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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADC</td>
<td>Agricultural Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARV</td>
<td>Antiretroviral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASDS</td>
<td>Agricultural Sector Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASMEP</td>
<td>Assistance to Micro and Small Enterprise Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAACH</td>
<td>Business Alliance Against Chronic Hunger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAF</td>
<td>Business Advocacy Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDS</td>
<td>Business Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMO</td>
<td>Business Member Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAP</td>
<td>Country Programme Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>Community Based Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBOs</td>
<td>Community Service Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Country Programme Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTU</td>
<td>Central Organization of Trade Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIDA</td>
<td>Danish International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBSC</td>
<td>District Business Solution Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCU</td>
<td>Donor Coordination Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPRETEC</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPC</td>
<td>Export Promotion Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERS</td>
<td>Economic Recovery Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>Economic Stimulus Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>Focused Group Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FKE</td>
<td>Federation of Kenya Employers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIM</td>
<td>Growing Inclusive Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immune Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information, Communication and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDC</td>
<td>Industrial Development Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAD</td>
<td>International Fund for Agricultural Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMD</td>
<td>Inclusive Market Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Investment Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAM</td>
<td>Kenya Association of Manufacturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARI</td>
<td>Kenya Agricultural Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KDHS</td>
<td>Kenya Demographic Health Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIA</td>
<td>Kenya Investment Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIBT</td>
<td>Kenya Institute of Business Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRDI</td>
<td>Kenya Industrial Research and Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIPPRA</td>
<td>Kenya Institute of Public Policy Research and Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNYDT</td>
<td>Kenya National Youth Development and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYEP</td>
<td>Kenya Youth Employment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOPND</td>
<td>Ministry of Planning, National Development and Vision 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSME</td>
<td>Micro Small and Medium Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSE</td>
<td>National Council for Small Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NESC</td>
<td>National Economic and Social Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSP</td>
<td>National Seed Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVOP</td>
<td>One Village One Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWG</td>
<td>Outcome Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Public Private Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDS</td>
<td>Private Sector Development Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSDG</td>
<td>Private Sector Donor Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEZ</td>
<td>Special Economic Zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEs</td>
<td>Small and Medium Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST&amp;I</td>
<td>Science, Technology and Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities and Threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPs</td>
<td>Trade-Related aspects of Intellectual Property Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCTAD</td>
<td>United Nations Conference on Trade and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDAF</td>
<td>United Nations Development Assistance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCA</td>
<td>Value Chain Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEP</td>
<td>Women Enterprise Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YERP</td>
<td>Youth Empowerment Regional Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPs</td>
<td>Youth Polytechnics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

1. This is a report of the evaluation of the Kenya Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) Outcome 44 - Policies and programmes for private sector development and employment creation developed and implemented by 2013. This is one of the outcomes of CPAP 2009-2013, which was developed to operationalize UNDP’s Country Programme Document (CPD). CPD represents the intended UNDP contributions to the goals and outcomes of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for the period 2009-2013. The current UNDAF was expected to end in December, 2013 but has now been extended to June 2014. CPAP outcome 44 was to be achieved through UNDP’s interventions as well as other players. Therefore, during 2009-2012, UNDP developed and implemented eight (8) programmes and projects, to contribute towards the realization of the outcome.

2. The purpose, utility, focus, key areas and methodology of the evaluation were as follows:

   - The purpose of this evaluation was to enable UNDP to take stock of its work, contributions and influence in support to the realization of CPAP outcome 44.
   - The evaluation was appropriate because it was done when current UNDP programmes and projects relevant to CPAP Outcome 44 are coming to an end. It was expected that the results would help in better programming for the next cycle.
   - The evaluation focused on assessing; how UNDP’s interventions contributed to the achievements of the CPAP Outcome 44; the relevance of the interventions in contributing to the attainment of the outcome; and the relevance of this outcome and how it contributed to the achievement of the UNDAF outcome 3.1 Economic growth, equitable livelihood opportunities and food security for the vulnerable groups enhanced and sustained.
   - The evaluation has covered the following five key areas - outcome analysis; output analysis; linkages between CPAP and UNDAF outcomes; partnership analysis and recommendations.
   - The evaluation methodology consisted of the following - participation in consultative meetings with UNDP to prepare inception report; review of the relevant documents; preparation of the data collection tools/instruments; collection, analysis, collation and synthesis of data; production of field reports; and production of drafts and comprehensive reports.

KEY FINDINGS

Outcome Analysis

3. The outcome analysis assessed the following five evaluation foci related to CPAP outcome 44: – relevance, effectiveness, contribution of UNDP, underlying factors and sustainability. The evaluation came up with the following findings:

   - Finding 1 – Relevancy: The selected CPAP outcome 44, was and is still relevant in the context of the development and poverty reduction issues in Kenya.
Finding 2 – Effectiveness: The CPAP outcome 44 has been partially achieved. Policies and programmes for private sector development, employment creation and public-private partnerships have been developed and implemented. Out of the 10 outcome indicators evaluated, only 60% have been fully realized.

Finding 3 – Contribution of UNDP: UNDP’s on-going projects significantly contributed to the realization of the CPAP outcome 44. The projects were also effective and relevant. However, going forward, some of the outcome indicators will need to be reviewed and consequently some of the projects will not be relevant.

Finding 4 – Underlying factors: There were underlying factors that contributed positively or negatively to the realization of the outcome. These factors are grouped under three categories: programmes initiated by the Kenyan government and developing partners; factors beyond UNDP’s control; as well as factors within the control of UNDP.

Finding 5 – Sustainability: Not all the outcomes realized through UNDP projects are sustainable and replicable. Outcomes realized through the District Business Solution Centers (DBSC), Donor Coordinating Unit (DCU), National Economic and Social Council (NESC) and Kenya National Youth Development and Training (KNYDT) are sustainable, whereas only outcomes realized through DBSC, Agribusiness II, KNYDT, Youth Empowerment Programme (YERP), and Promoting Women in Business and Investment (PWBI) are replicable.

Output Analysis

4. The output analysis assessed the following six evaluation foci related to UNDP outputs: – relevance, effectiveness, underlying factors, stakeholders involvement, private sector dialogue and areas of future contribution. The evaluation came up with the following findings:

Finding 6: Relevance – All the UNDP’s outputs (apart from one) are still relevant to the achievement of the outcome.

Finding 7: Effectiveness – Minimum progress has been made towards attaining the outputs. Out of the eight outputs, only three have been fully attained whereas five are partially attained. However, the outputs achieved have contributed towards the realization of the outcome.

Finding 8: Underlying factors – There were positive and negative factors that affected the accomplishment of the outputs. The positive factors included: signing and implementation of the peace accord; formation of the reconciliation groups in the Post-Election Violence (PEV) areas; commitment of the government in ensuring security in the PEV areas; high demand for Business Development Services (BDS); establishment of National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES), establishment of department of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) as well as active roles of NESC, Office of the President (OP), Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) and Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA). The negative factors included slow resettling of IDPs, slow legislative process, limited funding, limited human resources, delay in procurement and installation of capital equipment, cases of duplications, weak NIMES and inadequate and promotion of pro-poor programmes.

Finding 9: Stakeholders involvement – UNDP has addressed poverty reduction issues through formulation of pro-poor programmes that lead to enhancing income, creating employment opportunity, identifying market for products, capacity building for skills and development as well as creation of partnership. The stakeholders have been actively involved in this either as implementers or beneficiaries.
Finding 10: Engagement in private sector dialogue – UNDP has given support to private sector dialogue at national level with key partners but has limited ability to engage in coordination of these activities nationally. National coordination is currently done by the office of the prime minister which includes the ministry of planning, national development and vision 2030.

Finding 11: Areas of future contribution – UNDP can contribute to the following areas to improve on the achievement of the outcome: create strong outcome working groups that includes government work departments to monitor and evaluate outcome and impacts in real time; improvement in the mobilization of resources and more capacity building covering a wide area and discipline.

Linkages of CPAP outcome with UNDAF outcome

5. The linkage analysis assessed the relevance of CPAP outcomes, outputs, targets and indicators as well as programmes and projects to UNDAF outcome 3.1. - Economic growth, equitable livelihood opportunities and food security for the vulnerable groups enhanced and sustained.

6. Finding 12: – CPAP outcomes, outputs, targets and indicators as well as programmes and projects are relevant to UNDAF outcome 3.1. The two components of CPAP outcome 44 that were evaluated (promoting private sector development and employment creation as well as strengthening the public-private partnership) are relevant and can contribute to the realization of the four components of UNDAF outcome 3.1, particularly component 3.1.2 - business environment productivity and competitiveness of MSMEs improved. Similarly, most of the CPAP outputs are relevant to UNDAF 3.1 particularly component 3.1.2.

Partnership Analysis

7. Finding 13 - The UNDP has worked closely with the Kenya Government in designing and formulating programmes in accordance with the national vision and priorities as outlined in Vision 2030, Medium Term Plan and alignment with MDGs and with the UNDAF priorities and goals. This has been done in order to leverage financial, technical and human resources, UNDP also partners with other UN agencies, development partners (multilateral and bilateral), CSOs, the private sector, diverse institutions and communities/beneficiaries. The partnership strategy is appropriate and relevant but is not effectively implemented.

LESSONS LEARNED, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Lessons learned

8. From the findings of the evaluation, the following three key lessons learned can be highlighted:

- The development, formulation, effective implementation and sustainability of policies require the involvement of and contributions by all key partners especially communities and the government as clearly enunciated in UNDP partnership strategy.

- Capacity building (skills, knowledge, information, mindsets, cheap finance, institutions, new technologies, BDS) was critical to the progress in the achievement of the outcome/impact.
Elaborate bureaucracies can adversely affect delivery of outputs/outcome

Conclusions

9. Conclusion 1 - outcome analysis: The outcome, which is still relevant in the context of the development and poverty issues in Kenya, has been partially achieved through UNDP contributions, the Kenya government and other development partners. However, the following issues may need to be considered going forward;

- That some outcome indicators and targets were not realized and yet they may be important for the outcome in future
- That some outcome indicators will need to be reviewed and consequently some programmes will not be relevant.
- That UNDP may need to reflect on factors within its control that negatively affected the realization of the outcome. These include involvement of key stakeholders in program design, long procurement and disbursement procedures, weak communication and resource mobilization
- That the prospects of sustainability and replication of the outcome is low for most of the projects. This poses great concern.

10. Conclusion 2 - output analysis: Most outputs have been fully or partially achieved. The outputs achieved have contributed towards the realization of the outcome. The outputs relating to trade, investments, productivity and competitiveness, improvements and value chain development and linkages, were not evaluated since they were delivered under outcome 45. Most of the factors that negatively contributed to the attainment of the outputs were beyond the control of the UNDP. Attention will need to be paid to the following:

- Some outputs which were not realized are still important for the outcome in future.
- Capacity building has played a role both in the achievement of outcome and outputs.
- Delays in implementation which in some cases adversely affected delivery of outcomes/outputs were occasioned by long bureaucratic procedures, approvals, disbursements, procurement and staff mobility in UNDP
- There were no effective mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating outcomes and impacts in relation to interventions nationally and at the devolved level in real time.

11. Conclusion 3 – Linkages of CPAP and UNDAF outcomes: Whereas a linkage has been established that the realization of the CPAP outcomes contributes towards the attainment of the UNDAF outcome, the main contribution of CPAP outcome was towards the realization of UNDAF component 3.1.2 – enhancing competitiveness and productivity of MSMEs.

12. Conclusion 4 – Partnership Analysis: UNDP partnership strategy is appropriate and relevant but is not effectively implemented because of lack of firm commitment, tendencies towards independent implementation, lack of enforcement mechanisms and a multiplicity of partnership arrangements. The evaluation concluded that partnerships for the delivery of outcomes can better be galvanized by strong government leadership with the support of UNDP and linkages with the private sectors, Community Service Organizations (CSOs), Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and communities.

Recommendations

13. Recommendation 1: Programme design - Programming has been concerned with alignment to national priorities and goals. It is recommended that programming needs to be
extended to involve stakeholders at lower levels through programmed needs assessment, programme design, formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The increased involvement of the private sector, CSOs, CBOs and communities is highly recommended.

14. **Recommendation 2: Unrealized outcomes/outputs** - Outcome/output which have not been achieved are still relevant and should be included in the next programme cycle e.g. inclusive market development strategy, trade and investment and integrated value chain development and linkages, Business Management Organization BMOs.

15. **Recommendation 3: Sustainability** - Most programmes are soon coming to an end. Sustainability concerns should be addressed by UNDP opening serious dialogues with the government and other implementing partners to include development and operational budgets to take over the programmes. An inventory of sustainability prospects for all programmes should be drawn including the necessary minimum conditions to inform future programming and resource mobilization.

16. **Recommendation 4: Future focus** - In future programming, more funds should be allocated to outcomes leading to wealth creation, improved livelihoods and equity through targeting marginalized groups.

17. **Recommendation 5: Policy completion and implementation** - A number of policies are in various stages of formulation, development, legislations and implementation. Relevant institutions e.g. NESC should be facilitated and strengthened to take the lead in ensuring that policies which are relevant should be fast tracked to implementation stages and their impact monitored and evaluated. This should include structures for monitoring and evaluation of outcomes/impacts within UNCT, UNDP and government (OWG and NIMES).

18. **Recommendation 6: Devolved government** - There is need to more effectively coordinate, harmonize and synchronize government, donors, UN agencies and private sector programmes in keeping with stronger involvement of CSOs, CBOs, the private sector, communities and PPP dialogues at the devolved levels. Strong and effective outcome working groups (OWG) incorporating key partners have to be revived.

19. **Recommendation 7: Capacity building** - Since capacity building has been key to the achievement of the outcome, they should be expanded, devolved and strengthened in the next programming cycle taking into account the devolved government structure.

20. **Recommendation 8: NEX Modality** - The NEX modality of implementation is recommended with modifications to considerably reduce delays occasioned by bureaucracies while not compromising accountability. Consideration should be given to disbursement of funds to programme/project accounts on a quarterly basis based on AWPs specific budget and timelines, procurement plans approved by an effective steering committee, structured internal audits and international accounting principles.

21. **Recommendation 9: UNDP contribution** - UNDP contributions were quantitatively small compared to others but qualitatively useful in attaining national goals. It is noted that nationally, outcome and impact targets may not be fully achieved. It is recommended that UNDP through its unique outreach, expertise, partnership strategy especially South/South partnerships, explores how to effect quantum leaps in economic growth and poverty reduction nationally.
I: INTRODUCTION

Context and Description of the Programme

22. This is a report of the evaluation of the Kenya Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) Outcome 44 - *Policies and programmes for private sector development and employment creation developed and implemented by 2013*.

23. This evaluation is very important to the UNDP and the results are expected to inform and influence the new programme design of the Inclusive Economic Growth and Social Development Unit of UNDP Kenya, which mainly contributed to CPAP outcome 44. The former Poverty Reduction Unit has just completed the preparation of its new strategic framework 2012-2015, and will now work on preparing its new integrated programmes. This review is appropriate because it has been done when most of the projects are coming to an end. It has reviewed UNDP work and outcomes. It is expected that the results will also help in better alignment of indicators for reviewing the outcomes in the next CPAP cycle.

24. The UN has been responding to Kenya’s development challenge since before independence. A number of UN agencies with a wide range of mandates have worked with Kenya in areas of economic, social and political development. The United Nations Development Assistance Framework UNDAF (2009-2013) is the third UNDAF in Kenya; it has been now extended to 30 June 2014. It focuses on the UN System’s response to national priorities and needs in a collective, integrated and coherent manner. The Government of Kenya led the preparation and appraisal of UNDAF, and relevant partners from civil society, bilateral donors and the United Nations participated in the process. Therefore UNDAF (2009-2013) outcomes are the strategic contributions of the UN to Vision 2030 national priorities and reflect the UN system’s response. UNDAF (2009-2013) identifies three priority areas;

a. Improving governance and the realization of human rights

b. Empowering people who are poor and reducing disparities and vulnerabilities

c. Promoting sustainable and equitable economic growth for reduction of poverty and hunger

25. The third priority area mentioned above - sustainable and equitable economic growth - has two UNDAF outcomes (UNDAF Outcome 3.1. and UNDAF Outcome 3.2.). The twin reality of high income poverty and food insecurity in rural Kenya argues for UNDP investment in support of UNDAF outcome 3.1. - *Economic growth, equitable livelihood opportunities and food security for the vulnerable groups enhanced and sustained*. The major outputs from this investments was expected to be: (a) enhanced capacities for negotiating trade agreements; (b) improvement of business development and extension services (c) development of livelihood support systems for the vulnerable groups through assistance to youth and women and vulnerable groups to acquire quality and marketable vocational and entrepreneurship skills and (d) improvement in productivity and value addition of agricultural products. UNDAF Outcome 3.1. has the following two sub-outcomes:

- 3.1.1. Policies and programmes for an inclusive private sector development and employment creation developed and implemented by 2013. This is linked to CPAP outcome 44.
- 3.1.2. Policies and programmes for trade and investment facilitation developed and implemented by 2013. This is linked to CPAP outcome 45.
26. **CPAP Outcome 44**: CPAP (2009-2013) was developed to operationalize UNDP’s Country Programme Document (CPD) (2009-2013). The preparation of the CPD was integrated into the programming process in Kenya, which resulted in an agreed strategy for United Nations cooperation in the country for the period 2009-2012. The CPD represents the intended UNDP contribution to UNDAF goals and outcomes. CPAP outcome 44 has been delivered by UNDP’s programme interventions together with other donors as well as non-government and government programmes. CPAP outcome 44 focuses on three intervention areas (outcome components):

- Promoting private sector development and employment creation;
- Facilitating trade and investment and
- Promoting inclusive effective public private partnerships.

27. CPAP outcome 44 was to be achieved through UNDP’s interventions as well as other players. Table 1 below lists UNDP’s interventions that were required to achieve the outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CPAP outcome 44 component</th>
<th>Contributions of UNDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1 Promoting private sector development and employment creation** | 1. Support the establishment of the National Council for Small Enterprises to facilitate coordination of MSMEs development  
2. Facilitate easy accessibility of vulnerable groups to micro finances, micro insurances, BDS, energy services and new technologies  
3. Facilitate restoration of livelihood initiatives, basic infrastructure and food security in areas affected by post election violence  
4. Coordinate development partners’ support to the implementation of the Kenya’s private sector development strategy  
5. Support the revitalization of vocational and technical training and expansion of entrepreneurship and business skills’ training programmes  
6. Support conducting of needs assessment, diagnostic studies and reviews in order to institutionalize participatory planning to achieve national strategies based on the goals at the sub national level |
| **2 Facilitating trade and investment** | 1. Support building of the national capacity to negotiate and manage global and regional trade and labour agreements  
2. Support productivity improvement, competitiveness, value chain development and linkages, in selected sectors, through the growing of sustainable business initiatives approach and collaboration with development agencies and research institutions |
| **3 Promote inclusive and effective public private partnerships** | 1. Support capacity building of the private sector networks, such as KEPSA, relevant state and other non-state actors in policy formulation, effective monitoring and evaluation  
2. Support the development and implementation of a national policy for the public private partnership  

Table 1: Planned Interventions of UNDP to achieve the outcome

---

1 UNDP delivered this component under CPAP outcome 45. This evaluation focused on CPAP 44
28. **UNDP’s Programmes and Projects**: During 2009-2012, UNDP developed and implemented the following nine (9) programmes and projects, which were aimed at contributing towards the realization of the outcome².
   
   1. Promoting Women in Business and Investment
   2. Youth Employment Regional Programme (YERP)
   4. District Business Solutions Centers (DBSC)
   5. Agribusiness Phase II
   6. Donor Coordination Unit and Private Sector Development
   7. Inclusive Market Development (IDM)
   8. Expanded Business Alliance Against Chronic Hunger (BAACH)
   9. National Economic and Social Council (NESC) project

29. **Level of UNDP Investment**: To implement the above mentioned interventions, UNDP had proposed to invest US$ 12 million during this period.

30. This evaluation is **appropriate** because it has been done when all projects are ending. It has reviewed UNDP work and outcomes. It is expected that the results will help in better alignment of indicators for reviewing the outcomes in the next cycle.

**II: CONTEXT OF THE EVALUATION AND METHODOLOGY**

**Appropriateness, purpose, focus, scope and objectives of the Evaluation**

31. The **purpose** of this evaluation was to enable UNDP to take stock of its work, contributions and influence in support to enhancing private sector development and employment creation.

32. This evaluation **focused** on assessing; how UNDP’s interventions contributed to the achievements of the CPAP Outcome 44; the relevance of the interventions in contributing to the attainment of the outcome; and the relevance of this outcome and how it contributed to the achievement of the UNDAF outcome 3.1.

33. The **Scope** of this outcome evaluation covered the following five key areas³:
   
   a. Outcome Analysis
   b. Output Analysis
   c. Output-Outcome Link
   d. Partnership Analysis
   e. Recommendations

**Evaluation Methodology**

34. The evaluation methodology consisted of the following;
   
   a. Participation in consultative meetings with UNDP to prepare inception report.
   b. Review of the relevant documents.
   c. Preparation of the data collection tools/instruments.
   d. Collection, analysis, collation and synthesis of data.

---

² Brief description of each of these programmes and projects is given in Appendix 1
³ The detailed evaluation questions is give in the evaluation framework in Appendix 2
e. Production of field reports.

f. Production of drafts and comprehensive reports.

35. **The inception phase:** The inception phase took place in August 8-24, 2012. During this period the consultants reviewed existing documents and consulted with key project team in UNDP on the project and the evaluation exercise. This helped to fine-tune the assignment rational, scope, objectives, foci, methodology and schedule. In collaboration with the project team, customized interview protocols were developed and this guided data collection, analysis, and report writing.

36. **Desk Study:** Secondary data was collected through review of documents provided by UNDP, the Government and other stakeholders. The consultants reviewed documents in the public domain including those available on-line. Such reviews helped the consultants to understand in detail the context of the outcome, contributors to the outcome and help answer a number of review questions.

37. **Primary Data Collection:** This consisted of the following:

   a) **Conducting interviews with key informants** – A total of 38 people were interviewed including members of the project team, implementing partners, beneficiaries, donors and civil society. Seven of the respondents also completed questionnaires to complement face to face interviews.

   b) **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)**– Field visit was made to Muranga DBSC. Here FGD was conducted using semi-structured questions with the project implementers and beneficiaries

   c) **Key guiding questions** - At every stage of primary data collection, the consultants strived to ask respondents to reflect on the strategy, management and outcome in the form of a SWOT analysis in order to facilitate the production of a forward looking review report. At other levels, questions were simplified to probe on what has and what has not worked well, with suggested solutions.

38. **Data collection tool:** A general interview protocol was prepared and then customized for the following 4 key stakeholders so that the stakeholders could answer only those questions that were relevant to them;

   a. Customized interview protocol – UNDP Project Management Team
   b. Customized interview protocol – Kenya (Ministries) Programme Coordinators
   c. Customized interview protocol – Programme beneficiaries
   d. Customized interview protocol – Top Government Officials and donors

39. **Data Analysis:** The Consultants used **Descriptive analysis** to understand the programmes delivery strategy and the context in which the outcome were realized and identified challenges and areas of improvements in the design and implementation. **Content analysis** constituted the core of the qualitative analysis. Documents and consultation notes were analyzed to identify common issues, observations, views and trends.

---

4 The documents reviewed during the inception and data collections phases are provided in Appendix 3

5 List and contact details of the people interviewed is provided in Appendix 4
II: KEY FINDINGS

40. The presentation of the findings is organized on the basis of the five evaluation areas (outcome analysis, output analysis, output-outcome link, partnership analysis and recommendations). Each evaluation question is answered directly under the headings of each area and where necessary evidences to support the findings are provided. In each case, the key questions the evaluation sought to answer have been reproduced before the finding, to provide more clarity and ease of understanding.

OUTCOME ANALYSIS

41. Evaluation Questions: On outcome analysis, the evaluation analyzed the following foci:
   
a. Relevancy,
b. Effectiveness,
c. UNDP’s contribution,
d. Underlying factors,
e. Partnership,
f. Sustainability and replicability, and
g. Efficiency.

A: Relevance: Was the outcome selected relevant in the context of the development and poverty reduction issues in Kenya then, now and in near future?

42. Finding 1 – Relevancy: The selected CPAP outcome 44, was and is still relevant in the context of the development and poverty reduction issues in Kenya. This finding is supported by the following evidences, which touches on economic development, employment creation and public-private partnership:
   
a. Economic Development: First is that CPAP (2009-2012) was prepared at a period that followed the post-election violence (2007-2008), which resulted in significant loss of life, burning and looting of businesses and internal displacement. The violence significantly affected businesses operations in the country especially in Rift Valley, Nyanza and Western Provinces. These together with adverse weather experienced during this period, constrained the achievement of the then projected 10% growth by 2012, such that in 2008/2009, the economy grew by 2 %, down from 7 % in 2007/2008. These factors affected the level of poverty, unemployment and the activities of the private sector. CPAP outcome 44, was UNDP’s interventions to reverse this trend\(^6\). Therefore CPAP outcome 44 was no doubt relevant in the context of the Kenyan situation at that time. Secondly, during the period of implementation of the first Medium Term Plan (2008-2012) for Vision 2030, the economy grew steadily as follows: 1.6 % in 2008/09, 2.6 % in 2009/2010 and 5.6 % in 2010/2011 against targets of 6.2 %, 8.3 % and 9.1 %, respectively\(^7\). It is expected that measures targeting improving competitiveness of the private sector and promoting overall productivity of the economy, amongst other interventions, will contribute to achieving the desired growth rate of 10 %. Therefore the

\(^6\) Sources – TOR, CPAP (2008-2012)

promotion of the private sector remains relevant today and in the future economic development of Kenya.

b. Employment creation: Similarly, The MTP (2008-2012) projected the employment opportunities to grow by 8.4% in 2008/09, 8.7% in 2009/2010 and 9.1% in 2010/2011 which would have translated into creating an average of 740,000 new jobs per year over the period so as to combat poverty and inequality. However, only an average of 484,000 jobs was created per year during the period\(^8\). Moving forward, it is clear that employment creation will remain a key and relevant issue to the government of Kenya.

c. Public-Private Partnership (PPP): The PPP was floated by the Planning ministry in 2008 as a feasible strategy for financing capital intensive and long-term development projects under Vision 2030, but had largely remained unimplemented due to lack of a legal framework. According to the National Economic and Social Council (NESC)\(^9\), at least 70 per cent of the budget for Vision 2030 projects has to come from the private sector - made up of both the local and foreign investors. Creating policy and institutional framework for the implementation of the PPP is key to the Kenya Government development agenda. The 47 counties, which have a constitutional guarantee of only 15 per cent of the national budget, are expected to lean heavily on PPPs to fund a range of social services such as water, healthcare and social infrastructure. Today, a public private partnership (PPP) bill and its policy framework have been developed through the coordination of NESC and were approved by the cabinet in December, 2011. Therefore, PPP is a viable investment vehicle and remains relevant for the future development of Kenya.

B: Effectiveness: Has the outcome been achieved or progress made towards its achievement?

43. Finding 2 – Effectiveness: The CPAP outcome 44 has been partially achieved. Policies and programmes for private sector development, employment creation and public-private partnerships have been developed and implemented. Out of the 10 outcome indicators evaluated, only 6 have been fully realized. There have been positive changes in most of these outcome indicators, as discussed here below;

a. Action plan for livelihood intervention: In 2009 there were uncoordinated interventions supporting business recovery in post election areas. It was envisaged that an action plan for livelihood intervention would be put in place. During 2009-2012, two programmes (DBSC and Agribusiness phase 2) were prepared and implemented by UNDP targeting livelihood and business restoration in the affected PEV areas. In addition, the government also came up with a program to resettle Internally Displace Persons (IDPs). Currently, the government has resettled most of the people who were displaced during PEV. These people are now continuing with normal livelihood activities. Therefore, there has been a positive change on this indicator. The evaluation considers this outcome indicator to have been fully realized.

b. Framework for coordination of MSMEs support: In 2009 there was no coordination mechanism to give support to MSMEs. It was envisaged that such a framework would be put in place to coordinate the MSMEs supports. This has been

\(^8\) Source – same as above

\(^9\) Source – same as above
provided in the draft MSMEs bill (2010), which emanates from the sessional paper on MSMEs of 2005, and is currently before parliament. The bill makes provision for an MSME Council for coordination of MSME support, MSMEs Fund and a legal framework for dispute resolution mechanism. This evaluation considers this outcome indicator to have been partially realized.

c. **Projects and interventions responding to the needs of the vulnerable groups:**
In 2009, few programmes/projects were targeting delivery of DBS to vulnerable groups. It was envisaged that more programmes and projects responding to the needs of the vulnerable groups would be in place. Six of the programmes promoted by UNDP during 2009-2012 (DBSC, PWBIK, BMO component of the DCU/PSD Project, IMD and BAACH) were all aimed at providing various BDS services to youth, women and vulnerable groups. In addition programmes by the governments such as Youth Development Funds, Women Development Funds and Constituency Development Fund have contributed to providing financial services to women and youth. The evaluation considers this outcome indicator to have been fully realized.

d. **Coordination of PSDS:** In 2009, there was uncoordinated support of development partners to the implementation of PSDS. An operational donor coordinating unit was required. A Donor Coordination Unit (DCU) has been established within the Private Sector Donor Group (PSDG). The DCU coordinates information among donors supporting the PSD Strategy, discusses PSDG issues needing immediate attention and maintains oversight of the Catalyst Fund. The evaluation considers this outcome indicator to have been fully realized.

e. **Linkages between Training and Industry Needs:** In 2009, there were weak linkages between real industry needs and training supply and missing gender responsiveness to skills and knowledge development. Programmes and projects were required that could; come up with new curricula, link youth polytechnics to TIVET system, train quality standards and assurance officers and promote entrepreneurship. UNDP’s KNYDT programme as well as the Kenya Youth Employment Programme (KYEP) funded by the Spanish Cooperation, have contributed towards this outcome. For example a national policy on youth polytechnics and vocational training centres. However most of the outcome targets were not realized. The evaluation considers this outcome indicator to have been partially realized.

f. **Entrepreneurship development:** There were few programmes and projects targeting entrepreneurship development in 2009. Most of the programmes - supported by UNDP during the period 2009-2012, were targeting entrepreneurship development. So are programmes such as one village one product, 4K MSE 2030, subcontracting between MSME and large companies and MSMEs competitiveness project, which are all spearheaded by ministry of industrialization. The evaluation considers this outcome indicator to be fully realized.

g. **Coordination of Private Sector Policy Formulation and Effective M&E:** In 2009 there was a low and uncoordinated input by the private sector to policy formulation and its effective monitoring and evaluation. This has improved since UNDP has
supported the capacity building of KEPSA, an umbrella body of the private sector, in policy formulation. It has also supported NESC to bring together public and private sector to contribute to policy formulation. Furthermore, effective M&E framework for tracking relevant policy implementation has been developed under the ministry of planning, national development and vision 2030 under the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES). However, most of the policies initiated have not been finalized and structures for the implementation of NIMES have not been put in place. The evaluation considers this outcome indicator to have been partially realized.

h. Public Private Partnership Framework for Policy Analysis and dialogue: In 2009, there was no PPP Framework for policy analysis. Today, a public private partnership (PPP) bill and its policy framework have been developed through the coordination of NESC and were approved by the cabinet in December, 2011. A communication framework of PPP has been developed through the various round tables between the private sector and government bodies at various levels. The evaluation considers this outcome indicator to have been fully realized.

i. Communication framework for PPP. NESC has developed a communication policy and strategy which creates awareness to the public and private sector on policies and government activities undertaken by NESC. In addition, there are a number of communication frameworks established at the highest levels for dialogue with the private sector;

- Presidential Private Sector Working Forum (PPSWF) formed in 2009. Meets twice a year to discuss socio-economic climate
- Prime Minister’s Round Table (PMRT) established in 2008 meets quarterly to discuss policies and strategies for private sector development
- Ministerial Stakeholders Forums (MSFs) were established in 2006 to discuss sectoral and cross-cutting issues on a regular basis.
- Speaker Round Table discusses sectoral and legislative issues with the relevant Parliamentary Committees. Through these communication frameworks which were established at the beginning of CPAP and MTP (2008-2012), the private sector has participated in providing for reforms.
- The evaluation considers this outcome indicator to have been fully realized.

j. Pro-poor projects implemented by the private sector as their core business: In 2009, there was a low number of pro-poor programmes implemented by the private companies as part of their core business. It was envisaged that at least 10 pro poor programmes would be implemented by the private sector per year as part of their core business. During the period, through UNDP project, only Equity Bank launched such a program. The evaluation therefore considers this outcome indicator to have been partially realized.
C: **UNDP’s contribution**: What was the contribution, effectiveness and relevance of on-going UNDP projects in achieving the intended outcome?

44. **Finding 3 – contribution of UNDP**: UNDP’s on-going projects significantly contributed to the realization of the CPAP outcome 44. The projects were also effective and relevant. However going forward, some of the outcome indicators will need to be reviewed and consequently some of the projects will not be relevant (See table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Action plan for livelihood intervention</td>
<td>This was related to PEV and with therefore not be necessary in the next cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Framework for coordination of MSMEs support</td>
<td>Once the framework is in place, a program may be required to strengthen the capacity of the coordinating unit to implement the policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Project and interventions supported to respond to the needs of the vulnerable group</td>
<td>There will still be need for this outcome indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Operational Donor Coordination Unit</td>
<td>Lessons learned may be used to put in place similar coordination mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Linking the needs of private sector with skills supply</td>
<td>There will still be need for this outcome indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Entrepreneurship training programmes</td>
<td>There will still be need for this outcome indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Gender responsive entrepreneurship development</td>
<td>There will still be need for this outcome indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Needs Assessment report</td>
<td>May not need to be a stand alone indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Interventions to address the capacity gaps and existing M&amp;E Framework</td>
<td>There will still be need for this outcome indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 PPP Policy analysis framework in place</td>
<td>Policy framework is in place but there will be need for capacity building for policy implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Communication Framework in place</td>
<td>Policy framework put in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Pro poor projects implemented by the private sector as their core business</td>
<td>There will still be need for this outcome indicator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. **Contribution**: All the projects were linked to two components of the CPAP outcome 44 (private sector development and employment creation as well as promoting public-private partnership). The component of facilitation of trade and investment was covered under outcome 45. Table 3 shows the linkages between the on-going programmes and the outcome components and indicators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDP programmes implemented</th>
<th>Outcome Indicators to which they contributed</th>
<th>Outcome Indicator Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• District Business Solutions Centers</td>
<td>Action plan for livelihood intervention</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agribusiness Phase II</td>
<td>Framework for coordination of MSMEs support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Business Solution Centers</td>
<td>Projects and interventions supported to respond to the needs of vulnerable groups</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promoting Women in Business and Investment - Fanikisha</td>
<td>Operational Donor Coordination Unit</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Youth Employment Regional Programme</td>
<td>Linkages between industry needs and trainings and skills supplied</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kenya National Youth Development and Training Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Agribusiness Phase II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inclusive Market Development Strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• District Business Solutions Centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Business Alliance Against Chronic Hunger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private Sector Development Strategy Donor Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Kenya National Youth Development and Training Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting Women in Business and Investment – Fanikisha</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship training programmes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya National Youth Development and Training Programme</td>
<td>Gender responsive entrepreneurship development trainers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Business Solutions Centers</td>
<td>Needs assessment reports</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Alliance Against Chronic Hunger</td>
<td>Pro-poor projects implemented by the private sector as their core business</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Business Solutions Centers</td>
<td>Interventions to address capacity gaps and Existing M&amp;E frameworks</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Economic and Social Council</td>
<td>PPP policy analysis framework in place</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication framework for PPP in place</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. **Effectiveness**: Each of the on-going projects implemented by UNDP made contribution towards the realization of the outcome indicators targets, as explained here below:

   a. **District Business Solution Center (DBSC)**: The core function of the DBSC is to offer business development services, to the youth, women, SME and people with disability. The DBSC project has successfully contributed to facilitate restoration of livelihood initiatives, basic infrastructure and food security in 4 districts affected by post election violence. So far 7,124 people accessing BDS services, women (2878) and youth (4,246) have been trained in business skills, basic IT and management skills. In addition 50 IDP groups each of about 16 members were provided with grants (KES 50,000) for a revolving fund. Business profiling was conducted in 11 DBSCs and 16 business groups were provided with business profiles to enhance access to viable business opportunities. In addition, 37 groups were linked to financial and marketing institutions. This programme has contributed towards the realization of four out of the ten outcome indicators evaluated (outcome indicators nos. 1, 2, 3 and 6).

   b. **Agribusiness II**: The long term outcome of this project was the development and implementation of strategies for employment creation and enhancing social security through food production. To deliver the outcome, the project pursued the following three objectives in conjunction with the Agricultural Development Corporation (ADC): (a) Farmer groups in target areas organized and sensitized; (b) Modern and affordable land preparation extension services provision implemented and (c) project management unit operationalized. The project was confined to the following ADC zones: Lanet, Kitale, Molo and Garissa. This programme benefitted 6,680 families in Rift Valley and Western provinces and a total of 20040 hectares were prepared and planted. 80 % of the beneficiaries were women, who were adversely affected by the PEV. This programme contribution to outcome indicator no 1.

   c. **Promoting Women in Business and Investment**: Equity Bank launched the Fanikisha loan products in June 2007 which -offers loans to women for as little as Kshs 1,000 to over Kshs 10, 000, 000 to women groups (15-30) and individuals. Currently the bank has a portfolio catering to women of the amount Kshs 7.8 Billion. Through the partnership between Equity Group Foundation and MasterCard Foundation, approximately 320,000 women have been trained on debt management, budgeting and business plan. Through the EMPRETEC entrepreneurship programme 676 entrepreneurs have been trained through the UNCTAD copyright programme; which covers 10 personal entrepreneurship
competencies, while a further 167 entrepreneurs have been trained through the Ministry of Trade’s entrepreneurship workshop for women in business. BDS have been provided through the project’s partnership with Cherie Blair Foundation for Women in Business by e-mentoring Kenyan business women on an international platform provided by Google, where interaction and advice is customised to suit the Kenyan market but building towards the international market. Over 70% of the women that the project has trained and interacted with have been linked to institutions that provide product development such as Kenya Industrial Research and Development Institute (KIRDI), Kenya Institute of Business Training (KIBT), Export Promotion Council (EPC), and Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI). This programme has contributed towards the realization of three of the ten outcome indicators evaluated (outcome indicators nos. 3, 5 and 6).

d. **Kenya National Youth Development** - The revitalization of vocational and technical training and expansion of entrepreneurship and business skills’ training programmes has been achieved in the framework of the Kenya National Youth Development and Training Programme and the Fanikisha project. The KNYDT programme has helped to successfully revamp Kenya’s Polytechnics, with the formulation of 13 new trades. The programme has also promoted sustainable entrepreneurship culture among university graduates and enhances their capacity to provide business skills, through training of 347 trainees, profiling businesses as well as reviewing and editing training manuals. It has also enhanced capacity for YPs to offer market focussed/responsible skills. This programme has contributed towards the realization of three of the ten outcome indicators evaluated (outcome indicators nos. 3, 5 and 6).

e. **Donor Coordination Unit/PSD** – The DCU was effective in coordinating and mobilizing resources for the implementation of the private sector development strategy phase 1. This programme has contributed towards the realization of one of the ten outcome indicators evaluated (outcome indicators no 4).

f. **National Economic and Social Council** – Through the capacity building by UNDP, NESC generated more than 10 policies, which directly and indirectly supported the private sector development and employment creation in Kenya, promoted trade facilitation and strengthened public-private partnership. This programme has contributed towards the realization of three out of the ten outcome indicators evaluated (outcome indicators no 1, 2, 3 and 6).

g. **Expanded Business Alliance Against Chronic Hunger BAACH** - The Expanded BAACH project is a scale up of the successful BAACH pilot project that was rolled out in Siaya as well as in Yatta. The project is improving the physical performance of agriculture through application of new technologies such as drip irrigation & green houses as well as using market driven approaches such as value chain analysis to identify areas of sustainable profit maximization for players along the value chain. In this way, the project has contributed to outcome indicators nos. 4 and 6.

h. **Inclusive Market Developments (IMD)** – Markets play an essential role in the day to day lives of the poor. They generate jobs and incomes and provide goods, services and solutions for poor women and men. Markets therefore have the potential to increase opportunities and ultimately, reduce poverty. The IMD programme responds to this reality by identifying and supporting markets/value chains that contribute to significant employment creation and/or improved access to goods and services for the poor. In
Collaboration with Kenya Investment Authority, Changamuka Initiative (maternal health) was implemented. IMD has contributed to outcome indicator no 3.

47. **Relevancy**: Each of the on-going projects implemented by UNDP made contribution towards the realization of the outcome indicators targets.

**D: Influencing factors:** What factors contributed to or adversely affected the achievement of the outcome. Also what underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control influence the outcome

48. **Finding 4 – Underlying factors**: There were underlying factors that contributed positively or negatively to the realization of the outcome. These factors are grouped under three categories - programmes initiated by the Kenyan government as well as developing partners; factors beyond UNDP’s control; as well as factors within the control of UNDP.

49. **Government programmes** – The following government programmes and institutions contributed positively to the realization of the outcome:

   a. **Programmes towards private sector development** - A number of institutions have contributed to the development of the private sector, which is recognized as the pillar and engine of economic growth, employment and wealth creation. These include:
   
   - Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA) which has participated in the policy formulation, implementation and review in order to strengthen the sector. KEPSA has been supported in this by OPM, Ministry of planning, national development and vision 2030, NESC, EPC, KIPPRA and the line ministries of finance, industrialization, trade, agriculture, livestock and cooperatives.
   
   - The Kenya Association of Manufacturers (KAM) which has represented manufacturers with regard to policy matters.
   
   - Kenya Investment Authority is being developed as one-stop shop for investments.
   
   - Agencies such as ADB, WB, IMF, IFAD have also contributed towards the development of the private sector. Members of the KJAS which was signed in 2007 and updated in 2010 also contributed to the development outcomes in general.
   
   - The ministry of industrialization which has promoted projects such as; one village one product, subcontracting, business incubation and MSEs competitive programm

   b. **Employment Creation** - Private sector development and establishment of MSMEs resulted in employment creation. The following are some of government and development partners’ programmes that have been implemented and have had positive impact to employment creation

   - *The Kenya Youth Employment Programme* – KYEP is an internship programme financed by the World Bank. Under the life skills training, 1057 (415 female) were trained. In the Master Craftsman Skills training programme 314 were trained and 916 interns placed in jobs. KEPSA has been mandated by Government of Kenya to place 10,000 youths in the private sector between 2011-2014.

   - *Economic Stimulus Package* - ESP is an intensive, high impact programme, that stimulates economic activity, creates employment opportunities, encourages innovation in wealth-creation and spurs entrepreneurship. By leveraging ESP, the
Government clearly demonstrates its commitment to revitalize the economy and set it back on a sustainable medium to long-term term economic growth trajectory. Some of the activities covered under the ESP include expansion of irrigation-based agriculture, construction of wholesale and fresh-produce markets, construction and stocking of fish ponds with fingerlings, provision of aquaculture advisory services, fish ponds and ‘Jua Kali’ sheds and tree planting among other activities that are core to the mainstay of our rural and urban population. Other projects include construction of social infrastructures such as schools, health centers and roads. By 2011, the government had spent 22 billion Ksh on ESP.

• **Njaa Marufuku Kenya** - The Njaa Marufuku Kenya (NMK) programme was started in 2005 by Agriculture Sector Ministries with support from FAO and the MDG center, to provide an overall strategic framework for a 10-year action plan for hunger eradication in Kenya. It was formulated to fast track the fulfillment of MDG1. The Ministry of Agriculture is the focal point in NMK implementation. Grants of Kshs. 315.5 million have been disbursed to 2593 community groups comprising 77,140 small-scale farmers since June 2005. In addition 854 Community Groups Facilitators have been trained and attached to the benefiting groups to build their technical capacity.

• **Kazi Kwa Vijana** - In April 2009, the Kazi Kwa Vijana (KKV), the Work for Youth programme, was launched. It was aimed at the employment of youth in rural and urban areas in labour intensive public works projects, focusing on smaller projects that can be implemented rapidly. Examples are road maintenance sub-projects, small-scale water supply and sanitation, water harvesting, afforestation and waste collection.

• **Women and Youth Enterprise Fund** - Women Enterprise Fund (WEF) was conceived by the Government of Kenya in 2006 and officially launched in 2007. The principal objective of the fund is economic empowerment of women. Women Enterprise Fund loans reach the target beneficiaries through our partner financial intermediaries and directly through Constituency Women Enterprise Scheme (C-WES). The fund will enable the government realize MDG3. In recognition of the critical role women play in socio-economic development, the WEF has been identified as a flagship project under the social pillar in the Vision 2030. It is expected that the fund will play a catalytic role in mainstreaming women in the formal financial services sector. Although women constitute 52% of the total Kenyan population, majority of them have been excluded from the formal financial services – for example, few have bank accounts, can access loans, money transfer services, etc. The rural women are more disadvantaged than their urban counterparts.

• **The Youth Enterprise Development Fund** was established in year 2006 with the sole purpose of reducing unemployment among the youth who account for over 61% of the unemployed in the country. The target of the fund is young people within the age bracket of 18 to 35 years who number 13 million. The fund was then transformed into a State Corporation on 11th May 2007. The Fund’s strategic focus is on enterprise development as a key strategy that will increase economic opportunities for, and participation by Kenyan youth in nation building. The government has so far released Ksh. 1.75 billion to the fund with a further commitment of Ksh. 500 million in the financial year 2008/2009.
c. **Public-Private Partnership Dialogue** - Out of the four communication frameworks for PPP Dialogue, already mentioned, the following three are government initiatives;

- Presidential Private Sector Working Forum (PPSWF) on socio-economic climate
- Ministerial Stakeholders Forums (MSFs) on sectoral and cross-cutting issues on a regular basis.
- Speaker Round Table on sectoral and legislative issues with the relevant Parliamentary Committees.

50. **Factors outside the control of UNDP that negatively impacted on outcome 44:** – The following factors have impeded faster economic growth which was expected to be 10 per cent per annum during the CPAP and MTP (2008-2009) and consequently the realization of the outcome. These included

a. **Post Election Violence** - Right from the start of CPAP in 2008, the PEV affected economic growth adversely. Many businesses closed and people were displaced thus reducing agricultural production, commodity exports and a drop in tourism earnings. The economy only grew by 1.7 per cent. GDP has continued to expand by 2.6 per cent in 2009 and 5.8 per cent in 2010 but declined to 4.4 per cent in 2011. Several other factors have impeded faster economic growth which was expected to be 10 per cent per annum during the CPAP and MTP (2008-2009).

b. High cost of fuel, food and finance, climate change, drought, debt burden, population increase and HIV/AIDS have contributed to reduced expansion of the economy.

c. With regard to policy formulation and implementation, it has been extremely slow getting policies approved and implemented effectively. As a result, business competitiveness and productivity, international and domestic trade, market accesses and investment flows have been adversely affected.

d. **Long waiting time before actual projects’ starts.** For example, the BMO was expected to start in 2007 but started in 2010 due to long negotiation on roles and obligations. Consequently, some components like credit facility were dropped. (removed from 51)

51. **Factors within the control of UNDP that negatively impacted on the realization of outcome** – Respondents mentioned the following factors which negatively impacted on the implementation of the programmes and consequently the realization of the outcome.

a. Inadequate involvement of all stakeholders in project formulation and design. Most of the UNDP programmes were formulated and designed by UNDP in collaboration with the government. The involvement of direct implementers (e.g. departmental officers) as well as beneficiaries (lower level implementers and community) is rare. The beneficiaries only participate at the implementation.

b. Slow procurement and disbursement process. This is attributed to delays in approvals from UNDP for procurement and disbursement by UNDP. The evaluation established that there is expectation that UNDP transactions should be faster than that of the government and people are surprised when this is not so.
c. Ineffective communication between UNDP and implementing institutions as well as beneficiaries. Implementers and beneficiaries felt that UNDP do not adequately inform them on changes made in project budgets and resources, in the course of implementation.

d. Limited capacity of UNDP to mobilize the required resources

**E: Sustainability and replicability.** What is the sustainability and replicability of UNDP interventions related to the outcome?

52. **Finding 5 – Sustainability:** Not all the outcomes realized through UNDP projects are sustainable and replicable. Only those outcomes realized through the following four projects (DBSC, DCU, NESC and KNYDT) are sustainable, whereas only outcomes realized through DBSC, Agribusiness II, KNYDT, YERP, PWBI are replicable.

53. The evaluation found the following evidence to support the finding:

a. **DBSC** – Sustainability prospect is high because DBSC has been integrated as a regular programme in the ministry of trade. The lessons learned can be used for replication when implementing new DBSCs.

b. **DCU/PSD** – Sustainability prospect is high. A department for private sector development has been established under the Ministry of Trade and is operational. PSDS II is being formulated and some form of coordination will be required during its implementation. The lessons learned can be used in other multi-donor projects targeting the outcome.

c. **NESC** – Sustainability prospect is high. NESC capacity has been built and it is now a highly respected advisory body in Kenya. Strategies for PPP dialogue established are unique and will need to continue. NESC has developed a niche in bringing stakeholders together for policy formulation. The PPP dialogue is replicable, particularly to give support to the county government.

d. **KNYDT** – Sustainability prospect is high because it provides the beneficiaries with skills useful for enterprise creation and employability. The potential for scale up is also high.

e. **Agribusiness 2** – This program can be sustainable if services provided can be privatized. The lessons learned can be used for replication when implementing similar situation.

f. **IMD and BAACH** – These programmes have potential for sustainability and replication. For example, Kenya Investment Authority has taken the IMD approach in their business models.

g. **PWBI** – The Equity financing component is sustainable and replicable.

h. **YERP** – This project produced two studies which can be used to develop opportunities for employment and income generating activities amongst the youth. The studies led to starting the piloting of the now successful green house and drip irrigation project. In principal, this was a pilot aimed at attracting youth to agriculture. It is now evident that youth are receptive to modern methods of farming but are resistant to traditional methods.
EVALUATION AREA 2: OUTPUT ANALYSIS

54. **UNDP Outputs** – UNDP had planned the following eight (8) outputs to deliver CPAP outcome 44 – *programmes and policies for private sector development and employment creation established and implemented by 2013.*

   a. As an early recovery intervention, an action plan for restoring businesses, basic infrastructure and reducing food insecurity in areas affected by the post election violence developed and implemented (output 1).

   b. The establishment of the National Council of Small Enterprises (NCSE) fast-tracked (output 2).

   c. The access of vulnerable groups to micro finances, micro insurances, BDS, energy services and new technologies enhanced (output 3).

   d. The development partners’ support to the implementation of the PSDS coordinated (output 4)

   e. The revitalization of vocational and technical training supported and the entrepreneurship and business skills training programme expanded (output 5).

   f. The Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA) and other relevant state and non state actors’ capacity built for improved input to the policy formulation and effective monitoring and evaluation (output 6).

   g. A national policy, an implementation plan and an effective platform for dialogue for a comprehensive public private partnership developed and implemented (output 7).

   h. Private sector engagement for broad –based human capacity development strengthened and or deepened (output 8).

55. **Key Evaluation questions** – *In the analysis of UNDP outputs, the evaluation sought to address the following eight (8) questions:*

   a. *Relevance* - whether or not the UNDP outputs are still relevant to the outcome.

   b. *Effectiveness* - whether or not sufficient progress have been made in attainment of the outputs and how they have contributed to the attainment of the outcome.

   c. *Underlying factors* – factors (positive or negative) that affected the accomplishment of the outputs

   d. *Stakeholders involvement* - whether and how stakeholders have been involved in poverty reduction issues

   e. *Engagement in private sector dialogue* – UNDP’s ability to engage in private sector dialogue at national level with key partners including ministries, donor, NGOs, private sector and civil society
f. Areas for future improvement – areas where UNDP could contribute to that would improve achievement of the outcome

56. Finding 6: Relevance – All the UNDP’s outputs (apart from one) are still relevant to the achievement of the outcome.

a. Output 1 (an action plan for restoring businesses, basic infrastructure and reducing food insecurity in areas affected by the post election violence developed and implemented) – is no longer relevant since the businesses in PEV areas have been restored.

b. Output 2 is still relevant to the outcome since the National Council of Small Enterprises (NCSE) will contribute towards private sector development.

c. Output 3 - access of vulnerable groups to micro finances, micro insurances, BDS, energy services and new technologies – is still relevant since it will contribute towards private sector development and employment creation.

d. Output 4 is still relevant since coordination and mobilization of resources from donors for the implementation of PSDS2 will be required.

e. Output 5 is still relevant since vocational and technical training as well as entrepreneurship and business skills are required to support private sector development and improve employment opportunities for young graduates.

f. Outputs 6 and 7 and are relevant for promoting public-private partnerships and dialogue and thus enhance the involvement of the private sector in policy formulations.

g. Outputs 8 (private sector engagement for broad–based human capacity development strengthened and/or deepened) is relevant to income generation and employment creation for the poor.

57. Finding 7: Effectiveness – Minimum progress has been made towards attaining the outputs. Out of the eight outputs, only three have been fully attained whereas five are partially attained. However, the outputs achieved have contributed towards the realization of the outcome (see table below for details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDP’s CPAP 44 Outputs</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
<th>Contribution to the outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 As an early recovery intervention, an action plan for restoring businesses, basic infrastructure and reducing food insecurity in areas affected by the post election violence developed and implemented (output1)</td>
<td><strong>Fully achieved.</strong> 2 programmes were developed and implemented by UNDP, which has led to restoration of the collapsed businesses and employment opportunities in the PEV areas.</td>
<td>Promoted private sector development and employment creation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The establishment of the National Council of Small Enterprises (NCSE) fast-tracked (output 2).</td>
<td><strong>Partially achieved.</strong> Currently the SME bill, which has provided for the establishment of NCSE, is before parliament.</td>
<td>No contribution since the council is not yet in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The access of vulnerable groups to micro finances, micro insurances,</td>
<td><strong>Partially achieved.</strong> UNDP put programmes in place to address the</td>
<td>Promoted private sector development and employment creation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BDS, energy services and new technologies enhanced **(output 3)**.

special needs of the vulnerable groups. However, most of the output targets were not realized.
creation

**4** The development partners’ support to the implementation of the PSDS coordinated **(output 4)**.

**Fully achieved.** DCU was successfully established and operationalised.
Mobilized resources for implementation of PSDS and thus contributed towards private sector development and employment creation

**5** The revitalization of vocational and technical training supported and the entrepreneurship and business skills training programme expanded **(output 5)**.

**Partially achieved.** Two UNDP programmes – KNYDTP and YERP developed and implemented. But most of the output targets were not realized.
Provided appropriate skills for private sector development as well as skills for self employment

**6** The Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA) and other relevant state and non state actors’ capacity built for improved input to the policy formulation and effective monitoring and evaluation **(output 6)**.

**Partially achieved.** Capacity of KEPSA has been build. National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) has been put in place. However few state organs has been capacity built on M&E.
KEPSA’s active participation in policy development is promoting inclusive and effective public private partnerships

**7** A national policy, an implementation plan and an effective platform for dialogue for a comprehensive public private partnership developed and implemented **(output 7)**.

**Fully achieved.** PPP policy is now in place and is being implemented.
There is now policy and communication framework for inclusive and effective public private partnerships

**8** Private sector engagement for broad –based human capacity development strengthened and or deepened **(output 9)**.

**Partially achieved.** One private company (Equity) is now offering pro poor programmes as their core business. However, the target for 10 programmes per year as not been realized.
Contributes towards private sector development and employment creation.

58. **Finding 8: Underlying factors** – There were positive and negative factors that affected the accomplishment of the outputs. The positive factors included; signing and implementation of the peace accord; formation of the reconciliation groups in the PEV areas; commitment of the government in ensuring security in the PEV areas; high demand for BDS; establishment of NIMES, establishment of department of M&E as well as active roles of NESC, OP, OPM and KEPSA. The negative factors included slow resettling of IDPs, slow legislative process, limited funding, limited human resources, delay in procurement and installation of capital equipment, cases of duplications, weak NIMES and inadequate sensitization and promotion (see table below for details).

59. **Evidences** - The evidences for this finding is given in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDP’s CPAP 44 Outputs</th>
<th>Positive factors</th>
<th>Negative factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. As an early recovery intervention, an action plan for restoring businesses, basic infrastructure and reducing food insecurity in areas affected by the post election violence developed and implemented. <strong>Fully achieved</strong></td>
<td>1. Signing and implementation of peace accord. 2. Formation of reconciliation groups 3. Commitment of the government in ensuring security.</td>
<td>Slow resettling of internally displaced persons (IDPs)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
60. **Finding 9: Stakeholders involvement** – UNDP has addressed poverty reduction issues through formulation of pro poor programmes that lead to enhancing income, creating employment opportunity, identifying market for products, capacity building for skills and development as well as creation of partnership. The stakeholders have been actively involved in this either as implementers or beneficiaries.

61. **Finding 10: Engagement in private sector dialogue** – UNDP has given support to private sector dialogue at national level with key partners but has limited ability to engage in coordination of these activities nationally. National coordination is currently done by the office of the prime minister which includes the ministry of planning, national development and vision 2030.

62. **Finding 11: Areas of future contribution** – UNDP can contribute to the following areas to improve on the achievement of the outcome:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The establishment of the National Council of Small Enterprises (NCSE) fast-tracked. <strong>Partially Achieved.</strong></th>
<th>Push by Kenya National Federation of Jua-Kali Associations and other interested stakeholders</th>
<th>Slow legislative process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The access of vulnerable groups to micro finances, micro insurances, BDS, energy services and new technologies enhanced. <strong>Partially Achieved.</strong></td>
<td>High demand for BDS services</td>
<td>1. Limited funding 2. Limited human resources 3. Delay in procurement and installation of capital equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The development partners’ support to the implementation of the PSDS coordinated. <strong>Fully achieved.</strong></td>
<td>Support of the donors and government for basket funding approach.</td>
<td>Cases of duplications of funding still persists – for example BDSC and BIS are similar projects but funded by different donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The revitalization of vocational and technical training supported and the entrepreneurship and business skills training programme expanded. <strong>Partially achieved.</strong></td>
<td>1. High demand for entrepreneurship skills 2. Need to match demand and supply of skills</td>
<td>Slow and bureaucratic procurement and disbursement process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA) and other relevant state and non state actors' capacity built for improved input to the policy formulation and effective monitoring and evaluation. <strong>Partially achieved</strong></td>
<td>1. Active involvement of NESC 2. Establishment of Department of M&amp;E in the ministry of planning and economic development 3. The establishment of NIMES</td>
<td>NIMES is still weak and no structures to undertake M&amp;E at the devolved level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A national policy, an implementation plan and an effective platform for dialogue for a comprehensive public private partnership developed and implemented. <strong>Fully achieved</strong></td>
<td>Drive by NESC, OP and OPM</td>
<td>Slow pace of policy formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Private sector engagement for broad –based human capacity development strengthened and or deepened. <strong>Partially achieved</strong></td>
<td>High demand for pro poor projects</td>
<td>Inadequate sensitization and promotion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a. Create strong outcome working groups that includes government work
departments to monitor and evaluate outcome and impacts in real time.
b. Improvement in the mobilization of resources
c. More capacity building covering a wide area and discipline coverage

**EVALUATION AREA 3: CONTRIBUTION OF CPAP OUTCOME 44 TO UNDAF OUTCOME 3.1.**

63. **Key evaluation questions** - The evaluation sought to establish the relevance of the CPAP outcomes, outputs, targets and indicators in contributing to UNDAF outcome 3.1. *(equitable livelihood opportunities and food security with a focus on vulnerable groups enhanced and sustained)* and consequently also examine the relevance of the programmes and projects. **UNDAF Outcome 3.1** has the following four components

a. **CP Outcome 3.1.1:** Adoption of equitable pro-poor and gender sensitive economic policies and programmes increased.
b. **CP Outcome 3.1.2:** Business environment productivity and competitiveness of MSMEs improved.
c. **CP Outcome 3.1.3:** Food Availability and access for the most vulnerable population increased.
d. **CP Outcome 3.1.4:** Agricultural productivity and competitiveness of small holders increased.

64. **Finding 12:** – CPAP outcomes, outputs, targets and indicators as well as programmes/projects are relevant to UNDAF outcome 3.1. This finding is based on the following observations:

a. **Relevance of the outcomes** – The two components of CPAP outcome 44 that were evaluated (promoting private sector development and employment creation as well as strengthening the public-private partnership) are relevant and can contribute to the realization of the four components of UNDAF outcome 3.1.

- **CP Outcome 3.1.1** Adoption of equitable pro-poor and gender sensitive economic policies and programmes increased. This corresponds to CPAP outcome 44 *(policies and programmes for an inclusive private sector development and employment creation developed and implemented)*. Both outcomes support the government in its policy formulation intended to stimulate growth and redistribute wealth to vulnerable groups. They give support to various government institutions to develop relevant policies for implementation of programmes in Vision 2030 and the MTP through strengthening capacities at MOSPND& Vision 2030, NESC, MOT, KIA and the OPM.

- **CP Outcome 3.1.2** Business environment productivity and competitiveness of MSMEs improved. This outcome is closely aligned to Outcome 44 programmes which focus on increasing competitiveness and productivity in line with Vision 2030 and the Private Sector Development Strategy. Both Outcomes target MSMEs by increasing productivity and competitiveness through improved access to training, information, technology, BDS, energy, micro-finance and markets. They also promote value addition to commodities, support business environment, improve investment policies and incomes. The overall goal of these programmes is to create wealth and reduce poverty. Specific projects and initiatives include
implementation of PSDS, DBSCs, BAACH, vocational and technical training, KNYDBTP, PWBI, as well as support to KEPSA, NESC, KIRDI, WEF and FEWA.

- **CP Outcome 3.1.3** - Food Availability and access for the most vulnerable population increased. This outcome is supported by UNDP and its partners through its programmes such as BAACH and Agribusiness 11.

- **CP Outcome 3.1.4** – Agricultural productivity and competitiveness of small holders increased. This outcome is supported by UNDP and its partners through its programmes such as BAACH and Agribusiness 11.

b. **Relevance of CPAP outputs:** Most of the CPAP outputs are relevant to UNDAF 3.1 particularly component 3.1.2 on *business environment productivity and competitiveness of MSMEs improved* (see table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDP’s CPAP 44 Outputs</th>
<th>Relevancy to UNDAF Outcome 3.1.</th>
<th>3.1.1</th>
<th>3.1.2</th>
<th>3.1.3</th>
<th>3.1.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. As an early recovery intervention, an action plan for restoring businesses, basic infrastructure and reducing food insecurity in areas affected by the post election violence developed and implemented.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The establishment of the National Council of Small Enterprises (NCSE) fast-tracked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The access of vulnerable groups to micro finances, micro insurances, BDS, energy services and new technologies enhanced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The development partners’ support to the implementation of the PSDS coordinated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The revitalization of vocational and technical training supported and the entrepreneurship and business skills training programme expanded.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA) and other relevant state and non state actors’ capacity built for improved input to the policy formulation and effective monitoring and evaluation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A national policy, an implementation plan and an effective platform for dialogue for a comprehensive public private partnership developed and implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Private sector engagement for broad based human capacity development strengthened and or deepened.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. **Relevance of CPAP programmes:** Most of the CPAP programmes are relevant to UNDAF 3.1, particularly component 3.1.2 on *business environment productivity and competitiveness of MSMEs improved* (see table below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDP’s CPAP 44 programmes</th>
<th>Relevancy to UNDAF Outcome 3.1.</th>
<th>3.1.1</th>
<th>3.1.2</th>
<th>3.1.3</th>
<th>3.1.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. District Business Solution Centers (DBSC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Youth Employment Regional Programme (YERP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Agribusiness phase 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promoting Women Entrepreneurs in Business and Investment (PWEBI)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
65. **Key Evaluation Issues:** This evaluation sought to assess the partnership strategy in relation to the outcome – does the partnership strategy support the achievement of the outcome. In the analysis, the evaluation sought to address the following ten (10) partnership issues – strategy; appropriateness, relevance, effectiveness, formation, structure, coordination; participation of the beneficiaries; synergy and UNDP’s role.

66. **Finding 13** - The UNDP has worked closely with the Kenya Government in designing and formulating programmes in accordance with the national vision and priorities as outlined in Vision 2030, Medium Term Plan and alignment with MDGs and with the UNDAF priorities and goals in order to leverage financial, technical and human resources, UNDP also partners with other UN agencies, development partners (multilateral and bilateral), CSOs, the private sector, diverse institutions and communities/beneficiaries. The partnership strategy is appropriate and relevant but is not effectively implemented. The following observations have been made:

   a. **Partnership formation:** UNDP has established useful partnerships with the Government which in most cases is the main implementing partner for delivery of Outcome 44. Useful partnerships have also been forged with UN agencies, private sector, other government institutions, CSOs, CBOs and beneficiaries. In most projects these partners are part of the steering committee. However, there are no structured guidelines on the formation of partnerships. There is therefore a multiplicity of partnership structured resulting in low attendance to meetings and fatigue. UNDP should give clear guidelines on partnerships to support the Government and UNDP M&E programmes to deliver the outcome nationally.

   b. **Partnership structure:** A number of partnership structures were proposed by UNCT which included Programme Coordination Group (PCG), HAC, JPs, MEWG and KJAS. These structures have only partially worked well and have not contributed much to the outcome. An outcome working group would be useful in coordinating, collating information and monitoring and evaluation of the outcome in accordance with the result matrix and in helping with the trend towards outcome and impact evaluations.

   c. **Partnership coordination:** UN agencies and development partners not contributing to or included specifically in projects but working towards the same outcome do not coordinate nor consult. Each agency/institution work independently. The same obtains between government ministries/departments. There is therefore a disparate effort sometimes in the same region/locality not benefitting from synergies and complementarities possible in effective partnership. Examples are the DBSCs, BICs, District KNBS Offices, and District Information Centres. There is therefore no consensus among UNDP actors, partners and stakeholders on the partnership strategy to achieve the outcome. Secondly, UNDP has no capacity or ability to manage partnerships and bring together various partners across sectoral lines to address governance concerns in a holistic manner. This role was played by the office of the Prime Minister (OPM) in the
current cycles. Since this office is abolished in the new constitutional dispensation, the next cycle partnership will probably be managed by the Ministry of Finance, National Planning and Vision 2030 with the support of UNDP.

d. **Participation of the beneficiaries.** Direct beneficiaries have participated and benefited considerably in the partnership arrangements and management but other stakeholders at this level do not participate in the partnerships. Beneficiaries only participate at the implementation but rarely at project/programme design and formulation which appear to be the preserve of donors and the government.

e. **Synergy.** UNDP has utilized capacities of the private sector institutions and networks such as KEPSA, KMA, NCCI, FKE and COTU; government institutions such as NESC, KIPPRA, NCST, KARI, KIRDI, relevant government departments and MDGs- based capacities to deliver outcome 44. In view of decentralization, UNDP has to strengthen partnerships with the new devolved government structures.

f. **UNDP’s role.** The UNDP has played its role effectively in the delivery of the outcome, as follows:

- Designing and formulating new programmes in accordance with national priorities and MDGs as outlined in Vision 2030, MTP and alignment with the UNDAF.
- Assisting the government and UN agencies in donor coordination function with financial and technical resources- mobilization, managing of pooled funds (PSDS, BMOs, Women and Youth funds)
- Co-leading together with the government in policy advocacy, and innovative initiatives (BMOs, NESC, DBSCs)
- Capacity building at Ministry, department, institutions and beneficiary levels through provision of training; skills; knowledge management, generation and sharing; conducting monitoring and evaluations, providing advisory, development and procurement, joint programming and UNVs services.

67. The evaluation also noted the following challenges in the partnership arrangement:

- **The joint programmes** - The joint programmes relevant to outcome 44 were the Joint Programme on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (GEWE), Joint Programme on Food Security and Nutrition (FS&N) and Joint Programme on Youth. The review found that there was no working group in outcome 44 and that the Joint Programmes were not properly constituted and was not operational. The Agencies seem to be working independently but with close coordination with the relevant government departments.

- UNDP maximizes on its unique position as a flexible impartial organization with technical expertise in specific areas and country wide coverage and in keeping with its mandate to support coordination efforts. While the UNDP positioning and intentions are commendable, in practice the coordination and partnership strategy does not seem to work well with regard to outcome 44. It was however noted that UNDP worked very well with EU and the Kenya Government in the PSDS and also with DANIDA in the ASMEP/DBSCs. The involvement of the private sector in skills development together with technical training institutions and the World Bank was also a notable achievement.
All the programmes under the outcome 44 were managed under the NEX modality. The Ministry of Finance acted as the Government Coordinating Authority with an implementing partner (IP) working closely with other partners. A steering committee or project/programme executive board consisting of the IP, representatives of beneficiaries and all participating partners providing the overall policy direction, guidance, oversight, monitoring and evaluation, mobilization and commitment of resources and delivery of results. This provided an effective management and coordination at the project/programme level. While this arrangement worked well at the implementation level, it was noted that the same principles of partnerships were not effectively applied at the project identification, design and formulation levels. The result matrices do not always indicate specific contributions by partners and beneficiaries, thus complicating possibilities of attributions/evaluation of results.
LESSONS LEARNED, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

LESSONS LEARNED

68. The following three key lessons were learned during the evaluation:

- The development, formulation, effective implementation and sustainability of policies require the involvement of and contributions by all key partners especially communities and the government as clearly enunciated in UNDP partnership strategy.
- Capacity building (skills, knowledge, information, mindsets, cheap finance, institutions, new technologies, BDS) was critical to the progress in the achievement of the outcome/impact.
- Elaborate bureaucracies can adversely affect delivery of outputs/outcome.

CONCLUSIONS

69. Conclusion 1 - outcome analysis: The outcome, which is still relevant in the context of the development and poverty issues in Kenya, has been partially achieved through UNDP contributions, the Kenya government and other development partners. However, the following issues may need to be considered going forward;

- That some outcome indicators and targets were not realized and yet they may be important for the outcome in future.
- That some outcome indicators will need to be reviewed and consequently some programmes will not be relevant.
- That UNDP may need to reflect on factors within its control that negatively affected the realization of the outcome. These include involvement of key stakeholders in program design, long procurement and disbursement procedures, weak communication and resource mobilization.
- That the prospects of sustainability and replication of the outcome is low for most of the projects. This poses great concern.

70. Conclusion 2 - output analysis: Most outputs have been fully or partially achieved except those relating to trade, investments, productivity and competitiveness, improvements and value chain development and linkages, which were not evaluated since they were delivered under outcome 45. The outputs achieved have contributed towards the realization of the outcome. Most of the factors that negatively contributed to the attainment of the outputs were beyond the control of the UNDP. Attention will need to be paid to the following:

- Some outputs which were not realized are still important for the outcome in future.
- Capacity building has played a role both in the achievement of outcome and outputs.
- Delays in implementation which in some cases adversely affected delivery of outcomes/outputs were occasioned by long bureaucratic procedures, approvals, disbursements, procurement and staff mobility in UNDP.
- There were no effective mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating outcomes and impacts in relation to interventions nationally and at the devolved level in real time.
71. Conclusion 3 – Linkages of CPAP and UNDAF outcomes: Whereas a linkage has been established that the realization of the CPAP outcomes would contribute towards the attainment of the UNDAF outcome, the main contribution of CPAP outcome was towards the realization of UNDAF component 3.1.2 – enhancing competitiveness and productivity of MSMEs.

72. Conclusion 4 – Partnership Analysis: UNDP partnership strategy is appropriate and relevant but is not effectively implemented because of lack of firm commitment, tendencies towards independent implementation, lack of enforcement mechanisms and a multiplicity of partnership arrangements. The evaluation concluded that partnerships for the delivery of outcomes can better be galvanized by strong government leadership with the support of UNDP and linkages with the private sectors, CSOs, CBOs and communities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

73. Recommendation 1 – Programme design: Programming has been concerned with alignment to national priorities and goals. It is recommended that programming needs to be extended to involve stakeholders at lower levels through programmed needs assessment, programme design, formulation, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. The increased involvement of the private sector, CSOs, CBOs and communities is highly recommended.

74. Recommendation 2 – Unrealized outcomes/outputs: Outcome/output which have not been achieved are still relevant and should be included in the next programme cycle e.g. inclusive market development strategy, trade and investment and integrated value chain development and linkages.

75. Recommendation 3 - Sustainability: Most programmes are soon coming to an end. Sustainability concerns should be addressed by UNDP opening serious dialogues with the government and other implementing partners to include development and operational budgets to take over the programmes. An inventory of sustainability prospects for all programmes should be drawn including the necessary minimum conditions to inform future programming and resource mobilization.

76. Recommendation 4 - Future focus: In future programming, more resources should be allocated to outcomes leading to employment and wealth creation, entrepreneurship, improved livelihoods and equity through targeting marginalized groups.

77. Recommendation 5 - Policy completion and implementation: A number of policies are in various stages of formulation, development, legislations and implementation. Relevant institutions e.g. NESC should be facilitated, strengthened and devolved to take the lead in ensuring that policies which are relevant should be fast tracked to implementation stages and their impact monitored and evaluated. This should include structures for monitoring and evaluation of outcomes/impacts within UNCT, UNDP and government (OWG and NIMES).

78. Recommendation 6– Devolved government: There is need to more effectively coordinate, harmonize and synchronize government, donors, UN, agencies and private
sector programmes in keeping with stronger involvement of CSOs, CBOs, the private sector, communities and PPP dialogues at the devolved levels. Strong and effective outcome working groups (OWG) incorporating key partners have to be revived.

79. **Recommendation 7–Capacity building:** Since capacity building has been key to the progress in the achievement of the outcome, these programmes should be expanded, devolved and strengthened in the next programming cycle taking into account the devolved government structure.

80. **Recommendation 8–NEX Modality:** The NEX modality of implementation is recommended with modifications to considerably reduce delays occasioned by bureaucracies while not compromising accountability. Consideration should be given to disbursement of funds to programme/project accounts on a quarterly basis based on AWPs specific budget and timelines, procurement plans approved by an effective steering committee, structured internal audits and international accounting principles.

81. **Recommendation 9–UNDP contribution:** UNDP contributions were quantitatively small compared to others but qualitatively useful in attaining national goals. It is noted that nationally, outcome and impact targets may not be fully achieved. It is recommended that UNDP through its unique outreach, expertise, partnership strategy especially South/South partnerships, explores how to effect quantum leaps in economic growth and poverty reduction nationally.
APPENDIX 1
BRIEF INFORMATION ON THE UNDP PROGRAMMES TO CONTRIBUTE TOWARDS REALIZATION OF OUTCOME 44


Although women entrepreneurs constitute 55% of the total entrepreneurs in the country, their operations are characterized by low productivity, less access to and use of technologies, poor product development, less market penetration, low value addition and generally slow growth. The main objectives of this project were to: provide appropriate, easy access loan financing to women for investment; capacity building services; business development services; awareness on investment potentials through access to business information for wealth creation; and improving the business environment for women in business and investment in Kenya. This was done through training workshops, e-mentoring and networking. The mentoring programme was to be online using training modules developed by Chary Blair Foundation in London.

2. Youth Employment Regional Programme

The main objectives of this programme were to generate decent employment for young people and promote social cohesion through support to formulate/design and implement appropriate pro-poor policies that will facilitate the integration of vulnerable groups into employment markets. These objectives were linked to capacity building through skills development for increased youth paid and self-employment; and the promotion of policies to foster social, economic and political integration. The programme covered 12 African countries including Kenya. In Kenya, the programme supported Kazi Kwa Vijana Initiatives by undertaking the following activities:

- Carry out studies on the potential labour markets for the young graduates from high schools, vocational institutions and universities and develop a framework that links labour market demands to responsive youth training and engagement in employment related activities.
- Carry out an institutional diagnosis of the employment promotion structures that support the implementation of the National Youth Employment Scheme (Kazi Kwa Vijana Programme).
- Undertake value chain analysis (VCA) in selected sectors in selected constituencies


The goal of this programme is to contribute to sustainable livelihoods for the Kenyan Youth through entrepreneurship development and support of Youth Polytechnics (YPs). This component focuses on empowering the youth and catalyzing competitive growth of trade by enhancing self-employment, and injecting a new breed of productive labour force into the country’s economy in micro and small enterprises. This programme provides candidates with concrete hands-on business skills; inculcates entrepreneurial mindsets, stimulates and motivates them to establish and scale up own business into enterprises of scale and/or provide business consultancy services to other clients. The training is designed to transform the youth from being job seekers into job creators hence enabling them to be agents of change in their respective districts and/or constituencies. Additionally, the programme focuses on capacity building for the Ministry of Youth Affairs.

4. District Business Solution Centers (DBSCs)

The main outcome of this project was - stronger linkages between the formal and informal sectors developed and implemented. To contribute to the realization of this outcome, the following outputs were envisaged (a) Six District Business Solution Centres (DBSC) established and functional – as one stop shop for the provision of business development services to internally displaced persons, youth, women and MSMEs at district and lower levels; (b) establishment of the National Council for Small Enterprises
(NCSE) fast tracked and (c) three institutions (KIRDI, KIE and KIA) strengthened and positioned to support MSMEs. The project defined the inputs and activities required to deliver the outputs.

5. **Agribusiness Phase II**

The long term outcome of this project was the development and implementation of strategies for employment creation and enhancing social security through food production. To deliver the outcome, the project pursued the following three objectives in conjunction with the Agricultural Development Corporation: (a) Farmer groups in target areas organized and sensitized; (b) Modern and affordable land preparation extension services provision implemented and (c) project management unit operationalized. The project was confined to the following ADC zones: Lanet, Kitale, Molo and Garissa. Some of the information relevant to the evaluation are given in the table below:

6. **Donor Coordination Unit/PSD**

a. **The Private Sector Development Strategy (PSDS)**

The *Private Sector Development Strategy (PSDS)* was prepared by the former Ministry of Trade and Industry, after extensive consultations with a wide range of stakeholders. PSDS was supposed to provide a mechanism through which the Government of Kenya could leverage and catalyze the implementation of strategic actions to enhance private sector growth and competitiveness. This could, in turn, contribute to the achievement of the country’s medium-term objectives as outlined in the *Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation* (ERS). Private Sector Development Strategy (PSDS) Secretariat has been the Coordinating Office and acts as the Secretariat to the Steering Committee and links the Government, the private sector and the development partners. The mandate of the office includes the development and implementation of interventions and prudent management of funds, received both from the Government and development partners. The Coordinating Office is anchored in the Ministry of Trade given its mandate within the organizational structure of the Government of Kenya, which is to facilitate growth and competitiveness within the private sector.

b. **PSDS Donor Coordination Unit**

The Private Sector Donor Group (PSDG) was formed in 2007 to coordinate the activities of the donors that were active in funding the implementation of PSDS. Within the main PSDG there is a Donor Coordination Unit (DCU), which coordinates information among donors supporting the PSD Strategy, discusses PSDG issues needing immediate attention and maintains oversight of the Catalyst Fund, meeting as and when required. The DCU also functions as a Secretariat for the wider PSDG. The DCU is managed by UNDP and has a full-time technical adviser. Membership currently consists of six donors, the PSD Strategy Secretariat and the Ministry of Trade. At present, the DCU is co-chaired by the World Bank and the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Trade.

c. **The Business Member Organization**

This Business Member Organization (BMO) capacity building and advocacy support is a subcomponent of the Assistance to Micro and Small Enterprises Programme (ASMEP), a programme supported by the European Union (EU) with coordination from the ministry of trade. BMO is co-funded by EU and UNDP. It is also an output 3 of the PSDS. It is a three year project (2009-2012). Its main output is to improve capacities of the BMOs as service providers towards their MSEs. The project targeted 10-15 BMOs with a total of several hundred members as ultimate beneficiaries. The project provides grants and technical assistance for capacity building towards existing BMOs and support the creation of and formalization of new BMOs.

d. **Business Advisory Fund**
DANIDA-funded a project in Kenya to support the Business Advocacy Fund (BAF) II – which aims to strengthen the capabilities of business management organizations (BMOs) to engage with the government for the sustainable improvement of the business environment. BAF provides technical assistance, training and grants-based funding to micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) and BMOs to improve their capacities for dialogue and advocacy with government in business reforms and to promote sustainability amongst local organizations in rendering business advocacy services.

7. **National Economic and Social Council**

The long-term outcome of this project is to enhance institutional and human capacities to participate in and benefit from the multilateral trading system. The programme induces enhanced foreign direct investment and contributes to the improvement of the business environment through the formulation and implementation of policies, laws and regulations conducive to private sector development. The main objective of this project was to enhance the capacity of the National Economic and Social Council (NESC) to enable it to serve as a platform for constructive public-private sector dialogue based on solid analysis and information. Some of the information relevant to the evaluation are given in the table below:

8. **Inclusive Market Development Strategy**

At the core of poverty is the lack of opportunity caused by a lack of money and resources. Markets play an essential role in the day to day lives of the poor. They generate jobs and incomes and provide goods, services and solutions for poor women and men. Markets therefore have the potential to increase opportunities and ultimately, reduce poverty. The IMD programme responds to this reality by identifying and supporting markets/value chains that contribute to significant employment creation and/or improved access to goods and services for the poor.

9. **Expanded Business Alliance Against Chronic Hunger BAACH**

Almost 850 million people do not have enough to eat; 90% of these suffer from chronic hunger rather than short-term famine. The consequences of hunger and food insecurity frustrate progress towards the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), specifically that of eradicating extreme poverty and hunger. The solution to chronic hunger and poverty lies in improving the physical performance of agriculture through a range of measures that focus on new technologies and commercial, market driven approaches. BAACH is a public-private partnership which aims to reduce poverty and chronic hunger among the vulnerable groups (youth and women) by empowering them on Agribusiness and SMEs creation. It was formed by the World Economic Forum partners and constituents in 2006, and which includes UNDP/Growing Inclusive Markets (GIM) Initiative on its Advisory Board, works to develop and implement business-led solutions to hunger in Kenya. Through the Alliance, over 30 companies and partners are working to develop commercially viable, pro-poor models that improve food production and incomes in Kenya’s poorest districts. The Expanded BAACH project is a scale up of the successful BAACH pilot project that was rolled out in Siaya in 2008. The project is improving the physical performance of agriculture through application of new technologies such as drip irrigation & green houses as well as using market driven approaches such as value chain analysis to identify areas of sustainable profit maximization for players along the value chain.
### APPENDIX 2
### EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Foci</th>
<th>Sub Foci</th>
<th>Key Questions</th>
<th>Means of Verification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of the outcome (outcome analysis)</td>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td>To what extent is the intended outcome relevant in the context of the development and poverty reduction issues in Kenya?</td>
<td>Review of the CPD documents, Vision 2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>To what extent has the outcome been achieved or will be achieved</td>
<td>UNDP annual reports, UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries, Donors, Evaluation monitoring reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>UNDP contributions</strong></td>
<td>What are the contribution, effectiveness and relevance of on-going UNDP projects in achieving the intended outcome</td>
<td>UNDP annual reports, UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries, Donors, Evaluation monitoring reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>UNDP’s Advocacy</strong></td>
<td>To what extent has UNDP’s Advocacy contributed to the outcome</td>
<td>UNDP annual reports, UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries, Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Partnership</strong></td>
<td>To what extent have UNDP’s Partners contributed to the outcome</td>
<td>UNDP annual reports, UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries, Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Donor-coordination</strong></td>
<td>To what extent has the donor coordination contributed to the outcome</td>
<td>UNDP annual reports, UNDP Staff, Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Underlying factors</strong></td>
<td>Which underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control have influenced the outcome</td>
<td>UNDP annual reports, UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries, Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output Analysis</td>
<td><strong>Relevancy</strong></td>
<td>Are UNDP outputs still relevant to the outcome?</td>
<td>UNDP annual reports, UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries, Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How are the relevant opportunities integrated in all practice areas such as governance, environment, gender and capacity building with UNDP and within the UN system</td>
<td>UNDP staff, UN system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Have sufficient progress been made to attain UNDP outputs and how have they contributed to the outcome?</td>
<td>UNDP annual reports, UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries, Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How able is UNDP to engage in private sector dialogue at national level with key partners</td>
<td>Ministries, donors, NGOs, private sector an civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are there other areas UNDP could have contributed to improve achievement of outcomes and impacts</td>
<td>Ministries, NGOs, private sector an civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Foci</td>
<td>Sub Foci</td>
<td>Key Questions</td>
<td>Means of Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying Factors</td>
<td></td>
<td>Which outputs have been achieved through involvement of the beneficiaries, especially marginalised communities</td>
<td>UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What factors have affected the accomplishment of the outputs?</td>
<td>UNDP annual reports, UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries, Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output-Outcome Link</td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Is there evidence that there is link between UNDP outputs and other interventions with the achievement of the outcome?</td>
<td>UNDP annual reports, UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries, Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>Which are the key contributions that UNDP has made to the outcome?</td>
<td>UNDP annual reports, UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries, Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has UNDP contributed to sustainable national capacity development?</td>
<td>UNDP annual reports, UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries, Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soft Assistance</td>
<td>Is there evidence that there is link between UNDP’s soft assistance activities and the achievement of the outcome?</td>
<td>UNDP annual reports, UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries, Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>What is the prospect of the sustainability of the benefits beyond UNDP interventions</td>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships Analysis</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Which partnership exists?</td>
<td>Implementing staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How are they formed?</td>
<td>UNDP Staff, Beneficiaries, Donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What has been the role of UNDP?</td>
<td>Implementing staff, beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What has been the level of stakeholders participation?</td>
<td>Implementing staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How have these impacted the achievement of the outcome?</td>
<td>Implementing staff, beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How are the partnership formed and how do they perform</td>
<td>Implementing staff, beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership Strategy</td>
<td>Is there consensus on partnership strategy to achieve the outcome</td>
<td>Implementing staff, beneficiaries, donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>Has UNDP’s partnership strategy been appropriate and effective</td>
<td>Implementing staff, beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How has the partnership affected the achievement of or progress towards the outcome</td>
<td>Implementing staff, beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3
LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

8. MDGs Achievement and the Private Sector, UN, 2011
10. Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators, UNDP, 2002
15. UNDP, Kenya National Human Development Report 2010
18. Omolo, Jackob, Youth and Unemployment in Kenya, 2010
22. Nassiuma, Benard, Final Mid-Term Evaluation Report, DBSCs and PWBIK, UNDP, Nairobi, 2012
23. Project Implementation Documents, AWPs and Progress Reports for Outcome 44 Projects, UNDP
### APPENDIX 4

**LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>PHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>EMAIL ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Carolin Averbeck</td>
<td>UNDP- Team Leader, IEG&amp;SD</td>
<td>(+254 20) 762 4441</td>
<td><a href="mailto:carolin.averbeck@undp.org">carolin.averbeck@undp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Boniface Kitili</td>
<td>UNDP-Programme Analyst</td>
<td>0720639407</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Boniface.kitili@undp.org">Boniface.kitili@undp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lynette Lu vai</td>
<td>UNDP-Programme Officer, - IEG&amp;SD</td>
<td>(+254-20) 762 4472</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lynette.luvai@undp.org">Lynette.luvai@undp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Joyce Ogundo</td>
<td>MOT-Director Internal Trade</td>
<td>020 2241767</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jogundo@trade.go.ke">Jogundo@trade.go.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>G.M Kionano</td>
<td>MOT-Ag. Director, Dept. of Private Sector Development</td>
<td>0725 759 533</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gkionano@trade.go.ke">gkionano@trade.go.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nicholas M. Njogu</td>
<td>MOT-Principal Trade Development Officer</td>
<td>0722 968 806</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nicnjogu@yahoo.com">nicnjogu@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Samwel O. Otieno</td>
<td>Assistance to Micro Small Enterprises Programmes (ASMEP)- Programme Manager,</td>
<td>0722 248 376</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Samootieno@yahoo.com">Samootieno@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Dickson Khainga</td>
<td>KIPPPRA –Head, Microeconomic Division</td>
<td>0724 281 202</td>
<td><a href="mailto:khainga@kippra.or.ke">khainga@kippra.or.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Robert Ng’ong’a</td>
<td>MOT- Programme Officer, Dept. of Private Sector Development</td>
<td>0722 389 285</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Ngonga.robert@gmail.com">Ngonga.robert@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dinah C. Mwinzi</td>
<td>MOYAS- Director Youth Training</td>
<td>020-264 8534</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dmwinzi@youthaffairs.go.ke">dmwinzi@youthaffairs.go.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Monica Asuna</td>
<td>ODPM, MOF-Head, Aid Effectiveness Secretariat</td>
<td>0726 218 152</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmasuna@treasury.go.ke">mmasuna@treasury.go.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Patrick Macharia</td>
<td>MOSPNDSV2030- Economist, Poverty Eradication Commission,</td>
<td>0721 710 746</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pimacharia@treasury.go.ke">pimacharia@treasury.go.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Erick M. Kiilu</td>
<td>Ministry for State for Planning, National Development and Vision2030- Senior Economist, Poverty Eradication Commission,</td>
<td>0720 242 684</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thaerick@yahoo.com">thaerick@yahoo.com</a>/emkiilu@treasury.go.ke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Herbet Lusweti Masenegeli</td>
<td>Manager BMO Support UNDP, Poverty Reduction Unit</td>
<td>0722 281 238</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Herbert.masengeli@undp.org">Herbert.masengeli@undp.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:hlusweti@yahoo.co.uk">hlusweti@yahoo.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Josephine Kasera</td>
<td>UNDP, Ministry of Youth Affair and Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Leonard Kimani</td>
<td>National Economic and Social Council</td>
<td>0722876167</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lnkimani@nesg.go.ke">lnkimani@nesg.go.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Christine Musiko</td>
<td>National Economic and</td>
<td>0722797137</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmisiko@nesc.go.ke">cmisiko@nesc.go.ke</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Contact Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Patrick Ngumi</td>
<td>National Economic and Social Council</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pngumi@nesc.go.ke">pngumi@nesc.go.ke</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Aram Waweru</td>
<td>Muranga DBSC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Aram.waweru@gmail.com">Aram.waweru@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Joel M. Munyiri</td>
<td>Ministry of Trade, Muranga DBSC</td>
<td><a href="mailto:munyirijm@yahoo.com">munyirijm@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Charity Gachanja</td>
<td>Energy Saving Jikos</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Aram.waweru@gmail.com">Aram.waweru@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>William Kabuti</td>
<td>Worker Bee Self Help Group</td>
<td>0725327773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Margaret Wanjiru</td>
<td>Worker Bee Self Help Group</td>
<td>0713505301</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jane Njeri</td>
<td>Worker Bee Self Help Group</td>
<td>0716650244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jane Wambui</td>
<td>Worker Bee Self Help Group</td>
<td>0726048900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Francis Macharia</td>
<td>Worker Bee Self Help Group</td>
<td>0711929581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Alex Kioma</td>
<td>Worker Bee Self Help Group</td>
<td>0723689964</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Bildad Wachira</td>
<td>Worker Bee Self Help Group</td>
<td>0713003737</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Silvester K. Waguta</td>
<td>Chief of the Location and Group Leader</td>
<td>0721682126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dr Dinah Mwinzi</td>
<td>Director, ministry of youth affairs</td>
<td>0202648534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Victor Kirui</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>0721597105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Elene Amina</td>
<td>Programme officer, DANIDA</td>
<td>0722517809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Patrick Kimanthi</td>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:p.muguna@unido.org">p.muguna@unido.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Samuel Kiminza</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>0722780076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Michael Kalo</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>0729489957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Christopher Wambugu</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>0725446620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Timothy Walubengo</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>0722340360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Jessica Mutegi</td>
<td>MoT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jessica.mutegi@yahoo.com">Jessica.mutegi@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 5
CUSTOMIZED DATA COLLECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

UNDP TEAM

A: Brief information on the Respondent
   a. Name:
   b. Department:
   c. What is your relationship with the project by virtue of your position

B: Outcome Analysis (Status of the outcome)
   1. To what extent is the intended CPAP Outcome 44 relevant in the context of the
development and poverty reduction issues in Kenya? Please explain, giving evidence.
   2. To what extent has the outcome been achieved or progress made towards its
achievement? Please explain your response giving as much evidences as possible

C: Contribution of UNDP to the realization of the outcome
   3. What are the contribution, effectiveness and relevance of the on-going UNDP-PRU
   projects/programmes in achieving the intended outcome?
   4. What Soft Assistance Activities, relevant to the outcome were implemented by
   UNDP-PRU? Is there evidence that there is a link between UNDP’s soft assistance
   activities and the achievement of the outcome?
   5. Are UNDP-PRU outputs still relevant to the outcome? Please explain
   6. Have sufficient progress been made to attain UNDP-PRU outputs and how have
   they contributed to the outcome?
   7. Are there other areas UNDP-PRU could have contributed to improve on the
   achievement of the outcome?
   8. Is there evidence that there is a link between UNDP-PRU’s outputs with the
   achievement of the outcome?

D: Contribution of Partnership
   9. Which partnership exists? ; How are they formed?; What has been the role of
   UNDP?; and What has been the level of stakeholders participation?
   10. How have these partnership contributed to the realization of the outcome?
   11. Is there consensus that the UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and
effective in achieving the outcome?
   12. Which outputs have been achieved through the involvement of the beneficiaries,
especially marginalized communities? How have these outputs contributed to the
   realization of the outcome?
13. Which outputs have been achieved through the active involved involvement of the government departments? How have they contributed to the realization of the outcome?

D: Contribution of underlying factors (SWOT Analysis) to the realization of the outcome

14. What success factors (beyond the control of UNDP) could have contributed to the realization of the outcome?

15. What challenges did you encounter in the delivery of the outcomes. What recommendations do you propose to address the identified challenges?

16. What success factors (beyond the control of UNDP) could have contributed to the realization of the outputs?

17. What challenges did you encounter in the delivery of the outputs. What recommendations do you propose to address the identified challenges?

E: Link to UNDAF 3.1 - Equitable livelihood opportunities and food security with a focus on vulnerable groups enhanced and sustained

18. To what extent are the CPAP outcome, outputs, targets and indicators relevant to the realization of UNDAF 3.1?

19. To what extent are the CPAP outcome, outputs, targets and indicators contributed to the realization of UNDAF 3.1?

F: Recommendations and suggestions

20. How should UNDP adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures to ensure that the proposed outcome is fully achieved by the end of the CPAP period?

21. What corrective actions are recommended for the new, ongoing or future UNDP work in the CPAP outcome?

22. What suggestions, in your view are required to make the UNDP programmes most effectively continue to support the Government in effectively responding to governance and service delivery capacity of the state institutions?
APPENDIX 6

CUSTOMIZED DATA COLLECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

KENYA (MINISTRIES) PARTNER PROGRAM COORDINATORS
(MOYA, MOT, KIA, PM's Office, ADC, EAC)

A: Brief information on the Respondent
   a. Name:
   b. Department:
   c. Which UNDP programme are you implementing and what were the objectives?

B: Outcome Analysis (Status of the outcome)
   1. To what extent has the outcome been achieved or progress made towards its achievement? Please explain your response giving as much evidences as possible

C: Contribution of UNDP to the realization of the outcome
   2. What are the contribution, effectiveness and relevance of your UNDP-PRU projects/programmes in achieving the intended outcome?
   3. What were the expected outputs of your programme? Have they been achieved? How have they contributed to the realization of the outcome?

D: Contribution of Partnership
   4. Were there other partners who contributed to the realization of the outputs of your programme? How have these partnership contributed to the realization of the outcome?
   5. Who were the beneficiaries of your programme? Did they make any contribution to the realization of the outcome?
   6. What contributions did the government make to the realization of the outcome?

D: Contribution of underlying factors (SWOT Analysis) to the realization of the outcome
   7. What success factors (beyond the control of UNDP) could have contributed to the realization of the outcome?
   8. What challenges did you encounter in the delivery of the outcomes. What recommendations do you propose to address the identified challenges
   9. What success factors (beyond the control of UNDP) could have contributed to the realization of the outputs?
   10. What challenges did encounter in the delivery of the outputs. What recommendations do you propose to address the identified challenges.
E: Link to UNDAF 3.1 - Equitable livelihood opportunities and food security with a focus on vulnerable groups enhanced and sustained

11. To what extent did your programme/project contribute to poverty reduction?

F: Recommendations and suggestions

12. How should UNDP adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures to ensure that the proposed outcome is fully achieved by the end of the CPAP period?

13. What suggestions, in your view, are required to make UNDP programmes most effective in supporting the Government’s efforts in addressing issues of strengthening private sector, employment creation and poverty reduction?
APPENDIX7

CUSTOMIZED DATA COLLECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

BENEFICIARIES
Faniikisha, KKV, KNYD, BAACH (Siaya), DBSC (Siaya) and Changamuka Initiative- Maternal Health, ADC

A: Brief information on the Respondent
   a. Name:
   b. Group:
   c. What is your business activities

B: Outcome Analysis (Status of the outcome)
   1. To what extent has the project/programme contributed towards improving employment and income in your group or for you personally?

D: Contribution of Partnership
   2. Who else has contributed to the realization of to the project/program other than UNDP?

D: Contribution of underlying factors (SWOT Analysis) to the realization of the outcome
   3. What has worked well and why?
   4. What has not worked well and why? What solutions do you propose to address the identified challenges

F: Recommendations and suggestions
   5. What other recommendations would you like to make on the program design and implementation?
APPENDIX 8
CUSTOMIZED DATA COLLECTION QUESTIONNAIRE

TOP GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS AT POLICY LEVEL
(NESC, Vision 2030 Secretariat, MDG Secretariat, Poverty Reduction Commission)

A: Brief information on the Respondent

a. Name:
b. Department/Agency:
c. What is your relationship with the project by virtue of your position

B: Outcome Analysis (Status of the outcome)

1. In your, do you think that over the last four years, there has been strengthening of the private sector, increase in employment opportunities and poverty reduction. What is the evidence?

C: Contribution of UNDP to the realization of the outcome

2. In your assessment, to what extent has UNDP contributed to strengthening of the private sector, employment creation and poverty reduction

D: Contribution of Partnership

3. Other than UNDP, which partners have contributed to the achievements of the above mentioned outcomes?

D: Contribution of underlying factors (SWOT Analysis) to the realization of the outcome

4. What success factors could have contributed to the realization of the outcome?
5. What challenges did could have affected the realization of the outcomes? What recommendations do you propose to address the identified challenges
6. What opportunities and threats could influence the realization of the outcomes.

F: Recommendations and suggestions

7. What recommendations would you like to make to UNDP for the improvements in their programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods?