Integrated Support Project to the Devolution Process in Kenya

M&E CAPACITY ASSESSMENT REPORT

ABSTRACT

Summarized analysis of the M&E Capacity Assessment tool, which targeted and was administered to participants who occupy directorial positions at County level.

March, 2017

Contents

List of Tables

M&E CAPACITY ASSESSMENT REPORT

0. Executive Summary

Twenty one (21) counties, including Bungoma, Busia, Elgeyo Marakwet, Embu, Homa Bay, Kajiado, Kericho, Kilifi, Kirinyaga, Kitui, Kwale, Laikipia, Marsabit, Nakuru, Narok, Nyeri, Samburu, Taita Taveta, Turkana, Baringo and Wajir, participated[1] in this voluntary survey geared at assessing M&E capacities at county level, with the aim being to inform any interventions that can be made by UNDP's Devolution Project, such as instituting training measures so as to improve this component in the reporting of project activities.

Ten (10) main parameters were assessed in the evaluation of the sampled counties' M&E capacities, whereby a score of one (1) was assigned to symbolize a positive response - as applicable - and a zero (0) to denote negative feedback. Specifically, these (parameters) were:

   i.   *existence of M&E units;*
   ii.   *availability of full-time M&E officers;*
   iii. *availability of part-time M&E officers;*
   iv.   *preparation of M&E progress reports;*
   v.   *possession of M&E skills & competencies by county staff;*
   vi.   *availability of M&E training & capacity-building avenues at county level;*
   vii. *utilization of quantitative data collection & analysis techniques;*
   viii. *tracking of M&E indicators at the counties;*
   ix.   *utilization of data collection tools to track said M&E indicators;* as well as
   x.   *budgetary allocations for M&E.*

Subsequently, three (3) weighted tiers of counties were arrived at, based on the total aggregate score amassed by each, with the maximum score attainable being 10 and the least being 0. Resultantly, the following classification was arrived at (where **Tier 1** represents counties whose M&E capacity can be considered *strong* – scores ranging between 8-10*; **Tier 2*** being those with *average* M&E capacities – scores ranging between 5-7; and last but not least, **tier 3** encompassing those with *weak* capacities and the most urgent need for direct intervention so as to arrest the situation – scores ranging between 0-4);

   i.   **Tier 1 (strong):** *Bungoma, Embu, Homa Bay, Baringo, Kilifi, Narok* and *Kitui;*
   ii.   **Tier 2 (average):** *Nyeri, Turkana, Samburu, Wajir, Marsabit, Laikipia, Kajiado* & *Kirinyaga;*
   iii. **Tier 3 (weak):** *Busia, Kwale, Elgeyo Marakwet, Nakuru, Kericho & Taita Taveta.*

Succinct details of the above tiers are contained in *"[Table 7: Overall Assessment of the Counties M&E Capacity Needs 6]"*.

Ergo, concerted efforts should be made to ensure that the capacities of the six counties classified under **tier 3** are sufficiently built.

---

[1] *There were 21 sampled counties but 22 official respondents in this survey, attributable to the fact that two participants were chosen from Kajiado county due to the quality and/ or depth of their feedback as well as senior rank at county level, which explains the instances where negligible disparities in weighted percentages occur in the report. Specifically, all tables account for 21 counties, but every other detail assessed under the various sections herein incorporates the feedback from 22 respondents.*

1.0 Rationale of the M&E Capacity Assessment

In a bid to both acknowledge and better understand the counties' respective capacities to track and report on the project's outcomes, outputs and the aligned indicators, UNDP undertook an M&E capacity assessment, envisioned to ultimately enable the project to identify areas that need strengthening to enhance a results-based reporting approach in the remaining project period.

1.1 Respondent Profile

There were 27 total respondents, narrowed down to 22, based on *county, position* and *level of knowledgeability* in M&E matters. Their profile is illustrated by a **4:18** ratio of *women* to *men* (18%: 82%), attributable to the disproportionate nature of office-holding at county level, more so in the mid-level directorial positions. Noteworthy is that most of these respondents were domiciled within the **Finance & Economic Planning** (17), **County Budgets** (1), **Land, Housing & Physical Planning** (1) and **Office of the Governor** (3) dockets. Specifically, there were 9 Directors, 2 Assistant/ Deputy Directors, 3 Economists, 1 Chief of Staff, 1 Chief Officer, 3 Heads of Economic Planning, 1 Principal Budget Expenditure Officer, 1 Economic Planning Officer and 1 Information officer. Specifically, the <u>*21 counties*</u> that responded to the voluntary survey included: *Bungoma, Busia, Elgeyo Marakwet, Embu, Homa Bay, Kajiado, Kericho, Kilifi, Kirinyaga, Kitui, Kwale, Laikipia, Marsabit, Nakuru, Narok, Nyeri, Samburu, Taita Taveta, Turkana, Baringo and Wajir.*

1.2 Current Status of M&E Units at County Level

About a quarter (23%) of the respondents (5/22) reported **not having any** M&E Units/ Divisions in their respective counties, namely Busia, Elgeyo Marakwet, Kwale, Laikipia and Marsabit, with one more County (Nakuru) qualifying their response by stating that theirs is indeed in place but not fully functional. Here, it was noted that select *budget & economic planning staff* took on the M&E roles and responsibilities. Conversely, of the 17 counties that **affirmed the existence of said units**, 88% (15/17) reported that these are domiciled within the *Finance & Economic Planning* department.

Similarly, the number of full-time officers assigned to these units ranged between 0-7 (mean, 1.4) while those on part-time basis ranged between 0-20, with Kilifi County reporting the highest count (20).

The table below summarizes the data, with the figures enclosed in brackets outlining the specific number (of persons) in each stipulated county.

Table 1: Breakdown of Status of M&E Units in the Sampled Counties

Item	Count	%	Particulars
Counties **with** M&E units	15	71%	Bungoma; Embu; Homa Bay; Kericho; Kilifi; Kirinyaga; Kitui; Nakuru; Narok; Nyeri; Samburu; Taita Taveta; Turkana; Baringo; Wajir.
Counties **without** M&E units	6	29%	Busia; Elgeyo Marakwet; Kajiado; Kwale; Laikipia; Marsabit;
	N = 21		
Counties **with** at least one (1) full-time M&E officer	12	57%	Bungoma (2); Embu (1); Homa Bay (2); Kajiado (1); Kilifi (2); Kitui (1); Nyeri (2); Samburu (1); Taita Taveta (1); Turkana (3); Baringo (1); Wajir (7)
Counties **without** any full-time M&E officer	9	43%	Busia; Elgeyo Marakwet; Kericho; Kirinyaga; Kwale; Laikipia; Marsabit; Nakuru; Narok;
	N = 21		

Counties **with** at least one (1) part-time M&E officer	4	19%	Kajiado (4); Kericho (1); Kilifi (20); Kirinyaga (8);
Counties **without** any part-time M&E officer	17	81%	Bungoma; Busia; Elgeyo Marakwet; Embu; Homa Bay; Kitui; Kwale; Laikipia; Marsabit; Nakuru; Narok; Nyeri; Samburu; Taita Taveta; Turkana; Baringo; Wajir.
	N = 21		

1.3 Reporting, M&E Skills & Competencies, Training & Capacity-Building

As pertains **preparation of M&E progress reports**, 59% of the respondents (13/22) confirmed that their respective counties indeed took time to prepare these, with frequency of submission ranging between *sometimes on time (61%)* and *always on time (39%).*

Table 2: Breakdown of Counties' Preparation of M&E Progress Reports

Item	Count	%	Particulars
Counties **that prepare** M&E progress reports	13	62%	Bungoma; Embu; Homa Bay; Kericho; Kilifi; Kitui; Laikipia; Marsabit; Narok; Nyeri; Samburu; Turkana; Baringo.
Counties **that DO NOT prepare** M&E progress reports	8	38%	Busia; Elgeyo Marakwet; Kajiado; Kirinyaga; Kwale; Nakuru; Taita Taveta; Wajir.
	N = 21		

Asked whether the personnel involved in M&E possess **requisite skills and competencies**, nearly three-quarters (73%) of the respondents (16/22) affirmed that *yes, some staff* indeed did.

Table 3: Breakdown of M&E Skills & Competencies in the Counties

Item	Count	%	Particulars
Counties where **some staff possess** M&E skills & competencies	17	81%	Bungoma; Embu; Homa Bay; Kajiado; Kericho; Kilifi; Kirinyaga; Kitui; Laikipia; Marsabit; Narok; Nyeri; Samburu; Taita Taveta; Turkana; Baringo; Wajir.
Counties where **some staff DO NOT possess** M&E skills & competencies	4	19%	Busia; Elgeyo Marakwet; Kwale; Nakuru.
	N = 21		

Probed as to whether their respective counties provided avenues for **training and capacity-building on M&E,** 10 of the respondents (45%) replied positively, with the other 55% negating this reality, thus effectively highlighting a glaring gap.

Table 4: Status of M&E Training & Capacity-Building Avenues in the Counties

Item	Count	%	Particulars
Counties where **training & capacity building on M&E** is done	9	43%	Bungoma; Embu; Homa Bay; Kilifi; Kirinyaga; Kitui; Marsabit; Narok; Baringo.
Counties where **training & capacity building on M&E** is **NOT** done	12	57%	Busia; Elgeyo Marakwet; Kajiado; Kericho; Kwale; Laikipia; Nakuru; Nyeri; Samburu; Taita Taveta; Turkana; Wajir
	N = 21		

1.4 M&E Indicators, Data Collection and Analysis

Slightly under two-thirds (64%) indicated that their counties ___do not conduct quantitative data collection and analysis___ (including survey design, sampling, and statistical analysis). In close relation, the question of whether their counties **track M&E indicators** elicited a resounding 77% level of agreement, whereby 88% of these respondents confirmed the availability of **data collection tools to track said indicators** on **quarterly** (53%), **annual** (27%) and **semi-annual** (13%) basis.

Table 5: Status of Quantitative Data Collection & Analysis and Tracking of M&E Indicators

Item	Count	%	Particulars
Counties where **quantitative data collection and analysis** is conducted	8	38%	Bungoma; Embu; Homa Bay; Kitui; Narok; Nyeri; Baringo; Wajir.
Counties where **quantitative data collection and analysis** is **NOT** conducted	13	62%	Busia; Elgeyo Marakwet; Kajiado; Kericho; Kilifi; Kirinyaga; Kwale; Laikipia; Marsabit; Nakuru; Samburu; Taita Taveta; Turkana.
	N = 21		
Counties that **track M&E indicators**	16	76%	Bungoma; Embu; Homa Bay; Kajiado; Kilifi; Kirinyaga; Kitui; Laikipia; Marsabit; Nakuru; Narok; Nyeri; Samburu; Turkana; Baringo; Wajir.
Counties that **DO NOT** **track M&E indicators**	5	24%	Busia; Elgeyo Marakwet; Kericho; Kwale; Taita Taveta;
	N = 21		
Counties that have **data collection tools to track indicators**	14	67%	Bungoma; Embu; Homa Bay; Kajiado; Kilifi; Kitui; Laikipia; Marsabit; Narok; Nyeri; Samburu; Turkana; Baringo; Wajir.
Counties that **DO NOT** have **data collection tools to track indicators**	7	33%	Busia; Elgeyo Marakwet; Kericho; Kirinyaga; Kwale; Nakuru; Taita Taveta;
	N = 21		

1.5 Adequacy of M&E Budgetary Allocations

Fifty-nine percent (59%) confirmed that their county **does indeed allocate a budget for M&E**, with a hundred percent (100%) of these respondents following up by stating that this was **not adequate** at all.

Table 6: Allocation of M&E Budgets in Sampled Counties

Item	Count	%	Particulars
Counties where _**budget for M&E**_ is allocated	13	62%	Bungoma; Elgeyo Marakwet; Embu; Homa Bay; Laikipia; Marsabit; Nakuru; Narok; Samburu; Taita Taveta; Turkana; Baringo; Wajir.
Counties where _**budget for M&E**_ **IS NOT** allocated	8	38%	Busia; Kajiado; Kericho; Kilifi; Kirinyaga; Kitui; Kwale; Nyeri.
	N = 21		

1.6. Overall Assessment of the Sampled Counties' M&E Capacity Needs

Based on the M&E parameters that were analysed in the preceding sections, the following is a snapshot of the respective counties' M&E performance, classified into three main tiers. For each parameter assessed, a county was awarded a weighted score of 1 where said parameter was found to be positive, otherwise, a score of 0 was assigned in the analysis (_**simply YES = 1, NO = 0**_). Maximum possible score in the weighted scale is 10, whereas the minimum is 0. The closer a county's score is to 10, the stronger its M&E capacity and vice versa.

These tiers are as highlighted below:

➕ **TIER 1 – "STRONG" COUNTIES** (where M&E capacity may be said to be relatively strong);

The seven (7) counties with strong M&E capacities include _**Bungoma, Embu, Homa Bay, Baringo, Kilifi, Narok**_ and _**Kitui.**_

➕ **TIER 2 – "AVERAGE" COUNTIES** (where M&E capacity may be said to be moderate/ average);

**Nyeri, Turkana, Samburu, Wajir, Marsabit, Laikipia, Kajiado** & _**Kirinyaga**_ made up the eight (8) counties that performed averagely in this assessment, hence their classification into this tier.

➕ **TIER 3 – "WEAK" COUNTIES** (where M&E capacity may be said to be comparatively poor);

Six (6) counties were found to have the weakest capacities amongst those sampled, including _**Busia, Kwale, Elgeyo Marakwet, Nakuru, Kericho**_ & _**Taita Taveta.**_

Table 7 below illustrates the breakdown of this overall assessment.

Table 7: Overall Assessment of the Counties M&E Capacity Needs

	COUNTY	M&E UNITS	FULL-TIME M&E OFFICER	PART-TIME M&E OFFICER	M&E PROGRESS REPORTS	M&E SKILLS & COMPETENCIES	M&E TRAINING & CAPACITY BUILDING	QUANTITATIVE DATA COLLECTION & ANALYSIS	TRACKING OF M&E INDICATORS	DATA COLLECTION TOOLS TO TRACK INDICATORS	M&E BUDGETARY ALLOCATIONS	TOTAL AGGREGATE SCORE (MAX=10; MIN=0)	TIER 1 (STRONG M&E CAPACITY)	TIER 2 (AVERAGE M&E CAPACITY)	TIER 3 (WEAK M&E CAPACITY)
1	BUNGOMA	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9			
2	EMBU	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9			
3	HOMA BAY	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9			
4	BARINGO	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	9			
5	KILIFI	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	8			
6	NAROK	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8			
7	KITUI	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	8			
8	NYERI	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	7			
9	SAMBURU	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	7			
10	TURKANA	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	7			
11	WAJIR	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	7			
12	MARSABIT	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	6			
13	LAIKIPIA	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	5			
14	KAJIADO	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	5			
15	KIRINYAGA	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	5			
16	TAITA TAVETA	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	4			
17	KERICHO	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4			
18	NAKURU	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3			
19	ELGEYO MARAKWET	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1			
20	BUSIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
21	KWALE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			

1.7 List of the Main (Verbatim) M&E Capacity Weaknesses and their Associated Mitigations

The respondents were asked to give input on the perceived M&E capacity weaknesses at their respective counties, as well as their own recommendations to mitigate said bottlenecks. Resultantly, the feedback acquired is summarised in the table below, whereby **eight** (8) main weaknesses were discerned, related to the following aspects: ***training; staffing; tools & equipment; budget; political goodwill; M&E unit, policy, frameworks & indicators; data collection, analysis & management; and public participation.*** Some of the verbatim responses under each item are included in the table herein;

	CAPACITY WEAKNESS	MITIGATION
	(a) Training	
1	Lack of adequate M&E training (skills & competencies) for staff	Training for M&E staff (at KSG) would (be) quite vital
2	Inadequate skills in data analysis	Continuous trainings
3	Training and capacity building	The staff should be trained on the optimal way to achieve M&E objective
	(b) Staffing	
4	Shortage of staff	Hire (extra two) staff necessary to make the department effective
5	The M&E unit is under-staffed *(The UNV Officer in charge of M&E capacity strengthening of the county left after the contract was terminated, posing greater challenge on continuity of M&E programme in the County)*	Need to increase staff (to have 7 more officers) / Recruit at least one M&E officer in each department
6	(Inadequate) capacity in terms of staff, forces staff to undertake many roles at the same time, thus negating their role in M&E	
	CAPACITY WEAKNESS	**MITIGATION**
	(c) Tools and Equipment	
7	Reliance on borrowed transport means while undertaking M&E	A vehicle for M&E unit would help (us) undertake M&E as scheduled
8	Tools of trade	Dedicated vehicles, software and hardware (computers) equipment
9	Lack of M&E GIS software for efficient M&E	Procure and operationalize a web-based GIS-M&E software
10	Standardization of M&E tools	Coordinate and formulate a standard guideline for M&E
	(d) Budget	

11	Lack of budget, specifically for M&E	(Allocation) of budget to facilitate necessary working tools, e.g., laptops, etc.
12	Inadequate budgets	Increase M&E budgets to help in operations
13	Budget constraints	Proposals for grants to supplement budget / Donor support
(e) Political Goodwill		
14	Political Interference	Empower M&E department to avoid politics
15	Political goodwill	Partner with stakeholders to drive process
16	Conflict with the County Assembly, confuse(ion) with oversight	Relevant authorities, e.g., National Government, COG, to clear on oversight and M&E and who should do what
17	Lack of leadership from the top	Lobby for political goodwill from the executive
(f) M&E Unit, Policy, Frameworks and Indicators		
18	The counties do not embrace M&E	Need to come up with M&E policy
19	Lack of a(n) (fully functional) M&E unit/ office	Setting up an M&E unit as per the policy
20	There's no clarity on who is to carry out M&E	Set up M&E Unit
21	(Lack of) M&E framework	Come up with frameworks for implementation of M&E
22	Poor systems and indicators	Need capacity building to increase efficiency of M&E systems/ indicators
23	Institutional framework is lacking	Prepare, approve, disseminate and create awareness on M&E policy
(g) Data Collection, Analysis and Management		
24	Inadequate data for the county	Provide funds to recruit data collectors
25	Lack of a system that facilitates data management and reporting	Acquire a system that will support data capture (and) reporting
26	Improper record keeping	Improve on filing methods
27	Mode of communication and monitoring	System upgrade for M&E function
(h) Public Participation		
28	Lack of public participation and dissemination of M&E findings	Sensitization of chief officers, CECMs and non-state actors