UNDP Kuwait

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Final External Evaluation of the "Preservation and promotion of Kuwait's cultural heritage" Project

Funded by the Government of Kuwait - GSSPD and implemented by the NCCAL – with UNDP as responsible Agency & UNESCO as Technical Agency

Evaluation commissioned by UNDP Kuwait

Evaluator: Christian Bugnion de Moreta

Final Evaluation report – Field visit from 2 to 8 March 2019

24rd April 2019

Note: the contents of this report reflect the views of the evaluator and not necessarily those of the commissioning agency

Table of contents

Content

- TOR
- Inception report
- Evaluation presentation ppt
- Debrief presentation ppt
- List of interviewees
- Evaluation agenda
- Bibliography

NOTE: the evaluator would like to thank all respondents who were available for interview during the evaluation. It is however highly evident that there is room to improve the culture of evaluation in Kuwait and national ownership of the evaluation process. Dissemination of the revised UNEG evaluation norms and standards, as well as the UNDP PME Handbook and UNDG evaluation guidance should be encouraged to ensure relevant feedback on the evaluation report contents from all concerned parties.

Acronyms and abbreviations

CPD:	Country Programme Document
DAI:	Dar Alathar Alislammiya
FGD:	Focus Group Discussion
GSSCPD:	General Secretariat, Supreme Council for Planning and Development, State of Kuwait
KII:	Key Informant Interview
KNM:	Kuwait National Museum
KNDP:	Kuwait National Development Plan
KWD:	Kuwait Dinar
MSC:	Most Significant Change
NCCAL:	The National Council for Culture, the Arts and Literature
OECD:	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
PB:	Project Board
Prodoc:	Project Document
RBM:	Results-Based Management
SSC/TrC:	South-South Cooperation/Triangular Cooperation
ToR :	Terms of Reference
UNDG:	United Nations Development Group
UNDP:	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG:	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNESCO:	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
USD:	United States Dollars

1. Executive Summary

The current report constitutes the final evaluation of the project "Preservation and promotion of Kuwait's cultural Heritage" financed by the government of Kuwait through the General Secretariat of the Supreme Council for Planning and Development (GSSCPD) with US$ 1,000,000 and with national implementation through the National Council for Culture, Arts and Literature (NCCAL), with the technical support of the UNESCO and the project coordination provided by the UNDP.

The project started on 18th April 2017 with the signature of the project document and was expected to be completed by 31st December 2018. The project received a no-cost extension until end of February 2019 for activities, with a financial closure by the 30th of April 2019.

The final project evaluation was commissioned by UNDP Kuwait as foreseen by the project document. The evaluation took place in the months of February and March 2019, with a field mission for data collection in Kuwait from 2nd March to 8th March 2019.

The project goal is "to establish a clear framework for the development of culture by creating the basis for strong cultural institutions that operate with respect to international standards with qualified and skilled personnel to extend services to society and deliver a rich cultural agenda and programs, as well as effective platforms that encourage creativity and productivity in the cultural field". The goal was to be achieved through five specific outputs:

0.1. NCCAL strengthened through cultural policy development and institutional restructuring
0.2. Institutional strengthening for NCCAL with focus on Museums Division
0.3. Capacity development plan for NCCAL implemented and handicrafts and creative industries framework established and capacities enhanced
0.4. NCCAL undertakings widely disseminated
0.5. SSC/TRc enacted through benchmarking and knowledge sharing

The primary audience for the evaluation is the two national counterparts (GSSCPD, NCCAL) and the two UN agencies (UNDP, UNESCO), in addition to the KNM. Additional actors in the field of culture may be interested in the contents of the evaluation report. UNDP has commissioned the final project evaluation and has indicated that it will be placed on the Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC), so it is readily accessible to all interested parties.

The evaluation followed a standard methodology consisting of a) a documentary review and analysis of project documentation produced, b) a data collection field visit consisting of key informant interviews and group discussions with training and workshop participants. A total of 21 interviews were held for a total of almost 21 hours, with a total of 21 female respondents and 7 male respondents. Noteworthy that neither the Secretary General of the NCCAL nor of the GSSCPD were available for an interview. On-site observation was also used in KNM and other cultural facilities like the DAI, ASCC, Al Sadu House. Triangulation proved challenging given the lack of narratives to explain the changes from the original project document to the revised workplan and its related products and outputs.

The most important evaluation findings are the following:

The most significant change brought about by the project has been the level of motivation and commitment from trainees and workshop participants, under mainly output 3 and partly output

2 of the project. The project was able to share knowledge, develop skills and have some practical application, which led to an attitudinal change amongst trainees and participants. The change was also noted by the KNM management and was highly appreciated. The quality of the training courses and training materials, of the trainers, and of the overall value of the support was rated as very high, with an average rating of 4,91 out of 5 from six respondents interviewed. Longer training periods with more practical applications was a commonly echoed request.

For the other outputs and despite the production of a high number of quality reports and deliverables, the project achieved mixed results. For output 1, one national counterpart gave a minimum rating of 1 out of 5, while the other national partner could not provide a rating for this specific output.

For output 2, the one event that was highly regarded by respondents and national counterparts was the RE-ORG workshop, which was mentioned as having the potential to bring concrete change into the KNM and was cited as a good practice example of the type of support that can be provided for developing the institutional capacity. The other components (feasibility study and other reports) were less known and again the national counterparts could not provide a rating regarding this output.

For output 3, one part deals with the specialised training courses which obtained very high marks, as mentioned above. However, the other component related to the establishment of an Arts and Crafts Centre, was actually taken out of the project and carried out with a firm by NCCAL. UNESCO did deliver a feasibility study for the centre in 2019 under this project, but again no specific rating from the national counterparts could be obtained.

For one of the national stakeholders, if the project was only about capacity development, the rating would have to be a 4 out of 5 (high), since this proved to be one of the projects' strengths that was acknowledged by all stakeholders interviewed. However, the national counterparts seemed to have limited awareness and knowledge of the reports and deliverables produced. This is due in part to the fact that a large number of reports were delivered during the month of February 2019, and the evaluator had the chance to receive some reports at the time they were being submitted to the national counterparts.

Outputs 4 and 5 were, in the view of the evaluator, mistakenly indicated as outputs, but required a minimal level of input and a high level of creativity to interpret the meaning of the output statement. As a result, the outputs 4 and 5 are mainly testimonial, but have no direct relationship to the goal of the project nor do they support the rest of the primary outputs 1,2,3.

The major reason behind the partial success of the project is linked to the imperfect project design and in particular of its results framework, outcome and output statements and the selection of its indicators, inadequate definition of roles and responsibilities, absence of a shared vision about the objectives of the project, and difficulty in communication and understanding across the four main project partners (GSSCPD, NCCAL, UNDP, UNESCO).

The governance structures did not fully play the role they were intended to (Project Board meetings) and insufficient narrative evidence is available to explain the changes from the initial project document to the revised workplan used for the activities and the project results.

The overall project objective and its title are misleading and have not been achieved. The major result of the project has been the capacity development of the KNM staff, which has the

potential to be sustained in time and lead to behaviour change provided management support to the process is ensured.

Based on the results of the project (particularly outputs 3 and 2), KNM management has requested the GSSCPD for a project extension of six months, particularly targeting the capacity development and training process.

A number of lessons have been identified in the body of the report, and the main recommendations are:

Recommendations for all partners (GSSCPD, NCCAL, UNDP, UNESCO):

1) Facilitate timely feedback on the project deliverables and products to facilitate decision-making within one week of submission, by all partners
2) Ensure decisions taken at the Project Board meetings are clearly detailed and that all stakeholders' signature confirm their agreement to the decisions taken

Recommendations for the UNDP and UNESCO:

1) Ensure quality assurance of the project design and its results framework, in line with best project cycle development practices, and an RBM compliant results-framework for both UNESCO and UNDP
2) Establish clear and detailed delineation of roles and responsibilities between UNESCO and UNDP, and ensure the UN speaks with One Voice

Recommendations for the UNDP:

1) Consider providing an RBM training for the UN/government staff in Kuwait
2) Improve the evidence-base in English language that inform about the decisions taken by the project

Recommendations for the UNESCO:

1) Focus more on capacity development processes than on deliverables (reports), as the latter do not contribute directly to practical application and require follow-up by the national counterpart, if the main objective of the support is capacity development
2) Prepare a one-year workplan for each national counterpart trainee with benchmarks and performance indicators, to be signed and accepted by their management
3) Consider training through a Training of Trainers approach to ensure KNM has its own trainers for specialised courses and an induction course for new staff, and provide them with corresponding ToT certificates
4) Consider offering specialised trainings courses at two levels: a) introductory b) advanced

Recommendations for NCCAL:

1) Formalize the Task Force through clearly defined roles and responsibilities and an explanation of how each TF member should contribute to project implementation, while also specifying communication channels and specific reporting requirements.
2) Consider creating an internal pool of trainers in KNM for specialised courses that can be used to create an induction course for new KNM staff
3) Ensure management support to the benchmarking of trainees' performance based on their annual workplan established by the trainers and ensure their monitoring

Recommendations for GSSCPD:

1) Include six-months lead time when defining project life-span;
2) Ensure clarity over defined roles and responsibilities within government counterparts (NCCAL and GSSCPD, but also KNM) by defining in detail the roles of each party, responsibilities of each party, and clear communication lines between the four primary stakeholders. Signed specific MoU between each partner with full details of exact areas of competency to avoid discussion. Define the final decision maker at the PB when consensus cannot be reached between its members.
3) Assure national ownership of the governance arrangements and ensure oversight and monitoring of the NCCAL and KNM achievements

2. Object of the evaluation

2.0. Object of the evaluation

The UNPD has hired an independent consultant to undertake the Final Evaluation of the Project: "Preservation and promotion of Kuwait's cultural heritage". The project started on 18ᵗʰ April 2017 and as initially foreseen to last until 31ˢᵗ December 2018. It subsequently was awarded a no-cost extension until 30ᵗʰ April 2019 given initial implementation delays. The total project budget is USD 1,422,300 entirely funded by the Government of Kuwait. Of this amount, USD 1,000,000 was contributed by the Government-GS SCPD (General Secretariat, Supreme Council for Planning and Development) and an additional US$ 422,300 was contributed in-kind and proved challenging to manage on several occasions, to the point that stakeholders agreed to avoid in-kind contribution as lessons learnt as it provided more difficulties than benefits for project partners. The project is funded through the GS SCPD, but it is implemented by the NCCAL under national implementation, with UNDP providing the project coordination role and UNESCO providing the technical assistance to support the project activities and outputs. Of the budgetary contribution of USD 1 million, USD 800,000 were allocated to UNESCO for the technical execution, and USD 200,000 were allocated to UNDP for project coordination and management, including this evaluation.

This final evaluation has been contractually requested as part of the project document requirements.

The initial project document included an in-kind contribution from NCCAL up to an amount of USD 422,300.--. This amount covered logistical support, meals and accommodation for the various experts and consultants that have been deployed as technical support for the implementation of the activities, as well as the provision of office space, furniture, stationary and local logistics to facilitate project implementation, outsourcing third party research, costs of workshops and conferences, as described in the project document management arrangements (p.24). Interviews indicate that reporting regarding the in-kind contributions to have been removed from the financial statements, in order to focus specifically on the Government of Kuwait's financial contribution (e.g. USD 1,000,000.--).

2.1 Logic model and expected results chain

The project goal was "to establish a clear framework for the development of culture by creating the basis for strong cultural institutions that operate with respect to international standards with qualified and skilled personnel to extend services to society and deliver a rich cultural

agenda and programs, as well as effective platforms that encourage creativity and productivity in the cultural field". The goal was to be achieved through five specific outputs:

0.6. NCCAL strengthened through cultural policy development and institutional restructuring
0.7. Institutional strengthening for NCCAL with focus on Museums Division
0.8. Capacity development plan for NCCAL implemented and handicrafts and creative industries framework established and capacities enhanced
0.9. NCCAL undertakings widely disseminated
0.10. SSC/TRc enacted through benchmarking and knowledge sharing

The project results framework (p. 15 of the prodoc) does not provide any outcome level indicator, nor does it establish a baseline value or target for the project. The only indicator mentioned (4.2.1 Number of initiatives and action organised to promote cultural heritage in Kuwait) is an output indicator that does not measure change. There is no logical framework included to understand how the activities generate the desired products and outputs, and how these collectively contribute to the overall project goal.

There is no specific theory of change to show the linkages between the different outputs.

Both the project overall goal and its five outputs appear to be quite ambitious considering the short project time-frame and the amount of resources allocated while the title of the project is inconsistent with the contents of the outputs.

The output formulation is very vague, and the first three outputs are related to capacity development/institutional strengthening, albeit with different entry points. Outputs 4 and 5 are not well described nor is the objective which is being pursued.

The project document is vague and does not reflect the mandatory requirements of quality project documents. It does not incorporate the necessary elements to allow for a shared understanding of roles and responsibilities. Its results framework does not respond to the UNDG RBM guidance on output and outcome formulation. The low quality of the project document is highlighted as one of the major constraints that affected project implementation, as further developed in the findings section hereunder.

2.2. Contextual factors

The Government of Kuwait is represented in this project through two entities: The Supreme Council for Planning and Development, as the institution allocating the funding for the project implementation, and the National Council for Culture and Arts, as implementing partner for the project.

From the United Nations, two agencies are also involved in the project: UNDP as project coordinator, and UNESCO as the technical agency in charge of the technical support.

For all four institutions, the project objective is aligned to each institution's strategic and planning frameworks, as described in the project document.

The project is governed by a Project Board that includes all four institutions and is responsible for making consensus-based management decisions for the project (project document, p. 25).

While the project is accountable to the GSSCPD and to the UNDP, the detailed roles and responsibilities have not been clearly defined for each project stakeholder.

2.3. Complexity and scale of the project

The project does not have a high degree of technical complexity. It has five outputs of which three are operational outputs and two (O.4 and O.5) are vague indications of intent. The primary beneficiary of the project is the NCCAL. The project budget is clearly established at USD 1,000,000 (despite an indication that the project contribution from GSSCPD is USD 1,975,089 on p. 25) as financial contribution.

The complexity is linked to the lack of clearly identified and streamlined roles and responsibilities and insufficient communications and understanding between the four major project stakeholders. The PB was supposed to provide decisions regarding the project revisions, but the original activities identified in the project document have almost all been changed during the project implementation, without written evidence to support the decision-making process. As a result and in the absence of the minutes in English language[1] from the only two Project Board meetings that were held during the course of the project (only a presentation of the contents is available in power point, but not meeting minutes with each stakeholder inputs *ad verbatim*), it is not clear to the evaluator how changes and revisions have taken place, particularly in view of the fact that interviews held did not reflect the alleged consensus-based decision making that was warranted by the project. Undated workplan spreadsheet signed by the four stakeholders seem to support the changes made during project implementation (with one date 26.7.18 for UNESCO), but it does not provide a rationale or explanation for those changes. Meeting minutes drafted in Arabic may contain indications to this effect.

2.4. The key stakeholders of the project are the GSSCPD, the NCCAL, the UNDP and the UNESCO. Their roles were insufficiently defined in the project document, something that led to serious constraints and challenges during the project implementation.

2.5. Implementation status

The project is fully implemented by the end of February 2019, since all activities and outputs were to be completed by this date, given the operational extension received. The project will close financially at the end of April 2019. The evaluation has noted that most of the original activities contemplated in the project document have been amended, cancelled, or changed, with the agreement of the four key stakeholders (signed revised annual workplan mentioned under 2.3). However, from an evaluative perspective, the reasons for the changes made in the project implementation appear not to have been documented (subject to scrutiny of the PB Minutes of the meetings in Arabic language).

3. Evaluation purpose, objectives and scope

3.0. Objective, purpose and scope

The objective of this final evaluation is to provide an assessment of the project performance and its outputs. The criteria for the evaluation are standard evaluation criteria defined by the DAC (Development Assistance Committee) of the OECD (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development) and the UNEG (United Nations Evaluation Group): relevance, efficiency,

---

[1] Note: UNDP provided the Minutes of the Project Boards Meeting in Arabic language, but the evaluator is not able to understand its content. It may be that these decisions are in fact supported in the Arabic version of the minutes.

effectiveness, sustainability, impact. The evaluation was also requested to assess the following themes: gender and partnership strategy.

The evaluation has the following purposes, as mentioned in the TOR:

1) Determine if the project has achieved its stated objectives and explain why/why not;
2) Determine the impact of the project in terms of improvements achieved;
3) Determine, to the extent possible, the level of contribution to the CPD Outcome 4;
4) Provide recommendations for a possible second phase of the project building on achievements to date;
5) Document lessons learnt, success stories and good practices in order to maximise the learning from the experience gained;
6) Examine stakeholder perception of the value-added of the project, and its impact in terms of developing the capacities of national constituents to advance gender equality in the world of work;
7) Evaluate the UN's added-value to the government and provide concrete recommendations towards sustainability and to inform the next CPD

The scope of the evaluation is the entire duration of the Project implementation since its start on 18th April 2017 until the time of the evaluation. Additional documents and deliverables were obtained during the field mission, so that all project deliverables have been shared with the evaluator at the time of the writing of this draft evaluation report, except for the project final financial information. All documents consulted are listed in the relevant evaluation bibliographical annex.

3.1. Evaluation purpose

The evaluation was undertaken as required by the project document, as a final evaluation to provide accountability and evidence-based information about the project performance and identify lessons and recommendations that may be used by the primary stakeholders for a continuation or a replication of the project. The primary users are the UNDP, the UNESCO, the GSSCPD, and the NCCAL.

3.2. Main evaluation questions

The inception report details the main evaluation questions as well as the evaluation framework

3.3. Evaluation criteria

As requested by the TOR, the evaluation uses the standard criteria for project evaluations: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability.

The definition of each of the evaluation criteria has been given by the OECD/DAC glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management in 2002 as follows[2] :

"Relevance: The extent to which the objectives of a development intervention are consistent with beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, global priorities and partners' and donors' policies.

---

[2] OECD/DAC, glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management, Evaluation and Aid Effectiveness series, 2002

Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results

Effectiveness: The extent to which the development intervention's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.

Impact: Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended

Sustainability: The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed."

4. Evaluation methodology

4.0 Methodology

In line with UNDP evaluation practice, the evaluation follows the "PME Handbook" established by the UNDP in 2009, which are compatible with the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) evaluation norms and standards (2017 revision) and the UNDG RBM guidance (2012). The final evaluation also adheres to the UNEG ethical guidelines for evaluation. The approach follows also a "utilization-focused evaluation" approach that is described by M. Q. Patton in his book "utilization-focused evaluation[3]" that continues to be a good practice reference material for the conduct of evaluations.

4.1. Data collection methods and analysis

The evaluation used a combination of methods that included:

a) Documentary review of project outputs and reports submitted by the UNDP project coordinator;
b) Individual Key Informant Interviews (KII) with all stakeholders: Project Board members, (GSSCPD, NCAAL, UNESCO, UNDP), as well as with staff from KNM involved in the project, and other participants in project activities and outputs (from DAI, ASCC, Al Sadu House); in total 20 interviews took place with a total of 21 women and 7 men for a total of 21 hours of information collection.
c) Focus Group discussions – Group Discussions with KNM and other beneficiaries of the specialized training programmes undertaken under the project implementation (3 groups, 2 KNM trainees from various trainings, 3 trainees from NCCAL historical buildings department, 3 trainees from KNM conservation course). No sex-disaggregated groups were held since only one trainee was a man.
d) On-site observation at KNM, DAI, ASCC and AL Sadu House.

The evaluation was mostly qualitative and worked from the perspective of the Most Significant Change (MSC) approach, in order to obtain feedback from all the stakeholder groups. The evaluation sought to understand the main achievement of the project and to capitalize on its strengths. Similarly, it also identified weaknesses in order to inform recommendations.

KII used a protocol to ensure coherence, consistency and comparability. KII was done through a semi-structured individual interview process, using both open-ended and close-ended

---

[3] "Utilization-focused Evaluation", Michael Quinn Patton, 3rd Edition, Sage publications, 1997

questions. A five-point rating scale was used to obtain quantitative information regarding stakeholders' perception of the project.

4.2. collection methods and analysis

Contribution analysis was used to infer the causality between the observed and analysed impact and the factors that led to such an impact to the extent possible, taking into consideration that some of the suggested changes and improvements (e.g. at the institutional level, in the legal framework, etc.) are only likely to appear over the longer time-frame, thereby limiting impact analysis to the currently observable changes triggered by the project. There were no reference indicators of the project at the outcome level, while at output level all indicators were binomial (Yes/No, not/not done, delivered/not delivered, produced/not produced). Key informants were primarily drawn from the four primary project stakeholders (GSSCPD, NCCAL/KNM, UNDP, UNESCO) but participants in project activities from DAI, ASCC, Al Sadu House were also included in the list of respondents.

4.3. Sampling

Sampling was not applicable given the size and scope of the project. The primary beneficiaries (NCCAL, KNM management and trainees) were interviewed, as well as the PB members. 3 different groups of trainees were also interviewed to obtain direct feedback on the various trainings and workshops undertaken.

4.4. Participation and transparency

The evaluator made a presentation to the project board and project stakeholders upon arrival in the country for one hour, supported by a Power Point Presentation, to ensure all stakeholders are aware of the evaluation approach, process, methodology and tools. Similarly, on the last day of the field data collection mission, a validation/debriefing of preliminary findings and conclusions was held with the four main project stakeholders also supported by a Power Point Presentation. Both the initial presentation and the debriefing are included in the annexes.

4.5. Methods for gender and rights issue analysis

The project is not specifically targeting gender nor is it gender-responsive. However, the staff who work in the various institutions involved in this project, both public and private, are very largely composed of women, except for the top management positions. As a result and by default, amongst evaluation respondents only one man attended the trainings, and the overwhelming majority of key informants were women (see the list of interviewees in the annexes). There was no need to undertake a gender analysis of the project because the culture sector is largely dominated by female staff. The issue of rights analysis is not applicable to this project.

4.6. Data quality

The project has generated several deliverables and products which have been reviewed and analysed. Interview protocols and observation tools used are in line with the professional evaluation standards.

5. Findings

Table 1 Summary of evaluation criteria ratings using UNDP six-point scale from highest to lowest as follows:

HS – Highly Satisfactory

S – Satisfactory

MS – Moderately Satisfactory

MU – Moderately Unsatisfactory

U – Unsatisfactory

HU – Highly Unsatisfactory

Criteria	Ratings	Comments/Explanations
Relevance	S	Project is relevant but level of national ownership is difficult to assess
Effectiveness	MS	Mixed results achieved depending on the component. Support to KNM was rated has HS (part under Output 2, part under Output 3). Output 1 was rated U by a national partner, while national counterparts could not provide specific ratings on outputs 2, 3, 4, or 5. Based on stakeholder feedback and documentary analysis, the evaluator provides the following ratings for each Output. O.1 = U O.2 = MS (despite inability of national stakeholders to provide feedback on the products and activities) O.3 = MS (the trainings were the most successful, albeit only one component, of output 3) O.4 = U O.5 = HU
Efficiency	MS	The project was efficient in delivering products and carrying out trainings and other activities, with a delivery rate of over 90% at the end of March 2019 (and with a large number of activities completed during the extension period of January/February 2019).[4]
Impact	MS	The potential for impact is there but it is too early to judge and will depend on the degree to which national stakeholders use the products and continue the incipient process of capacity development
Sustainability	MS	The project itself if not sustainable nor designed as such. However, the benefits leveraged by the project, particularly the trainings, have the potential to be sustainable provided the management of KNM ensure performance monitoring and proper oversight.

---

[4] Looking at communication efficiency the UN did not speak with One Voice, and regarding project management efficiency, the lack of clearly defined roles and responsibilities contributed to a challenging environment between the UN agencies.

Gender	S	The cultural sector and KNM are mostly employing women and a majority of the stakeholders involved in the project activities are women. UNESCO and UNDP showed gender sensitivity in the choice of its experts and consultants.

The findings are presented following the criteria established in the TOR.

The project's title is "Preservation and promotion of Kuwait's Cultural Heritage" and its overall objective is "**To establish a clear framework for the development of culture by creating the bases for strong cultural institutions that operate with respect to international standards with qualified and skilled personnel to extend services to society and deliver a rich cultural agenda and programs, as well as effective platforms that encourage creativity and productivity in the cultural field**".

In order to achieve the overall objective, the project has identified the following **five specific outputs**:

1. NCCAL strengthened through cultural policy development and institutional restructuring
2. Institutional strengthening for NCCAL with focus on Museums Division
3. Capacity development plan for NCCAL implemented and handicrafts and creative industries framework established and capacities enhanced
4. NCCAL undertakings widely disseminated
5. SSC/TrC enacted through benchmarking and knowledge sharing

Relevance

The project supports the objectives for cultural development of the Kuwait National Development Plan 2015-2020 in the following areas: a) institutional strengthening; b) Museum development, c) Handicrafts and creative industries development, as the three areas represent the main components of the project design. The KNDP identifies a number of challenges in "culture, art and media":

• The need for modern cultural facilities, especially theaters supporting the theater scene.

• Invigorating Kuwait's role in supporting Arab and Islamic culture by preserving Arab and Islamic tradition and expanding methods for spreading the culture, including electronically.

• Poor cinematic production, weak art, literature, and musical festivals, and an inability to foster gifted persons.

• Government media inability to deal with competition from the private sector. This requires additional technological modernization and the development of production and satellite broadcasting capabilities.

• Ensuring media freedoms whilst preserving identity.

These challenges are to be addressed through four entry points as follows: a. Spreading culture, arts, and literature, and developing the Kuwaiti character, b. Modernizing infrastructure and technological development in the media and culture sector, c. Preserving Kuwaiti society's cultural identity, and d. Reinforcing cultural and media ties with other countries. The project most directly contributed to point b. and c. and to some extent d. with regional participation in some project events.

For the UNDP as responsible agency the project supports its CPD (Country Programme Document) outcome 4: Strategic multilateral partnerships at the global and regional levels established, including through South-South and triangular cooperation, to advance the post-2015 development agenda.

For the UNESCO as technical agency, the project is aligned with its Programme and Budget 38 C/5 under two lines of action:

Main line of action 1 – protecting, conserving, promoting and transmitting culture, heritage and history for dialogue and development

Main line of action 2 – supporting and promoting the diversity of cultural expressions, the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage, and the development of cultural and creative industries.

The project is relevant to the needs of the various stakeholders and is aligned to each stakeholder's planning framework as mentioned above. Furthermore, the main direct beneficiary of the project activities, the Museums Division (KNM), has clearly indicated that the support provided was fulfilling their needs and was extremely useful in filling gaps and providing knowledge and skills that were not previously available. The project remains relevant to date and the KNM has officially requested a six-months extension of the project to the GSSCPD for which an official answer should be received.

However, the project title is inadequate and is not aligned with the overall project objective. Key informants all recognised the project should have had a different title in line with its objective, possibly "capacity development of KNM and the NCCAL through training and policy advice".

Efficiency

According to the unofficial figures that have been provided by UNESCO and UNDP, as of March 2019 the **project delivery rate** (expenditures versus budget) **is 90,3%,** with a total expenditures of US$ 744,512.—for outputs 1 to 5 and US$ 158,051.—for project management, miscellaneous, evaluation and GMS, bringing the total of expenditures to US$ 902,563.—versus a total budget of US$ 1,000,000.--.

 Additional commitment during April 2019 for US$ 28,593.—have been reported by UNDP, therefore the final delivery rate as of end of April 2019 will be **93%.** The official final financial information will be submitted at a later date.

The management and governance arrangement for the implementation of the project have only partially been able to address the gaps and constraints of an inadequate project design. While the original project document foresaw the meeting of a quarterly project board comprising the GSSCPD, NCCAL, UNDP and UNESCO as the overall project governance mechanism, the lack of detailed written roles and responsibilities of each of the partners has contributed to confusion about the role of each partner and the lack of clear allocation of responsibilities.

The lack of clarity of the roles and responsibilities for each party under this project, coupled with the lack of clarity in the definition of concrete objectives of the project outputs, has fuelled varying interpretations and expectations from the project stakeholders, with in certain cases clearly diverging views.

The UNDP is tasked as project coordinator to "handle all project management and reporting requirements as well as organize and facilitate the various activities under the project", while

the UNESCO Technical Advisor was "to make sure that the project technical support fulfils the goals and objectives and that it is delivered to the highest technical standards"[5]. The exact functions of the government counterparts, namely GSSCPD and NCCAL, are not clearly established, except for the contribution to the budget and/or in-kind support (for NCCAL) required during project. GSSCPD should have a monitoring role of the NCCAL – but in practice this was not followed, and UNESCO didn't really accept UNDP as project coordinator, not seeing the added-value, so signed detailed roles and responsibilities would be useful for each partner

The Project Board was only able to meet officially twice during the life of the project and the "consensus basis management decisions for the project" were not clearly echoed by the key informant interviews undertaken. One signed workplan by the four stakeholders with revised activities has indeed been established, but no narrative or explanation on why most of the activities originally contemplated in the project document were cancelled or changed is provided. As a result, there appears to be no written history in English language of the changes that took place from the original project design and a lack of clarity as to the rationale for making some of these changes in the AWP[6].

An important weakness is linked to the inadequate project results framework, that is not RBM compliant[7] and only contains deliverables but no indicator or process indicator to capture capacity development or any change at the outcome level.

This clearly complicated the project management and implementation and only through many efforts and in some cases strong discussions was the project eventually able to implement the activities indicated in the revised workplan. The individual efforts to overcome the constraints allowed the project to achieve some results detailed in the effectiveness section, but mainly through the commitment of the project coordinator, the government counterparts' focal points, and the UNESCO technical staff working in Kuwait. Nonetheless, the efficiency of the management arrangements need improvement through clear definitions of roles and responsibilities for each project partner: GS SCPD, NCCAL, UNDP, and UNESCO, and the inclusion of KNM as the main beneficiary of the practical project activities (workshops and trainings).

Effectiveness

The primary impact of the project is linked to the Output 3 and to a lesser extent Output 2, and it is the institutional strengthening and capacity development of the KNM. On this particular objective, the project achieves very high marks, with an average rating of 4,91 out of 5 from 6 KNM respondents (e.g. trainees and management), on a scale of 1 (minimum) to 5 (maximum).

The support to the KNM was appreciated for various reasons. For one, it was directly fulfilling the needs of the KNM staff, and the variety of the trainings proved to be critical to develop staff level of knowledge and skills. The list of the training undertaken is included under output 3 hereunder. It is highly valued not only by the KNM staff, but also by other participants who represent other cultural institutions.[8] Another strength was the direct applicability of the learning, as in some cases it included demonstrations through practical applications. One of the main recommendations for the pursuit of capacity development trainings is in fact linked to

---

[5] Project document, p. 24, VII Governance and management arrangements

[6] As already mentioned, this is subject to scrutiny of the Minutes of the Project Board Meetings written in Arabic language which is not understood by the evaluator

[7] Please refer to the UNDP PME handbook 2009, UNDG RBM guidance 2012, for details on how to establish output and outcome statements and indicators.

[8] Such as ASCC

more practical, hands-on application of the trainings, and a preference for longer periods of training with enhanced application versus shorter periods of theoretical knowledge which may not be so relevant to the work undertaken by the staff at the KNM.

There is no doubt that the support received through the trainings and the workshops and activities have contributed to motivating and interesting the staff. Because public sector management does not use performance-based management tools, there is a dearth of incentives for performance management. The trainings have come to fill a gap not only regarding the level of technical knowledge and skills, but also as a support to management decision-making, provided they are used by KNM for such a purpose. The immediate outcome of the project is therefore higher morale and a confidence boost for the staff. It was indicated by one respondent that it was the first time they received trainings from an international organisation, and the level of trainers, as well as the contents of the trainings were judged to be of high quality.[9]

Not only is this the strongest aspect of the project, it has the potential to generate longer-term impact provided senior management at KNM is using the trainings as performance-management tools.[10] At present the change of attitude is evident, but in order to lead to behaviour change, the concrete application of the training contents have to be supported by an enabling institutional environment.

The project document structured output 2 as "Institutional strengthening for NCCAL with focus on Museums Division" but the specialised trainings were included under output 3 "Capacity development plan for NCCAL implemented and handicrafts and creative industries framework established and capacities enhanced", which is somewhat misleading as the main focus of the project and primary NCCAL staff that participated in the trainings were KNM staff. There is some disconnect between the project structure, the intended objectives and the activities as they were performed.

By output, the following results were achieved:

Output 1: NCCAL strengthened through cultural policy development and institutional restructuring

Revised workplan activities: 1) develop a cultural policy, 2) review legal framework for culture, 3) revise NCCAL strategy

Results:

1) A framework for the development of a national policy for culture for Kuwait produced by UNESCO in February 2019
2) A Kuwait Cultural Policy Paper *draft outline* prepared by UNESCO
3) A legal framework for the protection of the cultural heritage in Kuwait: analysis, evaluation and new Approach, UNESCO consultant, August 2018
4) A Proposed Structure of a Draft Law on the Protection, Management and Promotion of Tangible and Intangible Cultural Heritage in Kuwait, UNESCO consultant, undated

---

[9] Finding triangulated with the annex II of Training summary reports for conservation training I and II, communication for cultural institutions, exhibitions development in museums, visitor services, roles of museums in Kuwait: policies and practice.
[10] See recommendations section for details

5) Roundtable discussion reports on reviewing the Antiquities Law, 14th May and 25th July 2018
6) Mapping Kuwait's cultural assets, services and institutions, a baseline study, UNESCO
7) Assessment of the NCCAL strategic plan 2015-2020, UNESCO, February 2019
8) Proposal for restructuring Museums Division, March 2019

The output statement for **output 1** is misleading because the focus is not on institutional restructuring, but on the preparatory work that may eventually lead to such a process. All products and deliverables are studies, assessments, research and reviews and the production of specific deliverables, chief of which the review of the Antiquities Law and a proposed law structure; a framework for the development of a national policy for culture and an assessment of the NCCAL strategic plan, both delivered at the end of February 2019. From an evaluative perspective, only the first part of the output statement (cultural policy development) is completed, but there is no evidence that this leads to institutional restructuring. While a proposal for restructuring the Museums division has been provided at the end of the project, it needs to be accepted and implemented to bring about institutional restructuring. Furthermore, institutional restructuring requires a longer time-frame, a set of processes which are not even detailed in the output statement, and existing baselines on which the processes can be built, neither of which existed at the time of the project development.

As mentioned already, the inadequate construction of the output statements has led to different stakeholders having different expectations. As a result, the perception from the government counterparts fail to grant a satisfactory rating for this output. In one case, expectations were to have a written draft law, rather than a framework or draft structure for the law.

The NCCAL provides a minimal rating of 1 out of 5 (on a scale of 1 minimum to 5 maximum with 3 as average) regarding the output 1, while the GS SCPD is not able to provide a rating for output 1.

Output 2: Institutional strengthening for NCCAL with focus on Museums Division

Revised workplan activities: 2.1. Evaluate MoMA and KNM services and department and 2.2. Develop studies and programmes for NCCAL museums

Results:

1) KNM Storages survey report, UNESCO, February 2018
2) MoMA Storages survey report, UNESCO, March 2018
3) Report on the KNM Ethnographic Collection Condition Survey, UNESCO, January 2019
4) Reinstallation of Adlib bilingual software at KNM and training
5) Expanding the Visitors Services at the KNM, A feasibility Study, UNESCO, December 2018
6) Museological Programming for the KNM, A feasibility Study, UNESCO, January 2019
7) Holding of the RE-ORG workshop to reorganise KNM affiliated storage areas, 25th November 2018 to 6th December 2018, using ICCROM methodology, and participation from professionals from Kuwait and Oman
8) Revival of the Collection Management System for the National Council for Culture, Arts and Literature, Summary and Recommendations, Prepared by UNESCO, April 2018

The majority of the results are deliverables (reports and studies) that have been delivered as planned. However, no feedback on these was available from the national counterparts.

The evaluator was able to witness the use of the Adlib software installed in three computers at KNM. The evaluation found the software to be potentially very useful, based on a short demonstration of its use. However, based on a random sample of the data entry, it does not appear that the quality of the data is in line with the stated objective (insufficient information is entered), and the apparent lack of back-up and system maintenance indicates that the software, which was re-installed, requires follow-up from management to ensure it is being properly used and maintained.

The one event that was highly regarded by respondents and national counterparts was the RE-ORG workshop, which was mentioned as having the potential to bring concrete change into the KNM, and was cited as a good practice example of the type of support that can be provided for developing the institutional capacity.

Neither of the two government stakeholders interviewed could provide an overall rating on output 2 as they did not know enough about its contents.

Output 3. Capacity development plan for NCCAL implemented and handicrafts and creative industries framework established and capacities enhanced

Revised workplan activities: 3.1. Organised specialised trainings of NCCAL staff and 3.2 Develop a framework for crafts development in the NCCAL Strategic Plan 2015-2020, specifically under Axis 6 of the Sectors Strategic Objectives ("Supporting, encouraging and developing Fine Arts")

Results:

1) The following training courses and workshops have been held during the life of the project:
    a. Conservation principles, April to November 2018
    b. Role of Museums in Kuwait: policies and practices, 8-9 May 2018
    c. Adlib Software training, 1-4 July 2018
    d. UNESCO 2003 Convention (safeguarding ICH), 28-30 October 2018
    e. RE-ORG training, 25 November to 6 December 2018
    f. Conservation of metals, 9 to 20 December 2018
    g. Training for Museums' Guides, 12 December 2018
    h. Training in Communication for Cultural Organisations, 15-16 January 2019
    i. Exhibition Development, 20-22 January 2019
    j. Conservation of Siliceous Material, 6 to 24 January 2019
    k. Conservation of Organic Material, 26 to 31 January 2019
    l. Conservation of textiles, 3 to 14 February 2019
    m. Illicit Trafficking of Cultural Property, 18-19 February 2019
    n. Conservation of Paper, 10 to 21 February 2019
2) Establishment of an Arts and Crafts Centre in Kuwait, A feasibility Study, UNESCO, 2019
3) Capacity development plan for the NCCAL, Kuwait, A UNESCO report, January 2019

Output 3 shows again a disconnect between the output statement and the activities undertaken. Initially, there was no capacity development plan for NCCAL to implement as there was no clear guidance on what courses were to be held. A capacity assessment was to be undertaken, but it did not count with the necessary stakeholder support as reportedly national partners were not willing to circulate the survey. Eventually a development plan for NCCAL was produced in

January 2019 by UNESCO. But earlier in 2018, in absence of a clear needs' assessment, and based on the request of the NCCAL, a list of training courses was prepared and submitted to the NCCALs (as mentioned above). It is not clear for the evaluator to what extent all of these courses are demand driven, although the participants' feedback on the courses and workshops a,b,d,e,g,I,m above indicate that they came to fulfil gap for the participants. At the same time, some other stakeholders outside of NCCAL indicated that the level of the courses were too basic and that there should be varying levels for the training courses: induction for beginners and advanced courses for more experienced professionals.

For the second component of the output, the feasibility study for the establishment of an Arts & Crafts Centre, NCCAL indicated that this component was taken out of this project and developed separately by NCCAL with a firm, so a rating for this component could not be provided. There seems to be varying expectations amongst the project stakeholders on the results that were to be achieved, over and beyond the deliverables which have been supplied. The respondent from GS SCPD could not provide a rating for this output either but mentioned that if the project was only aiming at capacity development, it could be rated as 4 out of 5 (high), while for the rest of the components, no rating was possible as nothing was seen. This also seems to echo the varying expectations on the results of the project.

Output 4. NCCAL undertakings widely disseminated

Revised workplan activity: Develop rebranding strategies

Results: Framework for an upgraded communications strategy for the NCCAL; Kuwait, UNESCO, February 2019

This report has just been completed and no feedback was obtained on its contents from the evaluation respondents. From the point of the view of the evaluator, the document is useful, didactic and well written and can be a good resource for the NCCAL. Again, the results have no relationship with the output statement which is vague and inadequate

Output 5. SSC/TrC enacted through benchmarking and knowledge sharing

Revised workplan activity: 5.1 Build on the successful experience of DAI, explore international cooperation through a range of activities including scholarships and artists in residence programmes

Results: Recommendations for International Positioning of Kuwait through the Arts and Culture Sector, UNESCO, February 2019

This report has just been completed at the end of February 2019 and no feedback was obtained on its contents from the evaluation respondents. From the point of the view of the evaluator this should not be an output and the deliverable is just a compliance with the project requirement, although it is not clear to what extent if fulfils the expectations and meets the activity description.

Impact

It is difficult to appraise the impact of the project as there is not enough time after two years to assess the long-term consequences. There is however anecdotal evidence of positive outcomes as follows:

1) There has been an observable attitudinal change amongst the training and workshop participants, in terms of knowledge, motivation, and ownership, with a willingness to enhance the performance of their work, and not only amongst the KNM participants. This can lead to behaviour change if it is sustained and supported by senior management.

2) The NCCAL has established a committee composed of some ten members in late 2018 that have met three times to either draft a new law or amend the antiquities law. While this was not directly linked to the activities of output 1, it is nonetheless a spin-off from the project and shows that the NCCAL is taking the recommendations regarding the law seriously. However, it would have been preferable to form a Scientific Committee for the revision/drafting of the law, to ensure a participatory approach including all people with the adequate technical knowledge and competencies could participate and follow technical criteria in line with international standards and good practices.

3) The NCCAL created a Task Force in order to facilitate project implementation. While not all members of the Task Force contributed positively to the process, this shows interest from NCCAL to create an enabling environment for the project. In order to be more effective, it needs to be formally institutionalised with clear roles and responsibilities for the various TF members, and shorten the turn-around time required on deliverables to inform decision making.

4) Based on their high appreciation of the workshops and trainings, KNM management has reportedly requested an extension of six months to the GS SCPD in order to continue capacity development activities. It is unclear if this relates to only output 3 components (trainings) or whether it applies to the entire project, considering that no written documentary evidence was shared on this subject.

The sum of the various deliverables and products has the potential to generate positive impact over the longer-term provided senior management structures of government counterparts act on the recommendations and create an enabling environment which may lead, in time, to an institutional restructuring of the NCCAL while contributing to increased institutional performance.

Sustainability

The project was not designed to be sustainable nor does it contemplate a sustainability strategy. It has been funded by the Government of Kuwait and its continuation is dependent on funding allocation. There is a potential for sustainability of some of the trainings, provided an expressed willingness from the beneficiary is shown to institutionalise the trainings and create a pool of certified trainers within KNM for specialised trainings.

The sustainability of the benefits of the project will also depend on the extent to which the government partners decide to follow-up on the recommendations, feasibility studies and other products produced by the project, as well on depending on the priority level given to support to the culture sector as indicated within the next Kuwait National Development Plan 2020-2025.

Lessons identified

- An inadequately designed and focused project document creates numerous implementation challenges and misunderstandings, along with varying expectations from the different project stakeholders, and contributes to the confusion of the main stakeholders, starting with a misleading project title.
- The project document does not possess a results framework that follows the guidance for quality assurance of RBM practice as described in the UNDP PME Handbook (2009) and the UNDG RBM guidance handbook (2012). Outcome and output statements and indicators do not reflect the project vision and are not RBM friendly nor SMART. The results formulation in the project document is different from what was actually achieved.
- Changes in the project implementation plan must be documented to know the reason behind the changes and the rationale for the new activities. A signed revised workplan does not provide enough information to understand why activities and outputs have to be modified, which makes its evaluation more difficult, particularly when project stakeholders have different views.
- When a project has four different primary stakeholders (GS SCPD, NCCAL, UNDP, UNESCO) who interact during the implementation of the project, the roles and responsibilities of each party must be clearly defined. Interviews held during the evaluation mission evidenced that the lack of a clear definition of roles and responsibilities contributed to many constraints and created some frustration amongst the parties.
- National ownership implies assertive leadership in project governance and chairing of the project board (PB), with clear responsibilities amongst partners. The PB did not play its role as foreseen and did not meet according the desired frequency (quarterly). Furthermore, when consensus-based decisions are not possible, one of the partners must be tasked with the responsibility of the final decision.
- UN agencies were not able to speak with One Voice or appear as One UN vis-à-vis Government counterparts. There were different views and expectations between the UN agencies which stemmed from insufficiently defined roles and responsibilities in the project document. This contributed to lowering the perception of the inter-agency coordination capacity and undermined the strength of the UN support. In-country staff from UNDP and UNESCO, despite their differences, did their best to minimise these constraints and eventually were able to achieve the results stated above. In future projects the UN agencies should speak with One Voice and have very clearly defined roles and responsibilities.
- A project undertaken with UN support needs some lead-time to recruit the necessary staff and undertake procurement for the project implementation. This implies that the project life should include a six-months period for preparing the necessary set-up to implement the project. In the future, a two-year project should be a 30 months project to compensate for delayed start of activities linked to recruitment processes of the UN agencies.
- An initial project launch with all concerned partners is warranted to publicly explain the vision behind the project, its implementation and its objectives. Future projects should consider a launch event as an opportunity for shared communication and coordination.

6. Conclusions

Despite the constraints and varying expectations of the different parties, the project has been able to achieve a certain number of results, chief of which the activities linked to the capacity development of the KNM (workshops and trainings, RE-ORG, Adlib software). Many activities have been changed from the initial project document to the revised workplan, without providing an explanation for the changes. Interviews showed that stakeholders had different expectations and understanding of the project objectives, which indicates that a better project document is needed, that the roles and responsibilities have to be better defined in the project document, and that the governance arrangements (Project Board) need to be effectively managed to keep the project on its course. Responsibilities for the constraints are shared equally amongst the project stakeholders who signed a poorly designed project document lacking focus and clear results.

In terms of output achievement, the main achievements related to outputs 3 with the trainings and workshop, and output 2 for some activities. For output 1, the national implementing agency considered the results as insufficient. Outputs 4 and 5 are mostly testimonial, and should not have been considered as outputs in the document, but possibly as components of the other three outputs, considering the funding and effort level required for these outputs.

Because of the quality of the capacity development efforts, the main beneficiary, KNM has requested an extension of the support for another six months. Apart from the capacity development efforts and some round-table discussions and a survey analysis, the rest of the project products are mainly products: reports and feasibility studies. This may constitute a solid foundation for use by the NCCAL, but it is yet far from the institutional restructuring that is mentioned in output one. Looking at the overall project aim "to establish a clear framework for the development of culture by creating the bases for strong cultural institutions that operate with respect to international standards with qualified and skilled personnel to extend services to society and deliver a rich cultural agenda and programs, as well as effective platforms that encourage creativity and productivity in the cultural field", this objective cannot be realistically completed within the two-year project time-frame or with the type of outputs that are indicated in the project document.

Any further project in the cultural field should be focused on the realistically achievable results within its time-frame and taking into consideration the lessons mentioned above. The continuation of efforts to support NCCAL should focus on the support to KNM through continued training and capacity development as recommended hereunder, taking into consideration that future projects may be directly presented by the technical agency to the government within the new upcoming SPF programme cycle. It is too early to talk about capacity development and restructuring of NCCAL if it is not spear-headed by NCCAL itself. In order to provide added value UNDP should also increase its M&E and RBM skills to provide quality assurance on project implementation.

7. Recommendations[11]

Recommendations for all partners (GSSCPD, NCCAL, UNDP, UNESCO):

---

[11] At the request of the CO, the evaluator is also providing a justification for each recommendation (the *why* question)

1) Facilitate timely feedback on the project deliverables and products to facilitate decision-making within one week of submission, by all partners (given delays from all partners in providing timely feedback on products and reports submitted).
2) Ensure decisions taken at the Project Board meetings are clearly detailed and that all stakeholders' signature confirm their agreement to the decisions taken (to provide evaluative evidence in English of the decision-making process).

Recommendations for the UNDP and UNESCO:

1) Ensure quality assurance of the project design and its results framework, in line with best project cycle development practices, and an RBM compliant results-framework for both UNESCO and UNDP (given the poor quality of the project design and a results framework clearly inadequate to inform about the expected outcome level changes).
2) Establish clear and detailed delineation of roles and responsibilities between UNESCO and UNDP, and ensure the UN speaks with One Voice (given the collaboration challenges between the two organisations).

Recommendations for the UNDP:

1) Consider providing an RBM training for the UN/government staff in Kuwait (given the low level of knowledge of RBM concepts, hierarchy of results, outcome monitoring and evaluation, etc. to strengthen further local capacity).
2) Improve the evidence-base in English language that inform about the decisions taken by the project (ensure sufficient documentation in English is available for evaluations).

Recommendations for the UNESCO:

1) Focus more on capacity development processes than on deliverables (reports), as the latter do not contribute directly to practical application and require follow-up by the national counterpart, if the main objective of the support is capacity development (given the excessively broad and ambitious outcome of organisational restructuring which is not realistic with the means and time-frame allocated to the project).
2) Prepare a one-year workplan for each national counterpart trainee with benchmarks and performance indicators, to be signed and accepted by their management (to contribute to sustainability beyond the life of the project).
3) Consider training through a Training of Trainers approach to ensure KNM has its own trainers for specialised courses and an induction course for new staff, and provide them with corresponding ToT certificates (to consolidate the capacity development and contribute to sustainability of the benefits).
4) Consider offering specialised trainings courses at two levels: a) introductory b) advanced (given that some respondents indicated it would be useful to have courses at two different levels).

Recommendations for NCCAL:

1) Formalize the Task Force through clearly defined roles and responsibilities and an explanation of how each TF member should contribute to project implementation, while also specifying communication channels and specific reporting requirements (to facilitate the understanding of the role of each actor in project implementation and contribute to clearly define communication channels regarding the project).

2) Consider creating an internal pool of trainers in KNM for specialised courses that can be used to create an induction course for new KNM staff (thus contributing to the sustainability of the project benefits).
3) Ensure management support to the benchmarking of trainees' performance based on their annual workplan established by the trainers and ensure their monitoring (to consolidate capacity development and contribute to its sustainability).

Recommendations for GSSCPD:

1) Include six-months lead time when defining project life-span (to avoid the need to extend the project implementation period by recognising the delay in the initial start of implementation).
2) Ensure clarity over defined roles and responsibilities within government counterparts (NCCAL and GSSCPD, but also KNM) by defining in detail the roles of each party, responsibilities of each party, and clear communication lines between the four primary stakeholders. Signed specific MoU between each partner with full details of exact areas of competency to avoid discussion. Define the final decision maker at the PB when consensus cannot be reached between its members (to avoid diverging expectations from project partners, but also to avoid challenges in the coordination amongst partners).
3) Assure national ownership of the governance arrangements and ensure oversight and monitoring of the NCCAL and KNM achievements (to ensure monitoring of the national partner is contributing to capacity development and providing evidence of results).

8. Gender

The project is addressing a sector (culture) where most of the staff involved are women. While gender issues were not part of the project design, the large majority of project participants, as well as respondents for the evaluation, were women.[12] In addition, both UN agencies recruited women professionals for the project (UNDP for project coordinator, UNESCO for the technical advisor and conservator in Kuwait, as well as the project assistant based in Doha). The focal points for the project were mixed, with one man for the NCCAL and one woman for the GSSCPD. Almost all training and workshop participants interviewed by the evaluation, with one exception, were women. The project itself is not gender-responsive, but the staff involved are mostly female and the UN agencies were mindful of the gender aspect in the recruitment process when looking for the project staff.

---

[12] See list of interviewees as annex.