

Terms of Reference

Country Programme Document Outcome Evaluation: Systems of Community Security and Resilience

1. Background

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Kenya Country Programme Document (CPD 2014-2018) is the first-generation Country Programme Document of UNDP support to Kenya. The CPD was developed according to the principles of UN Delivering as One (DaO), aimed at ensuring Government ownership, demonstrated through UNDP'S full alignment to Government priorities as defined in the Vision 2030 and Medium-Term Plan 2013- 2017 and planning cycles, as well as internal coherence among UN agencies and programmes operating in Kenya. As an integral part of the UNDAF, the new country programme is closely aligned to the Medium-Term Plan (MTP) II and the UNDP Strategic Plan, 2014-2017 and informed by the new UNDP gender strategy and key recommendations of the 2013 Annual Delivery Review (ADR) for Kenya. UNDP designed its programme to address the interlinked issues of poverty, inequality and exclusion towards achieving sustainable and inclusive economic growth. Data - driven selection of target populations (female-headed households, youth, persons living with HIV and AIDS, etc.), with clear indicators, baselines and targets, are a central pillar in the programme. The CPD therefore sought to apply these approaches to realize the following four interrelated outcomes: (a) devolution and accountability; (b) productive sectors and trade; (c) environmental sustainability, renewable energy and sustainable land management; and (d) community security, cohesion and resilience.

In 2017, UNDP Country Office commissioned a Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) of its Country Programme focusing on the period 2014 to 2016. The purpose of the evaluation was to ascertain the outcomes and outputs of the country programme measured against its original purpose and objectives whilst in the process capturing evaluative evidence of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the programme.

Informed by the findings of the MTE and the UNDAF Evaluations, the Country Office has developed the next Country Programme for the period 2018-2022. The office now wishes to commission an Outcome Evaluation focusing on the area of **Systems of Community Security and Resilience** which states **"by 2018, counties and communities are able to anticipate, prevent and respond effectively to disasters and emergencies"**. The evaluation will examine specifically the progress made in realization of the outcome in totality and highlight any necessary elements of improvement in the subsequent CPD cycle including on interphases and interlinkages

The just concluded country Programme Document (CPD) 2014-18, was for an approximate expenditure of US\$ 119,230,000. The Outcome on Systems of Community Security and Resilience accounted for an approximate expenditure of US\$ 17,924,015 (15%) were mobilised for the period ending June 2018.

2. Purpose of the Outcome Evaluation

This outcome evaluation will be conducted in fulfilment of UN regulations and rules guiding evaluations. UNDP, in Kenya is commissioning this evaluation to ascertain the specific outcome and outputs of the CPD were realised as envisaged. The outcome evaluation will capture the evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the CPD and this will set the stage for new programme cycle. It is anticipated that the evaluation will outline lessons learned and recommendations which will be useful in contributing to the growing body of knowledge for the new programme cycle. The evaluation will serve as an important accountability function, providing the Country Office, national stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results.

3. The Context of the CPD Outcome Evaluation

The Kenya country office programme is supporting in integrated manner four strategic programme priority areas organized around four outcomes. As outlined earlier, these were (a) devolution and accountability; (b) productive sectors and trade; (c) environmental sustainability, renewable energy and sustainable land management; and (d) community security, cohesion and resilience. In the context of UN 'Delivering as one', the CPD outcomes were directly aligned to four UNDAF (2014-2018) outcomes with the four UNDAF Strategic Result Areas (SRAs). The UNDAF outcome areas were clearly aligned to the Government of Kenya development blueprint as spelt out in the Vision 2030 and specifically the MTP II. The UNDAF SRAs include 1) Transformative Governance; 2) Human Capital; 3) Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth; and 4) Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security. This evaluation will focus on the fourth programme outcome area i.e. Systems of Community Security and Resilience.

Community security, social cohesion and resilience: Human security presents a significant development challenge in Kenya. UNDP aimed to build the capacities of institutions, communities and vulnerable people, particularly women, to increase their resilience and reduce the risks and impacts of disasters, recurrent conflicts, violence and shocks, including from climate change. UNDP partnered with National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) to deliver Disaster Risk Management (DRM) capacity development to county staff. UNDP also supported the development of conflict management policies, strategies and programmes; building the capacities of institutions and communities, especially women and youth, to establish and operationalise coordination mechanisms and systems for mitigation and preparedness, early warning and timely response to disasters; and mainstreaming peace building, reconciliation, community security and DRM into key sectors and CIDPs.

4. The Scope and Objectives of the Outcome Evaluation

Scope

The Government of Kenya and UNDP proposes to undertake an outcome evaluation on Systems of Community Security and Resilience in October and November 2018. The outcome evaluation will cover the period July 2014 – June 2018. It will highlight the key lessons learned and provide informed guidance

to future programming under the new CPD. The evaluation will cover all activities planned and/or implemented during the period 2014- 2018 and will give a special focus on the contribution to the programme outcome on community security, social cohesion and resilience.

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 over the past CPD cycle. The evaluation will also focus on changes around the programmatic environment which include the CPD Mid Term Evaluation (2017), the UNDAF 2013-2017 end term evaluation, the UNDP Results Oriented Annual Reporting (ROAR), the socio-political context around the 2017 General Elections and the Fresh Presidential Elections.

The CPD 2014-2018 was launched after Kenya transitioned to a devolved system of governance, hence the evaluation will also assess the extent to which UNDP programming responded to the new governance context under devolution.

The post 2015 agenda, agenda 2030 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), renewing global attention to the most marginalized members of the community as well as revitalised partnerships for sustainable development were launched midway in the CPD and their integration with the remaining part of the programme may have impacted realization of programme results. The evaluation will in addition reflect on how the UNDP through the Implementing Partners (IPs) supported the Government of Kenya Development Agenda especially Medium Term Plan II (MTP II) and Vision 2030. The evaluation will identify areas requiring additional support either in programme management or new implementation strategies including exploring the possibilities of new partnerships.

The outcome evaluation will reflect on the CDP theory of change under the Devolution and Accountability outcome and reflect on how implementation of the outcome responded to the identified ToC and further how any lessons from this process may have been reflected in programmatic progress as well as registered to inform the new CPD. Key issues of concern will be the reflection on how gender has been incorporated in the programming and the sustainability of results under the outcome and how relevant partnerships for gender consideration were leveraged upon. The expected outcome is consensus on findings of the outcome evaluation and agreement on the options suggested for reinforcing efficiencies and effectiveness of development results including deliberations on new and emerging challenges in the new CPD.

The outcome evaluation will explore extent to which UNDP has utilized the results-based management, risk management, and early warning management in ensuring that results are realized as planned.

The timing of the evaluation is designed such that it will take place as the Country Office transitions to the new CPD, so as to factor in all interventions and the associated results into the new country programme. The key users of the outcome evaluation report will be; Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) of GoK at the national and county levels, UN agencies and development partners (DPs).

The outcome evaluation is a joint UNDP/ Government of Kenya exercise that will be conducted in close collaboration with implementing and development partners.

Objectives

The main objective of the outcome evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme, including the extent to which cross cutting issues (gender, climate change, youth, SDGs) have been mainstreamed. In addition, the evaluation will assess the extent to which the programme has been responsive to address emerging issues in the country. The evaluation will determine UNDP's contribution towards effectiveness of the Delivering as One modality in supporting achievements of the outcome area in line with the national Vision 2030 and MTP II. 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 through the outcome area on Systems of Community Security and Resilience.

The outcome evaluation will specifically:

- Assess achievements and progress made against planned results as well as assess challenges and lessons learnt over the CPD period against the programme theory of change.
- Assess how the emerging issues not reflected in the CPD (2014-18) such as sustainable development goals (SDGs) and County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) among others impacted on the outcome and make recommendations and suggestions for future programming under the new CPD to achieve greater development impact.
- Review effectiveness of the results framework under the outcome area including the outcome and output indicators, baselines and targets assessing how realistic/relevant and measurable they were and make recommendations for improvement, if any.
- Assess responsiveness to emergencies, disasters and socio-political complexities of the 2017 elections.
- Examine programmatic relationships with government, private sector, United Nations, development partners, non-state actors, the public at Regional, National, County and Subcounty and how these contributed to achievement or non-achievement of the outcomes and outputs.
- Review coherence in delivery of the outcome area and recommend ways in which the outcome area technical working groups may have increased effectiveness of programme delivery during the programme cycle.
- Assess how effectively the outcome area was compatible with national development priorities (Vision 2030, MTP II and initial CIDPs) and established policies for their delivery. Similarly examine any implications to delivery of the outcome that would have been occasioned by the graduation of Kenya to Lower Middle-Income status.
- Assess effectiveness towards attainment of results and reflect on how both UNDP and GOK has contributed to the UNDAF results on transformative governance through the implementation of programmes and projects.
- Assess effectiveness of and relative advantage of UNDP in the implementation and use of the Joint Programmes modality as a mechanism for fostering UN coherence and 'delivering as one' such as Marsabit- Moyale and the Turkana Joint Programmes under the outcome on Community Security and Resilience.
- Document lessons learnt, challenges and future opportunities, and provide recommendations for improvements or adjustments in strategy, design and/or implementation arrangements under the new CPD.

5. Outcome Evaluation Criteria and Review Questions

The following United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) quality criteria will be guiding the Outcome Evaluation: strategy, relevance, social and environmental sustainability, management and monitoring, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and national ownership. In addition, the outcome will explore extent to which five UN programming principles which include: i) Leave No One Behind ii) Human Rights, Gender Equality and Women Empowerment; iii) Sustainability and Resilience; and iv) Accountability

The following evaluation questions will guide the Outcome Evaluation

- i) Were the stated outcome and outputs achieved?
- ii) What progress towards that outcomes has been made?
- iii) What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcome?
- iv) To what extent have UNDP outputs and assistance contributed to outcome?
- v) Has the UNDP partnership strategy towards realization of the outcome been appropriate and effective?
- vi) What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?

Analysis of the UNEG Criteria and UN Programming Principles

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

- To what extent are the outcome results (i) responsive to the needs of the country (in particular the needs of vulnerable groups), (ii) aligned with government priorities (iii) as well as with UNDP, global policies and strategies and international partners' policies (including the SDGs and global references such as rights-based approach, gender equality, equity focus, human development principles, etc.).
- To what extent is UNDP engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including their role in the development context in Kenya based on their comparative advantage?
- Are the intended outputs aligned with the key development strategies of the country? Are they consistent with human development needs of the country and the intended beneficiaries? Do the outputs address the specific development challenges of the country and the intended beneficiaries? Were there any unintended consequences (positive or negative) that have implications to the development goals of the country?
- To what extent has the selected method of delivery been appropriate to the changes in the development context?
- Has UNDP been influential in country debates based on their comparative advantage and has it influenced national policies?

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

- To what extent have the Outcome related outputs been achieved? Did the outputs contribute to the achievement of the outcome?

- If not fully achieved, was there any progress? If so, what level of progress towards outcome has been made as measured by the Theory of Change (ToC) and outcome indicators presented in the results framework. What evidence is there that Outcome has contributed towards an improvement in national body's capacity, including institutional strengthening? What contributing factors are enhancing or impeding UNDP, performance in this area.
- How effective has UNDP, been in partnering with civil society and the private sector (where applicable) to promote the envisaged development in the country?
- To what extent has the outcome supported domestication of key regional frameworks, experiences and international best practices through national development plans and strategies?
- Has UNDP utilized innovative techniques and best practices in its programming under the outcome?

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

- Are the approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcome? Are they sufficiently sensitive to the political and development constraints of the country?
- Has UNDP's outcome strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective over a reasonable time period;
- To what extent did the country office take advantage of existing opportunities for synergies to maximize use of resources?
- Are the monitoring and evaluation systems employed helping to ensure that projects are managed efficiently and effectively for proper accountability of results?
- Have adequate financial resources been mobilized for the outcome?
- Is there a discernible common or collaborative funds mobilisation strategy?
- To what extent have administrative procedures (UNDP and GoK) been harmonised? Are there any apparent cost-minimising strategies that should be encouraged, that would not compromise the social dimension of gender, youth and PwDs?
- Are the implementation mechanisms for the outcome areas and technical working groups effective in managing the outcome?
- How efficiently have resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) been converted to outcome results at output level?
- 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)?
- Has UNDP demonstrated Delivering as One (DaO) principle in this outcome? If yes, how has this been done, and does it respond to programme results?

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

- Does the CPD outcome incorporate adequate exit strategies and capacity development measures to ensure sustainability of results over time? Is there a better exit and sustainability strategy that can be proposed?

- Are conditions and mechanisms in place so that the benefits of the project level interventions are sustained and owned by implementing partners at the national and sub-national levels after the programme has ended?
 - Have strong partnerships been built with key stakeholders throughout the programme cycle
 - What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term
- The outcome evaluation is a joint UNDP/ Government of Kenya exercise that will be conducted in close collaboration with implementing and development partners.

Impact: To the extent possible, assess the current contribution of the CPD Outcome on the lives of the poor?

- Is there any major change in outcome indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or be associated with CPD outcome, notably in the realization of SDGs, National Development Goals and the national implementation of internationally agreed commitments and UN Conventions and Treaties?
- What is the impact of the project on devolved institutions regarding empowerment, management, effectiveness, accountable, transparent and efficiency in service delivery?

Supporting Dialogue on Human Development- Sustainable Development Goal (SDGs)

- To what extent did the realization of the Outcome, lead to monitoring of the implementation of the SDGs?

Partnership and Coordination for Effective programming- Assess the effectiveness of UNDP's

- What was the Outcome's contribution to the UNDAF as a coordination and partnership framework?
- To what extent and in what ways has the outcome contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes/projects of UN agencies and the National and County Governments?
- Are there current or potential overlaps with existing partners' programmes;
- Has the CPD Outcome implementation enhanced joint programming by agencies? Were the strategies employed by agencies complementary and synergistic?
- Did CPD Outcome promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the other CPD outcome areas (e.g. national partners, International Financial Institutions and other external support agencies)?

The evaluation will also assess extent to which programme design, implementation and monitoring have taken the following cross cutting issues into consideration:

Human rights

- To what extent have poor, indigenous and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from CPD interventions

Gender Equality

- To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring the different interventions?

- To what extent has programme support promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?

Capacity Building

- Did the outcome adequately invest in, and focus on, national capacity development to ensure sustainability and promote efficiency
- Are the knowledge products (reports, studies, etc.) delivered by the programme utilized by the country?

The questions listed above are only indicative; the final set of evaluation questions will be determined during the design phase, after a discussion with the evaluation reference group.

6. Methodology

The CPD Outcome evaluation will be carried out by external evaluators, and will engage a wide array of stakeholders and beneficiaries, including regional bodies, governments where programmes or advisory support were provided, academics and subject experts, private sector representatives etc.

The evaluators will review all relevant sources of information, such as the programme document, projects document, projects evaluation, annual and project reports, CPD Mid Term Evaluation and UNDAF End Term Evaluation, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the CO team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [annex](#) of this Terms of Reference (ToR). The Evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner working on the basis that its essential objective is to assess the CPD Outcome implementation.

The Evaluation Manager will convene an Evaluation Reference Group (ERG) comprising of technical experts to enhance the quality of the evaluation. The ERG will review the inception report and the draft evaluation report to provide detail comments related to the quality of methodology, evidence collected, analysis and reporting. The ERG will also advise on the conformity of evaluation processes to the UNEG standards. The consultants will be required to address all comments of the ERG completely and comprehensively. The Evaluation Team Leader will provide a detail rationale to the advisory panel for any comment that remain unaddressed.

This evaluation is expected to take a “theory of change” (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that the Joint Office of UNDP has supported under this outcome and observed progress in human development.

The evaluators will develop in consultation with the ERG, a logic model of how CPD Outcome interventions are expected to lead to improved national and local service delivery. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits.

The evaluation exercise will be wide-ranging, consultative, and participatory ensuring representation of both women and men, entailing a combination of comprehensive desk reviews, analysis and interviews. While interviews are a key instrument, all analysis must be based on observed facts, evidence and data. This precludes relying exclusively upon anecdotes, hearsay and unverified opinions. Findings should be specific, concise and supported by quantitative and/or qualitative information that is reliable, valid and generalisable.

One week after contract signing, the evaluation team will produce an **Inception Report**. The Inception Report should include **an evaluation matrix** presenting the evaluation questions, data sources, data collection, analysis tools and methods to be used. The Inception Report should detail the specific timing for evaluation activities and deliverables and propose specific site visits and stakeholders to be interviewed. The evaluation team will also propose **a rating scale** in order that performance rating will be carried out for all of the evaluation criteria/sub criteria: relevance; effectiveness; efficiency; sustainability and ownership; and impact. The inception report will be discussed and agreed with the Country Office before the evaluators proceed with site mission.

The draft of the CPD Outcome Evaluation Report will be shared with all staff and stakeholders and presented in a validation meeting that the UNDP will organize. Key partners and stakeholders will participate in this workshop. Feedback received from these sessions should be considered when preparing the final report. The evaluation team will produce an 'audit trail' indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the final report.

Lessons learned report will also be produced and discussed during the validation workshop. Feedback received should be taken into consideration when preparing the lessons learned report. The lessons learned report should cover the different facets of the CPD outcome interventions and should take into account the mandates UNDP. This report should be annexed in the main evaluation report.

The evaluation report minimum contents and outline will be discussed with evaluation team at the beginning of their assignment. How the information has been obtained and analyzed should be specifically explained and all statements should be properly detailed, supported and explained. The evaluation team will identify any limitations to the evaluation and propose strategies to mitigate them. The suggested Table of Contents of the evaluation report is as follows:

- Title and Opening Pages
- Table of Contents
- List of Acronyms and abbreviations
- Executive Summary
- 1. Introduction
- 2. Description of Intervention
- 3. Evaluation Scope and Objectives
 - Scope
 - Objectives
- 4. Evaluation Approach and Methods
- 5. Data Analysis

6. Findings and Conclusions
 - Findings
 - Conclusions
 7. Recommendations
 8. Lessons
- Annexes

The steps in data collection are anticipated but not limited to the following:

Desk reviews: The evaluation team will collect and review all relevant documentation, including the following: i) Relevant National documents; ii) programme/project documents and activity reports; iii) past evaluation/ self-assessment reports; iv) deliverables from the programme activities, e.g. published reports and training materials; v) UNDP's corporate strategies and reports; and vi) government, media, academic publications were relevant.

Stakeholder interviews: The evaluation team will conduct face-to-face and/or telephone interviews with relevant stakeholders, including: i) UNDP staff (managers and programme/project officers) and ii) policy makers, beneficiary groups and donors in the country. Focus groups may be organized as appropriate.

Field visits: The evaluation team will visit selected programme sites to observe first-hand progress and achievements made to date and to collect best practices/ lessons learned. A case study approach will be used to identify and highlight issues that can be further investigated across the programme

7. Deliverables

The deliverables for this review will include the following documents:

- a. **The Inception Report:** The inception report should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. This will consist but not limited to the following sections: a). Stakeholder map b). Evaluation matrix including evaluation questions, codification, indicators, data collection methods, sources of information; c). Overall evaluation design and methodology including sampling techniques to be applied; d). Description of data gaps, including techniques and tools to be used (Focus Group Discussions, Key Informant Interviews, etc.); and detailed work plan of the assignment.
- b. **Draft CPD Outcome Evaluation Report** which will be presented to stakeholders in half day workshop.
- c. **Final CPD Outcome Evaluation Report** incorporating stakeholder inputs. Report format will include but not limited to: Executive summary, introduction, the development context, findings and conclusions, lessons learned, 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 analysed.

8. Implementation Arrangements

The CPD Outcome evaluation will be commissioned and overseen by the Government (The National Treasury) and UNDP. The responsibility to provide oversight and direction to the outcome evaluation process will rest with the Evaluation Reference Group under the joint leadership of the designated official within the National Treasury and the UNDP Country Director.

A ERG, which will serve as the Outcome Evaluation Technical Committee. This will comprise members UNDP, National Government, County Government and IPs. The main task of the ERG will be to guide the evaluation process at the design, implementation and report stages. The ERG will also participate in the CPD Outcome Evaluation validation workshop. The ERG will be co-chaired by a senior government official as designated by the National Treasury and UNDP staff identified by the UNDP Country Director. It will facilitate the preparation of a substantive programme of consultations, discussions and interviews and it ensures quality control of the process.

The Country Director's Office will be responsible for the day-to-day support of the consultancy team, maintaining a close liaison with the Technical Committee and coordination among stakeholders throughout the duration of the CPD Outcome evaluation process. Availability of background documents will be ensured by the Country Director's Office. Likewise, facilitation for meetings setting and scheduling is to be provided by the Country Director's office. On the Government side, The National Treasury and Ministry of Devolution and ASAL Areas will coordinate the participation of key ministries and other institutions in the Technical Committee.

An external Consultancy Team composed of one International Consultant (Team Leader) and one National Consultant (Team Member) selected by mutual agreement between the UNDP and the Government through a transparent thorough selection process will conduct the outcome evaluation while facilitating the self-evaluation process within the UNDP and Government. The Team will analyze the information gathered, interview key partners, working with outcome group, the CD Office and other stakeholders to ensure the impartiality, consistency and coherence of the evaluation and provide recommendations on any necessary actions to adjust the current CPD.

9. Team Composition and required Competencies

The MTR will be conducted by two (2) Individual Consultants with technical expertise in the CPD Outcome area.

Evaluation Team Leader with good credentials and qualifications in the following areas:

- Possess a minimum of a master's degree in relevant fields- social sciences, conflict resolution/peace building, development studies, international development among others.
- Have a minimum 10 years of increasingly responsible professional experience, and of which seven years in governance, development and/or social sciences evaluation.

- Demonstrate knowledge in the thematic issues covered by UNDP Outcome such as community resilience, disaster risk reduction (DRR); community security, peace and cohesion; human rights, gender equality and women empowerment as well as GoK policies in Kenya
- Experience conducting evaluation of multi-sectoral projects;
- Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies, and/or a proven expertise of research in social science relevant for the evaluation;
- Have strong research and analytical skills, communication (oral and written), facilitation and management skills with specific experience in undertaking evaluations
- Demonstrated capacity for strategic thinking and policy advice are essential.
- Must be able to work in a multidisciplinary team and multicultural environment.
- Must be committed to respecting deadlines of delivery outputs within the agreed time-frame.
- Sound leadership and organizational skills- demonstrating experience of having managed and led an evaluation team
- Experience in the application and implementation of gender-sensitive programmes as well as HRBA
- Familiarity with UNDP and UN operations will be an advantage.

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 Reference Group (ERG) regarding Outcome 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 and closely monitor their work
- Supervising data collection and analysis
- Consolidating draft and final Outcome Evaluation reports, and a proposed action plan with the support provided by team member
- Finalising the Final Outcome Evaluation report, which incorporated comments of the ERG and key stakeholders,
- Submitting the draft and final Outcome Evaluation report and a proposed action plan to Evaluation Technical Committee, on schedule
- Presenting Outcome Evaluation results and facilitating the meeting specific tasks of the team members

Evaluation Team Member

The Team Member will work under the Team Leader. Should demonstrate knowledge in one or more of the thematic issues covered under the Outcome area such as community resilience, disaster risk reduction (DRR); community security, peace and cohesion; human rights, gender equality and women empowerment as well as GoK policies in Kenya and experience conducting evaluation of multi-sectoral projects.

Additionally, a team member should have good credentials and qualifications as follows:

- Possess a master’s degree in relevant fields- social sciences, conflict resolution/peace building, development studies, international development among others;
- Have at least 7 years of relevant experience – specifically in evaluating similar programmes in the thematic area of specialization;
- 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;
- Experience in the application and implementation of gender-sensitive programmes as well as HRBA
- 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

Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria will be used to select the individual consultants for the assignment:

Team Leader

Evaluation Criteria	Max points
A Master’s degree in public administration, communications, Strategic management, public policy, business administration or any other relevant social sciences from a recognized University.	20
15 years of increasingly responsible professional experience, and of which seven years in governance, development and/or social sciences evaluation including playing a leadership role	30
Good understanding of Kenya’s development context	25
Demonstrated capacity for strategic thinking and policy advice including on gender and HRBA	15
Demonstrated research, documentation and communication skills	10
TOTAL	100

Team Member

Evaluation Criteria	Max points
A Master's degree in public administration, communications, strategic management, public policy, business administration or any other relevant social sciences from a recognized University.	20
Subject matter expertise in one of the selected CPD thematic areas under the outcome such as: community resilience, disaster risk reduction (DRR); community security, peace and cohesion; human rights, gender equality and women empowerment	25
10 years of relevant experience – specifically in evaluating similar programmes	10
Good understanding of Kenya's development context	25
Experience in the application and implementation of gender-sensitive programmes including HRBA	10
Strong analytical research and documentation and communication skills	10
TOTAL	100

10. Evaluation Ethics

Evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the evaluation policy of UNDP and UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. Evaluations of UN activities need to be independent, impartial and rigorous. Each evaluation should clearly contribute to learning and accountability. Hence evaluators must have personal and professional integrity and be guided by propriety in the conduct of their business.

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.

11. Time-Frame for the Outcome 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 ERG including 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 **Outcome 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 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 Country Director, UNDP Kenya.

Review and Quality Assurance – The draft report shall be shared with UNDP and the ERG 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 Outcome Evaluation 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 development partners that support the CPD Outcome area.

The evaluation shall be conducted over a period of **2 months starting in October 2018 for a period of 30 calendar days**. 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, the National Treasury and other key stakeholders for inputs 	Consultants Evaluation Reference Group	5 days

Phases	Description of Activities	Responsible persons	Schedule
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 		
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 	Consultants	15 days
Phase III: <i>Report Writing and Feedback</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The drafting and presentation of the draft evaluation report. Final report incorporating inputs from key stakeholders 	Consultants	8 days
Phase IV: <i>Dissemination</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dissemination Workshop and workshop summary report Management response to key recommendations of the final evaluation report 	Consultants UNDP	2 days

12. Consultancy Fees and Application Procedure

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

UNDP will cover prior agreed costs related to the MTR services and pay Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) per night spent on mission embarked upon as part of the evaluation process using standard UN DSA rates. The firm's fees will be paid in line with the following schedule and upon acceptance of key deliverables:

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