



*Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.*

## TERMS OF REFERENCE

### **NATIONAL INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT – CONSULTANT – (TEAM LEADER) MID TERM REVIEW-STRENGTHENING GOVERNANCE PROJECT**

<b>Job ID/Title:</b>	Consultant – (Team Leader) Mid Term Review Strengthening Governance Project
<b>Scope of advertisement:</b>	Nationally advertised
<b>Category (eligible applicants):</b>	External <sup>1</sup>
<b>Brand:</b>	UNDP
<b>Practice Area:</b>	Governance
<b>Application Deadline:</b>	<b>Thursday, 11 JUNE 2020 by 11.59 P.M (GMT+3.00)</b>
<b>Type of Contract:</b>	National Individual Contract
<b>Reference:</b>	<b>KEN/IC/2020/031</b> –Consultant – (Team Leader) Mid Term Review Strengthening Governance Project
<b>Duty Station:</b>	Nairobi, Kenya
<b>Languages Required:</b>	English
<b>Expected Duration of Assignment:</b>	45 working days within a Period of 3 Months

---

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

## I. Background and Context

UNDP Kenya in partnership with the Resident Coordinators Office (RCO) and the Government of Norway are currently supporting devolution, through the Strengthening Devolved Governance in Kenya project (2018-2022). The Government of the United Kingdom through the Department for International Development (DFID) also provided support to the project during the period April to December 2019. The project is being implemented in collaboration with the Government of Kenya (GoK) and is premised on the belief that for Kenya to realize the objectives of devolution and become a truly prosperous nation by 2030, the key institutions including county governments, have to be supported to deliver quality public services to the people in an accountable and transparent manner. The interventions on the project are through National Implementation (NIM) programming modalities of UNDP. Strengthening Devolved Governance in Kenya project was preceded by the Integrated Support Programme to the Devolution Process in Kenya Project (2014-2018) which was being supported by DFID, USAID, Governments of Sweden and Norway and targeting 27 counties. The project's implementing partner was the Ministry of Devolution and ASAL (MoDA) with Kenya School of Government (KSG), Commission on Revenue Allocation (CRA), Council of Governors (CoG), Intergovernmental Budget and Economic Committee (IBEC) being responsible parties.

The Strengthening Devolved Governance in Kenya devolution project is four-year project with an estimated cost of USD10 million. To date the UNDP has mobilized USD3,102,539 from Norway and DFID (1,979,900 and 1,122,639 respectively). The project document was developed through a highly consultative process with a wide range of stakeholders including national and county governments and development partners (DPs).

### **Devolution Project Outcomes and Outputs**

#### **a) Project Outcome**

The project contributes to United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) outcome 1.2 and Country Project Document (CPD) outcome , which states that, by 2022 people in Kenya can access high quality services at devolved level that are well coordinated, integrated, transparent, equitably resourced, accessible and accountable.

#### **b) Project Outputs**

There are five key result areas organized around five outputs as follows:

- i. National and county governments have strengthened capacities for formulation and implementation of policy, legal and institutional frameworks and mechanisms for coordinated, inclusive and effective service delivery at devolved level;
- ii. Performance management, M&E, data management systems established and functioning in the counties;
- iii. Strengthened county-level planning and public financial management (PFM) systems;
- iv. Strengthened citizen participation mechanisms and processes to ensure effective and equitable service delivery, transparent and accountable use of resources; and
- v. Strengthened coordination and oversight mechanism of multi-UN Agency initiatives established and operational for frontier counties development council (FCDC) counties.

## 2. Purpose of the Mid-Term Review (MTR)

It is envisaged that a MTR for the project will be undertaken midway through the project's implementation period. In this regard, the GoK and UNDP are planning to conduct an MTR of the project in 2020. The MTR will also coincide with the end of the current Agreement with Norway, which ends in August 2020. The review will provide an overall assessment of progress and achievements made against planned results, as well as assess and document challenges and lessons learnt since the commencement of the project. The MTR findings, recommendations and lessons learned will guide future direction of the remaining phase of the project including recommendations for corrective and/or mitigation measures necessary for enhanced project delivery. The information generated from this MTR will also contribute to the organizational learning as well as the global knowledge base on development effectiveness. The MTR will also review the Theory of Change (ToC) of the project (if any) and make recommendations and/or propose the refinement of the project ToC.

The review will also focus on significant developments that have taken place in the programming environment such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the transformational focus of leaving no one behind, and make recommendations for making the project more nimble and responsive to these developments. In 2019, the project supported the mainstreaming of Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change (DRR/CC) through a DFID funding. The MTR should assess the extent to which these DRR/CC issues are being addressed alongside the above project outputs and make recommendations on the same.

## 3. Scope of the MTR

The MTR is a joint GoK, UNDP and RCO review that will be conducted in close collaboration with implementing partners both at national and county level, and development partners. The MTR will be guided by the revised UNDP evaluation policy and the UNDP Programming and Policies Procedures and specifically will assess the project against the seven (7) UNDP Project Quality Criteria, which are closely related to the UNEG evaluation criteria. The UNDP Project Quality Criteria include i) strategic ii) relevant iii) social and environmental standards (SES), iv) management and monitoring v) efficient vi) effective and vii) sustainability and national ownership. These will be assessed through the lens of project impact, to establish the extent to which the intended results were achieved. It will also examine how project management and partnerships have facilitated project delivery. The MTR will cover the project period September 2018 to April 2020 and will cover the 4 national partners (CRA, CoG, MED and OAG<sup>2</sup>) and 8 county governments<sup>3</sup> i.e. Garissa, Isiolo, Lamu, Mandera, Tana River, Turkana and Wajir that are being directly supported by the project. The MTR will also conduct an evaluation of the interventions under the Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO) with its area-based programme office in Lodwar, Turkana County.

### ***Specific Objectives of the MTR***

Project design:

---

<sup>2</sup> Commission on Revenue Allocation, Council of Governors, Monitoring and Evaluation Department of National Treasury, Office of Auditor General

<sup>3</sup> Garissa, Isiolo, Lamu, Mandera, Marsabit, Tana River, Turkana, Wajir,

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review whether the lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design
- Review the relevance of the project implementation strategy and assess whether it is the most effective towards expected/intended results.
- Review whether the perspectives key project stakeholders were considered during project design processes.
- Assess efficiency in the utilization of programme funds including cost-effectiveness, value for money while balancing with social dimensions including gender equity, social inclusion and human rights;
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
- Assess effectiveness of and advantage of the use of the joint intergrated programme modality in Turkana in realizing project goals.
- To determine how the Turkana joint programme has supported the County Government and UN agencies to contribute more effectively and efficiently to realization of the Turkana CIDP
- Assess how strategic intent of the programme, has been taken forward by the Turkana County Government and the UN agencies in Kenya and outline the key enabling factors
- Assess contribution made by the programme towards realization of development priorities of the county .
- Document lessons learnt, challenges and future opportunities, and provide recommendations for improvements or adjustments in strategy, design and/or implementation arrangements.

#### Results Framework:

- Assess achievements and progress made against planned results, intended and unintended, positive and negative;
- Assess how the emerging issues such as SDGs etc. impact on outcomes and make recommendations and suggestions for future programming;
- Review effectiveness of the programme results framework specifically the indicators, baselines and targets assessing how realistic/relevant and measurable they are and make recommendations for improvement or suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary;
- Assess effectiveness towards attainment of results and reflect on how UNDP, RCO and GoK have contributed to the results through the implementation of AWP's activities;
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyze beneficial development effects (i.e. improved governance, quality service delivery that is integrated and equitably resourced etc.); and
- Assess the extent to which broader development, gender and youth aspects of the project are being monitored effectively.

## 4. Mid Term Review Criteria and Review Questions

The following UNDP project quality criteria will be guiding the MTR: strategy, relevance, social and environmental sustainability, management and monitoring, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and national ownership. In addition, the MTR will explore extent to which five UN programming principles of Human Rights Based Approach to planning (HRBA), gender equality, environmental sustainability;

capacity development and results-based management have been mainstreamed throughout the implementation period.

### ***Analysis of the Project Quality Criteria and UN Programming Principles***

#### **Strategic:**

- Assess the extent to which programming priorities and results:
  - Contribute to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs),
  - Are consistent with the UNDP/RCO Strategic Plan and
  - Are aligned with the UNDAF and the country programme document.
- Assess to what extent is the project pro-actively taking advantage of new opportunities, adapting its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities?

#### **Relevance:**

Assess the/if:

- Relevance of the programming objectives and results to the country context including the national and sub-national development priorities (Vision 2030, Medium Term Plan III (MTP III) and County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs), among others);
- Programming strategies consider interconnections between development challenges and results;
- A gender analysis is integrated to fully consider the different needs, roles and access to/control over resources of women, men and youth and if appropriate measures are taken to address these when relevant; and
- Programmes and projects regularly capture, and review knowledge and lessons learned to inform design, adapt and change plans and actions as appropriate, and plan for scaling up.
- To what extent has the project been able to respond to changes in the needs and priorities of the IPs?

**Effectiveness:** the extent to which programme results are being achieved.

- To what extent has the project contributed to improving the quality of governance and socio-economic development in Kenya
- What is the degree of achievement of the planned immediate and intermediate results of the project?
- To what extent is the programme outcome being achieved to date? What is the likelihood of achievement by 2022?
- To what extent has the annual work-plans (2018 and 2019) contributed to effective implementation of the programme?
- To what extent have effective partnerships and strategic alliances (e.g. national partners, development partners and other external support agencies) been promoted around the programme outcomes?
- What are some of the emerging successful programming/business models or cases especially from county programming and how would they be scaled up during the remaining programme period?
- Are there any unintended programme results either positive or negative?
- To what extent is the programme theory of change being realized?

**Efficiency** –Is the implementation mechanism the most cost effective way of delivering this programme?

- Have adequate financial resources been mobilised for the project?
- To what extent have administrative procedures (UNDP and GoK) been harmonised?

- Are there any apparent cost-minimizing strategies that should be encouraged, that would not compromise the social dimension of gender, youth and PwDs?
- Are the implementation mechanisms – KRAs, technical working groups (DDWG, DSWG, TWGs, SC), PSC, PST, M&E system, and communications effective in managing the project?
- How efficiently have resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) been converted to results?
- To what extent and in what ways have the comparative advantages of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context (including universality, neutrality, voluntary and grant-nature of contributions, multilateralism, and the mandate of UNDP)?
- Considering that this project is being implemented in partnership with the Resident Coordinator's Office (RCO),
  - Have the UN agencies together with county governments demonstrated Delivering as One (DaO) principle in this programme?
  - If yes, how has this been done and does it respond to programme results?
  - How has the coordination supported delivering of results to scale for government and the UN?
  - Is having an area-based office cost effective? If yes in which ways?
  - What are some of the results that were accelerated by having the area-based office?

**Sustainability and National Ownership-** the extent to which these implementation mechanisms can be sustained over time

- Did the project incorporate adequate exit strategies, technology (knowledge) transfer and capacity development measures to ensure sustainability of results over time?
- Are conditions and mechanisms in place so that the benefits of the project interventions are sustained and owned by IPs at the national and sub-national levels after the programme has ended?
- Have strong partnerships been built with key stakeholders?
- Are institutional capacity development and strengthening of national systems being built able to sustain results?

**Management and Monitoring-** the quality of the formulation of results at different levels, i.e. the results chain:

- To what extent are the indicators and targets relevant, realistic and measurable?
- Are there baselines against which to assess progress?
- Are there project indicators aligned to SDGs? If not, what changes need to be done?
- Are expected outcomes realistic given the project timeframe and resources?
- To what extent and in what ways have risks and assumptions been addressed in the project design?
- Is the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different partners well defined, facilitated in the achievement of results and have the arrangements been respected in the course of implementation?
- To what extent and in what ways are the concepts of cross-cutting issues, especially gender been reflected in programming? Was there effort to produce sex disaggregated data and indicators to assess progress in gender equity and equality? To what extent and how is special attention given to women empowerment? What needs to be done to further integrate these dimensions?

**Social and Environmental Standards**

- Does the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights-based approach?

- Are social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender and environment) being successfully managed and monitored in accordance with project document and relevant action plans?
- Are unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances that may arise during implementation assessed and adequately managed, with relevant management plans updated?

**Impact:** To the extent possible, assess the *impact* of the project on devolution especially on the understanding of the citizenry and their participation on the devolution process i.e.

- determine whether there is any major change in the indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or associated with the project.
- Assess any impacts that the project may have contributed to.
- Determine the impact of the project on devolved institutions in regard to empowerment, management, effectiveness, accountable, transparent and efficiency in service delivery.

## 5. Methodology

The MTR will be conducted by two external individual consultants who will apply participatory and iterative learning techniques. The review should be completed within a timeframe of 45 days spread over a period of 3 months beginning June-August 2020. The MTR will be jointly commissioned and managed by the GoK and UNDP in partnership with RCO. The review will utilize both qualitative and quantitative methods to ensure that findings are derived from a collective contribution from the target counties and the national institutions. Other methods will include; open and semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, a comprehensive review of documents (both from the government on national policies and strategies as well as from the UN agencies), a synthesis and analysis of data from regular programme monitoring as well as field visits. The consultants, when on board would be required to provide an inception report to include more details on the specific approaches cum methodology to achieve the purpose for which the review was commissioned.

Based on UNEG guidelines for evaluations, and in consultations with the Evaluation Technical Committee (referred in para 9), the consultants shall develop a suitable inclusive and participatory methodology for this review. The assignment will entail:

- a. A review of relevant literature including project reports produced during the life cycle of the project, which will serve two key purposes, deeper understanding of the programme and source of secondary data;
- b. Briefing and debriefing sessions with IPs, UNDP, RCO and donor representatives.
- c. Data collection using different methods such as key informants, questionnaires, interviews, focus group discussions, town halls with IPs including counties, UNDP, representatives of various donor involved in the programme, citizens and other relevant respondents to enrich the programme review with quantitative information; qualitative data will sharpen and support the quantitative data. The consultants will use triangulation as a central method, drawing information from multiple sources.

## 6. MTR Deliverables

The deliverables for this review will include the following documents:

- *The inception Report:* The inception report should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is

being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. This will consist but not limited to the following sections: a). Stakeholder map b). Evaluation matrix including evaluation questions, codification, indicators, data collection methods, sources of information; c). overall evaluation design and methodology including sampling techniques to be applied; d). description of data gaps, including techniques and tools to be used (E.g. Focus Group Discussions, Key Informant Interviews, etc.); and detailed work plan of the assignment.

- Draft MTR which will be presented to stakeholders in half day workshop.
- Final MTR incorporating stakeholder inputs. Report format will include but not limited to: Executive summary, introduction, the development context, findings and conclusions, lessons learnt, and recommendations
- A Power Point presentation containing the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation for dissemination and debriefing purposes.
- Electronic version of data collected and data sets analyzed.

## 7. MTR Team Composition and Required Competencies

The Review Team will be local consultants (Kenyan nationals) consisting of one Team Leader and one Evaluation Expert ( to be recruited to Support the team leader). Under the overall supervision of the Devolution Project Manager, the consultants will conduct a participatory MTR. The individuals must have solid experience in undertaking complex evaluations and impact assessments of large scale donor-funded projects preferably in the field of democratic governance and devolution in Kenya or East Africa. They must be well versed with the devolution sector in Kenya with a working knowledge of UNDP/other UN Agencies. They must have the ability to design evaluation studies and apply them using a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods.

### 7.1 Roles and responsibilities of the Consultancy Team

The team will undertake the following roles and responsibilities:

- Organizing the work and preparing an evaluation plan for the team;
- Conducting briefing and debriefing; and facilitating productive working relationships with client/implementing partners and the Consulting team;
- Consulting with MTR Technical Committee and related partners to ensure the progress and the key evaluation questions are covered
- Assuring the draft and final reports are prepared in accordance with the Terms of Reference;
- Facilitating the meeting to present the main findings and recommendations of MTR, and discussing the proposed action plan to implement recommendations including changes in contents and direction of the programme.

### Qualification requirement of the Team Leader:

The **Team Leader** will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of all deliverables including the final evaluation report to the Evaluation Technical Committee. Specifically, the lead consultant will perform the following tasks:



- Taking lead in contacting Evaluation Technical Committee regarding MTR-related issues and ensure that the process is as participatory as possible
- Organizing the team meetings, assigning specific roles and tasks of the team members and closely monitor their work
- Supervising data collection and analysis
- Consolidating draft and final MTR reports, and a proposed action plan with the support provided by team members
- Finalising the final MTR report, which incorporated comments of the Evaluation Technical Committee and key stakeholders,
- Submitting the draft and final MTR report and a proposed action plan to Evaluation Technical Committee, on schedule
- Presenting MTR results and facilitating the meeting specific tasks of the team members

The **Team Leader** will have good credentials and qualifications in the following areas:

- Be a Kenyan citizen;
- Possess a minimum of a Master's degree in relevant fields- social sciences, development studies, international development among others. A PhD will be an added advantage.
- Have a minimum 15 years of increasingly responsible professional experience in project/programme evaluation, and of which seven years in governance, development and/or social sciences evaluation.
- In-depth knowledge of governance issues and challenges, as well as GoK policies, substantive knowledge of devolved governance programmatic areas in Kenya as well as experience conducting evaluation of governance projects;
- Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies, and/or a proven expertise of research in social science relevant for the evaluation;
- Have strong research and analytical skills, communication (oral and written), facilitation and management skills with specific experience in undertaking evaluations
- Demonstrated capacity for strategic thinking and policy advice are essential.
- Must be able to work in a multidisciplinary team and multicultural environment.
- Must be committed to respecting deadlines of delivery outputs within the agreed time-frame.
- Sound leadership and organizational skills- demonstrating experience of having managed and led an evaluation team
- Experience in the application and implementation of gender-sensitive programmes as well as HRBA
- Familiarity with UNDP and UN operations will be an advantage.
- Previous experience in working with devolved governance structures is an asset.

### Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria will be used to select the Team Leader suitable for the assignment:

- **Will be National Consultant (Kenyan National)**

Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
	100%	100 points
Possess a Master's degree in	10%	10

relevant fields- social sciences, development studies , international development among others		
Have a minimum 15 years of increasingly responsible professional experience in project/programme evaluation, and of which seven years in governance, development and/or social sciences evaluation.	20%	20
In-depth knowledge of governance issues and challenges, as well as GoK policies, substantive knowledge of devolved governance programmatic areas in Kenya as well as experience conducting evaluation of governance projects.	20%	20
Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies, and/or a proven expertise of research in social science relevant for the evaluation.	20%	20
Have strong research and analytical skills, communication (oral and written), facilitation and management skills with specific experience in undertaking evaluations	20%	20
Sound leadership and organizational skills- demonstrating experience of have managed and lead an evaluation team	5%	5
Experience in the application and implementation of gender-sensitive programmes as well as human rights-based approaches and a thorough understanding of RBM for programme development	5%	5
<b>Total( Maximum obtainable points)</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100</b>

## 8. MTR Ethics

Evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the evaluation policy of UNDP and UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. Evaluations of UN activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and

accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business.

**Evaluation Team /Evaluators must observe the following:**

1. To avoid **conflict of interest** and undue pressure, evaluators need to be **independent**, implying that the Evaluators must not have been directly responsible for the policy/programming-setting, design, or overall management of the subject of evaluation, nor expect to be in the near future. Evaluators must have no vested interest and have the full freedom to conduct impartially their evaluative work, without potential negative effects on their career development. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner.
2. Should protect the anonymity and **confidentiality of individual participants**. 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 (not targeted at persons)**, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
3. Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body.
4. 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 the 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.
5. They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair writing and/or oral presentation of study limitations, evidence based findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

For details on the ethics and independence in evaluation, please see

- i. *Evaluation policy of UNDP* (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.shtml>)
- ii. *UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Norms for Evaluation in the UN System*  
(<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>[http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc\\_id=21](http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21))

## 9. Implementation Arrangements

The Evaluators will be reporting directly to the Devolution Project Manager. An Evaluation Technical Committee will be created and co-chaired between MoDP and UNDP. The Evaluation Technical Committee role will be to provide an overall oversight of the joint review and endorsement of the key deliverables (inception report, key tools and methodology and, draft and final report). The Evaluation

Technical Committee shall meet, at the beginning of the review and during the reporting stage for report presentation. Other consultation with the Evaluation Technical Committee will be done electronically as required. The Evaluation Technical Committee shall be composed of UNDP Kenya, MoDP, CoG, CRA, OAG and will also consult with the project donors - Government of Norway and DFID.

## 10. Time Frame for the MTR Process

The process of the evaluation will be divided into four phases, each including several steps.

### **Phase 1: Preparation and Desk Phase:**

**Desk review** – This phase will encompass preparatory work by the UNDP in collaboration with the Evaluation Team with inputs from the donors (identification, collection and mapping of relevant documentation and other data), the Evaluation Team will analyze all documents related to the project over the period of implementation.

**Stakeholder mapping** – A simple mapping of stakeholders relevant to the evaluation will be developed by the Evaluation Team in addition to the tentative list provided by the UNDP. The product of the mapping will include national institutions and county governments' stakeholders.

**Development of an operational/logistical plan** - The Evaluation Team in consultation with UNDP will develop evaluation operational/logistical plan and calendar, to address logistical issues related to the assessment and related field visits.

The main output of this phase is the **MTR Inception Report** – A report will be prepared by the Evaluation Team containing at the minimum, the proposed approach and evaluation design, which will include the stakeholders mapping, the evaluation questions and methodologies to be adopted, sources of information and plan for data collection, including selection of project/field sites for visits, and design for data analysis.

### **Phase 2: Data Collection Phase**

**Data collection** – The Evaluation Team will embark on data collection missions including visits to the offices of UNDP, DPs, IPs and other relevant Government Agencies.

Clarify the understanding of the Devolution related development challenges in the project focus areas with key stakeholders including the government and their view on the part played by UNDP supported project in addressing the challenges that fall within the project mandate areas. The Evaluation Team will in the process gather additional information necessary to enrich the evaluation process and its outcome.

At the end of this phase, the Evaluation Team will provide a debriefing of the preliminary findings to UNDP and the technical committee, take initial comments and validate the preliminary findings.

### Phase 3: Drafting the Evaluation Report

A draft evaluation report will be prepared by the Evaluation Team within the designated timeline after the data collection exercise. The draft report will be submitted to the Team Leader, Democratic Governance Unit, UNDP Kenya.

**Review and Quality Assurance** – The draft report shall be shared with UNDP and the Evaluation Quality Assurance Team (UNDP's M&E group) who will subject it to a formal review process before presentation to stakeholders. The Evaluation Team will be directly responsible for addressing any comments or observations towards eventual finalization of the report.

**Presentation of findings, Validation and submission of report-** The Evaluation Team shall present the draft and final versions of the report to the technical committee and relevant stakeholders in designated meetings upon clearance by UNDP. The exact medium for the presentation will be determined in conjunction with the Evaluation Team. The final copy of the report will be submitted to UNDP Country Office Resident Representative.

### Phase 4: Follow-up

**Management Response** – UNDP will prepare a management response to the evaluation recommendations in the final evaluation report in line with UNEG evaluation procedures to ensure that the findings and recommendations of the MTR contribute to improvement in the implementation of future projects of similar magnitude.

**Dissemination** - The final version of the evaluation report will be disseminated at appropriate fora. It will be widely distributed to all relevant stakeholders in the country and within the UN. It will also be submitted to the Governments of Norway and DFID.

The evaluation shall be conducted for a period of **45 days** spread over a period of 3 months starting in June-August 2020. The table below shows a tentative timeframe and key milestones for the consultancy process.

Phases	Description of Activities	Responsible persons	Schedule
<b>Phase I:</b> <i>Inception</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Draft Inception Report development and submission</li><li>• Presentation of the Inception Report to UNDP, MoDP and other key stakeholders for inputs</li><li>• Input to the Inception Report by the Evaluation Technical Committee (<i>review of study plan, protocol, analytical framework etc</i>)</li><li>• Final draft of Inception Report</li></ul>	Firm Evaluation Technical Committee	<b>7 days</b>
<b>Phase II:</b> <i>Data Collection &amp; Analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Implementation of the evaluation work plan for data collection in the respective focus areas plus gender equality and the start of assumptions/hypothesis testing using the</li></ul>	Individual Consultant	<b>25 days</b>

Phases	Description of Activities	Responsible persons	Schedule
	evaluation matrix. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Utilization of a multiple method approach for data collection that includes, at minimum: document review, focus group discussions and individual interviews and project/field visits. The Evaluation Team will use triangulation as a central method, drawing information from multiple sources.</li> <li>Data analysis</li> </ul>		
<b>Phase III:</b> <i>Report Writing and Feedback</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The drafting and presentation of the draft evaluation report.</li> <li>Final report incorporating inputs from key stakeholders</li> </ul>	Individual Consultant	<b>11 days</b>
<b>Phase IV:</b> <i>Dissemination</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Dissemination Workshop and workshop summary report</i></li> <li><i>Management response to key recommendations of the final evaluation report</i></li> </ul>	Individual Consultant, UNDP	<b>2 days</b>

## 11. Consultancy Fees

The Evaluators will be recruited and paid in accordance with UNDP terms and conditions of remuneration for firms. The payments will be pegged on the attainment of certain milestones as per the agreed Work Schedule within a working period of 45 days spread over 3 months.

UNDP will cover prior agreed costs related to the MTR services which the consultant will quote inclusive of travel and other related expenses. The Evaluators fees will be paid respectively in line with the following schedule and upon acceptance of key deliverables:

- Final Inception Report: 20%
- Draft MTR Report: 50%
- Final MTR Report: 30%.

## 12. Annexes

### Existing Information Sources

The following minimum documents will be used to support the Evaluation Team in obtaining detailed background information: the UNDAF, CPD, Project Document.

- I. Signed Project Document (2018-2022)
- II. Draft List of Stakeholders

- III. UNDAF (2018-2022) document
- IV. CPD (2018-2022)

Financial Evaluation (30% of total evaluation; maximum 30 points).

### 13. 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

$\mu$  = price of the lowest priced proposal

z = price of the proposal being evaluated

#### **Duration of the Work**

45 working days within a period of 3 Months

#### **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.

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:

<https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/procurement/business/procurement-notices/resources/>

Email submission of applications will not be accepted. Queries about the position can be directed to

[undp.kenya.procurement@undp.org](mailto:undp.kenya.procurement@undp.org)

---