



## **TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)**

### **Consultancy to Conduct a Mid-Term Review (MTR) of the Integrated Support Program to the Devolution Process in Kenya (2014 – 2018)**

#### **1. Background and Context**

UNDP Kenya in partnership with a group of donors is currently supporting devolution, through the UNDP Integrated Support Programme to the Devolution Process in Kenya (2014-2018). The devolution project is being implemented in collaboration with the Government of Kenya (GoK). The project 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.

UNDP's initial support to devolution was in 2012 through the Transition Authority but was expanded at the end of 2013 to include; the Commission on Revenue Allocation, the Council of Governors and three County Governments (Kilifi, Kisumu and Turkana). In 2014, UNDP Developed the Integrated Support Programme to the Devolution Process in Kenya (2014-2018), herein referred to as the Devolution Project. In addition to the main implementing partner, the Ministry of Devolution and Planning (MoDP), there are five other national and 21 county governments implementing the programme referred in the project document (Prodoc) as responsible partners. The programme was initially implemented by 13<sup>1</sup> select county governments, which has since been increased to 21 in the 2016 Annual Work Plan (AWP).

The devolution project is supported through a UNDP Managed Basket fund, estimated at a cost of US\$ 35 million over four years. The current basket fund donors include Sweden, Norway, DFID and USAID. The interventions on the project are through National Implementation (NIM) programming modalities of UNDP. 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).

---

<sup>1</sup> The first 13 counties are Kwale, Kilifi, Taita Taveta, Marsabit, Kitui, Nyeri, Turkana, Samburu, Laikipia, Vihiga, Bungoma, Kisumu and Homa Bay while the additional eight counties are Elgeyo Marakwet, Nakuru, Narok, Kajiado, Kericho, Embu, Busia and Kirinyaga.

## **Devolution Project Results (2014-2018)**

### **a) Project Outcome**

The project contributes to United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) outcome 1.3 and Country Project Document (CPD) outcome 1 on Devolution and Accountability which states that by 2017, Kenya enjoys a participatory devolution process that is well understood by stakeholders, adequately coordinated and equitably resourced for delivery of accessible and quality services; devolved institutions that are legally, financially and technically empowered, well managed, effective, and accountable and resource management that is transparent, equitable, effective and efficient at all levels.

### **b) Project Outputs**

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

- i. Policies, laws and institutional reforms for effective implementation of the constitution at national and county levels are adopted;
- ii. Strengthened institutional and human capacities at national and county level evident in supporting national and local development;
- iii. Improved service delivery mechanisms and response to opportunities and threats of insecurity and disaster;
- iv. Strengthened citizen participation mechanisms and processes to ensure effective and equitable service delivery, transparent and accountable use of resources; and
- v. An integrated service delivery framework pilot implemented.

## **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 to commence in July/August 2016. 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. Given the development context, and the complexity of the project design, it is expected that the MTR will 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 and changes that have taken place in the programming environment such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In 2015, project included significant contribution to mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change (DRR/CC) and Gender and is expected to respond to conflict sensitivity analysis. The MTR should assess the extent to which these cross-cutting issues are being addressed alongside the project outputs above and make recommendations on the same.

### 3. Scope of the MTR

The MTR is a joint GoK and UNDP 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 newly released 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. It will also examine how project management and partnerships have facilitated project delivery. The MTR will cover the project period July 2014 to June 2016 and will cover the 6 national partners (CRA, MoDP, CoG, KSG, IBEC and TA<sup>2</sup>) and 21 county governments (13 of which came on board earlier and 8 more that came on board in 2016) that were directly supported by the project.

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

Project design:

- 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 the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Assess relevance of the programme to the country context including the national and sub-national development priorities (Vision 2030, Medium Term Plan II (MTP) and County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs), among others).
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account 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;
- 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 programme modality in Marsabit and Turkana in realizing project goals.
- 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 as well as assess challenges and lessons learnt over the past two and a half years of implementation;

---

<sup>2</sup> It is important to note that Transition Authority was dissolved in March 2016 after its constitutional term expired. Nevertheless, the Evaluation Team will access various reports that gives the status of its activities under the programme through the MoDP.

- Assess how the emerging issues not reflected in the project document such as SDGs among others 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 and GoK have contributed to the results through the implementation of AWP's activities. Assess whether the project's outputs and components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame.
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyze beneficial development effects (i.e. improved governance, gender equality and women's empowerment, etc) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

#### 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:** The extent of contribution to higher level change in line with national priorities, as evidenced through sound RBM logic through the theory of change. Aligned with UNDAF, UNDP Strategic Plan and UNDP's potential to contribute

- 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?
- Is the project aligned with the thematic focus of the UNDP Strategic Plan?

**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 2018?

- To what extent has the annual work-plans (2014, 2015 and 2016) 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 the indirect results (externalities) of the project, if any?
- 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?
- Is there a discernible common or collaborative funds mobilisation strategy?
- 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), PSC, PST, M&E system, resource mobilisation strategy and communications effective in managing the project?
- How are the two joint programmes in Turkana and Marsabit helping the programme achieve its results?
- 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)?
- Have the UN agencies demonstrated Delivering as One (DaO) principle in this programme? If yes, how has this been done and does it respond to programme results?
- Are there any indications of leakages and how effective is use of resources?

**Relevance** –responsiveness of implementation mechanisms to the rights and capabilities of the rights-holders and duty-bearers of the programme (including national and county institutions, and related policy framework).

- To what extent were the interventions consistent with the needs of the IPs the project was designed to serve in line with the priorities set by, UNDAF, CPD, MTP II, CIDP and other national and sub-national policy frameworks?
- Does the programme design respond to the challenges of National Capacity Building Framework and does it promote ownership of the programme by the national partners? Do planned interventions adequately aligned to the objectives stated in the project document?

- To what extent has the project been able to respond to changes in the needs and priorities of the IPs? What was the quality of the response?
- Do the set of results address a) the rights of the targeted IPs; b) the relevant sectorial priorities identified at national and sub-national level; and c) the objectives of the Vision 2030, MTP11 and CIDPs?
- Are the stated project objectives consistent with the requirements of UN programming principles, in particular, the requirements of most vulnerable populations?
- How relevant and appropriate is the project to the devolved levels of government, what changes need to be done?
- Are all the target groups appropriately covered by the stated project results?
- Is there a participatory approach in implementation at the IPs?

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

- Did the project incorporate adequate exit strategies and capacity development measures to ensure sustainability of results over time? Is there a better exit and sustainability strategy that can be proposed?
- 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 throughout the project cycle
- Are institutional capacity development and strengthening of national systems being built able to sustain results and build resilience?

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

- To what extent is the project designed as a results-oriented, coherent and focused framework?
- To what extent are the indicators and targets relevant, realistic and measurable? Are the indicators in line with the SDGs and what changes need to be done? Are the baselines up to date -do they need adjusting?
- 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 reflected in programming? Were specific goals and targets set? 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?

### **Partnership and Coordination for Effective programming-** quality of programme management

- Was there active participation of the relevant government agencies, UN agencies and development partners, in project design, implementation and monitoring/evaluation?
- Do the IPs on the project have the appropriate authority and tools they need to effectively undertake their roles and responsibilities as envisioned by the programme?
- How has the project influenced the effectiveness of working together among UN Agencies in the country?

**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 an external, participatory, and iterative learning exercise, which should be completed within a timeframe of 60 days spread over a period of 3 months beginning August/-September 2016. The MTR will be jointly commissioned and managed by the GoK and UNDP. The review would utilize participatory methods using both mix of 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. Interviews with beneficiaries and local partners using participatory review and evaluation methodologies. The firm, 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 (refered in para 9), the firm shall develop a suitable methodology for this review. The review will be inclusive and participatory, involving all stakeholders in the analysis. The review will therefore utilize participatory methods using both qualitative and quantitative approaches for data collection and analysis. 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 and donor representatives.
- c. Data collection using different methods such as key informants, questionnaires, interviews, focus group discussions 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 firm 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 (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 firm will designate an Evaluation Team which will consist of one Team Leader and 2 Evaluation Experts. Under the overall supervision of the Devolution Project Manager, the firm will conduct a participatory MTR.

The successful evaluation firm should have:

- A minimum of **five (5)** years of solid experience in undertaking complex evaluations and impact assessments of large scale donor-funded projects preferably in the field of democratic governance in Kenya or East Africa
- Demonstrable understanding of democratic governance and devolution sector in Kenya.
- Working knowledge of UNDP, devolution sector and working with state/ public authorities on issues related to democratic governance.
- Ability to design evaluation studies and apply them using a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods
- Ability to designate a qualified Lead Consultant to be in charge of the Review and 2 qualified Evaluation Experts
- Legally registered in Kenya

#### **Tasks and responsibilities of the firm**

The tasks to be completed by the Firm, but are not necessarily limited to the following:

- Designate a Team Leader and 2 Evaluation Experts to constitute the Evaluation Team;
- Review background documentation on the UNDP devolution project programming and other relevant information;
- Perform a literature review on devolved governance in Kenya, and ensure that it feeds the proposed evaluation approach and design;
- Validate the devolution project Theory of Change as required, using both documentation and interview source of data;
- Meet with relevant stakeholders, such as donor, private sector, government partners as may be agreed with the Evaluation Technical Committee;
- Present for, approval to Evaluation Technical Committee, an inception report containing a detailed evaluation plan and design that address the specific evaluation questions proposed but not limited to; proposed potential evaluation questions that will allow the exercise to meet the evaluation objectives, relevant indicators, data collection methods and present evaluation design options to meet the quality expectation stated herein;
- Propose relevant data collection strategy, such as sample size with quality assurance processes;
- Implement the Approved Evaluation Work Plan;

- Liaise with the stakeholders through email, teleconference, in-person meetings as needed;
- Inform proactively the Evaluation Technical Committee of any significant modifications to the intervention/project that could affect the evaluation and any difficulties that may arise in implementing the approved evaluation design;
- conducting briefing and debriefing; and facilitating productive working relationships among the team members;
- Consulting with Evaluation 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 ToRs, facilitate 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;
- Prepare the inception report, draft and final MTR as agreed in the deliverables table;

**Qualification requirement of the Team Leader:**

The firm shall designate a **Team Leader** with good credentials and qualifications in the following areas:

- 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, 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.

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

#### ***Qualification Requirements for each of the Evaluation Experts***

The Consultancy firm shall designate 2 Evaluation Experts to work under the Team Leader with good credentials and qualifications in the following areas:

- Be Kenyan citizens;
- Possess a Master's degree in relevant fields- social sciences, development studies, international development among others;
- Have at least 10 years of relevant experience – specifically in evaluating similar programmes;
- 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;
- Demonstrate knowledge of and ability to apply theoretical knowledge in the design, management and evaluation of complex multidisciplinary programmes involving the national government, county governments civil society and international organizations;
- Have a strong understanding of the development context in Kenya and national development vision and strategies;
- Have strong analytical and communication skills;
- Have excellent writing skills in English and good spoken Kiswahili; and
- Demonstrate experience of having worked or evaluated UN programmes will be an added advantage

## Technical Evaluation Criteria

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

### Summary

		Score Weight	Points Obtainable
1	Technical Responsiveness of the Proposal	40%	40
2	Proposed Work Plan and Approach	30%	30
3	Personnel	30%	30
	Total	100%	100

### Form 1: Technical Responsiveness of the Proposal

S. No.	Description of Criteria	Max. Obtainable Points
1.1	A minimum of <b>five (5)</b> years of solid experience in undertaking complex evaluations and impact assessments of large scale donor-funded projects preferably in the field of democratic governance in Kenya or East Africa	15
1.2	Demonstrable understanding of democratic governance and devolution sector in Kenya	10
1.3	Proof of registration and tax compliance as per the laws of Kenya (e.g. certificate of incorporation, VAT certificates, etc.)	5
1.4	Ability to design evaluation studies and apply them using a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods	10
	<b>Total Form 1</b>	<b>40</b>

### Form 2: Proposed Work Plan and Approach

S. No.	Description of Criteria	Max. Obtainable Points
2.1	To what degree does the Offeror understand the task?	8
2.2	Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail?	8
2.3	Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR?	7
2.4	Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation of the project?	7
	<b>Total Form 2</b>	<b>30</b>

### Form 3: Personnel

S. No.	Description of Criteria	Max. Obtainable Points
<b>Part 3A: Team Leader (10 points)</b>		
3.1	Minimum of a Master's degree in relevant fields – social sciences, development studies, international development among others	5
3.2	Minimum 15 years increasingly responsible professional years, 7 of which are in governance, development and / or social sciences evaluation	3
3.3	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	2
Sub-total A		10

<b>Part 3B: Evaluation Expert 1 (10 points)</b>		
3.4	Master's degree in relevant fields	5
3.5	At least 10 years relevant experience evaluation similar programmes	3
3.6	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	2
Sub-total B		10

<b>Part 3C: Evaluation Expert 2 (10 points)</b>		
3.7	Master's degree in relevant fields	5
3.8	At least 10 years relevant experience evaluation similar programmes	3
3.9	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	2
Sub-total C		10

## 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 members of an Evaluation Team 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/102http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc\\_id=21](http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21))

## 9. Implementation Arrangements

The Consultancy Firm 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, UNWomen Kenya, MoDP, CoG, IBEC, CRA, KSG, USAID, DFID, Governments of Sweden and Norway.

## 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 Sweden and Norway, USAID and DFID together with the above stated management response.

The evaluation shall be conducted for a period of **60 days** spread over a period of 3 months starting in July/August 2016. 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 evaluation matrix.</li> <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>	Firm	<b>28 days</b>
<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>	Firm	<b>21 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>• Management response <i>to key recommendations of the final evaluation report</i></li> </ul>	Firm, UNDP	<b>4 days</b>

## 11. Consultancy Fees

The consultancy firm will be recruited and paid in accordance with UNDP terms and conditions of remuneration for firms. The payments to the firm will be pegged on the attainment of certain milestones as per the agreed Work Schedule within a working period of 60 days spread over 3 months.

UNDP will cover prior agreed costs related to the MTR services and pay Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) per night spent on mission embarked upon as part of the evaluation process using standard UN DSA rates. The firm's fees will be paid 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. Logistics/ Field Expenses

UNDP will only cater for daily subsistence allowance and transport costs for the three (3) CORE technical team members at the prevailing UN rates based on agreed travel schedules. This cost should **NOT** form part of the financial proposal.

However, all other expenses including transport, daily subsistence allowances and fees for field research assistants and other personnel shall be borne by the Consultancy Firm and should form part of its financial proposal.

## 13. 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, the project results matrix; the monitoring and evaluation framework and plans; the Project AWP, programme logic model (Theory of Change) and Progress Project Reports (quarterly, annual, donor reports etc) and any other reports produced during programme implementation.

- I. *Signed Project Document (2014-2018)*
- II. *Draft List of Stakeholders and MTR audience*
- III. *Periodic Project Reports for the duration of the project*
- IV. *UNDAF (2014-2018) document*
- V. *CPD (2014-2018)*
- VI. *Annual Work plans for each year of programme implementation.*
- VII. *Annex 7. Evaluation Report Template and Quality Standards*