

AMKENI WAKENYA MID-TERM REVIEW (2015-2020)
TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. BASIC INFORMATION

Assignment Type	Mid-Term Review
Type of Contract	Contract for Professional Services
Location	At the Contractors Location with scheduled meetings with CSOs, National Legal Aid Services, PBO Authority, Project Steering Committee, UNODC.
Expected duration of work	40 working days
Target start date	01 st April 2021
Latest date of completion	31 st May 2021
Travels Expected	Travel to a representative sample form the following project focus counties- Nairobi, Mombasa, Nakuru, Uasin Gishu, Kisumu, Kilifi, Tana River, Lamu, Kwale, Kitui, Turkana, Garissa, Wajir, Madera, Isiolo, Marsabit, Nyeri, Laikipia. Travel and accommodation to these areas should be factored in the Financial Proposal
Languages required	English
Application deadline	25 th February 2021

2. Introduction/Background Information

Amkeni WaKenya (hereinafter Amkeni) is a United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) project/facility that was established in 2008 to promote democratic governance through civil society strengthening in Kenya. The name “Amkeni WaKenya” draws inspiration from the second stanza of the National Anthem of the Republic of Kenya, which calls upon Kenyans to “arise” and actively participate in nation building. The facility is currently in phase two (2015-2022) of project implementation. Domiciled in UNDP-Kenya’s Governance and Inclusive Growth (GIG) Unit, the project provides technical and financial support to civil society organizations (CSOs) that promote human rights and democratic governance. The primary target groups are Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) including: Community-Based Organizations (CBOs), Faith-Based Organizations (FBOs), Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Trusts, Research Institutions and Academia.

The strategic focus of Amkeni WaKenya has continued to be; access to justice and realization of human rights; entrenching human rights-centred and accountable devolved governance; promoting an enabling environment for CSOs and; building capacity of CSOs to respond effectively to contemporary governance issues. Amkeni WaKenya contributes to United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Strategic Priority Area 1: *A democratic political system that is issue-based, people-centred, results-oriented and accountable to the public.* Outcome 3: *By 2022, people in Kenya enjoy improved governance, access to justice, respect for rule of law, human rights and gender equality* and Country Programme Document (CPD) Outcome 2: *By 2022, people in Kenya live in a secure, peaceful, inclusive and cohesive society;* Output 2.5. *Rule of law, justice and legislative institutions have*

technical and financial capacities to deliver normative inclusive, accountable, equitable services of the programme.

During the second phase of implementation, Amkeni WaKenya has attracted over \$11million from Embassy of Japan (EoJ), Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands (EKN), The European Union (EU) and UNDP. The EoJ supported projects in Kwale and Turkana counties whose overall goal was to strengthen participation of youth and women in the devolved governance functions. In 2021 EoJ is supporting CSOs in “an Inclusive and Multi-Sectoral Response to COVID-19 and Addressing its Socio-Economic Impact in Kenya”. Embassy of Netherlands in Kenya (EKN) has been supporting human rights promotion projects in nine counties¹. EKN has also supported strengthening of enabling environment for civil society, through institutional development of the NGO Board, promotion of self-regulation initiatives and capacity development for CSOs.

With support from the EU, Amkeni is implementing the Programme for Legal Empowerment and Aid Delivery in Kenya (PLEAD). This intervention is supporting non-state actors-including CSOs, paralegals, lawyers’ associations and universities- to continue providing legal aid and assistance to poor and often-marginalized communities in 12 urban and rural counties². In addition to hosting the Amkeni WaKenya facility, UNDP funded CSOs to support locally- driven and inclusive dialogues for promoting credible and peaceful elections in 2017. The project supported 16 CSOs to implement interventions across 30 Hotspots Counties which had previously been identified by the Ministry of Interior and Coordination of the National Government. UNDP had also previously supported a short-term anti-corruption research and advocacy project targeting the health sector in 2016.

Besides, Amkeni WaKenya has provided a platform for supporting CSO-targeted interventions that are implemented within the framework of integrated programming at the UNDP Kenya Country Office (KCO). For instance, in 2017, Amkeni WaKenya supported CSOs to conduct voter and peacebuilding education as part of UNDP KCO programming on conflict prevention during the 2017 elections. In 2020, Amkeni provided grants to CSOs to implemented various COVID-19 interventions as part of UNDP KCO response strategic framework.

3. Purpose of the Mid -Term Evaluation

UNDP-Amkeni WaKenya proposes to undertake a mid –term evaluation of the current project for the period between January 2015 to December 2020. 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 six years of the project implementation. The evaluation will also focus on significant developments that have taken place in the programming environment which includes the post 2015 agenda, the Sustainable Development Goals (SGDs) and ongoing UN reforms such as the delinking on the UN coordination function from UNDP, among others. The evaluation will identify and assess the results and lessons learnt from the key initiatives implemented under PLEAD, EKN, UNDP and Embassy of Japan funding as well as providing key strategic recommendations for the design of Phase III of the project.

The expected outcome is the documentation of key lessons learnt and recommendations for course correction as well as amplification of emergent impacts.

¹ Kisumu, Murang’a, Laikipia. Nairobi, Tana River, Turkana, Mombasa

² Garissa, Isiolo, Kisumu, Lamu, Mandera, Marsabit, Mombasa, Nairobi. Nakuru, Tana River, Uasin Gishu and Wajir

4. Objectives and scope of the Mid Term Evaluation

The mid-term evaluation is a joint UNDP/Development partners venture and will be conducted in close collaboration with other UN Agencies and key duty bearers including the National Legal Aid Services and the NGO Coordination Board. The main objective of the evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project objectives have been implemented and results achieved during the period 2015-2020. In specific terms the mid-term evaluation will:

- Assess achievements and progress made against planned results (6 year rolling work-plan), as well as assess challenges and lessons learnt over the past six years of the project.
- Assess how the emerging issues not reflected in the current project such as SDGs, environment, adoption of Third Medium Term Plan (MTP-III), COVID-19 and UN reforms among others impact on outcomes and make recommendations and suggestions for future programming to realign the project to these new priorities to achieve greater development impact.
- Assess integration of UNDP programming principles in the Amkeni project interventions- Human Rights-Based Approach to development (HRBA), Leave No One Behind (LNOB), gender equality and women empowerment.
- Assess Amkeni WaKenya contribution to UNDAF: Outcome 1 which aims to ensure that people in Kenya live in a secure, inclusive and cohesive society and more specifically; CPD Output 2.5: Rule of law, justice and legislative institutions have technical and financial capacities to deliver normative inclusive, accountable, equitable services.
- Serve as a comprehensive progress report of the project which will replace the 2014 annual evaluation report.
- Review the project results framework specifically the indicators, baselines and targets assessing how realistic/relevant and measurable they are and make recommendations for improvement while at the same time assessing progress towards achievements of the set targets.
- Review the planning, monitoring, evaluation, learning and reporting system and make suggestions on its improvements.
- Critically examine the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and coherence in the delivery of the project.
- Assess governance and management arrangements pertinent to the operations and oversight of the project
- Assess the extent to which the current project is compatible with national development priorities (Vision 2030, Medium Term Plan III goals among others).
- Assess achievements/progress towards attainment of results and reflect on how collaboration with UN Agencies has contributed to the project results.
- Reach consensus between the Development Partners and key stakeholders on the suggested strategies for programme implementation, partnerships and resource mobilization.
- Document lessons learnt, draw comparative best practices, challenges and future opportunities, and provide recommendations for improvements or adjustments in strategy, design and/or implementation arrangements which will eventually guide the design of PHASE III of the project.
- Assess the Potential and options of sustainability of the programme.

5. Evaluation criteria and Evaluation Questions

The key criteria for the mid-term evaluation are:

1. **Relevance**—responsiveness of implementation mechanisms to the rights and capabilities of the rights-holders and duty-bearers of the programme (including national institutions, communities, and the related policy framework).
 - Do the set of project Results address a) the rights of the communities being targeted; b) the relevant sectorial priorities identified at a national level; and therefore, c) the objectives of the MTPIII and Vision 2030? Are the stated project objectives consistent with the requirements of rights-holders, in particular, the requirements of most vulnerable populations?
 - How relevant and appropriate is the project to the devolved levels of Government
 - Are all the target groups appropriately covered by the stated project Results?
 - How has the project contributed to achievement of UNDF Outcome which aims to ensure that people in Kenya live in a secure, inclusive and cohesive society and more specifically; Output 2.5: Rule of law, justice and legislative institutions have technical and financial capacities to deliver normative inclusive, accountable, equitable services.
 - How has the project aligned with development cooperation strategies and frameworks of the respective development partners contributing to the Amkeni WaKenya basket?
 - Is there a participatory approach in programming?
 - To what extent does the project ensure that gender equality is enjoyed by all especially the most vulnerable women and girls?
 - Are human rights principles adequately addressed throughout the project? To what extent is human rights-based approach applied in programming and planning processes; To what extent is the project strengthening rights-holders' participation and duty-bearer's accountability; ensuring that the most vulnerable populations know, demand and enjoy their human rights and reinforcing capacities of duty bearers to respect, protect and guarantee these rights.
2. **Effectiveness** – the extent to which specific programme results are being achieved.
 - To what extent has the costed 6 year rolling work-plan contributed to effective implementation of the project?
 - To what extent are outcomes being achieved to date? What is the likelihood of their being achieved by 2022?
 - To what extent have effective partnerships and strategic alliances (e.g. national partners, development partners and other external support agencies) been promoted around the project Outcomes?
3. Recommend adjustments, if any, to programme strategies and directions for remainder of the programme. **Efficiency** –Is the implementation mechanism the most cost-effective way of delivering this programme?
 - Have adequate financial resources been mobilised for the project?
 - Is there a discernible common or collaborative funds mobilisation strategy?
 - To what extent have administrative procedures been harmonised?
 - Are there any apparent cost-minimising strategies that should be encouraged?
 - Are the implementation mechanisms (M&E, Resource mobilisation and communications effective in managing the Programme?
 - Progress in establishing the Project Management Unit (PMU) and its functionality

- How efficiently resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been converted to the project results at output level?
 - To what extent and in what ways have the comparative advantages of the UNDP been utilized in the national context (including universality, neutrality, voluntary and grant-nature of contributions, multilateralism, and the special mandates of UNDP)?
 - Are there any indications of leakages and how effective is use of domestic resources?
 - Are there challenges in effective use of resources, given by development partners (DPs) restrictions on funding?
 - **Sustainability** – the extent to which these implementation mechanisms can be sustained over time. Suggestions that can be made on further activities to improve sustainability of the programme. How have the CSOs embedded sustainability in their respective projects?
4. **Design and focus** of the project, the quality of the formulation of results at different levels, i.e. the results chain:
- To what extent is the current project designed as a results-oriented, coherent and focused framework?
 - To what extent are the indicators and targets relevant, realistic and measurable? Are the indicators in line with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and what changes need to be done? Are the baselines up to date or do they need adjusting?
 - Are expected outcomes realistic given the project timeframe and resources?
 - To what extent and in what ways have risks and assumptions been addressed in the project design?
 - Is the distribution of roles and responsibilities among the different partners well defined, facilitated in the achievement of results and have the arrangements been respected in the course of implementation?
 - Has the project responded to the challenges of national capacity development and do they promote ownership of programmes by the national/county partners?
 - To what extent have human rights principles and standards been reflected or promoted in the project? To what extent and in what ways has a human rights approach been reflected as one possible method for integrating human rights concerns into the project?
 - To what extent and in what ways are the concepts of gender equity and equality and other 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 girls' and women's rights and empowerment? What needs to be done to further integrate these dimensions?
5. **Impact:** To the extent possible, assess the *impact* of project on the lives of the beneficiaries, i.e. determine whether there is any major change in the project indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or be associated with the project, notably in the realization of goals in the applicable frameworks of development cooperation (PLEAD, UNDAF, CPD, SDG 16).

6. Methods and process

The evaluation will be an external, transparent, participatory, and interactive learning exercise, employing both quantitative and qualitative methods which should be completed within a timeframe of two months. It will take place from **01 April 2021 to 31 May 2021** and will build on the previous final evaluation of PHASE I and 2017 baseline survey. The Evaluation will be commissioned and managed by UNDP. The evaluation will also involve stakeholders such as United Nations Office On Drugs and Crime (UNODC), National Legal Aid Service, NGO coordination as well as CSOs. Stakeholder participation is essential and will be sought from the beginning of the process through a series of meetings and possibly through the organisation of a project evaluation workshop that will take place towards the end of the evaluation. The purpose of the workshop will be to validate and refine findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

To determine the scope of the evaluation, UNDP and the Development Partners and key stakeholders will initiate the evaluation process by assessing how the project can be evaluated in a reliable and credible manner given the data and resources. This assessment will include a review of the documentation available on the project design and implementation process. Mixed method using both qualitative and quantitative approaches will be used.

7. Management and organisation

The project evaluation will be commissioned and overseen by the UNDP. Amkeni PMU will have the responsibility to provide oversight and direction to the evaluation.

An external Consultancy firm will be procured competitively with mutual agreement from the Development Partners to conduct the evaluation.

8. Deliverables

The duration of the assignment is 40 days including the writing of the Report.

Deliverable	Timeframe	Responsible Party
Initial briefing	One day	Amkeni team
Desk review, Survey design & methodology and detailed work plan, and access to relevant reports	Five (5) days	Lead Consultant Survey team
Presentation of Inception Report, sampling framework and survey tools	(One day)	Lead Consultant Survey team
Consultations, meetings as well as field work and analysis and synthesis of the findings	Eighteen (18) days	Lead Consultant, Survey team Amkeni team
Preparation of draft midterm evaluation report and share the draft Report with Amkeni	(Eight -8-days)	Lead Consultant, Survey team
Presentation of draft midterm report to Amkeni, PSC, Development partners, UNDP	(One day)	Lead Consultant, Survey team
Feed-back by the Amkeni, PSC, DP and other stakeholders	(two days)	Amkeni team
Finalization of Midterm evaluation report incorporating additions and comments	(Three days)	Lead Consultant, Survey team

provided by the Amkeni team and the stakeholders		
Submission of the Midterm evaluation report to Amkeni Wakenya	(One day)	Lead Consultant Survey team

9. Payment schedule

Deliverable	Duration	Percentage
Inception report	10 days	20%
Data collection tools and raw data sets	20 days	20%
Draft report	10 days	30%
Final report and dissemination presentation deck	20 days	30%

10. Qualifications of the Firm

The minimum qualification for firms applying for this assignment will include:

1. **At least 5 years'** proven experience in conducting baseline, mid-term and end-term evaluations of projects dealing with human rights, access to justice, governance, democracy, or related fields.
2. Experience working with the United Nations, International Organizations, bilateral and multilateral development partners.
3. Demonstrable experience in engagement with local communities and indigenous peoples.
4. Demonstrable experience working with National Government institutions, county governments, civil society institutions and the private sector at national and subnational level.

The firm shall put together a team of three experts comprising the Democracy and Governance Expert who will double up as the **Evaluation Team Leader, Cross-cutting Issues Expert (gender, youth, marginalized, environment, etc) and an Evaluation expert** to support the evaluation. The Team Leader will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of all deliverables including the final MTE Report. Specifically, the Lead Consultant will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the mid-term evaluation team.
- Coordinate the study ensuring quality and responsiveness to the ToR.
- Design the detailed mid-term evaluation plan, methodology and survey instruments.
- Ensure efficient division of tasks between the members of the MTE team.
- Draft and communicate the evaluation report to Amkeni WaKenya PMU, Portfolio Analyst and UNDP management.
- Presentation of the draft report to stakeholders, capturing and incorporating stakeholder feedback into the final report; and
- Submission of a Final Mid-Term Evaluation Report containing as a minimum:
 - I. Title
 - II. Table of contents
 - III. List of acronyms and abbreviations
 - IV. Executive summary
 - V. Introduction

- VI. Description of the intervention
- VII. Evaluation scope and objectives
- VIII. Evaluation approach and methods
- IX. Data analysis
- X. Findings and conclusions
- XI. Recommendations
- XII. Lessons learned
- XIII. Annexes

11. Qualifications for the Evaluation Lead and Democracy and Governance Expert

- At least a Master's degree in a relevant field: such as law, political science, government, economics, public administration, public policy, or other related social science.
- **At least 7 years'** experience in coordinating monitoring, evaluation assignments, developing monitoring and evaluation systems, or research.
- An in-depth knowledge of results-based management, national planning and results accountability systems, monitoring and evaluation, knowledge management or related fields.
- **5 years'** experience working with the United Nations, National or County government institutions, international non-governmental organizations, bilateral or multilateral development partners.
- Professional expertise in areas of **Rule of Law, Human Rights, Access to justice, Democracy and Governance.**
- Experience leading teams to conduct large scale evaluations.
- Demonstrated analytical, communication and report writing skills.
- Demonstrate knowledge of and ability to apply theoretical knowledge in the design, management and evaluation of complex multidisciplinary projects supported by multiple development partners.
- Demonstrated experience with cross-sector application of UN programs is desirable.
- Fluency in written and spoken English and Swahili.

12. Qualifications for the Cross-cutting Issues Expert

- At least a Master's degree in Gender and Development, Environment, International Development, Public Policy.
- A senior expert with at **least 7 years'** experience in International Development.
- Demonstrated expertise in evaluating and programming in relation to cross-cutting issues in Kenya, particularly concerning Gender, the Environment, Governance and Human Rights;
- Experience with programming, including at policy/strategy levels, and Project Cycle Management (essential);
- Experience working with United Nations, Bilateral and Multi-lateral partners;

13. Qualifications for the M&E Expert

- A Master's degree in Project Planning Design and Management, Monitoring and evaluation, Strategic Management, Results-Based Management, Statistics, or related disciplines.
- Proven knowledge and experience (**7 years**) in implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems and methodologies in the field of international development, through use of quantitative, qualitative and mixed-methods evaluations;

- At least **seven (7) years** of providing evaluation services and executing M&E activities—which includes conducting evaluations for UN
- Strong project management experience, from conception to completion;
- Experience in developing monitoring tools, including baseline data collection, questionnaire formation, data analysis and interpretations.
- Prior experience in working with UN counterparts.
- Strong organizational, writing, research, quantitative, and interpersonal skills.
- Strong analytical thinking, attention to detail, timeliness, and work ethic.
- Ability to work as part of a team, prioritize and multi-task under tight deadlines.

14. Financial Proposal

The financial proposal should indicate how much the entire assignment will cost in terms of professional fee, reimbursable costs, and field travel to the selected (Busia, Garissa, Isiolo, Kisumu, Lamu, Mandera, Marsabit, Mombasa, Murang'a, Laikipia, Nairobi, Nakuru, Tana River, Turkana, Uasin-Gishu and Wajir) counties (transport, accommodation etc) as specified above.

15. Logistics/ Field expenses

The firm is required to quote for all expenses for field travel to the selected counties (transport, accommodation etc). as specified above.

16. Monitoring and Progress Control

The team will have reporting requirements to the Amkeni WaKenya Project Management unit with daily supervision by the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist.

17. Mid-Term Evaluation Ethics

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

The evaluation team will comply to the following ethical considerations:

1. To avoid conflict of interest and undue pressure, evaluators need to be independent, implying that members of an Evaluation Team must not have been directly responsible for the policy/programming-setting, design, or overall management of the subject of evaluation, nor expect to be in the near future. Evaluators must have no vested interest and have the full freedom to conduct impartially their evaluative work, without potential negative effects on their career development. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner.
2. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual participants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source.

- Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals (not targeted at persons) and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
3. Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body.
 4. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality.
 5. 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.
 6. 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.

18. Technical Evaluation Criteria

Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms		Score Weight	Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
				A	B	C	D	E
1.	Expertise of Firm / Organization submitting Proposal	30%	30					
2.	Proposed Work Plan and Approach	40%	40					
3.	Evaluation Lead and Democracy and Governance Expert	10%	10					
4.	cross-cutting issues expert	10%	10					
5.	M&E Expert	10%	10					
Total			100					
Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 1			Points obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
Expertise of firm / organization submitting proposal				A	B	C	D	E
1.1	At least 5 years' experience in conducting baseline, mid-term or end-term evaluations of projects dealing with, human rights and access to justice or related fields.		7					
1.2	General Organizational Capability which is likely to affect implementation (i.e. loose consortium, holding company or one firm, size of the firm / organization, strength of project management support e.g. project		7					

	financing capacity and project management controls)						
1.3	Extent to which any work would be subcontracted (subcontracting carries additional risks which may affect project implementation, but properly done it offers a chance to access specialized skills).	6					
1.4	Experience working with National Government institutions, county governments, civil society institutions and the private sector at national and subnational level	5					
1.5	Experience working with the United Nations or any other reputable international NGO, bilateral or multilateral development partners in developing countries, especially in Sub Saharan Africa	5					
Total part 1		30					

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 2		Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
			A	B	C	D	E
Proposed Work Plan and Approach							
2.1	Is the scope of task well defined and does it correspond to the TOR?	10					
2.3	Are the different components of the project adequately weighted relative to one another?	8					
2.5	Is the conceptual framework adopted appropriate for the task?	7					
2.7	Is the proposed approach and methodology appropriate to the assignment and practical in the prevailing project circumstances?	5					
2.8	Is the proposed assignment action plan pragmatic enough to enable finalizing of this task in a timely manner?	5					
2.9	Is the presentation clear and is the sequence of activities and the planning logical, realistic and promise efficient implementation to the project?	5					
Total Part 2		40					

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 3		Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
			A	B	C	D	E
3.1	Evaluation Lead and Democracy and Governance Expert	10					

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 3		Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
			A	B	C	D	E
	Master's degree in a relevant field: such as law, political science, government, economics, public administration, public policy, or other related social science.	2					
	At least 7 years' experience in coordinating monitoring, evaluation assignments, developing monitoring and evaluation systems, or research.	2					
	An in-depth knowledge of results-based management, national planning and results accountability systems, monitoring and evaluation, knowledge management or related fields.	2					
	5 Years' experience working with the United Nations, national or county government institutions, international non-governmental organizations, bilateral or multilateral development partners.	2					
	Professional expertise in areas of Rule of Law, Human Rights, Access to justice, Democracy and Governance.	2					
	Total for Team Leader	10					
3.2	Cross-cutting issues expert						
	Master's degree in Gender and Development, Environment, International Development, Public Policy.	2					
	7 years' experience in International Development.	2					
	Demonstrated expertise in analysing and programming in relation to cross-cutting issues in Kenya, particularly concerning Gender, the Environment, Governance and Human Rights	2					
	Experience with programming, including at policy/strategy levels, and Project Cycle Management (essential);	2					
	Experience working with United Nations, Bilateral and Multi-lateral partners	2					
	Total for Cross-cutting issues expert	10					
3.3	Qualifications of M&E Expert						
	Master's degree in Project Planning Design and Management, Monitoring and evaluation, Strategic Management, Results-Based Management, Statistics, or related disciplines.	2					

Technical Proposal Evaluation Form 3		Points Obtainable	Company / Other Entity				
			A	B	C	D	E
	Proven knowledge and experience (7 years) in implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems and methodologies in the field of international development, including quantitative, qualitative and mixed-methods.	2					
	At least seven (7) years of providing evaluation services and executing M&E activities—which includes conducting evaluations for UN	2					
	Experience in developing monitoring tools, including baseline data collection, questionnaire formation, data analysis and interpretations.	2					
	Prior experience in working with UN counterparts.	2					
	Total for M&E Expert	10					
	Total Part 3	30					