



TERMS OF REFERENCE

CONSULTANCY FOR CONDUCTING AN END TERM EVALUATION OF ‘STRENGTHENING THE APRM DIALOGUE IN KENYA PROJECT’

1. BACKGROUND

The NEPAD Kenya Secretariat, a Semi-Autonomous Government Agency (SAGA) in the Ministry of Devolution & Planning is mandated to spearhead the implementation of NEPAD continental initiatives in Kenya and the Eastern African region so as to support the realization of indigenously driven sustainable and equitable socio-economic and political governance development for transformation of Kenya in line with the continental agenda and the realization of the Kenya Vision 2030.

A flagship initiative of NEPAD is the self-monitoring good governance barometer – African Peer Review Mechanism (APRM). Its aim is to encourage and build a transformative leadership through a self-assessment process that is inclusive and participatory, constructive national dialogue and the sharing of information and experiences, in order to reinforce successful and exemplary practices among African countries.

The APRM not only provides for the assessment of governance in the participating countries but also an opportunity to share experiences and best practices, successes and challenges as well as constraints. It requires African states to subject themselves to self-assessment by their own citizens, followed by external review through a Panel of distinguished African leaders, called the African Peer Review Panel of Eminent Persons.

The four thematic areas of the APRM are: (i) Democracy and Political Governance; (ii) Economic Governance and Management; (iii) Corporate Governance; and (iv) Socio Economic Development.

Kenya acceded to the APRM in March 2003 in Abuja, Nigeria and was among the first four African states along with Ghana, Rwanda and Mauritius to be peer reviewed. The APRM process was guided by an independent multi-stakeholder National Governing Council (NGC) comprising a majority of non-state actors (NSAs) but also representatives of key line Ministries. This was meant to ensure that the APRM process was independent, participatory and all inclusive.

This process culminated in the development of a comprehensive Kenya Country Self-Assessment Report and a National Programme of Action (NPoA). Subsequently, the Country Self-Assessment report was validated by a team of external reviewers led by a member of the APR panel of eminent persons, Dr. Graca Machel and the team developed the Country Review Report of the Republic of Kenya. This Report was tabled at the APR Heads of State Forum in Banjul, the Gambia on 30th June 2006 and the Kenyan President H.E. Mwai Kibaki was subjected to review by his peers.

During the 10th APR Summit of January 2009, Kenya was commended for progress made in restoring peace and stability after the disputed 2007 Elections.

The Forum also recalled the pacesetting 1st APRM Review of Kenya and its recommendations which formed the pillars of the Agenda 4 Reforms. The Country was encouraged to undertake a Special Review to assess progress made after the Post-Election Violence of 2007/08.

In July 2011, Prof. Amos Sawyer the Lead Panelist led a team of African Experts to Kenya for the Special Review. The Country Review Team (CRT) submitted the draft report in November 2011. The Government prepared a Country Response to the matters raised in the report.

An inter-Ministerial Committee was set comprising Permanent Secretaries whose Ministries bore significant responsibilities on key issues raised in the Special Review Report. In July 2012, this committee noted that the Initial objectives of the Special

Review had been overtaken by fundamental progress made in consolidating Political and Governance Reforms under Agenda 4 of the National Accord.

Subsequently, in December 2012, the Kenya Special Review Report was withdrawn and the Country advised to conduct a comprehensive 2nd APRM Country Review covering all the 4 APRM Pillars.

2. CONTEXT

In July 2012, the Denmark Embassy signed a Local Grant Agreement No. 104.Ken.120-155(76) with the Government of Kenya on the basis of a three year Programme document to fund the Project ‘Strengthening the APRM dialogue in Kenya’.

Objectives and Outputs of the Project:

The project was to support the finalisation and implementation of the APRM 2nd Country Review with following expected outputs;

- a) APRM Review & National Plan of Action (NPOA) finalised
- b) Implementation of the NPOA supported
- c) Credible tracking (M&E) of APRM report recommendations
- d) Strengthening Civil Society engagement for APRM
- e) Implementation of a robust APRM Information Education & Communication (IEC) strategy
- f) Enhancing South-South Learning and Exchanges on APRM

Related outputs

- a) Capacity built of NEPAD Kenya Secretariat
- b) Structured research and fellowship programme implemented
- c) Gender Development and youth initiatives institutionalised
- d) Technical capacity enhanced.

3. OVERALL OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION

The NEPAD Kenya Secretariat is interested in procuring an individual to undertake an end term evaluation of the ‘Strengthening the APRM dialogue in Kenya’ Project.

The overall objective of the consultancy is to conduct an independent evaluation to review the extent to which the project’s objectives and outputs have been realized, identify strengths and weaknesses in implementation, and provide recommendations for future success of similar projects.

Participation of stakeholders in the evaluation should be maintained, reflecting opinions, expectations and vision about the contribution of the project towards the achievement of its objectives.

The results will be measured based upon the following key programme documents:

- NEPAD/APRM 3 Year Work plan Project document
- Local Grant Agreement No. 104.Ken.120-155(76)
- Annual Work plans & Budgets
- Quarterly Narrative & Financial Reports
- Audit Report

4. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES / SCOPE OF WORK

More specifically, the evaluation will undertake a review of the following criterion:

A. Effectiveness

- To what extent have the project’s objectives been realized?
- To what extent was the project implemented as envisaged by the project document in terms of planned activities and management? If not, why?
- Were the project activities adequate to realize the objectives?
- What has the project achieved? Where it failed to meet the outputs identified in the project document, why was this?
- Have any significant developments taken place since the project started, if so, explain how they affected the project goal and activities and evaluate the impact on the project?

- How has the project engaged with civil society (CSO's and citizens) and has their engagement been systematic. Will the engagement be sustainable?

B. Relevance

- Assess the realization of the project's outputs and outcomes. The efficiency and effectiveness of these actions given the available funding will be considered.
- Should another project strategy have been preferred rather than the one implemented to better reflect those needs and priorities? Why?
- Were risks appropriately identified by the projects? How appropriate are/were the strategies developed to deal with identified risks?

C. Sustainability

- To what extent has the project established processes and systems that are likely to support the continued implementation of the project?
- Are the involved parties willing and able to continue the project activities on their own (where applicable)?
- Are the project outcomes likely to be sustainable? If not, why not? Which remedial actions would have been good to take?

D. Project design and performance assessment/Efficiency

- Was the project design appropriate? If not, why not?
- Was the project, including its finances, human resources, monitoring, and oversight and support managed efficiently?
- What was the role played by the implementing agency (ies) and, where applicable, the executing agency in leveraging resources, internal or external, and expanding partnerships with other actors to support and expand this project?
- Describe and assess efforts of DANIDA in support of the implementing agency
- Review the roles and responsibilities of the various agencies and institutions and the level of coordination between relevant players. In particular, the capacity and performance of the implementing agency.
- Assess the strength of the log-frame process as a whole. Make recommendations as to how to improve future performance for similar projects in terms of effectiveness and efficiency in achieving impact.

E. Impact

- To what extent has/have the realization of the project objective(s) had an impact on the specific problem the project aimed to address and on the targeted beneficiaries?
- To what extent the project has caused and is likely to cause changes and effects, positive and negative, foreseen and unforeseen, on country?
- Is the project likely to have a catalytic effect? How? Why? Please provide examples
- Have the needs of project beneficiaries been met by the project? If not, why not?
- Assess the likelihood of continuation of project outcomes after completion of donor funding; and describe the key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of project outcomes.
- Describe the main lessons that have emerged in terms of: efforts to secure sustainability; knowledge transfer; and the role of M&E in project implementation. In describing all lessons learned, an explicit distinction needs to be made between those lessons applicable only to this project, and lessons that may be of value more broadly.

5. METHODOLOGY

It is envisioned that the consultant will develop a methodology premised on the following:

1. Extract the main performance targets and indicators from the relevant documents, and measure progress against those targets and indicators, (both qualitative and quantitative).
2. Assess the extent to which the work plans accurately interpreted and supported the main agreement documents.
3. Include in the analysis all activities that were carried out by the programme and funded by either GoK or development partners directly.
4. Focus Group Discussions/meetings with key staff involved in management and implementation of the programme; key staff of other government MDAs, Development and other key stakeholders including the private sector, media, civil society, and citizens.
5. Propose recommendations for future targeted results for the programme

6. Prepare a draft report and discuss it with stakeholders including the GoK and Development Partners
7. Prepare a final report, and present the major highlights of the report to the NEPAD Kenya Secretariat

6. Deliverables

1. A proposal indicating the detailed methodology based on these TORs to be used in the results evaluation process as well as a work plan for completion of work within five (5) days after recruitment
2. Draft Evaluation Report for discussion including all annexes detailed work done and discussions/focus meeting held
3. Final Evaluation Report

7. Qualifications of the Individual

The individual is expected to have the following qualifications;

- The individual should have a Masters degree in social sciences or political science or other relevant field.
- The individual should have at least 5 years' working experience in the area of governance.
- Knowledge and/or previous work experience on the APRM is an added advantage.
- The individual should have regional/international experience in governance programmes and reforms.
- The individual should have demonstrated ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distil critical issues and draw forward looking conclusions;
- Demonstrated knowledge and experience of the governance programmes and governance reform issues in Kenya

8. Duration

The consultancy will take approximately 30 working days.

9. Reporting

The NEPAD Secretariat shall arrange for necessary stakeholder meetings and meet associated logistical costs. Office space will be available to the consultant at the NEPAD Secretariat. The consultant will report to the CEO NEPAD Kenya Secretariat in the performance of the task.

10. Application Procedure

Forward your expression of interest to the address below by **7th February 2014** detailing the following:

- i. Contact details (address, telephone and fax numbers, e-mail, etc.).
- ii. Synopsis of capabilities to undertake the evaluation
- iii. Proof of experience in undertaking similar assignments
- iv. Technical proposal detailing methodology for undertaking the evaluations
(should take cognisance of the methodology as proposed in the TOR)
- v. Financial proposal detailing the proposed costs for undertaking the evaluations
- vi. Curriculum vitae

Chief Executive Officer
NEPAD Kenya Secretariat
Ministry of Devolution & Planning
P.O. Box 46270-00100
NAIROBI.