TERMS OF REFERENCE

Consultancy to Conduct End-of-Project Evaluation of the Strengthening Electoral Processes in Kenya (SEPK) Project 2015-2018

1) Background

a) Context

The Strengthening Electoral Processes in Kenya (SEPK) project is designed to consolidate and build on the gains made from the constitutional transition process and the 2013 General Elections to strengthen and develop sustainable and effective electoral institutions, systems and processes. This project grounds electoral assistance within the democratic governance framework and the electoral cycle. For greater impact, this project, in its implementation, taps into the comparative advantages of various UN agencies, including UN Women, UNODC and OHCHR, and leverages their programmatic strengths under the UN principle of Delivering as One (DaO). UNDP leads implementation of SEPK. The project has so far received US$ 17,954,000, including US$ 1,677,000 for the Fresh Presidential Election (FPE) from the financial contribution of DFID, USAID, Italy, Ireland, Germany, EU and Germany. This is US$ 6,059,800 shy of the US$ 24,013,800 budgeted at inception of the project.

This project is sequenced and prioritized. It started in Years 1 (2015) and 2 (2016) with institutional and professional capacity building of EMBs, completion of the legal and regulatory frameworks, consolidating gains, and strengthening key processes informed by lessons learnt from the 2013 cycle. This includes strengthening the participation of women, youth, and marginalized groups; the professionalism of electoral reporting; and electoral security and dispute resolution processes. This third year (2017) of the project focused on support geared towards strengthening implementation and participation in the 2017 general elections. Year 4 (2018) will be a year of reflection, dispute resolution including post-election mediation and support for any further reforms with an exit strategy that emphasizes sustainability and institutional capacity or strengthening needed for the next cycle of elections.

b) Project Stakeholders
  i)   Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC)
  ii)   Office of the Registrar of Political Parties (ORPP)
  iii)   Judiciary Committee on Elections
  iv)   Political Parties Dispute Tribunal
  v)   National Police Service
  vi)   Parliament – Senate and National Assembly

vii)   Political Parties Liaison Committee
viii)   Political Parties

c) Project Theory of Change

The SEPK theory of change is depicted in the chart below:

OUTCOMES	OUTPUTS
Outcome 1. Strengthened institutional and legal framework for the electoral processes;	Output 1.1. Legal framework strengthened
	Output 1.2. Institutional framework for coordination of electoral processes strengthened
	Output 1.3. Strengthened institutional capacity and professionalism of IEBC
Outcome 2. Strengthened participation of voters, parties and candidates in the electoral process with emphasis on women, youth and disabled	Output 2.1. More informed voters
	Output 2.2 Increased participation of women voters
	Output 2.3 Increased participation of youth, and marginalized groups
	Output 2.4.: More equitable participation by women political actors in the electoral processes
	Output 2.5. More objective, balanced and gender sensitive reporting on electoral issues and processes
Outcome 3. Delivery of more efficient, transparent and peaceful elections	Output 3.1. Improved Voter Registration
	Output 3.2. Strengthened electoral operations and logistics;
	Output 3.3. Increased professionalism and capacity of temporary electoral workers
	Output 3.4 Election security and risk management with specific focus on women, youth, persons with disability and other special interest groups
Outcome 4. Strengthened electoral justice and increased compliance with the electoral framework.	Output 4.1 Increased capacity for just and timely electoral dispute resolution that protects all and especially women
	Output 4.2 Strengthened enforcement for electoral laws and regulations
Outcome 5. Strengthened coordination of development partner support and management of Strengthening Electoral Processes in Kenya	Output 5.1. Effective and functioning PMU established
	Output 5.2. Effective technical assistance provided to IEBCs and other institutions

Key thematic areas integrated throughout SEPK are strengthened documentation and communications, increased institutional efficiency and compliance, inclusiveness especially of

women, youth and people with disabilities (PWDs), and accountability. Project activities and results focus around four main outcome areas:

i) strengthened institutional and legal framework for the electoral processes;

ii) strengthened participation of voters, parties and candidates in the electoral process with emphasis on women, youth and disabled;

iii) delivery of more efficient, transparent and peaceful elections; and

iv) strengthened electoral justice and increased compliance with the electoral framework.

The project seeks to develop more efficient and cost-effective systems and facilitate participatory stakeholder engagement to strengthen the electoral process and build national commitment and ownership for free, fair and peaceful elections. Gender and human rights have been mainstreamed through all four main areas.

2) Purpose of the End-of-Project Evaluation

Implementation of SEPK has been going on for two years. 2015 saw little activity in the project since it was the inception year. Interventions were scaled up in 2016. The year 2017 was probably the busiest for the project. During the year, IEBC commissioners vacated office paving way for appointment of new ones, new commissioners took office through a smooth transition, onboarding and induction, second phase of mass voter registration (MVR) was finalized, political parties undertook their primaries, IEBC tested and deployed the technology to be used for the 2017 General Elections, IEBC finalized nomination of candidates for the 2017 General Elections, political campaigns were finalized, the general election was held on August 8, 2017, the Supreme Court nullified the results of the presidential election on September 1, 2017, fresh presidential elections were held on October 26, 2017, the Supreme Court upheld the results of FPE on November 21, 2017 and the president-elect and deputy president-elect were sworn in on November 28, 2017. Meanwhile, the opposition NASA stepped up its campaign to reform the electoral process in Kenya, following a boycott which saw president Uhuru Kenyatta win with an overwhelming majority. The year 2018 remains for project closure, post-election evaluation and planning for the 2022 electoral cycle.

With the project approaching its end in December 2018, there is need to undertake a comprehensive end-of-project evaluation aimed at:

i) Identifying outcome results delivered against key milestones identified in the Project Document so as to establish reasons for over or under achievement;

ii) Assessing effectiveness of project implementation and management arrangements, and the functioning on the Project Management Unit (PMU);

iii)   Generating lessons to inform UNDP, UN Women and OHCHR programming on elections and to identify key themes for the 2022 electoral cycle support.

The end-of-project evaluation will examine the extent to which the project outcomes and outputs have been achieved by seeking to answer the following questions:
- Were stated outcomes and outputs achieved?
- What progress has been made towards achievement of the outputs and outcomes?
- What factors contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes and outputs?
- What was the contribution of UNDP and other UN agencies toward realization of the outcomes and outputs?
- To what extent has the project incorporated gender and social inclusion issues in its design and implementation? How can future project be made more responsive to gender, social inclusion and conflict issues?
- How appropriate and effective has the Delivering as One (DaO) principle been in ensuring seamless implementation of the project? What factors contributed to this effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

3) Scope of the End-of-Project Evaluation

3.1. Overall Objective of the End-of-Project Evaluation
The overall objective of the End-of-Project Evaluation is to assess the progress made by SEPK and provide recommendations for improving programming on elections for UNDP and other UN agencies.

3.2. Specific Objectives of the End-of-Project Evaluation
The specific objectives of the End-of-Project Evaluation are focussed around two themes: project design and results framework.

Project design:
- Review the problem addressed by the project and appropriateness of 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 development priorities identified in Kenya Vision 2030, Second Medium-Term Plan (MTPII), IEBC Strategic Plan, Elections Operations Plan, 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, 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.
- Review the extent to which the project achieved the gender and social inclusion targets identified following the gender and conflict sensitivity analysis undertaken at inception of the project.
- 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 period of implementation;
- Assess how emerging electoral issues have impacted on delivery of outcomes and make recommendations for future programming;
- Assess effectiveness towards attainment of results and reflect on how UNDP, other UN agencies and GoK have contributed to the results through implementation of project activities.
- Assess whether the project's outcomes, outputs and components are clear, practical, and feasible within its timeframe.

4) End Term Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The following UNDP project quality criteria will guide the End-of-Project Evaluation: strategic alignment, relevance, social and environmental sustainability, management and monitoring, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and national ownership. In addition, the end-of-project will explore extent to which five UN programming principles of Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) to programming, gender equality and women empowerment, environmental sustainability; capacity development and results-based management have been mainstreamed throughout the implementation period.

The End-of-Project Evaluation will seek to answer the following questions:

Strategic alignment: 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 Country Project Document (CPD).

- 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, UNDAF and UNDP-K Country Project Document (CPD)?
- To what extent has the design and implementation of the project promoted the principles of HRBA, GEWE, environmental sustainability, capacity development and leave no one behind?

Effectiveness: the extent to which project 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 are the project outcomes being achieved to date? What is the likelihood of their achievement by 2018?
- To what extent has the annual work-plans (2015, 2016 and 2017) contributed to effective implementation of the project?
- To what extent have effective partnerships and strategic alliances (e.g with national partners, development partners and other external support agencies) been promoted to deliver project 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 country programming and how would they be scaled up during the remaining project period?
- Are there any unintended project results, either positive or negative?
- To what extent is the project theory of change being realized?

Efficiency: Is the implementation mechanism the most cost-effective way of delivering this project?

- Were adequate financial resources been mobilized for the project?
- Was there a discernible common or collaborative funds mobilization strategy? How effective was this strategy in mobilizing resources for the project?

- To what extent were administrative procedures (UNDP, UN Women, OHCHR and GoK) been harmonised?
- Were there any apparent cost-minimizing strategies that should be encouraged, that would not compromise the social dimension of gender, youth and PwDs?
- Were the implementation mechanisms – Project Steering Committee, Project Donor Group, Project Management Unit, M&E system, resource mobilisation strategy and communications effective in managing the project?
- How efficiently were resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) converted to results?
- To what extent and in what ways did the comparative advantages of the UN organizations leveraged in the successful implementation of the project?
- Did the UN agencies demonstrate Delivering as One (DaO) principles in this project? If yes, how was this done and did it respond to programme results?
- Were there any indications of leakages and how effective was the use of resources?

Relevance: Responsiveness of implementation mechanisms to the rights and capabilities of the rights holders and duty-bearers of the project.
- To what extent were the interventions consistent with the needs of the government and non-government partners the project was designed to serve in line with the priorities set in UNDAF, CPD, IEBC Strategic Plan 2016 – 2021, Elections Operations Plan, MTP II or any other national policy frameworks?
- To what extent did the project respond to changes in the needs and priorities of its national and non-government partners? What was the quality and timeliness of such response?
- Were the stated project objectives consistent with the requirements of UN programming principles the requirements of most vulnerable populations?
- Were all the target groups appropriately covered by the stated project results?
- Was there a participatory approach in implementation of the project by the government and non-government partners?

Sustainability and National Ownership: The extent to which project implementation mechanisms can be sustained over time
- Did the project incorporate adequate exit strategies and capacity development measures to ensure sustainability of its results over time? Is there a better exit and sustainability strategy that can be proposed?
- Were conditions and mechanisms in place so that the benefits of the project interventions are sustained and owned by government and non-government partners at national and sub-national levels after the project has ended?

- Were strong partnerships built with key stakeholders throughout the project cycle?
- Was the institutional capacity development and strengthening of national systems able to sustain results and build resilience?

Management and Monitoring: The quality of 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 made?
- 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?
- was the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different partners well defined, facilitated in the achievement of results and were the arrangements respected during implementation?
- To what extent and in what ways were 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 was 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 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?
- Did the implementing partners have appropriate authority and tools to effectively undertake their roles and responsibilities as envisioned by the project?

- How did the project influence effectiveness of working together among UN Agencies in the country?

Impact: To the extent possible, assess the impact of the project on the electoral process especially on the understanding of the citizenry and their participation in elections. Whether the project contributed to any major changes in participation in elections, voter turnout, management and coordination of elections, credibility of the 2017 General Elections, and acceptability of election results.
- Did the project contribute to any notable impacts? Were there any unforeseen positive or negative impacts of the project?
- What was the impact of the project on key electoral institutions in regard to empowerment, management, effectiveness, accountability, transparency and efficiency in service delivery.

Conduct and performance of the 2017 General Elections: To find out public perceptions on the conduct of the August 2017 General Election and October 2017 Fresh Presidential Election.
- To what extent can the elections be said to be free, fair, credible and transparent? What factors contributed to the election being free, fair, credible and transparent?
- How did the Supreme Court rulings in the presidential petition following the August 8 General Election and October 26 FPE contribute to rebuilding public confidence in the judiciary?
- How did IEBC respond to the issues raised in the Supreme Court ruling on the peititoon following the August 8 General Election? How effective were these responses?
- How did SEPK contribute to the election being free, fair, transparent and credible?
- How effective was SEPK's response to priorities emerging from the FPE?

Gender and Conflict Sensitivity: To establish the extent to which the project promoted gender and social inclusion, and how it supported peace building and conflict management in Kenya.
- How did the project perform on its gender and conflict targets as set out in the Gender and Conflict Sensitivity Analysis undertaken before the inception of the project?
- What hampered (or supported) the achievement of the gender and conflict targets? How did the project deal with these issues?
- What are the gender and conflict sensitivity issues that UNDP needs to be aware of as it prepares its support for the 2022 Electoral Cycle?

5) Team Composition and Required Skills

SEPK seeks the services of a reputable consultancy firm to support this evaluation. The firm will designate an Evaluation Team which will consist of one Lead Consultant (international), two team members (local) and a team of research assistants/enumerators. Under the overall supervision of the SEPK Project Manager, and continuous liaison with SEPK M&E Specialist, the firm will conduct a participatory end-of-project evaluation.

5.1. Requirements of the Consultancy Firm
- At least seven (7) years proven expertise and experience in conducting evaluations of multi-donor funded governance projects, especially elections.
- Technical knowledge and experience in democratic governance, elections, or public sector reforms and conducting end term evaluations in Kenya and any other Sub Saharan Africa country.
- 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 including tracking and reporting on project indicators
- Good understanding of UNDP policies and processes on elections, governance, gender, human rights-based approach, and capacity development.
- In-depth understanding of national situation and context for elections in Kenya or any other sub-Saharan African country.
- Proven ability to design and undertake evaluations using a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods.
- Experience working in the UN system in other developing countries will be an added advantage.

5.2. Qualification Requirements for the Lead Consultant
- An advanced degree in political science, law, M&E, project management, strategic management or other relevant social sciences.
- At least fifteen (15) years' experience in a relevant governance or evaluation field.
- At least ten (10) years' experience in undertaking evaluations of governance programmes, especially of electoral reform projects in Sub Saharan Africa.
- Strong research skills and extensive experience in conducting evaluations especially end-of-project evaluations.
- Demonstrable understanding of governance, elections and public-sector reforms in developing countries in Africa.
- Working knowledge of the UN system and state/public authorities on issues related to democratic governance including elections, human rights, access to justice and people-centred devolution issues.

- Knowledge of human rights issues relating to gender, women empowerment, youth, persons with disabilities (PWDs), disadvantaged communities will be essential.
- Sound leadership and organizational skills- demonstrating experience of having managed and led an evaluation team
- Demonstrated experience and abilities to pro-actively lead and coordinate a team, including strong interpersonal skills with ability to multi-task and maintain effective work relationships with diverse range of institutional partners and undertake complex assignments.
- Have strong research and analytical skills, communication (oral and written), facilitation and management skills with specific experience in undertaking evaluations.

The Lead Consultant will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of all deliverables including the final End-of-Project Evaluation report. Specifically, the Lead Consultant will perform the following tasks:
- Lead and manage the evaluation team;
- Coordinate the study ensuring quality and responsiveness to the ToR;
- Lead the design of detailed evaluation plan, methodology and survey instruments;
- Ensure efficient division of tasks between the members of the evaluation team;
- Draft and communicate the evaluation report to SEPK and UNDP management;
- Present the draft report to stakeholders, capturing and incorporating stakeholder feedback into the final report; and
- Submit a Refined Final End-of-Project Evaluation Report containing as a minimum:
    - I. Title
    - II. Table of contents
    - III. List of acronyms and abbreviations
    - IV. Executive summary
    - V. Introduction
    - VI. Description of the intervention
    - VII. Evaluation scope and objectives
    - VIII. Evaluation approach and methods
    - IX. Data analysis
    - X. Findings and conclusions
    - XI. Recommendations
    - XII. Lessons learned
    - XIII. Annexes

5.3. Qualification Requirements for Consultancy Team Members

- Advanced degree in Project Management, Strategic Management, Law, political science, public administration or any other relevant discipline.
- At least 7 years of professional experience in democratic governance and/or results-based evaluations, with demonstrable bias to gender and social inclusion.
- At least five years' experience in conducting programmatic evaluations of complex projects in the development sector.
- 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 projects supported by multiple development partners
- Have a strong understanding of the governance context in Kenya and national strategies relevant to elections.

6) Scope and Methodology

6.1. Scope
The end-of-project evaluation will cover all the national counterparts of SEPK and sampled 10 counties. The successful firm will propose a robust sampling methodology for sampling the counties. Quantitative and qualitative data will be collected from all these counties, as elaborated in the approach below.

6.2. Approach
The evaluation exercise will be wide-ranging, consultative and participatory, entailing a combination of comprehensive desk reviews, analyses, field data collection, focus group discussions and key informant interviews. While interviews will be a key instrument, all analysis will be based on observed facts to ensure that the evaluation is sound and objective. The consultants will further elaborate on the methodology and approach in a manner commensurate with this assignment and reflect this in the inception report; which will be approved by the Project Management Team.

The key tasks to be undertaken during the evaluation will include but not be limited to the following:
- Interviews with key stakeholders identified in consultation with SEPK project management team.

- Field visits to key institutions and at least 10 counties. The consultants will propose a robust methodology for sampling the counties, collection of quantitative data and identification of key respondents.
- Comprehensive desk review to obtain an in-depth understanding of the assignment context and support key findings from interviews, focus group discussions and field visits.
- Focus group discussions to understand citizen and stakeholder views on the parameters of this assignment and other aspects relevant to it.
- Any other approach which will be proposed by the team of consultants in their inception report.

6.3. Key Deliverables

i. Inception report detailing the consultants' approach to undertaking the assignment and responding to the evaluation questions.
ii. Peer-reviewed and completed evaluation tools.
iii. Raw data sets and tables.
iv. Initial draft report of the findings of the evaluation.
v. PowerPoint presentation detailing methodology adopted and the major findings of the evaluation.
vi. Report of stakeholder validation meetings.
vii. Final evaluation report.
viii. End-of-assignment report detailing progress on the delivery of assignment deliverables, lessons learnt and challenges faced during the assignment.

7) End-Term Evaluation Timelines and reporting arrangements

7.1. Management arrangements

The Consultancy Firm will be reporting directly to the Country Office M&E Focal Point, who will act as the evaluation manager for purposes of overall quality assurance. The SEPK Project Manager, with support of the M&E Specialist, will be responsible for the daily administration of this End-of-Project Evaluation. The M&E Specialist will provide logistical support to the team of consultants in setting up the stakeholder interviews, arranging field visits, co-ordinating and liaising with other project stakeholders. The consultants will plan on how to reach other key respondents of the survey including citizens, national and county government officials.

7.2. Tentative time frame and schedule for the End-of-Project Evaluation

The assignment will run for 60 days distributed as follows:

Deliverable	Duration	Due dates	Related payments	Reporting
▪ Inception report ▪ Work plan	5 days	5 days from effective start date	30% of total contract value	▪ Review by SEPK M&E Officer ▪ Approval by SEPK Project Manager
▪ Reviewed and completed survey instruments	5 days	10 days from effective start date	N/a	
▪ Data collection ▪ Draft report ▪ Data tables and logs	35 days	45 days after effective date	30% of total contract value	
▪ Debriefing session and presentation	5 days	50 days from effective date	N/a	
▪ 2nd draft incorporating input from debriefing session	5 days	55 days from effective date	N/a	
▪ Final evaluation report ▪ End of assignment report	5 days	60 days from effective date	40% of total contract value	

8) Evaluation Criteria

8.1. Technical Evaluation Criteria
The following criteria will be used to select a suitable firm to undertake the assignment:

	Evaluation criteria	Score Weight	Max Points
1	Technical Responsiveness of the Proposal	40%	400
2	Proposed Work Plan and Approach	30%	300
3	Personnel	30%	300
	Grand Total	100%	1000

Form 1: Technical Responsiveness of the Proposal

S.No	Description of Criteria	Max Points
1.1	At least seven (7) years proven expertise and experience in conducting evaluations of multi-donor funded governance projects, especially elections.	80
1.2	Technical knowledge and experience in democratic governance, elections, or public sector reforms and conducting end term evaluations in Kenya and any other Sub Saharan Africa country.	60

1.3	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 including tracking and reporting on project indicators	60
1.4	Good understanding of UNDP policies and processes on elections, governance, gender, human rights-based approach, and capacity development.	50
1.5	In-depth understanding of national situation and context for elections in Kenya or any other sub-Saharan African country.	50
1.6	Proven ability to design and undertake evaluations using a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods.	50
1.7	Experience working in the UN system in other developing countries will be an added advantage	50
	Total Form 1	**400**

Form 2: Proposed Work Plan and Approach

S.No	Description of Criteria	Max Points
2.1	To what degree does the firm understand the task?	70
2.2	Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail?	70
2.3	Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR?	70
2.4	Is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise to deliver the task efficiently as it relates to end-of-project evaluation?	50
2.5	Is the presentation of the workplan and approach clear and coherent?	40
	Total Form 2	**300**

Form 3: Personnel

S.No	Description of Criteria	Max Points
	Form 3A: Team Leader suitability for the assignment	
3.1	An advanced degree in political science, law, M&E, project management, strategic management or other relevant social sciences.	10
3.2	At least fifteen (15) years' experience in a relevant governance or evaluation field.	10
3.3	At least ten (10) years' experience in undertaking evaluations of governance programmes, especially of electoral reform projects in Sub Saharan Africa.	10
3.4	Strong research skills and extensive experience in conducting evaluations especially end-of-project evaluations.	10
3.5	Demonstrable understanding of governance, elections and public-sector reforms in developing countries in Africa.	10

3.6	Working knowledge of the UN system and state/public authorities on issues related to democratic governance including elections, human rights, access to justice and people-centred devolution issues.	10
3.7	Knowledge of human rights issues relating to gender, women empowerment, youth, persons with disabilities (PWDs), disadvantaged communities will be essential.	10
3.8	Sound leadership and organizational skills- demonstrating experience of having managed and led an evaluation team	10
3.9	Demonstrated experience and abilities to pro-actively lead and coordinate a team, including strong interpersonal skills with ability to multi-task and maintain effective work relationships with diverse range of institutional partners and undertake complex assignments.	10
3.10	Have strong research and analytical skills, communication (oral and written), facilitation and management skills with specific experience in undertaking evaluations.	10
	Sub-Total A	**100**

S.No	Form 3B and 3C: Evaluation team members (Scoring to be undertaken for each of the two evaluation team members)	Maximum attainable score
3.11	Advanced degree in Project Management, Strategic Management, Law, political science, public administration or any other relevant discipline.	10
3.12	At least 7 years of professional experience in democratic governance and/or results-based evaluations, with demonstrable bias to gender and social inclusion.	20
3.13	At least five years' experience in conducting programmatic evaluations of complex projects in the development sector.	20
3.14	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;	10
3.15	Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies, and/or a proven expertise of research in social science relevant for the evaluation;	20
3.16	Demonstrate knowledge of and ability to apply theoretical knowledge in the design, management and evaluation of complex multidisciplinary projects supported by multiple development partners	10
3.17	Have a strong understanding of the governance context in Kenya and national strategies relevant to elections.	10
	Sub-Total B	**100**

8.2. Financial Proposal

The financial proposal shall clearly indicate the professional fees charged by the firm and the costs of logistics required for data collection and analysis. UNDP will cater for the costs of travel, accommodation and conferencing incurred as a result of data collection pursuant to the successful completion of this evaluation.

The remuneration of data collection assistants will be included in the costs paid to the successful offeror. Practicality and probity shall be considered in evaluating the financial proposals of prospective firms.

9) End-of-Project Evaluation Ethics

This end-of-project evaluation will be guided by the principles outlined in the UNDP evaluation policy and UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The evaluation shall be independent, impartial and rigorous. It is expected to contribute to knowledge development, learning and accountability. hence the evaluation team and the data collection assistants will uphold the highest standards of ethics and professionalism.

The evaluation team will comply to the following ethical considerations:

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.