

**Terms of Reference**

**Mid-Term Evaluation of the Kenya Country Programme Document 2014 - 2018**

**Table of Contents**

[**Table of Contents** 2](#_Toc463854657)

[**Acronyms** 1](#_Toc463854658)

[1. Background 2](#_Toc463854659)

[2. Purpose of the Review 2](#_Toc463854660)

[3. The Context of the CPD Mid -Term Evaluation 2](#_Toc463854661)

[4. The Scope and Objectives of the Mid Term Evaluation 4](#_Toc463854662)

[5. Mid -Term Evaluation Criteria and Review Questions 6](#_Toc463854663)

[6. Methodology 10](#_Toc463854664)

[7. Deliverables 12](#_Toc463854665)

[8. Implementation Arrangements 13](#_Toc463854666)

[9. Team Composition and required Competencies 14](#_Toc463854667)

[10. MTR Ethics 16](#_Toc463854668)

[11. Time-Frame for the MTR Process 18](#_Toc463854669)

[12. Consultancy Fees and Application Procedure 20](#_Toc463854670)

**Acronyms**

CPD Kenya Country Program Document

DaO Delivering as One

UNDAF United Nations Development Assistance Framework

MTP II Medium Term Plan II 2013-2017

ADR Annual Delivery Review

CSO Civil Society 0rganizations

SME Small and Medium-sized enterprises

NEMA National Environmental Management Authority

NDMA National Disaster Management Authority

DRM Disaster Risk Management

CIDP County Intergraded Development Plan

SDG Strategic Development Goals

MDAS Ministry Departments and Agencies

GoK Government of Kenya

DP Development Partners

1. Background

The United Nations Kenya Country Programme Document (CPD 2014-2018) is the first generation Country Programme Document of UNDP support to Kenya. The CPD was developed according to the principles of UN Delivering as One (DaO), aimed at ensuring Government ownership, demonstrated through UNDP’S full alignment to Government priorities as defined in the Vision 2030 and Medium-Term Plan 2013- 2017 and planning cycles, as well as internal coherence among UN agencies and programmes operating in Kenya. As an integral part of the UNDAF, the new country programme is closely aligned to the Medium Term Plan (MTP) II and the UNDP Strategic Plan, 2014-2017 and informed by the new UNDP gender strategy and key recommendations of the 2013 Annual Delivery Review (ADR) for Kenya. UNDP designed its programme to address the interlinked issues of poverty, inequality and exclusion towards achieving sustainable and inclusive economic growth. Data-driven selection of target populations (female-headed households, youth, persons living with HIV and AIDS, etc.), with clear indicators, baselines and targets, are a central pillar in the programme.

1. Purpose of the Review

This mid-term evaluation will be conducted in fulfilment of UN regulations and rules guiding evaluations. UNDP, in Kenya is commissioning this evaluation to ascertain the outcomes and outputs of the country programme measured against its original purpose, objectives whilst in the process capturing the evaluative evidence of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of this strategic programme document, which will set the stage for new programme cycle. It is anticipated that the evaluation will outline lessons learned and recommendations which will be useful in contributing to the growing body of knowledge for the coming planning cycle. The evaluation will serve as an important accountability function, providing the Country Office, national stakeholders and partners with an impartial assessment of the results.

1. The Context of the CPD Mid -Term Evaluation

The Kenya country office programme is supporting in an integrated manner four strategic programme priority areas organized around four outcomes including (a) devolution and accountability; (b) productive sectors and trade; (c) environmental sustainability, renewable energy and sustainable land management; and (d) community security, cohesion and resilience. In the context of UN ‘Delivering as One’, the CPD outcomes are directly aligned to four UNDAF (2014-2018) outcomes with the four UNDAF Strategic Result Areas (SRAs). The UNDAF outcome areas are clearly aligned to the Government of Kenya development blueprint as spelt out in the Vision 2030 and specifically the MTP II. The UNDAF SRAs include 1) Transformative Governance; 2) Human Capital; 3) Sustainable and Equitable Economic Growth; and 4) Environmental Sustainability, Land Management and Human Security. UNDP leads Strategic Result Area 1 on Transformational Governance.

**Devolution and accountability**: To ensure that devolution meets citizens’ needs in accordance with the Constitution, UNDP provides technical capacity development to county governments so that public service delivery is supported in an equitable manner, thus meeting the needs of women, youth, persons living with disabilities, HIV and AIDS and other vulnerable groups. As part of the broader United Nations assistance to devolution, UNDP specifically supports the development and implementation of policy and legislative frameworks; institutional strengthening; and transformative leadership and citizen engagement. UNDP interventions in this area are guided by principles of transparency and accountability in public financial management; effective public administration and integrity; conflict-sensitive programming (including decision-making and resource allocations); and inclusive public participation.

**Productive sectors and trade:** Through regional harmonization of trade policies, UNDP supports the creation of a business environment, at both devolved and national levels, that nurtures local capacities and innovation; facilitates private sector development driven by small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs); and promotes entrepreneurship and acquisition of vocational skills, targeting women, youth and marginalized groups.

**Environmental sustainability, renewable energy and sustainable land management:** The UNDP focus at national and subnational level is to promote renewable energy, natural resource management policy development, environmental sustainability and governance, including biodiversity protection. UNDP partners with devolved and national institutions such as the National Environmental Management Authority (NEMA) to jointly implement programmes in these areas.

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

1. The Scope and Objectives of the Mid Term Evaluation
	1. **Scope**

The Government of Kenya and UNDP proposes to undertake a mid-term evaluation of the CPD from October to December 2016. The mid-term evaluation will cover the period 2014 – 2016, highlighting the key lessons learned to provide informed guidance to future programming. The review will cover all activities planned and/or implemented during the period 2014- 2016 and will give a special focus on the contribution to the four programme outcomes of devolution and accountability; productive sectors and trade; and community security, social cohesion and resilience.

The review 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 first two and a half years of the CPD cycle. The evaluation will also focus on changes around the programmatic environment which include the, UNDAF 2013-2017 mid-term review, 2015 UNDP Results Oriented Action Reporting (ROAR), Disaster Risk Reduction especially youth radicalization and violent extremism, Climate Change especially the effect of El Nino and Lanina, the 2017 General Elections and how the future elections in 2017 will affect CPD programming

The CPD was launched after Kenya transited to devolved system of governance, hence the evaluation will also assess the extent to which UNDP programming has responded to the new governance context.

The post 2015 agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGS) were launched after the CPD and will impact on the CPD implementation and the realization of programme results. The evaluation will therefore assess the efforts to integrate SDG in the UNDP programming and propose measures of implementation for the remaining period in the context of the SDGs. The evaluation will in addition reflect on how the UNDP though the Implementing Partners (IPs) has supported the Government of Kenya Development Agenda especially Medium Term Plan II (MTP II) and Vision 2030. The evaluation will identify areas requiring additional support either in programme management or new implementation strategies including exploring the possibilities of new partnerships.

The mid-term evaluation will also reflect on the CDP theory of change and reflect on its continued relevance to the remaining programming cycle. Key issues of concern will the reflection on how gender have been incorporated in the programming, the sustainability of results, etc. The evaluation should also reflect on the programme alignment to the UNDP strategic plan and make recommendations for the same.

The expected outcome is consensus on findings of the review and agreement on the options suggested for reinforcing efficiencies and effectiveness of development results including deliberations on new and emerging challenges beyond the current CPD.

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

The timing of the evaluation is designed such that it will take place at the mid of implementation of activities on the project so as to factor in all interventions and the associated results achieved through the project. The key users of the MTR report will be; Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) of GoK, Development Partners (DPs), UN agencies and county governments

* 1. **Objectives**

The CPD mid-term evaluation is a joint UNDP/ Government of Kenya exercise that will be conducted in close collaboration with implementing and development partners. The main objective of the CPD mid-term evaluation is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme, including the extent to which cross cutting issues (gender, climate change, youth, SDGs) have been mainstreamed. In addition, the evaluation will assess the extent to which the programme has been responsive to address emerging issues in the country. The evaluation will determine UNDP’s contribution towards effectiveness of the Delivering as One modality in supporting achievements of the programme in line with the national Vision 2030 and Medium Term Goals. The evaluation will also assess the mechanisms put in place to enhance coordination and harmonization between UNDP, Implementing Partners, and the National and County Governments though the four outcome areas outlined above.

The mid-term evaluation will specifically:

1. Assess achievements and progress made against planned results as well as assess challenges and lessons learnt over the past two and a half years of the CPD against the programme theory of change.
2. Assess how the emerging issues not reflected in the current CPD such as sustainable development goals (SDGs) and County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPS) among others impact on outcomes and make recommendations and suggestions for future programming to realign UNDP assistance to these new priorities to achieve greater development impact.
3. Review effectiveness of the UNDP results framework specifically the outcome and output indicators, baselines and targets assessing how realistic/relevant and measurable they are and make recommendations for improvement, if any.
4. Review coherence in delivery of the overall UNDP programme and recommend ways in which the outcome result area groups and technical working groups may increase its effectiveness of programme delivery in the remaining period of the current cycle.
5. Assess how effectively the current CPD is compatible with national development priorities (Vision 2030, Medium Term program goals among others).
6. Assess effectiveness towards attainment of results and reflect on how both UNDP and GOK has contributed to the UNDAF results through the implementation of programmes and projects.
7. Assess effectiveness of and relative advantage of UNDP in the implementation and use of the Joint Programmes modality as a mechanism for fostering UN coherence and ‘delivering as one’ such as Marsabit- Moyale and the Turkana Joint Programmes.
8. Document lessons learnt, challenges and future opportunities, and provide recommendations for improvements or adjustments in strategy, design and/or implementation arrangements.
9. Mid -Term Evaluation Criteria and Review Questions

The following UNDP programme quality criteria will be guiding the MTR: strategy, relevance, social and environmental sustainability, management and monitoring, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and national ownership. In addition, the MTR will explore 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.

**Analysis of the Project Quality Criteria and UN Programming Principles**

**Strategic:** The extent of contribution to higher level change in line with national priorities, as evidenced through sound RBM logic through the theory of change. Aligned with UNDAF, UNDP Strategic Plan and UNDP’s potential to contribute to higher level results.

* To what extent is the programme pro-actively taking advantage of new opportunities, adapting its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities?
* Is the programme aligned with the thematic focus of the UNDP Strategic Plan?

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

To what extent are the programme results (i) responsive to the needs of the country (in particular the needs of vulnerable groups), (ii) aligned with government priorities (iii) as well as with UNDP, global policies and strategies and international partners' policies (including the SDGs and global references such as rights-based approach, gender equality, equity focus, human development principles, etc.).

To what extent is UNDP, engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including their role in the particular development context in Kenya based on their comparative advantage?

Are the intended outputs and outcomes aligned with the key development strategies of the country? Are they consistent with human development needs of the country and the intended beneficiaries? Do the outputs and outcome address the specific development challenges of the country and the intended beneficiaries? Were there any unintended consequences (positive or negative) that have implications to the development goals of the country?

To what extent has the selected method of delivery been appropriate to the changes in the development context?

Has UNDP been influential in country debates based on their comparative advantage and has it influenced national policies?

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

* To what extent is the CPD 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 SDGs and what changes need to be done? Are the baselines up to date -do they need adjusting?
* Are expected outcomes realistic given the CPD timeframe and resources?
* To what extent and in what ways have risks and assumptions been addressed in the CPD 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?
* Does the CPD and country projects respond to the challenges of national capacity development and do they promote ownership of programmes by the national partners?
* To what extent and in what ways are the concepts of 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 women empowerment? What needs to be done to further integrate these dimensions?

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

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

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

Are the approaches, resources, models, conceptual framework relevant to achieve the planned outcomes? Are they sufficiently sensitive to the political and development constraints of the country?

Has UNDP’s CPD strategy and execution been efficient and cost effective over a reasonable time period;

To what extent did the country office take advantage of existing opportunities for synergies to maximize use of resources?

Are the monitoring and evaluation systems employed helping to ensure that programmes are managed efficiently and effectively for proper accountability of results?

* Have adequate financial resources been mobilized for the Programme?
* Is there a discernible common or collaborative funds mobilisation strategy?
* To what extent have administrative procedures (UNDP and GoK) been harmonised?
* Are there any apparent cost-minimising strategies that should be encouraged, that would not compromise the social dimension of gender, youth and PwDs?
* Are the implementation mechanisms for the outcome areas and technical working groups effective in managing the Programme?
* How efficiently resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) have been converted to CPD results at output level?
* To what extent and in what ways have the comparative advantages of the UN organizations been utilized in the national context (including universality, neutrality, voluntary and grant-nature of contributions, multilateralism, and the mandate of UNDP)?
* Has UNDP demonstrated Delivering as One (DaO) principle in this programme? If yes, how has this been done and does it respond to programme results?

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

* Do the CPD programme outcomes incorporate adequate exit strategies and capacity development measures to ensure sustainability of results over time? Is there a better exit and sustainability strategy that can be proposed?
* Are conditions and mechanisms in place so that the benefits of the project level interventions are sustained and owned by IPs at the national and sub-national levels after the programme has ended?
* Have strong partnerships been built with key stakeholders throughout the project cycle
* What changes should be made in the current set of partnerships in order to promote long term sustainability?
* Are institutional capacity development and strengthening of national systems being built able to sustain results and build resilience?

**Social and Environmental Standards**

* Does the CPD seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights based approach?
* Are social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender and environment) being successfully managed and monitored in accordance with CPD and relevant action plans?
* Are unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances that may arise during implementation of the CPD assessed and adequately managed within projects, with relevant management plans updated?

**Partnership and Coordination for Effective programming**- Assess the effectiveness of UNDP’s CPDs contribution to the UNDAF as a coordination and partnership framework:

* To what extent and in what ways has CPD contributed to achieving better synergies among the programmes/projects of UN agencies and the National and County Governments?
* Are there current or potential overlaps with existing partners’ programme;
* Has the CPD enhanced joint programming by agencies? Were the strategies employed by agencies complementary and synergistic?
* Did CPD promote effective partnerships and strategic alliances around the main CPD outcome areas (e.g. national partners, International Financial Institutions and other external support agencies)?

To what extent the DaO has contributed or is contributing to a more coherent and efficient response to national priorities as well as to ensure greater coherence in planning, implementation and operational management?

**Impact*:*** To the extent possible, assess the current contribution of the CPD on the lives of the poor, i.e. determine whether there is any major change in CPD indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or be associated with CPD, notably in the realization of SDGs, National Development Goals and the national implementation of internationally agreed commitments and UN Conventions and Treaties

* Determine whether there is any major change in the indicators that can reasonably be attributed to or associated with the project.
* Assess any impacts that the project may have contributed to.
* Determine the impact of the project on devolved institutions in regard to empowerment, management, effectiveness, accountable, transparent and efficiency in service delivery.

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

*Human rights*

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

*Gender Equality*

* + To what extent has gender been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring the different interventions?
	+ To what extent has programme support promoted positive changes in gender equality? Were there any unintended effects?

*Capacity Building*

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

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

1. Methodology

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

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

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

This evaluation is expected to take a “theory of change’’ (TOC) approach to determining causal links between the interventions that the Joint Office of UNDP has supported, and observed progress in human development. The evaluator will develop in consultation with the CO team, a logic model of how CPD interventions are expected to lead to improved national and local service delivery. Evidence obtained and used to assess the results of UNDP support should be triangulated from a variety of sources, including verifiable data on indicator achievement, existing reports, and technical papers, stakeholder interviews, focus groups, surveys and site visits.

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

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

The draft of the CPD 2014-2018 Evaluation Report will be shared with all staff and stakeholders, and presented in a validation meeting that the UNDP will organize. Key partners and stakeholders will participate in this workshop. Feedback received from these sessions should be taken into account when preparing the final report. The evaluation team will produce an ‘audit trail’ indicating whether and how each comment received was addressed in revisions to the final report.

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

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

* Title
* Table of contents
* Acronyms and abbreviations
* Executive Summary
* Introduction
* Background and context
* Evaluation scope and objectives
* Evaluation approach and methods
* Data analysis
* Findings and conclusions
* Lessons learned
* Recommendations
* Annexes

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

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

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

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

1. Deliverables

The deliverables for this review will include the following documents:

* **The Inception Report**: The inception report should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. This will consist but not limited to the following sections: a). Stakeholder map b). Evaluation matrix including evaluation questions, codification, indicators, data collection methods, sources of information; c). overall evaluation design and methodology including sampling techniques to be applied; d). description of data gaps, including techniques and tools to be used (Focus Group Discussions, Key Informant Interviews, etc.); and detailed work plan of the assignment.
* **Draft MTR** which will be presented to stakeholders in half day workshop.
* **Final MTR** incorporating stakeholder inputs. Report format will include but not limited to: Executive summary, introduction, the development context, findings and conclusions, lessons learned, and recommendations
* A Power Point presentation containing the main findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation for dissemination and debriefing purposes.
* Electronic version of data collected and data sets analyzed.
1. Implementation Arrangements

The CPD mid-term evaluation will be commissioned and overseen by the Government (The National Treasury) and UNDP. The responsibility to provide oversight and direction to the mid-term evaluation process will rest with the Technical Steering Committee under the joint leadership of the designated official within the National Treasury and the UNDP Country Director.

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

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

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

1. Team Composition and required Competencies

The MTR will be conducted by four (4) Individual Consultants with technical expertise in any of the four CPD Outcome areas.

**Evaluation Team Leader (International)** with good credentials and qualifications in the following areas:

* Possess a minimum of a Master’s degree in relevant fields- social sciences, development studies, international development among others.
* Have a minimum 10 years of increasingly responsible professional experience, and of which seven years in governance, development and/or social sciences evaluation.
* Demonstrate knowledge in one or more of the thematic issues covered UNDP Programme such as governance, environment, inclusive economic growth and peacebuilding and resilience as well as GoK policies in Kenya and experience conducting evaluation of multi-sectoral projects;
* Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies, and/or a proven expertise of research in social science relevant for the evaluation;
* Have strong research and analytical skills, communication (oral and written), facilitation and management skills with specific experience in undertaking evaluations
* Demonstrated capacity for strategic thinking and policy advice are essential.
* Must be able to work in a multidisciplinary team and multicultural environment.
* Must be committed to respecting deadlines of delivery outputs within the agreed time-frame.
* Sound leadership and organizational skills- demonstrating experience of having managed and led an evaluation team
* Experience in the application and implementation of gender-sensitive programmes as well as HRBA
* Familiarity with UNDP and UN operations will be an advantage.
* Previous experience in working with devolved governance structures is an asset.

The **Team Leader** will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of all deliverables including the final evaluation report to the Evaluation Technical Committee. Specifically, the lead consultant will perform the following tasks:

* Taking lead in contacting Evaluation Technical Committee regarding MTR-related issues and ensure that the process is as participatory as possible
* Organizing the team meetings, assigning specific roles and tasks of the team members and closely monitor their work
* Supervising data collection and analysis
* Consolidating draft and final MTR reports, and a proposed action plan with the support provided by team members
* Finalising the final MTR report, which incorporated comments of the Evaluation Technical Committee and key stakeholders,
* Submitting the draft and final MTR report and a proposed action plan to Evaluation Technical Committee, on schedule
* Presenting MTR results and facilitating the meeting specific tasks of the team members

**Evaluation Team Members (National-Three Individual Consultants)**

The Team Members will work under the Team Leader. Each of the evaluation team members should demonstrate knowledge in one or more of the thematic issues covered UNDP Programme such as governance, environment, inclusive economic growth and peacebuilding and resilience as well as GoK policies in Kenya and experience conducting evaluation of multi-sectoral projects. The team member will act as a subject matter specialist and therefore should demonstrate expertise in one of the CPD thematic areas as follows:

1. Democratic governance
2. Peace building and conflict management including on countering violence extremism and youth radicalization
3. Sustainable environmental management including climate change and disaster risk reduction
4. Inclusive economic growth

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

* Possess a Master’s degree in relevant fields- social sciences, development studies, international development among others;
* Have at least 7 years of relevant experience – specifically in evaluating similar programmes in the thematic area of specialization;
* Solid understanding of evaluation methodologies, and/or a proven expertise of research in social science relevant for the evaluation;
* Demonstrate knowledge of and ability to apply theoretical knowledge in the design, management and evaluation of complex multidisciplinary programmes involving the national government, county governments civil society and international organizations;
* Have a strong understanding of the development context in Kenya and national development vision and strategies;
* Experience in the application and implementation of gender-sensitive programmes as well as HRBA
* Have strong analytical and communication skills;
* Have excellent writing skills in English and good spoken Kiswahili; and
* Demonstrate experience of having worked or evaluated UN programmes will be an added advantage

**Evaluation Criteria**

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

**Team Leader**

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

**Team Member**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Criteria** | **Max points** |
| A Master’s degree in public administration, communications, strategic management, public policy, business administration or any other relevant social sciences from a recognized University.  | 20 |
| Subject matter expertise in one of the selected CPD thematic areas | 25 |
| 10 years of relevant experience – specifically in evaluating similar programmes | 10 |
| Good understanding of Kenya’s development context  | 25 |
| Experience in the application and implementation of gender-sensitive programmes including HRBA | 10 |
| Strong analytical research and documentation and communication skills | 10 |
| **TOTAL** | **100** |

1. MTR 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.

**Evaluation Team /Evaluators must observe the following:**

1. To avoid **conflict of interest** and undue pressure, evaluators need to be **independent,** implying that members of an Evaluation Team must not have been directly responsible for the policy/programming-setting, design, or overall management of the subject of evaluation, nor expect to be in the near future. Evaluators must have no vested interest and have the full freedom to conduct impartially their evaluative work, without potential negative effects on their career development. They must be able to express their opinion in a free manner.
2. Should protect the anonymity and **confidentiality of individual participants**. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are **not expected to evaluate individuals (not targeted at persons)**, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
3. Evaluations sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body.
4. Should be **sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs** and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and **address issues of discrimination and gender equality**. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that the evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
5. They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair writing and/or oral presentation of study limitations, evidence based findings, conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

For details on the ethics and independence in evaluation, please see

1. *Evaluation policy of UNDP (*<http://web.undp.org/evaluation/policy.shtml>)
2. *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)*
3. Time-Frame for the MTR Process

The process of the evaluation will be divided into four phases, each including several steps.

**Phase 1: Preparation and Desk Phase:**

**Desk review** – This phase will encompass preparatory work by the UNDP in collaboration with the Evaluation Technical Team including identification, collection and mapping of relevant documentation and other data. The Evaluation Technical Team will analyze all documents related to the project over the period of implementation.

**Stakeholder mapping** – A simple mapping of stakeholders relevant to the evaluation will be developed by the Evaluation Team in addition to the tentative list provided by the UNDP. The product of the mapping will include national institutions and county governments’ stakeholders.

**Development of an operational/logistical plan** - The Evaluation Team in consultation with UNDP will develop evaluation operational/logistical plan and calendar, to address logistical issues related to the assessment and related field visits.

The main output of this phase is the **MTR Inception Report** – A report will be prepared by the Evaluation Team containing at the minimum, the proposed approach and evaluation design, which will include the stakeholders mapping, the evaluation questions and methodologies to be adopted, sources of information and plan for data collection, including selection of project/field sites for visits, and design for data analysis.

**Phase 2: Data Collection Phase**

**Data collection** – The Evaluation Team will embark on data collection missions including visits to the offices of UNDP, DPs, IPs and other relevant Government Agencies.

Clarify the understanding of the Devolution related development challenges in the project focus areas with key stakeholders including the government and their view on the part played by UNDP supported project in addressing the challenges that fall within the project mandate areas. The Evaluation Team will in the process gather additional information necessary to enrich the evaluation process and its outcome.

At the end of this phase, the Evaluation Team will provide a debriefing of the preliminary findings to UNDP and the technical committee, take initial comments and validate the preliminary findings.

**Phase 3: Drafting the Evaluation Report**

A draft evaluation report will be prepared by the Evaluation Team within the designated timeline after the data collection exercise. The draft report will be submitted to the Country Director, UNDP Kenya.

Review and Quality Assurance – The draft report shall be shared with UNDP and the Evaluation Quality Assurance Team (UNDP’s M&E group) who will subject it to a formal review process before presentation to stakeholders. The Evaluation Team will be directly responsible for addressing any comments or observations towards eventual finalization of the report.

**Presentation of findings, Validation and submission of report-** The Evaluation Team shall present the draft and final versions of the report to the technical committee and relevant stakeholders in designated meetings upon clearance by UNDP. The exact medium for the presentation will be determined in conjunction with the Evaluation Team. The final copy of the report will be submitted to UNDP Country Office Resident Representative.

**Phase 4: Follow-up**

**Management Response** – UNDP will prepare a management response to the evaluation recommendations in the final evaluation report in line with UNEG evaluation procedures to ensure that the findings and recommendations of the MTR contribute to improvement in the implementation of future projects of similar magnitude.

**Dissemination** - The final version of the evaluation report will be disseminated at appropriate fora. It will be widely distributed to all relevant stakeholders in the country and within the UN. It will also be submitted to the development partners that support the CPD.

The evaluation shall be conducted for a period of ***30 days*** spread over a period of 2 months starting in August 2016. The table below shows a tentative timeframe and key milestones for the consultancy process.

| **Phases** | **Description of Activities** | **Responsible persons** | **Schedule** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Phase I:** *Inception* | * Draft Inception Report development and submission
* Presentation of the Inception Report to UNDP, the National Treasury and other key stakeholders for inputs
* Input to the Inception Report by the Evaluation Technical Committee *(review of study plan, protocol, analytical framework etc)*
* Final draft of Inception Report
 | ConsultantsEvaluation Technical Committee  | **5 days** |
| **Phase II:***Data Collection & Analysis* | * Implementation of the evaluation work plan for data collection in the respective focus areas plus gender equality and the start of assumptions/hypothesis testing using the evaluation matrix.
* Utilization of a multiple method approach for data collection that includes, at minimum: document review, focus group discussions and individual interviews and project/field visits. The Evaluation Team will use triangulation as a central method, drawing information from multiple sources.
* Data analysis
 | Consultants  | **15 days** |
| **Phase III:***Report Writing and Feedback* | * The drafting and presentation of the draft evaluation report.
* Final report incorporating inputs from key stakeholders
 | Consultants | **8 days** |
| **Phase IV:***Dissemination* | * *Dissemination Workshop and workshop summary report*
* Management response *to key recommendations of the final evaluation report*
 | ConsultantsUNDP | **2 days** |

1. Consultancy Fees and Application Procedure

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

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

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

**Application Procedure**

To be inserted by Procurement

**Annex**

**List of Documents**

The following minimum documents will be used to support the Evaluation Team in obtaining detailed background information: the UNDAF, CPD, the CPD results and resources matrix; and annual reports.

1. UNDAF (2014-2018)
2. Country Programme Document (2014-2018)
3. Annual Programme Reports
4. CPD Project Evaluation Reports
5. Draft List of Stakeholders and MTR audience