



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR ONE INTERNATIONAL INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT.**

### **TERMINAL EVALUATION – UN JOINT PROJECT ON CLIMATE CHANGE PROJECT.**

#### **PROJECT DOCUMENT**

#### **INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with UNDP policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the ***Support to low carbon climate resilient development for poverty reduction in Kenya Project***, also called the ***UN Joint Project on Climate Change (Project Number - 00090583.)*** The UN Joint Climate Change Project titled ‘Support to Low Carbon Climate Resilient Development for Poverty Reduction in Kenya’ was designed in recognition of the impacts of climate change across all the key sectors in Kenya’s economy, because of the country’s geography and over-reliance on rain-fed agriculture, pastoral livestock production systems and tourism which are all heavily dependent on nature. The project brings together 5 UN Agencies (UNEP, UNHABITAT, UNESCO, ILO and UNDP), Delivering as One to support Kenya effectively respond to various challenges associated with climate change.

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

#### **PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE**

Project Title:	Support to low carbon climate resilient development for poverty reduction in Kenya Project			
UNDP Project ID:	00090583		<i>at endorsement</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion</i> <i>(Million US\$)</i>
UNDP Award ID:	00081421	DFID financing:	USD 1,1000,000	
Country:	Kenya	UNDP	USD 3000	
Region:	Africa	Government:		
Focal Area:	Climate Change	Other:		
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):		Total co-financing:		

Executing Agency:	Ministry of Environment, Natural Resources	Total Project Cost:		
Other Partners involved:	The National Treasury Ministry of Devolution and Planning MED	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		1 <sup>st</sup> June 2014
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 31 <sup>st</sup> Mar 2017	Actual: 30 June 2017

## OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

The project was designed by the Government of Kenya in recognition of the importance of climate change (CC) impacts on Kenya's development; and risks towards achieving Vision 2030 as highlighted in the National Climate Change Response Strategy 2010. The project, was principally designed to give effect to the National Climate Change Action Plan 2013-2017 (NCCAP), which stipulates the need to mainstream CC adaptation and mitigation measures in national and county planning and budgeting processes; and in all sectors of the economy as a means to further Kenya's people-centered development strategy. The NCCAP background briefings and studies clearly identified the needs of Government, private sector and the CSOs to successfully implement the NCCAP and result in meaningful change towards a low carbon, resilient development pathway for the benefit of Kenyans. This Project, implemented under the Delivery as One framework, by five UN Agencies (UNDP, UNEP, UNHABITAT, UNILO, and UNESCO) consisted of six outputs. Output 1: Pro-poor CC adaptation and mitigation mainstreamed in national and sub-national planning and budgeting processes (UNDP/UNEP); Output 2: Renewables and sustainable biomass production promoted in Arid and semiarid Lands (UNDP/KEREA); Output 3: Green buildings are promoted in the construction sector with associated benefits for employment, environmental improvement, social equity and economic prosperity (ILO); Output 4: Low carbon transport is included in the on-going urban planning processes and national policies are developed to promote importation of cleaner, more fuel efficient vehicles in Kenya (UNHABITAT/UNEP); and Output 5: Governance reforms in the wildlife sector contribute to reducing illegal wildlife trade in Kenya (UNEP/UNESCO).

### Output 1: Mainstreaming of pro-poor climate change adaptation and mitigation in Kenya's national and county planning and budgeting process (UNDP/UNEP)

This Output was geared to bridge the gap between inclusion of key NCCAP components and anticipated results in national plans (e.g. MTP II), sector strategies and budget processes (e.g. Medium Term Expenditure Framework) and County Integrated Development Plans (CIDP) and budgets. It was to reinforce a number of initiatives which had provided tools for strengthening integrated, cross-sectoral planning and monitoring (e.g. The UNDP's supported Millennium Institute's Threshold 21) and pro-poor environmental sustainability (e.g. the UNDP-UNEP Poverty Environment Initiative and more recently the DESA-UNDP-UNEP Green Economy project). Particularly the project was to seek sustainable means of integrating climate change in the budgeting processes at the national level, as means of securing sustained change in national and county planning and budgeting processes that increase public sector engagement and delivery in support of CC adaptation and mitigation, and environmental sustainability.

### Output 2: Promoting renewables and sustainable biomass production in Kenya (UNDP/UNIDO)

This Output was designed to support Kenya's energy policy to ensure adequate secure, affordable, sustainable and reliable supply of energy to meet national and county development needs, while protecting and conserving the environment. The activities particularly focused on the importance of biomass and renewables as a significant energy resource mainly for rural communities and poorer sections of the urban population. It was informed by evidence from biomass sector studies which identified the widening gap between supply and demand for wood-fuel, a challenge that required dedicated policy interventions to

redress. In spite of various efforts to promote wood fuel substitutes, the number of people relying on wood fuel was not decreasing, and biomass is predicted to continue to be the primary source of energy for the majority of the rural population and urban poor for the near future. Studies have established that charcoal production leads to the depletion of woodlands in Kenya at the rate of 0.5 ha per annum which has potential to accelerate climate change. This is attributed to the lack of formal management of the biomass stocks, inefficient charcoal kilns, and lack of standards and clear national targets for sustainable charcoal production. Despite the significant reliance on biomass energy in Kenya, efforts to promote sustainable charcoal production had not received the level of support.

In addition, the Output was geared to support the Kenyan solar PV market, often considered as a successful commercially driven market but with significant market spoilage due to poor quality of products, as well as design, installation and maintenance services. The work was informed by the 2009 census, where the 6.7 million households are not connected to the grid, only 1.6% (142,000 households) have a solar PV system; this in a country where the solar PV market started in the mid 80's. A field inspection and testing study of installed systems was undertaken by KERA in 2009 and covered 76 randomly systems across 7 provinces. It revealed that for only 48% of the surveyed systems did the users feel that the system had met their expectations. Technical assessment of these systems further revealed that only 36% were properly installed and only 10% were correctly designed.

### **Output 3: Enhancing Sustainability and Employment Creation in the Building Construction Industry (ILO/UNEP/UN-Habitat)**

This Output was designed in recognition that buildings constituted the single largest contributor to global greenhouse gas emissions and are responsible for more than one third of the global resource consumption, including 12 percent of all freshwater use. Furthermore, buildings significantly contribute to the generation of solid waste which is estimated at 40 percent of the total volume. In 2005, Kenya submitted to the UNFCCC its Technology Needs Assessment, which included energy efficient appliances, rain water harvesting, waste recycling and waste-to-energy at the household level. Several of the NCCAP objectives relate to resource and energy efficiency achievable through interventions in the building construction industry. For example, in relation to Population, Urbanization and Housing, the NCCAP notes that Kenya is expected to become a predominately urbanized country by 2030 mainly due to rural-urban migration. It identifies among priority climate change actions the upgrading of building codes to include climate resilience and green building concepts including undertaking of climate risk assessments for essential public buildings and emergency services and distributed clean energy solutions to households and institutions (such as solar lanterns, improved cook stoves and LPG cook stoves, and energy efficient lighting and appliances), which can have huge social and economic benefits. In relation to the tourism industrial which is critical for the Kenyan economy, the NCCAP identified low-carbon options applicable to tourism infrastructure development including use of renewable energy sources and local products for construction.

### **Output 4: Catalyzing Low Carbon Transport in Kenya (UN-Habitat/UNEP)**

The Output spearheaded by UNEP and UNHABITAT was designed in recognition of Kenya's rapidly urbanizing trends, with the population of the Nairobi metropolitan region expected to reach 20.6 million by 2030. One of the significant consequences of this population explosion is increased transport related externalities (pollution and carbon emissions). The country's urban transport sector is a key source of air pollution (small particulates) and climate emissions (CO<sub>2</sub> and black carbon). Better city planning, a systems approach, and introduction of proven approaches and technologies can significantly reduce these emissions and facilitate poverty reduction, economic growth and sustainable development, in addition to enhancing the resilience of transport in light of climate change adaptation. The NCCAP recognized Kenya's transport

sector as a major climate change emissions driver. Infrastructure was poorly integrated, overburdened and inaccessible to many Kenyans. Non-motorized transport facilities and policies were inadequate, despite the majority of trips in cities being on foot, estimated at 47% in Nairobi. Passenger cars represented a significant and rapidly growing segment of the transport sector; comprising of old and poorly maintained vehicles, coupled with poor fuel quality. Though carrying a mere 22% of travelers in Nairobi, they account for 64 % of traffic volume. Heavy-duty vehicles (HDVs) deliver the majority of freight across the country, further contributing to emissions. For Kenya, planning and implementing low-carbon transport strategies within the context of on-going urban planning processes is one of the most feasible means of reaching a low carbon climate economy while also addressing poverty and promoting development.

#### **Output 5: Addressing illegal wildlife trade (UNEP/UNESCO)**

This output sought to utilize the combined experience and expertise of UNEP and UNESCO, working with other national stakeholders, to support the Government of Kenya's efforts to address the illegal trade in wildlife and timber. It was designed in recognition of the fact that along with other African States, Kenya has been facing an upsurge in poaching and illegal wildlife trade, which undermine national and regional security, local and national development gains, and household and community resilience. Wildlife crime not only results in the theft of natural capital and heritage, but also represents a major threat to the security, economy, and political stability of countries affected. Wildlife tourism comprises approximately 70% of Kenya's tourism market, which employs around 300,000 nationals, and generates approximately 12% of the country's GDP. The illegal trade in wildlife and timber has become increasingly organized in recent years, in response to a growing demand for ivory, rhino horn and other wildlife and timber, and the growing involvement in organized criminal networks. The economic benefits for criminal networks, including for example Al-Shabaab in East Africa, is estimated at USD 7-23 million per year from the illegal trade in wildlife, and USD 30-100 billion per year from the illegal trade in timber. Illegal logging and timber trade is estimated to be responsible for over half of all deforestation in tropical countries. In Kenya in 2013 around 200 elephants and 40 rhinos (approximately 8% of Kenya's black rhino population) were poached from private, community, and government lands.

In recognition of the poaching crisis affecting Kenya's natural capital and heritage, a range of responses have been implemented at national level. These include the development by the Kenya Wildlife Service of national conservation and management strategies for elephant (2012 - 2021) and black rhino (2012 – 2016); the development by the Government of Kenya of a CITES national action plan to reduce illegal ivory trade (May 2013); the adoption by Parliament in December 2013 of a Wildlife Conservation and Management Bill, which aims to inter alia strengthen the deterrents for illegal killing and trade of wildlife; and the establishment by the Kenyan Cabinet of a national inter-agency collaboration, and an anti-poaching response unit. In addition, there has been a significant mobilization of national and international interest in particular in the plight of elephants and rhinos from the United Nations, Intergovernmental and Nongovernmental organizations and other Governments.

#### **EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD**

---

The evaluation will cover all activities supported by UNDP and, where appropriate, activities supported by the host institution, State Department of Livestock. It will also cover activities that other collaborating partners are supporting as part of the co-finance to the project. The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP-supported projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects](#). A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (fill in [Annex C](#)). The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the UNDP Country Office, the UN Agencies (UNEP, UNHABITAT, UN-ILO, UNESCO), Government partners, and all the key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to some of the areas where pilot activities were held. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: The Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources, The Climate Change Directorate and the Climate Change Council, the National Treasury, the Ministry of Devolution and Planning, The Council of Governors, The Ministry of Energy, Energy Regulatory Commission, the Ministry of Transport, The Labor Commissioner, The Kenya Wildlife Service, The Kenya Renewable Energy Association, DFID, FICCF, among others.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual and Quarterly reports, project budget revisions, progress reports, publications, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

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

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Plan ned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants								
Loans /Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
Totals								

## MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender. It will also seek to establish extent to which other UN Agencies participating in the project mainstreamed project activities against their critical areas of importance/mandates.

## IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of long-term impacts.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**. Conclusions should build on findings and be based on evidence. Recommendations should be prioritized, specific, relevant, and targeted, with suggested implementers of the recommendations. Lessons should have wider applicability to other initiatives across the region, the area of intervention, and for the future.

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Kenya, as the Administrative Agent (AA) for the UN Joint Project on Climate Change. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluator and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Teams

<sup>2</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluator to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the evaluation will be 20 working days (weekends excluded) according to the following plan:  
Start date is early April 2017

Activity	Timing
<b>Preparation</b>	3 days
<b>Evaluation Mission</b>	10 days
<b>Draft Evaluation Report</b>	5 days
<b>Final Report</b>	2 days

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

The evaluation consultant is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 1 week before the evaluation mission	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 1 week of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by Team Leader, PCU, OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

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

## EVALUATION TEAM COMPOSITION

The evaluation will be conducted by **one (1) International evaluator** with a prior experience in evaluating similar projects. Experience with UN Joint Projects, and or GEF financed projects is an advantage. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The Successful evaluator must present the following qualifications:

- Minimum 10 years of relevant professional experience (20%)
- Knowledge of UNDP, Joint Programming (15%)
- Previous experience with results-based monitoring and evaluation methodologies; (20%)

- Technical knowledge in the area of Climate Change areas (adaptation, mitigation, policies, wildlife) focal areas (30%)
- Experience of working in Africa is desirable (15%)

## EVALUATOR ETHICS

---

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

## PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

---

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

## APPLICATION PROCESS

---

### Duty Station

**Nairobi, Kenya.**

Any travel to the field will be facilitated by the Project.

### Application process

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

1. UNDP Personal History Form (P11)
2. Detailed Curriculum Vitae
3. Proposal for implementing the assignment

Qualified candidates are requested to email their applications to [consultants.ken@undp.org](mailto:consultants.ken@undp.org) to reach us not later than **COB on Friday, 24 March 2017**

Please quote **“Terminal Evaluation – UN Joint Project on Climate Change”** on the subject line.

## ANNEXES

**ANNEX 1 - TERMS OF REFERENCES (TOR)**

**ANNEX 2 - IC PROPOSAL FORM**

**ANNEX 3 - P11 TEMPLATE**

**ANNEX 4 - INDIVIDUAL CONSULTANT GENERAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS**



UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

## ANNEX A: PROJECT LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

PROJECT NAME	Support to low carbon climate resilient development for poverty reduction in Kenya (2014-2015)							
			Logframe date/version	1/1/2013				
IMPACT	Impact Indicator 1		Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (date)		
Kenya will have a transition to a low carbon climate resilient development pathway reducing the country's vulnerability to climate risk and improving livelihoods while contributing towards the global efforts to reduce green house gases emissions	Number of people and communities whose livelihoods have improved and reduced climate change vulnerabilities	Planned	National Climate Change Action Plan baselines	Implementation of the NCCAP components	Upscaling of programs been implemented	Dec-15		
		Achieved						
			Source					
			NCCAP, MTP II, National Development Plans, Annual Economic Survey					
	Impact Indicator 2		Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (date)		
	Tonnes of greenhouse gases avoided	Planned	Second national Communication			Dec-15		
		Achieved						
			Source					
			IPCC Reports					

OUTCOME	Outcome Indicator 1		Baseline	Milestone 1 (date)	Milestone 2 (date)	Target (Dec 2015)	Assumptions
Kenyans benefit from application of pro-poor and cross-sectoral CC adaptation and mitigation initiatives at national and sub-national levels	KPI 13: Level of integration of climate change in national and county planning as a result of ICF support.	Planned	Limited. Some reference in Second Medium Term Plan 2013-2017 (MTP II).				* Continuous security and stability in the country
		Achieved					

			Source				
			MTPII and annual progress reports, Country Development Plans and annual progress review documents.				
	Outcome Indicator 2		Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (Dec 2015)	
	KPI 11: Volume of public finance mobilized for climate change purposes as a result of ICF funding.	Planned	To be confirmed by the Climate Public Expenditure and Institutional Review (CPEIR)	To be determined based on the CPEIR results		To be determined based on the CPEIR results	
		Achieved					
			Source				
			CPEIR Report, Government budget, Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF)				
	Outcome Indicator 3		Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (Dec 2015)	
		Planned					
		Achieved					
			Source				
	INPUTS (£)	DFID (£)			Other (£)	Total (£)	DFID SHARE (%)
		1,140,000			(total of ALL Output cofinancing]	DFID + cofinancing	

OUTPUT 1	Output Indicator 1.1		Baseline	Milestone 1 (Dec 2014)	Milestone 2	Target (Dec 2015)	Assumptions
Pro-poor CC adaptation and mitigation mainstreamed in national and sub-national planning and budgeting processes.	Number of approved MTEF Sector guidelines/procedures and Budget Chart of Accounts that incorporate pro-poor CC adaptation and mitigation.	Planned	0	1 National level guideline/procedure approved		2 Sector working group guidelines approved	* Willingness of the Ministry of Devolution and Planning and Treasury to adopt changes in planning and budget processes in live with National Climate Change Action Plan
		Achieved					
		Source					
	Treasury MTEF Guidelines and Instructions, MTEF Sectoral Budgets for 2015, MTEF 2016-2017						
	Output Indicator 1.2		Baseline	Milestone 1 (Dec 2014)	Milestone 2	Target (Dec 2015)	

	Number of MTEF Sector working groups that apply revised MTEF Sector guidelines/procedures for budget year 2016-2017		0	Awareness of benefits from CC integration achieved		2 Sector working groups apply guidelines for 2016-2017 Budget	(NCCAP) * Assigned focal points with clear roles and responsibilities within the newly established line ministries as of January 2014. *Willingness of country leadership to integrate the NCCAP recommendations into planning and budgeting processes. * Existence of effective coordination channels between national and county levels. * Adequate national sectoral government representation at county level.
		Achieved					
		Source					
		National Treasury Progress Reports, Endorsed amendments to national system of accounts, National Economic Outlook Report					
	Output Indicator 1.3		Baseline	Milestone 1 (Dec 2014)	Milestone 2	Target (Dec 2015)	
	Number of government and county officials trained in application of MTEF Sector/County guidelines/produres that incorporate pro-poor CC adapation and mitigation.		0	50 officials (at least 25 Women) from national institutions and 2 pilot County administrations		100 officials (at least 50 Women) from national institutions and 2 pilot County administrations	
		Achieved					
Source							
NCCAP Secretariat Annual Reports, UNDP CO Reports.							
WEIGHTING (%)	Output Indicator 1.4		Baseline	Milestone 1 (Dec 2014)	Milestone 2	Target (Dec 2015)	
40%	Number of pro-poor CC adaptation and mitigation indicators included in MTP II National and County Integrated Development Plans (CIDP), and adopted in the Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES)	Planned	0	Awareness of benefits from CC integration achieved		At least 5 pro-poor CCA&M related indicators	
		Achieved					
		Source					RISK RATING
		NIMES Reports, NCCAP Secretariat Reports and UNDP CO reports					Low
INPUTS (£)	DFID (£)		Appeal income (£)	Other (£)	Total (£)	DFID SHARE (%)	

	GBP 400,000		400,000	46,464	446,464	90%
--	-------------	--	---------	--------	---------	-----

OUTPUT 2	Output Indicator 2.1		Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (Dec 2015)	Assumptions		
Renewables and sustainable biomass production promoted in Arid and semi arid Lands	Number of kilns deployed for demonstration in ASAL counties, and charcoal associations strengthened	Planned	Few functional charcoal associations - characterized by weak leadership and governance structures, Wood- charcoal conversion range of 10-15%		30 charcoal production associations install efficient kilns	Wood- charcoal conversion of 50-60%	Wood- charcoal conversion of 50-60%	* There is going to no resistance or new rules at the county level *Charcoal kilns are suitable for the proposed areas *Introduction of improved kilns will not lead to increased charcoal production increasing pressure on forests *The new charcoal regulations revised and institutions strengthened *Renewables promotion regulation supported by parliament	
		Achieved	National Charcoal Regulations, NEMA, KEFRI						
		Source							
		National Energy Policy, County Development Reports							
	Output Indicator 2.2		Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (Dec 2015)			
	Level of increased consumer access to good quality solar PV products and services	Planned			Accreditation criteria and processes (i.e. implementation and continuous monitoring and verification) developed (end 2014)	50 solar PV vendors in 5 major towns adopt the voluntary standard and are accredited (end 2015)	50 solar PV vendors in 5 major towns adopt the voluntary standard and are accredited (end 2015)		
		Achieved							
		Source							
		National Energy Policy							
Output Indicator 2.3			Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (Dec 2015)			

	NAMA policy framework for sustainable charcoal to guide the development of nationally appropriate mitigation actions along the charcoal value chain, ie forest management, production, trade and final consumption	Planned	Weak national charcoal regulations enforcement	Key stakeholders identified and stakeholders meetings held in 4 counties	NAMA Policy framework development	Dec-15	
		Achieved					
		Source					
	PISCES/Practical Action Socio-Economic Impact Assessment Study of a Sustainable Charcoal Sector In Kenya (2013), Forest Act 2005, Sessional Paper No.4 on Energy						
Weight 20%							
INPUTS (£)	DFID (£)		Appeal income (£)	Other (£)	Total (£)	DFID SHARE (%)	
	GBP 200 000		200,000	50,000	250,000	80%	
OUTPUT 3	Output Indicator 3.1		Baseline	Milestone 1 (2013)	Milestone 2 (2014)	Target (Dec 2015)	Assumptions
Green buildings are promoted in the construction sector with associated benefits for employment, environmental improvement, social equity and economic prosperity	Number of green building related direct Jobs created as a result of ICF support	Planned	111.78 thousand in Building and construction sector 2012	1000 new jobs created, 500 quality of jobs improved	1000 new jobs created, 500 quality of jobs enhance	2000 new jobs created, 1000 jobs enhanced	* Continuous security and stability in the country (Please add more). Willingness of Government to adopt policies for new technologies in construction industry. Willingness of county governments to adopt the new technologies in county
		Achieved					
			Source				
		Economic Survey 2013					
	Output Indicator 3.2		Baseline	Milestone 1 (2013)	Milestone 2 (2013)	Target (Dec 2014)	
	Number of building related low carbon technologies supported (units installed) through ICF support	Planned	Limited data exists on low carbon units: 35,000 housing units constructed annually	50	50	100 Units of green buildings	
		Achieved					
			Source				
		MTP II, Progress reports, National Housing Reports, County Development plans, County Dev reports, Annual Progress reports					

Output Indicator 3.3		Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (Dec 2015)	development plans and budget	
Level of installed capacity of clean energy in buildings as a result of ICF support	Planned	Limited data				* Willingness of the Ministry of Devolution and Planning and Treasury to adopt changes in planning and budget processes in live with National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP)	
	Achieved					* Assigned focal points with clear roles and responsibilities within the newly established line ministries as of January 2014.	
		Source					*Willingness of country leadership to integrate the NCCAP recommendations into planning and budgeting processes.
		Progress reports, National Housing Reports					* Existence of effective coordination channels between national and county levels.
						* Adequate national sectoral government	

			representation at county level.			
<b>INPUTS (£)</b>	<b>DFID (£)</b>		<b>Other (£)</b>	<b>Total (£)</b>	<b>DFID SHARE (%)</b>	
	GBP 200,000		200,000	0	200,000	100%

OUTPUT 4	Output Indicator 4.1		Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (date)	Assumptions
Low carbon transport is included in the on-going urban planning processes and national policies are developed to promote importation of cleaner, more fuel efficient vehicles in Kenya.	The SUMS Avoid-Shift-Improve approaches incorporated at city planning and national policy levels by 2015	Planned	Current planning approaches lack a people- based and consensus driven focus and do not address mobility challenges holistically.	One national workshop held to increase awareness and incorporate SUMS and NMT tools	Low carbon transport plans incorporated into urban planning - December 2015	Dec-15	* The World Bank project on urban planning remains on-course. * The new constitution associated changes to government structure & mandates can be implemented within a reasonable time to commence the urban planning process *NMT facilities/user perception & social/economic needs for NMT modal use remain roughly consistent * Public transport is developed in tandem with NMT * Investment in construction must be secured to ensure that final benefits (environmental, economic & social) are realized
		Achieved					
		City plans, Government statistics, UN data and surveys - annual reporting					
WEIGHTING (%)	Output Indicator 4.2		Baseline	Milestone 1	Milestone 2	Target (date)	
10%	Develop a comprehensive national policy to promote import of cleaner, more fuel efficient vehicles through improved vehicle standards, public outreach e.g. promotion of vehicle labeling, and development of a feebate system	Planned	Use vehicle import information and report on existing vehicle regulations compiled by the University of Nairobi	Vehicle emission standards developed to match fuel quality, and design of a feebate program and vehicle labeling completed	A national/regional workshop organized and a media campaign to promote policies on cleaner, more fuel efficient vehicles, including vehicle labeling	Dec-14	
		Achieved					
		Government Standards, UN reporting					



							* There is technical expertise to develop a feebate program.
<b>INPUTS (£)</b>	<b>DFID (£)</b>		<b>Appeal income (£)</b>	<b>Other (£)</b>	<b>Total (£)</b>	<b>DFID SHARE (%)</b>	
	GBP 100,000		100,000	20,000	120,000	83%	

OUTPUT 5	Output Indicator 5.1		Baseline	Milestone 1 (June 2014)		Target (Dec 2015)	Assumptions	
Governance reforms in the wildlife sector contribute to reducing illegal wildlife trade in Kenya	Improvement of coordination of national response towards illegal wildlife trade	Planned	(i) Not assessed, (ii) WCMC anticipated, (iii) 0	(i) Assessed, (ii) Approved, (iii) 1	(i) Assessed, (ii) Implementation underway, (iii) 2	Dec-15	* Government fully commits to the WCMB and take quick measures for implementation	
	(i) Assessment of coordination mechanisms, (ii) Status of the Wildlife Conservation and Management Bill (WCMB), (iii) number of training workshops with government officials	Achieved					* Willingness of the Government to cooperate with the United Nations on these issues	
			Source					* Local partners and national campaigns are able to reach concerned users in local communities
		Assessment report on coordination mechanisms, official statements, workshop reports						
	Output Indicator 5.2							
	Number of prosecutors and judges/magistrates trained to implement/apply	Planned	0	10	30	Dec-15		

	existing and new wildlife laws					
		Achieved				
			Source			
			Workshop reports			
WEIGHTING (%)	Output Indicator 5.3					
20%	Number of people reached through national/international media campaigns	Planned	0	50,000	200,000	Dec-15
	Number of strategic partnerships (private sectors, Embassies, NGOs) signed to leverage greater coverage		0	1	3 (1 Private sector, 1 Embassy, 1 NGO)	
		Achieved				
			Source			
			Media surveys, internet hits			
INPUTS (£)	DFID (£)			Other (£)	Total (£)	DFID SHARE (%)
	GBP 200,000			50,000	250,000	80%

## Annex B: List of Documents to be reviewed by the evaluators

### Project Documents

1. Project Document and Log Frame Analysis
2. Annual Work Plan 2015 & 2016
3. Implementing/Executing Partner arrangements
4. List and contact of details of project staff, key project stakeholders, including Project Boards, and other partners to be consulted
5. Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
6. Mid Term Reviews and other relevant evaluations and assessment
7. Annual; Project Implementation Report (APR)
8. Project budget, broken out by outcomes and outputs
9. Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, at terminal points
10. Financial data
11. Sample of project communications materials, i.e. press releases, brochures, documentaries etc.

### UNDP Documents

1. Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
2. Country Programme Document (CPD)
3. UNDP Strategic Plan

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

*This is a generic list, to be further detailed with more specific questions by CO and UN Teams.*

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the UN focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•		•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
•	•	•	•
•	•	•	•

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

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

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

---

### Evaluators:

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

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>3</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 *date*

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

---

<sup>3</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>4</sup>

---

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported project
  - UNDP project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>5</sup>)
- 1. Introduction
  - Purpose of the evaluation
  - Scope & Methodology
  - Structure of the evaluation report
- 2. Project description and development context
  - Project start and duration
  - Problems that the project sought to address
  - Immediate and development objectives of the project
  - Baseline Indicators established
  - Main stakeholders
  - Expected Results
- 3. Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>6</sup>)
- 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
  - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
  - Assumptions and Risks
  - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
  - Planned stakeholder participation
  - Replication approach
  - UNDP comparative advantage
  - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
  - Management arrangements
- 3.2 Project Implementation
  - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
  - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)
  - Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management

---

<sup>4</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>5</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

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

- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partners (UN Agencies) implementation / execution (\*)  
coordination, and operational issues

### 3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
- Relevance(\*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (\*)
- Impact

### 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

### 5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
- Annexed in a separate file: TE audit trail
- Annexed in a separate file: Terminal UN Tracking Tools



## ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM

---

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP Team Leader)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

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

UNDP Country Office

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

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

To the comments received on (date) from the Terminal Evaluation of (project name) (UNDP Project ID- PIMS #)

[illegible]

