

Effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation of CDF projects in Kenya. A case of Ainamoi Constituency

Ochieng, F. Owuor¹, Prof. Paul Chepkuto², Dr. Ruth Tubey² & L. Y. Kuto³

¹⁻³ Moi University

School of Human Resource Development

P.O. Box 3900 – 30100 Eldoret, Kenya

Email: fredrickochiengo@yahoo.com

Abstract

Constituency Development Fund (CDF) came into existence in Kenya after the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) came to power with the enactment of CDF Act in 2003 but amended in 2007. The CDF forms one of the devolved funds channeled by central government. The CDF is aimed at spurring development in the constituencies. Over the last ten years (2003 – 2012), various development have been achieved although there is continuous outcry from stakeholders on the management of the projects funded by CDF and this is blamed on ineffective monitoring and evaluation framework conducted by Constituency Development Fund Committee (CDFC). This paper looks at the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation process on CDF projects in Ainamoi constituency, Kenya. A case study research design methodology is used where the target population comprises of CDFC members, selected constituents, Project Management Committee (PMC), and District Development Officer (DDO). The results of the study show that PMC, CDFC and external assessors are involved in monitoring and evaluation of projects with minimal participation of constituents. It was also evident that most of the recommendations from M and E were utilised with the responsibility of utilisation of M and E result being under the CDF office. The study recommends that frequent and holistic involvement of all stakeholders affected by projects funded by CDF need to be involved and ensure that the recommendations made from M and E report need to be utilised to the fullest.

Key Words: *Monitoring and Evaluation, Constituency Development Fund and Projects*

Introduction

The success of project is critical to achieving development agenda in the local communities across the world. It is also understood that monitoring and evaluation of projects is fundamental if the project objectives and success is to be achieved. Monitoring and evaluation of project improves overall efficiency of project planning, management and implementation. Various projects could be initiated to transform social, political and economic well being of citizens in a particular country. UNDP (2002) reports that there has been growing demand for development effectiveness to improve people's lives. This calls for effective utilisation of monitoring and evaluation results for continuous improvement and quality of performance in organisation. This hinges with the new idea coined by UNDP as Results Based Management. The effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation process has seen significant impact in education, social and political reforms in developed countries as compared to countries in Sub Saharan Africa. The only country in Sub Saharan Africa that has made significant impact changes is South Africa (Jansen and Taylor, 2003). This is justified with the fact after the period of apartheid rule; the government under Nelson Mandela has achieved notable successes.

To address various economic injustices and low development levels in Kenya since independence, the government in Kenya has initiated various reforms aimed at transforming the country to a middle-income country by 2030. The various programmes are the enacted of Constituency Development Fund (CDF), Local Authority Transfer Funds (LATF), Secondary Bursary Fund (SBF), Economic Stimulus Programme (ESP), Youth Enterprise Fund (YEF), Women Enterprise Fund (WEF), HIV and AIDS Fund,

The Constituency Development Fund (CDF) in Kenya was established through CDF Act (2003) and Amended in 2007. The CDF is one of the devolved funds meant to achieve rapid socio-economic development at constituency level through financing of locally prioritized projects and enhanced community participation. Other devolved funds in Kenya are; Road Maintenance Fuel Levy Fund (RMLF), Local Authority Transfer Fund (LATF), HIV/AIDS Fund, Rural Electrification Fund (REF), Free Primary Education (FPE), Tuition Free Secondary Education (TFSE), Secondary Schools Bursary Fund (SSBF), Economic Stimulus Programme (ESP) among others. Studies conducted across the country 210 constituency by the CDF Board (2008) and National Anti Corruption Steering Committee (NACS) (2008) indicated that since its inception in 2003, CDF has facilitated the implementation of a number of local level development projects aimed at poverty reduction and socio – economic development of people.

Mungai (2009) asserts that CDF's origin can be traced back to the CDF Bill drafted by opposition MPs in a bid to have equitable distribution of resources across the country. The CDF bill was passed into law in 2003 following the coming into power of a new government (Gikonyo, 2008). CDF resources are generated from tax collected from Value Added Tax (VAT), Income tax paid by salaried employees, duty paid on manufactured and imported goods and fees charged on licenses. Therefore, each and every Kenyan contributes towards CDF (Gikonyo, 2008). At the national level, the CDF Act Amended in 2007 Section 4(2a) mandates that at least 2.5% of the government's annual ordinary revenue be channelled to the Constituencies for purposes of development. Section 19 (1) of the CDF Act stipulates the allocation criteria for the above 2.5% to the constituencies; 75% is allocated equally among all 210 constituencies and the remaining 25% is allocated based on the national poverty index multiplied by the constituency poverty index. At the Constituency level, a maximum of 3% of each constituency's annual allocation may be used for administration, 15% for an education bursary scheme, 2% for sports activities and 2% for environmental activities. Although CDF does not cover recurrent costs it allows 3% of the constituency's annual allocation to be used for recurrent expenses of vehicles, equipment & machinery since they constitute development projects under the CDF Act. 2% may be allocated for Monitoring & Evaluation of ongoing projects and capacity building activities while 5% is kept aside as an emergency reserve to be made available for emergencies that may occur in the Constituency.

However, studies conducted on the effectiveness of CDF have shown that various forms of corruption were found to be reducing its efficiency and effectiveness. The avenues of corruption include manipulation of the process by the MP (for example in CDF committee selection and exclusion of majority); gender bias; tribalism and nepotism in the award of tenders; lack of transparency in allocation and use of disbursed funds; funding of non-priority projects; lack of serious monitoring and evaluation, bribery to secure contracts, location of CDF office at the MP's home or rented from MP's premises at exorbitant and unrealistic monthly rates, etc. The CDF Project cycle consists of several stages: Identification, planning, implementation and monitoring. It's worth noting that equal representation irrespective of political, gender, tribal, racial affiliations among others is vital for successful implementation of CDF projects.

Literature review

In 2005, the Ministry of Planning and National Development commissioned work on the design of an appropriate framework for Monitoring and Evaluation (M and E) in the National Development Programme. This was a collective effort by the government, Private Sector and Civil Societies, Republic of Kenya implementation of M and E (2005). This proposed M & E framework has not been fully operational. Otherwise, there is a strong case that CDF should come up with participatory M and E component in its management. This view is supported by Wanjiru (2008) who indicated in her Social Audit of CDF that monitoring and reporting should be strengthened and deepened in all CDF projects. It is a fact that CDF Act, 2003 emphasizes on the Monitoring and Evaluation just like DFRD did. The mode of doing it is not well specified. The Act gives technical department, DDO and CDFC authority to monitor the project. The Act further allocates 2% of CDFC fund to be used for monitoring and evaluation exercise but this money is only spent after the CDFC recommendation through minutes CDF Act, (2003 revised 2007).

This makes M & E to be somehow difficult and sometimes cosmetic as it is the CDFC to decide which project to be monitored, which one to be evaluated, how much funds to remove and who to do the exercise. The Act gives room for CDFC to determine themselves instead of getting a different body to manage M & E within the CDFC projects. It also allows the unfaithful CDFC not to institute monitoring and evaluation to some projects they either have interest in or have interest of hiding something. Mulwa (2007) stated clearly that any judgment that emanates from evaluation would largely depend on the value system from which evaluating party originates. Conventionally, evaluating party is usually part of evaluation missions contracted and dispatched from the donor world. In the case of CDF Act (2003) revised (2007) the CDF identifies projects, implement, then monitors and evaluate or call technical person at their own peril. This can be a weakness that needs to be addressed. CDRA, (2001) reported that “Not everything that counts can be counted and not everything that can be counted counts”. He insisted that for monitoring and evaluation to be undertaken, indicators have to be put in place i.e. Which the outcome of a project can be understood and measured, gauged or standardized, against which change is measured. Feversten (1986) even went further and came up with nine types of indicators cited as follows: indicators of availability, indicator of relevance, indicators of accessibility, indicators of utilization, indicators of coverage, indicator of quality, indicator of effort, indicator of efficiency and indicator of impact. These indicators can be very instrumental in managing monitoring and evaluation of CDF projects, indicators of quality, utilization, availability and even effort are very important in assessing project development. Other indicators stated by Feverstein (1986) are equally important since they can assist detect related shortcomings. Odhiambo (2007) while referring to Feverstein, (1986) explained that locally managed and controlled funds have great potential to bring about positive development outcome at the local level especially if community participation is sufficiently enhanced and political interference reduced.

It is true that there is no proper system put in place to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the use of these funds this is so because the appointing authority is not restricted to nominating people with such knowledge. Grossman (2005) on his part argued that a program’s effectiveness can be measured accurately only if one knows what would have happened without it. Ochieng (2007) concurred with the assertion and states that measuring the effectiveness or impact of a policy or program hinges on asking the fundamental questions. What would the solution have been if the intervention had not taken place? Although one obviously cannot observe such a situation it is possible to approximate it by constructing an appropriate counterfactual which is hypothetical situation that tries to depict the welfare level, of individuals in the absence of a policy or program.

To measure the effectiveness, a Core Welfare Indicator Questionnaire which focuses on the three simple leading indicators of access, usage and satisfaction with different services provided. For instance in the education sector, access indicators include primary and secondary schools enrolment rates and satisfactory indicators are based on opinion questions to indicate household, ratings of the quality of services during the current year compared with the previous year (World Bank, 1997). This research tends to find out whether CDF is using or can adopt CWIQ standard.

Ajayi (2006) supported World Bank that CWIQ is an effective and quicker way of measuring the effectiveness of funds or programs since it answers questions on availability, accessibility and satisfaction of service provided by the program. CDF can equally achieve if this policy are well utilized noting that M AND E funds are available, only CDF Act to be amended to allow for the CWIQ survey technology that remove the problems of un timeliness of date, poor data quality and lack of statistics at the lowest administrative level as an effective tool for program in M and E.

FAO (2009) reports that while no conflict exists between performance and results indicators; and while effective monitoring and evaluation (M and E) systems necessarily track both – no unifying principles apply to ensure their synchronicity either. A project that is diligently monitored and evaluated for financial oversight and compliance with sound management and performance principles may very well achieve no impacts. The emphasis on aid effectiveness and results-based development obliges practitioners to empirically demonstrate the impacts of their projects and programs. This has shifted the focus of M and E from a concentration on inputs and outputs to a concentration on outcomes and impacts.

The ability to measure and demonstrate outcomes and impacts relies on the use of indicators that are based on reliable data, and on the capacity to systematically collect and analyze that information. The conditions in which M and E are carried out vary widely, depending on the demand for information, the extent to which it is used to inform decision making, and the reliability of the systems that are in place to capture and convey that information. Throughout much of the developing world these conditions are “less-than-ideal.” Information is irregular and often lacking altogether. In these conditions there is a lack of effective demand for information on the part of policy makers. The conditions are often especially pronounced in rural areas, where the costs of data collection are very high, and that quality of existing data is particularly low. Supporting and building capacity for M and E in these conditions is therefore a pressing imperative for interventions in the agriculture and rural development sector. Strengthening capacity for M and E begins at the national and sub-national levels, where addressing the weaknesses of national statistical systems is a common priority.

Statement of the problem

The study as informed with low participation of citizens in project cycles. Since monitoring and evaluation process is significant in ensuring the objectives and goals of the projects are achieved, the study sought to determine its effectiveness in Ainamoi Constituency, Kericho County Kenya. This is based on the assumption that inadequate studies have been conducted in the areas since the introduction of CDF back in the year 2003.

Purpose of the study

The main purpose of the study was to investigate the effectiveness of monitoring and evaluation process of projects funded by Constituency Development Fund in Ainamoi Constituency, Kenya. The paper tries to assess the following;

- (i) To determine the impact of projects managed by project management committee,
- (ii) The extent of involvement of stakeholders in the process of monitoring and evaluation
- (iii) To investigate the utilisation of monitoring and evaluation results on CDF projects

Methodology

The study utilised a case study design technique in trying to understand the procedures, impact and utilisation of monitoring and evaluation in Ainamoi constituency. The design involved a mixed method design as described by Creswell (2003) through use of qualitative and quantitative data in a single study. Sources of information for the study were questionnaires, documents and interviews. The collection of data was done simultaneously thus promoting triangulation. The participants for the study included CDFC members, PMCs, DDO, selected citizens and the area MP. The participants for the study totaled to 130. Before administration of research instruments, their internal consistency was determined through pilot studies and validation by research experts. Quantitative data collected was analysed with the aid of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 16.0 for window) while qualitative data collected from the field was analysed using content analysis. The results of the data analysis process are presented using tables and narrative forms.

Results

The study involved participation of Ainamoi CDFCs members, PMCs; local area MP selected members of the public from two divisions within Ainamoi and District Education Office. Gender equality was observed where male and female respondents were given equal chances of participating in the study. The respondents acknowledged that a lot of development has been experienced as a result of the introduction of CDF projects. New schools have been built; existing schools have been refurbished while old ones have been upgraded, health facilities have improved while new ones which acts as centres for excellence have come up, road infrastructure have improved, new tea buying centres have been constructed, HIV and AIDS awareness have increased, Youth and Women situation have been uplifted, security systems and infrastructure have improved and poverty level have reduced over the last ten years. However respondents lamented that since only 2.5% of the national budget is channeled to 210 constituencies across the country, the amount disbursed was too small as compared to needs and priorities of the constituents.

The study established that projects initiated by CDF fund are managed by CDFC committee appointed by the area MP while the PMCs are appointed by CDFC committee from locational level and are tasked with the process of project identification, selection, management, monitoring and evaluation. The study noted that since those elected to CDFC and PMCs were friends of the area MP, some citizens felt that they were not represented since they did not vote for the MP during the previous election. This made them to feel disillusioned with the development in their constituency.

At first, the study wanted to get information on how projects initiated by CDF were manned by checking the stability of projects they managed. The knowledge of this was seen important to the study as it assist the study to know the viability of the projects CDF sponsor. PMCs respondent gave their opinion as on the Table 1.

Table 1 Stability of projects managed by PMCs

How often PMC asses stability \ impact of the projects they manage	Frequency	Percentage
Not frequent	8	6.15%
Very frequent	63	49.23%
Frequent	58	44.62%
Total	129	100.00%

From the table and graph above, it can be said that PMC members own the project they manage as they asses their stability very frequently. This was indicated by 49.23% while 44.62% said they asses their projects stability frequently. The key word here is frequent it can be said that 93.85% of the PMCs respondent indicated that they frequently asses the stability of the projects they manage, only 8% said they do not assess the impact of the project they manage frequently.

All of the PMCs respondents were aware of the need to asses the impact of the projects. The CDFC executive on their side indicated the role of PMC in continuous assessing the impacts of their projects they manage because they are the owners. The DDO and The MP said that role of continuous assessing stability and impact of the project is all inclusive but community play okay role in any project located within its surrounding and since PMCs are their representatives, most cases they are entrusted with that role of communicating over the impact.

Stakeholder involvement in M and E

Involvement of stakeholders directly and indirectly affected by project is critical to its success. The study was interested in knowing whether external teams do at time come for monitoring and evaluation of CDF project as mandated by revised CDF Act 2007. This question was found necessary for the study because CDF management is usually do by only members of that constituency, therefore in case their is no outsiders involvement bad intention might go un noticed. While responding to that question, 96.12% of the respondents said yes, external teams do come for monitoring and evaluation, only 3.88% of the PMCs respondents said No. external teams do not come for monitoring and evaluation. Table 2 shows the response pattern.

Table 2: Whether external team come to M and E

Involvement of external assessors	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	124	96.12%
No	5	3.88%
Total	129	100.00%

It emerged clearly from the data that external team particularly from the CDF board monitors CDF project. Out of 129 respondents 124 indicated that CDF projects are monitored by external teams only 5 of the respondent from the same category said external teams are never welcomed to monitor and evaluate CDF project. CDFC executive indicated that monitoring and evaluating CDF project is an obvious thing as it is in the Act .DDO when asked the same question explained that experts from the District line ministries have to frequent visit the project even DDOs office, District Auditors office and that of District Accountant are supposed to be involved frequently if good management is to be observed. It was learnt from the officer that apart from the CDFC and district team mentioned, even Audit Unit from Province and National Management Board also visit the project. The area MP however explained that external team were always

selective in visiting projects as some projects are frequently visited because they are either unique or had problem in management.

Frequency of Monitoring and Evaluation

The respondents were asked to tell the team frequently involved in monitoring and evaluation their projects. This question was found necessary to the study because from the respondents answer on could be able to tell the nature of monitoring and evaluation the CDF project are subjected to. The results from the PMCs respondent are as shown on the Table 3.

Table 3: Team involved and preferred for M and E of CDF project

	Frequency	Percentage
CDF Office	31	24.04%
MP and his office	4	3.10%
Technical team from the government	8	6.20%
Both CDF office and technical team	86	66.66%
Total	129	100.00%

Results from Table 3 it can be suggested that monitoring, evaluation is done in Ainamoi Constituency through CDFC and Technical team (appointed by national CDF board) work together, and are the ones even preferred by the PMC. It came out that 66.66% of the respondents noted the proper involvement of the CDFC Office and technical team. However, CDFC office alone was equally seen to be instrumental in M and E, only 24.03% of the PMC stated their preferences and involvement of CDFC alone without technical team. The study also revealed that PMC do not prefer MP and his team involvement in M and E this was realized when only 3.10% of the respondents preferred they involved. Otherwise technical team from the government alone was equally not very much preferred as only 6.2% of the respondents stated their preferences.

This explains that PMC prefer the combination of CDFC Office as the local funders of CDF projects and technical team as the adviser. On an interview with the DDO, the officer stressed on the importance of M and E and mostly involvement of technical team as the only way CDF projects can be to made standard, she expressed concerned that most of the CDFC members may not have relevant knowledge to advice PMC adequately. The MP of the area when asked the same question, expressed belief in M and E as the only way to check and balance the PMC and proper evaluation of Projects in achieving the intended objective.

However discussions with selected citizens highlighted the issue that most of them were not able to monitor the implementation of funds and development projects in their areas. This is in contrast to CDFC and PMCs opinion that citizens were involved. This indicates that there lacks a simple monitoring and evaluation framework that include a component of citizen participation, which would be useful in enhancing M and E objectives have been attained. The results coincides with NACSC (2008) results that observed that the reason for poor participation by citizens was a general low level of awareness by community members on the fund, their lack of interest in implementation of development projects and M and E being perceived as expensive and time consuming. Kimenyi (2005) also observed that lack of citizens' participation in M and E was attributed to poor community organization where community structures have not been deliberately organized to facilitate this. Leadership is a necessary aspect in the organization of the communities in order to bring about the required participation in all the processes including M and E. The issue of citizen participation therefore has two sides where the duty bearers meant to facilitate it do not have in place systems for it and the right holders are also not organized in a way to meet the responsibility that comes with this right.

Utilisation of M and E results

Further, the study sought to reveal what PMC do with M and E reports they get from relevant departments. This information was viewed relevant because by knowing that, the level of monitoring and evaluation impact was going to be ascertained. To achieve this, respondents' answers from PMC respondents as indicated in Table 4.

Table 4: Utilisation of M and E results

Utilisation	Frequency	Percentage
Implement the recommendation	107	82.95%
Inform the MP	2	1.55%
No Report usually given	2	1.55%
Use it to ask for more funds	18	13.95%
Total	129	100.00%

From the above table, it shows clear that CDF projects are monitored and evaluated and even results forwarded to the project management committees. This can be well highlighted by the results got after the study. It became very clear that that 82.95% of the total PMC respondents, categorically indicated that the report when forwarded to them after are always very useful to them in implementing the recommendations their in 1.55% stated that no report is usually submitted to them after monitoring and evaluation process and another 1.55% said that the report once gotten they report its content to MP. However 13.95% of the respondents clearly stated that the report once gotten they used it to ask for more funding from the CDFC.

CDFC on their side said that the report they relay for PMC is meant to advice them for the purpose of improvement or set a stage for auditing to be done for the purpose of verifying the usage of funds. DDO equally noted that M & E report is usually a very important document for the PMC that if well used can assist in improving their status. The District Development Officer explained the need for follow up in such exercise for further funding determination. However the MP indicated that report from M and E is usually the minor for the PMCs if well followed by them, then a lot mismanagement people talk about can be a gone case. CDFC need to make constant follow up so that they can be able to determine further funding.

Conclusions and recommendations

The introduction of CDF has seen developmental activities increased in Ainamoi Constituency over the last ten years. The findings of the study have shown that there is need for the CDF board and CDF committee at the constituency level to adhere to M and E process in order to ensure adherence to quality and standards and avoid replication. This is despite PMCs acknowledging that the projects they manage were stable, researchers observation noted that some projects had stalled while others have not made significant impact because of ineffective M and E procedures used. Even though the CDF Act provides for public participation in the project identification and implementation, other legislation such as the Official Secret Act is a hindrance to active community participation in monitoring and evaluation of projects. Furthermore the CDF Act does not expressly put a requirement on the part of CDFCs and PMC to share information openly. This has been observed where citizens are not allowed to participate in the process of monitoring and evaluation and this could have significant effect on the achievement of project objectives. The M and E team should be composed of all stakeholders directly and indirectly affected by the project. The monitoring and evaluation activity should not be left to external team and CDFC alone but rather inclusion of citizens affected by the project is necessary.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge support received from local area MP, Ainamoi CDF committee (CDFC), Project Management committee members (PMCs) local citizens and District Development Officer (DDO) in ensuring the successful completion of this study.

References

- Ajayi, O. O (2006). Experiences in the Application of the Core Welfare Indicator Questionnaire (CWIQ) Survey Technology in Africa: The Journey so Far. *The African Statistical Journal*, Vol. 3 Nov 2006.
- Gikonyo, W. (2008) *The CDF Social Audit Guide: A Handbook for Communities*. Nairobi: Open Society Initiative for East Africa.
- Government of Kenya (2003) Constituencies Development Fund Act 2003. Retrieved 9th August 2012 from http://www.cdf.go.ke/images/docs/revised%20cdf%20act%20_annotatedversion.pdf.
- Jaylor, J & Taylor, N. (2003). Educational Change in South Africa 1994 – 2003: Case Studies in Large – Scale Education Reform. Country Studies. *Education, Reform and Management Publication Series*, Vol II No. 1.
- Kibua, N.T. (2006). *An Assessment of the Management and Utility of the Constituency Development Fund in Kenya*. Nairobi: Institute of Policy Analysis and Research.
- Mulwa F. W (2007) *Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Projects*. Community Based Project Monitoring, Qualitative Impact Assessment and People Friendly Evaluation Methods.
- Mungai, M. (2009). *Civil Society Organisations' Role in Enhancing Accountability and Community's Participation in the Management of Public Funds: The Case of the Constituency Development Fund in Kenya*. Research Paper. International Institute for Social Studies.
- Nyamori, O.R. (2009). 'Making Development Accountable: A critical analysis of the systems of accounting and accountability for the Constituency Development Fund in Kenya', *Journal of Accounting and Organisational Change* 5(2): 197 - 227.
- Odhiambo, PSO, (2007). Impact of Kenya Education Staff Institute Training on Secondary School Management in Kenya (Case Study of Siaya District). A Research Proposal for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Evaluation of Educational Programmes. Department of Education Comm.-Tech and Curriculum Studies, Maseno University.
- Oyugi, N.L. (2006) *Equity in Resource Allocation: The Need for Alternative Constituency Development Fund Allocation Criteria* (Vol. 76). Nairobi: Institute for Policy Analysis and Research.
- UNDP (2002). Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for Results. New York: UNDP.