



CONSOLIDATING GAINS AND DEEPENING DEVOLUTION IN KENYA

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Joint Devolution Programme (JDP) Mid-Term Evaluation

PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Programme Unit | Kenya |
| Project | Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya Programme |
| Required | Three (3) |
| Type of Contract | Individual Contract (IC) – National |
| Duration | 45 days |
| Duty Station | Nairobi with travel to Counties |
| Starting Date | 1 st January 2022 |

1. Background and Context

1.1. Introduction

Kenya's devolved system of governance, which was instituted with the creation of 47 counties in 2013, offers great promise towards addressing issues related to marginalization, equity, accountability, environment and climate change. The first five years of devolution (2013-17) provided for the rapid and effective establishment of the county governments. This was followed by the second phase (2018 – 22) which focuses on the installation of capacity at national and county levels to address these social, accountability, and environmental issues.

Human development since the advent of devolution has significantly improved. The improvement has been uneven across counties, with the vastly arid and semi-arid northern frontier counties lagging. Poverty rates remain above 80% in these remote, arid and sparsely populated counties where poverty levels adversely affect women, children, marginalized communities and other vulnerable groups. In order to address the urgent human development challenges of the most marginalized, UNDP, UN Women and UNICEF incepted the Consolidating Gains and Deepening Devolution in Kenya Programme (Joint UNDP-UN Women-UNICEF Devolution Programme) to target 14 of the most marginalized counties directly. The programme has supported the 14 counties to develop and implement policies, plans and strategies that address equity, accountability and environmental issues while at the same time streamlining revenue collection and budgeting processes.

The programme is implemented by National and County Government partners, with one component being implemented by non-state actors, through a national implementation modality (NIM). Some of the partners include the Ministry of Devolution and ASALs (MoDA), State Department for Gender Affairs, Council of Governors (CoG), Kenya School of Government (KSG), the County Assemblies Forum (CAF), Commission on Revenue Allocation, Office of the Auditor General, Office of the Controller of Budget, Kenya Institute of Policy Analysis and Research (KIPPRA) and Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS).

The programme is founded on the realization that devolution and marginalization are complex issues that are best addressed through a joint programme combining the strengths of multiple UN agencies, national government stakeholders and county government institutions with expertise in key sectors and lead roles in the achievement of Sustainable Development Goals. The Joint programming was also a recommendation for both the mid-term evaluation of the Strengthening Devolved Governance in Kenya project and the terminal evaluation of the Integrated Support to Devolution Project.

1.2. Devolution Programme Outcomes and Outputs

1.2.1. Programme Outcome

UNDAF Outcome 1.2: By 2022 people in Kenya access high-quality services at the devolved level that are well-coordinated, integrated, transparent, equitably resourced and accountable.

1.2.2. Programme Outputs

Output 1.1: Government has strengthened policy, legal and institutional mechanisms for coordinated, inclusive and effective service delivery:

- National and county governments have strengthened inter and intra-governmental structures.
- Governments have harmonized governance policy, legal and institutional frameworks to support devolution.
- Improved county capacities for effective implementation of child protection services and GBV.

Output 1.2: Public finance management institutions have strengthened processes and systems for equitable, efficient and accountable service delivery:

- County capacities strengthened for equitable and inclusive budgeting.
- County capacities improved for revenue projection, generation, collection and reporting.

Output 1.3: County level institutions have strengthened capacity for evidence-based planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for accountable service delivery:

- Counties have strengthened planning and service delivery mechanisms.
- National and County governments have strengthened monitoring, evaluation, reporting systems.
- National and County systems improved for the generation of disaggregated data (GBV, FGM, VAC, child marriages and marginalized populations including PWDs at county level, including a joint baseline study) for evidence-based decision making at both levels of government.

Output 1.4: People in Kenya have capacity to engage, deepen accountability and transparency in devolution, especially women, youth and persons with disability:

- County governments have established public participation policy, legislation and frameworks.

- County governments have established and operationalized inclusive citizen engagement and accountability mechanisms.
- Increased capacity of NSAs to engage county governments on planning, budgeting and service delivery.

2. Mid-term Evaluation Purpose, Scope and Objectives

2.1. Purpose

In line with UNDP Evaluation Guidelines and UN Evaluation Policy, an independent mid-term evaluation (MTE) will be undertaken midway through the programme's implementation period. In this regard, the GoK and UNDP are planning to conduct an MTE of the project in 2022. The MTE will provide an overall assessment of progress and achievements made against planned results, as well as assess and document challenges and lessons learnt since the commencement of the programme. The MTE findings, recommendations and lessons learned will guide the implementation of the remaining phase of the programme including recommendations for corrective and/or mitigation measures necessary for enhanced project delivery. The information generated from this MTE will also contribute to organizational learning as well as the global knowledge base on development effectiveness, social inclusion, gender equality and women empowerment in the implementation of Kenya's devolved system of government.

The review will analyse significant developments that have affected the implementation of the programme, including Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19), green economy and climate change, Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the transformational focus of leaving no one behind. The review will make recommendations for making the Joint Devolution Programme nimbler and more responsive to these developments.

2.2. Scope of the MTE

The MTE is a joint GoK, UNDP, UN Women and UNICEF review that will be conducted in close collaboration with development partners, implementing partner and responsible parties both at the national and county level. The MTE will be guided by the revised UNDP Evaluation Policy, UNDP Evaluation Guidelines, United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Standards and Guidelines for Evaluations, UN Evaluation Policy and UNDP Programming and Operational Policies and Procedures (POPP). The MTE will assess the programme against the seven (7) UNDP Project Quality Criteria, which are closely related to the UNEG evaluation criteria. The UNDP Project Quality Criteria include i) strategic ii) relevant iii) social and environmental standards (SES), iv) management and monitoring v) efficient vi) effective and vii) sustainability and national ownership. These will be assessed through the lens of programme impact, to establish the extent to which the intended results were achieved. It will also examine how project management and partnerships have facilitated project delivery. The MTE will cover the project period from January 2019 to December 2021 and will cover the national partners and the 14 county governments supported under the programme.

2.3 Objectives of the MTE

2.3.1. Programme design:

- Review the problem addressed by the programme and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review whether the lessons from other relevant projects were properly incorporated into the programme design.
- Review the relevance of the programme implementation strategy and assess whether it is the most effective towards expected/intended results.
- Review whether the perspectives of key project stakeholders were considered during programme design processes.
- Assess efficiency in the utilization of programme resources including cost-effectiveness, value for money while balancing with social dimensions including gender equity, environmental sustainability, social inclusion and human rights.
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were identified and addressed during programme design and implementation.
- Assess effectiveness and advantage of the use of the joint programme modality in realizing programme goals and strategic objectives of participating UN organizations.
- Assess contribution made by the programme towards the realization of development priorities outlined in the County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs) of targeted counties.
- Document lessons learnt challenges and future opportunities, and provide recommendations for improvements or adjustments in strategy, design and/or implementation arrangements.

2.3.2. Results Framework:

- Assess achievements and progress made against planned results, intended and unintended, positive and negative.
- Assess how the emerging issues such as SDGs, climate change, COVID-19 etc. impacted outcomes and make recommendations for improving programme response to these issues.
- Review effectiveness of the programme results framework specifically the indicators, baselines and targets assessing how realistic/relevant and measurable they are and make recommendations for improvement or suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Assess effectiveness towards the attainment of results and reflect on how PUNOs, national government stakeholders and county government partners have contributed to the results through the implementation of AWP activities.
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future, catalyse beneficial development effects in the targeted counties (i.e., improved governance, quality service delivery that is integrated and equitably resourced etc.).
- Assess the extent to which broader development, gender, youth and other marginalization aspects of the programme are being monitored effectively.

3. Mid-Term Evaluation Criteria and Review Questions

The following UNDP project quality criteria will be guiding the MTE: strategy, relevance, social and environmental sustainability, management and monitoring, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and national ownership. In addition, the MTE will explore the extent to which five UN programming principles of Human Rights-Based Approach to planning (HRBA), gender equality, environmental sustainability; capacity development and results-based management have been mainstreamed throughout the implementation period.

3.1. Strategic:

- Assess the extent to which JDP programming priorities and results contribute to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs); are aligned to United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), UNDP Strategic Plan, UNDP Kenya CPD, UN Women Strategic Note and UNICEF Kenya Strategic Plan; and are aligned with the UNDAF and the country programme document.
- Assess to what extent is the project pro-actively taking advantage of new opportunities, adapting its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities.

3.2. Relevance:

- Alignment of the programme objectives and results to the country context including the national and sub-national development priorities (Vision 2030, Medium Term Plan III (MTP III) and County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs), among others).
- If programming strategies consider interlinkages between development challenges and results.
- Whether an inclusion analysis is integrated to fully consider the different needs, roles and access to/control over resources of women, children, youth and other special interest groups and if appropriate measures are taken to address these when relevant.
- If the programme regularly captures and reviews knowledge and lessons learned to inform redesign, adapt, change or scale-up plans and actions.
- The extent to which the programme has responded to changes in the needs and priorities of the IPs and RPs.

3.2. Effectiveness: The extent to which programme results are being achieved.

- To what extent has the programme contributed to improving the quality of governance and socio-economic development in Kenya?
- What is the degree of achievement of the planned immediate and intermediate results of the programme?
- To what extent is the programme outcome being achieved to date? What is the likelihood of achievement by the planned programme closure date?
- To what extent have the annual work plans (2019, 2020, 2021) contributed to the effective implementation of the programme?
- To what extent have partnerships and strategic alliances with national partners, county governments, development partners and other external support agencies contributed to the achievement of programme outcomes?

- What are some of the emerging successful programming/business models or cases especially from county programming and how would they be scaled up during the remaining programme period?
- Are there any unintended programme results either positive or negative?
- To what extent is the programme theory of change being realized?
- To what extent have the Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs) exploited their field presence and relationship with the county and national governments to improve county governance capacity?
- Proportion of budgets which represent interest of various demographics, proportion of county budget allocated to public participation.
- Public satisfaction with county service delivery and their involvement in key county processes including planning, budgeting, implementation and reporting.

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

- Have adequate financial resources been mobilised for the programme? How can the programme unlock some of the bottlenecks to adequate resource mobilization?
- To what extent have UNDP and GoK administrative procedures been harmonized? Are there any apparent cost-minimizing strategies that should be encouraged, that would not compromise the social dimension of gender, youth, children, PwDs and other special interest groups?
- Are the implementation mechanisms – KRAs, technical working groups (DDWG, DSWG, TWGs, SC), PSC, PST, M&E system, and communications effective in managing the project?
- How efficiently have resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) been converted to results?
- To what extent and in what ways have the comparative advantages of the participating UN organizations been utilized in the national context (including universality, neutrality, voluntary and grant-nature of contributions, multilateralism, and the mandate of UNDP)?

3.5. Sustainability and National Ownership: The extent to which these implementation mechanisms can be sustained over time

- Did the programme incorporate adequate exit strategies, technology (knowledge) transfer and capacity development measures to ensure the sustainability of results over time?
- Are conditions and mechanisms in place so that the benefits of the programme interventions are sustained and owned by IPs at the national and county levels after the programme has ended?
- Have strong partnerships been built with key stakeholders? To what extent can these partnerships be sustained after the closure of the programme?
- Are institutional capacity development and strengthening of national systems being built able to sustain results?

3.6. Management and Monitoring: The quality of the formulation of results at different levels, i.e., the results chain:

- To what extent are the indicators and targets relevant, realistic and measurable?
- Are there baselines against which to access progress?

- Are there project indicators aligned to SDGs? If not, what changes need to be made?
- 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?
- To what extent and in what ways are the concepts of cross-cutting issues, especially gender been reflected in programming? Was there an effort to produce sex-disaggregated data and indicators to assess progress in gender equity and equality? To what extent and how is special attention given to women empowerment? What needs to be done to further integrate these dimensions?

3.7. Social and Environmental Standards

- Are social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender and environment) being successfully managed and monitored in accordance with the project document and relevant action plans?
- Are unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances that may arise during implementation assessed and adequately managed, with relevant management plans updated?

3.8. Impact: To the extent possible, assess the impact of the project on devolution especially on the understanding of the citizenry and their participation in the devolution process

- Are there any major changes in the indicators and/or the context of devolved governance that can reasonably be attributed to or associated with the programme?
- What lasting high-level results (impacts) has the programme contributed to?
- To what extent has the programme led to the strengthening of devolved institutions in regard to empowerment, management, effectiveness, accountability, transparency and efficiency in service delivery?

4. Methodology

The MTE will be commissioned by the Government of Kenya through the MoD and UNDP in partnership with UN Women and UNICEF. The review will utilize both qualitative and quantitative methods and instruments to ensure that findings are derived from a collective contribution from the target counties and the national institutions. The evaluation team will provide a detailed approach and methodology to achieve the purpose of the evaluation, time, data required and budgetary allocation.

Based on UNEG guidelines for evaluations, and in consultation with the Evaluation Technical Committee (referred in para 8), the evaluation team will develop a suitable inclusive and participatory methodology for this review. The assignment will entail:

- a) A review of relevant literature including project and quality assurance reports; theory of change and the results framework; annual work plans; and project steering committee (project board) meetings deliberations.
- b) Briefing and debriefing sessions with IPs, UNDP, RCO and donor representatives.

- c) Data collection using different methods such as key informants, questionnaires, interviews, focus group discussions, town halls with IPs including counties, UNDP, representatives of various donors involved in the programme, citizens and other relevant respondents to enrich the programme review with quantitative information; qualitative data will sharpen and support the quantitative data. The consultants will use triangulation as a central method, drawing information from multiple sources.
- d) Facilitation of stakeholder review and validation sessions.
- e) Development and finalization of the evaluation report.

5. MTE Deliverables

The deliverables for this review will include the following documents:

- 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 is 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 (e.g., Focus Group Discussions, Key Informant Interviews, etc.); and detailed work plan of the assignment.
- Draft MTE report which will be presented to stakeholders in half-day workshop.
- Final MTE report incorporating stakeholder inputs. The report format will include but not limited to: Executive summary, introduction, the development context, findings and conclusions, lessons learnt, and recommendations
- A PowerPoint presentation on main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation for dissemination and debriefing purposes.
- An electronic version of data collected, and data sets analysed.

6. Team Composition and Required Competencies

The evaluation team will consist of a Team Leader and two evaluation experts (all 3 national consultants) with experience in evaluating governance programmes and governance, gender, social inclusion issues. Under the supervision of the Devolution Project Manager, the team will conduct a participatory MTE.

6.1 Roles and responsibilities of the Consultancy Team

The evaluation team will undertake the following roles and responsibilities:

- Organizing the work and preparing an evaluation plan for the team;
- Conducting briefing and debriefing; and facilitating productive working relationships with UNDP, PUNOs, IPs and RPs;
- Consulting with MTE Technical Committee and related partners to ensure the progress and the key evaluation questions are covered
- Assuring the draft and final reports are prepared in accordance with the Terms of Reference;
- Facilitating the meeting to present the main findings and recommendations of MTE and discussion of the proposed action plan for implementing the recommendations.

6.2. Responsibilities and Qualification requirement of the Team Leader:

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:

- Lead in contacting Evaluation Technical Committee regarding MTE-related issues and ensure that the MTE process is as participatory as possible.
- Organize evaluation team meetings, assigning specific roles and tasks to the team members and closely monitoring their work.
- Supervise data collection and synthesis.
- Consolidate draft and final MTE reports, and a proposed action plan with the support provided by team members.
- Finalize the final MTE report, which incorporates comments of the Evaluation Technical Committee and key stakeholders.
- Submit timely draft and final MTE report and a proposed action plan to Evaluation Technical Committee.
- Present MTE results and facilitating the meeting specific tasks of the team members

Team Leader will have good credentials and qualifications in the following areas:

- Possess a minimum of a master's degree in social sciences, development studies, M&E, strategic management, international development or other relevant disciplines. A PhD will be an added advantage.
- Have a minimum of 12 years of increasingly responsible professional experience in project/programme evaluation, and of which seven years in governance, development and/or social sciences evaluation.
- A certification in portfolio, programme or project management or M&E will be an asset.
- In-depth knowledge of governance issues and challenges, as well as GoK policies, substantive knowledge of devolved governance programmatic areas in Kenya as well as experience conducting an evaluation of governance projects.
- Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies, and/or 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 is 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 timeframe.
- Sound leadership and organizational skills with demonstrated 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.
- Previous experience in working with devolved governance structures is an asset.

6.3. Evaluation Criteria for Team Leader

| Criterion | Weight 100% | Max. Points 100 points |
|--|----------------|---------------------------|
| A master's degree in social sciences, development studies, M&E, project management, strategic management, international development or other relevant disciplines. | 15% | 15 |
| A PhD will be an added advantage. | 5% | 5 |
| Have a minimum of 12 years of increasingly responsible professional experience in project/programme evaluation, and of which seven years in governance, development and/or social sciences evaluation. | 15% | 15 |
| A certification in portfolio, programme, project management or M&E | 5% | 5 |
| In-depth knowledge of governance issues and challenges, as well as GoK policies, substantive knowledge of devolved governance programmatic areas in Kenya as well as experience conducting an evaluation of governance projects. | 10% | 10 |
| Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies, and/or proven expertise of research in social science relevant for the evaluation. | 10% | 10 |
| Have strong research and analytical skills, communication (oral and written), facilitation and management skills with specific experience in undertaking evaluations | 10% | 10 |
| Sound leadership and organizational skills - demonstrating experience of having managed and lead an evaluation team | 5% | 5 |
| Experience in the application and implementation of gender-sensitive programmes as well as human rights-based approaches and a thorough understanding of RBM for programme development | 5% | 5 |
| A comprehensive practical technical approach for undertaking the assignment | 20% | 20 |
| Total (Maximum obtainable points) | 100% | 100 |

6.4. Qualifications of the two Evaluation Specialists

- Advanced degree in Project Management, Strategic Management, Law, public policy, monitoring and evaluation or other relevant disciplines.
- At least 7 years of professional experience in devolved governance, gender, human rights or results-based evaluations.
- At least five years' experience in conducting programmatic evaluations of complex projects in the development sector in developing countries.
- Experience in conducting evaluations for governance and gender and social inclusion programmes/projects.
- Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies, and/or proven expertise of research in fields relevant to the evaluation.

- Demonstrable knowledge of and ability to apply theoretical knowledge in the design, management and evaluation of complex multidisciplinary projects supported by multiple development partners.
- Have a strong understanding of the devolved governance context in Kenya.
- Exposure to the UN system will be an asset.

6.5. Evaluation Criteria for Team Members

| Criterion | Weight 100% | Max. Points 100 |
|--|----------------|--------------------|
| Advanced degree in Project Management, Strategic Management, public policy, monitoring and evaluation, gender or other relevant disciplines | 20% | 20 |
| At least 7 years of professional experience in devolved governance, gender, human rights or results-based evaluations, with a demonstrable bias to gender and social inclusion | 20% | 20 |
| At least five years' experience in conducting programmatic evaluations of complex projects in the development sector in developing countries | 20% | 20 |
| Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies, and/or proven expertise of research in fields relevant to the evaluation | 15% | 15 |
| Demonstrable knowledge of and ability to apply theoretical knowledge in the design, management and evaluation of complex multidisciplinary projects supported by multiple development partners | 10% | 10 |
| Have a strong understanding of the devolved governance context in Kenya | 10% | 10 |
| Exposure to the UN system will be an asset | 5% | 5 |

7. Mid-Term 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.

The Evaluation Team will collectively and individually observe the following:

- i. To avoid conflict of interest and undue pressure, evaluators need to be independent, implying that the Evaluators 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.
- ii. 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.

- iii. Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body.
- iv. 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.
- v. They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair writing and/or oral presentation of study limitations, evidence-based findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned. For details on the ethics and independence in evaluation, please see Evaluation Policy of UNDP (<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.shtml>); UNEG Ethical Guidelines and Norms for Evaluation in the UN System (http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102http://www.unevaluation.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21).

8. Implementation Arrangements

The evaluators will report to the Joint Devolution Programme M&E Officer. An Evaluation Reference Group will be created and co-chaired between MoDA and UNDP. The Evaluation Technical Committee will provide overall oversight of the MTE and endorsement of the key deliverables (inception report, key tools and methodology and, draft and final report). The Evaluation Reference Group shall meet, at the beginning of the review and during the reporting stage for the report presentation. Other consultation with the Evaluation Technical Committee will be done electronically as required. The Evaluation Technical Committee shall be composed of UNDP Kenya, UN Women, UNICEF, MoDA, COG, CRA, OAG and will also consult with the programme development donors.

9. Consultancy Fees

The Evaluators will be recruited and paid in accordance with UNDP terms and conditions of remuneration for individual consultants. The payments will be pegged on the attainment of deliverables/milestones as per the agreed Work Schedule.

UNDP will cover prior agreed costs related to the MTE services which the consultant will quote inclusive of travel to the 14 JDP counties, logistical and other related expenses. UNDP will directly cover the costs of conferences incidental to this evaluation. The Evaluators fees will be paid in line with the following schedule and upon acceptance of key deliverables:

- Final Inception Report: 20%
- Draft MTE Report: 50%

- Final MTE Report: 30%.

10. Annexes

The following minimum documents will be used to support the Evaluation Team in obtaining detailed background information:

- i. UNDAF 2018-22
- ii. UNDP Kenya CPD 2018-22
- iii. Joint Devolution Programme Document
- iv. Programme Theory of Change
- v. Programme Results and Resources Framework
- vi. Signed Project Document (2018-2022)
- vii. Programme Targeting Matrix
- viii. Programme Results Measurement Framework

11. Submission of the Financial Proposal

Applicants are instructed to submit their all-inclusive fee proposal in Kenya Shillings using the financial proposal template provided (Offeror's letter to UNDP). The financial proposal should be all-inclusive and include a breakdown. The term 'all-inclusive' implies that all costs (professional fees, travel-related expenses, communications, utilities, consumables, insurance, etc.) that could possibly be incurred by the Contractor will be factored into the financial proposal.

Financial evaluation (maximum 30 points):

The following formula will be used to evaluate the financial proposal:

$p = y (\mu/z)$, where

p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated
 y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal
 μ = price of the lowest-priced proposal
 z = price of the proposal being evaluated

12. Duration of the Work

45 working days within a period of 3 months.

13. Application process

- Interested and qualified candidates should submit their applications which should include the following:
 1. Detailed Curriculum Vitae
 2. Proposal for implementing the assignment – template provided
 3. Offerors letter to UNDP – template provided
- Note: The successful applicant will be required to complete a UNDP Personal History Form (P11) form prior to contracting.
- Firms are not eligible for this consultancy assignment. Open to national individual consultants only.
- Incomplete applications will be disqualified automatically.
- All applications must be submitted through the UNDP eTendering portal.

- If already registered, please go to <https://etendering.partneragencies.org> and sign in using your username and password, and search for the event:
Business Unit: UNDP1
Event ID:
- If you do not remember your password, please use the “Forgotten password” link. Do not create a new profile.
- If you have never registered in the system before, please complete a one-time registration process first by visiting <https://etendering.partneragencies.org> and using the below generic credentials:
Username: event.guest
Password: why2change
- Detailed user guide on how to register in the system and submit the proposal can be found at: <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/procurement/business/procurement-notices/resources/>
- Email submission of applications will not be accepted. Queries about the position can be directed to undp.kenya.procurement@undp.org