



Terms of Reference International Consultants Midterm Outcome Evaluation within the UNDP Kenya

1. BACKGROUND

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) activities in Kenya are informed by Country Programme Document (CPD 2018-2022) developed in line with the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) 2018-2022, which is aligned with the national vision 2030. The CPD is also aligned with the country's third Medium-Term Plan (MTPIII) and UNDP's corporate Strategic Plan 2018-2021.

Following the passing of UN Resolution 72/279 of 31 May 2018¹, UNDP assumed a unique role in supporting national efforts towards achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) – UNDP's integrator mandate serves both as a foundation for a strong UN development system, and as a key provider of integrated services and platforms in support of a coherent UN system approach to the achievement of the SDGs and national and sub-national levels. The reform of the United Nations development system (UNDS) as a result the resolution involved a set of far-reaching changes in the way the UN development system works to help countries around the world in achieving the Sustainable Development Goals² – at country level, this involved the designation of a Resident Representative, whose responsibilities were delinked from those of the UN Resident Coordinator.

UNDP's Programme in Kenya aims at supporting national efforts towards achieving inclusive sustainable development, within the framework of the SDGs, focusing more on the poor, marginalised and vulnerable groups. The Programme aims to address the interlinked issues of poverty, inequality and exclusion through systems, root causes and connections between challenges by investing in interventions in the following strategic priorities areas; a) governance, peace and security; (b) inclusive growth and structural transformation; and (c) environmental sustainability, climate change and resilience.

The CPD 2018-2022 focuses on providing support to the Government to accelerate progress in achieving the SDGs by building and strengthening institutional capacities for effective and efficient service delivery, promoting gender equality and empowerment of women and youth, ensuring conservation and sustainable use of natural resources, and building resilience at community and household levels. Under the guiding principle of national ownership and leadership, national institutions play a key role in programme implementation while with other implementation modalities, such as direct implementation, are also utilized in agreement with the Government. UNDP's line interlocutor in

¹ <https://reform.un.org/content/un-development-system-reform-101>

² *ibid*

programme implementation is the National Treasury and Planning.

2. BRIEF NATIONAL CONTEXT

Kenya adopted a new constitution in 2010 which underpinned the country's economic and democratic reforms position Kenya to become an upper middle-income country by 2030. In 2019, Kenya's economic growth averaged 5.7%, placing Kenya as one of the fastest growing economies in Sub-Saharan Africa³. Following the outbreak of the new Coronavirus pandemic, economic growth projection remains highly uncertain and the outcome will hinge on how the pandemic plays out internationally and within Kenya, along with policy actions taken to mitigate the situation⁴. Between 2015 and 2019, Kenya's Human Development Index has ranged between 0.548 and 0.579 positioning the country between ranks 145 and 147 out of 188 countries measured⁵. Although progress has been significant across different socioeconomic indicators in the recent past, more effort is required to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), especially after the devastating effect of the global new coronavirus pandemic.

Structural and sociopolitical obstacles continue to constrain achievement of sustainable and inclusive growth, participatory governance, community-level peace and security, sustainable environment and natural resource management and resilience to shocks and climate change. Income inequality levels have not decreased significantly in recent years. Kenya's Gini coefficient of 47.7 is above the 2019 sub-Saharan African average of 43.8⁶. Poverty rates remain above 80 per cent in remote, arid and sparsely populated north-eastern parts of Kenya. The highest rates of poverty and significant social inequalities exist in Garissa, Wajir, Lamu, Tana River, Mandera, Marsabit and Isiolo.

Low investment and productivity in the agriculture sector, which according to 2017 data, averaged 4.4 per cent between 2012 and 2016 and is impeded by land degradation and climate change account for majority of underlying causes of poverty in Kenya's rural areas. This includes the coastal region, which is the least developed region of Kenya with over 62 per cent of inhabitants living below the poverty line. Although investments have been made in transforming the country's production and labour markets, gaps still remain in efforts to ensure more expand the base for higher earning jobs and wealth creation.

Incidences of female poverty are high across several dimensions including less likelihood of formal employment, unequal access and capacity to dispose of land and poor access to credit – this make poverty so feminized in Kenya⁷. This is exacerbated by a higher disease burden for women, particularly HIV/AIDS. During the COVID-19 pandemic lockdown, an unprecedented increase in teenage pregnancies has recorded in Kenya, about 4,000 in Machakos County alone.

Following the adoption of the 2010 Constitution, which paved way for a devolved governance system, an expansion in the reach of services has been witnessed, particularly in the northern and coastal parts of the country. Increased budgetary allocations, including through the marginalization fund, have

³ <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/kenya/overview>

⁴ <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2020/04/29/covid-19-dampens-kenyas-economic-outlook-as-government-scales-up-safety-net-measures>

⁵ <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/KEN>

⁶ <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI?locations=ZG-EG-MA-NG-ZA>

⁷ <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/kenya/publication/kenya-economic-update-poverty-incidence-in-kenya-declined-significantly-but-unlikely-to-be-eradicated-by-2030>

resulted also in expanded road and telecommunication infrastructure, oil and gas prospecting initiatives and market access for local products. However, broader public sector reforms may still be necessary to ensure a public service that is efficient and responsive to the needs of the country's poor and marginalised communities.

Poverty and exclusion in Kenya are also exacerbated by structurally weak resilience capacities at both national and sub-national levels, which increase exposure and vulnerability. These are in turn amplified by climatic shocks, food insecurity and diseases resulting in famine, malnutrition and loss of human life, among other devastating consequences. Moreover, continued dependency on climate-sensitive sectors for a significant part of the country's economy has resulted in the country's economy continued exposure to climate vulnerabilities – tourism, water, agriculture, energy, and forestry are among the most affected. Agriculture employs close to 75 per cent of the population and contributes 25-30 per cent of the country's GDP. The World Bank (2020) predicts that if it takes longer than expected to bring the COVID-19 pandemic under control, GDP could contract by 1.0% in 2020, and see a delay in the projected recovery to 5.2% growth in 2021⁸.

The floods and locust invasion experienced in 2020 are but a few examples of how the country's multiple challenges continue to test the ability of communities in Kenya to bounce back after a disturbance of crises. Poverty and exclusion in Kenya are also exacerbated by structurally weak resilience capacities at both national and sub-national levels, which increase exposure and vulnerability. These are in turn amplified by climatic shocks, food insecurity and diseases resulting in famine, malnutrition and, sometimes, loss of human life, among other devastating consequences. Moreover, continued dependency on climate-sensitive sectors for a significant part of the country's economy has resulted in the country's economy continued exposure to climate vulnerabilities – tourism, water, agriculture, energy, and forestry are among the most affected. The Agriculture sector accounts for 65 per cent of Kenya's export earnings, and provides the livelihood (employment, income and food security needs) for more than 80 per cent of the country's population⁹.

3. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

In line with our Evaluation Plan, after two years of implementing the Programme activities, the Country Office will commission a Mid-Term Evaluation of the Country Programme focusing on the period 2018 to 2020 focusing on two Outcomes;

- **CPD Outcome One:** By 2022 Kenya has high quality services at devolved level that are well-coordinated, integrated, transparent, equitably resourced, accessible and accountable.
- **CPD Outcome Four:** By 2022, Kenyan people benefit from a progressive and resilient green economy underpinned by robust evidence based pro-poor policies and strategies contributing to sustainable economic growth.

The purpose of the evaluation is to ascertain progress made so far towards the attainment of the outcomes and outputs of the country programme against established targets at the commencement of implementation. This will be done through capturing evaluative evidence of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the programme so far.

⁸ <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/kenya/overview>

⁹ <http://www.fao.org/kenya/fao-in-kenya/kenya-at-a-glance/en/>

As the CPD is in the second year of its implementation period, the evaluation exercise will also be forward-looking, ensuring that findings inform and recommend improvements the second half of the implementation period. Therefore, the evaluation findings and judgments made must be based on concrete and credible evidence that will support UNDP's strategic thinking for the rest of the programme cycle, specifically in determining its strategic priorities in supporting the Government of Kenya within the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.

4. SCOPE OF EVALUATION AND OBJECTIVES

The Mid-Term Evaluation will focus on Outcomes 1 and 4 of the CPD under the period 2018-2020. The evaluation will assess the progress and achievements made so far to deliver the outcomes, the factors affecting the outcomes, key UNDP contributions to outcomes and assess the partnership strategy. It will evaluate processes, approaches and strategies of UNDP development interventions in the areas of devolution and resilience.

The proposed evaluation will assess the following Outputs falling under each of the two outcomes identified as stated in UNDP CPD 2018 – 2021:

Outcome 1: *By 2022, people in Kenya access high-quality services at devolved level that are well coordinated, integrated, transparent, equitably resourced and accountable.*

Output 1: Government has strengthened policy, legal and institutional mechanisms for coordinated, inclusive and effective service delivery.

Output 2: Public finance management institutions have strengthened processes and systems for equitable, efficient and accountable service delivery.

Output 3: County- level institutions have strengthened capacity for evidence-based planning, budgeting, implementation monitoring and evaluation for accountable service delivery.

Output 4: People in Kenya have capacity to engage, deepen accountability and transparency in devolution, especially women, youth and persons with disability.

Indicators: Number of counties with: (a) established; and (b) operational performance management systems increased; Number of counties providing detailed public budget information increased; Number of counties with improved M&E capacities increased; Percentage of counties with mechanisms for inclusive public participation of women, youth and persons with a disability increased.

Baseline: Only four counties have established and operational performance management systems; 22 counties are able to provide detailed public budget information; Only seven counties have improved M&E capacities; Only 33.3% of counties have mechanisms for inclusive public participation of women, youth and persons with a disability.

Target: An additional six counties have established and operational performance management systems; At least 30 counties are capable of providing detailed public budget information; 15 counties have improved M&E capacities; 50% of counties have mechanisms for inclusive public participation of women, youth and persons with a disability.

Projects directly linked to the Outcome

Under the outcome for evaluation—Outcome 1, UNDP Kenya has been implementing three key projects that are linked directly with this outcome as well as one other initiative aimed at promoting accountability and transparency in service delivery that partly contribute towards this outcome.

The three key projects that directly contribute towards this outcome are briefly described as follows:

1. **Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya:** - The project aims to strengthen Kenya's devolution process in order to improve service delivery at the county level while bringing governance closer to the people. It targets 14 counties viz; Garissa; Wajir; Mandera; Marsabit; Isiolo; Lamu; Tana River; Turkana; Samburu; Kilifi; Kajiado; Narok; West Pokot; and, Busia. This project, funded by the Governments of Finland, Italy and Sweden is implemented through national and regional institutions including the Ministry of Devolution and ASALs (MODA), Ministry of ICT, Innovation and Youth Affairs, the National Treasury & Planning, the Council of Governors (CoG), the Kenya School of Government (KSG), the County Assemblies Forum (CAF), the Frontier Counties Development Council (FCDC), Commission on Revenue Allocation.
2. **Strengthening Devolved Governance in Kenya:** - The project seeks to contribute accelerated realization of the dividends of devolution in at least 15 counties, namely; Garissa; Wajir; Lamu; Turkana; Tana River; Mandera; Marsabit; Isiolo; Samburu; West Pokot; Kilifi; Elgeyo Marakot; Kwale; Narok; and, Taita Taveta. This project is funded by the Government of Norway and is implemented through national and regional institutions including the Ministry of Devolution and ASALs (MODA), Ministry of ICT, Innovation and Youth Affairs, the National Treasury & Planning, the Council of Governors (CoG), the Kenya School of Government (KSG), the County Assemblies Forum (CAF), the Frontier Counties Development Council (FCDC), Commission on Revenue Allocation.
3. **Integrated Support Programme to the Devolution Process in Kenya:** - This project aims at providing technical support on the policy, legal and institutional programme in the implementation of devolution in Kenya through strengthening capacities and adoption of policy, legal and institutional reforms at county levels for improved service delivery. The project is implemented through the Ministry of Devolution and ASALs, the Council of Governors (CoG), County Assemblies Forum (CAF), the Transition Authority (TA), Commission on Revenue Allocation (CRA), Intergovernmental Budget and Economic Council (IBEC), and the Kenya School of Government (KSG).

Other project that also partly contributes to this outcome is:

1. **Strengthening Public Accountability and Integrity Systems:** - The project seeks to contribute to efforts by the government and non-state actors aimed at corruption prevention and combating corruption for improved service delivery and inclusive governance, by pursuing targeted interventions at both national and county-level and with a particular focus on the healthcare sector. The project is implemented through collaboration with the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (EACC), State Law Office and Department of Justice, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), Kenya Association of Manufacturers (KAM), the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and select civil society organizations.

Outcome 4: *By 2022, people in Kenya benefit from sustainable natural resource management and resilient green economy.*

Output 1: Government, private sector and communities have enhanced capacity for increased access to cost-effective and clean energy.

Output 2: Improved institutional and community capacity to deliver pro-poor, sustainable natural resource management initiatives.

Output 3: National and county governments have improved capacities to reduce disaster risk and climate change impact.

Output 4: Communities have improved adaptive capacity to disasters including from climate change

Indicators: Proportion of women headed households with access to clean and efficient energy increased; Number of natural resources managed through a sustainable use, conservation, access and benefit-sharing regime increased; Number of counties with data-informed development and investment plans that incorporate solutions to enable climate change adaptation and mitigation increased; Number of counties with gender-responsive policies and legal framework for disaster risk reduction increased; Number of men and women benefiting from improved climate proofed income generating activities increased.

Baseline: Only 13% of women headed households have access to clean and efficient energy; 16 natural resources managed through a sustainable use, conservation, access and benefit-sharing regime; No counties have data-informed development and investment plans that incorporate solutions to enable climate change adaptation and mitigation; Only three counties have gender-responsive policies and legal framework for disaster risk reduction; Only 13,499 men and women benefit from improved climate proofed income generating activities.

Target: At least 18% of women headed households have access to clean and efficient energy; An additional two natural resources managed through a sustainable use, conservation, access and benefit-sharing regime; At least seven more counties have data-informed development and investment plans that incorporate solutions to enable climate change adaptation and mitigation; Increase to ten, the number of counties with gender-responsive policies and legal framework for disaster risk reduction; At least 50,000 men and women (min 28,000) benefit from improved climate proofed income generating activities.

Projects directly linked to the Outcome

Under the outcome for evaluation—Outcome 4, UNDP Kenya has been implementing five key projects that are directly linked with this outcome as well as two other initiative aimed at promoting accountability and transparency in service delivery that partly contribute towards this outcome.

The three key projects that directly contribute towards this outcome are briefly described as follows:

1. **Kenya Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (REDD+ Readiness Project):** - The Project aims at supporting Kenya's efforts to pursue long-term, transformative development and accelerate sustainable climate resilient economic growth, while slowing the soaring rates of GHG emissions emanating from the forest sector. The REDD+ Readiness Project supports the government in

meeting its national targets of increasing forest cover. The project is implemented through collaboration with The Ministry of Environment.

2. **Environmental Governance for Sustainable Natural Resource Management:** - This global UNDP and SIDA programme responds to these challenges by strengthening the environmental, gender, human rights and rule of law-dimensions of the public administration of large-scale extractives sectors. The project is implemented by UNDP Country Office.
3. **Low Emission and Climate Resilient Development in Kenya (LECRD):** - The project is aimed at supporting Kenya's efforts to pursue long-term, transformative development and accelerate sustainable climate resilient economic growth, whilst slowing the growth of greenhouse gas emissions. The project is funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and implemented by the Ministry of Environment.
4. **Enhancing Wildlife Conservation in the Productive Southern Kenya Rangelands through a Landscape Approach:** - This joint UNDP-GEF project is aims to conserve the Amboseli landscape's threatened species and habitats and simultaneously promote sustainable development of the ecosystem for the benefit of the present and future generations. The project is implemented by the Ministry of Environment.
5. **Green Climate Fund Readiness Programme:** - The project is aimed at supporting the Government of Kenya in strengthening its national capacities to effectively and efficiently plan for, access, manage, deploy and monitor climate financing through the GCF once it is fully operational. The project was implemented by the National Treasury and Planning.

Other projects that also partly contribute to this outcome are;

1. **Extractive Industries for Sustainable Development in Kenya:** - This project seeks to support the development of the mining and petroleum sectors through capacity development, policy dialogue and knowledge sharing. It proposes to reduce environmental impacts from artisanal gold mining using mercury as an amalgamator. The project is funded by Department for International Development (Dfid) and implemented by the Ministry of Petroleum and Mining.
2. **Governance for Disaster Risk Reduction:** - The project seeks to support government efforts aimed at strengthening disaster risk reduction and management including support to counties to coordinate and manage disaster risks. Funding partners for this project includes; Government of Japan; Government of Brunei Darussalam; Government Of Sweden; UNDP Democratic People's Republic of Korea; the UNCDF; European Civil Protection & Humanitarian Aid Operations. The project is implemented by National Drought Management Authority.

5. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY EVALUATION QUESTIONS

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. An overall guidance on project evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results¹⁰.

Relevance

¹⁰ www.undp.org/eo/handbook

- To what extent has the intended outcome and the associated outputs addressed/contributed to addressing national priorities and to what extent are these aligned with UNDP's mandate?
- To what extent has the theory of change presented in the outcome model been a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base the initiatives?
- Are UNDP approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcome?
- Is the current set of indicators, both outcome and output indicators, effective in informing the progress made towards the outcomes? If not, what indicators should be used?
- Are the monitoring and evaluation indicators appropriate to link outputs to outcome or is there a need to establish or improve these indicators? If so, what are the suggestions?
- Is it consistent with human development needs and the specific development challenges in the country?
- To what extent has UNDP adopted participatory approaches in planning and delivery of the initiative and what has been feasible in the country context?
- Are the outcome indicators chosen sufficient to measure the outcomes? What other SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound) indicators can be suggested to measure these outcomes going forward?
- Are the UNDP outputs still relevant to the outcomes? How have the UNDP's outputs been relevant to the outcome?
- Have UNDP interventions so far been relevant to women and other marginalized populations?
- Relevance of programme and project design in addressing the identified outcome priority needs in the UNDAF 2018 -2022 and CPD 2018-2022.

Effectiveness

- To what extent are the planned outcomes on track to be achieved or has progress been made towards its achievement?
- How have corresponding outputs delivered by UNDP affected the outcome so far, and in what ways have they not been effective?
- What has been the contribution of partners and other organizations to the outcome, and how effective have UNDP partnerships been in contributing to achieving the outcome?
- What have been the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by UNDP's work?
- To what extent is the outcome progress benefiting women and men equally?
- To what extent are the poor, indigenous groups, women, and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefiting?
- To what extent have the project or programme implementation contributed towards the stated outcome? Has it at least set dynamic changes and processes that are moving towards the long-term outcomes?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outcomes?
- Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective so far?
- Extent of UNDP's contribution to human and institutional capacity building of partners as a guarantee for sustainability beyond UNDP interventions.
- What are the main factors (positive and negative) that have/could affect the achievement of the outcome? How will these factors limit or facilitate progress towards the outcome?

Efficiency

- To what extent, so far, have the programme or project outputs resulted from economic use of resources?
- To what extent have quality outputs delivered on time?
- To what extent have partnership modalities been conducive to the delivery of outputs?
- To what extent are monitoring systems providing management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
- How has UNDP promoted gender equality, human rights and human development in the delivery of outputs?
- Is the project or programme being implemented within deadline and cost estimates?
- Have UNDP and its partners taken prompt actions to solve implementation issues?
- Are UNDP resources focused on the set of activities that are expected to produce significant results?
- Are there any identified synergies between UNDP initiatives that contribute to reducing costs while supporting results?
- Extent of Monitoring and Evaluation contribution to increased programme efficiency.
- Are the outputs being delivered in a timely manner? Is programme design approach considered a viable and relevant execution instrument to attain development results?

Sustainability

- What indications are there that the outcomes will be sustained, e.g., through requisite capacities (systems, structures, staff, etc.)?
- To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national stakeholders, been developed or implemented?
- To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
- To what extent are partners committed to providing continuing support?
- Are initiatives designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks?
- Do they include an exit strategy?
- What issues are emerging during implementation as a threat to sustainability?
- How is UNDP approaching the scaling up of successful pilot initiatives and catalytic projects? Has the government taken on these initiatives? Have donors stepped in to scale up initiatives?
- How strong is the level of ownership of the results by the relevant government entities and other stakeholders?
- What is the level of capacity and commitment from the Government and other stakeholders to ensure sustainability of the results achieved?
- What could be done to strengthen sustainability?
- To what extent are relevant national stakeholders been included in programme design and implementation and policy advocacy processes?
- What is the likelihood that the benefits from the project will be maintained for a reasonably long period of time after the project phase out?
- Based on the above analysis, provide recommendations on how UNDP in Kenya should adjust its programming, partnership arrangements, resource mobilization strategies, working methods and/or management structures to ensure that the proposed outcome is fully achieved by the end of the CPD period.

6. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation will be carried out by independent international evaluators, and will engage a broad range of key stakeholders and beneficiaries, including government officials, donors, civil society organizations including organizations where programmes or advisory support were provided and UNDP staff, etc.

This evaluation is expected to take a “theory of change” (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that UNDP Kenya has supported for this initiative, and observed progress identified Outcomes. The evaluator will develop, in consultation with the programme team, a logic model of how UNDP Kenya initiatives covered under the two outcomes have so far contributed towards meeting the related national priority development goals.

The evidence gathering will closely track the RRF for this outcome. 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 terminal outcome evaluation will be carried out through a wide range of participation of all relevant stakeholders, 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. Findings should be specific, disaggregated (by sex, age and location) concise and supported by quantitative and/or qualitative information that is reliable, valid and generalizable.

Overall guidance on evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. The evaluator will determine the specific design and provide a complete evaluation methodology to UNDP as part of the evaluation inception report which will also include detailed plan for this assignment.

However, the methodology should include, but not limited to the following:

Desk reviews: The evaluator will collect and review all relevant documentation, including the following: i) Country Programme Document, ii) project documents and progress reports; iii) past evaluation reports vi) country office reports; vii) UNDP’s corporate strategies and reports; and viii) government publications.

Interviews and virtual discussions: The evaluation team will conduct individual-focused telephonic interviews and virtual discussions with relevant stakeholders, including: i) UNDP staff (Country Office’s senior management, managers and programme/project officers), government officers ii) government partners both at the central and County levels iii) beneficiary groups and donors iv) UN agencies working to contribute to the outcomes. Where possible, evaluators will need to consider limited group discussions with all the above-identified constituencies.

Field visits: Where possible (due to travel restrictions under COVID-19 circumstances), 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.

Briefing and debriefing sessions: Virtual briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and the government, as well as with other donors and partners.

7. EVALUATION PRODUCTS (DELIVERABLES)

The evaluator is expected to deliver the following;

1. Initial Work Plan
2. Evaluation Inception Report

Following initial meetings/engagements with the UNDP CO senior management, programme unit, and the desk reviews, the evaluator is expected to develop an inception report. The inception report will detail out the evaluator's understanding of what is being evaluated and why (logic or theory of change—how the initiative is supposed to work, including strategies, activities, outputs and expected outcome and their interrelationship). A presentation of the inception report will be made to and discussed with UNDP. The inception report will include, inter alia:

- **Evaluation purpose and scope**—A clear statement of the objectives of the evaluation and the main aspects or elements of the initiative to be examined.
- **Evaluation criteria and questions**—the criteria and questions that the evaluation will use to assess performance and rationale.
The evaluator will propose a rating scale in order that Performance Rating will be carried out for the four evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.
- **Evaluation methodology**—A description of data collection methods and data sources to be employed, including the rationale for their selection (how they will inform the evaluation) and their limitations; data collection tools, instruments and protocols and discussion of reliability and validity for the evaluation; and the sampling plan.
- **Evaluation matrix**—this identifies the key evaluation questions and how they will be answered by the methods selected; evaluation matrix outlining which data collection methodologies will be used to address each of the evaluation questions,
- Detailed **resource requirements** tied to evaluation activities and deliverables detailed in the work plan.
- A revised **schedule of key milestones**, deliverables and responsibilities.
- Initial **desk review results**.

The inception report will be discussed and agreed with UNDP country office before the evaluator proceed with site visits.

3. **Zero draft Evaluation Report** for initial feedback from UNDP.
4. **Draft Outcome Evaluation Report** to be shared with UNDP and relevant stakeholders for feedback and quality assurance.
5. Presentation of **Draft Project Evaluation Report** at the virtual validation meeting with key stakeholders, (partners and beneficiaries).

The draft Evaluation Report will be shared with stakeholders, and presented in a validation meeting that UNDP country office will organise. Key partners and stakeholders will participate in this meeting among others. Feedback received from these sessions should be taken into account

when preparing the final report. The evaluator will produce an 'audit trail' indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the final report.

6. Lessons Learned Report

A separate lessons learned so far report will also be produced and discussed during the validation meeting. Feedback received should be taken into consideration when preparing the lessons learned report. The lessons learned report should cover the different facets the programme implemented by the UNDP in Kenya and how the same could inform implementation strategies for the second half of the CPD. This report should be annexed in the main evaluation report.

7. **Evaluation debriefing meeting** with UNDP and key stakeholders where main findings will be presented.

8. **Final Outcome Evaluation Report**¹¹ a comprehensive analytical product in English. Refer Annex 7. UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for results Evaluation Report Template and Quality Standards

8. EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION AND REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

The outcome evaluation will be undertaken by two external evaluators, hired as consultants. The evaluators selected must be independent and objective; therefore, they should not have participated in the project design, implementation, and decision-making of the UNDP interventions contributing to the outcomes.

The evaluators will perform the following tasks:

- Desk review of documents, detailing the evaluation scope, development of methodology, detailed work plan and Evaluation outline; develop the inception report
- Field visits (where possible) to the project sites and interviews conducted with local stakeholders;
- Debriefing with UNDP and project implementing partner;
- Conduct the outcome evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation and UNDP evaluation guidelines;
- Prepare the draft evaluation reports;
- Present draft findings in the stakeholder meeting;
- Finalize the evaluation and lesson learned report and submit it to UNDP CO

Required Qualifications of the Evaluator:

- Minimum Master's degree in economics, Environmental science, public administration, regional development/planning, or other social science;
- Minimum 10-15 years of professional experience in public sector development, including in the areas of Environment and Sustainable Development, gender equality and social services.

¹¹ For more details, please refer to Annex 7 of UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring, and Evaluating for Development Results (2009)

- At least 5 years of experience in leading evaluations of government, policies and international aid organisations, preferably with direct experience with civil service capacity building;
- Adequate experience in programme evaluations in the development field and with proven accomplishments in undertaking evaluation for international organizations, preferably with UNDP

Competency requirements

- Good analytical and strategic thinking skills
- Extensive knowledge of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods
- Proven knowledge of evaluation methods
- Sound knowledge of results-based management systems, and monitoring and evaluation methodologies; including experience in applying SMART indicators;
- Strong working knowledge of the UN and its mandate region, and more specifically the work of UNDP in support of Environment and Sustainable Development initiatives in the region
- Proven commitment to the core values of the United Nations
- Excellent inter-personal, communication, and teamwork skills
- Ability to meet tight deadlines
- Excellent written and spoken English and presentational capacities

Documents to be included when submitting the proposals:

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

1. Proposal: explaining why he/she is the most suitable for the work including past experience in similar evaluations;
2. Financial proposal (in USD, specifying a total requested amount per day, other expenses e.g. flight cost the most direct economic route);
3. Duly completed and signed P11 Form, and at least 3 contacts for references.

9. EVALUATION ETHICS

- Evaluations in the UN are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'¹². Evaluators are required to read the guidelines and ensure a strict adherence to it, including establishing protocols to safeguard confidentiality of information obtained during the evaluation. The Evaluators upon signing the contract will also sign this guideline which may be made available as an attachment to the evaluation report.

10. IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

- The outcome evaluators (consultants) will be reporting to the Deputy Resident Representative (DRR/P) of UNDP Kenya. To facilitate the outcome evaluation process, a UNDP Evaluation Focal Point (EFP) will be assigned to oversee the overall evaluation process. The EFP will also be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits,

¹² UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at <http://www.unevaluation.org/document/download/547>

coordinate with the Government etc. An ‘Evaluation Focal Team’ composed of key stakeholders and UNDP relevant staff will be set-up in order to provide technical inputs to enhance the quality of the evaluation. The CO Senior Management will take responsibility for the approval of the final evaluation report.

11. TIME FRAME FOR THE EVALUATION PROCESS

- The evaluation is expected to take 27 working days over a period of 4 weeks starting 15 September 2020. The following table provides an indicative breakout for activities and delivery:

Activity	Estimated number of days invested	Place	Responsible party	Stakeholder involved
Meeting briefing with UNDP (DRR- Prog), Managers and project staff as needed)	At the time of contract signature	UNDP	UNDP	As appropriate
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the Evaluation Team	Upon signing of contract 1 Day	Email	UNDP	N/A
Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated work plan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed	2 Days	Home based	Evaluation expert	UNDP and presentation to GoK partner is needed
Submission of inception report	2 Days	Home based	Evaluation expert	
Virtual consultations and field visits (were possible), in-depth interviews and webinars	12 Days	Home based	Evaluation expert	Local project partners, project staff, local authorities, NGOs, etc
Preparation of draft evaluation report including an Executive Summary of approx. 5 pages)	5 Days	Home based	Evaluation expert	Key stakeholders interviewed, if and when needed.
Debriefing with UNDP	1 Day	Virtual	Evaluation expert	UNDP senior Mgt, PMSU, EA
Provision of comments to the draft report	2 Days	Virtual	UNDP	Government, key partners as appropriate
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff and UNDP CO	2 Days	Home based	Evaluation expert	
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP Kenya (max. 50 pages excluding Executive Summary and Annexes)		Email	Evaluation expert	
Total number of days	27			

12. COST AND PAYMENT MODALITIES

Interested consultants should provide their requested fee (all inclusive) when they submit their expressions of interest, in USD. Fee payments will be made upon acceptance and approval by the UNDP CO of planned deliverables, based on the following payment schedule:

Payment terms		Amount (US\$)
Inception report/ Upon submission of inception report with annotated outline detailed work plan and budget estimates.	10%	
Draft Evaluation Report and lessons learned report/ Following submission and approval of the 1 st draft evaluation report/ Upon completion of the first draft of evaluation report.	70%	
Final Evaluation Report with annexed lesson learned report/ Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO) of	20%	

the final evaluation report/ Upon submission, presentation and approval of the final evaluation report.		
TOTAL	100%	

13. TAX OBLIGATION

The consultant is solely responsible for all taxation or other assessments on any income derived from UNDP. UNDP will not make any withholding from payments for the purposes of income tax. UNDP is exempt from any liabilities regarding taxation and will not reimburse any such taxation to the subscriber.

14. ANNEXES¹³

This section presents additional requirements to facilitate the work of evaluators.

Annex1: Intervention Results Framework and Theory of Change

Annex2: List of key stakeholders and partners

UNDP Kenya; MODA, Treasury and National Planning, Ministry of Environment; UN Agencies (who contribute to the Outcomes under consideration); Project beneficiaries.

Annex3: Documents for Study by the Evaluator

- 1) UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for results
- 2) UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators
- 3) Common Country Assessments
- 4) UN Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation
- 5) UNDP Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) for Kenya (2018-2019)
- 6) Project documents and progress reports, project evaluation reports
- 7) National Development Strategies
- 8) United Nations Development Assistance Framework UNDAF 2018-2022
- 9) UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2018 – 2022
- 10) Country Programme Strategy for utilization of OP5/6 grant funds: The GEF – Small Grants Programme/Kenya
- 11) Sustainable Development Goals Reports in Kenya
- 12) National Human Development Reports

Annex 4: Evaluation matrix (Sample Evaluation Matrix)

To be included in the inception report.

Sample evaluation matrix						
Relevant evaluation criteria	Key Questions	Specific sub-questions	Data sources	Data collection methods/Tools	Indicators/Success standards	Methods of Data analysis

¹³ Annexes 1, 2 are part of the project documents. Annex 3 will be given when the contracts have been signed.

Annex 5¹⁴: Schedule of tasks, milestones and deliverables

Based on the time frame present in the ToR, the evaluator should present a detailed schedule.

Annex 6: Code of conduct

Evaluator will be requested to read carefully, understand and sign the UN 'Code of Conduct'.

Annex 7: Suggested Content of Inception Report

Annex 8: Suggested Outcome Evaluation Report structure

Refer Annex 7. UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for results Evaluation Report Template and Quality Standards

¹⁴ Annex 5 will be provided with the contract for signature