
**Mid-Term Evaluation of the Gender and Governance Programme III
in Kenya (2008-2011)**

FINAL REPORT

Presented to UN Women

By

George Zimbizi
Gertrude Kopyo
Jeremiah Owiti

DECEMBER 2011

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
The Evaluation Team	iv
List of Acronyms	v
Definition of Key Terms	vi
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Evaluation	1
1.2 Approach and Methodology	2
1.3 Contents of the Report.....	6
2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAMME	7
2.1 Background of the programme.....	7
2.2 Findings from Review of GGP II.....	7
2.3 Objectives of GGP III	9
2.4 Intended outcomes, outputs and activities.....	10
2.5 Programme stakeholders.....	12
2.6 Institutional Arrangements	12
2.7 Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation Arrangements.....	13
2.8 Risks and mitigation.....	13
2.9 Budget Summary	14
3. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAMME	15
3.1 Programme Relevance and Appropriateness.....	15
3.2 Programme Effectiveness.....	26
3.2 Programme Efficiency	38
3.3 Programme Sustainability.....	42
3.4 Inclusiveness and Participation.....	46
4. LESSON LEARNING	47
4.1 Application of Recommendations and Lessons Learnt from GGP II Evaluation	47
4.2 Key Lessons Learnt	49
5. KEY EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS	51
6. KEY EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS	54
7. APPENDICES	56
7.1 Terms of Reference.....	56
7.2 List of people interviewed	63
7.3 Data collection tools	65
7.4 Case Studies.....	76
7.5 Press Cuttings on Gender	80

Acknowledgements

The evaluation team would like to express its sincere gratitude to the following, without whose support the assignment would not have been a success: UN Women Regional Office and GGP staff for the support and facilitation of the evaluation process; staff from the relevant government ministries and institutions, donors and implementing partners for affording us time to have in-depth discussions about the programme; and last but not least direct beneficiaries of the programme as well as indirect beneficiaries who afforded the team time to discuss with them various issues pertaining to the programme. Thank you all for open and frank discussions.

The Evaluation Team

<p>George Zimbizi (Team Leader)</p>	<p>George Zimbizi is an International Social Development Consultant with over 16 years experience. He has done several assignments for international NGOs/Agencies such as DFID, CIDA, EC, USAID, Oxfam GB, Save the Children UK, Trocaire, UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, UNIFEM (UN Women), IOM, World Vision, SNV Netherlands, CARE International, SAT, HIV/AIDS International Alliance, CHF, Concern World Wide, CAFOD, and CRS. George’s competencies include Programme Evaluations, Gender Analysis and Mainstreaming, Gender Training and Participatory Methodologies.</p>
<p>Gertrude Kopyo</p>	<p>Gertrude Kopyo is a participatory gender trainer and consultant for nearly 20 years having undertaken assignments for different Government of Kenya Ministries and Agencies; international agencies among them: the World Bank, SNV, Sida, DfID, DANIDA, UNICEF, UNIFEM, and both local and international Civil Society Organizations among them CRS, Civil Society Network, Safe World. The bulk of work focused on engendering development for inclusiveness and equity. Played leading coordinating role in implementation of key processes and produced operating national and regional partnership instruments.</p>
<p>Jeremiah Owiti</p>	<p>Jeremiah Owiti has more than fifteen years experience in Project Design, Monitoring and Evaluation, Gender and governance assessments, Capacity Building Strategies for CSOs, Civic Education, Governance Assessments, Public Perception and Attitude Surveys, Applied Social Research (including baseline surveys & market research), Public Policy Analysis, as well as Ethics and Integrity Monitoring within Kenya and in the East and Central African region. Jeremiah has done several assignments on gender and governance, advocacy, capacity building for civil society organizations and voter education for international agencies, amongst them: Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA), United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Michigan State University, Uppsala University, Royal Netherlands Embassy, Japan International Development Cooperation Agency (JICA), Clingendael Institute of the Netherlands, Management Systems International and Inter-Church Organization for Development Cooperation (ICCO-Netherlands).</p>

List of Acronyms

ACK	Anglican Church of Kenya
ACWICT	African Centre for Women in ICT
AYT	Africa Youth Trust
CAI	Community Aid International
CCGD	Collaborative Centre for Gender & Development
CMD	Centre for Multiparty Democracy
CPDA	Christian Partners Development Agency
CREADIS	Community Research in Environment and Development Initiative
CWL	Caucus for Women's Leadership
DFID	Department for International Development
DTM	Development Through Media
DSC	Donor Steering Committee
ECAW	Education Centre for Advancement of Women
ECK	Electoral Commission of Kenya
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FGM	Female Genital Mutilation
FIDA	Federation of Women Lawyers
FONI	Friends of Nomads
GBV	Gender Based Violence
GGP	Gender and Governance Programme
GoK	Government of Kenya
GRRU	Gender Rapid Response Unit
IEA	Institute of Economic Affairs
IP	Implementing Partner
IIEC	Interim Independent Electoral Commission
KEWOPA	Kenya Women Parliamentarian Association
KIPPRA	Kenya Institute of Public Policy Research & Analysis
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MP	Member of Parliament
NCCK	National Council of Churches of Kenya
NCIC	National Cohesion and Integration Commission
UN Women	United Nations entity for gender equality and empowerment of Women
PFMA	Programme and Financial Management Agency
PMU	Project Management Unit
PRG	Partners Reference Group
RBM	Rights Based Management
Sida	Swedish International Development Agency
SJCC	St John's Community Centre
TI	Transparency International
UN	United Nations
UNIFEM	United Nations Development Fund for Women
UNW	United Nations Entity for Women
WAFNET	Women Action Forum for Networking
WPA	Women Political Alliance
WSP	Women Shadow Parliament
YWCA	Young Women's Christian Association

Definition of Key Terms¹

Key Term	Definition
Gender	Refers to the social attributes and opportunities associated with being male and female and the relationships between women and men and girls and boys, as well as the relations between women and those between men. These attributes, opportunities and relationships are socially constructed and are learned through socialization processes.
Gender Awareness	Recognition that women and men perform different roles in society and therefore have different needs which must be recognized.
Gender Discrimination	A difference in treatment of people based entirely on their being male or female. This difference contributes to structural inequality in society.
Gender Inequality	Refers to the unequal rights, responsibilities and opportunities of women and men and girls and boys in all sectors, political, social, legal and economic.
Gender Equity	Recognizing that different approaches may be needed to produce equitable outcomes by taking account of and addressing the differences between and amongst the lives of women and men, boys and girls and the diversity of different groups of women/girls and men/boys.
Gender Mainstreaming	The process of assessing the implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes, in any area and at all levels. It is a strategy for making the concerns and experiences of women as well as of men an integral part of the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies and programmes in all political, economic and societal spheres, so that women and men benefit equally, and inequality is not perpetuated. The ultimate goal of mainstreaming is to achieve gender equality.
Sex	This refers to the biological and physiological characteristics that categorize someone as either female or male.
Social Exclusion	The process through which individuals or groups are wholly or partially excluded from full participation in the society in which they live resulting in these individuals and groups being prevented from accessing resources, participating in society and asserting their rights.
Women Empowerment	A process through which women and girls acquire knowledge, skills and willingness to critically analyze their situation and take appropriate action to change the status quo of women and other marginalized groups in society.

¹ DFID Gender Equality and Social Inclusion Policy Documents and Action Plan, 2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

This report presents findings of a mid-term evaluation of the Gender and Governance Programme Phase III (GGP III: 2009-2011). The evaluation, which was carried out in the framework of UN Women's Evaluation Policy and Strategy (2008-2011), was conducted by a team of three external experts, comprising one international and two national consultants.

The Gender and Governance Programme III evolved from two preceding gender programmes implemented in Kenya namely: (a) the Engendering Political Participation Process (EPPP) programme Phase One (2002) and (b) the Gender and Governance Programme Phase Two (2004-2008). This mid-term evaluation focused on the third phase of GGP (2009-2011) but took into consideration the two preceding phases in order to understand how the programme evolved, its objectives as well as its strategic direction. GGP III, which is basket funded by a consortium of 8 donors chaired by the Government of Finland, has a three-year funding level of US\$12.1 million. The programme is currently supporting a total of 27 Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) who are the Implementing Partners (IPs). The programme and fund manager of GGP III is UN Women (formerly known as UNIFEM), whose key roles include managing programme funds, providing technical support and overseeing the implementation process.

The **Goal** of GGP III is *to ensure that Kenyan women and men are able to access services and opportunities and exercise their rights equally while its two main outcomes are: a) Increased number of Kenyan legal frameworks, laws and policies at national and local level that promote women's human rights and; b) Women participate in governance and decision-making processes at national and local levels and actively lobby for women's issues.* Key strategies to achieve desired outcomes include; institutional capacity building of relevant government institutions, national gender machinery and implementing partners; community sensitisation and support to civil society and; promoting the use of gender sensitive Results Based Management (RBM).

Purpose of the Mid-Term Evaluation

The main purpose of the mid-term evaluation was to determine the extent to which programme activities have so far contributed towards the achievement of desired outcomes and to draw out and document key lessons learnt as well as provide a set of recommendations on the strategic direction of the programme. The evaluation also sought to determine the relevance/appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and inclusiveness of the programme.

Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation employed mainly qualitative methods in gathering data. The following methods were used for data collection: **Review** of relevant programme documents; **Key Informant** Interviews (KII) with UN Women Programme Staff, Ministry of Gender, Children & Social Development, National Commission for Gender and Development, Interim Independent Electoral Commission, Embassies of Finland and Norway, Canadian Cooperative Office, Royal Dutch Embassy and leaders of IPs at both national and local levels²; **Focus Group Discussions** with targeted beneficiaries of the programme in the different programme areas visited by the evaluation team; **Media Content Analysis** highlighting the coverage that gender issues are getting in mainstream media; **Change Stories** collected from beneficiaries; and where possible **Observation** of programme activities. More than 50 key informants were interviewed while 16 FGDs were conducted. Twenty-seven current and past partners with both closed and open files, spread across Kenya and focusing on different components of GGP III, were sampled.

The evaluation adopted a participatory approach. Key stakeholders of the programme participated in refining the evaluation methodology and expressing their expectations during the inception workshop. They also participated during the evaluation process as key informants or as focus group participants where they submitted their judgements on programme performance as well as recommendations on the way forward. Stakeholders further participated at the results presentation workshop where they validated evaluation findings.

Methodological challenges of the evaluation included limited timeframe to enable a wider coverage of programme stakeholders, unavailability of some of the key stakeholders, a lack of response by some key stakeholders such as the Kenyan Women Parliamentarians (KEWOPA) and logistical complications emanating from the vastness of the programme.

KEY FINDINGS OF THE EVALUATION

The following were the Key Findings of the mid-term evaluation:

a) Lesson Learning from GGP II Evaluation

The design of GGP III was mainly informed by findings and recommendations of GGP II assessment as well as consultations with key stakeholders. The evaluation established that out of the 15 key concerns of GGP II evaluation, GGP III has managed to satisfactorily address 6 issues or 40% of the concerns. Issues that the evaluation considers to have been positively addressed include: focusing the programme more on governance and transformational issues; addressing the quantity vs quality debate of women parliamentarians through capacity building; providing technical and analytical support to national stakeholders and conducting a baseline survey and a risk analysis.³

² See annex 6.2 for a detailed list of KI and IPs interviewed

³ See section with detailed account on GGP III response to GGP II concerns and recommendations

Gaps identified by GGP II evaluation noted to still exist by this evaluation include: programme planning without being fully informed by previous evaluation; non-functionality of PRG; delays in funding disbursement and lack of a strong and united women's movement. The evaluation appreciates that some of the gaps identified by the GGP II evaluation, for example issues to do with ethnicity and patronage as well as late disbursement of funds owing to UN bureaucracy, are much more difficult to address through a programme with a short duration such as GGP III and where UN guidelines and procedures have to be adhered to. The evaluation also noted that efforts are being made by the programme to address some of the outstanding issues. However, issues such as M&E and having an effective PRG ought to have been more effectively addressed by the programme as part of the lesson learning process given that 15% and 7% of the programme budget were allocated for M&E and Learning respectively.⁴

b) Programme Relevance and Appropriateness

Programme goal and anticipated outcomes were found to be highly relevant and appropriate given the large gender disparities that characterise all spheres of Kenyan society, including governance. The thrust and objectives of GGP III were also found to be in alignment and complementary to the Vision 2030 of the Government of Kenya (GoK) and associated national processes and initiatives such as the Constitutional Reform, Presidential Directive on the 30% affirmative action quota for women in public institutions; National Policy on Gender and Development; Draft National Employment Policy which articulates women's rights and child labour issues; and the Mid-Term Plan. Kenya is signatory to regional and international conventions and instruments such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), CEDAW, Beijing Platform for Action, CRC and Solemn Declaration on Gender Equality in Africa (2004) whose objectives all resonate with GGP III. The evaluation however noted that there is need to harmonise programme documents so that they all reflect the same framework, goal and expected outcomes and outputs.

GGP III partnerships involving GoK, UN Women, donors, the majority of IPs and targeted beneficiaries were also found to be relevant and appropriate by the evaluation as the partners were found to be occupying strategic space and playing pivotal roles in the gender and governance domain. However, there is need for GGP III/UN Women to facilitate regular interaction between partners through the Partners Reference Group (PRG) and through Experience Sharing and Lesson Learning workshops for IPs. The evaluation established that most GGP III IPs were not collaborating with each other even when working within the same locality, leading to possible duplication of efforts, as was noted to be the case in Mombasa . Selection criteria for implementing partners needs further improvement to ensure that selected partners have both capacity and an understanding of GGP III objectives. Funds permitting, the programme should spread to cover more women and men in remote areas. In areas where there are no partners with capacity or whose activities are not in alignment with GGP III thrust, selection criteria should be loosened up to include such partners provided this is followed by intensive capacity building initiatives by the programme.

⁴ See budget analysis in Section 4.1

The pooled/basket funding approach by GGP III is in line with the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness which seeks to promote ownership, harmony, alignment and accountability of aid initiatives by donors to make those initiatives more effective. It is also in alignment with MDG 8, which calls for global partnerships as vehicles for achieving development.

Key risks identified and assumptions made at the beginning of the programme were found by the evaluation to be mostly valid. Given the drift towards the 2012 elections, there is need for GGP III to do scenario plotting and fall-back planning to minimise negative impacts should the risks and assumptions become real.

c) Programme Effectiveness

Determining programme effectiveness of GGP III was one of the most difficult aspects of the evaluation. This was so because there is a multiplicity of parallel processes and initiatives, particularly at national level, with the same Goal as GGP III that are taking place in Kenya. Attributing the extent to which GGP III has contributed to gender and governance achievements to date is therefore equally difficult. With this reality in mind, the evaluation therefore focused mainly at output and activity level with the assumption that accomplishment of planned activities and outputs would ultimately and inevitably make significant contributions towards the mid-term and long-term realisation of expected outcomes. GGP III collaborated with and complemented well other UN funded programmes with similar goals and objectives such as Uraia and Amkeni Wa Kenya, whose sum contribution will most likely lead to significant improvement in women's involvement and participation in Governance.

Under **Outcome I**, GGP III expected to increase the number of legal frameworks, laws and policies at national and local levels that promote and protect women's rights. This would be achieved through: (a) the development of knowledge on how to engender laws, policies and legal processes; (b) the creation of effective dialogue mechanisms between different stakeholders; (c) increasing the capacities of national gender machinery to mainstream gender in the development of legal frameworks, laws, policies and processes and; (d) enhancing capacities of key government institutions to put in place mechanisms that promote the participation of women in governance issues.

GGP III scored significant successes under this outcome including helping to support a gender audit of the new constitution; safeguarding gender gains in the constitution; facilitating the establishment of a roadmap for specific gender legislation and increasing awareness on international protocols for the protection of women's human rights. The programme also supported the creation of dialogue mechanisms and processes through support to GGP partners to undertake civic education on the draft constitution; awareness campaigns on women's gains in the new constitution and Kenya open day-partnership for peace. As part of its strategy to build capacities at national level, GGP seconded a Gender Advisor to the Ministry of Gender, held trainings on Gender Analysis for Gender Focal persons and Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB) for partners. GGP III was also instrumental in establishing the National Steering Committee (NSC).

Although most of the planned outputs and activities were achieved under Outcome I, the effectiveness of these efforts in transitioning outputs to outcomes was compromised by a number of strategic issues. There was a general perception by some stakeholders that the PFMA is focusing more attention on programming issues at the expense of policy and strategic issues. The majority of donors and the National Gender Machinery felt that UN Women needs to put more effort towards engagement with government and donors as well as towards the exploitation of policy and strategic space so as to improve progress towards the realisation of this anticipated outcome. Bureaucracy at both UN Women and National Gender Machinery (Ministry of Gender, Children & Social Development and the National Commission on Gender and Development) was reported to be impacting negatively on effective implementation of programme activities. UN Women and the National Gender Machinery mutually view each other as lacking capacity thereby diminishing the confidence that these institutions have in each other.

The full realisation of Outcome I will much depend on the extent to which the legal frameworks, laws and policies are operationalised and implemented at all levels. Experience in other countries, for example Zimbabwe, has shown that having gender sensitive laws and policies in itself does not automatically result in tangible benefits to women and neither is it a guarantee that women's rights will be promoted and protected. An effective implementation and operational framework needs to be in place and regularly monitored and hence the evaluation recommends more focus on this aspect by GGP III for full realisation of Outcome I.

Outcome 2 of GGP III focused on increasing women participation in governance and decision-making processes at national and local levels and improving their capacity to actively lobby for women's issues. This was to be accomplished through: (a) strengthened leadership capacity; (b) strengthened women's movement for effective lobbying; (c) increased awareness of women's rights and state responsibilities with regard to service provisioning and; (d) acceptance of women leadership and women's issues.

The programme partnered with more than 10 women's organisations and CSOs to train the leadership of these women's organisations on governance, leadership and gender equality issues. Almost all women's leaders interviewed during the evaluation reported that the training they received was extremely useful as it has boosted their confidence in their abilities as women leaders. An increase in the number of women appointed to become chiefs and sub-chiefs, women elected as councillors and those seeking to run for public office and women participation in the devolved funds decision-making processes has been recorded in most programme areas visited during the evaluation. Concerns were however raised by some beneficiaries interviewed about the coverage of the leadership training which seemed to have concentrated mostly at regional level. CSO leaders reported that women leaders in hard-to-reach areas need to be reached for the programme to have more impact.

The evaluation did not notice a strengthened women's movement that is speaking in one voice on national and local issues. The need to strengthen the women's movement was highlighted in the GGP II evaluation and no significant changes seem to have taken place between GGP II evaluation and this mid-term evaluation.

Through 17 partners, GGP III has managed to reach more than 10,000 women with information on women's rights, constitutional issues and governance. At local level, capacity enhancement of IPs and targeted beneficiaries was done through civic education, awareness programmes and training. The majority of implementing partners and beneficiaries interviewed expressed satisfaction with the transformational impacts of the initiatives on their lives as well as on their capacities as they can now effectively lobby for women's rights and have enhanced capacity to meaningfully participate in governance issues. Amongst the beneficiaries, there was generally evidence of awareness of rights and provisions of the new constitution as the majority of interviewed participants could articulate their basic constitutional rights as well as the rights to participate in governance. Statistics compiled by some of the IPs show that although progress is slow, there is increased participation by women in governance at local level in most programme areas as women now occupy positions such as chiefs and assistant chiefs, councillors and devolved funds committee members. An increasing number of women expressed their wish to participate in local and national elections. Substantial gains on gender and governance in Kenya can be identified with GGP activities. In some districts however, for example as revealed by a FONI study of 2 districts, participation by women in decision-making processes was noted to be still very low.

Through awareness campaigns that are targeting both men and women, the evaluation noted that there was a gradual acceptance, albeit slow in pace, of women's occupation of leadership positions. Community leaders were noted in some areas to be encouraging women to occupy leadership positions and to actively participate during meetings. This was particularly pronounced in previously conservative areas such as Mombasa where male gender warriors were spearheading the campaign for the inclusion of women in governance processes. The evaluation also noted that women's issues are no longer regarded as peripheral but have been brought to the fore of national development processes.

The evaluation identified a number of factors affecting programme effectiveness under outcome I. Among these were: implementing partners with limited capacity and whose goals, objectives and activities did not resonate with GGP III objectives; difficulties encountered in accessing women and men in some hard-to-reach outlying areas; training materials and tools which were too technical for the level of targeted participants; limited time for training resulting in crash-training programmes and information overload; and inadequate monitoring of IPs by UN Women. Perceived lack of a strong women's movement and a general lack of harmonisation, collaboration and experience sharing among IPs were some of the key factors identified by the evaluation to have slowed down programme effectiveness.

Despite the above shortcomings, the conclusion of the evaluation is that the programme is generally headed in the right direction and is significantly contributing towards the mid-term and long-term realisation of Outcomes 1 and 2.

d) Programme Efficiency

UN Women took a number of proactive measures informed by recommendations of GGP II to enhance the efficiency of GGP III. Measures taken include training and orientation of partners on UN Women reporting requirements, changing of funds disbursement modalities from a 90%: 10% ratio to 50%: 40%: 10% ratio to minimise risk of funds abuse and increasing reporting frequency by IPs from twice a year to a quarterly basis. The release of each tranche of funds was dependent upon satisfactory performance of the partner.

Efficiency challenges still exist within GGP III despite the above measures. Delays in the release of funding were experienced with some IPs receiving funds three months after signing of contracts with UN Women and three months after planned date for commencement of activities. The evaluation also established that some important reference documents for the program were prepared late, and sometimes produced at a point when their utility in informing programming was minimal. For example, one of the baseline studies, on the representation of women and women participation in key positions in both the public and private domain, was only finalized in August 2010, as the second year of program implementation was coming to a close. The mapping and scoping study for implementing partners on the other hand, was finalized later in December 2010. Finally, the mid-term review of GGP III was done at the end of the fourth quarter of 2011, when the current program was coming to a close.

An analysis of GGP III budget shows that the largest percentage (29%) was allocated for Outcome 3, followed by Outcome 2 (24%) and Outcome 1 (19%). It is commendable that the bulk of the funding was directed towards the funding of actual activities on the ground such as capacity building, lobbying and advocacy activities with tangible results. M&E had an allocation of 15% of the budget. The evaluation noted that there were challenges in the procurement of an M&E officer as the person selected for the post eventually failed to sign up the contract. This affected M&E activities as the programme was implemented without a dedicated M&E officer. Resultantly, M&E was noted to be weak amongst some implementing partners. The allocated funds should have been effectively used to strengthen M&E capacities of IPs, which the evaluation noted to be less than ideal. The evaluation however noted that there were efforts in place to strengthen the M&E component of the programme as UN Women was in the process of recruiting for an M&E officer during the time of the evaluation.

Administration and personnel costs constitute only about 5% of the total programme budget. In our view, there was need for increased human resources capacity at UN Women, particularly with regard to the M&E component of the programme and hence would have had no qualms with the administration and staff budget being around 10% of the total budget to ensure increased HR capacity.

e) Programme Sustainability

GGP III established a basis for sustainability by embarking on capacity building of national gender machinery, implementing partners and the targeted beneficiaries. The programme was also implemented through existing national and local structures and using local resource persons, which augurs well for programme ownership. The programme has used as entry points community leadership institutions as well as existing institutions such as churches and local government structures which will continue existing beyond the lifespan of GGP III. At local level, the evaluation noted that the majority of IPs, save for a few, identified strongly with programme objectives, and this was particularly the case with partners who have been with GGP for a long time and whose mandates coincided with GGP objectives.

The innovative direct and indirect involvement of men by some partners is also commendable given the context that in most cases men are central in shaping the value system of their communities. The fact that in some GGP III targeted communities visited during the evaluation, male leaders are calling for women participation and inclusion in local decision-making organs raises the hope that such messages are likely to continue even after GGP III officially comes to an end. The existence of women Regional Assemblies, Neighbourhood Assemblies and women's rights group provides a nucleus, around which women coalesce to advocate for their rights and such structures, provided they have developed adequate capacity, present opportunities for programme benefits sustainability.

A number of IPs and donors expressed reservations about national ownership of the programme. They contended that although GGP is supposed to be a programme for Kenyan civil society and Kenyan women, it is now increasingly being viewed as a UN Women programme. Branding of the programme and the limited involvement of the IPs in programme management and strategic decision making was cited as one of the reasons why the programme is progressively lacking in national ownership as key decisions are made by UN Women. This feeling of alienation, according to a number of interviewees, was fuelled primarily by the less than adequate interaction with PFMA and donors.

Key Lessons Learnt

The following were the key lessons learnt from the evaluation:

- ✚ Empowering rights holders, civic society while at the same time supporting transformation of legal frameworks, laws and policies is an effective strategy of promoting the recognition of women's rights and enjoyment of same rights.
- ✚ Working with traditional, religious and political leadership as well as men at national and local levels catalyses the gradual breakdown of cultural, political and religious barriers and increases chances of acceptability of women participation in governance and election to leadership positions.
- ✚ Lack of a platform through which IPs, PFMA and donors regularly interact and share experiences leads to misconceptions and mistrust amongst partners.
- ✚ The gender gap in political leadership is vast and can be addressed by legislation; hence the constitution and specific acts that have implications for gender equality.
- ✚ Engaging with the devolved government structures and funding mechanisms is a potentially major success in invigorating women's participation in leadership and resource management at the grassroots level.
- ✚ Sensitization alone is inadequate, structural and institutional barriers have to be removed to actualize gender equality
- ✚ The implications of not consciously addressing diversity (rural/urban, generation gaps, literacy, ethnicity, etc) of identities increases polarization within the women's movement and a feeling of discrimination
- ✚ Attitudinal and perceptual changes take a long time to take effect and approaches for the same need to take this into account.
- ✚ Creating a front consisting of both women and youth, who are both largely marginalised and socially excluded from political and governance processes, provides a basis for a strong advocacy alliance.

Key Conclusions

The following are key conclusions of the evaluation:

- ✚ **Overall Conclusion:** Although GGP III has faced a number of strategic and implementation challenges, the programme has made significant contributions towards the achievement of both Outcomes 1 and 2. This is largely attributable to the programme's ability to exploit opportunities provided by national processes and initiatives, capacity building initiatives for both national and implementation partners as well as awareness campaigns launched in programme areas targeted mainly at women, as well as at local leaders and men.
- ✚ **Programme Appropriateness and Relevance:** GGP III goal and expected outcomes are largely relevant and appropriate to the current gender inequality situation in Kenya and resonate well with current GoK vision and regional and international efforts to achieve gender equity and equality in all spheres of life, including governance. The majority of GGP III partners were found to be generally appropriate and well placed to enhance achievement of programme objectives. Given the women participation in governance and other developmental processes is constrained by cultural, political, legal and economic barriers, the targeting of mostly women by the programme was found to be appropriate and addressing a critical need amongst marginalised women. The programme was informed by preceding gender programmes, consultations with stakeholders, analysis of the Kenyan context with respect to gender and governance and GGP II evaluation and therefore sat on a solid, informed foundation.
- ✚ **Programme Performance: Outcome 1:** GGP III is one of the key programmes in Kenya which is driving processes of change aimed at the establishment of gender sensitive and gender informed legal and policy frameworks as well as gender responsive institutions. Progress towards the full realisation of this outcome is however dependent upon political willingness and commitment and the ability of gender equality advocates to keep gender issues within radar amongst a plethora of competing priorities. Realisation of this outcome will also largely depend on the extent to which the legal frameworks, laws and policies are operationalised and effectively implemented.
- ✚ **Programme Performance: Outcome 2:** Although progress is slow, GGP III has significantly contributed to the recorded gradual increase in women participation in governance at both national and local level structures through rights awareness creation, empowerment of women through training and the capacitating of civil society organisations to demand change and accountability from rights bearers.

- ✚ **Programme Efficiency:** GGP III was fairly efficient in delivering programme outputs. Efficient enhancement measures, informed partly by GGP II evaluation, were implemented by the programme. Efficiency gaps however still exist that need addressing such as late disbursement of funds emanating from UN bureaucracy and late production of some key documents. It is also commendable that over 50% of the budget was allocated for the realisation of Outcome 2, which required an intensive array of awareness raising and capacity enhancement activities spread throughout the country.
- ✚ **Sustainability:** GGP III has created the basis for sustainability by working and promoting buy-in through national and local structures, capacity building of both national and grassroots actors including CSOs and promoting participation of stakeholders in programme design and evaluation of the programme. Despite these achievements threats to sustainability include lack of political will, change of government, staff turnover in both government structures and among CSOs and a lack of human resource and financial capacity by CSOs.

Key Recommendations

The following are the key recommendations of the evaluation:

- ✚ **Overall:** Donors and all GGP III stakeholders need to keep the momentum on gender and governance that the programme has significantly contributed to through continued support for key activities such as awareness creation, capacity enhancement and support for women election candidates during the 2012 national elections and beyond. There is need for GGP III partners to realise that the existence of legal frameworks, laws and policies on paper does not automatically translate into tangible benefits for women unless these laws and policies are operationalised and effectively implemented. This therefore should be one of the key focus areas of GGP III. The programme should however continue to pursue the same Goal and Expected Outcomes.
- ✚ **Monitoring and Evaluation:** GGP III should, as a matter of priority, engage a dedicated M&E officer for effective implementation of the programme's M&E framework.
- ✚ **Partners Reference Group:** GGP III should revive the PRG to facilitate interaction and participation by implementing partners and donors in mapping out priorities and strategic direction of the programme.
- ✚ **Funding:** funding blockages need to be minimised to enable timely disbursement of funds by UN Women to IPs. The programme needs to consider setting up a “quick response” fund, which can be managed by one or more donors to circumvent UN bureaucracy, to enable partners to respond quickly to pertinent and urgent issues and opportunities which emerge during the politically fluid environment towards national elections in 2012.
- ✚ **Partnerships:** to reach out more to grassroots and marginalised women in remote places, GGP III should increase the number of grassroots CSO partners engaged by the programme. In cases where partners have limited capacity, the selection of these partners should be followed by intensive capacity building by UN Women in partnership with other stakeholders. Capacity enhancing initiatives should be tailor-made to suite the different capacity needs and levels of the selected partners. This entails increasing the human resources capacity at UN Women or alternatively, engaging technical partners to deliver capacity enhancement initiatives.
- ✚ **Policy Level Strategic Engagement:** UN Women needs to exploit more the policy and strategic space and opportunities through increased leveraging with government, donors and other key stakeholders as there was a general feeling amongst donors and national gender machinery that more could be done by UN Women in this regard.
- ✚ **Women's Movement:** There is need for GGP III together with other gender programmes such as Uraia and Amkeni, in partnership with CSOs, to come up with a strategy on how to facilitate the strengthening and consolidation of a strong women's movement with a more leveraging voice.

- ✚ **Learning:** Cross-learning and collaboration between implementing partners of GGP III should be encouraged by UN Women through thematic consortiums and the holding of periodic experience sharing and lesson learning workshops.
- ✚ **GGP Entry Points:** GGP III should continue promoting the engagement of traditional, religious and political leaders as well as teachers as entry points for the programme as these opinion makers have strategic influence in shaping values, behaviour and the socialisation process in communities. The use of these opinion makers by some GGP III partners as entry points has shown tremendous potential in shaping attitudes and behaviour towards women participation in leadership positions and governance.
- ✚ **Male Involvement:** the evaluation notes that GGP III is justifiably targeting mostly women given the historical barriers they face to participate in politics, governance and other spheres of life. The evaluation however noted that where men have been sensitised and used as agents of change in promoting gender equality, partners have reported better progress towards attitude change and acceptance of women into governance positions. As such, this evaluation recommends that more partners should be encouraged to use this strategic approach but with the realisation that women should occupy frontline positions in advocating for change.
- ✚ **Scenario Plotting & Planning:** Given the volatility likely to be experienced towards and after elections in 2013, there is need for GGP III to do scenario plotting and planning to adequately respond to emerging situations should some of the assumptions and risks made by the programme become real.
- ✚ **Programme Documents:** To improve programme coherence and consistency there is need to standardise programme documents so that they reflect same programme goal, outputs and outcomes. The programme document has two expected **outcomes** while the programme budget document has three outcomes.

I. INTRODUCTION

I.1 Background of the Evaluation

The mid-term evaluation of the Gender and Governance Programme Phase Three (GGP III) in Kenya was carried out by a team of three external experts, comprising one international and two national consultants. The evaluation was carried out in the framework of the UN Women Evaluation Policy and Strategy (2008-2011) which seeks to enhance learning and contribute to knowledge on women's empowerment and gender equality. The Evaluation Policy and Strategy further seeks to promote UN Women's internal and external accountability as well as inform decision-making on policies, developmental and organisational effectiveness and efficiency and programme design. The policy also makes it mandatory for mid-term evaluations to be carried out for programmes with a budget of over US\$3 million and where a commitment has been made by UN Women to stakeholders.

The Gender and Governance Programme III evolved from two preceding gender programmes implemented in Kenya namely: (a) the Engendering Political Participation Process (EPPP) programme of 2002 and; (b) the Gender and Governance Programme Phase Two (2004-2008) The second phase of GGP was funded by governments of Canada, Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom and managed by Action Aid Kenya. Following a review of the programme management framework, management of the programme was transferred to UNIFEM⁵ in 2006. The second part of GGP Phase 2, which had a total funding of almost US\$5 million and had 30 implementing partners, was funded by Canada, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the United Kingdom and Spain. The first two phases of GGP were largely event driven, focusing mainly on election issues and election related work towards and after election periods.

This mid-term evaluation focused on the third phase of GGP (2009-2011). The evaluation however took into consideration the first phase of GGP as well as the preceding EPPP in order to understand the evolution of scope, design, objectives and strategies of GGP III. The design of GGP III was informed by findings and learning from GGP II evaluation as well as by a series of consultations with donors, implementing partners, UN Women and the national gender machinery comprising of the Ministry of Gender, Children & Social Development and the National Commission on Gender and Development. The evolving political and social-economic context in Kenya was also taken into consideration in designing GGP III.

⁵ UNIFEM now known as UN Women

I.2 Approach and Methodology

(a) Purpose and Objectives of the Evaluation

The main purpose of the mid-term evaluation was to determine the extent to which programme activities have so far contributed towards the achievement of desired outcomes and to draw out and document key lessons learnt. Based on these key lessons learnt, the evaluation sought to provide recommendations regarding future action to consolidate progress made and on planning, implementation and strategy to improve performance and delivery of the programme.

Specific objectives of the evaluation were to:

- Assess the relevance of GGP III in terms of policy, objectives and plans of the implementing partners and the beneficiary's needs as defined by the implementing partners (extent of ownership and alignment).
- Assess the results and progress of the programme in terms of effectiveness (achieved outputs versus planned outputs) and efficiency of implementation (outputs results achieved against inputs and budgets used) and,
- Assess programme feasibility and sustainability in terms of design, scope, implementation, partnerships, management and steering.

(b) Scope and Focus of the Evaluation

The central focus of the assignment was in regard to *performance* (including *effectiveness and efficiency*), and issues probed included the appropriateness of the program's internal logic, the extent to which anticipated outputs and activities have been realized in both quantitative and qualitative terms, the adequacy of the implementation systems particularly with regard to adherence to internal controls, and how assumptions made impacted on project implementation and achievements.

Other evaluation issues covered include the extent to which project design was informed by adequate situational analysis, needs assessments and participation of the targeted beneficiaries in the assessments and design stages, as well as stakeholder awareness, understanding and buy-in of the project. With regard to *impact*, the evaluation probed both tangible and intangible changes that beneficiaries (both direct and indirect) have been able to discern as a result of the project interventions. A key question of the evaluation was to determine the extent to which the changes are attributable to the project. The evaluation also sought to establish the extent to which stakeholders are prepared and have the capacity to manage project outputs after exit of UN Women.

An in-depth focus on the effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation systems that were put in place was done by the evaluation. Key areas of investigation included planning and data collection process and tools used, quality and reliability of data collected and the extent to which the monitoring and evaluation system was operationalized. Utilization of information from the monitoring system to periodically review/improve program implementation approaches was also investigated.

(c) Approach

The general approach of the evaluation was a participatory and learning from experience approach. The evaluation utilised an inclusive process where all categories of stakeholders and implementing partners were represented in the study sample. The evaluation tried, as much as possible, to capture opinions of various stakeholders in order to establish opinion trends and overall conclusions regarding programme performance. The evaluation was also guided by UN Women Evaluation policy, which lays emphasis on specific Gender Empowerment (GE) and Human Rights (HR) criteria such as inclusiveness, participation, equality, non-discrimination and social transformation. The conclusions, analysis and interpretation of evaluation data by the evaluation team were premised on the principle of objectivity.

(d) Phases of the Evaluation

The evaluation was carried out in six, logically linked phases:

Phase	Activity
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of documents • Development of inception report • Development of evaluation tools • First round discussions/interviews with UN Women Staff
2	Key informant interviews with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UN Women GGP team • National Gender Machinery • Donors • Implementing Partners • Other governance programmes such as URAIA
3	Field visits to 22 ⁶ selected partner programme sites <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussions with implementing partner programme staff • Focus Group Discussions with targeted beneficiaries • Meetings with relevant stakeholders and resource persons in the field • Collection of significant Change Stories/Case Studies
5	Draft report writing and dissemination
6	Incorporating comments/inputs from stakeholders on draft report and writing of final report. Submission of final report to UN Women

(e) Methods for collecting evaluation data

The evaluation team employed the following methods to collect data for the evaluation:

i. Desk Review

The evaluation reviewed all the relevant programme documentation including the following:

- Programme design document 2009
- GGP II Evaluation report June 2008
- Knowledge Management reports
- Annual reports and Gender Mainstreaming and Audit Reports
- Implementing Partner reports
- Baseline Study report and other relevant reports.

⁶ Selection of implementing partners was informed by the need to capture the diversity of programme components and activities, the need to cover all geographical areas of the programme and the need to include current IPs and those partners that are no longer receiving GGP III funding support.

ii. Key Informant Interviews⁷

Key stakeholders strategically placed to possess vital perspectives on the content and implementation of the project were interviewed and invited to express their opinions on the programme. Key informants interviewed include:

- Government of Kenya officials responsible for relevant Ministries i.e. Department of Gender in the Ministry of Gender, Children & Social Development and the National Commission on Gender and Development
- Officials from agencies such as KIPPRA, NCIC, IIEC/TI
- Representatives of Donor Steering Committee
- Representatives of Implementing Partners
- Representatives of UN Women

iii. Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)

FGDs were conducted with targeted beneficiaries of the programme in the different programme areas visited by the evaluation team. FGDs were used to gauge the views of the direct beneficiaries of the programme on various aspects of implementation as well as perceptions with regard to the progress and impact of the project. Such perceptions expressed both individually and in a group context were useful to the evaluation in assessing the immediate and potential long-term impacts of the programme. The meetings separately targeted participants/representatives of organizations that benefited from the various trainings and interventions of the project as well as individuals and groups at community level that have benefited directly or indirectly from interventions supported by UN Women and the implementing partners.

iv. Most significant change/case study

The evaluation collected rich narratives from individual beneficiaries on the most significant positive changes that they have witnessed or experienced resulting from engaging with GGP III. Some of these stories appear in the annex.

v. Data management and Analysis

Data collected during the evaluation was primarily qualitative data, and as such, it was collated and verified in order for inferences, judgments and conclusions made to be as accurate as possible. To ensure a high validity, triangulation for data validation was applied to allow for comparisons and check for consistency.

⁷ See annex for a full list of key informants interviewed

(f) Stakeholder Participation

The evaluation adopted a participatory approach. Stakeholders were invited to have an input into the evaluation framework and methodology during an inception workshop. Stakeholders had further input into the evaluation when they were consulted/interviewed as key informants by the evaluators. At the evaluation findings presentation workshop, stakeholders were also given the opportunity to validate evaluation findings. Although some of the stakeholders registered concerns that they were not involved in drafting the Terms of Reference and the selection of consultants, it has to be understood that these were UN Women mandates as the PFMA of GGP III.

(g) Constraints of the evaluation

Methodological challenges of the evaluation included limited timeframe to enable a wider coverage of programme stakeholders, unavailability of some of the key stakeholders, a lack of response by some key stakeholders such as the Kenyan Women Parliamentarians (KEWOPA) and logistical complications emanating from the vastness of the programme.

1.3 Contents of the Report

The evaluation report is arranged into the following sections: Section 2 gives a description of the programme as it was designed and briefly summarises its activities. In Section 3, the results of the evaluation are discussed in terms of the key evaluation questions i.e. Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency and Sustainability of the programme as well as the extent to which the programme fostered Inclusiveness, Participation, Equality and Social Transformation. Section 4 discusses key lessons learnt emerging from the programme thus far, while Section 5 draws out key conclusions from the evaluation and provides a set of recommendations on the way forward. The recommendations are aimed at improving programme performance and informing programme strategic direction.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAMME

2.1 Background of the programme

GGP III (2009-2011) evolved from and was informed by two preceding gender programmes in Kenya, namely EPPP implemented in the early 2002 and GGP II (2004-8). These first two gender programmes were mainly focused on effectively supporting women to participate in Kenya's electoral processes. EPPP was implemented for 18 months leading to the 2002 elections while GGP II was implemented in the period leading to 2007 elections. GGP II was managed by Action Aid Kenya (AAK) from 2002-2004 before management was transferred to UN Women in July 2006 following review recommendations. The first phase of GGP II was funded by governments of Canada, Denmark, Ireland, The Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom. The second phase, which had a budget close to US\$5 million, was funded by Canada, Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, Norway, Spain, UK and Sweden and had a total of 30 implementing partners.

Although GGP II was a governance programme in principle, the major thrust of the programme was more towards increasing the number of women elected into power without clearly defining what those elected women were meant to do once elected into office.⁸ Reviews of the first two programmes identified a need to engender all government structures, rather than focusing only on the electoral process, leading to the birth of GGP III.

GGP III is a 3 year programme (2009-2011) funded by the Governments of Finland, Netherlands, Norway, Germany, Spain, United Kingdom, Sweden and the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA). The programme has a total funding of US\$12.1 million supporting between 22-26 implementing partners.

2.2 Findings from Review of GGP II

The design of GGP III was informed by GGP II review findings, lessons learnt and recommendations, as well as by consultative workshops with donors, implementing partners and UN Women. GGP III design was further informed by the existing and evolving socio-economic, political and developmental context in Kenya at the time of programme design. The evaluation of GGP II, which was done in 2008, concluded that the need for a gender and governance programme in Kenya is apparent and hence GGP III was trying to address a critical gap existing within Kenyan governance structures.

⁸ GGP II Evaluation finding

GGP II evaluation reported that although it was difficult to determine the extent to which the programme had contributed to social and political processes and achievements within the gender and governance sector given the multiplicity of actors and processes driving change in Kenya, the report noted that key milestones were achieved during the time GGP II was being implemented and hence it is justifiable for GGP to claim some credit for these achievements. Some of the notable achievements included an increased in the number of women seeking elective positions and number of women in parliament. Important pieces of legislation, such as the Political Parties Bill, were passed and the GoK issued a directive requiring a 30% representation of women in public positions. Gender equality issues found space and were accepted in constitutional negotiations.

A number of gaps were noted by the GGP II evaluation and a set of recommendations were proposed to address these gaps. The evaluation noted that programme lacked a grounded focus on governance and transformation. Focus of the programme was also more on quantity (ensuring as many women as possible get elected into governance positions) at the expense of quality (what the women elected will do once they get elected). The evaluation recommended that broad-based alliances and partnerships with other gender and governance programmes be formed to advance the national gender and governance agenda. Other recommendations included; the need for evaluations to inform future programme direction; the need to address issues of ethnicity and patronage; increasing level of input by partners into financial and management decisions made by PFMA; improve quality of RBM, M&E and financial management; improving e efficiency of funds disbursement

GGP III managed to address some of the gaps identified through implementation of some of the recommendations. This evaluation however noted that a number of gaps identified in GGP II still exist and that some of the recommendations were not carried through. Section 4.1 of this report (Lesson Learning) provides a detailed analysis of the extent to which GGP III managed to address gaps identified in GGP II as well as the extent to which the set of recommendations were implemented.

2.3 Objectives of GGP III

The overall **Goal** of GGP III is *to ensure that Kenyan Women and Men are able to access services and opportunities and exercise their rights equally.*

Expected **Impact** of the programme is *State institutions consistently implement gender-sensitive policies and laws.*

The intended **Outcomes** of the programme are:

- (i) Increased number of Kenyan legal frameworks, laws and policies at national and local level that promote women's human rights.
- (ii) Women participate in governance and decision-making processes at national and local levels and actively lobby for women's issues.

To achieve its intended outcomes, the programme is employing the following **strategies**:

- **Institutional capacity building** of relevant government institutions, national gender machinery and implementing partners through the provision of technical assistance to enhance the capacities of these institutions to come up with and influence policies, legal frameworks and processes that are gender sensitive and promote the human rights of women and men.
- **Community Sensitisation and Support to Civil Society** where the programme focuses on creating awareness amongst the public and women in particular on legal, policy and institutional reform processes and the achieved results of improved gender responsive delivery. A key priority under this strategy is to create a unified critical mass of women to push for a common platform for the realisation of gender responsive development and service delivery.
- **Promoting the use of Gender-Sensitive Results Based Programme Management** amongst GGP partners so as to be able to hold government to account on gender-responsive service delivery.

2.4 Intended outcomes, outputs and activities

The following table shows the intended outcomes, outputs and a summary of the related activities:

Outcome	Outputs	Activities
(1) Increased number of Kenyan Legal frameworks, laws and policies at national and local level that promote women's human rights.	1. Knowledge on how to engender laws, policies and legal processes is developed and made available	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the engendering of the constitutional review process 2. Conduct a comparative analysis of civic and penal law codes with the Kenya Law Reform Commission; Legal Ethics and Constitutional Reform Programme; and the Children's Department. 3. Develop and implement evidence based and informed advocacy and lobby strategy for law reform on specific issues. 4. Support the establishment of a legal framework for the protection and promotion of Human Rights and facilitate the enactment and implementation of the new constitution. 5. Promote and participate in the creation of Equal Opportunities Bill; Persons With Disabilities Amendment Bill; and Affirmative Action Bill
	2. Effective dialogue mechanisms/platforms between government actors and gender equality advocates on how to engender laws, legal frameworks, policies and processes.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support creation of a platform for women's organisations to dialogue with government actors on legal and constitutional reforms. 2. Support advocacy platforms to lobby legislative bodies to pass gender related bills and to discuss ratification and implementation of CEDAW, BPFA and AGD.
	3. National machineries in Kenya have increased capacity to mainstream gender equality into development strategies, legal frameworks, laws, policies and processes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the National Bureau of Statistics to finalise and disseminate the Women and Men Handbook across the board. 2. Support strategies that strengthen the monitoring of gender responsive planning and implementation at district level. 3. Support gender machinery and provide targeted capacity building to implement National Gender Policy in specific areas such as Civil Service Commission and Agriculture.
	4. Enhanced capacities of key government institutions and their organs to institute mechanisms that promote women participation in their processes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Work within the Public Sector Reform Process to fast track the implementation of the 30% presidential directive across the board and performance contracting focusing on judiciary and law enforcing bodies. 2. Facilitate women's fair representation in the Truth Justice and Reconciliation Commission 3. Support operationalisation of the Political Parties Act

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Support parliament and parliamentary committees to ensure passing of gender-responsive laws. 5. Capacity strengthening of KEWOPA to ensure effective lobbying of women’s issues within and outside parliament.
<p>(2) Women participate in governance and decision-making processes at national and local levels and actively lobby for women’s issues.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Women at the local level have strengthened their leadership capacity to contribute to decisions that promote gender equality issues 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support civil society in providing targeted capacity building initiatives for women on gender equality issues, leadership, networking and active participation skills as well as government structures, procedures and opportunities for their participation. 2. Support women participation in centralised and devolved government through Women Regional Assemblies, Youth Membership Programmes and traditional and community leaders. 3. Partnership and working with other Governance Programmes such as Uraia and CSDG
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Strengthened Women’s Movement that enables them to collectively lobby for key issues that affect women in Kenya 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support for civil society in creating a women’s agenda 2. Support creation of a national women’s network 3. Support and create opportunities for civil society and government dialogue. 4. Support media organisations to increase awareness of men and women journalist on gender-responsive reporting
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Women have increased awareness and access to information on their rights and state responsibilities regarding service provision 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support mobilisation, awareness raising, and capacity building of women on electoral processes and opportunities for participation in the 2012 election. 2. Continued support to election violence prevention, legal aid counselling and peace education.

2.5 Programme stakeholders

Stakeholders of the programme include the Government of Kenya (GoK), National and International Donors, UN Women, Civil Society Organisations (CSO) implementing the programme and the **men and women** of Kenya. Although different stakeholders are playing different roles, their ultimate objective is to achieve gender equality and equity in Kenya.

2.6 Institutional Arrangements

UN Women was appointed by the Donor Steering Committee (DSC) to be the Programme and Financial Management Agency (PFMA) for GGP III having taken over this role from Action Aid Kenya during the implementation of GGP II in 2006. As the Managing Agency, UN Women signs bilateral agreements with each contributing donor and the individual donors disburse the pledged amounts to UN Women. UN Women then calls for proposals from CSOs whose main areas of focus would be on gender and governance. Upon selection, qualifying CSOs sign agreements with UN Women. The contracts are guided by UN Women contractual guidelines and the selection criteria are agreed upon with the DSC.

The UN Women is responsible for strengthening management systems and procedures of selected partners so that they are compatible with UN Women governance and accountability standards and procedures. A register of programme assets is also maintained by UN Women. To improve communication and interaction between partners and donors on programme issues, a gap noted in GGP II, a Partner Reference Group (PRG) was initiated consisting of selected GGP III IPs, donors, GoK and UN Women.

As the financial manager, UN Women undertook to disburse funds to partners on time. Upon the recommendations of GGP II, UN Women developed and instituted new Operational Guidelines that are meant to improve the financial management systems, including disbursement of funds.

2.7 Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation Arrangements

GGP implementation is being done primarily through the selected implementing partners with overall supervision and quality assurance management by UN Women. In terms of M&E, GGP III is supposed to regularly report on output indicators in the Logical Framework of the programme. It is the responsibility of UN Women to ensure that specific partner indicators are in alignment with GGP III's overall indicators and that the reporting meets GGP III reporting standards and expectations. UN Women is also supposed to ensure that partners use appropriately designed RBM tools. UN Women was tasked with monitoring progress by partners through field visits and regular meetings. UN Women is also tasked with organising bi-annual joint review meetings with donors and IPs as well as quarterly Partners Reference Group (PRG) meetings in liaison with the co-chairs of PRG. Programme progress reports are to be submitted to the DSC by UN Women twice a year. A mid-term evaluation of the programme was scheduled for the end of year 2 of the programme.

A baseline study on Women Representation and Participation in the Public and Private Sectors in Kenya was carried out in September 2010. This was in response to recommendations of the GGP II evaluation which noted the lack of a baseline as one of the major weaknesses and failures of that programme.

2.8 Risks and mitigation

The following were identified as main risks facing the programme:

- Political instability and outbreaks of new conflicts
- Gender agenda marginalised due to competing priorities and limited resources
- Lack of higher level commitment and political will
- Lack of gender specific skills leading to inability by the gender machinery to create and sustain an enabling environment.
- Lack of research based data
- Lack of common vision and unity amongst women CSOs
- Low-level enthusiasm amongst women
- Lack of robust M&E framework
- Low potential for financial sustainability of implementing partners

The programme proposed a set of mitigating measures revolving around building the capacity of implementing partners, increasing awareness activities to sustain the current momentum and ensuring flexibility and rapid response measures to respond to emerging dynamics in the country.

2.9 Budget Summary

Outcome/Item	Amount in US\$	% of total budget ⁹
Outcome 1	2,315,000	19
Outcome 2	2,905,000	24
Outcome 3	3,530,000	29
M&E	1,830,000	15
Learning	840,000	7
Admin and personnel costs	630,000	5
Grand Total	12,100,000	

⁹ This is calculated to the nearest 10.

3. ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAMME

3.1 Programme Relevance and Appropriateness

A programme is deemed relevant or appropriate if it seeks to address the real needs of the targeted beneficiaries. The programme objectives should also be consistent and in alignment with the aspirations of beneficiaries, needs and priorities of the country as well as those of the local and international development community. In this mid-term evaluation, the relevance and appropriateness of GGP III was assessed in terms of a) its objectives; b) partnership arrangements; c) targeted beneficiaries; d) approach and strategy and e) risk and assumptions made at design stage.

a) Relevance of Objectives

The overall goal of GGP III was to enhance gender parity in accessing services and opportunities and to ensure that men and women have equal access to their rights. Key expected outcomes of the programme were focused on increasing and improving the number of Kenyan legal frameworks, laws and policies seeking to promote and protect women's rights as well as on improving women's participation in governance and decision-making processes and active lobbying on women's issues at both national and local levels.

GGP III was designed as a successor programme to EPPP and GGP II. The two preceding gender programmes were implemented amid the realisation that there were glaring gender imbalances within the Kenyan society, skewed in favour of men, in terms of access to resources and opportunities, exercising of human rights and participation in decision-making processes. The two programmes sought to address some of these gender imbalances by encouraging and promoting women participation in Kenya's electoral processes as election candidates. Although the two programmes scored major successes in putting gender issues on national radar and in encouraging women participation in elections as candidates, stakeholders noted that **meaningful** participation by women in decision making processes and improved access to rights and opportunities can only be achieved by reforming laws, institutions and policies whose entrenched patriarchal values and structural barriers were a great impediment to gender equality. The founding resolution of UNWOMEN identifies women as a key constituency in whose interests the organization can intervene. It was realized that it was important to move beyond engaging CSOs. Empowerment would require more substantive engagement with structures/systems/institutions that make decisions affecting women's exercise of their rights.

GGP III's two pronged approach, which sought to simultaneously address policy and legal issues as well as promoting women participation, not only in the electoral process but also in governance, was informed by the realisation that effective participation by women in governance and improved access to opportunities, services and human rights is inextricably linked to reformed and gender sensitive laws, policies and legal frameworks. GGP III objectives were also largely informed by findings and recommendations from GGP II Evaluation.

The vision of the Government of Kenya (GoK) is to *build a just and cohesive society with social equity in a clean and secure environment*. In working towards this vision, the GoK has made several international and regional commitments aimed at creating a framework for enhancing gender equity and equality in the country. The vision was enthused by gross gender disparities particularly in governance, which in turn have a domino effect on access to rights, services and meaningful participation in decision-making processes. In the 2002 general elections, only 6.1% of the candidates were women and of these, only 4.8% were elected into office while in 2007 only 11% (269) out of the 2,548 candidates were women. In the Kenya National Assembly, only 8.1% of elected members in 2007 were women and this compares unfavourably with the sub-Saharan Africa average of 16% women in parliament. In some of the key committees of parliament such as the Investigative Committee, Departmental Committee and the Ad hoc Committee, there is not even a single female MP who is part of the committee. In committees where there are female MP members, they constitute on average 25% of the membership.¹⁰ Women are also under-represented at ministerial level (15%), assistant ministerial level (11.5%) and permanent secretary level (15.9%).

At local government level, women representation is also minimal. Only 15.2% of city councillors are women, while in municipal, town and county councils, women constitute on average only 15.8% of the total number of councillors.¹¹ Within local authorities, women constitute only 10.2% of top-level employees while at middle level they constitute 25.5% of the total establishment. Low participation of women at local level in decision-making organs was also noted. For example, there is only 35% women representation in LASDAP committees, 35% in AIDS Control committees, 20% in CDF committees and 31% in School Bursary Fund committees. The only local committee where women have majority representation is the Women Enterprise Fund where they constitute 64% of the total membership.

¹⁰ Baseline survey report, September 2010.

¹¹ Ibid

There were no female judges in the High Court of Appeal in 2006 (one was only appointed in 2007) and only 37% of the judiciary service establishments were occupied by women in 2006. Up until 1997, Kenya's constitution excluded sex as grounds for discrimination.

The GoK is signatory to a number of regional and international instruments and conventions such as CEDAW, Beijing Platform for Action, CRC, Solemn Declaration on Gender Equality in Africa (2004) and the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). The sum thrust of these instruments is to eliminate gender discrimination and inequality and to create a just and equal society in line with Kenya's vision. MDG 3 in particular emphasises gender equality and women's economic empowerment. At national level, the GoK has had a number of initiatives to promote gender equality such as; the Presidential Directive on the 30% affirmative action quarter for women in public institutions; National Policy on Gender and Development; Draft National Employment Policy which articulates women's rights and child labour issues; Vision 2030 whose strategy is to enhance women participation in all social, political and economic decision making processes and the Mid-Term Plan of Vision 2030 which seeks to mainstream gender into the public and local governance sector and have at least 30% of the positions occupied by women by 2012. The government has also initiated flagship projects among them the Constitutional Reform Process, the Truth, Justice and Reconciliation Commission; the Independent Electoral Review Committee; Legal ethics and Constitutional Reform Programme; Electoral Process Reform and the Governance, Justice, Law and Order Sector Reform.

Rights awareness by women in Kenya was noted to be low by the evaluation. Before the constitutional process and awareness campaigns run under GGP, most women interviewed during the evaluation noted that their awareness levels on their constitutional rights and rights to participate in governance were very low. Most of the women reported that their assumption was that politics and governance issues were the realm of men. They were also unaware that they can demand their rights from the state for delivery of services. Consequently, a few of the women could articulate their rights, let alone enjoy those rights as provided for in the constitution. The constituency targeted by GGP III is not only relevant, but is key to the achievement of the MDGs.

The lack of a united and a strong women's voice implies that women cannot effectively lobby for their rights. As such, it is imperative therefore that women are organised to demand their rights through formation of coalitions and a strong civil society base. Facilitating the strengthening of a strong women's movement was thus one of the expected outcomes of GGP III.

All the above international, regional and national initiatives are aimed at enhancing gender equality, particularly in governance. The evaluation concluded that GGP III and GoK have a shared vision and the latter through these initiatives, has created opportunities which GGP can dovetail into. The evaluators are thus in agreement with the majority of key-stakeholders and implementing partners who concluded that GGP III's objectives are to a greater extent relevant to the context of Kenya and are in alignment with national, regional and international priorities and initiatives on gender and governance.

The evaluation however noted that although the overall goal of the programme focuses on women and men, implying that it is a gender programme, the expected outcomes of the programme only focus on women thereby reducing the programme at outcome level, to a women's programme. While we acknowledge that women have been traditionally disadvantaged and under-represented in governance and therefore need to be the focus of the programme, it is however imperative that the programme maintains a gender rather than a women perspective at outcome level for the outcomes to meaningfully contribute towards the overall goal of the programme-which is focused on **both** men and women.

Outcome I focuses on the promotion and protection of women's human rights. While enhanced women participation in governance and decision-making processes ultimately lead to promotion of their human rights in general, we feel that this expected outcome is too broad and should have focused primarily on governance related rights. Measuring broad human rights outcomes will be difficult given that the programme was focused specifically on gender and governance.

The evaluation noted that different programme documents present outcomes and outputs that are worded differently. For example, the programme document and the project budget document have outcomes and outputs couched differently. The latter has three expected outcomes, while the former has two outcomes. Having logical frameworks that are worded or structured differently shows lack of coherence and consistency in the programme conceptual framework. This gap was also identified by the GGP II evaluation. If there is need to alter or add objectives, outputs and outcomes during the course of programme implementation, there is need for an addendum to the programme document, detailing the reasons and rationale for the adjustments.

b) Relevance of Partnerships

GGP III partners include GoK, donors, CSOs and the targeted beneficiaries who are the women and men of Kenya. As discussed in the preceding section, the vision of the GoK is to create a just and cohesive society with social equity buttressed by good governance and human development in all sectors and elimination of discrimination in legislation, policies and legal frameworks. The vision of GoK is in alignment with GGP goal and objectives and GGP III is exploiting opportunities created by GoK commitments and flagship programmes currently being implemented with a strong component on gender and governance. Effective implementation of development programmes by civil society organisations largely depends on government good will and commitment as well as convergence of objectives and hence it was imperative that GGP III engaged the GoK and its relevant structures and institutions as key partners of the programme.

The consortium of donors funding GGP III has gender and governance as part of their key mandates. Donors not only provided funding for implementation of the programme but also helped create space and synergies between GGP III on the one hand and government structures and international partners on the other. The appointment of UN Women to be the programme fund manager was premised on the agency's strong leverage with government as a UN Agency as well as the ability of the agency to draw from its experience and pool of expertise on gender and governance. As a UN Agency, UN Women already had in place management systems which could immediately be put to motion in running the programme. This was a particularly important consideration given management challenges experienced when the programme was managed by Action Aid Kenya (AAK).

At implementation level, GGP partners were the selected CSOs that responded to a call for proposals by UN Women. The first round of calls was reviewed internally by UN Women, while the second round was reviewed with support from 2 consultants who selected IPs using templates designed by UN Women. Set criteria for selection included alignment of partner's objectives with those of GGP III and capacity of the partner to effectively implement components of the programme. Attempts were also made to identify partners addressing a critical niche within the gender and governance sector. Resultantly, a diverse range of partners was selected focusing on gender and governance awareness creation, gender-responsive budgeting, gender and the media, young women, youth and legal and policy issues amongst other issues.

Although the evaluation established that the majority of GGP III implementing partners were relevant in advancing the programme's core objectives, it was not clear for a few partners how their activities were adding value to the achievement of GGP III objectives and expected outcomes. For example, KIPPRA's report of the study on gaps in girl child education at secondary school level will not be ready in good time to be used for any programming or strategic purposes by GGP III. On the part of IIEC, soon to be Independent Electoral & Boundaries Commission (IEBC), it had not done anything substantial that is usable by GGP III by the time of the evaluation. NCIC on its part sought a simplistic conflation of its core mandate in promoting national cohesion with GGP III-outputs. This effort was not persuasive in our estimation.

An important perspective within GGP III, which we considered to carry some weight, is that whereas GGP III has changed to some degree, some partners have not. A sense of entitlement still pervades CSOs, and thus they have not been pulling their weight. All expectations are typically directed at UN WOMEN, irrespective of alignment with desired program outcomes.

The GGP II evaluation recommended that the process of selecting implementing partners should not be driven by the need to cover the whole country but by the need to select partners with capacity and whose core-mandate is in alignment with GGP objectives. Whilst this is plausible, we however take note of the fact that for GGP to create a critical mass of women demanding their voice and space in governance, the programme has to deepen outreach to remote parts of the country for purposes of information dissemination. The challenge however is that such areas might be lacking CSOs with capacity and mandates similar to GGP III objectives. In such scenarios, it would be reasonable for GGP to select partners with limited capacity and whose core s might not be in alignment with GGP III objectives provided there is intensive capacity building support for those particular partners. Selecting only partners with capacity may result in the programme being viewed as elitist as those with capacity are almost always led by elite and educated women with better access to information while those with limited capacity are most likely led grassroots women with low literacy levels. Although GGP III has a number of partners working at grassroots level, there is need to increase space and presence for grassroots CSOs to enable voices and aspirations of marginalised women to be heard.

c) Relevance of targeted beneficiaries

GGP III is mainly targeting women of Kenya as principal partners of the programme. As has already been mentioned in preceding sections, participation by women in Kenyan development processes is low as a result of cultural, political, economic and religious barriers entrenched within the patriarchal value system which permeates all levels of society in the country. Women of Kenya have largely been socially excluded from governance and as a result, promotion of their vested interests has been cosmetic at best and access to human rights, opportunities and other services severely restricted. Studies have already shown that gender inequality is a drawback to socio-economic development¹² and an impediment to the achievement of MDGs. Gender inequality reflects injustice, discrimination and unfair distribution of resources and influence within societies and is often the root cause of poverty amongst women. Women's second-class status carries a financial and social cost and hence the targeting of mostly women by GGP III is a significant contribution towards women inclusion in development processes and decision-making and ultimately towards the achievement of MDGs.

The evaluation established that although some of the targeted beneficiaries realised that there were gender equality gaps in governance constraining women's self-actualisation, some others were not conscious of these gaps and therefore the need for gender equality was an unrealised need. Interviewed women noted that this un-realised need was a result of the socialisation process which socialised women to believe that governance, politics and leadership were the domains of men and that the exclusion of women from such domains was "normal". The coming of GGP awakened women to the realisation of the existing gap and the need to fill the lacunae through proactive action. A woman beneficiary of the GGP III programme in Mombasa articulated her views on the programme as shown in the box below:

¹² UNFPA State of World Population Report, 2000

Before GGP, I was never interested in participating in elections, let alone seek for leadership positions. To me politics, governance and leadership were the realm of men and no decent woman would seek to dabble in politics. I used to have a dim view of women wanting to get into politics or challenging men for leadership positions. I used to firmly believe that certain positions are for men. This is what we grew up knowing, this is what we had been taught.

My perception completely changed when I attended an NCKK workshop on women's human rights, leadership and participation in governance. To tell you the truth it hit me in the face just like lightening, like somebody blind whose sight has been suddenly restored. I had not realised that as women we have our rights enshrined in the constitution and that just as men, we could run for political office. I now know about my property rights, inheritance rights and am now able to read the constitution and understand it. We were taught about the "wheel of life" concept which taught us how to know ourselves, how to handle our health and most importantly, how to communicate.

Through this training I have gained confidence as has happened to most women who went through this process, and I am not afraid anymore to put across my views and I now feel very strongly when I think that my rights are being violated. I can now stand up and speak in front of men and demand my rights. I have actually registered my intention to run for council elections in the next elections because I have realised that as women, if we are not in governance positions no one will safeguard and promote our rights. That is why I am willing to run for office. As they say knowledge is power, I would like to thank the programme for opening my eyes and making me able to demand what is rightfully mine. I wish the programme could spread to even the remotest parts of the country because it will be a wakeup call for all women.

As witnessed above, the programme has awakened a need in some of the targeted beneficiaries that they did not realise owing to inculcation of male-dominated values by society. The need to participate in governance was regarded as a critical need by almost all of the beneficiaries interviewed during the evaluation. In one area however (Kiambu), the need to participate in governance was ranked second after the economic empowerment and business mentoring need by young women during group discussions.

The 7th Periodic Report of Government of Kenya on implementation of CEDAW (2009) noted that measures taken to provide legal information on rights are limited in scope and resources. The report also pointed out that legal awareness in districts and provinces targeted limited number of participants leaving out the majority of the population. It is in light of these acknowledged gaps that GGP III interventions are highly relevant as they seek to increase awareness on rights through TOT workshops across the country whose messages will be cascaded down to grassroots level by the TOT beneficiaries.

d) Relevance of Approach and Strategy

GGP III is using a two-pronged human-rights based approach where it is working with both the state and citizens of Kenya at the grassroots level. The advancement of human rights and achievement of gender equality to a great extent depends on political will, efficient structures and institutions of the state and effectively functioning policies and legal frameworks. . The state therefore is a vehicle through which human rights and gender equality can be achieved. It is therefore imperative that state institutions be sensitised, mobilised and supported so that they can create an enabling environment for the promotion of human rights and gender equality. On the other hand, there is need to hold the state accountable by empowering rights bearers so that they can demand their rights from the state through advocacy, lobbying and articulation of issues affecting them. Empowering rights bearers also entails strengthening civil society organisations around which citizens can galvanise and demand for action and accountability. The two-pronged approach therefore promotes holistic engagement between the state and its citizens.

Relationships with the duty bearers, and in particular the Ministry of Gender are affected by the expectations gap on the part of both parties, and is increasingly the source of mutual disappointments. Working with rights holders on the other hand is compromised by the less than satisfactory relationships between PFMA and PRG. The latter is seen by PFMA as ineffective and the former is seen by PRG as distant and condescending.

GGP III is basket funded by a consortium of donors. The pooled funding approach is in line with the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness which sought to promote ownership, harmony, alignment and accountability of aid initiatives by donors to make those initiatives more effective. Pooled funding enables donors to harmonise their activities, avoid duplication of efforts and enhances more interaction where there is learning from each other's initiatives. The basket fund approach is also in alignment with MDG 8 which calls for global partnerships as vehicles for achieving development.

GGP III has also created linkages with similar governance programmes in Kenya such as Uraia and Amkeni, where such programmes have exploited each other's comparative advantages and partnered in a number of initiatives. This initiative by GGP III is a realisation that the space for gender and governance is big and therefore requires the collective efforts of different players for the ultimate goal to be achieved. Efforts by the programme to capacity build both state institutions and citizens augurs well for both sustainability and programme ownership.

Overall, the evaluation found both the approach and strategy of GGP to be largely relevant despite the above noted gaps.

f) Relevancy of Risks and Assumptions

The evaluation made an assessment of the risks and assumptions made at the launch of the programme in 2009 to determine whether those risks and assumptions still hold. The following table provides a summary of assessment findings for each of the risks/assumptions made.

Risk/Assumption	Relevance
Political instability and outbreaks of new conflicts and upsets due to external circumstances	This is still relevant given the elections that are scheduled for next year (2012) and the on-going ICC hearings and the possible trial of those implicated.
The gender agenda is marginalised due to competing priorities, limited resources and/or lack of high level political commitment to the concrete implementation of gender equality	The risk is still valid given the many transformative processes taking place in Kenya. The implementation of the new constitution is likely to result in the reduction of ministries leading to the possible "swallowing up" of the Gender Ministry which might be reduced to a department in another ministry. The voice of women and continued support from donors as well as active lobbying and advocacy is likely to reduce this risk by keeping the gender agenda on the radar.
Inability of the national gender machinery to create and sustain an enabling environment for change due to lack of gender specific skills and competencies	The risk is still valid as some of the gender focal persons within the national gender machinery lack requisite skills and experience to effectively spearhead a sustainable gender agenda. There is lacking political will and commitment to advance the gender agenda as evidenced by the level budgetary support to the Ministry.
Lack of research and data to support evidenced based advocacy for reform	Data on gender and governance are largely available as a number of baseline studies and other related researches have been done by different institutions. Some stakeholders felt that UN Women is not fully utilising the body of knowledge created by other institutions but instead chooses to

	commission own parallel studies. At national level, collection of data on MGDs for example, has not been consistent.
Limitations in ability of civil society to represent women's needs and issues in a unified manner to influence policy and decision making at state level	This risk is still valid as the evaluation established that the creation of a women's movement speaking with one voice is yet to be realised. Competition for resources, personal and political differences, ethnicity, political patronage and different perspectives on how to tackle women's issues have been identified as some of the barriers to the creation of a women's movement. Although at times women coalesce on a particular pertinent issue at a given period to air their collective voices, this is mostly done on an ad hoc basis..
Low level of enthusiasm by women to come together to express common needs and exert pressure on state and other players to deliver and protect women's rights and access to services	GGP III has to some extent reduced this risk through awareness programmes where women have awoken to some unrealised needs particularly in governance as well as with regard to their rights that they are entitled to. Where awareness programmes have been run, women are progressively speaking out. What can however dampen enthusiasm is differing class-based interests and needs where rural and poor women might prioritise basic needs and economic empowerment over governance and leadership issues.
Programme not adequately funded and thus unable to meet expected outcomes and therefore loses momentum and credibility	This risk has largely not played out as the majority of the implementing partners reported that funds that they were allocated under the programme were adequate for the planned activities but unable to address any urgent emerging issues. Although the programme faces strategic challenges, it is generally highly regarded by the different stakeholders.
Implementing partners' reporting and evaluation systems are not adequate to respond to the programme's M&E Framework.	The risk is still valid as the programme lacks a coherent M&E system and an M&E person. Given the diversity of the programme and the geographical spread of the IPs, there are no adequate human resources in the programme to effectively support IPs in M&E. The evaluation is of the opinion that due to this M&E deficiency, GGP III may be under-reporting its successes.
Poor financial sustainability of IPs coupled with low levels of capacity in programme management	This assumption is particularly true for some IPs with low capacity to attract funding. Without GGP III funding some of the IPs go under.

UN WOMEN correctly points out that assumptions and expectations towards the formulation of GGP III were high. Realities of the wide scope of issues addressed by the program, coupled with resource limitations do call for all the partners in GGP III to learn to manage their own expectations.

3.2 Programme Effectiveness

The mid-term evaluation assessed the effectiveness of GGP III implementation by looking at progress made towards the achievement of expected outcomes and the reasons for achievement and non-achievement of set targets. The evaluation also looked at effectiveness of programme strategy, partnership arrangements, programme management arrangements and the monitoring and evaluation framework.

a) Progress towards Achievement of Expected Outcomes and Outputs

i) Expected Outcome I: *Increased number of legal frameworks, laws and policies at national and local levels that promote and protect women's rights.*

Under this outcome, GGP III intended to help create an enabling legal and policy environment that would promote and protect women's rights. Notable achievements have been scored in this regard and GGP III was amongst a host of other parallel processes in Kenya seeking to achieve this outcome. Although it is difficult to determine the exact extent of GGP III contribution towards the achievement of this outcome, it is fair to conclude that GGP III played a pivotal role and made significant contributions towards on-going processes. It has also to be noted that although some of the legal frameworks and policies are in place, the extent to which these policies and framework will be effectively implemented to promote and protect women's rights remains to be seen in the medium to long-term.

Output I: *Knowledge (tools, model draft laws, analysis, memoranda, etc) on how to engender laws, policies and legal processes is developed and made accessible*

A number of initiatives were undertaken under this output. A comprehensive review of the constitution was undertaken as part of national processes but GGP III played a critical role in promoting, highlighting and safeguarding the gains of women in the proposed constitution. The 5-point agenda (i.e representation, devolution, public finance, bill of rights and gender commission) was an idea well received by women's organizations and leaders. Key gains for women in the constitution include equality of citizenship, opportunities for self-advancement, elimination of discrimination in land and property rights, and not more than 2/3 of either sex in elective bodies/appointive positions.

Three gender audits of the old constitution, the constitutional reform process and the new constitution were undertaken and an assessment was done on ten areas of law crucial to the attainment of gender equality and widely shared with partners, GOK and UN joint program. The scope of proactive strategic engagement with Kenya Law Reform Commission and Commission on the implementation of the Constitution which was recommended by the gender audit is not clear at this point. The evaluation noted that there was increased awareness on international protocols for the protection of women's human rights.

The process of developing a national action plan on UN 1325 has however been affected by the transition issues at the national gender commission.

Output 2: Effective dialogue mechanisms/platforms (think tanks, expert group meetings, multi stakeholder groups, women watch groups, lobbying groups, conferences etc)

GGP III supported partners to undertake civic education on the draft constitution. Ten partners were supported to inform communities on the gains for women in the constitution. It is estimated that over 10,000 people were directly reached as part of the CE campaign. This included over 1,200 provincial administrators, mainly chiefs and their assistants. IEC materials were distributed nationally. Although well received by partners, awareness levels of gains among beneficiaries at the grassroots vary widely. This was a major effort that could have had a more substantial impact with better targeting.

The women's national conference organized in collaboration with 23 women's organizations and bringing together over 1500 participants enhanced the sense of ownership of the constitution by women from all corners of the country and increased awareness on women's gains in the new constitution.

Output 3: National machineries in Kenya have increased capacity to mainstream gender equality into development strategies, legal frameworks, laws, policies and processes

GGP III sought to enhance capacity of national machinery through enhanced engagement, technical support through posting a Gender Advisor to the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Development, Training of Gender Focal Points on gender analysis and training on Gender Responsive Budgeting. Technical support to the Ministry was supposed to be formalised through a Letter of Agreement. The letter of agreement to support gender mainstreaming, gender training, CEDAW, CSW reporting and gender legislation had not yet been signed and operationalised at the time of the evaluation. The reason for non-signing of the agreement was mainly that the Ministry was yet to account for funds provided to them by the then UNIFEM in 2010. However despite the non-formalisation of the agreement, UN Women has been able to support some of the activities under the letter of agreement through direct support.

A Gender advisor was posted to the ministry to support the implementation of the letter of agreement. The work of the advisor and the uptake of the outputs anticipated in the letter by the ministry are compromised by the expectations gaps between the ministry and GGP. Training of gender focal points took place, with 40 beneficiaries from line ministries. The relatively low profile of most focal points within their respective ministries however does not inspire confidence that they can lead or fast-track the mainstreaming work as expected. The Gender mainstreaming framework and the gender responsive budgeting study have not met expectations of the ministry, and as such the ministry does not feel confident to provide leadership in these areas based on the tools made available by GGP III.

Output 4: Enhanced capacities of key governance institutions to institute mechanisms that promote participation of women

Key achievements under this output include: the launching of the Africa women's decade (2010-2020) in Nairobi in October 2010 which was attended by 5 heads of state and 51 ministers for gender and women's affairs ; the establishment of the National Steering Committee (NSC) which would contribute to the development of national action plan on UNSCR 1325; and the commemoration and initiation of UNSCR 1325 national action plan by the minister for Gender, Children and Social Development.

The capacity of NSC members was enhanced through the workshop on UNSCR 1325 and a learning trip to Finland in October 2010. The transition process in the gender commission has hampered the development of the national plan for action for UNSCR 1325. However, effort have been made by both UN Women and the Gender Commission to ensure that the activities are implemented and the drafting exercise is going on.

Progress towards Outcome I: Conclusion

Despite some challenges experienced in advancing towards this outcome, a number of achievements have been scored by GGP as the programme has contributed visibly and significantly to national efforts aimed at increasing the number of legal frameworks, laws and policies at national levels that promote and protect women's rights. Safeguarding key achievements for women in the constitution and ensuring that gender issues were embedded within the legal frameworks and development processes were key contributing achievements of GGP III. The key challenge towards the full realisation of this outcome (i.e. promotion and protection of women's rights) is the operationalisation and implementation of the legal frameworks, laws and policies that promote women's rights. The existence of legal frameworks, laws and policies on paper might not necessarily result in tangible benefits for women and hence more efforts need to be directed towards operationalisation and implementation of the laws. The conclusion of the evaluation is that GGP is making positive strides towards the realisation of this outcome in the mid to long-term.

ii) Expected Outcome 2:- *Women Participate in governance and decision-making processes at national and local levels and actively lobby for women's issues.*

Increased participation by women in governance and decision-making processes at national and local levels is one of the key outcomes of GGP III. Participation is not only perceived in quantitative terms but in terms of quality. In other words, once women participate in governance are they able to clearly articulate and actively lobby for women's issues? Participation in quantitative terms without focusing on the qualitative aspects was one of the major concerns of GGP II evaluation and hence GGP III tried to address this issue by focusing also on women's ability to actively lobby for women's issues.

An assessment of progress towards achievement of outputs under Outcome 2 is made as achievement of outputs will ultimately lead to the realisation of expected outcomes. The following were expected outputs under outcome 2.

Output 1: The Women at the local level have strengthened their leadership capacity to contribute to decisions that promote gender equality issues.

GGP III launched a number of initiatives aimed at strengthening leadership capacities of women in the different programme areas. The programme partnered with more than 10 women's organisations and CSOs to train the leadership of these women's organisations on governance, leadership and gender equality issues. Almost all women's leaders interviewed during the evaluation reported that the training they received was useful as it has boosted their confidence in their abilities as confirmed by women leaders of NCKK and CWL in Mombasa describing how GGP III leadership training transformed their leadership qualities and abilities. Their reports are contained in the following 2 boxes:

CWL Leadership

The training we got through GGP has really benefited us the women leadership in Mombasa. Women are now more enlightened and willing to be more involved in development issues. Through the training, we realised that any woman is entitled to any position within the governance structures that we have both locally and nationally. Women are now eager to run for political office. Here in Mombasa we never used to have Chief Administrators but now we have women who are chiefs and sub-chiefs. We used to have only one elected female councillor but now we have a total of six out of a total compliment of 36 councillors.

We lobbied to have women occupy 50% of the nominated positions. We have also lobbied successfully for women to participate in CDF committees. After a gender audit of our council that we did, we realised that most key committees of council were chaired by men and we also successfully lobbied for women to chair some of the committees. Now women chair committees such as Tourism, Social Services and Audit Committees. Women are also sitting in local boards such as Tourism Board, Human Rights Commission and the Central Agricultural Board.

The leadership training we got really inspired us. We would not have achieved all these things without the training we got through GGP. We used to think that certain positions are for men and we also lacked confidence and the support of other women. GGP has really empowered us as women leaders

Reverend Anne Deche, NCKK

As woman leader of NCKK, I was invited to attend a leadership training workshop where we were trained on effective leadership, governance, empowerment, the constitution and its provisions on women's rights. It was a wakeup call for me because I had never noticed the irony in our church that although women constitute almost three quarters of the congregation, almost all decision making positions in the church are male dominated. After the training, it became clear that even in church women have to have a voice.

Most of us women in church are afraid of participating in politics or take up leadership positions because of patriarchal values and beliefs which stereotype women who aspire for leadership positions as having loose morals. Before participating in the leadership training workshop, I and the other women were not able to speak for our rights. In fact we did not know what our rights were. But now we know our rights and we can claim our rights.

When I became the first female reverend of the Methodist church in my area, many men and even women could not stomach it. My ministry was very difficult because I lacked confidence and leadership skills. I was actually about to give up my leadership position when the leadership training programme was introduced. After the training I gained confidence and my ministry is much easier. Now I can stand up and speak even in front of men. I had that fear but that fear is gone now and I can claim my rights without any apology to anyone. Now that I am more empowered and have a voice, people, including men respect and listen to me. I am now even making decisions for men without any problems.

We have also been training other women on leadership and governance issues and you can see that there is change. A lot of women have come forward expressing their wish to participate in the next elections.

The following were some of the key achievements under this output:

- Appointment of women as chiefs and assistant chiefs
- An increase in the number of women elected as councillors and those seeking to run for public office
- Women demanding participation in CDF committees
- Women at national level contributing to debate on critical pieces of legislation such as the Constitution Amendment Bill
- Piloting gender centres of excellence to promote gender equality in decision-making and leadership at the local authorities.
- Increased participation by women in community forums
- Gender audits of local authorities

That GGP leadership training has enhanced leadership capacity of women and enabled them to participate in decision-making processes is not in doubt. Women leaders interviewed could articulate issues that they were trained on and could provide local evidence of changes that have taken place as a result of the training. Most of the CSOs expressed satisfaction with the quality of facilitators whom they described as resourceful and knowledgeable about the subject matter they delivered.

Concerns were however raised about the coverage of the leadership training which seemed to have concentrated mostly at urban level. CSO leaders reported that women leaders in remote areas need to be reached for the programme to have more impact. Accessing some of the areas is difficult and hence TOT was confined to easily accessible areas. The training duration was in some instances described as inadequate resulting in crash-training programmes which would result in information overload. Other leaders reported that some of the training materials, for example on Gender Responsive Budgeting (GRB), were too technical making it difficult for some of the CSO leaders to understand it. More friendly and easy to understand training materials and tools were recommended to make the training more effective.

Some CSOs complained that it was difficult to monitor their activities because of lack of a budget for M&E. This is despite the fact that it is a UN Women requirement under the programme that IPs should allocate at least 5% of their budget to M&E. Others were evaluating the impact of their trainings after every three months or so but not in a systematic way because of lack of adequate funds.

Output 2: Strengthened Women's movement that enables them to collectively lobby for key issues that affect women in Kenya

The evaluation did not notice a strengthened women's movement that is speaking in one voice on national and local issues. The need to strengthen the women's movement was highlighted in the GGP II evaluation and no significant changes seem to have taken place between GGP II evaluation and this mid-term evaluation. Rather, a new dimension is emerging that is increasingly promoting male involvement in women empowerment processes both at the local and national levels. On a different note, at local level, some GGP III partners were not aware of other GGP III partners working in the same locality. Whilst they might have known some of the partners by name, connectivity through GGP work was not established. Consequently, some of the partners were doing similar work within the same areas without rationalising that work or collaborating. The evaluation also established that, although women's groups coalesce around a particular theme on an ad hoc basis, it was more on a knee-jerk reaction basis than a result of a united women's movement effort. In most cases the momentum is lost soon after. A number of barriers to creating a women's movement were noted amongst them competition for resources and space between women's organisations, ethnicity, political affiliation and ideological and strategy differences.

Output 3: Women have increased awareness and access to information on their rights and state responsibilities with regard to service provision.

Through 17 partners, GGP III has managed to reach more than 10,000 women with information on women's rights, constitutional issues and governance. Women who were interviewed during the evaluation who had received these messages could to some extent articulate their rights and some of the provisions of the constitution with an implication on women's rights. The women did not only exhibit knowledge on women's rights, but they also expressed desire to assume leadership positions. Consequently, these women reported that they are demanding for participation in governance issues and have demanded that MPs account for CDF funds. In Isiolo County visited by the evaluation team, it was reported that after a GGP training, youth in the local community took the MP to court over allegations of misappropriation of CDF funds. After attending GRB trainings, women leaders have gone, in Mombasa for example, to demand for participation in budget formulation and advocated for gender parity in allocation of local educational scholarships and bursaries.

In some districts however, participation by women in decision-making processes was noted to be low. A study by FONI in two districts revealed that there was limited participation by women in devolved funds management structures such as CDF and Constituency Bursary Fund (CBF). The study also established that no affirmative action had been effected in distributing the bursary funds.

Output 4: *Increased acceptance of women leaders and women's issues*

GGP III has had a significant contribution in putting women's rights and governance issues on the agenda. Although initial resistance emanated from male dominated institutions, the empowering of women to articulate their issues has resulted in the gradual acceptance of women in leadership positions. As a result, men at community level are encouraging women to attend meetings, join CDF committees, and also participate in project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and continuously monitor the management of devolved funds to ensure community interests were safeguarded. Male gender advocates dubbed "gender warriors" have also been incorporated to fight for women's rights and to convince fellow men about the importance of gender equality. In Loitoktok for example, men are speaking in support of women leadership at community leadership meetings and other gatherings.

Women's issues are no longer regarded as peripheral issues but have been brought to the fore for every national development process such as constitution making and affirmative action. The presidential directive that women should constitute at least 30% of all public service positions is recognition of gender equality from the highest office in the land. Implementation of such a directive and the national gender policy is however likely to face clandestine resistance from some patriarchs within the government bureaucratic structures.

Progress towards Outcome 2: Conclusion

GGP III has made progress in contributing towards achievement of this outcome as evidenced by increased participation by women in governance at both local and national levels as well as increased awareness by women of their rights issues. There are however some districts where more work still needs to be done as evidence on the ground shows that women participation in governance issues is still low and has low momentum. More efforts are needed as the process of changing attitudes and behaviour is slow. The programme is generally in the right direction.

iii) Expected Outcome 3: *Kenya civil society has a unified voice in articulating women's needs, demanding and influencing the delivery of equitable services*¹³

Outcome 3 is not listed among the 2 core outcomes of the programme in the programme document although it appears amongst the budget lines in the programme budget document. The evaluation concluded that Outcome 3 was only introduced in the budget document to provide clarity for administrative and budget breakdown purposes and was therefore not analysed separately in this section. This is particularly in view of the fact that outputs under Outcome 3 are basically the same as those in Outcome 1. (See section 4.1 on programme budget analysis).

b) Effectiveness of Strategy

GPP III used a two-pronged strategy where it would work with the state and state institutions to influence changes and formulation of policies, laws and legal frameworks that are gender sensitive and would promote women's rights and participation in governance. It would also work with the citizens and create awareness and build their capacity to demand for accountability from the state and also to enhance their participation in governance issues. Working with and through the state is key to achieving national development objectives. So far, the GPP III has made some inroads within the national gender machinery and other relevant state institutions. To an extent, the programme contributed to influencing the outcome of the constitution and other legislative and policy processes toward engendering policy through GPP III partner participation in the political reform agenda. There were gaps however in that in some cases the national gender machinery was slow to respond to GPP III issues owing largely to government bureaucracy and limited capacity. Some decision-making meetings were postponed resulting in delays in making informed decisions.

Concerns were also raised by stakeholders that as a UN agency, UN Women should have the leverage to engage with government but the agency is failing to exploit fully its position to greater effect in terms of influencing the policy and strategic space in gender and governance. Some donors mentioned that UN Women does not always attend strategic policy meetings with government and donors thereby failing to take advantage of these high-level policy engagements to influence policy and legal processes. From the majority of donors' point of view, it seems UN Women was spending more time on programme management issues rather than on strategic policy level issues.

¹³ This outcome is not included in the programme document but appears in the Projected Budget 2009-2011

The other component of the GGP III strategy which engages with citizens and empowering them through capacity building has fairly been effective as it has contributed to the creation of a critical mass of women who are demanding their rights and slowly ascending to decision making positions. While this has been effective, the diversity of the individual IPs as well as their geographical locations has brought challenges to the implementation of GGP. IPs are at different levels of capacity and hence each partner needed a set of capacity building initiatives relevant to its needs. Given a narrow human resources base at UN Women, effective monitoring of all the partners became a challenge.

c) Effectiveness of Partnerships, Funding and Management Arrangements

As the programme and fund manager of GGP III, UN Women has a pivotal position within the programme. UN Women took over management of GGP from AAK after concerns were raised by stakeholders over management issues.

To encourage regular interaction between the GGP III partners, and donors, a Partners Reference Group (PRG) was proposed whose composition consisted of selected IPs, donors and UN Women as the secretariat. Through this vehicle, both donors and IPs would have the chance to have an input into programme management issues and strategic direction. PRG has held very few meetings since its inception giving the impression that this very important organ has virtually but collapsed. The collapse of PRG seems to emanate from confusion about roles in making the group functional. IPs seem to have the impression that UN Women was supposed to call for meetings of the group but have failed to do so, while on the other hand UN Women argues that they are only the secretariat of the organisation and the mandate to call for meetings rests with the co-chairs of PRG. A closer look at the Terms of Reference for the groups however shows that UN Women, as the PFMA, should have played a pivotal role in ensuring the functionality of PRG, including the facilitation of meetings.

The collapse of PRG has denied the three partners the chance to engage each other in a formal forum giving rise to allegations by IPs that GGP III is not transparently managed. IPs further allege that they have lost ownership of GGP III as the programme has been branded as a UN Women programme and that strategic decisions on the programme are now being monopolised by UN Women. Some IPs complained that when funding support from GGP ended, they were not informed why the support had ended when other partners continued to be funded.

Concerns were raised by both donors and IPs that UN Women's role as both fund manager and programme manager was conflicting, resulting in allegations of favouritism in the selection of IPs. Given that partners are also managed by UN Women in terms of programming, discontinued funding even on the basis of non-performance is likely to give rise to allegations of favouritism.

Disbursement of funding under GGP III has been affected by UN bureaucracy resulting in delays in implementing programme activities. The funding cycle of one year was also considered too short by most IPs as most gender and governance interventions require changing values and attitudes of targeted beneficiaries-a process which was estimated by some IPs to take three to four years.

Effective M&E of the programme is also being hampered by the lack of a dedicated M&E officer at UN Women. The diversity and scale of the programme requires a full time M&E officer. The evaluation team is of the opinion that GGP III is under-reporting some of its achievements and challenges owing to a non-robust M&E system. GGP III has to be commended for coming up with a structured reporting format with a logical framework which the partners are using to report on their activities. However some of the partner outputs and outcomes are not clearly defined and some partners seem to lack clarity on how to use the reporting framework. There is also need to capture more qualitative impacts of the programme as some of the reporting is based more on activity and output levels rather than on qualitative impact level. Some IPs reported that they do not have a budget to effectively monitor their activities even though a certain percentage of their budget was supposed to be set aside to fund monitoring activities. Although GGP III has a programme Logical Framework, there is no accompanying implementation plan, which makes it difficult to assess progress at activity and output levels.

d) Innovation, dynamism and creativity

Innovation and dynamism of the program comes at a price if not successfully executed, or too radical as to alienate partners and expose the program to criticism. The constantly evolving political environment and the high turnover of government contacts increase the complexity and dynamism of the environment, and programs like GGP are often in constant states of uncertainty and ambiguity. To its credit, GGP III seems more able to utilize opportunities for quick wins, e.g. constitutional referendum. The programme is demonstrating greater ability to respond flexibly to emerging issues thru rapid responses mechanisms.

3.2 Programme Efficiency

In assessing the efficiency of the programme, the evaluation sought to determine measures put in place during planning and implementation to ensure that resources were used efficiently as well as timely delivery of outputs. The evaluation also looked at the extent to which UN Women's organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively supported programme delivery and the extent to which the programme has used local capacities to achieve its outcomes.

A number of measures were put in place during the design of GGP III informed partly by GGP II evaluation recommendations and lessons learned from implementation. The two preceding phases of GGP faced a number of challenges including mishandling of financial resources by partners owing largely to capacity limitations and selection of partners whose areas of focus were not in alignment with GGP III objectives. GGP III engaged a consultant to do the selection of IPs and the selection criteria were based on financial and programme management capacity of the IP as well as alignment of IP objectives and activities with those of GGP. An institutional assessment of each partner was done before signing of contracts with UN Women. Partners who had showed lack of capacity or who mismanaged GGP III resources were not considered in the selection process. The process ensured that appropriate and relevant partners were selected who could use GGP III resources more efficiently and in the process contribute towards the achievement of programme goal and expected outcomes.

To ensure effective monitoring of IPs by UN Women, the reporting period for IPs was reduced from bi-annual reporting to quarterly reporting. The funds disbursement ratio was also changed from 90% and 10% to 50%: 40% and 10%. Although the new disbursement ratio means more administrative work for UN Women, it however reduces the risk of mismanagement of funds. Second and third disbursements are only effected upon satisfactory performance by the IPs of the initial disbursements.

As a buffer to deal with reported inability to account efficiently for finances, GGP III provided a financial management guide and training. Partners are using this manual and knowledge gained from the orientation training on signing the contract. Over 90% of partners interviewed felt that their ability to manage and account for finances was good. They also felt that the resources provided were adequate for planned activities, but they were unable to provide rapid response to emerging issues that required financing.

IPs however noted that the new disbursement model was causing delays in the release of funds thereby affecting implementation of activities. The evaluation established that a number of partners were not happy with disbursement delays and although this issue was raised by GGP II evaluation, the challenge is still prevalent in GGP III. The majority of the partners waited to receive funding sometimes exceeding 3 months from the date of signing of the contract due to the fact that UN Women is administered by UNDP.

Budget Analysis: An analysis of GGP III budget shows that the largest percentage (29%) was allocated for Outcome 3, followed by Outcome 2 (24%) and Outcome 1 (19%). It is commendable that the bulk of the funding was directed towards the funding of actual activities on the ground such as capacity building, lobbying and advocacy activities. Outcome 3 does not appear in the programme document and only appears in the Programme Budget document. The conclusion of the evaluation was that Outcome 3 was only put in the budget document for administrative purposes to clearly show a detailed breakdown of the budget rather than as a complete addition of a new outcome. Outputs under Outcome 1 and Outcome 2 are basically the same and hence it is reasonable to regard Outcomes 2 and 3 in the budget document as one outcome. By this logic, it entails that more than half of the budget (53%) was allocated for Outcome 2.

As discussed in Section 3 of this report, there has been noted increase in rights awareness rights awareness by women as well as state obligations in supporting and fulfilling those rights. The evaluation however noted that despite the largest allocation of the budget being allocated for the creation of a “unified voice” and a women’s agenda, there is still a long way in achieving this target owing to diversified interests, competition for resources, ethnicity, political affiliation and a lack of common grounding on what constitute the gender agenda amongst the women’s organisations. Women’s organisations and civil society organisations are however managing to coalesce on topical issues and demand change, although this is rather on an ad hoc basis. More efforts are needed towards this outcome given the resources that have been invested to achieve this outcome.

M&E has an allocation of 15% of the budget and we feel that the programme should have appointed a dedicated M&E officer given the resources allocated to support this role. The allocated funds should also have been effectively used to strengthen M&E capacities of IPs which the evaluation noted to be less than ideal.

Administration and personnel costs only constitute about 5% of the total programme budget. While this might mean more resources going towards programme activities there is need to ensure that the allocated resources allocated are effectively used by making sure that there is adequate human resources. In our view there was need for increased human resources capacity at UN Women, particularly with regard to the M&E component of the programme and hence would have had no qualms with the administration and staff budget being around 10% of the total budget.

Coordination and collaboration amongst GGP III implementing partners was found to be lacking in the areas visited. GGP IPs were generally not aware of the presence of other GGP partners and the programmes that they were implementing. The possibility of duplication of activities by IPs operating in the same area was high and in fact in one area visited, same beneficiaries were benefiting from three similar interventions by three GGP III partners. More efficient resource utilisation could be achieved through harmonisation of activities and joint planning by GGP Partners. The formation of consortiums of GGP partners operating in the same areas will not only enhance harmonisation of activities, but will also simplify monitoring of the programme by UN Women. Uraia is using the consortium model effectively and efficiently and has seen its M&E burden significantly reduced.

As discussed elsewhere in this report, interaction between UN Women, donors and IPs through the Partner Reference Group has been minimal because the organ has remained largely dormant. This has allegedly limited IP input into GGP III programme management issues and strategic direction and has affected UN Women's relationship with some of the partners, with the later accusing the former of lack of transparency

There is no timelines or implementation matrix to operationalise the logical framework for the program. For example, partner mapping and selection appear to be continuous throughout the program period, giving the impression that GGP III is operating on a flexi-time mode

To be deemed efficient, the program implementation should ideally be guided by a set of key documents prepared well in advance of program inception. However, the evidence suggests that some important reference documents for the program were produced late. For example, one of the baseline studies, on the representation of women and participation in key positions in both the public and private domain was finalized in August 2010, as the second year of program implementation was coming to a close. The mapping and scoping study for CSO partners on the other hand was finalized later in December 2010. Finally, the mid-term review of GGP III is being done at the end of the fourth quarter of 2011, when the current program should be closing.

The evaluation team feels that more partners should have been identified to contribute to the equally important outcome 1 although we note that more partners targeting outcome 2 were needed for awareness campaigns and civic education spread throughout the country, Notably, none of the partners addresses issues of women challenged with disability and their participation in democratic governance.

Out of the 26 partners, 80.77% (21 partners) are headquartered in Nairobi and are mostly affiliated to the ethnic identity of the founder. Communication between headquarters and field office level was found to be ineffective in some cases as some of the field officers interviewed were not familiar with GGP activities even though they were supposed to spearhead the implementation of GGP activities. To avoid the programme being labelled elitist and biased towards urban CSOs, more resources should be directed at grassroots CSOs. We note that targeting grassroots CSOs has its own challenges in terms of capacity and monitoring, but we contend that with adequate capacity building support, these CSOs have more potential for sustainability and provision of gender and governance messages to grassroots women who, by virtue of their location, have limited access to information.

Given the number and diversity of partners as well as their geographical locations, the GGP team is small to effectively monitor the IPs. UN Women has acknowledged that resources permitting, more needs to be done in terms of effectively monitoring partners, particularly those in remote areas.

3.3 Programme Sustainability

In assessing sustainability of the GGP III program, we focused on three broad areas of investigation, namely; the extent of ownership of the program by stakeholders; the preparedness and capacity of stakeholders to independently manage program outputs and extend the benefits of the program even without external financial and technical support and; the potential for the programme components to be replicated by stakeholders. The evidence suggests that the prospects for sustaining the program are strong in certain respects but weak in others as illustrated below:

a) Ownership

In our view, three key factors appeared to be at play in determining how strongly the sense of ownership was felt by stakeholders. The first is the alignment of the objectives of the partners with the stated goals and desired outcomes of GGP III. Accordingly, the clearer this alignment was discernible, the more the sense of ownership was stronger. The partners whose *raison d'être* and core mandate is, broadly stated, improving the governance domain in general or focusing on gender dimensions of governance generally feel more at home with the normative concerns of GGP III. This is the case particularly with most of the larger CSOs, a good proportion of which are headquartered in Nairobi.

In many respects, the sense of ownership of the program by beneficiary groups or communities was stronger if the activities and outputs implemented by the partners were addressing a locally topical issue. This is the sense we got for example with the gender dimensions of conflict and insecurity in North Rift, and with social exclusion of women in governance, female genital mutilation and low educational attainment for girls in Kuria and northern Kenya.

The second factor impacting the ownership of GGP III was the longevity, or the history of the implementing partner in interacting with gender and governance issues, and as a corollary to this, the capacity for basic gender analysis and programming. Thus for example, the organizations that have engaged with the gender and governance program, from the early days when it had a narrower focus on facilitating the higher representation of women in elective positions to its present broader remit, tend to feel a stronger sense of ownership of GGP III. Further, it was also clear that such organizations tend to be keener to be engaged in deeper, substantive ways in influencing the direction and focus of GGP III than say, newer implementers with broader policy or development mandates.

The foregoing notwithstanding, the overall impression of the evaluation team is that many partners, particularly CSOs, feel increasingly alienated from GGP III. This feeling of alienation, according to a number of interviewees, is fuelled primarily by the less than satisfactory interaction through the Partners Reference Group. Partners are also concerned with the frequency of changes in program focus, the one-year program implementing periods (or shorter) and the potential for cessation of support at around the time when the climax of the campaign for gender equality in the political domain is within sight particularly in view of the pending 2012 elections..

A number of IPs and donors expressed reservations about national ownership of the programme. They contended that although GGP is supposed to be a programme for Kenyan civil society and Kenyan women, it is now increasingly being viewed as a UN Women programme. Branding of the programme and the limited involvement of the IPs in programme management and strategic decision making was cited as one of the reasons why the programme is progressively lacking in national ownership as key decisions are made by UN Women. When GGP III was conceived, a Partners Reference Group (PRG) involving donors, IPs and UN Women was supposed to be formed to facilitate interaction between the key stakeholders and afford IPs and opportunity to have a say in how the programme was being run, including its strategic direction. The PRG had, up to the time of the Mid-term evaluation, been barely functional thereby depriving IPs the opportunity to have an input into how the programme is managed. This has also limited interaction between the donors and IPs.

b) Stakeholder preparedness to independently manage outputs and extend GGPIII benefits

Institutionally, a number of new partners from the public sector, and in particular the national gender machinery (including the Ministry of Gender Children and Social Development and the National Commission on Gender and Development), and to a lesser degree national commissions such as IEBC and NCIC do have the organic integrity and structural presence nationally to continue elements of GGP III outcomes and outputs. This is particularly in relation to outputs of a monitoring and mainstreaming nature, which are part of their core mandates and routine work. In addition, it is particularly helpful that gender mainstreaming is now part and parcel of the performance contracts for permanent secretaries, and as such a significant contribution to gender mainstreaming will now be part of routine government work.

Some challenges still abound for exploiting this important opportunity to advance gender inclusion. Some of the challenges relate to the capacity and financial resources necessary for highly technical processes such as gender analysis, and gender responsive budgeting among the cadre of gender officers and gender focal points within other ministries, agencies and departments (MADs). An additional challenge is that the national gender machinery feels constrained to provide leadership in gender mainstreaming and gender responsive budgeting, primarily as a result of the incompleteness of the requisite operational frameworks and tools for executing these functions. Finalization of the gender mainstreaming framework and guidelines for gender responsive budgeting to the satisfaction of government will be a major boost for sustainability.

But whereas government agencies may have demonstrable potential for sustaining and extending programme outputs and benefits, if not to the same quality possible with GGP III support, the same may not apply to especially CSOs implementing components of GGP III. Financially and in terms of technical capacity, many of the CSOs, and in particular the ones that have only recently come on board the gender and governance programming, are heavily reliant on GGP III support, and a cessation of financial support would all but lead to cessation of activities associated with GGP III support.

c) Potential to replicate program components

In strategic terms, tensions between the objectives of transforming the governance realm and increasing the number and visibility of women in leadership positions remain unresolved. As such, taking the program forward in the absence of a PMU that operates as a clearing house for programmatic agenda-setting would most likely be an uphill task.

Tactically, some of the approaches used in GGP III such as advocacy and lobbying of opinion leaders to increase acceptance and promotion of women's greater participation in leadership are understood in rather simplistic ways by especially grassroots-based organizations. The effective use of such strategies and tactics in the absence of a PMU or a similar outfit, with the necessary technical assistance capacities cannot be guaranteed.

As noted by the evaluation of GGP II, and still valid today, the struggle for gender equality is still beset by sectarian tensions, primarily of an inter-ethnic and inter-generational nature. Whereas GGP III has not yet formulated an adequate response to this problem, it does however provide a platform under which an honest conversation between partners of various motivations can take place about controvertible and divisive issues such as negative ethnicity. No doubt the absence of a GGP III-like programme would set back the pursuit of a coherent focus for championing disparate elements of gender inclusion.

On the positive side however, GGP III has used as entry points community leadership institutions as well as existing institutions such as churches and local government structures which will continue existing beyond the lifespan of GGP III. The capacity building that entailed rolling out of GGP activities and the knowledge accumulated on gender and governance issues is likely to continue being shared and cascaded down albeit most likely in an informal and unstructured way in the absence of external support. GGP III did not create parallel structures, but exploited existing ones by re-orienting them to embrace gender and governance issues and act as change agents in their respective communities. The use of existing structures is commendable as it augurs well for sustainability as well as ensuring that some elements of GGP III continue even after official cessation of GGP III initiatives.

The innovative involvement of men by some partners is also commendable given the context that in most communities men are central in shaping the value system of their communities. Breaking down gender barriers which are entrenched within the patriarchal cultural and religious system of a society therefore requires the collaboration and support of men, who have to understand and appreciate in the first place the pitfalls and impacts of gender discrimination on both local and national development. The fact that in some GGP III targeted communities visited during the evaluation male leaders are calling for women participation and inclusion in local decision-making organs raises the hope that such messages are likely to continue even after GGP III officially comes to an end.

The conclusion of the evaluation on sustainability is that aspects of GGP III that are entrenched and aligned with core mandates of institutions and organisations and are part of their day today activities are likely to continue beyond the official lifespan of the programme. The same applies to use of knowledge and capacities generated or enhanced through the programme. Activities that require intensive funding are likely to reduce in intensity without external support. Sustainability is also going to crucially hinge on political will and commitment of the new government to emerge from the 2012 elections as well as the position of gender issues in the perking order of priorities of the government.

3.4 Inclusiveness and Participation

The mid-term evaluation of GGP III sought to establish the extent to which the principles of ownership, inclusiveness and participation, which are key to UN policy, were fostered in the programme. These principles are the fulcrum for programme sustainability and hence it is important to determine the extent to which the programme is adhering to these principles.

The design of GGP III was informed by a series of consultative workshops involving donors, UN Women and implementing partners. The design was also informed by recommendations of an evaluation of GGP II as well as by the prevailing political and social context. Although key stakeholders reported that they had an input in designing the programme, some IPs complained that they were not consulted and hence had no input in the design of the programme. Others reported that when the programme was re-branded, they had little input into the process.

GGP III has encompassed women from all walks of life who are prepared to fight for space and rights within the current dispensation. Although the programme is national in coverage, there were concerns expressed by some implementing partners that women in some remote areas were being excluded as it was difficult for the IPs to reach these areas and create awareness. The programme has to be all inclusive to shake off the label that it is “elitist” and is only targeting educated women in urban centres and in specific regions that can be easily reached. Some of the partners are also embracing men in their programmes as “gender champions” while others are including women only in their activities. As a gender programme, GGP III should also involve men in its activities so that these men can spread the message of gender equality to their fellow men.

The GGP III mid-term evaluation has sought to include all the key stakeholders in the evaluation process. National gender machinery, UN Women, donors, implementing partners and targeted beneficiaries all participated in the evaluation as sources of information. Recommendations from all these stakeholders will help shape the strategic direction of the programme as well as promote programme ownership.

4. LESSON LEARNING

4.1 Application of Recommendations and Lessons Learnt from GGP II Evaluation

In this section, an assessment is made of the extent to which GGP III applied lessons learnt and recommendations from GGP II evaluation.

Issues flagged by the GGP II evaluation include: the programme's lack of grounded focus on governance and transformation; inappropriate implementing partners; more focus on quantity (ensuring as many women as possible get elected into governance positions) at the expense of quality (what the women elected will do once they get elected); concern over capacity of PIU staff; limited input by partners into financial and management decisions made by PFMA, leading to allegations of favouritism; concerns regarding quality of RBM, M&E and financial management; funds disbursement delays by UN Women; non-existence of baseline data; lack of standard approach to monitoring by implementing partners; lack of adequate utilisation by UN Women of its legitimacy and leverage to develop partnerships with governance institutions and provide technical and analytical support; lack of a risk analysis and; lack of a women's movement with clear vision and common purpose.

GGP III has made efforts to address some of these concerns by improving on IP selection through the use of two consultants to support the selection process; increasing focus on qualitative aspects of governance; improving on financial and programme reporting by IPs; conducting a baseline survey and carrying out a risk analysis amongst other initiatives.

However, despite efforts by the programme to address identified gaps, the evaluation noted that issues such as application of the RBM framework; M&E; limited participation and involvement by implementing partners in programmatic content and management decisions made by PFMA (mainly resulting from the ineffective Partners Reference Group (PRG) structure established under the programme); late disbursement of funds; and lack of optimum use of leverage and space to influence policy and strategy by UN Women as the programme manager still need addressing. Although efforts were made (with some degree of success) to improve the selection criteria for implementing partners, the evaluation noted that some gaps still exist as in some instances, it was difficult to see an alignment between some of the selected partners' activities and the objectives of GGP III. The evaluation also noted with concern that while GGP II recommendations and UNIFEM Evaluation Policy (2009) emphasize the need for evaluation outcomes to inform planning and strategic direction of programming, the PFMA was already calling for proposals and processing applications before the conclusion of this mid-term review.

The evaluation established that out of the 15 key concerns of GGP II evaluation, GGP III has managed to satisfactorily address 6 issues or 40% of the concerns. Issues that the evaluation considers to have been positively addressed include focusing the programme more on governance and transformational issues; addressing the quantity vs quality debate of women parliamentarians through capacity building; providing technical and analytical support to national stakeholders and conducting a baseline survey and a risk analysis.

The evaluation appreciates that some of the gaps identified by the GGP II evaluation, for example issues to do with ethnicity and patronage as well as late disbursement of funds owing to UN bureaucracy, are much more difficult to address through a programme with a short duration such as GGP III and where UN guidelines and procedures have to be adhered to. The evaluation also noted that efforts are being made by the programme to address some of the outstanding issues. However, issues such as M&E and having an effective PRG ought to have been more effectively addressed by the programme as part of the lesson learning process.¹⁴

¹⁴ See annex on action taken by GGP III on GGP II recommendations

4.2 Key Lessons Learnt

The following are the key lessons learnt discerned from the evaluation:

- ✦ Empowering rights holders, civic society while at the same time supporting transformation of legal frameworks, laws and policies is an effective strategy of promoting the recognition of women's rights and enjoyment of same rights.
- ✦ Working with traditional, religious and political leadership as well as men at national and local levels catalyses the gradual breakdown of cultural, political and religious barriers and increases chances of acceptability of women participation in governance and election to leadership positions.
- ✦ The gender gap in political leadership is too large and can only be addressed by legislation, hence the constitution and specific acts that have implications for gender equality. The new constitution for example still holds the biggest prospects for sustaining the results of the many years of work towards gender equality.
- ✦ Engaging with the devolved government structures and funding mechanisms will be potentially a major success in invigorating women's participation in leadership and resource management at the grassroots level. All partners commend this approach in building women's capacities for engaging with government structures and resources from below, as opposed to previous approaches that were premised on primarily Nairobi-based organizations making forays into the rural areas/smaller urban centres to "empower women" through civic education and capacity building.
- ✦ Lack of a platform through which IPs, PFMA and donors regularly interact and share experiences leads to misconceptions and mistrust amongst partners.
- ✦ Sensitization alone is inadequate, structural and institutional barriers have to be removed to actualize gender equality
- ✦ The implications of not consciously addressing diversity (rural/urban, generation gaps, literacy, ethnicity, etc) of identities increases polarization within the women's movement and a feeling of discrimination.
- ✦ Attitudinal and perceptual changes take a long time to take effect and approaches for the same need to take this into account.

- ✚ Creating a front consisting of both women and youth, who are both largely marginalised and socially excluded from political and governance processes, provides a basis for a strong advocacy alliance.
- ✚ The gender equality agenda competes with other governmental priorities/considerations, including poverty/corrective justice/food security etc and priority afforded the gender question in MADs is often associated with the commitment of specific officers/leaders

5. KEY EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS

The following are the key conclusions of the mid-term evaluation:

ISSUE	KEY CONCLUSIONS
Overall	<p>Although GGP III has faced a number of strategic and implementation challenges, the programme has made significant contributions towards the achievement of both Outcomes 1 and 2. This is largely attributable to the programme's ability to exploit opportunities provided by national processes and initiatives, capacity-building initiatives for both national and implementation partners as well as awareness campaigns launched in programme areas targeted mainly at women as well as at local leaders and men.</p>
Programme Relevance & Appropriateness:	<p>Goal and Objectives: GGP III goal and objectives are largely relevant to the current gender inequality situation in Kenya and in alignment with current GoK vision and regional and international efforts to achieve gender equity and equality in all spheres of life, including governance.</p> <p>Partnerships: Key GGP III partners namely GoK, Donors, UN Women, Implementing Partners and targeted beneficiaries were found to be appropriate and strategically placed to enhance achievement of GGP III objectives.</p> <p>Targeted beneficiaries: Evidence on the ground shows that participation by women in Kenyan development processes has been very low as a result of cultural, political, economic and religious barriers entrenched within the patriarchal value system which permeates all levels of society in the country. Targeting primarily women with GGP III interventions is an attempt to address gender disparities within Kenyan society.</p> <p>Approach and Strategy: The two-pronged approach where the programme engages both the state and rights bearers through empowering civil society organisations promotes holistic engagement between the state and its citizens.</p> <p>The basket fund model adopted by the programme is in alignment with the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness as well as MDG 8 which both seek to promote ownership, harmony, alignment and accountability of aid initiatives and global partnerships by donors to make those initiatives more effective.</p> <p>Risks and Assumptions: the main risks and assumption made at the beginning of the programme were still valid and relevant at the time of the mid-term evaluation</p>

<p>Programme Efficiency</p>	<p>GGP III has shown responsiveness to efficiency issues by improving the selection criteria for IPS, changing the funds disbursement ratio from 90:10 to 50:40: 10 to minimise misuse of resources before corrective action is taken. GGP III has also provided a financial management guide and training. Over 90% of partners interviewed felt that their ability to manage and account for finances has improved.</p>
<p>Programme Effectiveness</p>	<p>Progress towards achievement of outcomes: given the multiplicity of programmes and processes currently taking place in Kenya on gender and governance, it is difficult to determine the quantum of change attributable to GGP III interventions. However, the evaluation concluded that given the flurry of activities and outputs that GGP III has generated relative to similar programmes in Kenya, the programme is contributing significantly to the gradually transforming and evolving gender equality and equity scenario in the country whose fulcrum is legal, policy and institutional reform and citizens capacity enhancement through civic education and awareness campaigns.</p> <p>Effectiveness of Strategy: two-pronged strategy is fairly effective as it has contributed to the achievement of visible results so far. There were however incidences of mutual lack of confidence in the capacity each other between national gender machinery and UN Women has. Some IPs also felt that UN Women was not executing its mandate in a transparent manner.</p> <p>Learning, Monitoring and Evaluation: although some improvements have been noted on the M&E system compared to GGP II, the evaluation noted that a robust M&E framework with an implementation plan is lacking. Partners have log-frame template to guide their reporting but some of the outputs, outcomes and indicators are murky and quality of logical frameworks varies from partner to partner, mostly based on the longevity of their association with GGP.</p> <p>There is limited collaboration and cross-learning between GGP III implementing partners even when working in the same area giving rise to the possibility of duplication of activities and inefficient use of resources.</p> <p>Partnerships, Funding and Management Arrangements: There is limited interaction between donors, UN Women and IPs resulting in allegations of lack of transparency and favouritism within GGP III by UN Women.</p> <p>Flow of funding from UN Women to IPs is affected by UN Bureaucracy resulting in late implementation of some partner activities. Funding cycles of one year considered too short by partners to effectively address GGP III issues. Some of the partners have left their activities “hanging” after the one year funding cycle came to an end and their contracts were not renewed.</p> <p>IPS, changing the funds disbursement ratio from 90:10 to 50:40:10 to minimise potential misuse of resources GGP III has also provided a financial management guide and training. Over 90% of partners interviewed felt that their ability to manage and account for finances has improved.</p>

<p>Programme Sustainability</p>	<p>GGP III has created a basis for sustainability of programme benefits and activities by working through existing local and national structures, building capacities of institutions and individuals at both national and local levels and adopting a participatory ethos where key stakeholders participated at key stages of the programme cycle. Although a basis for sustainability has been established, long-term sustainability is not guaranteed given that the capacity of some of the partners has not been fully developed both in financial terms and human capacity terms. Sustainability of GGP III benefits and activities also depends on factors outside the control of the programme such as the political environment as well as political will of the government of the day.</p>
<p>Programme Inclusivity:</p>	<p>GGP III tried to involve all women from all walks of life irrespective of socio-economic status, political affiliation, religion and ethnicity. As a gender programme however, there is no strategic effort to include men save for individual innovation by some IPs. Special categories of women such as Women Living with Disability have not been mapped to participate in the programme.</p>

6. KEY EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Issue	Recommendation	By Who
Overall: way forward	Donors and all GGP III stakeholders need to keep the momentum on gender and governance that the programme has significantly contributed to through continued support for key activities such as awareness creation, capacity enhancement and support for women election candidates during the 2012 national elections and beyond. There is need for GGP III partners to realise that the existence of legal frameworks, laws and policies on paper does not automatically translate into tangible benefits for women unless these laws and policies are operationalised and implemented. This therefore should be one of the key focus areas of GGP III. The programme should however continue to pursue the same Goal and Expected Outcomes.	All stakeholders
Monitoring and Evaluation	GGP III should, as a matter of priority, engage a dedicated M&E officer for effective implementation of the programme's M&E framework.	UN Women
Partners Reference Group	GGP III should revive the PRG to facilitate interaction and participation by implementing partners and donors in mapping out priorities and strategic direction of the programme.	UN Women to facilitate the process in liaison with donors and IPs
Funding	Funding blockages need to be minimised to enable timely disbursement of funds by UN Women to IPs. The programme needs to consider setting up a "quick response" fund, which can be managed by one or more donors to circumvent UN bureaucracy, to enable partners to respond quickly to pertinent and urgent issues and opportunities which emerge during the politically fluid environment towards national elections in 2012.	UN Women and Donors
Partnerships	To reach out more to grassroots and marginalised women in remote places, GGP III should increase the number of grassroots CSO partners engaged by the programme. In cases where partners have limited capacity, the selection of these partners should be followed by intensive capacity building by UN Women in partnership with other stakeholders. Capacity enhancing initiatives should be tailor-made to suite the different capacity needs and levels of the selected partners. This entails increasing the human resources capacity at UN Women or alternatively, engaging technical partners to deliver capacity enhancement initiatives.	UN Women in collaboration with National Gender Machinery, IPs and technical partners

Policy Level Strategic Engagement	UN Women needs to exploit more the policy and strategic space and opportunities through increased leveraging with government, donors and other key stakeholders as there was a general feeling amongst donors and national gender machinery that more could be done by UN Women in this regard.	UN Women
Women's Movement	There is need for GGP III together with other gender programmes such as Uraia and CSOs to come up with a strategy on how to facilitate the strengthening and consolidation of a strong women's movement with a more leveraging voice.	UN Women in collaboration with similar programmes, donors and IPs
Learning	Cross-learning and collaboration between implementing partners of GGP III should be encouraged by UN Women through thematic consortiums and the holding of periodic experience sharing and lesson learning workshops	UN Women and IPs
GGP Entry Points	GGP III should continue promoting the engagement of traditional, religious and political leaders as well as teachers as entry points for the programme as these opinion makers have strategic influence in shaping values, behaviour and the socialisation process in communities. The use of these opinion makers by some GGP III partners as entry points has shown tremendous potential in shaping attitudes and behaviour towards women participation in leadership positions and governance.	Implementing Partners with support from UN Women
Male Involvement:	The evaluation notes that GGP III is justifiably targeting mostly women given the historical barriers they face to participate in politics, governance and other spheres of life. The evaluation however contends that where men have been sensitised and used as agents of change in promoting gender equality, partners have reported significant progress towards attitude change and acceptance of women into governance positions. As such, this evaluation recommends that more partners should be encouraged to use this strategic approach but with the realisation that women should occupy frontline positions in advocating for change.	Implementing Partners with support from UN Women
Programme Documents	To improve programme coherence and consistency there is need to standardise programme documents so that they reflect same programme goal, outputs and outcomes. The programme document has two expected outcomes while the programme budget document has three outcomes.	UN Women

7. APPENDICES

7.1 Terms of Reference

Mid-term review for the Gender and Governance programme (GGPIII)

I. Background of the GGPIII program

1.1 Contextual analysis

The Government of Kenya is committed to establishing good governance and human development in all sectors and eliminating discrimination in its legislation, policies, and programmes. It has begun to propose various interventions grounded in both policy and legal frameworks. Through its *Vision 2030*, Kenya seeks to build a just and cohesive society with social equity in a clean and secure environment and the Medium Term Plan (MTP) 2008-2012 is the first of the medium-term plans developed for its implementation with regard to governance and rule of law, the government is, or will be, implementing (i) flagship projects, which take into account the post-2007 election crisis and therefore aim to build a strong governance and rule of law foundation for the achievement of Vision 2030; (ii) other new and ongoing programmes across five strategic priority areas; and (iii) sector-wide initiatives within the scope of the Governance, Justice, Law and Order Sector (GJLOS) Reform Programme. All these constituted opportunities for the GGP III and together with an analysis of past programme achievements, lessons learned and stakeholder reviews and recommendations provided some strategic guidance for its focus and entry points.

1.2 The Gender and Governance Programme

The Gender and Governance Programme (GGP) in Kenya is an innovative response towards promoting women's rights in governance. The Millennium Development Declaration and Goals 2000 places gender equality as a goal to be achieved by 2015 and further sets a 50-50 target of women's representation in parliament as an indicator of achievement of this goal. At the same time, Goal 8 provides for global partnership, thereby calling on the donors, the UN agencies, NGOs and other actors to collectively contribute towards achieving the MDGs. Operationalizing the Millennium Development Goals, especially within the OECD countries has further been reinforced by the Paris Principles on Donor Coordination and Harmonization. Joint programme and collective focus on strategic results for sustainability and impact grounded on ownership and coherence is at the core of this effort. GGPIII therefore constitutes towards achieving gender equity and women's empowerment in Kenya, as it relates to women's representation in decision making process.

The Gender and Governance Programme (GGP III) represents the third phase of the original Gender and Governance Programme launched in September 2004, which followed the Engendering Political Processes Programme, Phase I (EPPPI). The design of the third phase of the GGP was informed by an evaluation of the GGP II programme entitled "*Evaluating the Gender and Governance Programme, June 2008*", which was undertaken by South Consulting during the first half of 2008. The evaluation enumerated the achievements and lessons learned under the EPPP and the GGP II was used in the design of the new programme (GGP III). The design was further informed by a series of consultative workshops with various donors, implementing partners and UN WOMEN (former UNIFEM) and considerations based on the recent, and evolving, political reform and development context in Kenya at that time. The GGP program has a budget of 12.1 M USD.

1.3 Program focus and strategies

The GGP III has adopted a two-pronged human-rights based approach working with the state (duty bearers) on the one side and the citizens at the grassroots level (rights-holders) on the other. The program focuses on providing technical support to government institutions and national gender machineries in achieving equal access of women to goods and services, and civil society organisations in holding duty bearers accountable. Through specific and varied activities, it strives to contribute to engendered national and local institutional policies and legal frameworks; increasing women's participation in governance at all levels; and supporting civil society in articulating women's needs, demanding and influencing the delivery of equitable services.

1.4 GGP III Stakeholders

The GGP III has a wide range of stakeholders which include the Government of Kenya, national and international donors of the programme, civil society and most importantly, the women of Kenya. The programme is managed by UN WOMEN (former UNIFEM) in the role of Programme and Financial Management Agency (PFMA), as appointed by the Donor Steering Committee (DSC) and is implemented through a broad range of organizations, largely acting as implementing partners, under the guidance, supervision and management of the PFMA.

2. Gender and Governance Program (GGP III) Objectives

The overall goal of GGP III is to ensure that Kenyan women and men are able to access services and opportunities and exercise their rights equally. The key outcomes of the project are:

- I. Increased number of Kenyan legal frameworks, Laws and policies at national and local levels that promote and Protect women's human rights
- II. Women participate in governance and decision-making processes at national and local levels and actively lobby for women's issues. To attain its development objectives, the GGP III Programme works through three key and crosscutting components that provide an encompassing conceptual framework for the entire Programme, These components include:
 1. **Institutional Capacity-Building:** GGP III interventions provide support to prompt institutional reform priorities through capacity-building, technical assistance, advocacy, and lobbying
 2. **Community Sensitization and Support to Civil Society:** Through this component, GGP III Programme focuses on awareness creation among the public and women in particular on legal, policy and institutional reforms processes and the achieved results in of improved gender responsive delivery. Additionally, it strengthens the ability to unify women to push for a common platform in realization of gender responsive development and service delivery and
 3. **Promoting Gender-Sensitive Results-Based Programmed Management:** Through this component, GGP III consistently build the capacity of its partners and provide technical expertise at all levels to promote the development and use of gender-sensitive results-based programme management methods and correct reporting on progress of reform processes, thus increasing and exposing government accountability in this regard.

3. Scope of the GGP Mid-Term Evaluation

3.1 Overall objective of the evaluation:

The overall goal of the midterm evaluation is to review progress made by the GGP III and its partners towards achieving the expected outcomes and to make recommendations on the future direction of the programme. The recommendations will suggest if deemed necessary – re-orientations and changes in the project design, scope and implementation approach and also provide recommendations on management and methodologies to improve performance and delivery of the programme. The evaluation will focus on assessing cost effectiveness of the programme, and on the review of structures, processes and systems established during the implementation period. More specifically, the evaluation will:

- assess the **relevance** of GGP III in terms of the priorities, policy, objectives and plans of the implementing partners and the beneficiaries' needs as defined by the implementing partners (ownership, alignment)
- assess the results and *progress* of the programme in terms of **effectiveness** (achieved outputs versus planned outputs) and the **efficiency** of implementation (output results achieved against inputs and budgets used) and
- Assess the **feasibility** and **sustainability** in terms of design, scope, implementation, partnerships, management and steering

3.2 Key Evaluation questions

Relevance of programme objectives:

- Are the program objectives addressing the needs of the target group(s)? Are the outcomes aligned and part of strategies/plans of implementing partners? Do programme objectives meet the needs and aspirations of stakeholders? Are the objectives owned by the stakeholders of the programme?
- What rights does the program advance under CEDAW and the Millennium Development Goals?

Effectiveness of the program

- What progress has been made towards achievement of expected outcomes and expected results? What results have been achieved?
- What are the reasons for the achievement and non-achievement?
- To what extent have the beneficiaries been satisfied with the results?
- Is the program cost effective, i.e. could the outcomes and expected results have been achieved at lower cost through adopting a different approach and or using different delivery mechanisms?
- Does the programme have effective monitoring mechanisms; are the indicators appropriate, relevant and measurable?

Efficiency of the programme

- What measures have been taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources are efficiently used?
- Have the outputs been delivered in a timely manner?
- Have UN WOMEN (former UNIFEM)'s organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively supported delivery of the programme?
- To what extent are the inputs and outputs equally distributed between different groups of women, and have the potentials of disadvantaged women been fully utilized to realize the outcomes?
- How does the program utilize existing local capacities of the right-bearers and duty holders to achieve its outcomes?

Sustainability of the programme

- What is the likelihood that the benefits from the programme will be maintained for a reasonably long period of time if the program were to cease?
- Is the program supported by national/local institutions? Do these institutions demonstrate leadership commitment and technical capacity to continue work with the program to replicate it?
- Are requirements of national ownership satisfied?
- What operational capacity of national partners, also known as capacity resources such as technology finance and staffing has been strengthened?
- What adaptive or management capacities of national partners such as learning, program and process management, networking and linkages have been supported?

Lessons Learned from the programme

- What Lessons can we draw from the implementation of the programme?
- To what extent have recommendations from the previous GGP evaluation been applied in ongoing implementation and if not, why?
- How can GGP do things better in the future? Which initiatives have relevance for future programming?

Underlying factors

Are there any underlying factors beyond the control of the programme that have influenced the outcome? What were the key assumptions made? Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, the degree of stakeholders and partner's involvement in the completion of outputs, and how processes were managed or carried out.

4. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation will adopt a mixed method approach. This will include:

- Literature review of various project documents and progress reports at UN WOMEN (former UNIFEM), and partner's offices. The project documents to be reviewed will include GGP III documents, strategic plan, partner review meeting reports and progress reports to donors
- Review of materials produced by GGP III partners- including Information Education and communication (IEC) materials, manuals, website content etc.

- Focus group and key informant interviews and discussions with organizations supported by the project, women groups and individual women who have benefited directly and indirectly from the programme as well as UN WOMEN (former UNIFEM) Staff in Nairobi and
- Direct observation by visiting supported partners
The evaluation will cover the entire range of partners within the Gender and Governance Programme. Sampling will be applied in selection of sites to be visited for meetings and beneficiaries.

5. Expected Deliverables

The key deliverables by the consulting team are:

- An Evaluation inception report outlining:
 - ✚ Interpretation of the TOR
 - ✚ Design of the Evaluation
 - ✚ Detailed work plan- work breakdown structure for evaluation team
 - ✚ Data collection tools/instruments
 - ✚ Sampling frames
- Field visit to program sites- The final report should include an annex of persons interviewed during the field visits, and findings from the discussions included in the evaluation report
- Presentation of preliminary findings and final results to key stakeholders and
- Evaluation Report: First draft for discussion during the debriefing workshop followed by a final report that incorporates comments from the debriefing workshop and UN WOMEN (former UNIFEM). The reports will be provided in both hard and soft copy.

7. Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will be composed of at least 3 consultants, 1 consultant **MUST** be an international expert and the other 2-national experts. The team leader should possess the following combination of skills and expertise:

- At least 7 years of advanced experience in conducting evaluations, with post graduate degree in Social sciences, development studies etc and with formal research skills
- Knowledge of issues concerning governance, women's rights and gender equality specifically in the area of democratic governance
- Excellent facilitation and communication skills and the ability to conduct and document focus group discussions and key informant interviews
- Ability to deal with multi-stakeholder groups
- Ability to write focused evaluation reports
- Wide experience in quantitative and qualitative data collection methods
- Willingness and ability to travel to the different project's sites in the country
- Ability to work in a team
- High proficiency in English, knowledge of local language is essential and
- Ability to manage and supervise the evaluation team and timely submission of the expected deliverables

6. Roles and Responsibilities

The role of the evaluation team is to develop the evaluation design outlining the key evaluation questions, identify appropriate evaluation tools, develop the data collection instruments, carry out data collection, data analysis and writing the evaluation report. The evaluators MUST adhere to the key principles of gender analysis and participatory approaches when working with communities and project partners. They MUST also adhere to UN Evaluation Group Norms and Standards and the UN Evaluation Group Ethical Code of Conduct. These documents can be accessed under the UN WOMEN (former UNIFEM) Evaluation Resource Center Website <http://erc.undp.org/unifem/>. The team leader will be in-charge of delivering the key deliverables of the evaluation as stipulated above.

8. Management arrangements and follow-up

The Evaluation Task Manager with input from UN WOMEN (former UNIFEM) colleagues/reference group will provide overall supervision and management of the evaluation. UN WOMEN (former UNIFEM) colleagues will provide administrative and logistical support.

9. Work plan and schedule

The Evaluation is expected to take place within a period of not more than 30 days, commencing mid February 2011.

10. Proposed format of the Evaluation Report

The report is expected to explicitly outline findings of the evaluation in relation to the set evaluation objectives. Recommendations are expected to draw attention to programme components that have demonstrated appreciable results and whose lessons could be important for replication in other programmes and districts, and lead to sustainability. Below is the proposed report format.

SECTION CONTENTS

Title Page

Title page to include name of programme being evaluated, geographical location of programme, dates of evaluation and name(s) of evaluators. Acronyms and definition of terms to be provided on separate page, which follows the title page.

Executive Summary

A summary of the report which highlights key findings pertaining to outcomes and recommendation

Introduction Overview

- Introduction to document
- Rationale for evaluation
- Scope and focus of evaluation

Evaluation Design: Overview of design

Methodology with rationale for gender sensitivity, participation, results orientation and rights based

- Key questions
- Sources of data
- Methods analysis
-

Evaluation findings and analysis

Findings with regards to results as per the TOR and the key evaluation questions

- Special attention should be paid to changes in the lives of women and progress towards gender equality
- Voices of women should come out strongly in the presentation of findings
- Lessons learnt With regard to bringing about change in the lives of women, to relations and equality between men and women. Include any boxes with real life stories
- Conclusions and recommendations. List these with emphasis on results that are rights based, Constraints, challenges and opportunities

Appendices

- References
- Statistical results (if any)
- Stories
- Samples of instruments
- List of categories of meetings held
- List of respondents
- Samples of media coverage of programme
- Terms of Reference

11. Submission of proposals

Interested consultants to submit capability statement and curriculum vitae this should be addressed to: jane.oteba@unwomen.org or caspar.merkle@unwomen.org . **The deadline for submission of proposals is 27th January 2011.**

Note: Acknowledgment will be made to the successful individual only.

7.2 List of people interviewed

#	Consultant	Name of implementing partner	Name of Contact Person	Location Visited	Interview conducted	
1.	GK	Abantu for Development	Lillian Nyandoro Mogiti,	Nairobi office	KII	
2.				Loitoktok		FGD
3.	GZ	Association of Media Women in Kenya	Jane Waboyi Thuo	Nairobi	KII	
4.	GK	Africa Youth Trust	Susan Odongo, Charity Naitore	Nairobi	KII	
5.	GK	African Centre for Women in Communication Technology	Constantine Obuya	Nairobi	KII	
6.	GK	Anglican Church of Kenya	Rhoda Luvuno Peter Wangai	Nairobi Office	KII	
7.			Peter Wangai	Embu		FGD
8.	JO	Centre for Multiparty Democracy		Nairobi Office	KII	
9.	GZ	Caucus for Women's Leadership	Amina Zueri Faridah Rashid Mishi Juma		KII	
10.	JO	Christian Partners Development Agency	Christine Njeru Jackline Nyangasi Daniel Mkumbi Festo Kihima Nelson Omido Mildred Khachu Peter Enonda	Nairobi Chavakali	KII	FGD
11.	JO	Collaborative Centre for Gender and Development		Nairobi	KII	
12.	JO			Marigat		FGD
13.	GZ	Development Through Media	Dommie Odotte	Nairobi	KII	
14.	JO	Community Aid International		Nairobi	KII	
15.	JO			Bondo		FGD
16.	JO	Community Research in Environment and Development Initiatives	Gladis Nabiswa	Bungoma	KII	
17.	JO	Education Centre for Advancement of Women	Rose Mwita	Isebania	KII	
18.	GK	Federation of Women Lawyers, K	Shiro Mogeni, Janet Nyamu	Nairobi	KII	
19.			Shiro Mogeni, Suzane	Murang'a		FGD
20.	GK	Friends of Nomads	Mercy Nkatha	Isiolo	KII	
21.				Isiolo		FGDs
22.	JO	Groots	Esther Mwaura Jael Amati Hellen Kameri Jane Nyaokabi Winrose Nyaguthi	Nairobi	KII	
23.	JO			Shinyalu		FGD

24.	JO	Interim Independent Electoral Commission	Anne Nderitu	Nairobi	KII	
25.	GK	Kenya Institute of Public Policy Research and Analysis	Dickson Khainga,	Nairobi	KII	
26.	GZ	Kenya Women Parliamentary Association	Maureen Gitonga	Nairobi	KII	
27.	JO	Ministry of Gender Children & Social Development	Eunice Ndonga, Protus Onyango Makabo	Nairobi	KII	
28.	GK	National Cohesion and Integration Commission	Guyo Liban	Nairobi	KII	
29.			Mary Kahingo	Kiambu		FGD
30.	JO	National Commission for Gender and Development		Nairobi	KII	
31.	GZ	National Council of Churches of Kenya	Jane Jilani Eunice Omodi Sami Kingi Anne Deche Anne Ofundi Anestina Mutuwa	Mombasa Mombasa	KII	 FGD
32.	JO	Uhai Lake Forum	Mark Omondi	Kisumu	KII	
33.	GZ	St John's Community Centre	Peter Njuguna	Nairobi	KII	
34.	GZ	Transparency International/Institute of Economic Affairs	Ruth Kihui Jonh Mutua Samuel Kimeu Juliet Mule	Nairobi Mombasa	KII	 FGD
35.	GZ	Advocacy and Legal Centre/Transparency International	Regina Kameni Tom Okelanaro Roland Eboni	Mombasa		FGD
36.	GZ	UN Women	Lucy Mathenga	Nairobi	KII	
37.	GZ	Uraia	Masiga Asunza Queen Katembu	Nairobi	KII	
38.	GK	Young Women Christian Association	Alice Abok	Nairobi	KII	
39.			Margaret Kiema	Kitui		FGDs
40.	GK	Woman Kind	Hubbie Hussein Al-Haji	Garissa	KII	
41.						
42.	JO	Women Action Forum for Networking	Easter Achieng	Kisumu	KII	
43.	JO	Women Political Alliance	Mary Wambui Kanyi	Nairobi	KII	
44.	JO			Kericho		FGD
45.	JO	Women Shadow Parliament	Monica Omolo	Kisumu	KII	
46.	GZ	Finnish Embassy	Jussi Laurikainen Marko Lehto	Nairobi	KII	
47.	GZ	Canadian Cooperation Office	Patricia Munayi Robert Simuyu	Nairobi	KII	
48.	GZ	Royal Norwegian Embassy	Geir Schei	Nairobi	KII	
49.	JO	Netherlands Embassy	Nashon Aluoka	Nairobi	KII	
50.	JO	Embassy of Sweden	Josephine Mwangi			

51.	All	PMU-Ursula, Zebib, Lucy and Mary	Zebib Ursula	Nairobi	KII	
52.	GZ	URAIA	Queen Katembu	Nairobi	KII	
53.	Total interviews conducted				40	16

7.3 Data collection tools

a) Question Guide for UN Women Programme Staff

I. Background

- Please provide a brief background of GGP III?
- In your view, what would you in summary, say is the central purpose of GGP III
- Briefly describe your own role within GGP III

2. Programme Relevance:

- Please indicate in specific terms how different stakeholders (beneficiaries/implementers/national gender machinery) in GGP III were engaged in designing the programme
- To what extent are the GGP III outcomes in alignment with national (national gender policy, vision 2030 and constitutional process etc) and global priorities (CEDAW, MDGs etc) on gender and governance?
- In which ways is the programme addressing the needs of targeted beneficiaries?
- What would you say, about the extent of programme ownership by key stakeholders of the programme

3. Validity of project design

- Please comment on how the needs assessment and situational analysis for GGP III clearly identify the key challenges in gender and governance in Kenya.
- What were the most important considerations used to select GGP III partners?

4. Effectiveness of the project

- What in your view are the most significant achievements made by the PMU (UN WOMEN) in relation to expected outputs, outcomes and results of GGP III? (What has been achieved to date vis-a-vis planned?)
- What factors do you consider as the most significant to the achievement or non-achievement of expected, outputs, outcomes and results.
- How satisfied is UN WOMEN with the extent of achievement of GGP III?
- In your view could the outcomes have been achieved more cost-effectively through adopting different approaches and or using different delivery mechanisms?

- How effective has UN WOMEN as PMU for GGP III been in monitoring and evaluating outcomes of GGP III?
- Please comment on the management capacities and arrangements put in place by UN WOMEN to support the achievement of expected results?

5. Programme Efficiency

- What measures have been taken during planning and implementation to ensure resources are efficiently used?
- To what extent were the resources of GGP III efficiently used? In what way could the resources been more efficiently used?
- How did UN WOMEN's organisations structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively support programme delivery
- To what extent has GGP III utilised national capacities to achieve its anticipated outcomes?

6. Sustainability of the Project

- To what extent can the ministry continue with the programme or replicate it in the absence of material support from GGP III?
- Are requirements for national ownership of GGP III satisfied?
- To what extent have the networking and linkages, financial, technological and human capacities of national partners been strengthened?

7. Programme Inclusiveness

- To what extent was the programme inclusive of all the different categories of women across different geographical areas?

8. Participation

- To what extent did stakeholders participate at all the stages of the programme life-cycle:
 - Design
 - Implementation
 - Monitoring
 - Evaluation

9. Non-discrimination

- To what extent was the programme non-discriminatory in terms of:
 - Politics
 - Ethnicity/region
 - Religion

10. Lessons learnt from the Project

- In your view, has there been any systematic process of learning from different rounds of GGP?

- What are the major lessons learnt from the programme's previous and current phase?
- To what extent have recommendations from the previous GGP evaluation been incorporated in GGPIII? If not why?

11. Underlying Factors

- Are there any underlying factors beyond the control of the project that have influenced the outcomes?
- What were the key assumptions made and did they hold?

b) Question Guide for National Gender Machinery (Ministry)

1. Background

- Could you please provide a brief background of the ministry's engagement with GGP?
- How long has this engagement been going on?

2. Programme Relevance:

- To what extent is the programme in alignment with national (national gender policy, Vision 2030, constitutional process etc) and global priorities (CEDAW, MDGs etc) on gender and governance?
- Extent of programme ownership by key stakeholders of the programme

3. Validity of project design

- How, if at all, was the ministry involved in design of GGP?
- For example, was the ministry involved in any way in the situational analysis/baseline survey or gender mainstreaming assessment towards the design of the programme?
- From what you know, is the design of the programme and partner strategies likely to lead to the achievement of intended outcomes?
- To what extent were the project objectives/outcomes realistic?
- Please indicate what specific roles are assigned to the national gender machinery in implementing GGP?

4. Effectiveness of the project

- What in your view are the most significant achievements made by the ministry in relation to expected outputs, outcomes and results of GGP? (What has been achieved to date vis-a-vis planned?)
- Please indicate what factors you consider to have been the most significant in contributing to the achievement and non-achievement of expected, outputs, outcomes and results.
- How satisfied is the ministry with the extent of achievement under the GGP III?
- In your view could the outcomes have been achieved more cost-effectively through adopting different approaches and or using different delivery mechanisms?
- What roles, if any, does the ministry have in monitoring the realization of the project outcomes?
- Please comment on the management capacities and arrangements put in place by UN WOMEN to support the achievement of expected results?

5. Programme Efficiency

- What would you say about the timeliness and adequacy of inputs from GGP III's PMU to the ministry?
- To what extent has the programme utilised capacities within the national gender machinery to achieve its outcomes
- What impact do you think UN Women's organisations structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms has had on the delivery of needed programme support

6. Sustainability of the Project

- To what extent can the ministry continue with the programme or replicate it in the absence of material support from GGP III?
- Are requirements for national ownership of GGP III satisfied?
- To what extent have the networking and linkages, financial, technological and human capacities of national partners been strengthened?

7. Programme Inclusiveness

- To what extent was the programme inclusive of all the different categories of women across different geographical areas?
- To what extent were both men and women included in the programme

8. Participation

- To what extent did stakeholders participate at all the stages of the programme life-cycle:
 - Design
 - Implementation
 - Monitoring
 - Evaluation

9. Non-discrimination

- To what extent was the programme non-discriminatory in terms of:
 - Politics
 - Ethnicity
 - Religion

10. Lessons learnt from the Project

- In your view, has there been any systematic process of learning from different rounds of GGP?
- What are the major lessons learnt from the programme's previous and current phase?
- To what extent have recommendations from the previous GGP evaluation been incorporated in GGPIII? If not why?

11. Underlying Factors

- Are there any underlying factors beyond the control of the project that have influenced the outcome?
- What were the key assumptions made and did they hold?

c) Question Guide for implementing partners

I. Background

- Please provide a brief background of your engagement with GGP III?
- What would you, in summary, say is the central purpose of GGP III
- Briefly describe your own role as an organization within GGP III

2. Programme Relevance:

- Please indicate what role your organization had in designing the GGP III
- To what extent are the GGP III outcomes in alignment with the priorities and programme focus of your own organization?
- In which ways does GGP III address the needs of your target beneficiaries?
- What would you say, about the extent to which GGP III has been cultivating ownership by key stakeholders
- How was your organization selected to participate in GGP III

3. Effectiveness of the project

- What in your view are the most significant achievements made by GGP III? (What has been achieved to date vis-a-vis planned?)
- What factors do you consider as the most significant to the achievement or non-achievement of expected, outputs, outcomes and results.
- How satisfied is your organization with achievements in GGP III?
- In your view could the outcomes have been achieved more cost-effectively through adopting different approaches and or using different delivery mechanisms?
- How effective has UN WOMEN as PMU for GGP III been in monitoring and evaluating outcomes of GGP III?
- Please comment on the management capacities and arrangements put in place by UN WOMEN to support the achievement of expected results?

5. Programme Efficiency

- What measures did your organization put in place during planning and implementation to ensure resources are efficiently used?

- How efficiently did your organization deploy resources of GGP III? In what way could the resources been more efficiently used?
- To what extent has your organization utilised locally available capacities to achieve its anticipated outcomes?

6. Sustainability of the Project

- To what extent can your organization continue with the programme or replicate it in the absence of material support from GGP III?
- How have the networking, financial, technological and human capacities of your organization been strengthened due to engagement with GGP III?

7. Programme Inclusiveness

- To what extent was your organization inclusive of all the different categories of women within the geographical area in which your organization is active?

8. Participation

- To what extent did you participate in any of the following key stages of the programme life-cycle:
 - Design
 - Implementation
 - Monitoring and Evaluation

9. Non-discrimination

- To what extent is GGP III non-discriminatory in terms of:
 - Politics/Ethnicity/region/Religion

10. Lessons learnt from the Project

- In your view, has there been any systematic process of learning from different rounds of GGP?
- What are the major lessons learnt from the programme's previous and current phase?

11. Underlying Factors

- Are there any underlying factors beyond the control of the project that have influenced the outcomes?
- What were the key assumptions made and did they hold?

d) Focus Group Discussion Guide for beneficiaries (women and men)

1. Background

- Could you please provide some background on how you engaged with the GPP III
 - How were you selected to participate in the programme?
 - What activities have you been participating in and for how long?

2. Programme Relevance:

3. Validity of project design

- Who was involved in designing the programme?
- Is the design of the programme and partner strategies likely to lead to the achievement of intended outcomes?
- To what extent were the project objectives/outcomes realistic?
- To what extent could the planned activities and outputs logically and realistically be expected to meet desired objectives/outcomes (causality)?
- Was a gender and social exclusion analysis/baseline carried out as part of the initial needs assessment of the project?

4. Effectiveness of the project

- Please highlight the key achievements/progress has been made to date towards achievement of expected outputs, outcomes and results? (What has been achieved to date vis-a-vis planned?)
- Reasons for achievement and non-achievement of expected, outputs, outcomes and results.
- Level of the satisfaction with the effectiveness of the programme
- How has the project impacted on the lives of men and women participating in the project?
- Is the project cost effective i.e. could the outcomes and expected results have been achieved at a lower cost through adopting different approaches and or using different delivery mechanisms?
- Does the project have effective monitoring mechanisms: are the indicators appropriate, relevant and measurable?
- The extent to which management capacities and arrangements put in place support the achievement of results?

5. Programme Efficiency

- What measures have been taken during planning and implementation to ensure resources are efficiently used?
- To what extent were the resources of the programme efficiently used? In what way could the resources been more efficiently used?
- Have the outputs been delivered in a timely manner?
- Did UNFEM's organisations structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms effectively support programme delivery
- To what extent has the programme utilised local capacities to achieve its outcomes

6. Sustainability of the Project

- What is the likelihood that the benefits from the programme will be maintained for a reasonably long period of time after the programme ceases?
- To what extent is the programme supported and involve national and local institutions? Do these institutions demonstrate leadership commitment and technical capacity to continue with the programme or replicate it?
- Are requirements for national ownership satisfied?
- To what extent have the process management, networking and linkages, financial, technological and human capacities of national partners been strengthened? What capacity gaps still exist?
- To what extent did the project adopt a partnership approach to sustain and leverage its interventions?

7. Programme Inclusiveness

- To what extent was the programme inclusive of all the different categories of women across different geographical areas?
- To what extent were both men and women included in the programme

8. Participation

- To what extent did stakeholders participate at all the stages of the programme life-cycle:
 - Design
 - Implementation
 - Monitoring
 - Evaluation

9. Non-discrimination

- To what extent was the programme non-discriminatory in terms of:
 - Politics
 - Ethnicity
 - Religion

9. Lessons learnt from the Project

- What are the major lessons learnt from the programme?

- To what extent have recommendations from the previous GGP evaluation been considered in GGPIII? If not why?
- What needs to be done differently in future to make the programme more effective?
- Which initiatives have relevance for future programming?

8. Underlying Factors

- Are there any underlying factors beyond the control of the project that have influenced the outcome?
- What were the key assumptions made and did they hold?

e) MSC story-telling interview guide (beneficiaries/communities)

Background

The Evaluation Team would like to capture stories of significant change that may have resulted from your participation in the GGP III. This will help the programme to improve its effectiveness and enable us to celebrate the successes together as well as being accountable to our funders.

The stories and information collected from these interviews will be used for a number of purposes including:

- To explore what GGP III supported interventions have achieved already and learn how the interventions have impacted on the targeted community/ beneficiaries
- To help Stakeholders/Partners understand what people in (project site) value, and support more of these sorts of outcomes.
- To acknowledge and publicize what has already been achieved.

Confidentiality

We may like to use your stories for reporting to our funders, or sharing with other people in the region or development sector

Do you, (the storyteller):

- Want to have your name on the story (tick one) Yes No
- Consent to us using your story for publication (tick one) Yes No

Contact Details

Name of storyteller* _____
Name of person recording story _____
Location _____
Name of Organization implementing GGP III programme _____
Date of recording _____
Title of story? _____

Questions

1. Could you please describe to me when and how you (the storyteller) first became involved with the GGP III project and what your current involvement is:
2. From your point of view, describe significant changes that have resulted from your involvement with the GGP III?
3. Of these significant changes, which one do you rank as the **most significant**?
4. Why is this the **most significant** to you?
5. Lessons Learnt
6. Any other comments

(Please read back the story to the storytellers to ensure that the story written is a true reflection of what they have told you).

f) QUESTION GUIDE FOR WOMEN PARLIAMENTARIANS (KEWOPA)

Introduction

Dear Honourable MP

As you might be aware, the Mid-Term Evaluation of the Gender and Governance Programme (GGP II) is currently underway and a team of three external consultants has been tasked to carry out this evaluation whose main objective is to determine the extent to which the programme is on track towards achievement of the expected outcomes. As part of the evaluation process, the evaluation team is conducting interviews with key stakeholders and focus group discussions with beneficiaries. In this regard, you have been identified as one of the key stakeholders of the GGP through your engagement with KEWOPA/GGP supported activities. Could you please kindly take a few minutes out of your busy schedule to answer the following questions in this questionnaire and email the completed questionnaire to: gzimbizi@yahoo.com and CC jeremiah.owiti17@gmail.com, kopiyog@gmail.com. Please note that your responses will be treated confidentially and will solely be used for the purposes of this evaluation anonymously.

Personal Information

1. Name of Parliamentarian _____

2. Constituency represented _____

3. Elected/Appointed _____

4. Number of Years in Parliament _____

5. Could you please provide a brief background of your engagement with KEWOPA/GGP III?

6. What specific activities or programmes did you participate in as a result of this engagement?

7. In your own opinion, did KEWOPA/GGP programmes and activities address the felt needs of women parliamentarians? What needs were particularly addressed by GGP III.

8. Which components of GGP were the most effective in addressing both the practical and strategic needs of women parliamentarian? (Give reasons to support your answers)

7. In what ways has your engagement with KEWOPA/GGP transformed the way you perform your work as a woman parliamentarian?

8. Of all the transformations that have occurred as a result of your engagement with KEWOPA/GGP, which one do you rank as the most important or significant and why?

9. Are there other needs of female parliamentarians that you feel are not being adequately addressed by KEWOPA/GGP that need addressing?

10. To what extent, in your opinion, are the GGP programme benefits for women parliamentarians likely to be sustained beyond the official lifespan of GGP III?

11. What recommendations would you put forward to enable KEWOPA/GGP to be more effective in meeting the needs of women parliamentarians? _____

12. Any other comments _____

End of Questionnaire

7.4 Case Studies

a) My Experience with GGP III and what it means to the Community of Isiolo: Micy Nkatha, Project Officer: Friends of Pastoralists (FONI)

When I was going through a daily newspaper one April morning in year 2010, I saw at the bottom right of one of the pages, a Request for Proposal from the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM). I crossed over to the CEO's office and requested if I could put in a proposal for the same which he agreed to. So we put in the proposal and one day got a call from Unifem saying that they were on their way to Isiolo to do an organizational audit. Sometime after the visit, the CEO signed a contract with them for the project which we began implementing in January of 2011.

I am the project officer tasked with the day to day implementation of the Gender Responsive Budgeting Project within the Gender and Governance Program whose key objective is to have Pastoral Women's Voices in Public Finance Management & Participation in Local Governance.

From my involvement in the implementation of this project, I have witnessed the following:

- Increased knowledge on Gender Responsive Budgeting
- Increased access to information on gender responsive budgeting in the community
- Enhanced capacities of government institutions to institute mechanisms that promote the participation of women

Of these significant changes, the one I can rank as the **most significant** is increased knowledge on Gender Responsive Budgeting. This is because in the community that I interact with, the concept of gender as it relates to both men and women, boys and girls is quite removed given that this is quite a patrilineal society in all spheres i.e. socio-cultural, economic and political. That there are mechanisms and tools that exist to ensure that a government process such as that of budgeting takes into consideration the needs of both is most of the times, a revelation to men and women here.

This initiative is of great significance to me because it brings to the fore, the very many complex, multi-layered and interlinked issues that either impede or enhance the implementation of such a project, given the understanding of gender and governance as it relates to a people who until 1993 were living in a state of

emergency since two weeks after the country's independence, a community that faces huge social, physical and communication infrastructure disparities from the rest of the nation, is an ASAL and has a unique pastoral/nomadic way of life. It also lays emphasis on the great deal of work ahead especially given the new constitution and devolved governments and the place of the woman in Isiolo County in its governance and development.

The lesson learned for me so far has been that out here are real women with real needs. Going in to the project, the assumption among others was that the community would be receptive to the message and that there would be no major natural setbacks that would hinder implementation. However, the drought that had been predicted by the meteorological department as far back as July 2010 turned out to be the worst in 60 years and its impact still continues to be felt. The issue of gender and gender roles tends to touch the very core of a peoples social/cultural construct. During implementation, what has come out clearly and is borne out by the Chairperson of the FONI Board of Director, Mr. Hassan Wako Wario is that, women in the region face triple levels of exclusion:

- The harsh environmental and climatic conditions and years of deliberate government marginalization
- Marginalization by a mix of cultural and religious interpretations that make it clear that the man is all in all.
- Marginalization by women amongst themselves. "Women" is not a homogenous group. Experiences vary with respect to class, race, religion, culture etc and it is no different here where the so called elite look down on their not so elite sisters found in *manyattas* who unfortunately are the greater majority.

It therefore becomes clear that the women's needs are real and only real and practical solutions will do. It will take years to reverse and then start over in the right direction working in the background of a region where the illiteracy rate of women stands at 92% and the Net Enrolment Rates for secondary schools in the region standing at 4.3%. As one woman in one of the forums put it, "**now that women as a constituency have been given hope and light from a distance, let it not be snuffed out just as they are reaching out towards it**".

In conclusion, the Gender Responsive Budgeting under the GGP III project has been the only project in a really long time that has had women as its specific target and not a byline (mainstreaming gender) or as a "crosscutting" issue in a different project context in this region. It would therefore be really disappointing for both the project beneficiaries and the project officer to see such a noble endeavour cut short in the face of the challenges expected in the implementation of the new constitution and in the gender and governance movement as a whole. If anything, efforts should be doubled to see to it that the issues of these women are not just highlighted but that something is done about it so that at the end of the day, we will indeed have pastoral women's voices in public finance management and participation in local governance in Isiolo County.

b) Disempowering Sayings Among the Somali: FONI Chairman, Hassan Wako Wario

Naturally, our community has both low and high regard for women. We have many sayings about women:

A woman is a child with a big/long foot. Never say that a woman is your friend, not anymore than you would tell people that your anus are part of your body. They will both destroy you. Your anus will embarrass you before other people when you least expect. And so will a woman. A community or persons led by a woman will surely be destroyed, in the morning or in the evening. But I also know that the community has some positive things about women. A man even the impotent one is whole only if he has a woman. At marriage a

woman is given a NDARU (a basket) with everything in it. She is told: this is all yours. The basket symbolizes the wealth of the husband including the house, the children, the livestock, etc. This remains as long as normalcy is maintained.

I started interacting with the gender discourse 4-5 years ago. I have been taught and been exposed. It has taken me long, but now I know that I can stand up for women empowerment as long as normalcy is maintained. Other men should undergo gender sensitization and awareness and they will support women. But the women should not lord over men when they get empowered. They should practice complementarity.

We have seen what women can do when they undergo empowerment training. The Kadhi reported to us recently that, the women have surprised him. They sat together on their own one afternoon and raised money on their own toward the building of the Mosque. This would never happen in the past.

c) I will continue to fight for women to serve on the Ranch Committee, Chairman, Loitoktok

In the Masai community, land and livestock belong to the man. Since the establishment of the ranching project that has seen the Masai protect but also lose community land, the tradition has continued to preserve male superiority over the management of the ranches.

When I noticed that some men were selling off parcels of their ranches and squandering the money, I knew it was time to get women involved. We have a total membership of 6,017 members. The 17 members are women. I am lobbying the other committee members to increase the number of women serving on the committee. Since the 17 women came on the committee, we have seen family land protected from careless men who would otherwise have sold it and left the family in the cold. [In Kitui, the women said: “**you as a woman cannot run away; a man can go away, or he can be around but do nothing about a family crisis**”].

I have educated all my children, girls and boys. I draw a great deal of satisfaction from the display of integrity and responsibility that I have seen from my daughters. Our newly appointed Assistant Chief (Mary Kahingo) who is the first woman ever to serve on the Provincial Administration is a role model. Her husband is a good man and is very supportive of her work. Judy Komite is in charge of the Bursary Funds at the local committees while Elizabeth Sereya is serving on the IIBER. This is a great encouragement to the young women in this community. More and more men are seeing the need to support women in leadership. In our forums, when a man stands up he speaks support for women leadership and this sends a message to the other men.

d) I am afraid we have a gender backlash: Lillian Mogiti, Project Officer Abantu

We have been working with GGP for a long time and we have done wonderful work under the programme. We had selected Nyeri and Loitoktok as areas with the worst record in women participation in all forms of leadership. We worked in Nyeri for a long time before we started receiving success stories. Most of the women we have trained are doing well economically and have also been able to vie for elective positions and made themselves available for appointive seats as well. So we decided to replicate Nyeri in Loitoktok.

But we are receiving reports of some unexpected negative impacts. In Nyeri, the trend has gone beyond the expected women empowerment for participation in leadership. The process seems to be transforming into aggression from women to men and creating a reverse impact. The women there seem to be consumed with power and have lost respect and submission to their husbands. The men are disempowered to the level where women are taking control creating a situation of female dominance. In turn the men are intimidated and resort to drinking. The differences between Nyeri and Loiktoktok women are evident.

While we are happy with the progress we are making among the Masaai community, we are re-thinking strategies to ensure complementarity and not competition between the men and women. We are encouraged by the role the men in Loitoktok are taking in supporting process of women and girl child empowerment for participation in democratic governance.

e) The Dilemma of the Women's Movement: Hubbie Hussein Al-Haji, Woman Kind; YWCA Women in Kitui, Charity Naitore Gituma, AYT Nairobi

The women movement in Nairobi seems to be promoting ethnicity. The programme has polarized instead of uniting women with majority of the partners being in Nairobi or urban-based against the few in the rural areas. There are experiences and perceptions of entrenching marginalization, creating gaps between the urban and rural and promoting egos and elitism with a focus on poor channelling and distribution of resources between partners. This is one of the factors that collapsed women's best vehicle (Kenya Women Political Caucus) to participate in political leadership. We should protect our institutions instead of destroying to oil individual egos. Women have yet to see themselves in leadership and in power. We see the ones who are already there as special and yet the link to women already elected to Parliament is very distant. Women should learn to celebrate ourselves and our successes. We have to learn the art of mentoring and role-modelling to encourage young women even to the highest office in the land. But we must remember that negative role-modelling may make it hard to promote women leadership to high office and discourage young people from participating in leadership. GGP is a women's programme and it should do everything possible to reach out to women in remote areas of this country and narrow the gap between the urban and rural.

7.5 Press Cuttings on Gender

a) **Francis Waweru...Letter of the day. The Star, Wednesday, October 19, 2011, pg 23**

The UN has praised Kenya for its gender reforms. Gender activism is aggressive in the country but every coin has two sides. Has anybody stopped to think of the effects of activism on society? It may have liberated women, but its effects on males and the family is overwhelming. Indeed what the Mututho law is trying to cure are symptoms of a bigger problem. Alcohol is not new in the country, so why have male youth now turned to alcohol and drugs?

Males are being systematically sidelined courtesy of sustained one-sided gender campaigns. Men have become unemployable as calls to empower women have worked wonders.

In Kenya, feminist groups make gender laws, examples are Sexual Offences Act and Family, Marriage and Matrimonial Property Bills pending in parliament. These laws criminalize relationships between youth. If a boy of 17 years and his same-age girlfriend have consensual sex, the boy is jailed for not less than 15 years. The girl's age is considered, but the boy's age does not count. Is the destruction of boys the price we pay for being educated?

b) **Daily Nation, Wednesday October 19, 2011**

More girls than boys are sitting for this year's Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) examination in Kirinyaga Central District. Yesterday 1,236 girls were writing their first English paper in 36 examination centres compared to 1,112 boys. Area District Education Officer D N Kariuki attributed this phenomenon to the high number of boys dropping out of schools.

"The rate at which boys drop out of school is high in comparison to that of their female colleagues," he told the Nation in his Kerugoya office. Mr Kariuki said boys cut short their education to work as casual labourers in coffee, rice and tea farms.

“In every forum people have been talking of girl child education and ignoring the boy child,’ he added. He blamed parents for not taking their sons’ education seriously and not checking on their progress in school. Mr Kariulki emphasized that , unlike in the past, boys were now the endangered lot and their plight should be urgently addressed.

c) Daily Nation, October 25, 2011. Page 11.

Snag in meeting gender rule...Public interviews put off women applicants

Public interviews for people seeking senior government jobs have discouraged women from applying, making it difficult to achieve the required gender balance. The chairperson of the panel for the recruitment of the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (EACC), Rose Mambo of the Association of Professional Societies of East Africa, said yesterday that most women find public scrutiny intrusive and avoid applying for the jobs.

This has resulted in the position of the EACC chairperson being re-advertised as female aspirants were too few to comply with the one-third gender rule, she said. Ms Mambo was speaking at the Public service Commission where she announced the re-advertisement and urged more women to apply. “Qualified women are likely to have been discouraged by the tone and public nature of other recruitment processes which have, in some instances, appeared intrusive. It is, however, a necessary process to ensure candidates are fully vetted, “ she said. The new constitution has seen a new change in recruitment of personnel for key government posts. The process involves long interviews by huge selection panels that are often broadcast in the media. Candidates could fear their past mistakes may be brought to public scrutiny.

The panel received 21 applications for the post of chairperson, with only 7 from women, who are said to be all unqualified. To qualify for the job, one must have a degree from a recognized university in Kenya, have a distinguished career and experience of not less than 15 years in various fields. Applicants must also meet requirements of chapter six of the constitution that deals with leadership and integrity. 164 applications were received from people wishing to be members and only 12 were shortlisted.

d) Limited menu for choice (East African Standard. 18th October 2011, page 6)

“Few women applied for the positions and it became a big challenge for the panel to meet the one-third requirement on gender balance in appointments... the fact that only 18.5% of the applicants for the position of member (commissioner) and 25% for chairperson presented a limited choice in respect to meeting the gender provisions of the constitution”.

Dr Ekuru Aukot, chairman of the selection panel for the Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC)