



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

**UNDP KENYA COUNTRY PROGRAMME**  
**DOCUMENT (2014-2018)**  
**MID-TERM EVALUATION**  
**May 2017**

Consultants: Ms. Busi Ncube (Team leader), Ms. Connie Ngandu, Dr. Nicholas Letting, Dr. Nicodemus Nyandiko (Team Members)

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>List of Figures, tables, and boxes .....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of appendices.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>List of Abbreviations and Acronyms .....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>Acknowledgements .....</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Chapter 1 Introduction and Background .....</b>	<b>14</b>
1.1 Purpose .....	15
1.2 Evaluation Scope and Objectives .....	15
1.3 Evaluation Criteria.....	16
1.4 Structure of the Report.....	16
1.5 Description of Country Programme.....	18
<b>Chapter 2. Evaluation Findings .....</b>	<b>20</b>
2.1 Strategic positioning and relevance .....	20
2.2 Programme design and results framework .....	21
2.3 Effectiveness.....	22
2.3.1 Devolution and accountability .....	22
2.3.2 Productive sector and trade .....	26
2.3.3 Environmental sustainability .....	27
2.3.4 Community Security, Social Cohesion and Resilience .....	29
2.4 Efficiency.....	32
2.5 Management and Monitoring .....	33
2.6 Sustainability .....	34
2.7 Partnerships .....	35
2.8 Capacity building and human rights based approach in programming.....	35
<b>Chapter 3 Lessons Learnt, Conclusions and Recommendation .....</b>	<b>38</b>
3.1 Lessons Learnt.....	46
3.2 Conclusions.....	38
3.3 Recommendations .....	39

**List of Tables**

Table 1.CPD Outcomes and Output	23
Table 2: Key Programme Partners	<a href="#">24</a>
Table 3: CPD Budget and Expenditure	<a href="#">25</a>
Table 4: Performance Rating Scale	<a href="#">26</a>
Table 5: Programme performance	45

**List of Boxes**

Box 1: Example of CPD Indicator	29
Box 2: Gender sensitive and inclusive county service delivery enhanced	32
Box 3: Example of courses brought before the HAT	33

**List of appendices**

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference	40
Appendix 2: Evaluation criteria and questions	61
Appendix 3:Stakeholders Consulted	64
Appendix 4:Documents Reviewed	69

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS/ACRONYMS

<b>ASAL</b>	Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
<b>AWP</b>	Annual Work Plan
<b>BSED</b>	Business Skills and Entrepreneurship Development
<b>CCA</b>	Climate Change Adaptation
<b>CBD</b>	Convention on Biological Diversity
<b>CCU</b>	Climate Change Unit
<b>CAJ</b>	Commission on Administrative Justice
<b>CBROP</b>	County Budget Review and Outlook Paper
<b>CD</b>	Country Director
<b>CEAP</b>	County Environment Action Plan
<b>CEBIC</b>	Clean Energy Business and Information Centre
<b>CO</b>	Country Office
<b>CoG</b>	Council of Governors
<b>CPAP</b>	Country Programme Action Plan
<b>CPD</b>	Country Programme Document
<b>CVE</b>	Countering Violent Extremism
<b>DaO</b>	Delivering as One
<b>DCDO</b>	Deputy Country Director Operations
<b>DFID</b>	Department for International Development
<b>DPC</b>	District Peace Committees
<b>DRR</b>	Disaster Risk reduction
<b>EALGF</b>	East Africa Local Government Forum
<b>EDE</b>	Ending Drought Emergencies
<b>ERC</b>	Energy Regulatory Commission
<b>ESAP</b>	Electoral Security Arrangements Project
<b>FBO</b>	Faith Based Organisations
<b>FGD</b>	Focus Group Discussion
<b>GEF</b>	Global Environmental Facility

<b>GHG</b>	Green House Gas
<b>GoK</b>	Government of Kenya
<b>HACT</b>	Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfer
<b>HAT</b>	The HIV and AIDS Equity Tribunal
<b>HMIC</b>	Higher Middle Income Country
<b>HR</b>	Human Resources
<b>HRBA</b>	Human Rights Based Approach
<b>IEBC</b>	Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission
<b>IEC</b>	Information Education and Communication
<b>IFMIS</b>	Integrated Financial Management Information System
<b>ILO</b>	International Labour Organisation
<b>IP</b>	Implementing Partner
<b>IPCC</b>	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
<b>IPSTC</b>	International Peace Support Training College
<b>JEC</b>	Judicial Election Committee
<b>KACCAL</b>	Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in the Arid Lands
<b>KDSP</b>	Kenya Devolution Support Programme
<b>KEPSA</b>	Kenya Private Sector Alliance
<b>KEREA</b>	Kenya Renewable Energy Association
<b>KFS</b>	Kenya Forest Service
<b>KII</b>	Key Informant Interview
<b>KMD</b>	Kenya Meteorological Service
<b>KNAP</b>	Kenya National Action Plan
<b>KNCHR</b>	Kenya National Commission on Human Rights
<b>KSG</b>	Kenya School of Government
<b>KWS</b>	Kenya Wildlife Service
<b>LoA</b>	Letter of Agreement
<b>LCDP</b>	Low Carbon Development Project
<b>LECB</b>	Low Emissions Capacity Building Project

<b>LECRD</b>	Low Emissions and Climate Resilient Development in Kenya
<b>M&amp;E</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>MDGs</b>	Millennium Development Goals
<b>MD&amp;P</b>	Ministry of Devolution and Planning
<b>MENR</b>	Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources
<b>MSEA</b>	Micro-Small Enterprises Authority
<b>MTP</b>	Medium Term Plan
<b>MTE</b>	Mid Term Evaluation
<b>MoICNG</b>	Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government
<b>MoPSYG</b>	Ministry of Public Service Youth and Gender
<b>NAMA</b>	National Appropriate Mitigation Action
<b>NDC</b>	Nationally Determined Contributions
<b>NDMA</b>	National Drought Management Authority
<b>NDOC</b>	National Disaster Operation Centre
<b>NGEC</b>	National Gender and Equality Commission
<b>NIM</b>	National Implementation Modality
<b>NGO</b>	Non-Governmental Organisation
<b>NPR</b>	National Police Reserve
<b>NSA</b>	Non-State Actors
<b>NSC</b>	National Steering Committee
<b>ODA</b>	Overseas Development Agency
<b>ORPP</b>	Office of the Registrar of Political Parties
<b>PFM</b>	Public Finance Management
<b>PIP</b>	Prosecutions and Investigations Department
<b>PMU</b>	Programme Management Unit
<b>PPDA</b>	Public Procurement and Disposal Act
<b>PPDT</b>	Political Parties Dispute Resolution Tribunal
<b>REDD+</b>	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation
<b>SALW</b>	Small Arms and Light Weapons

<b>SDGs</b>	Sustainable Development Goals
<b>SEA</b>	Strategic Environmental Assessment
<b>SEPK</b>	Support to Electoral Processes in Kenya
<b>SLM</b>	Sustainable Land Management
<b>SMART</b>	Specific, Measurable Attainable and Time bound
<b>SRA</b>	Strategic Result Area
<b>STARK+</b>	Strengthening Adaptation and Resilience to Climate Change in Kenya
<b>ToC</b>	Theory of Change
<b>TOR</b>	Terms of Reference
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>UNCCD</b>	United Nations Conventions to Combat Desertification
<b>UNDAF</b>	UN Development Assistance Framework
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNEP</b>	United Nations Environment Programme
<b>UNFCCC</b>	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
<b>UNOPS</b>	United Nations Office for Project Services
<b>UNSCR</b>	United Nations Security Council Resolution
<b>UNV</b>	United Nations Volunteers
<b>USAID</b>	United States Agency for International Development



## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We would like to thank all the key informants and focus group discussion participants for the information, experiences, insights and lessons shared during this exercise. Special appreciation goes to the Implementing Partners and field staff who organised and hosted the focus group discussions and county-level interviews. The assistance of the UNDP Kenya Country office, the evaluation manager and her team; the Advisory Committee that provided the technical and quality assurance backstopping; programme and operations staff for the various roles they played in facilitating a smooth process was invaluable and much appreciated.

We appreciate various UN Agencies, the Resident Coordinator's Office and development partners who participated in the evaluation. Your insights were invaluable and contributed to the quality of findings and recommendations made in the report.

This being an independent evaluation, the views and opinions expressed herein are those of the evaluation team. It is hoped that the findings and recommendations made will prove useful in enhancing the quality of the UNDP Kenya programme.



# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

## INTRODUCTION

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Kenya Country Office (CO) commissioned a Mid-Term Evaluation of its Country Programme as outlined in the Country Programme Document (CPD) 2014-2018. The purpose of the evaluation, which covered the period 2014-2016, was to assess performance and progress of implementation of the Country Programme against its original purpose and objectives. In so doing, the mid-term evaluation assessed the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the programme. In addition, it was to provide UNDP, national and county-level stakeholders and other relevant partners with an impartial assessment of progress and results of interventions made during the evaluation period. Thereafter, it presented lessons learnt and recommendations to inform the remaining period of the current programme as well as the design of the next country programme cycle.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE COUNTRY PROGRAMME

The UNDP Kenya Country Office Programme supports four strategic programme priority areas organised around four outcomes, namely: Devolution and accountability; Productive sectors and trade; Environmental sustainability, renewable energy and sustainable land management and Community security, social cohesion and resilience. In the context of the UN Delivering as One (DaO), the CPD outcomes are directly derived from the four Strategic Result Areas (SRAs) of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2014-2018.

## APPROACH, METHODS AND DATA ANALYSIS

The evaluation criteria and evaluation questions formed the basis of the evaluation. The following phases were followed:

- **Desk review:** Of key programme documents such as the CPD; project documents and reports. The UNDAF MTR report; Government of Kenya (GoK) Documents and other relevant literature.
- **Development of tools:** Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussion guides were developed as were questionnaires and observation checklists for primary data collection.
- **Key Informant Interviews (KIIs):** The KIIs provided the second stage of the evaluative evidence assembled by the evaluation team. 78 KIIs were conducted with implementing partners; select County Governments; Independent Commissions; development partners; and CO staff and management.
- **Focus Group discussions:** To draw on the experience of beneficiaries, eight FGDs were held in seven counties of Tana River, Mombasa, Narok, Taita Taveta, Kwale, Kitui and Nyeri. 49 beneficiaries drawn from community-level partner's and county governments participated in the FGDs.
- **Data analysis** Field notes and transcripts of interviews, secondary data sources and qualitative information were synthesised. Triangulation of the data sources was done to support a coherent view of issues under study. Information gathered from the stakeholders through KIIs was triangulated through analysis with the version provided by UNDP Kenya CO staff and implementing partners. The evaluation team finally rated performance of the outcome areas using the five-point rating scale below:

Performance rating				
1	2	3	4	5
Major improvements needed	Some improvements needed	Meets expectations	Often exceeds expectations	Consistently exceeds expectations

## **EVALUATION FINDINGS**

### **Strategic positioning and Relevance**

The CPD is drawn from the UNDAF 2014-2018, but also draws heavily from the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017. In addition, it is also aligned to the national priorities, as outlined in the Kenya Vision 2030 and its five-year Second Medium-Term Plan (MTP II) 2013-2017, since in fact the UNDAF 2014-2018 draws its four SRAs from the three pillars (economic, political and social) of these national development blue prints.

Certain national contextual realities have changed over the period under review, which can be attributed to the development interventions jointly designed and implemented by the Government of Kenya (national and county levels), UNDP and other development partners including donors and UN Agencies. Some of these include: The establishment and operationalisation of structures and institutions at national and county levels to support the implementation of devolution and the formulation and enactment of relevant laws, regulations and policies to support the devolved structures. In addition, the support of UNDP through its Country Programme and in collaboration with other development partners is helping to build capacities of key national and county institutions for effective service delivery. The programme design and related outputs therefore need to be reviewed to render them more relevant to the needs and priorities of these changing realities going forward. For instance, regarding policy and legislative framework support, focus should now move to strengthening implementation of existing laws and policies and further enhancing the institutional capacity built at both national and county levels for effective and efficient service delivery.

### **Programme design and results framework**

The country programme is an integral part of the UNDAF, and as such its four strategic programme priority areas are selected from UNDAF outcomes and the national development priorities as well. Under each of the four UNDAF SRAs, UNDP is contributing to one outcome, and the attendant results chain under the selected outcome is cascaded to the CPD.

### **Effectiveness**

The evaluation assessed the extent to which the programme has attained planned results and the contributions made to the achievement of CPD outcomes. Based on the assessment of the four outcome areas, programme performance on this criterion has been rated 4/5 based on the evaluation rating scale used. Programme interventions at the National, County and Community levels and the achievements made in each of the outcome areas have contributed to overall CPD effectiveness. Further, the strategic choice of working at the three levels (National, County and Community) has contributed to successful implementation.

### **Efficiency**

The evaluation observed that resources were utilised as intended resulting in achievement of planned outputs. The total programme budget from 2014 to 2016 stood at \$ 84,769,128 and expenditure was \$78,907,322 giving a delivery rate of over 90% in the years under review. While delivery is not the only indicator of good use of resources it does show that the programme was able to expend money on activities as planned. The evaluation found that several bills, policies, strategic plans, regulations, technology and knowledge products have been produced during the period as result of efficient use of resources. The team noted that the programmatic efficiency is good and is supporting the four outcome areas. The evaluation probed M & E systems to examine the efficiency and observed good systems in place for planning, monitoring and reporting. The Team noted that UNDP has a global web-based compliance system which looks at different parameters of compliance and monitoring in support of efficiency. Despite this, the evaluation found instances of delays in donor reporting and end of project closures. The evaluation noted that the UNDP M&E system is not integrated with IP M& E system thus impeding good reporting of programme results.

## **Sustainability**

The evaluation found that at the policy level, the programme has contributed to sustainability of results through support to the creation of a conducive policy and legal environment such as the enactment and/or revision of all schedule 5 Constitutional laws within the five-year transitional period of the Constitution; the finalisation and launch of the Kenya National Action Plan (NAP) on UNSCR 1325 on women, peace and security in March 2016 which has been rolled to counties; and the launch of the National Strategy on CVE among other policy support. Additionally, the evaluation noted that sustainability was integrated in the programme strategy of capacity building to ensure results out-live the programme exit. Implementing partners were found to have the requisite technical and human capacity to continue delivering results as evidenced by how NDMA and NDOC are spearheading the DRR agenda and how they articulated the interventions they are rolling out at the National and County level. Staff at the National Steering Committee that leads the implementation of peace building activities were found to be equally competent and particularly well versed in early warning issues, challenges and opportunities.

## **Monitoring and Management**

The evaluation found that the CPD result framework is largely coherent. CPD coherence was analysed at three levels: (i) assessment of coherence of outcome indicators and targets, (ii) coherence of the output indicators to outcome indicators and (iii) coherence of the outcome targets with outcome indicators. Indicators were analysed to assess the extent to which they were specific, measureable, realistic and time bound (SMART). Further, the programme contributes to some UNDAF outcomes that are not part of the current CPD. The evaluation Team found that some CPD output indicators had no baselines, or had inappropriate or over-ambitious targets to monitor progress e.g. output 1.1 under outcome 1. Some of the CPD outcomes are too wordy hence may risk misinterpretation. Whereas the country programme has utilised proxy indicators to measure and facilitate reporting and assessments, this is an anomaly in the results accountability chain that may make UNDP's claim to certain results tenuous in a sector with many development actors.

## **Gender, capacity building and human rights based approach in programming**

The evaluation found that each outcome area included a component of capacity building at the institutional and individual levels across National, County and Community level interventions. For instance, the programme supported the gender-sensitive Disaster Risk Management Bill and strengthened the capacity of the parliamentary caucus on DRR and Kenya Women Parliamentary Association (KEWOPA). This facilitated the furthering of the DRR policy and legislation agenda and thus, the DRM Bill has been drafted and now awaits reading and enactment. The programme has contributed to advancement of gender mainstreaming and gender equity in a number of ways: In partnership with UN Women, it supported gender mainstreaming and women empowerment at county level, 68 women entrepreneurs were trained and are now positioned to benefit from the 30% Access Government Procurement Opportunities (AGPO) reserved for women, youth and persons with disabilities. The evaluation found this intervention to have made a significant contribution in facilitating women access to meaningful livelihood opportunities and noted the opportunity for scaling up and increase participation of young women.

## **LESSONS LEARNT**

**Lesson 1:** Working at three levels (National, County and Community) proved useful in ensuring programme ownership by beneficiaries and more effective vertical coordination. This approach should be continued with increased presence at Community level.

**Lesson 2:** Better planning is crucial to effective programme delivery and helps reduce implementation delays.

**Lesson 3:** Setting standard operating procedures enhances implementation efficiency and consistency in achievement of planned results and policy implementation, additionally it will reduce likelihood of varying results enhance development gains and harmonise efforts.

**Lesson 4:** Civil society organisations are important partners and through partnerships and closer engagement with CSOs the programme can facilitate increased accountability of duty bearers.

**Lesson 5:** Adopting a collaborative approach and information sharing, learning and support among programme IPs is an enabler to coherent and effective programme delivery.

**Lesson 6:** Failure to clearly articulate procedures and criteria for targeting of vulnerable groups (Particularly PWDs, youth and the poorest of the poor) and communities negatively impacts on programme performance in this regard and progress towards results.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

**Conclusion 1:** The evaluation concludes that the programme has been relevant and has made demonstrable adjustments to adapt to emerging issues in the global and national development contexts. It was found to be relevant in meeting the needs of targeted vulnerable groups, however the evaluation noted the need for more focused targeting of vulnerable beneficiaries especially the youth and persons with disabilities. The same focus will be required for county level support in implementation of policies and laws enacted thus far.

**Conclusion 2:** The evaluation concludes that the programme has contributed to the creation of a conducive legal and policy environment to facilitate inclusive and sustainable development for Kenyans. The investments made in Institutional capacity building have contributed to improved capacities of key national institutions and county governments for better service delivery and fulfillment of their constitutional mandates. Further, the evaluation concludes that despite being implemented within a shifting context, the CPD is on course in most of its outcome areas within limited resources and at times limited continuity in project transitions. The achievements made in this first phase will, however, need to be strengthened especially at County level where there are still significant capacity gaps, lean staff and operational constraints that may impede implementation of policies and laws enacted and ultimately retard progress towards realisation of national development priorities.

**Conclusion 3:** The evaluation concludes that while the CPD delivery rate is commendable at above 90% throughout the period under review; and while the modes of delivery and processes contributed to attainment of demonstrable quality results across CPD outcome areas, however, there are still operational bottlenecks that, if overcome, would enhance programme efficiency. Further, the disconnect between the UNDP globalised M&E system and that of its partners is negatively impacting on joint learning to improve delivery and increase value for money.

**Conclusion 4:** The NIM has facilitated national ownership of the programme initiatives through high-level GoK participation and leadership. The strategy of building both institutional and individual capacity has further enhanced sustainability as it outlives programme interventions. However, in some cases, inadequate project-level strategies compromised sustainability of overall programme interventions and results.

**Conclusion 5:** The contribution towards the launch and domestication of SDGs both at National and County levels as well as UNDP leadership of the SDG platform is commendable and has laid a good foundation for the country and will strengthen coordination, implementation and fundraising and facilitate multi-actor effort. However, there is need for the programme to ensure SDGs indicators and targets are aligned at all levels. Additionally, the programme will need to align the remainder of the CPD cycle activities to the priorities and targets of the MTP III.

**Conclusion 6:** The Area Based Development Approach adopted in the Turkana and Marsabit joint programmes is effective and demonstrates the transformative potential of an integrated programme within a reasonably short period of time, thus showcasing the difference that UNDP can make in marginalised communities. This evaluation concludes that this is a model that can be replicated within UNDP programming for community level interventions in particular.

**Conclusion 7:** While programme performance has been rated highly in the period under review, the evaluation concludes that UNDP has many small interventions spread across the country with limited staff presence on the ground. This may have undermined attainment of planned results in the target communities.

**Conclusion 8:** The partnership with the UNV Programme through the deployment of National UN Volunteers has contributed significantly to enhancing programme delivery especially at County and Community levels. The evaluation concludes that this approach should be continued and further opportunities explored.

**Conclusion 9:** Lack of baseline data has a negative impact on tracking and assessing programme performance and ultimately impact. UNDP and its implementing partners may thus not be able to fully measure the contributions that they have made to improving the lives of vulnerable persons and communities under this programme.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Recommendation 1:** UNDP in the next CPD cycle should define criteria for identification and selection of the most vulnerable groups and counties to work in. This can be done by developing a list of criteria that is to be followed with very specific indicators and parameters for identification of beneficiaries.

**Recommendation 2:** There is need for continued support to strengthen the relevant institutions in fulfilling their mandates and in implementing policies, plans and legislation. Programme initiatives should be replicated in other areas where they have performed well in some areas. Evaluators recommend to UNDP to ensure continuity with previous interventions during project design.

**Recommendation 3:** The evaluation further recommends that UNDP and its partners find ways of harmonising their M & E systems to support efficiency and learning. The programme should continue supporting financial management and accountability of partners' capacities to accelerate disbursements and accounting for resources.

**Recommendation 4:** The good performance of NIM notwithstanding, the evaluation recommends expanding the partnerships with county governments and CSOs to increase the likelihood of sustainability of results at all levels. Focus being on County level support to ensure devolution gains are sustained.

**Recommendation 5:** The evaluation recommends that UNDP takes immediate steps to review programme outputs, and indicators to ensure the support for implementation of SDGs is mainstreamed in its programme and that these are aligned to the MTP III priorities and targets.

**Recommendation 6:** UNDP should identify two or three counties where an integrated area development approach can be piloted in the remaining life of the current CPD and use experiences and lessons learnt for further roll out in the next CPD cycle. Further, the programme should consider working in fewer counties for community level interventions. This will allow for scale and more visible impact.

**Recommendation 7:** To unlock its potential further in the next CPD cycle, the evaluation recommends that UNDP and its partners should further demonstrate innovation and an holistic approach in programming by exploiting synergies and complementarities. Thus they will achieve more and enhance impact of their interventions. Additionally, UNDP should consider adopting a programmatic approach by reducing the number of projects to one or two robust programmes per unit. The approach taken by the Deepening Foundations for Peace building and community security in Kenya 2014-2018 programme can be adopted as appropriate.

**Recommendation 8:** The evaluation recommends that UNDP and the UNV Programme further cement their partnership and explore opportunities for deploying young graduates and students on attachment to support County Governments and Community level activities, as well as how to work with the National Volunteer Service programme.

**Recommendation 9:** The UNDP and its partners should invest in baseline and end line surveys to provide a clear measure of the impact of this programme. There is need to commission these in readiness for the completion of the current CPD cycle and planning for the next. This will ensure that the programme is informed by evidence and solid data particularly with regards to levels of vulnerability that factor in environmental fragility elements and enablers for enhancing quality of life; both of which are central to sustainable development and human security.

# INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

---

## 1.1 PURPOSE

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Kenya Country Office (CO), commissioned a Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of its Country Programme as outlined in the Country Programme Document (CPD) focusing on the period 2014 to 2016. The purpose of the evaluation was to ascertain the outcomes and outputs of the country programme measured against its original purpose and objectives whilst in the process capturing evaluative evidence of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the programme. The evaluation was to then outline lessons learnt and recommendations which will inform the next programme cycle and provide the Country Office (CO), National and County-level stakeholders and partners with an independent assessment of results of the period under review (The ToRs are attached as Annex 1).

## 1.2 EVALUATION SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES

### Scope

The evaluation assessed overall programme progress and achievements against planned results; challenges and lessons learnt during this period. It also focused on how UNDP responded to changes around the programmatic environment which included the recommendations of the UNDAF 2013-2017 Mid-Term Review (June, 2016); the results of the 2015 and 2016 Country Office Results Oriented Annual Reporting (ROAR); youth radicalisation and violent extremism; climate change especially the effect of El Nino and Lanina, the upcoming 2017 General Elections and how these affected CPD programming. Efforts made to integrate SDGs in the UNDP programming were assessed and the evaluation proposed measures of implementation for the remaining period. The evaluation analysed how UNDP, through its implementing partners, has supported the Government of Kenya (GoK) development agenda and priorities especially the Vision 2030, the Medium-Term Plan II and the County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs). It then identified areas requiring additional support either in programme management or new implementation strategies including exploration of new partnerships.

### Objectives

The main objective of the evaluation was to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the programme, including the extent to which cross cutting issues of (gender, climate change, youth, SDGs) have been mainstreamed. Specifically, the evaluation was to:

- Assess achievements and progress made against planned results as well as challenges and lessons learnt over the past two- and-half years of the CPD against the programme theory of change and assess how emerging issues such as SDGs and CIPDs among others impact on outcomes and recommend how UNDP programme can be aligned to these new priorities for greater development impact;
- Review the effectiveness of the UNDP results framework specifically the outcome and output indicators, baselines and targets assessing how realistic, relevant and measurable they are and make recommendations for improvement if any; and review coherence in delivery of the overall UNDP programme;
- Recommend ways in which the outcome result area groups and technical working groups may increase effectiveness of programme delivery in the remaining period of the current CPD cycle;
- Assess effectiveness towards attainment of results and reflect on how both UNDP and GoK have contributed to UNDAF results through implementation of programmes and projects;
- Assess effectiveness of and relative advantage of UNDP in the implementation and use of joint-programmes modality and mechanism for fostering UN coherence and ‘delivering as one” such as Marsabit-Moyale and the Turkana Joint Programmes.

### 1.3 Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation was based on the UNEG Evaluation criteria and the UNDP programme quality standards including: strategic positioning, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, management and monitoring, sustainability and national ownership.

### 1.4 Structure of the report

This report presents the results of the MTE which was conducted by a team of four independent consultants (one international and three national) from late March to end of May 2017. This report is organised into three chapters: Chapter one-the introduction and programme description; Chapter two, evaluation findings; chapter three, lessons learnt conclusions and recommendations.

### 1.5 Description of the country programme

The programme is supporting four strategic programme priority areas organised around four outcomes, namely: Devolution and accountability; productive sectors and trade; environmental sustainability, renewable energy and sustainable land management; and community security, social cohesion and resilience. In the context of the UN Delivering as One(DaO) the CPD outcomes are directly derived from the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2014-2018 outcomes within four UNDAF Strategic Result Areas (SRAs).

The UNDAF outcome areas are clearly aligned to the GoK development blueprint as spelt out in the Vision 2030 and specifically the Medium-Term Plan (MTP) II. The UNDAF SRAs include: 1) Transformative Governance, 2) Human Capital, 3) Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth and 4) Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human security.

The major programmatic risks identified in the CPD include but are not limited to; security threats, environmental shocks and programme fragmentation. As mitigation measures, the programme continually assesses the environment and updates the risk log and identifies appropriate mitigatory measures. The Programme focuses on contribution to the following CPD outcomes through the outputs as outlined in the table below:

Table1. CPD outcome and outputs

CPD OUTCOMES	CPD OUTPUTS
<b>Outcome 1: Devolution and accountability</b>	1.1 National and county governments and the Constitutional Commission have the capacity for a coordinated and effective transition to the devolved system and to mainstream human rights and gender considerations in compliance with constitutional provisions 1.2 Kenya citizens and civil society meaningfully engage in democratic processes: and are empowered to be politically and socially engaged and to demand responsible and accountable governance from elected leaders. 1.3 National and County level capacities strengthened for equitable, accountable and effective HIV &AIDS responses.
<b>Outcome 2: Productive sectors and trade</b>	2.1 Public and private sectors at national and devolved level are technically capacitated to formulate (public and utilise(private) equitable evidence-based business friendly policies and frameworks that are Human Rights Based (HRB); gender-sensitive and stimulate Inclusive and sustainable economic growth; 2.2 The extractive sector is technically strengthened to apply measures that protect the environment and invest in community



	development and social services. 2.3 Public and private sectors are technically, technologically and financially capacitated to develop and adapt responsible and sustainable enterprises that are resource efficient and innovative.
<b>Outcome 3: Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human security.</b>	3.1 Government of Kenya has adequate capacity to develop evidence-based and coherent policy responses to the inter-linked challenges of environmental sustainability, land and resource management and human security 3.2 Effective technology and skills transfer to develop models of cost-efficient bio-energy, solar, geothermal electricity production, and mini-hydro and wind-power generation
<b>Outcome 4: Systems for community security and resilience</b>	4.1 Institutional capacity in place to implement and monitor gender and human rights-sensitive DRM, peace building and conflict prevention and community policies and strategies 4.2 Coordination mechanisms, preparedness, early warning and timely response and recovery systems operational at national, County and community levels.

These outputs are focused on upstream engagement with Government Implementing Partners including: Independent Commissions, Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs); CSOs and the Private Sector. With county-level support targeting 28 counties in Kenya.<sup>1</sup>

The community-level interventions target vulnerable communities and groups such as women, youth and persons with disabilities.

**Key Partners:** The Programme works with the partners outlined in table two below.

**Table 2: Key programme partners**

Development Partners	Japan, SIDA, DfID, USAID, Italy, Norway, Netherlands, EU
National	Ministry of Devolution and Planning, National Treasury, Ministry of Interior (NSC, KNFP); Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources: Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Labour; Ministry of Mining. The IEBC; NCIN; KNHCRG; NGEC; NDMA; NEMA; KFS; MSEA; KIPPRA; KenInvest; KEPSA; CAJ; CoG: among others.
UN	Collaboration is with nearly all the 26 UN agencies with presence in Kenya.

## Programme Resources

Table 3 below shows the total budget and expenditure per annum from 2014-2016. Development partners contributed approximately 85% of programme resources with GoK making in-kind contribution.

<sup>1</sup>Bungoma, Busia, Elgeyo- Marakwet, Embu, Homa Bay, Kajiado, Kericho, Kilifi, Kirinyaga, Kisumu, Kitui, Kwale, Laikipia, Marsabit, Nakuru, Narok, Nyeri, Samburu, Taita Taveta, Turkana, Vihiga, Garissa, Isiolo, Nandi, Tana-River, Mombasa, Kakamega, Baringo and ,Trans-Nzoia,.

**Table 3: CPD budget and expenditure**

CPD BUDGET AND EXPENDITURE 2014-2016 in US \$			
YEAR	BUDGET	EXPENDITURE	I/R
2014	31,070,073	28,271,737	91
2015	26,343,747	24,461,474	93
2016	27,355,308	26,174,111	96
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>84,769,128</b>	<b>78,907,322</b>	<b>93</b>

To deliver this programme, the UNDP Kenya Country Office has a staff complement of 105, of whom 33 are service contract holders. Two of the staff members are based in the field. The office is under the leadership of the Resident Representative and Country Director (CD) the latter being responsible for the day-to-day management of the Country Office supported by a Deputy Country Director Operations (DCDO) and a Head of Programme, 58% of the CO staff are female.

### 1.6 Approach, methods and data analysis

The evaluation criteria and evaluation questions formed the basis of the evaluation. The following phases were followed:

- **Desk review:** Of key programme documents such as the CPD; project documents and reports. The UNDAF MTR report; Government of Kenya Documents and other relevant literature. The list of is attached as (Annex 4)
- **Development of tools:** Semi-structured interview and focus group discussion guides were developed as were questionnaires and observation checklists for primary data collection.
- **Key Informant Interviews:** These Key Informant Interviews provided the second stage of the evaluative evidence assembled by the evaluation team. 78 KII were conducted with Implementing partners; select County Governments; Independent Commissions; Development Partners; and CO staff and management. The list of persons interviewed is attached as (Annex 5)
- **Focus Group discussions:** To draw on the experience of beneficiaries, eight FGDs were held in seven counties of Tana River, Mombasa, Narok, Taita Taveta, Kwale, Kitui and Nyeri. 49 beneficiaries drawn from community-level partner's county governments participated in the FGDs.

**Evaluation Criteria:** The evaluation criteria were assessed against a five-point scale shown below based on performance against set indicators as shown in Table 4 below.

**Table 4: Performance rating scale**

Performance rating				
1	2	3	4	5
Major improvements needed	Some improvements needed	Meets expectations	Often exceeds expectations	Consistently exceeds expectations

### Sampling

Purposive and random sampling techniques were utilised to select the key informants at national and community levels. Purposive sampling was used in the case of UN agencies interviewed (those who had partnered with UNDP in key interventions); as well as representatives of beneficiaries specifically

for the Community Security and Resilience outcome area. Random sampling was used for other beneficiaries at community level.

### **Data analysis**

Data entry, cleaning, and analysis were a continuous process from the development of the inception report, desk review, KIIs and FGDs during field work. Field notes and transcripts of interviews, secondary data sources and qualitative information were synthesised. Triangulation of the data sources was done to support a coherent view of issues under study. Information gathered from the stakeholders through KIIs was triangulated through analysis with the version provided by UNDP Staff and implementing partners.

### **Quality assurance, review and validation meetings**

A draft report was compiled, internally reviewed and presented to stakeholders in a workshop for their review and input. The validation workshop attended by 67 stakeholders drawn from UNDP, National and County governments, development partners, parastatals, private sector and NGOs was a way of validating and enhancing the quality of the findings and ownership.

### **Ethical considerations**

This study was conducted with the highest standards of integrity and respect. Free consent was obtained verbally at the start of the interviews and FGDs from the institutions and individuals who provided information. Interactions with individuals were done observing mutual respect and taking into consideration the needs of gender, disability and age. There was no conflict of interest among the evaluation team.

### **Team composition**

The team comprised of three national and one international consultant with expertise in each of the CPD outcome areas. The international consultant was the team leader. Largely, the team focused on their areas of specialisation (with agreed structure of working) coming together periodically to review progress and finally to analyse and compare findings; then consolidate the report.

### **Limitations of the study**

This evaluation was impacted by the tight timelines considering the need for a thorough review of the many documents some that were not always provided timeously at the most strategic preparation period. However, the evaluation team worked tirelessly to deliver the deliverables with an extension of the contract period. Another limitation is that the KII were largely conducted in Nairobi with National level partners due to limited time available for the field work. This may have skewed the findings but the team mitigated this by conducting a few interviews with County level respondents during the field missions. Nevertheless, these limitations did not have material impact on the findings as the information was triangulated to minimise gaps and validate evidence gathered.

# EVALUATION FINDINGS

---

## 2.1 Strategic positioning and relevance

The CPD is aligned with the UNDAF and the UNDP Strategic Plan. The CPD contributes to national priorities and needs as outlined in Vision 2030 and MTP II and sectoral policies and strategies including the CIDPs.

Certain national contextual realities have changed over the review period as a result of UNDP, GoK and other development actor interventions. These include: County government structures are now in place and operational; constitutionally mandated national laws, policies and institutions are in place; most counties have enacted enabling laws and policies; and capacities of key national institutions and counties for effective service delivery have been built in all CPD result areas. The programme design and related outputs therefore need to be reviewed to render them relevant to the needs and priorities of these new realities going forward. For instance, regarding policy and legislative frameworks support, focus should now move to supporting implementation of the new laws and policies and ensuring utilisation of the institutional capacity built for better service delivery. This calls for: increased investment in civic education and civil society strengthening to create awareness of the new laws and policies and increase local level demand for the services; and adherence to the rule of law support to ensure enforcement at national and county levels and more focus on county level implementation support.

The current drought led to re-organisation of GoK budgeting priorities with possible impact on its contributions to the programme. Corruption continues to be a major risk and threat to development resources and to undermine the national business ethic which is a critical concern especially in a MIC status. 2017 elections are a major national event to which the CPD is responding, and post-election political re-organisation will create need for capacity building at both levels of government. Dictates of capacity building, and possible new development priorities may emerge after the elections. The CPD needs to align itself to these changes to remain relevant.

Global level development frameworks that have emerged after inception of CPD create certain development imperatives some which the CPD has begun responding to. These include the SDGs and the clarion call '*leave no one behind*' principle. UNDP leads the UN Technical Working Group on SDGs, and has at country programme level embarked on a multi-pronged approach to SDG attainment including: capacity development of county state officials on mainstreaming; and policy development to create the imperative of integration of SDGs in planning and budgeting. There is however need to review the CPD to align it more strategically to the priorities created by the SDGs, and especially as outlined in the Kenya SDG implementation road map.

The issue of universal human development and with the theme of '*human development for everyone*' as highlighted in the Human Development Report (2016) translates into the elements of people-centeredness and inclusivity in the CPD ToC. In the implementation, however, inclusivity has been biased towards gender, with inadequate focus on youth and PWDs. The element of people-centeredness also needs to be more visible and deliberate in programme design and implementation. In the evaluation period, the programme has been predominantly upstream with few community level interventions (targeting communities directly). The next phase of CPD implementation should however centralise the principle of people-centeredness, with clear strategies for their integration.

UNDP has leveraged its comparative strengths for instance in democratic governance, to provide leadership and perform the heavy-lifting in constitutional implementation, devolution roll-out and

electoral support. It has also tapped into the strengths of strategic implementing partners within GoK, County governments, UN agencies, and engaged with a variety of leading donors in the programme areas. The evaluation noted that the programme did not adequately leverage the comparative advantage of civil society (such as their networks, national advocacy and local level knowledge); private sector (for funds and local level knowledge of the economy) and academia (for research capacities; creation of model and tools).

UNDP has utilised its convening power and lent its brand to raise the visibility of key programme initiatives through joint programming (under DaO) with other UN Agencies such as UN Women under the Electoral and Devolution Support projects, and UNAIDS on HIV/AIDS hence increasing accountability, efficiency and coherence. UNDP is also brought its comparative advantage to bear in the system-wide initiative to model counties for development assistance under UN DaO framework in Turkana and Marsabit counties in all the programme priority thematic areas.

## 2.2 Programme design and results framework

The country programme is an integral part of UNDAF, and as such its four strategic programme priority areas are contributing directly to the selected UNDAF outcomes. Under each of the four UNDAF SRAs, UNDP is contributing to one outcome, and the attendant results chain under the selected outcome is cascaded to the CPD. The CPD has further generated its own outputs under each outcome.

The evaluation noted that the actual programme is broader than presented in the CPD with programme areas responding to UNDAF SRA Outcomes that are not included in the CPD. Thus making the CPD results framework inadequate for comprehensive results measurement and reporting. An example is the Devolution and Accountability Programme area which contributes to CPD UNDAF Outcome 1.3. The actual programme at implementation however encompasses the entire UNDAF SRA contributing to SRA 1.1 *Policy and Institutional Framework*; SRA1.2: *Democratic Participation and Human Rights*; and SRA 1.4: *Evidence and rights based decision making*. Whereas the country programme has utilised proxy indicators to measure and facilitate reporting and assessments, this is an anomaly in the results accountability chain that may make UNDP's claim to certain results tenuous in a sector with many development actors.

Several CPD output indicators had no baselines, or had inappropriate or over-ambitious targets to monitor progress, for instance: for output 1.1 under Outcome 1.3. Further, many of the data sources for indicators measurement are external to UNDP (mostly GoK) which at times may not be always available timeously or updated as regularly. Some of the CPD outcomes are too wordy risking misinterpretation (for CPD Outcome 1.1 and 2.1). These issues make the CPD indicators only partially comply with the SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Time bound) standards.

### Text Box 1: Example of CPD indicator

**CPD Outcome 1.1** National and county governments and the Constitutional Commissions have the capacity for a coordinated and effective transition to the devolved system and to mainstream human rights and gender considerations in compliance with constitutional provisions.

**Indicator:** #county governments integrating gender-sensitive standards with a select number of public sectors. *Baseline:* tbd (2013); *Target:* all selected county governments (2018); *Data:* County Performance Plans; county governments performance reports

The programme design also departed from the programme ToC which was broad-based regarding partnerships for instance, reducing it into a default state-centric programme. The programme's heavy investment in government institutional partners left little room for collaborating with CSOs and other non-state actors such as the private sector and academia.

Corruption was a key national issue at the inception of the CPD, and continues to threaten development resources and national governance and business ethics including at county levels. The programme has not illustrated significant support focus in this area, despite whole programme area being dedicated to accountability (Outcome 1: Devolution and *Accountability*), and a great focus on county level support. Greater investment in this area would not only reduce risk to UNDP investments, but also compound other UNDP results in governance support.

## 2.3 Effectiveness

The evaluation assessed the extent to which the programme has attained planned results and the contributions made to the achievement of CPD outcomes. It is the view of the evaluation that the programme has been extremely effective in its interventions at the National, County and Community levels and that the achievements made have contributed to CPD outcome attainment. Further, the strategic choice of working at the three levels (national, county and community) has contributed to successful implementation.

### 2.3.1 Devolution and accountability

The Devolution and Accountability programme area contributes to national priorities through **UNDAF Outcome 3.1: *Devolution and Accountability*: By 2017 a participatory devolution process that is well understood by stakeholders adequately coordinated and equitably resourced for the delivery of accessible and quality services; devolved institutions are legally, financially and technically empowered, well-managed, effective, accountable; resource management is transparent, equitable, effective and efficient at all levels.** CPD level outputs guiding this contribution are: **CPD Outcome 1.1: National and County governments and the Constitutional Commissions have capacity for a coordinated and effective transition to the devolved system and to mainstream human rights and gender considerations in compliance with constitutional provisions;** **CPD Outcome 1.2: Kenyan citizens and civil society meaningfully engage in democratic processes and re-empowered to be politically and socially engaged and to demand responsible and accountable governance;** and **CPD Level Outcome 1.3: National and county level capacity strengthened for equitable, accountable and effective HIV & AIDS responses.** The country programme has sought to realise these outputs through the two main strategies of: Contribution to policies and legislative frameworks; and capacity building and institutional strengthening.

**Output 1.1 National and county governments and the Constitutional Commissions have the capacity for a coordinated and effective transition to the devolved system and to mainstream human rights and gender considerations in compliance with constitutional provisions.**

Support by the country office in the evaluation period has significantly contributed to development of the legal, policy and regulatory frameworks, that have: enabled national government agencies to implement their mandates more effectively and in alignment with the constitution; laid out the architecture for devolved governments and enabled their effective operationalisation and accountable management; established the national institutional framework for the support of county governments and inter-governmental relations. Further, the legal and policy infrastructure at both national and county levels (for programme select counties): citizen's democratic participation; equitable engagement in national and county governance; access to justice especially for poor and vulnerable groups; and for human rights and gender mainstreaming has been enhanced through the programme support. County specific laws and policies have also been developed under the programme interventions and are enabling select county governments' effective operations, management and service delivery.

Key enabling national laws and policies developed include: Legal frameworks support has included: The Small Claims Court Act 2016, the Legal Aid Act 2016 and Bail and Bond Policy Guidelines among others are facilitating faster and inclusive access to justice. The National Human Rights Policy Sessional Paper No.3 of 2014 and the National Policy and Action Plan for Human rights adopted in 2015 instrumental in operationalising various laws and policies on human rights as illustrated by stakeholders'



reliance on it during the Universal Peer Review process. The Devolution policy which is already being implemented in select counties; Second Revenue Sharing Formula; model laws for adaptation by County governments; Public Participation guidelines; Public Procurement and Asset Disposal Regulations; Public Procurement and Asset Disposal (PPAD) Act 2015; and Civic Education curriculum; and CIDP review guidelines are all facilitating an effective, accountable and participatory devolution process.

Despite CO support efforts, some gaps remain in key areas including: lack of a constitutionally aligned national gender policy; and the lack of the operationalisation of the constitutional two third's gender rule, which undermine the key programming principle and national priority of gender equality. It was also apparent that some of the county specific laws and policies need to be reviewed with a view to better integrate the Human Rights Based Approach and gender perspectives, and that the quality of training needs to be standardised and mechanisms developed for quality control.

The technical and institutional capacities of national oversight and specialised institutions and county governments have been enhanced through country programme interventions. As a result of this support, these institutions have and continue to: entrench constitutionalism in the country; facilitate transition to devolved governance; promote the culture of human rights, gender equality and access to justice; facilitate; inter-governmental coordination and collaboration; to build capacities of county governments in areas such as planning, budgeting, legislative and policy development, operations and management.

Under this support, the counties such of Turkana, Kilifi, and Nyeri, and key oversight institutions such as CoG, and IEBC have become more effective in their support to devolution as a result of technical support in the form of expert staff secondment in the areas of gender, and SDGs among others. In Nyeri for instance, the M & E UN Volunteer helped the county to develop data collection mechanisms which has generated data that has informed planning. Kilifi was provided with a RRI coach to accelerate discharge of targeted devolved functions and service delivery. Counties are sustaining the legislative and policy development given under the legislative and policy frameworks support through utilisation of legislative drafting skills developed through CPD legislative drafting training. Staff from 9 out of 9 targeted counties<sup>2</sup> have been trained on policy and legislative drafting and some have proceeded to formulate their own laws<sup>3</sup>.

Article 59 commissions (NGEC, CAJ, KNCHR) are implementing their mandates more effectively; state actors', including counties' capacity for application of the HRBA, and especially ESCR has been enhanced; and state actors and relevant government bodies' capacities to deliver on their constitutional mandates has been strengthened<sup>4</sup> as a result of CPD support). Achievements here have included: among other things, internal training on the integration of human rights-based approaches (HRBA). The commissions in turn strengthened the capacity of MCAs from 33 counties on applying HRBA principles in their oversight and legislative roles, and national government agencies such as the Kenya Forest Services. Human resource capacities of counties have been strengthened with skills in the areas of: Legislative drafting; Monitoring and Evaluation; Performance Management System; Record Management; Women Leadership; Financial Oversight; Risk management and mitigation through trainings. By end of 3rd Quarter of 2016, a total of 6,823 (4, 719 males and 2,104 females)<sup>5</sup> national and county governments officers have been reached by at least one capacity building intervention<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup>Bungoma, Kilifi, Kisumu, Kitui, Laikipia, Nyeri, Turkana, Taita Taveta and Kericho.

<sup>3</sup> Kisumu county has fourteen ministries and each ministry has developed a comprehensive draft policy which are now before CA; Kitui county has developed 'County ICT strategy 2015 – 2020; Turkana has developed County ICT strategy 2015 – 2020 and financed all its legislative drafting; and Nyeri has drafted: Elimu Fund bill, Enterprise Development Fund Bill and Regulations among others.

<sup>4</sup> UNDP: Support to the realisation of Human Rights and Access to Justice: End of Project Evaluation. November, 2015.

<sup>5</sup> A large gender imbalance is again noted in capacity building in counties.

<sup>6</sup> UNDP in Making Devolution Work

[http://www.ke.undp.org/content/kenya/en/home/library/democratic\\_governance/making-devolution-work](http://www.ke.undp.org/content/kenya/en/home/library/democratic_governance/making-devolution-work)

Effectiveness and efficiency of county staff has been enhanced through provision of office and IT equipment in MoDP and four counties.<sup>7</sup> In Kitui County, this enabled the setting up of a high capacity county documentation centre that has enhanced county communication, including the publishing of periodic county development initiatives.

Capacities for gender sensitive service delivery and gender mainstreaming in county governance has been built in the review period through integrated programming with UN Women.

#### **Text Box 2 Gender sensitive and inclusive county service delivery enhanced**

All counties' planning and budget officers, M&E officer, Controller of Budget (CoB) officers have been trained on GRB. Turkana County senior officials were taken through gender mainstreaming training and the county was provided with a gender advisor. CoG capacity for GEWE was enhanced through provision of a gender advisor, and gender/legal advisor who have led CoG efforts in GEWE. KSG training modules were engendered and gender indicators have also been incorporated within Kenyan SDG indicators. A Gender rapid assessment conducted in 10 counties<sup>8</sup> revealed significant varying gaps in GEWE in counties including in policies, laws and programmes in health and agriculture which will inform future support.

#### **CPD Outcome1.2: Kenyans citizens and civil society meaningfully engage in democratic processes and re-empowered to be politically and socially engaged and to demand responsible and accountable governance**

Citizen engagement in the democratic process has been enhanced through legal and policy framework development including: the enactment of the Campaign Finance Act, 2016), Electoral (Amendment) Act 2016, Electoral (Amendment) Act 2017, IEBC Strategic plan 2013-2020 and the Elections Operational Plan 2016, which have laid the legal and policy rails for peaceful, free and fair 2017 elections. Further, capacity building of key institutions involved in facilitating inclusive democratic participation and peaceful and free elections and electoral processes has been enhanced and they are already utilising that capacity for preparation for the 2017 general elections. These include the IEBC, Office of Registrar of Political Parties. Extensive technical support through secondment of over 10 technical staff including UNVs; and training of 9 directorates in their areas of electoral management has boosted their operational effectiveness. IEBC business processes have also been improved through support in the development of policies on gender and social inclusion, ICT, stakeholder engagement, communications and media engagement, logistics and warehousing, procurement and risk management.

UNDP has contributed to informed and inclusive participation in elections through support to civic and voter education and stakeholder engagement with emphasis of women, youth and people living with disabilities as for instance around the 2016 and 2017 voter registration processes. Electoral justice, conflict prevention and electoral security mechanisms have been strengthened through support to: Prosecution and Investigation Department (PID); Political Parties Dispute Tribunal (PPDT); the Judicial Elections Committee (JCE); and the Electoral Security Arrangements Project (ESAP) hence laying foundations for peaceful elections. Support to Mass voter registration in 2016 and 2017 which harvested 4 million voters has significantly increased electoral participation.

The evaluation found that UNDP support to civil society engagement in democratic processes and their empowerment to be politically and socially engaged to demand accountable governance has been low in the review period.

Nevertheless, the potential for human rights responsive delivery of services in Kitui, Machakos and Turkana counties has been enhanced through training of CSOs in HRBA. Potential for public

<sup>7</sup> Nyeri, TaitaTaveta, Kilifi, Kitui counties

<sup>8</sup> Meru, Kisumu, Vihiga, Kakamega, Transnzoia, Kilifi, Mombasa, Turkana, Makueni, and Wajir.



participation and civic engagement has been built for the county of Nyeri, Kitui, Kwale and Turkana through technical support in the development of County Civic Engagement frameworks. Implementation of the country Universal Periodic Review recommendations has also been enhanced through support to CSOs to participate in drawing up recommendations for implementation. CSO enabling environment was also enhanced through various forms of support including filing of a legal case to compel the state to operationalise the law, leading to its operationalisation. Access to justice and human rights has also been enhanced in the three counties through support to CSOs using innovative approaches and reaching over 100,000 individuals indirectly. A survey commissioned by the programme generated important programme baseline data hence complying with the CPD commitment to evidence-based programming and laying a foundation for an effective project results framework.

**CPD Level Outcome 1.3: National and county level capacity strengthened for equitable, accountable and effective HIV & AIDS responses**

The Kenya AIDs Strategic Framework (2014/15-2018/19 supported by the programme is now guiding the country's response to HIV/AIDS at both national and county levels. Access to justice for persons living with HIV/AIDS (PLHIV) has been enhanced through programme interventions. There has been an increase in litigation cases related to stigma and discrimination, and other HIV related cases as illustrated in Text Box three. The HIV and AIDS Equity Tribunal (HAT), the first of its kind in the world which is mandated to address HIV discrimination and other HIV human rights violations, is now effectively delivering on its mandate as a result of institutional strengthening under UNDP support. Lawyers from different counties have been trained on representation of clients before the HIV/AIDS tribunal. Judges, magistrates, and law enforcement officers been trained on gender equality, gender based violence, discrimination and human rights violations, and community networks of PLHIV have been trained on how to influence laws and policies and to access the legal system. Jurisprudential development on rights of PLHIV has been enhanced through the development of a compendium of cases decided by the HAT hence further enhancing justice.

**Textbox3. Example of courses**

- **HAT Petition on 605 of 2014:** SWK & others Vs MSF France & Others (*Tubal Ligation of 5 Women Living with HIV without their consent*)
- **HAT Petition 250 of 2015:** KELIN & Anor Vs The Cabinet Secretary Ministry of Health & others (Land mark judgement safeguarding the right of privacy of children living with HIV/AIDS)
- **HAT Petition 329 of 2014:** Daniel Ngétich v The Hon AG & others (Petitioners incarcerated under section 27 of the Public Health Act, 1921 for interrupting their TB medication. KELIN intervened under PIL support of the programme securing their release in 46 days. Court ruled TB is not a crime, and the incarceration was unlawful and unconstitutional)

As a result of these CPD intervention under this UNDAF outcome, the evaluation found that the foundations for the country's constitutionalism have been strengthened, and the country has successfully launched the ambitious devolved governance structures with the 47 county units in place and fully operational as mandated by the constitution, within globally unprecedented timeframes for rolling out devolved government. The CO has, in the evaluation period, clearly contributed to set the country on a result path toward MTP II Political pillar goal: *Enact governance reforms, including legislation to implement the Constitution, and Judiciary Transformation Framework.*

It was however noted that many national laws and cultures of most national government institutions are still not aligned to the reality of devolution. The review identified the need to remap stakeholders and partners to align with the demands of the second devolution phase. Key partners in the second phase would include CSOs, private sector and academia to fill in gaps in the demand side, for building private sector governance capacities, and to build development models for growth conducive governance towards HMIC and growth and service delivery in counties respectively.

The evaluation notes that capacity building was mostly gender imbalanced<sup>9</sup>, with most trainees being men. The evaluation identified key risks to devolution which need to be addressed including: intra-county ethnic rivalries; corruption; unresolved conflictual and litigation ridden inter-governmental relations; low ODA flows; weak demand side capacities and watchdog abilities at county levels; LMIC status and the attendant donor and eventual government shift from governance to trade in funding priorities. These issues need to be innovatively responded to in the remaining phase of the CPD and in next CPD cycle.

### 2.3.2 Productive sector and trade

The Productive Sector and Trade is implementing CPD Outcome 3.2: Productive Sectors and Trade. Its aim is that *by 2018 productive sectors (agriculture, manufacturing, extractive industry) trade and their value chains are private sector and SME-driven, sustainable, diversified, technologically innovative, commercially oriented and competitive on national regional and global markets*. In the period under review, a number of achievements were made as highlighted below.

**Output 2.1 Public and private sectors at national and devolved level are technically capacitated to formulate (public) and utilise (private) equitable evidence-based business friendly policies and frameworks that are human rights based, gender sensitive and stimulate inclusive and environmentally sustainable economic growth.**

During the period under review the programme achieved the following: Increased access to business development services to vulnerable groups (youth and women) through establishment of business development centres; enhanced partnerships with private sector players resulting in partnerships with Biashara Centres occasioning increased access to business development services at County Government level resulting in cost sharing for implementation of projects; creation of feasibility studies for banana and passion fruit value-chains within the context of Agribusiness Supplier Development Programme (ASDP) in Kwale and TaitaTaveta among others.

With the help of UNDP, Micro – Small Enterprises Authority (MSEA) formulated a Strategic Plan in cognisance of Kenya's Vision 2030, Millennium Development Goals, and the Constitution of Kenya; the MSE Act No. 55 of 2012 and the Sessional Paper No. 2 of 2005 among other legal and policy documents. The Authority has registered over 4,500 Associations in the period under review.

UNDP supported the Ministry of Mining in the review, development and enactment of the Mining Act 2016. Development of the regulations which support its implementation is currently in place and so far 16 Mining regulations have been developed and submitted to the Attorney General's office for publishing and enactment. This will operationalise the Mining Act 2016 which is regarded as one of the most progressive extractive laws on the continent. The new Mining Act recognises the Artisanal and Small Scale Miners who were earlier on regarded as illegal under the old Mining Act of 1940.

**Output 2.2 The extractive sector is technically strengthened to apply measures that protect the environment and invest in community development and social services.**

The programme supported the Ministry of Mining in enhancing public participation for the Mining Regulations and policies. This was done through supporting the conduct of public participation forums which enhanced public participation. Journalists and editors from five counties that are endowed with natural resources were trained to ensure responsible and accurate reporting on issues concerning communities and human development. The training was also aimed at ensuring that the media keep

---

<sup>9</sup>For instance, 12 females and 97 males for the DRR/CCA training; and 9 females and 27 males for the Inter-agency rapid assessment for disaster events training.

track of all investments projects and promises made to the local communities for accountability and ensuring that human rights are not violated in the process.

**Output 2.3 Public and private sectors are technically, technologically and financially capacitated to develop and adapt responsible and sustainable enterprises that are resource efficient and innovative.**

The Strategic Advisory Facility is the main Capacity Strengthening support that UNDP has offered to the government. The Ministry of Mining whose management and operational structures are not fully in place due to understaffing and limited capacity needed support to ensure effective and efficient implementation of its mandate. The Strategic Advisory Facility provides a framework not only for additional capacity but also building the capacity of existing staff with a view to ensuring sustainability and effective human and institutional capacity to support sustainable management of the extractive sector.

Further, the roll out of the employers' challenge on youth employability initiative (partnership between UNDP, KEPSA, MoDP, MoPSYG, Micro Soft EA), developed to address the issue of youth unemployment is contributing to the implementation of some priorities within the national Youth Empowerment Strategy. UNDP has supported the establishment of One Stop National Investment Centres led by Kenya Investment Authority.

The engagement of Youth in agriculture productive sector through the Aquaculture and Blue Growth programmes is transforming and up scaling aquaculture. At least fifteen (15) youth have been trained on Business skills and Entrepreneurship Development (BSED) through a two months training including field attachment and business plan competition.

### **2.3.3 Environmental sustainability**

The environment, climate change and energy portfolio seeks to contribute to national development frameworks and strategies as elaborated out in MPT II through following outcome: **CPD Outcome 4.1: Policy and legal frameworks:** By 2016, Kenya has robust and legal frameworks linking issues of environmental sustainability, climate change and sustainable land management to human security and resilience therefore requiring an integrated and coordinated response to all phases. The following outputs are propelling achievement of Outcome 4.1: **Output 3.1.** GOK has adequate capacity to develop evidenced-based and coherent policy responses to the inter-linked linkages of environmental sustainability, land and natural resource management and human security; **Output 3.2.** Effective technology and skills transfer to develop models of cost-efficient bio-energy, solar, geothermal electricity production, and mini-hydro and wind power generation.

**Output 3.1 GoK has adequate capacity to develop evidence-based and coherent policy responses to the inter-linked challenges of environmental sustainability, land and natural resource management and human security.**

### **Policies and legislative frameworks**

With substantial support from UNDP the country has strengthened policy, legal, institutional and regulatory frameworks that govern conservation and management of the environment, climate change, energy, biodiversity and wildlife management and tourism. Key institutional, policy and legal processes that UNDP in partnership with the government has supported during the 2014 – 2016 period include: implementation of climate change Act (2016), review of climate change Bill to incorporate REDD+ mechanism; alignment of Forest Act with the Constitution of Kenya 2010, development of County Environment Action Plans (CEAPs) and SEA guidelines. Counties through KMD have been supported with 20 automatic weather stations.

With UNDP support, Kenya is now a regional front-runner on REDD+ issues underpinned by free prior and informed consent guidelines to support indigenous communities' engagement in forest conservation and management. This is a notable milestone viewed as an effective model for enhancing environmental suitability. The REDD+ mechanism further enabled GoK to put in place policy measures that comply with Cancun safeguards agreed to during COP 16. The Climate Change Unit (CCU) is operational to spearhead climate change mitigation and adaptation actions. The CO contributed to huge transformation of the climate change framework through review of climate finance policy and climate change budget codes to track the funds under the IFMIS, these are key actions to safeguard against corruption and other governance loopholes. Review of KFS code of conduct to incorporate integrity issues is another notable action and is expected to significantly contribute to improved forest governance in Kenya. That notwithstanding, the MTE noted with concern limited exploitation of synergies and complementarities across UNDP initiatives which would challenge efficiency.

#### **Several high-level capacity building efforts conducted with impressive results.**

Several country-wide capacity building workshops were conducted to track climate finance through IFMIS and integration of climate change into national and county planning and budgeting processes. For instance, to create awareness on solar PV a total of 27 suppliers, 238 vendors and 259 technicians across 62 towns were visited to create awareness on the voluntary accreditation framework. Out of these, 13 suppliers, 52 vendors and 6 technicians were accredited. Technical staff drawn from the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock and other partners in facilitating SLM, experiential SLM learning of agro pastoral communities through Farmer Field Schools (FFS) enhanced. Capacity building on solar PV heating through trainings and development of manuals to improve quality and uptake of the products is impressive. Solar PV curriculum and training manual was developed at certificate level. Voluntary profiling of solar energy actors –importers, technicians, potential consumers and suppliers have been accredited to improve solar products and uptake with CO support to KERECA. All these actions are seen by the MTE as being effective in enhancing access to clean energy, sustainable land management, mainstreaming climate change into planning and budgeting processes and supporting pro-poor mitigation and adaptation efforts.

At community level, the SLM project has contributed to shifts in gender perceptions among the Masai in Narok County. Participants to the FGD shared this experience, " *Before the Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project came in this village, we used to walk up to 5 Kms to the nearest water point on either side of the hill. The borehole drilled by the project has made water available saving the time our women and children used to walk in search of water. It was a taboo and against Masai culture for women to sit together with men in meetings but due to the project learning in field schools the men now have totally changed their attitude towards women. The energy saving stoves have reduced by more than half the firewood needed for cooking food saving a lot of time spent by our women and children looking for firewood. Some of our members have now started small businesses in our local market as a result of time saved from firewood collection and fetching water. This project has really made tremendous transformation on attitude of our men and has made our lives better!!*"

#### **Output 3.2 Effective technology and skills transfer to develop models of cost-efficient bio-energy, solar, geothermal electricity production, and mini-hydro and wind power generation.**

**Innovative approaches and technology testing and transfer enhanced:** The evaluation team was impressed by the innovative model of establishment of Clean Energy Business and Information Centres (CEBICs) in Marsabit and Samburu where communities would access business information to spur growth of sustainable ventures particularly in the ASALs. Outstanding innovative approaches through the voluntary accreditation of solar stakeholders and potential users, promotion of biomass production in the ASAL counties, testing and development of standards for institutional stoves, testing and up scaling charcoal production technologies and development of standards for small hydro power are seen by the MTE as innovative approaches that need to be replicated and out scaled. There are gigantic

milestones with huge impacts on reducing emissions and building resilience of vulnerable populations. However, the MTE also noted that substantial and sometimes unacceptable delays have impacted on effectiveness in delivering these interventions due system wide inefficiency in UNDP.

#### **2.3.4 Community Security, Social Cohesion and Resilience**

The DRR and peace building portfolio contributes to national development frameworks and strategies as elaborated in the MPT II through **CPD Outcome 4: Systems for community security and resilience. By 2018 counties and communities are able to anticipate, prevent and respond efficiently to disasters and emergencies.** The following are the outputs: **Output 4.1.** Institutional capacity in place to implement and monitor gender-and human rights-sensitive DRM, peace building, conflict prevention and community security policies, strategies and plans; and **Output 4.2.** Coordination mechanisms, preparedness, early warning and timely response and recovery systems operational at national, county and community levels.

#### **Output 4.1 Institutional capacity in place to implement and monitor gender and human rights sensitive DRM; peace building conflict prevention and community security policies, strategies and plans**

**Formulation of national and county policies and legislation and strengthening institutional frameworks:** The evaluation noted that significant achievements have been made under this portfolio. It noted good progress in supporting policies, legislation and strategies, strengthening institutional coordination mechanisms and building capacity of national and county staff. Through governance for DRR programme, tangible results were observed on DRR county action plans, improved institutional frameworks, mainstreaming of DRR into national and county planning processes and strengthened partnerships and networks. The programme supported Disaster Risk Management Bill and enhanced the capacities especially of the NDOC and NDMA, key DRM institutions at the national level. At Parliamentary level, UNDP supported the drafting of gender – sensitive National Disaster Risk Management Bill in 2016 and strengthened capacity of parliamentary DRR caucus group whose main goal is to push for the enactment and implementation of the much needed DRR policy and legislation. With support from UNDP an holistic and gender sensitive County DRR Action Plans have been developed in five counties and DRM Bills/Policies developed in 9 Counties. UNDP's strong support to counties has thus strengthened key DRM institutions; supported legal processes and policy formulation thereby firmly embedding DRR and resilience building efforts in government.

The revision of the National Peace Council Bill was found to be a positive step in the direction of institutionalising peace and once passed, will augment local level peace building efforts. Further, Ethnicity and Diversity Audits targeting 161 State corporations/Parastatals, 15 Commissions, and 47 County Governments and County Public Service Boards were conducted and findings disseminated. Findings from the audits have already been utilised in monitoring and ensuring compliance at the National and County levels. Additionally, seven laws on Citizenship and Registration of Persons were reviewed, pending adoption. The evaluation learnt from the NCIC, that it has been able to raise its profile and demonstrate relevance even at county level and that thus the National Government now consults on numerous social cohesion issues.

The Deepening Foundations for Peace programme has through the NSC, ably supported County Governments in Peace building and Conflict Management. This has led to the setting up of Peace Directorates and creation of peace budgets in several counties. Further, the programme supported the development of National guidelines on peace building training thus standardising this training nationwide.

Another notable area of contribution is that of UNDP's support to the SALW reduction agenda. Given the porous borders with most of its neighbours and increasing sense of insecurity among Citizens,



coupled with intermittent cross-border conflicts, Kenya has, through UNDP's support to the Focal Point on Small Arms Control and Management within the Ministry of Interior registered good success in the period under review. UNDP support came at the right time, when the unit needed assistance in operationalising the National Police Reserve (NPR) which is the fourth arm of the Kenya Police service.

The NPR policy framework was developed in 2014 along with a curriculum for training the community-based members of the service. The following year, a bench marking study visit to Sudan was undertaken to understand stock pile management and disposal of SALW. This resulted in the destruction 5250 firearms; 192 000 ammunition and 1565 expired ordinances. The key informants pointed out that proliferation SALW is impacting negatively on progress towards attainment of Vision 2030 and *that once you eradicate illicit arms, there will be peace in Kenya. In their view, UNDP did well in supporting investments in the hardware side of peace building along with traditional soft-ware approach. NPRs are now appreciated unlike before and the County security apparatus now collaborates with them. This is the difference that UNDP support has made.*

The programme also supported the finalisation and launch of the Kenya National Action Plan (NAP) on UNSCR 1325 on women, peace and security as well as the launch of the National Strategy on Counter Violent Extremism (CVE) which is now the blueprint for CVE efforts.

#### **Output 4.2 Coordination mechanisms, preparedness, early warning and timely response and recovery systems operational at national, county and community level.**

**Early warning and early response has been increased** through the equipping of the NSC conflict early warning situation room, where state of the art equipment to receive and monitor alerts has been installed. The evaluation, in its interactions with the team, found it to be conversant in its use and adequately prepared for the increase in alerts as the 2017 general election draws near. The early response side however remains a challenge. Another notable achievement is the completion the national conflict and electoral risk assessments which resulted in the deployment of 12 UN Volunteers as peace monitors in conflict-prone counties. Their presence provides another level of early warning and early response coordination at community level.

Similarly, UNDP support to a scenario building exercise for UWIANO partners in 2016 resulted in the expansion of UWIANO platform members to include the Media, Faith Institutions, The Registrar of Political Parties, Council of Governors among others. This will ensure a well coordinated multi-actor approach to electoral violence containment. The partners commended UNDP for its technical support and continued commitment to the platform's revitalisation.

**Coordination mechanisms:** Significant progress has been made in enhancing coordination mechanisms for disaster risk management, peace building and conflict management. A notable achievement has been the establishment of 23 County Peace structures. Further, County DRM coordination platforms are established and are functional in 9 counties and at national level enhancing coordination mechanisms at the respective levels. The evaluation learnt and observed that in some counties, these coordination structures have proved useful in supporting county governments to implement their CIDP's and strategies.

**Community level mechanisms:** cognisant of the myriad of conflicts that occur at the local level, UNDP had supported the re-establishment of District Peace Committees and creation of 10 County Peace Forums to oversee coordination of peace building initiatives and resolution of conflicts. By building local capacities to mitigate conflicts, the programme has proved effective in addressing the diverse conflict typologies both in the different counties as well as within. Inter-communal peace agreements have been signed and in certain counties, continued revenge killings have been averted. This forward thinking and preparedness on prevention of electoral violence proved effective in that those counties such as Tana

River which are known hotspots, reported relative calm during the primary nomination process. The evaluation field visit came a day after the nominations and there were no incidents observed both in Hola and Garsen (Tana River).

Owing to the strong technical capacity of its implementing partners and a close working relationship and accompaniment, the evaluation found that this conducive relationship and capitalising on each partner's comparative advantage in implementation of activities played a pivotal role in enhancing programme effectiveness. Another contributor to successful implementation has been the investments made in strengthening operational and programmatic capacities of its partners and beneficiaries. The HACT assessments, through rigorous, and training were cited as having made a significant difference. Two partners pointed out that they were able to attract funding from other donors as a result, thus augmenting UNDP efforts in implementation of activities.

While good results have been registered, the evaluation observed that there was need to do more to enhance effectiveness. Examples are:

1. The re-establishment and training of DPCs could have yielded better results if the Committees had the financial and operational means to intervene. During FGDs, Committee members told of their frustration at not being able to respond timeously owing to lack of funds and means of transport. In certain instances, the District Commissioner's office has provided meeting venues and transport but this is not always the case. The evaluation noted that the accelerated roll-out of LPCs at county and local level while good, carries with it potential for little impact without the requisite administrative and financial accompaniment.
2. The tenure of 3 years for LPC membership was found to be too short and would negatively impact on LPC effectiveness in the long run. Establishing a durable peace architecture is by its nature a lengthy process and should not be unduly rushed. The Ghana model which is acclaimed as the standard thus far continues to evolve, with a National and Regional Committees to date. The National Peace Council legislation was only passed ten years into the process.
3. A related point concerning the work of LCPs is the need for reflecting (within reason) the demographic profile of the locality in the composition of the Committee. In certain counties, such as Mombasa where 57% of the population is in the 15- 25 year age group, increasing Youth representation would most likely yield better results. They would be more effective in reaching out to their peers and better understand how to address the complex challenges of low education, lack of economic opportunities and general feelings of marginalisation. Then support the design of interventions that will address the root cause of youth proclivity to political capture, criminality and radicalisation. This being augmented by meaningful livelihood opportunities and access to education and vocational training.

The evaluation further noted the need to augment the soft-approach with long-term practical solution to some of the perennial causes of conflict. An example would be support to permanent marking of water corridors as a preventive measure in agro-pastoral communities.

**Recovery systems and community resilience:** The programme supported activities that scale up and build on achievements from previous community resilience initiatives with a specific focus on development of productive assets, value chains and access to markets. Through these initiatives a total of 379,000 people directly benefitted. The initiatives implemented during the period are contributing to reducing vulnerability to disaster impacts and creating long-term employment among the disaster and conflict-prone communities. The initiatives include development of Livestock Based Value Chains

including irrigation, livestock value chain (leather), fish value chains, honey production and operation among others.

**Countering Violent Extremism and Radicalisation:** UNDP responded to the security threats posed by radicalisation and violent extremism and forged a partnership with the NCTC. This resulted in a two-year project funded annually by Japan which has made significant contributions to awareness and facilitated an holistic, multi-actor approach to CVE and a steady decline in recruitment trends.

## 2.4 Efficiency

The evaluation considered how the total financial resources of \$78,907,322 against a budget of \$84,769,128 were utilised and whether the programme realised value for money in the period under review. Modes of implementation were also examined to see the extent to which inputs were optimally utilised to translate in outputs and how these contributed to attainment of programme outcomes.

Generally, the evaluation views that resources were properly utilised for what they were planned for and did produce planned results. Several bills, policies, plans, regulations, technology and knowledge products have been produced during the period as a result of efficient use of resources. UNDP has developed a broad Resource Mobilisation Action Plan to mobilise funds to deliver on its programme. As a result, the CO has diversified to reach out to top six donors funding Africa and currently pursuing four others to come on board<sup>10</sup>, and attracting more due to the CO's well-established and efficient financial system, strong convening power and neutrality in discharging its development mandates. On absorption of funds, the evaluation was impressed to note that the UNDP and partners have consistently utilised over 90% of the budgeted funds, an impressive delivery rate by any standard. However, the evaluation noted that donor contributions to Kenya have declined over the period due to the global financial crisis, emerging crises in other countries, crowded market and rebasing of Kenyan economy<sup>11</sup>. As such the evaluation notes that there is need to develop innovative resource mobilisation strategies and expand outreach to non-traditional donors. A number of unforeseen risks such as electoral cycle, drought and corruption have also impacted on efficiency.

The evaluation probed M & E systems to examine the efficiency and observed good systems in place for planning and monitoring processes, as well as for the reporting of results. This notwithstanding, the evaluation found instances of late donor reporting and end of project closures. The Team noted that UNDP has a global web-based compliance system which looks for different parameters of compliance and monitoring in support of efficiency. The evaluation noted that the UNDP M&E system is not integrated with IP M&E system thus impeding good reporting of the CO results. In addition, the UNDP and GoK programming cycles are not synchronised thus undermining efficiency. To optimise on efficiency, the UNDP M & E system needs to be strengthened and considering the wide scope of coverage of the Country programme. Efforts should be made to harmonise the programming cycles of UNDP and GoK to reduce lost time in programme implementation.

The team noted that programmatic efficiency is good and is supporting the four outcome areas but with room for improvement. The CO uses the DaO modality to enhance synergies across relevant UN agencies with comparative advantage to scale up efficiency. UNDP Co-Chairs the Transformative Governance SRA, of the UNDAF and participates in other UNDAF SRAs. However, several interviewees noted that there is limited ownership by some UN agencies leading to duplication of efforts and wastage of resources. Adherence to standard reporting templates has also proved difficult as some agencies continue with their own style thereby undermining efficiency and increasing workloads for staff coordinating joint programmes.

---

<sup>10</sup>Top donors funding UNDP Kenya: DFID, USAID, GEF, SIDA, EU, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Finland

<sup>11</sup> UNDP Kenya 2016: Resource mobilization Action Plan



The evaluation noted that some projects operated inefficiently as they suffered substantial start-up delays thereby frustrating partners and curtailing efficiency. Interviewees cited factors causing delays such as delays signing the letters of agreement (LoA) and the project documents, procurement of consultants, recruitment of project management teams and in disbursement of funds. There was also notable delay in preparation of project documents mainly due to the need to have input of the project document from many partners. The evaluation however, noted efforts to streamline these to enhance delivery and implementation of activities.

## **2.5 Management and Monitoring**

The evaluation analysed the extent to which the results framework was coherent and focused; linkages of the output and outcome indicators to the SDGs and whether the indicators are realistic and measureable. The evaluation also examined if the roles and responsibilities of the UNDP partners is clear and the extent to which the cross-cutting issues of gender, environmental sustainability and human rights are reflected in the implementation and monitoring reports.

The evaluation found that the CPD result framework is rather coherent and focused. CPD coherence was analysed at three levels: (i) assessment of coherence of outcome indicators and targets, (ii) coherence of the output indicators to outcome indicators and (iii) coherence of the outcome targets with outcome indicators. Indicators were analysed and the extent to which they were specific, measureable, realistic and time bound (SMART). The evaluation noted that the CPD results framework which is derived from the UNDAF has a good results chain a clear reflection of UNDP's support to GoK's development priorities. The CPD outcomes and outputs are well linked to the UNDAF outcomes and MTP II development priorities. The programme which was guided with the objective of achieving MDGs was forward looking and incorporated major issues in the SDGs. Cross-cutting issues of gender, environmental sustainability and human-rights issues are firmly embedded in the outcomes and outputs. However, review of progress reports revealed that the gender issues are not consistently espoused throughout the reports.

The evaluation noted that UNDP has put in place an elaborate partnership mechanism with various UN organisations, national and county government, development partners, civil society organisations and the private sector to deliver the programme. The project documents have clear terms of reference on the roles and responsibilities of the various stakeholders. Most of the project documents reviewed have firmly embedded the risk management issues in their programmes and projects. However, the scope of the risks and assumptions identified in most projects is limited thereby leaving others which impact on the delivery of projects.

The evaluation critically analysed the extent to which the outcome indicators are aligned to SDGs and if they are realistic and measurable and makes the following observations:

- Low ambition levels of some of the targets and efforts to contribute to outcome,
- Linkage of the indicators and outcome to SDGs in some instances weak,
- There is mixed use percentages and absolute numbers to measure progress,
- Choice and use of some outcome indicators to measure outcome questionable.
- There is lack of baseline data for some indicators thus posing challenges in monitoring progress,
- The data sources might not provide prompt information to monitor progress to outcomes,
- The data sources might not provide prompt information to demonstrate reduction in incidences of disasters and conflicts.

Another element of programme management that the evaluation analysed was the human resource profile to assess the extent to which there is congruence between the staff complement, location and programme implementation especially in light of the programme's reach and implementing partner needs. The evaluation learnt from implementing partners that having UNDP staff co-located in their

respective institutions was helpful in facilitating compliance with UNDP requirements (planning and financial and reporting) thus enabling a smooth and efficient working relationship. For example, the National Counter Terrorism Centre (NCTC) reported that they have a better understanding UNDP processes and requirement owing to the UNDP staff working directly with them. This practice should be used more. A related observation is that while it is accepted that UNDP generally implements its activities through implementing partners especially at County and Community levels, there is need to increase its field presence as appropriate to ensure more effective coordination and county level accompaniment. The evaluation believes there is opportunity if the area development approach is replicated in the next CPD cycle.

## **2.6 Sustainability**

The evaluation analysed the extent to which the results attained thus far and implementation mechanisms can be sustained beyond the life of the programme. The extent to which programme interventions and outcomes incorporated exit strategies and strengthened implementing partners' capacities to sustain the gains made was assessed. Other aspects of sustainability that the evaluation considered were: The level of National and local ownership and how this has been demonstrated; programme partnerships that have been built and how these will contribute to sustainability of results; whether the institutional capacity strengthening interventions made will enable the sustaining of results and build resilience.

The evaluation found that at the policy level, the programme has contributed to sustainability of results through support to the creation of a conducive policy and legal environment such as the enactment and/or revision of all Schedule 5 Constitutional laws within the five-year transitional period of the Constitution; The finalisation and launch of the Kenya National Action Plan (NAP) on UNSCR 1325 on women, peace and security in March 2016 which has been rolled to counties; and the launch of the National Strategy on CVE. Independent Commissions institutional capacities have been built through: The development of strategic plans for the IEBC (2015 -2020) and all Human Rights Commissions which are now largely financed by Government and are generating financing from other non-government. All these efforts are contributing to strengthened capacity and sustainability.

Another key finding was that over 90% of UNDP projects were implemented through NIM. While the use of NIM demonstrates national ownership and would lead to sustainability of interventions and results; UNDP may need to review the level of CO support to NIM as a way of strengthening counterpart capacities in managing projects.

At the county level, the evaluation found that contribution to the development of CIDPs and the embedding of DRR, resilience building as well as the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues of gender and HRBA will aid in the sustaining of results and ownership. Some county governments are providing matching resources to support climate change, environmental sustainability DRR and peacebuilding interventions thus reinforcing potential for sustainability. While UNDP has invested \$6 million in areas such as performance management systems and monitoring and evaluation of public projects, the evaluation noted that a number of counties lacked the human and technical resources to fully implement the CIDPs, for instance, Tana River County has a peace building directorate and skeleton staff but has not been able to implement planned activities due to budgetary constraints. The programme should therefore identify other such counties that require further institutional building and programme implementation support to augment the gains made thus far and provide for this in the remainder of the current CPD cycle.

Additionally, the evaluation noted that sustainability was integrated in the programme strategy of capacity building to ensure results out-live the programme exit. Implementing partners were found to have the requisite technical and human capacity to continue delivering results as evidenced by how NDMA and NDOC are spearheading the DRR agenda and how they articulated the interventions they

are rolling out at the National and County level. Staff at the National Steering Committee that leads the implementation of peace building activities were found to be equally competent and well versed in early warning issues, challenges and opportunities.

## **2.7 Partnerships**

The ToC and programme design include a varied partnership base including: the national Government of Kenya as the key partner on a cost-sharing basis through key state institutions; select County Governments; a diversified group of donors (including Government of Netherlands; Swedish International Development Agency; Government of Sweden, Government of Italy; United States Development Aid (USAID); Department for International Development (DFID); and Government of Japan); Civil Society Organisations (CSOs); and UN Agencies under DaO agenda through joint programming such as with: UN Women; United Nations Industrial Development Organisations (UNIDO); UNAIDS; United Nations Volunteers Programme (UNV) and other agencies. Others include Global Environmental Facility (GEF), and South-South cooperation partners especially Brazil, China, India and Republic of Korea.

There is no evidence that the programme tapped into the Kenya Philanthropy Forum to leverage alternative resources in support to SDG 17 on establishing partnerships across traditional and non-traditional stakeholders for achievement of the goals collectively. This is a missed opportunity especially within the context of scarce development resources and shifting priorities of traditional UNDP donors.

A more structured response to the needs of the MIC status would present UNDP with an opportunity to partner with the private sector and leverage the sectors technical capital in specific areas. It would also present an opportunity for partnership, whereof UNDP would provide its global expertise for instance in the area of governance within the business sector which has been identified by the Global Human Development Report 2016<sup>12</sup> as being one of the pivotal issues inhibiting countries from progressing to HMIC from LMIC.

Kenya has a globally renowned robust civil society sector at both national and community levels. The sector has proven advocacy, civic education expertise, and nationwide and regional networks in the programme areas of focus and is therefore a development node with multiplier effects. Inadequate engagement with CSOs in such a major programme is a missed opportunity. UNDP should better utilise the HACT modality to expand its partnership with CSOs. Greater engagement with the academia would have assisted in the much-needed development of research towards models, and policies for instance in the new area of climate change, devolution and SDGs. These will be indispensable partners in the country's discourse on MIC status, the demographic dividend and SDGs. The few efforts to work with these partners should be scaled up in each programme area. UNDP should also invest in an analysis to identify the most strategic dimensions for engagement with each partner.

## **2.8 Capacity building and human rights based approach in programming**

The evaluation found that each outcome area included a component of capacity building at the institutional and individual levels across National, County and Community level interventions. For instance, the programme supported the gender-sensitive Disaster Risk Management Bill and strengthened the capacity of the parliamentary caucus on DRR and KEWOPA. This facilitated the furthering of the DRR policy and legislation agenda and as a result, the DRRM Bill has been drafted and now awaits reading and enactment; Officers from NDOC were sponsored to attend High level global and regional DRR meetings such as the African Regional DRR platforms in 2015 and 2016; At the community level, the programme supported NSC to train 621 District Peace Committee members (217

---

<sup>12</sup> UNDP, Global Human Development Report 2016.

females, 337 males, 73 Youth leaders and 4 persons with disabilities), Additionally, 10 County Peace Forums were established and trained on operations of a Peace Committee using the guidelines revised under the programme. This has increased community capacities to mitigate local level conflicts and contribute to social cohesion.

National capacities in documentation and knowledge product generation were also strengthened for instance, The NCIC commissioned Ethnicity and Diversity audits whose recommendations now inform recruitment of staff in parastatals and other public institutions such as State Universities. What the evaluation noted however is that the programme needs to go beyond publication of knowledge products and package them for wider dissemination (more short videos and films in local languages, community-level stories of change brochures and infomercials) even at Community level. This will allow for showcasing of UNDPs contribution to attainment of national priorities. The evaluation does acknowledge what has been done to date but suggests more investment in this regard.

A shortcoming that was noted is that when the evaluation probed into the existence of a central database of individuals trained, products developed and technologies distributed, policies and knowledge products developed under the programme; respondents could not answer in the affirmative. The evaluation found that as a result, there is risk of the programme continuing to build capacity in areas where there is already good capacity in the country but cannot be readily tapped into. A case in point is the mediation skills training that partners interviewed continue to demand under the Deepening foundations for peace programme both at the National and local levels.

The programme has contributed to advancement of gender mainstreaming and gender equity in a number of ways: In partnership with UN Women, it supported gender mainstreaming and women empowerment at county level, 68 women entrepreneurs were trained and are now positioned to benefit from the 30% access Government procurement opportunities reserved for women, youth and persons with disabilities. The evaluation found this intervention to have made a significant contribution in facilitating women access to meaningful livelihood opportunities and noted the opportunity for scaling up and increase the participation of young women. County government staff was trained in gender and SDG mainstreaming thus contributing to County Governments ability to deliver improved basic services. Other initiatives include the support in the recruitment of voter registration clerks, (41%) of those recruited by the IEBC were women. Support to the same Commission enabled the registration of 706,173 new women voters (48.3%) of total new voters registered. This was found to be a significant achievement and progress towards increasing women participation in electoral processes and attainment of gender equality. A related intervention was the adoption, by the Registrar of Political Parties (ORPP), of the Political Parties Leadership Training Source Book developed in partnership with UN Women. As a result, the ORPP has increased its capacity and understanding in how to include marginalised groups such as women, persons with disabilities and ethnic minorities in political party management.

Despite the successes highlighted above, when programme performance on gender was assessed through the gender marker scoring on the ROAR, the evaluation found that the highest percentages of total outcome area expenditure across all four outcomes fell under Gen1. Meaning that the interventions were rated as contributing to gender equality in a limited way. In 2016 for instance, \$ 8,679,299 was spent on activities that only contributed to attainment of gender development results in a limited way. The evaluation, in examining CPD indicators, found only one (output 3.2) indicator is focused on women: *% access of renewable energy by women headed households in rural areas*. This makes tracking of progress towards gender results almost difficult. The programme needs to address this as well as, in the next CPD cycle, have more projects with specific objectives focusing on gender equality given that the CPD has women among its primary target beneficiaries.

**2.9 Overall Programme performance:** The evaluation has rated the programme as being largely on track. Programme performance against set evaluation criteria was found to be above expectations as shown in Table 5 below.

Measure	Performance rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
	Major improvements needed	Some improvements needed	Meets expectations	Often exceeds expectations	Consistently exceeds expectations
Strategic positioning					
Programme design					
Relevance					
Effectiveness					
Efficiency					
Sustainability					
Project Implementation and adaptive management					
Delivering as One					
Partnerships					
National ownership					

The evaluation, having analysed the data sets and utilising the team's knowledge and experience in each of the four outcome areas, assessed the programme performance and progress to date and gave the ratings above for each of the performance criterion elements. Overall, the programme was deemed to have consistently exceeded standards and expectations with regards to its Strategic positioning and relevance in view of the manner in which it has been responsive to shifts in the Kenya development context, the choice of areas of engagement both in support to policy and community level interventions as well as its leadership on SDGs. Programme effectiveness, sustainability and National ownership were clearly demonstrated in all four outcome areas. The evaluation found numerous relevant and tangible examples of how the programme had performed to date under each of these thus warranting a rating of (4) out of a possible (5). Programme design, efficiency, project implementation and adaptive management were rated as generally meeting good practice with opportunities for improvement in some aspects as elaborated in the narrative above. Regarding Partnerships, the programme has worked well with its key partners in implementing activities, leveraging well on partner resources, despite a missed opportunity in CSO engagement noted in the analysis.

# LESSONS LEARNT CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

This chapter outlines the lessons learnt conclusions and recommendations based on evaluation findings on programme performance and progress towards attainment of intended results 2014-2016. It is intended for UNDP and its Implementing Partners as well as other key stakeholders. Overall, the programme has performed well and is on track to deliver the remaining planned results. This however, will largely depend on how UNDP will cover the resource gap or make adjustments to deliver the same results with fewer resources.

## 3.1 LESSONS LEARNT

**Lesson 1:** Working at three levels (National, County and Community) proved useful in ensuring programme ownership by beneficiaries and more effective vertical coordination. This approach should be continued with increased presence at Community level.

**Lesson 2:** Better planning is crucial to effective programme delivery and helps reduce implementation delays.

**Lesson 3:** Setting standard operating procedures enhances implementation efficiency and consistency in achievement of planned results and policy implementation, additionally it will reduce likelihood of varying results enhance development gains and harmonise efforts.

**Lesson 4:** Civil society organisations are important partners and through partnerships and closer engagement with CSOs the programme can facilitate increased accountability of duty bearers.

**Lesson 5:** Adopting a collaborative approach and information sharing, learning and support among programme IPs is an enabler to coherent and effective programme delivery.

**Lesson 6:** Failure to clearly articulate procedures and criteria for targeting of vulnerable groups (Particularly PWDs, youth and the poorest of the poor) and communities negatively impacts on programme performance in this regard and progress towards results.

## 3.2 CONCLUSIONS

**Conclusion 1:** The evaluation concludes that the programme has been relevant and has made demonstrable adjustments to adapt to emerging issues in the global and national development contexts. It was found to be relevant in meeting the needs of targeted vulnerable groups, however the evaluation noted the need for more focused targeting of vulnerable beneficiaries especially the youth and persons with disabilities. The same focus will be required for county level support in implementation of policies and laws enacted thus far.

**Conclusion 2:** The evaluation concludes that the programme has contributed to the creation of a conducive legal and policy environment to facilitate inclusive and sustainable development for Kenyans. The investments made in Institutional capacity building have contributed to improved capacities of key national institutions and county governments for better service delivery and fulfillment of their constitutional mandates. Further, the evaluation concludes that despite being implemented within a shifting context, the CPD is on course in most of its outcome areas within limited resources and at times limited continuity in project transitions. The achievements made in this first phase will, however, need to be strengthened especially at County level where there are still significant capacity gaps, lean staff and operational constraints that may impede implementation of policies and laws enacted and ultimately retard progress towards realisation of national development priorities.

**Conclusion 3:** The evaluation concludes that while CPD delivery rate is commendable at above 90% throughout the period under review. The modes of delivery and processes contributed to attainment of demonstrable quality results across CPD outcome areas, however, there are still operational bottlenecks that, if overcome, would enhance programme efficiency. Further, the disconnect between the UNDP globalised M&E system and that of its partners is negatively impacting on joint learning to improve delivery and increase value for money.

**Conclusion 4:** The NIM has facilitated national ownership of the programme initiatives through high-level GoK participation and leadership. The strategy of building both institutional and individual capacity has further enhanced sustainability as it outlives programme interventions. However, in some cases, inadequate project-level strategies compromised sustainability of overall programme interventions and results.

**Conclusion 5:** The contribution towards the launch and domestication of SDGs both at National and County levels as well as UNDP leadership of the SDG platform is commendable and has laid a good foundation for the country and will strengthen coordination, implementation and fundraising and facilitate multi-actor effort. However, there is need for the programme to ensure SDGs indicators and targets are aligned at all levels. Additionally, the programme will need to align the remainder of the CPD cycle activities to the priorities and targets of the MTP III.

**Conclusion 6:** The Area Based Development Approach adopted in the Turkana and Marsabit joint programmes is effective and demonstrates the transformative potential of an integrated programme within a reasonably short space of time, thus showcasing the difference that UNDP can make in marginalized communities. This evaluation concludes that this is a model that can be replicated within UNDP CPD programming for community level interventions in particular.

**Conclusion 7:** While programme performance has been rated highly in the period under review, the evaluation concludes that UNDP has many small interventions spread across the country with limited staff presence on the ground. This may have undermined attainment of planned results in the target communities.

**Conclusion 8:** The partnership with the UNV Programme through the deployment of National UN Volunteers has contributed significantly to enhancing programme delivery especially at County and Community levels. The evaluation concludes that this approach should be continued and further opportunities explored.

**Conclusion 9:** Lack of baseline data has a negative impact on tracking and assessing programme performance and ultimately impact. UNDP and its implementing partners may thus not be able to fully measure the contributions that they have made to improving the lives of vulnerable persons and communities under this programme.

### **3.3 RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Recommendation 1:** UNDP in the next CPD cycle should define criteria for identification and selection of the most vulnerable groups and counties to work in. This can be done by developing a list of criteria that is to be followed with very specific indicators and parameters for identification of beneficiaries.

**Recommendation 2:** There is need for continued support to strengthen the relevant institutions in fulfilling their mandates and in implementing policies, plans and legislation. Programme initiatives should be replicated in other areas where they have performed well in some areas. Evaluators recommend to UNDP to ensure continuity with previous interventions during project design.

**Recommendation 3:** The evaluation further recommends that UNDP and its partners find ways of harmonising their M & E systems to support efficiency and learning. The programme should continue

supporting financial management and accountability of partners' capacities to accelerate disbursements and accounting for resources.

**Recommendation 4:** The good performance of NIM notwithstanding, the evaluation recommends expanding the partnerships with county governments and CSOs to increase the likelihood of sustainability of results at all levels. Focus being on County level support to ensure devolution gains are sustained.

**Recommendation 5:** The evaluation recommends that UNDP takes immediate steps to review programme outputs, and indicators to ensure the support for implementation of SDGs is mainstreamed in its programme and that these are aligned to the MTP III priorities and targets.

**Recommendation 6:** UNDP should identify two or three counties where an integrated area development approach can be piloted in the remaining life of the current CPD and use experiences and lessons learnt for further roll out in the next CPD cycle. Further, the programme should consider working in fewer counties for community level interventions. This will allow for scale and more visible impact.

**Recommendation 7:** To unlock its potential further in the next CPD cycle, the evaluation recommends that UNDP and its partners should further demonstrate innovation and an holistic approach in programming by exploiting synergies and complementarities. Thus they will achieve more and enhance impact of their interventions. Additionally, UNDP should consider adopting a programmatic approach by reducing the number of projects to one or two robust programmes per unit. The approach taken by the Deepening Foundations for Peace building and community security in Kenya 2014-2018 programme can be adopted as appropriate.

**Recommendation 8:** The evaluation recommends that UNDP and the UNV Programme further cement their partnership and explore opportunities for deploying young graduates and students on attachment to support County Governments and Community level activities, as well as how to work with the National Volunteer Service programme.

**Recommendation 9:** The UNDP and its partners should invest in baseline and end line surveys to provide a clear measure of the impact of this programme. There is need to commission these in readiness for the completion of the current CPD cycle and planning for the next. This will ensure that the programme is informed by evidence and solid data particularly with regards to levels of vulnerability that factor in environmental fragility elements and enablers for enhancing quality of life; both of which are central to sustainable development and human security.



# Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

---

## 1. Background

The United Nations Kenya Country Programme Document (CPD 2014-2018) is the first generation Country Programme Document of UNDP support to Kenya. The CPD was developed according to the principles of UN Delivering as One (DaO), aimed at ensuring Government ownership, demonstrated through UNDP'S full alignment to Government priorities as defined in the Vision 2030 and Medium-Term Plan 2013- 2017 and planning cycles, as well as internal coherence among UN agencies and programmes operating in Kenya. As an integral part of the UNDAF, the new country programme is closely aligned to the Medium Term Plan (MTP) II and the UNDP Strategic Plan, 2014-2017 and informed by the new UNDP gender strategy and key recommendations of the 2013 Annual Delivery Review (ADR) for Kenya. UNDP designed its programme to address the interlinked issues of poverty, inequality and exclusion towards achieving sustainable and inclusive economic growth. Data - driven selection of target populations (female-headed households, youth, persons living with HIV and AIDS, etc.), with clear indicators, baselines and targets, are a central pillar in the programme.

## 2. Purpose of the Review

This mid-term evaluation will be conducted in fulfilment of UN regulations and rules guiding evaluations. UNDP, in Kenya is commissioning this evaluation to ascertain the outcomes and outputs of the country programme measured against its original purpose, objectives whilst in the process capturing the evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of this strategic programme document, which will set the stage for new programme cycle. It is anticipated that the evaluation will outline lessons learned and recommendations which will be useful in contributing to the growing body of knowledge for the coming planning cycle. The evaluation will serve as an important accountability function, providing the Country Office, national stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results.

## 3. The Context of the CPD Mid-Term Evaluation

The Kenya country office programme is supporting in an integrated manner four strategic programme priority areas organized around four outcomes including (a) devolution and accountability; (b) productive sectors and trade; (c) environmental sustainability, renewable energy and sustainable land management; and (d) community security, cohesion and resilience. In the context of UN 'Delivering as one', the CPD outcomes are directly aligned to four UNDAF (2014-2018) outcomes with the four UNDAF Strategic Result Areas (SRAs). The UNDAF outcome areas are clearly aligned to the Government of Kenya development blueprint as spelt out in the Vision 2030 and specifically the MTP II. The UNDAF SRAs include 1) Transformative Governance; 2) Human Capital; 3) Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth; and 4) Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security. UNDP leads Strategic Result Area 1 on Transformational Governance.

**Devolution and accountability:** To ensure that devolution meets citizens' needs in accordance with the Constitution, UNDP provides technical capacity development to county governments so that public service delivery is supported in an equitable manner, thus meeting the needs of women, youth, persons living with disabilities, HIV and AIDS and other vulnerable groups. As part of the broader United Nations assistance to devolution, UNDP specifically supports the development and implementation of policy and legislative frameworks; institutional strengthening; and transformative leadership and citizen engagement. UNDP interventions in this area are guided by principles of transparency and accountability in public financial management; effective public administration and integrity; conflict-sensitive programming (including decision-making and resource allocations); and inclusive public participation.

**Productive sectors and trade:** Through regional harmonization of trade policies, UNDP supports the creation of a business environment, at both devolved and national levels, that nurtures local capacities and innovation; facilitates private sector development driven by small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs); and promotes entrepreneurship and acquisition of vocational skills, targeting women, youth and marginalized groups.

**Environmental sustainability, renewable energy and sustainable land management:** The UNDP focus at national and sub national level is to promote renewable energy, natural resource management policy development, environmental sustainability and governance, including biodiversity protection. UNDP partners with devolved and national institutions such as the National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) to jointly implement programmes in these areas.

**Community security, social cohesion and resilience:** Human security presents a significant development challenge in Kenya. UNDP aims to build the capacities of institutions, communities and vulnerable people, particularly women, to increase their resilience and reduce the risks and impacts of disasters, recurrent conflicts, violence and shocks, including from climate change. UNDP partners with National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) to deliver Disaster Risk Management (DRM) capacity development to county staff. UNDP also supports the development of conflict management policies, strategies and programmes; building the capacities of institutions and communities, especially women and youth, to establish and operationalise coordination mechanisms and systems for mitigation and preparedness, early warning and timely response to disasters; and mainstreaming peace building, reconciliation, community security and DRM into key sectors and CIDPs.

#### 4. The Scope and Objectives of the Mid Term Evaluation

##### Scope

The Government of Kenya and UNDP proposes to undertake a mid-term evaluation of the CPD from October to December 2016. The mid-term evaluation will cover the period 2014 – 2016, highlighting the key lessons learned to provide informed guidance to future programming. The review will cover all activities planned and/or implemented during the period 2014- 2016 and will give a special focus on the contribution to the four programme outcomes of devolution and accountability; productive sectors and trade; and community security, social cohesion and resilience.

The review will provide an overall assessment of progress and achievements made against planned results as well as assess and document challenges and lessons learnt over the past first two and a half years of the CPD cycle. The evaluation will also focus on changes around the programmatic environment which include the, UNDAF 2013-2017 mid-term review, 2015 UNDP Results Oriented Action Reporting (ROAR), Disaster Risk Reduction especially youth radicalization and violent extremism, Climate Change especially the effect of El Nino and Lanina, the 2017 General Elections and how the future elections in 2017 will affect CPD programming

The CPD was launched after Kenya transitioned to devolved system of governance, hence the evaluation will also assess the extent to which UNDP programming has responded to the new governance context.

The post 2015 agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) were launched after the CPD and will impact on the CPD implementation and the realization of programme results. The evaluation will therefore assess the efforts to integrate SDG in the UNDP programming and propose measures of implementation for the remaining period in the context of the SDGs. The evaluation will in addition reflect on how the UNDP through the Implementing Partners (IPs) has supported the Government of Kenya Development Agenda Especially Medium Term Plan II (MTP II) and Vision 2030. The evaluation will identify areas requiring additional support either in programme management or new implementation strategies including exploring the possibilities of new partnerships.

The mid-term evaluation will also reflect on the CDP theory of change and reflect on its continued relevance to the remaining programming cycle. Key issues of concern will be the reflection on how gender has been incorporated in the programming, the sustainability of results, etc. The evaluation should also

reflect on the programme alignment to the UNDP strategic plan and make recommendations for the same.

The expected outcome is consensus on findings of the review and agreement on the options suggested for reinforcing efficiencies and effectiveness of development results including deliberations on new and emerging challenges beyond the current CPD.

The mid-term evaluation will explore extent to which UNDP has utilized the results based management, risk management, and early warning management in ensuring that results are realized as planned.

The timing of the evaluation is designed such that it will take place at the mid of implementation of activities on the project so as to factor in all interventions and the associated results achieved through the project. The key users of the MTR report will be; Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) of GoK, Development Partners (DPs), UN agencies and county governments

### **Objectives**

The CPD mid-term evaluation is a joint UNDP/ Government of Kenya exercise that will be conducted in close collaboration with implementing and development partners. The main objective of the CPD mid-term evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme, including the extent to which cross cutting issues (gender, climate change, youth, SDGs) have been mainstreamed. In addition, the evaluation will assess the extent to which the programme has been responsive to address emerging issues in the country. The evaluation will determine UNDP's contribution towards effectiveness of the Delivering as One modality in supporting achievements of the programme in line with the national Vision 2030 and Medium Term Goals. The evaluation will also assess the mechanisms put in place to enhance coordination and harmonization between UNDP, Implementing Partners, and the National and County Governments through the four outcome areas outlined above.

The mid-term evaluation will specifically:

- Assess achievements and progress made against planned results as well as assess challenges and lessons learnt over the past two and a half years of the CPD against the programme theory of change.
- Assess how the emerging issues not reflected in the current CPD such as sustainable development goals (SDGs) and County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPS) among others impact on outcomes and make recommendations and suggestions for future programming to realign UNDP assistance to these new priorities to achieve greater development impact.
- Review effectiveness of the UNDP results framework specifically the outcome and output indicators, baselines and targets assessing how realistic/relevant and measurable they are and make recommendations for improvement, if any.
- Review coherence in delivery of the overall UNDP programme and recommend ways in which the outcome result area groups and technical working groups may increase its effectiveness of programme delivery in the remaining period of the current cycle.
- Assess how effectively the current CPD is compatible with national development priorities (Vision 2030, Medium Term program goals among others).
- Assess effectiveness towards attainment of results and reflect on how both UNDP and GOK has contributed to the UNDAF results through the implementation of programmes and projects.
- Assess effectiveness of and relative advantage of UNDP in the implementation and use of the Joint Programmes modality as a mechanism for fostering UN coherence and 'delivering as one' such as Marsabit- Moyale and the Turkana Joint Programmes.
- Document lessons learnt, challenges and future opportunities, and provide recommendations for improvements or adjustments in strategy, design and/or implementation arrangements.

## **5. Mid -Term Evaluation Criteria and Review Questions**

The following UNDP programme quality criteria will be guiding the MTR: strategy, relevance, social and environmental sustainability, management and monitoring, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and national ownership. In addition, the MTR will explore extent to which five UN programming principles of Human Rights Based Approach to planning (HRBA), gender equality, environmental sustainability; capacity development and results-based management have been mainstreamed throughout the implementation period.

### **Analysis of the Project Quality Criteria and UN Programming Principles**

**Strategic:** The extent of contribution to higher level change in line with national priorities, as evidenced through sound RBM logic through the theory of change. Aligned with UNDAF,

UNDP Strategic Plan and UNDP's potential to contribute to higher level results

To what extent is the programme pro-actively taking advantage of new opportunities, adapting its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities?

Is the programme aligned with the thematic focus of the UNDP Strategic Plan?

**Relevance:** Responsiveness of implementation mechanisms to the rights and capabilities of the rights-holders and duty-bearers of the programme (including national and county institutions, and related policy framework).

To what extent are the programme results (i) responsive to the needs of the country (in particular the needs of vulnerable groups), (ii) aligned with government priorities (iii) as well as with UNDP, global policies and strategies and international partners' policies (including the SDGs and global references such as rights-based approach, gender equality, equity focus, human development principles, etc.).

To what extent is UNDP, engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including their role in the particular development context in Kenya based on their comparative advantage?

Are the intended outputs and outcomes aligned with the key development strategies of the country? Are they consistent with human development needs of the country and the intended beneficiaries? Do the outputs and outcome address the specific development challenges of the country and the intended beneficiaries? Were there any unintended consequences (positive or negative) that have implications to the development goals of the country?

To what extent has the selected method of delivery been appropriate to the changes in the development context?

Has UNDP been influential in country debates based on their comparative advantage and has it influenced national policies?

**Management and Monitoring-** the quality of the formulation of results at different levels, i.e. the results chain:

To what extent is the CPD designed as a results-oriented, coherent and focused framework?

To what extent are the indicators and targets relevant, realistic and measurable? Are the indicators in line with the SDGs and what changes need to be done? Are the baselines up to date -do they need adjusting?

Are expected outcomes realistic given the CPD timeframe and resources?

To what extent and in what ways have risks and assumptions been addressed in the CPD design?

Is the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different partners well defined, facilitated in the achievement of results and have the arrangements been respected in the course of implementation?

Does the CPD and country projects respond to the challenges of national capacity development and do they promote ownership of programmes by the national partners?

To what extent and in what ways are the concepts of cross-cutting issues reflected in programming? Were specific goals and targets set? Was there effort to produce sex disaggregated data and indicators to assess progress in gender equity and equality? To what extent and how is special attention given to women empowerment? What needs to be done to further integrate these dimensions?

**Effectiveness:** the extent to which programme results are being achieved.

To what extent have the CPD outputs been achieved? Did the outputs contribute to the achievement of the CCPD outcomes?

If not fully achieved, was there any progress? If so, what level of progress towards outcomes has been made as measured by the ToC and outcome indicators presented in the results framework. What evidence is there that the CPD has contributed or contributing towards an improvement in national body's capacity, including institutional strengthening? What contributing factors are enhancing or impeding UNDP, performance in this area.

How effective have UNDP, been in partnering with civil society (where applicable) and the private sector to promote the envisaged development in the country?

To what extent has the programme supported domestication of key regional frameworks, experiences and international best practices through national development plans and strategies?

Have UNDP utilized innovative techniques and best practices in its programming?

**Efficiency:** Is the implementation mechanism the most cost effective way of delivering this programme?

Are the approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcomes? Are they sufficiently sensitive to the political and development constraints of the country?

Has UNDP's CPD strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective over a reasonable time period;

To what extent did the country office take advantage of existing opportunities for synergies to maximize use of resources?

Are the monitoring and evaluation systems employed helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively for proper accountability of results?

Have adequate financial resources been mobilized for the Programme?

Is there a discernible common or collaborative funds mobilisation strategy?

To what extent have administrative procedures (UNDP and GoK) been harmonised? Are there any apparent cost-minimising strategies that should be encouraged, that would not compromise the social dimension of gender, youth and PwDs?

Are the implementation mechanisms for the outcome areas and technical working groups effective in managing the Programme?

How efficiently resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been converted to CPD results at output level?

To what extent and in what ways have the comparative advantages of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context (including universality, neutrality, voluntary and grant-nature of contributions, multilateralism, and the mandate of UNDP)?

Has UNDP demonstrated Delivering as One (DaO) principle in this programme? If yes, how has this been done and does it respond to programme results?

**Sustainability and National Ownership-** the extent to which these implementation mechanisms can be sustained over time.

Do the CPD programme outcomes incorporate adequate exit strategies and capacity development measures to ensure sustainability of results over time? Is there a better exit and sustainability strategy that can be proposed?

Are conditions and mechanisms in place so that the benefits of the project level interventions are sustained and owned by IPs at the national and sub-national levels after the programme has ended?

Have strong partnerships been built with key stakeholders throughout the project Cycle

What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?

Are institutional capacity development and strengthening of national systems being built able to sustain results and build resilience?

### **Social and Environmental Standards**

Does the CPD seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights based approach?

Are social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender and environment) being successfully managed and monitored in accordance with CPD and relevant action plans?

Are unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances that may arise during implementation of the CPD assessed and adequately managed within projects, with relevant management plans updated?

### **Partnership and Coordination for Effective programming-** Assess the effectiveness of UNDP's

CPDs contribution to the UNDAF as a coordination and partnership framework:

To what extent and in what ways has CPD contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes/projects of UN agencies and the National and County Governments?

Are there current or potential overlaps with existing partners' programme;

Has the CPD enhanced joint programming by agencies? Were the strategies employed by agencies complementary and synergistic?

Did CPD promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the main CPD outcome areas (e.g. national partners, International Financial Institutions and other external support agencies)?

To what extent the DaO has contributed or is contributing to a more coherent and efficient response to national priorities as well as to ensure greater coherence in planning, implementation and operational management?

**Impact:** To the extent possible, assess the current contribution of the CPD on the lives of the poor, i.e. determine whether there is any major change in CPD indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or be associated with CPD, notably in the realization of SDGs, National Development Goals and the national implementation of internationally agreed commitments and UN Conventions and Treaties

Determine whether there is any major change in the indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or associated with the project.

Assess any impacts that the project may have contributed to.

Determine the impact of the project on devolved institutions in regard to empowerment, management, effectiveness, accountable, transparent and efficiency in service delivery.

The evaluation will also assess extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

Human rights

- 1 To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from CPD interventions

Gender Equality

- 1 To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring the different interventions?
- 2 To what extent has programme support promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?

Capacity Building

Did the programme adequately invest in, and focus on, national capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency

Are the knowledge products (reports, studies, etc.) delivered by the programme utilized by the country?

The questions listed above are only indicative; the final set of evaluation questions will be determined during the design phase, after a discussion with the evaluation reference group.

## 6. Methodology

The CPD Midterm evaluation will be carried out by an external team of evaluators, and will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including regional bodies, governments where programmes or advisory support were provided, academics and subject experts, private sector representatives etc.

The evaluators will review all relevant sources of information, such as the programme document, projects document, projects evaluation, annual and project reports, UNDAF midterm review, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the CO team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [annex](#) of this Terms of Reference (ToR). The Evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that its essential objective is to assess the CPD implementation.

The Task Manager will convene an Advisory Panel comprising of technical experts to enhance the quality of the evaluation. This Panel will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The Panel will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The evaluation team is required to address all comments of the Panel completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detail rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remain unaddressed.

This evaluation is expected to take a “theory of change” (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that the Joint Office of UNDP has supported, and observed progress in human development.

The evaluator will develop in consultation with the CO team, a logic model of how CPD interventions are expected to lead to improved national and local service delivery. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits.

The evaluation exercise will be wide-ranging, consultative, and participatory ensuring representation of both women and men, entailing a combination of comprehensive desk reviews, analysis and interviews.



While interviews are a key instrument, all analysis must be based on observed facts, evidence and data. This precludes relying exclusively upon anecdotes, hearsay and unverified opinions. Findings should be specific, concise and supported by quantitative and/or qualitative information that is reliable, valid and generalisable.

One week after contract signing, the evaluation team will produce an Inception Report. The Inception Report should include an evaluation matrix presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. The Inception Report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables, and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. The evaluation team will also propose a rating scale in order that performance rating will be carried out for all of the seven programme quality and evaluation criteria: strategic; relevance; management and monitoring; effectiveness; efficiency; sustainability and ownership; and social and environmental standards. The inception report will be discussed and agreed with the Country Office and Regional Office before the evaluator proceed with site mission.

The draft of the CPD 2014-2018 Evaluation Report will be shared with all staff and stakeholders, and presented in a validation meeting that the UNDP will organize. Key partners and stakeholders will participate in this workshop. Feedback received from these sessions should be taken into account when preparing the final report. The evaluation team will produce an 'audit trail' indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the final report.

Lessons learned report will also be produced and discussed during the validation workshop. Feedback received should be taken into consideration when preparing the lessons learned report. The lessons learned report should cover the different facets of the CPD interventions and should take into account the mandates UNDP. This report should be annexed in the main evaluation report.

The evaluation report minimum contents and outline will be discussed with evaluation team at the beginning of their assignment. How the information has been obtained and analyzed should be specifically explained and all statements should be properly detailed, supported and explained. The evaluation team will identify any limitations to the evaluation and propose strategies to mitigate them. The suggested table of contents of the evaluation report is as follows:

The steps in data collection are anticipated but not limited to the following:

Desk reviews: The evaluation team will collect and review all relevant documentation, including the following: i) Relevant National documents; ii) programme/project documents and activity reports; iii) past evaluation/ self-assessment reports; iv) deliverables from the programme activities, e.g. published reports and training materials; v) UNDP's corporate strategies and reports; and vi) government, media, academic publications were relevant.

Stakeholder interviews: The evaluation team will conduct face-to-face and/or telephone interviews with relevant stakeholders, including: i) UNDP staff (managers and programme/project officers) and ii) policy makers, beneficiary groups and donors in the country. Focus groups may be organized as appropriate.

Field visits: The evaluation team will visit selected programme sites to observe first-hand progress and achievements made to date and to collect best practices/ lessons learned. A case study approach will be used to identify and highlight issues that can be further investigated across the programme

## 7. Deliverables

The deliverables for this review will include the following documents:

**The Inception Report:** The inception report should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. This will consist but not limited to the following sections: a). Stakeholder map b). Evaluation matrix including evaluation questions, codification, indicators, data collection methods, sources of information; c). Overall evaluation design and methodology including sampling techniques to be applied; d). Description of data gaps, including



techniques and tools to be used (Focus Group Discussions, Key Informant Interviews, etc.); and detailed work plan of the assignment.

**Draft mid-term evaluation report** which will be presented to stakeholders in half day workshop.

**Final mid – evaluation report** incorporating stakeholder inputs. Report format will include but not limited to: Executive summary, introduction, the development context, findings and conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations A Power Point presentation containing the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation for dissemination and debriefing purposes. Electronic version of data collected and data sets analyzed.

## **8. Implementation Arrangements**

The CPD mid-term evaluation will be commissioned and overseen by the Government (The National Treasury) and UNDP. The responsibility to provide oversight and direction to the mid-term evaluation process will rest with the Technical Steering Committee under the joint leadership of the designated official within the National Treasury and the UNDP Country Director.

A reference group, which will serve as the MTR Technical Committee will be constituted. This will comprise members UNDP, National Government, County Government and IPs. The main task of the reference group will be to guide the evaluation process at the design, implementation and report stages. The reference group will also participate in the CPD validation workshop. The reference group will be co-chaired by a senior government official as designated by the National Treasury and UNDP staff identified by the UNDP Country Director. It will facilitate the preparation of a substantive programme of consultations, discussions and interviews and it ensures quality control of the process.

The Country Director's Office will be responsible for the day-to-day support of the consultancy team, maintaining a close liaison with the Technical Committee and coordination among stakeholders throughout the duration of the CPD evaluation process. Availability of background documents will be ensured by the Country Director's Office. Likewise, facilitation for meetings setting and scheduling is to be provided by the Country Director's office. On the Government side, The National Treasury and Ministry of Devolution and Planning will coordinate the participation of key ministries and other institutions in the Technical Committee.

An external Consultancy Team composed of one Senior International Consultant and three National Consultants selected by mutual agreement between the UNDP and the Government through a transparent thorough selection process will conduct the MTR while facilitating the self-evaluation process within the UNDP and Government. The Team will analyze the information gathered, interview key partners, working with outcome groups, the CD Office and other stakeholders to ensure the impartiality, consistency and coherence of the evaluation and provide recommendations on any necessary actions to adjust the current CPD.

## **9. Team Composition and required Competencies**

The MTR will be conducted by four (4) Individual Consultants with technical expertise in any of the four CPD Outcome areas.

## **10. MTR Ethics**

Evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the evaluation policy of UNDP and UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. Evaluations of UN activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business.

### Evaluators must observe the following:

1. To avoid **conflict of interest** and undue pressure, evaluators need to be **independent**, implying that members of an Evaluation Team must not have been directly responsible for the policy/programming-setting, design, or overall management of the subject of evaluation, nor expect to be in the near future. Evaluators must have no vested interest and have the full freedom to conduct impartially their evaluative work, without potential negative effects on their career development. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner.
2. Should protect the anonymity and **confidentiality of individual participants**. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are **not expected to evaluate individuals (not targeted at persons)**, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
3. Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body.
4. Should be **sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs** and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and **address issues of discrimination and gender equality**. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that the evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
5. They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair writing and/or oral presentation of study limitations, evidence based findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

### 11. Time-Frame for the MTR Process

The process of the evaluation will be divided into four phases, each including several steps.

#### Phase 1: Preparation and Desk Phase:

**Desk review** –This phase will encompass preparatory work by the UNDP in collaboration with the Evaluation Technical Team including identification, collection and mapping of relevant documentation and other data. The Evaluation Technical Team will analyze all documents related to the project over the period of implementation.

**Stakeholder mapping** –A simple mapping of stakeholders relevant to the evaluation will be developed by the Evaluation Team in addition to the tentative list provided by the UNDP. The product of the mapping will include national institutions and county governments' stakeholders.

**Development of an operational/logistical plan** - The Evaluation Team in consultation with UNDP will develop evaluation operational/logistical plan and calendar, to address logistical issues related to the assessment and related field visits.

The main output of this phase is the **MTR Inception Report** – A report will be prepared by the Evaluation Team containing at the minimum, the proposed approach and evaluation design, which will include the stakeholders mapping, the evaluation questions and methodologies to be adopted, sources of information and plan for data collection, including selection of project/field sites for visits, and design for data analysis.

#### Phase 2: Data Collection Phase

**Data collection** –The Evaluation Team will embark on data collection missions including visits to the offices of UNDP, DPs, IPs and other relevant Government Agencies.

Clarify the understanding of the Devolution related development challenges in the project focus areas with key stakeholders including the government and their view on the part played by UNDP supported project in addressing the challenges that fall within the project mandate areas. The Evaluation Team

will in the process gather additional information necessary to enrich the evaluation process and its outcome.

At the end of this phase, the Evaluation Team will provide a debriefing of the preliminary findings to UNDP and the technical committee take initial comments and validate the preliminary findings.

### **Phase 3: Drafting the Evaluation Report**

A draft evaluation report will be prepared by the Evaluation Team within the designated timeline after the data collection exercise. The draft report will be submitted to the Country Director, UNDP Kenya.

**Review and Quality Assurance** – The draft report shall be shared with UNDP and the

Evaluation Quality Assurance Team (UNDP's M&E group) who will subject it to a formal review process before presentation to stakeholders. The Evaluation Team will be directly responsible for addressing any comments or observations towards eventual finalization of the report.

**Presentation of findings, Validation and submission of report-** The Evaluation Team shall present the draft and final versions of the report to the technical committee and relevant stakeholders in designated meetings upon clearance by UNDP. The exact medium for the presentation will be determined in conjunction with the Evaluation Team. The final copy of the report will be submitted to UNDP Country Office Resident Representative.

### **Phase 4: Follow-up**

**Management Response** –UNDP will prepare a management response to the evaluation recommendations in the final evaluation report in line with UNEG evaluation procedures to ensure that the findings and recommendations of the MTR contribute to improvement in the implementation of future projects of similar magnitude.

**Dissemination** - The final version of the evaluation report will be disseminated at appropriate fora. It will be widely distributed to all relevant stakeholders in the country and within the UN. It will also be submitted to the development partners that support the CPD.

The evaluation shall be conducted over a period of 2 months starting in November 2016. The Team Leader will be engaged for 40 calendar days while the Team Members will be engaged for 30 calendar days. The table below shows a tentative timeframe and key milestones for the consultancy process.

## Appendix 2: Evaluation criteria and questions

Evaluation Criterion	Key questions
<b>Strategic positioning</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent has the CPD contributed to National Priorities?</li> <li>• Aligned to the UNDP's Strategic plan as well as the current UNDAF?</li> <li>• Has UNDP demonstrated thought leadership on the four outcome areas?</li> <li>• To what extent does the programme demonstrate innovation and responsiveness on the part of UNDP in addressing the challenges that the country faces?</li> <li>• To what extent has the programme been adaptable and responsive to shifts in the context and global thinking and practice around the four outcome areas?</li> <li>• How has the programme enhanced UNDP's credibility and acceptability by the peoples of Kenya?</li> </ul>
<b>CPD Theory of change</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent are the results to date supporting the Theory of change?</li> </ul>
<b>Programme design and Implementation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there coherence in the design in terms consistency with the theory of change and interconnectedness of the outcome areas?</li> <li>• Did the programme have the requisite human resource to successfully implement it? What were the benefits/challenges experienced?</li> <li>• Was the delivery rate consistent across all four outcome areas? If not, what were the challenges and how could they be mitigated?</li> <li>• Were there any significant events that hindered successful and timely implementation? If so, what measures were put in place to overcome these or strategies to avert them and still attain intended results in a timely fashion?</li> <li>• What are the challenges that have been encountered with NIM and Joint-programming? How have these been handled?</li> </ul>
<b>Relevance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent is the programme addressing the development priorities and needs of the Country?</li> <li>• Have the interventions sought to address the real needs of the beneficiaries?</li> <li>• How relevant is the programme in light of recent developments in some of the outcome areas such as an increase in violent extremism and radicalisation among others?</li> <li>• How relevant is the NIM modality across the four outcome areas?</li> <li>• Could the GoK and its peoples be able to address and overcome some of the challenges without this programme? If so How and why?</li> <li>• What makes UNDP the partner of choice for the Government and peoples of Kenya on this particular outcome area?</li> <li>• What has been the value-addition of UNDP's involvement to the peoples of Kenya?</li> <li>• Has UNDP been influential in country debates based on their comparative advantage and has it influenced national policies?</li> </ul>
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the programme implementation contribute to progress towards the stated outcome? Or at least did it set dynamic processes and changes that move towards the long-term outcomes?</li> <li>• Who are the main beneficiaries (poor, non-poor, disadvantaged groups, gender equity)?</li> <li>• What are the differences between the IPs' capacities when the programmes began in 2014 and now?</li> <li>• To what extent have the targets been reached, according to outcomes indicators?</li> <li>• Are there other un-anticipated effects of the programme?</li> </ul>

Evaluation Criterion	Key questions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How have interventions been prioritised when underfunded?</li> <li>• To what extent the projects and all interventions directed towards the outcome had effects on the State Institution's balance power?</li> <li>• What evidence is there that the CPD has contributed or is contributing towards an improvement in national body's capacity, including institutional strengthening? What contributing factors are enhancing or impeding UNDP, performance in this area?</li> <li>• To what extent has the programme supported domestication of key regional frameworks, experiences and international good practice through national development plans and strategies?</li> <li>• Has UNDP utilised innovative techniques and good practice in its programming?</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent is the programme demonstrating value for money in the achieved results to date?</li> <li>• Could the same or better results have been attained with less? If so, why and how?</li> <li>• How has the internal coordination or lack, therefore, contributed to success or otherwise in implementation? What can be done to improve this?</li> <li>• What has UNDP done to enhance the efficiency of its partners in implementation and reporting? What challenges have been experienced and what are the lessons learnt?</li> <li>• What has been done to efficiently manage delivery and supply chain so that beneficiary needs are met timeously and equitably?</li> <li>• Has conflict sensitivity been demonstrated in resource allocation per region, sex, age-group etc.? What are the lessons learnt in this regard?</li> </ul>
<b>Partnerships and Coordination</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What have been the benefits/advantages of the NIM to date? What have been the constraints?</li> <li>• How has UNDP facilitated downstream partnerships between its implementing partners and Civil society and Community-based organisations where appropriate?</li> <li>• How have the capacities of its implementing partners been inhaled to date? What could be improved?</li> <li>• How well coordinated has implementation and reporting been? What are the challenges act have been experienced and lessons learnt?</li> <li>• To what extent has South-South cooperation been utilised and demonstrated in the programme? How can it be enhanced?</li> <li>• Has Joint-programming worked? If so how and if not how can it be improved?</li> <li>• What are the lessons learnt that could prove useful for future programming?</li> <li>• To what extent has the programme actively sought the participation of excluded groups and young people in its activities? How could this be enhanced?</li> <li>• How has the programme contributed to closer collaboration and cross-sharing of information and learning among its implementing partners and other key stakeholders?</li> </ul>
<b>National and local ownership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What evidence is there that the GoK and its implementing Ministries are leading in this programme?</li> <li>• What were the level of involvement of the implementing partners and target beneficiaries in the design and monitoring of the project to date?</li> <li>• Is there evidence of both national and local ownership of the programme? How has this been demonstrated?</li> <li>• What has been the major contributor in fostering national ownership? What are the lessons learnt?</li> <li>• How is this likely to contribute to the sustainability of results post UNDP support?</li> <li>• How is this ownership demonstrated in the resourcing of activities?</li> </ul>

Evaluation Criterion	Key questions
<b>Sustainability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has the programme invested in strengthening leadership and management capacities of implementing partners and beneficiaries to be able to sustain the initiatives post-UNDP leadership and management support?</li> <li>• Have there been exit strategies built into the programme and what is being done to increase the leadership role of National and local stakeholders as the programme progresses? How can this be further strengthened?</li> <li>• What is the level of commitment from government and stakeholders to ensure sustainability of the results?</li> <li>• What government or stakeholder measures are in place to ensure sustainability of results?</li> <li>• Are there mechanisms in place to upscale and replicate good practices from the interventions?</li> </ul>
<b>Impact</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To the extent possible, assess the current contribution of the CPD on the lives of the poor, i.e. determine whether there is any major change in CPD indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or be associated with CPD, notably in the realization of SDGs, National Development Goals and the national implementation of internationally agreed commitments and UN Conventions and Treaties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Determine whether there is any major change in the indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or associated with the project.</li> <li>▪ Assess any impacts that the project may have contributed to. Determine the impact of the project on devolved institutions in regard to empowerment, management, effectiveness, accountable, transparent and efficiency in service delivery.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Appendix 3: List of Stakeholders Consulted

---

S/No	Person to be consulted	Agency
<b>ENVIRONMENT, CLIMATE CHANGE AND DRR</b>		
	Harun Warui	Ministry of Environment (Climate Change Directorate)
	Cliff Owiti	Kenya Renewable Energy association (KEREa)
	Paul Matiku	Protected Areas project (Nature Kenya)
	Peter Odhengo	National Treasury
	Essau Omollo	Kenya Forest Service
	Judy Ndichu	UNDP REDD+
	Flora Mugure Programme Manager	National Drought Management Authority
	James Oduor	National Drought Management Authority
	Charles Owino	National Disaster Operation Centre
	Kenduiwa Kilele	National Disaster Operation Centre
	Patrick Nyakundi	National Disaster Operation Centre
	Gordon Muga	Ministry of Special Programmes
	Hassan Mohamed	National Cohesion and Integration Commission
	Timothy Ranja	Programme Officer UNDP

	Zeinabu Khalif	Programme Analyst UNDP
	Henry Ndede	Programme Officer UNEP
	Evelyn Koech	Programme Officer UNDP
	Jamin Rutto	Narok County Government
	Kombo Dzillambe	Tana River County
	Julius Kabubi	UNISDR Programme Officer
	Geoffrey Omedo	UNDP Programme Officer
<b>PRODUCTIVE SECTOR AND INCLUSIVE GROWTH</b>		
	Roslyn Ng'eno	KenInvest Authority
	Joseph Kanyi	Micro – Small Enterprises Authority (MSEA)
	Henry Munyasia	National Industrial Training Authority
	Jennifer Halwenge	Ministry of Mining
	Moses K. Kanagi	National Treasury
	Boniface Kitili	UNDP Kenya
	Patrick Maingi	UNDP Kenya
	Joan Vwamu	UNDP Kenya
	Dr. Zeinabu Khalif	UNDP Kenya
	Jackson Kimani	UNDP Kenya
<b>COMMUNITY SECURITY, SOCIAL COHESION AND RESILIENCE</b>		



	Hassan Mohamed Milicent Okatch	National Cohesion and Integration Commission
	Irene Tulel Fozea Hussain	National Counterterrorism Centre
	Tom Adala	National Counterterrorism Centre
	James Ngului Amos Katana Thomas Ngeiywa James Chege	Kenya National Focal point on Small arms
	Lollo Darin	Embassy of Sweden
	Siddharth Chatterjee Per Knutsson	Resident Coordinator Head RCO
	Amanda Serumaga	UNDP Country Director
	Zebibb Kavuma Idil Absiye	UN Women Country Director
	P.K. Thuku Dickson Magotsi Peter Mwamachi Selina Wanjiri	National Steering Committee
	Eucabeth Katana Kevin Maina -	International Peace Support Training Centre
	John Gathuya	Operations Manager UNDP
	Catherine Masaka	DCDO UNDP
	Jackson Mukiri POMU	UNDP
	David Ghadaffi	UNDP
	Michael Kenya Kioni	Tana River Deputy County Commissioner
	Evans Achoki	County Commissioner Tana River
	Pamela Obuya	Mombasa County Government

	Sokorote Lulutya	Tana River County Government
	Emmanuel Ole-Sayiorry	UNDP
	Samwell Oando Absalom Shalakha	UWIANO Platform
	CDR Tomohiro Tommatsu  Yo Ito  Tokumjitsu Kobayashi	Defense Attache Embassy of Japan  First Secretary Head of UN affairs Section  First Secretary Political and General Affairs Section
<b>DEVOLUTION AND GOVERNANCE</b>		
	Mr. Maurice Ogola	Ministry of Planning and Devolution
	Lucy Mwangi	The Judiciary of Kenya
	Mr. Joseph Masila	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
	Mr. Nelson Otwoma	The National Empowerment Network of People living with HIV/AIDS in Kenya ( <i>NEPHAK</i> )
	Mr. Allan Maleche	The Kenya Legal & Ethical Issues Network on HIV and AIDS ( <i>KELIN</i> )
	Mr. Hussein Marjan Ms. Betty Sungura	Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC)
	Dr.Nura Mohamed	Kenya School of Government (KSG)
	Mr. George Ooko	Commission on Revenue Allocation (CRA)
	Dr. Bernard Mogesa	Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR)
	Mr. Ismail Maaruf	Commission on Administrative Justice (CAJ)
	Ms. Gorretty Osur	National Gender and Equality Commission (NGEC)
<b>FOCUS GOUNP DISCUSSIONS- TAITA TAVETA</b>		

	Fridah Mwasingo	DATU Fund
	Jackline Wanjiku	DATU Fund
	Emmanuel Mbashu	Picel Designs
	Jane Majala	Trade and Community Affairs/Datu Fund
	Caroline Mshai	Receptionist
	Erick Ogonda	Eye – See Photography
	Roberto Mwashashu	UNDP
	Enock Manyonge	MSEA
	Robert Mrashui Mwakio	Self – Employed - Research Assistant
	William Macharia	Hub31
	Collins Kimaru	Hub31
	Innocent Mwasi	Elpro
	Joshua Mungai	Screenlock
<b>FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSIONS-KWALE</b>		
	Amina H. Mwafrika	Mina Africa Enterprises
	Margaret Kamau	Nehema Self Help Group
	James Muinde	Jua Kali Leatherworks
	Fatuma S. Zaunga	Jaribuni Women Group
	Juddy C. Kengo	Gimar Consultancy
	Fatuma L. Tsuma	EDA

	Shadrack Ochieng	Beadwork
	Philip Musembi	Millenium H. Ltd
	Amina Juma	EDA
	Kassim Dzombo	Kwale County
	Joyce Kanze Nzovu	UNDP
<b>FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION MOMBASA</b>		
	David Ghaddafi	NSC
	Sulleman Sultan	Former Peace Monitor
	Walter Kulp	Peace and Cohesion
	Barak Ali Nyondo	Peace committee member
	Rajabu Shaban	Peace committee member
	Mwalimu Bamu	KECOSCE
	Feisal Bahero	Chairperson Peace Committee
	Alfred Sico	Peace Youth Network (Peace Committee member
	Munira Faraj	Peace committee member
	Timothy Ochola	Peace committee member
	Vincent Ouma	Peace committee member
	Gwirai Likitoyi	Coast Interfaith Council of Clerics
	Irene Bandu	Peace committee member

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION TANA RIVER		
	Brandon Atiuki	Youth Sub-County peace committee
	David Galanda	Youth Sub-County peace committee
	Rowley Godhani	Sub-County peace committee member
	Morowa Harrison	Coordinator – Tana River Peace and Development organisation
	Yusuf Korio Abdi	Faith-based organisations representative
	Rose Haluva Isack	Women representative Sub-County peace Committee
	Hadira Zainabu Bwano	Maendelewo Ya Wana Wake representative
	Rosa Bonaya	Sub-County peace committee member
	Barak Wachu	Chair-Sub-County peace committee
	Saidi Buya Mbarak	Supreme Council of Kenya Muslims Representative
	Ismael Duode Ahmed	County Peace Forum member
	Michael Kenya Kioni	Tana River Deputy County Commissioner
	Mr. Douale	NDMA

# Appendix 4: Documents Reviewed

---

Country programme document for Kenya (2014-2018)

UNDP KENYA: Resource Mobilization Action Plan June 2016

UNDP Gender Equality Strategy 2014-2017

Final Judiciary Transformation Support Project Report On Activities Funded By UNDP For the Period 2013-2016.

Support to UNDP Democratic Governance and Rule of Law Programme (2012 - 2016) Final Report

Republic of Kenya: Roadmap to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Kenya's Transition Strategy 2016–2018

UNDP Results-oriented annual report (ROAR), 2016

Republic of Kenya: Second Medium Term Plan 2013-2017

UNDP Country Programme Document Report 2014-2015

Republic of Kenya Vision 2030 Abridged Version

United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Kenya 2014 - 2018

Transition Authority (TA) End of Term Evaluation Report

UNDG Task Team on Gender Equality, 'Interim United Nations Development Assistance Framework Guidance, 2016

UNDG, Standard operating procedures for countries adopting the Delivering as One Approach, 2014.

UNDP, Country Program for Kenya, Annual Report, 2015

UNDP, End of Project Evaluation, Support to the Realisation of Human Rights and Access to Justice in Kenya (2012-2015)

UNDP, the Integrated UNDP, Support Program to the Devolution Process in Kenya, 2014-2018, Quarterly Report, September 2016

UNEG, Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System, 2015

UNEG, /G (2011/12,'Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation, 2011.

Republic of Kenya, 'Constitution of Kenya' 2010.

Global Peace Index 2016 Institute for Economics &Peace

Getting Started with the Sustainable Development Goals a Guide for Stakeholders

From Monopoly to Oligopoly of Violence; Exploration of a Four Point Hypothesis regarding Organised and Organic Militia in Kenya; Muthali Ngunyi PHD, Musambayi Katumanga PHD

Human Development Report 2016