

A Values-Based Monitoring and Evaluation Analysis of Climate Smart Procurement in Kenya: The Case of the Draft Sustainable Public Procurement and Asset Disposal Framework

Author(s): Milcah Kerubo Gachuhi¹ & Isaac Odhiambo- Abuya^{1, 2} 

¹Department of Management Science and Project Planning, University of Nairobi

²Center for Policy Projects

2026: Vol 4(1), pp. 643-663

@The Author(s), 2026

Reprints and permissions:

The Regional Center for Project Management and Evaluation Training

eISSN 2958-9436

Received: 29/10/2025, Revised: 24/01/2026, Accepted: 10/02/2026



Copyright: © The Author(s), 2026. Published by The Regional Center for Project Management and Evaluation Training. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

A Values-Based Monitoring and Evaluation Analysis of Climate Smart Procurement in Kenya: The Case of the Draft Sustainable Public Procurement and Asset Disposal Framework

Milcah Kerubo Gachuhi¹ & Isaac Odhiambo- Abuya^{1,2}

¹Department of Management Science and Project Planning, University of Nairobi

²Center for Policy Projects

ABSTRACT

There is a high need for Values-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (VBME) in Kenya because majority of existing Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) approaches are traditional in nature. As such, they focus on quantifiable results, forgetting about the qualitative intangible values that focus on promoting social justice and equity in M&E processes. Using VBME approach, this conceptual paper critiques the definition, principles, practices and process of Climate Smart Procurement Programs (CSPPs) in the country. It establishes that while most of CSPPs in the country such as the Draft Sustainable Public Procurement and Asset Disposal Framework (DSPPADF) have clear mandates and objectives on sustainable practices, they lack a values-based aspect in their M&E systems; hence, do not evaluate the qualitative values of certain groups of stakeholders especially the marginalized and vulnerable ones. The paper identifies the need for development of values-based M&E tools in climate smart procurement processes.

Keywords: Values-based monitoring and evaluation (VBME), climate smart procurement, equity, social justice, sustainable development, draft sustainable public procurement and asset disposal framework (DSPPADF).

INTRODUCTION

Traditional Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) focus on measuring quantifiable results of projects and programs. However, a Values-Based Monitoring and Evaluation (VBME) approach goes beyond measuring and presenting quantifiable results to ensuring that programs and projects align their respective actions with core sets of social and ethical principles (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). Some of the social and ethical principles evaluated by VBME include social justice, transparency and equity (Syafika & Marwa, 2024)). These are the qualitative values, principles and ethics that are intangible in nature. In an effort to illustrate what defines VBME toolkit, this conceptual paper critiques the definition, principles, practices and processes of CSPPs in Kenya using VBME approach. The paper is organized in terms of each of the elements evaluated in the critique with

each of the elements broken down to its various elements. The paper finds that while most of CSPPs in the country have clear mandates and objectives on sustainable practices, they lack a values-based aspect in their M&E systems. The paper identifies the need for developing values-based M&E tools in climate smart procurement processes.

Definition of Climate Smart Procurement Programs (CSPPs)

Prior to critiquing CSPPs in Kenya, it would be relevant to start by outlining what the program(s) entail(s). CSPP is a procurement program that puts into considerations climate related issues in buying decisions with a view to build resilience, support sustainable goals and reduce emissions. It integrates climate deliberations into tendering processes, ensuring that private and public spending support climate targets and UN's sustainable development goals. The program is often implemented through Green Public Procurement (GPP) with a special focus on climate-smart agricultural inputs. However, GPP is somewhat limited in scope because it focuses much of its attention on environmental issues. Indeed, it restricts procuring entities to supplying goods and services that reduce environmental impact in their life cycles in comparison to other goods and services offered for procurement (Marege *et al.*, 2025). While such a scope is good, it is restrictive than the sustainable procurement that encompasses social procurement, circular procurement, and innovation procurement. The conceptual paper focuses its attention on sustainable procurement as opposed to simply GPP that has a narrow scope.

In Kenya, the Draft Sustainable Public Procurement and Asset Disposal Framework (DSPPADF) drafted in May 2025 serves as a good example of CSPP because it contains an element on sustainable practices. The framework was developed to make sure that public procurement went beyond the conventional quality and cost considerations. In contrast to conventional practices, it integrated a sustainability criterion in the public procurement processes. The framework is intended to mitigate effects emanating from climate change, promote environmental conservation and address risks associated with labor discrimination and violations in supply chains. It encourages public entities to prioritize suppliers who offer energy-efficient solutions, foster waste reduction, promote water conservation, support biodiversity protection, and promote sustainable resource utilization practices (Marege *et al.*, 2025). Additionally, it advocates for procurement practices that enhance social equity, acknowledge marginalized groups, support local communities

and promote fair labor practices throughout the procurement processes. Throughout the analysis, special attention is directed towards measures put in place to promote sustainable climate practices in public procurement. Accordingly, other public procurement processes upholding sustainable procurement practices are included in the analysis.

DSPPADF focuses on reduction of environmental impact, social responsibility, economic viability, ethical procurement, promotion of supplier diversity, prioritizes resource efficiency, innovation, compliance with standards and certification, stakeholder engagement, e-procurement and continuous learning and development (Marege *et al.*, 2025). Inasmuch as CSPPs in the country such as DSPPADF are effective M&E tools, they lack the value-based element contained in VBME. DSPPADF, for instance, does not promote social justice and equity because by nature it fails to include the aspirations and deep-rooted values of the people living in areas affected by changes in climate (Blaser, Ali, & Khumalo, 2020).

Indeed, vulnerable communities and groups living in these areas are not consulted in the procurement processes to give their views on what might work best in their areas. Instead, all procurement decisions are made by government officials and agencies that carry out procurement duties on behalf of the national government. In so doing, most of the goods and services procured by public entities may not always represent the interests of the vulnerable people living in areas affected by changes in climate. Other public procurement exercises in the country are carried out by high-ranking government officials and relevant departments without necessarily involving local people. By so doing, they fail to acknowledge the value provided by local communities (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025).

Values Based Monitoring and Evaluation Principles

Stakeholder participation

Stakeholder participation is an essential principle in VBME because it ensures the success and relevance of a project. It does not only encourage the participation of all relevant parties, but it also promotes a stronger sense of ownership of projects and transparency among parties involved in developing projects or programs (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). The inclusion of stakeholders in a

program acts as a social validation that promotes the legitimacy of the results of a program (Amin, Scheepers & Malik, 2023). Stakeholders, especially local ones, may possess local insights and knowledge that external evaluators may lack (Tengan & Aigbavboa, 2017).

Different stakeholders are involved in CSPP both locally and internationally. Some of these stakeholders include government agencies that are responsible for providing legal framework and setting policies relevant to climate smart practices. Others include environmental agencies that set policies and enforce standards and regulations relating to sustainable practices in green economy and suppliers who obviously supply goods and services to procuring entities (Amin, Scheepers & Malik, 2023).

A critical look at CSPPs in Kenya shows that while most of the relevant stakeholders are normally involved in procurement programs, a good number of them are normally ignored or bypassed during the procurement process. These include the vulnerable communities living in areas stricken by droughts and floods. Such people and communities are not seen as critical in procurement processes; hence, excluded in making decisions relating to public procurement. While the issue of bypassing or even ignoring some of the stakeholders may appear justifiable based on the different roles that stakeholders play in procurement processes, it undermines the success of CSPP. According to Odhiambo-Abuya (2025), lack of inclusion undermines the sense of ownership of the program; hence, may undermine the success of CSPPs in the country.

Transparency and accountability

Transparency in VBME entails openness and clarity in communication of issues related to evaluation process, findings, data and decisions to relevant stakeholders (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). It promotes confidence, credibility and trust among stakeholders while ensuring that activities align with public interest goals and ethical standards. Additionally, it allows stakeholders to examine the manner in which a program or a project is conducted by those entrusted to conduct it (O'Leary, 2017). Accountability, on the other hand, relates to the extent to which those executing a program or a project are willing to be held to account for their decisions, actions and whatever they do in a program or a project (Kabonga, 2018). It entails having mechanisms that may be applied to make corrections where performance fall short of intended outcomes (O'Leary, 2017).

Inasmuch as DSPPADF may appear to promote both transparency and accountability, it does not lay out mechanisms for holding public entities to account for their courses of actions. Even if other mechanisms such as chapter 6 in the constitution may be used to address that concern, the fact remains that DSPPADF does not outline measures that may be used to hold both public entities and suppliers to account for their courses of actions. Additionally, it lacks openness in communication of evaluation processes and other important issues relating to procurement processes of public goods. Failure to include the accountability and transparency measures in DSPPADF undermines its capability to provide value to different stakeholders as VBME does.

Evidence-Based Decision Making (EBDM)

The EBDM provides the data required to understand the effectiveness of a program or a project while the values-based attribute ensures that stakeholders' expectations, unique concerns and preferences are incorporated into the decision-making processes (Del Fabbro, Corbella & Taschieri, 2017). Evidence provides feedback loop that is necessary for continuous improvement and learning advanced by VBME (Baba & HakemZadeh, 2012; Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). It enables project managers to refine strategies and make timely corrections as projects progress. The fact that DSPPADF does not have an elaborate M&E procedure implies that evidence-based decision-making principle is rarely implemented in the program, and if it is implemented, there is no evidence to demonstrate how it is implemented. This is in relation to the fact that the document (DSPPADF) simply states that M&E tool for sustainable procurement will be developed by the national treasury (Marege *et al.*, 2025).

Equity and social justice

This principle promotes the inclusion of needs, aspirations and perspectives of all stakeholders including the vulnerable and marginalized groups and communities that are often seen as not adding value to a project or program (Stone, 2025). The principle is focused on promoting empowerment, changing societies to be just and serving the disadvantaged groups of people (Wolfe, Long & Brown, 2020; Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). It basically ensures that M&E exercises promote the interests of the people affected by programs, policies and their related interventions. While people living in areas stricken by changes in climate may not be relevant in procurement processes of goods and services for those areas, they are obviously the consumers of those goods and services. As a result, the failure of DSPPADF and other CSPPs in the country to include these

people and communities in procurement processes does not promote equity and justice among these people who obviously are part of the programs' stakeholders. It only discriminates against them without necessarily considering the dire consequences that the exercise may have on local communities if goods and services contracted do not align with local interests and aspirations.

Holistic and systems thinking

A holistic and systems thinking principle ensures that evaluations are useful, relevant and that they account for the value-laden and complex realities of interventions made in a project or program (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). It ensures that the interaction between various components of a system (program or project) are evaluated from a holistic perspective. This entails looking at the system as a whole rather than looking at individual components individually without considering how they interact with each other (Wotela, 2017). It also entails looking at the influence that external factors such as environmental, economic, political and cultural have on a system.

In relation to systems thinking principle, the components of a program are considered or viewed as interconnected, meaning that a change in one of them can have a direct or indirect effect on the program or its various components. In this respect, a change in one group of stakeholders can have ripple effects on other stakeholders (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). It is for this reason that VBME put more emphasis on the incorporation of views of diverse stakeholders in a program or project.

A critical look at DSPPADF and other CSPPs in the country suggests that a holistic and systems thinking approach is rarely incorporated in these programs. This is in relation to the fact that most of public procurement processes do not incorporate local communities in procurement processes. The exclusion of local communities in these processes means that their views are rarely considered in procurement processes, which obviously may have ripple effects on procurement processes in the event local communities fault the processes.

Purpose-driven and goal orientation

The purpose-driven and goal orientation principle ensures that everything in a project or a program is aligned with intended outcomes and core values of an initiative (Flanding & Grabman, 2022; Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). It ensures that a program does not only comply with intended processes, but it also drives meaningful impact that align with values. It clarifies what a program or a project

is trying to achieve including how success is measured.

A critical look at DSPPADF and other CSPPs in the country shows that they are both goal -oriented and purpose-driven because they have clear goals and purposes that they intend to achieve. The goals and purposes generally relate to carbon reduction and promotion of climate resilient practices, and measures of identifying suppliers aligned with these goals and purposes are clearly outlined in the procurement documents and processes.

Adaptability and continuous improvement

This principle transforms M&E procedures from mere reporting mechanisms into learning-oriented management tools that enable organizations to circumnavigate multifaceted environments. Adaptability helps M&E systems to adapt to different environments through flexibility whereas continuous improvement helps them to improve on a continuous basis based on continuous learning (Inisha & Elly, 2022; Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025).

While DSPPADF and other CSPPs in the country may not appear adaptable to different scenarios especially those that do not promote sustainable practices, the programs have an element of continuous learning. DSPPADF in particular is built on the concept of continuous monitoring that is geared towards promoting improvements and adjustments over program's lifecycle.

Values Based Monitoring and Evaluation Practices

Development of a VBME plan

According to Odhiambo-Abuya (2025), a VBME plan is a premeditated document that guides the use, analysis and collection of data from a project or program to understand whether intended objectives are attained or not. VBME plan links programs and projects to their underlying values making sure that programs and projects' impact and actions reflect what projects and programs intend to achieve through their missions (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). The plan is part of the broader methodologies that help organizations to reflect and understand their shared values including the extent to which they use shared values in developing and utilizing their M&E systems (Sisimayi, Ngwenya & Mabwe, 2024). VBME plan assess projects' success by not only evaluating stated outcomes, but also by evaluating how projects align with core principles and values (Odhiambo-

Abuya, 2025).

Inasmuch as most of CSPPs in the country are clear on what projects should attain in terms of minimizing carbon footprints, most of them do not have VBME plans outlining how data should be collected and analyzed to understand the manner in which objectives are attained or unattained. Indeed, most of them leave this responsibility to suppliers to determine how they measure the effectiveness of their measures geared towards reducing carbon footprints. This does not mean that CSPP are ignorant of their mandates, but it identifies a gap that need to be bridged by relevant stakeholders to ensure that CSPPs are effective in reducing carbon emissions. Until CSPP develop VBME plan, they will continue to measure the success of their projects and programs based on stated outcomes while failing to evaluate how projects and programs align with the core value and principle of reducing carbon emissions.

Development of a values-based theory of change

Odhiambo-Abuya (2025) defines a Values-Based Theory of Change (VBToC) as an approach aimed at creating a change plan based on certain core values. According to King (2021), the VBToC differs from a standard plan based on how it puts more emphasis on the values guiding its change process. It makes the values central point of the change process ensuring the manner in which the change process is implemented is rooted in organizational principles and that intended outcomes reflect organizational values (Weiss, 2018). The approach links everything in a project illustrating how organizational core values drive strategy implementation and desired outcomes. Inasmuch as most of CSPPs in the country are clear on intended outcomes, especially those relating to reduction of carbon emissions, the CSPPs lack core values guiding the change plans of those involved in procurement processes. Most of them do not outline how suppliers should minimize carbon footprints because they focus only on selecting suppliers who are deemed to supply goods and services that are friendly to the environment. By so doing, they leave most of the issues to suppliers to determine how they can reduce carbon emissions in the delivery of services and goods. While doing so encourages suppliers to be innovative in reducing carbon emissions, it fails to show how the theory of change is values-based because of the lack of a link between intended outcomes and organizational core values driving the change.

Formulation of values-based M&E questions

The formulation of values-based M&E questions is critical in making sure that programs' outcomes are effective and that they align with ethical considerations and relevant principles (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). The questions go beyond the impact and quality of a project on communities and people because they are designed to evaluate whether programs' outcomes and implementations align with organizational core principles (Spaulding, 2013). Additionally, they evaluate the cultural and ethical impact that programs have in their areas of operations.

The focus of M&E questions on relevant areas ensures that projects are relevant and that they do not harm the people they serve (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). Unlike traditional M&E questions that largely focus on quantifiable indicators alone, values-based M&E questions that are often qualitative in nature capture the intangible values such as stakeholder experiences, community cohesion and heritage that are also important in understanding projects' overall impact (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). The inclusion of perspectives of stakeholders, especially the marginalized ones, makes M&E processes more inclusive, which is critical in developing an element of project ownership by all stakeholders.

While CSPPs in the country may be regarded as all-encompassing, they do not focus on the core values of the marginalized people. Most of them focus on protecting the environment without necessarily taking into considerations inputs of the local people because most of them are expert-driven and lack the input of the local communities. While doing so is good as far as the application of science is concerned in climate related issues, it denies CSPP a chance to focus on qualitative aspect in its M&E exercises. In a nutshell, the M&E questions in CSPP do not focus on issues related to social justice especially among the vulnerable communities because most of them focus on standard performance metrics. In this respect, there is need for CSPPs in the country to go beyond the mere quantifiable performance metrics so that they can capture sustainability and social impact in procurement of climate smart goods and services.

Creation of values-based M&E indicators

Odhiambo-Abuya (2025) defines values-based M&E indicators as the performance measures that track projects' progresses towards outcomes developed out of stakeholders' aspirations and deep-

rooted values. In most cases, the indicators focus on the aspirations and values of marginalized individuals and communities (Burford, Tamás & Harder, 2016). They capture the intangible values such as empowerment, social cohesion and quality of change.

A critical look at the CSPP in the country indicates that although they have clear objectives, most of them do not capture the aspirations and values of local communities who most of the times tend to be vulnerable. The DSPPADF in particular does not include the aspirations of local communities who most of the time are affected by the outcomes of the procurement process executed by public entities in the country. While it may be relatively hard to capture the aspirations of those people in the procurement process, it is evident that the development of the procurement program was carried out by high-ranking stakeholders especially those in the government without necessarily capturing the aspirations of local communities. As a result, while the M&E indicators might appear both accurate and trustworthy, they may not necessarily reflect the aspirations of vulnerable communities. Indeed, they may not reflect how local communities are empowered by suppliers to promote climate resilient practices at local level.

Value-based data collection

A values-based data collection process collects data while taking into considerations practical and ethical values such as justice, beneficence, and autonomy to ensure that a program is methodically responsible and sound (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). Accordingly, the data collection process is designed with a clear purpose and anticipation of valuable data to stakeholders thereby privileging methods that are both ethical and fair, especially when dealing with sensitive issues (Zahle, 2018). A values-based data collection is not only data-driven, but also value-driven taking into considerations stakeholder well-being while aligning with organizational mission and ethical implications (Stasko, 2014; Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025).

To some extent, the DSPPADF may be regarded as efficient in collection of values-based data because a clear method of collecting pre-qualification and post-qualification data is clearly outlined. The method clearly outlines how public entities should collect data from suppliers before awarding tenders. Throughout the process, an element of value to the members of the public especially vulnerable communities is seen in the proposed data collection process because

certification is sought from suppliers. Nonetheless, on the part of suppliers, it is not clear how public entities collect data to ensure that local communities benefit significantly from suppliers awarded tenders.

Values-based data analysis

A values-based data analysis embodies ethical standards, desired impact and core principles in the entire process of analyzing and interpreting data (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). It assesses the manner in which programs and projects align with and deliver on essential principles and values related to inclusivity, accountability and transparency (Hwang, Nam & Ha, 2021). In so doing, it breaks data down to factors such as gender, ethnicity, age and socio-economic status to depict the extent to which a project is equitable to different groups and categories of people (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). Inasmuch as DSPPADF is clear on its mandates, the fact is that it does not stipulate the manner in which M&E in public procurement should be conducted to evaluate programs' outcomes. By so doing, it fails to provide a values-based data analysis procedure for evaluating how programs align with and deliver on principles related to sustainability. Accordingly, it may not be possible to determine how DSPPADF promotes inclusivity and transparency beyond just stating that it upholds fair labor practices and inclusivity in its practices.

The utilization of Values-based M&E findings

A values-based utilization of M&E findings focuses on efficient utilization of the findings. It appreciates that the findings should be utilized in a manner that promotes evidence-based practices (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). This entails depicting how facts from a program are acted upon to provide value to stakeholders (Yamaguchi, Oshima, Sasso & Aoki, 2020). It also entails interpreting and applying findings in an ethical context that is guided by organizational core principles.

The DSPPADF stipulates that an M&E framework will be developed by the national government. The fact that it is yet to be developed is a clear indication that M&E findings are not yet utilized in a values-based manner. This is in spite of the suggestion by DSPPADF that qualitative assessments, quantitative methods and surveys may be used to evaluate programs' progress and impact. Other CSPPs in the country do not outline how M&E findings are utilized to promote evidence-based practices apart from providing M&E tools and mechanisms.

Values Based Monitoring and Evaluation Process

Undertake VBME stakeholder analysis

The analysis of stakeholders in any program or project is vital in VBME because it serves as a basic step in effective engagement, project success and decision-making process. It ensures that affected groups and individuals are identified and involved in a project lifecycle (Breuer & Lüdeke-Freund, 2019; Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025).

Inasmuch as most of the stakeholders in CSPPs are identified and involved in procurement processes, a values-based analysis of stakeholders is rarely conducted in most of the public procurement processes including those focusing on climate resilience. To make the matter worse, when such an exercise is seen to be included in the procurement processes and even in monitoring and evaluation of such projects, the interests and values of the local people, especially the disadvantaged ones are rarely put into considerations. Normally, the local people are barely assessed to understand their values, needs and aspirations because most of the decisions regarding public procurement come from top-ranking government officials.

Establish values-based baselines

According to Odhiambo-Abuya (2025), values-based baselines act as initial reference points for a program or a project. They are the reference points against which progresses and impacts are evaluated upon. Unlike those in traditional M&E, baselines in VBME acknowledge that stakeholders' values, environmental and social factors in a program can change over time (Kelly & Reid, 2021; Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). As a result, they involve different stakeholders in defining desired change right from project inception. This includes the people affected by the program or intervention. Regardless of the project under evaluation, the baselines in VBME are tailored to specific environmental, social and cultural context in recognition that progresses can be defined differently in different situations and communities (Ssekamatte & Okello, 2016).

In theory, most of CSPPs in the country aim to reduce the emission of green-house gases by prioritizing the procurement of products and services with minimal energy consumption and low carbon footprints. In addition, they aim at building resilience by integrating measures that are

adaptable to changes in climate in supply chain processes. Furthermore, they aim at driving innovation by encouraging suppliers to invest heavily in climate-smart practices and technologies. While the baselines are good, the parties involved in setting the baselines of CSPP rarely actively involve local communities and vulnerable communities in setting the baselines. In some instances, the baselines tend to be rigid meaning that they tend to be more aligned to traditional M&E rather than VBME.

Develop VBME framework

Odhiambo-Abuya (2025) defines a VBME framework as an M&E approach that integrates and privileges the value of every stakeholder involved in a project or program. The framework goes beyond evaluating measurable results and objectives to consider deeply-rooted aspirations, beliefs and values that influence decision-making process and human behaviors. The VBME framework makes sure that M&E processes are guided by core values of an initiative, making them more holistic in nature than traditional M&E. It serves as a roadmap that makes sure that M&E system aligns with community's and organization's core values, desired principles and ethics for social change (Sisimayi, Ngwenya & Mabwe, 2024). The framework requires a clear understanding of the link between various aspects of a program or project. Additionally, it integrates subjective soft values that may not be easily quantifiable into the M&E process.

The CSPPs in the country integrates different stakeholders in the procurement process. However, the extent to which it values the value of every stakeholder in the program is not quite clear because some of stakeholders especially those at national level appear to undermine slightly the value of vulnerable communities. Sometimes, the contribution of vulnerable communities is underestimated; hence, public participation that is outlined in the constitution is ignored or overlooked in some instances for lack of an efficient VBME framework.

Develop VBME criteria

VBME criteria basically refers to the benchmarks or standards utilized in the evaluation of worth, significance or merit of an intervention, project or program by explicitly combining diverse beliefs of all key stakeholders (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). The criteria ensures that programs and projects are efficient, equitable and that they align with deeply rooted community and human values that

need to be served.

Inasmuch as CSPP in the country have the relevant standards and benchmarks for evaluating their success, they normally disregard the interests of local communities, especially the vulnerable ones. Mostly, the interests of high-ranking government officials and politicians override the interests of the vulnerable communities; hence, the programs rarely combine the diverse beliefs of all key stakeholders especially the vulnerable and disadvantaged ones.

Undertake regular values-based monitoring

Any project or program that intends to have a positive effect on the members of the public that it serves should engage in regular Value-Based Monitoring (VBM). Regular VBM entails continuously collecting and analyzing data from a project or program to track progress against desired objectives and values (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). The regular VBM ensures that programs and projects remain aligned with desired outcomes and core principles. It provides timely insights into whether programs and projects are progressing as planned or not (Matsiliza, 2019). In this respect, the reporting of VBM findings becomes critical in a project lifecycle because it promotes accountability and transparency as to how resources are utilized including results attained or not attained.

Most of CSPPs in the country do not engage in regular VBM. This is in relation to the fact that most of the public projects and programs in the country are evaluated after two (2) years. The evaluation in this case involves collecting data from projects and programs to understand whether they are moving in the right directions or not. Although a period of 2 years might appear reasonable in terms of value for money, it is at the risk of failing to detect deviations of a project or program from intended objectives and outcomes early enough. In fact, it limits relevant authorities from contracting consultants even when they feel the need to do so before the 2-years' time limit ends. The CSPP are not exceptional given that they are run by government institutions and agencies. In fact, the DSPPADF stipulates that the M&E exercises should be conducted in a time interval of three (3) years. Although a timeframe of 2 or 3 years may be debatable in terms of how regular they are, the fact remains that an urgent matter that needs to be monitored within a period of a year may go unnoticed.

Conduct values-based evaluations

A values-based evaluation of a program goes beyond the measurable outputs to include the intangible values such as dignity, social cohesion and cultural heritage (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). It focuses on the manner in which changes occur in a program as opposed to what changed in a program (Jiang & Li, 2016). By providing an interplay between various values, it equips project managers with evidence-based insights; hence, promote the adoption of strategies that align with local contexts.

The fact that DSPPADF is yet to develop an elaborate M&E tool implies that public entities do not always conduct values-based evaluation of their procurement processes. Additionally, it suggests that suppliers and those contracted to execute public projects do not necessarily conduct values-based evaluations of their projects. If they conduct such evaluations, then there is no evidence from the program to support the execution of values-based evaluations.

Undertaking Values-Based Reporting (VBR) of M&E findings

The VBR of M&E findings basically entails effective communication of the challenges, lessons learned, progress and results of a project or program with an emphasis on how the findings relate to initiatives' principles and core values as well as stakeholders involved (Odhiambo-Abuya, 2025). The exercise moves beyond presenting the findings to ensuring that lessons learned are incorporated into the findings and reporting processes. According to Odhiambo-Abuya (2025), the VBR of M&E findings goes beyond the reporting of quantitative data to qualitative assessment of a project or program. The quantitative data reporting entails providing the number of beneficiaries reached and other quantifiable outcomes whereas qualitative assessment is concerned about the extent to which projects align with organizational values, ethical or social values (Bozeman & Sarewitz, 2011). By focusing on qualitative assessment, VBR of M&E findings goes beyond answering questions relating to targets met to delivery of promises in line with shared values.

Inasmuch as CSPPs in the country are effective at reporting quantitative findings, they are ineffective at providing qualitative assessment of their findings. This is in relation to the fact that they rarely report the extent to which they deliver on promises in relation to shared values by

various stakeholders especially the vulnerable communities. When they provide such results, they do it superficially to the extent that it is unclear on what they delivered. Additionally, the findings are not provided in a way that could help those in management positions to make informed decisions. Instead, they are provided in a data point to simply indicate that a project or program was monitored and evaluated.

Promotion of values-based utilization of M&E results

The promotion and utilization of M&E results is an important process in VBME because it does not only ensure that the results are made available to relevant stakeholders, but it also ensures that they are utilized where they are supposed to be utilized. The utilization of M&E results helps in making decisions that are informed by data, findings and insights gathered via M&E activities (Bozeman & Sarewitz, 2011). It also helps in ensuring that programs and projects align with their objectives and values and they are effective.

Once again, DSPPADF does not provide a mechanism that is used in the utilization of M&E results. This does not mean that M&E results from public procurements in the country especially those relating to sustainable practices are not utilized in decision-making processes, but it means that DSPPADF does not provide a mechanism for utilizing such results. As a result, it is unclear how DSPPADF promotes values-based utilization of its M&E results.

Conclusion

This conceptual paper has critiqued the definition, principles, practices and process of CSPPs in the country using a VBME approach. It has established that while most of CSPPs in the country such as DSPPADF have clear mandates and objectives, they lack a values-based aspect in their M&E systems; hence, do not evaluate the qualitative values of certain groups of stakeholders especially the marginalized and vulnerable ones. The paper appreciates that while CSPPs in the country are geared towards reducing carbon emissions, they neglect some of the important aspects especially those related to values for stakeholders, social justice and inclusivity that may be critical in their successes.

References

Amin, H., Scheepers, H., & Malik, M. (2023). Project monitoring and evaluation to engage stakeholders of international development projects for community impact. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 16(2), 405-427.

Baba, V. V., & HakemZadeh, F. (2012). Toward a theory of evidence-based decision making. *Management decision*, 50(5), 832-867.

Blaser, M., Ali, A. J., & Khumalo, L. S. (2020). From evidence to values-based decision making in African parliaments. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, 20(2), 68-85.

Bozeman, B., & Sarewitz, D. (2011). Public value mapping and science policy evaluation. *Minerva*, 49(1), 1-23.

Breuer, H., & Lüdeke-Freund, F. (2019). Values-based stakeholder management: Concepts and methods. In *Rethinking Strategic Management: Sustainable Strategizing for Positive Impact* (pp. 217-239). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Burford, G., Tamás, P., & Harder, M. K. (2016). Can we improve indicator design for complex sustainable development goals? A comparison of a values-based and conventional approach. *Sustainability*, 8(9), 861.

Del Fabbro, M., Corbella, S., & Taschieri, S. (2017). Principles of Evidence-Based Decision Making. In *Evidence-Based Decision Making in Dentistry: Multidisciplinary Management of the Natural Dentition* (pp. 7-18). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Flanding, J. P., & Grabman, G. M. (2022). A practice of purpose-driven change management. In *Purpose-driven Innovation: Lessons from Managing Change in the United Nations* (pp. 21-44). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Hwang, S., Nam, T., & Ha, H. (2021). From evidence-based policy making to data-driven

administration: proposing the data vs. value framework. *International Review of Public Administration*, 26(3), 291-307.

Inisha, L., & Elly, B. (2022). Establishing Robust Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Systems. *Research Gate*.

Jiang, N., & Li, L. (2016). Doubly robust off-policy value evaluation for reinforcement learning. In *International conference on machine learning* (pp. 652-661). PMLR.

Kabonga, I. (2018). Principles and practice of monitoring and evaluation: A paraphernalia for effective development. *Africanus: Journal of Development Studies*, 48(2), 21-30.

Kelly, L. M., & Reid, C. (2021). Baselines and monitoring: More than a means to measure the end. *Evaluation Journal of Australasia*, 21(1), 40-53.

King, J. (2021). Expanding theory-based evaluation: Incorporating value creation in a theory of change. *Evaluation and Program Planning*, 89, 101963.

Marege, V., Gikuni, Y., Kiptoo, J., & Muiruri, A. (2025). *Draft sustainable public procurement and asset disposal framework (draft for validation on 26-6-15)*. Republic of Kenya: The national treasury and economic planning.

Matsiliza, N. S. (2019). Strategies to improve capacity for policy monitoring and evaluation in the public sector. *Journal of Reviews on Global Economics*, 8, 490-499.

O'Leary, S. (2017). Grassroots accountability promises in rights-based approaches to development: The role of transformative monitoring and evaluation in NGOs. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 63, 21-41.

Odhiambo-Abuya, I. (2025). Values-based monitoring and evaluation (VBME): principles, practices and process. *The African journal of monitoring and evaluation*, 3(1), 321-355.

Sisimayi, T. P., Ngwenya, S., & Mabwe, L. M. (2024). The Evolution of Value-Based Monitoring and Evaluation in Africa: Examining Michael Scriven's Influence on the Adoption of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems by African governments: A case of the Zimbabwean Government. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 14, 29-36.

Spaulding, D. T. (2013). *Program evaluation in practice: Core concepts and examples for discussion and analysis*. John Wiley & Sons.

Ssekamatte, D., & Okello, S. M. (2016). *Using baseline studies as a basis for monitoring and evaluation: a review of the literature*.

Stasko, J. (2014). Value-driven evaluation of visualizations. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Workshop on Beyond Time and Errors: Novel Evaluation Methods for Visualization* (pp. 46-53).

Stone, C. (2025). *Validity in social justice-oriented evaluation* (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University).

Syafika, W., & Marwa, N. (2024). The evolution of values-based education: bringing global insights and local practices to a sustainable future. *Sinergi International Journal of Education*, 2(4), 238-252.

Tengan, C., & Aigbavboa, C. (2017). Level of stakeholder engagement and participation in monitoring and evaluation of construction projects in Ghana. *Procedia engineering*, 196, 630-637.

Weiss, C. H. (2018). Theory-based evaluation: theories of change for poverty reduction programs. In *Evaluation and poverty reduction* (pp. 103-112). Routledge.

Wolfe, S. M., Long, P. D., & Brown, K. K. (2020). Using a principles-focused evaluation approach to evaluate coalitions and Collaboratives working toward equity and social justice. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 2020(165), 45-65.

Wotela, K. (2017). Using systems thinking to conceptually link the monitoring and evaluation function within development interventions and public policy. *The Journal for Transdisciplinary Research in Southern Africa*, 13(1), 13.

Yamaguchi, S., Oshima, H., Sas, H., & Aoki, S. (2020). How do people value data utilization?: An empirical analysis using contingent valuation method in Japan. *Technology in Society*, 62, 101285.

Zahle, J. (2018). Values and data collection in social research. *Philosophy of Science*, 85(1), 144-163.