



**GUIDELINES FOR MID-TERM REVIEW OF THE LOCAL
GOVERNMENT DEVELOPMENT PLANS (LGDPS) FOR THE
PERIOD 2015/16 TO 2019/20)**

National Planning Authority

April 2018

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. The Scope	1
3. Objectives of the Guidelines	3
4. Approach	3
5. Institutional Framework and Management Arrangements	4
6. Activity Timelines and Budgets	5
7. Expected Outputs	5
Annex: Structure of the DDP/MCDP MTR Report	6

National Planning Authority

Guidelines for Mid-Term Review of the Local Government Development Plans (LGDPs) (2015/16-2019/20)

1. Introduction

The Second National Development Plan (NDPII) M&E Strategy provides that the Mid-Term Review (MTR) is conducted two-and-a-half years into the Plan's implementation, i.e. between January and June 2018. In addition, the NDPII Implementation Strategy requires that all sectors, MDAs and Local Governments (LGs) produce plans that are aligned to the NDPII. Also, the Local Government Development Planning Guidelines and the District Development Plans/Municipal Council Development Plans (DDPs/MCDPs) provide for carrying out MTR to correspond with NDPII MTR.

Like the focus on the NDPII MTR, the mid-term review of the DDPs/MCDPs will assess the progress made against the intended objectives, targets and desired results towards the attainment of set goals in the Plans, after two-and-a-half year of implementation. Specifically, this will include: (i) Assessment of the extent of progress made towards achievement of the goal, objectives, priorities and sector-level service delivery targets and results of the Plan; (ii) Assessment of the extent to which the Plan has been adapted in guiding local investment decisions and actions towards the achievement of development goal, including local and national priorities; (iii) Assessment of the consistency of priorities in the DDP/MCDP and the corresponding progress; (iv) Assessment of the contribution of stakeholders, including the private sector, development partners, the civil society and other non-state actors; (v) Assessment of the extent to which the budget has been aligned to and addressed the DDP/MCDP priorities and objectives; and (vi) Make actionable, realistic, results-oriented and concrete recommendations to refocus as well as make changes in implementation, if any, that are required to achieve the DDP/MCDP targets over the remaining period and addressing emerging issues. The MTR will be useful in informing the formulation of next District/Municipal Development Plans and the NDPIII.

The mid-point for implementation of the NDPII, DDPs and MCDPs was December 2017. Each District/Municipality is therefore required to conduct MTR of its DDP/MCDP through interactive and open process involving key stakeholders. The guiding principle of the DDP/MCDP MTR will be objective self-assessment using internal and/or externally sourced technical and financial resources and process streamlined within the existing institutional framework. The DDP/MCDP MTR should be an honest and objective self-evaluation/assessment by local governments that will inform the local government leadership and other stakeholders like MDAs on the progress of implementation of the DDP/MCDP and benefit the districts/municipality by taking measures to improve implementation, going forward.

2. The Scope

The MTR will seek to assess the level of implementation, within the framework of the envisaged strategic direction, economic and social structural changes and emerging challenges and opportunities. The review will also cover progress on cross-cutting issues, including national commitments.

The proposed dimensions for the mid-term review are outlined in the sections below.

a. Results Framework

The DDP/MCDP is implemented within the provisions of the NDPII implementation strategy with a particular focus on the outputs and outcomes at the local government level. The DDP/MCDP overall objectives and priority intervention areas with the corresponding indicators and targets will constitute the results framework against which the progress of implementation will be determined. The review will therefore focus on assessment of results as well as the factors and conditions that have contributed to the attainment of results or otherwise. It will then make recommendations for changes in planning, coordination of implementation, monitoring and evaluation in line with the NDPII.

b. Institutional Framework

The mid-term review will determine the effectiveness of the institutional framework for implementing the Plan. This will involve appraisal of the current implementation framework. The assessment will particularly look at the following:

- (i) Assessing functionality of Development Committees and Project Management Committees at different LLG and Higher levels
- (ii) Strengths and weaknesses of institutional structures for implementation and management;
- (iii) The effect of DDP/MCDP on enhancing relationship between the LG and the Central Government, Civil Society, Private Sector and Communities, including effectiveness and efficiency of the communication strategies
- (iv) The extent of integration of civil society, private sector and local development actions in the implementation of the DDP/MCDP.
- (v) The relevance, ownership and leadership of the Plan amongst key stakeholders (DEC/MEC, Council and Civil Society);

c. Local Economic Development (LED)

The key issues that the mid-term review will seek to determine under local economic management include:

- (i) To what extent is the Local Economic Development strategy incorporated in the Plan?
- (ii) To what extent have the LED priorities been effectively budgeted for and financed?
- (iii) How has DDP implementation contributed to improvements in productivity, Private Sector Development and Competitiveness; and
- (iv) To what extent has the LED been adopted as a mechanism for wealth and job creation?

d. Financing Strategy

The key issues the mid-term review will seek to determine under financing strategy for the LGDP include:

- (i) To what extent has the DDP/MCDP financing strategy been successful and what could be done to increase the local revenue?

- (ii) To what extent have sector/departmental resource allocations and priority investments changed to reflect DDP/MCDP priorities?
- (iii) What have been the trends in the overall balance of administration and service delivery costs in the implementation of the DDP/MCDP?
- (iv) To what extent and how have additional private sector funds been harnessed to finance DDP/MCDP priorities?

e. Development Partnership

The support from development partners, both through budget and project support continues to be important for service delivery. The DDP/MCDP mid-term review will seek to determine:

- (i) The extent to which Development Partners support has been aligned to the Plan;
- (ii) The extent to which the DDP/MCDP has provided a basis for mutually agreed prioritization and accountability; and
- (iii) The extent to which the DDP/MCDP has increased donor focus to local priorities and development.

3. Objectives of the Guidelines

To facilitate orderly MTR and ensure uniformity across LGs, NPA has developed guidelines to:

- (i) Enable a standardised approach to the review of the District Development Plans (DDPs) and Municipal Council Development Plan (MCDPs) and provide harmony on the scope, dimensions and objectives of the DDP/MCDP MTR.
- (ii) Streamline the institutional framework and management arrangements for the MTR.
- (iii) Guide LGs (Districts and Municipalities) to undertake objective self-assessment of their Plans

4. Approach

In order to ensure that the process used for the MTR is reliable, data collection, triangulation and analysis techniques will be employed. The process will ensure quantifiable and representative data and information, including broad outreach to key stakeholders, allowing for cross-validation of the findings to ensure ownership.

In particular, the review will require:

a) Review of existing LG and study/monitoring reports

The various LG reports to review will include but not limited to; (i) the annual progress reports on the implementation of the DDP/MCDP; (ii) standing committees reports on performance of sectors/departments to council; (iii) programme/project monitoring reports; (iv) joint monitoring reports; (v) annual budget performance and physical progress reports, (vi) service delivery point/facility-based activity reports and (vii) LG

Certificate of Compliance (COC) Reports published by the National Planning Authority.

b) Reports of structured workshops held at district/municipal level

In addition to the review of LG study/monitoring reports, information will be obtained from structured workshop/meeting reports regarding sector/departmental/district planning and budgeting, including annual budget conference reports.

c) Theme specific studies

Review of specific service delivery study reports produced/published by CSOs or District NGO Forum. However, this should be restricted to reports that have been shared and/or discussed with key stakeholders, including the relevant standing committees and the Councils.

d) Face to face interviews/structured discussion with key informants

One-on-one and/or joint discussions with key stakeholders, including political and technical leadership of the LG and representatives of NGOs, Private Sector and Faith Based Organizations, opinion leaders will be required to obtain feedback on the progress of implementation of the DDP/ MCDP/ and challenges, lessons learnt and suggestions for improvement going forward.

e) Focus Group Discussions with sampled communities- for feedback

From sampled communities, e.g. Parish Development Committees (PDCs), Community Health Workers/Village Health Teams (CHEWs/VHTs), Women and Youth Groups and Persons with Disability (PWDs) and using guided questions the MTR will obtain feedback information on recent developments (improvement or otherwise) regarding service delivery in the district/municipality to enrich the process.

f) Field project site visits

Field visits to project sites by members of the MTR Technical Working Committee will be necessary to assess status of completed and on-going projects in the sub-counties/parishes. The team members may interact with the facility users and service providers to document changes brought about by the project including challenges, and suggestions for improvements to gauge the level of functionality and benefits.

5. Institutional Framework and Management Arrangements

The process of undertaking the MTR will be streamlined within the existing LG institutional frameworks (benefiting from both political, administrative and technical structures, system,

procedures and processes). However, for uniformity in the leadership and coordination, the following management arrangements will apply

The District Chairperson or the Mayor in the case of a Municipality will oversee the MTR process. The Chief Administrative Officer/Town Clerk (CAO/TC) will coordinate the process supported by the District/Municipal Planner.

A Mid-Term Review Technical Committee (MTRTWC) will be constituted and chaired by the Chief Administrative Officer or the Town Clerk in the case of a Municipality. The MTRTWC will comprise selected members of the District/Municipal Technical Planning Committee (D/MTPC), selected Lower Local Government (LLG) Chiefs (for Sub-county and Division), representatives of civil society organizations, private sector and local development partners. The MTRTWC will make own Terms of Reference in line with these guidelines.

The MTRTWC will design detailed assessment tools that mirror the scope and dimensions in these guidelines for capturing data/information.

The CAO/TC will periodically update the DEC/ MEC on the process and progress of the MTR and report to the relevant committee of the Council for adoption and approval of the Council

NPA will be available to provide technical guidance and clarifications during the MTR process.

6. Timelines and Financing of the MTR

The activity is expected to be completed by end of December 2018, with each district and municipal council developing specific mid-term review work-plans and budgets with clear milestones based on activities and expected outputs. Each LG (district and municipal council) is expected to find own resources and/or seek financial support from Development Partners (DPs) for the MTR of its Plan. Or work closely with DPs working in LGs to support the MTR process.

The newly created LGs which became operational effective July 2016 and July 2017 will have to delay their mid-term reviews until when the implementation will be mid-point of the life period of their Plans.

7. Expected Outputs

The mid-term review will require all districts and municipal councils to produce Mid-Term Review Reports based on the sections 1, 2 and 3 of these guidelines guided by sections 4, 5 and 6 and in line with the Terms of Reference of the MTRTWC.

The approved MTR Report will be shared with the NPA, MOLG, MFPED, OPM and other MDAs to inform the NDPIII formulation process. At the Local Government level, the MTR will, among others, be useful in informing the formulation of next District/ Municipal Development Plans.

Annex: Structure of the DDP/MCDP MTR Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD	
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	
ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	
LIST OF TABLES	
1. INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Background.....	
1.2 Objectives of the Review.....	
1.3 Specific Objectives	
1.4 Highlights/Thrust of the DDP (2015/16 – 2019/20)	
1.4.1 The Development Focus	
1.4.2 Adaptation of NDPII Objectives	
1.4.4 Priorities for 2015/16 – 2019/20	
1.4.5 Key National Projects.....	
1.5 Methodology	
1.5.1 Overview of methodology.....	
1.5.2 Data Collection and Analysis.....	
1.5.2.1 Review of Documents	
1.5.2.2 Field Sampling and Monitoring Reports.....	
1.5.2.3Interviews and Meetings.....	
2. RESULTS FRAMEWORK	
2.2 Assessment of adapted NDPII Objectives	
2.2.1 Sustainably increase production, productivity and value addition in key growth opportunities	
2.2.2 Increase the stock and quality of strategic infrastructure to accelerate the country’s competitiveness.....	
2.2.3 Enhancing Human Capital Development.....	
2.2.4 Strengthen mechanisms for quality, effective and efficient service delivery	
2.3 LG Specific Objectives	
2.4 Priority Areas	
2.5 Analysis of the DDP/MCDP Financing	
2.6 Recommendations for Improving Implementation over the Remaining Period.....	
(FY 2017/18 – 2019/20)	

3. INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK	
3.1 Functions and Management Architecture for the DDP	
3.1.1 Strengths and Constraints of Institutional Structures for Implementation and Management	
3.1.2 Oversight for the DDP/MCDP	
3.1.3 Political Leadership	
3.1.4 Ownership of the DDP/MCDP by the DEC/MEC	
3.2 Communications Strategy	
3.3 Key LG Messages	
3.4 Communication Tactics	
3.5 Media Relations (An Indirect Communication)	
3.5.1 Community Relations	
3.5.2 Private Sector Relations	
3.5.3 Civil Society Relations	
3.5.2 Government Relations	
3.6 Organization (Corporate) Communication	
3.6.1 Internal Communication	
3.7 Implementation of Communication Plan	
3.8 Alignment and Coherent Mechanisms for Implementation	
3.9 Effect of Change from OOB to PBB	
3.10 Monitoring and Evaluation	
3.11 Recommendations for improving institutional linkages and synergies	
4. LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	
4.1 Extent to which LED Strategy is Incorporated in the DDP/MCDP	
4.2 How DDP/MCDP Implementation has so far contributed to improvements in Productivity, Private Sector Development and Competitiveness	
4.3 Improving the Next Version of the DDP/MCDP from a LED Perspective	
5. DDP/MCDP FINANCING STRATEGY	
5.1 The extent of how the DDP/MCDP financing strategy been successful in financing the DDP/MCDP	
5.2 The Extent of How Additional Private Sector Funds Have Been Harnessed to Finance DDP/MCDP Priorities	
5.3 The extent of changes in sector/departmental resource allocations reflecting priority investments	
5.4 Recommendations for improving financing of the DDP/MCDP including Local Revenue contribution	
6. DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP	

6.1 Trends in Recent Development Partnership	
6.2 Development Partner Alignment to the DDP	
7. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES	
7.1 How Well the Cross-Cutting Issues Have Been Referred to in the Context Sections of the DDP/MCDP	
7.2 The Best Way of Strengthening the Inclusion of Cross-Cutting Issues in the Next DDP/MCDP	
7.3 The Extent to Which Cross-Cutting Issues Have Been Referred to in the Context Sections of the DDP/MCDP	
7.4 The Extent to Which the DDP/MCDP Implementation Priorities Address Cross-Cutting Issues.....	
7.5 How Far Funding and Implementation Commitments Have Been Honoured for the Cross-Cutting Issues	
7.6 Formulation and Tracking of the Most Appropriate Monitoring Indicators for Cross-Cutting Issues.....	
7.7 Recommendations for the Best Way of Strengthening the Mainstreaming of Cross-Cutting Issues in the DDP.....	
8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
9. REFERENCES	
10. ANNEXES.....	
Annex 1: Attendance for Entry and Exit Meetings	
Annex 2: Senior Officers’ Questionnaire.....	
Annex 3: People Interviewed.....	
Annex 4: Results Framework (List of Key Indicators, Targets and Achievements)	
Annex 5: Summary of CSOs Supporting LG District Development Process (Indicating Programmes, Activities and Their Location).....	