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# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Introduction

This document presents the Report for the Final Evaluation of the Kuwait Environmental Governance Initiative (KEGI) Project with the implementation period of January 2017 – December 2018 later extended till 30 June 2019. With the total budget of US$2 million fully funded by the Government of Kuwait, the project is designed to be Nationally Implemented (NIM) with a partnership between the UNDP Kuwait, the General Secretariat of the Supreme Council for Planning and Development (GSSCPD), the Kuwait Environment Public Authority (KEPA). UNDP has outsourced activities 1.1-1.4 to the UNEP office based in Bahrain.

***Evaluation purpose:*** The purpose of this end of project evaluation is to generate knowledge from the project implementation for the organizational accountability and learning. The specific ***objectives*** include:(a) to carry out an *independent appraisal* of the performance of the project to determine the extent to which planned objectives were achieved, to identify the factors of success or failure, to draw linkages between the project outputs and its contribution to programme outcomes; (b) to draw *lessons learned* that may inform future programming, policy-making and overall organizational learning, and (c) to develop key *recommendations* for the future programming.

***Methodology:*** To ensure logical coherence and completeness of the analysis, two compatible strategies of analysis were used:

* ***change analysis*** to compare the results indicators over time and against targets as defined in the project results framework. The status of achievement are rated as ***achieved***, ***partly achieved*** or ***not achieved.***
* context-sensitive ***contribution analysis*** to explore cause-effect assumptions and conclude about the contribution the project has made or not to both intended and unintended outcomes. ***relevance***, ***effectiveness***, ***efficiency***, ***sustainability***, ***impact*** of the project as well as ***coherence***, given that the project is a joint initiative between three organizations, GSSCPD, KEPA, UNDP Kuwait and UNEP. For each of the criteria an evaluation rating is applied that included the following options: *highly unsatisfactory, unsatisfactory, partially satisfactory, satisfactory, and highly satisfactory.*

**Figure 2.1: ToC of the of Kuwait Environmental Governance Initiative (KEGI) project**



The validation of the logical model is focused on each component of the model and their linkages as well as their contribution to the higher-level results. The intervention logic for the project is defined with the focus on two outputs:

* Output 1: Strengthened Participation in Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and Internationally Agreed Development Goals (IADGs)
* Output 2: Enhanced Environmental Information Systems

***Process:*** The evaluation is mandated by UNDP Kuwait and conducted by independent evaluator during April - June 2019 period, with the field mission to Kuwait on 15-23 April 2019.

## Evaluation Findings

The evaluation findings are presented per evaluation criteria of strategic relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact and an additional criterion of coherence.

## Change Analysis

The purpose of the change analysis is to provide an overview of the level of completion of each of the project activities as defined in the results framework. Below is the overview:

**Table 4.1 Overview of the completion of project activities**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***#*** | ***Activity*** | ***Progress by June 2019*** | ***Responsible Partner*** |
| ***Output 1: Strengthened Participation in Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and Internationally Agreed Development Goals (IADGs)***  |
| 1.1 | Conduct capacity self-assessment (NCSA) to identify capacity building needs relating to MEAs, including national and local needs and cross-thematic issues | Achieved | UNEP  |
| 1.2 | Develop National MEA Action Plan with measures to address achievement gaps including UNFCCC, UNCBD, and UNCCD. | Achieved | UNEP  |
| 1.3 | Organize national capacity building workshops on MEA implementation and readiness for new initiatives to implement the SDG environmental pillars including SDG 13 | Achieved | UNEP |
| 1.4 | Support for designing National Adaptation Plan (NAP) and related initiatives linked to water, city planning and other sectors | Achieved | UNEP |
| 1.5 | Undertake assessment of challenges and opportunities for achievement of the SDG environmental pillars in Kuwait, and prepare National SDG Reporting | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |
| 1.6 | Design and implement awareness raising programme on priority environmental issues including through proper campaigns, workshop and media outreach | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |
| ***Output 2: Enhanced Environmental Information Systems***  |
| 2.1 | Conduct gap analysis and user survey to assess the state and usage of existing EIS platforms for decision-making processes to implement EPL | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |
| 2.2 | Identify bottlenecks and recommend system enhancements to current EIS functions and services so as to be fit for purpose to implement EPL | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |
| 2.3 | Enhance eMISK IT capacity to support required EIS infrastructure, system administration and security requirements, and connectivity | Not achieved | UNDP/KEPA / Expected to be achieved in September 2019 |
| 2.4 | Identify and put in place new metrics and indicators for tracking performance on EPL | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |
| 2.5 | Train KEPA, the Central Statistical Bureau and stakeholders on data collection, quality control including data validation and reliability and statistical analysis related to environmental indicators | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |
| 2.6 | Document and share success stories and good practices in national indicators systems for tracking achieving SDG environmental pillars | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |

***Comments:*** the outstanding activity 2.3 is expected to be completed by the end of September 2019, after the closure of the project in June 2019. UNDP Kuwait committed quality control over this activity after the official closure of the project.

## Contribution Analysis

***Strategic relevance:*** The project strategic relevance is rated as ***highly satisfactory***. Project contributes directly to the achievement of the national development priorities set in the Kuwait Vision 2035. Also, the project is in line with the Country Development Programme agreed between UNDP and the Government of Kuwait, and the UNDP’s corporate strategic priorities outlined in the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017. Importantly, the project explicitly aims to contribute to the achievement of all ***‘Green SDGs’***, meaning ***SDG 6*** Ensure Availability and Sustainable Management of Water for All, ***SDG 7*** Ensuring Access to Affordable, Reliable, Sustainable and Modern Energy for All, ***SDG 11*** Making Cities and Settlements Inclusive, Safe, Resilient and Sustainable, ***SDG 12*** Ensure Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns, ***SDG 13*** Take Urgent Action on Climate Change and Its Impacts, ***SDG 14*** Conserve and Sustainable Use the Oceans, Seas and Marine Resources, ***SDG 15*** Sustainable Use of Ecosystems and Combat Land Degradation & Biodiversity Loss.

Also, the project objectives reflect the internal needs of KEPA with regards to capacities to effectively participate in the MEAs and IADGs, strengthening internal information management system in KEPA, and improving compliance and enforcement functions of the KEPA.

***Effectiveness:*** The project effectiveness is rated as ***satisfactory.*** The effectiveness of the project implementation varies significantly across activities and across partners involved. However, cumulatively the project has demonstrated satisfactory effectiveness by producing a number of important deliverables, despite all the challenges faced across the process. Two ***success factors*** include: (a) the high-caliber international expertise mobilized by UNDP Kuwait to support with specific and highly-specialized analytical studies, and (b) high level of adaptive management demonstrated by UNDP Kuwait to address multiple pitfalls within the project.

Unfortunately, deliverables of UNEP were very much delayed in the project, which had objective and subjective explanations. Objective reasons include the limitation of the UN administrative system to accommodate effective UN2UN implementation modalities. Subjective reasons include insufficient responsiveness of the UNEP throughout the project implementation.

UNDP Kuwait too delayed the deliverable 2.3, which is expected to be finalized after the closure of the project. This is explained by the conflicting situation arisen around the contract awarded to Mr. Brain Freeman for the realization of this deliverable. The KEPA’s eMISK department was strongly unsatisfied with the quality of the deliverable. Later, UNDP Kuwait has discovered the conflict of interest related to Mr. Freeman and had to suspend the contract. The new recruitment process took time and eventually the new contract was granted to the GIS GPC.

One of the major challenges for the project effectiveness remains data availability and data accessibility. This is both internal and external issue for the KEPA: various departments within the KEPA struggle to have access to the data from their own colleagues within the KEPA and all together they struggle to have access to the environmental data available outside the KEPA.

***Efficiency:*** The project efficiency is rated as ***marginally satisfactory***. This is explained by the significant number of delays caused throughout the project implementation. In fact, the project was continuously operating in the rush-mode and constantly behind the schedule.

Important to mention that highly adaptive and responsible actions of the project team from UNDP Kuwait allowed to reduce potential negative consequences of multiple delays. Unfortunately, while the project risks were escalated to the attention of higher-level management within UNDP Kuwait, the actions followed only at the later stage, missing thereby opportunities to minimize the governance challenges the project was confronted with.

***Sustainability:*** The project sustainability is rated as ***satisfactory***.

The project supported various departments within the KEPA to strengthen their inhouse expertise around multiple areas. However, building capacities of the KEPA to effectively fulfill its mandate defined by the EPL should be seen through the prism of long-term efforts spanning beyond the life time of this project.

* With regards to *technical sustainability* the project supported the KEPA staff with various analytical products, informing thereby more focused actions in the future.
* With regards to *governance sustainability* the project faced multiple challenges: while the governance mechanism is feasible and functional, the process of coordination and communication was below optimal. Importantly, the governance mechanism for the sustainable efforts towards building the KEPA’s capacities would further benefit if data governance considerations would be factored into governance mechanism.
* With regards to *operational sustainability* the operational sustainability of the KEPA is strong as its team across various departments is experienced and capable and with the support from the project has gained additional skills and knowledge to fulfill its mandate. Nevertheless, there is a need to continue supporting the KEPA with mobilizing top-notch international expertise across multiple areas of their engagement.
* With regards to f*inancial sustainability* the capacities of the KEPA are no sufficient for specific interventions that are required to gain further expertise and to significantly improve its performance as of recommendations provided within the project.

***Impact:*** the project impact is rated as ***satisfactory.*** The project impact is twofold including (a) analytical work produced during the project with clear recommendations that will guide the KEPA’s focused efforts towards further capacity development, and (b) actual skills and tools that the KEPA staff can immediately employ in their daily work. Much expectations are linked to the work related to enhancement of the internal environmental information system, but this work will be finalized only in September 2019. For stronger impact, there is a need to build upon the achievements of the project and continue supporting KEPA in realizing the recommendations produced within this project.

Also, highly successful information campaign ‘***Our environment is fighting back’*** organized between 7 February and 15 April 2019 suggests that the impact of the project is quite high.

***Coherence:*** the project coherence is rated as ***unsatisfactory***. The level of coherence among the project partners was constrained by the major several ***challenges***. Within the KEPA, the relationships between some players were politically-flavored and also, at some point, he KEPA-assigned National Coordinator, who is also the Head of Strategic Planning Department, has demonstrated explicit reluctance to cooperate with the project. This has caused multiple tensions and delays inevitably impacting the project implementation process.

There were also confusion and misunderstandings in the communication and relationships between UNEP, on one hand, and UNDP Kuwait and GSSCPD, on the other. Due to non-delivery status of the activities under the UNEP’s responsibility, the GSSCPD issued an official warning to the KEPA not to cooperate with UNEP in April 2019. At that time UNEP has reached an agreement with KEPA to finalize its deliverables by 31 May 2019, of which GSSCPD was unaware of. The ban was lifted upon discussion with UNDP, UNEP and KEPA in March 2019 and after a letter sent to KEPA in April 2019 informing the DG of the meetings held in March 2019 with KEPA. However, because the GSSCPD was not aware of these meetings and the letter it took time to lift the ban in May 2019.

The strict control over the project implementation from the side of the GSSCPD has created too narrow space for the partners’ decision-making and significant red tape that does not necessarily add value to the project implementation and the quality of the project results.

It is worth mentioning that none of the organizations has compromised the quality of the work delivered due to administrative constrains.

## Conclusions

The evaluative conclusion is the following: given all the challenges it was confronted with the KEGI is a ***satisfactory*** project that has created outputs and results with strong potential impact in the country. It is a ***controversially project,*** with uneven implementation, with delays, with challenges and risks along the way, and with dedication of the staff of all partner organizations to deliver results and not to compromise on quality. Taking into consideration the challenges encountered both those that should have been avoided and those that were naturally emerging around such a complex project, the project still has managed to deliver several useful results for the KEPA.

Table 5.1 provides an overview of the project rating per evaluation category. Additionally, the project highlights several lessons learned about *do’s* and *don’ts* to be seriously taken into consideration by all partners while designing and implementing other project.

**Table 5.1: Project performance rating**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Rating of Performance*** | ***Characteristics*** |
| ***Relevance*** | Highly Satisfactory |
| ***Effectiveness*** | Satisfactory |
| ***Efficiency*** | Marginally Satisfactory |
| ***Sustainability*** | Satisfactory |
| ***Impact*** | Satisfactory |
| ***Coherence*** | Unsatisfactory |
| ***OVERAL RATING*** | ***SATISFACTORY*** |

The lessons learned and the recommendations are as follows:

1. **Content specific lessons learned and recommendations**

***Lesson 1: Ensure needs-informed capacity development***

Proper capacity gap analysis is critical to inform any efforts directed to building capacity. ***Therefore,*** it is of high importance to ensure that capacity needs assessment is carried out at the early stage of the project implementation, especially if the focus of the project is building capacities of the national counterpart.

***Lesson 2: Support data governance***

Success of environmental governance depends largely on the availability and accessibility of environment-related data as well as the capacities of the decision-makers to interpret data adequately. ***Therefore,*** it is of high importance to explore and recommend a mechanism of environmental data governance that will engage stakeholders from the KEPA and beyond. This would require a strong and high-level leadership of such a mechanism and its direct link with the achievement of the SDGs in Kuwait. UNSD has strong expertise in this and it’s worth exploring in other project(s).

 ***Lesson 3: Ensure sharp logic of the intervention***

When project outputs are very diverse and loosely connected, they resemble a wish-list rather than achievements demonstrating strong logic of intervention. ***Therefore,*** it is recommended to ensure peer-review of the project document and ensure more active engagement of UNDP regional hub to provide technical support at the design and later on, at the implementation phase.

***Lesson 3: Maintain coherence of information management system***

Each new software solution comes with new complexity – how to link this new software to the existing information system? Hence, when MapX was introduced, however useful, the question was raised about compatibility of the tools applied within KEPA – MapX operates on open platform and therefore only on Android (not iPhone for instance). ***Therefore,*** to maintain high-level of coherence of the information management system, while introducing a new software it is critical to offer integration solutions in the package. In this case, explore MAPEX integration or data input to eMISK.

***Lesson 4: Minimize language barrier***

Successful environmental governance in Kuwait can be guaranteed if benefiting from the vast international expertise accumulated in this field of knowledge. Not always the experts and the resource materials are available in Arabic, while in the meantime, English (usually widely spoken within expert communities) might be a challenge to the KEPA staff. ***Therefore,*** it is recommended to ensure high quality of translation and interpretation and factor this consideration in the project design and implementation.

***Lesson 5: Support the KEPA to fully institutionalize compliance and enforcement functions***

Compliance and enforcement functions required different modalities and different approach for implementation. While the KEPA is granted the authority for both functions, clear demarcation of the portfolios for both remains critical and requires additional efforts. ***Therefore,*** it is recommended to continue supporting the KEPA in institutionalizing compliance and enforcement functions as defined by the Enforcement and Compliance Policy Systems and Indicators report for the KEPA (August 2018).

***Lesson 6: Maintain the KEGI’s momentum***

The KEGI project has produced a number of valuable recommendations for the KEPA and for the environmental governance in Kuwait, in general. In the meantime, some of the project activities were carried out in a rush-mode with limited consultations. Additional consultations would be highly beneficial for the KEPA. In the meantime, the project has delivered multiple valuable analytical papers that have a potential to significantly inform the effectiveness of the KEPA’s work. ***Therefore,*** it is recommended to maintain the momentum created by the KEGI project and in consultations with the KEPA staff shape a new roadmap to elevate the KEPA’s work to a next quality level. Special attention should be paid to the recommendations produced to sharpen the links with SGDs and national development priorities.

***Lesson 7: Raise awareness of policy-makers on Green SDGs***

While building the KEPA’s capacities for environmental governance remains of high priority, the success of this endeavor would also depend on the traction for evidence-based policy-making and environmental data governance in Kuwait. This requires additional efforts towards raising awareness of the value of Green SDGs and their linkages with the national development priorities. ***Therefore,*** it is recommended to combine efforts for strengthening environmental governance in Kuwait with raising awareness on Green SDGs among high-level policy makers to create necessary synergies.

1. **Process specific lessons learned and recommendations**

***Lessons 8: Include no-cost inception phase in the project implementation***

When intervention modality is project-based, it implies that the project staff will be hired only when there is a formal agreement for funds allocation. The recruitment of the project staff takes from several weeks to several months usually and if not accounted as no-cost inception phase, this time will be taken from the implementation phase of the project creating unnecessary rush in the project implementation. ***Therefore,*** it is strongly recommended to negotiate with donors on no-cost inception phase to organize necessary preconditions for the project implementation including hiring project personnel.

***Lessons 9: Ensure feedback loops to beneficiary while supporting with analytical papers***

Quite often and for various reasons (not least, time limit) the analytical work is outsourced to external international expert. While it is required and ensured by the project quality control to produce analytical products in a highly consultative manner, it is of high importance to ensure feedback loops with the receiving organization. This implies, not simply to deliver report but ALWAYS organize a workshop and present the findings and explain the process, discuss the limitations and implications. ***Therefore,*** it is highly recommended to introduce new quality control mechanism to ensure the analytical work within any project (a) is carried out in highly consultative fashion, and (b) is concluded with a final workshop to present the findings and have a chance for the final reflection on the main recommendations. Also, ensure each analytical report has a 3-5-page summary that must be disseminated within the broader range of beneficiaries. In the case of this project, while one department of the KEPA might be interested in the details of an analytical report, another department might still benefit from the summary of the findings.

***Lessons 10: Ensure readiness assessment before engaging into One UN delivery modality***

This project has demonstrated that UN administrative system needs closer attention to ensure two (or more) UN agencies can work effectively and efficiently with each other. ***Therefore,*** before entering into partnership with another UN agency, it is critical to analyze and compare administrative requirements to identify conflicts and gaps and to address them in advance.

***Lessons 11: Check for conflict of interest with 3rd parties***

This project has demonstrated once again the criticality of checking the possible conflict of interests when awarding a contract to the 3rd party. This is also important for the possible liability issues to recover costs made in case of hidden conflict of interest has been discovered. ***Therefore,*** it is strongly recommended to ensure ‘conflict of interest’ check prior to signing any contract with the 3rd party.

1. **Governance related lessons learned and recommendations**

***Lessons 12: Escalate if project governance mechanism is not functioning***

The project governance mechanism was not functioning as it was deemed to function. This required timely intervention of the higher-level management. ***Therefore,*** it is recommended to detect early in the process if governance mechanism is not functioning and address it at the necessary level of seniority.

***Lessons 13: Ensure multiple focal points in complex NIM projects***

This project has demonstrated that when the communication and coordination within the national implementing partner dependents largely to one person, this is high risk implementation arrangement. While in some cases such arrangement might leverage more benefits, in the project where there are multiple thematic and implementation dimensions, it is highly recommended to consider appointing focal point for each thematic area. ***Therefore,*** in a complex NIM project, it is strongly recommend to ensure National Coordinator and a council of focal points with clear division of responsibilities and clear line of communication.

# INTRODUCTION

This document presents the report for the Final Evaluation of the Kuwait Environmental Governance Initiative (KEGI) Project with the implementation period of January 2017 – December 2018 later extended till 30 June 2019. The total budget of the project is US$2 million fully funded by the Government of Kuwait. The project is designed to be Nationally Implemented (NIM) with a partnership between the UNDP Kuwait, the General Secretariat of the Supreme Council for Planning and Development (GSSCPD), the Kuwait Environment Public Authority (KEPA) and UNEP.

The evaluation has both ***retrospective*** and ***prospective*** focus – through stock taking of the project achievements the evaluation explores the progress made and through exploring lessons learned and recommendations the evaluation explores the opportunities for the future programming and planning in Kuwait.

The evaluation is commissioned by UNDP Kuwait and conducted by an independent evaluation expert. The evaluation covers the whole period of the project implementation, hence, from August 2017 till June 2019. The evaluation took place during April – early June 2019 period, with the field mission to Kuwait carried out on 15-23 April 2019.

The evaluation has a dual perspective, i.e. to address the progress made vis-à-vis project theory of change and to address the capacities developed through the project through the prism of evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. Since the project is implemented as a multi-partner initiative, the criterion of *coherence* is introduced to address the synergies and complementarity created between project partners.

## Purpose, Objectives and Scope

As a decentralized evaluation it is undertaken by UNDP Kuwait programme unit to ensure accountability and capture lessons learned for future programming and planning, hence, the ‘summative’ status of the evaluation. The ***purpose*** of the end of project evaluation is to generate knowledge from the project implementation for the organizational accountability and learning. The specific ***objectives*** include:(a) to carry out an ***independent appraisal*** of the performance of the project to determine the extent to which planned objectives were achieved, to identify the factors of success or failure, to draw linkages between the project outputs and its contribution to programme outcomes; (b) to draw ***lessons learned*** that may inform future programming, policy-making and overall organizational learning, and (c) to develop key ***recommendations*** for the future programming.

The ***deliverables*** comprise the following: the inception report, the draft final report, and the final report, including all recommendations and lessons learned.

The list of documents reviewed for the development of the final report is presented in *Annex 1.* All key definitions are explained in *Annex 2. Annex 3* presents the Evaluation Framework Matrix: questions, respondents, indicators and data sources.

## Structure of the report

The final report includes the Executive Summary and the main body of the report with six sections. *Introduction* provides the background and explains the main purpose of the final evaluation. *Overview of the Evaluated Project* explains the project in brief – its context, the Theory of Chance (ToC), target groups, implementation arrangements, project financing, reporting and M&E, as well as presents the partners of the project, i.e. GSSCPD, KISR, and UNEP. *Evaluation Approach, Methodology and Limitations* discusses the rational for the approach and methodology of the final evaluation as well as the limitation of the chosen methods: interviews and desk study. *Main Findings* details the findings from (a) change analysis over actual progress to complete each activity, and (b) contribution analysis across the evaluation criteria of (a) strategic relevance, (b) effectiveness, (c) efficiency, (d) sustainability, (e) impact, and (f) coherence. *Evaluation Conclusion* provides a high-level concluding remark on the findings from the final evaluation. *Lessons Learned* reflects on the major lessons learned from the project implementation. *Recommendation* lists the recommendations crystalized throughout the final evaluation. In addition, *Annexes* provides a list of annexes to this report: the list of the documents reviewed for this final evaluation, the key definitions used, the evaluation framework matrix, and an overview of the survey on media campaign ‘Our environment is fighting back’ to conclude about the project impact and visibility.

# **Overview of the Evaluated Project**

This section provides an overview of the evaluated project reflecting on its context, theory of change, target groups, implementation arrangements, financing, reporting and Monitoring & Evaluation, partners, and progress to date.

## Context and Theory of change

An environmental governance system has been in place in Kuwait since 1995 when the Law No 21 of 1995 (amended by Law 16 1996) was adopted. The Law established the Kuwait Environment Public Authority (KEPA) and mandated it with jurisdiction and the power to regulate practices that pollute the environment. KEPA can follow up, for example, on or evaluate impact assessment studies of projects, implement the polluter pays principle, promote the optimal use of oil resources, demand consumption reductions and energy saving technology in project design. The Law 16/1996 amendment clarified KEPA’s role in conservation, protection and liability concepts.

Nevertheless, the improvements in the achievement of environmental results were not very visible, moreover, the Yale Environmental Performance Index (EPI)[[1]](#footnote-1) demonstrate significant regress in Kuwait from 42 position in 2014 to 113 position in 2016. Confronted by multiple environmental challenges in Kuwait, the environmental governance system in the country was also constrained by inadequate enforcement capacities of KEPA and fragmented sectorial strategies.

Therefore, the optimization of the existing environmental governance system has become a critical imperative for Kuwait, especially after the adoption of the Environmental Protection Law (EPL) (Law No. 42/2014) on 14 October 2014. The latter defined the roles for three bodies involved in the environmental management system, i.e. the Supreme Council, KEPA, and an Environmental Protection Fund. The Law mandates KEPA with greater coordination responsibilities and oversight roles. Also, the Law emphasized the importance of enhanced participation in Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and Internationally Agreed Development Goals (IADGs). Of particular importance for KEPA and the Government of Kuwait is the reporting to the following MEAs: United Nations Convention Framework on Climate Change (UNFCCC), United Nations Convention on Biodiversity (UNCBD), and United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). The Government of Kuwait is a signatory of and has therefore, reporting commitments for multiple other environmental conventions and agreements. To effectively fulfill this new role, there was a need to support KEPA in strengthening its institutional capacities for better coordination, oversight, and reporting.

The KEGI project is designed to address the institutional capacity gap at KEPA for coordination, oversight, and reporting. The project’s far reaching *goal* is to achieve improvement in the sustainable management of the environment and natural resources in Kuwait. As explained in Figure 1, the *specific objective* of the project is *to contribute towards development, and implementation of comprehensive and integrated environmental strategies and policies for Kuwait* based on two project results: (a) *through* strengthening capacities of the KEPA to effectively participate in the Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and Internationally Agreed Development Goals (IADGs) such as SGDs; and (b) *through* building environmental information system in KEPA.

**Figure 2.1: ToC of the of Kuwait Environmental Governance Initiative (KEGI) project**



Each output comprises a set of rather independent activities that are jointly deemed to create necessary synergy and built necessary capacities for improved environmental governance in Kuwait. Below is the overview of the activities per objective:

***Output 1: Strengthened Participation in Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and Internationally Agreed Development Goals (IADGs)***

1.1 Conduct capacity self-assessment (NCSA) to identify capacity building needs relating to MEAs, including national and local needs and cross-thematic issues

1.2 Develop National MEA Action Plan with measures to address achievement gaps including UNFCCC, UNCBD, and UNCCD.

1. 3 Organize national capacity building workshops on MEA implementation and readiness for new initiatives to implement the SDG environmental pillars including SDG 13

1. 4 Support for designing National Adaptation Plan (NAP) and related initiatives linked to water, city planning and other sectors

1.5 Undertake assessment of challenges and opportunities for achievement of the SDG environmental pillars in Kuwait, and prepare National SDG Reporting

1.6 Design and implement awareness raising programme on priority environmental issues including through proper campaigns, workshop and media outreach

***Output 2: Enhanced Environmental Information Systems***

2.1 Conduct gap analysis and user survey to assess the state and usage of existing EIS

 platforms for decision-making processes to implement EPL

2.2 Identify bottlenecks and recommend system enhancements to current EIS functions and services so as to be fit for purpose to implement EPL

2.3 Enhance eMISK IT capacity to support required EIS infrastructure, system administration and security requirements, and connectivity

2.4 Identify and put in place new metrics and indicators for tracking performance on EPL

2.5 Train KEPA, the Central Statistical Bureau and stakeholders on data collection, quality control including data validation and reliability and statistical analysis related to environmental indicators

2.6 Document and share success stories and good practices in national indicators systems for tracking achieving SDG environmental pillars

## Target group

The project direct beneficiary is the Kuwait Environmental Public Authority (KEPA). Both outputs of the project are geared towards strengthening KEPA’s capacities to fulfil its mandate effectively. However, some of the project deliverables, such as for instance, the National Adaptation Plan (NAP), might and should have larger beneficiary groups.

## Implementation arrangements

The project is designed to be Nationally Implemented (NIM) and has three main partners, namely KEPA, GSSCPD, and UNDP Kuwait. The division of roles as deemed: ***KEPA*** is the project implementor fully responsible for the project realization. ***GSSCPD*** has the role of overall project guidance and assurance. ***UNDP Kuwait*** provides overall organizational support for the project implementation, which is the primary responsibility of the UNDP-assigned Project Manager. UNDP Kuwait has sub-contracted UNEP to implement some selected activities within the project, namely, activities 1.1 – 1.4 as of the results framework (see Table 4.1 below). UNEP has no country presence in Kuwait, however, given their vast expertise in environmental issues and previously successful relationships with KEPA, this partnership was considered value-added for the project.

**Figure 2.2: Project governance structure**



## Project financing

The project is fully funded by the Government of Kuwait. The total budget of the project is US$2 million. Initially, the budget was allocated for the period from January 2017 – December 2018, however, later a no-cost extension was agreed for 1 January - 30 June 2019 for UNDP deliverables and for 31 May for UNEP deliverables. This was explained by the need to finalize all activities envisaged in the project, many of which were delayed during the project implementation.

## Reporting, Monitoring, and Evaluation

Project has set up a monitoring scheme with quarterly reporting, as well as the final project evaluation and final project report. To date, the following quarterly reports were produced:

2018: Q1&Q2 reports: 1 January – 30 June 2018

2018: Q3&Q4 reports: 1 July – 31 December 2018

2019: Q1 report: 1 January 2019 – 31 March 2019

Project Board Meetings were organized respectively on: July 2017, April 2017, October 2018, and February 2019.

## Project partners

The project is designed to be Nationally Implemented (NIM) and has three partners, whereby ***KEPA*** is the implementing partner of the project; ***UNDP Kuwait*** provides Country Office Support Services for all recruitment and procurement activities under the project, which is the primary responsibility of the UNDP-assigned Project Manager; ***UNEP*** is contracted by UNDP on cost-recovery basis to enrich project implementation with their environmental technical expertise, and ***GSSCPD*** has the role of overall project guidance and assurance.

***Kuwait Environmental Protection Agency (KEPA)[[2]](#footnote-2)*** operates under the Ministry of Defense and is an independent governmental organization dedicated to environmental action, and domestic and international legislation and policy regarding the environment. As of EPL, KEPA has a broad mandate to ensure environmental protection in Kuwait.

***General Secretariat of the Supreme Council for Planning and Development (GSSCPD):[[3]](#footnote-3)*** The GSSCPD is the national implementing partner of the UNDP Kuwait. It is an independent body under the Council of Ministers established in 1970. GSSCPD works on directing the economic and social development in the State, which demonstrated the deep attention of the State for planning method and approach.

***UNDP Kuwait:[[4]](#footnote-4)*** UNDP has been working in Kuwait since 1962 cooperating with the Government and civil society to realize the country's aspirations for sustainable human development. UNDP programming is fully-funded by the state of Kuwait and is geared towards achievement of the national development priorities.

***United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP),[[5]](#footnote-5) sub-contracted by UNDP Kuwait:*** The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) is the leading environmental authority in the United Nations system. UNEP uses its expertise to strengthen environmental standards and practices while helping implement environmental obligations at the country, regional and global levels. UNEP’s mission is to provide leadership and encourage partnership in caring for the environment by inspiring, informing, and enabling nations and peoples to improve their quality of life without compromising that of future generations.

# Evaluation Approach, Methodology and Limitations

## Approach

The approach and methodology chosen for this evaluation is explained by the nature of the Kuwait Environmental Governance Initiative (KEGI) project itself. Therefore, *the evaluation is concerned with the progress made vis-à-vis its results framework as well as the synergy and complementarity between three project partners.*

Evaluation will be conducted in a gender and culturally sensitive manner and with due respect to human rights principles. It will be carried out in conformity with the requirements of the UNDP Evaluation Policy (2016)[[6]](#footnote-6) and the UNEG Norms and Standards for Evaluation[[7]](#footnote-7), namely, internationally agreed principles, goals, and targets; utility; credibility; independence; impartiality; ethics; transparency; human rights and gender equality; national evaluation capacities; and professionalism.

## Methodology

To ensure that the information collected is valid, reliable and sufficient to meet the evaluation objectives, the following data collection methods will be used: *desk review*; *individual and group interviews* with key informants both face-to-face and remotely with the use of technology (phone, Internet, etc.). The triangulation principle, meaning utilization of multiple sources for data and methods, will be applied to validate findings. *Annex 1* provides an overview of the main documents reviewed to design the approach and methodology of the evaluation.

To ensure logical coherence and completeness of the analysis, two compatible strategies of analysis were used:

* ***change analysis*** to compare the results indicators over time and against targets as defined in the project results framework. It provides a status of achievement towards results at the time of the final evaluation as ***achieved***, ***partly achieved*** or ***not achieved.***
* context-sensitive ***contribution analysis*** to explore cause-effect assumptions and conclude about the contribution the project has made or not to both intended and unintended outcomes. The focus of the contribution analysis will be not to quantify the degree to which the project has contributed to the outcomes but to provide evidence to support ***reasonable conclusions about the contribution*** made by the project to the desired outcomes. The analytical focus of this evaluation is based on the UNEG evaluation criteria, namely ***relevance***, ***effectiveness***, ***efficiency***, ***sustainability***, and ***impact***, which are also in line with the OECD DAC evaluation criteria. As a joint project between three organizations, GSSCPD, UNDP Kuwait, and KISR, there is a need for an additional evaluation criterium, that is ***coherence***. The focus is on exploring the coherence and complementarity of the implementation streams and the benefits that such an implementation modality leverages. Also, the focus is on having a common vision, sharing both risks and benefits, having a sense of ‘co-creation’, and contributions from all parties. *Annex 4* provides the Evaluation Matrix.

The following ***performance rating*** for the evaluation criteria will be used to each of the five results, on which basis the overall rating of the project will be proposed.

**Table 3.1 Project rating system**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Rating of Performance****(Relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, coherence and added-value)* | ***Characteristics*** |
| Highly Satisfactory (5) | The project had several significant positive factors with no defaults or weaknesses in terms of relevance/efficiency/effectiveness/sustainability/impact outlook. |
| Satisfactory (4) | The project had positive factors with minor defaults or weaknesses in terms of relevance/efficiency/effectiveness/sustainability/impact outlook. |
| Partially satisfactory (3) | The project had moderate to notable defaults or weaknesses in terms of relevance/efficiency/effectiveness/sustainability/impact outlook. |
| Unsatisfactory (2) | The project had negative factors with major defaults or weaknesses in terms of relevance/efficiency/effectiveness/sustainability/impact outlook. |
| Highly unsatisfactory (1) | The project had negative factors with severe defaults or weaknesses in terms of relevance/efficiency/effectiveness/sustainability/impact outlook. |

***Quality control***: is carried out by the UNDP Kuwait Programme Analyst, Project Manager and UN Deputy Residence Representative, as well as representatives from the GSSCPD and KEPA. They are engaged to (a) review and comment on the Inception Report, (b) review and comment on the draft evaluation report, as well as (c) be available for the reference and additional oversight, as deemed necessary, throughout the evaluation process.

***Key stakeholders*** contacted during the evaluation process include UNDP Kuwait programme and project staff, GSSCPD, KEPA staff members, UNEP, and 3rd parties, i.e. consultants.

## Limitations

1. During the filed mission, the intention was also to consult with the National Statistical Organization of Kuwait, but this was not possible to organize. This could have been particularly useful for the recommendations on future programming and planning.
2. Timing: the main part of the evaluation was to be finalized during the May 2019, which is month of Ramadan in Kuwait and there is a moderate risk that key stakeholders might not be fully available to review and comment on the draft report.
3. Limitations of the tools used:
* *Limitations of interviews:* Face-to-face surveys deliver the most representative results, however, the limitations for this work remains the very limited number of key informants that can be effectively reached for an interview.
* *General limitation during data collection:* the evaluator will remain vigilant to the following biases: (a) confirmation bias, i.e. tendency to seek out evidence that is consistent with the expected effects, (b) Empathy bias, i.e. tendency to create a friendly (empathetic) atmosphere during data collection with the consequence of creating overoptimistic statements over project; (c) Strategies that could be used by respondents on self-censor (reluctance of respondents to freely express themselves) or purposely distorted statements to attract evaluation conclusions closer to their views.

# Main Findings

This section provides the main findings from the evaluation regarding the progress made and capacities developed throughout the whole implementation period of the KEGI project.

## Change Analysis

The purpose of the change analysis is to provide an overview of the level of completion of each of the project activities as defined in the results framework. Below is the overview:

**Table 4.1 Overview of the completion of project activities**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***#*** | ***Activity*** | ***Progress by June 2019*** | ***Responsible Partner*** |
| ***Output 1: Strengthened Participation in Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and Internationally Agreed Development Goals (IADGs)***  |
| 1.1 | Conduct capacity self-assessment (NCSA) to identify capacity building needs relating to MEAs, including national and local needs and cross-thematic issues | Achieved | UNEP  |
| 1.2 | Develop National MEA Action Plan with measures to address achievement gaps including UNFCCC, UNCBD, and UNCCD. | Achieved | UNEP  |
| 1.3 | Organize national capacity building workshops on MEA implementation and readiness for new initiatives to implement the SDG environmental pillars including SDG 13 | Achieved | UNEP |
| 1.4 | Support for designing National Adaptation Plan (NAP) and related initiatives linked to water, city planning and other sectors | Achieved | UNEP |
| 1.5 | Undertake assessment of challenges and opportunities for achievement of the SDG environmental pillars in Kuwait, and prepare National SDG Reporting | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |
| 1.6 | Design and implement awareness raising programme on priority environmental issues including through proper campaigns, workshop and media outreach | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |
| ***Output 2: Enhanced Environmental Information Systems***  |
| 2.1 | Conduct gap analysis and user survey to assess the state and usage of existing EIS platforms for decision-making processes to implement EPL | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |
| 2.2 | Identify bottlenecks and recommend system enhancements to current EIS functions and services so as to be fit for purpose to implement EPL | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |
| 2.3 | Enhance eMISK IT capacity to support required EIS infrastructure, system administration and security requirements, and connectivity | Not achieved | UNDP/KEPA / Expected to be achieved in September 2019 |
| 2.4 | Identify and put in place new metrics and indicators for tracking performance on EPL | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |
| 2.5 | Train KEPA, the Central Statistical Bureau and stakeholders on data collection, quality control including data validation and reliability and statistical analysis related to environmental indicators | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |
| 2.6 | Document and share success stories and good practices in national indicators systems for tracking achieving SDG environmental pillars | Achieved | UNDP/KEPA |

***Comments:***

The outstanding activity 2.3 requires longer period exceeding the duration of the project. Hence, the project will be officially closed by the end of June 2019, however, activity 2.3 is expected to be completed by the end of September 2019. This has been agreed between all partners and most importantly, UNDP Kuwait committed quality control over this activity after the official closure of the project.

**Table 4.2: Progress towards project objectives’ targets**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Output*** | ***Indicator*** | ***Targets*** | ***Factual by June 2019*** |
| *Output 1:* Participation in Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) and Internationally Agreed Development Goals (IADGs) Strengthened | 1.2 Number of capacity development measures designed for meeting obligations under signed and ratified MEAs for Kuwait | 3 | 3+ |
| 1.4 Number of SDGs with nationally appropriate indicators measured to assess progress on SDGs environment pillars | 6 | 7 |
| *Output 2:* Environmental Information Systems Enhanced | Number of existing sectoral environmental databases supported and aligned to KEPA’s eMISK | 4 | In progress |

There are multiple capacity development measures identified and implemented within the project, exceeding the target. The project also outstrips the target with regards to nationally appropriate indicators measured to assess the progress on Green SDGs, hence, seven indicators are defined, and adequate input is provided in developing the first voluntary national (VNR) report of Kuwait. The work on eMISK is delayed and it is early to indicate the achievements as of indicators, however, there are grounds to conclude that the indicator is set to be achieved.

## Contribution Analysis

### Strategic Relevance

***The strategic relevance of the project is rated as ‘Highly Satisfactory’.***

The relevance analysis largely answers the following question: *Is the project’s adopted strategy pertaining to each result and overall objective still valid?*

Through its intended results the project aims to contribute to high level national development priorities and development priorities agreed to be address jointly by UNDP and the Government of Kuwait.

Hence, the objectives of the project are in line with the following development priorities:

1. High-level national development priorities: the CPD is developed in close partnership with the General Secretariat of the Supreme Council for Planning and Development, an official counterpart of UNDP in Kuwait (in accordance with Amir Decree 307, 2007) and is in line with the national development objectives of Kuwait. Hence, through realization of this project, UNDP Kuwait further contributes to the achievement of the national development priorities of Kuwait. More specifically, the project is in line with the strategic priorities set out in the ***Kuwait Vision 2035***[[8]](#footnote-8) and specifically, with one of its seven pillars, i.e. *Sustainable Living Environment*.
2. The priority set in the UNDP’s ***Country Programme Document (CPD) 2015-2018***: *Policy and regulatory economic, social and environmental frameworks are in place to build resilience for inclusive, sustainable growth and development*.
3. The priorities set by Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): Further, the project explicitly aims to contribute to the achievement of all ***‘Green SDGs’***, meaning ***SDG 6*** Ensure Availability and Sustainable Management of Water for All, ***SDG 7*** Ensuring Access to Affordable, Reliable, Sustainable and Modern Energy for All, ***SDG 11*** Making Cities and Settlements Inclusive, Safe, Resilient and Sustainable, ***SDG 12*** Ensure Sustainable Consumption and Production Patterns, ***SDG 13*** Take Urgent Action on Climate Change and Its Impacts, ***SDG 14*** Conserve and Sustainable Use the Oceans, Seas and Marine Resources, ***SDG 15*** Sustainable Use of Ecosystems and Combat Land Degradation & Biodiversity Loss. Also, through attainment of the ‘Green SDGs’, the project intents to contribute to all other SDGs.
4. The Project contributes directly to the achievement of the Output 5.2 of the ***UNDP Strategic Plan 2014 – 2017***:[[9]](#footnote-9) Legal and regulatory capacity development, including on issues of environment.

Also, project objectives reflect the internal needs of KEPA with regards to capacities to effectively participate in the MEAs and IADGs, as well as with regards to strengthening internal information management system in KEPA. Hence, KEPA is engaged in a number of international agreements and conventions yet the monitoring and reporting capacities across the organization are limited.

Three main international agreements to report on: Convention on Biodiversity,[[10]](#footnote-10) Convention on Desertification,[[11]](#footnote-11) Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC),[[12]](#footnote-12) as well as other agreements CITES,[[13]](#footnote-13) Basel Convention,[[14]](#footnote-14) Montreal Protocol,[[15]](#footnote-15) MARPOL,[[16]](#footnote-16) Stockholm Convention.[[17]](#footnote-17) Importantly, Kuwait intend to provide its second Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) and therefore, need robust evidence to define its ambitious targets regarding towards reducing emissions, taking into consideration its domestic circumstances and capacities. The second voluntary NDC is due in 2020, five years after the first one produced in 2015.

Overview of the KEPA’s capacities vis-à-vis its legal requirements towards coordination and oversight functions for the purpose of environmental governance in Kuwait, is another critical area for the successful implementation of its mandate and highly valued priority for the KEPA.

*To support the realization of the 2nd objective, the project team worked closely with the Climate Change, Biodiversity, and Statistical departments and with other departments within KEPA as relevant.*

The project has an ambitious objective to enhance environmental information system of KEPA. While the strategic relevance of this objective is very high, it remains an ambitious objective. This is largely explained by the complexity of the information system of KEPA. First, there are two main software’s that KEPA is using for environmental information management: CIMS, AQMIS, and eMISK. There are also some additional software’s used for specific purposes. However, these systems are not sufficiently linked and the primary purpose within this project was to develop roadmap to build synergies across all existing information systems on the basis of eMISK. The situation is even more complicated because eMISK itself is in the process of expanding. Currently, KEPA with its external partners from different countries is developing eMISK Air (USA), eMISK Marine (USA), eMISK subsurface (NL), eMISK waste (Germany). Obviously, it is difficult to synchronize something that is not in place yet. Nevertheless, some specifications from these applications of eMISK are already available and possible to take into consideration. Second, the environment-related data quality and availability is a challenge for KEPA. This is related to the data available within KEPA as well as data that other institutions hold and KEPA has limited if any access to. Obviously, there is a whole area of environment-related data that is not being collected and monitored yet in Kuwait.

*To support the realization of the 2nd objective, the project team worked closely with the eMISK department and with other departments within KEPA as relevant.*

While the highly satisfactory strategic relevance of the project – which is a ***success factor -*** the logical framework of the project was constrained by several ***challenges.*** The variability of activities of different size and duration under each objective are too broad, which loses the focus and created confusion within KEPA, if not properly communicated. The communication-related challenges were explicitly present within the project and have impacted the way how the project as a whole was perceived by the KEPA’s team, i.e. with some confusion about the content of the project and the roles of various partners engaged in the project.

### Effectiveness

***The effectiveness of the project is rated as ‘Satisfactory’.***

The effectiveness analysis is largely addressing the question: *Are the delivery of activities and outputs contributing to the achievement of the project results and the outcome?*

Even though the effectiveness of the project implementation varies significantly across activities and across partners involved, however, cumulatively it is possible to consider the project’s effectiveness as satisfactory. This rating is justified by a number of important deliverables produced by the project, despite all the challenges faced across the process. One of the ***success factors*** is the high-caliber international expertise mobilized by UNDP Kuwait to support with specific and highly-specialized analytical studies.

***With regards to objective 1 to enhance KEPA’s capacities to participate in MEAs and IADGs*** the project has delivered several analytical papers that create basis for the KEPA’s more focused activities in the future:

* In July 2018, a detailed *‘Legal and Institutional Assessment for the KEPA’* report was produced. The legal and institutional assessment was conducted against the international benchmarks, namely International Indicators of Environmental Performance and SDGs, as well as against the pillars of the Kuwait National Development Plan. The EPL was also compared with those from other GCC countries. Recommendations are provided on how to address the capacity gaps both at legal and institutional frameworks.
* In August 2018, a detailed capacity assessment report entitled *‘Capacity Building Programme’* was produced to link individual learning of the KEPA staff with the organizational mission and objectives. Building capacities of the staff is considered important in KEPA to retain the knowledge and to increase effectiveness and efficiency of its operations. The focus was on building capacities of the (a) strategic management, (b) operational management, and (c) technical and scientific staff. A detailed training plan has been developed for the KEPA.
* In August 2018, a legal study was conducted for the KEPA and report entitled *‘Enforcement and Compliance Policy Systems and Indicators for the KEPA’* was produced. The focus of the study is to support KEPA’s compliance and enforcement functions as defined by the EPL. The study maps the availability and non-availability of various tools that organization can potentially use to fulfil its mandate. Also, it provides direction on how to respond to environmental incidents with the potential to adversely affect human health or the natural environment.
* In December 2018, a detailed analysis was carried out to assess the readiness of the KEPA to monitor and report on Green SDGs. The report was published, entitled *‘Environmental Pillars of the Sustainable Development Goals in Kuwait’.* The specific focus of the report was to objective of the report is to provide an overview of national priorities in regard to environmental SDG targets and indicators, and provide insights on data availability, quality and data gaps, and identify potential areas to strengthen national monitoring and reporting capacity to assist national SDG readiness and planning to facilitate the integration and implementation of the SDG at the national level. In total, out of 57 indicators 20 have been agreed as priority for Kuwait to report upon.

UNDP Kuwaithas outsourced some activities to UNEP (based in Bahrain) to produce several important deliverables. The draft of the Kuwait National Adaptation Plan 2019-2030 was produced in April 2019. The work was not on schedule (which will be further explained under the *coherence* section) however, the report is produced and well-received by the Climate Department of the KEPA and the KEPA management. It needs to be mentioned that the development of NAP is a long-term process including multiple consultations with different stakeholders. The process of developing Kuwait NAP was constrained by limited time allocated for this work and only few active consultations with the KEPA. The main consultative workshop was organized on 12-14 March 2019, short before the submission of the final draft of the report. Due to time constrains caused by multiple delays in the process, the opportunities that could have gained during on-job training for the KEPA staff were limited.

Important to mention that it is disappointing that the capacity self-assessment (NCSA) of the KEPA for the purpose of identifying capacity building needs relating to MEAs were completed with insufficient consultations and only by the end of the project, hence, in April-May 2019. The true value of this assessment was expected to be in creating necessary buy-in and informing project capacity development efforts. This is obviously a lost opportunity for the project.

***With regards to objective 1 to enhance Environmental Information Systems*** some important work has been initiated but also major pitfalls faced.

To enhance the KEPA’s eMISK IT capacity an agreement was reached between UNDP and KEPA on November 2017 to organize open tender to recruit a qualified expert to provide necessary services. On January 2018 an expert was hired, Mr. Brian Freeman, and was awarded a contract of 20.000USD to analyze data collection, data validation, and data sets compatibility within KEPA, and to produce recommendations for improvement. However, the KEPA’s eMISK department was not satisfied with the focus and the quality of the work delivered. The focus of the work of the consultant was solely to fit the existing three information systems within KEPA, i.e. CIMS, AQMIS, and eMISK, into AQMIS. Most importantly, KEPA team was disappointed by the lack of scientific rigor in the proposed analytical work. The opinion about the quality of the work produced by the consultant diverged: while experts from eMISK department were strongly dissatisfied with the quality of the output, the KEPA’s focal point for the project who is also the Head of Strategic Planning Department, instead, took a strong position to support the consultant’s recommendations. Unfortunately, later on UNDP colleagues discovered conflict of interest in the Mr. Freeman’s assignment, since he is a business developer for the company that produces that same software Mr. Freeman was trying to promote. After this discovery, UNDP has suspended the contract with Mr. Freeman in agreement with GSSCPD and start looking for alternative options to ensure this activity is completed and the expectations of the KEPA colleagues are met. Nevertheless, it took several months to settle the conflict with Mr. Brain Freeman lasted from June till November 2018.

On March 2019 another tender was organized. On the competitive basis, the GIS GPC[[18]](#footnote-18) has been awarded the contract of 252,721 USD to actually complete the work under the activity 2.3: “Enhance EMISK IT capacity to support required EIS infrastructure, system administration and security requirements, and connectivity”. Also, the decision was made to repeat the activities and 2.1 and 2.2 as the counterpart was not satisfied with the result.

It took several months to settle the new contract, which is explained by a number of challenges. Most importantly, given negative experience with the previous consultant, the KEPA’s eMISK department insisted to take the role of the Focal Point for this one activity. This has caused reluctance to cooperate from the side of the KEPA’s National Coordinator, Head of Strategic Department and subsequently, multiple rounds of communications and lots of set-backs in terms of the implementation of this activity. UNDP had to convene an official Board Meeting to change the Focal Point for this activity in February 2019. Coupled with the usual duration of the tender, by the time GIS GPS was on board, the project remaining time was insufficient to accommodate the completion of this activity. Not to compromise the quality of the expected deliverable, the agreement has been reached between the project partners to allow this activity to be completed by the end of September 2019, while the project closure will remain June 2019. UNDP Kuwait took the responsibility to ensure quality control even after the project closure.

Additionally, various training courses and workshops were organized for the KEPA staff from different departments. Hence, UNDP Kuwait organized several workshops on how to calculate and capture SDGs indicators data and how to validate data. Also, UNDP Kuwait supported the biodiversity department team to participate to UN Negotiation for conventions course.

The MapX training organized for the biodiversity department team was well received and supported the team to analyze international indicators and decide which ones are not applicable for Kuwait (23 indicators) and agree on those to report towards. Also, the biodiversity team saw a strong potential for the broader use of MapX not only for CBD but also for other international conventions and the regional conventions on wild life for GCC countries.

One of the major ***challenges*** to the project effectiveness is data availability and data accessibility for the KEPA. This is both internal and external issue for the KEPA. Different departments within the KEPA still struggle to have access to the data from their own colleagues within the KEPA and all together they struggle to have access to the environmental data available outside the KEPA.

### Efficiency

***The efficiency of the project is rated as ‘Marginally*** ***Satisfactory’.***

The effectiveness analysis is largely addressing the question: *What is the efficiency of the project implementation?*

Project manager was hired six months after the inception of the project. This has caused a delay in the project schedule. Additionally, there were multiple other delays in the project caused by a variety of reasons. Even extension of the project from 1 January 2019 till 30 June 2019 cannot be considered a full compensation of those delays simply because the implementation of the project was not sufficiently informed by the possibility of extension. This means, that the project was operating on a rush-mode while the decision about extension of the project implementation was convened to the project team at the late point.

The delays in the project implementation have inevitably impacted the timing and the quality of the project deliverables. Significant delays have been caused by KEPA and within the KEPA. Flawed communication and coordination mechanism within the KEPA have become one of the major pitfalls for the project and all its partners. Delays were caused within the KEPA but also within UNEP due to various reasons. Hence, most of the activities of UNEP were delayed significantly. This has caused the situation when GSSCPD and KEPA has requested UNDP to send an official letter to the higher management of UNEP at the beginning of 2019. As a result, the project manager responsible for the outputs to be delivered by UNEP has been changed and UNEP has started producing deliverables.

Also, the financial report of the project was constrained by several challenges. As multiple evidence would suggest, UNEP failed to deliver financial reporting, financial forecasting and ensure transparency of the financial reporting in due time till the new project manager took the lead for the implementation. As a result, some funds have been relocated from UNEP’s activities to the implementation of output 2. This has caused more uncertainties for UNDP Kuwait and more efforts to manage the project in a predictable way.

**Figure 4.1: Budget allocations per output: planned and actual**

***Legends:***

**UNEP Activities: NSCA, Develop MEA Action plan, support for designing NAP.**

**Output 1: Environmental SDGs tracking, prepare national SDG reporting, and media outreach**

**Output 2: identify and put in place new metrics and indicators or tracking EPL, EIS.**

**Figure 4.2: Cost Performance and Schedule Performance Indexes**

***NB.*** CPI and SPI are on 1 means the project is on budget and on schedule. CPI and SPI below 1 means the project is over budget and behind schedule. CPI and SPI greater than 1 means the project is under budget and ahead of schedule.

The efficiency of the project implementation regarding budget realization and schedule performance can be illustrated by Figure 4.2: Cost Performance and Schedule Performance Indexes. The figure demonstrates that the project after the second quarter the project costs are significantly over one suggesting that the budget utilization is behind the expected since the then. This is due to multiple delays in the project implementation. Similarly, the SPI suggests that after the second quarter the project went much behind the schedule.

Unfortunately, while the project risks were escalated to the attention of higher-level management within UNDP Kuwait, the actions followed only at the late stage, missing thereby opportunities to minimize the governance challenges the project was confronted with.

### Sustainability

***The sustainability of the project is rated as ‘Satisfactory’.***

The effectiveness analysis is largely addressing the question: *To what extent are the project effects towards building capacity of the KEPA sustainable?*

The project supported various departments within the KEPA to strengthen their inhouse expertise around multiple areas. However, building capacities of the KEPA to effectively fulfill its mandate defined by the EPL should be seen through the prism of long-term efforts spanning beyond the life time of this project. The project sustainability could be addressed from several perspective:

* *Technical sustainability:* the project supported the KEPA staff with various analytical products that allows mapping existing situation across several areas and therefore, informing more focused actions in the future.
* *Governance sustainability:* The project faced multiple challenges with regards to its governance process. While the governance mechanism is feasible and functional, the processes of coordination and communication were below optimal. The lessons learned and recommendations from the project implementation should be taken into consideration to benefit each project partner and to allow for longer term sustainability of the governance model. Importantly, the governance mechanism for the sustainable efforts towards building the KEPA’s capacities would further benefit if data governance considerations would be factored into governance mechanism. The latter implies ensuring there is a platform/engagement/collaboration of multiple parties in Kuwait that collect, maintain, and use environment-related data.
* *Operational sustainability:* The operational sustainability of the KEPA is strong as its team across various departments is experienced and capable and with the support from the project has gained additional skills and knowledge to fulfill its mandate. Nevertheless, there is a need to continue supporting KEPA with mobilizing top-notch international expertise across multiple areas of their engagement.
* *Financial sustainability:* The KEPA has sufficient funds to support their existing staffing level. However, there are no sufficient funds available for specific interventions that are required to gain further expertise and to significantly improve its performance as of recommendations provided within the project.

### Impact

***The impact of the project is rated as ‘Satisfactory’.***

The effectiveness analysis is largely addressing the question: *Are there reasonable grounds to conclude that the project is set to achieve its long-term impact?*

The project impact is two-fold including (a) analytical work produced during the project with clear recommendations that will guide the KEPA’s focused efforts towards further capacity development, and (b) actual skills and tools that the KEPA staff can immediately employ in their daily work. Much expectations are linked to the work related to enhancement of the internal environmental information system, but this work will be finalized only in September 2019.

Also, between 7 February and 15 April a successful online campaign was carried out by UNDP Kuwait and the KEPA to raise awareness of the legal and regulatory requirements of individuals and of society under the EPL. The concept of ‘***Our environment is fighting back’*** was created to highlight the severity of environmental issues in Kuwait and their impact on the lives of Kuwaitis and the country residents. Here is the link to one of the videos produced within that campaign: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fnewvyRPnY0> The report on final analysis and recommendations of the campaign ***‘UNDP/KEPA campaign: Our Environment is Fighting Back’*** reported 2,4 million video engagements. Interestingly, the survey conducted to measure the impact of the campaign has demonstrated that 43% of people who saw the campaign sought more information. These numbers too suggest the impact of the project beyond the KEPA as a direct beneficiary as well as high visibility of the project itself. *Annex 5* provides key findings from the campaign evaluation survey.

Another success story of the project is the contribution made to Voluntary National Review (VNR) 2019,[[19]](#footnote-19) covering seven Green SDGs. This work has been approved by GSSCPD and been added for the upcoming VNR 2019 publication.

As mentioned by all respondents, the major ***challenges*** towards strong impact of the project are about data governance within the KEPA as well as between the KEPA and other external stakeholders. This challenge will define the impact the project has over longer term and requires therefore, more close attention from the KEPA in the future.

###

### Coherence

***The coherence of the project is rated as ‘Unsatisfactory’.***

The value of the partnership for the implementation of this project was largely envisaged in the added value of UN to ease contracting process, to mobilize international expertise and to tap into international best practices regarding environmental governance. Meanwhile, it was expected that the KEPA would maintain high level of ownership to benefit from its international partners. While UNDP Kuwait managed to demonstrate high responsiveness to the emerging needs for the successful implementation of the project, there are multiple challenges that did not allow exploring the value of this partnership in its full capacity.

The level of coherence among the project partners was constrained by the major ***challenge***: politically-flavored relationships between some players within the KEPA and at some point, the explicit reluctance of the KEPA-assigned National Coordinator, who is also the Head of Strategic Planning Department, to cooperate with the project. This situation has created multiple layers of communication and confusion in the communication between UNDP and GSSCPD, on one hand, and KEPA colleagues, on the other, as well as between the KEPA-assigned National Coordinator and the designated departments within the KEPA itself. This situation has led to low ownership over the project within the KEPA management and its staff members. As a result of such tension, the approvals of the project documents and the required feedbacks were continuously delayed, the dissemination of the project-related materials (e.g. reports, questionnaires, etc.) among the KEPA staff were delayed, the project and its progress was not conveyed to the KEPA colleagues in time. For instance, since July 2018 and for about three month the National Coordinator at KEPA was not approving any document causing significant delay in the project implementation. Another example, the National Coordinator sent Mr. Freeman’s report for the feedback to the KEPA departments on April 2019, when the contract with Mr. Freeman was suspended and report dismissed in November 2018. Two official letters were sent to KEPA highest management to take actions and correct the situation: on 16 October 2018 UNDP management sent a letter to KEPA, on 29 October 2018 the Secretary General of the GSSCPD sent an official letter to KEPA. Unfortunately, none of the letters were responded and no actions were taken to address the issue raised in both letters.

Dependency in formal line of communication between the GSSCPD and UNDP Kuwait versus the KEPA was caused by the fact that the KEPA-assigned National Coordinator was strongly against establishing a working group of focal points representing different departments within the KEPA. Hence, being dependent on one single point of contact within the KEPA that was not cooperating and to avoid any further escalation of the situation as well as non-delivery of the project, UNDP Kuwait attempted to reach out to each KEPA departments directly. This decision was agreed and supported by the GSSCPD. This shift in work modality could be considered as demonstration of adaptive management and one of the ***success factors*** that allowed the project to progress and to ensure that the majority of its deliverables are actually successfully delivered.

There were also confusion and misunderstandings in the communication and relationships between UNEP, on one hand, and UNDP Kuwait and GSSCPD, on the other. Due to non-delivery status of the activities under the UNEP’s responsibility, the GSSCPD issued an official warning to the KEPA not to cooperate with UNEP in April 2019. This ban has been lifted shortly, after UNEP met with the project partners, in March 2019 and submitted a letter with request to lift the ban in April 2019. The situation with delays of the activities under the UNEP’s responsibility is partially a planning and communication problem between two UN agencies. The major ***challenge*** is that the contract signed between the UNDP Kuwait and UNEP, the so-called ‘*UN to UN Agreement’*, that required cost-recovery modality (the section C of the contract) contradicts UNEP’s internal rules. UNEP does not pre-finance activities. UNEP’s role within the project was largely about conducting assessments and providing technical assistance wherefor they needed international experts. However, UNEP’s internal rules does not allow the organization to hire external experts if there are no actual funds available for that activity. It took about seven months before funds were disbursed to UNEP to proceed with its activities.

The reason why it took so long to transfer funds from UNDP to UNEP is another ***challenge*** for this project. The transfer from UNDP to UNEP had to be approved and administered by UNDP HQ to UNEP HQ. This itself took multiple iterations and delays. Moreover, for UNEP HQ to receive the funds there must be a project ID generated in the UN common administrative system called Umoja. When discovered, UNEP has to create a project document to create project ID to be able to receive funds. All these allow concluding that the administrative systems between two organizations are lagging far beyond their intentions to work as One UN and there is little flexibility in UN administrative system to accommodate variations.

Another administrative ***challenge*** is that according to the KEPA’s internal rules, any workshop should be officially opened by the Head of KEPA. Due to tight schedule of the KEPA’s senior management, the dates of workshops were changing. But UNEP, being a non-resident organization in Kuwait (meaning, UNEP has no office in Kuwait and needs to travel its staff when there are workshops or other events organized) had to issue a travel authorization in Umoja. That system has a requirement to issue travel request at least 21 days before travel. Understandably, this was not possible to comply for UNEP simply because the dates of travel are not known 21 days before the actual travel. As a result, the date for the workshop that eventually took place in March 2019 was changed seven (!) times. Similarly, not being present to some of the Board Meetings is due to the same administrative constrain – too short notice for UNEP that could not request travel authorization in Umoja, hence, could not travel.

While these administrative challenged are objective and out of direct control of both teams, it is still largely disappointing that the agencies couldn’t communicate these challenges properly and find feasible solutions jointly.

In the meantime, it must be mentioned that on a number of occasions UNEP has failed to communicate in advance with UNDP Kuwait on their activities. Hence, as multiple evidence would suggest, UNEP failed to deliver financial reporting, financial forecasting and ensure transparency of the financial reporting in due time for the largest share of the project duration. Importantly, it should be understood that non-delivering from UNEP’s side according to the agreed deadlines is inevitably reputational damage for UNDP Kuwait in this context.

Evidence suggests that insufficient responsiveness of UNEP has caused multiple challenges for the project and for UNDP Kuwait specifically that had to carry the whole burden of the situation and its consequences. Not responding to official emails from UNDP cannot be justified under any conditions. Eventually, requests for feedbacks from UNDP Kuwait had to reach out to higher levels within UNEP. When at the beginning of 2019 the Deputy Resident Representative reached out to UNEP’s higher management the situation was finally addressed. It must be mentioned that with the arrival of the new Project Manager in UNEP in January 2019, the communication and coordination with the GSSCPD, KEPA and UNDP Kuwait has significantly improved.

The communication, coordination, and planning between the project partners was not coherent and this situation has impacted the effectiveness and efficiency of the project implementation. It is worth mentioning that none of the organizations has compromised the quality of the work delivered due to administrative constrains. For instance, UNDP Kuwait didn’t compromise on the quality of the activity 2.3 (on eMISK capacity development) and initiated another contract with the GIS GSP and took additional responsibilities beyond the project period. Similarly, UNEP didn’t compromise the quality of NAP. The NCSA necessitated hiring a second international consultant to finalize the reports and submit a good quality report. Understandably, hiring a new consultant and initiating a new consultation process is pretty cumbersome process, especially given a complex governance within this project. Nevertheless, it is welcomed that both UNDP Kuwait and UNEP preferred quality over ease of administrative burden.

Another ***challenge*** was uncertainty about whether the project would be granted no-cost extension or not. Even if it was highly likely that GSSCPD would agree to extend the duration of the project, however, not having that decision official and in due time created pressure and sometimes, rush in the project implementation. This too contributed to less coherence between the project partners. For example, only on 21 May UNEP got official letter about the project final deadline which was stated 31 May. This left minimum time - effectively 10 days - for UNEP to dully complete remaining activities, meaning, to ensure necessary consultations with the KEPA on the National Capacity Self-Assessment for Global Environmental Management.

Regarding budget allocations and spending, it is important to reflect on the approval format of the project budget. While it is fully justified that GSSCPD holds full control over project spending, for a project with US$2 million budget it is rather difficult to ensure each invoice approved separately by the GSSCPD. Also, since September 2018, GSSCPD has requested the 3rd signature under each formal decision, hence, from KEPA, from UNDP Kuwait, and from GSSCPD. This creates too narrow space for the partners’ decision-making and significant red tape that does not necessarily add value to the project implementation and the quality of the project results.

In the nutshell, the partnership mechanisms, or the arrangements around this multi-partner cooperation has demonstrated multiple flaws and set-backs. This has increased the burden on UNDP Kuwait enormously to manage the project deliverables, to manage the process, and to manage its reputation. In the meanwhile, the project team has demonstrated strong focus on quality of project deliverables but less diligence in addressing administrative challenges in the spirit of cooperation and partnership.

# Evaluation Conclusion

The evaluative conclusion is the following: the KEGI is ***satisfactory*** project that has created outputs and results with strong potential impact for the country. It is a ***controversially project,*** with uneven implementation, with delays, with challenges and risks along the way, and with dedication of the staff of all partner organizations to deliver results and not to compromise on quality. Taking into consideration the challenges encountered both those that should have been avoided and those that were naturally emerging around such a complex project, the project still has managed to deliver several useful results for the KEPA.

Table 5.1 provides an overview of the project rating per evaluation category. Additionally, the project highlights several lessons learned about *dos* and *don’ts* to be seriously taken into consideration by all partners while designing and implementing other project.

**Table 5.1: Project performance rating**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Rating of Performance*** | ***Characteristics*** |
| ***Relevance*** | Highly Satisfactory |
| ***Effectiveness*** | Satisfactory |
| ***Efficiency*** | Marginally Satisfactory |
| ***Sustainability*** | Satisfactory |
| ***Impact*** | Satisfactory |
| ***Coherence*** | Unsatisfactory |
| ***OVERAL RATING*** | ***SATISFACTORY*** |

# Lessons Learned and Recommendations

This section provides lessons learned and recommendations related to the content, process, and governance of developing national energy outlook in Kuwait.

1. **Content specific lessons learned and recommendations**

***Lesson 1: Ensure needs-informed capacity development***

Proper capacity gap analysis is critical to inform any efforts directed to building capacity. ***Therefore,*** it is of high importance to ensure that capacity needs assessment is carried out at the early stage of the project implementation, especially if the focus of the project is building capacities of the national counterpart.

***Lesson 2: Support data governance***

Success of environmental governance depends largely on the availability and accessibility of environment-related data as well as the capacities of the decision-makers to interpret data adequately. ***Therefore,*** it is of high importance to explore and recommend a mechanism of environmental data governance that will engage stakeholders from the KEPA and beyond. This would require a strong and high-level leadership of such a mechanism and its direct link with the achievement of the SDGs in Kuwait. UNSD has strong expertise in this and it’s worth exploring in other project(s).

 ***Lesson 3: Ensure sharp logic of the intervention***

When project outputs are very diverse and loosely connected, they resemble a wish-list rather than achievements demonstrating strong logic of intervention. ***Therefore,*** it is recommended to ensure peer-review of the project document and ensure more active engagement of UNDP regional hub to provide technical support at the design and later on, at the implementation phase.

***Lesson 3: Maintain coherence of information management system***

Each new software solution comes with new complexity – how to link this new software to the existing information system? Hence, when MapX was introduced, however useful, the question was raised about compatibility of the tools applied within KEPA – MapX operates on open platform and therefore only on Android (not iPhone for instance). ***Therefore,*** to maintain high-level of coherence of the information management system, while introducing a new software it is critical to offer integration solutions in the package. In this case, explore MAPEX integration or data input to eMISK.

***Lesson 4: Minimize language barrier***

Successful environmental governance in Kuwait can be guaranteed if benefiting from the vast international expertise accumulated in this field of knowledge. Not always the experts and the resource materials are available in Arabic, while in the meantime, English (usually widely spoken within expert communities) might be a challenge to the KEPA staff. ***Therefore,*** it is recommended to ensure high quality of translation and interpretation and factor this consideration in the project design and implementation.

***Lesson 5: Support the KEPA to fully institutionalize compliance and enforcement functions***

Compliance and enforcement functions required different modalities and different approach for implementation. While the KEPA is granted the authority for both functions, clear demarcation of the portfolios for both remains critical and requires additional efforts. ***Therefore,*** it is recommended to continue supporting the KEPA in institutionalizing compliance and enforcement functions as defined by the Enforcement and Compliance Policy Systems and Indicators report for the KEPA (August 2018).

***Lesson 6: Maintain the KEGI’s momentum***

The KEGI project has produced a number of valuable recommendations for the KEPA and for the environmental governance in Kuwait, in general. In the meantime, some of the project activities were carried out in a rush-mode with limited consultations. Additional consultations would be highly beneficial for the KEPA. In the meantime, the project has delivered multiple valuable analytical papers that have a potential to significantly inform the effectiveness of the KEPA’s work. ***Therefore,*** it is recommended to maintain the momentum created by the KEGI project and in consultations with the KEPA staff shape a new roadmap to elevate the KEPA’s work to a next quality level. Special attention should be paid to the recommendations produced to sharpen the links with SGDs and national development priorities.

***Lesson 7: Raise awareness of policy-makers on Green SDGs***

While building the KEPA’s capacities for environmental governance remains of high priority, the success of this endeavor would also depend on the traction for evidence-based policy-making and environmental data governance in Kuwait. This requires additional efforts towards raising awareness of the value of Green SDGs and their linkages with the national development priorities. ***Therefore,*** it is recommended to combine efforts for strengthening environmental governance in Kuwait with raising awareness on Green SDGs among high-level policy makers to create necessary synergies.

1. **Process specific lessons learned and recommendations**

***Lessons 8: Include no-cost inception phase in the project implementation***

When intervention modality is project-based, it implies that the project staff will be hired only when there is a formal agreement for funds allocation. The recruitment of the project staff takes from several weeks to several months usually and if not accounted as no-cost inception phase, this time will be taken from the implementation phase of the project creating unnecessary rush in the project implementation. ***Therefore,*** it is strongly recommended to negotiate with donors on no-cost inception phase to organize necessary preconditions for the project implementation including hiring project personnel.

***Lessons 9: Ensure feedback loops to beneficiary while supporting with analytical papers***

Quite often and for various reasons (not least, time limit) the analytical work is outsourced to external international expert. While it is required and ensured by the project quality control to produce analytical products in a highly consultative manner, it is of high importance to ensure feedback loops with the receiving organization. This implies, not simply to deliver report but ALWAYS organize a workshop and present the findings and explain the process, discuss the limitations and implications. ***Therefore,*** it is highly recommended to introduce new quality control mechanism to ensure the analytical work within any project (a) is carried out in highly consultative fashion, and (b) is concluded with a final workshop to present the findings and have a chance for the final reflection on the main recommendations. Also, ensure each analytical report has a 3-5-page summary that must be disseminated within the broader range of beneficiaries. In the case of this project, while one department of the KEPA might be interested in the details of an analytical report, another department might still benefit from the summary of the findings.

***Lessons 10: Ensure readiness assessment before engaging into One UN delivery modality***

This project has demonstrated that UN administrative system needs closer attention to ensure two (or more) UN agencies can work effectively and efficiently with each other. ***Therefore,*** before entering into partnership with another UN agency, it is critical to analyze and compare administrative requirements to identify conflicts and gaps and to address them in advance.

***Lessons 11: Check for conflict of interest with 3rd parties***

This project has demonstrated once again the criticality of checking the possible conflict of interests when awarding a contract to the 3rd party. This is also important for the possible liability issues to recover costs made in case of hidden conflict of interest has been discovered. ***Therefore,*** it is strongly recommended to ensure ‘conflict of interest’ check prior to signing any contract with the 3rd party.

1. **Governance related lessons learned and recommendations**

***Lessons 12: Escalate if project governance mechanism is not functioning***

The project governance mechanism was not functioning as it was deemed to function. This required timely intervention of the higher-level management. ***Therefore,*** it is recommended to detect early in the process if governance mechanism is not functioning and address it at the necessary level of seniority.

***Lessons 13: Ensure multiple focal points in complex NIM projects***

This project has demonstrated that when the communication and coordination within the national implementing partner dependents largely to one person, this is high risk implementation arrangement. While in some cases such arrangement might leverage more benefits, in the project where there are multiple thematic and implementation dimensions, it is highly recommended to consider appointing focal point for each thematic area. ***Therefore,*** in a complex NIM project, it is strongly recommend to ensure National Coordinator and a council of focal points with clear division of responsibilities and clear line of communication.

# Annexes

## Annex 1: List of documents reviewed

* UNDP Evaluation Policy, 2016
* United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards for Evaluation, 2016
* OECD – DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, 2010
* UNDP KEGI Project Document
* Kuwait Vision 2030
* UNDP Country Programme Document 2015 – 2018
* UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017
* Project quarterly progress reports
* UN to UN Agreement between the UNDP Kuwait and UNEP
* National Adaptation Plan
* Kuwait SDG Portal: Best practices and recommendations
* Training needs assessment SDG Kuwait
* National Capacity Self-Assessment for Global Environmental Management
* Thematic Assessment Report Implementation of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Kuwait
* Thematic Assessment Report: Implementation of the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity In Kuwait
* Thematic Assessment Report: Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification In Kuwait
* Capacity Development Action Plan for Kuwait (Draft Framework)
* MapX Support to the Kuwait Environment Public Authority

## Annex 2: Key Definitions

***Evaluation:*** is an assessment, as systematic and impartial as possible, of an activity, project, programme, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area, institutional performance, etc. It focuses on expected and achieved accomplishments, examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality, in order to understand achievements or the lack thereof. It aims at determining the relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of interventions and contributions of the organizations of the United Nation System. Evaluation informs the programme planning, budgeting, implementation and reporting cycle. (UN Habitat Evaluation Policy 2013).

***Theory of change:*** Theory of Change describes how change is assumed to come about through intervention in a prevailing situation. (DFID Guidance Note: Developing a Theory of Change)

***Capacity development:*** the process by which individuals, groups and organizations, institutions and countries develop enhance and organize their systems, resources and knowledge; all reflected in their abilities, individually and collectively, to perform functions, solve problems and achieve objectives. (OECD-DAC - Guidelines and Reference Series Applying Strategic Environmental Assessment: Good Practice Guidance for Development Co-operation, OECD, Paris, 2006)

## Annex 3: Evaluation Framework Matrix: questions, respondents, indicators and data sources

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Question** | **Indicators** | **Data Sources** |
| *UNDP* | *GSSCPD* | *KEPA* | *UNEP* |  |  |
| ***Relevance*** |
| 1. Was the project ToC realistic given the budget, the baseline situation and the global context? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| 2. To what extent were project objectives consistent with international strategies (Sendai, SDGs, Paris Agreement)?  |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| 3. To what extent were project objectives consistent with national strategies and priorities? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| 4. How useful are the project results for the KEPA and other beneficiaries? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| 5. Were changes in the result context reflected in the project design? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| ***Effectiveness*** |
| 1. What is perceived and factual progress towards project objectives? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| 2. What are the factors and processing affecting the achievement of the project results? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the projectSurveyCase study | Interviews,Project Reports |
| 3. How effective are the partnership established within the project? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| 4. To what extend has KEPA improved its capacities towards improved environmental governance? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| 5. How adaptive was the project management throughout its implementation? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| ***Efficiency*** |
| 1. Were the required progress and financial reports prepared satisfactorily and submitted on schedule?  |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| 2. Was the staffing policy efficient? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| 3. To what extent did the delay in implementation affect the delivery of the project outcomes?  |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| ***Sustainability*** |
| 1. What is technical sustainability of the tools developed by the project? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the projectSurveyCase study | Interviews,Project ReportsQuestionnaires |
| 2. What are the factors affecting or likely to affect sustainability of the results? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the projectSurveyCase study | Interviews,Project ReportsQuestionnaires |
| 3. How the project supports capacity and capability development at KEPA? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the projectSurveyCase study | Interviews,Project ReportsQuestionnaires |
| 4. What is governance sustainability of the implementation model proposed by the project? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the projectSurveyCase study | Interviews,Project ReportsQuestionnaires |
| 5. How financially sustainable are the institutions what will take the results of the project further? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the projectSurveyCase study | Interviews,Project ReportsQuestionnaires |
| ***Impact*** |
| 1. What are the capacities the project supported? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| 2. What are the impact multipliers for this project? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| ***Coherence*** |
| 1. Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation?  |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the projectSurveyCase study | Interviews,Project ReportsQuestionnaires |
| 2. To what extent all implementation partners could formulate clear strategies on how they cooperate within the project? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |
| 3. How KEPA benefited from this partnership? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception, | Interviews,Project |
| 4. How appropriate are the financial modalities used? |  |  |  |  | Responders perception,Level of progress within the project | Interviews,Project Reports |

## Annex 4: List of responders

***Ali Alyousifi,*** Programme Liaison Officer

***Lateefah Alwazzan,*** Programme Analyst, Sustainable Development, UNDP Kuwait

***Samia Alduaij,*** Former Project Manager

***Fatma Bo khamseen***, GSSCPD staff

***Noura Alrashid,*** GSSCPD staff

***Faten Almusallam,*** KEPA Strategic Planning Department and Project National Coordinator

***Maryam Al Abdulmuhsin***, eMISK Department

***Shafi Trumboo,*** eMISK Department

***Hanan Malallah,*** Climate Change Department

***Shaima’a Alsaffar,*** Statistic Department

**Shreefa Alsalem, Head of the Department of Wildlife**

***Nadia Alsager,*** Biodiversity Department

***Eman Bahbahane,*** Biodiversity Department

***Dr. Walid Ali,*** Regional Climate Change Specialist Climate Change and DRR Team, Regional Hub in Amman, Regional Bureau for Arab States, UNDP

***Stephen Gitonga,*** Regional Sustainable Energy Specialist, Climate Change and DRR Team, Regional Hub in Amman, Regional Bureau for Arab States, UNDP

***Dr. Nasser Alyoub,*** data consultant, GIS GPC

***Theresa Dearden,*** Junior Analyst, eMESK, UNEP

***Mohammad J. Alatoom,*** international consultant

***Sabine Sakr,*** UN Environment Project Manager

***Abdelmenam Mohamed,*** UN Environment Project Manager

***Mark Sorensen***, Director GIS GPC

## Annex 5: UNDP/KEPA awareness raising campaign: evaluation survey key findings

1. ***Recall of the campaign was high,*** with over a quarter of all respondents (27%) saying they could definitely remember seeing the campaign.
2. ***There was strong support for the campaign message*** at 92% said that they supported the central message of environmental protection.
3. ***While the main focus of the campaign was to raise awareness, the campaign also prompted people to act on their awareness.*** 43% said they had sought out more information about the environment and 28% said they had told family and friends about environmental problems in Kuwait.
4. ***This appetite for further action was found across both the expat and Kuwaiti populations*** indicating a campaign which was engaging to both groups.
5. ***The campaign inspired both optimism and a sense of urgency reflecting the immediacy of the problem.*** 37% of those who recalled the campaign felt happy/optimistic, with 17% saying they felt worried/sad.
6. ***The sources of campaign exposure identified in the survey were mostly consistent with the media plan,*** with Facebook, YouTube and Instagram appearing as the major sources of exposure to the campaign.
1. <https://epi.envirocenter.yale.edu> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://www.epa.org.kw> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.scpd.gov.kw> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <http://www.kw.undp.org/content/kuwait/en/home/about-us.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <http://www.unenvironment.org> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/policy/2016/Evaluation_policy_EN_2016.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <http://www.uneval.org/document/guidance-documents> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. <http://www.newkuwait.gov.kw/home.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <https://strategicplan.undp.org> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. <https://www.cbd.int> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <https://www.unccd.int> [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. <https://unfccc.int> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. <https://www.cites.org/eng> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. <http://www.basel.int> [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. <https://ozone.unep.org> [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. [http://www.imo.org/en/About/Conventions/ListOfConventions/Pages/International-Convention-for-the-Prevention-of-Pollution-from-Ships-(MARPOL).aspx](http://www.imo.org/en/About/Conventions/ListOfConventions/Pages/International-Convention-for-the-Prevention-of-Pollution-from-Ships-%28MARPOL%29.aspx) [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. <http://www.pops.int> [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. <https://thegpcgroup.com> [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/memberstates/kuwait> [↑](#footnote-ref-19)