

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Independent Evaluation Office of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducted a country-level evaluation in Kenya. The Assessment of Development Results (ADR) attempts to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP contribution to development results at the country level. This ADR examined UNDP Kenya's country programme for the period between 2009 and 2013. The objectives of the ADR were to:

- Provide substantive support to the UNDP Administrator's accountability function in reporting to the Executive Board.
- Support greater UNDP accountability to national stakeholders and partners in the programme country.
- Serve as a means of quality assurance for UNDP interventions at the country level.
- Contribute to learning at country, regional and corporate levels.

This was the first ADR conducted in Kenya. It was carried out in 2013 in collaboration with the Government of Kenya, UNDP Kenya Country Office and the Regional Bureau for Africa (RBA). The ADR examined the country programme for the period between 2009 and 2013, including projects that were carried over from the previous programme cycle. It addressed two issues. First, UNDP's contribution to development results by programme outcome examined the performance of each of the programme portfolios with respect to relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. Second, UNDP's strategic position in the country was examined from three aspects: UNDP's overall responsiveness and relevance to meeting the development priorities of the country; its use of comparative strengths and partnerships; and its contribution to promoting core UN values such as gender

equity, human rights, capacity-building and South-South cooperation.

## UNDP PROGRAMME

Kenya has gone through an intense political transition in the recent years. The 2007 general elections that involved acute political rivalries and sharply disputed results led to widespread ethnically based violence and put the country in a national crisis. In the years that followed, the country engaged in much-needed national reconciliation processes and peaceful dialogues. Adoption of the Constitution in 2010 marked a significant shift, promising the devolution of powers to local authorities, peaceful and fair elections, judicial reforms and inclusive, rights-based development plans for its citizens. Guided by the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2009-2013, the UNDP Kenya country programme was designed to respond to emerging national priorities and development needs of the country. The programme comprised democratic governance, disaster risk reduction and recovery, peace building and conflict prevention, inclusive economic growth and energy and environment for sustainable development. The programme budget for 2012 was \$46 million, about a 54 percent increase from the \$29 million budgeted the first year of the programme 2009.

## FINDINGS

**Across all programme areas, the objectives of the programme outcomes were in alignment with the country's long-term development priorities and emerging needs.**

Kenya's development priorities and strategies are outlined in such national frameworks as the Vision 2030 (through its political, social

and economic pillars), the Government's action plans for the implementation of the Vision, i.e. Medium Term Plans (MTPs), as well as various sector-specific policies. The fundamental principles of human development are firmly embedded in the Constitution adopted in 2010. The UNDAF defines the work of all UN agencies to meet Kenya's development and emerging priorities. In all programme areas of the UNDP country programme, objectives sought in the programme outcomes were in alignment with these overarching frameworks.

**A set of important building blocks has been established as the foundation for development.**

In **governance**, UNDP contributed to the firm placement of the public service reform efforts on the national agenda for the country's long-term planning; support to constitutional, legal and electoral reforms have helped strengthen governance institutions and increased citizens' confidence in them; and a critical mass of civil society organizations (CSOs) has been mobilized – through initiatives such as Amkeni – to promote constitutional principles including human rights and gender equality. In the **disaster risk and conflict prevention** areas, UNDP has been recognized for its critical ability to bring different parties together to work on peace and reconciliation. UNDP also introduced best practices/lessons/cutting-edge thinking from other countries in the areas of disaster management and peace building. In the **inclusive economic growth programme**, UNDP focused on the economic empowerment of the country's particularly vulnerable groups, such as unemployed youths, women and small/medium businesses, and also on the strengthening of the public-private partnerships. The programme also helped the operationalization of national development goals (e.g. Vision 2030 and Millennium Development Goals) through support on MTPs and tools such as the National Integrated Monitoring & Evaluation System (NIMES). In environment and energy, through various projects that address environment and conservation of natural resources, UNDP played an important

role in establishing collaboration between the Government and communities. It has also developed strategic partnerships with the private sector on responding to climate change.

**Some of the choices made in programming were strategic, but the country programme's overall ability to demonstrate its results was weak at the outcome level. Administrative inefficiencies and challenges in sustainability were reported in many programme areas.**

Some of the strategic choices UNDP made in implementing its programmes facilitated its achievement of programmatic goals. They included, for example, UNDP's scaled-up interventions on peace building and conflict transformation after the post-election violence, by adapting sustained support to the Government, non-government organizations and communities in its programme, as well as by flexibly using both national- and direct-implementation modalities; a balanced mix of upstream and downstream interventions in HIV/AIDS; designing the inclusive economic growth programme to target the most vulnerable and relevant groups, i.e. unemployed youth, women and small/medium enterprises, particularly those from the regions affected by the post-election violence; focus on the human rights-based approach to programming through the provision of high-level technical expertise for critical government functions; and use of CSOs and community-based organizations as its agent in programme delivery in governance and energy and environment programmes.

At the same time, challenges were found in areas such as the limited scale of interventions compared to the needs of support (demand) on the ground; the existence of multiple, fragmented projects and outcomes, often sharing similar objectives and target audiences; unclear linkages between outcomes and their corresponding projects; insufficient or delays in sharing of project data and information with development partners; and administrative inefficiencies including delays in payment disbursement and procurement processes, which put pressure on the implementation

of remaining project activities and limited the opportunity to reflect results in the subsequent project phase. Some programmes were more promising than others in terms of programme sustainability (e.g. the level of ownership of project activities at the community and national levels), but in general, sustainability was an issue in many programmes due to lack of clear exit strategies, and limited availability of funds, human resources and capacity among partner agencies after the completion of UNDP projects.

**UNDP's use of partnerships with various state and non-state entities in delivering its projects was favourably acknowledged by stakeholders. But emerging challenges in the use of CSOs need to be addressed. Stronger partnerships also need to be forged with other development partners when designing UNDP's own programmes and projects.**

UNDP has collaborated with a wide range of partners in its programmes, including CSOs and the private sector, demonstrating its strategic use of partnerships in its interventions. CSOs, in particular, have taken a substantive role as implementing partners in many projects, for example in governance. But the CSOs tasked with executing UNDP projects often lack necessary project management and coordination skills. Among the UN and other development partners, there are many who operate in the country sharing similar development goals, such as in the areas of disaster risk management, HIV/AIDS, economic empowerment of youth and women, and gender issues. UNDP needs to strengthen collaboration with these entities that often have larger resources to synergize its efforts, scale up results and avoid duplication of work.

**Support to the devolution system is an emerging and urgent area where UNDP can take the lead, particularly ensuring the promotion of gender equality and human rights as reflected in the constitutional principles.**

UNDP has contributed to placing gender and human rights on the national agenda, but much

work remains to realize these rights, particularly at the county level. UNDP's efforts were recognized, for example, in the development of gender and human rights indicators for NIMES and gender-responsive statistics. With the devolution system now in effect, concerns were raised, however, about local authorities' limited ability to implement much of their expected roles and responsibilities, including the promotion of gender and human rights. There have been almost unequivocal expectations from national stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation that UNDP has a critical role to play in the capacity-building of county-level authorities, promoting those important constitutional principles.

## CONCLUSIONS

**Conclusion 1.** The outcomes of the country programme were relevant to the needs of the country, particularly in response to the crises following the post-election violence of 2007-2008.

**Conclusion 2.** UNDP's interventions have provided a critical foundation for development in many programme areas.

**Conclusion 3.** Opportunities to make higher-level results were missed, or long-term results have not been measured, due to limitations in programme design and approaches (e.g. limited scale of interventions, fragmentation of projects and outcomes, and lack of clarity in project-outcome linkages). UNDP's ability to demonstrate results was weak.

**Conclusion 4.** Most of the programme interventions were marred by delays and problems of inefficient administrative procedures that have affected the timely implementation of project activities.

**Conclusion 5.** Sustainability was a concern raised in the assessment of many of the programmes.

**Conclusion 6.** UNDP has collaborated with a wide range of partners in its programmes,

including the private sector and CSOs, demonstrating its strategic use of partnerships in its interventions. CSOs, in particular, have taken a substantive role as project implementing partners, but with varying degrees of project management skills. Partnerships with Kenya's bi-/multilateral development partners who work in the similar programmatic areas appeared limited.

**Conclusion 7.** UNDP has contributed to placing gender and human rights on the national agenda, but much work remains to realize these rights, particularly at the county level.

**Conclusion 8.** In some programme areas, UNDP has successfully brought in lessons from other countries, which has contributed to achievement of outcomes. In others, there was limited evidence of systematic partnership or collaboration with other countries to spur South-South cooperation, except for ad hoc activities.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**Recommendation 1.** UNDP should take a more strategic approach to programming to improve its programme effectiveness.

**Recommendation 2.** UNDP should re-examine its programme results framework and overall results/progress reporting systems for improved demonstration of results and greater accountability.

**Recommendation 3.** Critical risk areas in internal operational modalities and programme delivery – particularly the timeliness in financial and procurement transaction processes – should be urgently addressed to improve programme efficiency and sustainability.

**Recommendation 4.** Given the significant role CSOs have had in the country programme implementation, and yet with varying levels of capability, UNDP should define a clear strategy for effectively working with CSOs as implementing partners.

**Recommendation 5.** UNDP should continue (and scale up) its efforts to champion issues related to human rights, gender equity and protection of vulnerable people, including those living with HIV/AIDS.

**Recommendation 6.** In consultation with the Government, UNDP should take the lead in support of the country's new devolution system, ensuring capacity-building of county-level authorities, promotion of human development and use of partnerships with a diverse range of stakeholders.

**Recommendation 7.** UNDP should strengthen its strategic partnerships with international development partners, by ensuring appropriate representation and timely and close communication with them at sector-related and other external engagements.

## Chapter 1

# INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

The Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is independent of UNDP management, headed by a Director who reports to the UNDP Executive Board. The responsibility of the IEO is two-fold: (a) provide the Executive Board with valid and credible information from evaluations for corporate accountability, decision-making and improvement; and (b) enhance the independence, credibility and utility of the evaluation function, and its coherence, harmonization and alignment in support of United Nations reform and national ownership.

The IEO conducted an Assessment of Development Results (ADR) in Kenya in 2013. The ADR is an independent country-level evaluation aimed at capturing and demonstrating evaluative evidence of UNDP's contribution to development results and its strategic positioning in the country. The purpose of an ADR is to:

- Provide substantive support to the UNDP Administrator's accountability function in reporting to the Executive Board.
- Support greater UNDP accountability to national stakeholders and partners in the programme country.
- Serve as a means of quality assurance for UNDP interventions at the country level.
- Contribute to learning at country, regional and corporate levels.

This is the first ADR conducted in Kenya, which was carried out with support from the Government of Kenya, various other national stakeholders, and the UNDP Kenya Country Office and Regional Bureau for Africa (RBA). Results of the evaluation are expected to feed into the formulation of the new country programme, covering the period 2014-2018.

### 1.2 SCOPE OF EVALUATION

The ADR examined the UNDP Kenya country programme for the current period 2009-2013.<sup>1</sup> As noted in the terms of reference (Annex 1), it focused on one programme cycle, rather than two as in a typical ADR, due to high staff turnovers experienced in the office and resulting concerns over lack of access to information from the previous programme (2004-2008). However, projects from the previous cycle that were active or completed during the current programme were included in the evaluation.

ADRs assess UNDP's programme performance against a set of outcomes defined in the country programme. The ADR in Kenya examined a total of 10 outcomes articulated in the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2009-2013 and its Results and Resources Framework, managed under the Country Office's five programme units as well as the Strategic Policy Advisory Unit. Two of the programme units – Disaster Risk and Recovery, and Peace Building and Conflict Prevention – contribute to the same two outcomes, so the assessment of those outcomes is presented under one topical area. The work of the Strategic Policy Advisory Unit contributes

---

1 At the time of drafting the report, it was informed that the country programme was extended to 30 June 2014.

to the outcomes under the Inclusive Economic Growth Unit. Thus, the assessment of UNDP's contribution to development results is organized in four sections:

- Democratic governance
- Disaster risk reduction and recovery/peace building and conflict prevention
- Inclusive economic growth
- Energy and environment for sustainable development

The Kenya Country Office is one of the largest programmes in the Africa region, representing US\$46 million in its programme budget in 2012. The budget has increased to \$56 million in 2013.

### 1.3 METHODOLOGY AND APPROACHES

The evaluation was carried out by two staff members from the IEO and a team of four independent external experts, including three consultants from Kenya. An overview of evaluation questions and criteria, data collection and analysis and the evaluation process and management is presented below.

#### 1.3.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA

Guided by the 'ADR Method Manual',<sup>2</sup> the ADR had two main analytical components – UNDP's contribution to development results through its thematic/programmatic areas, and the strategic positioning of UNDP. Assessment were made based on the following criteria:

- For UNDP's contribution to development results through thematic/programmatic areas:
  - Relevance of UNDP projects, outputs and outcomes.
  - Effectiveness of UNDP interventions in terms of achieving stated goals.

- Efficiency of UNDP interventions in terms of use of human and financial resources.

- Sustainability of the results to which UNDP contributes.

- For UNDP's contribution through its strategic positioning, which assessed UNDP's position and niche within the development and policy environment in the country and the strategies it used to maximize its contribution:

- Relevance and responsiveness of the country programme to emerging national needs.

- Exploitation of UNDP's comparative strengths.

- Promotion of United Nations values from a human development perspective.

Particular attention was paid to identifying factors that influenced UNDP's performance, such as integration of gender equality and human rights into programming; capacity development; implementation modalities; promotion of South-South cooperation; appropriate partnerships; support for coordination of United Nations and other development assistance; and the degree of ownership at national and local levels after the country's devolution system has been put in place.

The evaluation criteria noted above form the basis of the ADR methodological process. The evaluation team generated findings within the scope of the ADR and used the criteria to make assessments. The factual findings and assessments were then examined to identify a broad set of conclusions and recommendations.

An outcome paper was developed for each outcome to examine the progress towards the stated

---

2 UNDP, Independent Evaluation Office, 'ADR Method Manual', January 2011.

objectives and the assumptions about a programme's desired change based on a theory-of-change approach. Each outcome report was prepared according to a standard template to facilitate the synthesis and the identification of conclusions. The findings and conclusions from each outcome paper were then synthesized into the overall ADR report.

### **1.3.2 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS**

In consultation with Country Office staff, a set of projects from each of the outcome areas was selected for review (Annex 4). The selection criteria included the following: balance in intervention areas, mix of national implementation (NIM) and direct implementation (DIM) modalities, existence of critical lessons to be learned, and the size of the budget.

The evaluation used a mix of data-collection methods, including desk reviews of reference material, interviews (face to face and by telephone) and field visits. The field visits were carried out at key project sites under the programme areas, including Coast, Mt. Kenya, Western Counties (Kakamega, Kapsabet and Kisumu), Eldoret, Nakuru, Nairobi, Nyeri, Kikuyu, Machakos, and Turkana. Reference material included programme- and policy-related papers and reports, statistics, past evaluation reports available at the Country Office, UNDP headquarters, as well as at the Government (Annex 3). Interviews were conducted with relevant stakeholders, including UNDP staff members, government officials, beneficiaries, donors and development partners (See Annex 2 for the full list of people consulted during the evaluation).

Statistics and information collected during the data-collection phase were used for the analysis and synthesis of findings for the final presentation of conclusions and recommendations. Results of interviews and observations from field visits were summarized and analysed after the data-collection phase. Data from different sources were triangulated and cross-examined.

### **1.3.3 EVALUATION PROCESS AND MANAGEMENT**

A preparatory mission to Kenya was conducted by the evaluation manager and associate evaluation manager at the IEO from 20 to 24 May 2013, after which the terms of reference were developed. They included an evaluability assessment and an evaluation plan. Following the recruitment of external experts, the evaluation team conducted a data-collection mission to the field from 7 to 28 August 2013. Team members then conducted follow-up data collection and prepared the outcome reports as a basis for the draft final report. After the team prepared the draft ADR report, the report was then shared with the Country Office and RBA on 27 December for their feedback. The Country Office sent its comments on 28 January 2014. Following the preparation of an audit trail of the comments and a revision, the final draft report was sent to the Country Office and RBA on 3 March. A stakeholder workshop was then organized in Nairobi on 24 April, in collaboration with the Government of Kenya, the Country Office and RBA. The workshop was attended by 56 participants, including senior government officials, civil society organizations (CSOs), UN agencies, donors and other development partners.

### **1.4 LIMITATIONS**

Security and access limitations constrained the selection of areas and projects to be visited, especially in arid and semi-arid (ASAL) regions. Tana River and Garissa Counties, which have several initiatives under the Enhanced Resilience to Disaster Risk, Conflict and Climate Change in Turkana and Tana River project as well as the Kenya Drought Recovery Programme, could not be visited due to security concerns. Primary data could be gathered on ASAL-related issues only in parts of the Turkana County. This meant that most of the data related to ASAL areas came from secondary sources such as reports, supplemented by some primary data obtained during field visits.

## **1.5 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT**

The report comprises six chapters. Following this introduction, Chapter 2 provides an overview of the country's development context and challenges, national responses to those challenges and the development environment in which UNDP has operated. Chapter 3 presents the structure and nature of UNDP's response and strategy in addressing national development needs,

including the overview of the country programme framework. Chapters 4 and 5 present evaluation results – the former on the assessment of UNDP's contribution to development results through its programmatic interventions and the latter on UNDP's strategic positioning in the country. Finally, Chapter 6 presents a list of conclusions and recommendations, drawing on findings and evidence presented in the previous chapters.