



REPUBLIC OF KENYA

**THE NATIONAL TREASURY AND PLANNING
STATE DEPARTMENT FOR PLANNING**

**GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING
MID-TERM REVIEW OF COUNTY
INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

DECEMBER 2020

FOREWORD

Proper tracking of implementation progress and impacts of policies, strategies and programmes is a key component of the development process. The Mid-Term Review of County Integrated Development Plans will contribute to a better understanding of the progress achieved in implementing the Plans, determine whether the counties are achieving the intended transformational results, and make recommendations on improvements that will strengthen performance and accountability.

Counties are expected to undertake a mid-point strategic reflection on the progress made so far in implementing the programmes and projects spelled out in their development plans. This includes a thorough review of the design, implementation modalities, financing strategies, coordination framework, stakeholder participation, and cross-sector linkages. This mid-way strategic reflection would enable them to come up with measures to address the existing challenges and ensure achievement of the development goals in efficient, effective and economical ways within the stipulated time frame. The lessons learnt and best practices should be documented and recommendations for improvement made for better informed future decision making.

To ensure uniform norms and standards by counties while undertaking the reviews, the National Treasury and Planning through the State Department for Planning, has developed these Guidelines for Conducting Mid-Term Review of the County Integrated Development Plans through a consultative and participatory approach. The Guidelines provide the phases and steps involved in the review process as well as the structure of the Mid-Term Review Report.

It is my expectation that the use of these Guidelines will enhance the tracking of implementation of the development initiatives by the counties.



**HON. (AMB.) UKUR YATANI, EGH
CABINET SECRETARY
THE NATIONAL TREASURY AND PLANNING**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Preparation of these Guidelines was done through an all-inclusive approach and was led by a technical team from the National Treasury and Planning. Special gratitude goes to the Cabinet Secretary, National Treasury and Planning, for his leadership and overall guidance during preparation of the Guidelines.

I wish to acknowledge Mrs. Katherine Muoki, the Economic Planning Secretary, for spearheading the process of preparing the Guidelines and Mr. Benson K. Kimani, Director Economic Development Coordination Directorate, for leading the technical team that developed the Guidelines. My sincere appreciation also goes to the other technical team members comprising Mr. Richard Mwarema, Mr. Edwin Njue, Ms. Ann Muthamia, Dr. Mary Karumba, Mr. Samuel Kimote, Ms. Ann Mwangi, Mr. Henry Mwaura, Mr. Jackson Kiprono, Ms. Elizabeth Wamalwa, Ms. Robina Kwamboka, Mr. Rodgers Achieng, Ms. Priscila Nyambura, Mr. Joseph Malonza, Mr. John Mbuti, Mr. Kevin Njuki, Mr. Morris Kamande, Ms. Victoria Wachaiyu, Ms. Winfred Kiriimi, Ms. Ann Mureithi, Ms. Felistus Mbuva, Mr. Samuel Nguluu, Mr. Timothy Anguza, Ms. Pamela Jerotich, Ms. Joyce Sanga and Mr. Samson Oduma.

I also wish to acknowledge the role played by the County Governments led by the Governors and the National Government Departments at the county led by the County Commissioners for their inputs during the county consultative forums to validate the Guidelines. In addition, I appreciate the role played by the Council of Governors' Secretariat led by Jacqueline Mogeni, the Chief Executive Officer, and technical officers, Ms. Mercy Wangui and Mr. Ken Oluoch, for enriching the document.

Finally, I wish to express our gratitude to the World Bank through the Kenya Devolution Support Programme and the Royal Danish Embassy through the Public Sector Reforms Programme for providing the resources to finance the consultative process and printing of the Guidelines.



**SAITOTI TOROME, CBS
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY
STATE DEPARTMENT FOR PLANNING**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	vii
DEFINITION OF TERMS	viii
SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Purpose of Mid-Term Review.....	1
1.3 Principles for Conducting Mid-Term Reviews.....	1
1.4 Policy and Legislative Frameworks for Performance Reviews.....	2
1.5 Rationale for Mid-Term Review Guidelines.....	3
1.6 Scope of the Guidelines	4
1.7 Organization of the Guidelines	4
SECTION TWO: THE PROCESS OF CONDUCTING THE MTR OF CIDP	5
2.1 Roles and Responsibilities of Key Players in Mid-Term Review Process.....	5
2.2 Phases and Steps Involved in Conducting Mid-Term Review.....	7
SECTION THREE: STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT ON MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE COUNTY INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN.....	15
3.1 Introduction.....	15
3.2 Mid-Term Review Report Structure.....	15
Preliminaries	15
Foreword	15
Acknowledgement	16
Executive Summary.....	16

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	17
1.1 Introduction.....	17
1.2 Objectives of the Mid-Term Review.....	17
1.3 Rationale for Mid-Term Review.....	17
1.4 Scope of the Review.....	17
1.5 Methodology.....	17
CHAPTER TWO: SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PERFORMANCE	18
2.1 Analysis of County Revenue Streams, Resource Requirement and Allocation for the Period under Review	18
2.2 Sector Performance.....	19
CHAPTER THREE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	21
3.1 Conclusions.....	21
3.2 Recommendations.....	21

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1- 1: Project Template (By Sector).....	9
Table 1- 2: Status of Programme Implementation	9
Table 1- 3: Projected and Actual Revenue.....	10
Table 1- 4: Allocation vs. Expenditure	10
Table 1- 5: Results Matrix	10
Table 1- 6: Projects' Cost and Schedule Performance (Optional).....	11
Table 1- 7: Variance in Revenue Mobilization.....	12
Table 1- 8: Allocation vs. Expenditure	12
Table 1- 9: Management Response Template.....	13
Table 2- 1: County Revenue Streams	18
Table 2- 2: Analysis of County Resources Requirement versus Allocation by Sector.....	18
Table 2- 3: Sector Programmes Performance	19
Table 2- 4: Flagship Projects and Sampled Projects Implementation Status.....	20
Table 2- 5: Projects Cost and Schedule Performance Indices (Optional).....	20

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CBEF	County Budget and Economic Forum
CECM	County Executive Committee Member
CIDP	County Integrated Development Plan
CIMES	County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System
CoK	Constitution of Kenya
COMEC	County Monitoring and Evaluation Committee
CPI	Cost Performance Index
CSP	County Sectoral Plan
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GOK	Government of Kenya
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IBEC	Intergovernmental Budget and Economic Council
ICT	Information, Communication Technology
KII	Key Informant Interview
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDAs	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
MTP	Medium Term Plan
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NT&P	National Treasury & Planning
PFMA	Public Finance Management Act
PPP	Public Private Partnership
SPI	Schedule Performance Index
SWG	Sector Working Group

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	vii
DEFINITION OF TERMS	viii
SECTION ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Purpose of Mid-Term Review.....	1
1.3 Principles for Conducting Mid-Term Reviews.....	1
1.4 Policy and Legislative Frameworks for Performance Reviews.....	2
1.5 Rationale for Mid-Term Review Guidelines.....	3
1.6 Scope of the Guidelines	4
1.7 Organization of the Guidelines	4
SECTION TWO: THE PROCESS OF CONDUCTING THE MTR OF CIDP	5
2.1 Roles and Responsibilities of Key Players in Mid-Term Review Process.....	5
2.2 Phases and Steps Involved in Conducting Mid-Term Review.....	7
SECTION THREE: STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT ON MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE COUNTY INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN.....	15
3.1 Introduction.....	15
3.2 Mid-Term Review Report Structure.....	15
Preliminaries	15
Foreword	15
Acknowledgement	16
Executive Summary.....	16

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION.....	17
1.1 Introduction.....	17
1.2 Objectives of the Mid-Term Review.....	17
1.3 Rationale for Mid-Term Review	17
1.4 Scope of the Review.....	17
1.5 Methodology.....	17
CHAPTER TWO: SECTOR DEVELOPMENT PERFORMANCE	18
2.1 Analysis of County Revenue Streams, Resource Requirement and Allocation for the Period under Review	18
2.2 Sector Performance.....	19
CHAPTER THREE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	21
3.1 Conclusions	21
3.2 Recommendations.....	21

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1- 1: Project Template (By Sector)	9
Table 1- 2: Status of Programme Implementation	9
Table 1- 3: Projected and Actual Revenue	10
Table 1- 4: Allocation vs. Expenditure	10
Table 1- 5: Results Matrix	10
Table 1- 6: Projects' Cost and Schedule Performance (Optional).....	11
Table 1- 7: Variance in Revenue Mobilization.....	12
Table 1- 8: Allocation vs. Expenditure	12
Table 1- 9: Management Response Template.....	13
Table 2- 1: County Revenue Streams	18
Table 2- 2: Analysis of County Resources Requirement versus Allocation by Sector.....	18
Table 2- 3: Sector Programmes Performance	19
Table 2- 4: Flagship Projects and Sampled Projects Implementation Status.....	20
Table 2- 5: Projects Cost and Schedule Performance Indices (Optional).....	20

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

CBEF	County Budget and Economic Forum
CECM	County Executive Committee Member
CIDP	County Integrated Development Plan
CIMES	County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System
CoK	Constitution of Kenya
COMEC	County Monitoring and Evaluation Committee
CPI	Cost Performance Index
CSP	County Sectoral Plan
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GOK	Government of Kenya
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
IBEC	Intergovernmental Budget and Economic Council
ICT	Information, Communication Technology
KII	Key Informant Interview
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDAs	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
MTP	Medium Term Plan
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NT&P	National Treasury & Planning
PFMA	Public Finance Management Act
PPP	Public Private Partnership
SPI	Schedule Performance Index
SWG	Sector Working Group

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Baseline: A value that shows the initial state of an indicator at the start of a phase/ project/ programme, against which progress can be assessed or comparisons made.

Emerging Issues: These refer to recent occurrences /events /phenomena which might impact the sector negatively or positively. They range from environmental, policy, legal, technological, economic, political, social and cultural.

Flagship/Transformative Projects: These are projects with high impact in terms of employment creation, increasing county competitiveness, revenue generation, among others. They may be derived from the Kenya Vision 2030 (and its MTPs), County Transformative Agenda/Long-term Plans, among others.

Mainstreaming: Integration of cross cutting and emerging issues into various stages of decision making.

Mid-Term Review: This is an assessment of the progress made halfway into the execution of an operation.

Outcome: The intermediate result generated relative to the objective of a programme/ intervention.

Outcome Indicator: This is a specific, observable, and measurable characteristic or change that will represent achievement of the outcome. Outcome indicators include quantitative and qualitative measures. Examples are enrolment rates, transition rates, mortality rates, customer satisfaction levels etc.

Output: Immediate tangible or intangible result (products, services, among others) achieved directly from the implementation of an activity.

Performance indicator: A measurable variable that assesses the progress of a particular project/ programme.

Programme: A grouping of related projects and/or services performed by an entity to achieve a common objective. Programmes must be mapped to strategic objectives.

Project: A set of coordinated activities implemented to meet specific objectives within defined time, cost and performance parameters/deliverables.

Sector: A composition of departments, agencies and organizations that are grouped together according to services and products they provide. They produce or offer similar or related products and services, and share common operating characteristics.

Sub-sector: Is an individual department, agency or organization that provides a specific service/product.

Target: A level of result desired to be achieved within a given time frame

SECTION ONE:

INTRODUCTION

This section provides some background information on devolution, the purpose and guiding principles for the Mid-Term Review, the policy and legislative frameworks for performance reviews, the rationale and scope of the Guidelines as well as how the document is organized.

1.1 Background

Article 174 of the Constitution of Kenya provides the objects of devolution of government, which include, amongst others: to promote democratic and accountable exercise of power; to recognise the right of communities to manage their own affairs and to further their development; and, to promote social and economic development and the provision of proximate, easily accessible services throughout Kenya. County planning and development is one of the functions assigned to the County Governments in the Fourth Schedule of the Constitution. Counties are expected to align their development policies, programmes and projects to the national development framework.

The National Government provides the guiding policies, norms and standards for developing various county plans as well as capacity building and technical assistance to the counties. It is in view of this that the National Treasury and Planning, through the State Department for Planning, has developed these Guidelines for Mid-Term Review of CIDPs.

1.2 Purpose of Mid-Term Review

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the County Integrated Development Plan provides a comprehensive assessment of the midpoint performance of a county towards attainment of the set development goals, objectives and targets in the development framework for a particular plan period. It also provides a scorecard on the extent to which the commitments by the county leadership to the citizenry have been achieved and identifies bottlenecks and emerging issues that may hinder attainment of the goals and objectives.

In addition, the MTR helps to identify preventive and corrective actions that can help restore the county back to the path of attaining the set goals and objectives within the remaining half of the plan period. It also identifies initiatives that demonstrate potential for future success.

1.3 Principles for Conducting Mid-Term Reviews

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:

a. Independence

The independence of a mid-term review means the reviewer is at liberty to express findings, conclusions and recommendations without undue influence from the implementing institution,

management or programme/project officers to distort the facts. The independence of a Mid-Term Review is important for the reliability of findings generated.

b. Impartiality

The conduct of the entire mid-term review, that is, from formulation of terms of reference, selection of reviewer(s), data collection, analysis, and reporting of findings should be carried out objectively, professionally and not in a biased way. Impartiality in the review will help to avoid or neutralize bias in findings, analyses and conclusions. As a good practice, *a county government can engage external reviewer(s) or ensure a project/programme from one department is reviewed by officers from a different department to alleviate the potential for conflict of interest.*

c. Credibility

The review should make use of reliable data and data sources. The reviewer should be consistent in the procedures adopted for the review and present findings which are reasonable and reliable in decision making.

d. Utility

The review should be useful, timely, and beneficial to all relevant stakeholders. The review should yield satisfactory findings to the users to meet their objectives.

e. Participatory approach

Consultation with the top leadership of the County Government and other stakeholders is critical for a successful review. Without compromising on independence and in order to promote a review culture based on knowledge sharing, reviewers should include key stakeholders throughout each stage of the review process. The MTR reports for the CIDP should then be validated and made publicly available for all stakeholders in a timely manner. A participatory approach will ensure ownership of results findings by all stakeholders

f. Evidence-based

The review process should be based on verifiable and reliable data and data sources. This contributes to well informed and credible review.

1.4 Policy and Legislative Frameworks for Performance Reviews

The need for having a performance review is informed by various existing policy and legal frameworks as indicated below.

a. County Government Act, 2012

The County Government Act, 2012 Section 102(h) underpins the effectiveness of county planning in providing a platform for unifying planning, budgeting, financing, programme implementation and performance review. Therefore, in order to strengthen provision of quality service delivery, Section 117 (3) emphasizes the need for a county government to carry out regular review of delivery of services with a view to improvement.

Further, Section 108(1) (c) and (d) state that the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP) shall have provisions for monitoring and evaluation; and clear reporting mechanisms, respectively.

b. Public Finance Management Act, 2012

Section 126 (1) of this Act requires that every county government prepares a development plan which includes, inter alia; strategic priorities for the medium term that reflect the county government's priorities and plans and, a description of how the county government is responding to changes in the financial and economic environment.

c. Urban Areas and Cities Act, 2011

Section 42 of this Act requires a city or municipal board to review its integrated development plan annually to assess its performance in accordance with performance management tools, and may amend the plan where it considers it necessary. The review of the integrated development plan should inform the review of the CIDP.

d. The National Development Planning Framework

The National Government is responsible for National Economic Policy and Planning as set out in the Fourth Schedule of the Constitution. The mandate and functions of the State Department for Planning broadly cover issues of national and sectoral development planning and includes providing policy guidance and technical support to counties on development planning. It is in view of this that the State Department, in collaboration with stakeholders, developed and issued the Guidelines for Preparation of the Second-Generation County Integrated Development Plans. The Guidelines provide for counties to set targets and their performance indicators that must be monitored, evaluated and reported on in order to review progress on implementation of policies, programmes and projects as well as assess the impact of the interventions.

e. National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Framework (NIMES)

The National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) is an essential component of Government's efforts to improve the effectiveness and quality of development initiatives. It provides feedback on implementation of policies, programmes and projects at all levels and allows the Government to build on its strengths and address the challenges experienced during implementation. In order to ensure alignment of the monitoring and evaluation of counties to NIMES, the State Department for Planning issued Guidelines for Establishment and Operationalization of the County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (CIMES) to facilitate tracking and reporting on implementation of county policies, programmes and projects.

1.5 Rationale for Mid-Term Review Guidelines

The State Department for Planning is responsible for coordinating the Economic Planning Function at the national level and providing policy guidance and technical support to the counties on development planning matters. In this regard, the State Department through the

leadership of the Cabinet Secretary for the National Treasury and Planning, has developed these Guidelines for Conducting Mid-Term Review of CIDPs. The Guidelines provide a step-by-step guide on how to conduct Mid-Term Reviews of County Integrated Development Plans as well as ensure norms and standards in the outputs of the review process in all counties.

The Guidelines were prepared through a consultative process involving stakeholders at the national and county levels. Preparatory workshops were held for various technical officers at the national level while consultative forums were held in all counties to validate the Guidelines.

1.6 Scope of the Guidelines

The Guidelines for MTR of CIDPs are applicable to all counties when carrying out the CIDPs' mid-term review. The review will cover the progress on the implementation of commitments in the CIDP as well as the impact of the interventions. The Guidelines outline the phases of conducting CIDP MTR as follows:

- i. Phase I (Pre-MTR) - Addressing the necessary arrangements in preparation of the review;
- ii. Phase II (MTR) – Actual conduct of the review; and
- iii. Phase III (Post-MTR) –Dissemination of the review findings.

1.7 Organization of the Guidelines

The Guidelines for Conducting the Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the CIDPs are organized into three sections. Section one provides the background of MTR; the purpose of a mid-term review; principles for conducting MTR; the policy and legal framework for performance reviews; rationale for MTR guidelines; and the scope of the guidelines. Section two indicates the process of conducting the Mid-Term-Review and includes the roles and responsibilities of key players, and the phases and steps involved in conducting the Review. Section three shows the recommended structure of the Report on Mid-Term Review of the County Integrated Development Plan.

SECTION TWO:

THE PROCESS OF CONDUCTING THE MTR OF CIDP

This section provides the roles and responsibilities, as well as phases and steps involved in the Mid-Term Review (MTR) process.

2.1 Roles and Responsibilities of Key Players in Mid-Term Review Process

This sub-section outlines the roles and responsibilities of the key players involved in an MTR process. These include the roles and responsibilities of: County Department responsible for Economic Planning, MTR Core Team, Core Team Sub-committees, and MTR Reviewer(s) - where an external party is engaged.

County Department responsible for matters Economic Planning

The county department responsible for Economic Planning should take the lead and provide secretariat services in the CIDP-MTR process. Some of the key responsibilities of the department include:

- a) Preparation of a concept note on conducting the MTR process;
- b) Issuing of a circular with instructions and deadlines for conducting MTR to all County Accounting Officers. For coordination purposes, the circular shall be shared with the County Commissioner, the County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF) and other key stakeholders by the CEC responsible for Economic Planning;
- c) Coordination of formation of MTR core team with clear Terms of Reference;
- d) Formulation of an MTR work plan/roadmap with clear activities of what should be done, by when and by who;
- e) Training of the Core Team members and Sub-committees on the provisions of these Guidelines;
- f) Sensitization of Sectors and other keys players on the guidelines, and work plan;
- g) Preparation of Terms of Reference (ToRs) to be used by the reviewer(s) (Refer to box below);

Terms of Reference Checklist

TORs should appropriately and clearly outline the purpose, objectives, criteria and key questions for the review exercise and give adequate time and resources. To ensure quality in development of the TORs:

- A. Check whether the TORs clearly outline the focus for the mid-term review in a logical and realistic manner. This will entail checking:
 - The purpose, scope and objectives of the CIDP review;
 - Outputs and/or outcomes to be checked and reviewed; and
 - Mid-Term review context and details.
 - B. Check if the TORs details adequate time frames and allocated days for conducting the CIDP review to completion, that is:
 - Time frame for the scope and focus for the review; and
 - Outline for the size of the team conducting the review, which recognizes the needs and scope of the CIDP review.
 - C. Check if the TORs clearly outline the planned approach to conduct the CIDP review with:
 - Clear role(s) for any other player(s) in the exercise; and
 - A well-defined feedback mechanism
 - D. Check if the proposed methodology and approach for conducting the review is clearly detailed in the TORs, that is:
 - General methodological approach;
 - Data requirements, sources and analysis approach; and
 - Funding analysis requirements and data on sources of funding.
 - E. Check if the TORs include detailed requests to the reviewer to include cross cutting issues in the review report such as gender and vulnerable groups.
 - Do the TORs outline the proposed tools, methodologies and data analysis to meet the requirements?
- h) Preparation of criteria for selection of the reviewer(s);
 - i) Serving as a central department linking other key players with the reviewer(s);
 - j) Organizing the necessary documentation to be provided to the reviewer(s);
 - k) Provision of secretariat services to the MTR Core Team;
 - l) Circulation of the draft MTR report to the top management and other relevant departments/agencies for their comments;

- m) Organization of validation workshop of the draft MTR Report;
- n) Tabling of the final MTR Report to the County Executive Committee; and
- o) Dissemination of the MTR Report.

Mid-Term Review Core Team

The members of the core team should comprise the County Chief Officers or their representatives drawn from various county departments. Further, representatives of National Government departments/agencies, County Monitoring and Evaluation Committee (COMEC), and County Budget, Economic Forum (CBEF) should also be incorporated. The core team should appoint one person for the position of its chair. The secretariat services for the team should be provided by officers from the county department responsible for Economic Planning matters.

The key responsibilities of the MTR core team will be:

- a) Spearheading and guiding the MTR review process;
- b) Reviewing the inception report;
- c) Reviewing the draft MTR Report and providing comments;
- d) Ascertaining the validity of the data collected and reported for the review process; and
- e) Dissemination of MTR report.

Depending on the magnitude of the review assignment to be undertaken, it may be necessary to form sub-committees within the core team that will represent sectors.

Mid-Term Review Reviewer(s)

- a) Prepare MTR inception report;
- b) Conduct the MTR;
- c) Present the initial findings to the MTR core team;
- d) Prepare the draft MTR report; and
- e) Incorporate comments to the draft report and submit the final MTR report.

2.2 Phases and Steps Involved in Conducting Mid-Term Review

This section provides an outline and explanation of the steps to be undertaken while conducting MTR of CIDP implementation. These steps are categorized into three phases namely; preliminary for the MTR, execution of the MTR, and dissemination of the MTR report.

2.2.1 Phase I: Preliminary for Mid-Term Review

At the preliminary phase, planning is a key activity that should be undertaken before engaging in any review activity. The Planning stage involves identification of key activities to be carried out towards the preparation of a mid-term review report, assigning roles and responsibilities

to key players, and setting the timelines for the review process. It is also important at this stage to ascertain the availability of financial and human resources prior to starting the review exercise. This is important to ensure the exercise is executed to completion.

A concept note of carrying out the MTR should be presented to the County Executive Committee Members for concurrence prior to starting the CIDP review process.

2.2.2 Phase II: Execution of Mid-Term Review

In this phase, the main activities include: data collection, collation and analysis; drawing conclusions and formulation of recommendations and drafting the MTR report.

Step 1: Data Collection, Collation and Analysis

During this step, data on implementation of the CIDP is collected, collated, analyzed by sub-sector and reported sector wise. Key activities in this step include: analysis of the CIDP programmes and projects implementation status; assessing the adequacy of resource mobilization strategies; and a gap analysis of existing institutional and legal frameworks. The findings should capture all the necessary information for decision making in a precise manner. Details of each step are as follows:

A. Data Collection and Collation

The reviewer should collect data with details such as programme/project attributes that may include Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), mid-term target; mid-term actual achievement; budget requirements; actual allocation; actual expenditure; projects location by ward (see Tables 1-1; 1-2; 1-3; 1-4; 1-5).

Establish performance of the programmes included in the CIDP, focusing on programmes and county flagships projects implemented by the county and national governments and non-state actors (Table 1-1). This is done as follows:

- (a) Depending on the status of the projects/programmes activities, the reviewer should conduct Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) [with Directors]; Focused Group Discussion (FGD) [with project beneficiaries] during physical field inspections to sampled projects/programme activities. For the programme activities/non-physical projects, the reviewer should sample a number of activities and verify through documented reports if the activities were undertaken. The goal should be to document the status, relevance and sustainability of the projects/programme interventions; and
- (b) Ascertain the existence of operations and maintenance plan to ensure that completed projects are sustainable.

Table 1- 1: Project Template (By Sector)

S/No.	Project Name	Location (ward)	Description of Key Activities	Mid Term Target	Key Milestones Achieved	Project Status/Completion Level	Total Budget Requirement (in millions)	Cumulative Actual Allocation (in million)	Total Actual Expenditure (in million)	Remarks
1.	Thwake Multi-purpose water dam	Kalawa ward	Acquiring land for dam construction; Procurement of contractor; actual land clearing and evacuation; etc.	70%	80 hectares of land have been purchased and 30 households compensated;	22%	120,000	30,000	26,000	There has been delay in acquisition of land due to lack of land documentations by some households; The procurement of the contractor will be done once all the earmarked households for displacement have been compensated
2.										
3.										

Table 1- 2: Status of Programme Implementation

SNo.	Programme Name	Objective	Key Outputs	Output Targets (Mid Term Period)		Remarks
				Planned	Achieved	
1.	Water supply services	To increase access to potable water by household	New households supplied with clean and safe water for domestic use	250	200	Construction of a water dam that targeted to supply water to 80 households was delayed due to land issues. This is expected to be completed in this financial year as all issues have been settled and contractor procured; However, additional 78 households were connected to piped water surpassing our target of 100h/h

Table 1- 3: Projected and Actual Revenue

Type of Revenue	Projected				Actual			
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3 (Mid Yr)	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3 (Mid Yr)	Total
Local revenue by category								
Equitable share								
Conditional grants (GoK)								
Conditional Grants (Development Partners)								
Equalization fund								
Other sources (Specify)								
Total								

Table 1- 4: Allocation vs. Expenditure

Sector	Allocation (Kshs. Million)				Expenditure (Kshs. Million)			
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3 (Mid Yr)	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3 (Mid Yr)	Total
Total								

Table 1- 5: Results Matrix

S/No.	Programme	Outcome	KPI			Remark
			Baseline Value	Mid Term Target	Mid Term Actual	

B. Data Analysis

a) Analysis of programme performance/project implementation status

- Compare the reported data as captured in Tables 1-1 and 1-2 and the information obtained from the projects' physical field visits and interviews, or programme activities information verification from Step 1. Mark those projects/programme activities whose reported status is significantly different from what you observe in the field or obtained from the verification exercise.

b) The type of analysis expected includes establishing the variances between the actual performance and the midterm targets, using the data collected in Part 1 above. Discuss/capture the causes in variance. This may include economic, social, political, environmental and technological factors amongst others.

- For the programmes with indicators, which include baselines, measure the level of improvement from the baselines using monitoring reports and surveys.

c) Undertake efficiency analysis by considering cost and schedule performance of projects, wherever applicable.

- Determine the Cost Performance Index (CPI) – the measure of cost efficiency of budgeted resources expressed as a ratio of the earned value to the actual cost (CPI=EV/AC). A ratio greater than 1 means that the project is performing well against the budget while a ratio less than 1 means that the project is over budget.
- Determine Schedule Performance Index (SPI) - the measure of schedule efficiency expressed as a ratio of earned value to planned value (SPI=EV/PV). A value greater than 1 indicates the project is ahead of schedule while a value less than 1 indicates that project is behind schedule.

This analysis can be presented as shown in Table 1-6.

Table 1- 6: Projects' Cost and Schedule Performance (Optional)

S/No.	Project	Location (Ward)	CPI	SPI	Remarks
	Thwake Multipurpose water dam	Kalawa ward	30,000/26,000=1.15	20/50 = 0.4	The project is performing well against the budget but the project is behind schedule.

d) Establish the adequacy of county resource mobilization mechanisms and expenditure by sector.

- The CIDP contains resource mobilization mechanisms envisaged to deliver the services proposed therein. Therefore, engage the county department responsible for finance in assessing the extent to which the resource mobilization strategies have worked.
- Use county finance reports (see Tables 1-3 and 1-4) and analyze the existing county revenue streams, allocation and expenditure by sector, budget absorption to establish the adequacy of CIDP financing.
- Prepare a summary performance matrix, as shown in Table 1-7 and Table 1-8, giving explanation on performance

Table 1- 7: Variance in Revenue Mobilization

Main Revenue Class	Projected				Actual				Variance
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total	
Local revenue by category									
Equitable share									
Conditional grants (GoK)									
Conditional grants (Development Partners)									
Equalization fund									
Other sources (Specify)									
Total									

Note: Variances can be calculated for each year-where there are major deviations for each year it should be explained

Table 1- 8: Allocation vs. Expenditure

Sector	Allocation (Kshs. Million)				Expenditure (Kshs. Million)				Absorption rate
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total	
Total									

- e) Establish the relevance of the existing projects
 - Analyze the information from the KIIs and FGDs to obtain themes that can indicate if the programme outputs are addressing the needs of the beneficiaries.
- f) Establish the level of equity, ownership and preparedness of the supported communities in sustaining the gains/benefits accruing from the ongoing/completed projects.
 - Analyze key success stories obtained from project beneficiaries through focus group discussions and key informant interviews.

The results obtained from the analysis in this section should be synthesized to form the findings of the MTR. The same should be documented to form a section in the MTR report.

Step 2: Writing and Submission

The reviewer should draft the MTR Report in line with the structure provided under section three of the guidelines and formally submit the report to the CECM in-charge of economic planning through the MTR Core team.

Step 3: Review of Draft Report and Management Response

This step involves verification of what is contained in the draft report and seeking ownership of the same by engaging the top management of the county. The main sub-activities include:

- a) **Internal review of the Draft MTR Report:** After the MTR Core Team submits the Draft MTR Report to the County Executive Committee Member (CECM) in-charge of economic planning, the report should be circulated to the top-management of the county and relevant departments for comments within a stipulated timeframe and prescribed format. The comments should be submitted formally to the CECM in-charge of economic planning, who further forwards to the reviewer for incorporation.
- b) **Preparation of Management Response:** Upon receipt of the revised MTR report from the reviewer, a Management Response should be prepared jointly by the Commissioning Unit/Department, implementing Departments, and stakeholders involved in CIDP implementation. The management response contains the reactions to the recommendations contained in draft MTR report and any contentious findings of the MTR. A follow-up plan with proposed actions, defined timelines and responsibilities are also provided. Refer to Table 1-9 for a template of the Management Response.

Table 1- 9: Management Response Template

Recommendations	Management Response	Follow-Up Action Plan		
		Key Action (s)	Time frame	Responsible Unit
<i>As stated in the MTR report</i>	<i>Is the recommendation relevant and acceptable? (Justification(s) should be provided if a recommendation is rejected or will be implemented in a different manner)</i>	<i>What are the concrete proposed actions?</i>	<i>What is the implementation timeframe?</i>	<i>Who are the responsible units? Who are key partners for the actions?</i>

In order to ensure use of the MTR findings and recommendations, the review process will only be considered to be complete after the Management Responses have been prepared by the respective CECs and approved by the Governor. (*The Management Response will form part of the final MTR Report annexes*).

Step 4: Validation and Finalization of the Draft Mid-Term Review Report

The county department responsible for Economic Planning should organize for a validation of the key findings and recommendations of the revised draft MTR report. The stakeholders to be involved in the validation exercise may include representatives from MTR Core Team, Sector Working Groups (SWGs), the County Budget and Economic Forum (CBEF), Members of County Assembly, County officials, community special interest groups and Development Partners. The validation of the findings is encouraged in order to relay MTR findings to

stakeholders (and to increase accountability on the management response follow-up actions). The Reviewer(s) will incorporate the comments arising from the validation and forwards to the CECM responsible for economic planning who subsequently forwards to the State Department for Planning for technical inputs. The reviewer(s) then incorporates inputs from State Department for Planning and finalizes the draft report, for handover.

Step 5: Handover of Final Mid-Term Review Report

Upon the finalization of the MTR Report, the reviewer(s) will officially handover the final MTR Report to the CECM responsible for economic planning through the MTR Core Team.

Step 6: Approval and Adoption

Once the finalized report has been officially handed over, it should then be tabled to the County Executive Committee for approval and adoption.

2.2.3 Phase III: Dissemination of Finalized Mid-Term Review Report

After approval of the MTR Report, the County Planning Unit should disseminate the report to all stakeholders. This will be done so as to share lessons learnt and recommendations, and put in place the required remedial actions as proposed in the report.

SECTION THREE:

STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT ON MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE COUNTY INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLAN

3.1 Introduction

This section presents the Structure of the Report on Mid-Term Review of the County Integrated Development Plan including the components of the various chapters/sections of the report.

3.2 Mid-Term Review Report Structure

The following is the proposed structure of the MTR of the CIDP report

Preliminaries

Cover Page

The cover page should contain the following:

- The National and County Government Logo
- {County Name}
- County Integrated Development Plan (Period e.g., 2018-2022) Mid-Term Review Report

First Page (Title page)

- Title: {Insert county name} County Integrated Development Plan Mid-Term Review Report
- County Vision and Mission

Subsequent Pages of the Report

- Table of Contents
- List of Tables
- List of Figures/Maps
- List of Abbreviations and Acronyms
- Definition of Terms

Foreword

The Foreword should contain the justification and purpose for conducting CIDP MTR and give a summary on achievements realized in the midterm period, challenges faced and lessons learnt as well as commitments going forward. **(To be signed by the Governor)**

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 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 Economic Planning)

Executive Summary

The executive summary should provide the reader with a quick preview of the contents of the CIDP MTR Report. It should provide an outline of the report. ***(It should be at most two***

pages)

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Introduction

Should include summary of the county background information, the implementation of the CIDP and how it's linked to Vision 2030 and the current Medium Term Plan, and tracking of the implementation of the CIDP. It should also include county priorities, and the environment within which the CIDP is being implemented.

1.2 Objectives of the Mid-Term Review

This section should present the general and specific objectives of conducting the CIDP Midterm Review.

1.3 Rationale for Mid-Term Review

This section should provide the justification for conducting Mid-term Review of the implementation of the CIDP. *Make reference to the relevant policy and legal framework that support the review process.*

1.4 Scope of the Review

This section should outline the extent or range of coverage of the Mid-Term Review. It should also include the timeframe within which the review is being conducted as well as inform on who the users of the MTR report are.

1.5 Methodology

This section should provide the review design, data collection method(s), collation and analysis.

changes can be attributed to the project or how the project has contributed to the observed changes. Show the extent to which the target group has been reached.

Efficiency: illustrate the extent to which resources or inputs are economically and appropriately used to produce the desired results. Compare what has been spent versus what was required to implement the project to achieve the desired results. Are there any alternatives for achieving the same results with less inputs/resources?

Sustainability: illustrate the extent to which the projects' benefits will continue after the projects have been closed or show the extent to which the projects' benefits are likely to be sustained and continued after completion. Illustrate the exit strategies and approaches and their effectiveness to phase out assistance provided by the projects after their closure

Table 2- 4: Flagship Projects and Sampled Projects Implementation Status

S/ No.	Project Name	Location (Ward)	Description of key activities	Key milestones achieved	Mid Term Targeted Activities	Project status/completion level	Total Budget Requirement (in millions)	Cumulative Actual Allocation (in million)	Total Actual Expenditure (in million)	Remarks

Table 2- 5: Projects Cost and Schedule Performance Indices (Optional)

S/No.	Project	Location (Ward)	CPI	SPI	Remarks
1					
2					
3					

NB: Refer to "A Guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK Guide)"

2.2.4 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, technological, environmental factors among others.

2.2.5 Sector Lessons Learnt

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

2.2.6 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 of the CIDP. This may cover issues such as economic, social, institutional, political, technological, environmental factors among others.

CHAPTER THREE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Conclusions

Briefly state the overall objective of the MTR, approach undertaken to conduct the MTR, findings that cut across sectors (general trend across sectors), and overall observations given the results (under/over performance).

3.2 Recommendations

The section should present practical and feasible actions/solutions directed to the implementers /management and relevant stakeholders. These comprise actions to be undertaken and decisions to be made. The recommendations should include:

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



REPUBLIC OF KENYA

**THE NATIONAL TREASURY AND PLANNING
STATE DEPARTMENT FOR PLANNING**

**GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING
MID-TERM REVIEW OF COUNTY
INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT PLANS**

DECEMBER 2020



**For Further Information, please contact:
The State Department for Planning
Treasury Building, Harambee Avenue
P.O Box 30005-00100, Nairobi
Tel. +254 20 2252299
Email: ps@planning.go.ke**

