

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data		
GEF project ID	3249	
GEF Agency project ID	3792	
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	World Bank	
Project name	Kenya Adaptation To Climate Change In Arid Lands (KACCALI) Project	
Country/Countries	Kenya	
Region	Africa	
Focal area	Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	Climate Change: Strategic Objective 8: To support pilot and demonstration projects for adaptation to climate change	
Executing agencies involved	Government of Kenya-National Drought Management Agency (NDMA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement	secondary executing agency: e.g. Murky Ordap	
Private sector involvement	No involvement	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	06/2009 (CEO endorsement, 050809, p.1)	
Effectiveness date / project start	09/2009 (CEO endorsement, 050809, p.1)	
Expected date of project completion (at start)	09/2013 (CEO endorsement, 050809, p.1)	
Actual date of project completion	06/30/2014 (PIR 2014,p.5)	
Project Financing		
	At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	
	Co-financing	
GEF Project Grant	6.79	1.0 (SCCF grant)
Co-financing	IA own	
	Government	
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	
	Private sector	
	NGOs/CSOs	
Total GEF funding	6.79	1.0
Total Co-financing	42.17	1.205
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)	48.96 (As of project endorsement in 2009, 09-10-09 Kenya Review sheet, p.1)	2.205
Terminal evaluation/review information		
TE completion date	06/10/2014 (TE,p.58)	
Author of TE	Oliver Chapeyama	
TER completion date	01/11/2016	
TER prepared by	Chenhao Liu	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	NR	MS (4)
Sustainability of Outcomes		L	NR	L
M&E Design		S	NR	MU
M&E Implementation		MS	NR	U
Quality of Implementation		MS	NR	U
Quality of Execution		S	NR	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MU (2.8)

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's Global Environmental Objective is "To enhance the resilience of the communities, to climate change impacts in agricultural and pastoral systems in arid and semi-arid lands in Kenya." (TE, p.40, Annex 1)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's main objective was to increase the capacity of communities in the selected districts of the arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) of Kenya to adapt to climate variability and change.

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

1. Enhanced capacity of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures.
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. (TE, p.3, Annex 1)

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

There was no change in GEO, but the DOs have undergone a few adjustments as a result of the withdrawal of the World Bank, originally a co-implementing agency with UNDP on the project. Subsequent to the World Bank's withdrawal, "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." (TE, p.17) Thus accordingly:

The project's main objective was changed to "To increase the capacity of communities in Mwingi District to adapt to climate variability and change" from "To increase the capacity of communities in the selected districts of the ASALs to adapt to climate variability and change". (TE, Annex 1)

The project’s original expected outcome 1 “Enhanced capacity of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures” was changed to “Enhanced awareness of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures in arid and semi-arid lands.” (TE, Annex 1)

Following the change of DO, there have been a number of changes in certain expected outputs. For example, “Availability of skills and tools necessary to continue CC (Climate Change) risk assessments after the conclusion of the project, assessed by survey” under project outcome 1 was changed to “Organization of CCA (Climate Change Adaptation) awareness creation workshops (year 1 through 3)”. (TE, Annex 1)

The project also received EUR 150,000 in co-financing towards the project’s third objective, which funded an initiative focusing on reducing the quantities of firewood through the introduction of energy efficient cook stoves to replace with the aim of Reducing CO2 emissions. The following outputs were expected: (TE, p.15)

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.

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.

Output 3: Seedlings nursery established with appropriate water harvesting facility.

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.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated the project’s relevance as “Relevant”. In a binary scale (Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory), this TER will rate the project’s outcome relevance as “Satisfactory”. The project is consistent with relevant strategic priorities for development at the national and international level.

The project was designed to address the country’s development priorities. “The KACCAL (Kenya Adaptation to Climate Change in Arid Lands) project was developed to address problems of lack of capacity to address the potential impacts of aridity and climate change in the ASALs (Arid and Semi-Arid Lands) 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 center of Kenya’s development planning agenda (such as in National Poverty Eradication Plan (1999), Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2001) and the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (2003)). This made KACCAL directly relevant to the national planning process.” (TE, p.21-22)The KACCAL project also contributes to the country’s global environmental commitments, such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1994 and the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). (World Bank PAD 2009, p.10).

The project is consistent with GEF-4 Focal Area Strategy for Climate Change (Strategic Objective 8: To support pilot and demonstration projects for adaptation to climate change Land Degradation) and Land Degradation (Strategic Program 1: Supporting Sustainable Agriculture and Rangeland Management). (Focal Area Strategies and Strategic Programming for GEF-4, p.4-5)

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	--

The TE rated the project’s outcome effectiveness as “Satisfactory”, without specifying in detail the comparison of actual outcome achievements and expected outcomes. This TER will rate the project’s outcome as “Moderately Satisfactory”, based on evidence presented by the final PIR (PIR 2014), which indicated the status of attainment of each specific outcome by June 30 2014 (which is also the date the project ended)(PIR 2014, p.4-25)

A comparison of the project’s achievements against its expected outcomes is presented below:

The project goal (after revision) was to increase the capacity of communities in Mwingi District to adapt to climate variability and change. The first outcome, enhanced awareness of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures in arid and semi-arid lands, was fully achieved by the end of the project. The project’s target was that national policy makers are aware of climate change impacts and climate change adaptation in arid and semi-arid lands (Achieved). The KACCAL Project scaled up the awareness, advocacy, outreach and community sensitization activities in the final year 2013-2014. The design and production of banners, brochures, fliers/pamphlets and posters on agriculture, water harvesting, energy, livestock, and seed bulking will go a long way in marketing the work of the project, and enhancing community buy-in and support to the

project. In addition to these products, the KACCAL Project also designed and will produce a 35 page booklet on KACCAL's activities, experiences, lessons and opportunities.

The project's second outcome, "enhanced capacity of district and local level stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures", was largely achieved. A number of capacity-building trainings aiming at sensitizing CCA (Climate Change Adaptation) for policy planners and various stakeholders at local level were conducted since the project started; A capacity perception index (CPI) was established by mid-2012 for district and local level stakeholders on CCA planning, management and implementation; The capacity building activities continued in the year 2013-2014, with over 300 locals going through a number of trainings on CCA (Climate Change Adaptation /CRM (Climate Risk Management) issues. Starting from FY 2013, the UNES (The University of Nairobi Enterprise Service) was contracted as a consultant to develop a training curriculum for enhancing the functional capacities of 24 county and sub-county planners to plan, implement and manage CCA measures. By the project's end the development of course content was completed and 73 planners at various levels trained.

A target under this outcome was that CCA would be mainstreamed into 3 district sectoral development plans (Agriculture, Water, Forestry and Wildlife). This was largely achieved. As a result of the decision to utilize the 'climate lens' tool adopted by the Ministry of Devolution and Planning, CCA issues were mainstreamed in the Kitui County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP) by involving sectors such as agriculture, water, environment, coordination of government, local based CBOs and PBOs etc by the end of the project.

The project's third outcome is that communities' ability to plan, manage and implement climate-related activities is enhanced. The first target under this outcome, that 180 households would benefit directly from the pilot projects (6 community groups), was achieved by mid-2013. The second target is an additional 360 households (12 community groups) were to benefit from exchange visits to pilot sites and 10,000 households in the pilot areas (75% of households) were to benefit from dissemination of adaptation advice. This target is partly achieved, as June 2014 PIR reported community groups with 140 members visited pilot sites (PIR 2014, p.26) and it didn't report more progress made under this target. The third target under this outcome is that, for the project's pilot communities there will be no change in income or household assets due to climate variability. For this target, the June 2014 PIR only reported a number of relevant capacity building activities carried out under this target. Thus, without more evidence from relevant project documents it is unable to assess this target.

As an extra part of the project, the Flemish government provided co-financing for an additional initiative under the project's outcome 3 which focuses on reducing the quantities of firewood through the introduction of energy efficient cook stoves to replace with the aim of Reducing CO2 emissions. Specifically, 4 outputs were expected:

The expected output 1 is the purchasing and installation of up to 2000 energy efficient cooking stoves to replace the traditional 3-stone arrangement typically used in rural households. This output is almost achieved. For this output, the June 2014 PIR reported 600 households have benefited from the cooking stoves by mid-2012. By the project end, the June 2014 PIR reported that installation of the Kuni Mbili' cooking stoves in the pilot community enhanced household savings and energy use, around "2200

beneficiaries are continuing this initiative” (PIR 2014, p.20-21) But the PIR 2014 didn’t clearly report as to if 2000 energy efficient stoves were de facto installed.

The expected output 2 is that twenty seedlings of fruit trees and other multi-purpose tree species were planted by each household benefiting from an energy efficient cooking stove. This is unachieved based on evidence currently available from the relevant project documents.

The expected output 3 is that seedlings nursery was established with appropriate water harvesting facility for support. This output is partly achieved. The June 2014 PIR reported that seed bulking was completed by the Katse community group, and new Drip irrigation technologies were piloted by 2 groups.

The expected output 4 consists of number of capacity building activities to be carried out. First, trainings were expected to be provided by local artisans for Mwingi communities on making and installing energy efficient stoves. Achievement of these this output is unclear. The PIR June 2014 only reported the installment of energy efficient stoves, but whether there has been training on making and installing the stoves was not reported. Second, trainings on on-farm care of trees were also expected to be provided. Achievement of this output is not clearly supported by the evidence currently available from relevant project documents either. Third, trainings for local farmers on marketing home-grown fruits were also expected. This output is partly achieved, as the June 2014 PIR reported trainings on Sustainable Business Models were provided to local farmers to enhance their knowledge of marketing and value addition.

Overall, one could draw the conclusion from the above evidence that the project was able to meet the majority of its expected outcomes, with the rest partly achieved. Thus, a rating of “Moderately Satisfactory” in the project’s outcome effectiveness is justified.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	--

The TE rated the project’s outcome efficiency as “Satisfactory”. This TER will rate it as “Moderately Satisfactory”. Relevant evidence currently available didn’t report any inefficiency in executing the budget, or any additional financial resources required to finalize the project, except revealing a slow disbursement of project finance due to the government’s institutional inefficiency. The project was completed with a moderately satisfactory outcome within the budget, with some evidence of cost-effectiveness. Therefore, a rating of “Moderately Satisfactory” for the project’s outcome efficiency is justified.

According to the TE, the project has “ridden already on-going initiatives that were started by the government in the mid-1990s” in similar programmatic areas, and therefore was able to utilize the existing institutional foundations to improve its cost-effectiveness. The project document also identifies the existence of supportive legal frameworks as enabling circumstances for cost-effective interventions. Also, the climate proofing community livelihoods also guaranteed cost-effective investment under the KACCAL project as it avoided the need to construct large physical infrastructure to mitigate the impacts of climate change. (TE, p.23)

The project’s partnerships with various institutions such as the University of Nairobi, ICIPE (African Insect Science for Food and Health), KEPHIS (Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Services) and the Mwingi honey processing and silk weaving center, was also proved a cost-effective strategy in terms of linking the project to centers of expertise and to markets for the delivery of results. (PIR 2013, p.42)

Financial information provided by relevant project documents was sparse, thus it is difficult to assess the budget execution in relation to the project outcome. The Final PIR and TE didn’t specify the final status of project finance in detail, but no additional evidence of financial mismanagement or ineffective budget execution was reported. The project had a normal financial closure.

Relevant project documents also reported a few cases of inefficiencies and delays in project implementation. For example, the PIR 2013 pointed out that a delay of 9-months was experienced at the project’s inception phase in hiring a project manager and the start-up of field activities, due to the withdrawal of the World Bank from the partnership and disagreement among relevant executing parties on the cash transfer modalities and other administrative and institutional issues. (PIR 2013, p.37) Also, delivery of budgets since the project start has been slow, mainly due to political reasons some of which were beyond the control of the project. (PIR 2013, p.34) The deadline for completion of TE was extended from June 2014 to September 2014 due to inefficiency in hiring the TE consultant. (PIR 2014, p.3)

Overall, a rating of “Moderately Satisfactory” for the project’s outcome efficiency is justified.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Likely
---------------------------	-----------------------

The TE rated the project’s overall sustainability as “Likely” based on its assessment of four sub-categories of sustainability: Financial resource sustainability (Likely); Socio-political sustainability (Likely); Institutional framework and governance sustainability (Likely); Environmental sustainability (Likely). However, the TE didn’t specify the rationales behind these ratings. This TER will rate the project’s overall sustainability as “Likely”. The project shows a promising sign of socio-political, institutional, and environmental sustainability, but it lacks strong evidence regarding financial supports for any immediate scale-up or replication.

Financial Resource Sustainability- Moderately Likely

This TER will rate the project’s financial sustainability as “Moderate Likely”. Although concrete financial commitments designated to scale up or replicate the project were not reported by the end of the project, according to relevant project documents, the project has a promising future for scale-up or replication: For example, the NDMA (National Drought Management Agency) is willing to invest national resources to ensure that activities that were left unfinished would be finalized in the post-project period. (TE, p.19) Also, the project’s capacity-building for developing alternative livelihoods for communities affected by climate change has a potential of generating economic benefits, which is also supported by the project’s capacity-building targeting on sustainable business model and marketing (TE, p.19, PIR 2014,p.6) Based on overall evidence, the project’s financial sustainability is moderately likely.

Socio-political sustainability-Likely

The project's socio-political sustainability is likely. The project is able to garner support from the country's social and political front due to its alignment with development priorities both at the regional and national level. Apart from being highly consistent with the national development plans, the project addressed the immediate concerns of rural communities in the piloted area, as they have "suffered from their inability to adapt to changing climatic conditions due to inherent constraints such as limited capacities and options for adaptation." (TE, p.32) As a response, the KACCAL project "aims to remove the barriers to climate change adaptation at the community level which if accomplished as planned, will contribute to the sustainability of the community interventions over the long term. "(TE, p.32) Also, the projects' socio-political sustainability is strengthened by participatory planning process that promotes 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. (TE, p.5)

Institutional Sustainability- Likely

The project's institutional sustainability is likely. As discussed elsewhere in this report, KACCAL was not designed to re-invent the wheel. Instead, the project was meant to build upon on-going national programs and improve on their ability to incorporate and integrate climate change adaptation and resilience. (TE, p.32) As the project's focus area was also the country's development priority, the favorable institutional arrangements for the project's further scale-up will still be in place in the near future.

Environmental Sustainability-Likely

The project's environmental sustainability is likely. The initiative targets practice rather than financial investment. Thus, the capacities of local communities dealing with climate change built up through this project will have a long-lasting impact. According to the project outcome, environmental-friendly cooking stoves already had marked impact on energy savings (PIR 2014, p.19), and draught management (?) has been already incorporated into the regional development plan as a permanent feature in the Kitui County which ensured the incorporation of CCA (climate change adaptation) knowledge disseminated through this project into future policy planning. (TE, p.21)

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Relevant project documents only provided very limited information regarding project finance in general. The TE specified that in addition to the GEF grant of 1 million, The Government of Kenya pledged co-financing in the order of and additional US\$ 1 million as in-kind contributions to the project (TE, p.27). No

evidence from relevant project documents ever specified the linkage between project outcomes and the level of co-financing.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was originally designed to operate from September 2009 to September 2013. Due to the withdrawal of the World Bank and disagreement among relevant executing parties on the cash transfer modalities and other administrative and institutional issues, the project had a 9-month delay in its start-up (PIR 2013, p.37) , and the actual implementation period was from 2011 to June 30th, 2014. No extension was reported, but the deadline for completion of TE was extended from June 2014 to September 2014 due to inefficiency in hiring the TE consultant. The delay in project start-up had no direct impact on the project outcome, but the project restructuring which caused the delay led to changes in the project's expected project outcomes/outputs.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The project's country ownership is at a high level. The project is driven by the national need for combating the adverse impact of climate change and climate change adaptation. It is relevant to the country's development priorities as well as the immediate need of local communities. The project has had concrete benefits to local communities and has received wide support from diverse stakeholders, whose contribution is crucial for the achievement of a moderately satisfactory overall outcome. For example, the National Communication for Kenya provided technical support in identifying the vulnerable areas to climate change as the pilot region during project design (TE, p.32), and the UNES (The University of Nairobi Enterprise Service) was contracted as a consultant to develop training curriculum for enhancing the functional capacities of 24 county and sub-county planners to plan, implement and manage CCA measures (PIR 2014, p.15). In addition, the participatory planning in project design and implementation as a marked feature of this project further enhanced the project's national ownership. (TE, p.5)

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE rated the M&E design at entry as “Satisfactory” but provided no discussion or evidence to support this rating. This TER will rate the project’s M&E design as “Moderately Unsatisfactory”. Besides certain shortcomings of the M&E framework, the project lacks a comprehensive M&E implementation arrangement after the project restructuring.

The project document laid out a comprehensive M&E plan and framework, but as the project has undergone a significant readjustment, its arrangement plans became no longer applicable.

The TE provided detailed information on the post-adjustment M&E framework. (TE, p.62-67) Under the M&E framework, each project outcome is measured by both a few indicators and expected outputs. Targets values, baseline values, means of verification, and risk & assumptions for these indicators and outputs were all specified. For example, under the outcome 3, the “number of households adopting adaptation technologies” and “percentage change income & household assets affected by climate shocks” were chosen as indicators, and “capacity development for agricultural extension officer to develop and disseminate climate change adaptation advice (year 1 through 3)” was identified as one of expected outputs. The indicators are specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and information is provided regarding means of verification. However, the M&E plan specified the completion timeline for the majority of the outputs but for none of the indicators. For example, the output under outcome 2 “Development of screening tools to climate proof sectoral development plans for the Mwingi District” was expected to be achieved from year 1 to year 3, meanwhile no timeline for reaching the target value of the indicator “capacity perception index” under the same outcome was specified. Besides, under each outcome component, more outputs than indicators were utilized to measure the progress toward achieving project outcome. This, however, could bring in difficulties when attempted is made in the M&E implementation to measure the progress toward achieving the expected project outcome.

The post-adjustment responsibility of program monitoring and reporting fell under the responsibility of UNDP. But relevant project documents didn’t indicate the existence of a specific and adjusted M&E implementation plan following the program change.

Overall, the program’s M&E design at entry was featured by a moderately satisfied M&E framework and lack of concrete M&E implementation plan. A rating of “Moderately Unsatisfactory” is justified.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------

The TE rated the M&E implementation as “Moderately Satisfactory” without specifying the reasons. This TER will rate the project’s M&E implementation as “Unsatisfactory”. The M&E implementation was proven to be ad-hoc, unorganized, inconsistent and ineffective.

Although in absence of a concrete M&E plan after project restructuring, the TE reported some details on the actual M&E implementation: “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.” (TE, p.27)

Although the TE’s description revealed the institutional efficiency of M&E implementation, this TER will give a negative rating due to the mess-up in monitoring of project progress toward expected outcomes, which resulted from the inconsistency of M&E framework adopted by the PIRs throughout the project period.

The output-based M&E framework as laid out by the TE was not observed since PIR 2012. Starting from PIR 2012, the M&E framework started to adopt a set of target-based indicators to measure project outcomes. For example, “National policy makers are aware of CC (climate change) impacts and CCA (climate change adaptation) needs in ASAL” was chosen to measure the Outcome component 1 “Enhanced awareness of national and regional stakeholders to plan, manage and implement climate change adaptation measures in arid and semi-arid lands”. This change led to chaos in recording and reporting the project’s outcome achievements. For example, for the target “180 households will benefit directly from the pilot projects (6 community groups)”, the final PIR detailed a list of the project’s final achievements, but none of them directly match this target. However, there is some indirect evidence of attainment of this target in the project achievements listed by the final PIR, which show that more than 180 household have benefited from the project. This ineffective reporting of project outcomes happened with other targets within the target-based M&E framework as well. As a result, the TE still adopted the output-based M&E framework originally designed, but it failed to specifically assess project achievements against each expected output as the project’s final achievements were no longer able to be categorized under specific targets or expected outputs. As the PIRs were adopting different M&E framework over the years, tracking of project progress toward targets by comparing the present values of indicators with the baseline and target values became meaningless.

Furthermore, the PIRs from 2013 onward didn’t report any information regarding project finance. A mid-term review was not conducted to provide any remedial suggestions for project implementation. The TE gave ratings for all areas in line with the GEF’s requirements, but it didn’t specify the rationale for many of its ratings.

Overall, the rating of “Unsatisfactory” for the project’s M&E implementation is justified.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
--	-------------------------------

, The TE rated the “Quality of UNDP Implementation” as “Moderately Satisfactory”. However, based on relevant evidence presented by the TE, this TER will rate the “quality of project implementation” as “Unsatisfactory.” In contrast to the TE’s positive rating, the evidence it presented regarding UNDP’s role and performance are largely negative.

“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 (Country Office) which negatively impacted on continuity and institutional memory.”(TE, p.27) In their supervisory role, the UNDP “was 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.” (TE, p.28) In addition, the above assessment of the M&E implementation by this TER has well indicated an inadequate performance of UNDP in supervising the M&E activities.

Thus, a rating of “Unsatisfactory” for the project’s “quality of project implementation” is justified.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
---	-----------------------------

The TE rated the project’s “quality of execution-executing agency” as “Satisfactory”. This TER will adopt the same rating due to the significant evidence presented by the TE of a successful project execution, especially regarding the outstanding performance of the project manager.

The Government of Kenya, as represented by the National Drought Management Agency (NDMA) was the project’s executing agency. A KACCAL project manager was appointed under the supervision of UNDP country office to be fully responsible for the project’s execution in the field. The project did not establish a Project Steering Committee, and 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. (TE, p.27) 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 effectively implemented. Without these relationships and partnership arrangements, little could have been achieved by the project manager. (TE, p.27, p.4) The project manager operated from the field without support staff. Despite this, the project manager covered for these functions in addition to his primary responsibility of delivering against expected results and still managed to produce periodic progress reports as required under the project. (TE, p.28) The project manager deserves special

commendation for ensuring that all stakeholders at the national, country, sub-county and community level were kept engaged in the project despite administrative bottlenecks experienced at UNDP. (TE, p.27)

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

As of June 30 2012, 600 households had benefited from the energy efficient cooking stoves introduced through the project. The energy savings as reported by the communities reached the level of 98% (PIR 2014, p.19). It worth noting that, although installment of more energy efficient cooking stoves and an increasing number of beneficiaries from this initiative was reported after mid-2012, additional information on the environment change following up this further progress was not reported by relevant project documents.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The use of the "Kuni Mbili' stoves especially for the local women groups have enhanced savings in energy use, improving their revenues from the local roadside business (eateries). (PIR 2014, p.21)

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

A number of capacity-building trainings aiming at sensitizing CCA (Climate Change Adaptation) for policy planners and various stakeholders at local level were conducted since the project started; A capacity perception index (CPI) was established by mid-2012 for district and local level stakeholders on CCA (Climate Change Adaptation) planning, management and implementation; The capacity building activities continued in the year 2013-2014, with over 300 locals going through a number of trainings on CCA /CRM (Climate Risk Management) issues. Starting from FY 2013, the UNES (The University of Nairobi Enterprise Service) was contracted as a consultant to develop training curriculum for enhancing the functional capacities of 24 county and sub-county planners to plan, implement and manage CCA measures. By the EOP, the course content was developed with 73 planners at various levels trained.

Various awareness, advocacy, outreach and community sensitization activities were conducted to promote the project. Banners, brochures, fliers/pamphlets and posters on agriculture, water harvesting, energy, livestock, seed bulking were designed and produced to market the work of the project, and enhance community buy-in and support to the project. In addition to these products, the KACCAL project also designed and will produce a 35 page booklet on KACCAL's activities, experiences, lessons and opportunities.

The Final PIR also provided the following fragmented information regarding the capacity changes of project stakeholders: (PIR 2014, p.4-25)

- A total of 30 (both staff and farmer representatives) were involved in a visit to Christian Impact Mission, Makueni and Nyumbani Centre in Kwa vonza- Kitui
- Training on Sustainable Business Models was conducted for local communities to enhance community marketing and value addition knowledge and skills, with the assistance of the NDMA (National Drought Management Authority)
- Mechanisms were developed for linking the local leadership to the Kenya Meteorological Service and spearheading elaborate weather messages, with a view of supporting the setup of a weather and community radio in Kitui, Kyuso area in Mwingi;
- A local NGO, the Murky Ordap, was supported by the project to establish model energy liners, with request sent to the county government to offer support through legislative and policy direction on the use of low-cost fuel efficient devices at household level.
- 83 students of the Kyuso Youth Polytechnic and 12 farmers were also trained on sericulture.
- Seed Bulking was done by Katse community group of 46 members which serves the wider community who wish to store grains in their storage facility at a fee.
- Itiva Nzou group of 27 members and Mumoni Horticulture group of 50 members started planting drought tolerant crops such as mangoes, cassava, and sweet potatoes
- Integrated environmental conservation by the Ndetani Shallow Well Group which has closed to 50 members (who have established mango trees in their farms) with irrigation and acquisition of drought resistant goat breeds for the local community members.
- Drip irrigation technologies were piloted by 2 groups: Kwamulungwa Green Growers with 18 members and Kanini Kaseo with 20 members who plant horticultural crops such as tomatoes and onions and vegetables for income.

b) Governance

As a result of the decision to utilize the 'climate lens' tool adopted by the Ministry of Devolution and Planning, CCA (Climate Change Adaptation) issues were mainstreamed in the Kitui County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP) by involving sectors such as agriculture, water, environment, coordination of government, local based CBOs and PBOs etc.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

Relevant project documents didn't identify any unintended impacts led by the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

There was no immediate scale-up or replication reported by relevant project documents. However, the TE reported that the executing agency (NDMA) will take over the project from the UNDP to ensure the completion of all the remaining activities and sustaining the project impact. (TE, p.22, p.37) The project indicated the future possibility of scaling up the project to other areas based on successful practice gained through this pilot project. (TE, p.22)

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE summarized the following lessons learned:"

- 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 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 initiatives 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.”(TE, p.6)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provided the following recommendations:”

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

- 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.”(TE,p.7)

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE made attempt to assess the project outcome by comparing actual achievements against expected outputs, but didn't complete that.	Moderately Unsatisfactory
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE is logically consistent and format in line with UNDP and GEF requirements, but majority of its ratings were not well substantiated with sufficient evidence.	Unsatisfactory
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project rated the project's sustainability using a four-category approach (financial, socio-political, institutional, environmental sustainability), but more information on the rationale behind these ratings should have been explained. The project gave a comprehensive assessment on the project's risks. The project indicated but did not clearly specify the project exit strategy (NDMA will take over the project from UNDP to finalized remaining activities)	Moderately Satisfactory
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons Learned section is adequate	Satisfactory
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE didn't report any details on actual project costs and actual co-financing used	Highly Unsatisfactory
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE assessed the project's M&E system, but information present inadequate	Moderately Unsatisfactory
		Moderately Unsatisfactory

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

In the preparation of this TER, 1 additional document was referred to as the source of information apart from PIRs, TE, and PD:

GEF-4 Focal Area Strategies and Strategic Programming

<https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.31.10.Revised%20Focal%20Area%20Strategies%2007.16.07.pdf>