



## TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT

### TERMS OF REFERENCE: CONSULTANCY SERVICES TO CONDUCT THE PROJECT FINAL EVALUATION FOR THE PROJECT "STRENGTHENING THE CAPACITY OF COUNTY BASED AND GRASSROOTS CIVIL SOCIETY GROUPS FOR ENHANCED GOVERNANCE, ACCOUNTABILITY AND PROTECTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE OF KENYA"

REF: NUMBER: EUROPEAID/174155/DD/ACT/KE

#### Table of Contents

<b>Background</b> .....	3
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	3
<b>Project Goals and Objectives</b> .....	4
<b>Description of Context and Problem Analysis</b> .....	4
<b>Description of Intervention Logic and Theory of Change</b> .....	5
<b>2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES</b> .....	5
2.2 Overall Objective.....	6
<b>3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION</b> .....	7
3.1 Geographical Scope.....	7
3.2 Time Scope .....	8
3.3 Thematic Scope.....	8
<b>4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS</b> .....	8
4.1 Evaluation Criteria (OECD/DAC) and Cross-Cutting Issues.....	8
<b>5. METHODOLOGY</b> .....	14
5.1 Introduction .....	14
5.2 Evaluation Research Design.....	14
5.3 Data Triangulation .....	14
5.4 Sampling and Case Selection .....	14
5.5 Sufficient and Independent Information Sources.....	15
5.6 Description of Limitations .....	15
5.7 Description of Result Areas and Indicators.....	15
5.8 Plausibility of Causal Claims .....	16



<b>TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT</b>	
5.10 Suggested Evaluation Methods.....	16
5.11 Answers to Evaluation Questions.....	17
5.12 Logic of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations in the ETE Report.....	17
<b>7. DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE.....</b>	<b>18</b>
7.1 Deliverables:.....	18
7.2 Timeline.....	19
<b>8. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....</b>	<b>21</b>
8.1 The Consultant or the Evaluator.....	21
8.2 Haki Ni Yetu Consortium Project Team.....	21
8.3 Evaluation Backstopping Team.....	22
8.4 Reporting and Communication.....	22
<b>9. REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CONSULTANT AND THE CONSULTANT'S TEAM.....</b>	<b>22</b>
9.1 Independence of the Consultant and Consultant's Team.....	22
9.2 Consultant and Consultant's Team, Qualifications and Skills.....	22
<b>10. BUDGET FOR THE EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>24</b>
10.1 Budget.....	24
10.2 Payment.....	25
<b>11.0 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR THE PROPOSALS AND HOW TO APPLY.....</b>	<b>25</b>



## TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT

### Background

**Haki Ni Yetu:** Is a governance accountability and rights project for Kenyans. The Haki Ni Yetu consortium KIOS Foundation, InformAction (IFA), CSONET-Kisumu, received 4-year funding from the European Union (EU) to implement a project titled “**strengthening the capacity of county based and grassroots civil society groups for enhanced governance, accountability and protection of human rights of the people of Kenya**”. The project is being implemented in 15 Priority counties and 5 Auxiliary counties in Kenya.

The Program is funded by the European Commission within the “*strengthening Kenyan civil society organisations as actors of good governance and development*”: Funded under LOT 1: “*Community-Based and Grassroots Organisations as actors of governance and development*”. The funding aims at reaching the diversity of CBOs, smaller grassroots organisations and social movements, which play a crucial role in social cohesion and organizing at community level. CBOs include not-for-profit, non-governmental and non-political organisations. The Department of Social Services registers, regulates and renews annual registrations for CBOs. However, the department capacity to adequately support and manage regulation requirements is low.

### 1. Introduction

The **Haki Ni Yetu** (HnY) consortium is led by the **KIOS Foundation** which has over 20 years’ experience in providing direct grants, mentoring, and communication and advocacy support to small and medium size civil society organisations including community-based organisations (CBOs) defending human rights in Kenya and elsewhere. Current KIOS programmes in Kenya focus on business and human rights, non-discrimination and gender equality, democracy and rule of law.

The Co-partners in the consortium include:

- ✓ **InformAction (IFA)** is a Kenyan women-led human rights organisation established in 2010, which uses film and community discussions to encourage citizens to speak out and defend individual freedoms. IFA works with communities, activist groups and CBO networks, and has formed over 250 community action and community journalists’ teams in rural and marginalised areas in 16 counties.
- ✓ **CSO Network-Kisumu** is a Kenyan women-led trust that has since 2003 empowered and built the capacities of CBOs and other grassroots organisations. Its programmes focus on women’s rights and leadership, good governance and accountability, and fighting corruption and impunity.

The 48-month Project started being implemented on **31<sup>st</sup> December 2022** and is to be complete by **31<sup>st</sup> December 2026**.



## TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT

### Project Goals and Objectives

The HNY Project overall objective to improve the participation of Kenyan people in civic life by enhancing the capacity and resources of CBOs and grassroots movements as agents of social change in Kenya, this project consists of inter-linked financing and capacity building programmes that target CBOs and grassroots organisations that work on:

- ✓ **Democracy and the Rule of Law:** good governance, promoting the rule of law and State accountability, fight against corruption and increasing access to justice
- ✓ **Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination:** women's rights, prevention of gender-based violence (GBV), and enhancing LGBTIQ+ rights
- ✓ **Business and Human Rights:** environmental and climate justice, corporate accountability

The Haki Ni Yetu Consortium members are peer supporters and enabling actors, who support CBOs and grassroots movements to fulfil their mandate and strengthen their impact in protecting and promoting the rights of their respective constituencies. The project provides the necessary impetus for CBOs to empower and mobilise the most vulnerable groups and people to strengthen duty-bearer accountability.

HnY Project has one impact statement that contributes to the overall objective, which is: *Increased participation of, and collaboration between grassroots actors and national actors contributing towards the public benefit and improvement of the lives especially of vulnerable communities in Kenya.*

The project has three (3) outcomes and are as populated below:

- a) Outcome 1: Targeted CBOs and grassroot groups in Kenya have improved capacity to defend human rights at local, national, regional and international levels
- b) Outcome 2: Rights-holders have increased abilities to claim their rights and participate in civic and political life in their communities for the protection and advancement of human rights
- c) Outcome 3: Duty-bearers are engaging with CBOs and grassroots groups to advance human rights in project counties.

### Description of Context and Problem Analysis

Haki Ni Yetu-project operates within a complex context of national, sectoral, and political challenges that shape civil society and the civic space in Kenya. CBOs and grassroots actors have an acute need for resources, skills enhancement and networking in order to protect individuals and groups in vulnerable situations. Especially small, local, remote and isolated women, youth and marginalised groups have challenges in accessing funding and support. This describes further the context in which the CBOs operate, and key challenges affecting the communities under our project implementation areas.

The political leadership in Kenya has led to shrinking civic and democratic space by introducing a combination of legal and practical constraints that contradicts fundamental rights



**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT** guaranteed in the progressive Constitution of Kenya (2010). Such measures have included the use of anti-terror legislation to delegitimise non-governmental organisations (NGOs), threats of deregistration of NGOs, shutdown of media houses, curtailing online freedoms of expression, vilification and arbitrary arrests, prosecutions and killings of human rights defenders and peacefully protesting citizens. Many civil society actors, especially those working on marginalised groups rights, anti-corruption, land and environmental rights and good governance, face security threats and limitations to their work. The civil society in Kenya has weakened because of restricted media freedom, political interference of independent bodies, ethnicization of politics, and intimidation. As the recent 2022 elections in Kenya showed, tensions and election violence were present and there were both identified capacity shortages and compromised impartiality by the Election Management Body. Income inequality has risen sharply, and Kenya's socio-economic landscape affected by poverty, lack of political accountability, poor political management and corruption that is embedded at all levels of decision-making. HNY project was design to address these underlying issues and increase citizen participation to strengthen accountability and democracy.

## Description of Intervention Logic and Theory of Change

The theory of change rests on the logic that if the consortium provides meaningful support to build the capacities and networking of grassroots organization and groups to enable them to gain more power and improve the effectiveness of their core activities according to their mandates for the benefit of their community members. The increased participation and collaboration of CBOs and other grassroots actors can mobilise broader communities to hold the government and other duty bearers accountable on the societal development and sustainability of the society. Finally, the increased participation of and collaboration between grassroots actors and national actors contribute towards the public benefit and improvement of the lives of especially vulnerable communities in Kenya.

The Haki Ni Yetu Theory of Change (ToC) acknowledges external factors, such as political instability and limited civic space, which could impact outcomes. For instance, the success of policy advocacy is dependent on governmental responsiveness and openness to civil society input. Assumptions underlying the intervention include the belief that empowered grassroots organization and groups will effectively mobilize, that inclusive narratives will resonate across society, and that advocacy will shift policy agendas toward justice.

## 2. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The HNY consortium is looking to engage a consultant to conduct an End Project Evaluation (EPE) for the Program. The EPE will build on the ROM findings and assess the overall progress, lessons learned and the sustainability of the Project. This section outlines the key objectives of conducting the EPE for the Project in terms of the overall objective, specific objectives and intended use of the evaluation. The overall objective of the End of Project Evaluation (EPE) is to assess the overall performance of the HNY project, balancing both accountability and learning. This will include assessing **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability,**



**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT** coherence, impact and **Haki Ni Yetu cross-cutting priorities** while also drawing lessons to inform future programming and advocacy strategies for the HNY Consortium Partners. The evaluation will also critically assess the partnership dynamics, particularly the effectiveness of the Global Consortium Model.

## 2.2 Overall Objective

The overall objective of the End of Project Evaluation (EPE) is to assess the overall performance of the HNY project, balancing both accountability and learning. This will include assessing **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coherence, impact** and **Haki Ni Yetu cross-cutting priorities** while also drawing lessons to inform future programming and advocacy strategies for the HNY Consortium Partners. The evaluation will also critically assess the partnership dynamics, particularly the effectiveness of the Global Consortium Model. It will explore how this approach has influenced collaboration, decision-making, and the overall impact of the project.

## 2.3 Specific Objectives

- a) **Relevance** - To measure the extent to which the intervention reflected the actual needs and interests of the target group and whether it did align with organizational, subnational, national global strategies.
- b) **Effectiveness** - To measure the extent to which the project has achieved expected and unexpected outcomes, including changes in climate justice policy, community resilience, and the capacity of civil society organizations to advocate for change
- c) **Coherence** - To evaluate the alignment and coordination of the HNY project's coherence with other initiatives, policies, programs at national, regional, and global levels and coherence between the strategic partnership and European Union Roadmap for Civil Society in Kenya
- d) **Impact** - To assess what are the positive or negative, intended, unintended, tangible and visible effects of the project on the target groups
- e) **Sustainability** - To assess the likelihood that the activities and results of the project across the outcomes will be sustained beyond the project's lifecycle, particularly with regard to local ownership, institutional capacity, and financial sustainability.
- f) **Haki Ni Yetu Cross-Cutting Factors** - To assess how effectively the HNY project integrated and addressed cross-cutting priorities such as gender transformation, climate, safeguarding, locally-led action, learning agenda reflection and evaluation processes.
- g) **Theory of Change (ToC) Validity and Adaptation** - To learn from program implementation about the validity and adaptation of the Haki Ni Yetu project ToC.
- h) **Lessons learnt** - To Identify lessons learnt and provide set of actionable recommendations on how the Project and the project coordination/management could be adjusted for future improvement and to strengthen delivery of results.

## 2.4 Intended Use of the Evaluation



## TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT

The results of the EPE will serve multiple purposes:

- a) **For Haki Ni Yetu Consortium Partners:** To refine future project strategies for learning and to improve the design and implementation of similar projects in the future. This is to **inform future** strategies, policies, instruments, modalities or interventions, including through scale-up, follow-up interventions and expansion of successful pilots
- b) **For the donor (EU):** To provide accountability regarding the use of funds and the achievement of project goals, and to inform future investment in European Union Civil society roadmaps for Kenya or such initiatives. This Project Final Evaluations also enables this intervention to account for the use of financial and non-monetary resources. This evaluation may justify adaptations during implementation and provide the rationale for such adaptations.
- c) **For the project participants and rights-holders:** To provide feedback and learning on how well the project met their needs and how they can be further engaged in bolstering of civil society space in Kenya.
- d) **For policymakers and duty-bearers:** To understand the project's contributions to subnational, national and international legal and policy frameworks specifically on the three thematic areas of the project.
- e) **Report on achievements** of and lessons from a strategy, policy, instrument, modality or intervention (learning and accountability).
- f) **Implementation modality:** How was the Consortium members partnership built. What was the value added of having a multiparter collaboration. What are the future recommendations.

### 3. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

This section describes geographical focus, the evaluation period, specific thematic domains and expenditure that will be a part of the evaluation.

#### 3.1 Geographical Scope

The evaluation will cover all the countries where the Haki Ni Yetu (HNY) project has been implemented in the following counties

The beneficiaries will come from a total of 21 counties distributed over four clusters:

- ❖ **Western Kenya Cluster:** -Kakamega, Bungoma, Busia, Migori, Kisumu, Homa Bay, Siaya, Kericho
- ❖ **ASAL Cluster:** -Narok, Laikipia, Turkana and Isiolo Marsabit
- ❖ **Central Kenya Cluster:** -Nairobi, Kirinyaga, Embu
- ❖ **Coastal Cluster:** -Kwale, Kilifi, Taita-Taveta, Tana river, Mombasa

as well as additional focus areas of the HnY program, including the regional, and global levels. The evaluation will consider both urban and rural contexts, with a particular emphasis on the above listed regions. To ensure depth and representativeness, the evaluation will include all



**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT** counties in both the desk review, while a carefully selected sample of counties may be used for the Evaluators primary data collection.

The sampling approach will be designed to capture a diverse range of experiences, contexts, and lessons learned, ensuring that findings are both comprehensive and actionable. The overall evaluation needs to reflect to the achievement of results vis a vis to the Logframe indicators in the original project contract made with the EU. The indicators need to be reflected with gender disaggregated data.

### 3.2 Time Scope

The evaluation will cover the full project cycle from **31<sup>st</sup> December 2022 to 31 December 2026**. The scope includes: review of project planning and inception phases (January- July 2023), assessment of ROM mid-term results (2024), and final assessment of outcomes in 2026. The assessment at the outcome level must adhere to assessment time grid matrix. The consultant will need to be aware of this time scope and propose ways in which results data achieved during the second half of 2026, while the evaluation is taking place, will be incorporated into the final evaluation report.

### 3.3 Thematic Scope

The thematic areas to be evaluated include the 3 thematic and ensuing sub-themes of the project results. These include:

- **Democracy and the Rule of Law:** good governance, promoting the rule of law and State accountability, fight against corruption and increasing access to justice
- **Gender Equality and Non-Discrimination:** women's rights, prevention of gender-based violence (GBV), and enhancing LGBTIQ+ rights
- **Business and Human Rights:** environmental and climate justice, corporate accountability

## 4. EVALUATION QUESTIONS

### 4.1 Evaluation Criteria (OECD/DAC) and Cross-Cutting Issues

The evaluation objectives and evaluation questions are guided by the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria: Relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. The evaluation questions have incorporated other relevant cross-cutting issues (e.g. gender, youth engagement, climate, safeguarding and locally led action), accompanied by cross-cutting questions. The evaluation questions will ideally incorporate requirements/perspectives from the HNY consortium partners as well as from the European Union Evaluation criteria and guidelines to which mutual agreement will be reached on how the evaluation is carried out (methodologically). The evaluation will include **efficiency** criterion on results efficiency (timely delivery of results) and operational efficiency (organizational efficiency). The selection of the **OECD/DAC criteria** and cross-cutting issues is based on criterion of European Union Evaluation Quality Criteria.

### 4.2 Evaluation Questions



## TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT

The evaluation will focus on the following main questions. The questions are aligned with the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria and the HNY cross cutting factors as outlined in the below table and will have to be answered and assessed through data collection methodologies and analysis which are aligned with evaluation criteria:

Evaluation Criteria	Main Question	Sub-Question
Relevance		<p>To what extent did the intervention reflect the actual needs and interests of the target beneficiaries/partners?</p> <p>To what extent did the intervention align with organizational, subnational and national strategies of the 21 counties?</p>
Effectiveness	<p>Has the Haki Ni Yetu Project achieved its expected and unexpected outcomes (in reference to the project's result framework for baseline data and targets), including changes in policy civil society organization resilience, and the capacity of civil society organizations to advocate for accountability, justice and human rights?</p>	<p>What progress has been made toward achieving the expected and unexpected outcomes across the 3 thematic areas and the 3 overall outcomes?</p> <p>Were the project's advocacy, capacity strengthening, and community engagement strategies effective in driving change in the Haki Ni Yetu project?</p> <p>Were the project's advocacy strategies effective in influencing legal and policy frameworks at the local, national, and international levels? How effective?</p> <p>Did the capacity-strengthening initiatives improve the ability of CSOs to advocate for Human rights, Accountability, Justice in Kenya?</p>



**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT**

		<p>How effective were the funded project's community engagement activities in fostering grassroots participation and mobilizing local action?</p>
<p>Efficiency</p>		<p>To what extent was the project cost-efficient?</p> <p>Were all the activities completed in good time in accordance with annual workplans?</p> <p>Organizational set-up: were the number and professional skills of the project team as well as the organizational set-up, adequate for the activities of the project and where are improvements needed?</p>
<p>Coherence</p>	<p>Has there been alignment and coordination of the HNY project's coherence with the EU roadmap for civil society in Kenya, other likeminded projects and programs at national, regional, and global levels and between the strategic partnership and European Union?</p>	<p>Has the HNY project been coherent with other initiatives, policies, and programs at the subnational, national, regional, and global levels?</p> <p>Has the HNY project been coherent with these initiatives and actors to enhance synergies, avoid duplication, and contribute to broader goals?</p> <p>Has the HNY project been coherent with the policies and priorities of EU roadmap for civil society in Kenya?</p> <p>Were the project's strategies coherent with emerging trends, advocacy strategies and priorities in strengthening civil society In Kenya?</p>



**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT**

		<p>Were the project’s interventions coherent between EU Roadmap for Civil Society in Kenya and other regional and global level interventions?</p>
Impact	<p>What are the positive or negative, intended, unintended, tangible and visible effects of the project on the target groups</p>	<p>What are the positive or negative, intended, unintended, tangible and visible effects of the project on the target groups, surrounding communities, the institutional level, the local government and national government?</p> <p>To what extent did the capacity building, mentorship &amp; coaching change and improve the knowledge, attitudes and practices of the beneficiaries?</p>
Sustainability	<p>Is there a likelihood that the activities and results of the project will be sustained beyond the project’s lifecycle, particularly regarding local ownership, institutional capacity, and financial sustainability?</p>	<p>Are the activities and results of the project likely to be sustained beyond the project’s end?</p> <p>Has the project built local ownership institutional capacity for civil-society Organizations in Kenya?</p> <p>What are the key conditions necessary for the sustainability of the project results? And to what extent have these conditions been achieved?</p> <p>Are there additional actions that the project should take to further boost the sustainability of its results?</p>



**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT**

		<p>What specific strategies or interventions would enhance this likelihood?</p> <p>Are there externalities of the project likely to advance or hinder sustainability?</p>
<p>Haki Ni Yetu Project's Cross-Cutting Factors</p>	<p>How effectively did the HNY project integrate and address crosscutting priorities such as gender transformation, climate, locally-led action, learning agenda reflection, non-discrimination, equality, safeguarding, security of human rights defenders, land &amp; environment defenders, environment and climate change?</p>	<p>Did the project address gender disparities? If so, how and was this effective? If not, why not?</p> <p>Has the project engaged and empowered youth, women and minority groups in governance, accountability, justice and advancing human rights initiatives?</p> <p>Did the project contribute to climate change adaptation and mitigation and what are the results in this regard?</p> <p>Were the safeguarding principles incorporated throughout the project? To what extent were they incorporated? Were there any challenges experienced?</p> <p>Did the project take adequate measures to protect marginalized &amp; vulnerable populations and protection on PSEAH in community engagement and project activities?</p> <p>Did the project foster locally led action? To what</p>



**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT**

		<p>extent? Were there any challenges experienced?</p> <p>How effectively were local communities, CSOs, and local leaders empowered to take ownership of this and their projects actions?</p> <p>Are these locally led action initiatives likely to last beyond the project's lifecycle?</p> <p>What lessons and best practices can be drawn from the project's learning agenda?</p> <p>How can these lessons and best practices and on the implementation to inform future programming?</p>
<p>Theory of Change (ToC) Validity and Adaptation</p>	<p>What can be learnt from program Implementation about the validity and adaptation of the Haki Ni Yetu project ToC?</p>	<p>the Theory of Change (ToC) and its underlying risks and assumptions was it relevant to the HNY strategies and results?</p> <p>What adaptations and interlinkages to the ToC are necessary to enhance its alignment with the HNY project's evolving priorities and the post-project sustainability strategy?</p> <p>All learning agenda questions related to the ToC answered successfully and how were they answered?</p>



## TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT

### 5. METHODOLOGY

#### 5.1 Introduction

The methodology for this evaluation will have to integrate approaches and methods aligned with European Commission Evaluation Quality Criteria and Guidelines, ensuring a thorough and ethical evaluation process. The Inception report, the draft and final evaluation reports will be approved based on this. This section will therefore provide guidelines on what type of methods are expected, set criteria for methodology and sampling. The proposed methodology will be elaborated in the Inception Report by the consultant, detailing how the proposed methodology meets the requirements of this ToR and standards and Quality of the Evaluation Criteria. The proposed methodology in the Inception Report needs to be approved by the HNY team leader and the Project Management Team (PMT) before the Evaluation itself will be conducted.

#### 5.2 Evaluation Research Design

The proposed evaluation's research design by the consultant will structure the overall approach and methods of the evaluation. The proposed approach and methods must achieve the evaluation objectives in a valid and reliable manner and be appropriate to answer the evaluation questions. The Expression of Interest (EoI), Technical Proposal (TP) and Inception Report (IR) should elaborate on the research design, the methods selected and how these methods are expected to validly and reliably contribute to answering the evaluation questions. The description of research design by the consultant will be approved based on criterion set evaluation Quality Criteria by the Haki ni Yetu consortium and the European Union Delegation in Kenya.

#### 5.3 Data Triangulation

The evaluation robustness will be increased by use of triangulation. The consultant is required to propose a comprehensive methodology that incorporates both quantitative and qualitative approaches, as well as triangulation of data, to address the evaluation questions and to fulfil the evaluation's objectives. To ensure the reliability and validity of findings, the evaluation will employ triangulation by using multiple data sources and methods to cross-check results. This will help to mitigate biases and ensure that findings are well-substantiated. Triangulation will be applied across methods by combining qualitative and quantitative data, data sources by collecting information from multiple stakeholder groups and data types by incorporating both primary and secondary data. The consultant must present the proposed information sources, indicators, result areas and selected research methods per evaluation question in an evaluation matrix.

#### 5.4 Sampling and Case Selection

Given the vast and wide geographical scope of the Haki Ni Yetu project, a robust sampling strategy will be required to ensure that findings are generalizable across the project's target counties.



## **TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT**

The consultant will need to propose a sample and sampling framework that ensures inclusivity across geographic regions with representation from urban, rural, and remote areas affected by climate change in the project, key and diverse stakeholders with representation from partners, government officials, local CSOs, community members, youth and women's organizations and target groups with representation from vulnerable groups such as women, youth, indigenous peoples and marginalized communities. Sampling method will include probability sampling (for quantitative methods) and purposive sampling (for qualitative methods). The proposed sample size and sampling framework should be justified based on representativeness and a clear rationale provided for the selection of case studies. The sample size should be based on a power calculation.

The sampling and case selection will further be discussed and agreed upon during the inception phase of the evaluation. The description of sampling and case selection by the consultant will be approved based on criterion set by the Haki Ni Yetu and European Commission Evaluation Quality Criteria.

### **5.5 Sufficient and Independent Information Sources**

There needs to be sufficient and independent information sources for the evaluation based on Haki Ni Yetu and European Commission Evaluation Quality Criteria. The consultant shall collect information from the HNY project non-direct stakeholders that were not directly involved with the project to provide important information about the external factors, assumptions or what would have happened in the absence of the intervention. Information on external factors and assumptions can be referenced from the HNY Project Theory of Change. In addition to information sources obtained from direct stakeholders, the consultant has to consider to include other information sources such as the non-targeted population, informed but not directly engaged stakeholders (staff from other donors, CSOs, NGOs, national or sub-national government officials; researchers, academics etc.) the evaluator's own direct observations and validated independent secondary data sources as per the set Evaluation Quality Criteria. The EOI Technical Proposal and Inception Report should present, which information sources will be included in a way that minimizes source bias, by using sufficient and independent information sources.

### **5.6 Description of Limitations**

The consultant's Technical Proposal and Inception Report should clearly describe the potential limitations that may arise in the reliability and validity (both internal and external) of the proposed methodology sampling strategy, case selection and available information sources.

### **5.7 Description of Result Areas and Indicators**

The Technical Proposal and Inception Report should present the valid quantitative and qualitative indicators that describe the result areas as concretely as possible to assess the intended results and should adhere to the SMART criteria. The description of results areas and the indicators for the Haki Ni Yetu project.



## TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT

### 5.8 Plausibility of Causal Claims

The proposed evaluation methods should be appropriate to assess the contribution or attribution of the interventions to the observed results at the outcome or impact levels. The consultant shall propose evaluation method(s) to evaluate the degree to which causal claims of the Haki Ni Yetu project interventions about the results, effects, and outcomes are plausible. The consultant can use qualitative evaluation methods that are suitable for substantiating claims about effectiveness such as: realistic evaluation, contribution analysis, process tracing and general elimination methodology. The consultant can consider to use quantitative evaluation methods to robustly substantiate causal claims about effects of HNY interventions making use of Maryland scientific methods scale that delineates 5 progressing levels of rigor: single observation moment, after a project: a comparison with and without the project (level 1), two observation moments, comparisons before and after the project, without a control group (level 2), two observation moments: comparing before and after, and with and without the project (double difference) (level 3), two observation moments: comparing before and after, and with and without the project (double difference, semi-experimental design), while accounting for other external influences (level 4) and two observation moments: comparing before and after, and with and without the project (double difference); participants are randomly assigned to a project (randomized control group, experimental design) (level 5). In this End of Project Evaluation, it is proposed that for quantitative evaluation should have a minimum of Level 4 rigor which is generally accepted as robust to support substantial causal claims.

### 5.10 Suggested Evaluation Methods

The evaluation will prioritize on utilizing existing project methods and existing project data. The consultant will propose their methodology, which will be further be discussed with the project team during the inception phase of the evaluation. The following are the suggested evaluation methods:

- a) **Participatory Evaluation Methods:** Methods such as outcome mapping or outcome harvesting (OH) can be used to capture the perspectives of local communities and their contributions to climate justice advocacy. The outcome substantiation of the OH database from routine reporting would be desirable.
- b) **Document Review:** A review of all relevant project documents, including the original project proposal, ROM evaluation, mid-term review reports, annual reports, policy briefs, and any other relevant HNY project publications.
- c) **Key Informant Interviews (KIIs):** In-depth interviews with stakeholders, including HNY project governance structures, donor representatives, consortium partners, county-level downstream partners, government officials, and project participants' representatives.
- d) **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs):** Group discussions with HNY project partners, project participants and community members to assess the perceived impact of the project on their livelihoods and resilience.



## TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT

- e) **Surveys and Questionnaires:** Quantitative surveys with HNY project partners, project participants and stakeholders to assess specific outcomes related to capacity-building, advocacy, and community resilience.
- f) **Case Studies and Most Significant Stories (MCSs):** Case studies and MCSs focusing on specific counties or regions where the project had notable successes or faced significant challenges. The case studies and MCSs should provide insights into the factors that influenced project performance and outcomes.

### 5.11 Answers to Evaluation Questions

The consultant's draft and final report should provide an answer to all evaluation questions. If the consultant faced unforeseen limitations during the evaluation process that prevents answering all evaluation questions, the reports must highlight which evaluation questions were not answered and give reasons for this.

### 5.12 Logic of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations in the EPE Report

The consultant should have a clear and rational connection in the EPE report from findings to conclusions, and from the conclusions to the recommendations. Each conclusion should be supported by specific findings. It is important that the final report takes possible limitations and bias sufficiently into account. Recommendations, in turn, must logically follow from the conclusions presented in the Project Final Evaluation report. It is expected from the consultant that the draft and final report(s) not only mention what limitations and possible biases are but also clearly and fully reflects on what this means for the conducted evaluation, the presented results and findings and the formulated conclusions and recommendations.

### 5.13 Inception, Draft and Final Report

The consultant will produce 3 reports in 3 stages: Inception Report, Draft Report and Final Report. The reports should present all research methods, data collection methods, data sources and data analysis techniques in a systematic, complete and transparent manner. The draft and final reports (or annexes) should discuss and compare findings from all different research methods, data collection methods and data sources as per Annex 3 of the Annexes section. The draft and final reports should transparently describe how it weighed the evidence, how it addressed the discrepancies between findings and how it combined findings from different sources and methods to come to an overall judgement and conclusion. The transparency of the draft and final reports will be approved based on the set Evaluation Quality Criteria.

## 6. RESEARCH ETHICS

The Haki Ni Yetu project focuses on vulnerable populations, making it critical that the evaluation adheres to the highest possible research ethics. The following research ethics must be integrated into the evaluation process:

- a) **Confidentiality, Anonymity and Data Protection:** Given the potentially sensitive nature of the information gathered, particularly related to advocacy activities and the



## TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT

experiences of marginalized groups, it is essential that all data be handled with confidentiality, securely stored and in compliance with data protection laws and HNY project policies. Personal identifiers should not be disclosed in any reports unless explicit consent is given by participants.

- b) Informed Consent:** All participants in the evaluation must provide informed consent before any data collection begins. This requires that participants are fully informed about the purpose of the evaluation, the use of the data, and their right to withdraw from the evaluation at any time without penalty.
- c) Safeguarding:** All research activities must prioritize safeguarding principles to ensure the safety, dignity, and rights of all participants, particularly vulnerable groups such as women, youth, and marginalized communities. The consultant must adhere to the HNY safeguarding policy and ensure that no participant experiences harm, discrimination, or exploitation as a result of their participation in the research.
- d) Protection from PSEAH:** Strict measures must be taken to prevent and address any risks of sexual exploitation, abuse, or harassment during data collection, stakeholder engagements, or community interactions. The consultant is required to establish and follow clear reporting and response mechanisms for any PSEAH-related concerns or incidents that may arise during the consultancy.
- e) Cultural Sensitivity and Respect:** The consultant must approach all interactions with cultural sensitivity and respect, ensuring that the data collection methods are appropriate for the context and do not perpetuate harmful stereotypes or biases.

Additionally, the consultant should propose other ethical risks and strategies for mitigating these potential ethical risks.

## 7. DELIVERABLES AND TIMELINE

### 7.1 Deliverables:

The assessment of the deliverables will be based on the ToR and evaluation quality criteria. In that premise, the consultant will be expected to deliver the following deliverables:

**1. Inception Report:** The consultant to provide an inception report outlining the detailed evaluation methodology, work plan, and timeline. It will also include an initial desk review of project documents, identification of key informants, and a sampling strategy. The report should **not exceed 20 pages** (excluding annexes).

**2. Data Collection Tools:** The consultant will provide data collection tools, including interview guides, survey instruments, and focus group discussion templates. These tools will be reviewed and approved by the Haki Ni Yetu Evaluation team prior to data collection.

**3. Preliminary Findings Report:** The preliminary findings report will summarize key insights from the fieldwork and provide an initial analysis of the data collected. This report will be used to engage stakeholders in a validation process to ensure that the findings accurately reflect the situation on the ground.



## TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT

**4. Draft Report:** The draft report will present a full analysis of the evaluation findings, addressing each of the evaluation questions and providing conclusion and recommendations. The report will include: Executive summary, description of the methodology used, analysis of the project's findings, challenges, and lessons learned, conclusions and recommendations as per the Template that will be provided by the Haki Ni Yetu Consortium and also will incorporate with European Commission Evaluation guidelines

**5. Final Evaluation Report:** The final report will be produced by incorporating all feedback from the HNY Internal Evaluation, Donor and the HNY Consortium Partners. It will be submitted in **English**. The report should not exceed **60 pages**, excluding annexes.

**6. Presentation of Findings:** The consultant will present the findings to the HNY Project governance structures and also to key HNY project stakeholders during a validation workshop. This workshop will provide an opportunity for stakeholders to discuss the findings, conclusions and recommendations. Consequently, the findings will be presented during the HNY Final Project Conference.

### 7.2 Timeline

The evaluation timeline is categorized into phases as guided by HNY Evaluation Quality Criteria: **Phase 1: Formation of the Internal HNY Evaluation Backstopping team, Phase 2: Field & data collection and Phase 3: Draft and Final Report. Phase 4: Dissemination of findings.** The entire Project Final Evaluation timeline is expected to be **60 days** from the date of contract signing. The Project Final Evaluation assignment is expected to kick off after the inception meeting. The detailed timeline is as follows;

No.	Task	Duration	Timelines (By when)	Responsibility Center
<b>Phase 1: Terms of Reference</b>				
1.	Establishment of the HNY Evaluation Backstopping Team	-	15 April 2026	TL, DTL M&E Advisor
2.	Drafting of the Terms of Reference	14 days	22 April 2026	TL, DTL, M&E Advisor, PMT
3.	Review and approval of the Terms of reference	14 working days	6 May 2026	Project Management Team Steering Committee European Union Program Manager/Head of Governance section



**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT**

4.	Advertisement of the Terms of reference	30 days	13 May – 15 June 2026	Communications Team all available HNY consortium digital channels.
5.	Receipt and Filing of Expression of Interest containing the technical proposal and Financial proposals for shortlisting	2 days	15-17 June	TL, DTL M&E advisor
6.	Review and shortlisting of EOI Technical & Financial	7 days	17-21 June	TL, DTL M&E Advisor, PMT
7.	Interview and selection of the consultant	2 days	21-23 June	TL, DTL M&E Advisor, PMT
8.	Contract signing and Kick-off meeting with the consultant	1 week	24-26 June 2026	TL, DTL, M&E Advisor, PMT
9.	Document Review of the HNY Project Documents by the Consultant. Development, Approval and Piloting of the Data Collection Tools	2 weeks	1-15 July 2026	Consultant HNY Evaluation Backstopping Team
<b>Phase 2: Inception Phase</b>				
10.	Submission and Approval of an Inception Report by the Consultant	2 weeks	15-29 July 2026	Consultant, HNY Evaluation Backstopping Team, Project Management team (PMT)
11.	Field Data Collection and on-line interviews with stakeholders	4 weeks	August 2026	Consultant, HNY Evaluation Backstopping Team
12.	Data analysis	2 weeks		Consultant
<b>Phase 3: Draft report &amp; Final Report</b>				
13.	Development, Submission and Approval of the Draft Report	2 weeks	By 20 September	Consultant, HNY Evaluation Backstopping Team, Project Management team (PMT), Steering Committee, EUD Kenya



**TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT**

14.	Development, Submission and Approval of the Final Report	2 weeks	October 2026	Consultant, HNY Evaluation Backstopping Team, Project Management team (PMT)
Phase 4: Dissemination				
15.	Report Validation Workshop	0.5 week	September 2026	Consultant, HNY Evaluation Backstopping Team, Project Management team (PMT), EUD Kenya
16.	Sharing the Results to HNY Consortium, Partners, Stakeholders, Funding agencies (Donor)	0.5 week	October-November 2026	KIOS
17.	Handover	0.5 week	October-November 2026	KIOS
Total duration				
May-November 2026				

## 8. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

### 8.1 The Consultant or the Evaluator

The consultant will be responsible for:

1. Developing and implementing the evaluation methodology and providing an Inception Report based on the initial desk study of the documents.
2. Conducting fieldwork and data collection.
3. Producing all ToR deliverables in line with the agreed timeline.
4. Ensuring compliance with research ethics throughout the evaluation.
5. Ensuring compliance with the ToR, Haki Ni Yetu and the EU Evaluation Quality Criteria 2025.

### 8.2 Haki Ni Yetu Consortium Project Team

The Haki Ni Yetu Project team will provide:



## **TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT**

1. Access to all project documentation.
2. Coordination with the donor, consortium partners, Steering Committee, country downstream partners and local partners to facilitate fieldwork
3. Facilitate the selection of key informants and stakeholders by the consultant for key informant interviews.
4. Mobilization of respondents in various counties in Kenya
5. Coordinate & Facilitate availability of meeting venues for FGDs
6. Coordinate & Facilitate availability of meeting venues for the validation workshop.
7. Coordinate & Facilitate availability of meeting venues for Evaluation report dissemination

### **8.3 Evaluation Backstopping Team**

The Evaluation Backstopping Team plays a crucial role in guaranteeing the quality and independence of the evaluation process. It serves as an advisory body to the PMT. The Evaluation Backstopping Team comprises the Team Leader, MEAL Coordinator Advisor, MEAL select workstream representative from each of the Three (3) consortium partner organizations, and one steering committee expert with experience in evaluation methodologies, relevant themes and geographical target counties. There is also partial participation of the Donor focal point from the European Union Delegation in Kenya Project Manager and Head of Governance Section, making it a joint responsibility to make the End Project Evaluation a success. The Evaluation Backstopping Team will be responsible for:

1. Ensure presentation of a ToR to the PMT review and approve the ToR.
2. Selection of consultant to be contracted as the evaluator.
3. To review and approve the inception report submitted by the evaluator.
4. To review and approve the draft and final End Project Evaluation Report by the evaluator.

### **8.4 Reporting and Communication**

The consultant will report directly to the Haki Ni Yetu Project Team Leader, the Deputy Team Leader and the M&E Advisor. This team will report to Evaluation Backstopping Team to review and approve the consultant's deliverables. Regular communication and updates will be achieved through meetings every week up to the final approval of final report.

## **9. REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CONSULTANT AND THE CONSULTANT'S TEAM**

### **9.1 Independence of the Consultant and Consultant's Team**

The evaluators and their affiliated organizations should not have been involved in the design or implementation of the project under evaluation, either with the organization responsible for implementation. Additionally, they must maintain complete impartiality with no vested interest in the ultimate outcome of the evaluation.

### **9.2 Consultant and Consultant's Team, Qualifications and Skills**

The Consultant and Consultant's Team must be composed as follows:



## TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT

- a) Comprising a minimum of 1 member, with diverse and complementary expertise relevant to End of Project Evaluation (EPE) for the Haki Ni Yetu project.
- b) A team that includes, at a minimum of 1-2 persons with extensive expertise and experience in Kenya. The suggestive non exhaustive following roles include:
  - ✓ **Lead Consultant/ Evaluator/ Team Leader:** An expert in evaluation methodologies, with extensive experience in managing and delivering complex evaluations, particularly for multi-themed, multi-year, multi-country, multi-stakeholder development projects.

### We welcome Proposal with the following Technical Team Structure. Competencies in the areas of:

- ✓ **Data Analysis expertise:** Proficient in both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis techniques, with experience using statistical and qualitative analysis tools.
- ✓ **Reporting expertise:** Expertise in synthesizing evaluation findings into clear, actionable, and donor-compliant reports, ensuring alignment with evaluation frameworks and stakeholder expectations.
- ✓ **Policy Advocacy expertise:** Deep knowledge on climate justice issues, including policy advocacy, grassroots engagement, and capacity building.
- ✓ **Gender mainstreaming and Inclusion expertise:** Expertise in integrating gender equity, Human Rights Based approaches (HRBA) youth engagement, and inclusion frameworks into evaluation processes and analysis.
- ✓ **Safeguarding expertise:** Proven experience in safeguarding and the Prevention of Sexual Exploitation, Abuse, and Harassment (PSEAH), ensuring ethical standards are upheld throughout the evaluation process.

The Consultant must mandatorily possess the following qualifications and skills:

- I. Hold a Masters' Degree from a recognized university in a relevant field such as Sustainable Development, Development Studies, Gender and Development, Social Sciences, Monitoring and Evaluation or equivalent.
- II. At least 10 years of professional experience in Civil society/Civic space, Governance & Human rights -related Project Evaluations, or related fields and evidence of previous consultancy assignments in the same area particularly for large-scale donor-funded programs.
- III. Has a strong background in MEAL for large, multi-themed, multi-year development programs in conducting Project Final Evaluations for development programs.
- IV. Has expertise in both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies, including participatory methods such as Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions, and desk research.
- V. Proven experience with qualitative and quantitative data analysis



## TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT

- VI. Has deep understanding of the civil society, civic space, Human rights and Governance in Kenya, including the political, social, and economic dynamics that influence such-like programs in Kenya.
- VII. Has commitment to upholding the highest ethical standards in engagement with stakeholders, ensuring confidentiality, transparency, impartiality throughout the assignment, manage conflicts of interest and maintain the independence throughout the assignment.
- VIII. Has familiarity with safeguarding principles, ensuring that no harm is caused to vulnerable populations during the review and data collection processes.
- IX. Demonstrate familiarity with the Haki Ni Yetu project ToC and objectives.
- X. Experience in evaluating programs European Commission/European Union funded projects and with a diversity of stakeholders.
- XI. Experience in facilitating online, offline, hybrid validation workshops.
- XII. Previous experience - at least two assignments - comparable in content, time, scope and money.
- XIII. Has team members and/or network of experts/ specialists/ consultants based in the Kenya and with consultancy experience in European Union/European Commission funded programs.
- XIV. Expertise in Human rights approaches, Gender and Feminist Evaluations, and a clear understanding of matters Civil society, accountability, Human-Rights and governance in Kenya.
- XV. Ability to communicate in English is mandatory. However, communicating in additional languages is an added advantage.
- XVI. Excellent conceptual and analytical skills. Strong writing, analytical and facilitation skills.
- XVII. Proven abilities in working across geographies, local languages, contexts and Kenyan cultures.
- XVIII. Ability to organize and deliver evaluation deliverables on time against a prompt deadline.

## 10. BUDGET FOR THE EVALUATION

### 10.1 Budget

The total budget for the evaluation will be in line with the Haki Ni Yetu budget provision. The budget reserved for the evaluation is set at **30,000 EUR** inclusive of applicable costs and taxes. The proposed budget should cover all costs related to: Consultant fees, fieldwork expenses, including travel and accommodation, data collection, translation and transcription services (if required) and report production and dissemination. Therefore, the consultant will be required to submit a detailed budget proposal including a breakdown of the number of days per lead consultant, number of days per consultant's team members, and costs per activity to ensure transparency and accountability. The final budget for this assignment will be determined based on the scope of work, methodology, and deliverables as outlined in this ToR.



## TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT

### 10.2 Payment

The consultant will be paid in the following schedule

- ✓ **30%** upon Signing of contract and acceptance of a satisfactory inception report,
- ✓ **40%** upon submission and acceptance of a satisfactory draft report; and the remaining
- ✓ **30%** upon acceptance and approval of the final report and all other deliverables in line with the ToR.

### 11.0 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA FOR THE PROPOSALS AND HOW TO APPLY

This consultancy is initiated by the Lead Party of the Consortium KIOS Foundation, and its procurement rules shall apply to awarding this assignment. A procedure requesting for competitive quotations is to be implemented. Applicants interested in undertaking the consultancy, are asked to express their interest by applying with the EOI-Technical Proposals and Financial Proposals. The Technical Proposals and Financial Proposals will be evaluated based on the following criteria:

#### **EOI-Technical Proposal (carries 50%)**

A technical proposal (**maximum 20 pages** excluding annexes) outlining how you plan to undertake the consultancy:

- ✓ Understanding and interpretation of the Terms of Reference;
- ✓ Description of the intended approach, methodology, tools, analysis and reporting in the consultancy assignment;
- ✓ Overview of the perceived risks and mitigation strategies.
- ✓ A detailed work plan including start and completion dates and the time periods required for each phase of the consultancy with the associated phase deliverables.
- ✓ Attach at least **three (3)** published samples of previous/similar assignments undertaken with a clickable **URL/link** to where the products are published this should be a website or Reputable peer reviewed journals.

#### **Team composition (carries 20%)**

A summary of the team composition and expertise including an annex of the CVs of the consultants who will carry out the work, outlining how they meet the expected criteria, including relevant experiences and their roles and person-day inputs on this evaluation.

#### **Financial Proposal (Carries 30%)**

- ✓ The consultant shall propose a detailed and itemized financial proposal including the professional fees, logistics, and, tax obligations, administrative costs as well as field Costs (including travel, accommodation, Enumerators (Full budget proposition for undertaking the assignment)

# Haki Ni Yetu

A Rights, Governance & Accountability  
Project for Kenyans



Funded by  
the European Union



KIOS  
Foundation



## **TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) FOR THE END PROJECT EVALUATION (EPE) OF THE HAKI NI YETU PROJECT**

- ✓ The final budget indication will be determined by the Consortium's Project Management Team (PMT) based on available fund

The prospective consultant/s or consultancy companies are expected to submit **detailed** technical and financial (itemized) proposals to by clicking on this link [CLICK HERE TO APPLY](#) by **close of business 15 June 2026**.

If you have any questions, write to us through **kios@kios.fi**