



REPORT

JOINT DEVOLUTION PROGRAMME TERMINAL EVALUATION 2020-2023

United Nations Development Programme - Kenya

Lawrence Robertson, Independent Contractor
Thomas Nyagah, Centre for Analytical Research in Development

27 December 2023

DISCLAIMER

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of UNDP, UNICEF, or UN Women.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluation team would like to thank all interview informants for their contributions to the work of the JDP and for sharing their experience with the team. The team particularly appreciates the support of UNDP's Evaluation Manager Valerie Munyeti for the evaluation's processes and Benard Abingo with its completion.



Project/outcome Information		
Project/outcome title	Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya Programme (Joint Devolution Programme)	
Atlas ID		
Corporate outcome and output	UNDP Strategic Plan Signature Solution 2: strengthen effective, accountable, and inclusive governance	
Country	Kenya	
Region	Africa	
Date project document signed	September 2019	
Project dates	Start	Planned end
	January 2020	September 2023
Project budget	USD 32,480,932	
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	USD 14,621,103	
Funding sources	Government of Sweden, Government of Finland, Government of Italy, UN agencies, Government of Kenya	
Implementing parties	UN Women, UNICEF, and UNDP	
Evaluation information		
Evaluation type (project/outcome/thematic/country programme, etc.)	Project evaluation	
Final/midterm review/ other	Terminal evaluation	
Period under evaluation	Start	End
	September 2019	September 2023
Evaluators	Team Leader: Lawrence Robertson Consultant: Thomas Nyaga	
Evaluator email address	robertsonlawrence@hotmail.com	tnyagah@cardke.org
Evaluation dates	Start	Completion
	25 June 2023	27 December 2023

Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	x
1. INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION	1
2. POLITICAL AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT FOR THE JOINT DEVOLUTION PROGRAMME 2	
3. DESCRIPTION OF THE JOINT DEVOLUTION PROGRAMME	3
4. EVALUATION METHODS	5
5. KEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	7
STRATEGY	7
RELEVANCE.....	8
COHERENCE	12
EFFECTIVENESS	14
EFFICIENCY	22
IMPACT.....	26
SUSTAINABILITY	29
MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING	31
CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES/SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS.....	33
6. LESSONS LEARNED	37
7. RECOMMENDATIONS	39
ANNEX 1: EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE	42
ANNEX 2: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	54
ANNEX 3: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES	59
ANNEX 4: EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS	63

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya Programme – referred to as the Joint UNDP-UN Women-UNICEF Devolution Programme (JDP) was developed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (UN Women) and United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) as the second phase of UN support for devolution in Kenya in 2019. The JDP was implemented from September 2019 through September 2023. The purpose of the Terminal Evaluation (TE) was to provide an assessment of progress and achievements compared to results planned in the Programme Document (ProDoc) as well as identify lessons learned and draw recommendations from the JDP’s experience. The scope of the evaluation is 2020-2023, with an emphasis on the period following the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) finalized in December 2022.

Brief Political and Development Context

Devolution, which began with the passage of the revised constitution in 2010, promised a dramatic shift in governance in Kenya. Power and resources for the delivery of key services such as health, agriculture, pre-primary education, county planning, roads, urban services and water began to be devolved to 47 new counties in 2013 in an effort to address issues related to marginalization, equity, accountability, and the environment. County governments made notable achievements in the delivery of services and established institutions and systems for service delivery. UN agencies supported this first phase of devolution, 2013 to 2017. At that point, devolution still needed substantial strengthening of institutional and human capacity at national and county levels to be successful. The JDP was developed towards supporting this second phase of devolution. The second phase of devolution (2018 – 22) focused on strengthening institutional and human capacity at national and county levels to address social, accountability, and environmental issues. The JDP built on the achievements of earlier programmes and the overall results of the first phase of devolution in this direction.

Brief Description of the JDP

UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women implemented the JDP through National and County Government partners and non-state actors through the National Implementation Modality (NIM). The JDP was developed within the context of the UN Delivering as One (DaO), with participating UN agencies using their comparative advantages towards delivering on the overall objective of the programme –strengthening the process of devolution to support service delivery in the counties. The overall outcome in the ProDoc was “By 2022 people in Kenya access high quality services at a devolved level that are well coordinated, integrated, transparent, equitably resourced, and accountable.” The four-year JDP sought USD 32,480,932 to implement planned activities towards outputs that together would support the overall outcome. Resource mobilisation however was USD 14,621,103, 45% of this total, from the Embassies of Sweden, Finland, Italy and the UNDP contribution.

The JDP was developed to work directly with national and county partners in 14 of the most marginalized counties: Busia, Garissa, Isiolo, Kajiado, Kilifi, Mandera, Marsabit, Narok, Samburu,

West Pokot, Tana River, Turkana, Wajir, and West Pokot. The Ministry for Devolution (and later the State Department for Devolution (SDD)) was the implementing partner (IP).

The JDP worked with many responsible parties (RPs) in government and civil society/non-state actors (NSAs) at the national and county levels, referred to as partners going forward. Partners at the national level included the State Department for Gender Affairs, the National Treasury, the Council of Governors (CoG), Kenya School of Government (KSG), the County Assemblies Forum (CAF), The Society of Clerks at the Table (SOCATT), Commission on Revenue Allocation (CRA), Office of the Auditor General (OAG), Office of the Controller of Budget (OCOB), National Youth Service (NYS), Directorate of Children Services, Kenya Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (KIPPRA), International Budget Partnership Kenya (IBPK), Federation of Women Lawyers (FIDA) Kenya, Action Aid Kenya, Services and Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS).

The four outputs of the programme were:

Output 1.1: Government has strengthened policy, legal and institutional mechanisms for coordinated, inclusive and effective service delivery.

Output 1.2: Public finance management institutions have strengthened processes and systems for equitable, efficient and accountable service delivery.

Output 1.3: County level institutions have strengthened capacity for evidence-based planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for accountable service delivery.

Output 1.4: People in Kenya, especially women, youth and persons with disability, have capacity to engage, deepen accountability and transparency in devolution.

Evaluation Methods

The TE began in August 2023 with document review and efforts to scope a useful, manageable evaluation in the limited time available through a draft inception report. As more stakeholders engaged through the evaluation reference group (ERG), efforts to address a more general set of evaluation questions instead reverted to a task of addressing a large number of evaluation questions as approved in the final inception report. The evaluation was organized through criteria of whether the JDP was strategic and the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and national ownership of the JDP, social and environmental sustainability, management and monitoring, and the extent to which five UN programming principles of Human Rights-Based Approach to planning (HRBA), gender equality (GE), environmental sustainability, capacity development and results-based management (RBM) were mainstreamed in implementation.

The evaluation was carried out by a team of two through document review and interviews. The international evaluator conducted in-person interviews in Kenya over a two-week period in early September and the national evaluator continued to interview in October and early November. Interviews were conducted with a total of 111 people, including 32 women, with in-person interviews conducted in seven counties (Narok, Lamu, Isiolo, Kilifi, Wajir, Turkana, and Busia) and remote interviews added to cover an 8th county (Tana River).

Key Findings and Conclusions

Strategic

Kenya made devolution central to its new constitution and the approach of successive governments since the 2010 referendum. The UN recognized the centrality of devolution in successive UNDAFs and now the UNSDCF, which the JDP as well as UNDP CPD, UN Women Strategic Notes and UNICEF Kenya CPD contribute to. The JDP directly partnered with the main government institutions and NSAs tasked with making devolution work at the national and county levels. The strategy to reach county beneficiaries in the 14 county governments and engage civil society with government worked to bring motivated, responsible actors together around devolution. UN agencies implementing the JDP chose and worked with the key strategic partners in Kenya for devolution, particularly for a focus on gender, youth and children in planning, budgeting, monitoring, and expanding participation. Other than developing COVID-19 emergency response programming, the JDP did not adapt its strategies significantly in implementation; the JDP was implemented using the strategies developed in the ProDoc.

Relevance

The JDP was clearly relevant to the UN agencies, government stakeholders and partners at the national level, and county beneficiaries in the civil service and from civil society. Programme partners were the most relevant institutions in Kenya for planning, budgeting, monitoring, and expanding participation through devolution at the national and county levels. The JDP adapted to meet changed needs in the pandemic through the JDP's COVID-19 programming. Otherwise the need of beneficiaries in devolution did not change significantly over JDP implementation. JDP objectives were clearly stated in the ProDoc in ways fully consistent with UN programming principles that focused on reaching the most vulnerable populations. The JDP captured lessons learned and best practices as a part of the programme's strategy to support devolution and as a regular, standard part of reporting. Needs and priorities of partners, other than addressing COVID-19, did not change dramatically in the period of JDP implementation. The programme did not need to adapt to changed needs. The programme did not seem to use lessons learned to change JDP implementation significantly over this period, although UN agencies reported working towards more jointness in 2023 after the MTE.

Coherence

The JDP presented a coherent design in the ProDoc on the relationships between different outputs and activities. Describing all activities as under UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women in the ProDoc and reporting raised expectations about jointness. Implementation by activity and output remained respectively under UNICEF, UN Women, and the PIU for UNDP to manage their own partners in practice, with some exceptions. With this many partners engaged – and the ongoing processes of UN reform in a context of declining donor resources for Kenya - UN agencies have been challenged to coherently implement the joint programme. UN agencies selected partners that were highly relevant to reaching these outputs. The large set of JDP partners was a coherent one to reach JDP objectives. Expectations that the JDP would be more coherent than it was led to a level of dissatisfaction among donors that was not addressed to their satisfaction by UN agencies.

Effectiveness

The JDP has reached or exceeded almost all of the output targets set in the ProDoc, demonstrating programme effectiveness despite programme funding coming in far lower than envisioned. Funding shortages were noted by PIU interviews as reducing what would have otherwise been even more overfulfillment of targets as well as planned activities to measure outcomes. The puzzle of an underfunded programme exceeding envisioned targets suggests targets were over-ambitious. Resource availability shaped how and how much JDP partners were able to do to realize these targets; how and how much activities stimulated participation for example were thus highly variable, and shaped how much and how many consultations were held at ward levels within counties and the number and extent of participation of women, youth, PWD, and marginalized communities (for example).

The JDP used AWP towards program effectiveness. AWP have been the way the JDP has adjusted to resource scarcity. Programme indicators – more than the targets - were only modified once in the JDP in 2020 with the Results Management Framework (RMF) dated July 2021, despite underfunding.

Partnerships and strategic alliances with national implementing partners and county governments as well as links with other devolution initiatives of development partners have been critical to programme effectiveness. The ToC, while complex, remained valid and was to some extent realized in JDP implementation – although it was not used actively in programme management, reporting, or on-going resource mobilisation.

UN agency relationships with key national partners were important in programme effectiveness. Field presence of UN agencies in the JDP was limited; However, the UNICEF regional staff were central in working with UNICEF's JDP partners and the target county governments to achieve the programme objectives. The JDP funded a UNDP-United Nations Volunteer position to work in some counties such as Isiolo county, who supported youth innovation centre operations and management, and in Coastal counties UN staff supported disaster risks management policy development and interventions in areas affected by disasters.

Efficiency

The JDP design, as implemented, led to limited jointness in programme management, implementation, monitoring, and reporting. UN agencies views differed on how best to support DaO through jointness, but shared views that more needed to be done. Resource mobilization for the JDP was approximately half of the funding envisioned in the ProDoc. UN agency staff noted limited efforts in resource mobilization in the three and a half years of programme implementation; UN agency staff interviewed noted that UN agency leaders did not continue efforts in resource mobilization or endeavor to jointly approach donors. Partnerships and strategic alliances with national implementing partners have been critical tools for implementing the JDP. County governments and CSOs have appreciated the opportunities to work with the JDP. UN agency staff, partner staff, and stakeholders noted greater coherence, effectiveness, efficiency,

and impact with more on-the-ground presence of UN staff, partner staff on the ground in JDP counties.

Impact

The JDP over 2020 through June 2023 supported a huge range of partners and activities towards outputs that advanced key products, practices, and processes in devolution at the national level and in the 14 marginalised counties where JDP efforts focused. These changes remain in process and devolution, as expected, takes substantial time to deliver on its promise. The JDP did not systematically track and report on contributions to planned outcomes. Many other initiatives and processes contribute to the results of devolution at the national and county levels which makes attributing change to JDP impossible; that said, JDP clearly contributed to key changes that have and are expected to continue to change governance in Kenya going forward, particularly towards reaching children, youth, and women.

Sustainability

The JDP design with extensive use of national government partners in implementation - and some strengthening for these partners - supported sustainability and impact. JDP support for county legislations and policies as well as support for professional staff and civil servants encouraged sustainability, while engagement with county level executives and MCAs was important for programme success but less sustainable as these positions had high turnover in the 2022 elections. Coordination and collaboration with other programmes working on devolution through donor working groups also supported sustainability as well as impact.

Management and Monitoring

Each UN agency managed its own partners within the JDP. Monitoring was through the PIU and large, high-level joint monitoring missions to selected counties. Output indicators and targets were realistic, measured, and largely met, but outcome measures received limited attention. While UN agencies understood which agency was responsible for activities and outputs in the JDP, this detailed picture was less clear outside UN agencies and in JDP reporting which intentionally conveyed jointness.

Cross-Cutting Issues/Social and Environmental Standards

The JDP was developed and implemented with a focus on the rights of citizens, women and gender equality, youth and children's rights. The design and implementation have recognized that the marginalised counties that are the focus of the JDP face social and environmental risks and hazards that also need to be assessed and managed.

Lessons Learned

- As UN agencies develop and implement joint programming, UN agencies face reputational concerns as expectations about joint programming may differ from and exceed plans and modalities.
- A wide-ranging joint programme with many different partners within it needs stronger coordination and communication to ensure effective and efficient implementation.

- A wide-ranging joint programme with many different partners within it needs to develop and use systematic ways to communicate and learn through dedicated, sustainable knowledge management platforms.
- Programmes can and should also use templates, cases and peer-to-peer learning as good methods to extend programme benefits.
- Peer learning, local leaders, and champions works to support social change.

Recommendations

- As there remain many unmet needs in devolution at the national and local levels that the UN could contribute to addressing, the UN should consider developing a successor programme to enable UN agencies to leverage their strengths and support Kenyan development through devolution.
- If a strategy to work directly with targeted counties is chosen in successor efforts to support devolution, the programme should fund and manage a single UN and/or partner staff person at the county level who would be responsible at a minimum for coordinating, implementing, monitoring, and reporting on joint initiatives.
- UN agencies should manage joint programmes like the JDP intentionally towards jointness.
- UN management needs mechanisms to bring senior agency managers across agencies together towards the higher-level management tasks of joint programmes like the JDP.
- Programmes should remain flexible and develop and implement targeted activities as needed to strengthen the capacity and engagement of key national government, county government and CSO partners.
- UN joint programming should develop, and support sustained, unified ways for gathering and disseminating information and learning from programming.
- Joint programming should focus on and report stronger evidence for programme impact through the outcome level in addition to output measurements.
- The JDP should develop and report on selected indicators for the outputs and outcomes to assess impact in its final report.
- Multi-year programmes with large numbers of implementing partners should consider developing, using, and repeating processes and practices that support coherence and more effective and efficient implementation within and across partners.

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ASAL	Arid and Semi-Arid Land
AWP	Annual Work Plan
ADSOCK	Advocacy for Social Change Kenya
CA	County Assembly
CAF	County Assemblies Forum
CBO	Community Based Organizations
CCO	County Chief Officer
CEC	County Executive Committee
CFSP	County Fiscal Strategy Paper
CHP	community health promotion
CIC	Community Information Centre
CIDP	County Integrated Development Plan
CIMES	County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System
COBMIS	Controller of Budget Management Information Systems
CoG	Council of Governors
CPD	Country Programme Document
CRA	Commission on Revenue Allocation
CSAS	County Staff Appraisal System
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DaO	Delivering as One
DDWG	Devolution Donor Working Group
DP	Development Partners
DPG	Development Partners Group
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
ERP	Enterprise Resource Planning
FGM	Female Genital Mutilation
FIDA	Federation of Women Lawyers
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
GE	Gender Equality
GEWE	Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment
GoK	Government of Kenya
GRB	Gender Responsive Budgeting
GSWG	Gender Sector Working Group
HACT	Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers
HRBP	Human Rights-Based Approach
IBPK	International Budget Partnership Kenya
ICT	Information Communications Technology
IGRTC	Inter-Governmental Relations Technical Committee
IP	implementing partner
JDP	Joint Devolution Programme
KES	Keynan shillings
KESRA	Kenya School of Revenue Administration

KIPPRA	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis
KNBS	Kenya National Bureau of Statistics
KSG	Kenya School of Government
LNOB	Leave No One Behind
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MCA	Member of County Assembly
MDA	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
MED	Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate
MoD	Ministry of Devolution
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
MTP	Medium Term Plan
NGEC	National Gender and Equality Commission
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIM	National Implementation Modality
NSA	non-state actor
OAG	Office of the Auditor General
OCOB	Office of the Controller of Budget
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OSR	Own Source Revenue
PC	Performance Contracting
PFM	Public Finance Management
PMS	Performance Management System
ProDoc	Programme Document
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PUNO	Participating UN Organization
PWD	People with Disabilities
RBM	results-based management
RMF	Results Management Framework
RP	responsible party
SCOA	Standard Chart of Accounts
SES	Social and environmental standards
SN	Strategic Note
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TICH	Tropical Institute for Community Health
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNSCDF	United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
WPDA	Wajir Peace Development Agency

1. INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (UN Women) and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) developed the Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya Programme (Joint UNDP-UN Women-UNICEF Devolution Programme or JDP) as a second phase of UN support for devolution in Kenya. The JDP was developed based on the lessons of the USD 18 million Integrated Support Programme to the Devolution Process in Kenya project implemented 2014 to March 2019 by UNDP and UN Women. The JDP Programme Document (ProDoc) was signed in September 2019. Implementation continued through close in September 2023.

The purpose of the evaluation, as stated in the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the international consultant for the terminal evaluation (TE), see Annex 1: Terms of Reference, was to provide an overall assessment of JDP progress and the achievements made against planned results from the ProDoc. The TE was also asked to assess and document challenges and lessons learnt since the commencement of the JDP. The TE followed the mid-term evaluation (MTE) which was finalized in December 2022. The TE was tasked with establishing whether the JDP has achieved the results envisioned in the ProDoc and whether there were unintended outcomes. The evaluation was also tasked with documenting lessons learned and providing recommendations for consideration for future support to devolution through a potential successor United Nations (UN) programme to support devolution. The TE also assessed the extent to which the project has applied key recommendations from the mid-term evaluation. The evaluation can contribute to the development of future programming, organizational learning, as well as generate knowledge for development effectiveness social inclusion, gender equality and women's empowerment from the design and the implementation of JDP support to Kenya's devolved system of government.

The scope of the evaluation is the work JDP towards its outputs from 2020 to September 2023, with a focus on results from July 2022 to the present (the period after the fieldwork for the MTE). Expected users of the evaluation are the participating UN organizations (PUNOs) - UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women, donors (Embassies of Sweden, Finland, and Italy), Government of Kenya (GoK) ministries and departments that work on devolution and with the JDP, the 14 county governments that work with the JDP, CSO partners of the programme and other devolution stakeholders.

The evaluation has been conducted by an international and a national consultant working as an evaluation team (ET). The terminal evaluation was contracted through UNDP in close collaboration with partner agencies UN Women and UNICEF. The TE was guided by UNDP Evaluation Guidelines and United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Standards and Guidelines for Evaluations which use Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria. Per the ToR, the TE was organized through UNDP project quality criteria: whether the JDP was strategic and the relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability and national ownership of the JDP, social and environmental sustainability, management and monitoring, and the extent to which five UN programming principles of Human Rights-Based Approach to planning (HRBA), gender equality

(GE), environmental sustainability, capacity development and results-based management (RBM) were mainstreamed in implementation.

2. POLITICAL AND DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT FOR THE JOINT DEVOLUTION PROGRAMME

The people of Kenya voted in favour of a new constitution in 2010 which proposed a dramatic shift in governance of the country through devolving power and resources to counties. To implement this change, Kenya instituted a devolved system of governance in 2013 through the creation of 47 counties. This effort was designed to address issues related to marginalization, equity, accountability, environment, and climate change in the country. Kenyans understood that this huge shift in how Kenya was governed would take years to fully implement.

The first five years of devolution (2013-17) focused on for the rapid and effective establishment of the county governments. This effort included capacity development, policy and legislation to support the devolved structures and functions of counties. The second phase of devolution (2018 – 22) focused on strengthening institutional and human capacity at national and county levels to address social, accountability, and environmental issues. UN frameworks and agencies developed their strategies around supporting devolution over this period, as well as projects and programmes towards these strategies. UNDP and UN Women had a project supporting the first phase of devolution, and UNICEF conducted extensive work with counties towards meeting their mandate. This background set the stage for UN support for the second phase of devolution through the JDP.

The ProDoc noted that during design in 2020, poverty rates remained above 80% in the remote, arid and sparsely populated northern frontier counties, and that poverty levels severely affect women, children, and other vulnerable groups. To address the urgent human development challenges of the most marginalized, the JDP thus directly targeted 14 of the most marginalized counties. These 14 counties were to be supported to develop policies, plans and strategies that address equity accountability and environmental issues while at the same time streamlining revenue collection and budgeting processes. The ProDoc further provided this apt analysis:

Devolved governments are new, however, having come into being only in 2013 and the last five years have understandably been a settling-in and experimenting phase. Many laws and arrangements put in place are still being tested and will need to be reviewed and revised based on real experiences on the ground. Several challenges remain to be addressed to fulfil the promise of devolution. First, the enabling environment (the policy, legal and institutional dimensions of devolution) is still weak. Second, there are continuing inter and intra-governmental issues related to Public Financial Management (PFM). Third, the counties' capacity for service delivery is still weak as they face weak statistical and monitoring and evaluation systems. Fourth, there are inadequate platforms for public participation hinder citizen voice

and accountability. Fifth, weak climate and disaster risk governance capacity hinders responsiveness to the climate-related crisis which impact all aspects of county development. The gaps contribute to a lack of access to quality essential services and especially safe and protective spaces for women, girls, children, survivors of sexual violence, psychosocial support, and access to justice. Further, access to economic opportunities, and markets for women and youth especially in rural spaces is largely compromised. (p. 6)

The importance and weak state of public participation was also recognized, with the lack of inclusiveness and citizen feedback, particularly of women and youth, at public planning meetings at the county levels seen as a major factor in inefficient public service delivery in the ProDoc.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE JOINT DEVOLUTION PROGRAMME

UNDP, UN Women and UNICEF and the Government of Kenya (GoK) implemented the JDP to support the second phase of devolution. The JDP has been implemented by National and County Government partners and non-state actors through the National Implementation Modality (NIM). The JDP was developed within the context of the UN Delivering as One (DaO); participating UN agencies were to use their individual comparative advantages towards delivering on the overall objective of the programme –strengthening the process of devolution to support service delivery in the counties.

The JDP was developed to contribute to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), and then contribute to the new United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF), as well as two UNDP Country Programme Document (CPDs), UNICEF CPDs, and UN Women Strategic Notes (SNs).

The ProDoc, signed in September 2019, developed a four-year JDP. UNDP reported that total resources mobilised for the JDP were USD 14,621,103, 45% of the total of USD 32,480,932 outlined in the ProDoc, from the Embassies of Sweden, Finland, Italy and UNDP contribution.

JDP implementation began in 2020; the COVID-19 pandemic negatively impacted implementation from the first half of 2020 on. Some UN agency interviews noted that regular implementation of the planned JDP began in earnest in August 2020. Then JDP implementation was slowed by the long electoral campaign and election period that stretched from 2021 to August 2022, with Presidential, Parliamentary, and county elections leading to substantial changes among key government counterparts at the national and county levels following the elections.

The JDP was developed to work directly with partners in 14 of the most marginalized counties in Kenya. Human development and improvements in human development has been uneven across counties in Kenya, with Busia, Garissa, Isiolo, Kajiado, Kilifi, Mandera, Marsabit, Narok, Samburu, West Pokot, Tana River, Turkana, Wajir, and West Pokot counties recognized as behind national averages in many areas. The counties in the arid and semi-arid land (ASAL) on the northern

frontier plus some other counties still had poverty rates above 80%. Poverty and under-development has even more adverse effects on women, children, marginalized communities and other vulnerable groups in these in these remote, often arid and sparsely populated counties. To support human development, the JDP has supported these 14 counties to develop and implement policies, plans and strategies that address equity, inclusivity, accountability and environmental issues while streamlining systems, revenue collection and budgeting processes.

The JDP Theory of Change was:

If services at the devolved level are well resourced and delivered in a coordinated, efficient, transparent, accountable, and equitable manner, underpinned by legal and institutional frameworks; effective public financial management systems; evidence-based policies; and active mechanisms for public participation and engagement, then people of Kenya will enjoy high quality and inclusive services that contribute to reduced poverty and inequality.

The JDP has four outputs:

Output 1.1: Government has strengthened policy, legal and institutional mechanisms for coordinated, inclusive and effective service delivery.

Output 1.2: Public finance management institutions have strengthened processes and systems for equitable, efficient and accountable service delivery.

Output 1.3: County level institutions have strengthened capacity for evidence-based planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for accountable service delivery.

Output 1.4: People in Kenya, especially women, youth and persons with disability, have capacity to engage, deepen accountability and transparency in devolution.

The Ministry for Devolution (MoD) and later the State Department for Devolution (SDD) was the implementing partner (IP). The JDP worked with many responsible parties (RPs) to support implementation of the JDP. These responsible partners are referred to as partners in the report. This includes key partners at the national level such as the State Department for Gender Affairs, the National Treasury, the Council of Governors (CoG), Kenya School of Government (KSG), the County Assemblies Forum (CAF), The Society of Clerks at the Table (SOCATT), Commission on Revenue Allocation (CRA), Office of the Auditor General (OAG), Office of the Controller of Budget (OCOB), National Youth Service (NYS), Directorate of Children Services, Kenya Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (KIPPRA), International Budget Partnership Kenya Services/ FIDA Kenya, Action Aid, and Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) as well as partners at the county level from governments and civil society organizations.

The 2022 MTE found important achievements as well as identified areas for improvement in the JDP. The MTE assessed output achievements and progress towards outcomes, noting that targets for almost all of the indicators had been either surpassed or were on track to be achieved. Recommendations of the MTE were:

- The programme remains relevant in Kenya and should continue focusing on strengthening capacity for service delivery.
- Improve coordination and internal communication.

- Focus on fewer counties for better impact.
- Improve on knowledge management.
- Support Inter-Governmental Relations efforts and prepare the new counties to deliver.

4. EVALUATION METHODS

The ET consultants worked towards fulfilling ToR for the international evaluator for the Terminal Evaluation, which provided guidance on evaluation methods, reporting to the UNDP Evaluation Manager who provided support for working with the evaluation reference group (ERG). The evaluation began in August 2023 with efforts to refine the key guiding evaluation questions to support evaluability towards scoping a useful, manageable evaluation in the limited time available. UNDP agreed that discrete questions could be developed that could be evaluated by the consultants within the limited time for the evaluation framed through UNDP project quality criteria and OECD-DAC categories used by UNDP and the UNEG. The purpose and objectives of the evaluation and objectives of the project were used in conjunction with the evaluation criteria and guiding evaluation questions from the ToR to draft a shorter number of main evaluation questions to be answered by the ET within the time and resources allocated to the evaluation.

The international evaluator drafted and submitted through UNDP an inception report which explained how the team had scoped the evaluation and questions towards making it feasible to conduct a high-quality evaluation within the limited time contracted for the work. The evaluation design was based on the independence of the evaluators, a focus on evaluating the most important activities towards reaching the project objectives, purposive sampling, triangulation, and comparison. After comments on the draft, the inception report was revised twice and approved 29 August 2023. The approved inception report proposed document review, interviews, field visits, and discussions with UNDP, UN Women, and UNICEF, their partners, and stakeholders and beneficiaries over a two-week period in early September, with the evaluators drafting a concise Draft Final Evaluation Report for submission 15 September 2023.

Instead, as interest among UN agencies, stakeholders, donors, partners grew, the effort to focus evaluation questions on a more manageable set of general questions appropriate to the wide-ranging programme was revised, and the set of questions to be addressed reverted to the extensive, detailed list in the ToR. Also the interview list expanded and the evaluation was prolonged to cover more remote and in-person interviews by both the national and the international consultant in counties, among partners, and with stakeholders. Once the timeline slipped, other commitments also delayed the international and national evaluators in working on the evaluation. These delays led to concerns at UN agencies and donors, which resulted in an interim presentation to Agencies and donors on evaluation processes and initial findings 12 October 2023. Interviews and document review continued into November by both the national and international evaluator. Data processing of many interviews took substantial time.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with management and staff from the PIU, UNDP, UN Women, and UNICEF, State Department for Devolution staff, RPs, donors, stakeholders, and beneficiaries, including at the county level. Interviews were conducted with a total of 111 people, including 32 women (Annex 3: List of Interviews). Interviews targeted PIU staff, the IP, the main

partner organisations, county beneficiaries, and CSOs at the county level. This prioritisation of organisations, asking for key informants from each category, led to this number of women being included. The interview team was sensitive to gender, and asked when no women were included, to identify relevant women interviewees from these organisations or counties.

The evaluators used semi-structured interview questions designed to gather qualitative information. Interviews were conducted largely in person, with some through remote methods by telephone or other communications software. Interviews were conducted in English, with only a few in Swahili (with later translation). Interview questions and the interview protocol are included as Annex 4. The ET obtained informed consent for all interviews. As planned, anonymity and non-attribution have been used per evaluation standards and assurances.

The ET, with the support of the evaluation manager and project team, divided and travelled to and interviewed in seven of the 14 counties prioritised by the JDP. The ET selected Narok, Lamu, Isiolo, Kilifi, Wajir, Turkana, and Busia to cover the diversity of counties where JDP worked. Additional remote interviews were added at PIU request to cover Tana River, an 8th county. Interviews made sure to interview at least one woman from each county. In the 8 counties, the ET interviewed 62 people, 50 men and 13 women.

One focus group was conducted to capture the views of youth beneficiaries in Isiolo (10 young men and 9 young women) as many beneficiaries turnout out and sought to participate in the evaluation's processes. These data have correspondingly been used in the analysis.

Documents reviewed include the Programme Document, work plans, annual reports, quarterly and semi-annual reports, and other materials produced by the JDP as well as the MTE. Document analysis continued during the evaluation; the data from document analysis will be used to tailor specific questions to different informants (when appropriate).

Limitations to the methodologies, data collection plan, and analysis plan, as well as ways to manage them, were identified in the inception report that are common and conventional in evaluations. Limitations were limited resources which limited data collection, too many evaluation questions and sub-questions, limited ability to assess causes and attribution, limited staff availability as well as knowledge limits plus recall and acquiescence biases, challenges differentiating the programme from the work of other projects, and insecurity.

The limitations did not prevent the evaluators from gathering and analysing more than adequate amounts of valid and reliable data to compile findings, draw conclusions, and make recommendations that target the purposes of the evaluation. Purposive sampling as well as the triangulation and analysis of data from different methods and organisations enabled the evaluation report to respond comprehensively to the purposes of the evaluation. The broad evaluation questions **in bold** in findings help aggregate the main findings.

The Terminal Evaluation Report is structured to identify findings and reach conclusions, as well as identify best practices and lessons learned as well as to make recommendations for UNDP, UN Women, and UNICEF. The organization of the Final Terminal Evaluation Report was approved with the inception report and followed. The draft is a synthesis of the evaluation team's analysis

drawn from many documents as well as interviews with numerous respondents. Quotations included to highlight particular issues do detailed descriptive information that could plausibly be used to infer the source of the remarks.

Two presentations have been made on findings, conclusions, and recommendations to the ERG and stakeholders through remote validation meetings. The evaluator has received comments from ERG reviewers and revised the initial draft to this Second Draft Terminal Evaluation Report addressing all comments. One further round of comments and revisions is expected before the submission of the revised Final Terminal Evaluation Report through UNDP for approval. The submission will include an audit trail that tracks the main comments on the second draft and changes made in response to comments. A final PowerPoint Presentation on main findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation for briefing purposes will also be submitted to UNDP.

5. KEY FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

STRATEGY

To what extent has the JDP been strategic for UN agencies, its main partners, and stakeholders?

Strategic assesses the extent that the project specifies how it is linked to and will contribute to other frameworks.

To what extent have JDP programming priorities and results contributed to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); were aligned to United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and United Nations Sustainable Development Framework (UNSDCF), UNDP Kenya Country Programme Document (CPDs), UN Women Strategic Notes and UNICEF Kenya Strategic Plans.

JDP documents and interviews with UN agency staff and the PIU noted that through the JDP, UN Agencies worked to advance core mandates: UN Women worked towards key goals of gender equality and women's empowerment, UNICEF on children's rights, and UNDP on public participation in governance. The JDP was developed to fit into UN support in the 2018-2022 UNDAF. Then the JDP informed and was an explicit part of the development of the new UNSDCF Outcome 1 in 2021.

Partners noted that the JDP was strategic for them because it funded their activities towards their organisations' priority goals (for example, the CoG's roles in strengthening county management by JDP's support for strengthening performance management systems in counties).

County level stakeholders interviewed from the civil service and CSOs greatly appreciated the support of JDP and partners for aspects of devolution in their counties. Civil servants interviewed universally noted that they valued the assistance provided through the JDP to them and for their counties in the many different areas where they had been supported. Civil servants interviewed did not argue that the modalities of support delivered were issues, that support should have been provided in different areas, or that support should have been provided differently in order to be

more comprehensive, coherent, or have larger cumulative effects in their counties. CSOs appreciated the opportunities to work on key issues of representation and accountability in counties through JDP support towards their work strengthening public participation in counties in budgeting/planning and social audits. This was the case whether a CSO worked with JDP in a single county or whether a CSO that worked with more than one county. Targeted JDP support also helping CSOs in another way, by enabling them to work on key issues using JDP resources, such as for creating safe spaces for women, children, youth and raising awareness on GBV prevention.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP has been strategic for UN agencies and the JDP's partners, and fits with and contributes to UN, UN agency, and GoK frameworks.

To what extent has the project proactively taken advantage of new opportunities, adapting its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities?

The JDP has been implemented through the COVID-19 pandemic, which created an imperative to contribute to Kenya's response to the novel corona virus. The JDP has supported devolution through the transition to a new Kenyan government following the 2022 General Elections which some interviewees felt had led to a somewhat different orientation towards devolution under the Ruto administration.

The ToC for the JDP has not been revised in implementation. PIU and UN agency staff interviewed noted that the ToC represented the kind of governance sought for Kenya. The JDP contributed towards developing the governance expressed in the ToC:

If services at the devolved level are well resourced and delivered in a coordinated, efficient, transparent, accountable, and equitable manner, underpinned by legal and institutional frameworks; effective public financial management systems; evidence-based policies; and active mechanisms for public participation and engagement, then people of Kenya will enjoy high quality and inclusive services that contribute to reduced poverty and inequality.

The COVID-19 pandemic affected the UN and Kenya from March 2020. Other than developing COVID-19 emergency response programming, documents and interviews suggest that the JDP did not adapt its strategies significantly in implementation 2020-2023. The MTE was finalized with less than a year remaining in the JDP, which left limited time for adjustments.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP has not been adapted significantly other than in addressing COVID.

RELEVANCE

To what extent has the JDP been relevant for UN agencies, its main partners, and stakeholders?

Relevance is the extent to which the project objectives and design respond to beneficiaries, regional, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change.

JDP documents and interviews for the evaluation clearly noted that the JDP was relevant to the UN agencies, government stakeholders and partners at the national level, and county beneficiaries in the civil service and from civil society. The MTE also affirmed that the programme remained “relevant in Kenya and should continue focusing on strengthening capacity for service delivery.”

The evaluation concludes that the JDP has been relevant for UN agencies, partners, and stakeholders.

To what extent were the interventions consistent with the needs of the IPs?

The JDP has only one IP, the State Department for Devolution. The sub-question as answered here addresses instead all of the JDP’s partners as well as the IP. The SDD is tasked with making devolution work including handling matters concerning coordination of government and management of devolved service delivery, enforcement, public participation, civic education, disaster management and special programs, research, documentation and knowledge management. Interviews with SDD staff and PIU staff noted that the programme supported some of these needs. The programme’s large number of partners were strategically chosen by UN agencies as the most relevant institutions in Kenya to support JDP implementation (e.g. CAF to work with County Assemblies, KESRA to come up with a revenue administration and enforcement frameworks for counties). Partners were chosen as relevant for planning, budgeting, monitoring, and expanding participation through devolution at the national and county levels. Partners had strategic plans that outlined their own larger goals and plans for achieving them. Some partner interviewees noted JDP support helped them towards achieving their mandates, such as facilitating the roles of county assemblies in terms of their mandates of oversight, legislation and representation for CAF.

The evaluation concludes that JDP interventions were in line with the mandates and plans of JDP partners.

Was the project designed in line with the priorities set in UNDAF/UNSDCF, UNDP Kenya CPDs, UN Women Strategic Notes, UNICEF Country Programme Documents, MTP III/MTP IV, County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs), and other national and sub-national policy frameworks?

The analysis and statements in the ProDoc made clear that the JDP fit UNCT priorities, participating UN agency priorities, Kenya’s MTP III, and the priorities of the counties. UN agency and GoK signatures on the ProDoc affirmed that leaders of agencies and the MoD found the JDP relevant at that time. Planning documents PUNOs and their reporting, as well as JDP reporting, noted that the programme remained relevant over 2020-2023 and was a key input to the UNSCDF, the UNDP CPD, UN Women SN, and UNICEF CPD developed and approved after the start of the JDP in September 2019. The July 2022 elections of a new Kenyan president and

government led to some institutional changes in the national government relevant to devolution, with a State Department for Devolution reporting directly to the Deputy President instead of a Ministry for Devolution - and some interviewees noted a change of emphasis in the importance of devolution. But interviewees and programme documents noted that devolution is central to the constitution and thus fundamentally does not change with the new national administration. Implementing devolution remained the focus of new county governors and members of county assemblies (MCAs) elected or reelected in July 2022 and for civil servants in the counties. CSOs at the county level interviewed noted they engaged with the JDP as relevant to county needs.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP is and has been consistent with key UN and Kenyan policy frameworks.

To what extent was the project able to respond to changes in the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries?

With COVID-19, the project adapted to meet new needs and priorities at the start of the epidemic. The JDP adapted to support newly elected county leaders after the 2022 elections through induction support and networking for new governors, MCAs, and key civil servants to build their understanding and knowledge of needs, requirements, and capacities (including support capacity) for PFM, OSR, M&E, PMS and participation, including of women, youth, and PWD. CSO partners in counties noted learning through their JDP activities, which drives the further activities of these CSOs – including with the JDP. Interviews with UN agency and PIU staff noted the JDP responded more to the ongoing and consistent challenges of making devolution work in marginalised counties with a focus on service delivery reaching women, children, and marginalised populations in these counties than to change.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP responded to some changed and evolving needs.

Were the stated project objectives consistent with the requirements of UN programming principles towards the most vulnerable populations?

The ProDoc developed the programme objectives, stating them clearly in ways that were aligned with UN programming principles that focus on reaching the most vulnerable populations. UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women staff interviewed noted that project objectives focused on reaching, benefitting, and working with vulnerable women, youth, children, and PWD in the most marginalized counties through the JDP.

The evaluation concludes that JDP objectives were consistent with UN programming principles on reaching the most vulnerable.

How relevant and appropriate was the project to the devolved levels of government?

The ProDoc effectively made the case that the programme was relevant and appropriate for county governments that needed support for the second phase of devolution, and that this support was particularly important for more marginalised counties like the 14 counties that the

JDP focuses on. JDP reporting documents affirmed this relevance throughout implementation through to the semi-annual report covering January to June 2023. Interviews with UN agency staff, national partners, civil servants in county governments, and CSO staff in counties asserted that the JDP was highly relevant and appropriately worked to help them meet priority county needs in a wide range of areas.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP was relevant and appropriate to the counties.

Did the programme regularly capture, and review knowledge and lessons learned to inform redesign, adapt, change or scale-up plans and actions?

JDP quarterly, biannual, and annual reporting regularly noted brief lessons learned. JDP partner documents also sometimes noted lessons learned. The analysis of these lessons identified that many lessons are broad, while many other lessons focus on improvements to make going forward. Some JDP-supported products of partners specifically focused on disseminating best practices and lessons learned towards greater programme effectiveness, impact, sustainability, and reach to women, children, PWD, and LNOB. These templates and models were seen as useful by county-level beneficiaries interviewed. However partners and stakeholders interviewed did not know the full extent of JDP products and supported processes, nor have easy access to many of these materials to use after the end of the JDP in September 2023.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP had some mechanisms to capture lessons learned, but did not seem to have processes to systematically use or disseminate these lessons learned itself or with partners.

To what extent did the programme respond to changes in the needs and priorities of the IP and RPs?

The JDP responded to meet new needs with COVID-19. The IP, the Ministry for Devolution, changed to the State Department for Devolution after the July 2022 elections. Documents and interviews did not find that the JDP evolved or changed significantly with this change. For responsible parties, interviews and partner documents noted that the needs and priorities of JDP partners to support in devolution otherwise were more constant than changed over 2020-2023. The elections did change some priorities due to personnel change, and programme support evolved correspondingly. The JDP developed additional outreach and induction materials for newly elected county leaders and new members of county assemblies (MCAs) after the July 2022 elections produced large turnover, especially among MCAs. Partners and civil servants interviewed noted this urgent need for induction and support, with newly elected leaders needing to quickly gain knowledge critical to their new roles (and important to JDP successes).

The evaluation concludes the JDP did not adjust much to the needs of the SDD after the change from the MoD but did make adjustments to work with partners due to changed needs after the July 2022 elections.

COHERENCE

To what extent has JDP implementation been coherent for UN agencies, its main partners, and stakeholders?

Coherence is the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or Institution.

The MTE and interviews for the evaluation noted challenges for UN agencies with internal coherence among UN agencies in the JDP, as joint programming has been challenging. UN agency interviewees identified the different roles of Agencies in the JDP, differences in the ways agencies managed their work in the JDP, and different institutional way of working (through projects for UNDP and UN Women but programmes for UNICEF) as contributing to differences among agencies. Interviews noted that UNICEF and UN Women had issues with the ways UNDP led as the RP. UNICEF and UN Women used staff funded through core resources for management and implementation of their JDP activities. UNDP used PIU staff funded by the JDP for the management and implementation of their JDP activities. UNICEF and UN Women were thus using more of the JDP for programming, while UNDP used programme funding for staffing programme implementation as well as for the PIU. And managing by projects – with agency funding in Kenya based on projects – contrasted with UNICEF’s larger programmes with more stable funding for staff.

The challenging environment for UN Agencies in a lower-middle income country where development partners had limited resources was seen by UN agency interviewees as contributing to coherence challenges between UN agencies, as UN agencies were not only collaborating but also competing for scarce resources. UN agency interviewees noted sensing that development partners were not satisfied with the coherence of the JDP and donor frustrations that these coherence issues were not addressed.

The JDP PIU reported participating in the sector and donor working groups on devolution chaired by donor agencies that has met monthly since 2016. The participation of the EU, FCDO, and World Bank in the working group along with JDP and donors has helped with coherence across donor programming in devolution. The WG has encouraged complementarities between programs and supported the development and implementation of programs that work together to support key aspects of decentralization such as own source revenue (OSR) generation by counties. PIU interviews noted that it was critical that the WG foster coherence. The WG has to support the development of agreed, shared systems that donors can support for devolution and avoid situations where different donors could develop different systems that are only implemented in some counties or that fail to work together with government systems (such as management of revenue collection and management).

Recommendations from the MTE for the JDP to focus on fewer counties and strategic targeting of priority workstreams within these counties from the MTE came with the completion of the evaluation in December 2022 too late to be feasibly taken by UN agencies with only nine months to go in JDP implementation. This however, may be considered in future programming cycles.

The evaluation concludes that coherence has been a challenge for the JDP, as expectations for a joint programme among key stakeholders have differed from the ways UN agencies and the PIU have come together to implement the JDP with their partners.

Did the project design promote ownership and participation by the national and county partners?

The ProDoc developed the JDP design; the stress on working through the key national government and civil society partners and reaching county leaders, key civil servants, and activating CSOs to expand public participation (with a focus on women, youth, and leaving no one behind (LNOB)) to promote ownership through the participation of the main national and county institutions and actors needed to make devolution work. County-level interviewees appreciated project support for their many needs.

Some partner interviewees were critical of the processes used in designing the JDP as not incorporating them into this process. As one noted:

We are engaged after they finish the design, everything, so you come and fit in into what they've designed. We fit in instead of all of us, you know, trying to fit together. So we struggle to fit in. So eventually you implement sometimes some programs that are not maybe key or priorities.

Some partner interviewees noted that key programme strategies did not match their institutional priorities. One for example reported:

we do not like isolating counties and picking a few. When we mount a training, we target all of them. So we do not, unless it is a tailor-made course where a certain county requests that we show up and assist, when we mount it ourselves, we target the 47. Of course, due to, you are in Kenya, due to political reasons. We don't want to seem like we are favoring a given region and not providing support to everybody. So from our end, we do not target the 14, we target 47.

Some partner interviewees asserted that they were not part of the processes of selecting the 14 counties, which they felt impeded coherence. Some noted “led to some backlash” or “feelings that your being biased in support” for organisations that were membership based and worked across all 47 counties.

Some partner interviewees also noted that they did not have a full sense of the JDP, which they felt impeded coherence. They were not able to explain satisfactorily to partners why “you might find more than five, two partners are working within the same county, and some other counties have not been looked into. So sometimes it puts you in a very awkward position trying to justify why you chose A and not B.” Again these factors may have been understood at some level of the organization or at the design phase, but were not cascaded downward or brought forward in reminders or briefings to those working on JDP activities for some partners.

The evaluation concludes that JDP development could have considered partner priorities to a greater extent, which might have built more coherence.

EFFECTIVENESS

To what extent has the JDP been implemented effectively?

Effectiveness is the extent to which the project achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups. The Joint Programme Results Framework and Results Monitoring Framework was revised in March 2020 by the PIU. The evaluation uses the version changed at that time, but dated July 2021, to assess JDP effectiveness.

Table 1 assesses the effectiveness of JDP implementation by sub-output by assessing whether targets had been met as of June 2023 using JDP reporting. The RMF did not determine indicators or set targets for the outputs themselves. The table uses dark green shading for sub-output targets that have been achieved or exceeded, and light green for those that have partially been achieved. This assessment finds that the JDP has met and exceeded all but five of its sub-output targets, which have been partially achieved. Funding shortages were noted by PIU interviews as reducing what would have otherwise been even more overfulfillment of targets as well as planned activities to measure outcomes.

Based on the achievement of sub-outputs as of June 2023, the evaluation concludes that the JDP has been implemented effectively as it has exceeded, achieved, or almost met its targets.

Table 1: Evaluation Assessment of JDP Output Achievement

Output	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Reported in Semi-Annual 2023		Evaluation Assessment
				Number/Data	Status	
1.1: Government has strengthened policy, legal and institutional mechanisms for coordinated, inclusive and effective service delivery						
1.1.1: National and county governments have strengthened inter and intra-governmental structures	# of new issues addressed by national and county government coordination and/or dialogue forums	0	8	11 issues addressed	Achieved	Achieved (exceeded)
1.1.2: Governments have harmonized governance policy, legal and institutional frameworks to support devolution	# of policies, bills and regulations in target counties in line with devolved functions (public participation, Gender, DRM, REBs, Child Protection, M&E, Youth)	5	10	16 policies developed, 7 finalized 31 bills developed, 15 finalized	Ongoing	Achieved (exceeded)
1.1.3: Improved County capacities for effective implementation of child protection services and Gender-Based Violence (GBV)	5 child protection committees capacitated to plan and implement child protection policies and Violence Against Women and Girls	5 child protection committees	5	9 county child protection committees operational	Ongoing	Achieved (exceeded)
	1 county has capacity to assess, plan and budget for GBV and Child Protection	0	5	5 counties	Achieved	Achieved
	1 standard county-level framework for child protection legal and policy documents in place	0	2	2 frameworks implemented	Ongoing	Achieved
	2 counties implementing alternative care programme/ plans	1	2	4 implementing	Partly achieved	Achieved (exceeded)
1.2: Public finance management institutions have strengthened processes and systems for equitable, efficient, and accountable service delivery						
1.2.1: County capacities strengthened for equitable and inclusive budgeting	% (in 5 counties) of county budgets aligned to CIDPs and ADPs	29% (2017)	40%	100% in 14 counties	Finalization of CIDPs for remaining JDP counties ongoing.	Achieved (exceeded)
	# counties with County Economic and Budget Forums (CBEFs) active in the budget process	4 counties (2018)	6	CBEFs from 11 counties capacity developed through peer learning	Achieved	Achieved (exceeded)

	# of public entities with capacity strengthened to develop and implement AGPO procurement plans	0 new counties	10	3	Partially achieved Capacity building of women entrepreneurs ongoing	Partially achieved (progress towards)
1.2.2: County capacities improved for revenue projection, generation, collection, and reporting	Gap between potential and actual OSR through realistic projection for all streams reduced from 47% to 40%.	47% 2017/18	40%	45.59%	Achieved 6 counties develop new OSR sources using REAPs	Partially achieved (progress towards)
	# of counties with harmonized codes between the revenue generation systems and the proposed Standard Chart of Account (SCOA) for all streams for ease of reporting.	0	14	SCOA and COBMIS used to strengthen budget tracking and reporting	Partially achieved. Roll out of COBMIS and SCOA to counties ongoing	Partially achieved (progress towards)
	1 county's OSR increased between fiscal years.	0	1	8	Achieved 6 counties identified new OSR sources	Achieved (exceeded)
1.3: County level institutions have strengthened capacity for evidence-based planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for accountable service delivery						
1.3.1: Counties have strengthened planning and service delivery mechanisms	# of counties have (a) established and (b) operational performance management systems in line with CIDPs/ADPs	(a) 6 (b) 6	(a) 10 (b) 10	(a) 10 (b) 10	Finalization of 2022/23 PCs ongoing	Achieved (exceeded)
	# of county plans and budgets developed that integrate women, youth and children priorities	0	14	14	Achieved Further mainstreamed in CIDP IIIs	Achieved
1.3.2: National and County governments have strengthened M&E and reporting systems	# of counties with operational CIMES for reporting CIDP targets and SDGs.	2	11	14 counties adopt CIMES, eCIMES. 4 counties undertake VLR	Achieved	Achieved (exceeded)
1.3.3: National and County systems improved for the generation of disaggregated data (GBV, FGM, VAC, child marriages and marginalized	# of county data sheets produced to collect disaggregated data on target sectors/groups	0	3	12	Ongoing. KNBS Assessment report to be disseminated and recommendations implemented	Achieved (exceeded)

populations including PWDs at county level, including a joint baseline study) for evidence-based decision making at both levels of government						
1.3.4. National and County governments have strengthened capacity for risk-informed development planning and budgeting.	# of counties that have increased budget allocation for disaster prevention and preparedness interventions.	0	14	11 counties made local budgetary allocations for DRM for FY 2021/22	Partially achieved	Partially achieved
	# of climate and disaster early warning products developed.	8	12	14 counties developed and are utilizing disaster risk information for planning	Achieved. DRM initiatives ongoing	Achieved (exceeded)
	# of counties that have functional and inclusive disaster and emergency coordination mechanisms.	0	8	14 counties establish disaster and emergency coordination mechanisms	Achieved. Collaboration with UN OCHA and WFP on DRR/M	Achieved (exceeded)
	# of counties with operational CC/DRM legal frameworks.	8		8 counties developed DRM Bills	Development of policies and legislation ongoing	Partially achieved
1.4: People in Kenya have capacity to engage, deepen accountability and transparency in devolution, especially women, youth, and persons with disability						
1.4.1: County governments have established public participation policy, legislation, and frameworks	# of counties that have public participation budget allocations and expenditure (county assembly and executive).	0	14	14 county governments allocate budget for public participation 14 county assemblies engage citizens in county budgeting processes	Achieved. Strengthening county civic engagement and public participation ongoing	Achieved
1.4.2: County governments have established and operationalized	# of counties engaged in the development of Open Budget Index (OBI)	0	14	14 counties engaged in OBI. County Budget Transparency	Achieved. Budget and expenditure information disseminated	Achieved

inclusive citizen engagement and accountability mechanisms				(CBT) for JDP counties increased to 38% in 2022 from 35% in 2021 and 33% in 2020	through Bajeti Yetu portal	
1.4.3: Increased capacity of CSOs and relevant NSAs to engage county governments on planning, budgeting and service delivery	# of CSOs in target counties influencing the county planning and budgeting processes.	0	6	16 CSOs influence county planning, budgeting and COVID-19 response through social audits and civic engagement	Achieved	Achieved (exceeded)
	# of women and youth entrepreneurs in target counties linked to trade finance and markets opportunities.	0	100	350 SMEs benefited AGPO training & buyer-seller. 167 SME Trainers of Trainers trained on agribusiness.	Achieved	Achieved (exceeded)
	# of women benefiting from company policies and initiatives stemming from Women Empowerment Programme (WEPs)	0	25	49 companies signed. 3 female youth entrepreneurs benefit from Generation Equality fund. 9 companies joined Unstereotype Alliance	Achieved	Achieved (exceeded)

To what extent have the annual work plans (2020, 2021, 2022, 2023– up to September) contributed to the effective implementation of the programme?

UN agency staff and PIU staff interviewed noted that JDP has used annual work plans as core implementation mechanisms. The 2020 workplan was disrupted by the COVID-19 pandemic. Interviews suggested that work plans originated from the three UN agencies (the PIU for UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women), which were then put together by the PIU. Some donors sought earlier availability of work plans and more careful review of these JDP work plans by the steering committee to increase their engagement in JDP planning. Work plans were how the JDP adjusted to less resource mobilisation than anticipated by the ProDoc.

The evaluation concludes that annual work plans were the main ways UN agencies planned programming in the JDP.

To what extent have partnerships and strategic alliances with national partners, county governments, development partners, civil society and other external support agencies contributed to the achievement of programme outcomes?

JDP documents note that partnerships and strategic alliances with national implementing partners have been critical tools for implementing the JDP; UN agency interviewees noted that they worked with and through long-term partners to implement the JDP. International UN staff asserted that it was better for implementation and results to have Kenyans working with Kenyans – and that this was one of the ways that using national partners for implementation was a best practice.

JDP investments in reforming national and county-level public financial management systems and practices worked with key partners towards these achievements. JDP worked with the Standard Chart of Accounts (SCOA) on the most important financial management system for reporting end-to-end programme-based budgeting for all Ministries, Departments and Agencies and counties. These systems covered policy, revenue, allocation, spending, and reporting of the budget. JDP focus helped to enable tracking of expenditures on SDGs especially allocation and spending on gender, children and climate change. This system was adopted and leveraged subsequent investments of IMF and World Bank to support implementation such as the configuration of IFMIS, the movement from cash to accrual accounting, and having public sector and accounts manuals rolled out to all health facilities and education institutions in Kenya. JDP investments of approximately KES 25 million in SCOA helped reform the whole of GoK budgeting for the four years of the JDP, an average per year of some 3 trillion KES.

JDP supported the development of the Controller of Budget Management Information System (COBMIS) to automate the role of the controller to release resources to all GoK ministries and 47 counties and speed up granular reporting in standardized formats. The system was configured to respond to the new SCOA format and new IFMIS format. JDP invested with lens of enables of more granular reporting on SDGs- especially on gender, children and climate change. By 2023, the initial application of the automated formats of reporting expenditure from counties has led to more comprehensive reporting on what has been invested on issues like gender, nutrition, DRR, sanitation and disability. JDP invested about KES 10 million in COBMIS, which like SCOA leverages the whole GoK budget per year for all four years of JDP.

And JDP supported the development of the National/County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (N/CIMES), which automated processes and was adopted by 46 counties.

Interviews with staff from county governments and CSO partners noted that they appreciated the opportunities and benefits of working with the JDP. Interviews with the PIU noted that the JDP has had links with other devolution initiatives of development partners that has contributed significantly to JDP outputs. This has included having USAID publish and disseminate products produced by the JDP to extend programme influence.

Some key government counterparts had limited engagement with the JDP; SDD interviewees did not explain or demonstrate how SDD capacities were supported and extended by the JDP, although JDP outputs and activities clearly supported SDD objectives and goals.

The evaluation concludes that partnerships were key to implementation of the JDP and the achievement of programme sub-outputs.

What are some of the emerging successful programming/business models or cases, especially from county programming, and how would they be scaled up during the remaining programme period?

JDP and partner reports are filled with examples of successes. Interviewees from the PIU, UN agencies, and partners noted that their activities and models were successful (some with caveats about what could be more successful). Both of the main mechanisms used in the JDP were successful. JDP modalities that implemented through national partners to reach across counties and benefit more than one county were seen as successful in interviews and reports. So too were modalities that used templates, examples, and cases from one county to bring knowledge and inspiration to another county through peer-to-peer processes.

UNICEF and UN Women through the JDP influenced GoK to produce the significant data for policy choices; JDP investments led to GoK institutions working with all of Kenya's counties to gather and publish evidence relevant to policy development and implementation, including in increasing allocations of budgets to social sectors. This includes:

- Comprehensive Poverty Report 2020
- 47 county comprehensive poverty profiles 2020
- 47 county gender profiles 2020
- Census 2019
- 11 Census monographs
- Kenya Demographic Health Survey 2022
- 47 county KDHS data sheets
- 47 county budget briefs.

JDP also supported the International Budget Partnership's work building a movement of more than 600 budget champions across the country and building the capacity of a network of CSOs on budgets. Again the model and Open Budget Index span all 47 counties. The GoK is progressively improving budget transparency based on these OBI reports, which has also triggered the Treasury to start the reform process on the open budget portal at the national level.

The evaluation concludes that there are successful models and cases, as both of the main modalities of the JDP (national partners working across counties and cases, templates, and peers from one county that can work in another county) but as the JDP is ending, there is not time to scale up in the remaining programme period.

Did the programme contribute to or deliver any unintended programme results, either positive or negative?

JDP support turned to support addressing the COVID 19 pandemic in 2020, which of course had not been envisioned in developing the programme. This support was noted in project reports as having been influential in spreading awareness on the novel corona virus through UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women to their JDP partners to then reach citizens in the counties as well as support providing scarce medical supplies to counties.

The evaluation concludes that COVID-19 results were the identified unintended results of the JDP as they were not envisioned in the ProDoc.

To what extent was the programme theory of change used and realized?

The JDP developed a ToC in the ProDoc. Documents subsequently did commonly cite the ToC. UN agency interviewees did not note that they used in activities, in management, in reporting, or in resource mobilisation (after the initial funding at ProDoc approval). UN agency staff asked specifically about the ToC noted that the ToC, “while complex, remained valid.” Another staff member asserted that the ToC “was to some extent realized in JDP implementation.” Partners interviewed did not bring up the ToC. The ToC was seen as aspirational, not something that could be realized within the framework of a four-year joint programme. The ToC was:

“If services at devolved level are well resourced and delivered in a coordinated, efficient transparent, accountable and equitable manner, underpinned by legal and institutional frameworks; effective public financial management systems; evidenced based policies; and active mechanisms for public participation and engagement, then people of Kenya enjoy high quality and inclusive services that contribute to reduced poverty and inequality”.

Interviewees from UN agencies noted that this ToC set out a long-term target for how Kenya could develop.

The evaluation concludes that ToC does not seem to have been commonly used in activities, in management, or in reporting. The ToC was not expected to be realized in the JDP, but worked towards as part of a long-term goal.

To what extent did the PUNOs exploit their field presence and relationship with the county and national governments to improve county governance capacity?

UN agency relationships with key national partners were cited in interviews with UN staff and partners as important in programme effectiveness. Field presence of UN agencies in the JDP was limited; UNICEF regional staff were central in working with UNICEF’s JDP partners in the counties while UN Women and UNDP did not have staff in counties. The one exception noted was that the JDP funded a UNDP staff position to work with the youth centre in Isiolo. UN agency interviews suggested that programme results were stronger where UN agencies had direct field presence. County civil servant interviewees that had engaged directly with UN staff in activities or in monitoring appreciated and valued their presence, and suggested more presence would increase

benefits to counties. New county executives and assemblies after the 2022 General Elections created needs for UN agencies and partners to sensitize and build new relationships with these new county authorities, which they have done since that time.

The evaluation concludes UN agencies had good relationships with national partners that supported implementation. UNICEF's field presence in some counties was used by other agencies to a limited extent.

EFFICIENCY

To what extent has the JDP been implemented efficiently?

Efficiency is the extent to which the project delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.

UN agencies implemented the JDP largely through partners. UN agencies used Agency mechanisms, rules, and programming principles designed to ensure accountability and the efficient use of resources in their contractual relationships with partners. The ProDoc articulates the strategy as “three UN agencies will enter into agreements towards the delivery of the Joint Programme’s overall objective. Each of the three UN agencies will be leading in realizing specific outcomes or outputs.”

Expectations about joint UN programming differed widely among JDP stakeholders. These different expectations led some interviewees to see inefficient implementation – as they had high hopes that joint programming would deliver more than delivery by a single UN agency and its partners.

UNICEF and UN Women reportedly had more experience working closely together, including through a memorandum of understanding. Interviews asserted that UNICEF and UN Women worked relatively more jointly in the JDP. PIU interviews and some UN agency interviews reported that PUNOs were doing more activities together in the last year of the JDP and that collaboration between all three UN agencies in the JDP in late 2022 and 2023 was more elaborate and more pronounced than it had been previously. UN Agency interviewees recognized that with donor interest and Resident Coordinator (RC) direction, they need to be more intensionally joint in operations and design now and going forward.

The PIU organised and managed monthly meetings for agency staff implementing the JDP. All key UN staff implementing the JDP were not always able to attend meetings as sometimes working in the field. These monthly meetings reportedly sometimes fell by the wayside during busy implementation periods, which was seen by UN agency interviewees as unfortunate.

UNDP and UN Women staff prepared for and had technical team assistance from their agencies to support technical shift of operations in the migration from Atlas to Quantum by UNDP and UN Women at the start of 2023. The process was expected to be and was difficult for UN agencies; nevertheless, this system change, PIU staff noted, led to a slow start to expenditures in Q1 2023.

CSOs that worked in more than one county with the JDP sometimes reported another partner or organization had already achieved their target in a county (such as SGBV policy in Narok); this was not seen as a problem for efficiency as this CSO could then work to further knowledge on and use of the policy through the JDP that further advanced county-level change.

The JDP support to some partners for implementation was seen by partners as critical to their effectiveness. As one partner interviewee noted:

They [JDP] supported us with the technical staff to support with the program, which really eased the burden on our end cause as currently constituted, we do not have adequate staff within the programs section that would support extended programs. So, they gave us a seconded staff that would allow us then to roll out the programs effectively.

In this example, support was particularly in communications and knowledge management, which led to effective communications with members on COVID awareness which MCAs then spread to citizens.

The evaluation concludes that efficiencies in implementation came largely through UN agency and partner processes and procedures; integration across partners and jointness that might be able to contribute to efficiencies was limited.

Were and how were the financial resources mobilized used in efficient way to reach results?

Funds from the JDP were used to work with national and local partners towards activities in AWPAs developed towards the achievement of JDP outputs. UN Agencies and partners had significant cost sharing and complementarities between their activities and funding for the JDP and other funds used by Agencies and partners towards shared goals through other activities. JDP partners had other funds working towards their core goals, which was noted in interviews as a route to amplifying programme results. Other partners, particularly county authorities, put other resources towards JDP results, further amplifying results. JDP required a minimum 10% cost share from partners; this 10%, UN agency and partner interviewees noted, does not represent and understates the overall contribution of partners to JDP results, as some of the main things JDP national partners and counties do is implement devolution, particularly in service delivery that is costly for key services at the county level.

JDP modalities of working with existing national and county-level structures for implementation were in the design of the JDP and used in implementation to be efficient as well as effective and sustainable. The JDP built on the national government's mandate to build the capacity of county governments. As one UN agency staff interviewee explained, JDP worked with government to do so efficiently- "so we work with their M&E. Support them to move to counties, build their capacity at the county level using government forces and technical expertise."

Some JDP partner interviewees were critical of "micromanagement" of some of their activities by UN agency staff, which they felt impeded efficient delivery by adding more steps and processes in decision making.

The evaluation concludes that UN agencies and their partnerships with implementing organisations brought significant financial resources towards reaching results in addition to the resources provided through the JDP. This cost sharing and additional contributions amplified programme financing, making it more efficient.

Were any cost-minimizing strategies apparent, used, and encouraged, without compromising the social dimension of human rights, gender, youth, and People Living with Disabilities?

The PIU reported that the JDP in its work with the counties required county authorities to allocate some of their resources to supporting their participation in JDP activities as a kind of cost sharing. This sharing reportedly usually worked well, by for example having JDP fund lodging and DSA costs for training participants from counties to an activity while County funds were used to cover transportation and miscellaneous costs for participants. The PIU reported that sometimes JDP covered all costs, as county governments did not have their funding allocated to them from the central government needed to support their participation.

The evaluation concludes that using additional resources outside of the JDP rather than cost minimization was the main way the JDP worked towards efficient delivery.

How efficiently were resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) converted to results?

The PIU, UN agencies, and partners in interviews noted that they had and used procedures to support the efficient use of funding to reach JDP outputs while ensuring accountability for the use of funds. UNDP, as the lead agency, took particular responsibility for accountability.

However, some county-level beneficiaries identified a lack of coordination even within UN agency programming. One interviewee suggested that “three UNDPs” worked with different county staff, on economic planning, vocational training, and public service management (or human resources). Another interviewee noted the lack of coordination among county departments was the problem for the county, but was critical that UNDP did not model better practices towards addressing this. This lack of coordination was noted as not being as efficient as possible.

Partners interviewed noted examples of not completing some work, such as on public participation legislation or on the development and use of the Controller of Budget Management Information System (COBMIS). Interview methods sometimes did not produce clear explanations for why partners had this problem (e.g. “We did it halfway because of some emerging issues that came up and we were unable to finish that work.” The COBMIS advanced less than anticipated, partner interviews noted, since the JDP did not fund all of the complementary technical systems and trainings needed to make this system operational and used by counties.

Partners varied in how they handled their internal processes towards efficient delivery. Interviews found key staff changed or had been on leave at various times in partners, who then had gaps in their knowledge and understanding of their organization’s engagement with the JDP. Some interviewees noted that their organisations needed stronger internal processes towards

continuity of programming in these cases. Some interviewees noted that recordkeeping and knowledge management by organisations or by the JDP could be stronger to support staff transitions.

The evaluation concludes that the focus on UN and partner processes for the use of funds ensured a level of efficiency and accountability in the JDP, but that JDP processes could have emphasized more coordination and broader results from programming that would have increased efficiency.

How and how was value for money taken into consideration?

Interviews with UN agency staff found that VfM was considered in the development of the JDP, in the identification of national and local partners, and in how activities were implemented by UN agencies and partners. This included coordinating across agencies to put training participants together to be more economical, for example. Another way value was emphasized was working with national partners that worked across more than the 14 counties of focus on the JDP; JDP work with these partners, like the COG, extended across to all 47 counties. The JDP also collaborated with other donor programs which further supported VfM, for example when USAID covered printing and dissemination for JDP produced materials and extended JDP programme benefits. An example was how JDP leveraged its convening power in intergovernmental relations to bring together national government Ministry of Health, Ministry of Labor and Social Protection, Senate and CoG to develop intergovernmental mechanisms on health financing, social protection and community health promoters. JDP investment of approximately 2 million Keynan shillings (KES) were complemented by funds from Sweden Social Protection. Out of the Naivasha declaration- national government and the 47 counties agreed to formally finance the 100,000 community health promoters on 50:50 basis between national and county government budgets. The whole Primary Health Care structure in Kenya is anchored on the community health promotion (CHP) model, now funded at over 3 billion KES per year. CHP funding is now done in a sustainable manner which delivers services that positively impact the health of the poorest, most vulnerable Kenyans.

The evaluation concludes that VfM was considered in the JDP mainly through efforts to maximize programme benefits, including to more than the 14 focus counties.

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

The comparative advantages of UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women were used in developing the JDP design, implementing the JDP, and in selecting and working with JDP partners. UNDP has global expertise in governance and focused on expanding participation to improve governance in the programme. UNICEF focused on children and children's rights, the agency's mandate. And UN Women focused on women and girls and GEWE, using particular county experience and expertise in public financial management to focus on this area as well in the JDP.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP used the comparative advantages of the three PUNOs in programme design and implementation towards outputs of the JDP.

Have, how have, and how have results been affected by UN agencies Delivering as One (DaO)?

UN agencies and the JDP PIU as well as other stakeholders noted that UN agencies in the JDP found it challenging to work jointly in the JDP. UNICEF and UN Women staff noted more ways that their staff had worked together in implementing activities in the JDP. Coordination in the JDP was reported to be stronger in late 2022 and over 2023 than before this time. UNDP and UN Women noted benefits of working with UNICEF's regional staff on the JDP. For most activities and work towards most outputs, UN agencies worked with their partners towards programme goals with the PIU tasked with integrating reporting and M&E for the whole JDP. UNDP and UN Women staff reported sometimes working with and engaging UNICEF staff in county hubs on the JDP.

The evaluation concludes that DaO had modest effects on results as UN Agencies mostly implemented specific programming as single agencies working with and through their partners.

IMPACT

What have the main impacts of the JDP been to date?

Impact is defined as a result or effect that is caused by or attributable to a project or program. Impact is often used to refer to higher level effects of a program that occur in the medium or long term.

JDP documents and interviews with the PIU, UN agency staff, JDP partners, and stakeholders noted important impacts that the JDP has contributed to. With other national and development partners active in supporting the same and similar initiatives in devolution, interviewees recognized that the results identified could not be attributed to JDP activities – but also that clearly JDP interventions had made important contributions to these results.

Partners noted that in some cases they had limited knowledge on the impact of their work, for example in supporting policies and legislation that targeted revenue allocation or training on using this legislation to raise revenues. As one interviewee put it, “sometimes the implementation is after you do the capacity building, but then after that capacity building, you may not have a role in the process.” Some UN staff, Partners, and donors interviewed recommended developing ways for longer-term monitoring of programme influence beyond the life of the JDP to better track impact. Some interviews noted that the project could do more analysis of impact in its final report.

Interviews noted the need for stronger tracking of outcome-level results and impacts in the JDP itself. The ProDoc did not develop indicators for the four outputs, only for sub-outputs under them. And the Project did not develop or measure outcomes and outcome-level indicators. The Results Management Framework (RMF) dated July 2021 did not develop output-level indicators. The RMF did develop outcomes and outcome indicators, but these outcomes have either not

been tracked (the planned survey to measure by county the proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services) or not been reported on systematically (Primary government expenditures as a proportion of original approved budget, by County Government sector, which was due to come from CoG reports). The 2022 JDP annual report (p. 6) however notes budget absorption by county governments to 81% in 2022 (against a target of 85%) from 75% in 2019 which was tracked by the Office of the Controller of Budget in their 2022 County Annual Expenditure Review Report. This provides the project with opportunities to use and report on these data towards impact in their final report.

The evaluation concludes that while there are important impacts that the JDP has contributed to, results measurement and monitoring was limited to the sub-output level, which has left the evaluation not able to clearly identify output and outcome level achievements that can be attributed to the JDP.

What have been the main impacts of the project on citizens' understanding and participation in devolution?

Programme Output 1.4, People in Kenya have capacity to engage, deepen accountability and transparency in devolution, especially women, youth, and persons with disability, stressed informed participation. JDP and partner strategies emphasized increasing citizen understanding of planning, budgeting, and monitoring processes at the county level in the 14 counties. This included working with public participation officers in county governments on stimulating community participation in county governance. JDP activities and partners particularly emphasized increasing the participation of marginalised women and youth, including in particular policies and legislation focused on them. JDP reports and interviews with beneficiaries in Lamu noted and appreciated JDP support for the Lamu County Civic Engagement and Public Participation Bill, which they expected to pass by the end of 2023. Some interviewees noted the main result that the JDP had contributed to was normalizing the idea that public participation was required and routinizing the use of county funds for some familiarization and public consultations by counties with communities.

The evaluation concludes that JDP activities have contributed to raising and realizing expectations that citizens would be consulted and have had important results in raising citizen awareness and understanding of budget, planning, and monitoring at the county level and the participation of citizens, particularly women, youth, PWD, and members of marginalised communities in these processes. Citizens participating, interviewees emphasized, then leads to different priorities being funded and focused on in county budgets and processes.

Are there any major changes in devolution that can reasonably be attributed to or associated with the project?

JDP reports and interviews with UN Agency and partner staff noted important changes in GoK processes and in counties that JDP had contributed to. Attribution was of course not only to the JDP, as many other factors contributed to these gains. Key examples noted include:

Stronger public participation in preparing CIDP IIIs, which led to different priorities in county plans, including initiatives that focused on women, youth, children and marginalised communities.

More participation around M&E and handbook preparation for CIDP III preparation, which led to more use of M&E and data in CIDP III.

County budget absorption rates were low in some counties. Bringing county executives and assemblies together led to remarkable progress in budget absorption (example of Samburu noted).

The evaluation concludes that project reporting and interviews for the evaluation did not identify major changes in devolution as “flagship” results that could be attributed to the JDP. JDP processes however clearly had tremendous influence and are directly associated with the dramatic changes in Kenya with devolution.

To what extent has the project strengthened devolved institutions to support empowerment, management, effectiveness, accountability, transparency, and efficiency in service delivery?

The evaluation (and JDP) had no straightforward way to answer this question. The absence of a clear baseline to measure extent of progress from after four years of programme interventions and the challenge of attribution of any identified changes to the JDP as other programmes and processes contribute to progress leave only general ways to answer this question.

PIU staff, UN agency staff, partners, and beneficiaries interviewed identified important results of the JDP that strengthened counties. This included improvements in county budgeting, planning, and monitoring and greater engagement of the public and CSOs, particularly women, youth, and PWD in ways that empowered citizens. These JDP supported processes further strengthened transparency and accountability through products and processes which supported more effective county management of service delivery (towards making services more effective in reaching citizens – particularly marginalised ones – in more efficient ways). However other donor and government programmes and actors also contributed to these results – and there have not been ways to assess the extent of JDP relative to other contributions to the many improvements noted in documents and interviews that have been used by the JDP. As noted in limitations in the draft and final inception report, the evaluation was not likely to be able to attribute results to the JDP. That said, interviewees and documents noted numerous ways that JDP support had supported progress via:

Training and induction for county secretaries;

The development of policies and bills on key processes and priorities (such as Child Protection and Public Participation);

Training and capacity development for services (such as CP and SGBV treatment and prevention);

More inclusive integrated county planning processes for the development of CIDP IIIs;

Improved revenue management at county levels;

Performance management for county authorities;

More attention and funding to the priorities of women and children in county budgets;

Production and use of disaggregated data at the county level and across counties;

Improved disaster risk management policies and practices;
Training and empowerment of youth through youth centres;
Support for county governments to consult and engage citizens on plans and budgets; and
Greater engagement of CSOs/NSAs in representation and service delivery at the county levels.

While no interviewee suggested that progress at the county level in the eight counties where interviews were held was sufficient, interviewees noted and supported that progress had been substantial as noted above. UN agency and PIU interviewees noted successes in the areas where they worked as well. This includes in public financial management, in public participation, and in broadening the reach to and engagement with women, children, and youth in counties.

The evaluation concludes that JDP support has made important contributions to improving county institutions in the 14 counties of focus, in particular for engaging and support women, youth, children and marginalised communities.

SUSTAINABILITY

To what extent are the results of the JDP to date sustainable?

Sustainability is the extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

JDP documents from the ProDoc on note that the design and implementation of the programme, through the focus on key national and county institutions in devolution and the alignment with Kenya's development priorities outlined in the MTP III, focused on making JDP results sustainable. The plan in the ProDoc is highlighted as "The programme's reach will be extended and sustained through the use of national and regional institutions such as the Council of Governors (CoG), the Kenya School of Government (KSG), the County Assemblies Forum (CAF) ..." (p. 4). This planned strategy was followed in implementation. Interviews with the PIU, UN agency staff, partners, and beneficiaries found that the value of this strategy of working with the institutions and actors responsible for devolution at the national and county levels was understood to be focused on sustainability. These institutions include the OCOB, CRA, CoG, and National Treasury. Interviewees emphasized that results were sustainable, as they were being used after activity implementation and that they were mandated to and/or planned to use these results in years to come independent of JDP support.

CAF noted that with high levels of turnover in MCAs, with 80% of the members "going home" after the 2022 election, the cycle of supporting MCAs started again as the "knowledge goes." CAF developed some ways of managing these issues (discussed below).

Partners noted that policies put into legislation that successfully passed through county executives and CAs as sustainable; however as one interviewee put it, in some cases, these the development process of those policies did not come to a conclusion. So I may not categorically speak about how impactful it has been since the bills have not been

completed. So they've not been implemented. So, there are still bills within the some within the still at the executive. Some are at the county assemblies

Did the project incorporate adequate exit strategies and capacity development measures to ensure sustainability of results over time?

JDP approaches focused on working with strong national partners with mandates in devolution as well as capacity building for national and local partners and beneficiaries in order to have sustainable results; this was fundamental to the ProDoc. National and local partners, while identifying how they have domesticated, extended, and/or continue to use JDP supported products and capacity, nevertheless sought to have a new JDP phase to continue to support and extend these results and overcome their own limitations based on scarce resources and extensive service delivery needs. UN agency staff interviewed expected to have a successor UN support project for the JDP developed to support devolution from 2024 and thus have not focused on an exit strategy.

Some partner programming was thought to be particularly sustainable; for example, SOCAT support for products, capacity building, and networking for the professional staff of county assemblies was considered sustainable as staff reportedly stay in their positions for sustained periods of time using these products and capacity. Legislation, once passed, was also sustainable.

Other partner programming had inherent sustainability challenges. Working with MCAs was important towards understanding, developing, and passing key legislation at the county level, such as on disaster risk management. Elections of course may not have incumbent MCAs run for or be re-elected. In these cases, the knowledge and experience invested in these MCAs leaves their CAs. Some county assemblies reportedly turned over completely, with no MCAs from the 2nd CA going on to serve in the 3rd CA elected in 2022. This turnover can leave draft legislation unfinalized or impede taking a draft to debate and potential approval. UN agencies and partners had to redo programming with newly elected MCAs towards bill passage in many counties. CAF noted working with the CA technical staff “for sustainability purposes” to help manage this problem.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP’s strategy of working with strong national partners supports sustainability as has support for the development and use of policies, legislation, and capacity in county-level governments/assemblies.

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

Agency staff and PIU staff noted that the JDP strategy of working with the key institutions in devolution – who have made substantial progress in capacity building and now have extensive experience from the first decade of devolution – has set conditions and used mechanisms to institutionalize ownership of JDP-supported results and their sustainability at the national and county levels. Partners interviewed noted that JDP support helped further institutionalise their processes and develop products that they expected would be used beyond the JDP

implementation period (such as the CIDP III). This included expectations that monitoring support from the JDP used for assessing CIDP II implementation would carry over to be used to monitor CIDP III implementation in the future. Increasing own-source revenues for counties was noted by CRA interviewees as sustainable, as counties are motivated to control revenues when possible.

Knowledge management by the JDP was not seen in interviews as strong or coherent, which inhibited sustainability. JDP products and learning are not apparently available in a single repository; interviews with partners noted that they did not know how to find project-supported templates and products that are expected to be used after the JDP.

The evaluation concludes that sustainability is supported by national and local partners that will continue this work, but that JDP supported products are not readily accessible for future use in a consolidated fashion to support sustainability.

Have strong partnerships been built with key stakeholders throughout the project cycle that would enhance sustainability?

UN agency staff interviewed noted that they have strong relationships with JDP partners from the JDP, other programming, and commitments to shared organisational goals. The JDP worked with national-level partners that have key roles in devolution. These national partners also noted in interviews that the value their relationships with UN partners. These national partners need and have relationships with county authorities that are elected to the executive and assemblies as well as with civil servants/CA staff. The JDP, through its support for partner activities, has furthered the partnerships that these organizations (such as CAF or the CoG) have with county authorities in important ways that support sustainability/ County level interviewees noted that they use and will continue use support and products from these partners for their development after the close of the JDP.

The evaluation concludes that UN agencies, including through the JDP, have partnerships with key national organisations for devolution that have been furthered through the JDP design and implementation.

Has institutional capacity development and strengthening of national systems been done through the JDP to enhance sustainability?

JDP has worked with strong, national partners. Some national partners noted systems strengthening as a component of their work with the JDP or a result of work with the JDP. For example, the NYC noted that it valued the project management capacity building that accompanied working with UNDP in the JDP.

The evaluation concludes that some strengthening of national systems of partners was supported by the JDP.

MANAGEMENT AND MONITORING

How effectively have UN agencies managed and monitored the JDP?

Management and monitoring assesses the leadership and oversight of projects and interventions.

The PIU managed UNDP partners, UNICEF managed UNICEF partners, and UN Women managed UN Women partners in the JDP. PIU management brought the agency managers together for JDP meetings monthly to update each other and report to the PIU.

Monitoring has been done through UN agencies and then through the PIU and the M&E specialist. In addition, the JDP has organized and done joint monitoring missions that brought UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women staff out together to counties to monitor JDP implementation. Planned joint monitoring missions for Tana River and Garissa counties were conducted in May 2023 and an earlier remote mission was done for Busia during COVID. A third in-person monitoring mission was done to Turkana. Interviews noted that the high-level character of these joint monitoring missions, with donors, UN agency leaders, and high-level participation of government and key partners was both a positive for visibility but a negative in that monitoring was conflated with promotion and stayed at a high level. Some UN staff noted that these missions were “not really monitoring” but focused on donor visibility. Donors, some UN agency staff, and some partner staff noted that joint monitoring at the technical level was needed towards supporting management, results reporting, and the integration of activities across the JDP. Donors were concerned about the high costs of the high-level joint monitoring visits, that required so much staffing and logistics by each UN agency and partner and bemoaned a lack of efficiencies in these missions which they felt showcased how UN agencies did not work together towards efficiencies by minimizing costs through ways of working jointly.

To what extent were JDP indicators and targets relevant, realistic, and measurable?

The PIU, once an M&E specialist was on board, revised the indicators from the ProDoc towards making sub-output indicators more measurable, and has measured these sub-output indicators since that time. Targets were not changed. These indicators and targets have been used in the assessment of effectiveness above (see Table 1). The evaluation concludes these sub-output indicators and targets were realistic and measurable, as they were measured and met (see Table 1 above, based on the 2023 biannual report).

The JDP did change outcome indicators and measures in the development of the results monitoring framework in 2020; this development did not set any targets for these two outcome measures or set and set measurements for the outputs themselves (only for the sub-outputs under them). The JDP has not measured or reported on the outcome indicators. This lacuna makes it difficult to assess programme impact, and whether these original or revised outcomes were realistic. PIU interviews reported developing plans to measure the RMF outcome indicators, but did not systematically follow through to do so. The “Proportion of population satisfied with their last experience of public services” would have required a public opinion poll in the 14 counties for a baseline and endline, but was not undertaken, reportedly since there was less budget for the JDP than anticipated. “Primary government expenditures as a proportion of

original approved budget, by County Government sector” could be tracked and reported on but was not done regularly.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP not using outcome indicators and targets impedes understanding impact of the JDP.

How were risks and assumptions addressed in the project design?

The ProDoc explicitly outlined the assumptions behind the JDP and developed a risk log that identified risks to JDP implementation and achievement. The PIU has reported on this risk log in its reports to donors. PIU interviews and UN agency interviews did not note making changes in the JDP due to risks. The programme does not appear to have made substantial adjustments to activities and implementation that was reported in documents based on identified risks.

The evaluation concludes that risks were considered in JDP design, but not used systematically for management in implementation.

Was the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different partners well defined, facilitated in the achievement of results, and respected during implementation?

The ProDoc intentionally did not specify which UN agency was to do what within the JDP. UN interviews noted that this decision was made to stress that the JDP was a joint programme. JDP Reporting continued this tradition. This practice makes it difficult to understand who is responsible for what and which UN agency partnered with which partners in activities and outputs (particularly when some partners partnered with more than one UN agency in the JDP). Some partners did have more than one UN agency partner for different activities in the JDP which further confuses issues of which UN agency is responsible for and managing towards what activities and outputs. Reports from particular activities were branded by UN Agency and partner which clarified relationships; however these internal reports were not shared widely. The comparative advantages of UN agencies however were well understood by partners and beneficiaries, who understood and expected that UNICEF would focus on children, UN Women on women and girls, and UNDP on governance. County civil servants interviewed and CA staff also understood what partners specialized on and worked on in the JDP.

The evaluation concludes that while joint programming had some effects that masked which UN agency did what activities in the JDP, programme partners understood the UN agency responsibilities – and beneficiaries at the county level understood which partners delivered what support.

CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES/SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS

To what extent were cross-cutting issues reflected in programming?

UNDP uses SES Social and environmental standards (SES) to have evaluations cover key programming principles of: Leave No One Behind, Human Rights, Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, Sustainability and Resilience, and Accountability.

The JDP was developed and implemented with a focus on the rights of citizens, women and gender equality, and children's rights. The design and implementation have recognized that the marginalised counties that are the focus of the JDP face social and environmental risks and hazards that also need to be assessed and managed.

How and how much has the JDP supported human rights?

The JDP was designed to and has emphasized expanding citizen participation and devolution towards increased and more equitable service delivery, which are fundamental human rights. PIU, UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women interviewees noted using a HRBA was what led to the focus in the JDP on reaching the marginalized counties and marginalized groups (women, children PWDs, and members of vulnerable groups) within them. The JDP's focus on marginalization was mainstreamed into the programme; the HRBA was thus mainstreamed, PIU and UN agency staff noted. Some partners explicitly noted that they focus on human rights, and used the JDP towards their missions in human rights (such as FIDA Kenya). Some UN women supported activities focused on SGBV to combat this rights violation.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP design and implementation took a HRBA.

How and how much has the JDP supported gender equality

The JDP was designed to further GE and has emphasized gender equality in implementation through a mainstreaming approach and through UN Women's mandate on women's rights and gender equality which focused JDP programming on GEWE. UN Women partners through the JDP supported oversight and implementation of legislation and policies at the county level on GEWE and gender budgeting to increase knowledge of how much of the budget focuses on GEWE and to increase this allocation. UN women has also strengthened the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) to provide gender-relevant data. CSO partners in counties such as ADSOK engaged on important mainstreaming work for GE in public participation in budgeting/planning and focused on key issues that impede GE, such as SGBV. CA clerks reported using CA staff to be gender champions to work with female MCAs once nominated and in place. Staff trained by SOCATT were able to empower these new MCAs to work within the CA, including towards passage of key women's priorities (e.g. a gender-based violence bill in Wajir). Capacitating and empowering nominated women's MCAs was also cited as leading to some of these women being elected MCAs in the 2022 election in counties where women had not won elected seats in the first or second CA like Wajir. UN Women through the JDP supported important public participation and social accountability work with FIDA Kenya and TICH which lead to some communities submitting memorandums to their counties' leadership to activate stalled community projects. Some of the issues raised were then addressed by county governments, such as the completion a maternity ward in Busia and a water project in Marsbit. Documents and interviews noted numerous examples of how more representation for women, CA bills on women, gender-based budgeting, and oversight by women MCAs led to budgetary spending that benefitted women and girls (e.g. sanitary kids from budget resources in Wajir). The JDP trained directors in charge of planning and gender from 13 counties on gender-responsive budgeting,

and gender and public participation officers on public participation for gender transformation and inclusion.

Interviewees still sought more capacity development for women legislators. This was sometimes particularly emphasized as needed for nominated members, who some noted were not taken as seriously as elected MCAs. These nominated women MCAs particularly needed advocacy and negotiation training to boost their skills and effectiveness in this context.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP has supported GE through a wide variety of initiatives. The JDP has supported GEWE to a substantial extent through the mainstreaming approach and through focused UN women and partner activities and outputs on GEWE.

Was there an effort to produce sex-disaggregated data and indicators to assess progress in gender equity and equality?

JDP supported the production of budget briefs that provided gender data in ways that could be and were used by county-level officials and stakeholders. JDP efforts to improve the production of sex-disaggregated data were noted by county interviewees. UN Women and the CoG produced data through the publication “Impact of Devolution on Women and Girls” which documents the impact of devolution on women and girls in selected sectors across the 14 counties where the JDP has focused. UN Women support for KNBS also worked towards better data on gender. KNBS produced a poverty report with sex-disaggregated data with JDP support. Progress in gender-based budgeting through JDP assistance is important progress towards gender statistics at the county level. Interviews with CSOs and county officials noted ways that JDP training, support, and products had led to better information on budgets reaching women and men and county-led processes that created space for women and men to participate in discussions on budget priorities. JDP support funded the CRA review of County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF) operational guidelines to better address gender equity and inclusion.

The most recent JDP report included as a lesson learned/recommendation that:

Lack of disaggregated data to effectively guide gender responsive planning and budgeting including resource allocation. There is need to develop capacity of counties to collect, archive and disseminate disaggregated data for evidence-based planning, budgeting and implementation.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP made efforts to produce sex-disaggregated data to assess progress in gender equality from the recognition that these data are essential to work towards GEWE.

To what extent was special attention given to women’s empowerment?

UN women’s mandate is women’s empowerment; UN Women and its partners focused on GE and women’s empowerment through data, support for processes and tools, and policy/plan development. UN Toolkit for County Assemblies to build their capacity to integrate gender into policies. The JDP supported the development and use of the Gender Responsive County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF) Training Tool to help counties integrate gender dimensions in the third generation County Integrated Development Plans (CIDP III). The programme also supported the

development of the County Assemblies Gender Responsive Oversight Checklist (GROC). Youth centre work from UNDP and its partners made sure to target young women as well as young men in Tana River and Isiolo, with close to gender equality reported for beneficiaries in the semi-annual JDP report for 2023 (p. 9).

The evaluation concludes that the JDP paid special attention to women's empowerment in design and implementation.

How and how much has the JDP supported children's rights?

UNICEF's mandate is children's rights. UNICEF and partners dedicated work in the JDP to developing a children's policy for counties. Under the JDP, they also supported public participation meetings on these policies in counties, working towards revising and validating childrens' policies to be taken to CAs for approval. Some interviews with county civil servants found them optimistic that for their county, having a children's policy will enable more donor investment in this area as the policy will provide a framework that they can link activities to. Other civil servants at the county level noted examples of counties choosing to use their own budget funds to build public day cares to benefit children and women (Busia) as demonstrating the results of the JDP focus on children.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP supported children's rights in design and implementation.

How and how much has the JDP been attentive to social and environmental impacts and risks?

The JDP was designed to focus on counties with specific social and environmental challenges, particularly ASAL counties. Disaster management was an explicit focus of the JDP towards helping counties manage their risks. Then the JDP was implemented during an exceptional drought in much of the ASAL counties. This emergency shaped disaster response efforts, including those of the JDP. The drought also diverted attention and resources towards emergency response from counties that the JDP had to manage while focusing on devolution. Interviewees from UN agencies and some partners noted that some county counterparts were focused on drought and county budgets were driven by drought response, which made it harder for the JDP to work with county partners on broader programme goals.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP was attentive to social and environmental impacts and risks in the design and in implementation, particularly in support for disaster management.

To what extent were social and environmental impacts and risks managed and monitored in accordance with the project document and relevant action plans?

The programme conducted a social and environmental assessment in compliance with UN requirements. Programme reports did include data on monitoring risks and sometimes modified the risk log. The ProDoc and work plan documents did not extensively consider risks. There was not evidence in interviews that risks were managed in a structured way and led to adjustments other than with COVID and the planned disaster response work of the JDP.

The evaluation concludes that social and environmental impacts and risks were monitored per UN requirements and managed in the cases of COVID-19 and through a planned and implemented outputs focused on disaster risk management.

To what extent were unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances assessed and managed, including by updating relevant management plans?

JDP support for data management and technology (with training) was recognized by UN agency staff and partners interviewed as important and effective, as was work on CDIP II M&E and CIDP III development. These processes brought in social and environmental issues as planned. Unanticipated social and environmental issues were not identified in the evaluation's fieldwork.

One unmet technology need was identified and seen as unanticipated by some partner interviewees. Some partners and stakeholders noted the need for redundant back up capacity to store data, but that support from JDP did not fund back up systems (which some interviewees noted should also be backed up). This led these partners to solicit GoK support for back up, which they are still waiting for.

The evaluation concludes that the JDP planned for social and environmental issues to be incorporated into plans and technology, leaving only the lack of support for back-up technology as an unanticipated issue identified in the evaluation.

6. LESSONS LEARNED

What are the main lessons learned from the JDP?

Interviews solicited lessons learned from JDP from PIU staff, UN agency staff, national and local partners, and beneficiaries, and are triangulated with project reported lessons. Additional lessons are drawn from the analysis of findings.

As UN agencies develop and implement joint programming, UN agencies face reputational concerns as expectations about joint programming may differ from and exceed plans and modalities.

Expectations management may especially be challenging in devolution, as devolution has come to mean many different things to many different stakeholders in Kenya. While the JDP design clearly relied on national implementing partners to reach counties, many stakeholders came around to ideas that the JDP should implement in a decentralized manner somewhat at odds with actual practice. And expectations of stakeholders about the extent of jointness were seldom met – and also seldom qualified and explained by UN agencies. UN agencies need their leaderships to engage actively in joint programme management, particularly in resource mobilization. The lead agency needs to take and maintain programme leadership for the whole period of programme implementation.

A wide-ranging joint programme with many different partners within it needs stronger coordination and communication to ensure effective and efficient implementation.

The JDP identified this lesson in its 2022 report, which then drew the conclusion that “Future support to devolution should delineate clear guidelines on how PUNOs work together, share information and leverage each other’s comparative advantages to maximize impact” (p. 48).

A wide-ranging joint programme with many different partners within it needs to develop and use systematic ways to communicate and learn through dedicated, sustainable knowledge management platforms.

JDP coherence, effectiveness, and efficiency would be furthered by more integrated, sustained ways to bring the knowledge and products of the programme together for UN agencies, partners, and stakeholders as the programme is being implemented. Better communication and knowledge management that endure after programme completion are needed to support impact and sustainability. Programme processes, products and results need to be kept together in usable, searchable form to be living documents that can continue to be used to support devolution after the JDP.

Programmes can and should also use templates and cases as good methods to extend programme benefits.

JDP evidence suggests that UN agencies and partners can support horizontal exchanges to spread programme effects in Kenya. Learning across counties was seen as effective by stakeholders and beneficiaries who appreciated opportunities to learn from the work of other counties and templates/cases to operationalize this learning for their contexts.

Peer learning, local leaders, and champions works to support social change.

Partners, including CSO partners, stressed the importance of working with local leaders towards social change, as social norms, cultures and traditions are powerful in counties – and to reach the people working through these gatekeepers was an effective way to build allies and disseminate information. Champions can be effective in advancing agendas. Gaining commitments from a few key MCAs can carry the day and advance policies in counties. Partners can effectively target key MCAs towards policy successes. CSOs stressed that civil servants also needed to be brought along as key allies, for example on gender. And this Peer learning supports adaptation of what works well in some counties to other counties.

Policy and plan development support from needs sustained effort to get policies passed, known by stakeholders, and implemented.

JDP support has led to the preparation and passage of many different policies and plans. Policies and plans need stakeholder advocacy to make sure they are adopted, not remain only drafts. And then documents and interviews noted that these policies need to be implemented. As the 2023 semi-annual JDP report noted, “policy development should be accompanied by effective implementation strategies to achieve the desired change” (p. 42).

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

As there remain many unmet needs in devolution at the national and local levels that the UN could contribute to addressing, the UN should consider developing a successor programme to enable UN agencies to leverage their strengths and support Kenyan development through devolution.

UN agencies have tremendous strengths that can benefit Kenya through devolution. National partners and county level beneficiaries recognize unmet needs in developing devolution and seek additional support towards follow through on many areas where devolution has made substantial progress, for example on M&E for the improved CIDP 3s to support implementation.

If a strategy to work directly with targeted counties is chosen in successor efforts to support devolution, the programme should fund and manage a single UN and/or partner staff person at the county level who would be responsible at a minimum for coordinating, implementing, monitoring, and reporting on joint initiatives.

Note that this is a contingent recommendation, based on how targeted any future programme is on particular counties. If a strategy different to the current one of working through national partners to reach a substantial number of counties is chosen, then a single UN or partner staff person should be identified, placed, and supported to support the programme in a comprehensive way at the county level. UN agencies should consider potentially further empowering this position and whether there are ways to make this staff responsible for and empowered to manage initiatives by all programme partners in the county.

UN agencies should manage joint programmes like the JDP intentionally towards jointness.

Project design, management, and monitoring should be structured and operate in a joint fashion, not within single agencies and through a PIU with staff from and in a single agency. UN agencies should consider how to establish programme management that is distinct from and apart from any single UN agency in the development, implementation, and learning from joint programme.

UN management needs mechanisms to bring senior agency managers across agencies together towards the higher-level management tasks of joint programmes like the JDP.

The UN needs ways to bring the Agency leaders engaged in a joint programme to actively collaborate at their level on joint programmes. Agency head or deputy head leadership is needed particularly for engaging with high-level government partners and to engage development partners for resource mobilization in a joint manner. JP visibility within the UN at the country level among top Agency managers could be increased by giving each JP a standing spot and a few minutes on the agenda of regular RC-led interagency meetings. Agency leaders also need to regularly communicate on joint programming as well as agency programming to partners and stakeholders.

Programmes should remain flexible and develop and implement targeted activities as needed to strengthen the capacity and engagement of key national government, county government and CSO partners.

UN programs should retain the flexibility to adapt plans as needed to meet evolving needs, including those of key partners (such as with the transition from the Ministry of Devolution to

the SDD). This institutional change was not accompanied by JDP change to engage with the IP to see whether and if changes were needed (and feasible within the JDP scope, budget and timeframe) within the JDP.

UN joint programming should develop, and support sustained, unified ways for gathering and disseminating information and learning from programming.

JDP processes and the results of the programme are described and shared in a wide variety of ways that do not make a unified picture accessible or stay visible for a long period of time. Ways to disseminate joint programme-supported learning and products need to be strengthened to extend learning and model better, more inclusive devolved practices at the county-level more widely to additional counties beyond the 14 counties where the JDP has focused as well as for other national partners and stakeholders in devolution.

Joint programming should focus on and report stronger evidence for programme impact through the outcome level in addition to output measurements.

JDP output indicators and reporting towards their achievement in quarterly, semi-annual, and annual reports focus on output achievements and meeting numerical targets. This fails to carry through the sense of change partners and stakeholders articulate that devolution and JDP support is bringing to the counties and the broader progress in devolution in Kenya that JDP and other support has contributing to in recent years (e.g. dramatic drops in child stunting with devolution).

The JDP should develop and report on selected indicators for the outputs and outcomes to assess impact in its final report.

Although the JDP cannot report with survey data as originally planned, the programme can use and report on other aggregate data and analyze these data as part of assessing the broader impacts associated with the JDP. Measures such as budget absorption by county governments (as proposed in the original results framework in the ProDoc) could be used to look at change and the variation across JDP supported (and other) counties. This and other measures, including the second outcome measurement in the RMF (Primary government expenditures as a proportion of original approved budget, by County Government sector), could be done towards assessing impact.

Multi-year programmes with large numbers of implementing partners should consider developing, using, and repeating processes and practices that support coherence and more effective and efficient implementation within and across partners.

Capacity of partners varies, and knowledge of other partners and the broader programme strategy within partners varies as well. UN agencies of course are not responsible for these issues. However, UN programmes could bring together partners in structured ways to encourage them to have stronger internal practices to support their effective and efficient implementation of activities (towards ways to integrate new staff into programme implementation for example) and support partner understanding of the larger UN goals and work of other partners within the programme. Well-structured all partner annual meetings could help in this regard. Mechanisms that recognize and award examples of strong partner procedures and processes can encourage their emulation by other partners. And awards could explicitly recognize and incentivize learning

and partnerships across partner organizations (recognizing that partners are sometimes in competition with each other, including for funding).

ANNEX 1: EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE



TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)
CONSOLIDATING GAINS AND DEEPENING DEVOLUTION IN KENYA
Joint Devolution Programme (JDP) Terminal Evaluation

TERMS OF REFERENCE
Individual Consultant

SUMMARY TABLE

1. Evaluation Information	
Programme Unit	Kenya
Project Title	Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya Programme (To be shortened to <i>"To be shortened to Joint Devolution Project [JDP]"</i>)
Project Category	Governance
Consultancy Title	Terminal Evaluation of the Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya Programme
Location	Nairobi, Kenya
Application Deadline	20th June 2023 (Mid Night-Nairobi Time)
Type of Contract	Individual Contractor (International)
Language Required	English
Start Date	3 rd July 2023
Expected Duration of Assignment	35 Days (spread across 2 months)

1. Background and Context

1.1. Introduction

Kenya's devolved system of governance, which was instituted with the creation of 47 counties in 2013, offers great promise towards addressing issues related to marginalization, equity, accountability, environment and climate change. The first five years of devolution (2013-17) provided for the rapid and effective establishment of the county governments, including capacity development, policy and legislation to support the devolved structures and functions. This was followed by the second phase (2018 – 22), which focused on the strengthening of institutional and human capacity at national and county levels to address these social, accountability, and environmental issues.

Human development since the advent of devolution has significantly improved. The improvement has been uneven across counties, with the vastly arid and semi-arid northern frontier counties lagging. Poverty rates remain above 80% in these remote, arid and sparsely populated counties where poverty levels adversely affect women, children, marginalized communities and other vulnerable groups. To address the urgent human development challenges of the most marginalized, UNDP, UN Women and UNICEF developed the Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya Programme (Joint UNDP-UN Women-UNICEF Devolution Programme - JDP) to target 14¹ of the most marginalized counties directly. The programme has supported the 14 counties to develop and implement policies, plans and strategies that address equity, inclusivity, accountability and environmental issues while at the same time streamlining systems, revenue collection and budgeting processes.

The programme is implemented by National, intergovernmental, County Government partners and non-state actors through a national implementation modality (NIM). Some of the partners include the State Department for Devolution (SDD), which is the main implementing partner, the State Department for Gender Affairs, The National Treasury, the Council of Governors (CoG), Kenya School of Government (KSG), the County Assemblies Forum (CAF), The Society of Clerks at the Table (SOCATT), Commission on Revenue Allocation, Office of the Auditor General (OAG), Office of the Controller of Budget (OCOB), National Youth Service (NYS), Directorate of Children Services, Kenya Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (KIPPRA), International Budget Partnership Kenya Services and Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS).

The programme is founded on the realization that devolution and marginalization are complex issues that are best addressed through a joint programme combining the strengths of multiple UN agencies, national government stakeholders and county government institutions with expertise in key sectors and lead roles in the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals. The Joint programming was also a recommendation by the mid-term evaluation of the Strengthening Devolved Governance in Kenya project and the midterm and terminal evaluations of the Integrated Support Programme to the Devolution Process in Kenya project.

1.2. Project Outcomes and Outputs

1.2.1. UNDAF/UNSDCF Outcomes

This project was aligned with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) support to the Government of Kenya (GoK) in line with the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2018-2022 Strategic Result Area on Transformative Governance. It was aligned with UNDAF Outcome 1.2, which stated that “by 2022 people in Kenya access high-quality services at the devolved level that are well-coordinated, integrated, transparent, equitably resourced and

¹ Busia, Garissa, Isiolo, Kajiado, Kilifi, Mandera, Marsabit, Narok, Samburu, West Pokot, Tana River, Turkana, Wajir, West Pokot

accountable". It is currently anchored in the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) 2022-2026 under Outcome 1.1, which states that "By 2026, people in Kenya at risk of being left behind, particularly in the arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL) counties, informal urban settlements, all women and girls, all children and youth – inhabit an inclusive, enabling, socially cohesive, and peaceful society where human rights are upheld, benefit from accountable institutions, participate in transformative governance systems that are gender-responsive, and uphold the rule of law". It is aligned with Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 1, 5, 10, 13, 16 and 17.

1.2.2. Alignment to Country Programme Documents (CPD)/Strategic Notes of PUNOs

Alignment to UNDP CPD

The project contributed to UNDP Kenya CPD (2018-2022) outcome 1, which states, "by 2022, people in Kenya access high-quality services at devolved level that are well coordinated, integrated, transparent, equitably resourced and accountable". The Project is aligned and contributes to 4 CPD outputs: 1.1: Government has strengthened policy, legal and institutional mechanisms for coordinated, inclusive and effective service delivery; 1.2: Public finance management institutions have strengthened processes and systems for equitable, efficient and accountable service delivery; 1.3: County-level institutions have strengthened capacity for evidence-based planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for accountable service delivery; 1.4: People in Kenya have capacity to engage, deepen accountability and transparency in devolution, especially women, youth and persons with disability. In the CPD 2022-2026, the project contributes to 1 CPD outcome 1: By 2026, people in Kenya at risk of being left behind – particularly in the arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL) counties, informal urban settlements, all women and girls, all children and youth – inhabit an inclusive, enabling, socially cohesive, and peaceful society where human rights are upheld, benefit from accountable institutions, participate in transformative governance systems that are gender-responsive, and uphold the rule of law. The project contributes to Output 1.3 in the UNDP Kenya CPD 2022-26: Enhanced capacity and governance of duty bearers to support public delivery of basic services at national and devolved levels.

Alignment to UN Women's SN 2019-2022 and 2023-2026:

The Joint Devolution Programme is aligned with the UN Women SN 2019-2022 Result Area 1: Women in Leadership and Decision Making and responds to Outcome 1.2 on Increased budgetary allocation for GEWE at the national and county level. The program ensures capacities and systems of targeted institutions for inclusive planning and budgeting are enhanced and expertise of national institutions is utilized to integrate gender in public financial management systems, to strengthen social accountability and enable county and national level monitoring and reporting on GEWE commitments. The JDP also aligns to the SN 2023-2026 SP Impact area 1: Governance & Participation in Public Life and responds to Outcome 1: Inclusive governance and gender-responsive peace and security. The programme focuses its contribution on strengthening systems for financing gender equality, public participation in governance and accountability for gender-responsive service delivery.

Alignment with UNICEF CPD

The UN Joint devolution programme is aligned with UNICEF Country Programme goal area 4. This seeks to ensure that by 2026, National and select county government entities will have increased capacities for child-inclusive policy formulation, planning and budgeting for better delivery of social sector services. Additionally, By 2026, national and select county government entities will have strengthened capacities to measure, monitor and use data to reduce multi-dimensional child poverty and ensure the realization of children's rights.

2. Terminal Evaluation Purpose, Scope, and Objectives

2.1. Purpose

The terminal evaluation (TE) will provide an overall assessment of progress and achievements made against planned results, as well as assess and document challenges and lessons learnt since the commencement of the project. This evaluation takes place just about a year after the conclusion of a mid-term evaluation. Both midterm and terminal evaluations are mandatory for projects with a planned budget or actual expenditure of more than US\$ 5 million. The evaluation findings will establish if the envisaged results have been achieved or not, whether there were unintended outcomes, document lessons learned and provide recommendations. The TE will establish the extent to which the project has applied the key recommendations from the mid-term evaluation. The information generated from this evaluation will contribute to organizational learning as well as generate knowledge for development effectiveness social inclusion, gender equality and women empowerment in the implementation of Kenya's devolved system of government.

2.2. Scope of the terminal evaluation

The terminal evaluation will be conducted in close collaboration with partner agencies, UN Women and UNICEF and implementing partners² and responsible parties³ both at the national and county level, and development partners. The evaluation will cover the project period from September 2019 to September 2023. The TE will be guided by UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Standards and Guidelines for Evaluations, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC), UNDP Programming and Operational Policies and Procedures (POPP). The terminal evaluation will be conducted in all the counties covered by the project and at the national level. The TE will be conducted within the framework of the UNDP Project Quality Criteria, which includes i) strategic ii) relevant iii) social and environmental standards (SES), iv) management and monitoring v) efficient vi) effective and vii) sustainability and national ownership. While the results will be generalised, the evaluation team will conduct sampling and identify at least 7 counties for field visits. This guidance is to aid the bidding by making it fairly. The counties of focus

² State Department for Devolution is the implementing partner (IP)

³ All other implementing organizations are responsible parties (RPs)

are Busia, Garissa, Isiolo, Kajiado, Kilifi, Mandera, Marsabit, Narok, Samburu, West Pokot, Tana River, Turkana, Wajir, West Pokot. For the purposes of this TOR, the following guidance is provided.

Region	Counties	Proposed sample for a physical visit
Western Kenya	Busia	1
Coastal region	Lamu, Kilifi, Tana River	2
North and North Eastern Kenya	Marsabit, Isiolo, Mandera, Wajir, Garissa	2
Rift Valley	Narok, Kajiado, Turkana, Samburu, West Pokot	2

2.3 Objectives of the Terminal Evaluation

The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project goals have been achieved, the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the project, including the extent to which cross-cutting issues (human rights, youth, gender, PWDs, SDGs, ASALs) have been mainstreamed. The evaluation will also assess the mechanisms put in place to enhance coordination and harmonization between JDP Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs), Implementing Partners, and state and non-state actors.

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Assess the Theory of Change to establish the alignment with the goals, outcomes, or problems addressed in the project and reflect on and learn from evidence and experience to inform adaptation, innovation, and improvement in subsequent projects of similar nature.
- Review the relevance of the project to the country context, including the national and sub-national development priorities.
- Establish the effectiveness of the project, including the attributability of results to the project. Review if there were areas of work that required strategies to be adjusted during implementation and with what effect.
- Assess efficiency in the utilization of programme resources, including cost-effectiveness and value for money, while balancing with social dimensions, including gender equity, environmental sustainability, social inclusion and human rights.
- Assess value add and the advantage of the use of the joint programming modality in realizing programme goals and strategic objectives of participating UN organizations (PUNOS).
- Review the extent to which the principles of LNOB were incorporated into the project implementation. These include women and girls; children and youth; people living in ASALs; people living in urban informal settlements, human rights, HIV/Aids and People Living with Disabilities (PWDs).

- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future, catalyse beneficial development effects in the targeted counties (i.e., improved governance, quality service delivery that is integrated and equitably resourced etc.).
- Document lessons learnt, best practices, challenges, and future opportunities, and provide recommendations for improvements or adjustments in strategy, design and/or implementation arrangements.
- Assess the sustainability of the programme and the overall UN support for devolution.

2. Terminal Evaluation Criteria and Review Questions

The following UNDP project quality criteria will be guiding the TE: strategy, relevance, social and environmental sustainability, management and monitoring, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and national ownership. In addition, the TE will explore the 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.

3.1. Strategic:

- Assess the extent to which JDP programming priorities and results contributed to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); were aligned to United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and United Nations Sustainable Development Framework (UNSDCF), UNDP Kenya CPDs, UN Women Strategic Notes and UNICEF Kenya Strategic Plans.
- Assess the extent to which the project proactively took advantage of new opportunities, adapting its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities.

3.2. Relevance:

- To what extent were the interventions consistent with the needs of the Ips? Was the project designed in line with the priorities set in UNDAF/UNSDCF, UNDP Kenya CPDs, UN Women Strategic Notes, UNICEF Country Programme Documents, MTP III/MTP IV, County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs), and other national and sub-national policy frameworks?
- Did the project design promote ownership and participation by the national and county partners
- To what extent was the project able to respond to changes in the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries?
- Were the stated project objectives consistent with the requirements of UN programming principles the requirements of most vulnerable populations?
- How relevant and appropriate was the project to the devolved levels of government?
- Did the programme regularly capture, and review knowledge and lessons learned to inform redesign, adapt, change or scale-up plans and actions?
- The extent to which the programme responded to changes in the needs and priorities of the IPs and RPs.

3.2. Effectiveness: The extent to which project results are being achieved.

- To what extent did the programme contribute to improving the quality of governance and socio-economic development in Kenya?
- What is the degree of achievement of the planned immediate and intermediate results of the programme?
- To what extent have the annual work plans (2020, 2021, 2022, 2023– up to September) contributed to the effective implementation of the programme?
- To what extent have partnerships and strategic alliances with national partners, county governments, development partners, civil society and other external support agencies contributed to the achievement of programme outcomes?
- What are some of the emerging successful programming/business models or cases, especially from county programming, and how would they be scaled up during the remaining programme period?
- Did the programme contribute to or deliver any unintended programme results, either positive or negative?
- To what extent was the programme theory of change being realized?
- To what extent did the PUNOs exploit their field presence and relationship with the county and national governments to improve county governance capacity?

3.4. Efficiency: Is the implementation mechanism the most cost-effective way of delivering this project?

- Were the financial resources mobilized used in the most efficient way to reach the results?
- Are there any apparent cost-minimizing strategies that were encouraged, and not compromised the social dimension of human rights, gender, youth, and People Living with Disabilities?
- How efficiently were resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) converted to results, including value for money?
- 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)?
- Have the UN agencies demonstrated Delivering as One (DaO) principle in this project? If yes, how has this been done, and does it respond to project results?

3.5. Sustainability and National Ownership: The extent to which these implementation mechanisms can be sustained over time

- Assessment of extent of sustainability of the project results thus far.
- Did the project incorporate adequate exit strategies and capacity development measures to ensure sustainability of results over time?
- Are conditions and mechanisms in place so that the benefits of the project interventions are sustained and owned by IPs at the national and sub-national levels after the project has ended?
- Have strong partnerships been built with key stakeholders throughout the project cycle that would enhance sustainability?

- Have institutional capacity development and strengthening of national systems been built to enhance sustainability?

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

- To what extent were the indicators and targets relevant, realistic, and measurable?
- To what extent and in what ways were risks and assumptions addressed in the project design?
- Was the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different partners well defined, facilitated in the achievement of results and have the arrangements been respected during implementation?
- To what extent and in what ways were the concepts of cross-cutting issues, especially gender reflected in programming? Was there an effort to produce sex-disaggregated data and indicators to assess progress in gender equity and equality? To what extent and how was special attention given to women empowerment?

3.7. Social and Environmental Standards

- To what extent were social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender, and environment) managed and monitored in accordance with the project document and relevant action plans?
- To what extent did unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances assessed and managed, with relevant management plans updated?

3.8. Impact: To the extent possible, assess the impact of the project on devolution especially on the understanding of the citizenry and their participation in the devolution process

- Are there any major changes in the indicators and/or the context of devolved governance that can reasonably be attributed to or associated with the project? What were the most significant changes?
- What lasting high-level results (impacts) has the project contributed to?
- To what extent has the project led to the strengthening of devolved institutions regarding empowerment, management, effectiveness, accountability, transparency, and efficiency in service delivery?

4. Methodology

The evaluation will be an external, independent, and participatory exercise to be completed within a timeframe of 35 days spread over a period of 2 months beginning in July 2023. The evaluation will be commissioned and managed by UNDP, according to UNDP Evaluation Guidelines⁴. Both qualitative and quantitative approaches will be employed to ensure that findings are derived from a collective contribution from the target counties and the national institutions. The consultant will be expected to define an appropriate methodology to respond to the above criteria. The technical proposal should provide specific approaches/methodology to

⁴ <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/>

achieve the objectives of the planned evaluation, including assessing the project indicators. The selected consultant will provide a refined methodology during the inception stage of the evaluation. Based on UNDP guidelines for evaluations and in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, the consultant shall develop a suitable methodology for this evaluation.

5. Terminal Evaluation Deliverables

The deliverables for this review will include the following documents:

- The inception report: The inception report should detail the consultant's 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. It will also detail how each of the project indicators will be measured. The consultant will be provided with the UNDP inception report format for use.
- First Evaluation Draft Report
- Draft Evaluation Report, which will be presented to stakeholders.
- Presentation of findings to stakeholders (Validation Forum).
- Final Evaluation Report. The report will follow the UNDP evaluation report format to be provided to the consultants.
- A comprehensive Audit Trail detailing how the consultant has responded to the feedback provided by the stakeholders.
- A PowerPoint presentation containing the main findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation for dissemination and debriefing purposes.
- Electronic version of data collected, and data sets analysed.

6. Responsibilities of the consultant

6.1. Responsibilities of the Consultant

The consultant will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of all deliverables, including the final evaluation report to the Evaluation Manager. Specifically, the consultant will perform the following tasks:

- Work closely with the Evaluation Manager on all TE-related issues and ensure that the TE process is as participatory as possible.
- Conducting briefing and debriefing; and facilitating productive working relationships with UNDP, PUNOs, IPs and RPs.
- Conducting data collection, synthesis analysis and triangulation.
- Drafting of the inception report, draft evaluation report and final evaluation report while ensuring the quality of the same.
- Submitting the evaluation deliverables in a timely manner and in accordance with the agreed proposed TE plan.
- Prepare and make presentations of evaluation results to various stakeholders as shall be organised by the evaluation manager.
- Prepare a comprehensive audit trail detailing how the consultant has responded to the feedback provided by the stakeholders.

6.2. Qualifications and Competencies of the Consultant

The consultant should have the following qualifications, skills and competencies:

- Possess a master’s degree in social sciences, development studies, project management, Monitoring and Evaluation(M&E), strategic management, international development or other relevant disciplines.
- Have a minimum of 10 years of increasingly responsible professional experience in project/programme evaluation, and must have evaluated projects/programmes in governance, decentralization, social protection, gender and disaster management sector.
- Demonstrated expertise in evaluating and programming in relation to cross-cutting issues particularly concerning gender, youth, children, disability, environment, and human rights, among others.
- Familiarity with UNDP and UN operations will be an advantage.
- Previous experience in working with devolved governance structures is an asset.

6.3 Technical Evaluation Criteria

S. No	Description of Criteria	Max Obtainable Points
Consultant’s Suitability Assessment for the Assignment		
2	At least 10 years of increasingly responsible professional in project/programme evaluation, and must have evaluated projects/programmes in governance, social protection, gender and disaster management sector. (10 years experience – 15 points; 12-15 years experience = 20 points; Over 15 years of experience =25 points)	20
3	Demonstrated expertise in evaluating and programming in relation to diversion and inclusion particularly concerning gender, children, youth, children, disability, environment, and human rights, among others. (None – 0 points Combination of up to 3 areas -8 points; up to 5 areas – 12 points, more than 5 areas – 15 points)	15
4	Previous experience in decentralization and local governance (minimal experience – 5 points, substantial experience – 10 marks)	10
5	Familiarity with UNDP and UN operations as regards evaluations.	5
6	Technical proposal (Missing TP – 0 points; some aspects of the TP acceptable - 10 points; at least half of the proposed methodology acceptable – 25points; sound methodology 40 points; sound methodology and all other sections of the TP well populated – 50 points)	50
Total		100

7. Evaluation Ethics

Evaluations in UNDP are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the evaluation policy of UNDP and United Nations Evaluation Group (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.

The consultant will observe the following:

1. To avoid conflict of interest and undue pressure, evaluators must be independent; 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 soon. Evaluators

must have no vested interest and full freedom to conduct their evaluative work impartially without potential negative effects on their career development. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner.

2. Evaluators should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual participants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect anyone'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 during 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.

For details on the ethics and independence in evaluation, please see the Evaluation Policy of UNDP (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.shtml>);

UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Norms for Evaluation in the UN System

(http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21).

8. Implementation Arrangements

The consultant will be reporting directly to a designated UNDP Evaluation Manager. The consultant will work in close collaboration with the Evaluation Manager in the day-to-day operations of the evaluation.

9. Time Frame and Duration of Work

The evaluation shall be conducted for a period of 35 days spread over a period of 2 months starting on 20 June 2023. The table below shows a tentative timeframe and key milestones for the consultancy process.

Phases	Description of Activities	Responsible persons	Time
Phase I: <i>Inception</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Inception Report development and submission • Input to the Inception Report by the project stakeholders (<i>review of study plan, protocol, analytical framework etc</i>) • Presentation of the Inception Report to the stakeholders • Final Inception Report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant • Evaluation Manager 	5 days
Phase II: <i>Data Collection & Analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of the evaluation work plan for data collection in the respective focus areas • Utilization of a multiple-method approach for data collection that includes, at a minimum: document review, focus group discussions and individual interviews and project/field visits. • Data analysis 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant • Evaluation Manager 	13 days
Phase III: <i>Report Writing and Feedback</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The drafting and presentation of the initial draft and more refined evaluation report. • Validation forum for key stakeholders • Final report incorporating inputs from key stakeholders • Complete the Audit Trail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultant • Evaluation Manager • Project Manager 	15 days
Phase IV: <i>Dissemination</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dissemination meetings • Management response to key recommendations of the final evaluation report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation Team • Evaluation Manager • Project Manager 	2 days

9. Consultancy Fees

The consultant will be recruited and paid in accordance with UNDP terms and conditions of remuneration for consultants (including the cost of data collection). The consultant should quote inclusive of travel and DSA to the various target counties, logistical and other related expenses. The payments to the consultant will be pegged on the attainment of certain milestones as per the agreed Work Schedule within a working period of 35 days spread over 2 months. The consultant's fees will be paid in line with the following schedule and upon acceptance of key deliverables:

- Final Inception Report: 20%
- Draft Evaluation Report: 40%
- Final Evaluation Report: 40%

ANNEX 2: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

UN Documents

United Nations Country Team Kenya, United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework (UNSDCF) 2022 – 2026. Nairobi: United Nations, 2022

GoK and United Nations. United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Kenya 2018-2022: Final Evaluation Report. Nairobi: United Nations, January 2022.

United Nations Country Team Kenya. Kenya United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2018-2022. Nairobi: United Nations, 2018.

United Nations Country Team Kenya, UN Common Country Analysis for Kenya.

United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). Quality Checklist for Evaluation TOR and Inception Report. New York: UNEG, June 2010. <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/608>

UNEG. Norms and Standards for Evaluation. New York: UNEG, June 2016. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/1914>

UNEG. Handbook for Integrating Human Rights and Gender Perspectives in Evaluations. New York: UNEG, August 2014. <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/1616>

UNEG. Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports. New York: UNEG, June 2010. <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/608>

UNDP Documents

UNDP Strategic Plan. 2018-2021. New York: UNDP, October 2017. <https://undocs.org/DP/2017/38>

Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Kenya. May 2022.

IEO UNDP. Independent Country Programme Evaluation: Kenya - Annexes. May 2022.

Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Population Fund and the United Nations Office for Project Services. Country Programme Document for Kenya (2022-2026). 19 April 2022.

Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Population Fund and the United Nations Office for Project Services. Country Programme Document for Kenya (2018-2022). 29 March 2018.

UNDP. United Nations Development Programme Social and Environmental Standards (New York: UNDP, 2021). <https://www.undp.org/publications/undp-social-and-environmental-standards#>

UNICEF Documents

United Nations Children’s Fund. 20 April 2022. Country programme document: Kenya.

https://www.unicef.org/executiveboard/media/10721/file/2022-PL16-Kenya_CPD-EN-ODS.pdf

United Nations Children’s Fund. 2018. Country programme document: Kenya.

<https://sites.unicef.org/about/execboard/files/2018-PL4-Kenya-CPD-ODS-EN.pdf>

UNICEF. 2017. Situation Analysis: Children and Women in Kenya.

<https://www.unicef.org/kenya/reports/situation-analysis-children-and-women-kenya-2017>

UN Women Documents

UN Women. Kenya Country Office, Strategic Note Narrative (2023-2026).

https://africa.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/2023-04/FINAL_SN%20popular%20version_3003_edited%20brochure%20version_030422_ONLINE%20VERSION.pdf

UN Women. UN Women Strategic Note 2019-2022, Kenya Country Office, SN Report 2022.

https://resources.unwomen.org/iati/2022/KEN_DRF_SN_Report.docx

JDP Documents

Joint Programme Document, July 2019.

GoK, UN Women, UNICEF, UNDP. Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya, January 1 – March 31, 2023 Quarterly Progress Report.

UNDP. n.d.. Devolution and The United Nations Development Programme in Kenya: From Conception to Inception and Beyond.

Management response, MTE Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya.

<https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/12480?tab=management-response>

UNDP. Kenya & Devolution: History, Opportunities and Challenges for Development Programming - Briefing for the Embassy of Sweden, Nairobi, Kenya, April 7, 2022.

GoK, UN Women, UNICEF, UNDP. Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya, 2022 Annual Report.

GoK, UN Women, UNICEF, UNDP. Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya Project, Project Number: 00122363 2021 Quarterly Progress Report: July 1 – September 30, 2021

UN Women, UNICEF, UNDP. Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya, Programme Bi-Annual Progress Report, January 1 – June 30, 2021

UNICEF, UN Women, UNDP. May 2021. UN Joint Devolution Programme Factsheet

UNICEF, UN Women, UNDP. 2021. Ugatuzi Brief Volume 5.

UN Women, UNICEF, UNDP. Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya, Programme Quarterly Progress Report January 1 – March 31, 2021

UN Women, UNICEF, UNDP. Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya, UNDP, UN Women, UNICEF. Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya, Programme Annual Progress Report January 1 – December 31, 2020

UNDP-UN Women-UNICEF Joint Programme, Programme Progress Report, January 1 – September 30, 2020

GoK and UN Kenya. Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya (UNDP/UNICEF-UN Women Joint Devolution Programme Response to the COVID-19 Crisis) - April – September 2020; Activity Progress Update – August 2020

UN Kenya. Strengthening Devolved Governance in Kenya, Project Number: 112294, Quarter 1 Report January to March 2020/

GoK and UN Kenya. 2019. Joint Programme Document - Programme Title: Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya.

Joint Programme Outcome (UNDAF Outcome 2): By 2022 people in Kenya access high quality services at devolved level that are well coordinated, integrated, transparent, equitably resourced and accountable.

Integrated Support Project to the Devolution Process in Kenya and Strengthened Devolved Governance in the FCDC Counties, Project Numbers: 00083473 & 00112294, 2019 Annual Report

UNDP. 2017. Ugatuzi Brief Volume 4.

UNDP. 2016. Ugatuzi Brief Volume 3.

Partner-produced documents

Commission on Revenue Allocation and Council of Governors. N.D. County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF): CBEF Effectiveness Tool.

Benard M. Muchoki. September 2022. Report on Post Adoption Implementation Assessment of the Gender Policy: Kilifi County Assembly, Tana River County Assembly, Busia County Assembly – Submitted to CAF. UN Women.

Expertise Global Consulting. 2022. COBMIS update meeting.

Federation of Women Lawyers and UN Women. n.d. Mipango Ya Kaunti Na Mwendo Wa Bajeti [County plans and Budget motions]

Federation of Women Lawyers and UN Women. n.d. Tunawezaje Kupata/Kupata Taarifa Zabajeti? [How Can We Get Information or Get Financial Information?]

SOCATT. November 2022. Gender Checklist of County CIDP Plans.

SOCATT. n.d. Gender Analysis Toolkit for County Assemblies in Kenya.

SOCATT. 2022. County Assemblies Gender Responsive Oversight Checklist.

UN Women and CAF. November 2021. Model County Assembly Gender Policy. Revised Nov.2021

UN Women and CoG. n.d. Assessment of implementation of County Public Participation and Access to Information with a Gender Perspective: Experiences from 14 Select Counties.

UN Women and COG. n.d. Model County Assembly Gender Policy Domesticated in Tana River, Kilifi and Busia Counties,

CAF, Garissa County Assembly, and UN Women. n.d. Draft Garissa County Assembly Gender Policy.

CAF, Kajiado County Assembly, and UN Women. n.d. Draft Kajiado County Assembly Gender.

CAF, Mandera County Assembly, and UN Women. n.d. Draft Mandera County Assembly Gender Policy.

CAF, Samburu County Assembly, and UN Women. n.d. Draft Samburu County Assembly Gender Policy.

CAF and UN Women. 2022. Turkana County Assembly Gender Policy.

UN Women and COG. n.d. Gender, Youth, Culture, Sports and Social Services Induction Manual.

UN Women and CRA. April 2021. Gender Responsive County Budget Economic Forum Training Tool.

CRA and UN Women. November 2021. Tana River County Government Own-Source Revenue Administration Assessment Report.

UN Women and COG. 2022. Assessment of the Impact of Devolution on Women and Girls Report.

Evelyne Atingu, 2021. Report on Content Consultation of Model County Assembly Gender Policy in Samburu: Submitted to CAF.

Evelyne Atingu, 2021. Report on Content Consultation of Model County Assembly Gender Policy in Mandera: Submitted to CAF.

Evelyne Atingu, 2021. Report on Content Consultation of Model County Assembly Gender Policy in Kajiado: Submitted to CAF.

Evelyne Atingu, 2021. Report on Content Consultation of Model County Assembly Gender Policy in Garissa: Submitted to CAF.

ANNEX 3: LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

PIU

Mary Njoroge, Programme Manager
James Wagala, M&E
Tim Colby, former Devolution Advisor

UNDP

Madelena Monoja, Deputy Resident Representative
Dan Juma, Team Leader – Governance and Inclusive Growth
Ann-Christine Dellnas, Senior Governance Advisor

UNICEF

Shaheen Nilofer, Representative
Ana Gabriela Guerrero Serdan, Chief of Social Policy
Robert Simiyu, Social Policy and Economic Specialist

UN Women

Lucy Mathenge, Team Leader, Democratic Governance
Anna Mutavati, Country Representative

JDP Partners, National Level

Maurice Ogala, Head policy and research, State Department for Devolution (SDD)
GK Ngongo, Advisor to PS, SDD
Peter Akwalu, Project officer, SDD
Charles Mupecha, M&E, SDD
Rhoda Wahuia, M&E, SDD
Lonah Losem, County Assemblies Forum
Regina Mutheu, Executive Director, Society of Clerks at the Table
Antony Mugambi, Society of Clerks at the Table
Michael Musyoka, Kenya National Bureau of Statistics
Roble Said Nuno, Commission on Revenue Allocation
Joshua Laichena, Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis
Eldah Onsomu, Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis
Julliet, Head of Research and policy, National Youth Council (NYC)
Victor , legal department, NYC
Isaac, aid to disabilities champion, NYC
Ilay, senior accountant, NYC
Elvis, Finance and accounts, NYC
Alfred Makonjio Makabira, Advocates for Social Change Kenya (ADSOCK)
Diana M. Watila, FIDA Kenya
Stephen Masha, Office of the Controller of Budget

Bosco Okumu, Monitoring and Evaluation Department
Alex N. Riithi, National Treasury-Budget Department
Jackline Miginde, Council of Governors
Ken Oluoch, Council of Governors
Selly Yagan, Commission on Revenue Allocation
Bilha Njeri, Intergovernmental Relations Technical Committee
Gordon Muga, National Disaster Operations Centre
Diana M Watila, FIDA Kenya
Benjamin Kahindi, Safe Community Youth Initiative (Kilifi)
Mohamed Turane Abdirahman, ALDEF
Davis Wafula, APAD-Turkana
Abraham Rugo, International Budget Partnership Kenya
Aden Abdi Awle, SUPKEM -Garissa
Linus Nthigai, InterReligious Council of Kenya
Faith Chelagat, Tropical Institute for Community Health
Alfred Makonjio Makabira, ADSOCK (Advocates for Social Change Kenya)

County level

Narok

Paul Kisotu, M&E Officer, M&E Unit, Finance and Economic Planning
Siololo Nkaket, Planning Statistician, Finance and Economic Planning
Sheikh Ali Juma, Chair, Inter-religious Council
Ramadan Shaaban, Youth leader, Inter-religious Council
Caleb Simonyan, Secretary general, Narok Youth Council

Lamu

Kasim, Chief Officer, Public Service Management, Devolution, Public Participation, and Disaster Risk Management
Andrew Waeru, Director, Planning and budgeting
Fatma Bwanahiri, Public participation officer
Shee Kupi, Director, Devolution and Disaster Risk management
Chief Officer, Medical Services
Dr. Omar Abdulkadir, Medical Superintendent, Lamu Hospital
Moses Maina, Kiunga Youth Bunge

Kilifi

Charles Otieno, UNICEF
Kelvin Mutuku, UNDP
Abel Mwandonga, Director, Economic Planning, Nicholas Kiama, Economist, Economic Planning
Felix Wanje, Human Resources
Benjamin Kahindi, Safe Community Youth Initiative

Jasinta Mbeyu, National Youth Council
Nicholas Kiamba, Economist - Finance/Economic Planning
Muyanga Victoria, County statistician - Finance/Economic planning

Busia

Wangui Karanja, UNICEF
Korir Kelong, Director of Finance and Economic Planning
Andrew Werambo, County Statistician
Douglas Barasa, Director, ECD
Charles Juma, Director Youth
Esther Wasige, County Coordinator Department of Children's Services
Salome Munyendo, Project Officer, USAID
Innocent Omboko, County Attorney
Maureen Ogombe, Legal Counsel, County Assembly
Beatrice Nakhole, CEC, Early Childhood Development and Education
Hon. Harrison Nyongesa, Assembly Committee Chair, Transport, Public Works and Disaster Management Committee
Ekisa Osere, Director Special Programs
Levis Ochok, Disaster Management Officer
Wicliffe Miyungi, Disaster Management Officer
Peter Sirima, WASH Coordinator, Public Health
Francis Namunja, Executive Director, Community Empowerment and Development Center

Wajir

Mohamed, UNICEF
Mohamed Turane Abdirahman, ALDEF
Abdi Abdille, Chief Officer, Economic Planning and Budgeting
Ibrahim Hassan, CDPHs
Ibrahim Maalim, CPHO
Mohamed Ibrahim, CHROI
Safia Abdi, CRHC
Oliver Kamar, NSO
Shalle Sheikh, County Clerk
Ibrahim Abdi, Deputy Clerk
Ikuu, Youth Officer, Youth Department

Turkana

Wilson Kisiero, UNICEF
Nelson Lolosi, UNICEF
Jackson Mutie, UNICEF
James Kanyuku, Assistant Director in Charge of Children Services
Idoka Hebrew, Deputy Director

William Ikamar, County Liaison Officer, County Assembly Services Board
Kakalel David Austin, Senior Youth Department Officer
Hellen Emojo, Acting Director, Youth and Gender
Francis Lokwar, Director of Economic Planning
Davis Wafula, APAD

Isiolo

Mohammad Gololcha, UNDP
Diba Abduba, Chief Officer, Youth
Gabriel Lekalkuli, Chief Officer - Economic Planning
Aileen Kajuju, CECM
Focus Group Discussion with 19 Youth beneficiaries (9 Female)

Tana River

Maurice Osano, Director, Human Resources/Chief of Staff
Abbas Kunyo, education, vocational training, youth and sports culture, gender and social services
Amani Bawata, Assistant Director M&E, Department of Finance and Economic Planning

Donors

Valdemar Holmgren, Embassy of Sweden
Anu Ala-Rantala, Embassy of Finland

ANNEX 4: EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

INTRODUCTION AND INFORMED CONSENT

The introduction and consent note was used to introduce the evaluators, the terminal evaluation, and methods to participants in the evaluation to gather the explicit consent of people with participating in the evaluation. The evaluators recited or summarized the following to all prospective interviewees and obtained their explicit oral consent to participate in the evaluation under these conditions.

Introduction and Informed Consent

Thank you for talking with me today.

My name is Lawrence Robertson/Thomas Nyagah. I am working independently for the United Nations to conduct an evaluation of the work conducted by the UNDP, UNICEF, and UN Women and their partners through the Joint Devolution Programme.

The goal of the evaluation is to learn from what has been accomplished through the programme, what has worked well, and what has not worked as well. Lessons from this evaluation will be used to help the UN and its partners in future work on devolution in Kenya and around the world.

The information collected today will only be used for the evaluation. I will not use this information in a way that identifies you as an individual in the report.

I would also like to clarify that this interview is entirely voluntary and that you have the right to withdraw from interview at any point without consequence.

I hope to learn from you from your knowledge and experience with the Joint Devolution programme and its activities. Are you willing to participate in this study? [Ensure that participant(s) verbally agree to participate]

Do you have any questions for me before I begin with a short list of questions to ask to learn about the ways that you and your organisation have worked with the JDP?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

[NOTE THAT NOT ALL QUESTIONS WERE ASKED TO IN ALL INTERVIEWS; INTERVIEWS FOCUSED ON THE AREAS AND QUESTIONS MOST RELEVANT TO INFORMANT'S KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE WITH THE JDP]

To what extent has the JDP been strategic for UN agencies, its main partners, and stakeholders?

To what extent have JDP programming priorities and results contributed to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); were aligned to United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and United Nations Sustainable Development Framework (UNSDCF), UNDP Kenya CPDs, UN Women Strategic Notes and UNICEF Kenya Strategic Plans.

To what extent has the project proactively taken advantage of new opportunities, adapting its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities?

To what extent has the JDP been relevant for UN agencies, its main partners, and stakeholders?

To what extent were the interventions consistent with the needs of the IPs?

Was the project designed in line with the priorities set in UNDAF/UNSDCF, UNDP Kenya CPDs, UN Women Strategic Notes, UNICEF Country Programme Documents, MTP III/MTP IV, County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs), and other national and sub-national policy frameworks?

To what extent was the project able to respond to changes in the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries?

Were the stated project objectives consistent with the requirements of UN programming principles the requirements of most vulnerable populations?

How relevant and appropriate was the project to the devolved levels of government?

Did the programme regularly capture, and review knowledge and lessons learned to inform redesign, adapt, change or scale-up plans and actions?

To what extent did the programme respond to changes in the needs and priorities of the IP and RPs?

To what extent has JDP implementation been coherent for UN agencies, its main partners, and stakeholders?

Did the project design promote ownership and participation by the national and county partners?

To what extent has the JDP been implemented effectively?

To what extent did the programme contribute to improving the quality of governance and socio-economic development in Kenya?

What is the degree of achievement of the planned immediate and intermediate results of the programme?

To what extent have the annual work plans (2020, 2021, 2022, 2023– up to September) contributed to the effective implementation of the programme?

To what extent have partnerships and strategic alliances with national partners, county governments, development partners, civil society and other external support agencies contributed to the achievement of programme outcomes?

What are some of the emerging successful programming/business models or cases, especially from county programming, and how would they be scaled up during the remaining programme period?

Did the programme contribute to or deliver any unintended programme results, either positive or negative?

To what extent was the programme theory of change used and realized?

To what extent did the PUNOs exploit their field presence and relationship with the county and national governments to improve county governance capacity?

To what extent has the JDP been implemented efficiently?

Were and how were the financial resources mobilized used in efficient way to reach results?

Were any cost-minimizing strategies apparent, used, and encouraged, without compromising the social dimension of human rights, gender, youth, and People Living with Disabilities?

How efficiently were resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) converted to results?

How and how was value for money taken into consideration?

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

Have, how have, and how have results been affected by UN agencies Delivering as One (DaO)?

What have the main impacts of the JDP been to date?

What have been the main impacts of the project on citizens' understanding and participation in devolution?

Are there any major changes in devolution that can reasonably be attributed to or associated with the project?

To what extent has the project strengthened devolved institutions to support empowerment, management, effectiveness, accountability, transparency, and efficiency in service delivery?

To what extent are the results of the JDP to date sustainable?

Did the project incorporate adequate exit strategies and capacity development measures to ensure sustainability of results over time?

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

Have strong partnerships been built with key stakeholders throughout the project cycle that would enhance sustainability?

Has institutional capacity development and strengthening of national systems been done through the JDP to enhance sustainability?

How effectively have UN agencies managed and monitored the JDP?

To what extent were JDP indicators and targets relevant, realistic, and measurable?

How were risks and assumptions addressed in the project design?

Was the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different partners well defined, facilitated in the achievement of results, and respected during implementation?

To what extent were cross-cutting issues reflected in programming?

How and how much has the JDP supported human rights?

How and how much has the JDP supported gender equality

Was there an effort to produce sex-disaggregated data and indicators to assess progress in gender equity and equality?

To what extent was special attention given to women's empowerment?

How and how much has the JDP worked with youth?

How and how much has the JDP supported children’s rights?

To what extent were social and environmental impacts and risks managed and monitored in accordance with the project document and relevant action plans?

To what extent were unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances assessed and managed, including by updating relevant management plans?

What are the main lessons learned from the JDP?

What is recommended for future UN Programming to support devolution?