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1.0: Background Information and Brief National Context of CPAP Outcome 44

1.1: Background
Experiences learnt from past development interventions clearly indicate that inclusive growth is essential for reducing poverty, improving equality, producing jobs and hence it contributes immensely in the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The globalization process, when properly managed, becomes an important ingredient for inclusive growth. It is in this context that the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) works to make real improvements in people’s lives, opening up their choices and opportunities. UNDP is working to reduce poverty and accelerate progress towards the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by supporting pro-poor economic growth and inclusive market development in Kenya. UNDP Kenya's strategy and related projects on poverty reduction seek to provide
low-income people with the tools and resources to lift themselves out of poverty through private sector initiatives.

As part of its efforts in enhancing Results Based Management (RBM), UNDP has shifted from traditional activity-based project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) to results-oriented M&E. An outcome evaluation assesses how and why an outcome is or is not being achieved in a given country context, within a time frame and the role UNDP and other partners have played in this regard. Outcome evaluations also help to clarify underlying factors affecting the situation, highlight unintended consequences (positive and negative), generate lessons learned and recommend actions to improve performance in future programming.

1.2: Brief National Context of CPAP Outcome 44 (2009-2013)

Though poverty reduction remains a major challenge especially in developing countries, the situation in Kenya was acerbated by the 2008 post election violence and adverse weather amongst other factors which have constrained the achievement of the then projected 10% growth by 2012 and weakened real GDP to about 2% from 7%. In order to contribute to the reversal of this trend, UNDPs programmatic interventions are anchored on outcome 44 of Kenya’s Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2009-2013, “Policies and programmes for private sector development and employment creation developed and implemented by 2013”. This outcome is aligned to UNDP’s strategic UNDAF outcome 3.1: Equitable livelihood opportunities and food security with a focus on vulnerable groups are enhanced and sustained.

This CPAP outcome focuses on three intervention areas:

- (a) Promoting private sector development and employment creation
- (b) Facilitating trade and investment
- (c) Promoting inclusive and effective public private partnerships

2.0: Programme Overview and Outcome Evaluations

2.1: Programme Overview

The current UNDAF for Kenya covers the period 2009-2013, and it focuses on the UN System’s response to national priorities and needs in a collective, integrated and coherent manner. The UNDAF outcomes are formally accepted as the strategic contributions of the UN to the Vision 2030 national priorities. The UNDAF (2009-2013) is substantively linked with the Country Programme Document of UNDP, ensuring that all UNDP’s programmes are consistent with UNDAF outcomes. The CPAP 2009-2013 is developed so as to operationalise the Country Programmes and to establish the commitments, particularly of resources, of the UN agencies and the government.

2.2: Outcome evaluations

In the recent past, UNDP has shifted from the traditional approach of assessing project results against project objectives to outcome evaluations. For the preferred outcome evaluations, the outcome is the reference point and the evaluation process reflects backwards while assessing the variables considered for purposes of the evaluation. In this context, UNDP would like to take stock of its work, contribution and influence in support to initiatives in relation to enhancing private sector development and employment creation.

2.3: Intended Outcome 44

Policies and programmes for private sector development and employment creation developed and implemented by 2013.
2.4: Baseline (2009)

- Uncoordinated interventions supporting business recovery in post election areas
- There is no mechanism for coordination of micro, small, and medium enterprises (MSMEs) in the country
- Few programmes/projects targeting delivery of micro-finance, micro-insurances, business development services (BDS), energy services and new technologies to vulnerable groups in place
- Uncoordinated support of development partners to the implementation plan for Kenya’s Private Sector Development Strategy (PSDS) 2006-12
- Weak linkages between real industry needs and training supply; missing gender responsiveness in skills and knowledge development
- Low and uncoordinated input by the private sector to policy formulation and its effective monitoring and evaluation
- Non-existent Public-Private-Partnership (PPP) framework for policy analysis
- Low number of pro-poor programmes implemented by private companies as part of their core business

2.5: Indicators

- Action plan for livelihood intervention
- Framework for coordination of MSMEs support
- No. of projects and interventions supported to respond to the needs of vulnerable groups
- Operational Donor Coordination Unit
- No. of Youth Polytechnics (YPs) linked to Technical Industrial and Vocational Training Institutions (TIVET) system and No. of Quality Assurance Officers trained
- No. of districts covered under entrepreneurship training programmes
- No. of gender responsive entrepreneurship development trainers
- Needs assessment reports
- No. of interventions to address capacity gaps and Existing M&E frameworks
- PPP policy analysis framework in place
- Communication framework for PPP in place
- No. of pro-poor projects implemented by the private sector as their core business

2.6: Target

- An action plan for livelihood restoration in selected areas in Rift Valley Province developed and implemented (2009)
- 2,600 smallholder farmers supported with mechanized land opening per year (by 2013);
- A framework for MSME support coordination established (2009)
- Institutionalization of the framework initiated in four districts (2010-2011); National Council for Small Enterprises (NCSE) established (2013)
- Four (4) projects supported to develop interventions responsive to the needs of the vulnerable groups per year with at least one (1) project dedicated to addressing skills and knowledge needs of women entrepreneurs (2009)
- 75 Enterprise development agents developed on average per year for BDS outreach
- Three DSBCs established as delivery mechanisms for development assistance to the vulnerable groups per year
- Framework for coordination of donor resources (DCU) in place (2009)
- Mechanism for business advocacy fund / catalyst fund in place (2010)
- Curriculum support materials developed and piloted in 35 YPs (2009)
- 35 YPs fully linked to the TIVET system per year (2010-2013)
• 50 Quality Standards and Assurance officers trained per year to support follow-up and monitoring of implementation of Technical, Industrial, Vocational and Entrepreneurship Training (TIVET) and other youth programmes
• Entrepreneurship training expanded to three new districts per year
• 10 Entrepreneurship trainers developed to provide gender responsive skills and knowledge to women entrepreneurs (2010)
• KEPSA as a Private Sector Umbrella body strengthened in policy formulation (2009)
• Effective M & E system to track relevant policy implementation in place (2010)
• Four other state and/or non-state actors strengthened in M & E (2011 to 2013)
• Public Private Partnership policy-analysis framework developed (2010)
• Structured communication framework on PPP between KEPSA and NESC developed (2013)
• At least 10 pro poor programmes implemented by private sector companies per year as part of their core business

3.0: Purpose and Scope of the Evaluation

3.1: Purpose of the Evaluation
The main purpose of the external evaluation will be to assess the following:

(a) **Outcome analysis**
Evaluate the progress that has been made towards the achievement of the outcome (including contributing factors and constraints);

(b) **Relevance of programmes/projects**
Examine and determine the relevance of the CPAP outcomes, outputs, targets and indicators in contributing the UNDAF outcome 3.1; and consequently also examine the relevance of the programmes/projects;

(c) **Output analysis**
Determine contributing factors and impediments and extent of the UNDP contribution to the achievement of the outcomes through related project outputs (including an analysis of both project activities and soft-assistance activities);

(d) **Output-outcome link**
Assess the contribution UNDP has made /is making to the progress towards the achievement of the outcome;

(e) **Assess UNDP partnership strategy**
Assess the partnership strategy in relation to outcome. Does the partnership strategy support the achievement of the outcome?

3.2: Scope of the Evaluation
This evaluation will focus on assessing how UNDP’s interventions have contributed to the achievement of the outcome on “policies and programmes for private sector development and employment creation developed and implemented by 2013”. It will also assess the relevance of the interventions in contributing

---

1 For UNDP, soft assistance activities include advocacy, policy advice/dialogue, and facilitation/brokerage of information and partnerships.
to attainment of the outcome. Further, this evaluation will assess the relevance of this outcome and how it contributes to the achievement of the UNDAF outcome 3.1: “Equitable livelihood opportunities and food security with a focus on vulnerable groups enhanced and sustained”.

- Evaluate the impact of UNDP interventions;
- Assess the appropriateness and relevance of the UNDP strategies in addressing the identified problems and hence contributing to the achievement of the outcome;
- Assess if the outcome has been achieved or will be achieved given the activities supported by UNDP;
- Provide appraisal on the validity/relevance of the outcome for UNDP supported interventions, and the extent to which the set results have or can be achieved; determine the quality of programme design (strengths, gaps and weaknesses) and provide recommendations as to their improvement;
- Identify lessons learnt from previous and ongoing interventions;
- Review and assess the programme’s partnership with the government bodies, private sector and other organizations in Programme implementation and comment on its sustainability;
- Review and assess the efficiency of implementation and management arrangements of the programme;
- Review links/joint activities with other UNDP programmes and UN Agencies and how these have contributed to the achievement of the outcome;
- Where appropriate provide recommendation on how best to implement the CPAP outcome and the its planned interventions;
- Identify best practices that can be scaled or replicated;
- Highlight any unintended consequences (negative/positive).

3.2.1: Outcome Analysis

- Examine relevance of the intended outcome in the context of the development and poverty reduction issues in Kenya;
- Determine if there has been progress made towards the achievement of the outcome, and also identify the challenges to attainment of the outcome;
- Examine contribution, effectiveness and relevance of on-going UNDP projects as listed above in achieving the intended outcome;
- Identify factors that contributed to or adversely affected the achievement of the outcome;
- Examine how UNDP’s advocacy, partnerships and donor-coordination contribute towards the achievement of intended outcomes;
- Analyze the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influence the outcome;
- Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management issues, including the timeliness of outputs, the degree of stakeholders and partners’ involvement and how the process is well managed or carried out;
- Ascertain the prospects of sustainability of UNDP interventions related to the outcome, i.e. can it be assured that the benefits would be maintained even after the withdrawal of UNDP
- Ascertain prospects of scalability and replicability of UNDP interventions;
- Assess whether the approach used is the most cost effective, compared with alternative approaches to accomplishing the same objectives.

3.2.2: Output Analysis

- Determine whether or not the UNDP outputs are still relevant to the outcome;
- Examine whether or not sufficient progress has been made in the attainment of UNDP outputs and how they contribute to the attainment of the outcome;
• Identify the factors (positive and negative) that affect the accomplishment of the outputs;
• Assess whether and how poverty reduction issues have been addressed and promoted in UNDP’s activities; i.e. whether UNDP activities have improved stakeholders involvement in this area and other related concerns in Kenya;
• Assess UNDP’s ability to engage in private sector dialogue at national level with key partners including key line ministries, donors, NGOs, private sector and civil society;
• Assess whether there are areas where UNDP could contribute to that would improve achievement of outcomes and impacts;
• Analyze how relevant opportunities have been integrated in all practice areas such as governance, environment, gender, capacity development) within UNDP as well as within the UN system;
• Analyze outputs achieved in relation to the involvement of targeted beneficiaries, especially marginalized communities and assess gender mainstreaming in UNDP interventions.

3.2.3: Output-Outcome Link (Causality Linkages)
• Determine causality linkages between UNDP’s outputs or other interventions to the achievement of the outcome (including the key outputs, projects and soft and hard assistance that contributed to the outcome);
• Identify key contributions that UNDP has made/is making to the outcome;
• Determine causality linkages between UNDP soft-assistance activities and the achievement of the Outcome;
• Determine if UNDP contributed to sustainable national capacity development;
• Analyze the prospect of the sustainability of benefits beyond UNDP interventions (what would be a good exit strategy for UNDP).

3.2.4: Partnerships Analysis
• Examine the partnership among UN agencies and other donor organizations in the relevant field: What partnerships have been formed? What has been the role of UNDP? What has been the level of stakeholders’ participation? How have these impacted the achievement of the outcome?
• Determine whether or not there is consensus among UNDP actors, partners and stakeholders on the partnership strategy to achieve the outcome:
• Determine whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective; UNDP’s capacity with regard to management of partnerships; UNDP’s ability to bring together various partners across sectoral lines to address governance concerns in a holistic manner:
• Analyze how partnerships have been formed and how they performed:
• Examine how the partnership affected the achievement of or progress towards the Outcome.

3.2.5: Recommendations

Based on the evaluation, the incumbent will provide recommendations addressing the following:
• How should UNDP 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 CPAP period?
• What corrective actions are recommended for the new, ongoing or future UNDP work in the CPAP outcome?
• Provide preliminary recommendations on how the Programme can most effectively continue to support the Government in effectively responding to governance and service delivery capacity of the state institutions?
4.0: Evaluation Methods and Team Composition

4.1: Evaluation Methods
An overall guidance on outcome evaluation methodology can be found in the *UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results* and the *UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators*. The evaluators are expected to come up with a suitable methodology for this outcome evaluation based on the guidance given in these two documents. It is suggested that the evaluators make the evaluation process participatory through consultations with key stakeholders in order to utilize existing information, examine local sources of knowledge and enhance awareness about and mainstreaming results-based management.

During the outcome evaluation, the evaluators are expected to apply the following approaches for data collection and analysis:

- Desk review of relevant documents (project documents with amendments made, review reports - midterm/final, donor-specific, etc);
- Discussions/interviews with the Senior Management and programme staff of UNDP Country Office;
- Briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP and the Implementation Partners, as well as with other donors and partners;
- Interviews with key informants (including gathering the information on what the partners have achieved with regard to the outcome and what strategies they have used) with partners, stakeholders and other donors;
- Field visits to selected project sites and discussions/interviews with project teams, project beneficiaries;
- Focus Group Discussions with project beneficiaries;
- Consultation meetings.

**Interviews:**
The consultants will liaise and gather information through meetings and interviews with key informants, with the various stakeholders, cooperating partners in the sector, NGOs and private sector representatives, as well as beneficiaries and local communities in the two demonstration sites).

**Field Visits:**
At least two field trips (or as may be approved by UNDP) will be undertaken to project sites to confirm and verify developments on the ground

**Presentation of the Findings:**
The initial conclusions and recommendations will be presented to the Deputy Country Director-Programmes and the Team Leader of the Poverty Reduction Unit.

4.2: Team Composition

4.2.1: Composition and Ethics
The Evaluation Team will consist of two independent national consultants. Consultant I will serve as the team leader and consultant II will provide professional support to Consultant I/Team leader. Under the overall supervision of UNDP Deputy Country Director, (Programme) the Evaluation Team will conduct a participatory outcome evaluation and undertake the task in accordance with the principles outlined in the *UNEG Ethical guidelines for Evaluation*.

4.2.2: Qualifications and Tasks
(a) Consultant I/Team Leader

Qualifications:
- Master’s degree or equivalent in business Administration, economics and or related field,
- Minimum 6 years professional expertise (post-Master’s degree) in programme evaluation, impact assessment and strategic recommendations for continued support/development of programming/strategies including strong reporting skills,
- Strong understanding of capacity development,
- Strong evaluation skills,
- Knowledge of poverty reduction strategies,
- Extensive knowledge of result-based management, monitoring and evaluation,
- Experience in applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios,
- Strong knowledge of UNDP, government institutions, private sector and other organizations on issues related to private sector development and trade,
- Good professional knowledge of the East Africa region,
- Extensive experience in working with the donors,
- Demonstrated analytical, communication and report writing skills,
- Fluency in speaking and writing English.

Tasks:
Consultant I will be the Team Leader and will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of all deliverables including the final evaluation report to UNDP. Specifically, the team leader will, besides undertaking the study, perform the following lead tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation mission,
- Design the detailed evaluation plan and methodology and evaluation survey instruments,
- Ensure efficient division of tasks between the team,
- Conduct the outcome evaluation in accordance with the proposed purpose and scope of the evaluation,
- Draft and communicate the evaluation report to UNDP.
(b) Consultant II:

Qualifications:
- Master’s Degree or equivalent in business, economics and or related field, minimum of 5 years relevant professional experience
- Experience in policy analysis, development work in the area of private sector development and trade amongst other related areas,
- Proven expertise in poverty reduction programmes, project/programme management,
- Proven experience and sound knowledge of the country’s institutional framework and poverty reduction policies,
- Hands-on experience and evidence of monitoring, reviewing and evaluating programmes and projects,
- Good English knowledge level,
- Good analytical and writing skills.

Tasks:
Consultant II will perform the following tasks
- Review documents,
- Participate in the design of the evaluation methodology,
- Conduct the outcome evaluation in accordance with the proposed objective and scope of the evaluation,
- In consultation with the Team Leader, draft related parts of the evaluation report,
- Assist the Team Leader in finalizing the draft evaluation report through incorporating suggestions received.

5.0: Planning and Implementation arrangements

5.1: Management Arrangements

These Terms of Reference follow the UNDP policies and procedures, and together with the final agenda will be agreed upon by the UNDP Regional office, UNDP Country Office and the Government. These parties will receive a draft of the final evaluation report and provide comments on it prior to its completion.

The UNDP country office will be responsible for liaising with the project team to set up the stakeholder interviews, arrange the field visits, co-ordinate with the Government the hiring of the consultants and ensure the timely processing of related administrative tasks.

The Consultants will use their own laptops. UNDP country office will not be responsible for providing office space and equipment to the consultants.

5.2: Time Frame and Schedule (tentative) for the Evaluation
The duration of this task shall be six weeks including writing of the report and shall commence in April 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desk review of documents</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td></td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>UNDP (provision of documents)C O/Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of Inception Report (includes evaluation design, methodology and</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>detailed work plan, and evaluation instruments)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial briefing</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>UNDP CO/Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations, meetings as well as for phone/in-person interviews related to</td>
<td>12 days</td>
<td>Nairobi &amp; Provinces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Programme including relevant partners</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and synthesis</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of draft evaluation report</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debriefing with UNDP</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written comments on the draft report by UNDP and stakeholders</td>
<td>5 days</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalization of evaluation report incorporating additions and comments</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provided by projects staff and UNDP CO</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP Kenya</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Nairobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total No of working days per Consultant</strong></td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total duration of assignment</strong></td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3: Key Deliverables

The incumbents will submit to UNDP the following key deliverables (in English language):

a) An Inception report (Includes methodology, evaluation plan, detailed design and evaluation instruments)
b) Initial briefing notes on major findings, conclusions and recommendations
c) A draft report
d) A final comprehensive evaluation/analytical report (Hard copy and a soft copy in MS Word and Acrobat reader) including at least the following contents:

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- The development context
- Description of the evaluation methodology
- Analysis of the situation with regard to outcome, outputs, resources, partnerships, management and working methods;
- Key findings
- Lessons learned
- Conclusions and recommendations for the future program implementation (see UNDP Guidelines for outcome evaluators for more detailed information.)
- Evaluation brief (3-5 pages)
- Annexes (TOR, field visits, people interviewed, documents reviewed, Questionnaires etc).
- All deliverables to be considered as accepted upon written confirmation from UNDP, and as per UNDP’s quality requirements.
6.0: Reporting, Duration of Assignment, Fees and Terms of Payment

The consultant(s) will be reporting directly to UNDP DCDP. The Outcome Board is composed of UNDP, and Government Partners. Representatives of the donor community may also be involved in the management of the evaluation.

6.1: Duration of Assignment
The assignment should be executed within a period of 6 weeks, covering 30 working man-days per consultant.

6.2: Fee and Terms of payment
The consultants will be recruited and paid in accordance with rates approved for locally recruited UN consultants.

Payment will be made in one instalment, upon satisfactory provision and acceptance of key deliverables as specified under 5.3.

6.3: Travel

The assignment might involve potential field visits within Kenya. Travel costs will be covered by UNDP, including tickets and DSA.

7.0: Document for Study by the Evaluators

UNDP Corporate Policy Documents
a) Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluation for results
b) UNDP Guidelines for Outcome Evaluators
c) UNDP Result-Based Management: Technical Note
d) UNDP Evaluation Policy

UN/UNDP Kenya Country Office Documents
a) Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Kenya 2009-2013
b) Country Program Document for Kenya 2009-2013
d) UNDP Kenya 2010/2011 Annual Reports
e) Annual Work Plans and Progress Reports
f) Programme documents and relevant thematic reports
g) Other documents and materials related to the outcome to be evaluated (from the government, donors, etc.)

8.0: Annexes
a) Evaluation report template and quality standards
b) UNEG Norms and standards
c) Code of conduct for Evaluators in the UN System

Application Procedure
Interested and qualified candidates should submit their application which should include the following:
1. Detailed Curriculum Vitae
2. UNDP Personal History Form (P11)
3. Proposal for implementing the assignment
4. Financial Proposal indicating their consultancy fee on daily rate, return air ticket (Economy – most direct route) and DSA

Please quote ‘REVIEW OF CPAP OUTCOME KEN 44’ on the subject line

Applications should be addressed to consultants.ken@undp.org to reach us not later than 25th April 2012 at 4.30 p.m. Kenyan Time.