

**AN ASSESSMENT OF THE AFRICA ENTERPRISE CHALLENGE FUND (AECF)  
MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM**

**BY**

**EMELDA MUHONJA LUMULA**

**REG NO: Q51/80725/2015**

**A RESEARCH PROJECT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS  
IN MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT  
PROGRAMMES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI**

**2019**

**DECLARATION**

This project is my original work and has never been presented for a degree in this or any other university.

**Emelda Muhonja Lumula**

**Q51/80725/2015**

Signature ..... Date.....

This project has been submitted for examination with approval of university supervisors:

**Dr. Anne Khasakhala**

Signature ..... Date .....

**Dr. Andrew Mutuku**

Signature ..... Date .....

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this work to my lovely mother Jones Tendwa Lumula, my sister Adelaide Alaka Lumula and my brother Patrick Ambosho Lumula for their unending inspiration and support during my entire study period.

Secondly, I dedicate this project to The African Enterprise Challenge Fund for the organizations moral support and willingness to offer the needed information throughout my study period. It is my sincere hope that this project findings will strengthen the institutions M&E systems.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

To my Project Supervisors Dr. Anne Khasakhala and Dr. .Andrew Mutuku, for your valued guidance, a special thank you. Their wealth of knowledge of the subject matter has really shaped my research project to what it is now. To the management of the University of Nairobi, thank you for providing the opportunity to learn and expound my knowledge.

I would like to acknowledge the management and staff at The AECF for the moral support and provision of information needed throughout this study.

I am forever grateful to my mother, Jones Tendwa Lumula for her daily prayers and immense support, my sister Adelaide Alaka Lumula, my brother Patrick Amboso Lumula and my friend Brian Otinda for their unwavering support. It is with your spirit that I go forward every day and try to spread the joy that I have in my life, not to change the world but to change somebody's world.

I also want to thank my sisters, brothers, friends, colleagues and the entire population Studies and Research Institute for the valuable counsel and guidance that contributed to the success of this project. Finally, I thank God for the gift of life and blessings to successfully carry out this study with minimal challenges.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>DECLARATION</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>DEDICATION</b> .....	<b>ii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>vii</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	<b>viii</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE</b> .....	<b>1</b>
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.1.1.The African Enterprise Challenge Fund.....	2
1.1.2. AECF’s Monitoring and Evaluation system.....	3
1.2 Problem Statement.....	5
1.3 Research Questions.....	6
1.4 Objectives of the Study.....	7
1.5 Justification of the Study.....	7
1.6 Scope and Limitations of the Study.....	7
<b>CHAPTER TWO</b> .....	<b>9</b>
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	9
2.1 Introduction.....	9
2.2 Theoretical Framework.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
2.2.1. Pattern Matching.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
2.3 The Evolution of Conceptualization of Monitoring and Evaluation systems.....	9
2.4 Monitoring and Evaluation Systems Components.....	11
2.4.1.Outer ring: People, Partnerships and Planning.....	11
2.4.2. Middle Ring: Data collection, capturing and verification.....	17
2.4.3. Centre: Data use for decision making.....	19
2.5 The importance for a Monitoring and Evaluation System.....	20
2.6 Empirical Evidence of Assessments of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems.....	21
2.7 The Conceptual Framework.....	23
2.8 Operational Framework.....	24
<b>CHAPTER THREE</b> .....	<b>28</b>
METHODOLOGY.....	28
3.1 Introduction.....	28

<b>3.2 Research Design</b> .....	28
3.3 Target Population.....	28
3.4 Sampling and sampling procedure.....	29
3.5 Data Collection method and Tools .....	29
3.5.1 Interviews .....	29
3.5.2 Document Review .....	30
<b>3.6 Description of Variables</b> .....	31
<b>3.7 Methods of data analysis</b> .....	32
3.8 Ethical Considerations .....	33
<b>CHAPTER FOUR.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>STATUS OF THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS AT AECF ..</b>	<b>34</b>
4.1 Introduction.....	34
4.2 Characteristics of Study Respondents.....	34
4.3 Status of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems at AECF.....	36
4.3.1 People, Partnership and Planning .....	36
4.3.1.1 Organizational Structure .....	36
4.3.1.2 Human Capacity.....	38
4.3.1.3 Monitoring and Evaluation Partnerships .....	39
4.3.1.4 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan .....	40
4.3.1.5 Costed M&E Workplan .....	42
4.3.1.6 M&E advocacy, Communication and Culture.....	43
4.3.2 Collect, Capture and Verify Data .....	45
4.3.2.1 Routine Program Monitoring.....	45
4.3.2.2 Surveys and Surveillance.....	47
4.3.2.3 M&E Databases .....	48
4.3.2.4 Supervision and data audit .....	49
4.3.2.5 Research and Evaluation.....	49
4.3.3 Centre: Data Use for Decision making.....	51
4.3.3.1 Data Use and dissemination.....	51
<b>CHAPTER FIVE .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>53</b>
4.4 Introduction.....	53
5.2 Summary of Findings.....	53

5.3 Conclusion .....	55
5.4 Recommendations for Policy and Programme .....	56
5.4.1 Human Capacity, Partnerships and Planning .....	56
5.4.2 Collect, Capture and Verify Data .....	57
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>60</b>
 APPENDICES .....	 64
APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE .....	64
APPENDIX II: Document Review Guide; adopted from UNAIDS 2009a&b). .....	75

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: The M&E system Components and the corresponding standards/indicators ..	25
Table 3.1: Target Population.....	29
Table 4.1: Percent distribution of respondents by various characteristics.....	35
Table 4.2: Results for the category of People, Partnership and Planning.....	36
Table 4.3: Results for the category of Organizational Structures.....	38
Table 4.4: Results for the category of Human Capacity.....	39
Table 4.5: Results for the category of M&E Partnerships.....	40
Table 4.6: Results for the category of Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.....	41
Table 4.7: Results for the category of Costed M&E Workplan.....	42
Table 4.8: Results for the category of M&E advocacy, Communication and Culture ....	44
Table 4.9: Results for the category of Data Management.....	45
Table 4.10: Results for the category of Routine monitoring.....	46
Table 4.11: Results for the category of Surveys and Surveillance.....	47
Table 4.12: Results for the category of M&E Databases.....	48
Table 4.13: Results for the category of Supervision and Data audit.....	49
Table 4.14: Results for the category of Research and Evaluation.....	50
Table 4.15: Results for the category of Data Use and dissemination.....	52



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: UNAIDS 12 Components of a functional Monitoring and Evaluation system .....	24
--	----

## **ABSTRACT**

The general objective of this study was to assess AECF's M&E system. Specifically, it sought to assess whether AECF's monitoring and Evaluation system meets the set standards and establish the strengths and weaknesses of the Monitoring and Evaluation system. The main sources of data were interviews with program staff and review of AECF documents. Descriptive statistics was the main method of data analysis.

The overall score for the AECF M&E system was 75 percent which implies that the system is functional. The results show that some components scored very high while others score very low. The best performing component is Costed M&E Workplan with a score of 91 percent followed by Routine Program Monitoring with a score of 88 percent and Supervision and Data audit with a score of 85 percent. Other components had lower scores. For instance, Survey and Surveillance, had the lowest score of 53 percent followed by Organizational Structure with M&E functions that scored 61 percent and M&E Advocacy, Communication and Culture with a score of 63 percent. Therefore, components with the lowest scores need strengthening to be fully functional.

The study identified the following as the major challenges; there are inadequate M&E staff at AECF including lack of M&E leadership, AECF does not have an online database therefore the systems are not automated, there are unclear reporting lines and the M&E budget is minimal to conduct M&E activities. Based on these findings, the study recommends that; AECF needs to resource the M&E department including hiring an M&E leadership and procure a Management Information system (MIS) that will help in automation of processes

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Background of the Study

Recently, governments across the world undertake monitoring and evaluation with a determination to efficiency in delivery of services. This has influenced formulation and implementation of policy regulations that enhance application of M&E systems to guarantee project success. Monitoring and evaluation tracks implementation and outputs and measures the program's effectiveness. In other words, it is the right tool to determine whether the program is on track and when modifications are required and more so, the quality of the activities being conducted. For funding agencies or donors, this may help with accountability of funds given (Kusek and Gorgens, 2009). Monitoring and Evaluation is employed to show that program endeavors gain expected results and have been executed adequately. It basically provides information and the comprehension needed for supervisors, organizers, implementers, policy makers and donors to make decisions. Successful completion of an organizational project within budget allocation, scope, without delays is determined by the effectiveness of the M&E system. For M&E systems to be termed effective, they should assist project managers to make corrective actions and decisions that can aid in future project initiation and implementation.

Monitoring and Evaluation influences program performance. Local governments in developing and developed countries are motivated by influence of success of projects attributed to monitoring and evaluation. Crawford and Bryce (2010) support this view by indicating that M&E systems help in enhancing collection of information and provision of project progress feedback, promote transparency and accountability to implement projects successfully. In the implementation of programs, monitoring and evaluation systems is the main actor in promoting accountability, transparency and determine deviations in program execution. M&E systems have emerged to be a key determinant of program implementation success (Pfeiffer, 2011).

In USA, public health program implementation guidelines greatly emphasize on the monitoring and evaluation practices enabling effective information collection and foster accuracy in implementing development programs. Most projects usually suffer delay and surpass the outlined contract sum. The result of such overrun can many a

times lead to abandonment of implementation of programs. Program implementation success in developing countries is believed to have a poor program performance outcome attributed to ineffective monitoring and evaluation systems that was characterized by risks of corruption, inadequate institution capacity and ineffective integration of government development functions.

In Africa, programs have instituted M&E systems in efforts to realize great performance in development programs and promote economic growth. Effective systems in M&E positively influence implementation of programs. National M & E systems lead to significant progress in government development projects however, M & E face constraints that include acute financial challenges, institutional, operational and technical capacity challenges and insufficient information that is not well coordinated hence affects effectiveness of Monitoring and evaluation. World Health institutions found that M&E systems play a huge role in completion of programs. Monitoring and Evaluation needs to be constituted with high level of expertise of the personnel handling the projects, the availability of the personnel, positive attitudes and perception of the project officers on M&E, adequate financial resources and geographical locations all have an influence on implementation of projects.

In the early 1980s, donors such as DFID, USAID, DANIDA among others had embraced Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PME). This resulted to acceptance, growth and strengthening of the M&E Unit at the AECF. In NGO's, M&E continue to evolve due to donor requirements. NGOS have been forced to develop M&E systems that can help in tracking and measurement of results and performance at large.

AECF conforms to the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED) that has a published standard that is used for tracking and measurement of results. The standard includes a results chain which is a very powerful but simplified tool that brings clarity to each step in the logical framework of a program starting from activities all the way up to outputs to outcomes and finally the impact.

## **1.2 The African Enterprise Challenge Fund**

AECF is a development non-governmental organization which supports agribusiness, renewable energy and adaptation to climate change technology sectors that are innovative and aim to alleviate poverty among the rural poor in Africa. It aims to

enable systemic change in market systems, ensuring that the poorest can better access crucial markets in agriculture, finance, and energy (OECD, 2016).

Driven by the organizations mission of enhancing a prosperous and enterprising rural Africa, AECF invests in businesses that have the potential to disrupt markets, stimulate new industries and create markets where none exists.

It was launched in 2007 at the World Economic Forum Africa as an initiative of the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) and became operational in 2008 to respond to the need for an African based fund that would support African business particularly in the areas of finance and agriculture. AECF is headquartered in Nairobi Kenya, at West End Towers, Kanjata Road Off Muthangari drive with satellite offices in Tanzania and cote d'ivoire in West Africa. It invests in high risk businesses and shares the risks with the businesses making the businesses attractive for commercial investors.

AECF provides catalytic funds as grants and interest free loans of matched finance to businesses that would not otherwise access adequate financing. The practice is that the business models enabled through co-finance by AECF, structurally benefit the rural population, for example through selling innovative higher quality inputs, providing income through outgrowing or provide sustainable access to electricity (Ecorys, 2015).

### **1.3 AECF's Monitoring and Evaluation system**

In 2010, AECF started the adoption of the DCED standard, an elaborate framework for results measurement of development programmes in the private sector. This set out criteria for good practice in monitoring, evaluation and results measurement, based on the preparation of results chains to visualize each of the AECFs project theory of change. A core technical advisory team, headed by the M&E manager who oversees Planning, monitoring and evaluation, maintenance of consistency and quality of results measurement, reporting as well as design and oversee learning for both internal and ecosystem audiences (Ecorys, 2015).

The DCED Standard is integrated into the M&E system and ensures that all reported results are credible and well-reasoned. The key test is whether they are believable to a skeptical, but informed observer. The DCED standard has got eight elements that AECF adheres to namely, articulation of the results chain illustrating how the

different program activities lead to achievement of the desired goal, beginning with inputs all the way to the impact, defining the Indicators of Change that are specific and measurable, measuring changes in indicators once they are identified, estimating changes that are attributable, capturing wider changes in the system, tracking costs of the programme, results reporting, results measurement by managing the system (DCED, 2010).

AECF runs a competitive challenge fund that allows businesses with suitable business models that suit the open window submit applications. The AECF monitoring and evaluation system does the following:

- i. Monitoring of competition applications and selection process of applicants with the most innovative and viable business that would bring about development impact.
- ii. Guide the Due diligence process on successful applicants to ensure the applicants are willing and ready to respond to AECF objective of alleviating poverty through their respective business models .
- iii. Guide the Induction process and funds disbursement for the successful investees.
- iv. Inform the communication/feedback to the unsuccessful applicants
- v. The M&E team keeps a database of all the applicants including the unsuccessful ones.
- vi. Monitor progress of activities during implementation of the projects by the program team with the help of the M&E team.
- vii. Monitor progress reports submitted to AECF for review and feedback by the investees semiannually and annually.
- viii. AECF program and M&E team conducts site visits to verify data and update development results measurement tools.
- ix. Analysis of data collected to inform portfolio management, enable challenge fund mechanism refinement and ensure accountability.
- x. Continuous auditing of results undertaken at different levels by the M&E department. The M&E system evaluates strategies, activities and outputs purposely to advise the management and the board on any gaps in implementation or propose changes due to any challenges faced.

- xi. The evaluation also involves measuring target versus achievement of results, undertaking effectiveness surveys with investee to improve on performance.
- xii. Impact evaluations for the project that come to an end are conducted by an external consultant to evaluate effectiveness, sustainability and efficiency of the programs.

A good monitoring system should show progress and changes in relation to an implementation plan, and progress towards project objectives.

Robust monitoring systems highlight key program strengths and weaknesses during implementation, allowing managers to deal with gaps and problems, address gaps and adapt to new circumstances to improve performance. Monitoring gives ‘early warning signs’ and allows for appropriate interventions in a timely manner (OECD, 2016).

Within the AECF, the M&E system as described above allows for the active collection and measurement of results achieved by the projects according to predetermined key performance indicators. These are mainly quantitative but are also qualitative for example, measures of market system changes. Monitoring, Evaluation and Results Measurement is an internal process, conducted by AECF programme managers and supported by the monitoring and evaluation team (OECD, 2016).

#### **1.4 Problem Statement**

As much as there exists knowledge with regards to the importance of monitoring and evaluation systems in project implementation, strides made to strengthen the same has not yielded the expected results hence not attaining the most significant levels of operation Karani (2014). Odhiambo (2009) points out that local NGO’s have not met internationally accepted M&E systems standards despite evident growth in M&E systems. This is attributed to poor organizational M&E systems being put in place by many private and public sectors to fully operationalize the M&E practice in the institutions (Liket, 2014).

According to OECD (2003) and AfrEA (2006), the existing Monitoring and Evaluation practices in Africa are as a result of donors and funders of the various projects having M&E as a requirement in programming. In the year 2009 the United Nations Development Program, advocated the need to have M&E practices embedded into programs as an innovative way of implementation and management of programs. By so doing, it creates knowledge and learning around results that is importance to

programs stakeholders in improving program performance. In Kenya, government and Non-governmental organizations initiate information sharing, involving the stakeholders and engaging experts in sharing knowledge during monitoring and evaluation forums and activities to achieve success in programs however, contribution of M&E activities towards program implementation remain contested.

For the above reasons, challenges exist in understanding nature and use of the M&E systems to improve on program effectiveness, efficiency and the most appropriate way to measure program impact attributed to such interventions (UNAIDS, 2009). In development programs, results measurement cannot be accurate or become a reality that Karani (2014) is referring to in cases where there are no functional and strong M&E systems. Continuously assessing the existing M&E system is important to ensure adjustments are done to response to the changing and complex development arena (FHI 360, 2013; World Bank, 2009; UNAIDS, 2009 and Global Fund et al., 2006).

In the recent past, there has been numerous program-based assessments and evaluations of organizations performance on effectiveness, efficiency and innovativeness but there is no comprehensive assessment of the AECF's M&E system which poses a challenge to ensuring that the M&E system is strengthened. In order to identify gaps, it is critical to assess the M&E system.

This study aims to address the knowledge gap by assessing status in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of the M&E system at AECF. It's critical to assess the application of the M&E systems in AECF's project implementation. In order to attain the main objective of supporting business to provide jobs, raise incomes, and reduce poverty in Africa, AECF needs a consistent monitoring and evaluation system that allows results from multiple projects to be aggregated, analyzed, and reported upon. This allows AECF to learn, share its findings, and be accountable to donors and the wider development community.

### **1.5 Research Questions**

The study sought to answer the following questions:

- i. Does the M&E system of The African Enterprise Challenge Fund meet the set M&E system standards?
- ii. What strengths and gaps does M&E system of the AECF have?



## **1.6 Objectives of the Study**

The general objective of the study was to assess AECF's M&E system. The specific objectives were;

- i. Determine whether AECF's monitoring and Evaluation system meets the set standards.
- ii. Establish the strengths and gaps the Monitoring and Evaluation system of the AECF.

## **1.7 Justification of the Study**

M&E systems play an important role in promoting and identifying development work that improves the lives in developing countries, Thomas (2010). Monitoring and Evaluation positively contributes to development outcomes whereas weak M&E systems leads to poor development outcomes.

FHI 360, (2013) states that evaluating an M&E system is an analytical process through which organizations identify areas of strength and weak points in the system and propose measures to sustain best performing areas and develop on the gaps. The study compared M&E system at AECF to the standard 12 M&E system components. The implication of the study findings will help AECF programs in the following areas; based on the results recommend the best measures to maintain the strengths and develop its weaknesses, as well as provide insightful information that will feed into the future interventions and funding of programmes. Future programmes will also benefit from the knowledge generated from the assessment to refine the M&E systems since the study provides recommendations for technical and managerial interventions. The study will form a basis for evidence-based policy formulation at the AECF and its investees. Finally, the findings will add to the already existing literature and serve as a basis for research.

## **1.8 Scope and Limitations of the Study**

The focus is on the assessment of the African Enterprise Challenge Fund's M&E system and how it contributes to performance of the programs in the organization. The assessment would have been conducted on other challenge fund organizations to give a wider understanding but due to resource constraints and time, the assessment was limited to the AECF. The results of the assessment are for AECF and therefore

cannot be generalized to other contexts. The results were based on the 12 components therefore will not be generalized to other contexts.

Despite the fact that the AECF implements its programmes in twenty-four countries in Africa with its headquarters in Nairobi and two satellite offices in Tanzania and cote d'ivoire, challenges with language barrier hence translation of the study questionnaire from English to French for the west African team as well as lack of availability of the Tanzanian team, the study focused only on the Nairobi Office, which is the lead office.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **LITERATURE REVIEW**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

The chapter presents literature review related to assessments of M&E systems. Part one presents the evolution of Conceptualization of M&E systems, part two presents M&E systems components and part three presents the empirical evidence of M&E system assessments, the conceptual framework and the operational framework.

#### **2.2 The Evolution of Conceptualization of Monitoring and Evaluation systems**

The implementation of M&E in development programs is believed to emanated from increase in educational programs in public schools and higher learning institutions. There exist seven stages in the growth of evaluation that began in 1972. The first official document that had information on the use of evaluation that placed emphasis on use of quantitative mark to rate students' performance. At that point, master craft laborers were adjudicating their student's handiwork and scholars were judging logical discussions earlier on. Manufacturing is one among many of the areas that evaluation became more official and conventional. The act of evaluation occurred one step at a time to react to the increasing call on to having consistent, duplicate and liable updated industrial world mostly expected from the US government versus US military pay out. The rising need to have a military paraphernalia for World War II resulted to performance of evaluation upgraded as the development assistance increased after World War II period when the US employed it to reconstruct European states destroyed by war.

After World war II period, the improvements in the education sector including on spending brought about growth in the awareness to criterion-referenced testing and objective based testing. What's more, evaluation in education system has aggressively grown since the enactment of Congress (1958) National Defense Education Act (NDEA) that supported development of the new curriculum project with millions of dollars. The 1965 Elementary and secondary education act (ESEA) brought about a thrust for evaluating programs the education sector. ESEA was mandated to evaluate performance of students and quality of standards of the teachers. In addition, it was tasked to provide resources that would support evaluation activities.

These congressional functions and the accompanying pool of funds brought about a call for improvement of the field of evaluation in programs. Evaluation in development programs was increasingly demanded by donor agencies after the World War II when they began to realize that evaluation is a vital management tool. It largely grew in the 1950s both at country level and UN systems. From that time, the growth has been at a slow speed and irregular. The late 1950's and all through 1960's was a period where M&E was slowly adopted at country level. During this time, the UN began promotion of building national development planning capabilities.

One of the ways that was thought to increase ownership of the development process was build M&E capacity. During this time, limited support in terms of scope and concept on M&E and technical assistance activities offered to strengthen development projects and increase chances of success. The concern was mainly on achievement that was based on output level pegged on the physical inputs. Little focus was put on the impact of the project to the beneficiaries. This has however been changing steadily. Evaluation of development programs became an established profession in numerous OECD countries. At that time, numerous M&E approaches, standards and techniques were developed. Expansion and integration of development evaluation into professional consortium that put in place the level or caliber for international programs. This only came into practice in the 1990's. Currently, there exist professional evaluation institutions like the American Evaluations Associations and organizations like the Evaluators' Institute at George Washington University and numerous online courses.

According to an M&E survey conducted by KPMG's to understand M&E approaches, the impact the fund has had and the design of the project, the findings show that an effective M&E is requisite to support governments, program managers, civil society officials and funders to plan projects in a systematic way that will bring about better planning, better outcome, increase success and enhance learning. More and more funds have been injected in development programs from different sources including NGO's, private investors and governments. An efficient M&E must have the ability to convey benefits that can be equated to the millions invested annually. The survey findings from organizations interviewed showed that the demand to measure impact and results achieved is on the rise, the interviewees were not satisfied with how they use findings to improve implementation of programs, there are limited resources and

that the technology present is still in the early stages. The OECD together with its members have taken the forefront in developing results measurement standards for development programs. In 1991, they published Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance that highlights critical information on how evaluation systems within organizations is managed and arranged (OECD DAC, 2010, P.5).

Estella & Gaventa (1997) acknowledge that M&E had evolved over time due to the need for the results-based management, limited resources and involvement of non-state actors in development. In the 2000s, there was a collaboration of poverty monitoring activities. The influence rose from increasing need to have development based on evidence and necessity to have national programmes that revolved around monitoring poverty reduction strategies. This was the start of acknowledging that M&E information is useful to planners, policy makers, public, civil society and institutions/governments in providing accountability in programs, private and public sectors.

### **2.3 Monitoring and Evaluation Systems Components**

UNAIDS has broken all 12 components into 3 different subsets namely;

- i. Information dissemination and Use
- ii. M&E partnerships, the people, organizational structure, budget and workplan, Planning, communication, advocacy and culture
- iii. Elements of data, information and knowledge management

#### **2.3.1. Outer ring: People, Partnerships and Planning**

This section is based on people, partnerships and planning. This category has six components of an M&E system which include; organizational M&E structures, human capacity, M&E plan, M&E partnerships, costs, M&E advocacy, culture and communications. Each of these components is discussed below.

##### **Organizational Structures with M&E**

For a system to be termed effective M&E system, organizations need to ask two questions;

- i. What are the M&E organizational structures the institution needs for efficiency and effectiveness of the organizational strategy?
- ii. How are the M&E functions being included and/ or aligned in the existing organizational structure?

Organizations need to organize and group major M&E functions and assign M&E responsibilities to positions such as lead in M&E and planning processes, lead in M&E system implementation, liaise with senior management and program team leads on M&E as an M&E manager role while M&E officers' role is to design tools and methods of data collection, etc.

### **Human Capacity for M&E**

The aspect of human capacity in project management is critical. Especially because they are key in ensuring an effective M&E unit. Vanesa & Gala, 2011 states that involving the technical capacity and skill of the human resources team in decision making at the time evaluations are being conducted can have very high impact on the evaluation in terms of the value add. Trainings on M&E by use of learning approach is believed to be the most effective way of delivery and has positive impact on the evaluation process. The M&E team is required to have relevant skills to perform M&E duties, allocation of enough resources, a system in place and be transparent to assure quality. This suggests the necessity for the team to have high skills and proper training to manage M&E activities effectively. Health institutions have experienced tremendous growth in implementing programs however, building capacity of M&E still suffers as little attention is given to this area. Project team members with actual training and expertise are essential in achieving results.

M&E staff capacity in terms of adequacy and qualification, needs a team with monitoring knowledge and skills, manage M & E results and foster implementation of projects (World Health institutions, 2011). This reason being, a project staff is a key determinant in achieving effective practices. (Gorgens and Kusek, 2009) state that the demand for skilled M&E professional, building capacity and having harmonized courses impact project implementation. Guidelines to achieve performance-oriented M&E role through improvement of programs implementation and policies in institutions s' accountability are provided. Skilled and knowledgeable persons have knowledge on new technologies and current methods used to achieve results and have clear grasp of M&E. They will guide on formats that can be adopted and create tools needed. (UNDP, 2012) handbook on M&E for results.

HIV prevention programs failures during implementation is caused by managing the program poorly more so where there are limited experienced staff in M&E. An

organization should put into consideration building capacity of members who conduct M&E activities especially when dealing with huge projects. This will allow the team to understand deeply all the details of the projects. Having practical training of some sort is vital in building capacity of individuals since it allows interaction with M&E practices.

### **M&E Partnerships**

The main reason for having a strong M&E approach all through a partnership is to trail the degree under which these concepts hold fast and identify if there are any divergence that might present itself. Partnering organizations need to spend quite some time together in understanding the different expectations from each of them just to align themselves. This provides an understanding on objectives and principles and how the organizations will work together going forward. There needs to a partnering agreement highlighting clearly the principles of M&E. the agreement ensures that partners understand the role they must play and agree to terms and conditions of engagement. Stakeholder theory is a strong mode of getting to know the firm better in its own environment. Patton, 2002 says that main aim of having a stakeholder theory is to allow managers get to know the partners and how to manage them in a strategic way. This theory has been in diverse fields involving varied methodologies, approaches, concepts and evaluation criteria. The idea of having stakeholders continues to gain traction, so is the increase of how people view the subject and accepts gives space to more stakeholder engagement in programming. It opens managers vision of the program beyond achievement of output results.

Patton (2002) proposes that in stakeholder models, any individual or group that has a valid reason and interest in a program only get involved to get benefits and there exists no priority of interests that supersedes the other. During stakeholder mapping exercise, all including employees, communities, customers, government institutions, NGO's and general public needs to be engaged. Leadership plays an important role in enhancing stakeholder involvement and shows that how stakeholders are treated contributes to buy in, ownership and in return successful implementation. This theory puts emphasis on the importance of how the program team and the stakeholders relate with each other. More so, project team should ensure that county officials have a buy in of the program and that they understand how the success of the program heavily depends on the participation of the several stakeholders involved. The stakeholder's

theory support engagement of Program managers as stakeholder to influence M&Es activities to achieve program outcomes.

M&E partnerships also helps in strengthening activities and also provides a platform for knowledge sharing in cases where one partner is performing better than the other in certain areas.

### **M&E Plan**

M&E planning is an essential component that calls for programs realistic planning to allow monitoring and evaluation of indicators in the log frames. USAID, 2016 indicate states that an M&E plan helps to manage the assessments and reporting of achievements and identifies the kind of questions that will be used during program evaluation. The plan has indicators, mentions the persons responsible for collection data on the indicators, sources of information, tools for data collection, how they will be filled in and the flow of data from the point of collection, to cleaning, to entry into an online system/excel to management/ stakeholders. Without an M&E plan, the M&E systems will be given little attention hence will not be of much use to the team. A documentation of the M&E plans should be done and shared with all parties involved which include donors. There needs to be a time period after which the M&E plan is to be updated to reflect a true picture and include any changes in the program. This will ensure it is always relevant to guide implementation. Questions on how important it is to update the M&E plan and the frequency have been raised in the previously studies. Updating M&E plans is critical in cases where previous laid out processes do not work as planned or properly. Sometimes the program changes and as a result, the approach need also to be changed.

Sharing the M&E plan allows for a wide engagement with different partners and each partner assigned any activity needs to be informed during the draft stage of the document. Studies conducted on involving stakeholders in development of M&E plans have limited information on the level which stakeholders were involved and do not touch on how this influenced the project performance.

Having an M&E plan in place provides staff with a reference document that they can always go back to incase they need to cross check or confirm any information. In addition, USAID (2007) notes that when an M&E plan has been developed using participatory approach, the team that is implementing directly clearly understand why



things happen the way they do and the processes. M&E plan guides in resource allocation and time needed to carry out M&E work.

In addition, UNDP (2012) indicates that M&E activities are carried out all through the implementation of the program and therefore reviews should be conducted, and plans updated on a regular basis. This is to ensure that the project responds to identified problems during implementation notwithstanding the changing conditions. Chaplowe, 2008 describes an M&E plan as a document that explicitly explains project indicators and ways through which they will be measured. He continues to say that sometime M&E plans are referred to as M&E framework or indicator matrix.

An M&E plan puts into consideration how well the project will perform by ensuring that planning is properly done. It addresses issues of inputs, outputs, outcomes, indicator definitions, information on baselines, measures put in place and an M&E schedule. This plan's main responsibility is to track the results achieved and provide a status program report. Any changes in the program including change of indicators affect performance and in return have an impact on evaluation. This calls for frequent update of the M&E plan to allow accurate results and performance measurement. (World Health institutions, 1980).

### **Costed M&E workplan**

A costed M&E workplan needs to be established and should include the M&E key activities with well-defined responsibilities for implementation, costs tied to specific activities and clear timelines for delivery of activities. A costed M&E workplan ensures an organization's financial and human resources are mobilized. A costed M&E will indicate who will finance and implement the planned program activities. A costed M&E workplan is a combined workplan that take into action the M&E undertakings of important partners. This allows key stakeholders to plot and implement activities with a plan that means there needs to be a participatory approach of all the key participants. M&E activities are mainstreamed into day to day program activities. However, the M&E budget has been set internally and monitored within a specified period. M&E and learning budget setting is guided by anticipated activities.

### **M&E advocacy, Communication and culture**

In programs, communication is a major component. It brings about clarity on what is expected, clearly outlines tasks and responsibilities. In addition, it allows sharing of

information on how well program is performing and how far to achieving results (UNDP, 2009). This can only be accomplished in presence of a practice that allows for sharing of updated accurate information in time to be used to make decisions. Communication in M&E the act of sharing information with stakeholders and vice versa through formal and informal means. Communication plays an integral role of creating awareness among implementers on project progress including products and services that the program intends to deliver (IFAD, 2005). A program is termed effective when information obtained from it has been used effectively. Communication is used to make clear the impact expected from the project, indicate how impact will be measured and show progress. In addition, it provides possible detailed rationale for succeeding or failing during implementation and suggest ways of how information can make better subsequent actions.

Participatory communication is crucial in all development work aspects. It allows two-way approach to sharing information hence the information move either way such as top bottom, bottom up, among individuals in the same level or iteratively. Involving stakeholders such as government institutions, civil society and private sector in programming from the onset has a huge effect on how the program will be designed, implemented and monitored depending on their contribution to the program. Communication increases awareness, eases mobilization, increases and improves partnerships in order to achieve the main program objective. When there is poor communication, the program suffers poor partnerships, poor problem-solving techniques, stakeholders are marginalized, poor distribution of services or product ; whichever the program is addressing and, in the end, hinder achievement of outcomes wished for.

(Pfeiffer, 2011) notes that there needs to be an environment conducive for stakeholders to share knowledge, ask for information, engage more and put into practice the learnings by having an effective communication in place. The appropriate ways through which information will be passed to stakeholders, who will be communicating among the various partners, frequency and mode of communication can create an environment for acquiring and sharing knowledge. In the long run, a meaningful M&E process increases ownership and in turn encourages accountability, equity, equal distribution of benefits and a transparent program. When designing a communication component, it requires that one has clear understanding of the partners

that will be involved in the program or the stakeholders. Possible project parties to communication in monitoring and evaluation include project leaders, project team members, program managers, institutions service providers, institutions staff and the government.

Developing effective messaging for projects, demands that one knows its stakeholders needs and interests, media consumption habits and knowledge regarding the project. A proper research on the stakeholders is conducted to understand the type of audiences. This can be done through FGDs and KII's.

### **2.3.2. Middle Ring: Data collection, capturing and verification**

This category has five components of an M&E system which include; routine program monitoring, surveys and surveillance, M&E databases, supervision and data auditing, evaluation and research. Each component is discussed below.

#### **Routine Program Monitoring**

Project managers employ the logical model in managing and evaluating outcomes. The success of M&E highly depends on the support from the program management who provide leadership, commit sufficient resources to achieve effective monitoring and evaluation in an effort to achieve project success. Below are some of the principles that guide performance monitoring;

- i. Results-oriented: A result measurement framework acts a footing for the Monitoring and evaluation plan with each indicator connected to a particular result.
- ii. Directly associated with underway program planning and implementation: Quantitative indicators and qualitative assessments are required during planning. Successive work plans are compared with the previous activities to determine whether they were a success and incorporate lessons learned. The program needs to come up with ways of ensuring lessons learned are incorporated into future program activities such as After-Action Reviews (AARs)
- iii. Participatory: Involvement of the entire program team and partners is effective in monitoring performance. It is essential to involve the technical staff members and all Program partners in activities such how data will be

collected, interpreted and used. This helps to strengthen local partners' capacity in monitoring performance even after the program comes to an end.

Monitoring tools to track and monitor the program including standard partner periodic progress reports and programmatic and financial reports. In the case of the AECF reporting requirements, semiannual and annual progress reports need to be submitted.

### **Surveys**

Programmes should anticipate collecting data using different survey instruments such as paper-based survey instruments as well as digitalized platforms via Android phones and web-based surveys, at partner level, which will then be entered into a database and aggregated for reporting purposes. The surveys range from feedback survey to needs assessment surveys. All M&E systems are designed to ensure both reliability, accuracy, validity, integrity, precision, timeliness and Routine Data Quality Assurance are achieved.

### **M&E databases**

Organizations should have a prescribed Program database to monitor program implementation and progress against timeline and indicator targets. A comprehensive database platform that allows the program team to track achievements/results in real time. As data is added to the system real time, it is immediately available for review and inclusion in reports. In addition, organizations database should include a robust reporting capability which allows the management team to quickly visualize progress and identify issues in a pro-active manner. Having standard tracking mechanism and common workflows reduces transcription errors at all levels from the source of the data to the final reporting system thereby reducing the required time to generate and compile information, allowing more time to be spent on program implementation. The program team needs a training on use the database, data collection tools, reporting tools and supported continuously to maximize on efficiency.

### **Supervision and data auditing**

This component highlights the importance of organizations to conduct quarterly Routine data quality assessments in order to determine quality of data collected. This will give a chance to come up with strategies that speak to the gaps identified and find ways of closing the loop holes. The process involves having structured questions to guide through the process of identifying gaps on data management processing and

finding the answers to the questions. Supervision and data audits will assist in pointing in areas of weakness and enables the staff to know how far they can go with defending the data collected and how much they trust the data for use in reporting, evaluating project performance and decision making. Supervision and audit teams comprise both program and M&E personnel including a few selected stakeholders and feedback provided real time. Supervision and data audit reports will be compiled, disseminated and files with clear steps of remedy as such need arises.

### **Evaluation and research**

Program evaluation needs to be led by the M&E technical assistance partner or evaluation consultants, who are expected to develop a strong monitoring and evaluation framework that will enable the team track development towards realization of the overall goal. Programs are assessed through studies such as the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS). It is critical for Programs to have a research arm that develops research questions. Evaluation consultants are brought on board to be involved in conducting an impact evaluation of the Programs. Research conducted will improve the organizations knowledge base and unlock potential areas where the team has limited knowledge with regards to specific fields of research.

Most Significant Change stories/ human interest stories are harvested on a continuous basis and used not only to share stories but also for learning. Institutions are expected to institute an operations research that will look into selected questions periodically that would give indication of systemic change on a range of interventions provided by the Program. While such outcomes from the operation research are to be shared with the stakeholders, they also inform continuous decision making, planning and re-planning processes.

#### **2.3.3. Centre: Data use for decision making**

This category has one component of an M&E system which is data use and dissemination. The component is discussed below.

**Data Dissemination and Use:** In information dissemination is vital to begin with data, choose the intended audience and customize the message relevant to the target audience in a way that suits the kind of audience you have (IFAD, 2005).

Health institutions management support sharing information timely will inform decision making for purposes planning of implementation and monitoring activities to ensure a successful implementation. An MIS comes in handy in improving quality of data, timely reporting and presentation preparation hence improves efficiency and effectiveness in delivery. Having a project that is successful in terms of beating timelines, meeting targets, attaining its intended objectives is a sign of having an effective M&E in place. It allows for the team to be accountable, transparent, make learning possible by carrying out learning sessions and having lessons learnt while implementing programs documented for the ease of sharing knowledge with implementers. The lessons learnt are applied in future programs implemented under similar conditions, environments, context and target.

#### **2.4 The importance for a Monitoring and Evaluation System**

An M&E system is a system intended to lead a process of collecting, analyzing, and data use with the aim of computing, recording achievements and continuously giving information to inform policy decisions, FHI 360 (2013). Monitoring and evaluation supplies the management team and other partners with endless feedback on execution and recognize verified or possible successes and difficulties early enough to allow timely accustoming to project operation. Programmes should perform midterm evaluation as way of reviewing progress in the initial stages. A projection of probable effects and a way to determine required adaptation in design of programs. Evaluation is described as the periodic assessment of comprehensive results attained. Monitoring focusses on activities done, whereas evaluation scrutinizes the achievements and impact created.

The importance of having M&E is slowly being recognized. World Bank (2009); FHI 360 (2013); Kusek and Rist (2001); UNAIDS (2009); and Global Fund et al. (2006) all agree that an M&E system is key to an organization to: determine whether a programmes are on-course, on schedule and make certain that funds are used on planned activities and that programmes are implemented as planned; determine whether a difference is being made by implemented programmes. OECD (2003), World Bank (2009); AfrEA (2006) and AfrEA (2006) note the persistent and increasing pressures on institutions and governments all over the world are responding more to external and internal partners demands on transparency, effectiveness, accountability, good governance and delivery of physical results.

Monitoring can be described as the tracking and examining project activities. Monitoring of a program during implementation enables program manager to know whether the program is on track and achieving the intended outcome. It is also important to conduct an end of program evaluation to determine its impact. M&E shapes the direction with which nations responds to epidemics. It is used to mobilize resources and guides allocation of resources.

Development initiatives that yields most positive change on the lives of the people is identified and promoted by M&E systems (Thomas,2010). For this reason, Thomas (2010) notes, positive development outcomes can be promoted by strong M&E systems and vice versa. Odhiambo (2000) notes that the significance of M&E task in institutions has been heightened by the rapidly increasing voice of the civil society with questions of good governance and better administration being in the limelight (Odhiambo, 2000).

## **2.5 Empirical Evidence of Assessments of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems**

FHI 360 (2013), World bank (2007), UNAIDS (2009) and Global Fund et al. (2006) are all in agreement that in order to identify the strengths and weaknesses that informs reforms in program implementation, there needs to be periodical assessments of national, organizational and program level M&E systems. The importance of M&E is increasingly and rapidly being recognized, as stakeholders in development programs question the development efforts on usefulness and effectiveness and usefulness. Subsequently, organizations have developed M&E systems to help measure results and performance of development metrics being targeted.

FHI 360 (2013) acknowledges the anticipated results of an M&E system that is functional as a way of generating high caliber data and ensures necessary inputs such as infrastructure, human resource, financial, supplies and equipment and capacity of the fundamental system are working to help the manufacture, analysis and utilization of data. Therefore, improving the quality and effectiveness of an M&E system is critical (FHI 360, 2013). Review of literature reveals existence of over eleven assessment frameworks and tools that can be utilized in analyzing M&E systems. The kind of tool to be adapted and used is informed by the focus, use and the audience targeted. A framework developed by UNAIDS has been widely used in the past in carrying out assessments as literature indicates. In addition, to the UNAIDS

framework, Global fund guidelines have also been commonly used as seen from literature.

Ogungbemi et al. (2012) assessed Nigeria's national AIDS Control Authority (NACA) M&E system to ascertain the system's capacity to provide essential data for monitoring HIV/AIDS program using the 12 components developed by UNAIDS (2009). The assessment employed both qualitative and participatory method that enabled dialogue, reflection and agreement. The assessments focused mainly on reviewing the UNAIDS 12 components used by partners as a foundation for dialogue and perspective planning and help construct commitment to refine performance. The assessment revealed that national level harmonized agencies had organizational structures that increases effectiveness in performing Monitoring and Evaluation decree and purpose. The sub-national, facility level and civil societies were missing the structures. The assessment found out that there was need to employ personnel with skills to manage the M& system.

Macintyre & Robinson (2002) assessed the monitoring and evaluation system of the Roll Back malaria program with an aim of providing recommendations to improve the partnership component. During the assessment, the following activities were carried out: a review of the database and documents, analyzing indicator and methodology, conducting KIIs in Harare, Geneva and Atlanta. The study showed weaknesses in the methods used to collect data, lack of standard methods of collecting data, delays in acquisition of data resulting in delay of data entry process and lack of financial and human resources during program implementation.

Karawita et al ., (2016) conducted an assessment HIV/ AIDs prevention and treatment program M&E systems in Sri Lanka to determine M&E systems strengths and gaps and come up with various solutions to the weaknesses and maintain the strong practices. Karawita used the 12 excel worksheets monitoring and Evaluation system strengthening Tool (MESST) that stakeholders filled in using a participatory approach. The MESS tool generates dashboards in summary form of information collected at a glance for all the 12 components showing both the strengths and weaknesses in the HIV program. The findings of the study indicated that human capacity, data audits, supervision and organizational structure are areas that needed improvement. Data use, HIV program M&E plan, communication, advocacy, culture,



evaluation and research and partnerships are almost to the standards. Surveys and surveillance are close to 50 percent strength.

(Holvoet, 2015), assessed the Uganda's Education Division M&E system and the study focused on diagnosis and stocktaking arising from a claim that irrespective of the method used, the leading step of each M&E capacity assessment effort is to acknowledge that which is existent on the demand of M&E and on the supply side. The study used the UNAIDS, 2008 12 components and concentrated on stakeholders different M&E needs and organizational roles and issues. The assessment focused on the status of systems that included policy, indicators, methodology, data collection, capacity building, non-governmental actors' involvement and partnerships and data use. Sources of data included; M&E reports from the education sector, Uganda's education sector documents, approaches and roles of donors M&E documents, policy documents among others. The study findings indicated that the education sector M&E system gives a model of a system that focusses mainly on monitoring while the evaluation is put at stake. The study also confirmed that there was a mass of monitoring activities with minimal due diligence on data gathered.

## **2.6 The Conceptual Framework**

The study adopted the UNAIDS framework for an effective and functional M&E system for a HIV program. Using a system approach to describe monitoring and evaluation, UNAIDS (2009a) developed a tool that would help in assessing M&E of systems for HIV in nation states under the UNAIDS. The toolkit contains 12 key components that are important or rather need to be adhered to when implementing a HIV program.

The key 12 components are alive and apply to other development focus programs hence the toolkit is critical when assessing any development programs M&E systems. According to UNAIDS, functional M&E systems are characterized by these 12 components categorized into three categories as described below:

**Inner ring:** Data dissemination and Use

**Middle ring:** Program monitoring, surveys, M&E databases, supervision and data auditing, evaluation and research

**Outer ring:** M&E structures, human capacity, M&E plan, M&E partnerships, costs, M&E advocacy, culture and communications.

**Figure 2.1: UNAIDS 12 Components of a functional Monitoring and Evaluation system**



Source: UNAIDS 2008

## **2.7 Operational Framework**

The UNAIDS, 2008 12 components framework is critical in appraising the status of an institution's M&E system by comparing and measuring the performance and application of each component against the established standards (World Bank, 2009).

The assessment will therefore operationalize the established 12 components that Karawita et al. (2016) adopted because it brings an overarching logical standard for each of the 12 components unlike the (FHI 360, 2013) and (USAID, 2010) assessment tools that focused on 8 and 7 components respectively. The latter systems only provide a snapshot of M&E systems since they do not address the issue of small sample of indicators selected for verification hence it makes it difficult for generalization of results of the assessment to program wide M&E system.

**Table 2.1: The M&E system Components and the corresponding standards/indicators**

M&E Components	Indicators
<b>Outer Ring: Human Capacity, Partnerships and Planning</b>	
Organizational Structure	<p>M&amp;E unit exist</p> <p>Adequate and qualified M&amp;E staff at AECF</p> <p>M&amp;E roles and responsibilities clearly defined in the job description</p> <p>Available budget to support M&amp;E activities</p> <p>Meetings to assess progress, plan and coordinate</p> <p>M&amp;E defined career paths</p>
Human Capacity for M&E	<p>Funds for M&amp;E staff capacity building available</p> <p>Skills related to M&amp;E for staff be assessed in the last three years</p> <p>M&amp;E job trainings</p> <p>Coordination of jobs to avoid duplication of work</p> <p>Gaps of M&amp;E related skills required by staff be incorporated in organizations capacity building plan</p>
M&E partnerships	<p>An inventory of all M&amp;E partners</p> <p>Availability of a mechanism for coordination among partners</p> <p>Participation in the national M&amp;E technical working groups</p>
Monitoring and Evaluation Plan	<p>Available M&amp;E plan</p> <p>Stakeholders involved in development of an M&amp;E plan</p> <p>Revised M&amp;E plan based on M&amp;E system reviews and assessments</p> <p>M&amp;E system in place meets the international standards</p> <p>Available budget estimates for M&amp;E activities</p>
Costed M&E workplan	<p>Work plan covers activities, who to implement, period of time, costs, and available budget.</p> <p>M&amp;E activities have been costed</p> <p>M&amp;E plan linked to program work plan.</p> <p>Work plan updated annually centered on performance monitoring.</p> <p>M&amp;E workplan is developed against the previous years' activities</p>
M&E advocacy, Communication	<p>Existence of a communication and advocacy plan</p> <p>Availability of structured, targeted and M&amp;E advocacy activities planned</p>

<b>M&amp;E Components</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
and Culture	<p>Existence of M&amp;E materials to give various categories distinct messages</p> <p>M&amp;E plans are integrated into the overall strategy of the organization</p> <p>Managers are supportive and involved in M&amp;E activities</p> <p>M&amp;E staff are part of planning and management team</p> <p>M&amp;E performance is frequently communicated</p> <p>The organization has people who champion and support M&amp;E activities</p>
<b>Inner Ring: Collect, Capture and Verify Data</b>	
Routine program monitoring	<p>Existence of M&amp;E guideline that document the procedures for reporting M&amp;E data</p> <p>Existence of guidance on how data quality is to be maintained</p> <p>Departments use standardized reporting tools</p> <p>Availability of all source documents during previous data audit visit</p> <p>Reports are verified by program officers and M&amp;E before reporting</p> <p>Available mechanisms to resolve variances in the reports</p> <p>Results of routine program monitoring are used to formulate indicators in the M&amp;E plan</p>
Survey and Surveillance	<p>An available updated inventory of all surveys conducted</p> <p>Surveys conducted have supported indicators being measured</p> <p>There are schedules for impending surveys</p> <p>Existence of roasters for future surveys</p>
M&E databases	<p>Existence of an integrated database that stores data captured</p> <p>There exist structures for transmitting information among various databases</p> <p>Mechanisms put in place to ensure data is captured accurately</p>
Supervision and data audit	<p>Existence of guidance for supervision of M&amp;E activities</p> <p>Adherence to data audit procedures and protocol</p> <p>Data audit and field visit reports can be accessed</p> <p>Periodic data audit visits</p>
Research and	Existence for a schedule of research and evaluation

<b>M&amp;E Components</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
Evaluation	Availability of research and evaluation guidelines highlighting methods and standards Indication of results discussed and disseminated Resources available for carrying out research and evaluation activities
<b>Centre: Data Use for Decision making</b>	
Data Use and Dissemination	Information needs of stakeholders have been assessed Information dissemination is regularly shared with the stakeholders Laid down principle to hold up Analysis, how to present and use data Tailored information for various audiences

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents the methodology of the study. It covers research design, research design, data collection tools, and methods of data analysis.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

The study adopted a case study design in assessing the AECF monitoring and evaluation systems to determine whether it meets the global standards.

Qualitative and quantitative research was adopted. (McLeod, 2017) describes qualitative research as a multiple method in focus, encompassing explanatory, realistic perspective to its theme. The design gathered information that sought to report on a topic more than take the measurements. It attempted to search deep into the topic in question to acquire knowledge about people's way of thinking, their attitudes and what motivates them. (McLeod, 2017) describes quantitative research as a research method which gives more focus on counting elements as well as categorizing elements and creating statistical models to give a description of what has been observed. Quantitative research helps to deduce general conclusions from your research. This study adopted both designs.

World Bank (2009) states that the 12 components are used to determine an organizations M&E system status. The researcher used a participatory approach employed by (Karawita et al., 2016) (USAID Kenya, 2010) and Ogungbemi et al., 2012), Njoka (2015) unpublished project) and Republic of Moldova, 2008) assessments. The plan focused on information type relevant to the study, a strategy that explained the approach for collection of data and analysis as explained below.

#### **3.3 Target Population**

A population alludes to the total collection of components which the researcher desires to make inferences from. The target population was; AECF M&E officers, portfolio officers, senior portfolio officers, portfolio managers and sector team leads from the Kenya, Nairobi Office. The distribution of the target sample is presented in the table below.

**Table 3.1: Target Population**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Target Population</b>	<b>Sample size</b>
Portfolio Officers	7	7
Portfolio sector team leads	2	2
Portfolio managers	2	2
Monitoring and Evaluation Officers	2	2
Senior portfolio officers	3	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>

### **3.4 Sampling and sampling procedure**

Sampling is a process of carefully selecting a few items from a population to be used for prediction of prevalence of information that is not known, regarding a particular population (Cooper & Schindler, 2013). The study limitation as mentioned above focused on Nairobi Office, which is the lead office despite having staff in Tanzania and Cote d’ivoire. Therefore, convenience sampling was used for this study whereby sample elements were selected at the convenience of the researcher. Convenience sampling is useful when a researcher has limited resources and time and would like to collect data in order to gain a quick understanding of trends or develop hypothesis for future research. Out of a population of close to 50 staff members, 16 were involved in the study; this sample size is the total number of employees involved in direct implementation of programs in the Nairobi office. The sample was based on availability and relevance of the respondents of the assessment, limitation in available resources as well as scientifically proven appropriate sample size that can give valid conclusions (Mugenda & Mugenda, 1999).

### **3.5 Data Collection method and Tools**

The researcher collected qualitative data through organizational document review while quantitative data was gathered mainly by use semi structured questionnaires to collect data on the standard 12 components of an M&E system.

#### **3.5.1 Interviews**

Semi structured questionnaire in this study refer to a questionnaire that contains closed ended questions with responses that the interviewee ticks off an answer such as

yes or no from a list of options and open-ended questions which gives an opportunity to interviewees to give qualitative and varying responses, but the questions are the same. The interviews helped to gain a deeper understanding of how the M&E is performing within each capacity area. The interviews provided a clear picture of AECF's M&E status, quality, technical capacity and financial autonomy. The interviews sought information on existence of an M&E unit, availability of funds for M&E activities, existence of an M&E plan, M&E stakeholders, existence of an M&E workplan, advocacy, communication and culture plan, existence of M&E guideline that document the procedures for reporting M&E data, surveys, availability of supervision visits guidance, existence of an M&E integrated database and availability of laid down guidelines to support analysis, presentation and use of data.

A questionnaire was designed based on the indicators and the 12 components of a functional M&E system from FHI 360 (2013a). Questionnaires used in collecting data captured both qualitative and quantitative data. (Mugenda, 2008) notes that quantitative and qualitative data allows for strength and abundance of perceptions in responses from individuals. Flexibility due to use of questionnaires was achieved and facilitated the collection of large volume of data. A decision to use questionnaire was made bearing in mind the cost and ease of performing analysis.

The questionnaires were delivered to the M&E and program employees. This team has first-hand knowledge about the program processes and the M&E components. They provided insights on the nature of challenges and gave recommendations on the gaps identified.

### **3.5.2 Document Review**

Review of documents involved collection of qualitative data by reviewing present documents which were in hard copies and some were in soft copies saved on a shared folder. The process ensured data was scrutinized and interpreted in a way that brought out meaning. The document review provided context about AECF M&E systems. Information collected helped in the framing of the questionnaires as well as provided context to the answers provided in the interviews. The review of documents sought information on availability of an M&E unit responsible for M&E functions, check if there existed a human capacity building plan at AECF, check if there was an inventory of stakeholders for M&E and whether it gets updated periodically, existence



of an M&E plan, check existence of guidelines on data recording, collecting, collating and reporting, verify the availability of surveys conducted by AECF, review the depth and quality of existing database and check the availability of an evaluation and research agenda.

The documents to be reviewed included; M&E frameworks, M&E plans, annual reports, project reports and data collection tools. A document review guide adopted from UNAIDS 2009a&b (see annex II) with guiding questions used to guide the review process.

### **3.6 Description of Variables**

An assessment tool was adopted from (World Bank, 2009), making M&E systems work which defines each of the 12 components based on the established standardized procedures. The assessment tool adopted response scale prescribed by UNAIDS, 2009b) A tool for strengthening M&E systems which is arranged as several indicators with three scales of response as illustrated below.

- I. 5-point scale (Yes-completely, Mostly, Partly, No-not at all, Not Applicable)
- II. 3-point scale (Yes, No, Not Applicable)
- III. Numerical responses

A difference that exist between 5-point, 3-point and numerical responses is that for a given component you can only have one category of responses for instance a component can never have both 3- point and 5- point scale. The need to have yes-completely and yes is informed by the fact that there are standards that are implemented in phases thus they can either be scored as yes completely or mostly and so on, where as there are standards that either exist or don't exist thus creating the dichotomy between yes- completely and yes.

Whereby:

- i. If a frequency is specified for every indicator, the answer is “Yes-completely”
- ii. If at least 75 percent but less than 100 percent of indicators, the answer should be “Mostly”
- iii. If for at least 50 percent but less than 75 percent of indicators, then score “Partly”
- iv. If there are no indicators indicated, then “No-not at all” is picked as the response.

- v. A not applicable section will be included in cases where the standard is not applicable.

Responses that fall within the bracket of response point scales: yes-completely, yes and mostly are considered excellent thus are computed against the total number of responses available for that given standard to give a reflection of performance; expressed as a percentage (UNAIDS, 2009b). Remarks for each of the score provided for each standard are provided separately.

Depending on the type of question, the respondents were expected to select appropriate responses from the options provided. The response scales were computed against the total number of responses available for that component to give a reflection of its performance expressed as a percentage.

**Expected value** = Total number of respondents \* Total number of response options

**Actual Value** = aggregate value of the response given

**Variance** = Expected value- Actual Value

**Percentage Value** = (Expected value/Actual Value)\*100

For example, on the organizational structure on whether there is an M&E budget to conduct M&E activities, the question has five response options

- (i) Yes, completely
- (ii) Yes, mostly
- (iii) Yes, partly
- (iv) No, not at all
- (v) Not applicable.

To get the expected value= Total number of respondents \* Total number of response options  
 $16*5$

Actual Value= total value of responses from each respondent such as 3+ 4+3+3+2....

Up to the 16<sup>th</sup> respondent.

### 3.7 Methods of data analysis

Descriptive statistics was the main method of data analysis. Qualitative and quantitative data was analysed. Scores for all the domains were keyed in Microsoft excel 2013 for analysis. Domain scores analysis included percentages, tables and charts generated for easy interpretation and presentation of the data.

Thematic analysis of qualitative data was conducted. This data was collected from the open-ended questions, discussions and document review guides. The information was used to support the score for each of the components assessed.

### **3.8 Ethical Considerations**

Ethical consideration is supreme for each study to ensure credibility and confidence in the results. Ethical matters are relevant to all research proposals and to each stage of research in question, including identifying the research problem, collection, analysis, interpretation of data, writing and dissemination of the research. Ethical matters include access, privacy and keeping participants anonymous. There is need to seek consent from the participants and legal issues such as intellectual ownership, access, privacy, and acceptance and deceitfulness.

This involves obtaining for a letter to allow data collection, informed consents, validate reporting and privacy of interviewees. The respondents were guaranteed confidentiality and an assurance that they would not be victimized for the information provided.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **STATUS OF THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS AT AECF**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

The chapter presents the findings of the study in line with the two objectives. The study aimed to establish whether AECF conforms to the standard M&E system requirements. The chapter begins with a presentation of the characteristics of study respondents. Part two presents the status of AECF's M&E system as assessed based on the 12 components of a functional M&E system.

#### **4.2 Characteristics of Study Respondents**

The assessment sought to capture the background characteristics of the respondents. The results of these characteristics are presented in table 4.1 below. Overall, the response rate was 88 percent. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) stated that a response rate of 50% and above is optimal for analysis and reporting, a rate of 60% is good and that of 70% and above is excellent. In this regard, the study had a (88%) response rate which is excellent. The results also show that over half of the respondents were male and 43 percent of respondents were females. In terms of level of education, the results show that 47 percent respondents were graduates while more than half of those who responded had attained a postgraduate degree relevant to their current roles. On number of years worked, the results show that majority of the staff had worked at AECF for less than three years and only 7 percent have worked for a period of 4-6 years and 21 percent have worked for AECF for more than 6 years. Furthermore, the results show that majority of the respondents (71 percent) had some formal training in M&E and only 29 percent had no form of training in M&E.

**Table 4.1: Percent distribution of respondents by various characteristics**

<b>Characteristics</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>Sex</b>		
Male	8	57
Female	6	43
<b>Level of Education</b>		
Graduate	6	47
Postgraduate	8	53
<b>Years of Experience</b>		
Less than 1 year	3	21
1-3 years	7	50
4-6 years	1	7
More than six years	3	21
<b>Job Designation</b>		
Portfolio Officers	5	36
Portfolio sector team leads	2	14
Portfolio managers	2	14
Monitoring and Evaluation Officers	2	14
Senior portfolio officers	3	22
<b>Training in M&amp;E</b>		
Yes	10	71
No	4	29
<b>Response Rate</b>	14	88

### 4.3 Status of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems at AECF

The assessment focused on the 12 components of M&E system based on UNAIDS framework. These 12 components are categorized into three categories. The first category is people, partnerships and planning; the second category is data collection, capturing and verification and the third category is data use for decision making. The results based on these three categories are presented below.

#### 4.3.1 People, Partnership and Planning

This section presents findings based on people, partnerships and planning. This category has six components of an M&E system which include; organizational M&E structures, human capacity, M&E plan, M&E partnerships, costs, M&E advocacy, culture and communications. The assessment focused on various aspects of these components. The results for each component are represented in table 4.2 below. The results show that out of the six components, costed M&E workplan has the highest score of 91 percent, followed by M&E workplan with a score of 81 percent and human capacity scored 80 percent while organizational structures with M&E scored the lowest; 61 percent. The study also assessed each of the various components of this category and the results are presented below.

**Table 4.2: Results for the category of People, Partnership and Planning**

<b>Components</b>	<b>Actual score</b>	<b>Expected score</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Organizational structures with M&E	178	294	61
Huma Capacity for M&E	225	280	80
M&E partnerships	84	126	67
M&E Plan	228	280	81
Costed M&E workplan	255	280	91
M&E advocacy, Communications and Culture	284	448	63

##### 4.3.1.1 Organizational Structure

For organizational structure, the assessment sought to find out if there exists an M&E unit at the AECF, whether there are adequate and qualified M&E staff, whether the M&E roles and responsibilities are clearly defined in the job descriptions, if there is

an available budget to support M&E activities, if meetings are conducted to assess progress, plan and coordinate M&E activities and whether there exists defined M&E career paths at AECF. The results of the assessment as shown in table 4.3 below. The results show that out of the six issues that were assessed, the existence of well-defined career paths for M&E staff at AECF scored the highest with a score of 69 percent followed by the availability of clearly defined M&E roles and responsibilities in the job descriptions and the M&E meetings conducted to assess progress, plan and coordinate both scoring 68 percent while the organization scored the least on the aspect of having available budget to conduct M&E activities.

The results also show that there is an M&E unit at AECF however, there are no clear reporting lines for the M&E team based on the interviews conducted with the M&E staff. Some M&E team members report to Strategy and Partnership department while others report to the Director of portfolio. The results from the interviews show that the M&E team is qualified but very limited in terms of the number of employees conducting M&E activities versus the number of projects that are ongoing. There are concerns around budget allocation for M&E which scored the least, 43 percent. The interviews further show that the budget is sometimes not enough or clearly thought through during the Programme budgeting phase. This implies that existence of an M&E unit at the AECF, adequate and qualified M&E staff, M&E roles and responsibilities clearly defined in the job descriptions, meetings conducted to assess progress, plan and coordinate M&E activities and whether there existence of well-defined M&E career paths at AECF are partly functional except availability of budget to support M&E activities. These findings are consisted with what Odieny, (2015) found when he conducted a study to assess the M&E systems of the International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) Kenya. (Odieny, 2015) found out that ICJ had an M&E unit that had inadequate human resources that was required to conduct its mandate.

**Table 4.3: Results for the category of Organizational Structures**

	<b>Organizational Structures</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Expected Score</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1	Existence of an M&E unit	15	28	54
2	Adequate and qualified M&E staff at the organization	34	56	61
3	M&E roles and responsibilities clearly defined in the job description	38	56	68
4	Available budget for M&E purposes	24	56	43
5	M&E meetings to assess progress plan and coordinate	38	56	68
6	Defined career paths for M&E	29	42	69

#### **4.3.1.2 Human Capacity**

For human capacity, the assessment sought to find out whether there are available funds for M&E staff capacity building at AECF, if the M&E related skills for staff have been assessed in the last three years, whether AECF conducts M&E job trainings, if there is coordination of jobs to avoid duplication of work and if gaps related to skills required by staff are incorporated in the organizations capacity building plan. The results of the assessment for human capacity are presented in table 4.4 below. It shows that out of the five issues that were assessed, the assessment of M&E related skills for staff in the last three years scored the highest followed by incorporation of gaps related to M&E skills required by staff in the organization's capacity building plan and M&E job trainings conducted. For assessment of M&E



skills in the last three years, the organization scored 98 percent followed by a score of 84 percent on incorporating gaps of M&E related skills in the organization’s capacity building plan and 79 percent on M&E trainings. This implies that the assessment of M&E related skills for staff in the last three years, M&E job trainings and incorporation of gaps of M&E related skills required by staff in the organizations capacity building plan is functional while availability of funds for M&E staff capacity building and coordination of jobs to avoid duplication of work is fairly functional. These findings are consisted with what Jelagat (2016) found when she conducted a study to assess the M&E systems of UNICEF Kenya Country office. Jelagat found out that 85 percent of staff at UNICEF had the necessary skills to carry out M&E activities but the study also showed that M&E skills had not been assessed in the last three years before the study was conducted.

**Table 4.4: Results for the category of Human Capacity**

	<b>Human Capacity</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Expected Score</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1	Availability of funds for M&E staff capacity building	40	56	71
2	Monitoring and Evaluation related skills for staff be assessed in the last three years	55	56	98
3	M&E job trainings	44	56	79
4	Coordination of jobs to avoid duplication of work	39	56	70
5	Gaps of M&E related skills required by staff be incorporated in organizations capacity building plan	47	56	84

#### **4.3.1.3 Monitoring and Evaluation Partnerships**

For M&E partnerships, the assessment sought to find out if there exists an inventory of all M&E partners, if there is a mechanism for coordination among partners and whether AECF participates in the national M&E technical working groups. The

results of the assessment shown in table 4.5 below show that out of the three aspects assessed, the existence of an inventory for all the M&E partners had the highest score of 76 percent while AECF’s participation in the national M&E technical working groups had the lowest score of 55 percent. This implies that existence of an inventory of all M&E partners is functional while availability of a mechanism for coordination among partners at AECF and participation in the national M&E technical working group is partly functional. The interviews show efforts from the REACT portfolio to participate in national technical working groups such as the GOGLA impact working group while the Agribusiness portfolio team is yet to start participating in sector specific M&E technical working groups.

These findings are consisted with what Odieny (2015) found when he conducted a study to assess the M&E systems of the ICJ which showed that ICJ M&E team was not participating in any M&E technical working group although it had partners in the M&E field.

**Table 4.5: Results for the category of M&E Partnerships**

	<b>M&amp;E partnerships</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Expected Score</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1	An inventory of all M&E partners	32	42	76
2	Availability of a mechanism for coordination among partners	29	42	69
3	Participation in the national M&E technical working groups	23	42	55

#### **4.3.1.4 Monitoring and Evaluation Plan**

Under the M&E plan component, the assessment sought to find out whether AECF has an M&E plan in place, if program based stakeholders are involved in the development of the M&E plan, if the M&E plan is revised based on M&E system reviews and assessments, whether the M&E system in place meets the international standards and whether there is available budget estimates for M&E activities. Out of

the five issues assessed, availability of budget estimates scored the highest followed by the availability of an M&E plan and involvement of stakeholders in the development of the M&E plan. The results are shown in table 4.6 below. The assessment on whether the M&E system at AECF meets the international standards scored the least. The interviews with the M&E team show that AECF uses information gathered from reviews and assessments of the M&E system to update the M&E plan on a minimal extent. This implies that the availability of an M&E plan, involvement of stakeholders in the development of an M&E plan and availability of budget estimates for M&E activities are functional. Revision of an M&E plan based on reviews and assessment of the M&E system is fairly functional while M&E system put in place meeting the M&E system international is partly functional.

These findings are consisted with what Odieny (2015) found when he conducted a study to assess the M&E systems of the ICJ. Odieny, found out that there was an M&E plan at ICJ that met the standard M&E plan requirements.

**Table 4.6: Results for the category of Monitoring and Evaluation Plan**

	<b>Monitoring and Evaluation Plan</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Expected Score</b>	<b>percent</b>
1	Availability of an M&E plan	51	56	91
2	Involvement of stakeholders in the development of an M&E plan	44	56	79
3	Revision of an M&E plan based on reviews and assessment of the M&E system	40	56	71
4	M&E system in place meets the M&E system international standards	37	56	66
5	Available budget estimates for M&E activities	56	56	100

#### 4.3.1.5 Costed M&E Workplan

Under the category of costed M&E workplan, the assessment sought to find out if the work plan covers activities, who to implement, period of time, costs, and available budget, whether the M&E activities have been costed, whether the M&E plan is linked to program work plan, whether work plan is updated annually and its centered on performance monitoring and if the M&E workplan is developed against the previous years' activities. The results of the assessment in table 4.7 below show that out of the five aspects assessed, linkage of the M&E plan to the program workplan scored the highest followed by inclusion of M&E activities, implementers, timeframes, costs and available budget in the workplan and costing of M&E activities. For linking M&E plan to the program workplan, the organization scored 100 percent followed by a score of 98 percent on inclusion of M&E activities, implementers, timeframes, costs and the available budget and a score of 91 percent on costing M&E activities. The interviews with the team show that activities at AECF are costed and that the workplan is updated on an annual basis factoring in activities from previous years. This implies that costed M&E workplan is functional with all the five aspects scoring above 75 percent.

These findings are consisted with what Jelagat (2016) found when she conducted a study to assess the M&E systems of UNICEF Kenya Country office. Jelagat found out that there was a costed M&E plan in the at UNICEF and that resources were allocated to meet specific M&E activities.

**Table 4.7: Results for the category of Costed M&E Workplan**

	<b>Costed M&amp;E Workplan</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Expected Score</b>	<b>percent</b>
1	Work plan covers activities, implementers, time frames, costs, and available budget	55	56	98
2	M&E activities have been costed	51	56	91
3	M&E plan linked to program work plan.	56	56	100

4	Work plan updated annually centered on performance monitoring.	50	56	89
5	M&E workplan is developed against the previous years' activities	43	56	77

#### 4.3.1.6 M&E advocacy, Communication and Culture

Under M&E advocacy, communication and culture category, the assessment sought to find out if there exists a communication and advocacy plan, if there are structured, targeted and planned M&E advocacy activities, if there exists M&E materials to give various categories distinct messages, if the M&E plans are integrated into the overall strategy of the organization, whether AECF managers are supportive and involved in M&E activities, if the M&E staff are part of planning and management team, if the M&E performance is frequently communicated and whether the organization has people who champion and support M&E activities.

The results in table 4.8 below show that out of the eight aspects being assessed the availability of people who champion and support M&E activities in the organization scored the highest followed by M&E staff being part of planning and management while the existence of an M&E communication and advocacy plan and availability of structured, targeted and planned M&E advocacy activities scored the lowest. For having people who champion and support M&E activities, the organization scored 93 percent and a score of 73 percent on M&E staff constituting the planning and management team. The interviews with the program and M&E team show that it is not clear to the team whether there is an M&E communication and advocacy plan at AECF and whether there are structured, targeted and planned M&E advocacy activities. This explains the lowest score of 46 percent for the two mentioned aspects. The interviews further show that M&E plans are not fully integrated into the overall strategy and that minimal M&E materials exist to communicate to different stakeholders. The aspect of the organization having people who champion and support M&E activities is functional while M&E staff being part of planning and management team and managers being supportive and involved in M&E activities is fairly functional while integration of M&E plans into the overall strategy of the

organization, frequent communication of M&E performance and existence of M&E materials to give different messages to various categories is partly functional. Existence of an M&E communication and advocacy plan and availability of structured, targeted and planned M&E advocacy activities is not functional. The findings are consisted with what Odieny (2015) found when assessing the M&E system of the ICJ. Odieny also found that the ICJ did not have a clear communication and advocacy strategy.

**Table 4.8: Results for the category of M&E advocacy, Communication and Culture**

	<b>M&amp;E advocacy, Communication and Culture</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Expected Score</b>	<b>percent</b>
1	Existence of an M&E communication and advocacy plan	26	56	46
2	Availability of structured, targeted and planned M&E advocacy activities	26	56	46
3	Existence of M&E materials to give different messages to various categories	30	56	54
4	M&E plans are integrated into the overall strategy of the organization	37	56	66
5	Managers are supportive and involved in M&E activities	39	56	70
6	M&E staff are part of planning and management team	41	56	73
7	M&E performance is frequently communicated	33	56	59
8	The organization has people who champion and support M&E activities	52	56	93

### 4.3.2 Collect, Capture and Verify Data

This section presents findings based on data collection, capturing and verification. This category has five components of an M&E system which include; routine program monitoring, surveys and surveillance, M&E databases, supervision and data auditing, evaluation and research. The results for each component are represented in table 4.9 below. The results show that out of the five components, routine program monitoring scored the highest followed by supervision and data auditing and evaluation and research while surveys and surveillance scored the lowest. For routine program monitoring, the organization scored 91 percent followed by a score of 85 percent for supervision and auditing and 75 percent for evaluation and research.

**Table 4.9: Results for the category of Data Management**

	<b>Data management</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Expected Score</b>	<b>percent</b>
1	Routine program monitoring	346	392	88
2	Surveys and surveillance	119	224	53
3	M&E databases	116	168	69
4	Supervision and data auditing	191	224	85
5	Evaluation and research	166	224	74

#### 4.3.2.1 Routine Program Monitoring

For Routine program monitoring, the assessment sought to find out whether there is an M&E guideline that document the procedures for reporting M&E data at AECF, whether there exists a guidance on how data quality is to be maintained, if the departments use standardized reporting tools, whether all source documents used during the previous data audit visit are available, if program reports are verified by program officers and M&E before reports are prepared and submitted and whether there are available mechanisms to resolve variances in program reports. The table 4.10 below show results of the seven aspects being assessed. It shows that use of standardized reporting tools scored the highest followed by verification of reports by program and M&E team and availability of mechanisms to resolve variances in the reports. For departments use of standardized reporting tools, the organization scored

100 percent followed by a score of 93 percent for verification of reports by the program and M&E teams and a score of 91 percent for availability of mechanisms to resolve variances in the reports. AECF has a strong program monitoring system based on the interviews with the program and M&E team. This implies that routine monitoring is functional with all the aspects scoring above 75 percent. The study findings are consisted with what Kasyoka (2018) found when assessing the M&E system of YEDF. Kasyoka also found that YEDF had guidelines for recording, collecting and reporting data and tools for data collection. He found a dispute in usage of uniform data collection forms on all the three categories of the 12 components of an M&E system.

**Table 4.10: Results for the category of Routine monitoring**

	<b>Routine Monitoring</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Expected Score</b>	<b>percent</b>
1	Existence of M&E guideline that document the procedures for reporting M&E data	50	56	89
2	Existence of guidance on how data quality is to be maintained	43	56	77
3	Departments use standardized reporting tools	56	56	100
4	Availability of all source documents during previous data audit visit	46	56	82
5	Reports are verified by program officers and M&E before reporting	52	56	93
6	Available mechanisms to resolve variances in the reports	51	56	91
7	Results of routine program monitoring are used to formulate indicators in the M&E plan	48	56	86



#### 4.3.2.2 Surveys and Surveillance

For surveys and surveillance, the assessment sought to find out whether AECF has an updated inventory of all surveys conducted, if the surveys conducted have supported the indicators being measured, whether there are schedules for impending surveys and whether there exist roasters for future surveys. The results in table 4.11 below show that out of the four aspects being assessed, surveys conducted having supported indicators being measured scored the highest with a score of 55 percent followed by availability of schedules for impending surveys. This implies that surveys and surveillance component is partly functional with all the four aspects being assessed under this component scoring between 55 and 52 percent.

The results show that the program team have minimal awareness of availability of an updated inventory of all the surveys conducted at AECF. The interviews show that the team is also not aware of present roasters for future surveys and that there are no clear schedules for impending surveys. Despite lack of awareness for the two aspects mentioned above, the interviews show that the surveys conducted have supported formulation of indicators being measured and sometimes informed change and addition of indicators. The study findings are consisted with what Masia (2018) found when assessing the M&E system the National Council for Population and Development. The assessment revealed that NCPD used external technical assistance and consultants in the development of strong supervision guideline and tools in conducting data audits and field supervision.

**Table 4.11: Results for the category of Surveys and Surveillance**

	<b>Surveys and Surveillance</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Expected Score</b>	<b>percent</b>
1	An available updated inventory of all surveys conducted	29	56	52
2	Surveys conducted have supported indicators being measured	31	56	55
3	There are schedules for impending surveys	30	56	54

4	Existence of roasters for future surveys	29	56	52
---	--	----	----	----

#### 4.3.2.3 M&E Databases

For M&E databases, the assessment sought to find out whether there exists an integrated database that stores data captured at the AECF, if there are structures for transmitting information among various databases and if there are mechanisms put in place to ensure data is captured accurately. The results in the table 4.12 below show that out of the three aspects being assessed, existence of an integrated database that stores data captured scored the highest followed closely by mechanisms put in place capture data accurately while existence of structures for transmitting information among various databases scored the least. For existence of an integrated database that stores data captured, the organization scored 71 percent and had a score of 70 percent for mechanisms put in place to ensure data is captured accurately. This implies that the existence of an integrated database that stores data captured and mechanisms put in place to ensure data is captured accurately is fairly functional while existence of structures for transmitting information among various databases is partly functional. These findings are consistent with what Jelagat (2016) found when she conducted a study to assess the M&E systems of UNICEF Kenya Country office. Jelagat found out that UNICEF M&E system has an integrated database used to capture and store data however, there is need to strengthen the structures used in transferring data between databases.

**Table 4.12: Results for the category of M&E Databases**

	<b>M&amp;E Databases</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Expected Score</b>	<b>percent</b>
1	Existence of an integrated database that stores data captured	40	56	71
2	There exist structures for transmitting information among various databases	37	56	66
3	Mechanisms put in place to ensure data is captured accurately	39	56	70

#### 4.3.2.4 Supervision and data audit

For supervision and data audit, the assessment sought to find out if there exists a guidance for supervision of M&E activities, whether AECF adheres to data audit procedures and protocol, if data audit and field visit reports can be accessed and if there exist periodic data audit visits. The results in the table 4.13 below show that out of the four aspects being assessed, the aspect of accessing data audit and field visit report scored the highest followed closely by periodic data audit visits and adherence to data audit procedures and protocol. For having access to data audit ad field visit reports, the organization scored 91 percent followed by a score of 88 percent for periodic data audit visits. This implies that supervision and data audit component is functional with all the aspects being assessed having scores between 79 and 91 percent. The study findings are consisted with a study by Njoka (2015) assessing M&E systems of local NGO's in Kenya. He found that some aspects of supervision and data audits are functional. He also found that data audits at local NGOs in Kenya are not conducted by the M&E team as frequent as it should be.

**Table 4.13: Results for the category of Supervision and Data audit**

	<b>Supervision and Data audit</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Expected Score</b>	<b>percent</b>
1	Existence of guidance for supervision of M&E activities	44	56	79
2	Adherence to data audit procedures and protocol	47	56	84
3	Data audit and field visit reports can be accessed	51	56	91
4	Periodic data audit visits	49	56	88

#### 4.3.2.5 Research and Evaluation

For research and evaluation, the assessment sought to find out whether there is a research and evaluation schedule at AECF, whether there are available research and evaluation guidelines highlighting methods and standards, if there is any indication of results being discussed and disseminated and if there are resources available for carrying out research and evaluation activities. The results in the table 4.14 below

show that of the four aspects being assessed, the availability of resources for carrying out research and evaluation activities scored the highest followed by discussion and dissemination of results and existence for a schedule of research and evaluation while availability of guideline that highlight research and evaluation methods and standards had the least score. For availability of resources for conducting research and evaluation activities, the organization scored 79 percent followed by a score of 77 percent for discussion and dissemination of results and a score of 75 percent for existence of a schedule for research and evaluation. This implies that availability of resources to carry out research and evaluation activities, discussion and dissemination of research results and existence for a schedule of research and evaluation is functional while availability of research and evaluation guidelines highlighting methods and standards is partly functional. The study findings are consisted with a study conducted by Obunga (2017). While he was assessing the M&E systems of Plan international, Kenya. Obunga notes that the research and evaluation component is functional however, dissemination of evaluations and studies need to be expanded to involve stakeholders.

**Table 4.14: Results for the category of Research and Evaluation**

	<b>Research and Evaluation</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Expected Score</b>	<b>percent</b>
1	Existence for a schedule of research and evaluation	42	56	75
2	Availability of research and evaluation guidelines highlighting methods and standards	37	56	66
3	Indication of results discussed and disseminated	43	56	77
4	Resources available for carrying out research and evaluation activities	44	56	79

### **4.3.3 Centre: Data Use for Decision making**

This section presents findings based on data use for decision making. This category has one component of an M&E system which is data use and dissemination. The assessment focused on various aspects of this component. The results show that data use and dissemination scored 75 percent. The study also assessed each of the various components of this category and the results are presented below.

#### **4.3.3.1 Data Use and dissemination**

For data use and dissemination, the assessment sought to find out whether the information needs of stakeholders have been assessed, if information dissemination is regularly shared with the stakeholders, whether there are laid down principle to support analysis, presentation and use data and whether there are tailored pieces of information for various audiences. The results in the table 4.15 below show that out of the four aspects assessed, assessment of stakeholder's information needs and tailored information for various target groups scored the highest followed by laid down procedures to support analysis, presentation and use of data while sharing of information dissemination regularly with stakeholders scored the least. For assessment of information needs of stakeholders and having tailored information that suits various stakeholders, the organization score was a tie of 77 percent for each of the aspects. The organization scored 73 percent for having laid down guidelines to support analysis, presentation and use of data. This implies that assessment of information needs of stakeholders and availability of tailored information for various audiences is mostly functional while availability if laid down guidelines to support analysis, presentation and use of data and regular information dissemination to stakeholders is fairly functional. The study findings are consisted with a study conducted by Global Fund (2006) that state that institutions must ensure that there is a plan in place for data dissemination to the key stakeholders.

**Table 4.15: Results for the category of Data Use and dissemination**

	<b>Data use and dissemination</b>	<b>Actual Score</b>	<b>Expected Score</b>	<b>percent</b>
<b>1</b>	Information needs of stakeholders have been assessed	43	56	77
<b>2</b>	Information dissemination is regularly shared with the stakeholders	40	56	71
<b>3</b>	Laid down guidelines to support Analysis, presentation and use of data	41	56	73
<b>4</b>	Tailored information for various audiences	43	56	77

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **4.4 Introduction**

This chapter presents the summary, conclusions and recommendations. Part one presents the summary of findings, part two presents the conclusion and part three presents the recommendations based on the study findings.

#### **5.2 Summary of Findings**

The assessment sought to find out if AECF M&E system meets the established 12 components of an M&E system and to identify the strengths and the gaps of the M&E system. The study adopted both qualitative and quantitative research methods and data was collected through review of documents and questionnaires which were administered to the key program team.

The results of the assessment show that AECFs M&E system is functional with an overall score of 75 percent. This shows that the system is functional. The results show that the organization scored the highest on costed M&E workplan; 91 percent, while surveys and surveillance had the least score of 53 percent.

The assessment result shows that the strong components of the M&E system at AECF include; costing of the M&E workplan, program monitoring, supervision and data audit on a routine basis, M&E plan and human capacity for M&E. All the above-mentioned components scored above 80 percent. The results from the assessment show several components need improvement. These components include; documentation of M&E procedures, inadequate M&E staff, unclear reporting lines for the M&E team, not having clearly defined reporting processes, dissemination of research studies not done in a systematic manner and not involving all the program staff during dissemination of different knowledge products either through meetings or dissemination forums.

Results from the interviews with program and M&E team shows that the M&E team is limited in terms of number of employees. The results show that sometimes the budget allocation for M&E is not enough or clearly thought through during the Programme budgeting phase, thereby leaving a deficit especially when the Programmes end.

The M&E team lacks an M&E leadership based in the interviews with program and M&E team. Results from the interviews indicate that the former M&E leader had transitioned from the organization and the position had not been replaced. The assessment interviews reveal that there are unclear reporting lines in the M&E unit. It shows that some team members are partially sitting outside of the portfolio; reporting to strategy and partnerships while some members report to portfolio management. The interviews show that the issue of having different reporting lines makes it difficult for the program team to allocate job activities and hold the MEL team accountable. The study also shows that there is no clear differentiation between M&E and Knowledge and Insights functions. Based on the interviews, the study found out that it was unclear to the team whether M&E will be a function under portfolio or whether it will be made an independent unit with roles distinct from the portfolio officers' roles. In addition, the study found out that the M&E functions have been designated by sector such as Agribusiness sector M&E role and Renewable energy sector M&E role, which limits cross learning and understanding of other sectors.

The study results show that in the recent past, there has not been publications or learning papers shared in the different conferences or meetings that AECF investees and the organizations comparators attend to increase and encourage knowledge exchange. The assessment results show that AECF uses MS Excel instead of using an online database. Use of Excel is cumbersome due to heavy loads of data, hence time consuming and in addition, it tampers with the quality and accuracy of data.

In reference to M&E system contribution to programming at AECF, the findings from the assessment show that, the M&E system has played a vital role in ensuring investees submit both the annual and the semi-annual reports, program and M&E team conduct data quality checks and review the reports, the M&E team updates the database and conduct analysis for the different reports including donor reports, annual impact report or for accountability purposes. The M&E system has also enabled usage of data to identify the investees who are struggling to meet their targets by updating each of the programs log frames. Based on the interviews, M&E also plays a big role in conducting different research studies, country context studies before venturing into new markets.



### **5.3 Conclusion**

The results show that the study attained its intended objectives. The objective of the study was to determine whether AECF's monitoring and Evaluation system meets the set standards and establish AECF's M&E system strengths and gaps. From the study findings, AECF has a strong M&E system that meets the standards for an M&E system to be termed effective with a score rating of 75 percent which is a 'good' score. This is supported by having most of the components score above 50 percent. Based on the academic grading criteria in South Africa, a score of above 50 percent is good (Wikipedia, 2019). Interviews with programme staff indicate that AECF is working to improve the M&E system. The findings indicate that some of the initiatives already being implemented include; the recent initiative from the M&E team to develop an online system. The system is targeted to improve on efficiency, data quality and in managing site visit reports, progress reports, disbursements and loan collection. In addition, the results indicate that the organization has plans to resource the M&E department in terms of staff, conduct capacity building trainings and has developed a strategy to guide the dissemination of research studies and program evaluations.

Despite the steps undertaken to improve the M&E system as mentioned above, there is need to strengthen other components that scored low based on the results. The areas that were highlighted in the interviews for improvement include; staffing of the M&E unit with personnel who have M&E skills and experience to carry out M&E activities effectively, AECF needs to prioritize procurement of an MIS system to ensure data is captured on an online system instead of using Microsoft Excel which is manual, hence time consuming. This will directly address the documentation aspect. In addition, the issue of the M&E team working without an M&E leadership was raised during the interviews to have had a direct impact on delivery of planned activities for the year 2019. Based on the results, continuous support from the management and program team in terms of resource allocation, work planning and assessments for improvement can lead to the organization having an exemplary M&E system to other 'challenge funds' in the country with respect to the diversity of the programs.

Based on the interviews, the performance of the M&E system at AECF is satisfactory and can be used as a model by other institutions to develop and implement a functional M&E system.

## **5.4 Recommendations for Policy and Programmes**

The recommendations were made based on the study findings. The assessment found that there are areas of AECF's M&E system that need to be strengthened to ensure conformity to the standard M&E system. The following recommendations were made:

### **5.4.1 Human Capacity, Partnerships and Planning**

**Organizational Structure:** The assessment found that the M&E team is not umbrellaed under the portfolio team. It is recommended that M&E should be umbrellaed under portfolio or made independent; but work closely with the portfolio team because currently it is not under programs.

The interviews show that there was no M&E leadership and that there were inadequate staff in the M&E department. It is recommended that AECF should hire an M&E manager and focus on having adequate resources in terms of staff and financial resources to conduct M&E activities.

The assessment results show that M&E roles are separated in terms of reporting lines, sector and job titles. Recommendations made from the interviews are that separation of roles and responsibilities needs to be clearer in a way that the roles of M&E and knowledge and insights are unpacked.

**Human Capacity for M&E:** The results from the interviews conducted with the program and M&E team show that the program officers carry out M&E activities. It is recommended that training sessions be conducted to build M&E capacity for the program officers on preparation of result chains, beneficiary models DCED standards of results measurement. In addition, AECF needs to allocate more funds for capacity building and enhance proper integration of skillset needs for the M&E staff.

**M&E partnerships:** The study findings showed that there is lack of information on whether there are M&E partnerships at AECF. However, the results show that renewable energy sector signed a partnership with GOGLA impact working group. Based on the interviews with program and M&E team, it is recommended that the agribusiness sector forms sector specific M&E partnerships like REACT's partnership with GOGLA.

***Monitoring and Evaluation Plan:*** The assessment found that AECFs M&E plan is not updated. It was recommended that the M&E updates the M&E plan to reflect the current AECF post transition; from being a project managed by KPMG to an organization. The team interviewed further recommended that in order to help the M&E team in updating the M&E plan, AECF should incorporate the M&E team during contracting phase of businesses.

***Costed M&E Workplan:*** The assessment found that there is a limited budget that cannot allow the team to conduct all the required M&E activities. It is recommended that teams involved in costing should provide clarity on cost allocation and how monies for each of the activities is to be charged. In addition, M&E budget should be increased and the workplan should be detailed in a way that it provides clarity on what activities in-house staff can accommodate versus what needs to be outsourced to consultants which should be guided by the activities, availability of resources and timelines.

***M&E advocacy, Communication and Culture:*** The assessment found that the M&E advocacy, communication and culture strategy at the AECF was not updated. The program and M&E team interviewed recommended that updating the M&E advocacy, communication and culture strategy is the first activity that should be considered, and that the strategy should be integrated into the overall AECF strategy. In addition, the team recommends that AECFs' senior management and the board should be more involved in championing M&E products, impact modelling and measurement.

#### **5.4.2 Collect, Capture and Verify Data**

***Routine program monitoring:*** The results of the assessment showed that there was no digital program monitoring system and that data verification is based on a manual process. The program and M&E team interviewed recommend that AECF should purchase a digital system for monitoring and reporting purpose considering the amount of data collected. The team suggests the purchase of a system such as the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) support system.

***Survey and Surveillance:*** The results from interviews with the M&E and program team show that the team had little information on whether there was an inventory of all the surveys conducted and it had not been shared with the team. The team

recommended that the M&E unit should make a deliberate effort to update the survey inventory and share with the team.

***M&E databases:*** The assessment found that AECF uses a Microsoft Excel database. The results from the interviews show that use of Excel is manual, time consuming to retrieve information and conduct analysis. The team interviewed recommend that AECF needs to procure an MIS to enhance data management, data storage and data use to improve on quality and consistency. The team interviewed recommend digitization and automation of all the processes.

***Supervision and data audit:*** The study finding show that at AECF, the time, the number of staff and data that is expected to be collected during support supervision visits is not realistic. The study also show that site visits are not aligned to businesses calendars. It is recommended that the M&E team should develop a site visit schedule that should consider the number of employees going for a site visit in respect to the kind of data expected to be collected. In addition, site visits should be aligned with investees calendar It is also recommended that AECF should consider engaging consultants to conduct some tasks.

***Research and Evaluation:*** The assessment found that Research and Evaluation component lacks a clear dissemination strategy. The study further shows that research and evaluation is not embedded into programs and that there is no clear schedule for research and evaluation activities. From the interviews with the program and M&E teams, it is recommended that the M&E team needs to develop a clear strategy for dissemination of results for the research products and share the strategy with the rest of team. It is further recommended that Research and Evaluation activities be embedded into design of programs instead of treating the component more like an ‘afterthought.

### **Data Use for Decision making**

***Data Use and Dissemination:*** The assessment found that there was no clear guidance on data dissemination at AECF. It was recommended that the M&E team needs to develop clear procedures for data dissemination and frequently share M&E information with all stakeholders on a regular basis. The program and M&E teams interviewed further recommend that the M&E and portfolio teams should be trained more on how to conduct data analysis, preparation of presentation and how the team

can use data and prepare tailor made information for various stakeholders. It is recommended that the M&E team should consider partnering with other data miners for benchmarking, learning and adapting current M&E trends.

### **5.5 Recommendations for Further Research**

The assessment of the M&E system at the AECF only focussed on the Nairobi office which is the Headquarters. Other studies can be done at the satellite offices which include those Cote d'ivoire and Tanzania to establish the status of their M&E systems.

## REFERENCES

- OECD. (2016). *Private Sector Peer Learning: Mechanism Profiles: Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund, Alliance for a green revolution in Africa*. Paris, France.
- Ecorys. & Carnegie, C. (2015). *Evaluation management Unit (EMU) for the Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund*. Final Mid Term evaluation. Rotterdam, Netherlands.
- Chaplowe, S. G. (2008). *Monitoring and Evaluation Planning: Guiding Tools*. USA: Catholic Relief Services and American Red Cross.
- Crawford, P. & Bryce, P. (2010). *Project Monitoring and Evaluation: A method of enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of aid project implementation*. *International Journal of Project Management*, 21(5): 363 – 37319.
- DCED. (2010). *A Walk Through the DCED Standard for Measuring Achievements in Private Sector Development* ISBN 92-64-08527-0.
- FHI 360. (2013). *Participatory M&E System Assessment Tool, Framework and Operational Guide for Implementation*. FHI 360. North Carolina, USA.
- Global HIV M&E Information. (2013). *12 Components of a Functional National HIV M&E System. Review Report*.
- Görgens, M. & Kusek, J. Z. (2009) *Making Monitoring & Evaluation systems work: a capacity development tool kit*.
- Hak, T&Dul J. (2009). *Pattern Matching*. Erasmus Research Institute of the Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University and the Erasmus School of Economics (ESE) at Erasmus Uni, Research paper.
- Holvoet, N. (2015). *Diagnostic Review of the Monitoring and Evaluation System of Uganda's Education Sector: Selected Findings and Discussion* *Journal of Education and Training* ISSN 2330-9709 2015, Vol. 2, No. 1.
- IFAD. (2010). *Project level monitoring and evaluation: who really wants to know*. Office of Evaluation, The annual report on results and impact of IFAD operations. Rome, Italy.
- Jelagat, R.S (2016). *An assessment of UNICEF Kenya Country Office Monitoring and Evaluation system*. (Unpublished master's project), University of Nairobi.
- Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS. (2009). *12 components of Monitoring and Evaluation system strengthening tool*. Geneva: UNAIDS.

- Karani, F., Walter, O., & G.K., C. (2014). *Effective Use of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems in managing HIV/AIDS Related Projects: A case study of Local NGOs in Kenya*. Science Journal of Business and Management, 2(2), 67-76.
- Karawita, A., Ariyaratne, K.A.M., Suranga, S. and Ranatunga, D. (2016). Application of M&E System Strengthening Tool (MESST) to assess the M&E systems for HIV Prevention and treatment programme in Sri Lanka.
- Kasyoka, D.A, (2018) Assessment of the Monitoring and Evaluation Systems for the Youth Enterprise Development Fund. (Unpublished master's project), University of Nairobi.
- Kusek, J. Z., & Gorgens, C. R. (2009). Ten steps to a Results-based Monitoring and Evaluation Practice. Washington DC, World Health institutions Report.
- Liket, K. C., & Maas, K. (2015). Nonprofit Organizational Effectiveness: Analysis of Best Practices.
- Macintyre, K., Eckert, E., & Robinson, A. (2002). *Assessment of the Roll Back Malaria Monitoring and Evaluation System*. WP-02-55
- McLeod, S. (2017). *Qualitative vs. Quantitative Research*. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org/qualitative-quantitative.html>.
- Mugenda & Mugenda A. (1999). Research methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches . Nairobi: Acts Press.
- Njoka, S. K. (2015). Assessment of M&E Systems of Local NGOs in Kenya: A case study of Family Health Options Kenya. (Unpublished master's project), University of Nairobi.
- Odieny, G. (2015). An assessment of the International Commission of Jurists Kenya Monitoring and Evaluation System. (Unpublished master's project), University of Nairobi.
- OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development). 2002. OGAC, PEPFAR, USAID, WHO, UNAIDS.

- Odhiambo, K.T. “*Monitoring and evaluation and the development challenge in Africa*” Seminar and Workshop organized by the development Bank of Southern Africa, Johannesburg, 25-29 September 2000.
- Ogungbemi, K., Kola A.O., Stephanie, M., Anne, L., Aderemi, A., David B., Tendayi, N.M., Natasha, K. & Akinyemi, A. (2012). Using UNAIDS’s organizing framework to assess Nigeria’s national HIV monitoring and evaluation system. *Open Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2(3) 372-378.
- Patton, M.Q. (2002). Evaluation, knowledge management, best practices, and high-quality lessons learned. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 22(329), 329-326.
- Pfeiffer, K. M. (2011). *Monitoring and Evaluation in the United States Government: Overview*. Washington DC: Independent Evaluation Group, the World Health Institutions Group.
- Obunga, R.O, (2017). *An assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems of Plan Kenya: A case study of Young Health Programme and Adolescent Girls Initiative Kenya*, Nairobi, University of Nairobi.
- Masia, S.M, (2018) *Assessment of the Monitoring and Evaluation Systems for the National Council for Population and Development*. (Unpublished master’s project), University of Nairobi.
- The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria; WHO; World Bank; UNICEF; UNAIDS; USAID; HHS/CDC; MEASURE Evaluation and Family Health International. (2006). *Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit for HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria*.
- Thomas, V. (2010). *Evaluation systems, ethics , and Development Evaluation* . *American Journal of Evaluation*, 31(4) 540 -548, The World Bank Group , Washington , DC.
- UNAIDS (2009a). *12 components monitoring & evaluation system strengthening tool*, Geneva.
- UNAIDS (2009b). *12 components monitoring & evaluation system strengthening tool*, Geneva
- UNAIDS (2004). *Report on the Global AIDS Epidemic*, July 2004.



- UNAIDS (2008 a). Organizing framework for a functional National HIV Monitoring and Evaluation System, Geneva.
- UNAIDS (2008 b). *Organizing Framework for a Functional National HIV Monitoring and Evaluation System*, Geneva.
- UNDP (2012). Results based management Handbook, United Nations Development Group, <http://www.undg.org/docs/12316/UNDG-RBM%20 Handbook - 2012.pdf>.
- United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). (2014). *“The Programme Managers Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Toolkit*. New York, NY: UNFPA.
- Vanesa W. and Gala D. (2011) *Sound Expectations: From Impact Evaluations to Policy Change*. New Delhi, India.
- Wikipedia contributors (2019). Academic grading in South Africa. In Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia. July 22  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Academic\\_grading\\_in\\_South\\_Africa&oldid=907360722](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Academic_grading_in_South_Africa&oldid=907360722)
- World Bank (2009). Making Monitoring & Evaluation systems work: a capacity development tool kit. World Bank. Washington, DC.
- World Bank Group (2013). Results and Performance of the International Finance Corporation (IFC) and Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA). Washington, DC.
- World Bank (2007). How to build M&E systems to support better Government. World Bank. Washington, DC.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONNAIRE

Greetings, my name is Emelda Lumula, a student at the University of Nairobi pursuing a master's degree in M&E of population and Development programs. As a requirement for the award of the degree, I am undertaking a research study to assess the M&E System of the AECF. The survey will focus on the 12 components of an M&E system and will help in providing an in-depth understanding of the M&E system of the AECF. The outcome of this study will be useful in fulfilling my academic requirement for the award of master's degree in M&E and to AECF management, staff and Board in terms of how well the M&E system of The AECF is functioning. The information collected will be confidential and will be used for the purpose of this study only.

I'm therefore seeking your assistance to fill the questionnaires. Are you willing to participate in filling in the questionnaire?

1. Yes (Proceed)
2. No (End)

#### Section A: Respondent Details

1. Please indicate your gender

Female        [   ]

Male         [   ]

2. Kindly indicate the highest level of education attained

1. Secondary level    [   ]

2. Diploma            [   ]

3. Graduate            [   ]

4. Postgraduate        [   ]

3. For how long have you been working at the Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund?

Less than 1 years [   ]

- 1 to 3 years            [   ]
- 4 to 6 years            [   ]
- Above 6 years        [   ]

4. Job Designation

.....  
 .....

5. Have you received any training in Monitoring and Evaluation?

Yes [   ]

No [   ]

**SECTION B:**

**Component 1: Organizational Structure with M&E Functions**

1. Does the organization have an M&E unit/directorate?

Yes

No

2. Is the M&E roles and responsibilities are clearly defined in job descriptions?

1. Strongly agree    2. Disagree    3. Agree    4. Strongly agree

3. The number of M&E staff at the unit is adequate and qualified?

1. Strongly agree    2. Disagree    3. Agree    4. Strongly agree

4. Is there a budget for M&E purposes?

(i) Yes, completely                      (ii) Yes, mostly                      (iii) Yes, partly

(iv) No, not at all                      (v) Not applicable

5. Does the M&E unit meet regularly to assess progress plan and coordinate

1. Strongly agree    2. Disagree    3. Agree    4. Strongly agree

6. Are there well-defined career paths for M&E staff at the AECF?

6. (i) Yes, (ii) No, not at all (iii) Not applicable

7. Please identify any three major challenges in the organizational structure in relation to M&E functions

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

8. Please suggest any key improvements that are necessary in this area

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**Component 2: Human Capacity for M&E**

1. Are there funds for M&E staff capacity building?

- (i) Yes, completely (ii) Yes, mostly (iii) Yes, partly  
(iv) No, not at all (v) Not applicable

2. Has monitoring and evaluation related skills for staff been assessed in the last three years?

- (i) Yes, completely (ii) Yes, mostly (iii) Yes, partly  
(iv) No, not at all (v) Not applicable

3. Does AECF conduct M&E job trainings to enable staff carry out tasks related to M&E?

- (i) Yes, completely (ii) Yes, mostly (iii) Yes, partly  
(iv) No, not at all (v) Not applicable

4. Are jobs coordinated at the AECF to avoid duplication of work?

- (i) Yes, completely (ii) Yes, mostly (iii) Yes, partly

(iv) No, not at all (v) Not applicable

5. Are gaps of M&E related skills required by staff been incorporated in the organization’s capacity building plan?

(i)Yes, completely (ii) Yes, mostly (iii)Yes, partly

(iv) No, not at all (v) Not applicable

6. Please identify any three major challenges in human capacity for M&E

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

7. Please suggest any key improvements that are necessary in human capacity for M&E

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**Component 3: M&E Partnerships**

1. Does AECF have an inventory of all M&E partners?

(i)Yes, (ii) No, not at all (iii) Not applicable

2. Are there mechanisms to coordinate with all stakeholders?

(i)Yes, (ii) No, not at all (iii) Not applicable

3. Does AECF M&E team participate in M&E technical working groups for exchange?

(i)Yes, (ii) No, not at all (iii) Not applicable

Please suggest any three major challenges in M&E partnerships

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Please suggest any key improvements that are necessary in this area

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

**Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation Plan**

To what extent do you agree with the following statement concerning AECF's Monitoring and Evaluation plan (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3 = Not applicable 4= Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.)

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
1. AECF has an updated M&E plan					
2. Stakeholders are involved in the development of an M&E plan					
3. Revision of an M&E plan is done based on reviews and assessment of the M&E system					
4. M&E system in place meets the M&E system international standards					
5. Available budget estimates for M&E activities					

6. Please identify any three major challenges in Monitoring and Evaluation Plan at the AECF

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

7. Please suggest any key improvements that are necessary in this area.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

**Component 5: Costed M&E Workplan**

To what extent do you agree with the following statement concerning Costed M&E workplan at the AECF (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3 = Not applicable 4= Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.)

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
1. Work plan covers activities, implementers, time frames, costs, and available budget.					
2. M&E activities have been costed					
3. M&E plan linked to program work plan.					
4. Work plan updated annually centered on performance monitoring					
5. M&E workplan is developed against the previous years' activities					

6. Please identify any three major challenges in Costed M&E workplan at the AECF

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

7. Please suggest any key improvements that are necessary in this area.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

**Component 6: M&E advocacy. Communication and Culture**

To what extent do you agree with the following statement concerning M&E advocacy, Communication and Culture at the AECF (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3 = Not applicable 4= Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Existence of an M&E communication and advocacy plan					
2. Availability of structured, targeted and planned M&E advocacy activities					
3. Existence of M&E materials to give different messages to various categories					
4. M&E plans are integrated into the overall strategy of the organization					
5. Managers are supportive and involved in M&E activities					
6. M&E staff are part of planning and management team					
7. M&E performance is frequently communicated					
8. The organization has people who champion and support M&E activities					

9. Please identify any three major challenges in M&E advocacy, communication and Culture at the AECF

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

10. Please suggest any key improvements that are necessary in this area.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

**Component 7: Routine program monitoring**

To what extent do you agree with the following statement concerning Routine program monitoring component at the AECF (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3 = Not applicable 4= Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.)



	1	2	3	4	5
11. Existence of M&E guideline that document the procedures for reporting M&E data					
12. Existence of guidance on how data quality is to be maintained					
13. Departments use standardized reporting tools					
14. Availability of all source documents during previous data audit visit					
15. Reports are verified by program officers and M&E before reporting					
16. Available mechanisms to resolve variances in the reports					
17. Results of routine program monitoring are used to formulate indicators in the M&E plan					

18. Please identify any three major challenges in Routine monitoring component at the AECF

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

19. Please suggest any key improvements that are necessary in this area.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

**Component 8: Survey and Surveillance**

To what extent do you agree with the following statement concerning Surveys and Surveillance component at the AECF (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3 = Not applicable 4= Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. An available updated inventory of all surveys conducted					
2. Surveys conducted have supported indicators being measured					
3. There are schedules for impending surveys					
4. Existence of roasters for future surveys					

20. Please identify any three major challenges in Surveys and surveillance component at the AECF

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

21. Please suggest any key improvements that are necessary in this area.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

**Component 9: M&E Databases**

To what extent do you agree with the following statement concerning M&E Databases component at the AECF (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3 = Not applicable 4= Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.)

	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
1. Existence of an integrated database that stores data captured					
2. There exist structures for transmitting information among various databases					
3. Mechanisms put in place to ensure data is captured accurately					

22. Please identify any three major challenges in M&E databases component at the AECF

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

23. Please suggest any key improvements that are necessary in this area.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

**Component 10: Supervision and Data Audit**

To what extent do you agree with the following statement concerning Supervision and Data Audit component at the AECF (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3 = Not applicable 4= Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Existence of guidance for supervision of M&E activities					
2. Adherence to data audit procedures and protocol					
3. Data audit sand field visit reports can be accessed					
4. Periodic data audit visits conducted					

24. Please identify any three major challenges in supervision and data audit M&E component at the AECF

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

25. Please suggest any key improvements that are necessary in this area.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

**Component 11: Research and Evaluation**

To what extent do you agree with the following statement concerning Research and Evaluation component at the AECF (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3 = Not applicable 4= Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Existence for a schedule of research and evaluation					
2. Availability of research and evaluation guidelines highlighting methods and standards					
3. Indication of results discussed and disseminated					
4. Resources available for carrying out research and evaluation activities					

26. Please identify any three major challenges in research and evaluation component at the AECF

.....  
 .....  
 .....

27. Please suggest any key improvements that are necessary in this area.

.....  
 .....  
 .....

**Component 12: Data Use and Dissemination**

To what extent do you agree with the following statement concerning Data use and dissemination component at the AECF (1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3 = Not applicable 4= Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree.)

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Information needs of stakeholders have been assessed					
2. Information dissemination is regularly shared with the stakeholders					
3. Laid down guidelines to support Analysis, presentation and use of data					
4. Tailored information for various audiences					

28. Please identify any three major challenges in data use and dissemination component at the AECF

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

29. Please suggest any key improvements that are necessary in this area.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

***Thank you!***

## **APPENDIX II: Document Review Guide; adopted from UNAIDS 2009a&b).**

### **Introduction**

This guide will help the assessor with specific information of the Africa Enterprise Challenge Fund M&E system through a review of available documents such as M&E framework (MRM), M&E plan, annual reports, project report , data collection tools among others. The score will be alongside parameters such; not applicable, does not meet, partially meets, fully meets. Explanation and comments on the rating should be provided in the comments column in the excel document.

### **1. Organizational Structures Functions**

- Check if AECF has an M&E unit responsible for M&E functions
- Check AECF's number of full-time and/or part-time M&E posts (filled or vacant)
- Obtain any documents that provide the policy and legislative framework for the M&E system at the AECF

### **2. Human Capacity for M&E**

- Review M&E workplan, annual workplan and human capacity building workplan
- Check if there is a human capacity building plan; it could be in the M&E Plan, or exist as a stand-alone document
- Check if M&E capacity gaps are addressed
- Obtain any documents describing plans to increase M&E staff
- Check if existing human capacity building plan is based on assessment results

### **3. M&E Partnerships**

- Check if there is an inventory of stakeholders for M&E and whether it is periodically updated.

### **4. M&E plan**

- Is there an M&E plan?
- Review AECF's strategic plan

- Verify if the M&E plan describes the 12 components, the budget projects for the M&E, the timelines for the M&E plan is harmonized with that of the strategic plan, the M&E plan contains indicators to track M&E system performance, Indicator sources of data are detailed in the M&E plan, indicator data collection regularities are detailed, there is a detailed plan for data use, each indicator has a set of targets and indicator baselines have been included.

#### **5. Costed, M&E Work Plan**

- Check the existed of and M&E workplan and assess
- Check if the National M&E Work Plan is costed, has timeline for implementation, responsible partners are identified for implementation of each activity
- Assess if the workplan has been reviewed

#### **6. Communication, Advocacy and Culture for M&E**

- Check if the policy or other similar document includes M&E policy issues and strategies

#### **7. Routine Programme Monitoring**

- Identify the main programme areas(safeguards, human rights protection)
- For each programme area, check if there are guidelines on data recording, collecting, collating and reporting
- Check whether there are guidelines on how data quality should be maintained

#### **8. Surveys and Surveillance**

- Verify if there is an inventory of surveys conducted by AECF
- If it exists, check when the inventory was last updated
- Prepare a summary on how frequently surveys are conducted

#### **9. M&E databases**

- Review the breadth, depth and quality of existing databases

#### **10. Supportive Supervision and Data Auditing**

- Find and review all the reports of data quality studies and data audits done in the last one year
- Find organization's policy on supervision of record keeping and reporting by projects

#### **11. Research and Evaluation**

- Check if there is an Evaluation and Research Agenda
- If yes, when was it last updated and how was it used
- Obtain any inventory of research work and evaluations

#### **12. Data Dissemination and Use**

- Obtain samples of the information products from various databases used in reporting
- Find reports generated in the last one year, mentioned in the M&E plan
- Review any national or programme/project-specific websites that contain M&E related information