

TERMS OF REFERENCE

NATIONAL INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT – LEAD CONSULTANT ON THE TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE LOW EMISSION CLIMATE RESILIENT DEVELOPMENT(LECRD)

Job ID/Title:	Lead Consultant - Terminal Evaluation of the Low Emission Climate Resilient Development (LECRD)
Scope of advertisement:	Nationally advertised
Category (eligible applicants):	External ¹
Brand:	UNDP
Practice Area:	Climate Change
Application Deadline:	Thursday, 26 March 2020 by 11.59 P.M (GMT+3.00)
Type of Contract:	National Individual Contract
Reference:	KEN/IC/2020/005 – Lead Consultant - Terminal Evaluation of the Low Emission Climate Resilient Development (LECRD)
Duty Station:	Nairobi, Kenya
Languages Required:	English
Expected Duration of Assignment:	40 working days

¹ External defines as applicants external to UNDP and to the UN Common system, including UNDP non-staff.

Background:

In accordance with UNDP M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the USAID funded and GOK implemented Low Emission and Climate Resilient Development (LECRD) Project.

Kenya is highly vulnerable to climate change impacts and this poses a serious threat to socioeconomic development. The country has experienced frequent and unpredictable weather conditions such as droughts and floods that have devastating effects on the country's ecosystems and the economy. Indeed it is estimated that the annual cost of climate change impacts could cost as much as US\$500 million a year (equivalent to approximately 2.6 percent of the country's GDP). The country is mainly Arid and Semi-arid Lands (ASAL) which constitutes 88% of the country's land mass; with a total human population projected at 50 million. Close to 45% of the population lives below the poverty line with poverty levels higher in female led households making them more vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. The Government of Kenya (GOK) made a commitment to low carbon climate resilient development pathway as articulated in the first and second National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP), third Medium Term Plan (MTP III), The Climate Change Act, 2016 and Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan (GESIP 2016-2030).

The Ministry of Environment and Forestry continues to partner with UNDP through its Environment and Resilience Unit to undertake climate change actions in Kenya. The signature project that has been implemented over the last 5 years (from 22nd September 2014 to 21st February 2020) to support Kenya's climate change programs is the Low Emission and Climate Resilient Development (LECRD) Project. The LECRD project has been implemented through National Implementation Modality (NIM) by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MEF) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) with funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). In this implementation modality, the Ministry has the overall responsibility for achieving the project goal and objectives and is directly responsible for creating the enabling conditions for implementation of all project activities. UNDP has an oversight role in the implementation of the project through monitoring the implementation of the project, reviewing progress in the realization of the project outputs, and ensuring for proper use of the funds. The overall goal of LECRD project was to support Kenya in her efforts to pursue long-term, transformative development and accelerate sustainable climate resilient economic growth, while slowing the growth of greenhouse gas emissions.

Objective

The specific objectives of the project are to strengthen capacity for low emission development in Kenya; build national and county institutions' capacity to better coordinate climate change activities and finances; enhance decision making for increased resilience to climate change impacts and promote climate smart technologies and business opportunities. This was to be achieved through the following key project outputs:

- **Key Result Area 1:** National climate change coordination processes enhanced
- **Key Result Area 2:** Enhanced access to clean and efficient energy systems
- **Key Result Area 3:** A national sustainable Greenhouse Gas Inventory in place
- **Key Result Area 4:** National and county decision making process for climate change interventions enhanced
- **Key Result Area 5:** Climate knowledge management and capacity is enhanced

- **Key Result Area 6:** Minimize the Impacts of Extreme Climate Events for Improved and Resilient Livelihoods
- **Key Result Area 7:** Kenya leverages funding from private sector to implement NDC
- **Key Result Area 8:** Domestic entrepreneurship and innovation to reduce emissions and improve resilience promoted
- **Key Result Area 9:** Energy efficiency in the public sector promoted
- **Key Result Area 10:** Renewable energy business promoted

Scope of Work

UNDP Kenya is seeking to procure two independent Individual Consultants (1. Lead Consultant and 2. Support Consultant) to undertake the Terminal Evaluation of the LECRD Project. The LECRD end-term project evaluation is aimed at assessing its stages and products through participatory approaches; measuring to what extent the objective/outputs/activities have been achieved against the results and identifying factors that have facilitated or hindered the success of the project. The evaluation will constitute an assessment of positive or negative effects attributable to the project. The evaluation will also assess the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability and ownership of the project. The evaluation will target beneficiaries from national government ministries, county governments, departments and institutions, as well as private sector, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), research/ academic institutions and the media.

Tasks of the Assignment

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method² for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**. The evaluation should seek to accomplish the following:

- a) Review the performance of the Project in achieving the outputs as per the Project Document and the contributions to the UNDP Country program Document outcomes;
- b) Evaluate the results achieved and the Impact made by the Project since inception in November 2015 to the project end period (21st February 2020).
- c) Identify factors, which facilitated or hindered the achievement of results, both in terms of the external environment and those internal to UNDP and document lessons learned in the implementation stages. This should include but not be limited to assessing the strengths and weaknesses in project design, management, coordination, human resource, and financial resources among others;
- d) Assess the appropriateness of the programme strategy including the programme institutional/management arrangements and the funding modality to reach the intended outputs and outcomes;
- e) Establish the extent to which the approach and implementation of the Project contributes to sustainable development in Kenya, specifically within climate change area;
- f) Determine the extent to which the project addresses crosscutting issues including gender and human rights;
- g) Make clear and focused recommendations that may be required for enhancing effectiveness of the LECRD by UNDP and development partners, especially a clear sustainability and transition framework;

The evaluation methodology should be consistent to UNDP's guidelines on evaluations and participatory and

² For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

include 1) Review of documentation; 2) Interviews with relevant stakeholders and project beneficiaries; 3) Field Visits/observations; 4) Stakeholders workshops among others consistent with global best practices in evaluation methodologies. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry Focal Point, UNDP Country Office, project team, USAID and all other key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to some of the project sites in Kenya to interview project beneficiaries. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. The Ministry of Environment and Forestry
2. The Climate Change Directorate
3. NETFUND
4. Kenya Industrial Research Development Institute (KIRDI)
5. The Jomo Kenyatta University of Agricultural Technology
6. The Green Africa Foundation
7. Kenya Meteorological Department
8. The National Treasury
9. Kenya Renewable Energy Association (KERA)
10. The Arid Lands Information Network

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of some key documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex A](#) of this Terms of Reference. [Annex B](#) contains the key leading questions that will guide the evaluators in undertaking this evaluation. It is expected that the evaluator will share the initial findings and recommendations to the UNDP Country Office, USAID, and the Government of Kenya partners. Thereafter, the findings will be revised to incorporate feedback, then finalized for record and use.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework in the LECRD Project Document, which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria.

The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex C](#).

Evaluation Ratings:			
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	

		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	
--	--	---------------------------------------	--

Mainstreaming

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations and lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Kenya. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The LECRD Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *40* days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing
Preparation	5 days
Evaluation Mission	10 days
Draft Evaluation Report	15 days
Final Report	10 days

Deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception Report	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 1 weeks after signing the contract.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Draft Final Report	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 2 weeks of the evaluation period	Sent to CO
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

The professionalism of evaluators and their effective use of appropriate evaluation methods are critical. Key questions and areas for investigation should be clear, coherent and realistic. Evaluation plans should be practical and cost-effective. Evaluations should be built on explicit results frameworks and theories of change, where available.

The evaluation team will be composed of (1 individual consultant evaluator) who will receive support from 1 Support Consultant in the Country Office and a team in the LECRD Project Management Office at the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Lead Consultant will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of all deliverables including the final evaluation report to UNDP Kenya. Specifically, the lead consultant will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation process;
- Design the detailed evaluation plan, methodology and survey instruments;
- Draft and communicate the evaluation report to UNDP

Qualifications:

Education

A post-graduate degree in environmental management, climate change, project management, Economics, statistics or a related field.

Experience

- Proven experience of at least 7 years in undertaking project/programme evaluations. The experience should include undertaking of at least five (5) medium to large scale donor funded project/programmes (of which two (2) should be in climate change related fields) in the past 5 years.
- Experience in Capacity development, institutional/organizational strengthening and Policy development/mainstreaming.
- Proven experience and good knowledge of the UNDP Evaluation Policy, Results Based Evaluation Policies and Procedures, NIM Guidelines and Procedures and Understanding of Human Rights approach and advancing gender equality principles in Projects.

Language

Fluency in both written and spoken English.

Evaluation Criteria

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants' qualifications, technical and financial proposals. The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable; and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation, with technical criteria being weighted at 70% and financial criteria being weighted at 30%.

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Technical Criteria (Maximum 70 points)

- A bachelor's degree in environmental management, project management, business management, finance, statistics or a related field. (20 points)
- Proven experience of at least 5 years in project management within UN entities and institutions. The experience should include budget analysis, analysis, planning and organization, grant management, capacity assessment, to donor funded project/programmes in the past 5 years. (30 points)
- Experience in providing administrative support to complex projects, evaluations, institutional/organizational strengthening and Policy development/mainstreaming programmes covering national governments and county governments in Kenya. (15 points)
- Proven experience and good knowledge of the UNDP Evaluation Policy, Results Based Evaluation Policies and Procedures, NIM Guidelines and Procedures and Understanding of Human Rights approach and advancing gender equality principles in Projects (15 points)
- Have excellent English writing and communication skills (20 points)

Financial Criteria (Maximum 30 points)

%	Milestone
20%	At submission and approval of the Inception Report
30%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO) of the final terminal evaluation report

Submission of the Financial Proposal

Applicants are instructed to submit their all-inclusive fee proposal in KSH using the financial proposal template provided (Offerors letter to UNDP)

The financial proposal should be all-inclusive and include a breakdown. The term 'all-inclusive" implies that all costs (professional fees, travel related expenses, communications, utilities, consumables, insurance, etc.) that could possibly be incurred by the Contractor are already factored into the financial proposal.

Financial evaluation (maximum 30 points):

The following formula will be used to evaluate financial proposal:

$p = y (\mu/z)$, where

p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated

y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal

μ = price of the lowest priced proposal

z = price of the proposal being evaluated

Duration of the Work

40 working days

Application process.

Interested and qualified candidates should submit their applications which should include the following:

1. Detailed Curriculum Vitae
2. Proposal for implementing the assignment – template provided
3. Offerors letter to UNDP – template provided

Note: The successful applicant will be required to complete a UNDP Personal History Form (P11) form prior to contracting.

Applications should be sent to consultants.ken@undp.org to reach us not later than Thursday, 26 March 2020 by 11.59 P.M (GMT+3.00)

Please quote “**KEN/IC/2020/005 – Lead Consultant - Terminal Evaluation of the Low Emission Climate Resilient Development (LECRD)**” on the subject line.

Firms are not eligible for this consultancy assignment. Open to **national** individual consultants only.

Incomplete applications will be disqualified automatically.

All applications must be submitted through the UNDP eTendering portal.

- If already registered, please go to <https://etendering.partneragencies.org> and sign in using your username and password, and search for the event:
Business Unit: **UNDP1**
Event ID:
• If you do not remember your password, please use the “Forgotten password” link. Do not create a new profile.

- If you have never registered in the system before, please complete a one-time registration process first by visiting <https://etendering.partneragencies.org> and using the below generic credentials:
Username: **event.guest**
Password: **why2change**

Detailed user guide on how to register in the system and submit the proposal can be found at:

<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/procurement/business/procurementnotices/resources/>

Email submission of applications will not be accepted. Queries about the position can be directed to
undp.kenya.procurement@undp.org

ANNEX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

UNDP. Evaluation Office. 2012. *Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects.* iii + 53 p.

Project development documents:

UNDP LECRD Project Document 2014.

Technical Documents developed as part of the project implementation:

Activity Implementation Reports from the field

Project Management Documents:

Project Annual Workplans and budgets
Project Budget and financial data
Project internal monitoring and evaluation reports,
Project Monitoring and Evaluation Reports
Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings
Annual Audit Report (2014,2019)

National Documents

UNDP Country Programme Document
UNDAF Kenya
Climate Change Act 2016
1st National Climate Change Action Plan
2nd National Climate Change Action Plan (2018 – 2022)
Nationally Determined Contributions
Climate Finance Policy

ANNEX B: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the climate change area, and to Kenya's environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, improved climate change policies and regulatory frameworks and low emissions climate resilient development in Kenya?			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

based on the particulars of the project.

ANNEX C: RATING SCALES

<p>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution</p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p>Sustainability ratings:</p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p>Relevance ratings</p> <p>2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p>Impact Ratings:</p> <p>3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i></p> <p>Not Applicable (N/A) Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE³

- i. Opening page:
 - Title of UNDP supported project
 - UNDP project ID#s.
 - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
 - Implementing Partner and other project partners
 - Evaluation team members
 - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁴)
- 1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2. Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
- 3. Findings
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁵)
 - 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
 - 3.2 Project Implementation

³The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

⁴ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

⁵ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
 - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
 - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
 - Project Finance:
 - Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
 - UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3** Project Results
- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance (*)
 - Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability (*)
 - Impact
- 4.** Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5.** Annexes
- ToR
 - Itinerary
 - List of persons interviewed
 - Summary of field visits
 - List of documents reviewed
 - Evaluation Question Matrix
 - Questionnaire used and summary of results
 - Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by UNDP Country Office Name: _____ Signature: _____ Date: _____	
---	--