



**KENYA ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE IN ARID LANDS (KACCAL) PROJECT**

**(PIMS 3792)**

**TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**Recipient: United Nations Development Programme Kenya Country Office**

COMPILED BY: OLIVER CHAPEYAMA  
Enviroplan (Pty) Ltd  
P.O. Box320184, Tlokweng  
Botswana  
Tel: +267-3972489

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Executive Summary.....	3
Evaluation Ratings:.....	4
List of Acronyms.....	8
1. Background and Introduction .....	10
1.1 Purpose of the evaluation.....	10
1.2 Methodology of the evaluation .....	11
1.3 Structure of the evaluation.....	12
1.4 Evaluation Team.....	13
2. Project Description and development context.....	14
3. Evaluation Findings .....	17
3.1 Project Formulation.....	17
3.2 Project Implementation.....	25
3.3 Project Results.....	28
3.3.6 Summary of Assessment of Project Performance.....	33
Table Evaluation Ratings: .....	33
4. Conclusions, recommendations & lessons.....	35
5. Annexes.....	39
Annex 2: Evaluation Terms of Reference.....	46

## **Executive Summary**

### **Background**

The Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in Arid Lands (KACCAL) project was funded through a US\$1 million grant from the Special Climate Change Fund. The three-year project was implemented between 2011 and 2014 by UNDP Kenya Country Office in collaboration with the Government of Kenya (GoK). The project's main aim was to increase the capacity of poor rural communities in Kyuso and Mumoni divisions of Kitui County to adapt to climate variability and change. The project also focused on integrating climate change adaptation into the development plans for the agriculture, water, and forestry and wildlife sectors.

The project aimed to achieve its objectives through the following three outcomes:

1. Enhanced awareness of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures in arid and semi-arid lands.
2. Enhanced capacity of district and local level stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures.
3. Enhanced communities' ability to plan, manage and implement climate-related activities.

In addition to this main project, is a Euro 150,000 Flemish funded initiative focusing on reducing the quantities of firewood through the introduction of energy efficient cook stoves. The logic of this project was that reduction in fuel wood use would result in reduced carbon emissions from deforestation and increase the extent of carbon sinks through forest conservation.

As per the GEF requirement the KACCAL project was subjected to a Terminal Evaluation whose aim was to:

- Provide a comprehensive and systematic accounting of the performance of the project;
- Assess the effectiveness of project design, implementation, the likelihood of sustainability of the project's results and their possible impacts;
- Assess the appropriateness, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project;
- Identify lessons learned and provide recommendations for use in the development of future projects; and
- Measure the possible overall and lasting impact of the project.

### **Implementation**

The original project was planned to be funded by the World Bank and UNDP to a level of US\$ 5 million. It was intended to cover all the Arid and Semi-arid Lands and to strengthen capacity for climate change adaptation at national, district and local community levels but later was scaled back to focus on the pilot districts of Mumoni and Kyuso due to a number of reasons. The original

objective of building capacity for climate change adaptation at national level was also scaled back to a focus on creating awareness about climate change at this level. This was because it was realised that with the limited funding available to the project, it would be unrealistic to expect the project to achieve capacity enhancement at national level. This re-focused the attention of the project on district level stakeholders and beneficiary communities on a pilot basis.

This report details the results and findings of the Terminal Evaluation. The report also highlights the lessons that were learnt from the implementation of the project and proposes recommendations for future programming by GEF.

The KACCAL project was designed to address the problems of drought and aridity which have traditionally affected poor rural communities in the ASALs regions of Kenya. This focus was on a problem that is relevant to Kenya's development planning processes. The project also introduced the innovation of community participation in the design and implementation of the project, an approach which had not been used in addressing drought in Kenya.

### Summary of Evaluation Results

The evaluation established that the UNDP funded KACCAL project managed to coordinate all relevant institutions working in the area of drought and climate change resulting in successes in creating awareness about climate change at national level. District level institutions were also provided with training and capacity enhancement. With this enhanced capacity and understanding of the science of climate change and adaptation, these district institutions were now able to integrate climate change adaptation into their development planning operations. Further, these institutions were now able to provide effective services to community groups which had hitherto been unable to respond to the exigencies of variable and unpredictable weather patterns. The affected communities are now able to plan, manage and implement activities that directly targeted the adverse impacts of climate change.

Despite the fact that the Project Manager had been deployed to the field without office support, he managed to build very strong collaborative processes with a range of governmental and non-governmental institutions in the field which resulted in effective project implementation. Project resources were efficiently utilised with a very effective investment to results ratio. The evaluation's conclusion is that the Sustainability of the project results is **Likely (L)** to subsist over the long term.

The evaluation established that the project had met its objectives and was therefore adjudged to be **Successful (S)**.

The Table below summarises the ratings of various aspects of project implementation which the evaluator assessed to arrive at the conclusion that the project had been successful.

Evaluation Ratings:

1. Monitoring and Evaluation	Rating	2. IA & EA Execution	rating
M&E design at entry	S	Quality of UNDP Implementation	MS
M&E Plan Implementation	MS	Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	S
Overall quality of M&E	MS	Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	S
3. Assessment of Outcomes	Rating	4. Sustainability	rating

Relevance	R	Financial resources:	L
Effectiveness	S	Socio-political:	L
Efficiency	S	Institutional framework and governance:	L
		Environmental :	L
		<b>Overall likelihood of sustainability</b>	<b>L</b>
<b>Overall Project Outcome Rating</b>			<b>S</b>

### Lessons Learned

The evaluation has highlighted that there had been earlier efforts by the Kenya government to address issues related to climate variability and change in the ASALs of the country with little success. The KACCAL project has however made considerable progress towards addressing these issues and sustaining the gains made over the long term. This level of success has yielded a number of lessons that have been documented for use in the planning and development of similar activities in Kenya and elsewhere. These lessons are summarised below.

1. Projects targeting the improvement of livelihoods in rural contexts require that all technical support agencies and service providers work in close collaboration with each other so as to deliver a consolidated programme to affected communities. The KACCAL project addressed the lack of coordination in previous project interventions through conducting a comprehensive stakeholder analysis which indicated the strengths of each stakeholder prior to project design and start up. This was used to develop collaborative planning strategies which have positively impacted on community capacities to adapt to climate change.
2. Participatory planning processes promote more long lasting impacts among beneficiary communities. The approach adopted under the KACCAL project to involve community groups in the project design and implementation has resulted in community groups at the pilot sites owning the project which bodes well for sustainability.
3. Capacity building can easily become a never ending process if it does not deliberately and specifically target groups to benefit from it. The stakeholder consultations discussed above identified three discrete stakeholder groups that were to receive targeted awareness and capacity enhancement support. These were the national level government entities that received awareness raising support, county and division level extension service providers who received climate change adaptation training and the beneficiary communities which also received training on climate change adaptation.
4. It is not always the large multi-million dollar projects that have the most significant impact on community development. Small targeted projects are more likely to result in significant impacts. KACCAL was a reduced scale project which provided targeted capacity building support to community groups in the project area with significant impacts as is documented in this report.
5. Climate change adaptation needs to be mainstreamed into development planning initiatives at various planning levels for the results from the initiatives to be sustainable over the long term. The integration of climate change adaptation initiatives into County Development

initiatives will guarantee the institutionalization of this response to climate change into development planning.

6. Projects aimed at addressing climate change need to ensure that they involve women at all levels of management as women are the ones that suffer the most from climate change and variability.

## **Recommendations**

The KACCAL project has already been operationally closed so the recommendations that are provided in this report will only be of use to UNDP/GEF for use in the design of other projects. They may also be applied, if the UNDP/GEF decides to re-activate one or two elements of the project to utilize the remaining funds in the project.

Training materials on climate change adaptation and its mainstreaming into development planning have been developed under the memorandum of understanding with the University of Nairobi. The evaluation has established that all those that undertook this training had their appreciation of climate change increased to different levels with county level staff now incorporating the concept into their integrated planning frameworks. This process of climate proofing development planning is expected to improve the resilience of rural communities over time.

***Recommendation 1: It is recommended that UNDP Kenya Country Office and the National Drought Management Agency collaborate to package the training materials on climate change adaptation that were produced by the University of Nairobi for use on similar follow-on projects. The NDMA has already committed to continuing with the training and capacity building activities initiated under the project and will therefore benefit from these materials which have been very well received by all stakeholders who were exposed to them***

The training provided by the University of Nairobi was preceded by a Capacity Perception Index survey which measured the perceptions that various groups of stakeholders have on climate change and variability. The results of this survey were then used to develop a customized training response that addressed this complicated subject at the appropriate level. This survey was to have been followed up by a Perception Assessment Survey to assess the extent to which stakeholder perceptions of climate change had shifted following training. This survey was never conducted as the project ran out of time. Future training will require the use of the results of this second stage survey.

***Recommendation 2: It is recommended that UNDP Kenya CO and NDMA use the left over project financial resource to engage the University of Nairobi to conduct this planned survey with the results of the survey being used to inform both on-going and new interventions in the area.***

At the time the KACCAL project was closed, a number of procurement contracts for the production of project communications and publicity materials had been issued but the results of the work had not been delivered. The UNDP Kenya Country Office is expecting to receive final versions of these materials at the time of the Terminal Evaluation. These materials included information pamphlets and leaflets, T-shirts and others which were to be disseminated to communities around the pilot sites.

***Recommendation 3: That UNDP CO finalise the production of these materials as a matter of urgency and hand them over to the NDMA for dissemination over the divisions where the project was implemented. These materials will promote the continued engagement of participating communities and also encourage those that had not benefitted directly from the project to also take up the new ideas that were generated.***

The Kitui County government has taken up the products from the KACCAL project and integrated climate change adaptation into their Country Integrated Development Plan. This recognition of the work that was done under the project is an important development in Kenya's continuing efforts at addressing climate change issues in the arid and semi arid regions of the country. It is important that the momentum generated at the pilot project sites is nurtured into the future.

***Recommendation 4: It is recommended that the County government continues to engage with all the pilot projects initiated under the KACCAL project with a view to sustaining the initiatives into the future. The experiences gained at these sites should be scaled up and replicated across the rest of the ASALs in Kenya through this support which the NDMA have already committed to.***

## List of Acronyms

ALRMP	Arid Lands Resource Management Project
ASAL	Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
BTC	Belgium Technical Cooperation
CBO	Community Based Organization
CIDP	County Integrated Development Plan
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CPI	Capacity Performance Index
CRM	Community Resource Management
DAO	District Agricultural Officer
DCO	District Crops Officer
DDO	District Development Officer
DFO	District Forestry Officer
EDRP	Emergency Drought Recovery Project
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ERS	Economic Recovery Strategy
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FF&LS	Farmer Field and Learning Schools
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FFS	Farmer Field Schools
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GIZ	German Development Organization
GoK	Government of Kenya
ICS	Improved Cook stove
ICPAC	IGAD Climate Prediction Application Centre
IPM	Integrated Pest Management
KACCAL	Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in Arid Lands
KAPP	Kenya Agricultural Production Project
KARI	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute
KIRDI	Kenya Industrial Research and Development
KMC	Kenya Meat Commission
KSC	Kenya Seed Company
KMD	Kenya Meteorological Department
LFA	Logical Framework Approach
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
MFIs	Microfinance Institutions
MUKY-ORDAP	Mumoni & Kyuso Organization for Rural Development & Active Participation
NALEP	National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme
NDMA	National Drought Management Authority



NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OP	Office of the President
SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund
SPFS	Special Programme for Food Security
SRA	Strategy for Revitalization of Agriculture
ToR	Terms of Reference
TOTs	Training of Trainers
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

## **1. Background and Introduction**

The rural populations of the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs) of Kenya are particularly vulnerable to recurrent droughts, and to the long-term impacts of climate variability and change.

In response to this, the Kenya Government through the Ministry of State for Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands has been implementing a GEF funded Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in Arid Lands (KACCAL) project since 2011 aimed at supporting rural populations in Mwingi District to enhance their capacity to adapt to recurring droughts and floods through livelihood diversification and enhancement interventions. The KACCAL project has been focused on a broad range of issues including improving access to irrigation technology, promoting the growing of indigenous crops, the re-introduction of livestock varieties that are more resilient to climate variability and the diversification of livelihood options through the introduction of fuel efficient cook stoves as a means towards reducing the levels of deforestation that was leading to land degradation in the district.

An addition to this programme was the grant by the Flemish government that targeted Objective 3 above through the introduction of efficient cookstoves among 2000 households in Mwingi District as an intervention to reduce widespread deforestation caused by the production of charcoal and clearing land for cultivation. More efficient cookstoves would lead to reduced pressure on the woodland resources and result in a net increase in woodland cover which acts as a carbon sink. Further, the reduction in demand for wood would liberate the women and girls in the district from the drudgery of collecting wood for fuel with the time saving being dedicated to other productive activities.

The KACCAL project and the additional Flemish support ended in June 2014 and are due for a Terminal Evaluation. This Inception Report details the purpose and process to be followed in conducting the subject Terminal Evaluation which will be conducted using the standard UNDP/GEF guidance to the conduct of project evaluations.

### **1.1 Purpose of the evaluation**

Monitoring and evaluation is a critical function of project management. While monitoring is a continuous activity that assists project managers with tracking progress with project implementation, evaluation is a strategic time bound process aimed at assessing progress towards programme objectives and targets. Evaluations are usually conducted at mid-term and end of project implementation. Terminal evaluations provide an opportunity for the review of the performance of the project at the end of the project cycle. The process considers the total effort put into the development and implementation of the project and assesses the design of the project, implementation procedures used by implementing agencies. Terminal evaluations are intended to assess whether the project has achieved its intended objectives and document the results from the project and whether these are likely to be sustainable over the medium to long term. Terminal evaluations are also intended to assess whether there are any discernable impacts resulting from the implementation of the project.

The objective of the evaluation of the KACCAL project is to:

- Provide a comprehensive and systematic accounting of the performance of the project;
- Assess the effectiveness of project design, implementation, the likelihood of sustainability of the project's results and their possible impacts;
- Assess the appropriateness, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project;
- Identify lessons learned and provide recommendations for use in the development of future projects; and
- Measure the possible overall and lasting impact of the project.

The target audience for a terminal evaluation is the GEF Operational Focal Point at country level, project partners and beneficiaries, UNDP at country, regional and Headquarters, UNDP Evaluation Office, GEF Secretariat and GEF Evaluation Office. Lessons learned from the implementation are also compiled from Terminal evaluations for use in informing future programming actions. More importantly, these lessons contribute to UNDP's knowledge management processes.

## **1.2 Methodology of the evaluation**

Standard approaches to evaluation usually include the following stages and processes: an inception phase, document review, stakeholder consultations and data gathering, data compilation and production of draft reports, validation of findings and the production of the final report. These stages were followed in conducting the evaluation of the Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in Arid Lands (KACCAL) project. The following sections describe each of these aspects of the review process.

### **Inception Phase**

The evaluation of the KACCAL project was initiated through an inception phase during which the consultant produced a report detailing their understanding of the client's expectations and provided a programme of work or roadmap that was followed in conducting the evaluation. This phase was intended to assist both the consultant and the client with clearing any misunderstanding and establishing common expectations from the evaluation. The Inception Report detailed the activities that the consultant was to undertake throughout the evaluation process and provided timelines for the performance of these tasks. Further, the report highlighted critical points of engagement between the consultant and the client and other stakeholders involved in the implementation of the project as well as the various deliverables under the assignment.

### **Document Review**

Following the approval of the Inception Report, the consultant undertook a review of all available and relevant documents relating to the programme in order to gain an understanding of the various elements of the programme. These included the various documents that established the context and defined the project so as to put it into its proper context. Among these documents were the Project Document, periodic progress reports such as term reports (quarterly, semi annual and annual

reports), financial and audit reports. The Terms of Reference for the evaluation provided a sample of documents to be reviewed. While these are mandated as sources of programmatic information by the client, the consultant also reviewed other documents such as national development planning plans, drought and flood mitigation plans that were made available to him and which provided additional information on the KACCAL project.

### **Stakeholder Consultation**

With the understanding of the project context and its various elements obtained from document review, the consultant engaged with stakeholders who were involved in the design and implementation of the project at national and district level to ascertain the extent to which they have contributed to project implementation, and also the extent to which these stakeholders have benefitted from the project. The various stakeholders were classified into primary, secondary and tertiary stakeholders as well as according to the project objectives that they contributed to. The KACCAL project worked with up to fifteen community groups in the areas of agricultural development, livestock improvement and energy efficiency. A sample of stakeholders that adequately represented these clusters was identified for focused assessment with care being taken to identify successful, moderately successful and unsuccessful community projects from which to draw lessons for use in future programming. Principal stakeholders consulted included Government of Kenya principals at national and county levels, UNDP project managers, project implementing partners, and representatives of community groups that have benefitted from the project. The critical questions relating to project design and implementation and the results of the project as detailed in the Terms of Reference were used as the basis for stakeholder consultations although the evaluator was inclined to allowing for free discussion of issues without resorting to the use of a structured questionnaire.

The consultants visited Kitui County where they interviewed project implementation partners in the project focus areas of Muunoni and Mwingi as well as at the County Headquarters at Kitui.

The information collected through stakeholder consultations was compiled into data sets responding to the questions the evaluation seeks to answer with regards the various aspects of the programme. Evaluation criteria of Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Sustainability and Impact were assessed on the basis of evidence gathered during stakeholder consultation. The findings from the evaluation processes described above were then synthesised into this report which is now presented to the client for validation of findings.

It is important to note at this point that the data gathered from the stakeholders who were consulted in the field and in Nairobi was the primary basis upon which the conclusions and recommendation made in this evaluation were made. Stakeholder involvement in the process therefore was used to authenticate the evaluator's initial impressions from reading literature on the project.

### **1.3 Structure of the evaluation**

The evaluation report follows the structure as set-out in the Terminal Evaluation (TE) Terms of Reference (ToRs) and the guidance of UNDP (2012). It comprises three main sections as follows:

- Project description and development context
- Evaluation Findings, and
- Conclusions, Lessons and Recommendations

The Project description and development context section of the report provides an overview of the context within which the project was designed and implemented. This covers the problems that the project was expected to address, approaches to addressing these, an overview of the risks and assumptions that were considered to have potential implications for project implementation and achievement of results. The section also provides an analysis of the stakeholders that were deemed to be relevant for the implementation of the project.

The findings section of this report details what happened during project implementation with a focus on the achievements made as well as problems experienced with project implementation. The performance of the project is assessed in this section with ratings provided for critical elements of project implementation. This section also provides the evaluator's overall assessment of project achievements which forms the basis for recommended future actions emanating from the project implementation process.

GEF evaluation guidelines require that lessons learnt from the implementation of projects be documented and presented in both mid-term and terminal evaluation reports as a contribution to the ongoing GEF knowledge management process. The lessons learned through the implementation of the project are documented in this section of the report together with recommendations for future programming and project implementation.

The annexes provided cover the ToRs, evaluation mission programme, lists of people consulted, a list of documents reviewed, the outline of questions discussed in interviews. A copy of the signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form is also included in the report.

#### **1.4 Evaluation Team**

The Evaluation Team was made up of Mr. Oliver Chapeyama who served as the International Consultant and Team Leader. Mr. Kimathi Mtungi who served as the KACCAL Project Manager during project implementation was recruited on a short term contract by UNDP Kenya Country Office to offer logistical guidance to the International Consultant in the conduct of the Terminal Evaluation. Mr. Mutungi did not however have any direct responsibility for the performance of the evaluation. His role was to accompany the international consultant in the field as he was the only person available who could lead the consultant to project sites. This limitation in the role that Mr. Mutungi played in the evaluation was to ensure that there was no potential for conflict of interest since he had served as the Project Manager.

The evaluation was conducted as per the provisions of the United Nations Evaluation Group Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation (UNEG, March 2008). The consultant conducted the subject evaluation so as to meet the minimum requirements for independent evaluations which include: independence, impartiality, credibility, accountability, honesty and integrity, respect for dignity and diversity and the need to ensure confidentiality and transparency in process.

## 2. Project Description and Development Context

Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in Arid Lands Project was initially designed as a US\$ 6 million project to be co-funded by the World Bank, United Nations Development Program-Kenya (UNDP-K) and Government of Kenya. The Project was to be implemented over a four year period (2009-2013) with a focus on the Arid and Semiarid Lands of Northern Kenya. The World Bank however withdrew from the project before its start up. Following the withdrawal of the US\$ 5 million World Bank funding the project was scaled down to a US\$ 1 million dollar initiative focussing on Muunoni and Kyuso Divisions of Kitui County. The withdrawal of the World Bank funding also resulted in delays in project start up with project implementation only effectively starting in 2011 and ending on June 30<sup>th</sup> 2014.

The KACCAL project targeted supporting poor and vulnerable communities in Mwingi District to enhance their adaptive capacity to droughts and floods. The project was also intended to strengthen climate risk management, planning and capacity of District level planners to mainstream climate change into District-level sectoral development plans.

The rural populations of the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs) of Kenya are particularly vulnerable to recurrent droughts, and to the long-term impacts of climate variability and change. In response to this, the Kenya Government through the Ministry of State for Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands has been implementing a GEF funded Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in Arid Lands (KACCAL) project since 2011 aimed at supporting rural populations in Kitui County to enhance their capacity to adapt to these recurring droughts and floods through livelihood diversification and enhancement interventions. The KACCAL project has been focused on a broad range of issues including improving access to irrigation technology, promoting the growing of indigenous crops, the re-introduction of livestock varieties that are more resilient to climate variability as a means towards reducing the levels of deforestation that was leading to land degradation in the region.

The KACCAL project had the following three principal objectives:

- Enhanced awareness of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures in arid and semi-arid lands.
- Enhanced capacity of district and local level stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures
- Enhanced communities' ability to plan, manage and implement climate-related activities

An addition to this programme was the grant by the Flemish government that targeted Objective 3 above through the introduction of efficient cookstoves among 2000 households in Mwingi District as an intervention to reduce widespread deforestation caused by the production of charcoal and clearing land for cultivation. More efficient cookstoves would lead to reduced pressure on the woodland resources and result in a net increase in woodland cover which acts as a carbon sink. Further, the reduction in demand for wood would liberate the women and girls in the district from the drudgery of collecting wood for fuel with the time saving being dedicated to other productive activities. The project had the following intended outputs:

**Output 1:** Purchase and installation of up to 2000 energy efficient cooking stoves to replace the traditional 3-stone arrangement typically used in rural households. The stoves are made of fired clay liners and have been piloted for many years by the Ministry of Agriculture through GTZ. The models are cast by locally trained artisans in the districts where the technologies were first introduced. The cook stoves cost about USD\$10 each.

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

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

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

According to the Project Document, site specific adaptation measures were identified through the conduct of vulnerability assessments, and stakeholder consultations with the local communities. Participatory Rural Appraisal approaches were also used to validate the community's vulnerability profiles and to ascertain demand for specific interventions. The UNDP component also used informal and formal consultations with representatives from the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development, Ministry of Water Development, National Environment Management Authority and the UNFCCC Focal Point, University of Nairobi, Kenyatta University, Kenya Forestry Research Institute, Arid Lands Resource Management Authority, FAO Kenya, Kenya Meteorological Department, and various NGOs and CBOs and also representatives of farmers and pastoralists in Mwingi District. In addition to consultations in the field, formal consultations were held through two national stakeholder meetings at the Ministry of Agriculture Headquarters and a stakeholder workshop held at Mwingi District Headquarters.

Following these consultations, the following key stakeholders in the implementation of this project were identified:

#### **Key Stakeholders and their Roles**

<b>Stakeholder/Organization</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Technical Input</b>
Ministry of Agriculture	Participation in the Project Board  Provision of extension	Land use planning, soil and water conservation, agricultural training and

	support to communities  District level Agricultural Policy & Management	extension  Policy formulation
UNDP Country Office	Accountability to GEF for funds disbursement for overall delivery of project results;  Member of Project Board	Ensure project implementation adheres to guidelines of the SPA and also alignment with UNDP's Adaptation Portfolio
Ministry of Environment and Natural resources	Environmental Policy	Policy formulation  Integrating climate change risk management into Environment Policy  Driving the integration of climate change risk management into operations of other line Ministries
National Environmental Management Authority	Environmental Impact assessment	Environmental management;  Coordination with other national initiatives on climate change adaptation
Arid Lands Resource Management Programme (ALRMP)	Project Management Services	Vulnerability and Food security Assessments  Coordination with World Bank Component
Ministry of Water Development	Technical support on water resources management	Catchment management
Kenya Meteorological Department	Provision of climatic information	Weather stations, climate monitoring and forecasting
IGAD Climate Prediction Application and Centre (ICPAC)	Provision of climate seasonal predictions and early warning	Climate modeling  Training for local communities
Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development	Technical support for livestock development	Livestock production



Forestry Department	Information on land use planning	Land use planning Forest management
Mwingi District Development Committee	Facilitating involvement of community leadership	Coordination of socio-economic development
Development Partners	Co-financing	
NGOs and CBOs	Livelihoods training Community facilitation Co-financing	Resource mobilization Community facilitation
Local Communities	Community project implementation Input in adaptation project design	Monitoring of results
Universities	Livelihood research and training	Research and training

### 3. Evaluation Findings

#### 3.1 Project Formulation

This section of the report assesses the clarity with which project objectives were defined as well whether they were attainable in the period the project was to be implemented. The section also assesses the extent to which the capacities of institutions that were involved in project implementation were assessed to promote collaboration and the extent to which lessons from other projects in the sector were used to influence the design of the project. Comment will also be made on the extent to which the design team identified counterpart funding sources and defined the legal context for project implementation.

##### 3.1.1 Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)

As stated earlier, the KACCAL project was designed as a larger initiative that was to be funded with support from the World Bank, UNDP and the Government of Kenya. The project was to address threats from climate change and variability to livelihoods of poor rural communities in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands of Kenya. Lessons from the implementation of the project were to be documented for use in planning similar initiatives in other parts of the East African region. Following the withdrawal of support by the World Bank, UNDP decided to reduce the scale of the project and focus on Mumoni and Kyuso areas in Mwingi District (now Kitui County) from where results of piloting would be documented for dissemination and replication to the rest of the country. At the same time the original intention of the project to build capacity for climate change adaptation among national level institutions was considered to be too ambitious given

the limited implementation timeframe that was left for the project. Instead, the expected project Outcome was refocused to the creation of awareness of the implications of climate change among national decision makers. The enhancement of capacity to stem these impacts was focused on the district and community level institutions where specific activities would be implemented.

Kenya has been engaged in addressing the problems related to drought and floods and the associated poverty and limited livelihood options for a very long time. A number of initiatives have been developed in this connection with little impact on the problem primarily because of lack of coordination among the institutions that have been involved in these activities. The lessons from these failures were used in the design the KACCAL project which resulted in a coordinated approach to this perennial problem. The impact of better coordination is documented in the results section of this report. Briefly though, focusing on creating awareness of the implications of climate change among national institutions created an environment where decision makers at this level understood the need for district and local level institutions to incorporate climate change mitigation in their normal operations thereby impacting directly on the livelihoods of community groups. The changes made to the original Outcomes and Outputs also resulted in targets that were more attainable than those originally agreed to in the Project Document.

The theory of change that starts with awareness creation through capacity enhancement resulting in communities being able to plan climate change adaptation strategies was more attainable following the adjustment to the project concept following the withdrawal by the World Bank. A possible mis-match between Outcomes and Outputs was in respect to Outcome 3 where the enhancement of capacity at district level was expected to result in enhanced capacity to plan and implement climate change related activities at community level. An Output targeting enhancing capacities for planning at community levels would have directly resulted in improved capacity to plan and execute projects at community level. Despite this mis-match however, the evaluation was able to identify situations where community groups involved in the project were better able to plan their activities. This was not necessarily because of interventions under the KACCAL project but could have been the result of previous interventions that have involved the same communities over the years. Specific examples of where this was evident include the Kisungi Village community where the project management committee was able to articulate their plans into the future despite the very difficult odds that they face due to the harsh climatic conditions. The Katse Seed Bulking project was another example where communities are in control of the planning process which will lead to them producing seed stocks that will meet their local needs.

### **3.1.2 Assumptions and Risks**

The main assumption upon which the KACCAL project design was predicated was with respect to continued recurrence of droughts and climate variability in the project area. This assumption was augmented by others which were in relation to continued government commitment to addressing problems of drought through the allocation of increased resources. Government commitment would also be measured through attendance by government extension workers at training sessions targeting enhancement of capacity to address climate change. The evaluation

established that the assumption that climate change would continue to be a problem in the Arid and Semi-Arid regions of Mwingi has held as climate variability has continued to worsen over the years.

Government commitment to addressing drought and climate change is evidenced by the fact the the National Drought Management Agency is willing to assume management control over the project following the termination of UNDP support to the KACCAL project. Further, the County Government in Kitui has also adopted climate change adaptation as part of its planning process by integrating this approach into their County Integrated Development Plan. Most extension agents at the sub-county level have been trained in climate change adaptation and now include this newly acquired knowledge as a tool to screen the development plans that they are developing with the communities in Kitui county.

The one assumption that has not held is that the proposed community radio would be established to facilitate dissemination of new knowledge on climate change. Despite this however, UNDP Kenya Country Office, Kenya Meteorological Department and the National Drought Management Agency are committed to have the station operational even after the closure of the project.

The risks to the KACCAL project that were identified at project design were assessed during the Terminal evaluation. The Table below shows the results of the assessment.

#### Risks

<b>Risk</b>	<b>Risk Rating</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures</b>	<b>Results of Assessment at Terminal Evaluation</b>
Sustaining coordination with KSFM and other disaster management platforms due to change in institutional home	M	Under the Coalition Government, with reorganized/divided ministries, ALRMP was moved to the newly established State Ministry for Development of Northern Kenya and Other Arid Lands reporting to the Prime Minister's Office. This could potentially affect the leverage and coordination power of ALRMP which it had in its previous location (Office of the Prime Minister). However, the ALRMP and the Bank have discussed this with the highest level of the GOK and been assured that the change will not negatively affect the implementation of ALRMP and	The National Drought Management Agency has assumed control of the coordination role following the closure of the project and is willing to invest national resources to ensure that activities that were left unfinished would be finalized in the post-project period.  <b>Rating at TE: L</b>

		KACCAL. The program continues to straddle the two ministries to support various activities and functions managed by both entities	
Alternative sustainable livelihood strategies to pastoralism are not taken up in the arid lands	H	Diversification in the arid lands has been limited, hampered by lack of market access, credit availability and linkages to the rest of the economy. This project cannot alone change these fundamental constraints. However, the project will provide support for creating a more conducive environment for diversified sustainable livelihoods, particularly in increasing the sustainable extraction/production and value addition of dryland products. The project will provide technical assistance and facilitate public-private-community partnerships towards this objective.	<p>The KACCAL project introduced new livelihood options which community groups have adopted at the pilot sites that the evaluator visited. The Wendo Wa Syana Group (Goat Improvement) and the Ndetha Poultry Group (chicken breeding) have gone beyond traditional livestock management approaches to introduce improved breeds. KACCAL has also initiated a market identification survey which is intended to identify market opportunities for the products from these innovative ideas. These initiatives will need to be finalized in the post-project implementation period.</p> <p><b>Rating at TE: L</b></p>
Continued and growing conflict, especially in the arid districts	M	Conflict management has been an integral part of ALRMP implementation, in recognition of the severe competition for resources in the Arid Lands and spillover from conflict in neighboring countries. The potential for conflict still exists and could increase as the pressure over resources intensifies. By helping reduce the vulnerability of communities in face of resource scarcity, the project is contributing to reducing the sources of conflict.	<p>Although the evaluator did not identify the conflict that is reported in the north and north east regions of Kenya during field visits, this issue remains a threat to the security and livelihoods of the communities in the project area.</p> <p><b>Rating at TE: M</b></p>

Technical capacity and services available are inadequate to support local development	M	Capacity constraints in the arid lands are prevalent in many sectors. The project alone will not be able to address general capacity constraints but the project includes a substantial focus on capacity strengthening – both in technical issues of climate risk management for service providers, policy makers as well as in community capacity to integrate climate risk in their development plans and in monitoring. The project will use the same mechanism as the ALRMP, i.e. mobile extension teams for this purpose.	<p>The KACCAL project has targeted technical capacity enhancement at extension agent level at the sub-county as well as at the county level which has resulted in communities receiving better advice than before. This coupled with capacity enhancement activities that have been implemented at community level has had significant impact on community level planning for climate change adaptation.</p> <p><b>Rating at TE:L</b></p>
Recurrent droughts during the implementation period of the project keep diverting attention away from long-term planning	M	This risk is being mitigated partly by the fact that the baseline project has already created substantial capacity to effectively respond to these short-term emergencies, and partly by building capacity among the key agencies to be improve the response to immediate catastrophes. In addition, it should be noted that recurrent extremes can also provide an additional motivation to address the underlying long-term vulnerabilities that might have remained hidden or tolerable under normal climate conditions.	<p>Drought is now accepted as a permanent feature in Kitui County resulting in the County Government incorporating drought mitigation as an integral part of the County Integrated Development Plan. Long term development planning in the region is now predicated upon mitigation drought and adapting to climate change.</p> <p><b>Rating at TE:L</b></p>

Rating Scales: High (H); Medium (M); Low (L)

### 3.1.3 Relevance

The KACCAL project was developed to address problems of lack of capacity to address the potential impacts of aridity and climate change in the ASALS of Kenya. Numerous attempts had been made to address these issues prior to this initiative with limited results. KACCAL adopted

an integrated approach to the problem which brought together a range of stakeholders to work in a collaborative manner. The issues that the project was set up to address have always been at the centre of Kenya's development planning agenda. This made KACCAL directly relevant to the national planning process.

#### 3.1.4 Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation

Section 3.1.9 below discusses the linkages between the KACCAL project and other similar projects that have been implemented in Kenya. Some of the earlier responses to drought in Kenya were the Emergency Drought Recovery Project (EDRP) which was implemented with World Bank support from 1991 to 1996 in the dry northern regions of Kenya and the Arid Lands Resource Management Project (ALRMP), a 15-year, 3-phase project also funded by the World Bank and implemented by the Office of the President (OP). The main lesson learned from the EDRP was that emergency responses to drought were not sustainable as they did not adequately prepare affected communities to respond to recurrent droughts. ALRMP on the other hand suffered from lack of effective coordination among all involved institutions. The KACCAL project has used these lessons to design a more effective response initiative which is coordinated through the NDMA. The NDMA have assumed control over current initiatives and will invest national resources into these initiatives now that UNDP support has come to an end.

Institutional and individual capacities for adoption and implementation of climate change adaptation have to date been limited resulting in little impact on this perennial problem. This lesson resulted in the KACCAL project taking up capacity building at sub-county and county level as a central pre-condition for addressing drought and climate change in the dry regions where the project has been implemented.

#### 3.1.5 Stakeholder participation (\*)

The implementation of the KACCAL project was preceded by an intensive stakeholder assessment process through which critical stakeholders were identified and roles and responsibilities allocated. The evaluation saw clear evidence of the participation of a range of stakeholders from national, through county and sub-county level to the participating communities in project implementation. Most stakeholders that were interviewed during the evaluation also demonstrated clear understanding of what the project was about which demonstrated their direct involvement in project activities.

Stakeholder participation in the design and implementation of the KACCAL project was adjudged to be **Satisfactory (S)**.

#### 3.1.6 Replication approach

The KACCAL project was implemented at fifteen pilot sites in Muunoni and Mwingi Division of Kitui County with the expectation that project results from these sites would be replicated across the region and beyond. Replication was predicated upon good practices being adopted by neighboring communities as has happened with the Wendo Wa Syana initiative which has already established a second community group involved in goat improvement. The energy efficient stoves that the Mumoni-Kyuso Organisation for Development Adaptive Participation

(MUKY) institution is promoting with Flemish funding is already showing signs of replication into areas where the project has not even been implemented. The business potential that lies within this project will also make it attractive for replication. Finally, the KACCAL project also actively encouraged replication of project results through community peer learning through exchange visits between communities in Kitui and Meru regions of Kenya.

A second stream of replication was identified at government extension agent level where institutions that received capacity enhancement training took the new skills that they acquired through the project and disseminated them through planning processes and new projects which they introduced to non-pilot communities.

#### 3.1.7 Cost-effectiveness

The KACCAL project has not tried to reinvent the wheel. Instead the project has ridden on already on-going initiatives that were started by the government in the mid-1990s but did not take off because of lack of coordination. The foundations laid through these projects have meant that KACCAL could focus on specific areas that needed attention thereby improving on the cost effectiveness of the investment.

Climate proofing community livelihoods also guaranteed cost effective investment under the KACCAL project as it obviated the need to construct large physical infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of climate change. This process will also generate new knowledge that communities and extension agents alike can use to inform the identification of new and sustainable options.

As stated earlier, KACCAL was built on the foundations of previous interventions. The Project Document also identifies the existence of legal frameworks for project implementation as enabling circumstances for cost effective interventions.

#### 3.1.8 UNDP comparative advantage

UNDP has had a long history with the implementation of GEF funded projects. Governments are generally comfortable working with and through UNDP because of their neutral or apolitical status. With most countries in the developing world being members of the United Nations system governments generally feel unthreatened by having UNDP and other UN agencies assisting them in addressing pressing national issues. Further, UNDP have the comparative advantage of global representation through their network of national and regional offices through which they can source information to backstop local interventions.

#### 3.1.9 Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector, including management arrangements

The Government of Kenya has been seized with addressing the problems associated with drought and climate change since the early to mid-1990s. In the process the country has produced various policy and strategic guidelines including the National Environment Action Plan of 1994; Session Paper no. 1 of 1994 on Recovery and Sustainable Development by the Year 2010; the National Poverty Eradication Plan (1999), and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2001) and the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (2003). All of these pronouncements include coverage of the need to address the problems associated with ASLAs.

KACCAL has learned from these initiatives and put in place a coordinated mechanism for addressing drought and climate change mitigation.

The KACCAL Project Document summarises the other interventions implemented in the Arid and Semi-arid Lands of Kenya as follows:

*“The review of the ASAL Development Policy and Investment Plan (dating from 1992) is a recent activity, relying on participatory national and localized stakeholder discussions and drafting sessions. The draft revised policy documents indicate the past decades of gaps and political failures regarding the necessary attention to Kenyan ASALs, which is of key importance to understanding the situation and development state of Kenyan ASALs. The policy presents a new approach to development in the ASALs as it introduces an integrated cross-sectoral approach to sustainable development and links this to an investment plan for all relevant sectors. The investment plan was prepared by each of the line ministries and the two coordinating ministries.*

*In March 2004 the Ministry of Agriculture launched the Strategy for Revitalization of Agriculture (SRA), which gives special attention to the ASALs and agro-pastoralists. The SRA stresses the need for developing a participatory extension system that is responsive to the needs of the communities in the ASALs. The Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERS) gives particular emphasis to agriculture as the engine for growth for the Kenyan economy (Ministry of Agriculture, March 2004). The overall goal is to achieve a progressive reduction in unemployment and reduce the level of poverty.*

*The Draft National Land Policy of May 2007 notes the need to ensure that land use and practices under pastoral tenure in ASALs conform to principles of sustainable resource management and that disaster management legal and policy frameworks for prevention and management of land related disasters will be ensured. The First Medium Term Plan (2008-2012) of Vision 2030: Chapter 5 notes that climate change is a serious challenge to Kenya’s economic development due to low adaptive capacity.*

*At District Level the Government of Kenya has an integrated extension programme in Mwingi that include the National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP) that plans to expand into the semi-arid districts during its second phase (NALEP Phase II). NALEP is co-funded by the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) that has been involved in the Kenyan agricultural sector for several decades. The overall goal of NALEP is to enhance the contribution of agriculture and livestock to the social and economic development and poverty alleviation. This goal will be reached through a pluralistic, efficient, effective, and demand-driven professional national agricultural extension system. The Kenya Agricultural Productivity Project (KAPP), funded by the World Bank, also supports participatory extension mechanisms, and links this to applied research and technology adoption.*

*The Special Programme for Food Security (SPFS) first introduced the Farmer Field School (FFS) approach on a small-scale in Kenya in 1995 of which Kenya was one of 15 pilot countries, with an initial focus on Integrated Pest Management (IPM). Since 1995, the FFS approach has been tested and adapted for farmer driven learning for a range of crop and livestock enterprises and has increasingly been applied as a training tool for agricultural topics in general rather than just for IPM. In 1999, FAO’s Global IPM Facility launched an East African pilot project for FFS on*



*Integrated Production and Pest Management (IPPM) covering three districts in Western Kenya. With IPPM as the entry point, the FFSs have included other aspects that have a bearing on production and livelihoods in general. Improved resource management issues as well as financial management are recognized as important components for capacity-building”.*

## **3.2 Project Implementation**

### **3.2.1 The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool**

The UNDP component of the KACCAL project was designed as a part of a larger ASALs project which was to be co-financed with the World Bank and the Government of Kenya. After the World Bank withdrew support for the larger initiative the project was scaled down to one that was focused on Mumoni-Kyuso divisions of what is now Kitui County. This change in focus required a realignment of project objectives and expected outputs with available resources.

The original KACCAL Project Objective was aimed at addressing climate change adaptation issues among selected community groups in all the ASALs in Kenya. ***(To increase the capacity of communities in the selected districts of the ASALs to adapt to climate variability and change)***

This was changed to focus on communities in Mwingi District in line with the reduction in available resources ***(To increase the capacity of communities in Mwingi District to adapt to climate variability and change.)***

The original Logframe also targeted the building of capacities for planning, managing and implementation of climate change adaptation measures at national and regional levels. With the reduction in scope and focus of the project, the expected Outcomes were also adjusted to be in line with these new realities.

**Outcome 1: “Enhanced capacity of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures”** was changed to focus instead on creating awareness of national and regional stakeholders of the need to plan and manage the implementation of climate change adaptation: ***“Enhanced awareness of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures in arid and semi-arid lands.”***

Likewise, the original Outputs which were in relation to capacity building were changed to reflect the new focus on awareness creation. The eight (8) Outputs that were originally planned were reduced to three (3) as follows:

1.1 Organization of CCA awareness creation workshops (year 1 through 3)

1.2 Development of outreach program and materials (year 1 through 3)

1.3 Documentation and dissemination of good practices (year 2 and 3)

Project Outcome 2: ***“Enhanced capacity of district and local level stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures”*** was retained with the Outputs under it changed as reflected below:

## **Original Outputs**

2.1 Trained extension officers in climate risk management practices

2.2 Percent change in stakeholders' capacities to make agriculture/pastoralism decisions based on climate information, assessed by survey.

## **New Outputs**

2.1 Capacity Perception Index (CPI) for adaptation planning and implementation for district and local level stakeholders (...local civil society organizations, NGOs, local GOK staff etc) (year 1)

2.2 Development of training courses, organization of workshops (year 1 through 3)

2.3 Development of screening tools to climate proof sectoral development plans for Mwingi District (year 1 through 3)

**Outcome 3: "Enhanced communities' ability to plan, manage and implement climate-related activities"** was also not changed but the Outputs under it were amended as shown below:

## **Original Outputs :**

3.1. Technical and financial feasibility assessments of proposed interventions

3.2 Percent change in farmers/pastoralists use of climate-resilient methods for managing climate change risks, assessed via survey.

3.3 Agricultural and pastoral productivity increased.

## **New Outputs**

3.1 Capacity development for agricultural extension officers to develop and disseminate climate change adaptation advice (year 1 through 3)

3.2 Climate risk information and adaptation advice disseminated to communities via radio - and other appropriate extension info outlet avenues (year 1 through 3)

3.3 Organization of exchange visits of other community groups to the pilot projects.

3.4 Six(6) adaptation action plans (one per community group) developed (year 1)

The changes in Outcome and Outputs statements under Outcomes 1 and 2 had a logical fit with the realization of the outputs linking directly to the Outcome and the proposed Project Objective. The attainment of Outcome 3 however could not be measured through the realization of the four new Outputs. This relationship required the articulation of outputs that measured what was happening at community level instead of inferring a link between capacity enhancement at district level and what happens at community level. Having said that though, the evaluator can point communities that are now capable of planning initiative that target changing their livelihoods to reflect that they now have enhanced capacity to do so. The Ndetha Poultry Community and the Katse Seed Bulking projects were cases in point as the communities interviewed at these two sites could articulate clear plans for addressing their own

circumstances into the future.

### 3.2.2 Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region

The KACCAL project did not establish an effective Project Steering Committee. Management decisions were made through long distance efforts of the Project Manager who was based in the project area and liaised with critical stakeholders like the NDMA. At the project level, the Project Manager established very strong working relationships with government extension agents and County Government authorities through whom the project was implemented. Without these relationships and partnership arrangements little could have been achieved by the Project Manager who operated from the field without support staff such as a draft and office administrative staff. The Project Manager deserves special commendation for ensuring that all stakeholders from national, country, sub-county and community level were kept engaged in the project despite administrative bottlenecks experienced at UNDP.

As the implementing agency for the GEF UNDP Kenya Country Office provided management oversight over the Project Manager and the project. They also practiced their fiduciary oversight over the project through a system of replenishing advances upon liquidation of previous disbursements a process which was not clearly understood by the Government of Kenya. The problems caused by this management system were further compounded by staff changes at UNDP Kenya CO which negatively impacted on continuity and institutional memory.

### 3.2.3 Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

#### *Financial Planning*

+The KACCAL project was funded through a SCCF grant of US\$ 1 million which was administered by the UNDP Kenya Country Office. The Government of Kenya pledged co-financing in the order of and additional US\$ 1 million as in-kind contributions to the project. These were in the form of staff time afforded to the project by stakeholders from the various Ministries and Departments that were involved in the implementation of project activities. The Project Manager was also allocated office space at the NDMA offices in Mwingi.

#### *Monitoring and evaluation (\*)*

Project monitoring was exercised primarily by the UNDP GEF Regional Technical Advisor who provided critical guidance to the Project Manager at project mobilization stage. This support enabled the changes to the project Logframe to be introduced with little disruption to project implementation. UNDP Country Office provided intermittent support in the field with the bulk of the support being provided from the office in Nairobi.

The evaluation saw no evidence of the project having been guided by a Project Steering Committee with the Project Manager confirming that he had to do a lot of “leg work” between the project area and Nairobi to get decisions made especially by the UNDP CO where responsible staff also changed during the course of the project being implemented. At the time of the Terminal evaluation a new control officer had just assumed responsibility for the project at the UNDP Country Office. While the Terminal Evaluation was adequately supported, it was clear that

the staff members responsible were stretched across a number of other activities and could therefore not provide their undivided attention to the process.

Following his appointment, the Project Manager had to find his way through the process of building the very close and effective partnerships that the evaluator witnessed among the County, National and Local stakeholders that were interviewed. All this was achieved without office support systems such as administrative personnel and a driver. The Project Manager covered for these functions in addition to his primary responsibility of delivering against expected results. Despite these limitations the Project Manager still managed to produce periodic progress reports as required under the project. While no Midterm evaluation was conducted, the project commissioned a Terminal Evaluation which is the subject of this report.

Project Monitoring and evaluation was adjudged to have been **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)**.

#### *Execution and implementation modalities*

The project was funded by the GEF through the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF). Government of Kenya, as represented by the National Drought Management Agency were the Project Executing Agency

#### *Management by the UNDP Country Office*

The UNDP Country Office provided oversight over the project as per their role of Implementing Agency. This aspect of management was however plagued by problems relating to weak implementation support to the Project Manager and delays in disbursement of funds for project implementation. The Project Manager was also not supported by office or logistical support resulting in him operating as the Project Administrator and driver in addition to his technical duties. UNDP should have provided for these positions in the management arrangements for the project.

### **3.3 Project Results**

#### **3.3.1 Attainment of objectives (\*)**

The KACCAL project was designed to address problems that were considered to be critical to the survival of communities that reside in the arid to semi-arid regions of Kenya. These problems presented themselves in the form of limited livelihood options for these communities who are caught in the vicious cycle of environmental degradation and water shortages which are being made worse by the burgeoning specter of climate change.

Following the withdrawal of the World Bank from supporting the larger component of KACCAL the only support that was left was that which was provided through UNDP with the following objective:

**To increase the capacity of communities in Mwingi District to adapt to climate variability and change**

The Objective was to be met through the realisation of the following three interrelated Outcomes:

- Enhanced awareness of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures in arid and semi-arid lands;
- Enhanced capacity of district and local level stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures; and
- Enhanced communities' ability to plan, manage and implement climate-related activities.

The Terminal Evaluation has established that community groups that were involved in the implementation of the project are now able to plan, manage and implement their own climate related interventions. This is primarily due to the targeted training and capacity building activities provided under the project. These community groups have also been supported by divisional and county level extension entities whose capacity for incorporating climate change adaptation strategies into planning has also been enhanced by the training provided through the KACCAL project. While national level stakeholders and institutions were not necessarily put through the same rigorous training as was done at the lower levels, the awareness of decision makers at this level has been enhanced through the project resulting in them facilitating collaborative planning and project implementation at community level which has resulted in increased capacity of communities in the project area to adapt to climate variability and change.

As summarised in Annex 1 to this report, the project objective of "Increasing the capacity of communities in Mwingi District to adapt to climate variability and change has been met. This is demonstrated by the range of projects and activities that the communities in the pilot sites have adopted in their efforts to diversify their livelihoods. Typical examples of this achievement are borne out by the following "stories from the field" recorded during the field visits that were conducted as part of the project evaluation:



Ms. Jedidah Mbula-Muli is a single mother of five who had experienced crop failures almost every year due to erratic rainfall in Mwingi. She could afford to provide for her children from her job as a shop keeper in a local village. She was unable to pay school fees for her children. Then she joined the Wendo Wasyana (We Love Our Children) Goat Improvement Group four years ago and she received a gift of one doe (female goat) from the group. With support from the KACCAL project she got another six goats and now has a total of ten goats. The Wendo Wasyana group has introduced modern methods of livestock rearing with a focus on managing livestock diseases that afflict goats in the area. Because of the management systems put in place the goats managed under this projects breed more successfully than the ones kept under traditional pastoral systems. Ms Mbula-Muli now sells one goat each school term and can now afford to pay for school fees for her first child who is now in the second year of High School. Ms Mbula Muli intends to continue looking after goats as she is convinced that this is a sustainable way of raising money to educate the rest of her children while sustaining the environment through appropriate stocking rates.





Mr. Joseph Mwendwa Maluki is a subsistence farmer from the Katse area. He remembers the years gone by when the rains were always on time and the villagers always harvested enough to feed their families. These days however the rains are erratic resulting in poor harvests. He hopes that the Seed Bulking Project funded by KACCAL will reintroduce traditional seed varieties which can withstand the variations in climate which have adversely impacted on the livelihoods of rural Kenyans who live in the dry regions of the country. This aspect of the project is adjudged to have been **Highly Successful (HS)**.

### 3.3.2 Country ownership

Kenya ratified the UNFCCC on 30<sup>th</sup> August 1994 and is eligible for financial support under Annex 1 of the UNFCCC, and is also eligible for technical assistance from UNDP.

The KACCAL project is premised upon Kenya's expression of a desire to intervene to address problems of food shortages caused by erratic rainfall, in the dry regions of the country. The project is therefore driven by national considerations with Kenya's Poverty Reduction Plan (PRSP) emphasizing the importance of drought management and food security.

The National Communication for Kenya formed an important starting point in project design and site selection. The information in the National Communication was used in identifying areas that are vulnerable to climate change, in terms of projected scenarios of rainfall and temperature changes and thus formed the basis upon which the KACCAL project was developed.

The project is therefore driven by national considerations and responds to national priorities.

### 3.3.3 Mainstreaming

The KACCAL project targets mitigating the implications of climate change on poor vulnerable communities in the arid and semi arid regions of Kenya. Successful interventions in this area will contribute directly to the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF 2014-2018) Strategic Result 4: Environmental Sustainability Land Management and Human Security.

The enhanced capacities of communities to plan, manage and implement climate resilient programmes will contribute to increased resilience to climate change and other disasters among these poor disadvantaged communities, especially women. Improved land management programmes envisioned under the KACCAL project will also contribute to enhanced human security and the long term sustainable management of natural resources.

Most of the community projects that have been supported through KACCAL have more women members and therefore address the gender dimensions to development. On average, more than ninety percent of group membership is made up of women.

KACCAL is not a stand- alone environmental management project though as it addresses the underlying environmental considerations to other developmental programmes such as employment creation and regeneration of rural livelihoods through targeted investments in activities with the potential to generate economic growth in hitherto marginal rural environments..The project can therefore be mainstreamed into the larger national development planning framework.

### 3.3.4 Sustainability (\*)

As stated earlier in this report the KACCAL project was developed through a highly consultative process involving national level, district and community level stakeholders who contributed to the design of the intervention. The project is therefore based upon local priorities which makes it sustainable over time due to the fact that it is not an imposition from outside.

Most rural communities suffer from their inability to adapt to changing climatic conditions due to inherent constraints such as limited capacities and options for adaptation. KACCAL aims to remove the barriers to adaptation at community level which if accomplished as planned, will contribute to the sustainability of the community interventions over the long term.

As discussed elsewhere in this report, KACCAL was not designed to re-invent the wheel. Instead, the project is meant to build upon on-going national programmes and improve on their ability to incorporate and integrate climate change adaptation and resilience. Addressing climate change adaptation from a policy formulation perspective is expected to institutionalize adaptation approaches at various planning levels which will make them sustainable over the long term. This aspect of sustainability will also be enhanced by the collaborative planning and management of



development interventions that are implemented by the various institutions. The 2010 Kenyan constitution has created fertile ground for this development with the devolution of authority and decision making to the local level.

KACCAL will be sustainable over the long term because it is aimed at building systemic resilience to outside shocks through the enhancement of capacity to adapt at multiple planning levels. The initiative also targets practice rather than financial investment. By impacting on the way people, from community groups to high level government bureaucrats, do business the KACCAL programme will ensure the sustainability of its interventions over time. The potential for the sustainability of the KACCAL project results is rated as **Likely (L)**.

### 3.3.5 Impact

While it is too early to measure and establish the impact of the project, all indications point to the fact that the KACCAL project will have long term implications for development planning. Further, the enhancement of local level capacities for project planning will increase local level ownership of development interventions with direct implications for sustainability and impact. The KACCAL project has also ensured that women are represented on the management boards of all the projects that were supported. Women are more vulnerable to the impacts of climate change primarily due to the roles that play at the family level. They are the ones who experience increased hardships as they spend more time sources environmental goods such as water and fuel wood which keep households provided for. For this to happen though, UNDP will need to liaise with the National Drought Management Agency to ensure that activities that were planned to be implemented during the lifespan of the project are continued beyond the project lifespan.

### 3.3.6 Summary of Assessment of Project Performance

It is a GEF requirement that the discussion of project implementation results discussed above be presented in matrix form as a valuation table.

**Table Evaluation Ratings:**

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

**Rating Scales: Effectiveness, Efficiency, Monitoring and Evaluation and Implementation and Execution**

Ratings are based on the conventional six-level UNDP-GEF scale below:

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): sever problems

**Sustainability Ratings**

4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability
3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks
2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks
1. Unlikely (U): severe risks

**Rating Scale for Relevance**

2. Relevant (R)
1. Not relevant (NR)

**Impact Ratings**

3. Significant (S)
2. Minimal (M)
1. Negligible (N)

## 4. Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

### 4.1 Conclusions

Although the KACCAL project was scaled down from the larger initiative that was to be funded in collaboration with the World Bank and was only implemented in pilot sites in Mwingi District over a limited period of time, the initiative produced results that will directly impact on the capability of poor rural communities to adapt to the climate change.

The KACCAL project has introduced a participatory and collaborative approach to project implementation which has hitherto been difficult to nurture among government institutions charged with the responsibility to address the problems of drought and climate change in Kenya. Awareness creation activities targeting national level decision makers have enhanced the ability of decision makers to articulate appropriate policy responses to issues of poverty that have afflicted rural communities in ASLAs in Kenya for a long time. Following the training provided through the project, government extension officers at the County and Division levels in Mumoni and Kyuso have been able to incorporate climate change adaptation strategies into County Development plans as well as into the extension messages that they have taken to the communities which they work with.

Community groups that have received support from the project were adjudged to be able to plan, manage and implement their own projects as evidenced by the “stories from the field” that were collected by the evaluator during the field visits. The business development and market identification activities that were initiated by the project towards its close out were intended to open opportunities for beneficiary communities to improve their livelihoods from activities that were introduced as climate change adaptation initiatives. Examples of these include the goat improvement project at Mwendo Wa Syana, the seed bulking project at Katse and the improved energy efficiency stoves that are being promoted and marketed by MKYU.

The overall assessment of the terminal evaluation of the KACCAL project is that the project goal of enhancing the resilience of the poor rural communities to climate change impacts in agricultural and pastoral systems in arid and semi-arid lands in Kenya has been realised. In addition the project Objective of increasing the capacity of communities in Mwingi District to adapt to climate variability and change have both been met. UNDP and the National Drought Management Agency will need to work together to ensure that these gains are sustained into the future. The project is rated as **Successful (S)**.

### 4.2 Lessons Learned

The evaluation has highlighted that there had been earlier efforts by the Kenya government

to address issues related to climate variability and change in the ASALs of the country with little success. The KACCAL project has however made considerable progress towards addressing these issues and sustaining the gains made over the long term. This level of success has yielded a number of lessons that have been documented for use in the planning and development of similar activities in Kenya and elsewhere. These lessons are summarised below. Projects targeting the improvement of livelihoods in rural contexts require that all technical support agencies and service providers work in close collaboration with each other so as to deliver a consolidated programme to affected communities. The KACCAL project addressed the lack of coordination in previous project interventions through conducting a comprehensive stakeholder analysis which indicated the strengths of each stakeholder prior to project design and start up. This was used to develop collaborative planning strategies which have positively impacted on community capacities to adapt to climate change.

Participatory planning processes promote more long lasting impacts among beneficiary communities. The approach adopted under the KACCAL project to involve community groups in the project design and implementation has resulted in community groups at the pilot sites owning the project which bodes well for sustainability.

Capacity building can easily become a never ending process if it does not deliberately and specifically target groups to benefit from it. The stakeholder consultations discussed above identified three discrete stakeholder groups that were to receive targeted awareness and capacity enhancement support. These were the national level government entities that received awareness raising support, county and division level extension service providers who received climate change adaptation training and the beneficiary communities which also received training on climate change adaptation.

It is not always the large multi-million dollar projects that have the most significant impact on community development. Small targeted projects are more likely to result in significant impacts. KACCAL was a reduced scale project which provided targeted capacity building support to community groups in the project area with significant impacts as is documented in this report.

Climate change adaptation needs to be mainstreamed into development planning initiatives at various planning levels for the results from the initiatives to be sustainable over the long term. The integration of climate change adaptation initiatives into County Development initiative will guarantee the institutionalization of this response to climate change into development planning.

Projects aimed at addressing climate change need to ensure that they involve women at all levels of management as women are the ones that suffer the most from climate change and variability.

#### 4.3 Recommendations

The KACCAL project has already been operationally closed so the recommendations that are provided in this report will only be of use to UNDP/GEF for use in the design of other

projects.

Training materials on climate change adaptation and its mainstreaming into development planning have been developed under the memorandum of understanding with the University of Nairobi. The evaluation has established that all those that undertook this training had their appreciation of climate change increased to different levels with county level staff now incorporating the concept into their integrated planning frameworks. This process of climate proofing development planning is expected to improve the resilience of rural communities over time.

***Recommendation 1: It is recommended that UNDP Kenya Country Office and the National Drought Management Agency collaborate to package the training materials on climate change adaptation that were produced by the University of Nairobi for use on similar follow-on projects. The NDMA has already committed to continuing with the training and capacity building activities initiated under the project and will therefore benefit from these materials which have been very well received by all stakeholders who were exposed to them***

The training provided by the University of Nairobi was preceded by a Capacity Perception Index survey which measured the perceptions that various groups of stakeholders have on climate change and variability. The results of this survey were then used to develop a customized training response that addressed this complicated subject at the appropriate level. This survey was to have been followed up by a Perception Assessment Survey to assess the extent to which stakeholder perceptions of climate change had shifted following training. This survey was never conducted as the project ran out of time. Future training will require the use of the results of this second stage survey.

***Recommendation 3: It is recommended that UNDP Kenya CO and NDMA use the left over project financial resource to engage the University of Nairobi to conduct this planned survey with the results of the survey being used to inform both on-going and new interventions in the area.***

At the time the KACCAL project was closed a number of procurement contracts for the production of project communications and publicity materials had been issued but the results of the work had not been delivered. The UNDP Kenya Country Office is expecting to receive final versions of these materials at the time of the Terminal Evaluation. These materials included information pamphlets and leaflets, T-shirts and others which were to be disseminated to communities around the pilot sites.

***Recommendation 4: That UNDP CO finalise the production of these materials as a matter of urgency and hand them over to the NDMA for dissemination over the divisions where the project was implemented. These materials will promote the continued engagement of participating communities and also encourage those that had not benefitted directly from the project to also take up the new ideas that were generated.***

The Kitui County government has taken up the products from the KACCAL project and integrated climate change adaptation into their County Integrated Development Plan. This

recognition of the work that was done under the project is an important development in Kenya's continuing efforts at addressing climate change issues in the arid and semi arid regions of the country. It is important that the momentum generated at the pilot project sites is nurtured into the future.

***Recommendation 5: It is recommended that the County government continues to engage with all the pilot projects initiated under the KACCAL project with a view to sustaining the initiatives into the future. The experiences gained at these sites should be scaled up and replicated across the rest of the ASALs in Kenya through this support which the NDMA have already committed to.***

## 5. Annexes

## Annex 1: Summary of Evaluation Results

Goal and Objectives		Expected Outcomes	Original Output	Output-Amended Results Framework	Activities	Remarks	TE Comments	Evaluation Ratings
<b>Overall Goal</b>	To enhance the resilience of the communities, to climate change impacts in agricultural and pastoral systems in arid and semi-arid lands in Kenya.							
<b>Project Objectives</b>	<b>New:</b> To increase the capacity of communities in Mwingi District to adapt to climate variability and change.  <b>Original:</b> To <i>increase the capacity of communities in the selected districts of the ASALs to adapt to climate variability and change.</i>	<b>New:</b> 1. Enhanced awareness of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures in arid and semi-arid lands.  <b>Original:</b> <i>Enhanced capacity of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures</i>	1.1 Availability of skills and tools necessary to continue CC risk assessments after the conclusion of the project, assessed by survey.	1.1 Organization of CCA awareness creation workshops (year 1 through 3)	-Key National stakeholder awareness w/shop	*30 National stakeholders shared/sensitized on experiences and lessons learnt	Stakeholder workshops have been held through the implementation period for the various stakeholder groups from community level to county level. Extension workers and community groups exposed to climate change dynamics resulting in enhanced understanding of impacts of climate change on livelihoods	HS
			1.2 Percent change in stakeholders' use of climate risk assessment methods for design and/or decision-making on agriculture-related investments, assessed by survey.	1.2 Development of outreach program and materials (year 1 through 3)	-Use District Social and Gender Office together with Education office to organize Cultural events and competitions	-Activity has been assigned to a Local CBO, Muky-Ordap and needs fast tracking.	Community mobilisation and sensitization among 700 members (540 females and 160 males). A total of 32 groups were formed with 605 members (497 females and 108 males) (Pamphlets and	S



							brochures, posters, banners)  UNDP Kenya CO has also contracted the production of outreach materials which had been finalized and approved by the time of the evaluation. These comprised items such as T-Shirts, CAPS, and Brochures which will be printed and disseminated to the general public.	
			1.3 Evaluation of utility of meteorological information for agricultural decision-making.	1.3 Documentation and dissemination of good practices (year 2 and 3)	-Engage consultant to document good practices and produce posters, roller banners and brochures for the project	-Consultant is on board	Consultant had submitted draft final reports at the time of the evaluation but these had not been disseminated to target audiences. evaluator did not have a chance to	MS
			1.4 Documentation and evaluation of indigenous knowledge system on climate risk management.				This is to be addressed on an on-going basis post-project implementation. Focus will be on IKS with respect to land management and conservation of trees, animal husbandry etc.	
			1.5 Establishment of District climate risk management institutional framework/process.				Mainstreaming of climate change into County government planning processes.	
			1.6 Development outreach programme and materials.				Promotional materials developed (pamphlets, project promotional materials-shirts,	

							lessos/kanga, bags etc) and disseminated among project beneficiaries.	
			1.7.Level of Community awareness on policies and institutions supporting drought preparedness				Part of the sensitization process?	
			1.8Documentation of good practices and success stories that is adaptive.				Consultant produced report and produced templates of materials.	
		<b>Assessment of Outcome 1</b>						<b>S</b>
		2. Enhanced capacity of district and local level stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures  NO CHANGE	2.1 Trained extension officers in climate risk management practices	2.1 Capacity Perception Index (CPI) for adaptation planning and implementation for district and local level stakeholders (...local civil society organizations, NGOs, local GOK staff etc) (year 1)	-Training various stakeholders on CCA/CRM -Consultancy to develop baselines -Validation w/shop(s)	-Capacity Perception Index (CPI) baseline established at score 2/5 -Development baseline established	CPI established. Training of extension workers conducted	S
			2.2 Percent change in stakeholders' capacities to make agriculture/pastoralism decisions based on climate information, assessed by survey.	2.2 Development of training courses, organization of workshops (year 1 through 3)	MoU with University of Nairobi (Enterprise Services) Training curriculum and plan developed	-Course content developed 73 planners at various levels trained as follows: -24 District level planners trained and certified -22 County level assistant	University of Nairobi engaged to develop training programme and run courses on climate change for extension workers. Extension workers interviewed confirmed enhanced capacity to mainstream climate change in their	HS

						directors sensitized on CCA mainstreaming -27 County chief officers and directors sensitized on CCA mainstreaming	operations. Some have taken up climate change mitigation as a profession. One officer trained through the Project has been invited to present the work that they are doing at an international conference in Pretoria in November 2014.  State of awareness to be assessed as on-going activity post project.				
				2.3 Development of screening tools to climate proof sectoral development plans for Mwingi District (year 1 through 3)	<b>Climate lens screening tool</b> that looks at development plans in terms of: 1. Vulnerability-how vulnerable is the decision to climate change? 2. Current adaptation- to what extent have climate risks already been taken into account? 3. Maladaptation- does the decision increase vulnerability to climate change or over-look opportunities for adaptation? 4. Climate-Proofing: can the decision be amended to take into account the risks posed by climate change?	-Climate Change Adaptation mainstreamed in the Kitui County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP) -Sectors involved include: agriculture, water, environment, coordination of government, local based CBOs.	County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP) and County Environmental Management Plan have mainstreamed Climate Change Adaptation.	HS			
				<b>Assessment of Objective 2</b>							<b>HS</b>
				3. Enhanced communities'	3.1. Technical and financial feasibility assessments of	3.1 Capacity development for	-Train at least 20 Agricultural Extension agents	-20 agricultural extension agents	Sub-county extension officers and County	MS	

		ability to plan, manage and implement climate-related activities  NO CHANGE	proposed interventions	agricultural extension officers to develop and disseminate climate change adaptation advice (year 1 through 3)	-Refresher courses -Study excursions	trained on CRM -22 retrained on CRM -2 learning visits to Isiolo(#13pax) and Makueni(#30 pax) -about 1800 community members trained on CCA planning, management and implementation	level officers interviewed at Kyuso and Kitui expressed satisfaction with the training that they received through the project. Training and extension services provided to community groups are showing signs of communities being able to plan, manage and implement climate resilient projects	
			3.2 Percent change in farmers/pastoralists use of climate-resilient methods for managing climate change risks, assessed via survey.	3.2 Climate risk information and adaptation advice disseminated to communities via radio - and other appropriate extension info outlet avenues (year 1 through 3)	-Local leaders and extension staff sensitization workshops -Staff training on use of simple weather measuring devices such as rain-gauges	-40 local leaders and staff sensitized by KMD -95 more sensitized on seasonal climate outlook and dissemination strategies -Community radio and weather station land set aside -30 field monitors trained on use of rain-gauges -Staff and farmer learning tour of existing community radios in Kangema, Suswa, Emuhaya and Budalangi	Kenya Meteorological Department conducted basic training of extension workers in the two sub-counties on weather systems and climate change together with University of Nairobi. The proposed community radio station was however never established primarily due to the short planning timeframe of the project.	MS
			3.3 Agricultural and pastoral productivity increased.	3.3 Organization of exchange visits of other community groups to the pilot	Groups outside the pilot sites are organized to visit pilots to learn from the demos. Expected to reach 360 additional farmers/households	4 groups with 140 members visited pilot sites.	Exchange visits to Meru and other Counties organised. In addition, agencies such as Muky-ORDAP have	S

				projects.			organised community groups through which energy saving stoves are being popularized through exchange visits.	
				3.4 Six(6) adaptation action plans (one per community group) developed (year 1)	Extension Staff and local leaders identify and develop CCA interventions for groups	15 CCA pilots assisted to develop action plans. Support in the tune of KES 25m extended to the pilot groups. Government extension services now use the KACCAL project outputs as the basis for their work.	A sample of six pilots were visited (Kisungi, Katse Seed Bulking, Ndetha, Wendo WaSyana/Wendo Walveti, Muky-ORDAP, Ndetani Shallow Well) where the evaluator interviewed project beneficiaries. All beneficiaries were familiar with the project and its objectives. While no specific climate change adaptation action plans have been developed the evaluator's assessment was that project beneficiaries were generally aware of what was happening to their environment and had a common vision of what needs to be done to reverse the trends towards degradation.	MS
Assessment of Objective 3								MS
OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT PERFORMANCE								S

## Annex 2: Evaluation Terms of Reference



### Terms of Reference

#### FOR INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANTS/CONTRACTORS (IC)

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

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

**Country of Assignment:** Kenya

**Duty Station:** Mwingi District of Eastern Province, Kenya

**Duration** 27working days over 2 months

#### 1. Introduction

Project evaluations assess the efficiency and effectiveness of a project in achieving its intended results. They also assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to medium-term and longer-term outcomes. Terminal evaluations (TE) provide a comprehensive and systematic accounting of performance at the end of the project cycle, considering the totality of the effort from project design, through implementation to wrap up, also considering the likelihood of sustainability and possible impacts. The target audience for a

terminal evaluation is GEF Operational Focal Point, project partners and beneficiaries, UNDP at country, regional and HQ levels, UNDP Evaluation Office, GEF Secretariat and GEF Evaluation Office.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Indicative total budget: Euros 150,000**

## **Background**

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

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

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

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



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

## **2. Objectives of the Evaluation**

The objective of the evaluation is to:

Provide a comprehensive and systematic accounting of performance;

Assess project design, implementation, likelihood of sustainability and possible impacts.

Assess the appropriateness, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project.

Provide lessons learned and recommendations for future phases of the project.

Measure the overall and lasting impact of the project.

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

## **3. Scope of the Evaluation**

Annex 5 contains the report outline which should be adhered to for the KACCAL project. The content is outlined in the following sections which are organized as three components, each with sub-sections i) project design, ii) project implementation and iii) Results. The evaluation criteria across these components are as follows: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Results and Sustainability, Further guidance on these evaluation criteria can be found in the UNDP guide to Terminal Evaluations (pp15).

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

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

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

### **3.1 Project formulation:**

Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its time frame?

Were the capacities of the executing institution(s) and its counterparts properly considered when the project was designed?

Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design?

Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project approval?

Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry?

Were the project assumptions and risks well-articulated in the PIF and project document?

Were the planned outcomes SMART?

Was the Theory of Change/Logical Framework logical (i.e. outputs leading to Outcomes leading to the objective)?

### ***3.1.1 Assumptions and risks:***

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

An assessment of the stated assumptions and risks as set out in the PRODOC and logical framework/Results framework, whether they are logical and robust, and have helped to determine activities and planned outputs.

Externalities (i.e. effects of climate change, global economic crisis, etc.) which are relevant to the findings.

### ***3.2 Project implementation:***

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

The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool

Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region

Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

An analysis of how efficiently project planning and implementation were carried out. This includes assessing the extent of organizational structure, managerial support and coordination mechanisms used in supporting the project.

Project's contribution to capacity development at three levels - community, District and National levels.

Project delivery mechanisms including institutional arrangements and how these supported or constrained project delivery.

#### ***3.2.1 Finance/co-finance***

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

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

Whether there was sufficient clarity in the report co-financing to substantiate in-kind and cash co-financing from all listed sources.

The reasons for differences in the level of expected and actual co-financing;

The extent to which project components supported by external funders was well integrated into the overall project;

The effect on project outcomes and/or sustainability from the extent of materialization of the co-financing;

Whether there is evidence of additional leveraged resources that have been committed as a result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and may be from other donors, NGOs, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector.

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

Cost effectiveness factors including:

Compliance with additional cost principle and securing co-financing and associated funding;

The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes according to schedule and as cost effectively as initially planned.

The project has been subject to strong financial controls that allow project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a timely flow of funds and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables;

The project has been subject to due diligence in the management of funds including periodic audits;

The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach to ensure that the costs were comparable to other projects.

### **3.2.2 IA and EA execution:**

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

Whether there was an appropriate focus on results

The adequacy of IA & EA supervision

The quality of risk management

Responsiveness of the managing parties to significant implementation problems (if any)

Quality and timeliness of technical support to the project team

Candor and realism in supervision reporting

Suitability of chosen executing agency for project execution

Any salient issues regarding project duration, for instance to note project delays, and how they may have affected project outcomes and sustainability

Adequacy of management inputs and processes including budgeting and procurement;

Government ownership

### ***3.2.3 Monitoring and evaluation:***

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

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

The quality of M&E plan implementation: Was the M&E plan sufficiently budgeted and funded during project preparation and implementation?

The effectiveness of monitoring indicators from the project document for measuring progress and performance;

Compliance with the progress and financial reporting requirements/ schedule, including quality and timeliness of reports;

The value and effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation reports and evidence that these were discussed with stakeholders and project staff;

The extent to which follow-up actions, and/or adaptive management, were taken in response to monitoring reports (PIRs);

Check to see whether PIR self-evaluation ratings were consistent with TE findings. If not, were these discrepancies identified by the project steering committee and addressed?

The extent to which changes were made to project implementation as a result of the mid-term evaluation.

#### **3.2.4 Stakeholder involvement:**

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

A review of the quality and thoroughness of the stakeholder plan presented in the PIF and project document which should be reviewed for its logic and completeness.

The level of stakeholder participation during project implementation.

Questions regarding stakeholder participation include:

Did the project involve the relevant stakeholders through information sharing and consultation and by seeking their participation in project design, implementation, and M&E? For example, did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?

Did the project consult with and make use of the skills, experience, and knowledge of the appropriate government entities, nongovernmental organizations, community groups, private sector entities, local governments, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities?

Were the perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process taken into account while taking decisions? Were the relevant vulnerable groups and powerful supporters and opponents of the processes properly involved?

#### **3.3.5 Adaptive management:**

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

Did the project undergo significant changes as a result of recommendations from the RTA at the start of implementation? Or as a result of other review procedures? Explain the process and implications.

If the changes were extensive, did they materially change the expected project outcomes?

Were the project changes articulated in writing and then considered and approved by the project steering committee?

### **3.4 Project results:**

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

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

#### **3.3.1 Country ownership:**

Was the project concept in line with development priorities and plans of the country (or countries)?

Were the relevant country representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project steering committee?

Was an intergovernmental committee given responsibility to liaise with the project team, recognizing that more than one ministry should be involved?

Has the recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project?

Have the Outcomes from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans?

Has the government(s), enacted legislation, and/or developed policies and regulations in line with the project's objectives?

#### **3.3.2 Mainstreaming:**

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

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

The section on mainstreaming should assess:

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

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

If the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP country programme document (CPD) and country programme action plan (CPAP).

Whether there is evidence that the project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with natural disasters.

Whether gender issues had been taken into account in project design and implementation, (i.e. project team composition, gender-related aspects of pollution impacts, stakeholder outreach to women's groups, etc). If so, indicate how.

The mainstreaming assessment should take note of the points of convergence between UNDP environment-related and other development programming.

### **3.3.3 Sustainability:**

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

Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy e.g. Community uptake on the adaptation mechanisms and most importantly the business model and the community micro-projects among others.

Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project's objectives).

Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.

Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.

Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.

Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.).

Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).

Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.

Achieving stakeholders' consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

#### **3.3.4 Catalytic effect**

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

Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).

Expansion of demonstration projects.

Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.

Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

#### **4.3.5 Impact**

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

### **3.4 Conclusions, Recommendations and Lessons**

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

The evaluation report should provide practical, feasible recommendations directed to the intended users of the evaluation about what actions to take and decisions to make. The recommendations should be specifically supported by the evidence and linked to the findings and conclusions around key questions addressed by the



evaluation. The Recommendations for the project (exit strategy) should be synthesized in a table highlighting the recommendation, suggested action, responsible party and timing, as follows:

Recommendation	Management response	Key Actions	Timeframe	Responsible Unit	Status*	Comment

\*Completed; partially completed; pending;

Recommendations for future programming should also be prepared.

The evaluation report should include, if available, lessons that can be taken from the evaluation, including best (and worst) practices that can provide knowledge gained from the particular circumstance (programmatic and evaluation methods used, partnerships, financial leveraging, etc.) that are applicable to other GEF and UNDP interventions.

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

#### 4. Outputs/Deliverables

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

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

**A table setting out how the comments received on the draft evaluation report have been addressed.**

**A final evaluation report.**

Annex 6 contains the sample outline report. The draft report is considered complete, in contractual terms, only when it has achieved acceptable standards.

#### **4.1 Payment schedules**

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

#### **4.1.1 Tasks**

<b><u>Task</u></b>	<b><u>Dates</u></b>
Tender the ToR:	30 <sup>th</sup> April 2014
Consultant hired:	10 <sup>th</sup> May 2014
Contract begins:	12 <sup>th</sup> May 2014
Draft documents	15 <sup>th</sup> May 2014
Finalized report Documents	10 <sup>th</sup> June 2014.
Documentaries and photos	30 <sup>th</sup> June 2014

#### **4.1.2 Budget**

The assignment will be a total of 27 days broken down as follows:

4 days desk review and production of an inception report.

1111111111111111111111111117days writing the draft report

## 4.2 Conduct of work

The evaluation will properly examine and assess the perspectives of the various stakeholders. Interviews should include a wide array of interested persons including civil society, NGOs and the private sector, local ministry officials as relevant, and national ministry officials (in addition to the OFP).

Data analysis should be conducted in a systematic manner to ensure that all the findings, conclusions and recommendations are substantiated by evidence. Appropriate tools should be used to ensure proper analysis (e.g. including a data analysis matrix that records, for each evaluation question/criteria, information and data collected from different sources and with different methodology). Limitations of the data should be discussed as well as for the conclusions and ratings for the project evaluation.

Following the review of the draft evaluation report, the evaluation team should indicate how comments have been addressed in the revised evaluation report.

The duty station is Nairobi. The consultant will spend at least two(4) days in Nairobi and five(5) days at most in Mwingi District, with frequent travels to the pilot sites in (Mumoni and Kyuso districts which are approximately 60 km from Mwingi district headquarters) to gather the relevant information and conduct necessary interviews with stakeholders

## 6. Reporting Lines

The consultant will report to the KACCAL Project Manager, the UNDP Country Office and CEO-NDMA, and should keep in regular (day to day) contact by email, phone and in person when possible.

## **7. Required skills and experience**

### **7.1 Education**

Master's degree with 15 years' experience or PhD with five years' experience in Agriculture, Natural Resources Management, Development Studies or other relevant Social or Natural sciences.

Some experience working in the field of Environment and Climate Change and knowledge of GEF projects will be an added advantage

### **7.2 Competency profile**

A minimum of at least 5 years relevant work experience in conducting independent evaluations of rural/agricultural development projects, especially donor-funded projects and GEF.

Experience working with the Government, International organizations, NGOs, Donors or the UN system in the Southern Africa is an added advantage.

Demonstrated solid knowledge of climate change, climate change adaptation or development, Environment and food security issues

Demonstrated experience in project design, development, implementation or management as well as experience in carrying out financial audits.

Conversant with monitoring and evaluation of projects, including developing results-oriented targets and indicators and collecting quantitative and qualitative data.

Good communication, writing and editing skills in English as well as IT skills to support his work.

## **8. Evaluation Criteria**

	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Max Points</b>
	<b>Technical</b>	100%	100
1	Experience working with the Government, International organizations, NGOs, Donors or the UN system in the Southern Africa is an added advantage.	20%	20
2	Demonstrated solid knowledge of climate change, Climate change adaptation or development, Environment and food security issues	20%	20
3	Demonstrated experience in project design, development, implementation or management as well as experience in carrying out financial audits	20%	20

4	Conversant with monitoring and evaluation of projects, including developing results-oriented targets and indicators and collecting quantitative and qualitative data.	25%	25
5	Good communication, writing and editing skills in English as well as IT skills to support his work.	15%	15
	<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100</b>

## 12) Remuneration

Successful candidate will be paid on UN Consultants terms and conditions

Payment will be done against deliverables within specific timelines provided under section 7 on deliverables.

Transport and accommodation for field work will be provided by the project

DSA will be provided to the consultant while in the field

## 13) Annexes

Annex 1: The KACCAL Results Framework and outputs

Annex 2: Ratings table

Annex 3: Evaluation questions

Annex 4: Sample Evaluation Criteria Matrix

Annex 5: SAMPLE Matrix for Rating the Achievement of outcomes

Annex 6: Evaluation Report Outline

Annex 7: Co-finance table

Annex 8: Code of conduct agreement form:

Annex 9: Itinerary (List of people to interview)

Annex 10: List of documents to review

## ANNEXES

Annex 1: The KACCAL Results Framework and outputs

Result	Indicator	Baseline value	Target and benchmarks	Means of verification and frequency	Risks & Assumptions
<b>Overall Goal:</b> To enhance the resilience of the communities, to climate change impacts in agricultural and pastoral systems in arid and semi-arid lands in Kenya					
Project Objective: To increase the capacity of communities in Mwingi District to adapt to climate variability and change.	1.Number of household adopting adaptation technologies  2.Number of adjustments (climate proofing) made to district level sectoral development plans	1. As per baseline survey  2.Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) has not been mainstreamed in District sectoral development plans,	1. 180 households will benefit directly from the pilot projects (6 community groups); an additional 360 households (12 community groups) to benefit from exchange visits to pilot sites; c. 10,000 households in the pilot areas (75% of households) will benefit from dissemination of adaptation advice.  2. CCA mainstreamed into 3 District sectoral development plans (agric, water and Forestry and Wildlife)	1. Household surveys (beginning and end of project)  2.Climate proofed sectoral development plans (annually for 2012/2013 and 2013/2014)	Risks:  Implementation of new constitution in terms of new decentralized government structures. Could affect co-financing.  Assumption:  Government support not affected by 2012 elections
Outcome 1:	Stated awareness of national policy	Little or no awareness of	National policy makers are aware	Survey (end of	Implementation of new

Overall Goal: To enhance the resilience of the communities, to climate change impacts in agricultural and pastoral systems in arid and semi-arid lands in Kenya

Project Objective: To increase the capacity of communities in Mwingi District to adapt to climate variability and change.	1. Number of household adopting adaptation technologies	1. As per baseline survey	1. 180 households will benefit directly from the pilot projects (6 community groups); an additional 360 households (12 community groups) to benefit from exchange visits to pilot sites; c. 10,000 households in the pilot areas (75% of households) will benefit from dissemination of adaptation advice.	1. Household surveys (beginning and end of project)	Risks:
	2. Number of adjustments (climate proofing) made to district level sectoral development plans	2. Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) has not been mainstreamed in District sectoral development plans,	2. CCA mainstreamed into 3 District sectoral development plans (agric, water and Forestry and Wildlife)	2. Climate proofed sectoral development plans (annually for 2012/2013 and 2013/2014)	Implementation of new constitution in terms of new decentralized government structures. Could affect co-financing.  Assumption:  Government support not affected by 2012 elections

Outcome 1:	Stated awareness of national policy	Little or no awareness of	National policy makers are aware	Survey (end of	Implementation of new
------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------------	----------------	-----------------------

USD 0.13m  Enhanced awareness of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures in arid and semi-arid lands.	makers of CC implications for ASAL's development and CCA solutions.	CCA needs in ASAL	of CC impacts and CCA needs in ASAL.	project)  Evaluation results of trainings/workshops	constitution in terms of new decentralized Government structures; Could affect co-financing.
Outputs	<p>1.1 Organization of CCA awareness creation workshops (year 1 through 3)</p> <p>1.2 Development of outreach program and materials (year 1 through 3)</p> <p>1.3 Documentation and dissemination of good practices (year 2 and 3)</p>	<p>1.1 Insufficient awareness on linkage between CC, impacts and possible adaptation measures</p> <p>1.3 None</p>	<p>1.1 Create CCA awareness for 20 focal point national and regional stakeholders</p> <p>Document and disseminate one success story per year</p>	<p>Training reports</p> <p>ALM/UNDP-DDC website</p>	

<p>Outcome 2:</p> <p>USD 0.14m</p> <p>Enhanced capacity of district and local level stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures</p>	<p>1.Capacity perception index</p> <p>2.Number of adjustments (climate proofing) made to district level sectoral development plans</p>	<p>1. Based on index assessment</p> <p>2. CCA has not been mainstreamed in District development plans.</p>	<p>1. Improvement from the baseline</p> <p>2. CCA mainstreamed into 3 District sectoral development plans (Agric, Water, Forestry and Wildlife)</p>	<p>Survey (beginning and end of project)</p> <p>Climate proofed development plans(annually)</p>	<p>Implementation of new constitution in terms of new decentralized Government structures</p>
<p>Output</p>	<p>2.1 Capacity perception index for adaptation planning and implementation for district and local level stakeholders (...local civil society organizations, NGOs, local GOK staff etc) (year 1)</p> <p>2.2 Development of training courses, organization of workshops (year 1 through 3)</p> <p>2.3 Development</p>	<p>2.1 As per the CPI assessment</p> <p>2.2 No course content on CCA</p>	<p>2.1 Improve baseline value</p> <p>2.2 Develop training course based on CPI and use content for</p>	<p>2.1 Survey (beginning and end of project)</p> <p>2.2 Training curriculum and Training reports</p>	





		economic baseline survey			
Output	<p>3.1 Capacity development for agricultural extension officer to develop and disseminate climate change adaptation advice (year 1 through 3)</p> <p>3.2 Climate risk information and adaptation advice disseminated to communities via radio - and other appropriate extension info outlet avenues (year 1 through 3)</p> <p>3.3 Organization of exchange visits of other community groups to the pilot projects.</p> <p>3.4 Six(6) adaptation action plans (one per community group) developed</p>	<p>Climate change information not ingrained in extension messages</p> <p>Information passed once per season in national radio-station before start of the rain season</p> <p>No exchange visits</p>	<p>75% of agricultural extension staff in pilot sites location trained</p> <p>Community radio and village based Rannet radios used to pass climate info on weekly basis</p> <p>2 community groups per season per year = 4 per year x 3 years = 12</p>	<p>Surveys and Training reports</p> <p>Interviews and records from satellite broadcasting station</p> <p>Excursion reports</p> <p>Group Interviews</p>	<p>Extension staff willing to disseminate climate information (trust and perception problems with Met forecasts)</p> <p>Rannet radio continues to operate</p>

	(year 1)	None on the ground	community groups.  6 adaptation action plans	Visit to pilot sites	
Project Management:  USD 0.37m	Project vehicle and maintenance  Administrative costs  Project office goods and equipment	Current vehicle is loaned for one year and office allocated to project needs assorted goods and equipment	-one vehicle and assorted office goods and equipment procured	Stores stock cards	Risk:  Loaning unit does not extend loaning arrangement beyond the agreed one year.

## Annex 2: Ratings table

Ratings Scales		
<i>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</i>  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	<i>Sustainability ratings:</i>  4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability 3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks 2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks 1. Unlikely (U): severe risks	<i>Relevance ratings</i>  2. Relevant (R) 1.. Not relevant (NR)  <i>Impact Ratings:</i> 3. Significant (S) 2. Minimal (M) 1. Negligible (N)
<i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i>  Not Applicable (N/A)  Unable to Assess (U/A)		

A useful table to include in the evaluation report is set out below, (click on **(rate)** and the drop-down scale is provided),

Rating Project Performance		
Criteria		Comments
Monitoring and Evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall quality of M&E	(rate 6 pt. scale)	

<i>M&amp;E design at project start up</i>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<i>M&amp;E Plan Implementation</i>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
IA & EA Execution: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Implementation/Execution	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<i>Implementing Agency Execution</i>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<i>Executing Agency Execution</i>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Outcomes Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S) Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)		
Overall Quality of Project Outcomes	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<i>Relevance:</i> relevant (R) or not relevant (NR)	(rate 2pt. scale)	
<i>Effectiveness</i>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
<i>Efficiency</i>	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability: Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U).		
Overall likelihood of risks to Sustainability:	(rate 4pt. scale)	
<i>Financial resources</i>	(rate 4pt. scale)	

<i>Socio-economic</i>	(rate 4pt. scale)	
<i>Institutional framework and governance</i>	(rate 4pt. scale)	
<i>Environmental</i>	(rate 4pt. scale)	
Impact: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N)		
Environmental Status Improvement	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Environmental Stress Reduction	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Progress towards stress/status change	(rate 3 pt. scale)	
Overall Project Results	(rate 6 pt. scale)	



### Annex 3:Evaluation questions

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?				
Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?				
Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?				



Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?				
Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?				

Annex 4: Sample Evaluation Criteria Matrix

Evaluative Criteria	Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the UNCBD and GEF focal areas, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels for biodiversity conservation in Carpathian mountain grassland ecosystems?				
Is the project relevant to UNCBD and other international convention objectives?	<p>How does the project support the objectives of the UNCBD?</p> <p>Does the project support other international conventions, such as the Carpathian Convention, and the UNFCCC?</p>	<p>UNCBD priorities and areas of work incorporated in project design</p> <p>Level of implementation of UNCBD in Czech Republic, and contribution of the project</p> <p>Priorities and areas of work of other conventions incorporated in project design</p> <p>Extent to which the project is actually implemented in line with incremental cost argument</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>National policies and strategies to implement the UNCBD, other international conventions, or related to environment more generally</p> <p>UNCBD and other international convention web sites</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>Interviews with project team, UNDP and other partners</p>
Is the project relevant the GEF biodiversity focal area?	How does the project support the GEF biodiversity focal area and strategic priorities	Existence of a clear relationship between the project objectives and GEF biodiversity focal area	<p>Project documents</p> <p>GEF focal areas strategies and documents</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>GEF website</p> <p>Interviews with UNDP and project team</p>

Is the project relevant to the Czech Republic's environment and sustainable development objectives?	<p>How does the project support the environment and sustainable development objectives of the Czech Republic?</p> <p>Is the project country-driven?</p> <p>What was the level of stakeholder participation in project design?</p> <p>What was the level of stakeholder ownership in implementation?</p> <p>Does the project adequately take into account the national realities, both in terms of institutional and policy framework in its design and its implementation?</p>	<p>Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives</p> <p>Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies</p> <p>Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities</p> <p>Level of involvement of government officials and other partners in the project design process</p> <p>Coherence between needs expressed by national stakeholders and UNDP-GEF criteria</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>National policies and strategies</p> <p>Key project partners</p>	<p>Documents analyses</p> <p>Interviews with UNDP and project partners</p>
Is the project addressing the needs of target beneficiaries at the local and regional levels?	<p>How does the project support the needs of relevant stakeholders?</p> <p>Has the implementation of the project been inclusive of all relevant stakeholders?</p> <p>Were local beneficiaries and stakeholders adequately involved in project design and implementation?</p>	<p>Strength of the link between expected results from the project and the needs of relevant stakeholders</p> <p>Degree of involvement and inclusiveness of stakeholders in project design and implementation</p>	<p>Project partners and stakeholders</p> <p>Needs assessment studies</p> <p>Project documents</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews with relevant stakeholders</p>
Is the project internally coherent	Are there logical linkages between expected results of the project (log frame) and the project design (in terms of project components, choice of partners,	Level of coherence between project expected results and project design	Program and project documents	Document analysis

in its design?	structure, delivery mechanism, scope, budget, use of resources etc.)?  Is the length of the project sufficient to achieve project outcomes?	internal logic  Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach	Key project stakeholders	Key interviews
How is the project relevant with respect to other donor-supported activities?	Does the GEF funding support activities and objectives not addressed by other donors?  How do GEF-funds help to fill gaps (or give additional stimulus) that are necessary but are not covered by other donors?  Is there coordination and complementarity between donors?	Degree to which program was coherent and complementary to other donor programming nationally and regionally	Documents from other donor supported activities  Other donor representatives  Project documents	Documents analyses  Interviews with project partners and relevant stakeholders
Does the project provide relevant lessons and experiences for other similar projects in the future?	Has the experience of the project provided relevant lessons for other future projects targeted at similar objectives?		Data collected throughout evaluation	Data analysis
<b>Effectiveness:</b> To what extent have/will the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been/be achieved?				
Has the project been effective in achieving the expected outcomes	Has the project been effective in achieving its expected outcomes?  1. Institutional capacity in place to assess, plan and implement priority conservation management of	See indicators in project document results framework and logframe	Project documents  Project team and relevant stakeholders  Data reported in project	Documents analysis  Interviews with project team

and objectives?	<p>mountain grasslands taking advantage of newly available EU funding mechanisms</p> <p>2. Farmers' capacity and incentives for and participation in conservation-oriented management of mountain grasslands is improved</p> <p>3. Monitoring and evaluation programme for mountain grassland biodiversity conservation management in place</p> <p>4. National policy for agro-environmental schemes incorporates project experience</p>		annual and quarterly reports	Interviews with relevant stakeholders
How is risk and risk mitigation being managed?	<p>How well are risks, assumptions and impact drivers being managed?</p> <p>What was the quality of risk mitigation strategies developed? Were these sufficient?</p> <p>Are there clear strategies for risk mitigation related with long-term sustainability of the project?</p>	<p>Completeness of risk identification and assumptions during project planning and design</p> <p>Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues</p> <p>Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>UNDP, project team, and relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>
What lessons can be drawn regarding effectiveness for other similar projects in the future?	<p>What lessons have been learned from the project regarding achievement of outcomes?</p> <p>What changes could have been made (if any) to the design of the project in order to improve the achievement of the project's expected results?</p>		Data collected throughout evaluation	Data analysis

**Efficiency:** Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?

Was project support provided in an efficient way?	Was adaptive management used or needed to ensure efficient resource use?	Availability and quality of financial and progress reports	Project documents and evaluations  UNDP  Project team	Document analysis  Key interviews
	Did the project logical framework and work plans and any changes made to them use as management tools during implementation?	Timeliness and adequacy of reporting provided		
	Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate for project management and producing accurate and timely financial information?	Level of discrepancy between planned and utilized financial expenditures		
	Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?	Planned vs. actual funds leveraged		
	Was project implementation as cost effective as originally proposed (planned vs. actual)	Cost in view of results achieved compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations		
	Did the leveraging of funds (co-financing) happen as planned?	Adequacy of project choices in view of existing context, infrastructure and cost		
	Were financial resources utilized efficiently? Could financial resources have been used more efficiently?	Quality of results-based management reporting (progress reporting, monitoring and evaluation)		
	Was procurement carried out in a manner making efficient use of project resources?	Occurrence of change in project design/ implementation approach (i.e. restructuring) when needed to improve project efficiency		
	How was results-based management used during project implementation?	Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compare to alternatives		

How efficient are partnership arrangements for the project?	<p>To what extent partnerships/linkages between institutions/ organizations were encouraged and supported?</p> <p>Which partnerships/linkages were facilitated? Which ones can be considered sustainable?</p> <p>What was the level of efficiency of cooperation and collaboration arrangements?</p> <p>Which methods were successful or not and why?</p>	<p>Specific activities conducted to support the development of cooperative arrangements between partners,</p> <p>Examples of supported partnerships</p> <p>Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained</p> <p>Types/quality of partnership cooperation methods utilized</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>Project partners and relevant stakeholders</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>
Did the project efficiently utilize local capacity in implementation?	<p>Was an appropriate balance struck between utilization of international expertise as well as local capacity?</p> <p>Did the project take into account local capacity in design and implementation of the project?</p> <p>Was there an effective collaboration between institutions responsible for implementing the project?</p>	<p>Proportion of expertise utilized from international experts compared to national experts</p> <p>Number/quality of analyses done to assess local capacity potential and absorptive capacity</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>UNDP</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>
What lessons can be drawn regarding efficiency for other similar projects in the future?	<p>What lessons can be learnt from the project regarding efficiency?</p> <p>How could the project have more efficiently carried out implementation (in terms of management structures and procedures, partnerships arrangements etc...)?</p> <p>What changes could have been made (if any) to the</p>		<p>Data collected throughout evaluation</p>	<p>Data analysis</p>

	project in order to improve its efficiency?			
<b>Results: What are the current actual and potential long-term, results of activities supported by the project?</b>				
How is the project effective in achieving its long-term objectives?	<p>Will the project achieve its overall objective to “Strengthen the conservation management of globally significant biodiversity in species-rich mountain grassland habitats (grasslands and pastures) in two Protected Landscape Areas (PLA) in the Carpathian Mountains of the Czech Republic”</p> <p>Is the globally significant biodiversity of the target area likely to be conserved?</p> <p>What barriers remain to achieving long-term objectives, or what necessary steps remain to be taken by stakeholders to achieve sustained impacts and Global Environmental Benefits?</p> <p>Are there unanticipated results achieved or contributed to by the project?</p>	<p>Change in capacity:</p> <p>To pool/mobilize resources</p> <p>For related policy making and strategic planning</p> <p>For implementation of related laws and strategies through adequate institutional frameworks and their maintenance</p> <p>Change in use and implementation of sustainable livelihoods</p> <p>Change in the number and strength of barriers such as:</p> <p>Knowledge about biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity resources, and economic incentives in these areas</p> <p>Cross-institutional coordination and inter-sectoral dialogue</p> <p>Knowledge of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use practices by end users</p>	<p>Project documents</p> <p>Key stakeholders</p> <p>Monitoring data</p>	<p>Documents analysis</p> <p>Meetings with UNDP, project team and project partners</p> <p>Interviews with project beneficiaries and other stakeholders</p>



		<p>Coordination of policy and legal instruments incorporating biodiversity conservation and agro-environmental strategies</p> <p>Agro-environmental economic incentives for stakeholders</p>		
How is the project effective in achieving the objectives of the UNCBD?	<p>What are the impacts or likely impacts of the project?</p> <p>On the local environment;</p> <p>On economic well-being;</p> <p>On other socio-economic issues.</p>	Provide specific examples of impacts at species, ecosystem or genetic levels, as relevant	<p>Project documents</p> <p>UNCDB documents</p> <p>Key Stakeholders</p> <p>Monitoring data</p>	<p>Data analysis</p> <p>Interviews with key stakeholders</p>
Future directions for results	How can the project build on its successes and learn from its weaknesses in order to enhance the potential for impact of ongoing and future initiatives?		Data collected throughout evaluation	Data analysis
<b>Sustainability:</b> Are the conditions in place for project-related benefits and results to be sustained?				
Are sustainability issues adequately integrated in project design?	Were sustainability issues integrated into the design and implementation of the project?	<p>Evidence / quality of sustainability strategy</p> <p>Evidence / quality of steps taken to ensure sustainability</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>UNDP and project personnel and project partners</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>

			Beneficiaries	
Financial sustainability	Did the project adequately address financial and economic sustainability issues?	Level and source of future financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities after project ends	Project documents and evaluations	Document analysis
	Are the recurrent costs after project completion sustainable?	Evidence of commitments from international partners, governments or other stakeholders to financially support relevant sectors of activities after project end  Level of recurrent costs after completion of project and funding sources for those recurrent costs	UNDP and project personnel and project partners  Beneficiaries	Interviews
Institutional and governance sustainability	Were the results of efforts made during the project implementation period well assimilated by organizations and their internal systems and procedures?	Degree to which project activities and results have been taken over by local counterparts or institutions/organizations	Project documents and evaluations	Document analysis
	Is there evidence that project partners will continue their activities beyond project support?	Level of financial support to be provided to relevant sectors and activities by in-country actors after project end	UNDP and project personnel and project partners	Interviews
	What degree is there of local ownership of initiatives and results?	Efforts to support the development of relevant laws and policies	Beneficiaries	
	Were laws, policies and frameworks addressed through the project, in order to address sustainability of key initiatives and reforms?	State of enforcement and law making capacity		
	What is the level of political commitment to build	Evidences of commitment by government enactment of laws and resource		

Social-economic sustainability	on the results of the project?  Are there policies or practices in place that create perverse incentives that would negatively affect long-term benefits?	allocation to priorities		
	Did the project contribute to key building blocks for socio-economic sustainability?  Did the project contribute to local stakeholders' acceptance of effective agro-environmental schemes?  Are there adequate market incentives to ensure sustained environmental and economic benefits achieved through the project?	Example of contributions to sustainable socio-economic changes in support of national development goals and strategies  Examples of contributions to sustainable socio-economic changes in support of the objectives of the UNCBD and other conventions	Project documents and evaluations  UNDP, project personnel and project partners  Beneficiaries	Interviews  Documentation review
Environmental sustainability	Are there risks to the environmental benefits that were created or that are expected to occur?  Are there long-term environmental threats that have not been addressed by the project?  Have any new environmental threats emerged in the project's lifetime?	Evidence of potential threats such as infrastructure development  Assessment of unaddressed or emerging threats	Project documents and evaluations  Threat assessments  Government documents or other external published information  UNDP, project personnel and project partners  Beneficiaries	Interviews  Documentation review

Individual, institutional and systemic capacity development	<p>Is the capacity in place at the regional, national and local levels adequate to ensure sustainability of the results achieved to date?</p> <p>Were the necessary related capacities for lawmaking and enforcement built?</p>	Elements in place in those different management functions, at the appropriate levels (regional, national and local) in terms of adequate structures, strategies, systems, skills, incentives and interrelationships with other key actors	<p>Project documents</p> <p>UNDP, project personnel and project partners</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p> <p>Capacity assessments available, if any</p>	<p>Interviews</p> <p>Documentation review</p>
Replication	<p>Were project activities and results replicated nationally and / or scaled up?</p> <p>What was the project contribution to replication or scaling up actively or passively promoted?</p> <p>Were project activities and results replicated or scaled-up in other countries?</p>	<p>Number/quality of replicated initiatives</p> <p>Number/quality of replicated innovative initiatives</p> <p>Scale of additional investment leveraged</p>	<p>Other donor programming documents</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p> <p>UNDP, project personnel and project partners</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>
Challenges to sustainability of the project	<p>What are the main challenges that may hinder sustainability of efforts?</p> <p>Have any of these been addressed through project management?</p> <p>What could be the possible measures to further contribute to the sustainability of efforts achieved with the project?</p>	<p>Challenges in view of building blocks of sustainability as presented above</p> <p>Recent changes which may present new challenges to the project</p> <p>Education strategy and partnership with school, education institutions etc.</p>	<p>Project documents and evaluations</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p> <p>UNDP, project personnel and project partners</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Interviews</p>
Future directions for	Which areas/arrangements under the project show		Data collected	Data analysis

sustainability and catalytic role	<p>the strongest potential for lasting long-term results?</p> <p>What are the key challenges and obstacles to the sustainability of results of the project initiatives that must be directly and quickly addressed?</p> <p>How can the experience and good project practices influence the strategies for biodiversity conservation of mountain grasslands through agro-environmental schemes?</p> <p>Are national decision-making institutions prepared to continue improving their strategy for effective biodiversity conservation through agro-environmental schemes?</p>		throughout evaluation	
-----------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------	--

**Annex 5: SAMPLE Matrix for Rating the Achievement of outcomes**

<b>PROJECT GOAL:</b> To catalyze the improved conservation of globally significant biodiversity through the demonstration of new mechanisms and approaches for effective management of protected areas and natural resources adjacent to them.						
<b>GOAL/OBJECTIVE/Outcome</b>	<b>Performance Indicator</b>	<b>2006 Baseline</b>	<b>2011 End of Project Target</b>	<b>2011 End of Project Status*</b>	<b>Terminal Evaluation Comments</b>	<b>Rating</b>

<b>PROJECT OBJECTIVE:</b> To strengthen the management effectiveness and sustainability of the three selected protected areas of different types, thereby providing models and best practices replicable throughout the national PA system.	Improved Management effectiveness of protected areas	METT scores  Current average METT score – 22 for the PA system	METT scores improved by 100% from the baseline average within 10 years post project.  <b>NB</b> Indicator changed post MTE from 100% increase by end of project in ProDoc to 100% within 10 years. Latter is more realistic target but not applicable for TE purposes.	Average METT score for 20 PAs is 38 out of potential score of 96 (ref Table XX).  <b>NB</b> This indicator cannot be rated for state of delivery as it was not designed to be met by end of project.	METT scores have increased on average by 42%, which is considered satisfactory progress towards the 10 year target.	<b>S</b>
	No further reduction in the total land under conservation management compared with the baseline.	25,100 ha (under PA)  <del>105,500</del> 104,170 ha – surrounding landscape  3,100,000 ha under system level	25,100 ha (under PA)  <del>105,500</del> 104,170 ha – surrounding landscape  3,100,000 ha under system level (the whole PA system in the country)	25,100 ha (under PAs)  <del>102,500</del> 102,400 ha – surrounding landscape  3,100,000 ha under entire PAs system	No change but Presidential Order issued to expand one of the protected areas by an additional 28,000 ha.  Reduction due to transfer of 1,770 ha in one PA to private forest under cooperative management in 2008.  No change but PAs system is expected to cover 3,502,800 ha after planned expansions	<b>S</b>

<b>Outcome 1:</b> Strengthened environmental governance provides a more sustainable land-use context for the PA system	Local policies on sustainable land-use designed and supported by the selected local governments	Policies on sustainable land-use at local level do not exist	Policies on sustainable land-use at local level designed and supported by the selected local governments	Preparation of specific district land use policies and plans largely in order to focus more on Forest Code and management planning.  Land use within non-core areas (under remit of Forestry Agency) addressed for next 5 years in management plans.	Project design focused on strengthening Protected Areas Law (see ProDoc logframe) but during implementation it became apparent that a new Forestry Code (see MTE logframe) was a necessary precursor. Both these instruments needed to be in place ahead of being able to strengthen land use policies at local level. Thus, switch to initial focus on Forestry Code, alongside Protected Areas Law, justified.	<b>MS</b>
	Sustainable land use practices adopted by selected communities and community members	No widely accepted sustainable land-use practices exist	Sustainable land-use practices implemented by selected communities and community members	More sustainable practices tested / demonstrated under Component 3, plus introduction of normative acts related to access and resource use (e.g. visitor access, tree cutting and fuel wood collection, forest management grazing and collection of hay, collection and preparation of medicinal herbs,).	Management plans for 2 PAs (provide basis for adopting sustainable land-use practices but demonstration of good practice jeopardized by lack of time to implement plans.	<b>MU</b>
	Amendments to the existing or new versions of the  Protected Areas Law and the Forest Code prepared and submitted to the Parliament	New draft of the Protected Areas Law exists but required a thorough revision	New draft prepared, consultations held by mid- 2007  The draft law submitted to the Parliament by end of 2007	Draft PAs Law submitted to Lower Chamber of Parliament in April 2011; adopted by Higher Chamber on 30 Nov. 2011; and new <i>Law on Specially Protected Natural Areas</i> adopted by Presidential Order #788 on 26 Dec. 2011.	Project instrumental in establishing Working Group of relevant stakeholders (government agencies, biodiversity experts and parliamentarians) to fast-track revision of legislation.  Major achievement to have	<b>S</b>

		Current Forest Code of 1993 is considered outdated and needs to be revised	New draft or amendments prepared and consultations held by mid-2007, and submitted to the Parliament by end of 2007	New <i>Forest Code</i> adopted by Parliament in May 2011 and signed by President 2 August 2011.	new Forest Code and PAs Law adopted in 2011.	
--	--	--	---	---	--	--



## **Annex 6: Sample Evaluation Report Outline**

### **Title and opening page**

Provide the following information:

Name of the UNDP/GEF project

UNDP and GEF project ID#s.

Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report

Region and countries included in the project

GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program

Executing Agency and project partners

Evaluation team members

Acknowledgements

### **Executive Summary**

2 -3 pages that:

Briefly describe the project evaluated

Explain the purpose and objectives of the evaluation, including the audience

Describes key aspects of the evaluation approach and methods

Summarizes principle conclusions, recommendations and lessons

### **Acronyms and Abbreviations**

(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>1</sup>)

### **Introduction**

Purpose of the evaluation

Briefly explain why the terminal evaluation was conducted (the purpose), why the project is being evaluated at this point in time, why the evaluation addressed the questions it did, and the primary intended audience.

---

<sup>1</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

## Key issues addressed

Providing an overview of the evaluation questions raised.

## Methodology of the evaluation

Clear explanation of the evaluation's scope, primary objectives and main questions. The Evaluation ToR may also elaborate additional objectives that are specific to the project focal area and national circumstances, and which may address the project's integration with other UNDP strategic interventions in the project area

Stakeholders' engagement in the evaluation, including how the level of stakeholder involvement contributes to the credibility of the evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations.

## Structure of the evaluation

Acquaint the reader with the structure and contents of the report and how the information contained in the report will meet the purposes of the evaluation and satisfy the information needs of the report's intended users

## Evaluation Team

Briefly describing the composition of the evaluation team, background and skills and the appropriateness of the technical skill mix, gender balance and geographical representation.

## Ethics

The evaluators should note the steps taken to protect the rights and confidentiality of persons interviewed (see UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluators' for more information).<sup>2</sup> Attached to this report should be a signed 'Code of Conduct' form from each of the evaluators.

## Project Description and development context

Project start and duration

Problems that the project seeks to address

Immediate and development objectives of the project

Main stakeholders

---

<sup>2</sup>UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2008. Available at: <http://www.uneval.org/search/index.jsp?q=ethical+guidelines>

## **Findings**

(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) should be rated<sup>3</sup>)

### **Project Formulation**

Analysis of LFA (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)

Assumptions and Risks

Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation

Stakeholder participation (\*)

Replication approach

Cost-effectiveness

UNDP comparative advantage

Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector, including management arrangements

### **Project Implementation**

The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool

Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region

Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

Financial Planning

Monitoring and evaluation (\*)

Execution and implementation modalities

Management by the UNDP country office

Coordination and operational issues

### **Project Results**

Attainment of objectives (\*)

---

<sup>3</sup> The ratings are: Highly Satisfactory, Satisfactory, Marginally Satisfactory, Unsatisfactory

Country ownership

Mainstreaming

Sustainability (\*)

Catalytic Role

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

Annexes

TOR

Itinerary

List of persons interviewed

Summary of field visits

List of documents reviewed

Questionnaire used and summary of results

Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

**Annex 7: Co-finance table**

Co financing (Type/ Source)	IA own Financing (mill US\$)		Government (mill US\$)		Other Sources* (mill US\$)		Total Financing (mill US\$)		Total Disbursement (mill US\$)	
	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual	Proposed	Actual
Grant										
Credits										
Loans										
Equity										
In-kind										
Non-grant Instruments *										
Other Types										
<b>TOTAL</b>										



## **Annex 8: Code of conduct agreement form:**

Evaluator<sup>1</sup>:

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.

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.

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.

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.

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 limitations, findings and recommendations.

Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>4</sup>**

**Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at \_\_\_\_\_ (place) on \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>4</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)





**Annex 9: Itinerary (List of people to interview)**

	<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Organization</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Physical address</u></b>	<b><u>Contacts</u></b>	<b><u>Tentative dates</u></b>	<b><u>Time</u></b>
1							
2							
3	David Githaiga	UNDP-EECCU	Team Leader	Block M, 3 <sup>rd</sup> floor	0723-785123 <a href="mailto:David.githaiga@undp.org">David.githaiga@undp.org</a>		
4							
5	Saiyana Lembara	NDMA	Project Coordinator	Lonhro House 7 <sup>th</sup> floor	saiyana.lembara@ndma.go.ke		

**\*\*To be completed**



## Annex 3: Evaluation Itinerary

### Revised Itinerary for KACCAL Project Terminal Evaluation

Day/Date	Timing	Activity	Remarks
Sunday-05/10/2014		TE Consultant arrives in Kenya	
Monday-06/10/2014	Morning hours	Hold an expectations leveling briefing /meeting with UNDP EECCU Team and IP	TL to chair
	Afternoon hours	Travel to Mwingi	Logistics by UNDP
Tuesday-07/10/2014	Whole day	Visit community groups	Kimathi to guide
Wednesday-08/10/2014	Whole day	Visit community groups	Kimathi to guide
Thursday-09/10/2014	Morning hours	Meet with the Mwingi-based technical implementing team	Geoffrey/Kimathi to arrange meeting logistics
	Afternoon hours	Meet County Government representatives	Kimathi/CDC to guide
Friday-10/10/2014	Whole day	Open day for tying up any loose ends in the field /travel back to Nairobi	TE Consultant to decide
Saturday& Sunday	Whole day	Preparation of draft report	TE Consultant
Monday-13/10/2014	Morning hours	Presentation of draft report to a panel nominated by UNDP/IP	Logistics of venue - UNDP

\*\* A separate program to guide the field visits will be in-place and shared during the expectations leveling meeting (06/10/2014).

## **Annex 4: List of persons interviewed**

## **Annex 5: List of documents reviewed**

## **Annex 6: Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

### **Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

#### **Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System**

**Name of Consultant:** Oliver Chapeyama\_\_\_\_\_

**Name of Consultancy Organization** (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at: Gaborone Botswana

: November 5<sup>th</sup> 2014



Signature: