Terms of Reference

TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR)

Consultancy to Conduct an Evaluation of the Government of Kenya and United Nations Development Programme – Deepening Foundation for Peacebuilding and Community Security in Kenya (2014-2018)

1.   Background and Context

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) supports the Government of Kenya (GoK) in line with the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) and Country Programme Document (CDP). In the period 2014-2018, peacebuilding work falls under UNDAF Strategic Result 4 on Environmental Suitability, Land Management & Human Security, as well as CPD outcome on Community Security, Social Cohesion and Resilience.

It is in this context that the "Deepening Foundations for Peace Building and Community Security in Kenya, 2014-2018" (PBCS) programme is implemented. It is a programme that builds on the achievements made under the previous programme: "Consolidating the Peace Process and Establishing Foundations for a Peaceful Political Transition, 2010-2013". It is supported by UNDP, Government of Sweden, UK Department for International Development (DfID), European Union (EU), GoK and implemented by state and non-state actors. The Implementing Partner is the Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government -- National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management (NSC) and National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC) and collaborating partners.[1]

---

[1] Collaborating partners include Kenya National Focal Point on Small Arms and Light Weapons (KNFP); Security Research and Information Centre (SRIC); Agency for Cooperation in Research and Development (ACORD); Partnership for Peace and Security (PfPS); Inter-Religious Council of Kenya (IRCK), Peace and Development Network (PeaceNet), United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) including the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights and UWIANO Platform for Peace partners including NSC, NCIC, UNDP, UN Women; IRCK, PeaceNet, Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission (IEBC); Office of Registrar of Political Parties (ORPP); National Police Service (NPS); Council of Governors (CoG); Media Council of Kenya (MCK); Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA)

The programme is in its fourth and last year of implementation. It aims at developing institutional capacities for policy formulation and implementation; strengthening structures for peacebuilding, cohesion and community security; improving response to conflicts, risks and disasters; reducing community security threats; and mainstreaming peacebuilding, cohesion, reconciliation and community security in national and county government agendas. Coupled with the UWIANO Platform for Peace, the programme strengthened strategic leadership and coordination for election violence reductions in preparation for the 2017 general elections. The estimated program budget is USD 19,525,000 as provided in the signed programme document. So far, USD 11,369,698 has been mobilized and over USD 8,000,000 is utilized.

Programme Results (2014-2018)

Programme Outcome
The programme contributes to United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2014-2018 outcome 4.2: Community Security, Peace and Social Cohesion, and Resilience Building: By 2018, counties and communities are able to anticipate, prevent and respond effectively to disasters and emergencies.
The programme contributes to CPD outcome 4.2.1: Institutional capacity in place to implement and monitor gender- and human rights-sensitive disaster risk management, peace-building, conflict prevention and community security policies, strategies and plans and to outcome 4.2.2: Coordination mechanisms, preparedness, early warning and timely response and recovery systems operational at national, county and community levels.

The programme outcomes are as follows:

Outcome 1: Institutional capacity development for policy formulation and implementation.
Outcome 2: Reduction of community security threats and improved response to conflicts, risks and disasters.
Outcome 3: Mainstreaming of peacebuilding, reconciliation and community security in the development agenda enhanced.

Outcome 4: Results based management, strategic partnerships and coordination at the Programme level enhanced.

There are key result areas organized around outputs as follows[2]:

Output 1.1 Institutional capacity to formulate, implement and monitor peace-building, conflict prevention, cohesion, community security and arms control policies, strategies and plans enhanced at national and county levels.

Output 2.1 Coordination mechanisms, preparedness, early warning, timely response, community security and recovery systems operational at national, county and community levels.

---

[2] Prodoc: "Deepening Foundations for Peace Building and Community Security in Kenya, 2014-2018", pages 14-19.

Output 2.2 Institutional capacity to address conflicts related to natural resource management and extractive industries enhanced.

Output 2.3 Partnership and capacity development of non-state actors in conflict research, peacebuilding, cohesion and community security.

Output 2.4 National and county level leadership capacities for collaboration and dialogue strengthened.

Output 2.5 National Unity, reconciliation, cohesion, resilience and integration promoted at national and county levels.

Output 3.1 Human rights, conflict sensitivity, gender and HIV & AIDS issues related to peace building, conflict prevention, reconciliation, and cohesion and community security mainstreamed in national and county development plans.

Output 4.1 Capacities for Programme management, strategic partnerships, coordination and monitoring and evaluation frameworks for delivery of key development results strengthened.

Output 5.0: Coordination and leadership for Electoral Violence Reduction Initiatives (EVRI) enhanced.

2.   Purpose of the Evaluation

The Evaluation, is planned for 2018 as the programme is due to come to an end in December 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 programme. The Evaluation findings will establish if the envisaged results have been achieved or not, and the recommendations and lessons learned will inform the next phase of the peace building support under the new CPD to be launched in 2018. The information generated from this Evaluation will contribute to organizational learning as well as generate knowledge for development effectiveness.

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

3.   Scope of the Evaluation

The Evaluation 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 Evaluation will cover the programme period July 2014 to June 2018. The Evaluation will be assessed against the following seven (7) UNDP Programme Quality Criteria, which are aligned with 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 comprehensive list of partners is provided as Annex 2.

Objectives of the Evaluation

The overall objective of the Evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme, including the extent to which cross cutting issues (human rights, gender, SDGs) have been mainstreamed. The evaluation will also assess the mechanisms put in place to enhance coordination and harmonization between UNDP, Implementing Partners, and state and non-state actors.

The specific objectives of the evaluation will be to:

- Review the programme Theory of Change i.e. problem addressed by the programme and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the programme results as outlined in the Programme Document.
- Review the relevance of the programme strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.
- Assess relevance of the programme to the country context including the national and sub-national development priorities (Vision 2030 and Medium-Term Plan II (MTP), CIDPs, among others).
- Review decision-making processes and whether the perspectives of those who would be affected by programme decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process were taken into account during programme design processes.
- Assess efficiency in the utilization of programme funds including cost-effectiveness, value for money while balancing with social dimensions including gender equity and environment.
- Review the extent to which relevant human rights, gender, youth, HIV/Aids and People Living with Disabilities issues were raised and addressed by the programme.
- Document lessons learnt, challenges and future opportunities, and provide recommendations for improvements or adjustments in strategy, design and/or implementation arrangements.

- Review what results are attributable to the programme and how relevant and effective was the programme to the 2017 context overall. Review if there were gaps/inefficiencies, areas of work that required strategies to be adjusted during implementation, and with what effect.

On the results framework, the Evaluation 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 programme 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, human rights and gender aspects of the programme were achieved; and
- Assess quantitative and qualitative achievements against each of the programme indicators.

4.   Evaluation Criteria and Review Questions

The following UNDP programme quality criteria will guide the Evaluation: 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 Programme Quality Criteria and UN Programming Principles of the programme.

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 programme 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 programme 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 programme 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 programme?
- 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 programme, if any?
- Are there any unintended programme results either positive or negative?
- What are some of the emerging successful programming/business models 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 programme 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 human rights, gender, youth, HIV/Aids and People Living with Disabilities?
- 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 Country, County IPs including national and county institutions.

- To what extent were the interventions consistent with the needs of the IPs the programme 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 promote ownership and participation by the national and county partners and respond to the challenges of National Capacity Building Framework?
- To what extent has the programme been able to respond to changes in the needs and priorities of the IPs?
- Are the stated programme objectives consistent with the requirements of UN programming principles, in particular, the requirements of most vulnerable populations?
- How relevant and appropriate is the programme to the devolved levels of government?
- Are all the target groups appropriately covered by the stated programme results at national and county level?

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 programme 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 programme 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 programme cycle that would enhance sustainability?
- Have institutional capacity development and strengthening of national systems been built to enhance sustainability?
- Are there good strategies at sub-national levels that can be replicated and scaled up?

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 programme 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 programme 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 peace building support programmes (synergies, complementarities, overlaps/duplication etc.).
- Did UNDP recruit and retain the right caliber of personnel and suggestions?
- Did UNDP identify the right partners for programme implementation?

Social and Environmental Standards

- Does the programme seek to further the realization of human rights using a human right 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 programme 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 programme on peacebuilding especially on the understanding of the citizenry and their participation i.e.

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

5.   Methodology

The Evaluation will be an external, independent and participatory exercise, which should be completed within a timeframe of 40 days spread over a period of 2 months beginning in April 2018. The Evaluation will be jointly commissioned and managed by a team consisting of 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 programme indicators. Each of the programme 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 programme 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 (refereed in para 9), the evaluation firm shall develop a suitable methodology for this review. This will entail:

a. A review of relevant literature including programme reports produced during the life cycle of the programme, 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.   Evaluation 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 programme 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 Evaluation Draft Report to be reviewed by the Technical Committee, whose inputs will be incorporated into the Draft Report.
- Draft Evaluation Report which will be presented to stakeholders.
- Final Evaluation 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.   Evaluation 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 Team Leader – Governance, Peace and Security, the firm will conduct a participatory Evaluation.

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 programmes preferably in the field of peace building or democratic governance in Kenya or East Africa
- Demonstrable understanding of peace building and democratic governance sector in Kenya.
- Working knowledge of UNDP, peace building sector and working with state/ public authorities on issues related to peace building or democratic governance.
- Strong understanding of gender issues in Kenya especially in the context of peace building.
- 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 peace building programme programming and other relevant information;
- Perform a literature review on peace building in Kenya, and ensure that it feeds the proposed evaluation approach and design;
- Validate the peace building programme Theory of Change as required, using both documentation and interview source of data;
- Meet with relevant stakeholders, such as donor, implementers of other peace building 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/programme 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 Evaluation, 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 Evaluation.

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.
- 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 peace building or governance issues and challenges, as well as GoK policies, substantive knowledge of peace building or governance programmatic areas in Kenya as well as experience conducting evaluation of peace building or governance programmes;
- 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 peace building or 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 Evaluation-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 Evaluation reports, and a proposed action plan with the support provided by team members

- Finalising the final Evaluation report, which incorporated comments of the Evaluation Technical Committee and key stakeholders,

- Submitting the draft and final Evaluation report and a proposed action plan to Evaluation Technical Committee, on schedule

- Presenting Evaluation 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:

- 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 programme 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 peace building or governance programmatic areas in Kenya as well as experience conducting evaluation of peace building or governance programmes;
- Strong understanding of gender issues in Kenya especially in the context of peace building;
- 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

8.   Evaluation 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 Conflict Prevention and Resilience Specialist in terms of day to day operations of the evaluation. An Evaluation Technical Committee will be created and co-chaired between Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government - NSC 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, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) Kenya, National Steering Committee on Peace building and Conflict Management (NSC); National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC).

10. Time Frame for the Evaluation 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 programme 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 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 **Evaluation 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 programme/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 peace building related development challenges in the programme focus areas with key stakeholders including the government and their view on the part played by UNDP supported programme in addressing the challenges that fall within the programme 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.

The following Counties and Implementing Partners will be visited:

Counties:

1. Nairobi
2. Kiambu
3. Kitui
4. Kwale
5. Kilifi
6. Isiolo
7. Wajir
8. Nakuru
9. Narok
10. Uasin Gishu
11. Bungoma
12. Migori

Key Implementing partners to be interviewed:

1) National Steering Committee on Peace building and Conflict Management (NSC/PBCM)
2) National Cohesion and Integration Commission (NCIC)

3) Kenya National Focal Point on Small Arms and Light Weapons (KNFP)
4) Security Research and Information Centre (SRIC)
5) Partnership for Peace and Security (PfPS)
6) Inter-Religious Council of Kenya (IRCK)
7) Peace and Development Network (PeaceNet)
8) Agency for Cooperation in Research and Development (ACORD)
9) United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR)
10) UNDP
11) UN Women
12) UWIANO Platform for Peace partners (in addition to above) – IEBC, ORPP, NPS, CoG, MCK, KEPSA, KNCHR
13) Development partners – Sweden, DFID, EU
14) Other peacebuilding programmes that have worked closely with Uwiano – Jamii Thabiti, Safer World

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, Peace and Security 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 Evaluation contribute to improvement in the implementation of future programmes 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, DfID and EU together with the above stated management response.

The evaluation shall be conducted for a period of *40 days* spread over a period of 2 months starting in May 2018. The table below shows a tentative timeframe and key milestones for the consultancy process.

Phases	Description of Activities	Responsible persons	Schedule
Phase I: *Inception*	• Draft Inception Report development and submission • Presentation of the Inception Report to UNDP, OHCHR, NSC, NCIC and other key stakeholders for inputs • Input to the Inception Report by the Evaluation Technical Committee *(review of study plan, protocol, analytical framework etc)* • Final draft of Inception Report	Firm Evaluation Technical Committee	**5 days**
Phase II: *Data Collection & Analysis*	• Implementation of the evaluation work plan for data collection in the respective focus areas plus gender equality and the start of	Firm	**23 days**

Phases	Description of Activities	Responsible persons	Schedule
	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 programme/field visits. The Evaluation Team will use triangulation as a central method, drawing information from multiple sources. • Data analysis		
Phase III: *Report Writing and Feedback*	• The drafting and presentation of the initial draft and more refined evaluation report. • Validation forum for key stakeholders • Final report incorporating inputs from key stakeholders	Firm	**10 days**
Phase IV: *Dissemination*	• *Dissemination Workshop/meeting and workshop summary report* • Management response *to key recommendations of the final evaluation report*	Firm UNDP	**2 days**

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 40 days spread over 2 months.

UNDP will cover prior agreed costs related to the Evaluation 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:

Deliverable

- Final Inception Report: 20%

- Draft Evaluation Report: 30%

- Final Evaluation Report: 50%.

Target Dates for the deliverables will be discussed at contract signature stage

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.

A. Annexes

Existing Information Sources

The following minimum documents will be used to support the Evaluation Team in obtaining detailed background information: the UNDAF, CPD, Programme Document, the programme results matrix; the monitoring and evaluation framework and plans; the Programme AWPs, programme logic model (Theory of Change) and Progress Programme Reports (quarterly, annual, donor reports etc.) and any other reports produced during programme implementation.

  I.   *Signed Programme Document (2014-2018)*
  II.   *Draft List of Partners*
 III.   *Periodic Programme Reports for the duration of the programme*
 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 Programme Indicators*