



REPUBLIC OF KENYA
THE NATIONAL TREASURY
STATE DEPARTMENT FOR ECONOMIC PLANNING

**GUIDELINES FOR
PLANNING AND CONDUCTING
MID-TERM REVIEWS OF COUNTY
INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT
PLAN (CIDP) 2023-2027**

April 2026



The National Treasury

State Department for Economic Planning

**GUIDELINES FOR
PLANNING AND CONDUCTING
MID-TERM REVIEWS OF COUNTY
INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT
PLAN (CIDP) 2023-2027**

April 2026

FOREWORD

As county governments proceed with the implementation of the County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) adopted in 2023, the State Department for Economic Planning (SDEP) acknowledges the mid-term mark of the efforts so far. These Mid-Term Review (MTR) guidelines have been developed by the SDEP in a widely participatory manner with the intent to provide a harmonized tool for counties to assess progress in the first half of implementation of their development Blueprints.

The MTR is timely as it provides counties the opportunity to build on past lessons and offer recommendations to improve in the remaining years of CIDP implementation and beyond. SDEP is proud to share that the MTR guidelines lend counties a systematic approach to assess their institutional capacities and identify the gaps in delivering planned targets and fulfilling goals. The monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the CIDPs which this MTR is a part of, has come a long way from the binary checklist approach used in the first-generation guidelines.

These second-generation MTR guidelines provide a means for comprehensive assessment across all county sectors, with a focus on progress made towards attainment of planned results. The ensuing MTR Reports will provide invaluable synthesis of the substantial development and service delivery improvements that continue to be progressively actualized in the counties. The reports will provide recognition to the work that has been done and the progress that has been achieved across sectors while acknowledging the challenges that must be addressed together as counties and as a nation.

Towards 2026 and beyond, the counties must take into consideration emerging and cross-cutting issues. The MTR opens up an opportunity to calibrate a new approach, and initiatives moving forward. Indeed, the current socio-economic conditions challenges the counties to take up innovative approaches, to do more and to do better than the usual in the new normal. Five Key messages to counties as they undertake the MTR process: (1) Good progress has been made, more needs to be done; (2) Better response to cross-cutting issues; (3) Embark on broader and more meaningful engagements; (4) Use past lessons to inform future directions and (5) Embrace and adapt to new developments trends.



HON. FCPA JOHN NGÓNGO MBADI, EGH
CABINET SECRETARY
THE NATIONAL TREASURY

STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRPERSON, COUNCIL OF GOVERNORS

The Mid-Term Review of the County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) 2023–2027, provides county governments with a timely opportunity to take stock of the progress made, reflect on lessons learned, and realign priorities to ensure the full realization of county development aspirations and improved service delivery to citizens.

The Mid-Term Review process will support counties to systematically assess progress towards planned outcomes, identify implementation challenges, and institute appropriate corrective measures aimed at strengthening accountability, enhancing performance management, and promoting responsive governance in line with the spirit of the Constitution of Kenya 2010.

The review process will be inclusive, County-led and County-owned, with active involvement of citizens, development partners, private sector actors, and other stakeholders to ensure that development interventions remain responsive to local needs and priorities. This provides an opportunity to mainstream cross-cutting priorities (climate change, technological transformation, youth employment, gender equality, social inclusion, and resilience to socio-economic shocks) into County planning frameworks and to adopt innovative approaches that enhance efficiency, sustainability, and impact.

Additionally, the Mid-Term Review offers a platform for strengthening intergovernmental collaboration between County and National governments, fostering policy coherence, and enhancing resource utilization. Through coordinated action and shared accountability, Kenya can achieve structured, sequenced and impactful transformation.

On behalf of the Council of Governors, I commend the State Department for Economic Planning for spearheading the development of these Mid-Term Review Guidelines through a consultative and participatory process. In order to deliver fiscally-sustainable and responsive development, all counties are urged to utilize these guidelines to undertake objective and comprehensive reviews that will inform strategic adjustments for successful implementation of the CIDPs.



H.E FCPA, AHMED ABDULLAHI, EGH
CHAIRPERSON, COUNCIL OF GOVERNORS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The State Department for Economic Planning extends special gratitude to the technical team for the efficient and responsive organization of the planning and logistics of these mid-term review guidelines for the County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs). Special acknowledgement goes to the technical members who participated in the special focus groups and county consultative fora which provided important perspectives.

Special appreciation is extended to all the county governments and their technical teams for having contributed their valuable time and immense knowledge of evaluation operations. The inputs from public engagement fora at the county and national levels helped to shape these guidelines.

The State Department appreciates and recognizes the resources accorded by the Council of Governors (CoG) led by CEO Ms Mary Mwiti, EBS, Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA), Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS), National Government Constituencies Development Fund (NG-CDF), German Agency for International Cooperation (GIZ), UN Women, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), National Council for People Living with Disability (NCPWD), as well as representatives of the private sector and civil society.

The drafting of the Guidelines was spearheaded by a dedicated team of officers in the State Department for Planning which ensured that all views and suggestions were carefully considered before being incorporated in the Guidelines. The Secretary Economic Planning Mrs. Evelyn Anupi provided the overall leadership to the team. I wish to appreciate Mr. Mathews Tsuma, Director Intergovernmental Development Planning Division, for ably guiding the technical team that played key roles during the process. Other officers included: Mr. Timothy Anguza, Mr. Jacob Mumia, Mr. Fahat Dekow, Mr. Tiras Murage, Mr. Kennedy Mitito, Ms. Jane Lagat, Ms. Faith Kobingi, Ms. Selestine Chepkorir, Mr. Felix Ouma, Mr. Mohamed Hillow, CoG Staff; Mr. Stephen Momanyi, Ms. Eunice Fedha, Mr. Ken Oluoch and Ms Juliet Owino.

SDEP thanks all stakeholders who participated in the process of developing these guidelines to support the institutionalization of performance management in the counties.



BONFACE MAKOKHA
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
STATE DEPARTMENT FOR ECONOMIC PLANNING

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	I
STATEMENT BY THE CHAIRPERSON, COUNCIL OF GOVERNORS.....	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	III
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	IV
DEFINITION OF TERMS.....	VI
PART ONE	1
BACKGROUND INFORMATION	1
1.1 OVERVIEW.....	1
1.2 MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE COUNTY INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANS.....	1
1.3 PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES	2
1.4 PRINCIPLES FOR CONDUCTING MTRS.....	2
1.5 POLICY AND LEGAL FRAMEWORKS FOR MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES.....	3
1.6 RATIONALE FOR MTR GUIDELINES.....	3
1.7 MTR METHODOLOGY.....	3
1.8 ORGANIZATION OF THE GUIDELINES	3
PART TWO	4
MID-TERM REVIEW PROCESS AND STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT.....	4
2.1 OVERVIEW.....	4
2.2 PLANNING FOR THE MTR PROCESS	4
2.2.1 MID-TERM REVIEW TIMING AND BUDGET	4
2.3 MID-TERM REVIEW PHASES	4
2.4 MANAGEMENT RESPONSE	7
2.5 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF STAKEHOLDERS IN THE MTR PROCESS.....	7
2.5.1 STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS AND ENGAGEMENT PLAN	7
2.5.2 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF MTR STAKEHOLDERS.....	8
2.6 PROCEDURE FOR CONDUCTING PROGRAMME SPECIFIC REVIEWS.....	9
PART THREE	16
STRUCTURE OF THE COUNTY INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN MID-TERM REVIEW REPORT	16
3.1 OVERVIEW.....	16
3.2 STRUCTURE OF THE MTR REPORT.....	16
APPENDIX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE	32
APPENDIX 2: PROJECT INFORMATION PACKAGE LIST.....	35
APPENDIX 3: AUDIT TRAIL TEMPLATE	36
APPENDIX 4: MID-TERM PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS (OUTCOME-LEVEL ASSESSMENT) MATRIX	37
APPENDIX 5: JOINT REVIEW/EVALUATION CONSIDERATION CHECKLISTS	39

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

List of Tables

Table 1: Comparison between the MTR and TEs.....	1
Table 2: Summary of MTR Phases, Activities, and Timeline	7
Table 3: Management response guide.....	7
Table 4: Stakeholder Analysis Matrix Template	8
Table 5: Roles and Responsibilities of MTR Stakeholders	9
Table 6: New indicator criteria	10
Table 7: Progress Towards Results Rating Scale.....	12
Table 8: Programme Implementation & Adaptive Management Rating Scale	13
Table 9: Sustainability Rating Scale	14
Table 10: MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary.....	14
1. 1: Key Indicators	18
2. 1: Analysis of County Revenue Streams	20
2. 2: County Sector Allocations vs Absorption	21
2. 3: Summary of Issues, Interventions and outcomes	24
2. 4: Analysis of Sector Programmes and Projects	26
2. 5: Midterm Review Reporting on Key Issues Mainstreamed in the CIDP	28
2. 6: Mid-Term Review Evaluative Matrix Template	29

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

4IR	Fourth Industrial Revolution
C-APR	County Annual Progress Report
CCP	Cross Cutting Priorities
CEC	County Executive Committee
CECM	County Executive Committee Member
CIDP	County Integrated Development Plan
CoG	Council of Governors
COMEC	County Monitoring and Evaluation Committee
CPTT	County Performance Tracking Tool
CSA	Climate Smart Agriculture
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DBST	Double Bituminous Surface Treatment
EA	Enabling Activities
ECD	Early Childhood Development
ECDE	Early Childhood and Development Education
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FY	Financial Year
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GENDER	Gap – Minded, Encompassing, Disaggregated, Enduring, Rights observing
GIZ	German Agency for International Cooperation
GoK	Government of Kenya
HS	Highly Satisfactory
HU	Highly Unsatisfactory
IFMIS	Integrated Financial Management Information System
KII	Key Informant Interview
KIPPRA	Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis
KNBS	Kenya National Bureau of Statistics
KNSP	Kenya National Spatial Plan
LSP	Large Sized Projects
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

MDACs	Ministries, Departments, Agencies and Counties
MDAs	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
MEL	Monitoring Evaluation and Learning
MELR	Monitoring, Evaluation, Learning and Reporting
METT	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool
ML	Moderately Likely
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MP	Mega Projects
MS	Moderately Satisfactory
MSMEs	Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises
MSP	Medium Sized Projects
MTR	Mid-Term Review
MU	Moderately Unsatisfactory / Moderately Unlikely
NCPWD	National Council for People Living with Disability
NGAOs	National Government Administrative Officers
NG-CDF	National Government Constituencies Development Fund
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PA	Protected Area
PAPs	Project Affected Persons
PESTEL	Political, Economic, Social, Technological, Environmental, Legal
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
SDEP	State Department for Economic Planning
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SHA	Social Health Authority
SCOT	Strengths, Challenges, Opportunities, Threats
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TMG	Technical Management Group
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN-SWAP	United Nations System-Wide Action Plan
VTCs	Vocational Training Colleges
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Term	Definition
Activities	Actions taken through which the project inputs are mobilized to produce specific outputs
Adaptive Management	The project's ability to adapt to changes to the project design (project objective, outcomes, or outputs) during implementation resulting from: (a) original objectives that were not sufficiently articulated; (b) exogenous conditions that changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed; (c) the project's restructuring because the original objectives were overambitious; or (d) the project's restructuring because of a lack of progress.
Co-financing	Includes Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.
Cost Effectiveness	Assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept.
County Ownership	Relevance of the project to county development and environmental agendas, recipient county commitment, and national, regional and international agreements where applicable

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

Term	Definition
Environmental risks to sustainability	Environmental factors that threaten sustainability of project outcomes (i.e., biodiversity-related project gains or water quality-related project gains that may be at risk due to frequent severe storms)
Evaluation	Project evaluations assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a project in achieving its intended results. They also assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to medium-term and longer-term outcomes. Projects can be evaluated before implementation (ex-ante evaluation) during the time of implementation (mid-term evaluation), at the end of implementation (Terminal Evaluation), or after a period of time after the project has ended (ex-post evaluation).
Executing Agency	An entity or agency that receives Funding from the county or national government or development Partners in order to execute a specified project, or parts of a project, under the supervision of the financing government or development Partner Agency. May also be referred to as “project executing agency.”
Financial Planning	Includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing
Financial risks to sustainability	Financial factors that threaten sustainability of project outcomes. Factors to be considered are whether financial and economic resources are likely to be available after grant assistance ends, or if macroeconomic conditions in the county/country/region are likely to affect future funding.

Term	Definition
Inputs	Financial, human and material resources used for the project
Implementing Partner	Project management terminology for the entity to which the national or county enters into a formal agreement with specific development partners to manage the project and achieve the results defined in the relevant documents. The county government may select an implementing partner for a project from one of five different types of partner organizations. These categories are: 1. National Government entities – Ministry, Department or Agencies (MDACs) 2. Development Partner Agencies. 3. NGOs and Community Organizations 4. Private Sector
Implementation Approach	Includes an analysis of the project’s work-planning, finance, stakeholder engagement, communication strategy, partnerships in implementation arrangements, and overall project management
Institutional framework and Governance risks to sustainability	Legal, policy, and governance factors that threaten sustainability of project outcomes. Factors to be considered are whether systems of accountability, transparency, and technical know-how are in place.
Jointly-conducted Midterm Review	A Midterm Review in which different donor agencies and/or partners participate
Monitoring	The periodic oversight of a process, or the implementation of an activity, which seeks to establish the extent to which inputs, work

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

Term	Definition
	schedules, other required actions and outputs are proceeding according to plan, so that timely action can be taken to correct the deficiencies detected
Outputs	Products and services that result from the project
Outcomes	The likely or achieved short- and medium-term effects of an intervention's outputs. Examples of outcomes could include, but are not restricted to, stronger institutional capacities, higher public awareness (when leading to changes of behavior), and transformed policy frameworks or markets.
Quality Assurance/Review	Quality assurance encompasses any activity that is concerned with assessing and improving the merit or the worth of an intervention or its compliance with given standards. For the purposes of this Guide, it especially refers to the assessment of the quality of Midterm Reviews carried out for publicly funded or development partner funded and supported projects.
Replication	In the context of publicly/development partner funded projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects
Results	The positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen changes to and effects produced by a development intervention. In Kenyan context, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and longer-term impact including global economic, social, technological, environmental etc. benefits, replication

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

Term	Definition
	effects, and other local effects.
Socio-economic risks to sustainability	Social risks to economic changes and/or political and cultural factors that threaten sustainability of project outcomes. Factors to be considered are level of stakeholder ownership (over project planning, resources, project benefits, etc.) and stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives.
Stakeholder	Agencies, organizations, groups or individuals who have a direct or indirect interest in the intervention or its evaluation
Stakeholder Engagement	The process by which a project involves people who may be affected by the decisions it makes or can influence the implementation of its decisions
Sustainability	The likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion

PART ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Overview

This section provides highlights on the Mid-Term Review (MTR) Guidelines of the County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs 2023-2027); including purpose and scope; Principles for Conducting MTRs; Policy and Legal Frameworks; Rationale for MTR; MTR Methodology; and Organization of the Guidelines.

1.2 Mid-Term Review of the County Integrated Development Plans

The CIDPs are central to county and national development alignment. MTRs are monitoring and evaluation tools that identify challenges, outline corrective actions, and lay the ground work for terminal evaluations (TEs). Key differences between MTRs and TEs are summarized in Table 1.

Midterm Review		Terminal Evaluation
Mandatory for:	All CIDP priority programmes and projects currently under active implementation	All projects except for expedited Enabling Activities (EAs); for which TEs are optional
Focus	Assessment of progress towards results Monitoring of implementation and adaptive management to improve outcomes Early identification of risks to sustainability Emphasis on supportive recommendations	Verification and assessment of implementation and results Identification of project's successes in order to create replicability Actions necessary for consolidation and sustainability of results Emphasis on Lessons learned Improve design of other future projects
Timeframe	Mid-way through project implementation	Carried out during the period 6 months before to 6 months after project operational closure
Values & Emphasis	Independent; emphasis on a participatory and collaborative approach; opens opportunities for discussion and change in project, as needed	Independent; an assessment of results; participatory and collaborative approach, with emphasis on the accountability and learning functions of evaluation
Ratings provided	Progress Towards Results (by Outcomes) Project Implementation & Adaptive Management Sustainability	Monitoring and Evaluation Development Partner Agency & Executing Agency/ Implementing Partner Execution Outcomes (Relevance, Effectiveness, and Efficiency) Sustainability Impact Overall Project Results

Table 1: Comparison between the MTR and TEs

The reviews shall apply the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)/ Development Assistant Committee (DAC) evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability set out in Box 1.

Box 1: Evaluation Criteria

REVELANCE: Is the intervention doing the right things? The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to global, national, and county needs, policies, and priorities and those of beneficiaries and partner institutions and continue to do so as circumstances change.

COHERENCE: How well does the intervention fit? The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in the country, sector or institutions

EFFECTIVENESS: Is the intervention achieving its objectives? The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve its objectives, and its results, including any deferential results across groups.

EFFICIENCY: How well are resources being used? The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way.

SUSTAINABILITY: Will the benefits last? The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue.

1.3 Purpose and Scope of Mid-Term Review Guidelines

The guidelines provide the county governments with a comprehensive and standardized framework for planning and conducting mid-term reviews of CIDPs 2023-2027 to inform continuous improvements. They also promote, facilitate and institutionalize the use of reviews in the counties. It integrates international evaluation best practices with Kenya's devolved governance framework to ensure CIDPs remain relevant, effective, and accountable. The guidelines apply to all county governments in Kenya.

1.4 Principles for conducting MTRs

In order to achieve optimal results from the MTR process, a set of guiding principles which stem from the basic norms and standards should be observed. These include: County Ownership and Leadership; Independence and Impartiality; Ethical Conduct; Evidence-based; Transparency and Accessibility; Inclusivity and Equity responsiveness; Utility and Timeliness; Participatory approaches; Futuristic and Forward-Looking. The MTR is a county-led process from start to end. The review should be objective and free from undue influence and adhere to confidentiality, informed consent, and "do no harm" principles.

1.5 Policy and Legal Frameworks for Mid-Term Review Guidelines

The need for having a Mid-Term review is informed by various existing policies and legal framework. Policy frameworks include: Executive Orders in force; The Kenya Vision 2030; Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); Kenya National Spatial Plan 2015-2045; County Annual Progress Report (C-APR) Guidelines; Kenya Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2022; The Kenya National Evaluation Guidelines, 2020. Legal Frameworks include: The Constitution of Kenya 2010; County Government Act, 2012; Public Finance Management Act, 2012; Urban Areas and Cities Act, 2011. These provide the mandate to SDEP to prepare MTR Guidelines for systematic assessment of CIDP implementation and performance.

1.6 Rationale for MTR Guidelines

The rationale of Mid-Term Review (MTR) guidelines is to provide counties with a uniform and harmonized implementation review tool that will enhance consistency across counties and significantly improve national level reporting. The intent of the mid-term reviews is to contribute to a better understanding of the progress achieved in implementing the CIDPs, determine whether counties are achieving transformational results, and make recommendations about improvements that will strengthen performance.

1.7 MTR Methodology

These guidelines were developed through a participatory and inclusive approaches with invaluable inputs from stakeholders received through focus group discussions (FGDs), key informant interviews (KIIs), citizens surveys, feedback from counties and desk reviews.

1.8 Organization of the Guidelines

The Guidelines are divided into three parts. The first part outlines the background information on MTR. The second part explains the MTR process, roles, and responsibilities of key participants in the MTR cycle. The final section details the structure of the MTR report.

PART TWO: MID-TERM REVIEW PROCESS AND STAKEHOLDERS' ENGAGEMENT

2.1 Overview

This section presents the MTR Planning Process; Mid-Term Review Timing and Budget; Mid-Term Review Phases; Roles and Responsibilities of Stakeholders in the MTR Process; and Procedure for Conducting Programme Specific Reviews.

2.2 Planning for the MTR Process

The MTR planning should follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with key participants including the county government departments and entities, and other key stakeholders. This approach enables the department responsible for County Economic Planning to secure political and administrative buy-in. Additional planning activities include; official communication to all relevant stakeholders on the MTR process, conducting preliminary scoping, establishing relevant MTR delivery structures including the oversight steering committee, developing detailed MTR Plan and Budget and allocating and securing funds for the process.

2.1.1 Mid-Term Review Timing and Budget

The department responsible for County Economic Planning starts the MTR process by preparing the MTR Terms of Reference (ToR) in a consultative manner. The ToRs for the MTR should be finalized and ready for use before the lapse of the third quarter of Financial Year preceding the Mid-Term Review. The MTR process should begin in the 3rd quarter of Financial Year 2025/26, therefore, the County Executive Committee Member in charge of Finance should ensure sufficient funds are available in the county annual budget for the MTR process.

2.3 Mid-Term Review Phases

The MTR process is divided into four phases, as follows:

Phase 1: Pre-MTR – the County Planning Unit should engage key internal and external stakeholders on the process and obtain broad support.

Phase 2: Preparation (Coordinated by the County Planning Unit)-Entails the preparation of MTR ToRs, Inception Report, engaging and briefing the MTR Team on the process and ethical considerations. The inception report should also include a clear overview of the Mid-Term Review approach, including:

- The purpose, objective, and scope of the review;
- The MTR approach includes a summary of the data collection methodologies and the criteria on which these methodologies were selected. For example, documentation reviews, stakeholder interviews, site visits, questionnaires, focus groups and other participatory techniques

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

- for information gathering;
- The principles and criteria against which the MTR team is selecting interviewees and field site visits;
- Any limitations of the MTR;
- A proposed work plan including a schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables of the MTR (including a proposed detailed MTR mission plan); and
- An MTR evaluative table, specifying the main review criteria, and the indicators or benchmarks against which the criteria will be assessed. See Mid-Term Review Evaluative Matrix Template (Table 2.6)

The MTR inception report should be circulated to the County Executive Committee, County Planning Unit, the Project Teams, and Key Stakeholders that will participate in the MTR.

The team should be briefed on project information packages to be referenced such as the approved project concepts, Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), Project Documents, the project inception reports, quarterly progress reports, Project Management Committee meeting minutes, and financial data, including co-financing data. The county should emphasize that assessments must be independent, impartial and rigorous.

Phase 3: Implementation -MTR Implementation requires the preparation of a work plan with clear deliverables as per the Inception Report to guide the execution of the mission.

The MTR team will undertake interviews and site visits according to the detailed MTR mission plan in the MTR inception report.

When the MTR team is conducting interviews and site visits, it is not appropriate for County Government staff, project management committee, and Project Team members to participate in the interviews or act as translators. It is recommended to interview project beneficiaries, project affected persons (PAPs), community leaders, development partners and other relevant stakeholders.

At the end of the MTR mission, the MTR team should present a summary of initial findings to the County Planning Unit, the County Project Team and other stakeholders in a mission wrap-up or other format as appropriate.

Phase 4: Post-MTR (Coordinated by the County Planning Unit)- The MTR team drafts, reviews and finalizes the MTR Report, ensuring the inclusion of management responses and follow-up action guidance for the MTR report.

Phase 4 entails participatory review of the MTR report. The review process is designed to highlight factual errors, omissions, or errors in analysis, and to ensure that the MTR report covers all requirements outlined in the ToR. As an independent body, the MTR

team has the prerogative to develop its own conclusions, ratings and recommendations. The County Planning Unit will collate comments on the report and send them to the MTR team. The MTR team is required to provide an 'audit trail' listing the comments received and how they have or have not been addressed in the final Mid-Term Review report (see Appendix 3 for an Audit Trail Template). If applicable, the County Planning Unit must ensure that popular versions of the final report are produced and disseminated appropriately.

Table 2 provides a summary of the phases, key activities, timelines and key outputs. After the MTR Team is on-boarded, the entire MTR process should not exceed 5 months.

Phase	Key Activities	Lead	Expected Duration	Key Outputs
1. Pre-MTR	1. Issuance of the circular and clear roadmap to Secure political & administrative buy-in. 2. Conduct preliminary scoping. 3. Establish Steering Committee. 4. Develop detailed MTR Plan & Budget. 5. Allocate and secure funds.	CECM in charge of Economic Planning	1 Month	-MTR Concept Note & Work Plan -Approved Budget -Inception meeting minutes -Steering Committee established
2. Preparation	1. Draft and finalize Terms of Reference (TOR). 2. Form MTR Technical Team 3. Prepare data collection tools (questionnaires, etc.) 4. Share the relevant documents. 5. Sensitize MTR Team on deliverables, field work and data collection ethics 6. Develop and submit Inception Report. 7. Approval of the Inception Report by the Steering Committee	CECM in charge of Economic Planning	1 Month	-Final TOR -MTR Technical Team Formed -Relevant Document Packages -Approved Inception Report
3. Implementation	1. Conduct desk review. 2. Plan and execute field missions (interviews, FGDs, surveys). 3. Compile and analyze data against evaluation criteria. 4. Draft MTR report. 5. Stakeholder validation workshop.	CECM in charge of Economic Planning	2Months	- MTR Report

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

Phase	Key Activities	Lead	Expected Duration	Key Outputs
	6. Prepare Management Response containing the reactions to the recommendations contained in draft MTR report and any contentious findings of the MTR. 7. Prepare a follow-up plan with proposed actions, defined timelines and responsibilities 8. Finalize MTR report.			
4. Post-MTR	1. Disseminate final report to all stakeholders. 2. Integrate corrective actions into plans & budgets. 3. Monitor implementation of recommendations.	County Executive Committee Member responsible for Economic Planning		-MTR dissemination Report - Action Plan - M&E Report

Table 2: Summary of MTR Phases, Activities, and Timeline

2.4 Management Response

The County Planning Unit should draft the management response to the MTR. The MTR management response outlines how the Project Team and other stakeholders will respond to the recommendations included in the MTR report. Management response is prepared based on guidance indicated in Table 3.

Recommendations	are they relevant and acceptable?
Actions	- What are the concrete proposed actions? - Who are the key partners assigned to specific actions?
Implementation	- Who are the responsible units? - What is the implementation timeframe?

Table 3: Management response guide

2.5 Roles and Responsibilities of Stakeholders in the MTR Process

2.5.1 Stakeholder Analysis and Engagement Plan

County governments to conduct a stakeholder analysis and prepare a stakeholder engagement plan that provides a structured engagement framework before and during the MTR process. Table 4 is a sample stakeholder analysis matrix template.

Stakeholder Group	Interest in CIDP	Influence/ Power	How to Engage Them	Timing
County Executive	High (Accountability, Legacy)	High (Decision-makers)	Briefings, Steering Committee, Review of drafts	Throughout
County Departments and Agencies	High	High (Decision-makers)	Briefings, Steering Committee, Review of drafts	Throughout
County Assembly	High (Oversight, Budget)	High (Approval authority)	Briefings, Invitation to validation, Official presentation	Phases 1, 3, 4
Citizens (General)	High (Beneficiaries)	High	Public barazas, Citizen surveys, social media updates, Radio shows	Phases 1, 3, 4
Special Interest and Vulnerable groups	High (Targeted groups)	Medium	Dedicated FGDs, Accessible formats (Braille, sign language), Gender-balanced teams	Phase 3
Civil Society Organizations	High (Advocacy, Watchdogs)	Medium	Interviews, CSO forum, Review of draft report	Phases 1, 3, 4
Development Partners	Medium (Funding, Support)	Medium	KIIs, Sharing of final report	Phases 1, 4
National MDAs	Medium (Technical support)	Medium	Forums. Review of reports, provision of data	Phases 3, 4
Members of Parliament	High	High	Dissemination of Reports	Phases 4
National Government Administrative Officers (NGAOs)	High	Medium	NGAO Forums, Dissemination of Reports	Phases 3, 4

Table 4: Stakeholder Analysis Matrix Template

2.5.2 Roles and Responsibilities of MTR Stakeholders

The roles and responsibilities of key actors in the MTR cycle are outlined in this section as indicated in Table 5.

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

Stakeholder	Key Responsibilities
Citizens/Members of the Public	Provide feedback loops on effects and impacts of interventions
County Economic Planning Unit	Lead MTR process, prepare ToR, coordinate reporting, ensure funding, prepare management responses, coordinate dissemination of MTR report
County Project Team	Provide data, support logistics, draft management response
MTR Team	Conduct independent review, prepare inception and final reports
County Administrative Officers	Facilitate meaningful public participation
County Executive Committee	Provide oversight, approve management response
NGAOs	Facilitate grassroots engagement, provide administrative support
National Government Entities at County Level	Provide financial and technical support, serve as liaison between county and national government
NGOs	Provide project financing and beneficiary analysis
Development Partners	Provide financial and technical support to development interventions

Table 5: Roles and Responsibilities of MTR Stakeholders

NB: The county to provide additional stakeholders and their respective responsibilities as appropriate.

2.6 Procedure for Conducting Programme Specific Reviews

The MTR Team should conduct a sector-wise review of programmes under implementation. The findings from these reviews should be presented around the following four areas outlined in the standard MTR ToR template: **(I) Programme/Project Strategy, (II) Progress Towards Results, (III) Programme Implementation and Adaptive Management, and (IV) Sustainability** as detailed in Appendix 1 (Terms of References).

Each of the aspects to be assessed (I to IV) will be rated based on different rating scales as indicated in Appendix 4 and as provided by this guidance.

I. Programme/Project Strategy

Purpose: To evaluate the initial design and strategic relevance of CIDP programmes/projects and identify required adjustments.

Key Elements for Review:

- i. Integration of lessons from past projects;
- ii. Alignment with county priorities and ownership;
- iii. Assessment of sustainability, viability, and external risks (e.g., climate change, global economic crises, change in national socio-economic situation, etc.);
- iv. Inclusion of stakeholder perspectives in design;
- v. Thorough identification of environmental and social risks;

- vi. Consideration of perspectives of key stakeholders (those affected, those who can affect project outcomes and those who could contribute information or other resources) in decision-making processes; and
- vii. Mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues in relation to governance, livelihood benefits, income generation, social inclusion, etc. in programmes/project design as provided in Table 2.5.

Action: If broader impacts lack indicators, develop new ones using the **GENDER** criteria: Gap-minded, Encompassing, Disaggregated, Enduring, Rights-observing. New indicators should be based on the criteria in Table 6.

G	Gap-minded	Addressing the gaps and inequalities between women and men, boys and girls as per recognized population categories
En	Encompassing	Developed on the basis of participatory approaches and inclusive processes
D	Disaggregated	By sex, and wherever possible by age and by socio-economic group (or any other socially significant category in society)
E	Enduring	Having a long-term, sustainable perspective, because social change takes time
R	Rights observing	In accordance with human rights laws and standards

Table 6: New indicator criteria

II. Progress Towards Results

Purpose: To assess achievement against planned outputs and outcomes using verified data.

Process:

- i. **Assessment of progress:** Should consider programme objectives and outcomes
- ii. **Data Sources:** Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), County Performance Tracking Tools (CPTTs), MTR mission findings.
- iii. **Analysis:** Populate Tables on: **a)** sector programmes (Table 2.4 **Analysis of Sector Programmes and Projects**) and **b)** priority programmes and projects under implementation (Appendix 4: **Mid-Term Progress Towards Results (Outcome-Level Assessment) Matrix**) to compare baseline, mid-term targets, and actual achievements.

Outcome analysis: Populate the matrix in Appendix 4: (**Mid-Term Progress Towards Results (Outcome-Level Assessment) Matrix**) to summarize the progress towards the end-of-project targets for the project objective and each outcome. The columns such as “**Baseline Level**”, “**Midterm Target**”, and “**2027 End-of-CIDP Target**” should be populated with information from the results framework, scorecards, PIRs and County Project Documents.

Rating: Using the data from the populated matrix in Appendix 4, the MTR team should complete the column “Mid-Term Level & Assessment” and conclude whether the 2027 End-of-CIDP target is: a) achieved or is on course to be achieved (Above 70% achievement) (color the “Mid-Term Level & Assessment” table cell (green); b) is partially achieved or likely to be achieved (between 40% and 69% achievement) by the end of the project (color yellow); or c) is at high risk of not being achieved by the end of the project and needs attention (below 40% achievement) (color red). Use the 6-point scale (Table 7) to rate progress for each outcome and the overall objective.

The “**traffic lights system**” will be utilized only for the Midterm level & Assessment column of the matrix in Appendix 4.

Visual Tracking: Color-code progress in the column indicated mid-term level & assessment in the analysis matrix Appendix 4:

- i. **Green (>70%):** On track/achieved.
- ii. **Yellow (40-69%):** Partially achieved.
- iii. **Red (<40%):** High risk, needs attention.

For those indicators marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red), the MTR team may recommend actions to be taken, which should be summarized in the MTR report. The six level scale in Table 7 should guide the MTR team in assigning ratings to the column labeled achievement rating in the matrix Appendix 4.

Level of Satisfaction	Description	Scores
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.	Above 70 (70-90(on course to be achieved & above 90 (has been achieved, above 100-exceeded achievement)
Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.	
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.	Between 40- 69 Partially achieved or likely to be achieved by end of the project period
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.	
Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.	Below 40 High risk of not being achieved by the end of the project period.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.	

Table 7: Progress Towards Results Rating Scale

III. Programme Implementation & Adaptive Management

Purpose: To review the efficiency and effectiveness of management processes and identify improvements.

Aspects Assessed:

- i. **Management Arrangements:** Clarity, effectiveness, and changes from original plan.
- ii. **Work Planning:** Timeliness, results-based approach, use of results framework.
- iii. **Finance & Co-finance:** Budget controls, expenditure variances, audit compliance.
- iv. **M&E Systems:** Quality, appropriateness, inclusivity, use for adaptive management.
- v. **Stakeholder Engagement:** Partnerships, local ownership, public awareness.
- vi. **Risk Management:** Mitigation and management of environmental and social risks.
- vii. **Reporting:** Fulfillment of requirements, sharing of lessons and adaptive changes.

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

The MTR team should refer to Appendix 2 (**Project Information Package list**) and Appendix 3 (**Audit Trail Template**) for guidance on relevant documents and information to support the analysis of project implementation and adaptive management. In cases where the county decides to undertake the Mid-Term Review of the CIDP jointly with other development partners, reference should be made to Appendix 5 (**Joint Evaluation Consideration Checklists**)

Rating: The MTR team should assign one overall **Programme Implementation & Adaptive Management** rating using the 6-point scale in Table 8.

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	80%+ of components leading to efficient implementation ("good practice")
Satisfactory (S)	60% - 79% leading to efficient implementation, few need remedial action.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	50% - 59% leading to efficient implementation, some need remedial action.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	40% - 49% not leading to efficient implementation, most need remedial action.
Unsatisfactory (U)	30% - 39% not leading to efficient implementation.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Below 30%. No components leading to efficient implementation.

Table 8: Programme Implementation & Adaptive Management Rating Scale

The selected rating and a description/explanation of that rating should be included in the *MTR Ratings & Achievements Summary Table* (Table 10).

IV. Sustainability

Purpose: To assess risks to the continuation of benefits after the project ends, setting the stage for the Terminal Evaluation.

Risk Categories & Guiding Questions (*MTR team can propose additional risks categories and guiding questions based on county contexts*):

- i. **Financial:** Likelihood of resource depletion post-funding? Opportunities for continued financing?
- ii. **Socio-economic:** Social/political risks? Level of stakeholder ownership and awareness?
- iii. **Institutional/Governance:** Do policies support sustainability? Is institutional capacity built?
- iv. **Environmental:** Are there environmental factors that could reverse project outcomes?

Rating: The MTR team should assign an overall **Sustainability** rating using the 4-point scale in Table 9.

Likely (L)	Negligible risks; key outcomes on track to continue.
Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks: at least some outcomes expected to be sustained
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Significant risk key outcomes won't carry on, but some outputs will
Unlikely (U)	Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained

Table 9: Sustainability Rating Scale

NB: The selected rating and a description/explanation of that rating should be included in the MTR Ratings & Achievements Summary table (Table 10).

The MTR team should summarize the MTR findings as guided by **Mid-Term Review Evaluative Template** (Table 2.6). The findings should focus on programme/projects aspects assessed including:

- i. Programme/projects strategy
- ii. Progress towards results
- iii. Implementation and adaptive management
- iv. Sustainability

In populating the matrix in Appendix 4, the MTR team should relate the findings as guided above to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) / Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, impact and sustainability.

Finally, the MTR team should include its ratings of the project's results and descriptions of the associated achievements in the MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary in Table 10.

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (Rate 6 pt. scale) Etc.	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(Rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(Rate 4 pt. scale)	

Table 10: MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary

V. Conclusions & Recommendations

Conclusions

Provide a balanced, evidence-based synthesis of strengths, challenges, and results, directly responding to the ToRs key questions.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, the MTR report should provide practical, feasible and actionable suggestions (max 15). Examples include:

- i. Corrective actions for design or implementation.
- ii. Actions to reinforce initial benefits.
- iii. Proposals for future directions to mitigate sustainability risks.
- iv. Include a summary chart in the executive summary assigning responsibility for each recommendation.

New Priorities and Emphasis

The MTR team, based on recommendations, should ascertain new priorities and sectors of emphasis, including accelerating the green transition, digital transition, leveraging socio-economic opportunities and institutionalization of sustainable project financing models.

The following is an example:

During the remaining Plan period, strengthened sectoral growth and structural reforms as well as accelerated innovation and technology adoption, particularly among SMEs, are anticipated to bolster economic growth. In addition, a more knowledge-intensive and skilled workforce will be integral to support the economic sectors in moving up the value chain. Leveraging 4IR will also be vital to ensure that the county benefits from the rapid technological advancement to increase competitiveness and market efficiency. Meanwhile, the provision of quality infrastructure in terms of improving connectivity, efficiency and reliability will further support economic activities. These collective and concerted efforts will enhance productivity and ensure the county remains on track to deliver inclusive development.

PART THREE: STRUCTURE OF THE COUNTY INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN MID-TERM REVIEW REPORT

3.1 Overview

This Part provides the MTR report structure which includes the Background Information, Analysis of Sector Performance, Summary of Key Findings, and Conclusions and Recommendations. The Mid-Term Review (MTR) report for county governments is structured in two parts: Part I presents background information and evaluates performance against selected outcomes, targets, strategies, and initiatives for the review period FY 2023/24- Midpoint of FY 2025/26, while Part II outlines revised priorities and emphases to enhance county development in the remaining Plan period, based on sector performance analysis, key findings, and policy recommendations.

3.2 Structure of the MTR Report

The MTR outline for the CIDP 2023-2027 is as indicated below:

Preliminaries

Cover Page

The cover page should contain the following:

- i. The Government of Kenya Logo (Top Left) and County Government Logo (Top Right)
- ii. {County Name}
- iii. Mid-Term Review Report for the County Integrated Development Plan, (2023-2027)
- iv. First Page (Title page)
- v. Title: {Insert County name} Mid-Term Review Report for the County Integrated Development Plan

Foreword

The Foreword should contain the justification and purpose for conducting CIDP MTR and give a summary of key achievements realized in the midterm period, challenges faced and lessons learnt as well as transformational commitments going forward.

The section is intended to give authority or credibility to the MTR report. It should include the MTR direction, rationale and commitment of the county government towards implementation of the CIDP.

(To be signed by the Governor, preferably one page)

Acknowledgement

This should recognize all those involved in the CIDP MTR process. The role played by the various stakeholders including County and National Governments officials, development partners, non-state actors, private sector among others who supported

the review process in developing the CIDP MTR Report and the role of the public in general should also be acknowledged.

(To be signed by County Executive Member responsible for County Economic Planning, preferably one page)

Subsequent Pages of the Report

- i. Table of Contents
- ii. List of Tables
- iii. List of Figures/Boxes/Maps
- iv. List of Abbreviations and Acronyms
- v. Definition of Terms

Executive Summary

The executive summary should cover introduction, evaluation findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

(Utmost two pages)

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 County Development Context

Provide a 2 - 3 pages overview of the CIDP implementation status, environmental and socio-economic factors underpinning implementation, key successes, challenges, key cross-cutting & emerging issues and relevant baseline data using indicators such as poverty rates, population statistics, and health metrics. Information on key indicators should be provided in Table 1.1.

Key Indicators	unit	2023/24	2024/25	2025/26	2026/27	2027/28
Absolute Poverty Headcount						
Total poverty rate for the county	% Population					
Population						
Total Population	Million					
Population Density	per sq. km					
Male/Female Ratio	100 Female					
Life Expectancy at birth						
Male						
Female						
Health						
Maternal mortality ratio	100,000 live births					
Neonatal mortality rate	(1,000 live births)					
Child under 5 years mortality rate	1,000 live births					
Life Expectancy at birth						

1. 1: Key Indicators

1.2 Objectives of the Mid-Term Review

This section should present the broad and specific objectives of conducting the CIDP Mid-term Review.

1.3 Rationale for Mid-Term Review

The section justifies the MTR by referencing policy and legal frameworks, emphasizing its role in assessing progress, identifying challenges, promoting learning, ensuring accountability, and enabling course correction.

1.4 Methodology

This section should clearly document the approach adopted in developing the MTR. This may cover a brief on the process followed including stakeholder consultations, methods and sources of data collection and analysis among others.

1.5 Scope of the Mid-Term Review

This section should clearly outline the period under review (FY 2023/24- midpoint FY2025/26), programmes and projects in the CIDP under implementation within the period under review, the key development players, and key stakeholders.

Chapter Two: Performance Analysis

The county should conduct a performance analysis review by sector as provided for in the CIDP. The analysis should be done as follows:

2.1. Analysis of Financial Performance

2.1.1. Analysis of Revenue Performance

This sub section should provide an analysis of the Projected Revenues vs. Actual Receipts for the period under review as per Table 2.1.

Type of Revenue	2023/2024		2024/2025		2025/2026		Remarks on Trends
	CIDP Target	Actual Receipts	CIDP Target	Actual Receipts	CIDP Target	Actual Receipts	
a) Own Source Revenue in Million	1,000	800	1,200	950	1,500	1,300	
b) Equitable Share							
c) Conditional grants (GoK)							
d) Conditional grants (Development Partners)							
e) Other Sources (specify) e.g., NG-CDF, Equalization Fund etc.							
Total							

2. 1: Analysis of County Revenue Streams

NB: use revenue data to highlight key trends and give a brief analysis of the revenue data

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

2.1.2. Analysis of Expenditure

This sub section should provide a summary of the county sector estimated budget, actual allocation, actual expenditure, and absorption rate as indicated in Table 2.2.

Sector	Budget Type	FY 2023/24 (As per CIDP)				FY2024/25 (As per CIDP)				Mid FY 2025/26 (As per CIDP)			
		Estimate d Budget t 23/24	Actual Allocatio n	Actual Expenditu re	Absorpti on	Estimate d Budget	Actual Allocatio n	Actual Expenditu re	Absorpti on	Estimate d Budget	Actual Allocatio n	Actual Expenditu re	Absorpti on
Agricultur e	Rec												
	Dev												
	Sub-Total												
Water Resources	Rec												
	Dev												
	Sub-Total												
County Totals	Recc												
	Dev												
	G/Total												

2. 2: County Sector Allocations vs Absorption

NB: Capture Table 2.2 in landscape format.

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

2.2. Analysis of Outcomes and Intervention Areas

This sub-section should provide highlights of the extent to which the development issues identified in CIDP have been addressed, in terms of interventions and outcomes as per Table 2.3.

Sector	Development issue (from CIDP)	Interventions	Outcome	Remarks
Agriculture		Promotion of smallholder farming, blended finance, new crops (e.g. Palm oil and sugar beets)	Increased Food and Nutritional Security	Promotion of smallholder farming, blended finance, new crops (e.g. Palm oil and sugar beets)
Trade		Promotion of exports, leverage African continental free trade area, development of tourism markets, implement sector master plans	Expanded trade and investment opportunities	Promotion of exports, leverage African continental free trade area, development of tourism markets, implement sector master plans
Infrastructure		Priority catalytic projects, broadband, energy, water systems and climate resilient infrastructure	Increased infrastructure investment	Priority catalytic projects, broadband, energy, water systems and climate resilient infrastructure
Health		Strengthening of primary health care, rolling out national health insurance, improving maternal health care and improving mental health services	Better and responsive health care access	Strengthening of primary health care, rolling out national health insurance, improving maternal health care and improving mental health services

2. 3: Summary of Issues, Interventions and outcomes

NB. The remarks column should provide additional information on the interventions.

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

2.3 Analysis of Sector Outcomes and Milestones

2.3.1 Overview of the sector: Indicate the name of the sector

This sub-section should provide a brief summary of the implementation of sector programmes as indicated in Table 2.4. Provide evidence using current and official statistics/data to support the analysis.

Sub-Programme	Key Output	Key Performance Indicators	Linkage to SDG Target	CIDP Midterm Target	Achievement at Mid-Term	Projected Exp. Kshs in Millions	Actual Exp. Kshs in Millions	Remarks
Programme: Early Childhood Development Education								
Programme Objective: Increase access to ECD Education								
Programme Outcome: Increased access to ECD Education								
ECDE School meals	Implementation of school feeding programme	No of pupils benefitted	SDG 4.1	190	60	190	60	
ECDE Infrastructure	Construction of classrooms	No of classrooms constructed	SDG 4.1	40	80	40	80	
	Construction of sanitation facilities	No of sanitation facilities constructed	SDG 4.1	40	15	40	15	
	Supply of water tanks	No of water tanks supplied	SDG 4.1	58	5	58	5	
	Electrification of centers	No of centers supplied with electricity	SDG 4.1	52	5	52	5	
	Provision of age-appropriate furniture	No of chairs & tables supplied	SDG 4.1	4,540 & 3,800	16	4,540 & 3,800	16	
	Erection and construction of fences	No of centers fenced	SDG 4.1	20	40	20	40	

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

Sub-Programme	Key Output	Key Performance Indicators	Linkage to SDG Target	CIDP Midterm Target	Achievement at Mid-Term	Projected Exp. Kshs in Millions	Actual Exp. Kshs in Millions	Remarks
Programme: Vocational Training								
Programme Objective: To increase access to quality Vocational Training								
Programme Outcome: Increased access to quality Vocational Training								
VTC infrastructure	VTCs constructed	No of VTCs constructed and established	SDG 4.1	5	30	5	30	
	centers connected to electric grid	No of centers connected to electric grid	SDG 4.1	0	0	3	1	
	centers connected to fresh water	No of centers connected to fresh water	SDG 4.1	1	1	1	1	
	Supply of modern furniture in 8 existing centers & 7 new established centers	No of centers supplied with furniture annually	SDG 4.1	4	2	4	2	

2. 4: Analysis of Sector Programmes and Projects

NB. The remark should provide additional information on the target outcomes, milestones, challenges and recommendations on the way forward.

2.4 Analysis of Sector Programmes for Mid-Term Review

The Counties should populate Appendix 4 sector-wise with emphasizes on prioritized programmes under implementation.

2.5 Analysis of Progress Towards Results

Provide an assessment of progress towards results using the matrix given in **Appendix 4** and the subsequent ratings as provided for in the guidelines.

2.5.1 Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the CIDP outcome indicators against progress made towards the 2027 end-of-CIDP targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix (Appendix 4) and following the colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome.
- The columns such as “Baseline Level”, “Mid-Term Target”, and “2027 End-of-CIDP Target” should be populated with information from the results framework, scorecards, PIRs and County Project Documents. Using that data, the MTR team should complete the column “Mid-Term Level & Assessment” and conclude whether the end-of-project target: a) has already been achieved (color the “Mid-Term Level & Assessment” table cell green); b) is partially achieved or on target to be achieved by the end of the project (color yellow); or c) is at high risk of not being achieved by the end of the project and needs attention (color red).
- The “traffic light system” will be utilized only for the Mid-Term level & Assessment column in Appendix 4.

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved
------------------------	---	--

In addition to the progress towards outcome analysis:

- Compare and analyse the Baseline level with the one completed (County Internal Reports) right before the Mid-Term Review.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

2.6 Analysis of Cross-cutting Issues

To ensure Counties report on identified key cross-cutting issues in the CIDP, the Table 2.5 gives a guide on how to report on the mainstreamed issues in the CIDP.

Key Issue/ Mainstreaming Issue	Design and Preparation	Implementation	Monitoring	Impact	Remarks
Review Questions	Were cross-cutting issues mainstreamed in the CIDP Programmes?	To what extent have cross-cutting issues been addressed?	Are cross-cutting indicators included in the CIDP Programmes?	What is the impact of cross-cutting issues to local contexts?	Provide an overall statement regarding the findings
SDGs					
Gender					
Youth					
Social / Child Protection					
PWDs					
Climate Change					
Disaster Risk Management (DRM)					
HIV/ AIDS					
Technology					
Knowledge Management					

2. 5: Midterm Review Reporting on Key Issues Mainstreamed in the CIDP

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

2.7 Summary of Key Findings

County governments will summarize the Mid-Term Evaluation findings and present them as shown in the Mid-Term Review Evaluative Matrix Template (Table 2.6), based on the following criteria: Relevance of programmes and projects in the CIDP; effectiveness of interventions; efficiency of operations and resource utilization; coherence of programmes and projects in the CIDP, sustainability and impact orientation.

Programme	Strategy & Relevance (Alignment, design, inclusion)	Progress Towards Results (Outputs and outcomes vs targets)	Implementation & Efficiency (Value for money, delivery)	Adaptive Management & Governance (Responsiveness, coordination)	Sustainability & Risk (Financial, institutional, environmental)	Key Issues / Bottlenecks	Priority Actions / Recommendations
Sector: Agriculture, Rural & Urban Development							
Programme 1	- Aligned to food security & livelihoods - Partial Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) integration - Inclusion gaps (youth/women)	- Increased inputs & extension - Modest productivity gains - Irrigation below target	- Low dev. absorption - Weak aggregation/markets - Limited private sector role	- Weak data-driven extension - Fragmented coordination	- High climate risk - Limited agri-finance - Land degradation	- Low commercialization - Weak value chains - Limited irrigation	- Scale irrigation & CSA - Strengthen cooperatives - Promote agro-processing - Deploy digital extension
Sector: Energy, Infrastructure & ICT							
Programme 1	- Strong growth alignment - Limited green integration	- Roads, power ongoing - Uneven last-mile access	- Procurement delays - Cost overruns - Weak maintenance	- Weak project tracking - Limited digital monitoring	- High capital needs - Climate exposure	- Stalled projects - Digital divide	- Complete stalled projects - Climate-proof infrastructure - Expand connectivity - Strengthen asset management
Sector: General Economic & Commercial Affairs							
Programme 1	- Aligned to MSMEs & trade - Weak export orientation	- SME growth - Low industrialization	- Inefficient markets - Limited financing access	- Weak PPP frameworks - Limited reforms	- High informality - Low competitiveness	- Weak value addition - Limited market access	- Develop industrial hubs - Expand MSME finance - Promote exports - Operationalize PPPs
Sector: Health							
Programme 1	- Strong UHC/PHC alignment - High inclusion focus	- Improved PHC access - Mixed health outcomes	- High wage bill - Drug stock-outs	- Moderate M&E - Weak digital integration	- Donor dependency - HR constraints	- Staffing gaps - Supply chain issues	- Strengthen PHC - Digitize supply chains - Improve HRH - Expand NHIF uptake
Sector: Education							
Early Childhood Development Education (ECDE)	- Strong ECDE focus - Improving inclusion	- Increased enrolment - Mixed quality outcomes	- Infrastructure-heavy spend - Teacher gaps	- Weak learning tracking - Poor labour linkage	- High recurrent costs - Quality risks	- Skills mismatch - Low retention	- Improve teacher deployment - Invest in quality inputs

2. 6: Mid-Term Review Evaluative Matrix Template

2.8 Sector Challenges

Highlight the major challenges encountered by the sector during implementation of programmes, projects and activities. The challenges may cover economic, social, institutional, political/governance, technological, environmental factors among others. Using either / both PESTEL and SCOT.

2.9 Sector Lessons Learnt

Provide a summary of **key** lessons learnt during implementation of the programmes.

2.10 Sector Cross-cutting Issues

The county should outline a range of issues that impact programme implementation such as climate change, green transition, disaster risks, geo-economic shocks, etc.

2.11 Sector Emerging Issues

Describe concerns that might not have been foreseen during planning but have occurred during the first half of implementation of CIDP and are likely to be influential in the second half of implementation. This may cover issues such as economic, social, institutional, political/governance, technological, and environmental factors among others.

Chapter Three: Conclusions and Recommendations

3.1 Conclusions

The conclusion sub-section should summarize the key findings from the Mid-Term Review while drawing broad insights across sectors. It should include: a summary of progress made across all sectors, indicating whether the county is on track to achieve its planned objectives, and measures to sustain the same beyond the current plan period.

3.2 Recommendations

This sub-section should be structured to provide practical and actionable solutions to improve performance, efficiency, and sustainability based on findings, lessons learnt, challenges and emerging issues. The recommendations may include:

- i. Suggested steps to be undertaken to hasten implementation during the remaining period for projects/ activities found to be lagging behind
- ii. Future areas of improvement
- iii. Suggest risk mitigation measures
- iv. Possible actions for sustainability of the projects

Key aspects of recommendations may include:

- i. *Accelerating Innovation and Technology Adoption- Harnessing the opportunities of the Fourth Industrial Revolution (4IR) through emerging technologies such as advanced robotics, AI and blockchain*
- ii. *Enhancing investments in quality Infrastructure in terms of integration, coverage and connectivity as well as affordability and sustainability*
- iii. *Outlining new priorities and emphasis, aiming to reform existing policies and outline the revised socioeconomic targets*
- iv. *Upgrading capacity and capability of SMEs Industry players to produce high value-added products and services to move up to the global value chain through technology adoption*

Counties should have Appendices 1 and 4 as part of the MTR Report. Important data sources such as; county monitoring and evaluation reports should be hyper-linked to Appendix 4 to guide users for detailed information as appropriate. The rest of the Appendices are for information purposes and should not form part of the report.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference

Terms Of Reference (ToR) For Mid-Term Review of the CIDP

A. Background

The county is implementing its five-year CIDP (2023- 2027), whose theme is.....It is anchored on the following Strategic Objectives (SO) which are:

- SO1: Diversify agricultural technologies and expand frontiers for next-gen products in Kenya and beyond
- SO2: Promote the creation of a functional enabling environment for delivery of quality health services

To address a wide range of issues that impact farmers, the county has cross-cutting priorities (CCPs) that underpin the strategic objectives above, these CCPs are as follows:

- CCP1: Improve climate change resilience among farmers
- CCP2: Enhance access to resources, agribusiness opportunities and technology for women and youth.
- CCP3: Improve Early Learning Outcomes.
- CCP4: Build knowledge and foster evidence-based decision making.

To take stock of progress and guide strategic recalibration, the county is commissioning a Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) to be undertaken between January and April 2026. The mid-term evaluation will serve as a strategic reflection point to:

- **Assess** the strategic aptness of the current approach and recommend adjustments to better align with emerging needs, opportunities, and delivery realities.
- **Evaluate delivery models** – Examine the effectiveness of current implementation approaches, including roles of county entities and its partners, to determine whether delivery is optimized and aligned with comparative advantage.
- **Gauge progress and sustainability** – Identify progress toward intended outcomes, assess what's working or not, and identify areas needing course correction to strengthen long-term results.

B. Purpose of the Review

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) will assess progress toward strategic outcomes and outputs while also reviewing the extent to which the county government is fulfilling the broader commitments articulated in the CIDP 2023–2027. The MTR will provide insights into what is working, what is not, and what needs to change to maximize impact in the remaining period of the strategy.

Specifically, the objectives are:

1. To assess the extent to which the Key Performance Indicators have been achieved and assess what's working or not and identify areas needing course correction to strengthen long-term results.
2. To evaluate how effectively the county is delivering on key strategic commitments, including examining the effectiveness of current implementation approaches and determining whether delivery is optimized and aligned with comparative advantage.
3. To assess the internal and external factors on strategy performance and identify emerging risks or opportunities with potential to significantly impact delivery
4. To provide forward-looking recommendations for mid-course adjustments especially for those aspects of the strategy where traction is lagging.

C. Scope of Work

The assignment will include, but is not limited:

- **Document Review:** Strategic plans, business plan, annual reports, baseline report, MEL reports, technical reports among other reports
- **Key Informant Interviews:** With county staff, project beneficiaries, partners, stakeholders, and funders
- **Quantitative Analysis:** Based on existing monitoring/ performance data
- **Case Studies:** Illustrating outcomes, strategic shifts, or innovations
- **Develop a strategic commitment scorecard** which will be used to assess fulfilment of non-indicator-based goals.
- **Learning workshop** with County Government staff: To determine critical success factors and appraise challenges faced during strategy implementation.
- **Validation** of findings through workshop/ presentation to County Executive Committee/top county management

These approaches should integrate strategic evaluation methods to enhance relevance, learning, and enhance decision making.

These include evaluating strategic commitments alongside results indicators, contribution analysis instead of linear attribution, learning-oriented and adaptive evaluation design, participatory methods and evidence-to-influence strategies for organizational learning and impact.

D. Expected Deliverables

The MTR team will be expected to deliver the following:

- Inception report: Detailed workplan, evaluation methodology and interview tools that effectively address the objectives of the MTR.
- Draft Mid-Term Review Report
- Strategic Commitments Scorecard/Matrix

- Final Synthesis Report: Serves as an intervention brief, highlighting strategy achievements, identification of opportunities for more improvement in performance of strategy, key takeaways, lessons and recommendations, as well as implications for organization strategy implementation
- Two Workshops: Learning and Validation Workshops (as appropriate)
- Slide Deck for Board/Leadership presentation
- Two-page well designed Strategy Learning Brief

E. Timeframe

The assignment will take a duration of **six months** from the third quarter of FY 2025/26 and the definitive timeframe and planning for execution will be agreed with the Management, but should not go beyond 30th June 2026.

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

Appendix 2: Project Information Package list

Item #	Items (electronic versions preferred if available)	Comments
1	Project Identification Form - PIF	
2	County/Development Partner Project Initiation Plan	
3	Approved Final County/Development Partner Project Documents (Bills of Quantities, Architectural Designs, Concept Notes, Technical Approvals/Endorsements, etc.)	
4	County/Development Partner Environmental and Social Screening results	
5	Progress reports (quarterly, semi-annual, or annual) with associated project work plans and financial reports	
6	Project Inception Reports	
7	All Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)	
8	Quarterly progress reports and work plans of the various implementation task teams	
9	Audit reports, electronic copies if available	
10	Electronic copies of finalized relevant County/Development Partner tracking tools(<i>fill in specific TTs based on programme/ project's focal area</i>)	
11	Oversight MTR mission reports	
12	Minutes of the (<i>Project Title</i>) Project Committee/Board meetings or other meetings (i.e. Project Appraisal Committee meetings)	
13	Maps of location sites, as necessary	
14	Other management related documents: adaptive management reports, management memos	
15	Electronic copies of project outputs – voluntary community reports, newsletters, booklets, manuals, technical reports, articles, etc.	
16	Summary list of formal meetings, workshops, etc. held, with date, location, topic, and number of participants	
17	Any available information on relevant environmental monitoring data (<i>species indicators, etc.</i>), beyond what is available on indicators in log frame in PIRs	
18	Any relevant socio-economic monitoring data, such as average incomes / employment levels of stakeholders in the target area, change in revenue related to project activities	
19	Actual expenditures by project outcome, including management costs, and including documentation of any significant budget revisions	
20	List of contracts and procurement items over ~\$5,000 USD (i.e. organizations or companies contracted for project outputs, etc., except in cases of confidential information)	
21	Co-financing table with expected and actual totals broken out by cash and in-kind, and by source, if available	
22	List of related projects/initiatives contributing to project objectives approved/started after development partner project approval	
23	Data on relevant project website activity – e.g. number of unique visitors per month, number of page views, etc. over relevant time period, if available	
24	Confirmation on list of names and titles of stakeholders actually met on MTR field mission (include after the MTR field mission)	
25	Development Partner country/countries programme document(s)	

Appendix 3: Audit Trail template

Note: The following is a template for the MTR Team to show how the received comments on the draft MTR report have (or have not) been incorporated into the final MTR report. This audit trail should be included as an annex in the final MTR report.

To the comments received on (date) from the Midterm Review of (project name)

The following comments were provided in track changes to the draft Midterm Review report; they are referenced by institution ("Author" column) and track change comment number ("#" column):

Author	#	Para No./ comment location	Comment/Feedback on the draft MTR report	MTR team response and actions taken

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

Appendix 4: Mid-Term Progress Towards Results (Outcome-Level Assessment) Matrix

Green= Achieved **Yellow=** On target to be achieved **Red=** Not on target to be achieved

Programme	Outcome	Indicator (Strategic Level Only)	Baseline (2022/23)	Midterm Target	Midterm Status (2025)	2027 End-of CIDP Target	Mid-Term Performance Assessment (Color code each cell- traffic lights)	Rating (Use 6 scale rating in Table 7 on Progress Towards Results)	Interventions to close the Gaps/to scale performance
AGRICULTURE, RURAL & URBAN DEVELOPMENT SECTOR									
Agricultural Finance & Inclusion under BETA	Improved financial inclusion	Proportion of farmers MSMEs accessing formal credit	30% farmers of (7.5M farmers) accessing formal credit	40% farmers of (7.5M farmers); Accessing affordable credit.	56.7% farmers/MSMEs supported	75% farmers MSMEs supported	The proportion of farmers MSMEs accessing credit is above the mid-term target, due to enhanced uptake and involvement of grassroots agriculture support organizations.	HS	Scale blended finance; Cooperative governance reforms; Expand digital credit scoring; Financial literacy programs
	Enhanced aggregation, and traceability of farmers	Number of registered farmers cooperatives societies	150	350	575	800	225 more farmer cooperatives were registered compared to the mid-term target due to economies of scale and enhanced market access.	HS	Professionalization of farming as an economic undertaking.
ENERGY, INFRASTRUCTURE & ICT SECTOR									
Road Maintenance	Improved accessibility	Kilometers of rural access roads constructed and maintained	250KM	350KM	280KM	600KM	Payment of roads pending bills was prioritized and therefore no new road projects were implemented.	U	The county will enter into working agreements with the NYS and KERRA to maintain the rural road network
Water	Improved access to clean and safe water	Proportion of households with access to clean and safe water	20%	25%	23%	35%	60% of mid-term target has been achieved due to enhanced partnerships with development partners in the provision of water and sanitation services	MS	Leverage blended financing to de-risk projects and attract private investment. Offer fiscal incentives such as tax waivers and duty exemptions to

Programme	Outcome	Indicator (Strategic Level Only)	Baseline (2022/23)	Midterm Target	Midterm Status (2025)	2027 End-of CIP Target	Mid-Term Performance Assessment (Color code each cell- traffic lights)	Rating (Use 6 scale rating in Table 7 on Progress Towards Results)	Interventions to close the Gaps/to scale performance
									improve project bankability and competitiveness.
ECONOMIC & COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS SECTOR									
e.g. Trade and Enterprise Development Services									
HEALTH SECTOR									
Afya Bora Mashinani	Improved maternal and neonatal health	Proportion of births attended by skilled health personnel	60%	70%	64%	85%	It takes time to establish health facilities and undertake recruitment of healthcare workers, due to budgetary constraints. Cultural practices hinder achievement of targets	MU	County government should enhance budgetary allocations to health sector. Sensitization of expectant mothers to attend ANC and PNCs
EDUCATION SECTOR									
e.g. Vocational Training Services									
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND GOVERNANCE SECTOR									
e.g. PFM Services									
SOCIAL PROTECTION, CULTURE AND RECREATION SECTOR									
e.g. Social Protection Services									

Programme	Outcome	Indicator (Strategic Level Only)	Baseline (2022/23)	Midterm Target	Midterm Status (2025)	2027 End-of CIDP Target	Mid-Term Performance Assessment (Color code each cell- traffic lights)	Rating (Use 6 scale rating in Table 7 on Progress Towards Results)	Interventions to close the Gaps/to scale performance
ENVIRONMENT, WATER AND NATURAL RESOURCES SECTOR									
e.g. Water Supply Services									

NB: Appendix 4 should form part of the MTR Report

Appendix 5: Joint Review/Evaluation Consideration Checklists

This checklist is designed to guide County Governments and their partners when considering or planning a Joint Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP). A joint review involves multiple partners (e.g., multiple county departments, national government agencies, development partners, CSOs) collaborating in the review/evaluation process.

	Key Questions to Consider	Guidance / Action Points for County Government
1. DECIDING ON THE NEED FOR A JOINT MTR		
1.1 Multi-sectoral Scope	> Does the CIDP outcome or thematic area being evaluated cut across multiple sectors and county departments? > Would a single-department review provide an incomplete picture?	• If YES, a joint review involving relevant sector departments (e.g., Health, Water, Education for a "WASH outcome") is recommended to assess coherence and collective contribution.
1.2 Multi-partner Financing/Implementation	> Is the CIDP component being reviewed co-financed or co-implemented by multiple partners (e.g., National Government, multiple donors, private sector)? > Do different partners have separate evaluation requirements?	• If YES, a joint review can reduce transaction costs, avoid duplication, and foster a unified understanding of results. Initiate early discussions with all financing partners.
1.3 Accountability & Learning Needs	> Is there a need to build a collective sense of accountability among several implementing entities? > Would a joint process enhance mutual learning and strengthen partnerships?	• If YES, a joint MTR can build coordination, share lessons, and create shared ownership of findings and future actions.
1.4 Evaluability	> Is the programme/project component ready to be evaluated? > Are objectives clear? Is data available? Are stakeholders willing to participate?	• Conduct a quick evaluability assessment with potential partners before committing to a joint process.

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

	Key Questions to Consider	Guidance / Action Points for County Government
2. DETERMINING PARTNERS		
2.1 Identifying Core Partners	➤ Which entities are essential for a credible and useful review? ➤ Who are the primary implementers, funders, and oversight bodies?	• List all potential partners: Relevant County Departments, National Government Ministries (e.g., State Dept. of Planning), County Assembly Committees, Key Development Partners, Major CSOs. • Engage them early in the concept stage to secure commitment.
2.2 Managing Partner Numbers	➤ Can the process be manageable with the number of interested partners?	• Aim for a core group of 4-6 key agencies to drive the process. Others can be part of a broader reference group. Too many partners in the core group can slow decision-making.
3. MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE		
3.1 Steering Committee	➤ What high-level body will provide oversight and legitimacy?	• Establish a Joint MTR Steering Committee. • Composition: Representative from each core partner organization (e.g., CECM Planning, Chief Officer Finance, Donor Representative, CSO Chair, Assembly Committee Chair). • Role: Approves TOR, provides oversight, ensures balance in findings, champions the use of results.
3.2 Technical Management Group	➤ Who will handle the day-to-day coordination and management?	• Establish a smaller Technical Management Group (TMG). • Composition: Technical staff from core partner agencies (e.g., County M&E Officer, Partner M&E Focal Points). • Role: Drafts TOR, manages procurement, coordinates logistics, reviews draft reports. The County Director of Planning should chair or co-chair this group.
4. DIVISION OF WORK & ROLES		
4.1 Clear Mandates	➤ How will tasks be divided among partners? ➤ Who has the lead role?	• At the outset, formally agree and document decision-making arrangements and division of labor in a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) or Terms of Reference for the Joint Process. Clearly designate the Lead Agency (typically the County Planning Department).
4.2 Conflict Resolution	➤ How will disagreements be resolved?	• Agree on a conflict resolution process upfront (e.g., escalation from TMG to Steering Committee).
5. DRAFTING THE TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)		
5.1 Lead Drafting	➤ Who will take the lead in drafting the MTR TOR?	• Practical Approach: The County Planning Department (as Lead Agency) takes the lead in drafting. • The draft must be circulated, discussed, and agreed upon by all core partners in the TMG and Steering Committee.
5.2 Incorporating Interests	➤ How will different partners' evaluation questions and requirements be included?	• The TOR must explicitly include the key evaluation questions and criteria important to all core partners. It should be a synthesis, not just one agency's template.
6. DETERMINING WHOSE PROCEDURES WILL BE USED		

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

	Key Questions to Consider	Guidance / Action Points for County Government
6.1 Evaluation Guidelines	➤ Which set of evaluation norms and standards will guide the review? ➤ Do partners have conflicting requirements?	• Agree to use this County MTR Guide as the primary standard, as it aligns with national and UN norms. • For donor partners, agree on any additional specific requirements (e.g., specific templates, criteria) and integrate them into the TOR from the start.
6.2 Procurement & Financial Procedures	➤ How will consultants be recruited and funds managed?	• Recommended: Use the County Government's procurement procedures (as per Public Procurement and Asset Disposal Act), as the County is the primary accountable entity. • Alternative: If a donor is providing most funds and insists, use their procedures, but this increases complexity. Clarify this before starting.
7. FUNDING MODALITIES		
7.1 Pooled Funding	➤ Can partners pool financial resources?	• Preferred Option: Partners pool funds into a dedicated basket managed by the County Finance Department. • This simplifies contracting, reporting, and ensures all partners are equally invested.
7.2 Cost-Sharing by Components	➤ Will differently partners fund specific parts?	• Alternative: Partners agree to fund specific components (e.g., Donor A funds consultancy, County funds logistics, Donor B funds dissemination). • This increases transaction costs and requires meticulous coordination and reporting.
8. SELECTING EVALUATORS/TEAM		
8.1 Recruitment Process	➤ Who will manage the recruitment? ➤ How will partners be involved?	• The Lead Agency (County) manages recruitment via its procurement system. • Crucial: A Joint Evaluation Panel with representatives from core partners must be formed to shortlist, interview, and select the evaluation team. This ensures joint ownership of the selected team.
8.2 Team Composition	➤ Should partners contribute their own experts?	• The selected independent team should be a coherent unit. Avoid a team where each member reports to a different partner. • Partners can propose experts for the roster, but the joint panel makes the final selection.
9. REPORT DISSEMINATION & OWNERSHIP		
9.1 Factual Accuracy Review	➤ How will partners correct factual errors?	• All core partners get the opportunity to review draft reports for factual errors only.
9.2 Handling Dissenting Views	➤ What if partners disagree with findings or conclusions?	• If disagreements on interpretation cannot be resolved, the evaluators' conclusions stand as independent. • Option: Dissenting views from a partner can be included in an annex to the report, clearly marked.
9.3 Multiple Reporting Requirements	➤ Do partners need separate reports or products?	• Agree from the start that there will be one main joint MTR report.



The National Treasury

State Department for Economic Planning

**Treasury Building, 10th Floor,
Harambee Avenue.
P. O. Box 30005 – 00100,
Nairobi, KENYA
Tel.: +254-20-2252299 / Fax: 2218475**

CIDP MID-TERM REVIEW GUIDELINES, 2026

	Key Questions to Consider	Guidance / Action Points for County Government
		• If partners have specific reporting needs (e.g., a donor requires a 2-pager), the evaluators can produce derived products based on the main report.
10. MANAGEMENT RESPONSE & FOLLOW-UP		
10.1 Joint vs. Separate Responses	➤ Will there be one joint management response?	• Recommended: Produce a Joint Management Response and Action Plan signed by all core partner agencies. • This demonstrates collective commitment to act on recommendations.
10.2 Follow-up Mechanism	➤ How will implementation of actions be monitored?	• Integrate the Joint Action Plan into the County's performance monitoring system (e.g., CIDP Annual Review). • The Joint Steering Committee or TMG should track progress bi-annually until all actions are closed.