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# Abbreviations and Acronyms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| AWP | Annual Work Plan |
| CEDAW | Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women |
| CSOs | Civil society organizations |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee |
| DaO  | Delivering as One |
| DPs | Development Partners (donors) |
| ERG | Evaluation Reference Group |
| FGD | Focus Group Discussion |
| FGM | Female Genital Mutilation |
| GBV | Gender Based Violence |
| GoK | Government of Kenya |
| HDI | Human Development Index |
| JP GEWE | UN Joint Programme on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment |
| KEWOPA | Kenya Women Parliamentary Association  |
| KII  | Key informant interview |
| KNCHR  | Kenya National Commission for Human Rights |
| KWJA  | Kenya Women Judges Associations |
| MDGs | Millennium Development Goals |
| MoGCSD  | The Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development |
| NCGD  | The National Commission on Gender and Development |
| OECD | Organization Economic Cooperation and Development |
| PWG | United Nations Programme Working Group on Gender |
| RC  | Resident Coordinator  |
| RCO | Resident Coordinator Office |
| S/GBV | Sexual and Gender Based Violence |
| UNCT  | The UN Country Team |
| UNDAF | United Nations Development Assistance Framework |
| UNEG | United Nations Evaluation Group  |

# Introduction

The evaluation team engaged to conduct the final evaluation of the GoK/UN Joint Programme on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (JP GEWE) started its work on 6 May 2014. This inception report is submitted by the evaluation team as the first deliverable of the evaluation. It sets out the design of the evaluation and is intended to guide the whole evaluation process. The first part of the inception report provides a brief description of the programme and its context as well as the purpose and scope of the evaluation. The methodology to be employed in conducting the evaluation, including the evaluation approach and criteria, data sources and collection methods, sampling and data analysis methods are discussed in part two. Part three of the report presents the detailed work plan of the evaluation. Finally, the inception report included an annex part which contains the evaluation matrix, the list of documents reviewed and the data collection tools.

## Background and Context

### Kenya Country and Gender Context

Kenya is a republic located in the East African region, and borders Ethiopia in the North, Somalia in the North East, the Indian Ocean in the South East, Tanzania in the South East, Uganda in the West and South Sudan in the North West. The total population of Kenya is estimated at 43,013,341 (July 2012 est.). According to the most recent census, women constitute 52% of the total population. About 80 per cent of Kenyans live in rural areas, where the dominant economic activity is subsistence agriculture[[1]](#footnote-1). The Human Development Index (HDI) Survey by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) 2013 ranked Kenya at 145th out of 187 nations. There exist wide regional disparities, with overall poverty highest in the North Eastern and Coastal provinces (73.9% and 69.7% respectively).

Kenya’s Gender Inequality Index (GII)[[2]](#footnote-2) is high at 0.608 in 2012 reflecting high maternal mortality rate, low share of parliamentary seats held by women (9.8% in 2012), and a relatively low participation of women in university education (43% in 2012). As confirmed by the 2013 GGI, there are significant gender gaps in enrolment in tertiary education (0.70), despite perfect gender parity in primary education enrolment (1.01). Women are more likely than men to be poor, and they are more vulnerable to adverse shocks with 54% of rural and 63% of urban women and girls estimated to live below the poverty line. Other challenges include cultural practices that limit women’s control over land and property, and gender-based violence.

Recent years have seen some progress towards gender equality. Measures to this end include:[[3]](#footnote-3)

* introduction of a one-third gender rule public services employment in the 2010 constitution;
* adoption of a National Gender and Development Policy in 2011;
* creation of 47 special seats for women in the National Assembly elected in March 2013;
* establishment of a Women Enterprise Fund; and,
* the enactment of laws to eliminate harmful practices against women and to increase access to land by women.

**Gender Mainstreaming:** Kenya has adopted and implemented a series of laws designed to protect the rights of women and contribute to women’s empowerment. Gender issues have also been mainstreamed in the relevant national policy documents including Vision 2030, National Land Policy (2009), National Reproductive Health Policy (2007), Maternal and Newborn Health Roadmap (2010), and the Strategy for Revitalizing Agriculture 2004-2014. The establishment of constitutional institutions such as the Commission for the Implementation of the Constitution, the National Gender and Equality Commission, the Kenyan National Human Rights Commission, and the Commission on Administrative Justice is also designed to strengthen the national legal and policy framework for gender equality and women’s empowerment. However, a number of shortcomings have been noted in relation to gender mainstreaming in Kenya. Major among these are:[[4]](#footnote-4) insufficient resources for the effective functioning of the national machinery for the advancement of women in terms of promoting specific programmes, effective coordination among institutions and ensuring comprehensive gender mainstreaming in all Government sectors.

**Gender Based Violence:** The adoption of the Constitution and enactment of a series of laws (including the Sexual Offences Act) over the last decade as well as the adoption of policies to fight sexual and gender based violence mark significant landmarks in addressing GBV in Kenya. However, the available evidence suggests an increasing trend in the incidence of GBV. Reports from medical sources show that the number of GBV cases has been increasing year on year.[[5]](#footnote-5) Convictions, on the other hand, are rare owing to serious lapses in the response by law enforcement and judiciary as well as an apparently low reporting rate. [[6]](#footnote-6) The prevalence of other forms of GBV is also high in Kenya with the most recent DHS putting the prevalence of FGM in girls and women (aged 15-49 years) at 27.1% (DHS 2008-09).[[7]](#footnote-7) Although the overall rate has shown a decline over the years, there is a worrying trend of the medicalisation of FGM in Kenya. More recently, the government of Kenya has issued a more robust Prohibition of Female Genital Mutilation Act 2011 to address gaps in the previous anti FGM law and prohibit all forms of FGM.[[8]](#footnote-8)

**Gender and Governance:** Although women constitute more than half of the Kenyan population, their participation in politics and the electoral process has been very limited. Only 50 women have ever been elected to Parliament between 1963 and 2012.[[9]](#footnote-9) While improvements have been seen since 2007, the proportion of women in the 10th Parliament (2008-2013) was 9.8 per cent. This compares negatively with Rwanda’s 56 percent, Tanzania’s 36 percent, Uganda’s 35 percent, and Burundi’s 30 percent. Overall, Kenya is 10 percent below the EAC’s regional average of 20 percent representation of women in parliament. The figures are even more dismal in relation to executive offices. The first woman minister was appointed only in 1995. However, the trend improved in the 9th Parliament when the NARC government came to power in 2002 and appointed seven women to cabinet positions, including three cabinet ministers and four assistant ministers. On the 25th of April 2013, Kenya’s fourth President, Uhuru Kenyatta, made history when he nominated six women to the cabinet—the highest number the country has had since independence and a number representing one-third of the total cabinet seats.

**Economic Empowerment:** While the Kenyan economy has shown signs of progress, the country faces challenges in terms of generating growth that is more inclusive.[[10]](#footnote-10) Kenya’s level of poverty is estimated at 46% with a higher prevalence in the rural areas (49.1%) compared to urban areas (33.7%), and wide variations across Counties. Women, single-headed households and pastoralists are more likely to be poor. With regard to some indicators women have lost ground despite the overall growth and improvements. For instance, maternal mortality increased from 414 to 488[[11]](#footnote-11) during 2008-11, compared to the MDG target of 147 per 100,000 births. This is largely attributed to poor access to functional health facilities in rural areas, high malaria prevalence, high fertility, HIV/AIDs, and high cost of maternal health care.[[12]](#footnote-12) Women are also disproportionately affected by limited access to basic services, inequality and unemployment.

It is based on the above context and the need to address existing gender issues and gaps that the Government of Kenya (GoK) and UN agencies in Kenya developed the GOK – UN Joint Programme on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment in 2009 guided by the Kenya United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF 2008-2013).

### Programme Overview

The Government of Kenya-UN Joint Programme on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (JP GEWE) was established in 2009 following a year-long intense consultation with national stakeholders. It was set to run from 2009 to 2013, but received an extension to 31 December 2014, to align with the extension of the current UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The Programme was designed to align with national priorities on gender equality and women’s empowerment in Kenya as reflected in various national policy documents.[[13]](#footnote-13)

The JP GEWE aims to contribute to national objectives by working on five inter-related strategic priority areas, namely:

1. **Gender Mainstreaming** to strengthen the capacity of the national gender machinery for gender mainstreaming; build the capacity of relevant line ministries to meet their gender obligations under their performance contracts; strengthen the capacity of key institutions for gender responsive data collection, analysis and dissemination (including within national M&E systems) and support the development, review and/or enactment of relevant gender responsive laws, policies and protocols.
2. **Gender Based Violence** interventions that seek to strengthen the capacity of key actors to respond to and prevent GBV; support the development, refinement and enactment of laws, policies, strategies and protocols relevant to the prevention and response to GBV; enhance awareness among citizens and support behaviour change programmes related to GBV prevention and response mechanisms and human rights issues, particularly within marginalized communities; strengthen coordinated approach and network creation for the prevention and response to GBV, particularly at community level and amongst marginalized groups.
3. **Gender and Governance,** specifically support to initiatives that ensure that reform processes as described in Agenda 4 are gender responsive and enhance women’s participation in decision-making fora that affect their lives. The programme will also respond to specific gender related needs following the possible passing of a new constitutional dispensation.
4. **Economic Empowerment** of women through support to the operationalization and strengthening of business development services and vocational training for women and enhance women’s access to financial services, productive and human capital developmentopportunities.
5. **UN Coordination and “Delivering as One”** initiatives which ensure that the UN progressively “Delivers as One” in support of national priorities in the area of gender equality and women’s empowerment and relevant areas of the Millennium Development Goals. It also aims to build the UN’s internal capacity to mainstream gender throughout its operations and programmes in the country.

The Programme is guided by the principles of the UN reform process and the *‘Delivering as One’* agenda. It brings together 14[[14]](#footnote-14) of the 17 UN agencies resident in Kenya (at the time of setting up) under one programmatic, budgetary, monitoring and evaluation framework, one coordinating agency and one leader. The accountability for the Joint Programme on Gender within the UN system in Kenya is vested with the Resident Coordinator (RC) as Chair of the UN Country Team (UNCT). The UN system appointed UN Women to be their coordinating agency with the mandate of organizing the development and implementation of the UN Joint Programme on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment both within the UN and with national counterparts. Each of the five pillars in the JP is in turn led by one UN agency, responsible for convening other agencies and national partners to encourage a more coordinated approach to work.

**Budget and funding arrangements**

The funding arrangements for the JP GEWE are of two modalities:

* **Parallel funding**: The budget components of each participating UN organization are consolidated into the Joint Programme budget. Each UN organization accounts for the income received to fund its programme components in accordance with its financial regulations and rules.
* **Pass-through funding:** for the additional donor funding supporting the Joint Programme locally.

The JP has a total budget of USD$56.5 million. The UN Agencies through parallel funding, i.e., through “core and non-core” were to raise an estimated budget of $28.5 million over the 5 year period. The balance of $28.1 million was to be raised through “pass-through-funding”, i.e. additional resources raised through local, regional and global fundraising. The first 3 years of the JP were funded by the 14 UN Agencies. A contract was signed with Norwegian Embassy in December 2011 to fund $2.3million over the next 3 years.

**Management and implementation structure**

The UN’s main national partner in the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the JP GEWE has been the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development (MoGCSD) (now the Gender Directorate under the Ministry of Devolution and Planning), in close collaboration with the Ministry of State for Planning National Development (now the Ministry of Devolution and Planning). The Programme also works with other relevant line ministries[[15]](#footnote-15), women’s rights and other Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), the private sector and relevant county level actors.

The Programme has put in place several management and oversight arrangements. The National Steering Committee (NSC), chaired by the Permanent Secretary in the Ministry of Gender (now the Gender Directorate) provides overall policy guidance, ensuring that the Programme outcomes and implementation are in line with the national development goals.

Within the UN, the JP GEWE is implemented and monitored through the UN Programme Working Group on Gender which consists of technical staff from all participating UN agencies. Each of the five pillars in the JP is in turn led by one UN agency, responsible for convening other agencies and national partners to encourage a more coordinated approach to work.

The overall co-ordination of the programme is managed by a Secretariat hosted at UN Women. The Secretariat is responsible for a) day-to-day operations; b) support to the functioning of the management structures; c) programmatic alignment to national priorities and providing policy advice where required d) coordinating the development, operationalization and continued monitoring and coordination of the monitoring and evaluation of the Programme including timely reporting to the UN Country Team (UNCT), donors and national counterparts; e) coordinating joint resource mobilization (f) coordinating the implementation of the JP Communication Strategy.

Financial administration and reporting is handled by the Multi Partner Trust Fund (MPTF) which is managed by UNDP.

## Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

As per the Terms of Reference (TOR) the purpose of the evaluation is to assess the Joint Programme operations, administration, and outcomes in order to identify lessons and good practices that can improve future gender equality and women’s empowerment Joint Programmes and joint programming in Kenya. The evaluation will look at progress made under the 5 Priority Areas and evaluate the extent to which the JP has met its overarching development goal. The specific objectives of the final evaluation are:

* To assess to what extent the Programme has contributed to the overall development goals of the country (i.e. contribution/alignment with Vision 2030, Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development’s Strategic Plan 2008-2012 and UNDAF 2009-14).
* To assess the level of progress made in the implementation towards achieving the goal and outcomes set out in the programme document and identify impacts of the programme that can be sustained and scaled-up;
* To identify and share lessons learned regarding the value of the approach and the relevance of the methodological and institutional arrangements in supporting national gender equality and women’s empowerment priorities;
* To identify and analyse challenges specific to the context or overall implementation, and suggest ways of addressing these in the future;
* To assess the extent to which recommendations of the mid-term evaluation have been incorporated; and
* To verify the effective and efficient use of funds to deliver results

The geographic scope of the evaluation will be the national and selected county level sites in which the JP GEWE actively implemented programming. The evaluation will include field visits to a selection of these sites, offering the evaluation team an opportunity to visit field sites for all relevant outputs. The final selection of the field sites will be done in collaboration between the evaluation team and the JP GEWE PWG.

Thematically, the evaluation will look into all activities implemented under the five outcomes of the Joint Programme from mid-2009 to February 2014. The document review and interviews will take into account the relevant preparatory work spanning 2008 – 2009 that went into development of the JP. As this is a joint programme the evaluation should look at the links between the five priority areas and analyze progress made as a whole.

# Approach and Methodology

## Evaluation Approaches

The design and implementation of the evaluation will be guided by the UNEG’s major evaluation principles and approaches. Based on the emphasis given in the ToR, this evaluation particularly adopts the human rights based and gender equality as well as participatory and inclusive approaches. The application of these interrelated and overlapping approaches has informed the process and methodological considerations/choices of the evaluation. In applying these approaches, the evaluation uses a range ways. Among others, these include:

* Ensuring the recognition of human rights and gender equality issues in the framed evaluation questions;
* Respecting gender and human rights principles throughout the Evaluation process, including; the protection of confidentiality; the protection of rights; the protection of dignity and welfare of people; and ensuring informed consent of informants (some of these considerations are already reflected in data collection tools –see Annex 4 below);
* Maximizing the degree of participation of stakeholders in the Evaluation (for instance, survey via email is included in the data collection methods with a view to reach a wider group of stakeholders-see section 2.3. below);
* Ensuring the inclusion of representatives from all stakeholders in the data collection process, particularly historically excluded groups of women such as those in rural areas, youth and survivors of GBV (this consideration has guided the identification and sampling of informant groups under section 2.3. below);
* Ensuring close and ongoing engagement with the Steering Committee and ERG, who are representatives of a wider group of stakeholders, to maximize the relevance, acceptance and eventual utilization/application of evaluation outputs;
* Using disaggregating data by gender and social group where feasible;
* Ensuring that evaluation outputs use human-rights and gender-sensitive language.

## Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The evaluation will use the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability as the analytical framework for responding to the evaluation questions. In addition to these 5 evaluation criteria, the ToR included the dimensions of coherence as well as management and coordination as separate evaluation criteria. As a joint programme, the issues of coherence, management and coordination figure prominently in the JP GEWE and the evaluation will use these issues as stand-alone criteria in addition to the 5 DAC evaluation criteria. The following table presents a summary of the evaluation criteria and the corresponding evaluation questions for the assignment.

Table 1: Evaluation Criteria and Key Evaluation Questions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Evaluation Questions** |
| **Relevance** | * Has the programme addressed the relevant rights and needs of the target group(s) in the country? Have new, more relevant needs emerged that need to be addressed?
* Is the programme design articulated in a coherent structure? Is the definition of goal, outcomes and outputs clearly articulated?
* What rights does the programme advance under CEDAW, the Millennium Development Goals, other international and regional commitments on gender equality and women’s empowerment? How has the programme contributed towards the achievement of MDG3 in Kenya?
* Have the stakeholders taken ownership of the programme concept?
* To what extent did the programme contribute to the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development’s Strategic Plan 2008-2012, the National Commission on Gender and Development (NCGD) Strategic Plan (2008-2012) and UNDAF 2008-2014?
 |
| **Effectiveness** | * What has been the progress made towards achievement of the expected outcomes and expected results? What results have been achieved?
* What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of results?
* To what extent have beneficiaries been satisfied with the results?
* Does the Programme have effective monitoring mechanisms in place to measure progress towards results? Were these monitoring mechanisms able to identify challenges and were the necessary follow up actions taken to address these challenges?
* To what extent have the capacities of duty-bearers and rights-holders been strengthened?
* How has the JP contributed to achieving the national agenda?
* How has the JP enhanced ownership and contributed to the development of national capacity to address gender equality and women’s empowerment issues?
* Has the programme produced demonstrable successes?
 |
| **Efficiency** | * How has the JP affected transaction costs for the government and agencies?
* Have programme funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the bottlenecks encountered?
 |
| **Coherence** | * To what degree did partners work towards the same results with a common understanding of and building on the inter-relationship between interventions?
* To what extent was the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) to programming and results based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion?
* To what extent (administration, planning, implementation, reporting, fundraising) did the JP work as ONE?
* To what extent did the JP enhance UN coherence with regard to support for national priorities on gender equality, women’s rights and empowerment in Kenya?
 |
| **Impact** | * What, if any, are the positive or negative, primary or secondary, long term effects produced by the JP, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended
 |
| **Sustainability** | * What is the likelihood that the programme achievements will be sustained after the JP support comes to an end?
* Are national partners able to continue with the programme? How effectively has the programme built necessary capacity of people and institutions (of national partners and implementing partners) to sustain or replicate the results achieved?
 |
| **Management and Coordination** | * How well are responsibilities delineated and implemented in a complementary fashion?
* To what extent did the various management structures set up (Steering Committee, Programme Working Group) contribute to the functioning and substantive work of the JP? What were the challenges and how can these be addressed in future?
* How well have the coordination functions been fulfilled?
* Were management and implementation capacities adequate?
* Has the programme made strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other Joint Programmes to increase its effectiveness and impact?
* Were recommendations of the mid-term review significantly addressed?
 |

## Data Sources and Collection Methods

The information required for the evaluation will be collected both from secondary and primary sources. In terms of primary sources, the list of informant groups includes, but is not limited to, the following:

1. UN Agencies
	* Participating UN Agencies
	* JP GEWE Secretariat
	* Resident Coordinator Office (RCO)
2. Government institutions involved in the management and implementation of the JP GEWE
	* Gender Directorate, Ministry of Devolution and Planning
	* The Treasury (Ministry of Finance)
	* Other line Ministries with which the JP GEWE has been working: the Ministry of Health, Education, Industrialization, Environment, etc.
	* Relevant Commissions like the Gender and Equality Commission, Constitutional Implementation Commission, Independent Boundaries and Election Commission, etc.
	* Parliament/KEWOPA
3. Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) or Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) that have participated in the Programme – in the Steering Committee or as implementing partners.
4. Development partners – key in the gender sector
5. Beneficiaries (women and community members who benefited from the Programme)
6. Private sector organizations involved or targeted by the Programme

 A mixed methods approach that involves the use of both qualitative and quantitative techniques of data collection will be used to collect information from relevant secondary and primary sources. The specific data collection methods/techniques to be used, including targeted data sources or informant groups as well as sample size to be covered under each method, are described below.

### Desk Review

It is expected that the evaluation team will generate the bulk of information required for the evaluation from secondary sources using the desk review method. The desk review will cover all relevant documents on the design and implementation of the JP GEWE as well as its context. The range of documentary sources will include, among others, documents generated under the JP GEWE (programme document, work plans, progress reports, mid-term evaluation report, minutes of meetings, strategies and research outputs, etc), relevant GoK policy and program documents, the current UNDAF, international and regional instruments related to GEWE, relevant documents on the international agenda on aid effectiveness and the UN initiative on Delivering as One (DaO), documents related to best practices on similar joint programmes in Kenya or other countries. Preliminary list of specific documents reviewed is included as Annex 2 in this report.

### Key Informant Interview (KII)

Key informant interview (KII) sessions will be organized with representatives of principal institutions that are directly involved in the management, coordination and implementation of the JP GEWE. These informants are expected to possess firsthand and valuable information on the design, implementation and achievements of the Programme. A KII guideline has been developed (Annex 4.3.1) to guide the KII sessions. Considering time constraints, the KII will focus on representatives/staff of UN agencies, government institutions, CSOs and DPs directly involved in the management of the programme, particularly in the Steering Committee and Core Management Team. Interviews will also be used during field visits with field level technical staff. The KII tool is primarily planned to be administered in person/face-to-face. However, it is also planned to use telephone interviews to cover a wider group of informants.

### Focus Group Discussions/Group Interviews

The evaluators will employ FGD and group interview sessions for informants with similar profiles, especially beneficiaries, CSOs as well as government structures as appropriate. FGD topic guides have been developed for use (see Annex 4.3.2). FGD participants from beneficiary women and community members will be selected purposefully focusing on beneficiaries who directly received supports/services from the Programme at different stages. Efforts will also be made to make the FGD groups to be representatives of different social groups in terms of age, sex and other social status factors. The number of FGD participants in each FGD session would be between 6-10 persons. The FGDs will be facilitated by the independent evaluators without the presence of any representatives of implementing partners.

### Survey

The evaluators will administer a survey questionnaire (see Annex 4.3.3). The survey questionnaire is expected to serve a dual purpose: reaching UN agencies, government institutions and other stakeholders that may be difficult to reach through the other tools, particularly through KII; and, generating quantitative data to confirm and triangulate the findings from other tools. This will cover all participating UN agencies, staff involved directly in project management and implementation, technical working group members, and representatives of key government and non-government partner institutions. Where appropriate, the questionnaires will be administered to more than one person per institution. The survey questionnaire will be administered by using online survey application software (survey monkey). The evaluators expect to reach a minimum of 40 to 50 informants through this tool.

### Case Studies

The evaluators expect that interesting case studies will emerge during the data collection process which best illustrate promising results and practices or major challenges faced by the Programme. Such cases are expected to develop organically from the interaction of the evaluators with stakeholders and beneficiaries in the data collection process. As appropriate, some of these cases will be identified and pursued to gather more relevant information for the evaluation.

### Field Observation

The evaluators will keep an extensive record of the context and process of data collection (research diary) to inform the data analysis process.

### Debriefing and validation workshops

As per the ToR, the evaluators will present preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations to the ERG, PWG and UN Country Team (UNCT). Also a verification or validation workshop is planned with a wider group of state and non-state stakeholders. These debriefing and validation workshops are expected to serve as an opportunity to gather additional information missed by the data collection process from stakeholders.

## Sampling of Field Visit Sites

It is suggested to purposefully select sites/projects for field visits. The proposed selection criteria include: geographic representativeness, including urban/rural settings, logistical feasibility, and Programme maturity level and diversity in terms of thematic focus. Based on these criteria and in consultation with representatives of Output leads, the following project sites are selected for field visits.

* Migori – to visit 2 projects under Output 2 & 4
* Naivasha – to visit a project under Output 2
* Tulimani, about 25 kilometres from Machakos Town – to visit a project under Output 4

## Data Analysis

Quantitative and qualitative data collected through the different collection methods will be analyzed using different and appropriate data analysis methods. The specific data analysis methods to be utilized include: descriptive analysis; content and pattern analysis; comparative analysis; and, quantitative analysis.

# Work Plan

The table below presents the detailed activities and time schedule of the evaluation.

Table 3: Work Plan

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **DATE/S** | **ACTIVITY** | **REMARK** |
| May 6 | Commencement |  |
| May 6-15 | Desk review and Inception report writing | Submission of draft inception on 15 May 2014 |
| May 16 – 21 | Inception report reviewed by the ERG |  |
| May 21 | International consultant travels to Nairobi |  |
| May 22 | Presentation of the inception report to ERG |  |
| May 23-26 | Incorporation of feedback from the ERG and finalization of the inception report | Submission of final inception report on 26 May 204 |
| May 22 & 23  | KII and other data collection in Nairobi |  |
| May 26-30  | KII and other data collection in Nairobi |  |
| June 2-4  | Field visits  |  |
| June 5-9 | KII in Nairobi and team work to consolidate preliminary findings |  |
| June 10  | Presentation of preliminary findings to the ERG |  |
| June 10  | International consultant returns to home base |  |
| June 11 – 20  | Report writing | Draft report submitted on June 20 |
| June 23  | International consultant travels to Nairobi |  |
| June 24 | Presentation to PWG |  |
| June 25 | Presentation to UNCT |  |
| June 26  | Stakeholders workshop;  |  |
| June 27  |  Presentation to GSWG |  |
| June 28  | International consultant returns to home base |  |
| June 30  | Compile comments on the draft report received |  |
| July 1-4  | Incorporation of comments | Final report submitted by July 4 |

The two evaluators will conduct the initial data collection stage jointly to establish a common understanding of the process and enable a more synergetic evaluation process. Once the initial data collection has been conducted, the evaluators will conduct separate field visits and undertake the latter stages of data collection in Nairobi separately. This is intended to enable a more efficient data collection process and increase the coverage of the evaluation.

# Annexes

## Evaluation Matrix

Table 3: Evaluation Matrix

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Evaluation Questions** | **Sources of Information** | **Tools** |
| Relevance | Has the programme addressed the relevant rights and needs of the target group(s) in the country? Have new, more relevant needs emerged that need to be addressed?  | GoK and UN reports on the country context; research reports, baseline surveys and other documentsBeneficiaries and implementing institutions | Document reviewKIISurveyFGD/group interview |
|  | Is the programme design articulated in a coherent structure? Is the definition of goal, outcomes and outputs clearly articulated? | Program document, AWPs, narrative reports and evaluation reports | Document review |
|  | What rights does the programme advance under CEDAW, the Millennium Development Goals, other international and regional commitments on gender equality and women’s empowerment? How has the programme contributed towards the achievement of MDG3 in Kenya? | CEDAW, MDG documents;National reports on gender equality and MDGs;Program document, AWPs, narrative reports and evaluation reports | Document review |
|  | Have the stakeholders taken ownership of the programme concept? | Program documents; UN Agencies; Government institutions | Document reviewKII |
|  | To what extent did the programme contribute to the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development’s Strategic Plan 2008-2012, the National Commission on Gender and Development (NCGD) Strategic Plan (2008-2012) and UNDAF 2008-2014?  | MoGCSD Strategic Plan; NCGD Strategic Plan; UNDAFCoordinating government institutionsUN agencies | Document reviewKII; survey |
| Effectiveness | What has been the progress made towards achievement of the expected outcomes and expected results? What results have been achieved? | Program document, AWPs, periodic reports,Involved government institutions;Participating UN agencies Implementing partnersbeneficiaries | Document reviewKII; surveyFGDCase studyField observation |
|  | What are the reasons for the achievement or non-achievement of results? | Program document, AWPs, periodic reports,Involved government institutions;Participating UN agencies Implementing partnersbeneficiaries | Document reviewKII; surveyFGDCase studyField observation |
|  | To what extent have beneficiaries been satisfied with the results?  | Program document, AWPs, periodic reports,Involved government institutions;Participating UN agencies Implementing partnersbeneficiaries | Document reviewKII; surveyFGDCase studyField observation |
|  | Does the Programme have effective monitoring mechanisms in place to measure progress towards results? Were these monitoring mechanisms able to identify challenges and were the necessary follow up actions taken to address these challenges? | Program document, AWPs, periodic reports, evaluation reportsCoordinating government institutions;UN AgenciesImplementing partners | Document reviewKII, Survey  |
|  | How has the JP contributed to achieving the national agenda? | Program document, AWPs, periodic reports, evaluation reportsCoordinating government institutions;UN Agencies | Document reviewKII, Survey  |
|  | How has the JP enhanced ownership and contributed to the development of national capacity to address gender equality and women’s empowerment issues? | Program document, AWPs, periodic reports, evaluation reportsCoordinating government institutions;UN Agencies | Document reviewKII, Survey  |
| Efficiency | How has the JP affected transaction costs for the government and agencies? Have the UN Agencies supported GoK as ONE? | Program document, AWPs, periodic reports, evaluation reportsCoordinating government institutions;UN Agencies | Document reviewKII, Survey  |
|  | Have programme funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the bottlenecks encountered? | Program document, AWPs, periodic reports, evaluation reportsCoordinating government institutions;UN Agencies | Document reviewKII, Survey  |
| Coherence | To what degree did partners work towards the same results with a common understanding of and building on the inter-relationship between interventions? | Management and monitoring reportsMinutes of SCUN AgenciesCoordinating government institutions | Document reviewKII |
|  | To what extent was the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) to programming and results based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion? | Programming and reporting documentsUN AgenciesCoordinating government institutionsOther implementing partners | Document reviewKIISurvey Field observation  |
|  | To what extent (administration, planning, implementation, reporting, fundraising) did the JP work as ONE? | Programming and reporting documentsUN AgenciesCoordinating government institutionsOther implementing partners | Document reviewKIISurvey Field observation  |
|  | To what extent did the JP enhance UN coherence with regard to support for national priorities on gender equality, women’s rights and empowerment in Kenya? | Programming and reporting documentsUN AgenciesCoordinating government institutionsOther implementing partners | Document reviewKIISurvey Field observation  |
| Impact | What, if any, are the positive or negative, primary or secondary, long term effects produced by the JP, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended | Programme reportsBeneficiariesImplementing partnersUN AgenciesCoordinating government institutions | Desk reviewFGDKIIField observation |
| Sustainability | What is the likelihood that the programme achievements will be sustained after the JP support comes to an end? | Programme reportsBeneficiariesImplementing partnersUN AgenciesCoordinating government institutions | Desk reviewFGDKII |
|  | Are national partners able to continue with the programme? How effectively has the programme built necessary capacity of people and institutions (of national partners and implementing partners) to sustain or replicate the results achieved? | Programme reportsBeneficiariesImplementing partnersUN AgenciesCoordinating government institutions | Desk reviewFGDKIIField observation  |
| Management and Coordination | How well are responsibilities delineated and implemented in a complementary fashion?  | Programme documentUN AgenciesCoordinating government institutions | Desk reviewKII |
|  | To what extent did the various management structures set up (Steering Committee, Programme Working Group) contribute to the functioning and substantive work of the JP? What were the challenges and how can these be addressed in future? | Programme documentsUN AgenciesCoordinating government institutions | Desk reviewKII |
|  | How well have the coordination functions been fulfilled? | UN AgenciesCoordinating government institutions | KII |
|  | Were management and implementation capacities adequate? | UN AgenciesCoordinating government institutions | KII |
|  | Has the programme made strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other Joint Programmes to increase its effectiveness and impact? | UN AgenciesCoordinating government institutions | KII |
|  | Were recommendations of the mid-term review significantly addressed?  | UN AgenciesCoordinating government institutions | KII |

## List of Documents Reviewed

1. Agenda item 4 of the National Accord and Reconciliation Agreement
2. CEDAW, Concluding Observations on Government of Kenya 7th Periodic Report on CEDAW, 2 February 2011
3. Joint Programme on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (JP GEWE) Programme Document
4. Joint Programme on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment, Annual Report 2012, 1 January to 31 December 2011
5. Joint Programme on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment, Annual Report 2011, 1 January to 31 December 2012
6. Joint Programme on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment, First Annual Progress Report, 01 January – 31 December 2010
7. Joint Programme on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment, Mid-Term Evaluation Report, February 2012
8. The Government of Kenya - United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2009-2014
9. The Millennium Development Goals
10. The Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development (MoGCSD) Strategic Plan (2008 – 2012)
11. The National Commission on Gender and Development (NCGD) Strategic Plan (2008-2012)
12. The National Framework towards response and prevention of GBV (2009)
13. The National Gender and Development Policy (2000) and its Action Plan (2008-2012)
14. The Sessional paper no. 2 of May 2006 on Gender Equality and Development
15. Vision 2030 and its Medium Term Plan (2008 – 2012)

## Data collection tools

### Key Informant Interview Guides

**Introductory notes**

* The following guiding questions are intended mainly to be used for semi-structured interviews with representatives key stakeholders of the JP GEWE programme:
	+ UN Agencies (representatives of the RCO, UNCT, participating UN agencies)
	+ GoK (representatives of major coordinating and implementing government partners)
	+ CSOs (representatives of Steering Committee member CSOs)
	+ Development partners (representatives of JP GEWE funding donors)
* The questions provided below are meant to serve as a menu. Only relevant questions will be used in each interview, depending on the experience and involvement of the interviewee in the programme.

**Steps**

* Introduction of evaluator/s and interviewee
* Introduction of interview purpose
* Obtain the consent of the interviewee
* Question and answer

**Guiding Questions**

***Relevance***

1. To what extent the programme has addressed relevant rights and needs of target groups? Have there been more relevant needs that should have been addressed by the programme?
2. Was the overall design of the programme appropriate, coherent and realistic?
3. To what extent the programme is aligned to and advances national policies and priorities as well as UNDAF 2008-2014?
4. To what extent the programme is aligned to and has contributed towards the achievement of international and regional commitments on gender equality and women empowerment, as enshrined in the CEDAW, MDGs, etc?
5. Have the major stakeholders taken ownership of the programme concept, in particular the joint programme concept and its implications?

***Effectiveness:***

1. To what extent the progamme achieved each of its 5 planned outcomes and results under them? What were the major factors that positively or negatively impacted the achievement of results?
2. How was the quality of the outputs or benefits delivered by the programme, including the satisfaction of beneficiaries?
3. To what extent the programme approaches and strategies have been effective in building national ownership and capacity to address gender equality and women’s empowerment issues?
4. Has the programme put in place and implemented effective monitoring mechanisms to measure progress as well as to identify and address challenges faced during implementation?

***Efficiency:***

1. Are sufficient resources allocated to the programme? Have programme funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? If there were delays, what were the causes?
2. How has the programme affected transaction costs for the government and UN agencies? Do you have specific examples?

***Coherence:***

1. To what degree did partners work towards the same results with a common understanding of and building on the inter-relationship between different programme components?
2. To what extent was the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) to programming and results based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion?
3. To what extent did the JP work as ONE and enhance UN coherence?

***Impact:***

1. Can you please state the major long term effects produced by the programme?

***Sustainability:***

1. What is the likelihood that the programme achievements will be sustained after the JP support comes to an end? Are there changes in national institution’s policy, structure and capacity that would contribute to sustain or replicate the results achieved?
2. Which components and/or results of the programme should be carried over into a second phase?

***Management and Coordination:***

1. Was the management and coordination arrangement set out in the programme document appropriate and realistic? Were the responsibilities of the management structures clearly defined and understood by all?
2. How well the coordination functions have been fulfilled? What were the challenges and how can these be addressed in future?
3. Were management and implementation capacities adequate?
4. Has the programme made strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other Joint Programmes to increase its effectiveness and impact?
5. Were recommendations of the mid-term review significantly addressed?

***Lessons learned and recommendations***

1. In your opinion, what are the major lessons to be drawn from the implementation of the JP GEWE?
2. What recommendation do you suggest to improve similar future programmes, in terms of programme thematic focus, management and administration, strategies, working procedures, stakeholders participation, etc?

### Focus Group Discussion Guidelines

**Introductory notes**

* The following FGD/group interview guidelines are intended to be used with selected representatives of beneficiaries (individuals and community members) and project officers and local government stakeholders in field visit sites.
* Depending on the number of participants and issues that would emerge in the process, an FGD or group interview session could take between 1-2 hours.
* The FGD sessions with beneficiary women and community members will be facilitated by the independent evaluators without the presence of representatives from stakeholders.
* In facilitating the FGD sessions with beneficiaries, the evaluators will present the discussion questions in a less theoretical and technical manner to ensure active and effective discussions.

**Steps**

* Introduction of evaluator/s and FGD participants
* Introduction of the FGD purpose
* Obtain the consent of the FGD/group interview participants
* Question and answer

**Part I: FGD with programme beneficiaries**

* Relevance
	+ What are the major problems related to gender equality and women’s empowerment in your local community?
	+ What JP GEWE related specific project was implemented in your area?
	+ How were you involved in the project? What services did you receive at individual or community level through the project?
	+ Howe important and relevant was the service/support your received to you or your community?
	+ Have you or any community member participated or been consulted in the design of the project?
* Effectiveness
	+ What have you and your community benefited from the implemented project?
	+ How do you see the quality of the support/service you received? Are you satisfied with the service you received?
* Impact
	+ What long term structural changes/effects related to gender equality have resulted from the implementation of the project in your community?
* Sustainability
	+ Can the local community and direct beneficiaries maintain the results of the project after financial support has been withdrawn?
* Additional comments and observations

**Part II: FGD/group interview with Field Level Implementers and Institutional Stakeholders**

* Relevance
	+ What are the major gender related problems in the project implementation area?
	+ To what extent has the field level project implemented in the area taken into account the prevalent gender related problems in the project implementation area?
	+ Have you or anyone from your institution participated or been consulted in the design of the implemented project? What about other project level stakeholders and implementers?
	+ Was the local community consulted or given a chance to participate in the design of the specific project implemented in your area?
* Effectiveness
	+ What specific projects are supported under the JP programme in your area? Which UN agencies support the program? What are the thematic areas of focus?
	+ How often do you report on the project activities? To whom? In what format? (can you provide documentation on the specific project?)
	+ What were the major planned activities under the project?
	+ What was the progress in relation to planned activities and results?
	+ What results has the project achieved in your area? What has it failed to achieve?
	+ How has your institution and your community benefited from the implemented project?
* Efficiency
	+ Was the resource allocation sufficient/adequate to conduct planned activities and bring about planned results?
	+ Have the planned resources and activities been delivered in a timely manner? If not, why not?
* Impact
	+ What are the major impacts or long-term effects of the project in terms of gender equality?
* Sustainability
	+ Can the implementing partners, local community and direct beneficiaries maintain the results of the project after financial support has been withdrawn?
* Additional comments and observations

### Survey Questionnaire

**Introduction**

The Government of Kenya-UN Joint Programme on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (JP GEWE) is a programme designed to run from 2009 to 2014. Now that the JP implementation period is drawing to a close, an independent team of evaluators has been engaged to evaluate the Programme. The evaluation will look at progress made under the five Priority Areas and evaluate the extent to which the JP has met its overarching development goal. This questionnaire has been developed as part of an evaluation exercise designed to assess the Joint Programme operations, administration, and outcomes in order to identify lessons and good practices that can improve future gender equality and women’s empowerment Joint Programmes and joint programming in Kenya.

We would be very grateful for your time in providing answers to the following questions with as much specificity, clarity and candidness as possible.

In responding to a YES or NO or other close-ended questions, please provide additional information if necessary to serve as illumination to the specific question.

We thank you for your time and candor.

1. **Respondent Profile**
	1. Gender: Male € Female €
	2. Institution Represented
	3. Type of institution
		1. UN Agency €
		2. GoK Institution €
		3. NGO/CSO €
		4. Private sector organization €
	4. Current Position of Respondent in the Institution
	5. How long have you involved in the management or implementation of the JP GEVE?
		1. One year €
		2. Two years €
		3. Three years €
		4. Four years €
		5. Five years €
	6. Which of the 5 JP GEWE outputs does your organization work with?
		1. Gender mainstreaming €
		2. Gender Based Violence €
		3. Gender and governance €
		4. Women’s economic empowerment €
		5. Delivering as One €
2. **Relevance**
	1. The JP is expected to respond to the needs of the country in terms of the development and gender context. In your opinion and related to the output area that you work on, to what extent has the programme responded to the actual needs of the country in general and target groups in particular?
		1. To a large extent €
		2. To a medium extent €
		3. To a small extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
	2. To what extent have the JP goal and objectives been aligned to GoK Policies[[16]](#footnote-16)?
		1. To a large extent €
		2. To a medium extent €
		3. To a small extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
	3. To what extent has the JP been aligned to Kenya –United Nations Development Assistance Framework?
		1. To a large extent €
		2. To a medium extent €
		3. To a small extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
	4. To what extent have the stakeholders understood and taken ownership of the joint programme concept?
		1. To a large extent €
		2. To a medium extent €
		3. To a small extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
3. **Effectiveness**
	1. To what extent has the programme achieved its intended results in your output area/s?
		1. Achieved all or most of the results €
		2. Achieved some of the results €
		3. Achieved very few of the results €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
	2. Did the program have an effective monitoring and evaluation system both at output and programme levels?
		1. To a large extent €
		2. To a medium extent €
		3. To a small extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
	3. To what extent has the JP GEWE contributed to the development of national capacity to address gender equality and women’s empowerment issues?
		1. To a large extent €
		2. To a medium extent €
		3. To a small extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
4. **Efficiency**
	1. Have programme funds been delivered in a timely manner? Did you release or receive funding for activities in a timely manner?
		1. To a large extent €
		2. To a medium extent €
		3. To a small extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
	2. Have programme activities been conducted/supported as planned/in a timely manner?
		1. To a large extent €
		2. To a medium extent €
		3. To a small extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
	3. Did UN agencies work effectively together to deliver on this JP and support the GoK?
		1. To a large extent €
		2. To a medium extent €
		3. To a small extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
5. **Coherence**
	1. Do you believe that partners involved in the JP GEWE have a common understanding of the program components and their interrelationship?
		1. To a large extent €
		2. To a medium extent €
		3. To a limited extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
	2. To what extent was the Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) to programming and results based management understood and pursued in a coherent fashion?
		1. To a large extent €
		2. To a medium extent €
		3. To a limited extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
6. **Sustainability**
	1. Do you believe that the programme achievements will be sustained after the JP support comes to an end?
		1. To a large extent €
		2. To a medium extent €
		3. To a limited extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
	2. Has the programme built necessary capacity of people and institutions (of national partners and implementing partners) to sustain or replicate the results achieved?
		1. To a large extent €
		2. To a medium extent €
		3. To a limited extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
7. **Management and Coordination**
	1. Are management and coordination structures and corresponding responsibilities clearly defined and understood?
		1. Very clearly €
		2. To a medium degree €
		3. To a very limited extent €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
	2. How do you assess the actual coordination of the programme (both at output and programme levels)?
		1. Coordinated very well €
		2. Coordinated satisfactorily €
		3. Coordinated poorly €
		4. Unsure/Don’t know €
8. **Additional information**
	1. What are the core gender equality and women’s empowerment related problems in the country? Have these been addressed by the JP?

* 1. What were the most serious challenges in terms of program design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation?

* 1. What are the major lessons to be drawn from the design and implementation of the JP?

* 1. What recommendations do you have to improve similar future programmes, in terms of programme thematic focus, management and administration, strategies, working procedures, stakeholders participation, etc?

1. GoK, Economic Survey, 2013; Second Medium Term Plan, 2013 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. African Development Bank Group, Kenya: Country Strategy Paper, EARC, February 2014, p. 9 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. African Development Bank Group, Kenya: Country Strategy Paper, EARC, February 2014, 9-10 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Committee on the elimination of Discrimination Against Women, Concluding observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women: Kenya, Forty-eighth session, 17 January – 4 February 2011, p. 4 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Gender Forum, Sexual Gender Based Violence Report, Nairobi, 27th February 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Violence against Children in Kenya: Findings from a 2010 National Survey: Summary Report on the Prevalence of Sexual, Physical and Emotional Violence, Context of Sexual Violence, and Health and Behavioral Consequences of Violence Experienced in Childhood. Nairobi, United Nations Children’s Fund Kenya Country Office, Division of Violence Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, 2012 [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 28 Too Many, Country Profile: FGM in Kenya, May 2013, p. 7 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 28 Too Many, Country Profile: FGM in Kenya, May 2013, p. 8 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Federation of Women Lawyers (FIDA) Kenya, Key Gains & Challenges: A Gender Audit of Kenya’s 2013 Election Process, 2013, p. 2 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. African Development Bank Group, Kenya: Country Strategy Paper, EARC, February 2014 [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. AfDB, February 2014, p. 8 – Also see: United Nations Office of the Resident Coordinator in Kenya, Progress Report on the Implementation of K-UNDAF 2009-2013, 2011 (Quoting: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) and ICF Macro, Kenya Demographic and Health Survey 2008-09, Calverton, Maryland, 2010) [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. AfDB, February 2014, p. 8 – Also see: Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, Concluding Observations of the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women: Kenya, Forty-eight session, 17 January – 4 February 2011, 2 February 2011, para. 37 [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Such major policy documents include: Kenya’s development blueprint, Vision 2030 and its Medium Term Plan (2008 – 2012), the National Gender and Development Policy (2000) and its Action Plan (2008-2012), the Sessional paper no. 2 of May 2006 on Gender Equality and Development, the National Commission on Gender and Development (NCGD) Strategic Plan (2008-2012), the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development (MoGCSD) Strategic Plan (2008 – 2012), the National Framework towards response and prevention of GBV (2009), Agenda item 4 of the National Accord and Reconciliation Agreement, and the Millennium Development Goals. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The 14 UN agencies includes: UN Women, ILO, IOM, UNIDO, UNHABITAT, UNICEF, UNAIDS, UNDP, UNFPA, UNODC, UNESCO, UNEP, UNOCHA, and WHO. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. These are the key line ministries each agency works with [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Including the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development’s Strategic Plan 2008-2012, the National Commission on Gender and Development (NCGD) Strategic Plan (2008-2012), Vision 2030? [↑](#footnote-ref-16)