



Terms of Reference

FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANTS/CONTRACTORS (IC)

Post Title: Consultancy Services Terminal Evaluation for the Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in Arid Lands (KACCAL) project

Agency/Project Name: Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in Arid Lands (KACCAL)

Country of Assignment: Kenya

Duty Station: Mwingi District of Eastern Province, Kenya

Duration 27working days over 2 months

1. Introduction

Project evaluations assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a project in achieving its intended results. They also assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to medium-term and longer-term outcomes. Terminal evaluations (TE) provide a comprehensive and systematic accounting of performance at the end of the project cycle, considering the totality of the effort from project design, through implementation to wrap up, also considering the likelihood of sustainability and possible impacts. The target audience for a terminal evaluation is GEF Operational Focal Point, project partners and beneficiaries, UNDP at country, regional and HQ levels, UNDP Evaluation Office, GEF Secretariat and GEF Evaluation Office.

The project in question is funded by the Special Climate Change Fund, a UNFCCC fund managed by the GEF. The project title is: Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in Arid Lands (KACCAL) project whose objective is *to enhance the resilience of communities and the sustainability of rural livelihoods threatened by climate change, in the arid and semi-arid lands of Kenya*. KACCAL project started implementation in May 2011 and is due run until June 2014. A second project attached to KACCAL is funded by Government of Flanders focusing on improved cook stoves for an amount of Euros 150,000 from Jan 2013 to June 2014.

The KACCAL project objective is to be achieved by realizing the following outcomes:

Enhanced awareness of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures in arid and semi-arid lands.

Enhanced capacity of district and local level stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures

Enhanced communities' ability to plan, manage and implement climate-related activities

The Flemish grant expands the scope and coverage of Outcome 3 of the project: *Enhanced communities' ability to plan, manage and implement climate-related activities* by focusing on improved cookstoves. This grant will deliver 4 outputs to benefit 2000 households (Annex 1). The project target that the Flemish support will contribute to:

No change in income or household assets due to climate variability.

The additional Fleming financing sets out to deliver four outputs as follows to benefit 2000 households in Mwingi district, as follows:

Output 1: Purchase and installation of energy efficient cooking stoves, to replace the traditional 3-stone arrangement typically used in rural households. The stoves are made of fired clay liners and have been piloted for many years by the Ministry of Agriculture through GTZ. The models are cast by locally trained artisans in the districts where the technologies were first introduced. The cook stoves cost about USD\$10 each. Indicative Budget: Euros 20,000.

Output 2: 20 seedlings of fruit trees and other multi-purpose tree species (which could be used for fuel wood provision) planted by each households benefiting from an energy efficient cooking stove. This translates to planting at least 80,000 trees which would improve the livelihoods of the communities through improved nutrition and income from sale of fruits. Mango is shown in trials to be appropriate and popular based on its ability to tolerate drought. Indicative Budget: Euros 30,000

Output 3: Seedlings nursery established with appropriate water harvesting facility. The type of nursery envisaged is one covered by shade net and has water supplied through drip system. The water harvesting structure will be either a lined water pan shallow well or a sand dam based on the identified nursery site. Financially sustainable management arrangements will be identified through stakeholder consultations and based on good practice. Indicative Budget: Euros 70,000

Output 4:Capacity developed for i) training local artisans to make stoves for Mwingi communities ii) training for installation of improved stoves iii) on-farm care of trees iv) marketing of fruits. Farmers will be organized into marketing groups to maximize supply and bargaining power with buyers for markets that are between 60km and 200km away. Indicative Budget: Euros 30,000

Indicative total budget: Euros 150,000

Background

Kenya's geographic location makes it inherently prone to cyclical droughts and floods. Moreover, according to the Initial National Communication (INC), such types of cyclical climate-driven events will increase in intensity and frequency due to global climate change. Livelihoods and economic activities in Kenya are highly vulnerable to climatic fluctuations, with the districts of the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs) being among the most vulnerable to recurrent droughts, and to long-term climate change. The rural poor are the most vulnerable to the impacts of Kenya's current climate variability.

In response to this, Kenya Government through the Ministry of State for Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands received funding from GEF in 2009 to support the Kenya Adaptation to Climate change in Arid Lands (KACCAL) project. The 3-year USD 1.0m fund is managed through UNDP and has from 2011 been supporting poor and vulnerable communities in the Mwingi District of the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs) to enhance their adaptive capacity to drought (and flood). The thrust of the project has been on livelihood diversification and livelihood enhancement interventions.

Working in Kyuso and Mumoni pilot areas, this is being achieved through enhanced access to and management of water for irrigation, promotion of indigenous crops that are more resilient to anticipated adverse climate (and improved access to markets for these crops), and promoting livestock breeds that are more suited to the climate, development and promotion of alternative livelihood opportunities (such as beekeeping and fish farming activities). Livelihood improvement technologies such as use of energy efficient cooking stoves at household level have been rolled out. The project is also strengthening climate risk management planning and capacity of District level planners to mainstream climate change into District-level sectoral development plans. Extension workers are being supported to improve their adaptation extension advice to farmers based on best available climate forecast information.

The background to the Flemish support is the expanding land degradation in Mwingi District because of tree felling for charcoal burning and/or clearing land for cultivation. Land degradation worsens the affects of climate variability and change on communities. One way of stemming this degradation is by minimizing the pressure on trees by using technologies that use less wood. The saved standing trees mitigate climate change by acting as carbon sink in addition to saving time for women who spend many hours fetching fuel-wood. The saved time would be used for productive work.

Improved cook stove dissemination is high on the government and many development partners' agenda at the moment mainly because of deforestation, CO₂ reduction, indoor air quality issues and economic concerns. To date, Mwingi has not benefitted from improved cook stoves as the feeling among government planners has been that Mwingi communities had sufficient bush wood - a situation that is drastically changing.

2. Objectives of the Evaluation

The objective of the evaluation is to:

- Provide a comprehensive and systematic accounting of performance;
- Assess project design, implementation, likelihood of sustainability and possible impacts.
- Assess the appropriateness, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project.
- Provide lessons learned and recommendations for future phases of the project.
- Measure the overall and lasting impact of the project.

Beneficiaries of the TE report include GEF Operational Focal Point, project partners and beneficiaries, UNDP at country, regional and HQ levels, UNDP Evaluation Office, GEF Secretariat and GEF Evaluation Office.

3. Scope of the Evaluation

Annex 5 contains the report outline which should be adhered to for the KACCAL project. The content is outlined in the following sections which are organized as three components, each with sub-sections i) project design, ii) project implementation and iii) Results. The evaluation criteria across these components are as follows: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Results and Sustainability, Further guidance on these evaluation criteria can be found in the UNDP guide to Terminal Evaluations.

In relation to the Flemish grant it will be sufficient to discuss the benefits and impacts.

This evaluation will also use the benefits analysis report the impact of the capacity development during the course of implementation of the KACCAL project. The Baseline and road mapping for promotion of adaption in Kyuso and Mumoni districts through enabling public sector policies and instruments Report will be used as the baseline (Appendix 3).

The following sections outline the questions that should be covered by the evaluation:

3.1 Project formulation:

- Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?
- Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and its counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?
- Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?
- Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?
- Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?
- Were the project assumptions and risks well-articulated in the PIF and project document?
- Were the planned outcomes SMART?
- Was the Theory of Change/Logical Framework logical (i.e. outputs leading to Outcomes leading to the objective)?

3.1.1 Assumptions and risks:

The evaluation should provide an assessment of the project assumptions and risks as set out in the PRODOC and results framework, including:

- An assessment of the stated assumptions and risks as set out in the PRODOC and logical framework/Results framework, whether they are logical and robust, and have helped to determine activities and planned outputs.
- Externalities (i.e. effects of climate change, global economic crisis, etc.) which are relevant to the findings.

3.2 Project implementation:

Some elements to include in the assessment of the implementation approach include:

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.
- An analysis of how efficiently project planning and implementation were carried out. This includes assessing the extent of organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms used in supporting the project.
- Project's contribution to capacity development at three levels - community, District and National levels.
- Project delivery mechanisms including institutional arrangements and how these supported or constrained project delivery.

3.2.1 Finance/co-finance

The evaluation report should clarify the financial particulars of the project including the extent of co-financing. Project cost and funding should be presented, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures should be assessed and explained. Observations from financial audits as available should be considered. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

When considering the effectiveness of financial planning, the evaluator should determine:

- Whether there was sufficient clarity in the report co-financing to substantiate in-kind and cash co-financing from all listed sources.
- The reasons for differences in the level of expected and actual co-financing;
- The extent to which project components supported by external funders was well integrated into the overall project;
- The effect on project outcomes and/or sustainability from the extent of materialization of the co-financing;
- Whether there is evidence of additional leveraged resources that have been committed as a result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and may be from other donors, NGOs, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector.

- The evaluation should include a table that shows planned and actual co-financing commitments, as set out in Annex 8. Evaluators during their fact finding efforts should request assistance from the Project Team to fill in the table, and the Evaluator should then follow up through interviews to substantiate. The evaluator should briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

Cost effectiveness factors including:

- Compliance with additional cost principle and securing co-financing and associated funding;
- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes according to schedule and as cost effectively as initially planned.
- The project has been subject to strong financial controls that allow project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a timely flow of funds and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables;
- The project has been subject to due diligence in the management of funds including periodic audits;
- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach to ensure that the costs were comparable to other projects.

3.2.2 IA and EA execution:

The evaluator should assess and rate (R) the quality of Implementing Agency execution (refer to Annex 2 for the ratings table). The assessment should be established through consideration of the following issues:

- Whether there was an appropriate focus on results
- The adequacy of IA & EA supervision
- The quality of risk management
- Responsiveness of the managing parties to significant implementation problems (if any)
- Quality and timeliness of technical support to the project team
- Candor and realism in supervision reporting
- Suitability of chosen executing agency for project execution
- Any salient issues regarding project duration, for instance to note project delays, and how they may have affected project outcomes and sustainability
- Adequacy of management inputs and processes including budgeting and procurement;
- Government ownership

3.2.3 Monitoring and evaluation:

The evaluator should assess and rate (R) the quality of monitoring and evaluation (refer to Annex 2 for the ratings table). The evaluation team should be expected to deliver an M&E assessment that provides:

- An analysis of the M&E plan at project start up, considering whether baseline conditions, methodology and roles and responsibilities are well articulated. Is the M&E plan well-conceived? Is it articulated sufficiently to monitor results and track progress toward achieving objectives?

- The quality of M&E plan implementation: Was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?
- The effectiveness of monitoring indicators from the project document for measuring progress and performance;
- Compliance with the progress and financial reporting requirements/ schedule, including quality and timeliness of reports;
- The value and effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation reports and evidence that these were discussed with stakeholders and project staff;
- The extent to which follow-up actions, and/or adaptive management, were taken in response to monitoring reports (PIRs) ;
- Check to see whether PIR self-evaluation ratings were consistent with TE findings. If not, were these discrepancies identified by the project steering committee and addressed?
- The extent to which changes were made to project implementation as a result of the mid-term evaluation.

3.2.4 Stakeholder involvement:

The evaluation should include findings on the role and involvement of key project stakeholders. Two aspects can be considered:

- A review of the quality and thoroughness of the stakeholder plan presented in the PIF and project document which should be reviewed for its logic and completeness.
- The level of stakeholder participation during project implementation.
- Questions regarding stakeholder participation include:
- Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation and by seeking their participation in project design, implementation, and M&E? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?
- Did the project consult with and make use of the skills, experience, and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, nongovernmental organizations, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities?
- Were the perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes properly involved?

3.3.5 Adaptive management:

The evaluation team should take note whether there were changes in the project framework during implementation, why these changes were made and what was the approval process in addition to determining the reasons for change? The evaluator should also determine how the changes were instigated and how these changes then affected project results. A few key questions to consider:

- Did the project undergo significant changes as a result of recommendations from the RTA at the start of implementation? Or as a result of other review procedures? Explain the process and implications.
- If the changes were extensive, did they materially change the expected project outcomes?
- Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the project steering committee?

3.4 Project results:

A 'result' is defined as a describable or measurable development change resulting from a cause and effect relationship. For UNDP-supported projects the main focus of attention is at the Outcome level. A sample matrix for assessing outcomes against indicators is included in Annex 5.

In addition to assessing project outcomes, the evaluation should include consideration of results as measured by broader aspects such as: country ownership, mainstreaming, sustainability, catalytic role and impact. These aspects are outlined below.

3.3.1 Country ownership:

- Was the project concept in line with development priorities and plans of the country (or countries)?
- Were the relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?
- Was an intergovernmental committee given responsibility to liaise with the project team, recognizing that more than one ministry should be involved?
- Has the recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project?
- Have the Outcomes from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans?
- Has the government(s), enacted legislation, and/or developed policies and regulations in line with the project's objectives?

3.3.2 Mainstreaming:

UNDP projects financed by the GEF are key components in UNDP country programming. As such, the objectives and outcomes of the project should conform to UNDP country programme strategies.

The TE must therefore assess how the project are successfully mainstreaming other UNDP priorities including poverty reduction, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from disasters and women's empowerment. The UNDAF in the country and the UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) should therefore be reviewed as the baseline for this assessment.

The section on mainstreaming should assess:

- Whether it is possible to identify and define positive or negative effects of the project on local populations (e.g. income generation/job creation, improved natural resource management

arrangements with local groups, improvement in policy frameworks for resource allocation and distribution, regeneration of natural resources for long term sustainability).

- If the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP country programme document (CPD) and country programme action plan (CPAP).
- Whether there is evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters.
- Whether gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation, (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc). If so, indicate how.
- The mainstreaming assessment should take note of the points of convergence between UNDP environment-related and other development programming.

3.3.3 Sustainability:

The evaluator should assess and rate (R) the overall risks to sustainability (refer to Annex 2 for the ratings table). Sustainability is considered to be the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF project ends. Consequently, the assessment of sustainability considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes. The GEF Guidelines establish four areas for considering risks to sustainability: Financial risks; socio-economic risk; institutional framework and governance risks; and environmental risks. Each should be separately evaluated and then rated on the likelihood and extent that risks will impede sustainability.

Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy e.g. Community uptake on the adaptation mechanisms and most importantly the business model and the community micro-projects among others.
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.).
- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).
- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
- Achieving stakeholders' consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

3.3.4 Catalytic effect

The reviewer should consider the extent to which the project has demonstrated: a) production of a public good, b) demonstration, c) replication, and d) scaling up. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and

experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include: a) Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc). b) Expansion of demonstration projects, c) Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions d) Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

4.3.5 Impact

The reviewer should discuss the extent to which projects are achieving impacts or are progressing toward the achievement of impacts among the project beneficiaries. Impacts in the context of adaptation projects refer to the extent to which vulnerability to climate change has decreased, as measured by the indicators included in the Results Framework, and other quantitative and qualitative information. In the discussion on impacts it will be important at a minimum to identify the mechanisms at work (i.e. the causal links between project outputs and Outcomes) and assess the likely permanence of the impacts.

3.4 Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons

Conclusions for the KACCAL project should present an integrated assessment of the project ratings across the evaluation components (project design, project implementation and project results): project relevance, effectiveness and efficiency as well as the quality of the M & E systems. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight the strengths, weaknesses and outcomes of the project. They should be well substantiated by the evidence and logically connected to the evaluation findings. They should respond to key evaluation questions and provide insights into the identification of and/or solutions to important problems or issues pertinent to project beneficiaries and UNDP (such as gender equality, human rights and capacity development).

The evaluation report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the evaluation. The Recommendations for the project (exit strategy) should be synthesized in a table highlighting the recommendation, suggested action, responsible party and timing, as follows:

Recommendation	Management response	Key Actions	Timeframe	Responsible Unit	Status*	Comment

*Completed; Partially completed; Pending;

Recommendations for future programming should also be prepared. The evaluation report should include, if available, lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best (and worst) practices that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions. In relation to the Flemish grant it will be sufficient to discuss the benefits and impacts.

4. Outputs/Deliverables

An inception report should be prepared by the evaluation team prior to the main evaluation mission. It should detail the evaluators' understanding of the project being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question (detailed in Section 3 of this ToR) will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. The inception report should annex the signed code of conduct agreement form – attached at Annex 8.

A draft evaluation report, which includes the evaluation scope and method, findings, conclusions and recommendations. The report should cover the following five major criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, results and sustainability, applied to a) project formulation b) project implementation and c) project results.

A final evaluation report.

The draft report is considered complete, in contractual terms, only when it has achieved acceptable standards.

4.1 Payment schedules

Deliverables	Target Date	Payment
Produce an inception report which will be approved by the supervisors before the work begins	15 th May 2014	20%
Produce the draft evaluation report for review and make a presentation in a validation workshop	15 th June 2014	40%
Produce the final report which will incorporate all the comments from stake holders and fro the validation workshop.	30 th June 2014	40%