior Staff member explains that for the CRA, raising citizen awareness about their role in budgeting processes is crucial for enriching public discourse on issues related to public service delivery and creating a robust revenue sharing formula:

/ "During civic education sessions, the youth are largely absent, and their enthusiasm for governance issues is notably missing. Intriguingly, they're actively involved in political campaigns, but their engagement in core governance issues drops significantly post-campaigns. Their accountability in monitoring governance systems and active participation is simply not there. Our civic education initiatives haven't attained the desired impact to ensure broad-based citizen involvement in overseeing both local and national government actions."

Economic Hardship
Economic hardship, a critical yet often overlooked factor, significantly hampers citizen engagement in Kenya's public budgeting processes. The country's recent economic challenges have had a direct impact on public participation. The Senior Staff member says that when individuals grapple with basic necessities like food and financial stability, or immediate concerns such as their children's health or education, participation in budgetary consultations takes a back seat.This link between widespread poverty and diminished involvement in fiscal discussions severely limits meaningful citizen input in developing revenue sharing models that in turn addresses those needs:

/ "During our nationwide tour, we consistently observed that economic hardship significantly affects public participation. In areas where individuals are struggling with basic needs — such as hunger, illness, or lack of education for their children — there's a noticeable decrease in their willingness to engage in public discussions. Economic challenges, based on my experience, play a crucial role in determining the extent of citizens' participation. This pattern is starkly visible in poorer communities, where there is almost no citizen participation due to these pressing economic hardships. Conversely, in more affluent communities, the level of engagement is substantially higher. In these areas, citizens are more likely to ask informed questions and actively participate, as they are not burdened by the same level of economic distress."

Conclusion: Embracing Public Participation Data for Future Revenue Sharing Models

This case study explores how Kenya's horizontal revenue sharing system, overseen by the Commission on Revenue Allocation (CRA), has evolved since the new constitution's adoption. A significant change has been the move towards greater public engagement, involving consultations with governments, experts, and citizens. These interactions have been key in improving the third revenue sharing model for more equitable resource distribution. Yet, issues like political disengagement, limited civic knowledge, and economic difficulties continue to impede public access to relevant data. Looking to the future, the Senior Staff member notes that there are positive developments in the revenue sharing framework. The rise in civic education initiatives is enhancing citizen involvement in public budgeting, including the CRA's community consultations for revenue sharing. Additionally, the recent county-level elections under the new constitution are expected to bring more informed and engaged governors, crucial for encouraging public participation and data collection for tailored revenue allocations. The CRA is also anticipated to keep recruiting skilled commissioners to further improve the revenue sharing formula. Importantly, ongoing technical training for new commissioners, particularly those without a background in fiscal decentralization, is essential. This training, the Senior Staff member notes, should extend to lower county administrations to facilitate the use of public participation data in policy making. With data-driven policies still new to many, ongoing education and capacity building are key.

The changing landscape of Kenya's revenue sharing methodology indicates a promising future for more effective and inclusive public engagement, setting the stage for more innovative and equitable policies in horizontal fiscal decentralization.

References

1. Smoke P, Whimp K. The Evolution of Fiscal Decentralization under Kenya's New Constitution: Opportunities and Challenges. Published online 2023.
2. Constituency-Development-Funds-Scoping-Paper.pdf.
3. 201. Principles of public finance - Kenya Law Reform Commission (KLRC). Accessed November 30, 2023. https://www.klrc.go.ke/index.php/constitution-of-kenya/147-chapter-twelve-public-finance/part-1-principles-and-framework-of-public-finance/370-201-principles-of-public-finance
4. Kenya 2010 Constitution - Constitute. Accessed November 10, 2023. https://www.constituteproject.org/constitution/Kenya_2010
5. County Government Structure in Kenya. Published April 26, 2022. Accessed November 30, 2023. https://icma.org/articles/article/county-government-structure-kenya
6. Jason Lakin. The Kenyan Public Finance Management Act 2012 FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions) For Citizens. Published online March 2013.
7. Devolution and Resource Sharing in Kenya. Brookings. Accessed August 27, 2023. https://www.brookings.edu/articles/devolution-and-resource-sharing-in-kenya/
8. Commission on Revenue Authority. Mandate of CRA. Accessed November 30, 2023. https://cra.go.ke/mandate/
9. Mudida R. Structural Sources of Constitutional Conflicts in Kenya.; 2015.
10. Public Participation Key to Kenya's Devolution. World Bank. Accessed November 10, 2023. https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2015/04/30/public-participation-central-to-kenyas-ambitious-devolution
11. Ministry of devolution and Planning, and Transition Authority. Devolution And Public Participation In Kenya Civic Education Handouts For Participants Executive Programme. Published online 2016.
12. Commission on Revenue Allocation. Technical Report of the Third Basis of Revenue Sharing Among County Governments. Published online 2021.
13. Commission on Revenue Allocation. Technical-Report-Brochure -The Third Basis on Revenue Sharing Among County Governments. Published online 2021.
14. Public Administration Review - 2005 - Cooper - Civic Engagement in the Twenty First Century Toward a Scholarly and.pdf.
15. KENYA: 'The denial of resources for civic education has been a massive blow for civil society.' Accessed November 30, 2023. https://www.civicus.org/index.php/media-resources/news/interviews/5778-kenya-the-denial-of-resources-for-civic-education-has-been-a-massive-blow-for-civil-society

Endnotes
1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12