# Contents

## Annex I: Evaluation Matrix

| Evaluation Criteria 1: Relevance | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Evaluation Question 1: To what extent did the project contribute to UN Women's strategic frameworks, the UNSDCF, the GAC Strategic Plan, and national priorities, and how well did it address the evolving needs and priorities of beneficiaries, partners, and other stakeholders?** | | | | | |
| **No** | **Evaluation Sub-questions** | **Measure/Indicator of progress** | **Main Sources of Data/ Information** | **Data Collection Methods** | **Data Analysis Methods/ Triangulation** |
| 1.1 | To what extent was the project aligned with and contributed to UN Women's Global Strategic Plan, KCO's Strategic Note 2023-2026, the UNSDCF, the GAC Strategic Plan, and Kenya's national priorities and strategies, including Kenya's 12 commitments to the Generation Equality Forum (GEF)? | Alignment with and contribution to the UN Women, UN, and GAC strategic plans, as well as national priorities and strategies. | Project documents Relevant literature Key stakeholders | • Documentation review <br> • Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team, duty bearers and development partner) | Document synthesis and triangulation |
| 1.2 | To what extent were the project's priorities still valid in the context of the targeted counties and relevant to the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries? | • How the project is responsive to the needs and priorities of beneficiaries <br> • The extent to which the needs of different groups were appropriately identified, targeting was based on those needs, and interventions were tailored accordingly | Project documents Relevant literature Key stakeholders | • Documentation review <br> • Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team, duty bearers IPs and FGD with beneficiaries) | Document synthesis and triangulation |
| 1.3 | To what extent was the project design articulated in a coherent structure, with clear definitions of the goal, outcomes, and outputs? Is the Theory of Change still valid and aligned with the project's objectives? | Project design and focus | Project documents Key stakeholders | • Documentation review <br> • Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team) | Document synthesis and triangulation |

| 1.4 | To what extent is the project results framework (indicators) plausible and doable (using SMART Criteria)? | Project theory of change and formulation of project performance indicators | Project documents | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team) | Document synthesis and triangulation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.5 | How strategic are the implementing partners in terms of mandate, influence, capacities, and commitment? | Process of selection of IPs and Partnership engagement | Project documents<br>Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs) | Document synthesis and triangulation |

| **Evaluation Criteria 2: Coherence** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Evaluation Question 2 How has the project promoted coherence with, complemented, and integrated into other interventions supported by UN Women? To what extent have similar interventions by other actors supported or undermined the project, including aspects of complementarity, harmonization, and coordination?** | | | | | |
| 2.1 | To what extent were there synergies and interlinkages between the project and other ongoing interventions implemented by UN Women? | Similar initiatives and interlinkages with other interventions implemented by UN Women | Project documents<br>Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team) | Document synthesis, Triangulation and |
| 2.2 | To what extent has the project been able to establish relationships, complement, harmonize, and coordinate with other actors implementing similar interventions in the targeted counties? | Collaborative initiatives or partnerships established with other actors implementing similar interventions | Project documents<br>Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs) | Document synthesis, Triangulation and |
| 2.3 | To what extent has the project leveraged or coordinated with other GAC-funded or similar initiatives, fostering cross-program collaboration, resource sharing, and shared learnings to enhance efficiency, effectiveness, and the sustainability of its outcomes? | Similar initiatives and interlinkages with other interventions supported by GAC | Project documents<br>Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team, IPs and donor) | Document synthesis, Triangulation and |

| **Evaluation Criteria 3: Effectiveness** | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Evaluation Question 3: To what extent and under what conditions has the project achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives and target results at both the outcome and output levels?** | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Is the Project being implemented as designed? To what extent were the project outputs and outcomes | The intervention logic against progress reports; Achievement of planned | Project documents<br>Key stakeholders (project team, IPs | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs) | Triangulation and Contribution analysis |

| | | achieved? What factors contributed to the achievement or non-achievement of these results? | results (outputs and outcomes); comparative analysis of the project's performance across the seven counties | and direct beneficiaries) | • FGD with direct beneficiaries | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.2 | | To what extent did the approach of combining several thematic areas in a 'layered' manner contribute to generating impact for the beneficiaries? | Duplication and synergy; Review the project's Theory of Change/Pathway to ultimate outcomes to understand the catalytic effect of combining the thematic areas. | Project documents Key stakeholders (project team and IPs) | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs) | Triangulation and Contribution analysis |
| 3.3 | | To what extent has the project addressed structural barriers to women's political participation, including economic empowerment, party politics, mentorship Projects, societal attitudes, and access to political networks, while ensuring sustainable progress in women's leadership? | • Project results (Planned and achieved)<br>• Project adaptability to changes in context and emerging issues | Project documents Key stakeholders (project team, IPs and direct beneficiaries) | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team, duty bearers and IPs)<br>• FGD with direct beneficiaries | Document synthesis, Triangulation and Contribution analysis |
| 3.4 | | What challenges, if any, emerged during the project implementation? How did the project adapt to changes in the context and address emerging challenges during the project implementation? | • Factors that may have affected project results.<br>• Project adaptability to changes in context and emerging issues | Project documents Key stakeholders (project team, IPs and direct beneficiaries) | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs) | Document synthesis and triangulation |
| 3.5 | | Were there any unintended or unexpected results achieved by the project that can be documented as lessons learned? | Unplanned or unexpected (positive or negative) results achieved | Project documents Key stakeholders (project team, IPs and direct beneficiaries) | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team, duty bearers and IPs)<br>• FGD with direct beneficiaries | Triangulation and Contribution analysis |

| 3.6 | To what extent did the project employ an effective and reliable M&E strategy, along with innovative strategies and practices, to achieve planned results and enhance impact? | • M & E strategy<br>• monitoring and evaluation mechanisms | Project documents<br>Key stakeholders (project team, IPs and direct beneficiaries) | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs) | Triangulation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 3.7 | To what extent were the key stakeholders involved in the project implementation? | Level of involvement of key stakeholders in project implementation. | Project documents<br>Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs) | Document synthesis and triangulation |
| **Evaluation Criteria 4: Efficiency** | | | | | |
| **Evaluation Question 4: To what extent has the project been implemented efficiently and cost-effectively, and how effective are the management and coordination mechanisms in generating the expected results?** | | | | | |
| 4.1 | To what extent is the project management structure and coordination mechanism, as outlined in the project document, efficient in generating the expected results? What specific modes of engagement have been most efficient? | Governance Structure, management, right mix of skills and expertise available, Coordination Mechanisms, Planning and Implementation Processes, Communication and Information Flow, Decision-Making Processes, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL), Accountability Mechanisms | Project documents<br>Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs) | Triangulation |
| 4.2 | To what extent has there been an economical use of resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.)? Have resources been allocated strategically to achieve the desired outputs and outcomes? What measures were taken during planning and implementation to ensure that resources were used efficiently? Were project activities implemented in a timely manner? | • Was project budget aligned with the priorities outlined in the project design?<br>• Were the resources used in a cost-effective manner?<br>• Use of funds in comparison to the scale and scope of activities?<br>• Resource use monitoring and adjustments | Project documents<br>Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs) | Document synthesis and triangulation |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | • Proportionality of Expenditure to Results<br>• Adherence to project timelines and work plans<br>• Implementation delays and causes | | | |
| 4.3 | Were there any constraints (e.g., political, cultural, bureaucratic etc) to addressing the rights of women efficiently during implementation? What level of effort was made to overcome these challenges? | Risks, threats, and implementation challenges | Project documents<br>Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs)<br>• FGD with direct beneficiaries | Document synthesis Triangulation and |
| **Evaluation Criteria 5: Sustainability** | | | | | |
| **Evaluation Question 5:** *To what extent are the accrued benefits and results of the project sustainable beyond the project period, considering the potential risks in the operating environment?* | | | | | |
| 5.1 | To what extent are the project initiatives and achievements sustainable beyond the Project period? How have the technical, operational, and financial capacities of duty-bearers, rights-holders, and partners been strengthened to sustain long-term outcomes? | • Involvement, commitment, and ownership of Project interventions by key stakeholders<br>• Collaboration with government and other actors | Project documents<br>Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with duty bearers, project team and IPs)<br>• FGDs with direct beneficiaries | Document synthesis, Context analysis and Triangulation |
| 5.2 | To what extent did the project promote ownership, mutual accountability and inclusivity to ensure the sustainability of efforts and benefits? | Buy-in and ownership of the project interventions by stakeholders | Project documents<br>Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with duty bearers, project team and IPs)<br>• FGDs with direct beneficiaries | Document synthesis Context analysis Triangulation and |
| 5.3 | To what extent have the project interventions, innovations, and institutional frameworks built adequate capacities for sustained results? To what extent has the project integrated these capacities into | Likelihood of sustainability of project interventions/initiatives | Project documents<br>Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with duty bearers, project team and IPs) | Document synthesis Contribution analysis and Triangulation |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | existing national and county systems, ensuring ownership, capacity transfer, and sustainability through mechanisms such as policy frameworks, resource allocation, and training programs? | | | • FGDs with direct beneficiaries | |
| 5.4 | What best practices and lessons learned from the project provide actionable insights for GAC and donors to sustain, scale, or replicate outcomes, address emerging gaps, foster partnerships, and implement innovative funding approaches? | Good practices and lessons learned that can contribute to the improvement of project implementation | Project documents Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with duty bearers, project team and IPs)<br>• FGDs with direct beneficiaries | Document synthesis and triangulation |
| 5.5 | To what extent do economic, social, or political risks and challenges threaten the sustainability of the project's outcomes? How will the benefits of the interventions be secured for rights holders? | Risks and opportunities that might impact on sustainability of interventions and results | Project documents Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with duty bearers, project team and IPs)<br>• FGDs with direct beneficiaries | Risk assessment analysis, Context analysis and triangulation |
| 5.6 | What recommendations should be considered for future projects to ensure the sustainability of project achievements? Are there innovative approaches that the project could adopt? | Recommendations from stakeholders | Project documents Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with duty bearers, project team and IPs)<br>• FGDs with direct beneficiaries | Triangulation |
| **Evaluation Criteria 6: Impact prospects (Orientation towards impact)** | | | | | |
| **Evaluation Question 6: What identifiable changes have occurred or are likely to occur in the lives of target beneficiaries as a result of the project's interventions?** | | | | | |
| 6.1 | What identifiable changes have occurred under each intermediate outcome that could lead to long-term impact? | Impact Prospects of Project Results | Project documents Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs)<br>• FGDs with direct beneficiaries | Document synthesis, triangulation and contribution analysis |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6.2 | What unintended positive or negative effects have occurred, and how might these affect the long-term sustainability of the project's impact? | Factors that positively and negatively influenced project implementation | Project documents Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs)<br>• FGDs with direct beneficiaries | Document synthesis, triangulation and contribution analysis |
| 6.3 | To what extent was gender equality and women's empowerment advanced as a result of the project's implementation? | Project contribution to gender equality and women's empowerment | Project documents Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with duty bearers, project team and IPs)<br>• FGDs with direct beneficiaries | Document synthesis, triangulation and contribution analysis |
| **Crosscutting issues** | | | | | |
| **Evaluation Question 7: To what extent have UN programming principles (human rights, gender equality, and women's empowerment) been integrated and mainstreamed in the design and implementation of the project?** | | | | | |
| 7.1 | To what extent were gender and human rights principles integrated into the project design, implementation, and monitoring of results, and how well did the project align with development effectiveness standards? | Integration and mainstreaming of UN programming principles; geographical coverage | Project documents Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs)<br>• FGDs with direct beneficiaries | Document synthesis Context analysis and triangulation |
| 7.3 | To what extent have the project interventions followed equality and non-discrimination principles at all times? | Human rights-based approach (HRBA) principles are taken into consideration during project implementation. | Project documents Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs)<br>• FGDs with direct beneficiaries | Document synthesis and triangulation |
| 7.4 | To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? To what extent has the project advanced gender equality, improved the quality of life for women and girls, and aligned with | Project contribution to gender equality and women's empowerment | Project documents Key stakeholders | • Documentation review<br>• Stakeholder consultations (KIIs with project team and IPs)<br>• FGDs with direct beneficiaries | Document synthesis, triangulation and contribution analysis |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | international human rights frameworks? | | | |

# Annex II: Stakeholder analysis table

| Stakeholder category | Stakeholder groups | Role |
|---|---|---|
| Internal stakeholders | UN Women Kenya CO project staff and senior management | Project implementation |
| Beneficiaries | Young women leaders mentored through Ms. President show, supported political and peace/security leaders, women mentees, GBV survivors, male champions, as well as those who have been sensitized on women's leadership, access to essential GBV services | Direct beneficiaries of project interventions |
| Duty Bearers | • State Department for Gender and Affirmative Action<br>• Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government- National Steering Committee on Peacebuilding and Conflict Management (NSC)<br>• County Government stakeholders in the seven counties<br>• Gender Sector Working Groups in the seven counties<br>• Officers from National Police Service (NPS)<br>• Healthcare providers<br>• Justice actors participating in Court User Committees (Chiefs, religious leaders etc).<br>• County Peace Committees in the seven counties | Strategic level stakeholders and service providers |
| Implementing Partners | • International Association of Women Judges-Kenya Chapter (IAWJ)<br>• The National Police Service<br>• Healthcare Assistance Kenya (HAK),<br>• URAIA Trust,<br>• Media Focus on Africa (MFA)<br>• Kenya Women's Parliamentary Association (KEWOPA),<br>• The State Department for Gender and<br>• Affirmative Action (SDfGAA)<br>• National Council of Churches of Kenya (NCCK),<br>• African Women Child Features Services (AWCFS) | Project partners |
| Development partner | • Global Affrairs Canada | Funding the project |

## Annex III: Proposed evaluation schedule and timelines

| No | Phase | Deliverable | Timelines |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | **Inception phase/Evaluation design**- (a) A preliminary desk review of relevant documents and reports; (b) development of the inception report alongside the evaluation matrix; and (c) development of data collection tools/interview guides and (d) Presentation of IR | Approved Inception Report | *April 4,2025 |
| | | Presentation of IR | |
| 2 | **Data collection Phase** - Field mission, data collection (detailed documentation review, key informant interviews, focus group discussions with direct beneficiaries), and debriefing session | Primary data collected | April 28 to May 20, 2025 *(2 days in each county)* *(Some national stakeholders may be interviewed virtually)* |
| | | Debriefing session | TBD (Between May 26-May 30,2025) |
| 3 | **Data analysis** and **draft reporting** | Draft evaluation Report | June 21 to June 10, 2025 |
| 4 | Submission of 1st draft final evaluation report | | |
| 5 | Written feedback and validation meeting | | June 16 to 20, 2025 |
| 6 | Submission of 2nd draft report (incorporating feedback) | 2nd draft report | June 27, 2025 |
| 7 | **Final report** (incorporating feedback) | Approved final report | By June 30,2025 |

# Annex IV: KII/FGD Question Guides

**KII and FGD Guide for UN Women Kenya country team; Duty Bearers; Implementing Partners;**

**Introduction**

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. I am an independent consultant engaged by the UN Women Kenya Country Office (KCO) to conduct the Final Evaluation of the Enhancing Women's Participation in Political Leadership and Decision-Making Project. The primary objective of this evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project has achieved its intended outcomes and outputs, provide an in-depth analysis of the reasons behind the achievement or non-achievement of these outcomes, evaluate the challenges encountered, and document lessons learned to improve future projects in this domain.

I kindly request an interview with you, as you have been identified as one of the project's key stakeholders. Our discussion will seek to gather your opinion and impressions on project performance, focusing on issues related to relevance, effectiveness, impact/results, efficiency, coherence, inclusiveness, and sustainability. Please note that this discussion is confidential, and the information you provide will only be accessible to the evaluator, who will keep it strictly confidential. You are also free to withdraw from the discussion at any time or choose not to answer certain questions if you feel uncomfortable or unwilling to do so. There will be no negative consequences should you decide not to participate.

With your permission, I would like to record our discussion so that I can capture all of your key points.

a)  It is okay to record the interview?
b)  Can I include your statements in the evaluation report? I won't use your name or your organisation's name in the report.
c)  Can I include your name in the list of key informants?

## 1. Background

- Please provide a brief background of your involvement and participation in the project?
- Please give a brief description of your role in the project and the work and activities you have done or participated in under this project?
- In your view, what would you in summary, say was the central purpose of the project?

*(Note: The guiding questions listed below are intended to steer the discussions, but they are not exhaustive. The data collection approach will encourage broader discussions around these questions)*

**UN Women Kenya Internal stakeholders (KII)**

**Relevance**

1.  How closely did the project align with UN Women's strategic priorities and goals? In what ways did the project contribute to advancing gender equality and women's empowerment, as outlined in UN Women's strategic framework?

2.  Can you describe the extent to which the project supported or contributed to achieving the outcomes outlined in the Kenya UNSDCF?

**Coherence**

3.  Did you observed any synergies and interlinkages between the project and other interventions supported by UN Women? To what extent has the project been able to co-ordinate with other actors implementing similar interventions at the national level and in the project locations?

**Effectiveness**

4.  Was the project implemented as designed? Explain.  What challenges emerged during project implementation (if any) and how were they addressed?

5.  To what extent has the project achieved its intended objectives/results? What are the main achievements? What were the enabling/hindering factors? Were there any unintended or unexpected results achieved by the project? explain

6.  In your opinion, how did the integration of different thematic areas influence the outcomes or benefits experienced by the beneficiaries? Can you provide examples where the combination of thematic areas had a direct impact on the beneficiaries?

7.  How can the design and implementation of the programme be improved to achieve better outcomes and ensure more effective implementation? Are there interventions that need to be scaled up/down or removed/included and why?

**Efficiency**

8.  How did you ensure economical use of resources? Are there alternative strategies for achieving the same project results with fewer resources?

9.  Were project activities implemented on time? Were there any delays? What caused the delays (if any)?

10. What factors influenced the choice of implementing partners? Do the project partners have adequate capacity to implement the project interventions? What are the gaps?

**Sustainability**

11. What is the likelihood that the accrued benefits of the project will be sustainable in the long term? How well are risks and assumptions being managed? Are there any socio-economic, institutional, financial, environmental and/or political factors that may jeopardize sustainability of project results? Please explain

**Impact Prospects**

12. What identifiable changes occurred under each intermediate outcome that have the potential to lead to long-term impact?

**Cross-cutting issues**

13. How did the project address and promote Inclusiveness, participation, and social transformation during its design and implementation?

14. How were the poor, people with disabilities, and other disadvantaged or marginalized groups benefiting from the project?

**Duty bearers (relevant national ministries and county government stakeholders)-KII**
**Relevance**

1. How well did the project align with national/county development priorities, strategies, and policies, particularly those related to women's participation in political leadership and decision-making?

**Coherence**

2. How did the project's interventions complement national/county development goals? What specific issues or gaps in your sector did the project address?
3. To what extent did the project address the needs and priorities of targeted beneficiaries?

**Effectiveness**

4. How have the project interventions contributed to strengthening the capacity of the government at the national and county levels?
5. What changes would you recommend to strengthen future collaboration between the government, UN Women, and project partners for similar interventions?

**Efficiency**

6. How would you rate the linkages, interactions, and coordination between the government, UN Women, and implementing partners throughout the project's implementation period?

**Sustainability**

7. What is the likelihood of sustainability for the project's initiatives and the benefits it has accrued?
8. What actions did the government take to integrate the project's interventions into its programs or budgets?

## Duty bearers (NPS members, justice actors, healthcare providers)-KII

**Relevance**

1. How did your organization support women's participation in political leadership and decision-making within the community during the project?
2. What specific challenges or barriers did women face when engaging in political leadership roles, and how did your organization address these?
3. What role did your organization play in addressing issues such as gender-based violence, discrimination, and other barriers affecting women in political leadership?

**Coherence**

4. How did your organization collaborate with other sectors to provide holistic support for women who aspire to or are involved in political leadership and decision-making?

**Effectiveness**

5. What changes did you observe in the community regarding women's participation in political leadership and decision-making, and how do you think your organization contributed to these changes?
6. Did you notice any shifts in attitudes toward women in leadership roles among men, community leaders, or other decision-makers as a result of your organization's efforts?
7. In your opinion, what more could have been done to overcome the barriers hindering women's involvement in political leadership and decision-making?

**Sustainability**

8. Do you believe the changes your organization contributed to will be sustained in the long term? What actions are necessary to ensure continued progress in women's participation in political leadership and decision-making?

**Gender and human rights**

9. How did your organization ensure that women were treated equally and fairly in legal/healthcare/ safety matters related to political leadership?

## Implementing partners (KII)

**General question**

1. How were you involved in the implementation of the project? What was the process for your selection to be part of the project?

**Relevance**

2. In your view, did the project design address the context, needs, and priorities of the target groups? Could you comment on how the issues the project aimed to address were identified?

3. How would you rate the issues the project aims to address, as well as the issues you would have preferred to be addressed? Are there any other interventions, beyond those the project seeks to implement, that you would have preferred to be included in the project design?

**Effectiveness**

4. In your opinion, how did the integration of different thematic areas influence the outcomes or benefits experienced by the beneficiaries? Can you provide examples where the combination of thematic areas had a direct impact on the beneficiaries?

5. Have any planned activities not been implemented? If so, what have been the main challenges? Were there any unplanned or unintended positive or negative outcomes resulting from the project implementation? Please explain

**Efficiency**

6. How effective was project's governance structures been in supporting implementation? What specific roles did these structures play, what challenges did you encounter, and what lessons did you learn from your experiences?

7. Could the same results have been achieved in another way? What would you have done differently to achieve better results?

8. Based on your assessment, were the allocated resources adequate and effectively utilized to achieve the intended outputs and outcomes? If there were any variances, please explain.

9. Were there any instances where certain interventions or activities required more resources than originally allocated? Please explain.

10. In your view, were all the interventions implemented on time as planned? If not, which interventions were delayed, and what were the reasons for the delays? Additionally, could you comment on how these delays affected the overall project?

**Gender and human rights**

11. Do you believe the project adequately addressed gender equality, human rights, and the needs of minority and vulnerable groups? Do you have any comments or suggestions on how future projects could better consider these groups? Please explain.

**Lessons learned**

12. What key lessons did you learn while carrying out project activities? Did you receive any feedback from beneficiaries and other participants? Did the project adapt its strategies to partner feedback and evolving partner needs and priorities during the project lifecycle?

**Sustainability**

13. In your view, what measures did the project put in place to ensure that its interventions and accrued benefits would continue after the project's completion?

14. What is your general observation regarding the continuity of the project interventions? What factors do you believe could compromise the sustainability of the project's interventions and outcomes?

**Recommendations**

15. Would you have any other comments/suggestions/ recommendations to add?


## Direct Beneficiaries (FGD)

### Introduction

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. I am an independent consultant engaged by the UN Women Kenya Country Office (KCO) to conduct the Final Evaluation of the Enhancing Women's Participation in Political Leadership and Decision-Making Project. The primary objective of this evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project has achieved its intended outcomes and outputs, provide an in-depth analysis of the reasons behind the achievement or non-achievement of these outcomes, evaluate the challenges encountered, and document lessons learned to improve future projects in this domain. Please note that this discussion is confidential, and the information that you provide will only be accessible to me, the evaluator, who will keep it in strict confidence. You are also free to withdraw from the discussion at any time or refuse to answer any questions should you feel uncomfortable or unwilling to answer them. You will not suffer any prejudice should you decide not to participate.

Are you willing to participate in the interview?

I thank you for your cooperation.

**General questions**

1. Can you describe how you were involved in the project? (Probe: What activities or services did you participate in or benefit from?)
2. What motivated you to participate in this project, and how were you selected or recruited?
3. What would you say has worked well in the project, and what could have been improved?


**Relevance**

1. To what extent did the project address the specific needs of women in political leadership and decision-making in Kenya?
2. Did the project effectively consider the unique barriers women face in political leadership? How well were these barriers addressed?

**Effectiveness**

1. What types of resources (financial, material, social) did the project provide to support your advancement in political leadership and decision-making?

2. Was the support provided by the project sufficient to enable you to actively participate in leadership? If not, what additional resources or support would have been helpful?
3. Since your involvement, what changes have you observed in your life, household, or community in terms of women's participation in political leadership and decision-making? In your view, how did the project contribute to these changes? (Probe: Which parts of the project made the biggest difference for you?)
4. In what ways did the project help you become more involved in political leadership or decision-making processes in your community or beyond?
5. What specific skills or knowledge did you gain through the project that have supported your role in political leadership and decision-making? How useful were they in preparing you for political leadership?
6. Have you noticed any changes in the representation of women in political leadership roles in your area since the project started? Were there any unintended or unexpected results achieved by the project? explain
7. How have the attitudes of men, community leaders, and other decision-makers towards women in political leadership shifted as a result of the project?
8. What was the most significant impact of the project on the community's perception of women in leadership roles?
9. To what extent do you feel the project challenged traditional gender norms and increased the acceptance of women in leadership roles?
10. How would you assess the project's effectiveness in promoting gender equality and the empowerment of women in your community?
11. What additional support do you think would be helpful for women like yourself to continue advancing in political leadership and decision-making?

**Sustainability**

12. Do you believe the changes brought by the project will be sustained in the long term? What actions do you think are needed to ensure the continued increase in women's participation in political leadership and decision-making?
13. **Recommendations**


## Embassy of Canada (Donor)- KII

### Introduction

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me today. I am an independent consultant engaged by the UN Women Kenya Country Office (KCO) to conduct the Final Evaluation of the Enhancing Women's Participation in Political Leadership and Decision-Making Project. The primary objective of this evaluation is to assess the extent to which the project has achieved its intended outcomes and outputs, provide an in-depth analysis of the reasons behind the achievement or non-achievement of these outcomes, evaluate the challenges encountered, and document lessons learned to improve future projects in this domain.

I kindly request an interview with you as the main donor for the programme. Our discussion will seek to gather your opinion and impression of project performance, focusing on issues around relevance,

effectiveness, impacts/results, efficiency, coherence, inclusiveness, and sustainability. Please note that this discussion is confidential, and the information you provide will only be accessible to the evaluators, who will keep it in strict confidence.

With your permission, I would like to record our discussion so that I can capture all of your key points.
   a) It is okay to record the interview?
   b) Can I include your statements in the evaluation report? I won't use your name or your organisation's name in the report.
   c) Can I include your name in the list of key informants?

***General questions***
1. Could you confirm how long you have been involved with the project and in what capacity?
***Relevance***
2. What are GAC's current development priorities, and how does the project align with these goals?
3. What are GAC's development priorities and country strategy for Kenya?
4. Why did you choose to support the project? What do you perceive as the comparative advantages of UN Women, and do you feel that you are getting value for money? Please explain.
***Effectiveness***
5. Was the project implemented as originally designed? What challenges did you observe during its implementation?
6. How satisfied were you with the results achieved by the project? What were its biggest achievements, and what do you consider as least successful outcomes?
7. Would you consider supporting UN Women again in the future? If not, could you please explain why?
***Efficiency***
8. How satisfied are you with the communication procedures and mechanisms employed by UN Women?
9. Did you receive narrative and financial reports in a timely manner? What is your perception of the quality of the reporting?
10. What are your recommendations for future programming?

# Annex V: Membership of EMG and ERG

## Evaluation Management Group

| Name | Organization |
|------|--------------|
| Stephen Njuku | Evaluation Manager |
| Angela Wambugu | Programme Manager |
| Hellen Muchunu | Project Analyst-Women Peace and Security |
| Christine Okeno | Project Analyst-Ending Violence Against Women and Girls |
| Maureen Nyaga | Programme Associate |

## Evaluation Reference Group

| Name | Organization | Thematic Area |
|------|--------------|---------------|
| Kay Lau | UN Women-ESARO | Evaluation Specialist |
| Harrison Manga | Media Focus on Africa | WPP |
| Arthur Okweba | African Woman and Child Feature Service | WPP-WPS |
| Rosemary Juma | KEWOPA | WPP |
| Kevin Muiruri | URAIA TRUST | WPP |
| Pauline Kamau | NCCK | WPS |
| Fanis Lisiagali | HAK-1195 | EVAW |
| Peris Macharia | IAWJ | EVAW |

## Annex VI: Data collection Itinerary.

| No | County | Travel Date | Data Collection Days | Travelers | Notes |
|----|--------|-------------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
| 1 | Kajiado | 28.04.25 | (29-30th) | Driver/Evaluator/Staff | by road |
| 2 | Embu | 30.04.25 | (30th-2nd) | Driver/Evaluator/Staff | by road |
| 3 | Back to Nairobi | 02.05.25 | N/A | Driver/Evaluator/Staff | by road |
| 4 | Samburu | 05.05.25 | (6-7th) | Evaluator/Staff | by flight |
| 5 | Back to Nairobi | 08.05.25 | N/A | | |
| 6 | Kisumu | 12.05.25 | N/A | Evaluator/Staff | by flight (Driver Travels on 11th) |
| 7 | Homabay | 12.05.25 | (12-13th) | Driver/Evaluator/Staff | by road |
| 8 | Kisii | 13.05.25 | (13-14th) | Driver/Evaluator/Staff | by road |
| 9 | Kericho | 14.05.25 | (15-16th) | Driver/Evaluator/Staff | by road |
| 10 | Back to Nairobi | 16.05.25 | N/A | Driver/Evaluator/Staff | by road |
| 11 | Wajir | 19.05.25 | (19-20th) | Evaluator/Staff | by flight |
| | | | | | |

# Annex VII: Sampling frame

| Sampling Frame: Key Informant Interviews and FGDs Counties | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Woman Aspirant | Miss President Participants | Male Champions | Security Officers | Journalists | WROs/ CSOs | FGDS with Women and Male Gender Champions |
| Kericho | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Kijiado | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Kisii | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Homabay | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Embu | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Samburu | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Wajir | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **Sampling Frame: Key Informant Interviews Partners and Government** | | | | | | | |
| KEWOPA | | | | 1 | | | |
| MFA | | | | 1 | | | |
| AWCFS | | | | 1 | | | |
| IAWJ | | | | 1 | | | |
| URAIA | | | | 1 | | | |
| NPS | | | | 1 | | | |
| HAK-1195 | | | | 1 | | | |
| **Sampling Frame: Key Informant Interviews UN Women** | | | | | | | |
| Deputy Country Representative | | | | 1 | | | |
| Operations Manager | | | | 1 | | | |
| Programme Team | | | | 1 | | | |

| Monitoring and Evaluation Focal Point | 1 |
|---|---|

# Annex VII: Terms of Reference

See separate submission

## Annex IX: List of key informants

This list of respondents is incomplete, and based on the available data collection notes after the passing of John Kimote.

| Name | Organization | Title |
|---|---|---|
| Harrison Manga | MFA | |
| Cynthia | The African Women and Child Teacher Service | Political and peace secretary |
| Jackline Saleiyan | MFA | |
| Mary Taiko | GSWG Kaijado | |
| J Kamau | Margistrate and Peace S | |
| Hanifa and Ogutu | HAK | |
| Catherine Kayaro | SDGAA | |
| Angela Muthoni Wambugu | | Project Manager |
| Lither Ngeno | UN Women | |
| Christine Okeno | UN Women | Project Analyst-Ending Violence Against Women and Girls |
| | Nominated MCA Kisii | |
| | Simon County Assembly Samburu | |
| Hellen Muchunu | | |
| Kevin Uraia | | |
| IAWJ PERIS MACHARIA | | |
| | Gender unit Kisii | Chief officer Gender |
| | Uraia guy Samburu | |
| | Gender unit Samburu County | Gender Director |