

# **Final evaluation of Building Climate Resilience in Drylands through Community-Based Resilience Analysis Project**

## **Final report**

Consultants for Development (CD)  
Copenhagen  
February 29, 2016

## List of Content

Acknowledgements .....	2
Abbreviations .....	3
1 Executive Summary .....	4
2 Introduction.....	6
3 The evaluation.....	6
3.1 Methodology .....	6
3.1.1 Document review .....	7
3.1.2 Skype/telephone interviews .....	7
3.1.3 Reporting.....	8
4 The project .....	8
4.1 Objectives.....	8
4.2 Expected results .....	9
5 Findings .....	10
5.1 Result 1 - Regional level .....	10
5.1.1 Relevance .....	10
5.1.2 Effectiveness.....	11
5.1.3 Impact.....	12
5.1.4 Sustainability .....	12
5.2 Result 2 - National level .....	13
5.2.1 Relevance .....	13
5.2.2 Effectiveness.....	13
5.2.3 Impact.....	15
5.2.4 Sustainability .....	15
5.3 Efficiency .....	16
6 Conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learnt.....	17
6.1 Relevance .....	17
6.2 Effectiveness.....	17
6.3 Efficiency .....	19
6.4 Impact.....	19
6.5 Sustainability .....	20
6.6 Recommendations .....	20
6.7 Lessons learned .....	21
Annex A – TOR.....	22
Annex B - List of people interviewed .....	26
Annex C - Interview guidelines.....	27
Annex D - Project activities and budget.....	30
Annex E - EDE Theory of Change .....	31

## Acknowledgements

The development of this report was only possible with the cooperation of the people interviewed as listed in Annex B. Special thanks go to staff of the Global Policy Centre on Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification (GPC) whom facilitated the evaluation and engaged in quality discussions regarding the project.

The openness with which interviewees and GPC staff shared information was welcome and very valuable.

Given the short time available for the evaluation there are bound to be some factual errors and some degree of subjectivity, especially in arriving at conclusions. The author takes responsibility for these and welcomes suggestion for minimising factual errors and improving the quality and reliability of this document.

The ownership of this document lies with the GPC, but the opinion expressed in it are the author's and not necessarily that of GPC.

Erik Toft  
*CD (Consultants for Development)*  
*Email: erik@toft.CD*  
*Web: toft.CD*  
*February 2016, Copenhagen, Denmark*

## Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Explanation
CoBRA	Community Based Resilience Analysis
CPF	Common Programme Framework
DRR	Drought Risk Reduction
ECHO	European Commission Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection
EDE	Ending Drought Emergencies
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GPC	Global Policy Centre on Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification
HIP	Humanitarian Implementation Plan
HoA	Horn of Africa
IDDRSI	IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience Sustainability Initiative
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MIS	Management Information System
MTP	Medium Term Plan
NDMA	National Drought Management Authority
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation & Development's Development Assistance Committee
RAU	Resilience Analysis Unit
RIMA	Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WFP	World Food Programme

## **1 Executive Summary**

The Global Policy Centre on Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification (GPC) hosted at UNDP has received EUR 340,000 from ECHO for the Building Climate Resilience in Drylands through Community-Based Resilience Analysis project (hereafter the project) in the Horn of Africa (HoA). The project was implemented from April 2014 to December 2015 with the principal objective to strengthen the capacity of IGAD and member states' capacity to align planning and programming with local needs, and the specific objective of improving the coherence of resilience measurement and analysis in order to ensure evidence-based disaster resilience policy-making and investment. The project consisted of two main components: Support to the Resilience Analysis Unit (RAU) under the framework of IGAD's Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI), and support to enhance the capacity of Kenya's framework for Ending Drought in Emergencies (EDE).

This external end-of-project evaluation of the project was conducted in early 2016. The objectives of the evaluation were to assess the achievements and lessons learnt and to develop recommendations as per the standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The evaluation consisted of i) desk study for analysing documents; ii) collection of primary data through interviews with 31 stakeholders via Skype and telephone calls; and iii) analysis, triangulation and reporting.

The reported achievements include facilitation of the development of various M&E framework and learning manual, including indicators, and training. The project design is found to be adequate with generally good correlation between results, indicators and the reported achievements. The project is relevant to the ECHO 2014 HIP, and is also found to be relevant for the regional (IGAD) and national (Kenya) efforts to prevent or reduce the impact of recurrent disasters, and to ensure a more coordinated and result-oriented approach to resilience activities. The GPC's longer-term perspectives with regard to both development and humanitarian assistance and experiences with qualitative as well as quantitative measurement hereof are found to have been very relevant.

Implementation of the project has been effective with professional and participatory consultations at all levels. The GPC is generally found to have contributed to produce quality documents, also when others have been the main authors, only the RAU learning modules are found wanting. The products for which the GPC were the only or main author are found to be of high quality. Overall, the project's targets have been achieved, and mainly of high quality.

The cost of the project is found to have been reasonable taking into consideration the substantial time required to facilitate the processes and develop documents. There were some initial delays to implementation, but these were mostly outside the control of GPC, and the project has been implemented as timely as could be expected. There was no turn-over of GPC staff which is believed to have contributed to the smooth implementation.

The facilitation of the processes have contributed to improve the quality of the various tools and documents, thus providing a solid foundation for future work; the main impact remains to be seen in the years to come.

Facilitation of processes is not expected to be sustainable as such, but the product produced will be used to provide guidance for and measure of resilience activities in the region and in Kenya. The very participatory processes have contributed to ensure ownership, which contributes to sustainability.

Based on the evaluation three recommendations have been developed as listed in the table below.

No.	Recommendation
1	Future phases or follow-up activities, by UNDP or other partners, should devote resources to revise - or develop when missing - indicators in the Joint Programme Document and in the EDE M&E Framework, and ensure that baseline data is available or can easily be identified.
2	Future user manuals should be developed in an electronic format that allows the users to navigate easily between different parts of the manual.
3	Future activities should focus on assessing the capacity needs at all levels and on the basis hereof develop a plan for how to achieve the required capacities.

Four lessons have been learned during the evaluation as listed below.

No.	Lesson learned
1	Development of learning modules should be tested as part of ensuring high-quality documents.
2	By bringing together qualitative and quantitative methodologies for measuring resilience, additional insights into root causes of vulnerabilities and aspirations of people are brought to the table.
3	Supporting the development of M&E frameworks for institutions and programmes that are not clearly defined from the onset, and the definition of which will suffer from the institutions being either politically influenced and/or consisting of multiple stakeholders such as UN-agencies and intergovernmental bodies can be a difficult task requiring more time than anticipated.
4	Applying a participatory approach and bringing people together contributes, unsurprisingly, to ensure ownership, and facilitates future work on and use of the outputs.

## **2 Introduction**

In 2014 the Global Policy Centre on Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification (GPC) hosted at the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Nairobi secured EUR 340,000<sup>1</sup> from the European Commission Directorate General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO) for the Building Climate Resilience in Drylands through Community-Based Resilience Analysis project (hereafter the project) in the Horn of Africa (HoA) as part of the 2014 HoA HIP<sup>2</sup>. The total cost of the project was EUR 393,095 with a co-financing by GPC of EUR 53,095. The project commenced in April 2014 and ended in December 2015 after a 6-month extension to 21 months from originally 15 months.

As part of the project, an external evaluation of the project was conducted in January-March 2016. This report contains the findings and recommendations from the evaluation.

## **3 The evaluation**

The objectives of the evaluation as per TOR (see Annex A for details of TOR) are to:

- 1) Assess extent of achievements of the project, e.g. the extent of attainments of the intended objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities; and
- 2) Generate findings on opportunities, constraints/challenges and lessons learnt during implementation.

The proposed framework of the evaluation is as per the standard Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee (OECD/DAC) criteria for evaluations, i.e. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, including recommendations and lessons learned for future building on the project achievements.

### **3.1 Methodology**

The overall framework guiding the evaluation is the five criteria described above (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability) with the two results of the project being analysed separately with regard to relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Efficiency is analysed jointly for both result 1 and 2. Based on the analysis, conclusions and recommendations were arrived at.

As the main activities of the project was to facilitate and coordinate other actors efforts, there, naturally, is a limit to the extent to which the project can be accountable for the quality and

---

<sup>1</sup> The original envisaged funding from ECHO was EUR 300,000, with an additional funding of EUR 40,000 for hosting a high-level meeting of regional officials for discussing the effects of the up-coming El Nino weather phenomenon.

<sup>2</sup> Humanitarian Implementation Plan (HIP) 2014 - Horn of Africa (ECHO/-HF/BUD/2014/91000).

timeliness of the end-products (the reports, manuals, etc.). Instead, the project is more about ensuring the quality of the - less tangible - process leading to the end-products. Attempts have been made to ensure that this was captured during the interviews by asking about the process as well as the GPS inputs to the quality of the outputs.

The data used for the analysis was collected through three (overlapping) phases: i) Document review; ii) Skype/telephone interviews with key stakeholders and iii) Reporting. Validation of the data was done through triangulation of data from the different sources and feedback from stakeholders to the draft report. The three phases are described in more details below.

### **3.1.1 Document review**

The desk study was used to review and analyse relevant documents, including the original project proposal, interim progress report and project amendment request forms, field trip reports, and the various specific outputs such as workshop reports, tools, etc.

The desk study provided an overview of the project and the approach as well as preliminary quantitative and qualitative data on the achievements. During the desk study telephone and Skype conferences were held with GPC staff in Nairobi and numerous questions were answered through email.

The desk study was also used to develop the stakeholder interview guidelines used for the Skype/telephone interviews described below.

### **3.1.2 Skype/telephone interviews**

To complement and provide more details, data was collected from project stakeholders through Skype/telephone interviews. To guide the interviews, a guideline was developed with semi-structured open-ended questions based on the information gathered during the desk study (Annex C). The interview guidelines are organised by theme (basically the evaluation criteria); however, the actual sequence of the questions varied according to flow of the interview. Depending on the nature and extent of the involvement of the key informant in the project, not all questions were asked to all stakeholders.

Interviewing through Skype/telephone does not allow for the same level of rapport as is the case when interviewing face-to-face. However, the fact that the evaluator was well-versed in the topic and had a good knowledge of the GPC and its staff (having conducted the evaluation of the project phase I two years ago), and the fact that all interviewees were at least mid-level officials meant that the interview were conducted in a pleasant and open atmosphere, and the evaluator has no reason to believe that the outcome of the interviews would have been substantial different if the interviews were conducted face-to-face.

The selection of stakeholders to interview was done by the consultant with inputs from GPC staff. The criteria for final selection were: 1) degree of engagement in different aspects of the project; 2) representation from all the project intervention areas at regional (i.e., IGAD), national (i.e., Kenya) and sub-national (i.e., Turkana and Baringo counties) levels; and 3)



different types of stakeholders (e.g., government institutions, UN agencies, NGOs, research institutions, and the donor).

Depending on the exact nature of the interviewees' involvement in the different activities they could be biased, e.g. through emphasising positive aspects of activities in which they themselves were involved in or vice versa. However, prior to the interviews basic information of the interviewees' involvement in the activities was available, ensuring that the evaluator took into consideration such issues. Furthermore, given the consistent feedback from everybody, it is believed that all interviewees responded as neutrally as could be expected.

A total of 31 stakeholders were interviewed of which a third were related mainly to regional level activities and two thirds mainly related to national activities. 7 interviewees were not available; these were not crucial to the evaluation. For the full list of interviewees, please refer to Annex B. The interviews took place between 3 and 22 February 2016.

### **3.1.3 Reporting**

The collected data were analysed and triangulated and a draft report was developed. The report was submitted to the GPC project team for feedback. Relevant feedback to the draft report was incorporated into the final report.

## **4 The project**

The project consisted of two components, one dealing mainly with the regional level, and one with the national (Kenya) level:

- 1) Support to IGAD's Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI) through support to strengthening resilience impact measuring under the framework of the Resilience Analysis Unit (RAU); and
- 2) Support to enhance Kenya's framework for Ending Drought in Emergencies' (EDE) capacity to mainstream resilience - mainly through support to Pillar 6 of the EDE, monitoring and coordination.

### **4.1 Objectives**

The project's principal objective was "To strengthen IGAD and member states capacity to align planning and programming frameworks with local needs".

The specific objective was "To improve the coherence of resilience measurement/analysis through which to enhance evidence-based disaster resilience policy-making and investment".

The wording of the specific objective can be difficult to grasp at first. It basically means that resilience-related policy-making and investments are to be enhanced with evidence from coherent resilience measurements/analysis.

The indicator for the specific objective was to ensure that at least two national and sub-national project partners/beneficiaries were integrating key pillars of resilience building into their plans, strategies and programmes.

## 4.2 Expected results

The project has two expected results as per table 1 below with each result having two indicators. The current achievements as reported in the project progress reports are included. The reported achievements were validated during the evaluation.

Table 1: Results framework

Results	Objectively Verified Indicators	Achievements
1. Scope and mode of partnership between the IGAD and its Member States clarified and strengthened in resilience impact measurement and monitoring and future planning.	1.1: One (1) Analytical framework for resilience M&E and knowledge management systems for IGAD Member States in place.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RAU Joint Programme Documents</li> <li>• RAU Learning Modules on Resilience Measurement and Analysis for Technical Experts and Middle Level Policy-makers</li> <li>• Qualitative Resilience Measurement Tool: Procedures, Templates and Best Practices.</li> </ul>
	1.2: One (1) database on resilience investments developed for the IGAD region among the IDDRSI Implementing countries.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3W Resilience Investment Tracker User Manual</li> </ul>
2: Institutional capacity on climate resilience mainstreaming enhanced at national level in Kenya based on the EDE MTP pillar priorities.	2.1: One (1) EDE MTP resilience assessment tools/guideline in place in Kenya.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EDE M&amp;E framework (Version 1)</li> </ul>
	2.2: Fifty (50) DRR/resilience institutions at national and county levels acquiring the skills in integrating the resilience assessment into DRR planning and M&E systems.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Turkana and Baringo County Indicator Handbooks.</li> <li>• County M&amp;E Framework Development Training Workshops in Turkana and Baringo counties</li> <li>• 117 individuals from 59 organisations have participated in training and workshops</li> </ul>

Annex D contains a more elaborate overview of the project, including more detailed descriptions of the activities and the budget.

Analysing the relationship between the results, the corresponding indicators and the reported achievements there is found generally to be a good correlation, especially for result 1 as described below.

- Result 1: Strengthened regional resilience impact measurement and monitoring with a target of ensuring that an IGAD M&E framework and a database is place as measured through the development of a programme document, learning modules, tools for measurement of resilience, and a database are found to correspond well to each other with clear linkages.
- Result 2: Development of national (Kenya) capacity to mainstream resilience as indicated by the development of an M&E framework and of institutions with the skills necessary to integrate resilience assessment into their M&E systems also corresponds well. The linkages between the result and the indicators are clear and logic. An M&E framework has been developed. It is not measured if the people who participated in the workshops and meetings acquired the skills required (and slightly fewer organisations participated than anticipated) and the full achievement of the second target (indicator 2.2) is thus less certain.

Overall the intervention logic of the project is found to be well designed with relevant activities and indicators, and the targets have mainly been met. The project is also relevant to the 2014 HIP in which resilience is highlighted as of "paramount importance", and in which one of the identified needs are that national stakeholders and partners should develop a better understanding and common analysis of issues related to resilience.

## **5 Findings**

This chapter analyses the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency (under one heading in section 5.3 on page 16), impact and sustainability of the two result areas.

### **5.1 Result 1 - Regional level**

The expected result of Result 1 is "Scope and mode of partnership between the IGAD and its Member States clarified and strengthened in resilience impact measurement and monitoring and future planning" with two indicators: i) One (1) Analytical framework for resilience M&E and knowledge management systems for IGAD Member States in place; and ii) One (1) database on resilience investments developed for the IGAD region among the IDDRSI Implementing countries.

#### **5.1.1 Relevance**

The project is focusing on supporting a stronger partnership between IGAD, its member states, and partners for clearer and stronger resilience impact measurements, monitoring and subsequent planning with a focus on developing tools for the Resilience Analysis Unit (RAU) and for the IGAD Drought Disaster Resilience Sustainability Initiative (IDDRSI). This support is relevant for the regional (IGAD) efforts to prevent or at least reduce the impact of the recurrent disasters - mainly drought - the region is faced with, and resilience activities are well-suited to fill the gap between humanitarian and development assistance. At the same time, different actors have different definitions of what resilience is and how it is achieved -

joint efforts to define and measure resilience will support coordination of activities while at the same time strengthen the results of these activities through the application of (common) standards.

There has been a tendency that resilience was mainly dealt with by humanitarian actors, and thus many activities were short-term in nature. The GPC is located within UNDP which traditionally has a longer-term development approach, and has extensive experiences with a more developmental-oriented approach towards resilience obtained through the GPC's work on developing a methodology for community-based resilience (the Community Based Resilience Analysis (CoBRA) approach). The GPC's contribution to ensure a longer-term perspective and a more qualitative measurement than the traditional quantitative measurements<sup>3</sup> of resilience has been useful for incorporating other aspects of resilience and was appreciated by the interviewees to this evaluation.

One of the more tangible outputs of the project was the user manual for IDDRSI's 3W (who is doing what and where) resilience investment tracker database developed by OCHA. The aim of the user manual is to facilitate entering of data in the database by relevant actors; the manual is considered relevant for training purposes and for day-to-day use of the database.

### **5.1.2 Effectiveness**

The processes of facilitating the establishment of joint resilience measurement were conducted through a number of activities. GPC represented UNDP in the RAU Management Advisory Board member and in the RAU Technical Team, organised and participated in workshops and meetings.

Interviewees agreed that the GPC led a good process with participatory consultations throughout. In particular, GPC was able to ensure a more holistic view on resilience by ensuring a long-term qualitative perspective that would capture peoples' aspirations also. Furthermore, GPC was said to be very diligent when checking details and was found by interviewees to be professional and committed. Interviewees also found that the GPC contributed to improve the quality of the outputs (learning modules, etc.) through the application of the GPC staff's strong technical knowledge on resilience. One interviewee, however, suggested that the GPC could have taken a more prominent leadership role, although this would then potentially have jeopardised sustainability, see also section 5.1.4 below for more on sustainability.

The outputs to which the GPC contributed directly under result 1 are:

- The RAU Joint Programme Document;
- The RAU Learning Modules on Resilience Measurement for Technical experts and Middle Level Policy Makers;
- The Qualitative Resilience Measurement Tool: Procedures, Templates and Best Practices; and

---

<sup>3</sup> Other measurements of resilience have often focused on food security, e.g. through FAOs Resilience Index Measurement and Analysis (RIMA) tool.

- The 3W Resilience Investment Tracker user manual.

The RAU Joint Programme Document is a well-structured document containing, among other things, as expected, an overview of the joint programme and the reasons for its development, a results framework, and an overview of RAU's management structure. The results framework is clear, but lack indicators at both result and outputs levels. The results framework might have benefited from the use of a ToC approach as applied during the development of the M&E Framework for Kenya (see section 5.2).

The learning modules were not developed by the GPC, but by consultants hired by RAU with support from the GPC (the international consultant). The learning modules are generally found to be quite heavy with a less clear structure. This is acknowledged by some interviewees and there are plans to submit them first for peer review and subsequent to transfer the learning modules to an e-learning platform, all of which might improve the quality.

The Qualitative Resilience Measurement Tool is of good quality; in fact it is found to have a more clear structure than the learning modules and contains a number of useful and relevant examples of how to measure resilience using qualitative tools. The tool takes the reader through a number of steps in measuring resilience while at the same time presenting different options. The main concern is that the tool in some places perhaps becomes too technical, e.g. the section on data sampling, validity and accountability can be hard to understand for non-academics, and might be of less use to the average reader.

The 3W Resilience Investment Tracker user manual is well-structured and to-the-point with easy to understand instructions supported by relevant screen dumps. It contains a number of relevant simulation exercises that enhances the benefit of the user manual. To make it even more user-friendly it would have been useful to have a 'clickable' electronic version, perhaps in HTML format - this would facilitate jumping back and forth between relevant sections.

### **5.1.3 Impact**

As indicated also in section 5.1.2 above, the facilitation of the various process is believed to have improved the quality of the various tools and documents and as such has had the intended impact. Furthermore, some interviewees appreciated the GPC contributions to the tools themselves by ensuring qualitative aspects of resilience, which in turns enables a more holistic approach to resilience measurement.

Given the relative short duration of the project with most of the outputs only available during the last quarter of 2015, the specific impact of the outputs remains to be seen.

### **5.1.4 Sustainability**

The processes facilitated by the project/GPC as such are not sustainable, nor are they expected to be. The processes, however, carries the potential to ensure more sustainable institutions insofar that valuable tools have now been made available, including the RAU Joint Programme Documents and the learning modules, which will be used for guidance and measurement of future resilience-related activities at national and regional level.

Furthermore, the user manual developed for the 3W Resilience Investment Tracker database and the learning modules will be used directly in the future - there are however possible concerns regarding how to upgrade the user manual if the database interface changes. There are plans to further develop the learning modules into e-learning platforms, and the Joint Programme Document will be used as guidance for the future work of the RAU.

The highly participatory process as emphasised by all interviewees at all levels has contributed to a high level of ownership of the outputs, which generally bodes well for ensuring future sustainability as the users have received the products/outputs they requested and found them useful.

## **5.2 Result 2 - National level**

The expected result of Result 2 is "Institutional capacity on climate resilience mainstreaming enhanced at national level in Kenya based on the EDE MTP pillar priorities" with two indicators: i) One (1) EDE MTP resilience assessment tools/guideline in place in Kenya; and ii) Fifty (50) DRR/resilience institutions at national and county levels acquiring the skills in integrating the resilience assessment into DRR planning and M&E systems.

### **5.2.1 Relevance**

Development of the national capacity to mainstream climate resilience in line with the EDE MTP priorities is highly relevant given the recurrent droughts in Kenya. Implementation of the EDE is a national priority with initial support from the highest political levels while the capacity to implement it at the same time has been somewhat limited. As also applies to the regional level, resilience has often fallen between the two chairs of humanitarian and development assistance with the risk that too little has been done. Utilising the regional experiences of the GPC, including the CoBRA approach, the current project contributes to ensure a relevant, holistic and longer-term perspective on resilience as also appreciated by interviewees - one interviewee put it like this: "is key to show where we are and to show progress".

Additionally, the development of indicators at county level provided a good opportunity for ensuring incorporation also of indicators relevant to resilience. As part of the process, the GPC conducted Theory of Change (ToC) workshops which interviewees found relevant for moving towards results-based monitoring rather than the traditional output-based monitoring. The support to development of the county indicator handbooks was very relevant for the counties; in fact they requested the support themselves.

### **5.2.2 Effectiveness**

Enhancing the capacity of resilience mainstreaming was done through facilitation of workshops and provision of technical support to the development specific outputs in the form of an EDE M&E frameworks and two county indicator handbooks. Also in Kenya was the GPC praised by interviewees for leading participatory processes which nobody else would likely have been in a position to do due to the limited capacity of the EDE secretariat and of the

newly established counties. GPC was described by interviewees as "truly facilitators", passionate and with a focus on results.

The EDE M&E Framework is a well-structured document based on ToCs for the five pillars of the EDE Common Programme Framework (CPF) outlining the tasks and responsibilities in a clear manner. The M&E Framework has almost 100 indicators at all levels from the EDE goal to impacts and medium-term and immediate outcomes. The number of indicators might be too large to realistically be collected as evidenced also by the fact that baseline data so far is available only for 14 indicators - the latter partly also because baseline data are not available in electronic form meaning that additional time is needed to identify them. A few interviewees furthermore expressed concern that the indicators are not all fully aligned with existing data sources, complicating collection of the missing data. The large and ambitious number of indicators is partly an expression of the M&E Framework being a joint document covering all relevant sectors involved in EDE, and as just is not the result of GPC's work only - furthermore, as the document is relatively recent, the baseline data will mostly be filled out in the coming months. The EDE secretariat is satisfied with the M&E Framework and will proceed to printing and dissemination of it.

Interviewees agree that GPC was instrumental in developing the M&E framework, and that the strong technical capacity of the GPC staff ensured good guidance and provided "support where it was needed" due to their combined in-depth knowledge of M&E and resilience. Interviewees stated that the M&E Framework would not have been completed within such a relatively short time period had it not been for the support provided by GPC.

As a further testimony to the quality of the activities in Kenya, IGAD has been following the Kenyan processes and outputs and would like to replicate it in other member states.

For developing the indicators in the M&E Framework and the County Indicator Handbooks, a ToC approach was used - the overall EDE ToC is included in Annex E as an example, each pillar has its own ToC that feeds into the overall ToC. Although the ToC element was difficult for some participants to grasp, there was agreement among interviewees that the introduction of ToC was useful with interviewees finding that the resulting result-based monitoring as established in the county indicator handbooks is more useful than the traditional out-put based monitoring. The indicator handbooks are generally well developed although the number of indicators is on the high side and not all baseline data are available yet. This is recognised at county-level and is partly because the county indicators are not only for measuring resilience but for measuring progress in implementing the County Integrated Development Plans (CIDP), partly due to the counties' need to further revise the indicators, and partly because of the lack of baseline data in general for the relatively newly established counties. The indicator handbook for Baringo County has, however, already been updated (February 2016) and the baseline data are almost complete.

One of the indicators of result 2 is that 50 DRR/resilience institutions have acquired the skills required for integrating resilience assessments into DRR planning and M&E systems. A total of more than 100 people from 59 different organisations have participated in various



workshops and training sessions. The target for the number of organisations participating has been reached, but as it is difficult in the short-term to measure if the participants (and thus the organisations) through participation in the training session have in fact obtained the skills necessary for integrating resilience assessment into planning and M&E, it is possible that the target has not been fully achieved - the results of any training is typically best measured in a medium or longer term perspective. However, given the short timeframe of the project the target is at the same time found too ambitious, while at the same time at least some of the participants/institutions are likely to have acquired some of the required skills.

### **5.2.3 Impact**

The impact of the project's Kenya-related activities is not measurable in the short-term. Most of the outputs were produced in the last half of 2015, and the use of them will only commence in 2016. However, a solid foundation for the future measurement of resilience-related activities and incorporation of resilience-relevant activities into national and local plans has been facilitated. Development of resilience indicators at both national and local levels is important as one would not succeed without the other, and the simultaneous development of indicators at both levels have ensured that inputs from counties were also considered during the development of the national level M&E Framework, as one interviewee put it: it ensured a "Stronger voice of counties".

Besides laying a sound foundation for the future work on resilience in Kenya, a few interviewees involved in result 2 stated that the facilitation conducted by the GPC assisted with bringing together different government institution which will be beneficial also for other national/local initiatives.

### **5.2.4 Sustainability**

The M&E Framework and the county indicator handbooks developed through the processes facilitated by the GPC will be used also for future implementation of the EDE. Interviewees agreed that the processes were highly participatory, and as such ensured ownership. The county indicators are aligned to the CIDPs, which will continuously be implemented by the counties as part of their regular work, and interviewees at county level stated that there would be continuous follow-up through annual reviews. The indicators in the M&E Framework for EDE pillar 2 (infrastructure) is already being used by the EU delegation for a new project, and the EU delegation supposedly has indicated that they are willing to support a Management Information System (MIS) for the M&E Framework.

At national level there is a wish to find ways of replicating the processes in other counties, while at regional level IGAD wish to use the experiences to replicate it in other member states. In one of the counties, the indicators in the County Indicator Handbook will be used as guidance also for programming by other actors<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>4</sup> On a side-note; Two interviewees stated that the findings from the phase 1 of the current project, the COBRA project, were used actively in the counties, and that they felt that the lack of specific follow-up activities was a missed opportunity. UNDP also stated that they are using CoBRA data for development of proposals, and that they have started funding secondary schools because of the findings of the CoBRA studies.



To preserve momentum, it is necessary to further develop the capacity at national and county levels with regards to data collection and data management - this was explicitly expressed by many interviewees. UNDP Kenya has indicated that they will continue working with the counties, but there will be a need also to roll out the processes to other counties, and GIZ indicated that they also have resources available to support future EDE related work at county levels. In late 2015, GPC had drafted a plan for the future roll out of the M&E Framework which was submitted to NDMA.

### **5.3 Efficiency**

The total budgeted cost of the project is almost EUR 400,000, with expenditures distributed almost equal between the four main activities as seen in Annex 4. The total budget was spent over almost 2 years of coordination, facilitation of workshops, development and dissemination of documents, etc. Given the substantial time that needs to be allocated to such task the evaluator finds that the cost is reasonable. This is confirmed by interviewees whom were asked questions about if the cost was reasonable/if the funds could have been spent better otherwise - as one interviewee said, the GPC is "Not reinventing the wheel, putting support where it is needed." Another interviewee stated that the work of the GPC was good value due to their contribution to resilience thinking.

The project experienced some initial delays resulting in most of the outputs being produced during the last quarter of the project. The delays were largely outside the hands of GPC: mainly due to the slow process of establishing the RAU as witnessed by the fact that the RAU Joint Programme Document was only finalised in October 2015, while at the same time the Kenyan EDE lost steam and suffered from limited capacity within NDMA.

The interviewees generally found that the inputs and support from GPC were as timely as could be expected and several interviewees praised the GPC for, unlike the other partners, being able to maintain the same staff in the RAU board and technical team. There was also among the interviewees a feeling that if the GPC had not been providing support, the various processes would have taken longer and been "less smooth".

In an ideal world, coordination and facilitation of M&E frameworks would be undertaken by the concerned organisations themselves in order to ensure sustainability and increase the level of alignment with the organisations' structures and procedures. However, given the relative limited capacity of the regional and national institutions the use of an 'external' organisation like the GPC is an efficient way to ensure development of appropriate M&E formats.

## **6 Conclusions, recommendations, and lessons learnt**

Overall the project is found to be well designed with most clear linkages between objective, activities and indicators. The expected results have mostly been achieved; only the acquisition of skills to integrate resilience assessments into planning and M&E systems has potentially not been fully achieved.

### **6.1 Relevance**

The project is found to be relevant to implementation of the ECHO 2014 HIP which emphasises a need for a common understanding and analysis of resilience-related issues.

Strengthening and coordinating measurements of resilience within both IGAD and in Kenya is relevant to ensure a more coherent and coordinated approach to development of resilience, which in turn can lay the foundation for reducing consequences of the recurrent disasters that the region is faced with.

The project is also found to be relevant for ensuring a more holistic and broader understanding of the concept of resilience in the region (through RAU) by bridging the gap between humanitarian and development practitioners and between advocates of the more narrow quantitative methodologies and the broader qualitative methodologies used for data collection. The qualitative methodologies can be better at capturing peoples' aspirations and underlying causes of vulnerability than quantitative methodologies.

In Kenya the project has provided relevant support to the roll-out of the EDE not only at national level but has also taken the first steps to roll it out at county levels. The project activities in Kenya have been relevant also to ensuring coherence between the national and the county levels indicators for measuring resilience.

### **6.2 Effectiveness**

Overall, the expected results are found to have been largely achieved with the only exception being that the number of institutions that have acquired the required skills to integrate resilience assessment into planning and M&E has not been fully achieved.

The processes facilitated by GPC at regional and national levels have been effective with participatory consultations led by a very capable GPC team. Interviewees found that the GPC team was committed and technically very professional and competent with an eye for the important details and a focus on results. There was agreement among interviewees that GPC was filling an important gap that nobody else would have been able to fill.

The tangible outputs of the project/the facilitation are mostly of high quality, especially when it comes to documents that the GPC has provided substantial inputs to or has been the sole

author of such as the Qualitative Measurement Tool which has a clear structure and contains useful examples - the tool, however, in some places tends to become a bit too theoretical.

The RAU Joint Programme Document - which is a document guiding the collaborative operation of collaboration of the RAU consisting of IGAD and UN-partners - is well-structured with a clear results framework. However, there are no indicators for the expected results, making future follow up on the extent to which the results have been achieved difficult. The EDE M&E framework has perhaps too many indicators with baseline data missing for most, and would benefit from a revision.

The county indicator handbooks are overall of good quality, and the utilisation of ToC for developing a results-based monitoring system was appreciated by interviewees. The indicator hand books also have very many indicators with most baseline information missing, but as the hand books covers not only resilience-related activities but the entire county development plans.

**Recommendation 1:** Future phases or follow-up activities, by UNDP or other partners, should devote resources to revise - or develop when missing - indicators in the Joint Programme Document and in the EDE M&E Framework, and ensure that baseline data is available or can easily be identified.

The learning modules developed by RAU, which the GPC was not responsible for but only supported the development of, does not maintain the same high standard as the above documents. The documents are very heavy, more than 100 pages with a not so clear structure - the modules have not been tested, which probably would have contributed to improve their quality. There are plans to further refine the documents and eventually develop them into an e-learning platform which might improve the quality.

**Lesson learned 1:** Development of learning modules should be tested as part of ensuring high-quality documents.

The user manual for the 3W Resilience Investment Tracker database was produced by the GPC, and is found to be a well-structured and to-the point tool with useful examples. The tool would, however, benefit from being available in an electronic format as to allow easy navigation between the different parts.

**Recommendation 2:** Future user manuals should be developed in an electronic format that allows the users to navigate easily between different parts of the manual.

Throughout the evaluation, the evaluator has been informed by interviewees that one of the main benefits of having GPC on board for facilitation and coordination has been the GPC staff's insistence on also including qualitative methodologies for measuring resilience. This partly stems from the GPC's previous work on developing the CoBRA methodology as funded through a previous ECHO grant. The findings from this previous phase are now being used as a basis for implementation of development activities by other actors. Interviewees found that

the inclusion of qualitative methodologies brought to the table additional aspects of resilience, especially from the peoples' perspectives.

Lesson learned 2: By bringing together qualitative and quantitative methodologies for measuring resilience, additional insights into root causes of vulnerabilities and aspirations of people are brought to the table.

### **6.3 Efficiency**

Overall the project is found to have been implemented in a cost-effective manner with the total cost found to be reasonable and good value.

The project experienced some delays leading to most tangible outputs being available only towards the end of the project. However, most of these delays were largely outside the control of the GPC as it was due to constraints of especially the RAU being a multi-stakeholder organisation without a joint programme framework (which was only developed during the project duration with the support also of the GPC). The kick-off of the EDE in Kenya was also delayed with the EDE Common Programme Framework only available in November 2015. Several interviewees stated that if the GPC had not been supporting the different processes, they would have taken even longer.

Lesson learned 3: Supporting the development of M&E frameworks for institutions and programmes that are not clearly defined from the onset, and the definition of which will suffer from the institutions being either politically influenced and/or consisting of multiple stakeholders such as UN-agencies and intergovernmental bodies can be a difficult task requiring more time than anticipated.

### **6.4 Impact**

The project is believed to have ensured a higher quality of the joint outputs, e.g. the RAU Joint Programme Document, the EDE M&E Frameworks and the county indicator handbooks, than would have been the case if the GPC had not supported the development of the documents. As most of the tangible outputs were only finalised during the second half of 2015, full the impact of the documents remain to be seen.

The evaluator finds that regardless of tangible impacts not been identifiable at this point in time, the specific objective of ensuring enhancement of resilience-related policy-making and investments have been achieved through development of a more coherent and holistic approach to measuring and analysing resilience. The evaluator also finds that the project's principal objective of strengthening IGAD and member states' capacity to align planning and programming frameworks with local needs is likely, at least in the medium or longer term, to be improved, that is when the M&E Frameworks and tools are applied throughout.

An unintended positive impact of the project has been that the staff at county levels in Kenya have embraced a more results-based approach to measuring progress towards implementation of their integrated development plans - this is partly due to the introduction of ToC processes.

## **6.5 Sustainability**

The processes facilitated by GPC are in themselves not sustainable, and are not expected to be. Nevertheless, the processes were highly participatory and have contributed to ownership of the outputs (the various documents). Taking ownership to documents is crucial for sustainability and will ensure that the documents are aligned with the end-users interests and needs, facilitating their use also in the future. Interviewees confirmed that work would continue on the documents, including annual reviews of indicators.

The actual outputs, such as the learning modules, the EDE M&E Framework, and the county indicator handbooks, will thus be used also in the future and most likely developed/improved further.

Lesson learned 4: Applying a participatory approach and bringing people together contributes, unsurprisingly, to ensure ownership, and facilitates future work on and use of the outputs.

In Kenya there is a wish to replicate the development of county indicators handbooks, including the associated training in ToC etc., in other counties, and IGAD wishes to replicate the entire process in other countries.

Both at regional and Kenya level there is a concern, however, that the capacity of the various institutions are not fully developed to an extent where the future processes of data collection and management will continue smoothly. There is therefore a need to ensure that capacity development activities continue, and other donors such as GIZ and UNDP have already indicated their interest in supporting such activities.

Recommendation 3: Future activities should focus on assessing the capacity needs at all levels and on the basis hereof develop a plan for how to achieve the required capacities.

## **6.6 Recommendations**

As the project has generally been well-executed without major problems, the number of recommendations is limited to three as put forward above. The recommendations are listed in table 2 below for easy references.

*Table 2: List of recommendations*

No.	Recommendation
1	Future phases or follow-up activities, by UNDP or other partners, should devote resources to revise - or develop when missing - indicators in the Joint Programme Document and in the EDE M&E Framework, and ensure that baseline data is available or can easily be identified.
2	Future user manuals should be developed in an electronic format that allows the users to navigate easily between different parts of the manual.
3	Future activities should focus on assessing the capacity needs at all levels and on the basis hereof develop a plan for how to achieve the required capacities.

## 6.7 Lessons learned

Four lessons learned have been identified during the evaluation of the project. The lessons learned are listed in table 3 below for easy references.

*Table 3: List of lessons learned*

No.	Lesson learned
1	Development of learning modules should be tested as part of ensuring high-quality documents.
2	By bringing together qualitative and quantitative methodologies for measuring resilience, additional insights into root causes of vulnerabilities and aspirations of people are brought to the table.
3	Supporting the development of M&E frameworks for institutions and programmes that are not clearly defined from the onset, and the definition of which will suffer from the institutions being either politically influenced and/or consisting of multiple stakeholders such as UN-agencies and intergovernmental bodies can be a difficult task requiring more time than anticipated.
4	Applying a participatory approach and bringing people together contributes, unsurprisingly, to ensure ownership, and facilitates future work on and use of the outputs.

## Annex A – TOR

### United Nations Development Programme

Global Policy Centre on Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

### Terms of Reference

#### **Final Evaluation of Building Climate Resilience in Drylands through Community-Based Resilience Analysis Project**

Location:	Home based
Type of Contract:	Individual Contract
Languages Required:	English
Expected Duration of Assignment:	January-February 2016

### **Background**

UNDP Global Policy Centre on Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification (GPC-Nairobi) has been managing the Building Climate Resilience in Drylands through Community-Based Resilience Analysis Project (hereafter the project) with the financial support from the Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection Department of the European Commission (ECHO). The project was implemented in the Horn of Africa (HoA) region between April 2014 and December 2015 with the overall objective to strengthen the national/regional and other institutional capacities to align their planning and programming frameworks with the local needs for long-term climate resilient, sustainable development.

More specifically, the project was designed around two interlinked components:

**1. Regional Support to Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)'s Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability (IDDRSI):** This component focuses on clarifying and strengthening the scope and mode of partnership between the IGAD and its Member States in resilience impact measurement and monitoring and future IDDRSI planning. This component was implemented under the framework of the IGAD-led Resilience Analysis Unit (RAU) initiative and in close coordination with the RAU partners.

**2. National Support to the Ending Drought Emergencies (EDE) in Kenya:** This component focuses on the enhancement of institutional capacity on climate resilience mainstreaming at national level in Kenya based on the EDE MTP pillar priorities. This component was implemented through the UNDP Kenya County Office's Governance of DRR in Kenya Programme and in partnership with the EDE Secretariat, housed within the National Drought Management Authority in Kenya, as well as the pilot county governments.

Annex 1 provides a more detailed description on the agreed results and resources framework, including the Project outputs and corresponding output indicators, targets and activities, based on which to monitor the results of the Project.

### **Objectives and Scope of the Final Project Evaluation**

The main objectives of the final project evaluation are 1) to assess achievements of the Project, i.e. the extent of attainments of the intended objectives, outcomes, outputs and activities as defined in the results and resources framework (Annex 1), and 2) generate findings on opportunities, constraints/challenges and lessons learnt during the implementation of the project.



Specific issues to be studied by the Consultant include:

- Relevance of interventions under this Project;
- Efficiency of implementation to-date (including implementation approaches employed as a basis to guide possible future improvements in programme delivery);
- Opportunities, constraints/challenges and lessons learnt during the implementation of the Project;
- Effectiveness of the Project;
- Impact of the Project, including assumptions used in the development of the Project;
- Potential sustainability; and
- Recommended actions to be taken in the future building on the Project achievements.

#### **Methodology**

The evaluation shall be carried out under the supervision of the UNDP GPC-Nairobi project team and in line with the rules and regulations of UNDP. Given the nature of the Project, i.e., regional focus with training/capacity building-based approach, the collection of data will be mainly undertaken on a home basis. They are envisaged to cover at least the following areas:

- Desk study review of all relevant project documents;
- Teleconferencing/email-based consultations with the UNDP GPC-Nairobi project team, the above mentioned project component counterparts and partners, the project donor (i.e., ECHO) and other relevant stakeholders; and
- If considered relevant, questionnaires and interviews with those who have participated in the project-funded workshops/training events may be carried out.

The UNDP GPC-Nairobi, in support of the final project evaluation, will:

- Provide all relevant background documents to the Consultant;
- Provide an overall briefing to the Consultant on the Project;
- Avail any necessary follow-up support for telephone/email-based consultations and interviews; and
- Provide any additional information and support as required.

#### **Expected Deliverable**

The main product of the final project evaluation will be a Final Project Evaluation Report. The language of the report is English. The report format should comply with the UNDP requirements. The detailed outline of the report shall be agreed upon the commencement of the assignment.

The draft report will be submitted by the Consultant to the UNDP GPC-Nairobi for review. It will also be shared with the participating organizations in the evaluation process for their comments and feedback to ensure that the report reflect adequately on their inputs. The draft report will be amended further by the Consultant taking into account all the comments from the stakeholders.

The final report shall be submitted to the UNDP GPC-Nairobi in digital form using latest MS-Office programs. GPC-Nairobi will share the copies of the report to the donor and any other relevant stakeholders.

#### **Duration and Implementation Modalities of the Assignment**

This consultancy is envisioned to be completed in 14 (fourteen) working days spread over the period of 1 (one) months between January and February 2016. Payment will be made based on satisfactory submission of the final report.

The overall supervision of this assignment will rest with the Project Manager at the UNDP-DDC. The Consultants will be bound by the terms and conditions of UNDP Procurement rules and guidelines. S/He will be briefed at the beginning of the assignment by teleconference.



During the evaluation, the Consultant is entitled and expected to discuss with all the persons and organisations relevant to the assignment. The Consultant has no authorisation to make any commitments on behalf of UNDP or the ECHO.

**Required Skills and Experience**

Education:

- Advanced university degree in disaster management, natural resources management/environment or related disciplines;

Experience:

- At least 5 years of experience in results-based management and participatory monitoring and evaluation;
- Professional background in sustainable development and capacity building with UNDP or other major developmental multilateral or bilateral organization(s);
- Familiarity with development and humanitarian challenges in drylands areas specifically in the Horn of Africa would be desirable;
- ;
- High attention to detail and ability to work under tight deadlines; and
- IT competencies at least in Word and internet.

Language:

- Strong conceptual and analytical skills, communication and writing skills with proficiency in English and ability to compile information in coherent and succinct formats

**Annex 1: Results and Resources Framework**

<b>Principal Objective:</b> To strengthen the capacities of IGAD, its Member States and other relevant stakeholders to align their planning and programming frameworks with the local needs for long-term climate resilient and sustainable development.		
<b>Specific Objective:</b> To improve the coherence of resilience measurement/analysis tools and their findings under the shared understanding and operational framework, through which to enhance evidence-based disaster resilience policymaking and investment decision-making in the IGAD region.		
Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Target Value	Sources of Verification
Number of national and sub-regional project partners/beneficiaries integrating key pillars of resilience building into their plans, strategies and programmes.	At least 2	- Planning, strategy and programming documents of IGAD, its Member States and other relevant stakeholder institutions.
<b>Result 1: Scope and mode of partnership between the IGAD and its Member States clarified and strengthened in resilience impact measurement and monitoring and future planning.</b>		
Intended Outputs	Target Value	Sources of Verification
Analytical framework for resilience M&E and knowledge management systems for IGAD Member States in place.	1	- Regional/national forum reports - Guiding document for IGAD-Member State(s) partnership on resilience measurement/ analysis, M&E and knowledge management - Project progress monitoring reports
Number of database on resilience investments developed for the IGAD region among the IDDRSI Implementing countries.	1	- Resilience investment dataset - Project progress monitoring reports
<b>Result 2: Institutional capacity on climate resilience mainstreaming enhanced at national level in Kenya based on the EDE MTP pillar priorities.</b>		
Intended Outputs	Target Value	Sources of Verification
EDE MTP resilience assessment tools/guideline in place in Kenya.	1	- National/local consultation reports - Project progress monitoring reports - EDE MTP frame work for M&E and resilience assessment/analysis
Number of DRR/resilience institutions at national and county levels acquiring the skills in integrating the resilience assessment into DRR planning and M&E systems.	50	- Training plans - Field exercise analysis reports including the post-training self-assessments by the participants - Project progress monitoring reports

## Annex B - List of people interviewed

Table B.1 below provides details of the people interviewed. The date indicated is the date of the first Skype/telephone call, subsequent interviews are not recorded.

*Table B.1: Stakeholders interviewed*

<i>Name</i>	<i>Position/Organization</i>	<i>Date</i>
Yuko Kurauchi	Policy Specialist, UNDP Global Policy Centre on Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification (GPC-Nairobi)	26/1-16
Francis Opiyo	Project Coordinator, UNDP GPC-Nairobi	26/1-16
Vanessa Tilstone	Head of Programmes/Monitoring, Learning and Communication Manager Drylands Learning and Capacity Building Initiative	3/2-16
Hien Vu	Consultant, FAO	3/2-16
Johnstone Kibor	Member of Pillar 1, EDE, NDMA	3/2-16
Luigi Luminari	Ex-Chair of Pillar 5, EDE, NDMA	3/2-16
Cinzia Papavero	Former WFP RTT member	4/2-16
Eliud Wamwangi	Chair of Pillar 2, EDE, NDMA	5/2-16
Emmanuel Kisangau	Resilience Officer, NDMA, Turkana	5/2-16
Tesfaye B. Asfaw	Ex-Technical Coordinator, RAU	5/2-16
Thomas Pitaud	Programme Specialist, UNDP IGAD Resilience initiative	8/2-16
Pascal Ledroit	Programme Manager, EU Kenya	8/2-16
Laban MacOpiyo	National Consultant	9/2-16
Eugenie Reidy	Former Programme Specialist, UNICEF	11/2-16
Comas Omolo	Principal Livestock Officer, MoAFL	11/2-16
Claudia Piacenza	Livelihood advisor, DFID	12/2-16
Francis Matheka	Programme Specialist, UNDP Kenya	12/2-16
Dr. Ayan Mahamoud	Programme Coordinator, IDRRSI	12/2-16
Pauline Gogo	Stakeholder Liaison Officer/Administrator, NDMA EDE Secretariat	12/2-16
Paul Obunde	Planning and Policy Manager / NDMA	12/2-16
Flora Mugure Kanga	Programme Officer, UNDP Kenya	12/2-16
Brian Mutie	M&E Officer / NDMA	12/2-16
Sanjay Rane	Information Management Officer, UNOCHA	12/2-16
Emathe Namuar	Turkana County Planning Unit	15/2-16
Anthony Awira	Monitoring and Evaluation Expert, IDRRSI IGAD Secretariat	15/2-16
Samuel Oinyiaku	Planning and M&E Advisor, GIZ	15/2-16
Elliot Vhurumuku	Senior Regional VAM Officer, WFP	16/2-16
Asmerom M. Gilau	International Consultant, Ph.D	16/2-16
Kiprono Kosgei	Senior Economist, Planning Unit	19/2-16
Andrea Ambroso	Disaster Risk Reduction & Food Assistance Advisor, ECHO	19/2-16
Priscilla Amiri	Programme Assistant – Drought Risk Reduction, ECHO	19/2-16

## **Annex C - Interview guidelines**

### **Introduction**

- Confidential
- Contracted by Global Policy Centre on Resilient Ecosystems and Desertification (GPC) hosted by UNDP in Nairobi to evaluate the ECHO funded project on Building Climate Resilience in Drylands through Community-Based Resilience Analysis
- Project consisted of two main components: i) Support to IGAD's Drought Disaster Resilience and Sustainability (IDDRSI) Initiative through support to strengthening resilience impact measuring under the framework of Resilience Analysis Unit (RAU); ii) Support to enhance Ending Drought in Emergencies (EDE) capacity to mainstream resilience - mainly through support to Pillar 6, monitoring and coordination.
- The objective of the evaluation is to i) Assess achievements of the project, ii) Generate findings on opportunities, constraints/challenges and lessons learnt.
- What was your engagement like/how did you participate in the project

### **Relevance**

The project's principal objective: To strengthen IGAD and member states capacity to align planning and programming frameworks with local needs.

The specific objective is to improve the coherence of resilience measurement/analysis through which to enhance evidence-based disaster resilience policy-making and investment.

- Were the objectives achieved (why, why not, alternatives).
- How do the project fit with the local/regional/national activities, priorities and policies of your organization (why, why not, alternatives)
- Could the relevance of the project (to your organization, government or the local population communities) be improved, how and why

### **Effectiveness**

- What expected results were achieved
  - 1) Scope and mode of partnership between IGAD and its Member States clarified and strengthened in resilience impact measurement and monitoring and future planning.  
Indicators were:
    - 1.1) Analytical framework for resilience M&E and knowledge management for IGAD member states in place
    - 1.2) Number of database on resilience investments developed for the IGAD region among the IDDRSI implementing countries

- 2) Institutional capacity on climate resilience mainstreaming enhanced at national level in Kenya based on the EDE MTP pillar priorities.

Indicators were:

- 1.1) EDE MTP resilience assessment tools/guidelines in place in Kenya
- 1.2) Number of DRR/resilience institutions at national and county levels acquiring the skills in integrating the resilience assessment into DRR planning and M&E systems.

- What was not achieved/what were the constraints and challenges
- What could have been done instead to address the constraints and challenges, why

#### Efficiency

- Where the results and outputs timely (why, why not). Do you know why there were delays?
- Could the results and outputs have been achieved differently (less costly)
- What could have been done instead, why

#### Impact

- Has the project made any difference for your organisation, the region (IGAD), which, why, why not
- Do you know of other impacts/changes (what has happened) brought about by the project directly or indirectly, intended or unintended (*principal objective: To strengthen IGAD and member states capacity to align planning and programming frameworks with local needs.*). The specific objective is *to improve the coherence of resilience measurement/analysis through which to enhance evidence-based disaster resilience policy-making and investment.*
- Why, why not
- Any unintended impacts (negative/positive), why?

#### Sustainability

- Will the achievement be useful/used also after this project is finalised (why, why not, how)

- Opportunities/challenges, lessons learned, recommendations
  - Any opportunities or challenges not discussed above generated by the project
  - What are the main lessons learned from the project
  - If there would be another phase of the project, what would you propose should be done

Any other comments?

Any questions?

## Annex D - Project activities and budget

Results	Activities	Budget Category	Detailed descriptions	Inputs (EUR)	Total Budget (EUR)
1. Scope and mode of partnership between the IGAD and its Member States clarified and strengthened in resilience impact measurement and monitoring and future planning.	1.1. Stakeholders consultation meetings convened to develop a shared understanding among the IDDRSI partners at regional and national levels on the guiding principles and operational frameworks for coordination in resilience M&E and knowledge management.	Travel/Workshop/Training	Organization of regional/national consultation forums	20,949	69,194
		Personnel Cost	Oversight, reporting, coordination and technical backstop	23,255	
		External Technical Support	Facilitate regional/national consultations and development of harmonized resilience M&E frameworks	17,640	
		Knowledge Management/ Publication	Editing, designing, and dissemination of M&E and KM frameworks	7,350	
	1.2. Technical backstopping support provided to establish the resilience investment database and develop the institutional framework for the data management, updating and sharing among the IGAD, its Member States and other IDDRSI partners.	Travel/Workshop/Training	Organization of face-to-face meeting and online discussion forums for the IDDRSI database development	55,743	97,022
		Personnel Cost	Oversight, reporting, coordination and technical backstop	23,638	
External Technical Support		Expert to moderate multi-stakeholder process of developing regional resilience database for IDDRSI	17,640		
2. Institutional capacity on climate resilience mainstreaming enhanced at national level in Kenya based on the EDE MTP pillar priorities.	2.1. Participatory consultative meetings organized among the EDE stakeholders from respective pillars to agree upon the programme-wide framework for the EDE MTP M&E and resilience assessment/analysis.	Travel/Workshop/Training	Organization of meetings for development of EDE MTP M&E and resilience assessment framework	30,209	85,489
		Personnel Cost	Oversight, reporting, coordination and technical backstop	41,315	
		External Technical Support	Technical backstopping and facilitative support for participatory development of the framework	13,965	
	2.2. Government and other partner institutions/individuals at national and local levels received intensive training support on resilience assessment, data analysis and integration of assessment/analysis results into M&E, knowledge management and planning processes.	Travel/Workshop/Training	Organization of desk/field-based training and data collection/analysis for government and other partners	44,100	98,644
		Personnel Cost	Oversight, reporting, coordination and technical backstop	41,314	
		External Technical Support	Technical backstopping support for smooth implementation of training and data collection/analysis	13,230	
Sub-total Results Area Costs					350,349
Other Costs		Equipment and Goods	Maintenance of goods/equipment	2,940	17,030
		Office Expense	Project hosting cost including rent, communications, etc.	5,513	
		Visibility/Communication	Production of materials to enhance donor visibility	1,227	
		Monitoring and Evaluation	Independent final project evaluation	7,350	
Sub-total Other Costs					17,030
Total Direct Costs of the Action - Sub-total Results Area Costs + Sub-total Other Costs					367,379
Total Indirect Cost of the Action (7%) - ECHO requested contribution portion + UNDP co-financing contribution portion					25,716
Total Cost of the Action					393,095



## Annex E - EDE Theory of Change

