

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

Consultancy to Conduct an End-term Evaluation 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 13¹ 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 project as at December 2017 had mobilized US\$ 22.1 million. 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). The integrated nature of the project is achieved through the close collaboration of interventions under the UNDP Governance Unit and the UNDP Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction (CC/DRR) under the Energy and Environment Unit. Further, with the adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), mainstreaming of SDGs was incorporated through the technical support of the UNDP's Strategic Policy Advisory Unit. Lastly, gender mainstreaming is ensured through joint programming with UN Women.

Devolution Project Results (2014-2018)

a) Project Outcome

The project contributes to United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2014-2018 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,

¹ 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.

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 End-Term Evaluation (ETE)

The project document (Prodoc) requires that the project conducts a mid-term Evaluation (MTE) midway of the project implementation period and an end term evaluation at the end of the project by independent, external evaluators. Pursuant to this requirement, the GoK and UNDP conducted a MTE in 2016 which was finalized and disseminated in 2017. The ETE, is planned for the first quarter of 2018 as the project is due to come to an end in June 2018. The evaluation 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 ETE findings, recommendations and lessons learned will establish if the envisaged results have been achieved or not, and also inform the next phase of the devolution project. The information generated from this ETE will contribute to the organizational learning as well as generate knowledge for development effectiveness.

UNDP therefore plans to engage a firm to conduct the ETE.

3. Scope of the ETE

The ETE 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 ETE will be assessed against the following seven (7) UNDP Project Quality Criteria, which are aligned to the UNEG evaluation criteria: i) strategic ii) relevant iii) social and environmental standards (SES), iv) management and monitoring v) efficient vi) effective and vii) sustainability and national ownership. The ETE will cover the project period July 2014 to June 2018 and will cover the 5 national partners (CRA, MoDP, CoG, KSG and IBEC) and 21 county governments. The DRR/CC components are supported mainly by the Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate (MED), the National Drought Management Authority (NDMA) and the national Disaster Operation Centre (NDOC). Gender mainstreaming work through UN Women is with the State Department of Gender Affairs, the Office of the Controller of Budget, the National Treasury and the County Assemblies Forum. The comprehensive list of partners is provided as Annex 2.

Objectives of the ETE

The overall objective of the ETE is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme, including the extent to which cross cutting issues (gender, climate change, SDGs) have

been mainstreamed. The evaluation will also assess the mechanisms put in place to enhance coordination and harmonization between UNDP, Implementing Partners, and the National and County Governments.

The specific objectives of the evaluation will be to:

- 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.
- Assess relevance of the project 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 and whether the 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 were 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 and addressed by the project
- Assess effectiveness of and advantage of the use of the joint programme modality in Marsabit and Turkana in realizing project goals; and
- Document lessons learnt, challenges and future opportunities, and provide recommendations for improvements or adjustments in strategy, design and/or implementation arrangements.

On the results framework, the ETE will:

- Assess achievements and progress made against planned results, intended and unintended, positive and negative as well as assess challenges and lessons learnt;
- Assess, to the extent possible, how the emerging issues not reflected in the project document such as SDGs may have impacted on outcomes;
- Assess effectiveness towards attainment of results and reflect on how UNDP and GoK have contributed to the results achieved;
- Assess if broader development and gender aspects of the project were achieved; and
- Assess quantitative and qualitative achievements against each of the project indicators.

4. End Term Evaluation Criteria and Review Questions

The following UNDP project quality criteria will guide the ETE: strategy, relevance, social and environmental standards, management and monitoring, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and national ownership.

The following should guide the evaluators in undertaking an analysis of the Project Quality Criteria and UN Programming Principles of the project.

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, alignment with UNDAF, UNDP Strategic Plan.

- To what extent did 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?
- Was 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 results of the project?
- To what extent has the programme outcome and outputs been achieved (assess outcome and output indicators against targets)?
- 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?
- What are the indirect results (externalities) of the project, if any?
- Are there any unintended programme results either positive or negative?
- What are some of the emerging successful programming/business models or cases especially from county programming and how would they be scaled up in the next programme?

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

- Were the financial resources mobilized used in the most efficient way to reach the results?
- Noting that the project funding has come from various development partners with different conditions attached to the funding, has this affected efficiency?
- Are there any apparent cost-minimizing strategies that were encouraged, and not compromised the social dimension of gender, youth and PwDs?
- 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, including value for money?
- 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?

Relevance—responsiveness of implementation mechanisms to the needs of IPs including national and county institutions.

- 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 and participation by the national partners?
- To what extent has the project been able to respond to changes in the needs and priorities of the IPs?

- 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?
- How relevant was the project to the transition period to devolved governance and more recently, in the transitioning to the second phase of devolution?
- Are all the target groups appropriately covered by the stated project results?

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

- Assessment of extent of sustainability of the program thus far.
- Did the project incorporate adequate exit strategies 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 throughout the project cycle that would enhance sustainability?
- Have institutional capacity development and strengthening of national systems been built to enhance sustainability?

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?
- Were the expected outcomes realistic given the project timeframe and resources?
- Were the indicators in line with the SDGs and what changes need to be done in the next programme?
- To what extent and in what ways were risks and assumptions addressed in the project design?
- How were such risks dealt with during the programme implementation phase?
- Is the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different partners well defined, facilitated 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?
- To the extent possible, look at UNDP programme in relation to the other devolution support programmes (synergies, complementarities, overlaps/duplication etc).

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?

- Were unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances that arose 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, including impact of the project on devolved institutions in regard to empowerment, management, effectiveness, accountable, transparent and efficiency in service delivery.
- Assess any impacts that the project may have contributed to.

5. Methodology

The ETE will be an external, independent and participatory exercise, which should be completed within a timeframe of 40 days spread over a period of 3 months beginning February/March 2018. The ETE will be jointly commissioned and managed by the GoK and UNDP. It will use both qualitative and quantitative approach to ensure that findings are derived from a collective contribution from the target counties and the national institutions. The evaluation firm will be expected to define an appropriate methodology to respond to the above criteria and the 21 project indicators (7 CPD indicators the project is contributing to and 14 project output indicators). Each of the project indicators must be assessed hence the evaluation firm must ensure that the proposed methodology is responsive to this.

The evaluation firm in their technical proposal will provide specific approaches/methodology to achieve the planned evaluation, including assessing the project indicators. The selected evaluators will provide a refined methodology during inception stage of the evaluation.

Based on UNEG guidelines for evaluations, and in consultations with the Evaluation Technical Committee (referred in para 9), the evaluation firm shall develop a suitable methodology for this review. This 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; and
- 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. ETE 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. It will also detail how each of the 21 project indicators will be measured. 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.

- First ETE Draft Report to be reviewed by the Technical Committee, whose inputs will be incorporated into the Draft Report.
- Draft ETE which will be presented to stakeholders.
- Final ETE 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. ETE Team Composition and Required Competencies

The firm will designate an Evaluation Team which will consist of one Team Leader and 2 Evaluation Experts and appropriate data collection assistants. Under the overall supervision of the Devolution Project Manager, the firm will conduct a participatory ETE.

The successful evaluation firm should have:

- A minimum of seven (7) 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.
- Strong understanding of gender issues in Kenya especially in the context of devolution.
- 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 and data collection assistants 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, implementers of other devolution programmes, 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 ETE, and discussing the proposed action plan to implement recommendations including changes in contents and direction of the programme;
- Prepare the inception report, initial Draft Report, draft and final ETE.

Qualification and Responsibility 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 Human Rights based approach (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 ETE-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 ETE reports, and a proposed action plan with the support provided by team members
- Finalising the final ETE report, which incorporated comments of the Evaluation Technical Committee and key stakeholders,
- Submitting the draft and final ETE report and a proposed action plan to Evaluation Technical Committee, on schedule
- Presenting ETE 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;
- At least one of them to have a good command of statistics, data collection and analysis, research methodologies and ability to track and report on project outcome and output indicators against targets;
- 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;
- Strong understanding of gender issues in Kenya especially in the context of devolution;
- 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

Research Assistants

- In view of the number of indicators to be assessed, the firm will be required to engage qualified research assistants at local level (where data will be collected) such as university students or other qualified categories of researchers on the ground.

Technical Evaluation Criteria

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

		Score Weight	Max Obtainable Points
1	Technical Responsiveness of the Proposal	40%	400
2	Proposed Work Plan and Approach	25%	250
3	Personnel	35%	350
	Grand Total		1000

Form 1: Technical Responsiveness of the Proposal

S.No	Description of Criteria	Max Obtainable Points
1.1	Reputation of Organization (Competence / Reliability) i.e. long-standing knowledge and experience in similar assignments (minimum 7 years)	90
1.2	Ability of the firm to track outcome and output indicators against targets including data collection and reporting	85
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	85
1.4	Ability to design evaluation studies and apply them using a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods	80
1.5	Experience on Similar Programme / Projects especially dealing with Democracy and Governance issues and understanding of democratic governance and devolution sector in Kenya	60
	Total Form 1	400

Form 2: Proposed Work Plan and Approach

S.No	Description of Criteria	Max Obtainable Points
2.1	To what degree does the firm understand the task?	80
2.2	Have the important aspects of the task been addressed in sufficient detail?	40
2.3	Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR?	80
2.4	Is the presentation clear? and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise to deliver the task efficiently as it relates to conducting the baseline survey	50
Total Form 2		250

Form 3: Personnel

S.No	Description of Criteria	Max Obtainable Points
Part 3A: Team Leader suitability for the assignment		
3.1	A PhD in social sciences or a Master's degree in relevant fields – social sciences, development studies, international development among others	20
3.2	Minimum fifteen (15) years increasingly responsible professional years, 7 of which are in governance, development and / or social sciences evaluation	20
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	20
3.4	Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies, and/or a proven expertise of research in social science relevant for the evaluation;	20
3.5	Working knowledge of UNDP and working with state/ public authorities on issues related to democratic governance including human rights, access to justice and people-centred devolution issues.	10
3.6	Sound leadership and organizational skills- demonstrating experience of having managed and led an evaluation team	20
3.7	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.	20
3.8	Have strong research and analytical skills, communication (oral and written), facilitation and management skills with specific experience in undertaking evaluations	10
Sub-Total A		140
Part 3B: Survey team member 1		
3.9	Master's degree in relevant fields- social sciences, development studies, international development among others;	15

4.0	At least ten (10) years of relevant experience – specifically in evaluating similar programmes;	10
4.1	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;	15
4.2	Strong understanding of gender issues in Kenya especially in the context of Devolution	15
4.3	Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies, and/or a proven expertise of research in social science relevant for the evaluation;	15
4.4	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;	20
4.5	Have a strong understanding of the development context in Kenya and national development vision and strategies;	15
	Sub-Total B	105
	Part 3C: Survey team member 2	
4.5	Master’s degree in relevant fields- social sciences, development studies, international development among others;	15
4.6	At least 5 years statistical experience in outcome and output data collection, tracking and reporting against the targets.	25
4.7	At least ten (10) years of relevant experience – specifically in evaluating similar programmes;	15
4.8	Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies, and/or a proven expertise of research in social science relevant for the evaluation;	15
4.9	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;	20
5.0	Have a strong understanding of the development context in Kenya and national development vision and strategies;	15
	Sub-Total C	105
	Total Form 3	300

8. ETE Ethics

Evaluations in UNDP are 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)

9. Implementation 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 Evaluation Team will work in close collaboration with the Devolution Project Manager in terms of day to day operations of the evaluation. 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, initial draft report, draft and final reports). 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, UN Women Kenya, MoDP, CoG, IBEC, CRA, and KSG.

10. Time Frame for the ETE 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 **ETE 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 ETE 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 August/September 2016. The table below shows a tentative timeframe and key milestones for the consultancy process.

Phases	Description of Activities	Responsible persons	Schedule
Phase I: <i>Inception</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Inception Report development and submission • Presentation of the Inception Report to UNDP, MoDP and other key stakeholders for inputs • Input to the Inception Report by the Evaluation Technical Committee (<i>review of study plan, protocol, analytical framework etc</i>) • Final draft of Inception Report 	Firm Evaluation Technical Committee	7 days
Phase II: <i>Data Collection & Analysis</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • 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. • Data analysis 	Firm	21 days
Phase III: <i>Report Writing and Feedback</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The drafting and presentation of the initial draft and more refined evaluation report. • Final report incorporating inputs from key stakeholders 	Firm	10 days
Phase IV: <i>Dissemination</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Dissemination Workshop/meeting and workshop summary report</i> • <i>Management response to key recommendations of the final evaluation report</i> 	Firm, UNDP	2 day

11. Consultancy Fees

The consultancy firm will be recruited and paid in accordance with UNDP terms and conditions of remuneration for firms (including cost of data collection). 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 ETE 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 ETE Report: 30%
- Final ETE Report: 50%.

12. Logistics/ Field Expenses

UNDP will cater for daily subsistence allowance and transport costs for the three (3) technical team members at the prevailing UN rates based on agreed travel schedules. This cost should **NOT** form part of the 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 Partners*
- 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. Evaluation Report Template and Quality Standards*
- VIII. List of Project Indicators*