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Summary of End of Programme Evaluation (January 2013)
1. Background

Trócaire’s Governance and Human Rights (GHR) programme in Kenya covered the period August 2009 to August 2012 and involved 8 partners,¹ both faith based organisations working at diocesan and parish level and secular, national level organisations. Partners were spread geographically, working in the North West near the borders with Southern Sudan and Uganda, in East and Central Kenya and with one partner working in Kibera, Nairobi.

Overall, the goal of the programme was ‘to improve access to justice, increase accountability and responsiveness of the state and its institutions by strengthening civil society and communities’ capacity to demand and engage in productive dialogue with state actors on key reform areas’. To this end specific objectives were: to increase accountability and responsiveness of devolved structures to citizens’ needs; improve access to justice (formal and informal) for women, urban and rural poor, those in custody, pastoralist and other vulnerable groups by advocating for reforms in the administration of justice and demanding accountability of justice actors; and to contribute to reductions in levels of violent conflict in target areas.

An external evaluation of the EC funded access to justice component of the programme was carried out in November 2012. This end of programme evaluation, conducted in December 2012 and finalised in January 2013, therefore focussed primarily on activities carried out under the devolved structures/funds and conflict resolution and peace building components whilst drawing on the access to justice evaluation to draw programme level conclusions and recommendations.

2. Methodology Summary

This end of programme evaluation was carried out by an external consultant incorporating a peer review process. Staff from partner organisations participated in each of the key stages including sampling, development of tools, data capture and preliminary analysis. The consultant compiled conclusions and recommendations based on these findings as well as observations, encounters with Trócaire and partner staff, review of literature and program documentation. The form of this report reflects the participatory and reflexive nature of the research methodology employed. However final conclusions and recommendations are the views of the external consultant.

3. Key Findings

**Devolved funds**

The level of data generated by the dioceses on publicly funded projects in the respective localities over the past 3 years has been significant (over 400 projects audited, reflecting sustained engagement with local level processes) and the calibre of social audit teams appears high. Information on publicly funded projects is more widely available as a direct result of partner interventions. The evaluation did identify some weaknesses. Social auditors faced many challenges and sometimes felt isolated as they went about their work, the social audit reports themselves could be stronger in terms of analysis and presentation and potential for linkages across the dioceses was not harnessed. While a lot of work has

¹ The eight partners were: CJPC Kitale (Diocese of Kitale); CJPC Kitui (Diocese of Kitui); CJPC Lodwar (Diocese of Lodwar); CJPC Nyeri (Diocese of Nyeri); OHR Kibera (Parish of Christ the King Kibera); Kenya Human Rights Commission (National); SCCRR (Dioceses of Lodwar and Kitale); AOSK National.)
been carried out on devolved funds at community level, the evaluation did not find evidence of effective links between partners and national level organisations engaging in legislative reform on devolution.

**Access to Justice**

The November 2012 external evaluation concluded that a lot was achieved in the target areas in terms of reducing congestion in prisons, addressing case backlogs and improving collaboration between the various justice actors. The pioneering of new models of dispensing justice notably the establishment of small claims courts and the establishment of court user committees in various court locations throughout the country was commendable. Well integrated research and advocacy work was carried out under this objective. The quality of publications was high and the content engaging. Partners benefited from each other’s strengths and this enhanced impact.

**Conflict resolution and peace building**

The evaluation found partners to be deeply engaged in peace and conflict work in their respective localities. Their work is centred on every day conflict mitigation and mediation, they are held in high esteem by program benefactors and the commitment of partner staff is high. Monitoring and documentation systems need to be upgraded however, to enhance early warning systems and also to allow for deeper understanding and tracking of the systemic drivers of the conflict and the development of appropriate responses (including advocacy positions). In the case of Lodwar/Kitale, inter-diocesan linkages could be strengthened as well as links with research and training bodies like Shalo Centre for Conflict Resolution and Reconciliation (SCCRR).

4. Conclusions

Overall the program made considerable strides towards achieving its overall goal ‘to improve access to justice, increase the accountability and responsiveness of the state and its institutions by strengthening civil society and communities’ capacity to demand and engage in productive dialogue with state actors on key reform areas’. There is a good level of cohesion among program partners and the partnership with Trócaire is highly valued.

This evaluation also finds that significant outcomes have been realised under each of the programme’s three objectives. The relevance of the interventions to the specific contexts is without question and partner rootedness in community is evident and of immeasurable value. There is a high level of cohesion among program partners and potential for exciting linkages across as well as up. There are also bodies of work that could be built upon (the work with small claims courts and court user committees; the social audit reports and their recommendations). Mindful of existing resource constraints (both human as well as financial) and mindful of forthcoming elections and a new political dispensation, it is for Trócaire and partners to now think through what bodies of work they want to build on and how they want to structure their collaboration.

5. Recommendations

**Devolved Funds**

- Harness potential for linkages e.g. link up dioceses engaged in devolved funds work and link dioceses up to national organisations engaged in legislative reform around devolution; strengthen interdiocesan collaboration on the Turkana/West Pokot conflict corridor (possibility to extend it beyond meetings to common monitoring and documentation and common advocacy)
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Access to Justice

- Partners involved in activities under the access to justice objective appreciated the experience immensely. They cited the extra accompaniment from Trócaire, the joint planning, the synergies and the assistance with monitoring and evaluation as high points for them. These elements should inform the Monitoring and Evaluation framework for GHR programs going forward.

- The quality of the material produced (policy papers as well as other materials) under the access to justice objective was excellent and the policy paper on sentencing received well by other actors. These successes should inform future approaches to research and advocacy work under this program.

Conflict resolution

- Partners need to strengthen their conceptual work on durable solutions for peace among pastoralist communities in North West (NW) Kenya and feed this work into their plans and strategies. SCCRR could be utilised here, with clear links to NW based partners.

- There is potential to introduce Association of Sisterhoods of Kenya (AOSK) peace circle methodology to other partners, particularly Organic Health Response (OHR) Kibera.

Other

- Partners need creative and easy to use tools to monitor and document their daily work and experiences.

- There is scope, and appetite amongst partners, for more research and advocacy work under each of the three objectives but partners need to be motivated and also assisted. Advocacy agendas must be based on what partners feel is important and must be partner driven but Trócaire could provide more technical support, necessary exposure, linkages. Clear targets seemed to have helped the European Union (EU) project.

- Going forward, Trócaire and partners need to develop a common and meaningful monitoring and evaluation framework for the program – partners need to 'own' the objectives and the targets that they are working towards.

- Meaningful monitoring requires participation of Trócaire as well as partners. There needs to be annual plans for partner meetings and field visits.

6. Summary of Trócaire’s Management Response

Methodology

Overall we are satisfied with the process. However it would have been helpful if the process had included a stronger quantitative focus and more information and analysis that related to the programme baseline. The evaluation has largely emphasised qualitative information and analysis and there is little analysis of how the programme has influenced / changed the situation recorded at the baseline or the achievement of the programme against the programme log frame (replaced with a results framework in 2012). This is partly a flaw in the design of the evaluation and partly a flaw in the design of the programme and baseline. The programme itself is very broad (geographically and thematically) and so the baseline was also fairly broad, making it a challenge to measure against. There is work ongoing regarding the best way to conduct baselines for GHR programmes and there should be some learning from this process to contribute to this work. A more tightly focused programme would allow a more focused and in depth baseline that would in turn allow clear indicators to be set and measured.
The involvement of partners in the evaluation process was greatly appreciated by the partners themselves and they would like more opportunities to be involved in such processes. This also ensures the learning is more ‘alive’ for them and it is felt that this will result in a higher likelihood of taking this learning into their programmes, than if this had been a traditional purely ‘external’ evaluation.

**Findings and conclusions**

The report found that the programme had made ‘considerable strides’ towards achieving its overall goal. This is strengthened by strong cohesion between the work of different partners and the partners’ value their partnership with Trócaire. It was also found that we could do better in our capacity building work with partners and our role in linking partners to each other and other actors. Whilst this worked very well in the EC funded access to justice element of the programme in the other 2 components of the programme it was a bit neglected. This may in part be related to workload within Trócaire.

With regard to findings on devolved funds (see above) we largely agree with these findings. It seems the devolved fund work was most effective where partners were very focused and largely only worked on this element of the programme. Trócaire could also play a stronger role in coordination and in ensuring better links with national actors. These issues need to be looked at if work on devolved funds will continue especially as over the next few years in Kenya there will be many more organizations and programmes entering this field of work as the devolution process is rolled out and there is increasing emphasis on strengthening devolved structures.

With regard to findings on the access to justice component of the programme (see above) we agree with these findings and see the success of the access to justice component of the programme as an example of what can happen when a programme is well resourced and focused. Also the programme funder places an emphasis on improving quality and we need to ensure we roll this out across the rest of the programme in future.

With regard to findings on the conflict resolution and peace building component (see above) we agree with the above and feel that to effectively do this work we need a more focused programme. Proper analysis and mapping of conflict, the development of early warning and response mechanisms all require significant human and financial resourcing within partners and Trócaire. This would demand a more geographically focused engagement. It also may be necessary to encourage partners to emphasise this element of their work more strongly and perhaps scale back on other aspects of ‘governance and human rights/ justice’ work as a result. We also need to link this work more closely with other Trócaire programmes in Kenya such as the Arid and Semi Arid Lands Resilience Programme since the conflicts have significant humanitarian and livelihoods consequences and triggers.

**Response to recommendations**

**Recommendation** - Harness potential for linkages e.g. link up dioceses engaged in devolved funds work and link dioceses up to national organisations engaged in legislative reform around devolution; strengthen inter-diocesan collaboration on the Turkana/West Pokot conflict corridor (possibility to extend it beyond meetings to common monitoring and documentation and common advocacy).

**Response** – Strengthening of inter-diocesan collaboration on conflict will be looked at as will improved documentation and advocacy. Trócaire itself should play a stronger role in accompanying this work.

**Recommendation** - Partners need to strengthen their conceptual work on durable solutions for peace among pastoralist communities in NW Kenya and feed this work into their plans and strategies. SCCRR could be utilised here, with clear links to NW based partners.
Response – Yes, this will be done with a stronger Trócaire role and link to other programmes in Kenya.

Recommendation - Partners involved in activities under the access to justice objective appreciated the experience immensely. They cited the extra accompaniment from Trócaire, the joint planning, the synergies and the assistance with monitoring and evaluation as high points for them. These elements should inform the monitoring and evaluation (M and E) framework for GHR programs going forward.
Response – acknowledged - this will be looked at in the design of a new programme. It is expected that a more focused programme (geographically and thematically) will free up Trócaire staff to play a stronger role in M&E and coordination.

Recommendation - The quality of the material produced (policy papers as well as other materials) under the access to justice objective was excellent and the policy paper on sentencing received well by other actors. These successes should inform future approaches to research and advocacy work under this program.
Response – Agreed although it also needs to be noted that this depends a lot on the quality of the partners. Some local diocesan partners may not have the research, documentation and advocacy capacities of national partners such as LRF. We will work to strengthen these capacities and will also ensure more effective linkages between partners with different skills.

Recommendation - There is potential to introduce AOSK’s peace circle methodology to other partners, particularly OHR Kibera.
Response – Work on this has already begun through the Disaster Risk Reduction elections programme and will be carried forward into the new GHR programme.

Recommendation – Partners need creative and easy to use tools to monitor and document their daily work and experiences.
Response – This will be looked at in the new programme and is an issue being worked on across the country programmes.

Recommendation - There is scope, and appetite amongst partners, for more research and advocacy work under each of the three objectives but partners need to be motivated and also assisted. Advocacy agendas must be based on what partners feel is important and must be partner driven but Trócaire could provide more technical support, necessary exposure, linkages. Clear targets seemed to have helped the EU project.
Response – This recommendation will be taken on board and considered as we design the new programme. Again this requires focus as Trócaire does not have the capacities to keep abreast of and support advocacy and policy work across all 3 broad areas of the evaluated programme.

Recommendation - Going forward, Trócaire and partners need to develop a common and meaningful monitoring and evaluation framework for the program – partners need to ‘own’ the objectives and the targets that they are working towards.
Response – Agreed

Recommendation - Meaningful monitoring requires participation of Trócaire as well as partners. There needs to be annual plans for partner meetings and field visits.
Response – Agreed

Use made of learning from the evaluation
The evaluation will be used as one of the pieces of information in the design of the new programme and is already influencing the design of the draft results framework for 2013. However it is felt stronger recommendations on what to focus the new programme on in the context of what others are doing and the evolving national context would have made the evaluation more useful. However it is accepted that limited time in country made this part of the evaluation a challenge as other actors were not met and there was little time to fully analyse and understand the changing country context. As the new programme is designed we will undertake a deeper contextual analysis as part of the process.