





TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Low Emission and Climate Resilient Development (LECRD) project

Submitted by: Dr.Laban MacOpiyo (Team Leader) labanmacopiyo@gmail.com Dr.Lubanga Makanji lubangamakanji@gmail.com

August, 2020

Contents

LIST	List of Abbreviations and Acronyms					
Exe	Executive summary					
S	trate	gic-Level Results	6			
P	rogra	ammatic-Level Results	7			
1.	Intr	oduction	11			
2.	Eva	luation Methods	11			
3.	The	LECRD Project	15			
3	.1.	Context	15			
3	.2.	Objective and components	15			
3	.3.	Project implementation structures and partners	18			
3	.4.	Adaptive management (changes in design during implementation)	18			
3	.5.	Project Financing	20			
4.	The	ory of Change at Evaluation and Analysis of the Results Framework	21			
5.	Eva	luation Findings	23			
		-	20			
5	.1.	Strategic Relevance	23			
5 5	.1. .2.	Strategic Relevance	23 23 24			
5 5 5	5.1. 5.2. 5.3.	Strategic Relevance Effectiveness Efficiency	23 24 34			
5 5 5 5	.1. .2. .3.	Strategic Relevance	23 24 34 36			
5 5 5 6.	5.1. 5.2. 5.3. 5.4. Con	Strategic Relevance Effectiveness Efficiency Sustainability clusions and Recommendations	23 24 34 36 38			
5 5 5 6.	.1. .2. .3. .4. Con	Strategic Relevance Effectiveness Efficiency Sustainability clusions and Recommendations	23 24 34 36 38 38			
5 5 6. 6	5.1. 5.2. 5.4. Con 5.1. 5.2.	Strategic Relevance	23 24 34 36 38 38 38 42			
5 5 6. 6 6	5.1. 5.2. 5.4. Con 5.1. 5.2.	Strategic Relevance	23 24 34 36 38 38 42 43			
5 5 6. 6 6 6 7	5.1. 5.2. 5.4. Con 5.1. 5.2. 5.3. nex I.	Strategic Relevance	23 24 34 36 38 38 42 43 45			
5 5 5 6. 6 6 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	5.1. 5.2. 5.4. Con 5.1. 5.2. 5.3. nex I.	Strategic Relevance Effectiveness Efficiency Sustainability clusions and Recommendations Conclusions Lessons learned Recommendations List of documents consulted.	23 24 34 36 38 38 42 43 45 47			
5 5 5 6. 6 6 7 7 8 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	5.1. 5.2. 5.3. Con 5.1. 5.2. 5.3. nex I. nex II.	Strategic Relevance	 23 24 34 36 38 38 42 43 45 47 48 			

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

AEZ	Agro-Eco zones
ASALs	Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
ATAR	Adaptation Technical Analysis Report
AWS	Automatic Weather Station
ALIN	Arid Lands Information Network
СС	Climate Change
CCD	Climate Change Directorate
CCE	Crop Cutting Experiments
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCF	Climate Change Fund
CCTWG	Climate Change Thematic Working Group
COVID 19	Corona Virus Disease 2019
CS	Cabinet Secretary
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
CEBIC	Community Education Business and Information Centre
CTCN	Climate Technology Centre & Network
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DFIF	Department for International Development (UK)
DRSRS	Directorate of Remote Sensing and Resource Surveys
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EAC	East African Community
GIA	Green Innovations Award
GGEP	Green Growth and Employment Project
GHG	Green House Gases
GIZ	The German Agency for International Cooperation
GOK	Government of Kenya
GOVTS	Governments
HPC	High Performance Cluster
ICT	Information Communication Technology
IECC	Integrated Environment and Climate Change Project of USAID
IFMIS	Integrated Financial Management Information System
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development
IMTR	Institute for Meteorological Training and Research
INDC	Intended Nationally Determined Contributions
JKUAT	Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology
KAIRM	Kenya Agriculture Insurance & Risk Management Programme Document (KAIRM)
KEPSA	Kenya Private Sector Alliance
KEREA	Kenya Renewable Energy Association
KFS	Kenya Forestry Service
KIRDI	Kenya Industrial Research and Development Institute
KTN	Kenya Television Network
KU	Kenyatta University
KIRDI	Kenya Industrial Research Development Institute
KAM	Kenya Association of Manufacturers
KMD	Kenya Meteorological Department
MEPS	Minimum Energy Performance Standards

Mpesa	Mobile banking service used to store and transfer money through mobile phones
MTAR	Mitigation Technical Analysis Report
MTP	Medium Term Plan
KALRO	Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization
KSG	Kenya School of Government
LED	Light Emitting Diode
LECB	Low Emission Capacity Building
LECRD	Low Emission and Climate Resilient Development Project
LFA	Log Frame Analysis
LMIC	Lower-Middle Income Economy
MEF	Ministry of Environment and Forestry
MTP III	Third Medium Term Plan (2018-2022) of Kenya's Vision 2030
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NCCRC	National Climate Change Resource Centre
NCCRS	National Climate Change Response Strategy
NCCAP	National Climate Change Action Plan
NDC	Nationally Determined Contributions
NEMA	National Environment Management Authority
NETFUND	National Environment Trust Fund
NITA	National Industrial Training Agency
PAD	Project Appraisal Document (USAID)
PMU	Project Management Unit
PV	PhotoVoltaic
ProDoc	Project Document
RCMRD	Regional Centre for Mapping of Resources for Development
RIAT	Ramogi Institute of Advanced Technology
RMG	Results Management Guidelines
TE	Technical Evaluation
TNC	Third National Communication to UNFCCC
ТОС	Theory of Change
TTI	Technical Training Institute
TVET	Technical and Vocational Training
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention On Climate Change
UoN	University of Nairobi
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	United States Dollars

Executive summary

This Terminal Evaluation is undertaken on completion of the "Low Emission and Climate Resilient Development (LECRD)" project in Kenya. The evaluation set out to assess the project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability. The evaluation has two primary purposes: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge- sharing through results and lessons learned among UNDP, the Government of Kenya, USAID and other implementation partners. The evaluation further aims to identify lessons of operational relevance for future project formulation and implementation.

The goal of the project implemented over the last 5 years (from 22nd September 2014 to 21st February 2020) was to support Kenya's efforts to pursue long-term, transformative development and accelerate sustainable climate resilient economic growth, whilst slowing the growth of greenhouse gas emissions. The stated objectives of the project were to strengthen capacity for low emission development in Kenya, build national and county-level institutions' capacity to better coordinate climate change activities and finances, enhance decision making for increased resilience to climate change impacts and to promote climate-smart technologies and business opportunities.

LECRD was funded through a USAID grant to United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (PIO Grant # AID-615-IO-14-00006) and implemented through a National Execution (NEX) modality with the National Climate Change Secretariat (NCCS) under the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MEF), in its official role as the coordinator of all climate change affairs in Kenya. A Project Management Unit (PMU) based in the MEF managed the project. The PMU reported to Energy Environment and Climate Change section at UNDP, Kenya, Principal Secretary, the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources and to the USAID/Kenya Environment Office.

The NEX modality of implementation with the National Climate Change Secretariat (NCCS) under the Ministry of Environment and Forestry involved several Responsible parties (RPs) including Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT), Kenya Industrial Research Development Institute, Implementing Partners (IPs) such as the , Arid Lands Information Network (ALIN, NETFUND, Kenya School of Government and Green Africa and Implementing partners such as Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO), Kenya Meteorological Department, the Media Council of Kenya, The Ministry of Agriculture Livestock and Fisheries, Energy Regulatory Commission and the National Treasury. The project's total funding was 8,795,427 (USD) with a contribution of 8,445,427(USD) from USAID.

The project offered comprehensive technical assistance across the following 10 key result areas:

- 1. Strengthen the national climate change coordination processes;
- 2. Contribute toward enhancing access to clean and efficient energy systems;
- 3. Support development of a national sustainable greenhouse gas inventory system;
- 4. Facilitate improved national and county decision making on climate change interventions;
- 5. Support capacity building of climate knowledge management system;
- 6. Minimize the impact of extreme climate events for improved and resilient livelihoods.
- 7. Kenya leverages funding from private sector to implement NDC
- 8. Domestic entrepreneurship and innovation to reduce emissions and improve resilience promoted
- 9. Energy efficiency in the public sector promoted
- 10. Renewable energy business promoted

These components provided a comprehensive approach for creating an environment conducive to enhancing low carbon climate resilient development in Kenya, addressing the major challenges of green economic growth and strengthening policies, regulations and institutions.

Evaluation Findings and Conclusions

Strategic-Level Results

LECRD has made notable contributions in promoting and supporting Kenya's institutions, policies, strategies, plans and or regulations addressing climate change (mitigation, adaption) and environmental governance thus creating an enabling environment for improved public services for and resilience to climate change. The project has modeled a number of approaches, mechanisms, services and demonstrated important results in implementation settings and pilots across all climate action planning sectors during its implementation. Significantly more sustained work is required to take advantage of the momentum created for institutionalizing and up-scaling to ensure sustainability of results.

UNDP has maintained a close relationship with the Government of Kenya and is strategically positioned to respond to the needs of the government institutions. However, the demand driven approach of its work sometimes results in multitude of interventions within a loosely defined theory of change and limited cross-sectoral linkages, a weakness that can undermine the outcomes of its programmes. The LECRD programme however demonstrated how effective a programme can be when effective cross-sectoral linkages are created as it succeeded in bringing a large number of actors and sectors under the umbrella of one programme. It was however noted that LECRD did not substantially invest efforts in coordination with other UN agencies, resulting in partial utilization of the partnership potential. However, the establishment of the CCTWG launched during the course of the review of the Kenya's Third Medium Term Plan (MTP III) and which can bring a broad range of stakeholders (including UN agencies) has the potential and is an excellent opportunity to enhance coordination and explore synergies to enhance the cumulative impact of climate change programming in the country. MTP III includes climate change as a crosscutting issue, and climate change is mainstreamed in the relevant sectors.

The programme attempted to foster cooperation modalities to enhance Kenya's profile as a regional/global player by sharing its best practices, experiences and results in addressing climate change (mitigation and adaption) and reducing emissions at international conferences, exhibitions etc. While this has strengthened Kenya's positioning and recognition as a regional and global player in this area, the sustainability of these efforts, which are still in their early stages, are unclear and there is need to seek more active collaboration and cooperation in resilience programming with countries within the region (i.e. EAC, IGAD regions) where climate change impacts are much closer to home.

Kenya's LMIC status, declining core resources (especially within the landscape of COVID-19 Pandemic), and a shrinking landscape of donors presents climate change programming such as LECRD with a demand to be innovative and diversify resource portfolios. The government and development partners remain the largest contributors to climate change programming. There is need to explore other partnerships e.g. with the private sector to make such programmes less vulnerable from the standpoint of financial stability.

LECRD made some early strides in bringing about system level changes in the manner climate change and resilience programming addresses issues of gender and rights of most vulnerable groups, especially pastoral communities. While the work in these areas has been commendable and brought important results in the way the government views, addresses and protects rights of marginalized communities and integrates

gender in policies, the results are still delicate and dependent on political and institutional commitment, resources and willingness to invest in addressing long rooted inequalities and social norms.

Engagement of County Governments is critical to ensure ownership and buy-in. Many of the actions will be delivered at the County level and the inputs of the Counties have informed the development of NCCAP 2018-2022 as supported by LECRD

Recommendations

- 1. *Recommendation 1*. There is need to build on the achievements of LECRD and deepen engagement to upscale and institutionalize the results by strengthening existing partnerships and engaging with other non-traditional partners.
- 2. *Recommendation 2.* There is need to continue investing in critical areas where support was initiated during the project cycle especially in the enhancement of national/county climate change coordination processes and also capacity building that is focused on improving national and county-level decision making on climate change interventions.
- 3. *Recommendation 3.* There is need to continue spearheading initiatives for empowerment of women, the marginalized groups and civil society to take more active role in decision making processes based on lessons learned and results of interventions in the areas achieved thus far by the project.
- 4. *Recommendation 3 to UNDP*. UNDP needs to consolidate its country support portfolio of climate change and resilience programming and ensure effective coordination with other UN agencies to ascertain that each agency contributes to its area of strongest comparative advantage in case of any future programming.

Programmatic-Level Results

Strategic relevance: The promotion of low carbon climate resilient development in Kenya remains consistent with the implementation of the Government of Kenya's National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) (2013-2017), and now (NCCAP 2018 – 2022). The project scope and aspirations are also highly relevant to the national priorities of the country and partners including the United nations. Relevance is reinforced by the significant number of complementary initiatives within the key result areas that are aligned with the project.

Quality of project design: The project was found to be well designed and well-timed to drive critical Climate Change Action planning in the country including support for CCD, climate financing mechanisms, NDC's Third National Communication to UNFCCC (specifically the GHG inventory). The broad mixture of interventions was well chosen to create a comprehensive enabling platform for mainstreaming climate resilient practices among the various sectors. Weaknesses in the design related to (i) an over ambitious scope and delivery targets given the available timelines; and (ii) heavy reliance on Government partners and slow bureaucratic processes to progress key delivery milestones. The establishment of the steering committee structure composed of MEF, UNDP and USAID meant that high profile government representation could be fully leveraged for support and sponsorship.

Effectiveness (attainment of project objectives and results): The project successfully established a highly credible institutional framework and knowledge base that will continue to inform policy, planning and development decisions in Kenya potentially also other countries. The portfolio of resources developed for training, standards, curricula, communication and awareness creation is extensive, creating a comprehensive platform for learning and informing future direction by all role players.

LECRD has supported the strengthening of the national climate change institutions and coordination processes including supporting the operationalizing a comprehensive institutional framework, the Climate Change Directorate (CCD). Among other key results, the project was instrumental in developing Kenya's ambitious Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) submitted to UNFCCC in July 2015. The project supported the preparation of a briefing paper to inform the Government of Kenya on the signing of the Paris Agreement, which was signed on April 22, 2016 in New York at the United Nations. Additionally, the project fully supported the process of establishing National GHG inventory system by preparing among others institutional arrangements to produce accurate and verifiable GHG emission factors from livestock and crop production, and land-use change. A national Measurement Reporting and Verification (MRV) system for Kenya has been developed to facilitate tracking and reporting on climate actions and means of implementation.

Capacity has also been developed at national and county levels on mainstreaming climate change into national and county policy, planning and budgetary processes. Toward this end, a curriculum and course administered by the Kenya School of Government has been developed.

Whilst the activities of the National Climate Change Council have been delayed due to various external factors, the project provided valuable support to the Climate Change Directorate (CCD) and other relevant institutions towards the implementation of the Climate Change Act (CCA), 2016.

The project managed to enhance access to clean and efficient energy systems by supporting capacity development of ten (10) Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVETs) Institutes for training on solar photovoltaic and solar water heating installation, maintenance and repair. Also supported was the development of Minimum Energy Performance Standards and the establishment of a testing and research facility at KIRDI.

In the area of climate knowledge management, the Project equipped and operationalized the National Climate Change Resource Centre (NCCRC) that acts as an information hub and clearing house to coordinate and disseminate climate data, information and knowledge. The project constructed and equipped a Community Education Business and Information Centre (CEBIC).

In order to minimize the impacts of extreme climate, the project enhanced the capacity for production and dissemination timely and reliable early warning information on extreme climate events such as floods and droughts by enhancing the capacity of the Kenya Meteorological Department (KMD).

The project has further promoted domestic entrepreneurship and innovation by stimulating climate smart technologies and promoting adoption of climate smart technologies, including the use of biogas, solar, recycled biomass and clean cook stoves.

LECRD has also demonstrated some success with influencing the leveraging complementary initiatives and funding to widen its scope of activities and sphere of influence by getting USAID to provide additional funding during the course of the completed project and having the government (The National Treasury) institutionalize climate finance with leadership from the Treasury. Efforts to strengthen funding for implementation of NDC's through inclusive budget allocation need to be sustained.

Despite not all outcomes being met in full, a robust platform has been established consisting of a sound capacity development platform and knowledge base, a high-level legal and institutional framework,

growing voluntary support for activities at local level by implementing partners and creation of awareness among stakeholders.

Efficiency: The project execution has been slow, facing challenges with recruiting and retaining suitable team members and a high turnover of the chief accounting officers (Principal Secretaries) and Project managers (UNDP). Ineffective and protracted support services such as procurement within MEF also meant that the project faced significant delays.

Sustainability: The evaluation found adequate evidence that socio-political commitment, financial resources and institutional capacity had been created to ensure sustainability into the future.

Lessons learned and recommendations

Four lessons were noted that may be useful for future projects of a similar nature.

- 1. *Lesson 1*: The National Execution (NEX) modality of implementation under the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MEF), with a steering committee composed of MEF, UNDP and USAID proved to be an appropriate governance structure.
- 2. *Lesson 2*: The heavy reliance on the Government affected performance due to the slow bureaucratic processes that hindered the delivery on key milestones. A hybrid mechanism may be appropriate for similar projects in future.
- 3. *Lesson 3*: Capacity development activities such as curriculum developed at KSG and at TIVETS are good models for entrenching long term relevant capacity within institutions and ascertaining that the project has a lasting impact.
- 4. *Lesson 4*: Impact monitoring is critical to quantify the collective impact of activities due to the technical assistance as it was difficult to establish early signs of impact attributed to the programme.
- 5. *Lesson 5*: For cost-effective capacity building, LECRD fostered internship initiatives for university postgraduate students to provide them with practical experience in climate change programming. This initiative has increased both human and research capacity in the area of climate change in the country. Many of these interns have gone ahead and become practicing experts in their own fields and are supporting climate action planning within the country. This is a model that should be replicated in similar future programmes.

Recommendations

- Recommendation 1: It is highly recommended that the entire knowledge base and portfolio of resources for communication, training and awareness created by this project, be curated and made available online given that it currently very hard to find all the resources from the very many activities of this project. This is where the National Climate Change Resource Centre (NCCRC), University and Institutional partners and Community Education Business and Information Centre (CEBIC) could play a significant role. This should be easy and quick to implement, with limited cost implications and will make a significant contribution to the longevity and wider impact of the project.
- 2. This knowledge base should be consolidated as soon as possible in a place that will be accessible for the foreseeable future.
- 3. *Recommendation 2:* It is recommended that the standards, rating tools, fact sheets etc. developed under the project e.g. Green Building Standards for Kenya be piloted immediately and additional funds leveraged for this purpose to ensure they serve their purpose as demonstration projects with aim mainstreaming them into regular programming in the future.

- 4. *Recommendation 3:* Aligned with the above, it is further recommended that efforts be made to leverage further funding through the project, and help unlock or crowd in development partners or complementary projects by leveraging the initial gains of the project to support the activities that have been started under various key results areas. This seems to be an area where the project has excelled with seed funding for example already coming into the tune of 350,000 (USD) from France and DFID to support the Kenyan Climate Change Adaptation (KCCAP) Programme.
- 5. *Recommendation 4:* As a priority, provide support for the completion of operationalization of the activities of National Climate Change Council which was envisaged as an output in the Key Result Area 1. The council is at the apex of coordination and guidance in implementation of obligations and functions under the Climate Change Act, 2016. Therefore, its establishment and operationalization is a priority to ensure that it takes charge of the process of legislative implementation and preserve the gains that have already been achieved under LECRD such as the strengthening of the CCD, the secretariat to the council.

Overall, the project receives a **Satisfactory** rating in the terminal evaluation. The respective project ratings are summarized below.

Evaluation criteria	Rating
Relevance	Relevant
Effectiveness	Moderately Satisfactory
Efficiency	Moderately unsatisfactory
Likelihood of Impact	Significant
Overall Project Outcome Rating	Moderately Satisfactory
Capacity Development	Highly Satisfactory
Financial Management	Satisfactory
Policy and Regulatory Frameworks	Satisfactory
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	Moderately Likely
M&E design at entry	Highly Satisfactory
Overall Quality of M&E	Moderately Satisfactory
Gender Mainstreaming Strategy at entry	Highly Satisfactory
Gender Mainstreaming at Implementation	Moderately Satisfactory

1. Introduction

This report presents the findings of the Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP Project "Low Emission and Climate Resilient Development (LECRD) project.

LECRD is a signature project of Ministry of Environment and Forestry of the in partnership with UNDP's Environment and Resilience unit that has been implemented over the last 5 years (from 22nd September 2014 to 21st February 2020) to support Kenya's climate change programs

The project was designed with the goal of supporting Kenya's efforts to pursue long-term, transformative development and accelerate sustainable climate resilient economic growth, whilst slowing the growth of greenhouse gas emissions.

The specific objectives of the project were to strengthen capacity for low emission development in Kenya; build national and county institutions' capacity to better coordinate climate change activities and finances; enhance decision making for increased resilience to climate change impacts and promote climate smart technologies and business opportunities.

The project is funded through a USAID grant to United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (PIO Grant # AID-615-IO-14-00006) to the tune 8,445,427(USD).

2. Evaluation Methods

In accordance with UNDP M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. The objective of the evaluation was to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits of the LECRD project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. This evaluation assessed the project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determined outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability. The objectives of the evaluation were two-fold: (i) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and (ii) to promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNDP the Government of Kenya, and USAID. The expectation is therefore that the evaluation will identify lessons of operational relevance for future project formulation and implementation.

Scope & Methodology

The Methodology used to conduct this final evaluation is compliant with international criteria and professional norms and standards; including the norms and standards, adopted by the UN Evaluation Group.

i. Overall Approach

The evaluation was conducted by two Independent Consultants in accordance with the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance¹. It was undertaken in-line with principles: independence, impartiality, transparency, disclosure, ethical, competencies/capacities, partnership, credibility and utility.

¹ Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Results, UNDP (2009); UNEG Norms & Standards for Evaluation, 2016; UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference and Inception Reports, UNEG/G(2010)1; UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports, UNEG/G(2010)/2.

The evaluation team developed evaluation tools that were structured around six major evaluation criteria which are internationally accepted and as set out by OECD2. There are:

- RELEVANCE relates to an overall assessment of whether the project is in keeping with donor's and partner policies, with national and local needs and priorities as well as with its design.
- EFFECTIVENESS, a measure of the extent to which formally agreed expected project results (outcomes) have been achieved, or can be expected to be achieved.
- EFFICIENCY, a measure of the productivity of the project intervention process, i.e. to what degree the outcomes achieved derive from efficient use of financial, human and material resources.
- IMPACTS are the long-term results of the project and include both positive and negative consequences, whether these are foreseen and expected, or not.
- SUSTAINABILITY is an indication of whether the outcomes (end of project results) and the positive impacts (long term results) are likely to continue after the project ends.
- GENDER MAINSTREAMING involves the integration of a gender perspective into the preparation, design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policies, regulatory measures and spending programmes, with a view to promoting equality between women and men, and combating discrimination.

In addition, the knowledge of and expertise of the Consultants on Kenya's Climate Resilience discourse was applied, including methodological principles such as:

Validity of information: multiple measures and sources were sought out (triangulation) to ensure that the results are accurate and valid;

Respect and anonymity: all participants had the right to provide information in confidence.

The evaluation was conducted following a set of steps presented in the Figure below.

Figure 1: Steps Followed During the Evaluation.



 $^{^2}$ OECD DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance – $\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$ OECD 1991.

ii. Evaluation Instruments

The evaluation findings presented here were triangulated through "multiple lines of evidence" using several evaluation tools and gathering information from different types of stakeholders. The following evaluation instruments were used:

Documentation Review: The Consultants conducted a thorough document review (see Annex 1). A list of documents were identified during the start-up phase and further searches were done through the web and with recommendations from stakeholders through the process of snowballing/chain-referral.

Evaluation Matrix: An evaluation matrix was developed based on the evaluation scope presented in the TOR, the project log-frame and the review of key project documents (see Annex 3). This matrix is structured along the five evaluation criteria and includes all evaluation questions; including the scope presented in the TORs. The matrix provided overall directions for the evaluation and was used as a basis for interviewing people and reviewing project documents.

Interview Guide: Based on the evaluation matrix, an interview guide was developed to solicit information from stakeholders.

Interviews: Multiple stakeholders were interviewed (see Annex 2). The semi-structured interviews were conducted using an interview guide adapted for each interviewee (e.g. each implementation partner had an interview guide that was tailored to the areas of activities they contributed to in the LECRD project). All interviews were conducted via teleconferencing (due to the COVID-19 situation), email or phone as needed. Confidentiality was guaranteed to the interviewees.

Achievement Rating: The Consultants rated project achievements according to the UNDP project review criteria with rating scale shown in Table 1.

Code	Rubric for assigning rating for each criteria	Value	Code	Rubric for assigning rating for each criteria	Value
Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E,			Sustaind	ability ratings:	
ana Gen	laer Mainstreaming				
HS	Highly Satisfactory: no shortcomings	6	L	Likely: negligible risks to sustainability	4
S	Satisfactory: minor shortcomings	5	ML	Moderately Likely: moderate risks	3
MS	Moderately Satisfactory: some shortcomings	4	MU	Moderately Unlikely: significant risks	2
MU	Moderately Unsatisfactory: significant shortcomings	3	U	Unlikely: severe risks	1
U	Unsatisfactory: major problems	2	Relevance ratings:		
HU	Highly Unsatisfactory: severe problems	1	R	Relevant	2
Impact Ratings:			NR Not relevant		1
S	Significant	3	Additional ratings where relevant:		
М	Minimal	2	N/A	Not Applicable	-
Ν	Negligible	1	U/A	Unable to Assess	-

Table 1: UNDP project review criteria.

iii. Evaluation Users and Stakeholders

This Terminal Evaluation was initiated by UNDP-Kenya who is the primary stakeholder. Other stakeholders include the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, the Project team, USAID, the Climate Change Directorate and other implementation partners such as the National Environment Trust Fund (NETFUND), Kenya Industrial Research Development Institute (KIRDI), The Jomo Kenyatta University of Agricultural Technology, The Green Africa Foundation, Kenya Meteorological Department, The National Treasury,

Kenya Renewable Energy Association (KEREA), The Arid Lands Information Network, all of whom were implementation partners on the project.

iv. Limitations and Constraints

The findings and conclusions contained in this report rely primarily on a very tight 40-day period of the assignment within which desk review of project documents, internet information collation, a brief four-day field visit to 4-project locations and 21 teleconference meetings with project implementation partners and other key informants was undertaken. Within the limited time allocated to this final evaluation, the consultants were unable to conduct much more detailed assessments and make follow-ups with a variety of other potential stakeholders. It is also important to highlight that the evaluation was undertaken during the COVID-19 Pandemic which restricted travels to many of the project sites and precluded the more effective face-to-face interviews with key stakeholders.

3. The LECRD Project

3.1. Context

Kenya is highly vulnerable to climate change impacts and this poses a serious threat to socioeconomic development. The country has experienced frequent and unpredictable weather conditions such as droughts and floods that have devastating effects on the country's ecosystems and the economy. Indeed, it is estimated that the annual cost of climate change impacts could cost as much as US\$500 million a year (equivalent to approximately 2.6 percent of the country's GDP). The country is mainly Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs) which constitutes 88% of the country's land mass; with a total human population projected at 50 million. Close to 45% of the population lives below the poverty line with poverty levels higher in female led households making them more vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. The Government of Kenya (GOK) made a commitment to low carbon climate resilient development pathway as articulated in the first and second National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP), third Medium Term Plan (MTP III), The Climate Change Act, 2016 and Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan (GESIP 2016-2030).

While Kenya is still a relatively low-emitter of Greenhouse Gases (GHGs), its emissions are expected to rise as Kenya continues to develop rapidly. In the agriculture and energy sectors, for example, it is estimated that the rise in CO2 emissions will rise from 12million tonnes in 2012 to 24.3million tonnes in 2030. This increase in GHG emissions will be especially sharp if emphasis is not placed on low-emission growth. While Kenya is currently under no international obligation to lower its emissions, the Government of Kenya (GoK) has expressed a commitment to green growth and an interest in developing a low carbon economy that meets its development goals.

The GOK has articulated its economic development and climate change goals and strategies in several documents, including Vision 2030, the Least Cost Power Development Plan (LCPDP), National Climate Change Response Strategy (NCCRS) and the National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP). The NCCAP serves the purpose of implementing the NCCRS as well as the second set of 5-year medium term sectoral plans (MTPII). The Constitution of Kenya 2010 has devolved functions of planning and environmental management to the county governments. Implementation of climate change activities will therefore take place within the counties. For this reason, the county governments need capacity strengthening in order to better undertake these new functions. Kenya is in the process of finalizing the National Climate Change Bill and Policy. The policy will facilitate a coordinated, coherent and effective response to the local, national and global challenges that climate change presents.

The LECRD project built upon the results of UNDP's Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP) and Low Emission Capacity Building (LECB) Programmes implemented by the then Ministry of Environment, Water and Natural Resources (now Ministry of Environment and Forestry).

3.2. Objective and components

LECRD project supported Kenya's efforts to pursue long-term, transformative development and accelerate sustainable climate resilient economic growth, while slowing the growth of greenhouse gas emissions. Activities under the LECRD and NDC Support programme were to contribute towards the realization of

specific outputs at the country level on supporting implementation of the Climate Change Act, 2016 and implementation of the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC).

The project's support was further designed to support Kenya's effort to reduce emissions and increase the resilience of people and ecosystems. Kenya aims to undertake an ambitious mitigation contribution towards the 2015 Paris Agreement. It sought to abate its GHG emissions by 30% by 2030 relative to the BAU scenario of 143 MtCO2eq; and in line with its sustainable development agenda. Kenya would ensure enhanced resilience to climate change towards the attainment of Vision 2030 by mainstreaming climate change adaptation into the Medium Term Plans (MTPs) and implementing adaptation actions.

The climate change Act, 2016 stipulates a new climate change institutional framework that brings on board the National Climate Change Council as the highest decision making organ and establishes a Climate Change Directorate (CCD), in the ministry responsible for climate change affairs. The project would further support the operationalization of the Act including the capacity development of institutions and processes that the Act stipulates, which will facilitate implementation of the NDC.

The project would also support government efforts towards implementation of the NDC. It would facilitate development of a strategy to catalyze private sector investment in the implementation of climate change, in addition to support establishment of the Climate Change Fund in line with the Climate Change Act 2016, including management and coordination of climate finance in both national and county governments.

The specific objectives of the project were to strengthen capacity for low emission development in Kenya; build national and county institutions' capacity to better coordinate climate change activities and finances; enhance decision making for increased resilience to climate change impacts and promote climate smart technologies and business opportunities.

The key result areas of LECRD project as per the agreement (PIO Grant # AID-615-IO-14-00006) are:

- 1. Strengthen the national climate change coordination processes;
- 2. Contribute toward enhancing access to clean and efficient energy systems;
- 3. Support development of a national sustainable greenhouse gas inventory system;
- 4. Facilitate improved national and county decision making on climate change interventions;
- 5. Support capacity building of climate knowledge management system;
- 6. Minimize the impact of extreme climate events for improved and resilient livelihoods.
- 7. Kenya leverages funding from private sector to implement NDC
- 8. Domestic entrepreneurship and innovation to reduce emissions and improve resilience promoted
- 9. Energy efficiency in the public sector promoted
- 10. Renewable energy business promoted

Table 2 presents the Project's key outcome and output areas of the programme

INTENDED RESULTS	KEY OUTPUTS
Outcome 1: National climate	Output 1.1. Climate Change Directorate strengthened.
change coordination processes	Output 1.2: Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) prepared and
strengthened	implemented.
	Output 1.3: Mechanism established to track climate financing flow
Outcome 2: Enhanced access to	Output 2.1: Trained TTI instructors on Solar PV and thermal installation and
clean and efficient energy systems	repair.
	Output 2.2: Low cost quality solar lanterns widely adopted.
	Output 2.3: Clean Education, Business and Information Center in ASALs
	established.
	Output 2.4: Standard and labels developed for at least 3 energy products
	Output 2.5: Green Building Standards and rating tools developed for Kenya
Outcome 3: A national sustainable	Output 3.1: An operational National GHG Inventory system.
GHG Inventory system in place	Output 3.2: Kenya specific emission factors for key sectors.
	Output 3.3: The GHG inventory and Bork report.
Outcome 4: National and county	Output 4.1: Short course on mainstreaming climate change into national and
decision making tools for climate	county policy, planning & budgetary processes developed.
change interventions enhanced	Output 4.2: National & county officials on mainstreaming climate change
	into national and county policy, planning & budgetary processes trained at
	KSG
	Output 4.3: Capacity developed at national & county levels on
	hudgetary processes
Outcome 5: Climate knowledge	Output 5 1: Equipped and operational Climate Change Resource Centre
management and canacity	Output 5.1. Equipped and operational climate change resource centre.
enhanced	information
	Output 5.3: Trained media practitioners on climate related disasters
	Output 5.4: Support documentary series on climate change innovations at
	community level.
	Output 5.5: Facilitate production of quarterly magazine to be widely
	distributed (similar to Joto Afrika)
Outcome 6: Minimize the impacts	Output 6.1: Operational National Climate Change Diagnostic Laboratory.
of extreme climate events for	Output 6.2: Capacity (ICT, climate modelling and NWP) built at KMS.
improved and resilient livelihoods	Output 6.3: Area yield index insurance (AYII) provided to farmers
	Output 6.4: Automatic Weather Stations (AWS) to increase data coverage in
Outrans 7. Kanada anta d	ten counties in arabie AEZ established
Outcome/: Kenya supported	Output 7.1: Implementation of the climate change Act 2016 supported
Cuttom 8: Demostic	Output 7.2: Implementation of NDC facilitated
entrepreneurship and innovation to	promoted
reduce emissions and improve	promoted
climate resilience promoted	
Outcome9: Energy efficiency in the	Output 9.1: Energy efficiency opportunities in the public sector identified
public sector promoted	
Outcome 10: Renewable Energy	Output 10.1: Awareness on renewable energy business opportunities and
Industry business promoted	policy environment in Kenya enhanced
··· , ·······	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

Table 2: LECRD Project Outcome and Output areas

3.3. Project implementation structures and partners

The LECRD project has been implemented over 5 years (from 22nd September 2014 to 21st February 2020) through a National Execution Modality (NEX) by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MEF) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) with funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). In this implementation modality, the Ministry had the overall responsibility for achieving the project goal and objectives and was directly responsible for creating the enabling conditions for implementation of all project activities. UNDP had an oversight role in the implementation of the project through monitoring the implementation of the project, reviewing progress in the realization of the project outputs, and ensuring for proper use of the funds.

The NEX modality of implementation with the National Climate Change Secretariat (NCCS) under the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MEF) also involved several Responsible parties (RPs) including Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT), Kenya Industrial Research Development Institute, Implementing Partners (IPs) such as the , Arid Lands Information Network (ALIN, NETFUND, Kenya School of Government and Green Africa and Implementing partners such as Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO), Kenya Meteorological Department, the Media Council of Kenya, The Ministry of Agriculture Livestock and Fisheries, Energy Regulatory Commission and the National Treasury). More IPs were progressively incorporated into the project.

3.4. Adaptive management (changes in design during implementation)

The project scope and results were not formally revised during implementation. An amendment of the project document recorded a revising of the project budget and activities to allow for incorporation of new activities. An additional funding of 1,200,000 (USD) was received from USAID by the Project in 2017 to support additional four outcome areas. These four (4) additional outcome areas include:

- Kenya leverages funding from private sector to implement NDC
- Domestic entrepreneurship and innovation to reduce emissions and improve resilience promoted
- Energy efficiency in the public sector promoted
- Renewable energy business promoted

The project was granted 3 no-cost extensions over its lifetime, moving the completion date from June 2016 to end February 2020.

Table 3: LECRD [·] Proje	ct changes in o	design during	implementation
-----------------------------------	-----------------	---------------	----------------

Output	Scope of revision
Output 1.1. Climate Change Directorate strengthened	Output changed from <i>Climate Change Council (CCC) established</i> to <i>Climate Change Directorate(CCD) strengthened</i> Since the new governance structure did not incorporate a Cabinet Climate Change Committee, activities and funds were realigned towards strengthening the CCD instead of the council which faced delays in convening its meetings due to pending court over its membership; Other output areas associated with the creation of the council were also dropped
Output 1.3: Mechanism established to track climate financing flow	Initially, the project aimed at supporting identification of Rio markers relevant to the Kenyan context; however in line with the Climate Change Act, this changed to the climate finance policy and budget codes as spearheaded by the National Treasury;
Output 2.3: Clean education, business and information center in ASALs	Initially, the project had envisioned supporting 5 existing buildings to be constructed by the Ministry as Community Education Business and Information Centers. However feasibility survey findings and the actual costs required for an operational center, informed the project to support only one CEBIC which was constructed in Lesidai, Samburu County
Output 2.5: Green Building Standards and rating tools developed for Kenya	This output was initially under Key Result Area 5, however it was more related to clean energy access and it was therefore put under Key Result area 2. Development of manuals, trademark etc. was added as a new activity. This was to enable creation of awareness on the standards developed and their importance
Output 3.1: An operational National GHG Inventory system	a new sub-activity to Support the development of regulation on GHG reporting under the climate change Act,2016 was added as a requirement of the Climate Change Act to ensure timely reporting by institutions under the GHG Inventory Framework
Key Result Area 4: National and county decision making process for climate change interventions enhanced	This Result Area was completely realigned with focus changing to development a short course and then train national and county level officials. The outputs expected are that sustainability will be ensured through the use of the curriculum in the regular trainings at KSG of national and county level officials in mainstreaming climate change into national and county policy, planning & budgetary processes. County climate change processes were also spearheaded by the UN-Joint Climate Change project. An aspect of sensitization for Environmental Committees for Senate & National Assemblies spearheaded by the CCDs was also included
Output 5.1: Equipped and operational Climate Change Resource Centre	A new activity for developing a resource center strategy was included
Output 5.3: Trained media practitioners on climate related disasters	This activity was a complete realignment of the original <i>Output 5.2: 'Trained national and county leadership, media practitioners and judiciary'</i> in the original ProDoc and updated to solely target the media who were seen as a great vehicle to enhancing & demystifying climate change and El Nino phenomena amongst the public.
Output 6.3: Area yield index insurance (AYII) provided to farmers	Initially the project had set out to implement 'Weather based index agricultural Insurance'; however an opportunity to synergize with the State Department of Agriculture presented itself and hence the output shifted to provision of 'Area yield index insurance (AYII).

Although the formal scope of the project did not change, it was noted that adjustments were made to activities and budget lines to accommodate changing circumstances, unexpected delays, challenges and opportunities. These did not materially change the expected deliverables or project budget, and rather reflected agility and adaptive management by the project team.

3.5. Project Financing

The total budget for the LECRD project was USD 8,795,427. Of this total, the USAID contributed USD 8,445,427 while the rest was contributions committed by the respective project partners including funding for Ministry's Low Emission Capacity Building (LECB) Programme, financed by the EU, Germany, and AusAID. The budget had been allocated towards each of the project components as shown in the breakdown in Table 4 with Figure 2 showing the distribution per component.

Table 4:	LECRD	project	Budgeted	cost per	component
	LLCND	project	Duugetteu	cost per	component

KEY RESULT AREA	USD
KRA 1: National climate change coordination processes enhanced	237,050
KRA 2: Enhanced access to clean and efficient energy systems	1,835,493
KRA 3: A national sustainable Greenhouse Gas Inventory in place	567,545
KRA 4: National and county decision making process for climate change interventions enhanced	260,975
KRA 5: Climate knowledge management and capacity is enhanced	1,946,340
KRA 6: Minimize the impacts of extreme climate events for improved and resilient livelihoods	1,271,514
KRA 7: Kenya leverages funding from private sector to implement NDC	648,560
KRA 8: Domestic entrepreneurship and innovation to reduce emissions and improve resilience promoted	156,200
KRA 9: Energy efficiency in the public sector promoted	192,170
KRA 10: Renewable energy business promoted	63,250
Project Management and Personnel Costs	1,616,330
TOTAL	8,795,427





4. Theory of Change at Evaluation and Analysis of the Results Framework

A Theory of Change (TOC) was not defined for the LECRD project at design stage. A reconstructed Theory of Change was drafted at the start of the evaluation, drawing on the following components from the Project Document:

- Intervention logic and key assumptions
- Results framework
- Extensive background information and consultations provided by the Task Manager as to the motivation of the project.
- The detailed end-of-project targets of the LECRD project

LECRD was designed to support Kenya's effort to reduce emissions and increase the resilience of people and ecosystems to climate change. Kenya aims to undertake an ambitious mitigation contribution towards the 2015 Paris Agreement. It seeks to abate its GHG emissions by 30% by 2030 relative to the BAU scenario of 143 MtCO2eq; and in line with its sustainable development agenda. Kenya will ensure enhanced resilience to climate change towards the attainment of Vision 2030 by mainstreaming climate change adaptation into the Medium Term Plans (MTPs) and implementing adaptation actions. The theory of change was therefore stated as follows: IF *Kenya's efforts to pursue long-term, transformative development and to accelerate sustainable climate resilient economic growth, while slowing the growth of greenhouse gas emissions are supported*, THEN *inclusive, market-driven, environmentally sustainable economic growth in Kenya will be achieved*.

The project was logically structured in accordance with the requirements of the LFA as evidenced by the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework in the LECRD Project Document, which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The project thus met the guidelines of UNDP (objectives and results), with the corresponding figures for assessing its effectiveness compared with baseline (Outcomes and Outputs). The target performance indicator values at end of LECRD project and the sources of verification and assumptions made during the design phase were also identified and presented for the first six outcome areas. Similar information was however unavailable for the last four key results areas incorporated into the programme during the programme extension of 2017.

The draft reconstructed TOC was tested and reviewed with stakeholders (directly and indirectly) during the assignment period to produce the TOC at Evaluation (refer Figure 3).

It is concluded that the logic and causal pathways of the original results framework were sound, and no significant changes were made to recreate a TOC and only a few amendments to wording were done.

Figure 3: Theory of Change at Evaluation

Project Impact	Support Kenya's efforts to pursue long-term, transformative development and accelerate sustainable climate resilient economic growth, whilst slowing the growth of greenhouse gas emissions									
Project Outcomes	Outcome 1: Capacity for low emission development in Kenya strengthened Outcome 2: National and county-level institutions' capacity to better coordinate climate change activities and finances built Outcome 3: Decision making for increased resilience to climate change impacts enhanced Outcome 4: Climate-smart technologies and husiness concertuities promoted									
			1					1		
Project Outputs	Output 1: National climate change coordination processes strengthened	Output 2: Enhanced access to clean and efficient energy systems	Output 3: A national sustainable GHG inventory system in place	Output 4: National and county decision making tools for climate change interventions enhanced	Output 5: Climate knowledge management and capacity enhanced	Output 6: Minimize the impacts of extreme climate events for improved and resilient livelihoods	Output 7: Kenya supported towards implementation of NDC .	Output 8: Domestic entrepreneurshi p and innovation to reduce emissions and improve climate resilience promoted	Output 9: Energy efficiency in the public sector promoted	Output 10: Renewable Energy Industry business promoted
Project Activities	Activity 1.1: Strengthening Climate Change Directorate Activity 1.2: Preparing and Implementing Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC). Activity 1.3: Establishing mechanism to track climate financing flow	Activity 2.1: Training TTI instructors on Solar PV and thermal installation and repair. Activity 2.2: Low cost quality solar lanterns widely adopted. Activity 2.3: Establishing a Clean Energy, Business and Information Center in ASALS. Activity 2.4: Developing Standards and labels for at least 3 energy products Activity 2.5: Developing Green Building Standards and rating tools for Kenya	Activity 3.1:Producing an operational National GHG Inventory system. Activity 3.2: Developing Kenya specific emission factors for key sectors. Activity 3.3: Producing TNC GHG Inventory and BUR reports	Activity 4.1: Developing short course on mainstreaming climate change into national and county policy, planning & budgetary processes. Activity 4.2: Training National & County officials on mainstreaming climate change into national and county policy, planning & budgetary processes a t KSG Activity 4.3: Developing capacity at National & County levels on mainstreaming climate change into national and county policy, planning & budgetary processes	Activity 5.1: Equipping and operationalizing Climate Change Resource Centre. Activity 5.2 Developing Portals for dissemination of climate change information Activity 5.3: Training media practitioners on climate related disasters Activity 5.4: Supporting documentary series on climate change innovations at community level. Activity 5.5: Facilitating production of quarterly magazine to be widely distributed (similar to Joto Afrika)	Activity 6.1: Operationalizing National Climate Change Diagnostic Laboratory. Activity 6.2: Capacity building (ICT, climate modelling and NWP) at KMS. Activity 6.3: Providing Area yield index insurance (AYII) to farmers Activity 6.4: Establishing Automatic Weather Stations (AWS) to increase data coverage in ten counties in arable AEZs	Activity 7.1: Supporting implementatio n of the Climate Change Act 2016 Activity 7.2: Facilitating implementatio n of NDC	Activity 8.1: Promoting climate smart technologies, practices and innovations	Activity 9.1: Identifying energy efficiency opportunities in the public sector	Activity 10.1: Enhancing awareness on renewable energy business opportunities and policy environment in Kenya
Assumptions	1. An opportunity 2.Adequate Natio 3. USAID will con 4. Enabling envir 5. National/Coun	v exists to significan onal and County gov tinue funding the pr onment for private i ty governments have	tly influence Kenya' ernment commitme 'oject for continued nvestment in Kenya e adequate staff an	s efforts towards sustair int exists to drive climate sustainability over the c is favorable. d technical expertise to	nable climate resilient e resilience activities p ourse of the programm oversee co-managemen	economic growth and rovided the necessar le nt	l reduce emissions y tools, information	and support can be	e made available to) them.

5. Evaluation Findings

5.1. Strategic Relevance

The LECRD project directly contributes to the implementation of the Government of Kenya National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) (2013-2017), and now (NCCAP 2018 – 2022) which has the overarching goal of enhancing low carbon climate resilient development in Kenya. The NCCAP represents Kenya's low-carbon development pathway options for mitigating increasing national emissions. The plan also addresses the enabling aspects of finance, policy and legislation, knowledge management, capacity development, technology requirements and monitoring and reporting for pathway options. The NCCAP support the integration of climate change into policy and programming, as well as promote coordinated action among ministries (Government of Kenya, 2013).

LECRD further contributes to Kenya mitigation commitment towards the 2015 Paris Agreement where it seeks to abate its GHG emissions by 30% by 2030 relative to the BAU scenario of 143 MtCO2eq; and in line with its sustainable development agenda. Kenya will ensure enhanced resilience to climate change towards the attainment of Vision 2030 by mainstreaming climate change adaptation into the Medium Term Plans (MTPs) and implementing adaptation actions

Finally, by contributing towards strengthening of the national climate change coordination processes; enhancing access to clean and efficient energy systems; supporting development of a national sustainable greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory system and facilitating improved national and county-level decision making on climate change interventions the project is aligned and directly supporting the implementation of the Climate Change Act of 2016.

The project is also built on the results of the UNDP's Africa Adaptation Programme and is in line with the US Global Climate Change Strategy. The LECRD project is also based on the USAID Kenya Integrated Environment and Climate Change Project (IECC) project appraisal document (PAD) which provides a strategic framework for a comprehensive and integrated approach to addressing Kenya's environmental and climate change challenges. The LECRD project is part of the USAID/Kenya IECC Project whose purpose is to build more resilient people and ecosystems to climate change in a green growth economy. The IECC strategically contributes to USAID Kenya Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDC) Development Objective number three (DO3) "Inclusive, market driven environmentally sustainable economic growth" and contributes directly to the high level outcomes of CDCS Intermediate Result (IR) No. 3.2 i.e. "more resilient people and ecosystems in a green growth economy".

It was evident from the interviews that the significance of LECRD is recognized at various government departments and institutions. During the interviews with key stakeholders, a Kenyan government official stated that "LECRD is the most important initiative that has shaped Kenya's national low-emission climate development agenda over the past decade". Government staff acknowledged the importance of communication and coordination both horizontally i.e. across Ministries, and or Agencies) and vertically (e.g. between Nation and County governments).

Strategic Relevance rated 'Relevant

5.2. Effectiveness

The effectiveness of outputs for each component are discussed in subsequent tables. Considering the extensive portfolio of key results areas developed by the project, a selection of the most pertinent ones are highlighted for discussion within the text.

Key Result Area 1: National climate change coordination processes

The Climate Change Directorate (CCD) was established under the Climate Change Act (CCA), 2016 to serve as the Secretariat of the Climate Change Council. CCD also assists the Cabinet Secretary at the time responsible for climate change matters in discharging the duties and functions as stipulated under the Act Some of these duties include: (a) formulating and periodically reviewing the climate change policy, strategy and the National Climate Change Action Plan and submit to the Council for approval; (b) coordinating negotiations on climate change related issues; among other duties.

Expected Project	Examples of Outputs Achieved
Outputs	
Output 1.1.	The project successfully undertook capacity strengthening activities for the Climate Change
Climate Change	Directorate (CCD) (established under the Climate Change Act (CCA) of 2016) to execute its'
Directorate	duties as stipulated in the Act, the supported activities included;
strengthened	Support for Stakeholders Engagement
	• Sector coordination meetings for monitoring and reporting on ongoing climate change
	actions in the country
	• Taking stock of actions implemented for the NCCAP 2013 – 2017.
	• Pre - COP24 meeting to develop Kenya's position paper & post-COP24 meeting to reflect on
	 Dest SBs EQ meeting which simed to provide an appartunity for stakeholders to get feedback.
	• Post SBS-50 meeting which almed to provide an opportunity for stakeholders to get reedback
	on climate actions to be tackled by various climate change actors
	Finalization of the scheme of service for the directorate
	The Project then supported the Climate Change Directorate develop a scheme of service in
	August 2016 to foresee the Directorate's operationalization. The scheme of service defined the
	iob descriptions and specifications standards for recruitment training advancement career
	planning, and succession management for the CCD
Output 1.2:	Preparation and creation of awareness on the (I) NDC
Nationally	• Six (6) multi stakeholder consultative workshops were carried out to develop and validate
Determined	Kenya's Intended National Determined Contributions (INDC) leading to submission to the
Contributions	UNFCCC on 23rd July 2015.
(NDC) prepared	INDC Awareness Creation and Development of Implementation Plan workshops
and implemented	• A background paper on Kenya's position on the Paris Agreement also developed.
Output 1.3:	Launch of the draft climate finance policy
Mechanism	• The Climate Finance Policy and the Climate Public Expenditure and Budget Review (CPEBR)
established to	inception report was launched and validated
track climate	Capacity building on climate finance and budget codes
financing flow	• 155 national and county officers at national and county level were trained on incorporating
	climate change into the integrated Financial Management Information System (IFMIS) and
	on establishing mechanisms to track climate finance flows.

Table 4: Outputs from Key Result Area 1: National climate change coordination processes strengthened

Outputs for Key Result Area 1 are of high quality, of potential high impact to National climate change programming especially in terms of implementation of the Climate Change Act (CCA) of 2016 and were evidently well received by all key stakeholders.

The project was responsive to challenges it encountered, amending the outputs to be relevant to the reality at the time and focusing on the Climate Change Directorate Instead Climate Change Council that would take long to establish due to political factors that were outside the control of the programme.

Key Result Area 2: Access to clean and efficient energy systems enhanced

Expected Project	Examples of Outputs Achieved
Outputs	
Output 2.1: Trained Technical Vocational and Education Training (TVET) Institutes instructors on Solar PV and Solar Water Heating installation repair and maintenance	 In collaboration with JKUAT, Institute of Energy and Environmental Technologies (IEET), the programme supported capacity development of ten (10) Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVETs) Institutes for training on solar photovoltaic and solar water heating installation, maintenance and repair. This was achieved through: Equipping of 10 TVETs as model training centers of excellence Equipping of 10 TVETs as model training centers of excellence A National Training manual on Solar Water Heating installation, repair and maintenance was developed, published and is currently being used for training across the country
	Training of Trainers on installation and repair of Solar PV and Solar Water Heating
	 Sixty (60) instructors (52 males and 8 female) from the ten (10) TVETs were trained on installation, maintenance and repair of solar PV and solar water heating systems The Project is supporting training of 200 technicians on Solar PV & Solar Water heating installation, across the 10 TVETs
Output 2.2: Low cost quality solar systems widely adopted	 Technical and socio-economic baseline survey of the existing solar lanterns A technical and socio-economic survey on pico-solar systems carried out by KIRDI which is Kenya's national designated entity (NDE) for Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN) that assessed enabling actions required to promote the adoption and local production of pico-solar PV systems A Socio-Economic survey was conducted in eight (8) counties namely, Nanyuki, Isiolo, Migori, Bungoma, Embu, Kirinyaga, Kitui and Samburu resulting in the development of a policy brief on <i>'Accelerating pico-solar market in Kenya''</i> Preparation of policy brief on acceleration of Pico solar uptake in Kenya A Policy brief prepared on "Accelerating pico-solar PV systems Proposal development for submission to CTCN on capacity development on solar lantern maintenance & repair A proposal for assembling of prototype lanterns was prepared by KIRDI and submitted to CTCN, - is the operational arm of the UNFCCC Technology Mechanism.
Output 2.3: Clean Energy, Business and Information	• A Community Education Business and Information Centre (CEBIC) in Lesidai, Samburu County has been constructed and equipped. The Centre will promote access to information as well create business opportunities for vulnerable communities in arid and semi-arid lands. Services to be offered at the

Table 5: Outputs from Key Result Area 2: Access to clean and efficient energy systems enhanced

Centre in ASALs established	Centre include ICT services, M-pesa, Renewable energy shop, Agrovet, training facilities, cultural Centre, library and edutainment. The Project facilitated carrying out of the following activities
Output 2.4: Standard and labels developed for three (3) energy products	 Establishing an energy efficiency research and testing facility at KIRDI An Energy Efficiency Research and Testing Facility has been established at KIRDI, to test if appliances conform to the Minimum Energy Performance Standards (MEPS). The laboratory will be used for testing on lighting appliances and motors. Specialized training for KIRDI staff The Project supported the training of the laboratory personnel on testing of industrial motors at the Industrial Training Research Institute (ITRI) Taiwan and on testing of lighting appliances at The Energy Research Institute (TERI), India.
	Minimum Energy Performance Standards (MEPs) for Televisions, Computers, and LED lighting developed. The LECRD project provided support for the development of MEPS. These are a set of regulations prescribing Minimum Energy Performance for appliances and equipment in the market and will be incorporated into the Minimum Energy Performance Standards Regulations, 2015. Development of MEPS will ensure the reduction in energy related GHG emissions by improving the energy efficiency of selected appliances and equipment in the residential, commercial and industrial sectors.
Output 2.5: Green Building Standards and rating tools developed for Kenya	 Preparation of green building standards and rating tool Project developed the voluntary green building standards (GreenMark rating system) and certification tool in collaboration with Green Africa foundation. The tool highlights best practices in building construction, operation and maintenance to reduce or eliminate the adverse impact of buildings on the environment and occupants to achieve sustainable development while slowing emissions in Kenya. Development of manuals, trademarks, labels, certificates, communication and information materials
	• Supported the development of Green Building Manual including trademarks, labels, certificates, communication and information materials. These materials will be necessary for the operationalization of the GreenMark standard.

Outputs for Key Result Area 2 were many and varied and of significance both at the national level and county levels. The next challenge (as highlighted by the respondents) lies with the operationalization of standards developed under this output. The ability to quantify the economic benefits as a business case for governments or developers as motivation to prevent a 'business as usual' consumption growth scenario of energy would also be important.

With regard to Community Education Business and Information Centre (CEBIC) in Lesidai, Samburu County, concerns were raised regarding real risk of failure of sustainability due to a lack of concrete mechanism for ownership and commitment to management of the center. The MoU developed between Samburu County, Ministry of Environment and Forestry and local community is a first towards this direction and needs to go further, and to ensure that the county governments commits actual financial and human resources to manage and maintain the center.

Key Result Area 3: National sustainable GHG inventory system established

A GHG inventory is an essential tool for planning mitigation activities, projecting future emissions and identifying sectors for emission reduction projects. Improved, transparent, consistent, and comparable inventories are the foundation for national, regional and global policy discussions.

Expected Project Outputs	Examples of Outputs Achieved
Output 3.1: An Operational National Greenhouse Gas Inventory	 The project supported the establishment of a GHG unit at the National Climate Change Resource Centre to facilitate data sharing amongst GHG inventory teams. The established unit will address inadequate data sharing and archiving system challenge. Draft data sharing agreements have been prepared. These agreements are especially important where sensitive data is involved. Data collection templates prepared that define the type of data required, units of reporting, reporting period and provides for meta data submission. These templates can be used in the reporting regulations and will make data collection sustainable. Institutional arrangements for sustainable greenhouse gas inventory prepared. This will need to be formalized through the reporting regulation.
Output 3.2: Kenya	Develop Kenya Specific emission factors
specific emission	• The Project is supporting KALRO to carry out research to develop Kenya specific emission
sectors	• Farm survey for characterization of farm systems
	 On farm and on station research
	 Procurement laboratory consumables and equipment for KALRO's testing lab
	• The use of Kenya specific emission factors will improve accuracy in estimation of
	greenhouse gases from the livestock sector. Manure management was identified as a key source of emissions in the country.
Output 3.3: GHG	Develop the GHG Inventory for Third National Communication
Inventory for	• This has been prepared by sectoral teams of experts' form Ministries and Departments.
National	This has been done through a learning by doing approach that will improve sustainability
Communication and	for future inventories. Twenty core modelers were engaged in online training course of
Biennial Update	development of GHG inventories. The inventory will be used for the country's third
Report prepared	national communication to the UNFCCC and first Biennial Update Report (BUR)

Table 6: Outputs from Key Result Area 3: National sustainable GHG inventory system established

Outputs for Key Result Area 3 are of high quality and shows significant progress on what expected in this key result area, even though the project was initially overly-ambitious about the programme's ability to produce a robust national GHG Inventory within the project period. Some the outputs in this area are therefore still works in progress.

Key Result Area 4: National and county decision making tools for climate change interventions improved

The Climate Change Act, 2016 obligates the national and county governments to mainstream climate change responses into development planning, decision-making and implementation. To bridge the capacity gap, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, through the project has supported the Climate Change Directorate, in collaboration with the Kenya School of Government to develop a training program on "Climate Change Policy, Planning and Budgeting at National and County Level'. Outputs for Key Result Area 4 are of high quality and show the greatest potential for sustainability. Specifically, the project supported the following:

Table 7: Outputs from Key Result Area 4: National and county decision making tools for climate change interventions improved

Expected Project Outputs	Examples of Outputs Achieved		
Output 4.1: Short course	Development of curriculum and training manuals		
developed on	• Development of Curriculum and training material for a 10-day program entitled; Climate		
mainstreaming climate	Change in Policy. Planning and Budgeting at National and County Level developed in		
change into national and	collaboration with various stakeholders including Kenva School of Government and		
county policy planning &	Kenva Institute of Curriculum Development		
budesterrererererererererererererererererer	Renya institute of curriculum Development.		
budgetary processes	• Documentation and dissemination of climate change initiatives in Narok and Killi		
	Counties through development of 5 training case studies to complement climate change		
	training programs at the Kenya School of Government		
Output 4.2: Trained National	• 23 facilitators were trained at the Kenya School of Government in Embu to deliver the		
& County officials on	climate change training program		
mainstreaming climate Facilitating an inaugural short course on mainstreaming climate change into			
change into national and	county policy planning and budgetary processes		
county policy planning &	 Insurgural training program with 27 participants; 10 pational and 17 county officers was 		
budgeter unreseases at KCC	hald at Nalum in lung 2017. The alignets change training programs is new being offened		
budgetary processes at KSG	neid at Nakuru in June 2017. The climate change training program is now being offered		
	at the Kenya School of Government (KSG). Training of national and county officers is		
	currently on-going through the support of other programs.		
Output 4.3: Capacity	Sensitization workshop for Environmental Committees for Senate & National Assembly		
developed at national &	• A learning workshop for the National Assembly and Senate Environmental Committees		
county levels on	on the Climate Change Act 2016, the National Climate Change Action Plan 2018 – 2022.		
mainstreaming climate	climate finance and the Sustainable Waste Management Bill and Policy 2019 was held		
change into national and	The workshop stimulated dialogue on the different acts and policies and increased		
	success for improved implementation		
county policy, planning &	awareness for improved implementation.		
budgetary processes			

Key Result Area 5: Climate knowledge management and capacity enhanced

Significant climate change knowledge is being generated by key institutions and individuals. However, there is inadequate sharing of climate change information leading to lack of timely and authoritative response to climate change. To address this the project undertook the following:

Table 8: Outputs from Key Result Area 5: Climate knowledge management and capacity enhanced

Expected Project	Examples of Outputs Achieved				
Outputs					
Output 5.1: Equipped	Developed a Resource Centre Strategy				
and operationalized	• Engaged a consultant to develop the National Climate Change Resource Centre (NCCRC)				
the Climate Change	Operationalization Strategy with guidelines on communication, publicity, branding and				
Resource Centre	fundraising strategies, training, information and awareness-creation of the NCCRC				
	Equipped the Climate Change Resource Centre				
	• The Project equipped and operationalized the National Climate Change Resource Centre				
	(NCCRC). The Centre acts as an information hub and clearing house to coordinate and				
	disseminate climate data, information and knowledge.				
	Offices partitioning/refurbishing				
	• The offices at the National Climate Change Resource Centre were partitioned to create				
	more office spaces for Climate Change Directorate staff.				
	Acquired equipment, physical and electronic resources for the NCCRC library				
	The Project provided the following for the NCCRC Library;				
	Over 500 Climate change digital and electronic publications purchased for the National				
	Climate Change Resource Centre Library				

	Robust and Integrated Library Management and Security System installed
	All the books tagged and catalogued
Output 5.2 Portals	Development of the Climate Change Knowledge Portal
developed for	• Supported the development and operationalization of the Kenya Climate Change
dissemination of	Knowledge Portal www.kcckp.go.ke , a virtual online platform, a one stop repository of
climate change	climate change information in Kenya which will ensure that there will be widespread
information	access and dissemination of climate change related information. The portal also has
	microsites for children and youth.
	• Supported the development of the sustainable energy for all website www.se4all.go.ke
	that is a hub of information on clean energy technologies in the country.
Output 5.3: Trained	• Training of editors and journalists on responsible and responsive reporting on climate
media practitioners	related disasters including El Nino
on climate related	• Monitoring on Volume and Quality of Media Coverage on Climate Change and El-nino
disasters	Related Disasters
	• Shared knowledge on climate change innovations and practices to policy makers,
	practitioners and local communities
	Climate change resource Centre awareness through art competition was undertaken
	• Facilitated production of quarterly magazine to be widely distributed (similar to Joto Afrika)

Key Result Area 6: Impacts of extreme climate events for improved and resilient livelihoods minimized Early warning information is useful in rapid response to extreme climate events such as floods and droughts. The information generated by Kenya Meteorological Department (KMD) need to be disseminated widely and timely for informed and effective response especially by farmers. To this end the project addressed the following:

Table 9: Outputs from	n Key Result	Area 6: I	mpacts of	extreme	climate	events	for	improved	and	resilient
livelihoods minimized										

Expected Project Outputs	t Examples of Outputs Achieved
Output 6.1: Operational National Climate Diagnostic Laboratory (NCDL)	 Operational national diagnostic laboratory Procurement and installation of a High-Performance Cluster (HPC) system Procurement of meteorological base stations for the diagnostic laboratory ongoing
Output 6.2: Capacity Building (ICT, climate modelling and NWP) at KMD	 Train staff in High Performance Cluster (HPC) at graduate level (abroad) KMD staff member sponsored to pursue a one-year master's degree in HPC and ICT at University of Reading in the UK Train meteorologists in climate modelling at graduate level (in country) One KMD staff member supported to pursue master's degree in climatology at University of Nairobi (2015 -2017)
	 KMD Outstations Staff capacity building Supported curriculum development and training of 43 Participants (38 males, 5 female) on AWS basic operation and maintenance. Curriculum reviewed by the Institute for Meteorological Training and Research (IMTR) and entrenched in its regular programmes to ensure its sustainability, making it the first meteorological institute in Africa to offer this course

Output 6.3: Area yield	• Validation of the Kenya Agriculture Insurance & Risk Management Programme Document
index insurance (AYII)	(KAIRM)
provided to farmers	• Unit areas of insurance mapped for Rongai sub county and used by Insurance companies to
	develop premiums
	 Crop insurance launched at Rongai, Nakuru County
	Stakeholder workshops and sensitization forums
	• Members of the Nakuru county assembly – Agricultural committee sensitized on importance of
	Ayrı crop insurance
	Training of trainers on crop cutting experiment
	• Agricultural staff of Rongal Sub-County in Nakuru trained on: Data collection techniques; Crop
	Cutting experiments (CCE) and Area estimation for crop insurance
	Registration of farmers and identification of unit areas of insurance
	• Supported the registration of farmers through radio announcements, roadshows and field work
	in Rongal sub county. A total of 10,772 farmers registered as of 31° March 2016
	South-South Exchange visits
	• The Project facilitated government officials from the Ministries of Agriculture and Environment
	and Forestry to attend a 10-day experiential learning tour of India on crop insurance
	Set up Automatic Weather Stations (AWS) to increase data coverage in ten counties in arable AEZ
	• The Project supported the equipping of the Kenya Meteorological Department by procurement
	and installing of twenty (20) Automatic Weather Stations in ten (10) counties. The AWSs will
	improve climate information data collection and weather forecasting and contribute to
	minimizing the impacts of extreme climate events for improved and resilient livelihoods through
	with installed.
	• In factory training on operation and maintenance of AWS. Eight (8) KMD personnel participated
	in the training held 2nd-13th November 2015 in Vienna, Austria.

Key Result Area 7: Kenya supported towards implementation of NDC

Kenya will use its National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) as a five-year iterative tool or the national mechanism through which the NDC will be implemented, in accordance with the Climate Change Act, 2016. To this regard, the Project has supported development of the NCCAP 2018 – 2022, Adaptation Technical Analysis Report (ATAR) and the Mitigation Technical Analysis Report (MTAR). It has also carried out the following:

Table 10: Outputs from Key Result Area 7: Kenya supported towards implementation of NDC

Expected Project	Examples of Outputs Achieved
Outputs	
Outputs Output 7.1: Implementation of the Climate Change Act, 2016 supported	 Climate Change Thematic Working Group (CCTWG) – Medium Term Plan (MTP) III During the MTP II, the impacts of climate change on the different socio-economic sectors were acknowledged and the need to address them. Consequently, there was some level of mainstreaming of climate change adaptation and mitigation across the sectors. This was done despite the absence of a legal framework for mainstreaming climate change. In addition, there was strong political goodwill to address climate change effects at all levels. There was enhanced awareness of climate change. Legal establishment of the CCTWG during the development of MTP IIII, enabled mainstreaming of climate change across all sectors through Government planning process. Support the establishment of the climate change fund
	• Draft climate change fund regulations, resource mobilization strategy and the M&E framework have been developed through a CCF Taskforce appointed by the CS, The

	 National Treasury & Planning, for operationalization of the Climate Change Fund established under the CCA, 2016 (section 25). The draft Fund regulations have undergone both public and stakeholder consultations and recommendations reviewed and incorporated if necessary, in the regulations, the Layman's draft Fund regulations have currently been submitted to the Cabinet Secretary, The National Treasury & Planning for onward submission to the Cabinet. Consultant is currently being procured to review the draft resource mobilization strategy and the M&E framework.
Output 7.2: Implementation of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) facilitated	 Development of ATAR through holding five (5) adaptation thematic working group workshops and offering technical support in carrying out sector consultation meetings with; Forestry, Energy, Health, Industry (KAM, KEPSA), Agriculture, Waste, Water, Transport, Disaster Risk Management, Wildlife & Tourism sectors. Development of MTAR through holding four (4) mitigation thematic working group workshops Held eight (8) NCCAP Taskforce meetings including a validation meeting and consultation meetings (Jan 2018) with parliamentary committees on environment and natural resources, private sector, youth, marginalized groups and five (5) county consultation through Kenya's regional /economic blocs covering forty (40) counties. Development of a private sector engagement framework to promote coordinated and inclusive implementation of the NCCAP 2018 – 2022 by private sector actors. This will also contribute to the implementation of the Climate Change Act, SDGs and the NDC. The framework establishes and maintains an effective and efficient institutional arrangement for mainstreaming climate change responses within the private sector.

Key Result Area 8: Domestic entrepreneurship and innovation to reduce emissions and improve climate resilience promoted

Promotion of climate smart technologies is key priority mitigation intervention in the Kenya's NDC. NETFUND is promoting adoption of climate smart technologies, including the use of biogas, solar, recycled biomass and clean cook stoves. NETFUND sent out calls biennially to the public to participate in a competition on promotion of green technologies. The project is supporting NETFUND to provide incubation support, business advisory services and publicity of the winning technologies Unfortunately this was one of the areas of the project that returned weak results. NETFUND did not have the capacity to manage most of the small-scale innovation/entrepreneurships technologies and the results on this outcome were therefore suboptimal. The activities endeavored under this result area included:

Table 11: Outputs from Key Result Area 8: Domestic entrepreneurship and innov	ation to reduce emissions
and improve climate resilience promoted	

Expected Project	Examples of Outputs Achieved
Outputs	
Output 8.1: Climate	The Project is supporting incubation of three (3) innovations;
smart technologies,	1. Product and Business development for the Green Charcoal Carbonization Kiln in
practices and	Garissa County
innovations promoted	2. Soya Value Chain Addition project in Migori County
	3. Producing furniture with particle boards made from rice husks
	Holding annual forums and exhibitions on climate change technology innovations and expos
	on business opportunities by NETFUND
	• The Project supported NETFUND to organize the Green Innovations Exhibition and
	Investors Forum
	The Project supported NETFUND to hold the Green Innovations Award (GIA)

Key Result Area 9: Energy efficiency in the public sector promoted

This key results area addressed the following output:

Expected Project	Examples of Outputs Achieved
Outputs	
Output 9.1 Energy	Carried out assessments of energy efficiency opportunities in the public sector with support
efficiency	from (NREL).
opportunities in the	• The Ministry of Environment and Forestry has partnered with the Kenya Association of
public sector	Manufacturers to carry out assessments of energy efficiency opportunities in the public
identified	sector with a case study of the Kenya Meteorological Department and the National
	Climate Change Resource Centre. This work builds on the findings from walk-through
	energy audits carried out by the National Renewable Energy Laboratories (NREL). The
	Project would be supporting implementation of the recommendations which would be
	informed by a comprehensive Investment Grade Audits (IGA) Energy Study including a
	detailed financial analysis. KAM will also carry out a full feasibility study for some of the
	recommendations and provide linkages green financiers.

Table 12: Outputs from Key Result Area 9: Energy efficiency in the public sector promoted

Key Result Area 10: Renewable Energy Industry business promoted

This key results area addressed the following output:

Expected Project	t Examples of Outputs Achieved
Outputs	
Output 10.1:	Prepared a special issue of the KEREA's Energy Digest magazine by documenting renewable
Awareness on	energy business opportunities and supportive regulatory environment in Kenya
renewable energy	• The Project is procuring the services of firm to compile and disseminate the special issue
business	of the KEREA Energy Digest. The magazine will be launched during the Renewable Energy
opportunities and	Industry Exhibition
policy environment i	Holding renewable energy industry business exhibitions in collaboration with KEREA and
Kenya enhanced	ministries of Energy and Environment
	• The Project is supporting the Kenya Renewable Energy Association (KEREA) to hold its first
	ever renewable energy industry exhibition. The two (2) day exhibition aims at promoting
	and creating awareness on renewable energy technologies as well as providing
	information on renewable energy markets and markets actors. The Project will procure
	the services of a professional event management team to plan and organize the event.

Fable 13: Outputs from Ke	y Result Area 10: Renewable E	Energy Industry business promoted
---------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Delivery of outputs across the ten components is rated Moderately Satisfactory.

Delivery of Outcomes

INTENDED RESULTS	INDICATORS	STATUS	
			EVIDENCE / COMMENTS
Outcome 1: National	Number of institutions	Partially	Project successfully managed to strengthen the CCD to execute its'
climate change	with improved capacity	achieved	duties and also prepared and implemented the Nationally
coordination processes	to address climate		Determined Contributions (NDC).
enhanced	change issues		
Outcome 2: Enhanced	Number of institutions	Achieved	The project supplied 10 TIVETS with Solar Photovoltaic systems and
access to clean and	supported to enhance		Solar Water heating equipment for training. Some of the
efficient energy systems	access to clean and		equipment were installed and are in use whereas others are for
	efficient energy systems		training. Examples from Kaiboi Technical institute indicate that the
	Number of staff trained		local community has taken up installation of Solar PV as a priority,
	on clean energy systems		since the area is prone to power fluctuations.
Outcome 3: A national	Functional reporting unit	Achieved	The project supported the establishment of a GHG unit at the
sustainable GHG	established		National Climate Change Resource Centre to facilitate data sharing
Inventory system in place	sources of emissions		amongst GHG inventory teams. The national GHG inventory has
	Reports generated		also been infalized and validated by stakeholders .
Outcome A: National and	Relieve frameworks for	Achieved	With the support of the project, the Climate change Act 2016 same
county decision making	enhanced decision	Achieveu	into being and policy makers at both levels of government were
tool for climate change	making at county and		trained on related areas. The project also supported the creation of
interventions enhanced	national levels		hudget lines to support climate change at all levels of government
Outcome 5: Climate	Number of trainings.	Achieved	Training were held for different levels of officers. This includes
knowledge management	curriculums developed,		TIVETS, Kenya School of Government, Kenya Meteorological
and capacity enhanced	numbers of trainees		Department, KIRDI and even sensitization workshops for national
			assembly and senate. Training manuals and curriculums have also
			been created. Centres were also established to share knowledge.
			Two portals were established for knowledge sharing.
Outcome 6: Minimize the	Early warning systems	Achieved	The project installed 20 Automatic weather stations in 10 counties,
impacts of extreme	established, Information		trained some KMD staff on the use and maintenance of the same in
climate events for	sharing established		Austria and sensitized farmers in Rongai Nakuru county on the need
improved and resilient	Insurance options for		for climate risk insurance.
livelihoods.	crops and livestock in use		
Outcome7: Kenya	Financial flows	Achieved	The project supported the development of the NCCAP which is the
supported towards	emanating from the		framework under which the NDC is being implemented in the
implementation of NDC.	private sector for climate		country.
Outcome 8: Domostic	AUTIVITIES	Partially	The Project is supporting incubation of three (2) innovations:
entrepreneurshin and	actors emission reducing	achieved	1 Product and Business development for the Green Charcoal
innovation to reduce	entrepreneurshins and	achieveu	Carbonization Kiln in Garissa County
emissions and improve	innovations		2. Sova Value Chain Addition project in Migori County
climate resilience	milliovations		3. Producing furniture with particle boards made from rice husks
promoted			(FunKidz Ltd)
			The rest of the activities have been left to NETFUND to carry out.
			, There is still not evidence of progress.
Outcome9: Energy	Number and	Partially	The project identified energy efficiency measures and these have
efficiency in the public	opportunities for energy	achieved	since been implemented at the NCCRC
sector promoted	efficiency in the public		
	sector.		
Outcome 10: Renewable	Number and types of	Partially	Activities accomplished: Magazines produced and Workshops held.
Energy Industry business	businesses adopting	achieved	Need to capture information on businesses that have benefited
promoted	renewable energy		from this outcome and adopted the practises.

5.3. Efficiency

As previously mentioned, three no cost extensions were allowed over the project life, extending completion by three years, from an initial planned period of two years.

The no cost extensions did not seem to significantly impact the delivery of the project in a negative way. The extended implementation timelines while largely attributed to the numerous changes in position of Principal Secretaries/Accounting Officers at the Ministry of Environment and Forestry also appeared to have offered an opportunity for better alignment of project activities with government processes and provided for a prolonged period of engagement that may have contributed positively. By chance, it was also well aligned to the Kenyan Government's efforts to Kenya to implement its NDC under the Paris Agreement following the enactment of Climate Change Act 2016 that provides for the legal framework for effective response to climate change including implementation of the NDC.

The project workplan anticipated all the outcome areas to run in parallel, but with a number of key dependencies between them. It is not clear if these interdependencies occurred and most output activities had proceeded on their own. The project started off slowly, taking a long time to recruit a project staff. Observations by the project team was that significant delays occurred due to a high turnover of Principal Secretaries at the Ministry and subsequent reliance on these Principal Secretaries to authorize activities and payments. UNDP also embarked on significant internal restructuring around the same period further impeding project progress. Interfacing modalities with project implementation partners was also a process that was not yet established and well understood as originally thought, which then required additional time to understand where to focus engagement with the respective partners, something that also took a long time between project development, stakeholder consultation and the final approval.

The short nature and lengthy periods it took to renew contracts for project staff meant that the staffing at the PMU was always inadequately resourced to cover the full scope of the project activities. The recruitment of staff in itself faced a lot of bureaucratic challenges from within the ministry, but once staffed with suitably qualified professionals, a more suitable and effective structure emerged. It is noted that project officers were dependent on strong support from the PMU, which was not always available particularly in periods the PM role was vacant.

The rating for the efficiency of the project is informed by the high number of extensions. It is noted that each one of the extensions led to delays in implementation. The evaluation did not however identify any large group of stakeholders that was significantly negatively affected on by the extensions. As such efficiency is rated Moderately Unsatisfactory instead of Unsatisfactory rating that is usually associated with three or more-time extensions.

Efficiency is rated Moderately Unsatisfactory

Monitoring and Reporting

A comprehensive monitoring and evaluation plan was prepared as part of the project design phase. The USAID Environment Office identified the LECRD project as one of the projects to be evaluated to provide lessons learnt for future programming on climate change activities. The M&E plan was appropriately structured with the majority of indicators SMART, baselines, indicators mid-point and end of project targets defined.

Regular reporting and performance tracking required by the M&E plan were implemented in adherence with USAID guidelines as indicated in the Agreement Document negotiated between the USAID/UNDP and

the project management unit. In the following the guidelines for monitoring and reporting by the programme are presented.

Annual Work Plans

LECRD develops annual work plans that are reviewed and approved by the steering committee and USAID Agreement Officer's Representative (AOR) 60 days before the end of each USAID fiscal year, UNDP submits to the AOR an annual work plan for the following fiscal year. The work plans include proposed activities for the given year, time frame for implementation of annual activities, detailed budget, review of previous year's accomplishments (if applicable), problems, and progress towards achieving award results and proposed annual accomplishments and progress towards achieving results.

The LECRD project submits its AWP to both UNDP and USAID who happen to have different annual end year dates. This presents a challenge because UNDP requires AWP for funding while USAID requires it for monitoring performance and reporting. Progress on implementation of AWPs would be reviewed semiannually by the LECRD project steering committee.

Performance Monitoring Plan

USAID required that UNDP prepares and submits a Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP) within 90 days of award of the project. This document responds to this requirement despite the fact that it has been developed a year into implementation. The PMP outlines key program activities, indicators of achievement, and associated annual and life-of-project targets. The plan is reviewed and approved by the AOR.

Quarterly Performance Reports

It is stated in the Project agreement that LECRD project will submit quarterly, semi-annual and annual reports that give insight into the progress of planned activities. The narrative report includes qualitative and quantitative information describing activities carried out and specific results achieved during the quarter. In addition, the narrative report indicates key implementation challenges encountered and how they were or are planned to be resolved. To the extent that the PMP includes quarterly targets, this should be reflected in the narrative report. Reporting periods will coincide with USAID fiscal year quarters, with reports due no later than thirty (30) days after the end of each quarter (e.g. February 1, May 1, August 1, November 1), or by any other schedule agreed upon with the USAID AOR. The report should also include budgeted versus actual expenditures (along with a brief analysis of any variance) and estimated accruals for the quarter.

Quarterly Financial Reporting

The USAID and UNDP agreement also states the following:

UNDP will submit electronic copies of Financial Reports (quarterly SF 425 and final SF 425) in keeping with 22 CFR 226. The SF 425 must be submitted via electronic format to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (http://www.dpm.psc.gov). In addition, copies of all final financial reports shall be submitted to M/FM and the AOR.

Annual Reports

The LECRD project has to submit to the AOR an annual report. This report complements, not replaces, the relevant quarterly reports. The report, based on the approved PMP but not necessarily limited to such, should indicate the results and impact the program is having on the target beneficiaries.

Closeout Plan

Six months prior to the completion date of the agreement, the UNDP would submit a demobilization plan for Agreement Officer' approval. The demobilization plan would include a) draft property disposition plan, b) plan for the phase-out of in-country operations, c) delivery schedule for all reports or other deliverables required under the agreement, and d) timetable for completing all required actions in the demobilization plan, including the submission date of the final property disposition plan to the Agreement Officer.

Final Report

The final performance report is a detailed report which summarizes the accomplishments and impact in relation to the expected results, in accordance with the approved PMP. It should contain a three-page executive summary, an index of all reports and information products produced under the agreement, and should discuss the elements listed in 22 CFR 226.51(d). The report shall be submitted no later than 90 days after the end-date of the agreement to the Agreement Officer, and the AOR.

Quarterly and annual reports for the years 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 were available for review. The draft final report was also available.

Monitoring and Reporting is rated Satisfactory

5.4. Sustainability

The Government of Kenya has demonstrated clear commitment to green growth and has fully leveraged the knowledge and support made available by the LECRD. It was recognized that continued awareness and capacity building will be helpful to assist with operationalization and integration across multiple national structures, and that successful implementation will come from the momentum already created by LECRD. Sustainability is expected to be high, without any dependency.

The country has further progressed well with the establishment of the high-level enabling policy context green growth through the NCCAP as supported by LECRD. Kenya will continue to use its National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) as a five-year iterative tool or the national mechanism through which the NDC will be implemented, in accordance with the Climate Change Act, 2016. To this regard, the Project has supported development of the NCCAP 2018 – 2022, Adaptation Technical Analysis Report (ATAR) and the Mitigation Technical Analysis Report (MTAR). Sustained progress would benefit greatly from continued support and engagement especially in the form of capacity building, awareness creation and training. While the extended delay in creation of Climate Change Council is an issue of concern, the strengthening of the Climate Change Directorate which is the lead agency of the government on national climate change plans and actions will comprehensively support progress towards enhancing effectiveness of the LECRD outcomes.

The Climate Change Act, 2016 obligates the national and county governments to mainstream climate change responses into development planning, decision-making and implementation. To bridge the capacity gap, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, through the LECRD project supported the Climate Change Directorate, in collaboration with the Kenya School of Government (KSG) to develop a training program on "Climate Change Policy, Planning and Budgeting at National and County Level. Included in this is a course on how to mainstream climate change into national and county policy, planning & budgetary processes. Subsequently, national and county officials have been trained on mainstreaming climate change into

national and county policy, planning & budgetary processes at KSG. This is an effort that will enhance Programme sustainability and combined with active county governments, this could potentially create a groundswell towards further sustainable green growth actions both at national and county levels.

In terms of Financial Sustainability, the government has fully taken over the role and committed resources for implementation of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) in accordance with the Climate Change Act, 2016. Leveraged funding for complementary initiatives will fulfil the financial requirements and various opportunities exist for securing funding to progress the implementation of the programmes that have begun under LECRD.

Institutional and Financial Sustainability is rated Moderately Likely

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

6.1. Conclusions

The LECRD project has made significant contributions to and has been one of the most important initiatives for climate change action planning in Kenya. The project has made important inroads in raising the profile of green economic development in Kenya and strengthening capacity for low emission development by placing the topic on the agenda at the national and county levels. It has created an extensive portfolio of high-quality programmes and knowledge resources, establishing a comprehensive platform to support planning and inform decision-making by key development actors.

LECRD has supported the strengthening of the national climate change institutions and coordination processes including a comprehensive institutional framework. The Climate Change Directorate (CCD) has been strengthened, the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) prepared and implemented and a draft climate finance policy produced. The project was instrumental in developing Kenya's ambitious Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) submitted to UNFCCC in July 2015. The project supported the preparation of a briefing paper to inform the Government of Kenya on the signing of the Paris Agreement, which was signed on April 22, 2016 in New York at the United Nations. Additionally, the project began the process of establishing National GHG inventory system by preparing among others institutional arrangements for sustainable greenhouse gas inventory. A national Measurement Reporting and Verification (MRV) system for Kenya has been developed to facilitate tracking and reporting on climate actions and means of implementation. In addition, the MRV system will contribute to fulfilling Kenya's National Communication to the UNFCCC and improve ability to take advantage of opportunities offered by climate change. The system also provides for reporting on related sustainable development goals (SDGs).

Capacity has also been developed at national and county levels on mainstreaming climate change into national and county policy, planning and budgetary processes. Toward this end, a curriculum and course administered by the Kenya School of Government and Kenya Institute of Curriculum Development has been developed on mainstreaming climate change into national and county policy, planning & budgetary processes.

Whilst the project did not manage to establish the National Climate Change Council as initially envisaged, the project has provided support institutions under the Climate Change Act (CCA), 2016 such as the Climate Change Directorate (CCD) in the implementation of the Act. Activity support have included facilitation for the implementation of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC), supporting the establishment of the climate change fund, supporting private sector engagement and coordination framework among others.

The project managed to enhance access to clean and efficient energy systems by supporting capacity development of ten (10) Technical and Vocational Education and Training (TVETs) Institutes for training on solar photovoltaic and solar water heating installation, maintenance and repair. This included supporting the equipping of 10 TVETs with Solar Photovoltaic (PV) and Solar Water Heating training equipment, development of national training manual for solar water heating installation repair and maintenance and undertaking the Training of Trainers on installation and repair of Solar PV and Solar Water Heating. Standard

and labels developed for energy products were also developed including Green Building Standards and rating tools.

In the area of climate knowledge management, the Project equipped and operationalized the National Climate Change Resource Centre (NCCRC) that acts as an information hub and clearing house to coordinate and disseminate climate data, information and knowledge. A Climate Change Knowledge Portal (<u>www.kcckp.go.ke</u>) and a hub of information on clean energy technologies in the country has also been established. Apart from construction and equipping of a Community Education Business and Information Centre (CEBIC) in Samburu County, the project enhanced sharing of information and knowledge on climate change through the production and dissemination of nine (9) digital and physical issues of the quarterly Joto Afrika magazine.

In order to minimize the impacts of extreme climate, the project enhanced the capacity for production and dissemination timely and reliable early warning information on extreme climate events such as floods and droughts by enhancing the capacity of the Kenya Meteorological Department (KMD). This was achieved by operationalizing National Climate Diagnostic Laboratory (NCDL), training KMD staff and establishing and expanded network of Automatic Weather Stations (AWS) to increase data coverage in ten counties in arable AEZs. Farmers were also provided with Area yield index insurance (AYII).

The project has promoted domestic entrepreneurship and innovation by stimulating climate smart technologies and promoting adoption of climate smart technologies, including the use of biogas, solar, mini hydropower, recycled biomass and clean cook stoves. Along the same lines the project also carried out assessments of energy efficiency opportunities in a bid to improve energy efficiency in the public sector while at the same time increasing awareness on renewable energy business opportunities and policy environment in Kenya by documenting renewable energy business opportunities and holding renewable energy industry business exhibitions in collaboration with KEREA and ministries of Energy and Environment.

LECRD has also demonstrated some success with leveraging complementary initiatives and funding to widen its scope of activities and sphere of influence by getting USAID to provide additional funding during the course of the project and having government (The National Treasury) take over the full implementation including budget allocation for NDC activities.

The project faced many challenges. It targeted a well-designed, but highly ambitious scope of activities within a very short timeframe. This comprehensive scope that included policy (Climate Change Act Implementation) and institutional elements (establishment of a Climate Change Council headed by the President of the Republic) was not fully enabled by the available timeline and the lean project unit at the PMU.

Project implementation and management: Implementation was hindered by a high turnover of the accounting officers (Principal Secretaries) at the Ministry and also UNDP project managers. Other problems included slow mobilization of staff and powerful vested interests around recruitment, delayed project start, a slow and lengthy procurement process at the Ministry all which significantly delayed project implementation activities and therefore negatively impacted implementation and progress. The working relationship between the PMU team appear to have been effective and constructive. Some challenges were experienced with the changeover of project management and delays in renewal of project staff contracts. The majority of team members were well-qualified for their roles, although the turn-over rate of key project team members and government staff (especially procurement officers) presented challenges.

The reliance on project partners to lead processes has severally hampered the project's ability to deliver since some of the partners such as NETFUND were unable or did not have the capacity to deliver on the outputs committed. Where challenges were identified that were within the control of the project, adjustments were made to mitigate the impact (e.g. Soya Value Chain Addition project).

The governance structure designed for the project implemented through a National Execution (NEX) modality with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MEF), in its official role as the coordinator of all climate change affairs in Kenya and a Project Management Unit (PMU) based in the MEF managing the project and a steering committee comprised of USAID, UNDP and MEF provided adequate governance, oversight and strategic direction function it was intended. The steering committee structure also meant that high profile government representation could be fully leveraged.

After five years of implementation, the sustainability of interventions and the adequacy of the momentum created towards capacity for Kenya's low emission development remains strong especially at the institutional and policy levels but there is also uncertainty within several key results areas. The future operations of CEBIC and NCCRC and who is responsible for continued efficient operations is still in question, whilst the success of the domestic entrepreneurship and innovation activities initiated by the project is highly in doubt without additional funding and support. Furthermore, tools developed under the project such as Green Building Standards and rating have not been piloted or extensively tested and will require more time to be mainstreamed into the construction sector and building programs.

Stakeholders' participation and public awareness: The project benefitted from a strong analysis of stakeholder groups. Workshops, training and engagement with stakeholders' groups was generally good. Collaboration with partner organizations was effective, unlocking significant value for the project. The project contribution and impact on poor and vulnerable groups were duly considered in activities such as establishment of CEBIC in an ASAL, promoting smallholder climate smart technologies, practices and innovations by NETFUND and provision of Area yield index insurance to farmers. Additionally, youth were also considered with training on solar photovoltaic and solar water heating installation in TVETs and provision of internship opportunities at the PMU.

The project was not subject to the gender index. The impact on gender was noted at design stage, but was not reflected in the logframe or budget. While no major focus was put in gender in the initial stages of the project, promotion of gender in the latter stages of the project has been undertaken with the undertaking of an in depth gender analysis in the Context of Kenya's NDC. The Project is supported the promotion of gender mainstreaming in NDC planning, implementation and monitoring across sectors. Gender analysis is one an essential step toward gender mainstreaming into NDC and ensures that gender responsive actions are identified, planned, budgeted for and implemented. In partnership with the UNDP New York office, UNDP Country Office and the Ministry of Environment and Forestry also hosted a global gender workshop, "Gender Equality in National Climate Action: Working Towards Gender-Responsive NDCs,". Participants from over 15 countries attended and shared their experiences, lessons learned and way forward on gender-responsive NDC planning and implementation.

There is limited evidence suggesting that there is an adequate level of ownership, interest and commitment among the Implementing Partners (excluding Government Entities) to drive the implementation of the project outcomes after project closure. Sustainability will therefore largely depend on (i) institutional partners such as t JKUAT, KIRDI, KALRO, KSG, Kenya Meteorological Department; (ii) continued efforts of complementary existing and new initiatives, (iii) the quality of engagement of the subject matter platforms created e.g. the Climate Change Thematic Working Group (CCTWG) created during MTP III review and the private sector engagement and coordination platform (iv) global and regional trends influencing governments and project proposers funding opportunities.

The platforms that arose during the implementation of the LECRD programme e.g. adaptation thematic working group, mitigation thematic working group, private sector engagement and coordination platform among other Technical Working Groups (e.g. GHG) are likely to support the growth and sustainability of project successes.

Overall, the project receives a **Satisfactory** rating in the terminal evaluation. The respective project ratings are summarized below.

Evaluation criteria	Rating	Value	Summary of Supporting Evidence		
Relevance	R	2	The project is responding to the National Climate Action Planning Priorities, UN climate action and Kenyan CC realities.		
Effectiveness	MS	4	The project achievement significant number of key Outputs, Outcomes and show Likelihood of impact.		
Efficiency	MU	3	Resources of time and capital seem to have been well utilized to achieve the results. A few shortcomings may be in seen in equipment that are not adequately used.		
Overall Project Outcome Rating	MS	4	At least the first eight Key result areas had good or above average outcomes. Key Result area 9 and 10 may not have been well realized.		
Capacity Development	HS	6	The project incorporated a significant number of capacity building activities. This is evident in the Key result areas where almost 8/10 incorporate elements of capacity building		
Financial Management	S	5	There was no indication of overutilization of financial resources on personal emoluments. Most staff were seconded thus reducing the need for employment. In areas where. Resources were also put in capacity building which creates of a pool of human resources for future action.		
Policy and Regulatory Frameworks	S	5	The project worked within the agreeable policy and regulatory framework for all stakeholders. In some cases it contributed towards better policy e.g. i creation of climate finance budget lines		
Overall Likelihood of Sustainability	ML	3	At the national level, structures exist for enabling the activities to move further. At the lower levels, various activities have been broken down to manageable levels that can promote sustainability, for example the equipment supplied to TIVETS that can be used for training.		
M&E design at entry	HS	6	This was clearly spelt out starting from annual work plans, performance monitoring plans all the way to special reporting.		
Overall Quality of M&E	MS	4	There is no evidence of a mid-term evaluation that may have informed the subsequent flow of activities. However it was noted that there were frequent visits to project sites and quarterly, and annual reporting		
Gender Mainstreaming Strategy at entry	HS	6	This was well thought out and is evident for example in training programmes where the one-third gender rule seems to have been adhered to		
Gender Mainstreaming at Implementation	MS	4	Most of gender mainstreaming activities focused on training programmes; with gender analysis coming at the tail-end of the Programme through the gender analysis in the Context of Kenya's NDC		

6.2. Lessons learned

Based on the findings of the evaluation, a number of lessons may be useful for future projects of a similar nature, focus or with such a large footprint.

Lesson 1

The National Execution (NEX) modality of implementation under the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MEF), with a steering committee composed of MEF, UNDP and USAID proved to be an inappropriate governance structure. This high level steering committee was conceptually sound and provided a framework for engagement with key policy makers for effective implementation.

This is certainly a repeat lesson, encountered by many projects before. Projects aiming to influence policy positions, should be very assertive in its engagement with policy makers, ensuring a precise understanding of the relevant role players, identifying the most effective government entity to engage, ensure strong, high-level project sponsorship by the government, and ensuring appropriate and strategic placement of project representatives to effectively facilitate progress.

Lesson 2

The heavy reliance on the Government by the PMU for all aspects of the Programme implementation affected performance due to the slow bureaucratic processes that hindered the delivery on key milestones. In particular, the design of the project implementation structure, depending on a small central PMU with Government partners to drive most of the implementation at a national level, proved to be a major challenge. Delivery timelines on the overall project and delivery on multiple outputs were adversely impacted because of this especially in the area of procurement. Alternate hybrid structures and/or platforms could be sought for future projects to whereby procurement can be handled by UNDP or a more agile entity than through Government departments. Additionally, dependence on government representatives to prioritize project activities and objectives above other daily priorities, may not practical or realistic.

The introduction of interns as by the project was a helpful measure, but not fully adequate. Project implementation structures should more appropriately support the delivery objectives.

To the extent that it is possible, partner governments should be locked in with specific commitments to provide support services, infrastructure, contribute to remuneration and/or dedicated people to support project execution.

Lesson 3

Capacity development vs technical assistance: It was noted that skills transfer is not immediate, requiring a period of active engagement in a way that will enable integration of new techniques into everyday practices in order to effectively achieve mainstreaming. Once off training creates awareness, but does not fully empower individuals to implement or integrate concepts into their daily activities.

Ideally a balance should be sought between awareness creation and interventions aimed at entrenching a new approach to working among key role players and decision-makers. Towards this end, activities such as the relevant curriculum developed at KSG and at TIVETS are good models for entrenching relevant capacity within institutions and ascertaining that they have a lasting impact. Sustainability is expected through the use of the curriculum in the regular trainings at KSG of national and county level officials in mainstreaming climate change into national and county policy, planning & budgetary processes. Additionally, the learning by doing approach used in the development of the GHG inventory is a good example of this entrenching process.

Lesson 4

Impact monitoring is critical. Projects indicators and baselines were defined at design stage to enable project contributions to be gauged and demonstrated. The monitoring plan suggested several data collection tools and instruments that were implemented to various degree of success. No effort has

however been made to quantify the collective impact of activities due to the technical assistance. Very little information is available regarding the impact of the projects and/or any benefits derived from implementing these activities. Monitoring of indicators for project reporting is not the same as impact measurement. This should be clearly differentiated. The importance of establishing baselines, identifying or establishing instruments, tools and resources to track impacts and then to actually track and report tangible numbers, cannot be over emphasized. The project's ability to demonstrate its contribution may depend on this.

Simple measures such as keeping a record of all behavioral changes arising attributed to the project, undertaking short surveys or feedback questionnaires following training events, tracking frequency and reach of communication, can all provide a valuable indication of the project contribution without excessive cost implications.

6.3. Recommendations

The following actions are recommended for the LECRD project. The recommendations are made to ensure the project fully leverages the excellent resources that have been established. The last recommendation is aimed at ensuring the project is in integrity with the original design parameters and commitments which formed the basis on which USAID grant funding was made available. Responsibility for implementation of the recommendations reside with the PMU, unless otherwise stated.

Recommendation 1

It is highly recommended that the entire knowledge base and portfolio of resources for communication, training and awareness created by this project, be curated made available online given that it currently very hard to find all the resources from the very many activities of this project. This is where the National Climate Change Resource Centre (NCCRC), University and Institutional partners and Community Education Business and Information Centre (CEBIC) could play a significant role. This should be easy and quick to implement, with limited cost implications and will make a significant contribution to the longevity and wider impact of the project.

This knowledge base should be consolidated as soon as possible in a place that will be accessible for the foreseeable future.

Recommendation 2

It is recommended that the standards, rating tools, fact sheets etc. developed under the project e.g. Green Building Standards for Kenya be piloted immediately and additional funds leveraged for this purpose to ensure they serve their purpose as demonstration projects with aim mainstreaming them into regular programming in the future.

Recommendation 3

Aligned with the above, it is further recommended that efforts be made to leverage further funding through the project, and help unlock or crowd in development partners or complementary projects by leveraging the initial gains of the project to support the activities that have been started under various key results areas. This seems to be an area where the project has excelled with seed funding for example already coming in to the tune of 350,000 (USD) from France and DFID to support the Kenyan Climate Change Adaptation (KCCAP) Programme.

Recommendation 4

As a priority, provide support for the completion of operationalization of the activities of National Climate Change Council which was envisaged as an output in the Key Result Area 1. The council is at the apex of coordination and guidance in implementation of obligations and functions under the Climate Change Act, 2016. Therefore, its establishment and operationalization is a priority to ensure that it takes charge of the process of legislative implementation and preserve the gains that have already been achieved under LECRD such as the strengthening of the CCD, the secretariat to the council.

Recommendation 5

There was no evidence of a midterm evaluation being undertaken for the project. This needs to be considered in the next phases or in future projects in order continued relevance of the intervention and the progress made towards achieving its planned objectives. A midterm evaluation would provide an opportunity to make modifications during project implementation to ensure the achievement of overall objectives within the lifetime of the project.

Annex I. List of documents consulted

- UNDP LECRD Project Document 2014: Low Emission and Climate Resilient Development in Kenya
- UNDP LECRD Project Document 2017: Enhancing Capacity for Low Emission and Climate Resilient Development Project
- Achievements of The Low Emissions and Climate Resilient Development (LECRD) Project Report
- Activity Implementation Reports from the field
- Project Annual Workplans and budgets LECRD
- Project Budget and financial data LECRD
- Project internal monitoring and evaluation reports,
- Project Monitoring and Evaluation Reports
- Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings
- Annual Audit Report (2014,2019)
- UNDP Country Programme Document
- UNDAF Kenya
- GoK (2016) Climate Change Act 2016
- GoK. Third National Communications (TNC) to the UNFCCC and Biennial Update Reporting (BUR)
- GoK. Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs).
- 1st National Climate Change Action Plan
- 2nd National Climate Change Action Plan (2018 2022)
- Nationally Determined Contributions
- Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Results, UNDP (2009); UNEG Norms & Standards for Evaluation, 2016; UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Terms of Reference and Inception Reports, UNEG/G(2010)1; UNEG Quality Checklist for Evaluation Reports, UNEG/G(2010)/2.
- OECD DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance © OECD 1991.
- CIAT. 2011. Future climate scenarios for Kenya's tea growing areas.
- Cinner et al. 2012. Vulnerability of coastal communities to key impacts of climate change on coral reef fisheries
- Climate Service Center Germany. 2015. Climate FactSheet: Kenya.
- EC. 2017. Country profile on nutrition, Kenya.
- GoK. 2015. Second National Communication, UNFCCC.
- GoK. 2013. Long-term national low carbon climate resilient development pathway: climate risk assessment.
- GoK. 2012a. Government of Kenya Adaptation Technical Analysis Report.
- GoK. 2012b. Kenya Post-Disaster Needs Assessment, 2008-2011 Drought.
- IFPRI. 2012. East African agriculture and climate change: A comprehensive analysis, Kenya.
- IFRC. 2012. DREF final report: Kenya floods
- Kabubo-Mariara et al. 2016. The Impact of Climate Change on Food Calorie Production and Nutritional Poverty: Evidence from Kenya.
- Kebede et al. 2010. Impacts of climate change and sea level rise: Preliminary case study, Mombasa.
- SEI. 2010.Economics of climate change, Kenya.
- Thornton et al. 2009. Spatial variation of crop yield response to climate change in East Africa.
- UNEP. 2012. Africa without glaciers.
- UNICEF. 2015. Malaria mortality among children under five is concentrated in sub-Saharan Africa.
- USAID. 2014. Compilation of three climate change research reports: Ghana, Kenya and Burkina Faso.
- USAID. 2010. A climate trend analysis of Kenya.

- USAID. 2018. Climate Change Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation Assessment for East Africa.
- Wesangula. 2017. Dying gods: Mt Kenya's disappearing glaciers spread violence below.
- WHO. 2015a. Climate and health country profile, Kenya.
- WHO. 2015b. Kenya: WHO statistical profile.
- World Bank. 2016. Kenya Country Profile.
- World Bank. n.d. Kenya Climate Risk and Adaptation Profile.
- World Travel & Tourism Council. 2017. Economic Impact 2017, Kenya.
- United Nation, Transforming our world: the 2030 agenda for sustainable development
- GoK 2010 The Constitution of Kenya, 2010
- Government of the Republic of Kenya, Ministry of Planning and National Development and the National Economic and Social Council (NESC), Office of the President, 2007.Vision 2030
- Government of Kenya 2010, National Climate Change Response Strategy

Annex II. List of persons contacted/interviewed

Contact Person - Organization

- 1. Dr Pacifica Ogola-CCD
- 2. Purity M. Njeru-JKUAT
- 3. Dr. Dan Kithinji-MOE
- 4. Nickson Otieno-GAF
- 5. Zacheus Mwatha-KEBS
- 6. Edwin Mokaya-KIRDI
- 7. Michael Okoti-KALRO
- 8. Rachel Ngesa-KSG
- 9. James Nguo-ALIN
- 10. Chrispine Omondi-NETFUND
- 11. Victor Bwire-MCK
- 12. David Muchemi-KMD
- 13. Anahinga Ken-MoALF
- 14. Chrispine Omondi-NETFUND
- 15. Georgina Wachuka-KAM
- 16. Kamal Gupta-KEREA
- 17. Omedo Geoffrey-UNDP
- 18. Enock Kanyanya-USAID
- 19. Augustine Kenduiwo-CCD
- 20. Yvonne Nyokabi-LECRD
- 21. Peter Mwangi-LECRD
- 22. Jemimah Nyakwara-LECRD
- 23. Harun Warui-LECRD
- 24. James Chirchir, Deputy Principal Kaiboi Technical Training Institute
- 25. Dr. Maren Omondi (PhD), Principal Ramogi Institute of Advanced Technology
- 26. Mr. Joseph Mbugua Forester in Charge Bahati Forest Station, Nakuru County
- 27. Mr Agade Stephen Ndonga Kenya Meteorological Station Nakuru, Nakuru County

Annex III: Evaluation matrix

Evaluation Criteria	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods	Indicators Success Standard	Methods for Data Analysis
Relevance: Ho	w does the project relate to the ma	ain objectives of the climate change area, and to Kenya's	s environment and deve	lopment priorities at	the local, regional and r	ational levels?
1.To what	1.1 Were the objectives and	1.1 Were the objectives and implementation strategies		 Review of reports 	Level of alignment	
extent is the	implementation strategies	consistent with:	 Comparison 	with project	with (contribution of	 Document
project	consistent. aligned and coherent	1.1.1. National, regional and global issues and	project document	results	results to) national	review
relevant to	with key stakeholder priorities?	needs;	and annual reports	 Semi-structured 	and sub- regional	• TOC
Kenya's main		1.1.2. expectations and needs of key stakeholder	and national, regional	interviews of key	environmental issues,	approach
objectives on		groups	& international policy	stakeholders.	USAID mandate and	
climate		1.1.3. the UNDAF outcome areas and policies at the	and strategy papers,		policies at the time of	Compilation
change area,		time of design and implementation	Interviews with	Site visits (where	design and	of data
and to Kenya's		1.1.4. USAID focal area's strategic priorities and	ministry staff, project	viable).	implementation;	
environment		operational programme Policy	staff and			
and			governmental			
development			agencies			
	1.2 Did the (political,			 Review of reports 		
	environmental, social,		 Project progress 	with project	Reported adaptive	 Document
	institutional) context change		reports/PIR	results	management	review
	during project implementation		 Interviews with PMU, 	 Semi-structured 	measures in response	• TOC
	and how did the project adapt to		project staff and key	interviews of key	to changes in context	approach
	this?		stakeholders	stakeholders.		
						Compilation
						of data
Effectiveness:	To what extent have the expected	l outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved	?			
2. To what	2.1. Have the following 4 project			 Review of reports 		
extent has	objectives been met by the	Have the following projects results been realized?	 National Climate 	with project	Identification of	 Document
long-term,	planned strategic interventions?	2.1.1. National climate change coordination	Change documents	results	examples where	review
transformativ		processes enhanced	 Project progress 	 Semi-structured 	project objectives are	• TOC
е	i. strengthening capacity for low	2.1.2. Enhanced access to clean and efficient energy	reports	interviews of key	met and where there	approach
development	emission development in	systems	 Other relevant 	stakeholders.	are gaps.	• Compilation
and accelerate	Kenya;	2.1.3. A national sustainable Greenhouse Gas	documents, key	 Site visits (where 		of data.
sustainable		Inventory in place	stakeholders.	viable).		

climate	ii. building national and county	2.1.4. National and county decision making process				
resilient	institutions' capacity to better	for climate change interventions enhanced				
economic	coordinate climate change	2.1.5. Climate knowledge management and capacity				
growth, while	activities and finances:	is enhanced				
slowing the	iii enhancing decision making for	2.1.6 Minimize the Impacts of Extreme Climate				
growth of	increased resilience to climate	Events for Improved and Resilient Livelihoods				
greenhouse	change impacts: and	2.1.7 Kenva leverages funding from private sector				
gas emissions?	iv promoting climate smart	to implement NDC				
gas en 115510115 : 1	technologies and husiness	2.1.8 Domestic entrepreneurship and innovation to				
	opportunities	reduce emissions and improve resilience promoted				
	opportunities	2.1.9 Energy efficiency in the public sector				
		promoted				
		2.1.10 Renewable energy business promoted				
	2.2 To what extent are stratogic	2.2.1. Which strategic interventions by sector were		Poviow of roports	Compara original	Documont
	2.2 10 what extent are strategic	2.2.1 Which strategic interventions by sector were	National Climate	• Review of Teports	compare original	
	Interventions achieved?	2.2.2 Which strategic interventions by sector	National Climate Change decuments	with project	interventions	review
		2.2.2 Which strategic interventions by sector		results	identified with	• TUC
		1 du Wedknesses?	• Project progress	• Semi-structured	identified with	approach
		2.2.3 Are the strategic interventions offertive	reports	interviews of key	progress in different	Compilation
		2.2.4 Are the strategic interventions effective,	• Other relevant	stakeholders	sectors	of data
		efficient, relevant, sustainable and inclusive?	documents, key	 Site visits (where 	 Identify best 	 Identificatio
			stakeholders.	viable).	practices.	n of best
						practice
						case
						studies.
3. To what	3.1 How suitable are the	3.1.1 What institutions were developed to address		 Literature review 	 Identification of the 	 Document
extent does	institutional frameworks for	climate change governance?	 Project team, 	and	social networks of	review, TOC
the project	climate change governance?	3.1.2 How did the institutions evolve during the	documents and key	 interviews with 	governance.	approach
strengthen		project?	stakeholders	key stakeholders.		 Mapping
governance?		3.1.3 What institutions are in place to continue the				governance
		work started with the project?				networks.
		3.1.4 What new institutions could be created to				
		address gaps in governance?				
	3.2 Who were the key actors	3.2.1 Who were the key actors who adopted		 Literature review 	 Identification of the 	 Document
	involved in climate change	leadership roles in the project?	• Project team,	and	social networks of	review, TOC
	governance?	3.2.2 Are there actors that could have played a more	documents and key	 interviews with 	governance.	approach
		central role in the project?	stakeholders	key stakeholders.		

	3.3 How has the project made use of collaboration and coordination with other national institutions	 3.3.1 Does the project situate climate change adaptation and mitigation in the context of national development priorities? 3.3.2 What have been the strengths and weaknesses of collaboration with other national institutions and international institutions? 3.3.3 Are there additional potential strategic opportunities for collaboration 	 Project team, documents and key stakeholders 	 Literature review and interviews with key stakeholders. 	 Identification of the social networks of governance. 	 Document review, TOC approach .
4. To what extent does the project engage stakeholders?	4.1 How does the project engage with key stakeholders?	 4.1.1 How are the concerns and views of stakeholders included? 4.1.3 What are the mechanisms of collaboration amongst stakeholders? 4.1.4 Is project management and implementation participatory and does this contribute towards the project objectives? 	 Project team, documents and key stakeholders 	 Literature review and interviews with key stakeholders. Site visits as possible 	relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability.	 Document review, TOC approach
	4.2 How does the project engage with the wider public?	 4.2.1 How is information about the project communicated to the wider public? 4.2.2 What and how are the key messages about climate change adaptation communicated to the public? 4.2.3 To what extent have disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefitted from the project? 	 Project team, documents and key stakeholders 	 Literature review and interviews with key stakeholders. Site visits as possible 	relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability.	 Document review, TOC approach
Efficiency: Was	the project implemented efficient	ly, in-line with international and national norms and sta	ndards?			
5. To what extent has the project offered financial value?	5.1 Have resources been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?	 5.1.1 Has there been economical use of financial and human resources? 5.1.2 Have the outputs been used by partner organizations in decision-making? 5.1.3 Do the results achieved justify the costs? 5.1.4 Are the monitoring systems in place helping ensure effective and efficient project management? 	 Project team, documents and key stakeholders 	 Literature review and interviews with key stakeholders. Site visits as possible 	relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability.	 Document review, TOC approach
6. Has the project partnership strategy been	6.1 How have partnerships affected the progress towards achieving outputs?	6.1.1 How does the PMU interact with stakeholders?6.1.2 What are the strengths and limitations of the partnerships formed?	 Project team, documents and key stakeholders 	 Literature review and interviews with key stakeholders. 	relevance, efficiency, effectiveness,	 Document review, TOC approach

appropriate		6.1.3 What is the level of consensus amongst the		 Site visits as 	sustainability.	
and effective?		USAID and other donor organizations?		possible		
Sustainability: To	o what extent are there financial,	institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental ris	sks to sustaining long-te	rm project results?		
7 How	7 1 Are there	7.1.1. Is stakeholder engagement and ownership	[Literature review		
sustainable is	social, political or economic	sufficient that project benefits will be sustained?	• Project team.	and interviews	Identify partnerships	 Document
the project?	risks that may jeopardize the	7.1.2 Are lessons learned being documented and	documents and key	with kev	formed and their	review. TOC
]	sustainability of project	shared with others who can learn from the project?	stakeholders	stakeholders	strengths. limitations	approach
	outcomes?	7.1.3 Do the interventions have well designed		stakenolders	and overlaps	approact
		and well planned exit strategies?				
		7.1.4 Are there limitations to the current legal				
		frameworks, policies, governance or processes that				
		may undermine the long term sustainability of project				
		benefits?				
		7.1.5 Are there environmental risks that may				
		jeopardize the sustenance of the project				
		outcome?				
		7.1.6 Are there recommended modifications to the				
		current partnerships to promote long-term				
		sustainability of project outcomes?				
Impact: Are the	re indications that the project ha	s contributed to, or enabled progress toward, improv	ed climate change polic	ies and regulatory fr	ameworks and low emi	ssions climate
resilient develop	oment in Kenya?					
8. What are	8.1 Through its activities related	8.1.1 What early impacts have been achieved by		 Field visits to 	beneficiaries of the	 Document
the impacts of	to Improved policies and	the programme	 Project team, 	demonstration	outputs that	review, TOC
the project?	improving resilience, to what	8.1.2 How could the Programme build on its	documents and	projects,	contribute low-	approach
	extent have the programme	obvious successes and learn from its weaknesses	interviews with local	interviews with	emission techniques	
	initiatives began to translate into	in order to increase the potential impact of current	stakeholders	local stakeholders	etc., perceive	
	improved local livelihoods in the	and future initiatives?		involved with	improvement of their	
	intervention areas? Is there			these projects and	living conditions	
	evidence of direct impacts			the direct	(income, food	
	arising from improved living			beneficiaries	security) and are able	
	conditions at the local level?				to provide clear	
					examples for this	

Annex IV: Evaluation ToR



United Nations Development Programme

Empowered lives. Resilient nations.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

NATIONAL INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT – LEAD CONSULTANT ON THE TERMINAL EVALUATION OF THE LOW EMMISION CLIMATE RESILIENT DEVELOPMENT(LECRD)

Job ID/Title:	Lead Consultant - Terminal Evaluation of the Low Emission Climate Resilient Development (LECRD)
Scope of advertisement:	Nationally advertised
Category (eligible applicants):	External ¹
Brand:	UNDP
Practice Area:	Climate Change
Application Deadline:	Thursday, 26 March 2020 by 11.59 P.M (GMT+3.00)
Type of Contract:	National Individual Contract
Reference:	KEN/IC/2020/005 – Lead Consultant - Terminal Evaluation of the Low Emission Climate Resilient Development (LECRD)
Duty Station:	Nairobi, Kenya
Languages Required:	English
Expected Duration of Assignment:	40 working days

 $^{^{1}\ {\}rm External}\ {\rm defines}\ {\rm as}\ {\rm applicants}\ {\rm external}\ {\rm to}\ {\rm UNDP}\ {\rm and}\ {\rm to}\ {\rm the}\ {\rm UN}\ {\rm Common}\ {\rm system},\ {\rm including}\ {\rm UNDP}\ {\rm non-staff}.$

Background:

In accordance with UNDP M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the USAID funded and GOK implemented Low Emission and Climate Resilient Development (LECRD) Project.

Kenya is highly vulnerable to climate change impacts and this poses a serious threat to socioeconomic development. The country has experienced frequent and unpredictable weather conditions such as droughts and floods that have devastating effects on the country's ecosystems and the economy. Indeed it is estimated that the annual cost of climate change impacts could cost as much as US\$500 million a year (equivalent to approximately 2.6 percent of the country's GDP). The country is mainly Arid and Semi-arid Lands (ASAL) which constitutes 88% of the country's land mass; with a total human population projected at 50 million. Close to 45% of the population lives below the poverty line with poverty levels higher in female led households making them more vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. The Government of Kenya (GOK) made a commitment to low carbon climate resilient development pathway as articulated in the first and second National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP), third Medium Term Plan (MTP III), The Climate Change Act, 2016 and Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan (GESIP 2016-2030).

The Ministry of Environment and Forestry continues to partner with UNDP through its Environment and Resilience Unit to undertake climate change actions in Kenya. The signature project that has been implemented over the last 5 years (from 22nd September 2014 to 21st February 2020) to support Kenya's climate change programs is the Low Emission and Climate Resilient Development (LECRD) Project. The LECRD project has been implemented through National Implementation Modality (NIM) by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MEF) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) with funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). In this implementation modality, the Ministry has the overall responsibility for achieving the project goal and objectives and is directly responsible for creating the enabling conditions for implementation of all project activities. UNDP has an oversight role in the implementation of the project through monitoring the implementation of the project, reviewing progress in the realization of the project outputs, and ensuring for proper use of the funds. The overall goal of LECRD project was to support Kenya in her efforts to pursue long-term, transformative development and accelerate sustainable climate resilient economic growth, while slowing the growth of greenhouse gas emissions.

Objective

The specific objectives of the project are to strengthen capacity for low emission development in Kenya; build national and county institutions' capacity to better coordinate climate change activities and finances; enhance decision making for increased resilience to climate change impacts and promote climate smart technologies and business opportunities. This was to be achieved through the following key project outputs:

- Key Result Area 1: National climate change coordination processes enhanced
- Key Result Area 2: Enhanced access to clean and efficient energy systems
- Key Result Area 3: A national sustainable Greenhouse Gas Inventory in place
- Key Result Area 4: National and county decision making process for climate change interventions enhanced
- Key Result Area 5: Climate knowledge management and capacity is enhanced

- Key Result Area 6: Minimize the Impacts of Extreme Climate Events for Improved and Resilient Livelihoods
- Key Result Area 7: Kenya leverages funding from private sector to implement NDC
- Key Result Area 8: Domestic entrepreneurship and innovation to reduce emissions and improve resilience promoted
- Key Result Area 9: Energy efficiency in the public sector promoted
- Key Result Area 10: Renewable energy business promoted

Scope of Work

UNDP Kenya is seeking to procure two independent Individual Consultants (1. Lead Consultant and 2. Support Consultant) to undertake the Terminal Evaluation of the LECRD Project. The LECRD end-term project evaluation is aimed at assessing its stages and products through participatory approaches; measuring to what extent the objective/outputs/activities have been achieved against the results and identifying factors that have facilitated or hindered the success of the project. The evaluation will constitute an assessment of positive or negative effects attributable to the project. The evaluation will also assess the effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, sustainability and ownership of the project. The evaluation will target beneficiaries from national government ministries, county governments, departments and institutions, as well as private sector, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), research/academic institutions and the media.

Tasks of the Assignment

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method² for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance**, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact. The evaluation should seek to accomplish the following:

- a) Review the performance of the Project in achieving the outputs as per the Project Document and the contributions to the UNDP Country program Document outcomes;
- b) Evaluate the results achieved and the Impact made by the Project since inception in November 2015 to the project end period (21st February 2020).
- c) Identify factors, which facilitated or hindered the achievement of results, both in terms of the external environment and those internal to UNDP and document lessons learned in the implementation stages. This should include but not be limited to assessing the strengths and weaknesses in project design, management, coordination, human resource, and financial resources among others;
- Assess the appropriateness of the programme strategy including the programme institutional/management arrangements and the funding modality to reach the intended outputs and outcomes;
- e) Establish the extent to which the approach and implementation of the Project contributes to sustainable development in Kenya, specifically within climate change area;
- f) Determine the extent to which the project addresses crosscutting issues including gender and human rights;
- g) Make clear and focused recommendations that may be required for enhancing effectiveness of the LECRD by UNDP and development partners, especially a clear sustainability and transition framework;

The evaluation methodology should be consistent to UNDP's guidelines on evaluations and participatory and

² For additional information on methods, see the <u>Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for</u> <u>Development Results</u>, Chapter 7, pg. 163



include 1) Review of documentation; 2) Interviews with relevant stakeholders and project beneficiaries; 3) Field Visits/observations; 4) Stakeholders workshops among others consistent with global best practices in evaluation methodologies. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry Focal Point, UNDP Country Office, project team, USAID and all other key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to some of the project sites in Kenya to interview project beneficiaries. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- 1. The Ministry of Environment and Forestry
- 2. The Climate Change Directorate
- 3. NETFUND
- 4. Kenya Industrial Research Development Institute (KIRDI)
- 5. The Jomo Kenyatta University of Agricultural Technology
- 6. The Green Africa Foundation
- 7. Kenya Meteorological Department
- 8. The National Treasury
- 9. Kenya Renewable Energy Association (KEREA)
- 10. The Arid Lands Information Network

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR, project budget revisions, progress reports, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of some key documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in <u>Annex A</u> of this Terms of Reference. <u>Annex B</u> contains the key leading questions that will guide the evaluators in undertaking this evaluation. It is expected that the evaluator will share the initial findings and recommendations to the UNDP Country Office, USAID, and the Government of Kenya partners. Thereafter, the findings will be revised to incorporate feedback, then finalized for record and use.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework in the LECRD Project Document, which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of **relevance**, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria.

The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in <u>Annex C</u>.

Evaluation Ratings:					
1. Monitoring and Evaluation	rating	2. IA& EA Execution	rating		
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation			
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency			
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution			
3. Assessment of Outcomes	rating	4. Sustainability	rating		
Relevance		Financial resources:			
Effectiveness		Socio-political:			
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:			
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:			

	Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

Mainstreaming

The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Kenya. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The LECRD Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be 40 days according to the following plan:

Activity	Timing
Preparation	5 days
Evaluation Mission	10 days
Draft Evaluation Report	15 days
Final Report	10 days

Deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
Inception	Evaluator provides	No later than 1 weeks after	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
Report	clarifications on timing	signing the contract.	
	and method		
Draft Final	Full report, (per annexed	Within 2 weeks of the	Sent to CO
Report	template) with annexes	evaluation period	
Final Report*	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP
		UNDP comments on draft	ERC.

*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

The professionalism of evaluators and their effective use of appropriate evaluation methods are critical. Key questions and areas for investigation should be clear, coherent and realistic. Evaluation plans should be practical and cost-effective. Evaluations should be built on explicit results frameworks and theories of change, where available.

The evaluation team will be composed of (1 individual consultant evaluator) who will receive support from 1 Support Consultant in the Country Office and a team in the LECRD Project Management Office at the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Lead Consultant will have overall responsibility for the quality and timely submission of all deliverables including the final evaluation report to UNDP Kenya. Specifically, the lead consultant will perform the following tasks:

- Lead and manage the evaluation process;
- Design the detailed evaluation plan, methodology and survey instruments;
- Draft and communicate the evaluation report to UNDP

Qualifications:

Education

A post-graduate degree in environmental management, climate change, project management, Economics, statistics or a related field.

Experience

- Proven experience of at least 7 years in undertaking project/programme evaluations. The experience should include undertaking of at least five (5) medium to large scale donor funded project/programmes (of which two (2) should be in climate change related fields) in the past 5 years.
- Experience in Capacity development, institutional/organizational strengthening and Policy development/mainstreaming.
- Proven experience and good knowledge of the UNDP Evaluation Policy, Results Based Evaluation Policies and Procedures, NIM Guidelines and Procedures and Understanding of Human Rights approach and advancing gender equality principles in Projects.

Language

Fluency in both written and spoken English.

Evaluation Criteria

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on a cumulative analysis taking into consideration the combination of the applicants' qualifications, technical and financial proposals. The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable; and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation, with technical criteria being weighted at 70% and financial criteria being weighted at 30%.

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 49 points (70% of the total technical points) will be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Technical Criteria (Maximum 70 points)

- A bachelor's degree in environmental management, project management, business management, finance, statistics or a related field. (20 points)
- Proven experience of at least 5 years in project management within UN entities and institutions. The
 experience should include budget analysis, analysis, planning and organization, grant management,
 capacity assessment, to donor funded project/programmes in the past 5 years. (30 points)
- Experience in providing administrative support to complex projects, evaluations, institutional/organizational strengthening and Policy development/mainstreaming programmes covering national governments and county governments in Kenya. (15 points)
- Proven experience and good knowledge of the UNDP Evaluation Policy, Results Based Evaluation Policies and Procedures, NIM Guidelines and Procedures and Understanding of Human Rights approach and advancing gender equality principles in Projects (15 points)
- Have excellent English writing and communication skills (20 points)

Financial Criteria (Maximum 30 points)

%	Milestone
20%	At submission and approval of the Inception Report
30%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO) of the final terminal evaluation report

Submission of the Financial Proposal

Applicants are instructed to submit their all-inclusive fee proposal in KSH using the financial proposal template provided (Offerors letter to UNDP)

The financial proposal should be all-inclusive and include a breakdown. The term 'all-inclusive" implies that all costs (professional fees, travel related expenses, communications, utilities, consumables, insurance, etc.) that could possibly be incurred by the Contractor are already factored into the financial proposal.

Financial evaluation (maximum 30 points):

The following formula will be used to evaluate financial proposal:

 $p = y (\mu/z)$, where

p = points for the financial proposal being evaluated

- y = maximum number of points for the financial proposal
- μ = price of the lowest priced proposal
- z = price of the proposal being evaluated

Duration of the Work

40 working days

Application process.

Interested and qualified candidates should submit their applications which should include the following:

- 1. Detailed Curriculum Vitae
- 2. Proposal for implementing the assignment template provided
- 3. Offerors letter to UNDP template provided

Note: The successful applicant will be required to complete a UNDP Personal History Form (P11) form prior to contracting.

Applications should be sent to <u>consultants.ken@undp.org</u> to reach us not later than Thursday, 26 March 2020 by 11.59 P.M (GMT+3.00)

Please quote "KEN/IC/2020/005 – Lead Consultant - Terminal Evaluation of the Low Emission Climate Resilient Development (LECRD) on the subject line.

Firms are not eligible for this consultancy assignment. Open to national individual consultants only. Incomplete applications will be disqualified automatically.

All applications must be submitted through the UNDP eTendering portal.

 If already registered, please go to https://etendering.partneragencies.org and sign in using your username and password, and search for the event: Business Unit: UNDP1

Event ID:

 If you do not remember your password, please use the "Forgotten password" link. Do not create a new profile.

 If you have never registered in the system before, please complete a one-time registration process first by visiting https://etendering.partneragencies.org and using the below generic credentials: Username: event.guest

Password: why2change

Detailed user guide on how to register in the system and submit the proposal can be found at:

http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/procurement/business/procurementnotices/resources/

Email submission of applications will not be accepted. Queries about the position can be directed to

undp.kenya.procurement@undp.org

ANNEX A: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS

UNDP. Evaluation Office. 2012. Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects. iii + 53 p.

Project development documents: UNDP LECRD Project Document 2014.

Technical Documents developed as part of the project implementation: Activity Implementation Reports from the field

Project Management Documents:

Project Annual Workplans and budgets

Project Budget and financial data

Project internal monitoring and evaluation reports,

Project Monitoring and Evaluation Reports

Minutes of the Project Steering Committee Meetings

Annual Audit Report (2014,2019)

National Documents

UNDP Country Programme Document UNDAF Kenya Climate Change Act 2016 1st National Climate Change Action Plan 2nd National Climate Change Action Plan (2018 – 2022) Nationally Determined Contributions Climate Finance Policy

CLIMATE FUND REGULATIONS

ANNEX B: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectiv	es of the climate change area, and to	Kenya's environment a	nd development
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes a	and objectives of the project been ach	nieved?	
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line v	vith international and national norms	and standards?	
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•		•
•	•	•	•
Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutio project results?	nal, social-economic, and/or environ	mental risks to sustainin	g long-term
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contribu regulatory frameworks and low emissions climate resilien	ited to, or enabled progress toward, t development in Kenya?	improved climate chan	ge policies and
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

based on the particulars of the project.

ANNEX C: RATING SCALES

Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&E, I&E Execution	Sustainability ratings:	Relevance ratings
 6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings 5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings 4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings 2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems 1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems 	 Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks Unlikely (U): severe risks 	 Relevant (R) Not relevant (NR) <i>Impact Ratings:</i> Significant (S) Minimal (M) Negligible (N)
Additional ratings where relevant:	1	
Not Applicable (N/A)		
Unable to Assess (U/A		

ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

Evaluators:

- 1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
- Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
- 3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
- 4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
- 5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.

- 6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study imitations, findings and recommendations.
- 7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE³

i. Opening page:

- Title of UNDP supported project
- UNDP project ID#s.
- Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
- Implementing Partner and other project partners
- Evaluation team members
- Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
 - Project Summary Table
 - Project Description (brief)
 - Evaluation Rating Table
 - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations
 - (See: UNDP Editorial Manual⁴)
- 1. Introduction
 - Purpose of the evaluation
 - Scope & Methodology
 - Structure of the evaluation report
 - Project description and development context
 - Project start and duration
 - Problems that the project sought to address
 - Immediate and development objectives of the project
 - Baseline Indicators established
 - Main stakeholders
 - Expected Results
- 3. Findings

2.

- (In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (*) must be rated⁵)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
 - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
 - Assumptions and Risks
 - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
 - Planned stakeholder participation
 - Replication approach
 - UNDP comparative advantage
 - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
 - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation

⁵ Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.



³The Report length should not exceed **40** pages in total (not including annexes).

⁴ UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

- Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
- Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (*) coordination, and operational issues
- 3.3 Project Results
 - Overall results (attainment of objectives) (*)
 - Relevance (*)
 - Effectiveness & Efficiency (*)
 - Country ownership
 - Mainstreaming
 - Sustainability (*)
 - Impact
 - Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons
 - Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
 - Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
 - Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
 - Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success
- 5. Annexes

4.

• ToR

- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cle	ared by	
UNDP Country Office		
Name:		
Signature:	Date:	