DFID IUDD EngKAR Evaluation Kenya Case Study
December 2004

Julius Court, Research Fellow, ODI
Email: j.court@odi.org.uk

Patrick Balla, Independent Consultant, Nairobi
Email: patrick.balla@itdg.or.ke

**An Independent Evaluation of the DFID EngKaR Programme:
Kenya Case Study**

Julius Court and Patrick Balla
December 2004

Abstract:

This Report is the Country Case Study for Kenya as part of an evaluation of the Engineering Knowledge and Research (EngKaR) Programme of the UK Department for International Development (DFID). The evaluation was commissioned by DFID's Central Research Department (CRD) and will cover the outputs and activities of the six EngKaR sector programmes over the period 2000 to 2004. As part of the evaluation, country case studies on India and Kenya are being conducted. Julius Court from ODI and Patrick Balla, an independent consultant, were responsible for the Kenya case study.

The evaluation in Kenya focused on the following issues:
1) whether in-country activities are relevant, and that poverty needs are addressed;
2) the extent to which programme activities assess and relate to local context;
3) how project implementation proceeded
4) the extent projects have identified, and engaged with, potential users or beneficiaries of the research – whether government, private sector or civil society;
5) the effectiveness of dissemination to identified stakeholders;
6) the influence on policy makers;
7) any evidence of impact projects have had on poverty;
8) to identify good news cases which can be used to exemplify good practices.

The assessment is based on individual interviews, review of project documentation and creation of policy influence and communications matrices and a workshop to verify and enrich the main findings and make suggestions for ways to enhance the impact of the programme.

The main recommendations focus on:
- Potential actions to optimize outcomes of existing projects;
- Possible strategies and issues for future DFID funding in the areas of energy, water and sanitation, geoscience and transport research themes;
- Potential future areas of research not covered above;
- Process improvements that may be considered by DFID;
- Potential for strengthening dissemination and knowledge sharing activities;
- Future evaluation activities.

Contact:

Julius Court, Research Fellow, ODI.   Email: j.court@odi.org.uk
Patrick Balla, Independent Consultant, Nairobi. Email: patrick.balla@itdg.or.ke

1. INTRODUCTION

Background

This Report is the Country Case Study for Kenya as part of an evaluation of the Engineering Knowledge and Research (EngKaR) Programme of the UK Department for International Development (DFID). The evaluation was commissioned by DFID's Central Research Department (CRD) and will cover the outputs and activities of the six EngKaR sector programmes over the period 2000 to 2004. Technopolis Ltd and the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) carried out the evaluation. As part of the evaluation, country case studies on India and Kenya were conducted. Julius Court from ODI and Patrick Balla, an independent consultant, were responsible for the Kenya case study, which took place from 22 November to 30 November 2004.

EngKaR is a research for development programme divided into the six sectors of Infrastructure and Urban Development (IUD), namely: water; urban; energy; information and communication technologies (ICTs); geoscience; and transport. There are two, small, newer funds for cross-sectoral research and for the development of disability technology (that we gave less emphasis in this study). The content of the research programmes is largely derived from a competitive bidding process traditionally held over an annual cycle. Proposals are made under theme headings relating to knowledge gaps identified within each sector. Commissioned research is also undertaken. The programme is currently funding approximately 180 projects spending £12m to £14m per year.

As required by the Terms of Reference, the evaluation provides evidence regarding:
- The effectiveness of processes for identifying needs and opportunities;
- The added value and benefits of DFID inputs into the programme;
- The quality of the processes employed in running the programme;
- The quality and relevance of research outputs produced within each sector of the programme;
- The effectiveness of dissemination of programme outputs to identified stakeholders in both developing countries (DCs) and the UK;
- The value added in terms of poverty alleviation measures and other impacts on the poor;
- The extent of uptake by decision makers and other end users in developing countries (DCs).

The evaluation will culminate in the production of a final report, to be submitted to the Head of Research at CRD in December 2004. The main recommendations are expected to focus on:
- Possible strategies for future DFID funding in the areas of energy, water and sanitation, geoscience and transport research themes;
- Potential future areas of research not covered above;
- Process improvements that may be considered by DFID;
- Potential for strengthening dissemination and knowledge sharing activities;
- Potential actions to optimize outcomes of existing projects;
- Future evaluation activities.

Issues covered in the Country Visits

Within the overall context provided in the inception report, the country visits were primary intended to generate information on:

1. An assessment of whether in-country activities are appropriate and relevant, and that knowledge gaps and poverty needs are addressed (NEEDS);
2. The extent to which programme activities assess and relate to local context – economic and political – and complement other initiatives both within and outside DFID. Context is crucial to whether engineering research has a broader impact; understanding context is crucial to maximizing research impact (CONTEXT);
3. How project implementation proceeded (PROCESSES)
4. The extent projects have identified, and engaged with, potential users or beneficiaries of the research – whether government, private sector or civil society (ENGAGEMENT);
5. The effectiveness of dissemination to identified stakeholders, including comparative review of the effectiveness of localised dissemination of targeted outputs, versus widespread dissemination of more generalised outputs (DISSEMINATION);
6. The influence on policy makers through improved decision making, policy formulation and needs specification (POLICY IMPACT);
7. Any evidence of impact projects have had (POVERTY IMPACT);
8. Actions and activities with a high degree of impact, that can be used to exemplify good practice and determine critical 'success factors' for future projects (SUCCESSES).

Approach for the Country Studies

The main objective of this Country Studies was to review the formulation, progression and impacts of clusters of EngKaR projects and dentify issues arising from them according to the framework above.

The Country Studies encompassed the following elements:
- Document Reviews of project documentation focusing on key elements of the project and with preliminary assessments regarding the extent of emphasis on issues related to policy impact (see Annex 1 for a list of projects by sector). This review has looked at documentation from 38 EngKAR projects which were completed since 2001 or are still on-going.
- Document Reviews of project documentation focusing on the extent of emphasis given to issues related to communication and engagement with different stakeholders;
- In-country interviews with research performers (covering 24 of the 38 projects) to assess the relevance, utility and impact of a sample of recently completed and on-going projects (also see Annex 1 for projects where staff interviewed);
- In-country interviews with a small number of government officials, independent experts and DFID officials to assess their knowledge of the EngKaR programme, their view of country needs and suggestions in this area. A number of project holders were also former GoK officials (See Annex 2 for a list of policymakers and project staff interviewed).
- In-country workshop with project holders and policy makers had two main aims: (i) to review the preliminary findings to verify, amend or add to them; and, (ii) a substantial proportion of the workshops focused on recommendations for DFID regarding the key issues identified above (see Annex 3 for the agenda, Annex 4 for a list of participants and Annex 5 for a rough workshop report).
- Review of other relevant documentation, such as DFID sector strategies, Country Assistance Plans (for Kenya) – a full list of the electronic and paper-based reports collected (and the electronic files and printed copies) is given in Annex 5.

Table: Sectoral breakdown of EngKaR projects in Kenya, 2001-2004

Sector	Total Kenya Projects	Of which staff interviewed
Energy	10	8
Water	10	3
Urban Devt & Housing	7	7
ICT	4	3
Transport	4	1
Geosciences	0	0
Disability Technology	2	1
Cross-sectoral	1	1
Total	**38**	**24**

The Country Visit took place from 22 November to 1 December 2004.

It is important to make a number of comments about the limitations of the approach taken and validity of the findings:

- Superficially it often seems that information is there, but often project documentation was difficult to get hold of, inconsistent and not systematically comparable. And many project holders (even in the same sector) didn't know who was also involved in EngKaR work. [Recommendation 1 is that DFID develops a better mechanism for project information sharing and management.]
- Before the country visit an attempt was made to assess from the documentation the degree to which projects had assessed user needs and the policy context, how well they had engaged with and communicated the results to users and policy makers, and their influence on policy and poverty. Analysis indicated that while most had undertaken some sort of user needs and policy context analysis, had engaged well with and communicated the results well to users, fewer had engaged effectively with, and communicated the results to policy makers. But the scores allocated on the basis of documentation were often found to be inappropriate after meeting the project holders.
- Based on cross-referencing in the interviews, we believe that analysis based *solely* on project documentation is unlikely to be accurate enough to draw conclusions. It is almost impossible to assess the projects fully from the documentation alone – especially not impact on policy and practice.
- The interviews are very helpful in clarifying and enriching the understanding of each project, although it is of course difficult to fully assess a project from just one interview

However, given a triangulation of the document reviews and interviews of project holders and the other stakeholders, we do feel comfortable drawing a number of conclusions about some of the broader issues regarding the EngKaR programme. The extent of the document reviews and interviews – and the triangulation of sources – as well as the verification meeting lead us to believe that the findings for Kenya are basically accurate and valid.

The main issues that emerged are described below.

2. FINDINGS

Before going into the main findings, it is worth mentioning some preliminary points:

First, it important to note that the EngKaR programme has supported very different types of projects – from scoping or background studies to "academic" research to action research and demonstration projects. Most of the work in Kenya was at a small scale – and are often part of international comparative projects. Three indicative examples are:

o   Community responses to HIV/AIDS along transit corridors and areas of transport operations: Scoping study (R8155) – Managed by CSIR Transportek in South Africa, this 1-year project was a scoping study to examine the literature on community responses to the threat of HIV/AIDS along transport corridors, nodes, termini and areas of infrastructural development in Eastern and Southern Africa and identify scope for the transport sectors community focused interventions. It included work in Kenya, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe. In Kenya, the work started in September 2003 and ended in February 2004 and was purely a desk-based review which resulted in a synthesis report regarding HIV/AIDS along transport corridor.

o   Urban waste management for small scale energy production (R7882) – Managed by ITDG in collaboration with the Nottingham University, this project aimed to provide livelihood opportunities for the urban poor by investigating the potential for the use of waste in urban areas as a small scale energy supply for households and micro-enterprises, using appropriate technologies. The first phase focused on Sri Lanka, Senegal, Cuba, Kenya and Nepal. A second phase focused on Kenya and Cuba. In Kenya, ITDG, though a participatory technology development process, developed a briquette compressing technology, which was used and tested by communities who make briquettes from wastes.

o   Guidelines for Sustainable Handpump Projects in Africa (R7817) - Managed by Loughborough University, this 40 month project aimed to improve benefits from communal handpumps in Africa (Ghana, Kenya, South Africa, Uganda, Zambia) through an increased application of factors affecting sustainability in new projects. In Kenya, AMREF was involved in assessing the community institutional and socio-economic factors critical for the sustainability of handpumps to complement the technological assessments also done.

While diversity is often important, the Kenya case reinforces the view that the rationale for the programme as a whole and the intervention logic are not always clear. Who is the research for? (DFID, Government of Kenya, the communities, the global knowledge base). This is linked to the issue of: Whose agenda matters? (Project holders, DFID, Government of Kenya, the communities, the global knowledge base). These have different implications for how the next phase looks. [Recommendation: As part of developing the next phase, it might be useful to conduct some kind of outcome mapping exercise for the programme as a whole (as well as sub-components) in order to help clarify this set of issues.]

Second, there are major differences between sectors supported by EngKar in Kenya.
a) in terms of the number of projects – urban, energy and water and sanitation had more projects with fewer for transport and none for geoscience that we were aware of.
b) it was also very difficult to find information on projects in the transport and geosciences sectors. It was hard to find documentation and few organizations in Kenya knew of work going on in these areas – in geosciences there were no projects identified and the main transport projects had finished in 2000/01.

[Recommendation: It would be useful to understand these differences better as part of the full evaluation.]

Third, it was very clear that the work supported by EngKaR in Kenya was very fragmented. They were fragmented in a number of ways:
- o By issue – i.e. small stand-alone projects within each sector
- o Within Kenya – i.e. projects were scattered across the country (although virtually all were managed by organizations based in Nairobi)
- o Across countries – i.e. many of the projects were small cross-country comparative projects, but different issues were looked at (within and between sectors) in different countries.

[Recommendation: In the short term, there seems great need for activities for learning, synthesis and promotion across the programme – as well as to help DFID orient the next phase of work in this area. This could be done via country or regional workshops – within as well as across sectors. This would also help keep current stakeholders engaged while DFID reorients its programme.]

The aim of the country studies was to provide information on the following issues:
- Whether activities are appropriate and relevant (Needs)
- Fit with local economic, social and political issues and other initiatives (Context)
- How project implementation proceeded (Processes)
- Engagement with stakeholders (Engagement)
- Dissemination to immediate beneficiaries and other stakeholders (Communication)
- Influence on policymakers (Policy impact)
- Impact on poverty (Poverty Impact).
- We also focus on other issues that emerged (Other issues).
- Identify approaches which seem to have worked well (Successes)

These issues are addressed in turn below.

Programme Relevance & Value

There are a number of key issues here:

The projects assessed in Kenya (i.e. mostly urban, energy, and WATSAN) generally:
- Have an emphasis on the needs of the poor
- Provide resources for innovative activities
- Often feed into existing organization programmes
- Provide support in important areas of limited donors' or GoK interest.

However, as noted, virtually all of the Kenya work is part of projects that are externally coordinated. Some is directly subcontracted; some involves flexibility and local reorientation in the early stages. This was seen to have some benefits (technical expertise, experience from elsewhere and scientific credibility).

However, it was also seen to have a number of drawbacks. There were questions raised regarding the relevance to local needs, issues of ownership and the often "extractive" nature of the work. It also raises issues regarding the extent of policy and poverty impact (see below). As indicated above, the main impression is that the research in the programme is very fragmented.

Potentially EngKaR work would be useful. However, EngKaR work is not that known by GoK interviewees (some people and organizations are but not projects or findings). GoK policymakers indicated they want work that is:

– Grounded
– Empirical
– Objective
– Timely
– Good quality (person not project was indicated as crucial)
– Packaged well
– Widely applicable

Regarding relevance to DFID, the EngKaR programme could give DFID a longer term view on Kenyan technology and development issues. This research could also feed into other donor programmes. But the challenge at the national level is to ensure the connections are made to people who could potentially use the findings.

DFID-K recognises the need for research, and that valuable research needs to be longer term and more strategic. This can and does go on in parallel to DFID-Kenya's development programme. But EngKaR issues are not included in the DFID CAP.

[Recommendation: It would help if the programme was clearer about who the work is really for, who are the beneficiaries and who owns the results.]

[Recommendation: To help maximize impact, the programme will need to support projects that are much more closely aligned to the policy process in the country (GoK or DFID). See Recommendation x.]

Implementation Processes

A number of key issues emerged:

A general issue is that projects run more slowly & achieve less than hoped – partly due to over-selling and partly due to constraints in developing contexts. It seems particularly difficult to work with the commercial sector – there are tensions around values, project objectives and timeframe that need to be through better in project planning.

Most project holders regard the EngKAR projects as just one of a longer term programme of activities, and DFID as a useful source of funds for research which is often difficult to get funded locally.

Many complained Funding is externally coordinated with project conceptualization done outside the country. This means that the projects had already been designed before they became involved. Some were usually able to modify them and commented favourably on the flexibility of their partners, very few seem to have been substantially involved in project design from proposal preparation stage. This was seen as an issue of concern since the capacity to conceptualize and develop projects credibly was seen as important.

Some organisations have become involved in EngKAR projects because they already have relationships with UK-based researchers who can access EngKAR funds (especially the organizations, such as ITDG, that have institutional links to UK organizations. Others have been approached by EngKAR project holders who have heard about them or met them on the international conference circuit. Some were found by UK-based researchers who were

actively looking for partners in Kenya for specific projects. Others approached UK-based organisations looking for potential avenue of collaboration and EngKAR happened to be one of such

It was thought that sometimes DFID behaviour can undermine impact. Some of the issues mentioned included:
- There do seem gaps at DFID in terms of substantive and administrative capacities to monitor, manage and learn from the work
- DFID policies and priorities change quickly, and research that is fashionable one year is not fashionable the next making it difficult to get follow-up funds to capitalise on results (It was noted that EngKaR selection priorities changed each year)
- The limited linkage between DFID-UK and DFID-K
- DFID-K staff too busy to visit projects
- DFID-K has other priorities
- Reluctance to fund follow-up work leaves researchers and communities hanging (see below)

Needs assessment

There were a few issues here:

More generally, needs assessments are seen to be very important. Some of the studies were really scoping studies or primary research, thus needs assessments were not directly relevant.

Few projects have formal needs assessments but:
- Some are academic or scoping studies (HIV transport)
- Most emerge from existing work by organizations that have a lot of experience in the field (VSO)
- Few explicitly map existing initiatives
- Some have more formal assessments. Eg: some used the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA) as a framework; others did scan surveys and held focus groups discussions in order to rank problems & needs.

In the workshop it was noted that:
- There is a greater need for coordination at all levels; DFID, national government, communities
- Socioeconomic impact needs to be stressed in formation and implementation
- Sub contractees are often not fully able to give input during conceptualization phase which leads to gaps in program design
- EngKaR addresses funding gaps in state support for research and knowledge
- Clarification of ownership of research and target beneficiaries; who owns activities and results

Context assessment

Kenya is very diverse (in terms of the range of ethnic groups, socio-economic contexts across the country) and differs from other countries that DFID EngKaR is engaged with. In comparative projects, context assessment is vital to orienting the research and synthesizing the findings in a coherent manner as well as planning and implementing a strategy for policy

influence. It was also noted repeatedly that context changes over time (sometimes substantially) in Kenya. However, very few projects undertook formal context assessments before starting or early in the project life.

Some projects did review the formal legal or policy context?. However, very few looked seriously – and collected information – on the informal, political and institutional contexts. Some did collect information during the project, with a view to incorporating the results in recommendations at the end (Urban, Energy, Traffic Safety) context assessments. Most projects are implemented by people with existing programmes who know the political context well and orient their work accordingly. However, given the crucial importance of political context,[1] it would seem to make sense for projects to undertake formal assessments – both to orient their own strategies and to help with synthesis.

In the workshop it was noted that:
- Need for independent formal local and national context analysis;
- Key people (such as policymakers, end users etc?) have previously not been involved in project process
- Research needs to fit into local context for impact
- To promote continuity projects need to fit into DFID Country Action Plan and have a better link to DFID country office
- Lack of involvement of implementers in concept phase is the greatest problem
- Efforts need to be made to involve government early in process; concept phase

[Recommendation: To help facilitate learning, orient the project strategy and maximize project impact it would be useful that formal needs and contexts assessments are carried out at key moments in project cycle.

Policy Maker Engagement

Policy makers in Kenya tend not to be influenced by research. Most policy is politically driven, and research driven by academic incentives. This reflects wider comments about researchers and policymakers living in parallel universes.

The EngKaR projects in Kenya have engaged with communities (a lot), with policymakers (some) with other partners (a little). This has tended to happen through visits, workshops, and seminars. Some engage to test ideas; others to get ideas to test. The nature of this engagement varies considerably - Some only "inform"; other "liaise" and others really "involve" policymakers. There was the general feeling that "proper" engagement means from start of project not at end

For Kenya, majority of project holders highlighted the key importance of the senior government officials such as Permanent Secretaries in the policy process in their ministries. There were also interesting anecdotes about how to engage such people if they were not initially interested in the projects – either by working with known friends of champions below them in their department – or by working with DFID or senior parliamentarians to put pressure on them "from above".

In the workshop it was noted that:
- Government and implementers need to be engaged early in concept phase

---

[1] Court et al., 2005, *Bridging Research and Policy in International Development: Evidence and the Change Process*, ITDG 2005.

- Define who the research is for to ensure local engagement and national involvement
- Forums for govt officials so information can be disseminated
- Project duration should allow for meaningful engagement
- Capacity building for program managers to deal with policy makers
- DFID country office should be involved in leveraging of policy makers based on results of research.

[Recommendation: To orient the project strategy and maximize project impact, projects should have a thought-through strategy for how to engage key stakeholders at key moments and in what ways.]

Communication and Dissemination

Some of the older projects have done little more than produce a final report. More generally, there is greater emphasis on dissemination than 2-way communication.

Only a minority of projects emphasise the need to influence policy-makers. Most concentrate on disseminating their results to other researchers and aid practitioners; local service-providers and grassroots end-users. A relatively large number of projects have information available on a web-page. This is often backed up by CD roms and print publications for those without internet access.

However, many projects produce a range of communication outputs for various audiences (communities, local authorities, government departments, academics) this is seen as key. In a rather rare example, one project good example (R7882) made an explicit effort to develop attractive packaging for its publications. Only a few projects mentioned using research and practitioner networks to distribute findings.

In terms of Kenya, it was stressed that "seeing is believing." Many emphasise the importance of face-to-face dialogue through field visits, workshops and seminars. Word of mouth was seen as having a greater impact than printed communications. Reports which come from UK project holders or DFID head office may not be compatible to local situation.

Localized dissemination was much more effective in terms of reaching policymakers and changing policy than widespread dissemination of more generalised outputs. Policymakers are not aware of the widespread dissemination outputs.

Most would like to do more – and there was some frustration. There were particular problems regarding informing communities of findings. There were also concerns regarding the language of communications – both in terms of nature (simplicity) and in terms of different language needs of different ethnic groups. However, this seemed to be addressed in only a few projects.

We didn't find any examples where a project had carried out communications impact assessments – and assessed the benefits, costs and value of different options. It is also important to communicate all experiences not just findings – this is crucial for learning and so there isn't a "success" bias

The basic impression we are left with is that there is scope for much better communications strategies within EngKaR work. Communications approaches seem weak generally.[2]

---

[2] See Ingie Hovland for a good review of the literature and experience in this area.

Particularly at the country level, they are constrained by the lack of emphasis given by the often-external driven nature of projects. Better communications approaches would maximize the impact of projects at the country level.

[Recommendation: See below – for details, but much more emphasis on local dissemination is needed if the programme is to have a greater impact in the future.]

Policy Influence

Some of the older and more technology-focused projects (and scoping studies) didn't aim to influence policy, over and above generating some policy recommendation in the final report/workshop/seminar.

There are some good examples direct influence – for example:
- o Participatory urban planning
- o Informing primary schools about HIV
- o VSO project on disabilities

Some projects have contributed with other factors to creating a policy space and imperative for further work. Others have been taken up by other donors looking for new approaches, and have been taken up on a much lager scale than originally anticipated, providing models of practice which are more visible (Indoor air pollution work in Kenya taken forward much more in Uganda and Tanzania than Kenya).

However, the main finding is that policy influence has been rare, indirect, incremental and patchy. The Kenya case reflects the broader view that "EngKar projects not changing the world". Often the institutional capacity of project holders to influence policy is lacking

Many project holders and other informants stressed the important role that donors can play in influencing policy – and lamented the DFID-K was not more engaged in this area.

Based on a synthesis of the Kenya work, it seems that policy influence is maximized when projects:
- – Engage with policymakers (unanimous)
- – Engaged with existing policy processes
- – Are part of broader holder organizational programmes
- – Have longer term horizons
- – Generate research that is credible
- – Collaborate with other groups
- – There is already a policy demand
- – Donors also push the initiative

There is a widespread view that the problem is implementation not influencing policy formulation and policy documents – and there is limited success in influencing practice. Often the stated policy may be good, but there is no implementation.

No projects had carried out a formal assessment of their policy impact in order to establish the extent and nature of impact they are having. Incorporating evaluation at policy maker level will help to establish whether projects are having any influence at that level.

The workshop noted that a key issue, especially for larger projects, is that projects should actually define their policy aims and identify indicators of policy change. These might include development of or changes in:
- o Formal policy documents

- Policy / issue awareness – by target groups
- Changing behaviour
- Formulation;
- Enactment
- Implementation
- Budget Changes

It was also noted that approaches were also important (eg making processes more transparent or participatory) and that perhaps these should be developed separately. For many projects, this is actually the change in behaviour desired.

[Recommendation: If policy influence is a specific overarching goal, it will have a number of specific implications. These are dealt with generically here, but would include that research projects will need to be more relevant to policy concerns, better engage in policy processes, engage with policymakers, build capacity of project holders in this area and evaluate the impact of their work toward policy goals.]

Poverty Impact

This is not a *direct* objective for many. Most claim the benefits will be realised later on through influencing policy and practice via widespread communication.

Many claimed that there is no impact despite relevant work. Key issues are:

- the lack of scale up from research or pilot is key issue. For example, when the community was ready to go further, the project did not have funds to help the community package and market the briquettes or to provide the skills to fabricate and produce the technology. "We have a document, but the community has not benefited."
- projects are short – takes at least 18 months to impact on outcomes (& policy)

However, it was also noted that any pilot or demonstration must contain an approach that can be mainstreamed (i.e. leading to sustainability), but that many projects do not work this through. The key is to get commitment to implementation within community itself.

It might be useful to have long term post project evaluation in order to see impacts on poverty.

Other Issues

The main issue that emerged consistently was regarding the issue of capacity. This is seen as a crucial area in the sense that research capacity limited and policy capacities are limited (eg National Council for Science and Technology   NCST). Capacity of project holders enhanced in bigger projects with explicit CB goals. However, most project holders felt that capacity issues were not given enough emphasis by DFID.

A key challenge is whether and how EngKaR projects should ensure broader Capacity Building aims? Capacity building for who / for what?

- Projects have not really engaged private sector well (this is partly to do with project strategy and partly to do with DFID constraints)

- Creating expectations in poor communities – not met – "communities left hanging".

- They can have unexpected spin off benefits (e.g. disability project network used to discuss HIV issues in the communities).

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This section provides a set of recommendations based on our own interpretation from the document review, country visits and the results of the workshop.

In addition to the points above, it covers the following topics:
  o How to optimize outcomes of existing projects;
  o How to strengthen dissemination and knowledge sharing activities;
  o Priority areas for DFID research funding in the areas of energy, water and sanitation, geoscience and transport;
  o Potential future areas of research not covered above and holistic issues,
  o How to improve the research programme management processes in India/Kenya
  o What is DFID's comparative advantage in India/Kenya

How to optimize outcomes of existing projects

While the findings of this evaluation suggest that much could be gained through project-specific support to communication and policy advocacy activities of the existing projects this is unlikely to be feasible. The emphasis for the existing programme should be to make sure as much knowledge is captured and made widely available as possible. Much of this is already being done by CIMRC, but little is known to project holders or policymakers.

Therefore, in addition, it would be worth considering:
- Making a small amount of additional funding available for communication and policy advocacy activities of existing projects. Letting project holders know about this, and establishing mechanisms to ensure the resources are spent usefully.
- One way would be to provide seed money to take forward some of the key areas that would have an impact on policy, practice or poverty.
- Establishing an e-mail list for projects working in Kenya to make sure they are aware of other DFID EngKAR-funded projects and can get hold of project reports.
- Organising a high-level conference/workshop for EngKAR – funded project holders in Kenya to provide a forum for them to showcase the results of their work to policy makers, practitioners and donors.
- It would also be useful to have learning activities with the aims to identify and disseminate success and failures of projects to learn from each case. A key challenge is to define conditions in which successes can be duplicated.
- Establishing a contact person in DFID-K who knows where to find more information about the projects on DFID and related websites and who can respond to requests for information from project holders, policy makers and other donors AND/OR commissioning a Kenyan organisation to provide this service.
- Encouraging DFID-K staff to take a practical interest in the existing projects and provide whatever limited support they can within their other work responsibilities.
- Having knowledge sharing / synthesis activities (eg East African synthesis by sector)
- Write up 2-3 "good news" cases more thoroughly.

How to strengthen dissemination and knowledge sharing activities in Kenya

In order for projects to communicate better and to share learning across projects, recommendations would include all of the above, plus:

- Developing a simple, framework for describing projects, including process and impact information that is:
  o Not going to change frequently
  o Layered (ie has summary information at different levels of detail linked to detailed project reports).
- Establishing a support network for people involved in DFID-funded work in Kenya including an e-mail newsletter, a specific section of the Infrastructure Connect Website, and other services as required which might include regular seminars and conferences etc.
- Ensuring that (appropriate and effective) communication strategies are built into every project. This should include dissemination of results, as appropriate, to communities, GoK and the DFID country office.
- In particular better communications to the community should be encouraged – for example through open community meetings (baraza's). Greater dissemination of results in local languages would also help.
- Establishing new mechanisms to "join up" DFID funded research and programme work in Kenya, and the Central Research Department and Policy Division in the UK.

Priority areas for DFID research funding in this area

In terms of strategic orientation, there should be clearer guiding principles. For example, from 2006, DFID should focus on:
- Broader policy issues
- issues which will contribute towards the MDGs, and which will more explicitly benefit poor people.
- Better oriented to context & so have a maximum chance of impact
- base its programme on work within themes that are of relevance to policymakers. For example, in Kenya, there is real demand for issues around pro-poor service delivery linked to decentralization
- Emphasis should move down list from:
  – What is knowledge gap?   *to*
  – Can this research / pilot intervention actually lead to changes in policy & practice? and
  – What will solve a problem? (Is more knowledge needed?)

Some of the key issues for future investigation might include:

Energy
- Better Understanding of Household Energy Use
- More on Access to Affordable Energy Sources
- Energy Delivery Mechanism of Poor

Water and Sanitation
- Water Availability for the Poor
- Development of Water Harvesting Technologies;
- Water and Health
- Small Scale Sanitation Options

Transport
- Socio-Economic Impact of Transport System
- Promotion of Alternative Transport
- Efficient Means of Non-motorized Transport

Urban
- Security in Urban Areas
- Urban Governance
- Municipal financing

Other Areas
- Implications of Pressures on Land Use Systems
- Energy Efficiency
- Decentralization (GoK policy makers)
- Climate Change

How to improve research programme processes (in Kenya)

In order to have a greater impact, DFID might consider the following changes in process for EngKaR research:

Some strategic option would be to
- Move to programme aid to orgs (following the PPA model of the CSO department) – and / or support research and resource centres. This would enable DFID to package a range of related research, training, communications and advocacy interventions towards goals of policy influence over a longer time frame.
- Projects should be clearly located within longer-term programmes with clear strategies for scaling up or influencing policy (i.e. implemented by agencies with the commitment to take the ideas forward) and / or should link up with other research and policy work in Kenya, with better communication of the results to organizations that might take the work forward (eg line ministries).
- If the programme is to have greater impact in Kenya (and other DCs), a much greater proportion of funding should go to Kenya (or other DC organizations) rather than to institutions in the North.
- There should be greater emphasis to strengthen capacity (systemic and organizational more than individual) – with the goal of building critical mass in country.
- There should be an emphasis on close engagement with users. Policy makers and other stakeholders should also be involved as necessary. One way to do this is through a project advisory team involving all relevant departments and other stakeholders.
- Projects should have realistic objectives with appropriate time-lines and budgets. They should be more action-orientated than pure scientific research with a shift of emphasis from the technology to communication and follow-up activities.

More specific recommendations would be regarding the need to:
- Decrease number of projects, but broaden scope and size of individual projects to improve research credibility and increase policy relevance
- The EngKaR Programme also needs to
    - Have adequate substantive capacity to engage in projects (greater focus?)
    - Have adequate administrative capacity to respond in timely manner

- Reduce reporting requirements, but engage & assess more rigorously at key moments throughout projects
- Formalize the importance of and need for Needs and context assessments in project development and implementation
- Ensure the intervention logic of projects is more rigorously assessed.
- Projects should be longer (incl rolling budgets)
- Much greater funding availability for communications
- Address issues of creating expectations in poor communities (circulate / develop some guidelines)
- Involve more local researchers, organizations, and institutions
- Project anchored in national development program; involve govt. bodies
- Ownership of information should be localized to maintain credibility and institutional memory
- There is a greater need for coordination at all levels; DFID, national government, communities.
- Have capacity building for program managers to deal with policy makers
- Have a small, more open blue sky window (not withstanding main thrust above)

Recommendations Regarding Other Related DFID Processes

- All informants felt that for DFID-funded research to be effective in Kenya there should be much more interaction with DFID-K to assist with implementation, lesson learning and incorporation of the results into Kenyan and DFID policy, practice and programmes. Ideallly there should be two way processes whereby researchers factors in DFID concerns and DFID factor in EngKaR research into its Country Assistance processes.
- DFID country office should be involved in leveraging of policy makers based on results of research.
- More broadly there should be development of systems for follow-up and implementation of ways forward identified in research. This could be via some of the synthesis and learning activities suggested above as well as more direct linkages with DFID programmes.

What is DFID's comparative advantage for infrastructural research in Kenya?

- DFID-funded research can play an important "catalysing role": funding otherwise difficult to fund research eg, with NGO's working closely with local communities, to identify technology for the poor, or providing scientific evidence to support implementation of big government programmes, or research that interfaces between government and civil society.
- Given DFIDs position as a donor it has a special ability to support research that leads to implementation. This is currently not happening very well. The Kenya workshop felt that DFID should support research leading to project implementation – and that this recommendation should be taken very seriously.

Annex 1
DFID EngKAR Projects in Kenya 2000-2004

* Interviews conducted with representatives of projects in **bold**.

Code	Project Title	Sector	Documents Consulted
R7300	**Income Generation Through the Provision of Integrated Sanitation Systems for Low-Income Urban Communities (Vacutug)**	**Urban**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;**
R7395	**Integrated Urban Housing Development in Kenya and India**	**Urban**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004; Research report**
R7533	**Innovative Approaches to Tenure for the Urban Poor**	**Urban**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;**
R7882	**Urban waste management for small scale energy production**	**Urban**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;**
R7982	**Building in Partnership; Participatory Urban Planning**	**Urban**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;**
R8057 / U303	**Building Local Accountability in Municipal Governments**	**Urban**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;**
-	**Regulatory Guidelines for Urban Upgrading**	**Urban**	
R6845	**Micro-Solar Lanterns - Development and Marketing -**	**Energy**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;**
R6846	**Pico hydro for affordable village power worldwide**	**Energy**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;**
R7368	**Poverty Alleviation Aspects of Successful Improved Household Stoves Programmes**	**Energy**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004; KaR Project Report; Final Summary Report**
R7665	Energy services for rural institutional supply and demand (ESRI)	Energy	Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research, Project website; IUDD EngKar CD 2004; Project report
R7666	**Disseminating Approaches to Energy for Sustainable Livelihoods**	**Energy**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;**
R8019	**Fuel Substitution - Poverty Impacts on Biomass Fuel Suppliers**	**Energy**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;**
R8021	**Smoke, health and household energy**	**Energy**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;**
R8037	**Encouraging CDM energy projects to aid poverty alleviation**	**Energy**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004; Final Project Report**
R8345	**Researching Pathways to Scaling Up Sustainable and Effective Kitchen Smoke**	**Energy**	
-	Small and Medium sized Industries and Rural Electrification	Energy	
R7811	**ICTs and growth of peri-urban informal sectors enterprises**	**ICT**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004; Mini CD**
R8085	**Micro-Media and the Poor**	**ICT**	
R8139	Strategies for Pro-poor sustainable agricultural knowledge centre in East Africa	ICT	Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;
R7840	**Would ICTs constrain or empower poor urban women?**	**ICT**	
R7788	Impact Of Road Condition on Operating Costs Of Bicycles	Transport	Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;

R8155	Community Responses to HIV/AIDS along transit corridors and areas of transport operation: Scoping study	Transport	Project Report
R6990	Rational road drainage design for natural pavement materials	Transport	
R6897	Dense bituminous surfacings for developing countries	Transport	
R6252	Alleviation Of Water Pollution By Agro-Industry In Developing Countries	Water	Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;
R7130	Pricing And Service Differentiation Of Utility Watsan For The Poor	Water	Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;
R7132	Improved Irrigation in Peri-urban Areas	Water	Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;
R7237	**Domestic Water Use and Environmental Health in East Africa**	**Water**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research: IIED website; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;** *Drawers of Water II* **book series (IIED)**
R7386	Designing WS&S Projects to Meet Demand: The Engineer's Role	Water	Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research, WEDC website; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;
R7535	Simplified Sewerage: Windows Based PC Design Package	Water	Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;
R7817	**Guidelines for Sustainable Handpump Projects in Africa**	**Water**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research, WEDC website; project interim report, project final report; EngKar CD 2004**
R7832	Improving uptake of past research outputs – DFID water for food	Water	Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;
R8028	Gender issues in the promotion of hygiene and sanitation amongst the urban poor	Water	Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;
R8060	**Better access to water in informal urban settlements through support to water providing enterprises**	**Water**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004;**
C1-P05	Evaluation of a new instrument to assess the impact of a community-based intervention for children with communication disabilities in Kenya	Disability	Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004; C1-P05 project factsheet; KaR Project Report
C1-P32	**Capacity building in Community Based Rehabilitation (CBR) for children with disabilities**	**Disability**	**Websites: Infrastructure Connect, DFID Research; IUDD EngKar CD 2004; C1-P32 project factsheet; KaR Project Report**

Annex 2: Interviews in Kenya

Policymakers
- Francisca Maina, Ministry of Local Government, Kenya
- Margaret Maimba, National Council for Science and Technology (NCST), Kenya
- S. Arungu Olende, Independent Expert, Kenya (former UN DESA on Energy)
- John Hansell, DFID, Kenya

EngKaR Project-related Staff

Code	Sector	Contact Name	Contact Address
C1-P32	Urban (Health)	Wambui Kennedy	
R7300	Urban	Dr. Graham Alabaster	HSO, Research & Development Division, UNCHS (Habitat), PO Box 30030, Nairobi, Kenya.
R7395	Urban	Mr. Isaack Oenga	ITDG East Africa, P.O.Box 39493, Nairobi. AAYMCA Building, Off State House Avenue, Nairobi. tel.; 254-20-2719313/ 2719413/2715299/2713540
R7533	Urban	Professor Saad Yahya	Saad Yahya Associates, PO Box 14687, Maendeleo House, Nairobi, Tel: 214633
R8057 / U303	Urban	Francisca Maina: Co-ordinator, KLGRP Dr Peter Lewa	Kenya Local Government Reform Programme (KLGRP), Ministry of Local Government, P O Box 28251, Nairobi. Tel: +254 2 210992 or 216197 Fax: +254 2 216756 United States International University P O Box 61176, Nairobi Tel: (home) +254 2 573450 (mobile): +254 72 867213
R6845	Energy	Energy Alternatives Africa Ltd	PO Box 76406, Rose Avenue, Off Ngong Road, Nairobi. Tel. 00 254 2714623
R7368	Energy	Andrew Cohen And Charles Gitundu	Energy Alternatives AFRICA, P.O. Box 76406, Nairobi, Kenya RTE-RETAP, PO Box 28201, Nairobi, Kenya
R7665	Energy	Bernard Osawa And Michael Bicker	
R7666	Energy	The Country Director The National Director	22 Chiromo Access Road, PO Box 39493, Nairobi, Kenya. Tel +254-2-442108, 446243, 444887, fax +254-2-445166 ICA Kenya PO Box 21679 Nairobi Kenya **tel:** +254 2 712732 / 712601 /724314 **fax:** +254 2 720666
R8019	Energy	Charles Gitundu Stephen Mutimba	**Energy Alternatives AFRICA** P.O. Box 76406, Nairobi, Kenya Tel: +254 2 714623 Fax: +254 2 720909 and **Rural Technology Enterprises Ltd.,** PO Box 28201, Nairobi, Kenya Tel: +254 2 535 997/8 Fax: +254 2 540 447
R7811	ICT	The Country Director	22 Chiromo Access Road, PO Box 39493, Nairobi, Kenya. Tel +254-2-442108, 446243, 444887, fax +254-2-445166 and AfricaOnLine, Union Towers Building, Moi Avenue, Nairobi, Kenya
R6252	Water	Mr. J Karanja Mburu	Coffee Research Foundation, Ruiru, Kenya

R7130	Water	Cyrus Njiru	Now the research manager at WEDC, Loughborough University
R7132	Water	Diana Lee-Smith	International Potato Centre (CIP) P O Box 25171 Nairobi 00603 Kenya. Tel: 254 20 630743 ext. 4942 Fax 254 20 631499 Mob: 254 722 677 526
		Sarah Nyongesa	Green Towns Partnership Association of Kenya (Green Towns Project - GTI) Address: P.O. Box 54909 Nairobi. Telephone: 254 221 711, 254 337 41140 Telefax: 254 2 221 600
		Dr Patrick S. Adolwa	Director of city planning for Nairobi City Hall PO Box 30075 Nairobi
R7237	Water	Dr. Munguti Katui-Katua	Director of Community Management & Training Services
R7535	Water	Graham Alabaster	UN Habitat
R7817	Water	Pauline Ikumi And	Network for Water and Sanitation International (NETWAS) Magadi Road, Off Langata Road P.O. Box 15614-00503 Mbagathi NAIROBI, Kenya Tel: 254-2-890555/6/7/8/9 Fax: 254-2-890553/890554
		Gerald Rukunga	Environmental Health AMREF Kenya P.O. Box 30125 Nairobi Tel(Office):02 601593 Mobile:0733 937715 / 0722 496269
R7832	Water	Diana Lee-Smith	International Potato Centre (CIP) P O Box 25171 Nairobi 00603 Kenya. Tel: 254 20 630743 ext. 4942 Fax 254 20 631499 Mob: 254 722 677 526
		Sarah Nyongesa	Green Towns Partnership Association of Kenya (Green Towns Project - GTI) Address: P.O. Box 54909 Nairobi. Telephone: 254 221 711, 254 337 41140 Telefax: 254 2 221 600
		Dr Patrick S. Adolwa	Director of city planning for Nairobi City Hall PO Box 30075 Nairobi
R8028	Water	David Kuria	ITDG Kenya
R8060	Water	Isaack Oenga	ITDG Kenya

Annex 3: Kenya Workshop Agenda

8:30-9:00	Registration	
9:00-9:20	Welcome & Introductions	Welcome & Introduction to the workshop (DT) Introductions by Participants
9:20-9:30	The Evaluation	Introduction to the EngKAR Programme and the Evaluation including methodology and RAPID Framework (JC)
9:30-10:00	Evaluation Results	The main results of the country visit (PB & JC): 1. is the programme appropriate and relevant 2. does the programme relate to local context 3. are the results effectively disseminated; 4. engagement with users or beneficiaries of the research; 5. evidence of policy impact 6. actions and activities which maximise impact (& success stories). Q&A: Any issues of clarification.
10:00-11:00	Discussion	Workshop participants discuss the findings in 3 groups & endorse, add, subtract as appropriate: ▪ Group 1 – is the programme appropriate for India/Kenya (ie 1 & 2 above) ▪ Group 2 – does it engage with all stakeholders (3 & 4) ▪ Group 3 – Evidence of impact and approaches to maximise impact (5 & 6)
11:00-11:30	*Coffee*	
11:30-12:45	Feedback	Group Rapporteurs present key issues followed by discussion (We
12:45-14:00	*Lunch*	
14:00-15:15	Recommendations	Workshop Participants work in groups to develop recommendations for DFID to "enhance the impact of research in this sector in India/Kenya: ▪ Group 1 - How to maximising the outcome of existing projects (including improved dissemination and knowledge sharing activities)? ▪ Group 2 - What are the key research/policy/practice issues in the sector now and in the future? ▪ Group 3 - Are there better ways of doing it & what is DFID's comparative advantage?
15:15-15:45	*Tea*	
15:45-16:45	Feedback	Group Rapporteurs present key issues followed by discussion
17:00	Close	

Annex 4: Participants for the EngKaR Evaluation workshop

Name	Organisation	Contact details
Janet Wildish	CfBT	Tel. 226917, Kimathi Street, IPS Building 12th Floor. j.wildisg@cfbtken.co.ke
David Kuria	ITDG-EA	David.kuria@itdg.or.ke Tel.2713540
Stephen Mutimba	Energy for Sustainable Development Africa (ESDA)	P.O. Box 76406-00508, Nairobi Kenya Tel. 571027,577942 Mobile: 0722-721 680 smutimba@esda.co.ke
Daniel Theuri	Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG-EA)	P.O. Box 39493 Parklands Tel 254 (20) 2713540 Daniel.theuri@itdg.or.ke
Paul Chege	Intermediate Technology Development Group (ITDG-EA)	P.O. Box 39493 Parklands Tel 254 (20) 2713540 Paul.chege@itdg.or.ke
Dr. Munguti Katui	COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT AND TRAINING SERVICES (CMTS)	P.O BOX 292, KISERIAN- KENYA. TEL +254-303-23010 EMAIL cmts2001@mitsuminet.com Cmts2001ke@hotmail.com
Margaret Maimba	National Council for Science and Technology (NCST)	Margaret Maimba to provide contact wamaimba@ncst.go.ke
Dr. S. Arungu Olende	Queconsult (former UN Secretariat Official)	ArunguOlende@aol.com
Patrick Balla	Independent Consultant	

Annex 5: DFID EngKaR Evaluation Kenya Workshop

(Held at Holiday Inn on the 29th November 2004)

Daniel Theuri began by welcoming everyone to the Dfid EngKar Evaluation Workshop for Stakeholders. The workshop began with introductions of all participants. (see list). He then led the workshop participants through the day's program.

Julius Court, ODI, began by describing the evaluation process. The point of the evaluation is not to assess the success/failure of individual projects, but to assess the overall DFID program. The first objective of the workshop is to verify and build on the information gained in the project interviews. The second objective is to inform DFID of the key country issues in Kenya and to provide suggestions on the way forward. The interviews suggested that projects because of funding mechanisms were often unclear about EngKAR, so information is included in the workshop packets, as well as information on ODI and their work on research and policy, list of projects, and the preliminary results of the evaluation.

Overview

DFID EngKAR is the research program of the Infrastructure and Urban Development Department and initially focused on six sectors; water, energy, transport, ICT, geoscience, and urban issues. Two sectors were added disability and technology. Total 180 projects have been funded.

This evaluation is part of a move on DFID's part to reorient the EngKar Program. There is a very short timeline for this evaluation and the evaluation is focused on answering general questions related to the program's relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability. The country evaluations are taking place in India and Kenya. These evaluations include a needs, context, and process assessment and engage experts, stakeholders, policymakers, and implementers. The framework of analysis being used is a ven diagram which includes external influences, political context, research, and the links between the policy and research communities. The goal of the evaluation is to provide recommendations about current program process, strategies for future research, new areas of research, means to strength dissemination and knowledge sharing activities and optimize research outcomes.

Results
International study (so far) Kenyan context in broader international study
DFID project selection process is complicated and expensive. A lot of money is spent in choosing projects Project selection is not systematic within the sectors. There is little activity on the ground in transport and geosciences and there is not enough emphasis on poverty impacts. The projects are small scale and unsustainable, so it difficult to synthesize to provide policy recommendations.

EngKar agenda is not clear and there is often staff turnover in DFID which impact institutional memory. There is a missing link between country offices and DFID-UK. For example, the Kenyan programme officer has retired and not been replaced.

The documentation is not systematic and there is a disconnect between documentation and what is really happening. Julius emphasized that assessment is difficult from one interview, but unlike India where the sample size was small, the Kenyan evaluation did talk to 22 of 38 projects funded. The triangulation method is being used to assist in validating interview findings.

Relevance for Kenya
Funding is externally coordinated-
This means that project conceptualization is done outside the country raising questions of relevance. Questions concerning whose needs were being met by research were also raised. Projects are often very small making generalization of results difficult. Projects in Kenya do focus on the poor. Program monies are often used for innovative activities that fit into the existing framework of organizations work.

Engagement with stakeholders-
There is engagement with communities to test ideas and to get ideas.
Engagement may be about informing; liasing, or involvement policymakers. The importance of engagement at the beginning of the project was defined as "good" engagement.

Communication and dissemination
There is more emphasis placed on dissemination than communication in all projects, not just IEC directed projects. The importance of packaging products to targeted audiences was seen as key. Interviewees highlighted the difficulties of informing communities of findings and indicated that assessments of communication strategies were rare.

Policy Impact
Some projects have changed policies, but there is little knowledge of the EngKAR projects among policymakers. The majority of influence was found in projects that were longer term, research was credible, collaboration with other groups took place, a policy demand already existed, and implementer was already engaged and seen as credible in the eyes of the policymakers.

Morning Discussion Report
Needs/Relevance to Kenyan Context
- Initially projects were started in timely fashion;
- The govt was in the process of implementing changes which complemented projects.
- There is a greater need for coordination at all levels; DFID, national government, communities
- A cross-sectoral approach would add value to projects
- Socioeconomic impact needs to be stressed in formation and implementation
- Sub contractees are often not fully able to give input during conceptualization phase which leads to gaps in program design
- EngKaR addresses funding gaps in state support for research and knowledge
- Development of systems for follow-up and implementation of projects identified in research
- Clarification of ownership of research and target beneficiaries; who owns activities and results

Context
- Diverse issues should be addressed in research to keep with changing national context
- Need for independent formal local and national context analysis;
- Key people have previously not been involved in project concept process
- Research needs to fit into local context for adequate local involvement in research

- Basic resources to meet recommendations; linkages between DFID Kar and DFID
- To promote continuity projects need to fit into DFID Country Action Plan-
- DFID country office is often unaware of projects
- Lack of involvement of implementers in concept phase is the greatest problem
- Efforts need to be made to involve government early in process; concept phase
- Clarification of research target population and beneficiaries is needed
- DFID can pursue local or national agenda formulated on research findings
- A program approach would allow for understanding of broad goals and how individual projects and targets fit in.

Engagement
- Government and implementers need to be engaged early in concept phase
- Define who the research is for to ensure local engagement and national involvement
- DFID UK needs to play a greater role
- Build capacity of government officials to understand relevance of work
- Lawmakers need to be engaged throughout project process
- Forums for govt officials so information can be disseminated
- DFID country office should be involved in leveraging of policy makers based on results of research.
- Project duration should allow for meaningful engagement
- Capacity building for program managers to deal with policy makers
- Need to use local knowledge
- Clear definition of end users needed

Do projects maximize impact?
- The literal and figurative language for dissemination is important.
- Strengthening links between country office and head office would improve projects.
- Research results; Reports which come from DFID head office may not be compatible to local situation.
- Link between research and impact on national policy was questioned. DFID UK-doesn't have impact on local situation and provides little feedback to local/national governement to shift policy
- Evaluation at policy maker level will help to establish whether it is having any influence at that policy making level.
- Local researchers need to be involved along on long term basis.
- Capacity development of local implementers would improve institutional capacity
- Emphasis on communication as opposed to dissemination-
  - There is a need to change budget to providing resources to be able to really communicate with stakeholders and provide funding for post-research communication
  - Important to communicate all results; no "success" bias

Impact on Policy
Need evaluations at policy level
Evidence to influence policy-
Institutional capacity to influence policy is lacking
Clarification of what impact of policy means and levels of policy, institutions which should be influenced
Indicators needed for policy change;
Clear analysis of impact of policy and defined policy aims

Large projects needed to provide information to influence policy

Policy Indicators
- o Formal policy documents
- o Policy awareness-grassroots users/awareness of policy-
- o Changing behavior
- o Formulation; Engage those involved in policy change; increase in resources available for change
- o Enactment
- o Implementation
- o Budget Changes
- o Participatory approach to policy work

Impact of poverty

Project which influence policy process promote sustainable development therefore influence positively impact poverty
Commitment to implementation within community itself-
Long term post project evaluation needed to see impacts on poverty.

<u>Afternoon Session</u>
Julius began by giving a brief overview of the afternoon session. This session will build on the work of the morning and is focused on giving concrete suggestions to DFID. Two small groups will discuss the list of topics and then report back to the group as a whole.
The topics to be discussed:
- How to optimize outcomes of existing projects
- Strengthen dissemination and knowledge
- Suggestions for research funding-which topics needs most funding
- Potential other areas of research
- Process improvements
- The optimal role of DFID funded research-(what is the comparative advantage of DFID research)

Julius stressed how important this opportunity to report on

Optimize Outcomes of Existing Projects
- Need for long-term impact monitoring on projects
- Need for packaging post-evaluation of existing projects
- Provision of seed money for outcome of research activities
- Increase in percentage of funds directed to country office
- Improved involvement of DFID country office
- Shift from sectoral approach to overall program approach by DFID to enhance learning between projects
- Development of timelines that reflect needs of research and respond to issues of research fatigue
- Identify and disseminate success and failures of projects to learn from each case
- Define conditions in which successes can be duplicated
- Identify users of information-and then disseminate information through best channels
- Decrease number of projects, but broaden scope and size of individual projects to improve research credibility and increase policy relevance

Dissemination and Knowledge Sharing

- Improve coordination and identify channels of dissemination; cost effective
- Identify potential users as target group
- Define clearer objective of research to be able to share knowledge
- Increase communication between projects no cross sharing
- Conduct socioeconomic analysis for all projects
- Involve key stakeholders from inception to completion
- Involve local research institutions
- Disseminate results to DFID country office; National Government; Community and in turn results should be reflected in KAP, PRSP,etc and be reflective of "true results' on the ground;(feedback mechanism representative of results)
- Involve entire community through open community meetings, barazzaa
- Dissemination of results in local languages

Suggestions for Research Funding
Energy
- Household Energy Use/and Institutions
- Access to Affordable Energy Sources
- Promotion of Partnerships between Civil Society/
- Healthy Homes
- Energy Delivery Mechanism of Poor
- Development of Codes and Standards for Energy
- Harmful Impacts Heavy Metals

Water and Sanitation
- Water Harvesting Technologies;
- Integrated Water Resource Management
- Water and Health
- Water, Sanitation, and Education
- Small Scale Sanitation Options; Grey Water
- Environment, Water, Sanitation Research

GeoScience
- Urban Infrastructure; Bridges, Houses,etc.
- Faults and Development in Urban Areas
- Energy Production
- Underground Water Pollution
- Waste Disposal

Transport
- Socio-Economic Impact of Transport System
- Promotion of Alternative Transport
- Efficient Means of Non-motorized Transport

Cross-cutting issues
- Energy efficiency

Other Areas
- Urban Development
- Security
- Land Use Systems related to Urban Migration/Sprawl
- -Nairobi and Kenya in general moving to arid areas
- Solid Waste Management (decentralized)
- Energy Efficiency
- Decentralization (policy makers)
- Market Access

- Urban Governance

Process Improvements
- Improvement of linkages between implementers, country offices, users
- Projects should include all stakeholders
- Project should bear in mind long term nature of research
- Fewer projects, but bigger-consortium of organizations implemented projects
- Involve more local researchers, organizations, and institutions
- Project anchored in national development program; involve govt. bodies
- Ownership of information should be localized to maintain credibility and institutional memory
- Need for post research phase (Phase II-program implementation)
- Involvement of country office-respect to existing projects
- Adopt program oriented approach; opposed to sector approach
- Improve linkages between projects that already exist
- Provide funding for packaging of outcomes of research to different users; as well as follow-up funding for "second round" of information dissemination/communication
- DFID should factor in country wide policy processes; two way information process
- Process requires more funding

Optimal role for DFID research
- Need for link between DFID research and local academic institutions
- DFID needs better knowledge of local capacity
- Research leading to project implementation
- Should take recommendations seriously

Other Issues
- Continuous capacity building
- Building critical mass in country for project development
- Partnership with other academic institutions
- Increase of research funds
- Improvement of project implementation and capacity
- Where should the research be directed/whose agenda should it meet?
- Participatory research-whose agenda will the research address