

ANGAZA PROJECT END-TERM EVALUATION



REPORT

By

Dr. Sebastian Njagi Runguma
(Independent Evaluation Consultant)



22 October 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Overview of the Angaza Project	2
1.3 Purpose, Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation.....	3
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY	4
CHAPTER 3: ANGAZA PROJECT OUTCOMES.....	3
3.1 Context Analysis.....	3
3.2 Classification of the Project Outcomes	4
3.3 Contribution and significance analysis	3
CHAPTER 4: PROJECT DESIGN, PERFORMANCE AND MANAGEMENT	5
4.1 Relevance and Design.....	5
4.2 Effectiveness	6
4.3 Efficiency	8
4.4 Sustainability.....	9
4.5 M&E Practice.....	10
4.6 Gender and Social Inclusion	10
4.7 Partnerships and relationships with key stakeholders	11
4.8 Factors that enhanced or hindered the performance of the project	14
CHAPTER 5: GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED	15
5.1 Good Practices	15
5.2 Lessons Learned.....	16
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
6.1 Conclusions.....	18
6.2 Recommendations.....	19
ANNEXES.....	23

ACRONYMS

AF	Adaptation Fund
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CCBC	Climate Change Budget Coding
CCD	Climate Change Directorate
CCG	Climate Change Governance
CIDP	County Integrated Development Plan
CoG	Council of Governors
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
DAI	Development Alternatives Incorporation
DDP	Deepening Democracy Programme
DFID	Department for International Development
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GCF	Green Climate Fund
GESI	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion
GESIP	Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan
GYM	Gender Youth and Marginalized
ICF	International Climate Fund
KIE	Kenya Industrial Estate
KPCG	Kenya Platform on Climate Governance
KII	Key Informant Interview
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability, and Learning
MTP	Medium Term Plan
NAP	National Adaptation Plan
NCCA	National Climate Change Act
NCCAP	National Climate Change Action Plan
NCCC	National Climate Change Council
NCCF	National Climate Change Fund
NCCRS	National Climate Change Response Strategy
NDA	National Designated Authority
NDCs	Nationally Determined Contributions
NEMA	National Environment Management Authority
NSAs	Non-State Actors
OH	Outcome Harvesting
PACJA	Pan African Climate Justice Alliance
PAMACC	Pan African Media Alliance on Climate Change
PEA	Political Economy Analysis
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
TECKNOCA	Technology, Capacity and Knowledge Management
TOR	Terms of Reference
TWG	Thematic Working Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to the Pan African Climate Justice Alliance (PACJA) for allowing me to evaluate the Angaza Project (Strengthening CSO Advocacy for Improved Climate Change Governance in Kenya), which I found to be a timely, relevant and successful intervention.

Special gratitude to the staff of PACJA for providing invaluable information as key informants and for logistical support throughout the evaluation process. I am especially grateful to Sellah Wanjekeche (Monitoring, Evaluation Learning and Reporting Officer) and Dickson Kithinji (Angaza Project Officer) and Fides Kirimi (Project assistant) who provided excellent guidance that aided the successful planning, execution and reporting on this evaluation. Thanks also to Salina Sanou (PACJA Head of Programmes), Anna Makena (Human Resource, partnerships, and outreach Officer), Alex Maingi (PACJA Senior Finance Officer), and the Kenya Platform for Climate Governance (KPCG) Steering Committee.

Many thanks to officials and members of KPCG and its thematic working groups for input as key informants as well as logistical support in the evaluation. I am equally grateful to Fatima Osman (Deepening Democracy Programme Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning Officer), national and county Government officials, representatives of civil society organisations (CSOs), journalists, community members, and other stakeholder holders of the project who supported this evaluation in one way or another.

Sincere thanks to John Murithi, my able research assistant who provided excellent support in the evaluation. Finally, I thank the Deepening Democracy Programme in Kenya (DDP) and the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID) for providing funds that made the commissioning and successful completion of this evaluation possible.

Dr. Sebastian Njagi Runguma
(Independent Evaluation Consultant)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Pan African Climate Justice Alliance through the support from Deepening Democracy Programme funded by DFID implemented the Angaza Project from September 2017 to September 2019. The project was a 25 months intervention, which aimed at contributing to improved climate governance in Kenya through the strengthening of CSO advocacy and engagement in climate change policy processes at the national level. The end-term evaluation of the project was undertaken in September 2019 to identify changes and establish the extent to which the project had contributed to them.

The evaluation adopted the Outcome Harvesting Approach as the principal methodology. Specific methods of data collection included an outcome harvesting workshop with the project team, key informant interviews, focus groups, and desk review. The evaluation participants were carefully selected using a combination of purposive and random sampling techniques, which ensured that key project stakeholders were involved in the evaluation. These included national and county government officials, representatives of CSOs, journalists, community members, donor representatives, Angaza Project staff at PACJA, members and leaders of KPCG, and climate change experts in Kenya.

Key findings

The evaluation identified twenty-eight verifiable outcomes¹ for which the Angaza Project had a major contribution. These outcomes fall under four major categories: (i) Accountable climate change policy processes; (ii) climate finance monitoring and tracking; (iii) CSOs organizing and strengthening and; (iv) unexpected outcomes.

Outcomes under category 1 concerned changes in national-level climate change policy processes, which included the National Climate Change Action Plan (2013-2017). For example, in 2019, the Climate Change Directorate within Kenya's National Treasury in partnership with KPCG developed the Civil Society NDCs implementation and coordination framework whose objective was to promote coordinated and inclusive implementation of the NCCAP 2018-2019 by civil society actors. Another notable outcome under this category was that in April 2019, the Council of Governors (COG) collaborated with KPCG to map and scale up of county climate actions in Kenya to enhance climate governance.

Outcomes under category 2 concerned Climate Finance Monitoring and Tracking, which was a major focus area of the Angaza Project. A notable outcome was the action by the National Treasury to develop the National Climate Finance regulations (draft) in 2018 for

¹ An outcomes harvested in this evaluation constitute what the social actors targeted by the Angaza Project did differently that was linked to the intervention either directly or indirectly. The outcomes focused particularly on behavior (what actors are doing), relationships (how do actors associate/interact with each other), and the climate governance processes, policies, laws that the project contributed to. Information on outcomes was collected from project stakeholders through the application of the 4 "Ws" outcome harvesting questions framework (Who did What, When and Where?). Here, the evaluation participants described changes (outcomes) they perceived the project had achieved whether expected, unexpected, positive or negative. They also provided views on their perceived significance of the outcomes harvested.

tracking climate finance flows in Kenya. Another outcome was the roll-out of the National Climate Change Fund (NCCF) in 2018 by the National Treasury, in line with the provisions of the National Climate Change Act 2016.

Outcomes under category 3 concerned the strengthening of CSOs for effective climate governance advocacy. Through the KPCG, the project strengthened CSOs to be inclusive, collaborative and with a unified voice in undertaking climate advocacy in Kenya. At the time of the evaluation, KPCG had united more than 50 CSOs working on climate governance at the national level. During 2018 and 2019, the five thematic working groups² formed by the KPPG planned and carried out over 15 climate advocacy actions targeting selected county governments, the Climate Change Unit at the National Treasury, County-level CSOs, and Climate Change Directorate at the Ministry of Environment and Forestry.

The fourth set of outcomes, categorized as “Unexpected Outcomes”, were linked mainly to the unplanned activities undertaken by the project. Specific outcomes include enhanced awareness, visibility, interest, and profile of climate change agenda at national and county levels; and the initiation of practical climate actions by community members and CSOs that were reached by the project through the Thematic working groups’ county outreach activities³.

The Angaza Project contributed to the outcomes identified in this evaluation through various approaches. These included the facilitation of civic engagement and public participation, capacity development and technical knowledge enhancement of CSOs, joint actions and collaborative efforts with government agencies, and lobbying and advocacy of key relevant government ministries.

The outcomes harvested were highly significant; many of them happened for the first time, represent an important change in original situation that the Angaza Project sought to change, and touched on the core national climate governance policies relating to mitigation and adaptation actions in Kenya and the global climate governance landscape.

The Angaza Project was a relevant and timely intervention that focused on the needs and priorities of CSOs engagement in CCG in Kenya. It had a strategic fit with PACJA's and DDP's goal for enhanced CCG in Kenya.

There was a remarkable inclusion of key interest groups in the project activities. For example, during the process of review and contribution to the development of NCCAP 2018 – 2022, key social interest groups representing men and women, and youth within state and non-state actor sectors actively participated in the process. Inclusion was also achieved in the process of development and validation of in-depth gender analysis in the context of nationally determined contributions (NDCs), CSOs engagement and

² These were the Mitigation group; Adaptation group; Climate Finance (CF) group; Gender Youth and Marginalized (GYM) group; Technology, Capacity and Knowledge Management (TECKNOCA) group

³ These outcomes were most noticeable in Kitui and Makeni counties.

coordination framework for implementation of NCCAP 2018-2022, National Post and pre-COPs Consultative Workshops in which all key social interest groups actively participated.

The objectives of the project captured in the logframe were met to a large extent, a view that was backed by the project team and other evaluation participants. Also, the project used the available resources responsibly in pursuit of the desired results. The institutional arrangements for implementing the project were appropriate although high staff turnover affected the timeliness of activity implementation and utilisation of budget particularly during 2018. Other challenges included financial constraints and unpredictable Government plans which led to delays in the implementation of some of the planned activities.

Some level of institutional sustainability of project gains was noted. One important sustainability aspect was a strong emphasis on diversity of KPCG membership which was cascaded up to the county level. At the time of the evaluation, there was no evidence of dedicated or substantial financial support for the KPCG and its working groups. As such, the financial sustainability of the project was uncertain.

Several lessons emerge from the project implementation experiences. These include the importance of county level climate outreaches as a core tool for effective climate governance in Kenya and the need to address project challenges, including those on sustainability early enough in the project cycle. The project demonstrated several best practices, which PACJA and other actors could replicate in future climate interventions. These include network development for effective advocacy, use of participatory, evidence-based policy influence and engagement, and the adoption of adaptive programming.

Overall, the Angaza Project represents an important effort in ensuring that CSOs have enhanced and unified voice and collective action in advocating and influencing decision making processes and their outcomes, including climate change policies and laws at national and sub-national levels in Kenya.

Key recommendations

- Develop a follow-up intervention to consolidate the gains of the Angaza Project. This is important for boosting the momentum of KPCG, TWGs, CSOs, journalists and other key stakeholders reached by this project; and for upscaling the work of the project from national to county levels.
- Strengthen the design of future projects by instituting various measures including the design and financing of activities that have a greater focus on the counties especially those focusing on Climate Finance. Although PACJA has demonstrated strength in climate advocacy at the national level, the outcomes harvested in this evaluation showed that it can broaden the scope of work and impact through county-level work conducted through partners.
- Strengthen the impact and sustainability of future CCG projects by planning project sustainability early enough in the project cycle which is then followed by the development and implementation of clear exit and sustainability plan.

- Strengthen implementation and management arrangements. Specific measures include continued collaboration with national and sub-national organisations and undertaking capacity development initiatives for staff and key stakeholder groups such as on advocacy skills, policy influencing and communication, and on effective CCG approaches.
- Support monthly dialogue forums for climate change governance bringing together State actors and non-state actors (CSOs, Private Sector, and Trade Unions) with focus on mainstreaming climate policies and plans in implementation of the government plans especially the Big 4 Agenda⁴.
- Support Climate Finance Thematic Working Group to work with other partners including Treasury climate finance unit, Climate Change Directorate and Council of Governors to build the capacity of County governments, CSOs, and Private Sector on access and management of climate finance. Climate finance transparency and accountability remains a potential area that should be exploited to achieve Climate governance in Kenya. This will also involve the development of the Green Climate Fund (GCF) bankable projects for economic blocks in Kenya to enhance the resilience of vulnerable communities at the local level.

⁴ These are; enhancing manufacturing; food security and nutrition; universal health coverage; and affordable housing

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Climate Change Governance (CCG)⁵ Kenya is characterized by substantial progress in the policy framework. Various tools and policies have been developed to address climate change including the National Climate Change Response Strategy (NCCRS) 2010, the National Climate Change Action Plan 2018-2022 (NCCAP), the Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan (GESIP) and the National Climate Change Act (NCCA) 2016. The approval of the National Climate Change Framework Policy in 2016 and Kenya's ratification of the Paris Agreement⁷ in the same year gave impetus to the implementation of the NCCA 2016.

The translation of the various policy and legislative documents to sustainable climate actions require robust stakeholder engagement, including state and non-state actors at the national and county levels in a participatory manner. Participatory climate change governance in Kenya is largely dependent on the prevailing socio-political conditions in the country influenced by the complex environment that characterize the country's political economy. Although there is a consensus among decision-makers that tackling climate change has potentially huge long-term benefits there is a dilemma of how the costs for climate actions will be met. Implementing climate change policies poses a challenge in the context of competing socio-political and economic issues prioritized by the national and county administrations.

Kenya has a vibrant civil society sector working on advocacy on climate change governance and policy processes. However, there has been a lack of a unified civil society voice that collectively articulated critical concerns, influencing issues and maintaining its watchdog status. The CSOs had degenerated into various formations mostly based on their sectoral and thematic areas which undermined the civil society-led catalytic role in influencing change. This was largely attributed to disagreements and lack of good coordination which weakened CSOs' voice and contribution to national climate change governance.

PACJA is one of the key actors that have actively advocated for climate justice in Africa and Kenya. The organization is a coalition of over a thousand civil society organizations from 45 African countries that are united in their commitment to promote climate justice at the national, regional and international levels. From September 2017 to September 2019, PACJA pursued its climate advocacy work in Kenya mainly through the Angaza

⁵ Climate change governance refers to the process in which decisions regarding the tackling of climate change issues are made and decision-makers are held accountable⁵. It entails policies, plans, and measures that the state puts in place to address climate change and its implementation in an effective manner. In practice, CCG is about two inter-related behaviors; applying the principles and values of good governance to plan and implement climate interventions and secondly, to apply a climate lens in the planning and execution of the responsibilities of governance at all levels and in all sectors of development.

⁶National Council for Law Reporting (2010), Climate Change Act No. 11 of 2016

⁷ See: https://unfccc.int/files/meetings/paris_nov_2015/application/pdf/paris_agreement_english_.pdf

Project which ended in September 2019 paving way for an independent end-term evaluation.

1.2 Overview of the Angaza Project

The Angaza Project was a 25-months nation-wide intervention implemented by PACJA through the Kenya Platform on Climate Governance (KPCG)⁸ between September 2017 and September 2019 with funding from DFID⁹. The project aimed at contributing to improved climate governance in Kenya through the strengthening of CSO advocacy and engagement in climate change policy processes at the national level.

The project had three specific objectives as follows:

- a) To catalyze and facilitate civil society and broader citizen participation in the implementation of the National Climate Change Act, 2016, review of the National Climate Change Action Plan (2018-2022), Implementation of the Nationally Determined Contributions and Influence the National Climate Change Council (NCCC).
- b) To track and monitor climate financing to ensure the National Budget allocated for climate change and other climate finance streams meet the needs of the most vulnerable communities at the frontline of climate change impacts.
- c) To solidify gains achieved in the coordination of diverse groups aimed at consolidating a unified civil society voice in national climate change policy dialogues and interventions¹⁰.

Broadly, the Angaza Project sought to enhance climate change governance at the national level through increased coordination among non-state actors so that they can engage and advocate for transparent, accountable, participatory climate response mechanisms. The expected outcome was “Strengthened civil society for improved engagement in Climate Change Governance in Kenya”.

PACJA and the KPCG implemented the project at the national level and outreach activities in select counties¹¹ in two phases: an initial inception phase covering four months (September 2017 - December 2017), and twenty-one months of implementation of project activities.

⁸ This was previously known as the CSO Momentum committee, a coalition of networks and organizations working on climate governance in the country. The KPCG is made up of five thematic working groups: Adaptation; Mitigation; Climate Finance; Technology, Knowledge Management, and Capacity Building; and Gender, Youth and Marginalized Groups.

⁹ This is through the Deepening Democracy in Kenya Programme

¹⁰ This means consolidating the fragmented CSOs efforts in the climate change space for unified and impactful interventions.

¹¹ The KPCG thematic working groups conducted outreach activities in Makueni, Kitui, Machakos, Taita-Taveta, Nakuru, Marsabit, Isiolo and Kisumu counties. Outreach activities were also undertaken among the Council of Governors (CoG), Academia, Private Sector and Civil Society Organizations.

1.3 Purpose, Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

The purpose of the evaluation was to identify changes brought about by the Angaza Project and establish the extent to which the project has contributed to these changes. The specific objectives of the evaluation were to:

- a) Identify and describe the changes¹² contributed by the project to its target groups;
- b) Identify factors that facilitated and/or impeded the achievement of project objectives;
- c) Assess the relevance, efficiency/management, effectiveness, sustainability, and gender and social inclusion sensitivity aspects of the project, and;
- d) Identify lessons and provide recommendations that will help the PACJA in future project management and decision making where necessary.

The evaluation had an expanded scope beyond the traditional outcome harvesting evaluation focus as it looked into project performance and management issues to facilitate learning and aid PACJA's future climate justice programming.

¹² These changes referred to the outcomes contributed by the Angaza Project. An outcome was understood as a change in behavior, relationships, actions, activities, policies or practices of social actors that were involved, targeted or influenced by the project. These social actors include individuals, groups, institutions, organizations and communities in the five project counties and nationally (Ricardo, 2012).

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

The evaluation adopted a participatory approach and triangulation of data sources and research methods. Meaningful interaction with the Angaza Project team at PACJA, KPCG, TWGs, and the project's target groups was achieved through their participation in individual interviews and focus group discussions.

The evaluation process commenced in September 2019 through an inception meeting held in Nairobi between the consultant and Angaza Project team at PACJA. The purpose of the meeting was to generate a common understanding of the focus, expectations, and principles that guided the evaluation. Subsequently, the consultant reviewed the project documents and relevant external documents from which the initial outcome descriptions were developed. The draft outcomes were discussed during the review of the inception report and this paved way for data collection at the national level and two counties (Kitui and Makueni) to test evidence on the documented outcomes and to collect additional evaluation data.

The questions contained in the TOR served as the main guide in determining specific evaluation questions, and methods of data collection and analysis, and the interpretation of findings. These questions are outlined in Box 1.

Box 1: Key evaluation questions

- What changes have occurred among the target groups?
- Why are these changes important?
- To what extent is PACJA's intervention responsible for the changes that have happened?
- To what extent has the project remained relevant to its objective during the rapidly evolving political and socioeconomic context during which it is being implemented and also the project's relevance to DDPs outcomes?
- To what extent were planned outputs and outcomes of the project realized in relation to the inputs provided?
- To what extent have the project objectives been achieved?
- What is the likelihood of the sustainability of the results of the project?
- To what degree has the project been sensitive to gender and social inclusion?

Primary data were collected from the project's key project stakeholder groups at the national and county level. The participants were carefully selected using a combination of purposive and random sampling methods in efforts to ensure that all key stakeholder groups were represented in the sample. These included KPCG leaders, Project team at PACJA, Project beneficiaries (Journalists, and county climate change groups/networks), County and national government officials, and donor representative.

Secondary information was collected from Project M&E records (project document, progress reports, annual project reports, political economy analysis reports, stories of change, among others) and external documents (Official records of the institutions, organizations, and governments; media houses reports; DDP reports, among others).

The Outcome Harvesting Approach (OH) was the principal methodology utilized in this evaluation. The evaluator customized the OH steps¹³ to align with the evaluation objectives and available resources. Analysis of outcomes involved organizing and examining all outcomes carefully, making sense of them and then providing evidence-based answers to the harvesting questions. This process was guided by evaluation objectives and questions set out in the ToR.

In addition, the evaluator used the thematic content analysis technique to organize and make sense of the data on other areas of inquiry in the evaluation (questions relevant to project performance and management). Here, data were examined in line with the key evaluation questions. The main issues emerging from across the various interviews, FGDs and literature were noted. The results of the data analysis are presented in Chapter 3.

¹³ There are usually six steps in an outcome harvesting evaluation: design of the evaluation; review documentation/draft outcomes; engaging key informants; substantiation of outcomes; analysis and interpretation of outcomes; and supporting use of the evaluation findings.

CHAPTER 3: ANGAZA PROJECT OUTCOMES

3.1 Context Analysis

The Angaza Project was implemented within a context where climate change poses major threats to the environment, to economic growth and to sustainable development in Kenya. The country grapples with increasing impacts of climate change-related hazards like droughts and flooding on livelihoods and the economy with poor people and communities being most impacted. This problem is exacerbated by poor governance in the country; evidenced by the recurrent disasters and climate-related hazards which when they strike, many Kenyans are exposed with the poor being more vulnerable and at risk of their livelihoods being destroyed. In a country where its economy is largely dependent on agriculture, the impact has been felt by many households both in the urban and rural areas as the cost of living has increased thus straining the quality of life for most families.

In terms of policy environment, various tools and policies have been developed to address climate change in Kenya including the National Climate Change Response Strategy (NCCRS) 2010, the National Climate Change Action Plan 2018-2022, the Green Economy Strategy and Implementation Plan (GESIP) and the National Climate Change Act (NCCA) 2016. The implementation of the NCCA 2016 was given impetus by the approval of the National Climate Change Framework Policy, and Kenya's ratification of the Paris Agreement¹⁴ in the same year.

Kenya also has one of the most vibrant civil society organizations working on advocacy on climate change governance and policy processes. However, there has been a lack of a unified civil society voice that collectively articulated critical concerns, influencing issues and maintaining its watchdog status. The CSOs had degenerated into various formations mostly based on their sectoral and thematic areas which undermined the civil society-led catalytic role in influencing change. The CSO momentum which had been in existence was not active on climate issues.

Although Kenya had put in place several climate change processes and policies, there was a gap between climate change actions and implementation of policies at the national level and how this trickled down to counties. Therefore, there was a need for structures and efforts for the domestication and implementation of national-level climate policies, laws, processes, and actions at sub-national levels.

The Angaza Project was implemented at a time PACJA was revamping efforts on climate change justice in Kenya. PACJA was undertaking other climate justice activities in the country at the national level. Therefore, the Angaza Project built on PACJA's existing

¹⁴ The Paris Agreement required countries to come up with Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). These are an individual country's commitment to global processes in addressing climate change anchored in the Paris Agreement. The NDCs are the current driving factors that shape the national and global climate governance landscape.

work and as such there was bound to be overlaps and synergy building between the Angaza Project and other projects, especially at the county level.

The Angaza Project was part of a wider group of more than twenty climate change governance projects that were implemented by NSAs in eighteen counties¹⁵ under the funding of DFID through DDP. Of these, eleven were climate change governance interventions at the county level while the Angaza Project was implemented at the national level. Collectively, these projects aimed to strengthen governance systems, citizen participation, and agency in the community to county-level decision making related to climate-resilient natural resources management. They applied various approaches¹⁶ that focused on strengthening the community to county-level institutions and linkages, entitlements, participation, voice of vulnerable community members (pastoralists, farmers, among others), access to information and flexible and inclusive decision-making and governance.

This context presented both an opportunity and enabling factors for the design and implementation of the Angaza Project.

3.2 Classification of the Project Outcomes

The 28 outcomes harvested in this evaluation were relevant to Angaza Project's aim of enhancing climate change governance in Kenya through the strengthening of civil society organizations' role in climate change governance, particularly government-led processes and policies. The harvested outcomes were also relevant to the climate change governance outcome pursued by the DDP and contributed positively to climate justice work in Kenya.

Many of the outcomes were realized at the national level as intended at the design of the project. These were therefore intended outcomes and revolve around the National Climate Change Act (NCCA) 2016, the National Climate Change Action Plan 2018 -2022 (NCCAP), Draft National Climate Finance Regulations and the Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). A few outcomes were harvested at the county and community levels¹⁷.

The outcomes harvested were positive. The direct targeting of the Kenya Industrial Estate (KIE) and county outreach activities conducted by the KPCG's five thematic working groups led to several outcomes from the private sector and at the county and community levels.

¹⁵ These included Marsabit, Turkana, Samburu, Kilifi, Garissa, Baringo, West Pokot, Elgeyo Marakwet, Siaya, Migori, Trans Nzoia, Vihiga, Kakamega, Bomet, Kisii, Kisumu, and Nandi counties.

¹⁶ These approaches focused on the issues of integration of climate change into governance processes including policy, plans and budgets; increasing knowledge of climate change among government officials and other actor's at different levels (national, county and community levels); and increasing local adaptive capacity to climate change.

¹⁷ These were harvested mainly from key informants. This was not possible from project records due to a lack of proper monitoring and documentation on the part of the TWG or the project.

Many of the outcomes occurred for the first time and represent an important change in the situation that the Angaza Project sought to change. As such, the twenty-eight outcomes received a generally high rating in terms of significance. These outcomes were mainly in the form of policy, institutional and relationship changes. Other outcomes were at individual and community level, notably those relating to increased knowledge and skills in climate change matters, and those realized in the specific counties that were reached by the project.

Outcomes harvested have been classified under four broad and fairly interlinked categories: (i) Accountable Climate Change Policy Processes; (ii) Climate Finance Monitoring and Tracking; (iii) CSOs organizing and strengthening and (iv) Unexpected/other outcomes. The classification of outcomes under a manageable number of categories has enabled further analysis, discussion and presentation of changes linked to the Angaza Project.

Outcome category 1: Accountable National Level Climate Change Policy Processes

"The project made a great contribution to the national climate action plan 2018 – 2022 and the involvement of marginalised groups in the plan even though it has not yet been passed", Project stakeholder interview, 2019.

The National Climate Change Action Plan (2013-2017) was due to be revised in 2018 and hence the Angaza Project positioned its planned advocacy actions towards this activity, and thereby directly influenced the formulation and development of NCCAP 2018-2022. The Climate Change Act 2016 was also only a year old and its implementation process was expected to commence during the project implementation period. Following Kenya's ratification of the Paris Agreement in 2016 and subsequent development of NDCs, the country entered into NDCs implementation readiness period, a process that Angaza Project was keen to influence.

To build the capacity of CSOs on the provisions of the National Climate Change Act 2016, the project produced a simplified national climate law titled "Climate Law for the people" as a reference document through which CSOs could visualize and understand climate change governance and administration in the Kenyan context. The document focused on explaining the provisions of the National Climate Change Act 2016. In 2018, KPCG thematic working groups supported by the project reviewed the achievements and failures of the National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) 2012-2017. The findings of the review formed the basis of engagement of CSOs during the design and formulation of NCCAP 2018 -2022¹⁸.

In 2019, CCD in partnership with KPCG developed the Civil Society NDCs implementation and coordination framework. The general objective of the framework was to promote a coordinated and inclusive implementation of the NCCAP 2018-2019 by civil society actors. The framework will also contribute to the implementation of the Climate

¹⁸ The National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) 2018 - 2022, is the framework for implementing Kenya's Nationally Determined Contributions (NDC) and will shape the current and future climate change response mechanisms.

Change Act, Sustainable Development Goals and the NDCs. The KPCG played the important role of mobilization, facilitation, and participation in the consultative review process in collaboration with the relevant government taskforce and other non-state actor partners.

Guided by advocacy strategy, KPCG collaborated with the Council of Governors (CoG) to co-host the first-ever National Climate Governance Conference at Safari Park Hotel in Nairobi on 9th October 2018. The conference was held as a pre-event of the seventh edition of the Climate Change and Development in Africa¹⁹. The Conference created a good environment for all stakeholders to discuss the issue of climate financing at national and county government levels. County governments such as Makueni demonstrated how they had established County Climate Fund Mechanisms that helped them to budget 2% of their annual fiscal allocation to mitigation and adaptation projects geared towards enhancing the resilience capacity of the county. The conference also facilitated discussion on the role of counties in implementation of the climate response policies and plans including the NDCs, National Adaptation Plan (NAP) and NCCAP (2018 – 2022), especially on the reporting mechanisms.

Following the outcomes of the National Climate Governance Conference in 2019, the KPCG collaborated with the Council of Governors (CoG), County Governments and other actors to undertake an inter-county dialogue forum in Makueni County. The dialogue brought together forty-one (41) counties to discuss how best to upscale climate mitigation and adaptation actions at local levels. Following this dialogue forum, more counties developed an interest to learn from Makueni County regarding the progress they had made on climate governance. At the time of this evaluation, Makueni County had hosted other counties for peer learning and these included Kwale County, Siaya, and Narok counties.

Despite the progress made by CSOs to ensure accountable climate policy processes focused on NCCA 2016, NCCAP 2018-2022 and NDCs, there are aspects that are yet to be implemented due to delay by the responsible government agencies²⁰. Among key priority areas for the 2018-2022 NCCAP are disaster risk management, food, and nutrition security. The inputs from KPCG and marginalized groups shaped the actions under these two priority areas as well as ensuring NCCAP integrates a gender perspective and proposed ways for effective youth participation in adaptation and mitigation.

Examples of outcomes under this category include the following: (i) During 2018 and 2019, five thematic working groups under Kenya Platform for Climate Governance (KPCG) participated in the national level climate governance and decision making

¹⁹ The theme of the national climate governance conference was the *“Role of Devolved Governments in the Transition to low carbon climate Resilient Economic Development”*.

²⁰ In particular, two key climate governance institutions are yet to become fully operational: The National Climate Change Council (NCCC) and the National Climate Change Fund. The NCCC remains at a limbo due to differences in the nomination of the CSO representative, a matter that is currently contested in the court. The NCCC is yet to convene any meeting since its inception due to differences in the nomination of the CSO representatives. The National Climate Change Fund is not yet operational because the climate finance regulations are yet finalized spearheaded by Treasury. A few counties have operational County Climate Change Funds largely focused on the budgetary allocations from county fiscal planning processes.

processes whereby their views and inputs on climate policies at national level were incorporated in the policy documents including NCCAP II and Draft Public Finance Management (Climate Change Fund) Regulations (2018); In-depth gender analysis of Kenya's Nationally Determined Contribution (2019); (ii) The Climate Change Directorate of the Government of Kenya engaged KPCG in August 2019 to develop the NDCs civil society engagement and coordination framework and agreement was reached towards this output; and (iii) In April 2019, the Council of Governors (COG) collaborated with KPCG in undertaking a mapping and scaling up of county climate actions in Kenya to enhance climate governance. In particular, the Council undertook a mapping workshop in Makueni County in April 2019 targeting all the 47 counties.

Outcome category 2: Increased Climate Finance Monitoring and Tracking

The project focused on Climate finance because it is recognized both locally (in several climate change policies and strategies) and internationally (within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change - UNFCCC) as crucial to addressing development challenges exacerbated by climate change. The Paris Agreement recognizes that significant resources will need to be mobilized for climate actions, if the world is to avoid “dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system” and to “adapt naturally to climate change, to ensure that food production is not threatened and to enable economic development to proceed in a sustainable manner”. Since the Paris Agreement came into being in 2015, climate finance flows into the country have increased largely attributed to existing supporting policies and plans that allow for international investments into climate change work. It is anticipated this trend will continue to facilitate the NDCs implementation.

In efforts towards better climate finance monitoring and tracking backed by evidence-based advocacy, the Angaza Project undertook a comprehensive national climate finance flow analysis report focused on the global and national landscape. The outcome report facilitated the climate finance thematic working group to effectively track and monitor climate finance at the national level and connects that to international processes. The report contains the analysis of the current and proposed climate finance governance framework, the capacity of Kenyan to access regional and international climate finance, the flow of climate finance at national and county levels, as well as the effectiveness of such climate finance, flows for meeting the needs of the most vulnerable communities and individuals. Tracking tools were developed by the National Treasury while the Angaza Project supported both state and no-state actors to participate and track Climate budgets at the county level. This was done through coordinated training for economic regional blocks involving all Kenya's 47 Counties.

The project created enabling spaces for CSOs momentum to contribute to climate finance policy documents. For instance, through the Angaza Project, the Climate Finance thematic working group led the process of inputting and submitting recommendations from non-state actors to the draft climate finance regulation 2018 that are to guide the National Climate Change Fund as provided for by the National Climate Change Act 2016.

The Climate Finance Working group also participated in and contributed to the development of the Climate Finance budget coding, tracking and reporting tools. The training handbook is part of the Government of Kenya's strategic intervention to build capacities on climate financing to better coordinate resource mobilization and track expenditures on climate change both at national and county levels. Climate finance tracking and reporting will enhance coordination and effectiveness of climate change mitigation and adaptation efforts and initiatives, and promote robust transparency in line with the Paris Agreement of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and NCCAP 2018-2022. It will also improve the country's ability to mobilize and effectively manage and track adequate and predictable climate change finance from public and private sources.

The project improved collaboration and partnership between non-state and state actors. For example, KPCG through Climate Finance thematic working group developed good working relations with NEMA and the National Treasury Climate Change Unit. As a result, the National Treasury Climate Finance Unit and NEMA collaborated with the Climate Finance thematic working to undertake eight training workshops targeting county-level state and non-state actors on Green Climate Fund (GCF) and Adaptation Fund. There were also organized and coordinated economic blocks consultative forums, during which the economic blocks identified key climate problems in their regions. Task forces for all 6 economic blocks in Kenya were formed to finalize the process of GCF proposal development. The taskforces are spearheading GCF proposal development for all the six economic blocks, and these proposals are expected to be in line with NDCs, National Climate Change Action Plan 2018-2022, NAP and the Kenya Medium Term Plan (MTP III) priority areas.

Specific outcomes under this category include the following: (i) The National Treasury developed the National Climate Finance regulations (draft) in 2018 for tracking climate finance flows in Kenya and the roll-out of National Climate Change Fund (NCCF) provided for in the National Climate Change Act 2016; and (ii) Between November 2018 and September 2019, the Climate Finance Unit at Kenya National Treasury and the Climate Change Directorate trained CSOs and other stakeholders on Climate Change Budget Coding (CBCC), tracking and reporting.

Outcome category 3: Strengthening of CSOs for effective climate governance advocacy

"The work the KPCG and TWGs are doing at the county level has been building momentum on CSOs involvement in climate change governance and there is going to be valued with the structures they are building in the counties", Project stakeholder interview, 2019

Kenya has one of the most vibrant civil society sector working on advocacy on climate change governance and policy processes in Africa. However, there has been a lack of a unified civil society voice that collectively articulated critical concerns, influencing issues and maintaining its watchdog status. The CSOs had degenerated into various formations mostly based on their sectoral and thematic areas. This undermined the civil society-led catalytic role in influencing change. This was largely attributed to disagreements, turf

wars, and lack of good coordination of civil society organizations in Kenya. This weakened their voice in national climate change debates thus hampering their contribution to better climate governance in the country.

The Angaza Project made an important contribution towards addressing this gap by the establishment of the KPCG and five thematic working groups (TWGs)²¹. Through the KPCG, the CSOs explored ways to work together on thematic issues and to collectively push for increased climate action in the country. This was achieved by enhancing CSOs' capacity to engage and provide informed contributions to climate governance processes. CSO capacity development was achieved through three main strategies. The first strategy entailed network capacity development for coordination and advocacy with the key outputs being the improvement of capacity for network coordination of the Kenya Platform on Climate Governance and the achievement of climate governance advocacy actions. The second strategy entailed evidence-based policy influence and engagement and stronger partnerships with, academia (Research institutions like Wangari Maathai Institute) government and private sector within the climate governance space. The third strategy involved strategic monitoring for transparency and accountability through monitoring and tracking climate finance.

The CSOs under the KPCG were strengthened to be inclusive, collaborative and with a unified voice in undertaking climate advocacy. At the time of the evaluation, the KPCG had a membership of approximately fifty (50) organizations working on climate governance. These CSOs are organized in 5 thematic working groups: Mitigation, Adaptation, climate finance, Gender Youth and Marginalized (GYM), and Technology, Capacity and Knowledge Management (TECKNOCA) depending on the interest of the organization. Each thematic working group comprises of at least 10 organizations.

KPCG networks at the county level have established County platforms that will link up with Working groups and influence County government Climate policies and plans. One of these platforms is Kitui County Climate Change Platform (KCCCP)²² that was established in September 2019 by KPCG Adaptation working group. Having in place a network that brings together all the county CSOs have the benefits of increasing the credibility and visibility, a united voice that is louder and stronger and broadens the base of support through bringing together the different constituencies that each member works with.

²¹ These are the Climate Finance thematic working group; Climate Adaptation thematic working group; Climate Mitigation thematic working group; Technology transfer and capacity building thematic working group; and Gender, youth and marginalized thematic working group.

²² The KCCCP convener is Caritas Kitui while the co-convener is Anglican Development Service (ADS). This platform at the county has brought together Networks, and CBOs working on climate change policies and environmental protection in Kitui County.

The KPCG and member organisations provided informed input in the technical review of climate policy and information on climate governance processes. Their contribution formed part of the actions of the national and county government plans. Following the empowerment and skills they had gained, the thematic working groups provided informed perspectives that complemented the government's work through enhanced participation. For example, KPCG in collaboration with CCD spearheaded the development of the CSOs NDCs implementation framework in 2018.

The KPCG was further strengthened through collaboration with academia and research institutions as well as making use of various individual experts to conduct research and generate findings to support evidence-based policy influence. During the life of the project, key research activities were conducted whose findings helped to generate informed policy proposals for climate governance, and track climate finance flows. For instance, KPCG partnered with Wangari Mathaai Institute, University of Nairobi undertaking a successful review of the “County Level Perceptions on Climate Governance in Kenya”.

The TWGs groups took lead in technical thematic advocacy initiatives/ interventions. For example, the Technology and Knowledge Management thematic working group partnered with the private sector through the Kenya Industrial Estate (KIE) to establish the status of Small and Medium Enterprises' preparedness to effects of climate change in Kenya. The research focused on knowledge and awareness of climate change by SMEs; measures established to mitigate the effects of climate change; and how resilient they were to the effects of climate change.

The project worked with Pan African Media Alliance on Climate Change (PAMACC) which led to 3 training sessions in 2018 for journalists on climate change governance (including simplification of climate information), the capacity of journalists to report on climate governance in Kenya improved and ToTs have been identified to conduct training workshops in the counties. This led to better understanding among journalists on the interconnectedness of key issues such as water, food security, and climate change. The journalists interviewed in this evaluation reported that the knowledge and skills gained by the training workshops had helped them to become better in reporting climate change content.

Examples of outcomes under this category include the following:

- In 2018, the CSO platform and thematic working groups (Climate finance; gender and youth and marginalised groups; technology and capacity development; and adaptation, mitigation working groups) made direct inputs into the policy and legal documents - National Climate Change Action Plan (2018 – 2022), Gender Analysis in the context of NDC, and the draft climate finance regulations.
- The Kenya Platform on Climate Governance (KPCG) has united more than 50 CSOs working on climate governance at National level since 2018, which led to formation of 5 thematic working groups (Mitigation, Adaptation, Climate Finance (CF), Gender Youth and Marginalized (GYM), and Technology, Capacity and

Knowledge Management (TECKNOCA) to spearhead climate change advocacy in Kenya.

- During 2018 and 2019, the five thematic working groups formed by the KPPG planned and carried out over 15 climate advocacy actions targeting selected county governments, the Climate Change Unit at the National Treasury, County-level CSOs, and Climate Change Directorate at the Ministry of Environment and Forestry.

Outcome category 4: Unexpected Outcomes

"The training we received from PACJA opened our eyes to what we can do, how we can get and publish good climate stories for advocacy. It motivated us to engage effectively in reporting on climate change issues and gave a rare opportunity for us to develop and publish unique and impactful stories that would otherwise not find a platform in mainstream legacy media", Project stakeholder interview, 2019.

The project contributed to enhanced awareness, visibility, interest, and profile of climate change agenda at national and county levels. This was achieved through global meetings, national forums/events, county-level engagements, and community meetings, and research studies, publications, and media articles/reports that were facilitated or linked to social actors reached by the project. Most notable was the work of the journalists that were trained by the project. Oral testimonies from six journalists who were interviewed in this evaluation indicate that the training provided by the project offered a rare opportunity for them to develop and publish unique and impactful stories that would otherwise not find a platform in mainstream legacy media.

Using knowledge and skills from the training workshops, the journalists have written climate change stories in English as well as Kiswahili language, some as many 10 covering diverse issues on the impacts of climate change on local communities in the counties. The stories covered issues such as floods; droughts; resource-based inter-community conflict; human-animal conflict due to climate change; bird migration; charcoal burning; sand harvesting; drought-resistant crops; recovery of riparian land; food security and livelihoods; rainwater harvesting; green energy; climate change impacts on women, farmers, and pastoralist communities; climate change and technology; climate finance; environmental conservation which they publish and share through local FM radios, YouTube and Facebook channels. This increased visibility and interest on climate change matters within communities as explained by a journalist in the following way:

By doing climate change stories, I received a lot of calls from community members about agriculture and technology issues. There was increasing interest among communities on climate change and its effects on livelihoods.

The journalists also used the knowledge and skills gained from the training workshops to raise awareness on climate change issues in the counties as explained by one of the journalists interviewed in this evaluation:

The knowledge and skills I obtained from the PACJA training on climate change are very important. I do radio breakfast shows...every day must tell people about weather forecasts which I receive from the MET. If I don't people call me asking me why. Fishermen want to

know about risks of flooding or strong winds; farmers want to know if and when the rains will come. Teachers and school children want to know whether each day so that they can release children on time to cross laggas before they are flooded...Our FM radio is the only one reporting daily weather forecasts in the county”, Project stakeholder interview, 2019.

A journalist in Mombasa County has won prestigious awards (recognition and funding to write on climate change issues) as a result of high quality climate change stories developed during 2018 and 2019²³. In Turkana, a journalist developed and disseminated several climate change stories. However, many of these impressive outcomes that the project contributed to, directly or indirectly, were not captured in project documents largely because of limited follow up by the projects on its county outreach activities. These were important unexpected and un-reported project achievements that PACJA may need to follow up and document comprehensively during the post-project period.

The Angaza Project contributed to practical climate actions by community members and CSOs in counties reached by the TWGs. For example, in Kitui County, following a one-day climate adaptation awareness held at Kabati Township in Kitui East Sub-county in September 2018, community members joined and were able to access loans from the local financial services association (FSA) which has improved their livelihood and local economy. Other community members were have installed rainwater harvesting systems and constructed sand dams to increase water retention in seasonal rivers. In addition, local self-help groups and community based organisations undertook local level climate change response actions such as tree planting, water harvesting, food security initiatives and awareness-raising activities with support of government agencies and NSAs that had interacted with the Angaza Project²⁴. These actions pointed to the project’s contribution in the few counties reached towards the empowerment of grassroots actors, enhanced local adaptive capacity to climate change, and sustainable natural resource management. A stakeholder in Kitui County gave the following account of an indirect contribution of the Angaza Project that is traceable to the project’s county outreach work:

There is a CSO network in Kitui County called Community Voluntary Development Network Association of Kenya which is made up of many CSOs in the county. The County Government is working with the CSO to support them plant 8 million trees in Kitui, Makueni and Machakos counties during the October 2019 rainy season. The Angaza Project gave impetus to this network during county interactions in 2018. The CSO is now much interested in improving the local environment, Project stakeholder interview, 2019.

The project contributed to accelerated policy change on charcoal burning in Kitui County. Key informants in Kitui explained that following training by the Angaza Project, CSOs lobbied for a charcoal ban in the county. These efforts received further boost when the Minister for Interior visited the county in April 2019 and emphasized that the charcoal ban must be affected fully in the county. There is now a policy framework to regulate sand harvesting and charcoal production in Kitui County.

²³ These include awards by Media Council of Kenya (2019), Open Forum on Agriculture Biotechnology in Africa (2019), and Women International Fund (2018; 2019).

²⁴ These include the Agricultural Officers and county officials in the ministries of environment and natural resources.

Other specific outcomes under this category were as follows;

- KIE has since early 2019 actively engaged SMEs in climate discourse to enhance their capacity to adaptive capacities. For example, in January – June 2019, KIE partnered with the project to survey the level of preparedness of SMEs on the transition to low-Carbon, Climate-resilient green economy. The survey findings will seek to help SMEs mitigate and adapt to climate effects.
- In April 2019, CSOs in Makueni County formed a platform of 30 organizations including local CBO's on climate governance which is working closely with national level Climate Change CSOs through the KPCG.
- In 2018 and 2019, community members and CSOs in Kitui and Makueni counties took a wide range of practical actions (joining financial services association, rainwater harvesting, tree planting, community natural resource management initiatives, etc) that were relevant to climate resilience in the local communities.

3.3 Contribution and significance analysis²⁵

The outcomes harvested were directly or indirectly linked to Angaza Project activities at national and county levels. The contribution of the project was channelled through activities implemented by the project team, KPCG, and TWGs. The contribution also came in form of technical advice, and financial contribution to activities and processes that were carried out by the project jointly with other actors or solely by some of the target actors such as the CSD, KIE, and CoG.

Diverse forms of contribution were noted. These included instances where the project inspired and encouraged CSOs (KCPG, TWGs, and county level CSOs) to act; facilitation and support (financial and material) to national-level processes and activities (research with the Wangari Maathai Institute; National Climate Change Conference; etc.); persuading Government actors to take necessary actions (CCD, National Treasury, NCCC, NEMA, etc.), technical input in developing policies, plans, tool kits, etc.); and capacity building initiatives (KPCG, TWGs, and County-level CSOs).

In terms of activities, the contribution of the Angaza Project to the outcomes harvested into the following categories:

Capacity building: Includes training and awareness-raising activities which involved journalists, CSOs/CBOs, and KPCG members

²⁵ In outcome harvesting approach, the contribution of a change agent to an outcome or change can take various forms: through inspiring and encouraging taking or desisting from particular actions, facilitating and supporting direct action, persuading and pressuring the social actor to change (Ricardo, 2012). The aim of contribution analysis is to understand the pathways to change: who was involved? How? When? Why? These questions help to develop clear links between change and contribution. In assessing significance, the consultant paid attention to several variables, notably the context before the outcome, impact on people's lives, and the changed circumstances of the social actors.

Facilitation of forums/ meetings: These forums were conducted by the project and included National level conferences, consultative meetings with CCD, and county level outreach events conducted by TWGs.

Technical activities: These included development or participation in the development of strategies and policies, research, and analysis of policies.

Joint activities: Includes planning, financing and hosting of events such as NCPA organised jointly with national and county government entities.

During focus group discussions and key informant interviews, the respondents gave a score of five to eight out of ten contribution scores that were given to the project. Many stakeholders were of the view that the input of the project was significant for the realization of most of the outcomes harvested.

In many cases the Angaza Project was a main but not the only contributor of the outcomes²⁶ identified in this evaluation. Some of the outcomes of the Angaza projects contributed to involved other actors who collaborated in one way or the other to realize positive change. For example, KPCG and organizations in the TWGs, CSOs, COG, and other actors were instrumental and provided support in one way or another to the outcomes²⁷.

The outcomes are highly significant; they touch on the core national climate governance policies in Kenya. Matters relating to NCCAP II, National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and climate finance are utterly critical as NDC implementation commences in 2020 with anticipated revision and global stocktake. The outcomes generated were critical for a more concerted, collective approach towards climate change advocacy and engagement which has, in turn, exerted more influence with government agencies.

Assessed in terms of the volume of resources invested (funds, staff time, and technical support), there was medium to high contribution of the project to the outcomes harvested. On the other hand, all outcomes harvested were highly significant when viewed in the context of the project²⁸.

²⁶ In outcome harvesting approach, the contribution of a change agent to an outcome or change can take various forms: through inspiring and encouraging taking or desisting from particular actions, facilitating and supporting direct action, persuading and pressuring the social actor to change (Ricardo, 2012).

²⁷ Other contributors who were mentioned in the evaluation were Government agencies (CCD, MET, KIE; KEFRI, NDMA, National Treasury, CoG, County governments, etc); County CSOs; Journalists; KPCG members. Other NSAs mentioned as having been reached, collaborated or supported the project and therefore having some contribution to the outcomes harvested included ADS-Eastern, Child Fund Kenya, Troicaire, Caritas, Christian Aid, CARE Kenya, WWF, Farm Practice, Wote Youth Development Project, and Self Help Groups particularly in Kitui and Makueni counties and other counties reached.

²⁸. This finding was arrived at after the analysis of the opinions of the evaluation participants, as well as project narrative reports and stories of change collected by the project.

CHAPTER 4: PROJECT DESIGN, PERFORMANCE AND MANAGEMENT

4.1 Relevance and Design

The project design process, analysis of the problem and identification of actions were informed by a detailed context analysis that was supported by an inception period of three months whereby an intensive political economy analysis and a detailed Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI)²⁹ assessment were undertaken. The project had a strategic fit with PACJA's overall climate justice work and the need for strengthening CSOs' voice in climate change governance in Kenya at both national and county levels.

A Political Economy Analysis (PEA) was undertaken on the project. This revealed there had been the lack of a unified civil society voice that is capable of collectively articulating critical concerns, influencing issues and maintaining its watchdog status. This was largely being attributed to self-inflicted wounds by the civil society whose disagreements and intolerance to each other and lack of foresight had weakened their voice in national climate change governance processes. The PEA noted that in 2009 CSOs were a single, multi-sectoral, all-inclusive platform in but since then they have degenerated into various formations mostly based on their sectoral and thematic areas like gender, water, agriculture, marginalized groups, finance, governance, and faiths.

The objectives, activities, and results of the project focused on accountability and collective action of CSOs and other actors and were highly relevant to climate justice issues in Kenya and the work of PACJA. The project made noticeable efforts to provide for an avenue for CSOs to engage the government on access and modalities of climate finance, and to keep government accountable on the climate finance flows, through climate finance tracking within the government and communities. It engaged both state and non-state actors, including government ministries and departments, Council of Governors, development partners, international development agencies, Academia, Private Sector, and Civil Society.

The policy advocacy work of the project was aligned to current climate governance instruments including the NDCs, the National Climate Change Act, 2016, and the National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) I & II. Moreover, the project was aligned to the Deepening Democracy Programme's Theory of Change by focusing on collective action requiring engagement by multiple stakeholders, inside and outside of government. It also aligned with DDP's overall objective of enhancing more inclusive and accountable governance in Kenya through the electoral and non-electoral accountability pathways. Specifically, the climate change governance projects under the DDP aimed to strengthen

²⁹ GESI was a significant aspect that contributed positively to project implementation and achievement of objectives. It promoted the participation of all key interest groups during project implementation. For example, after reviewing the validation process for NCCAP (2013 – 2017), PACJA organised consultative meetings with CSOs, Youth groups, Women groups, and marginalized groups to ensure their voices were included in the NCCAP (2018 – 2022) validation process.

governance systems, citizen participation, and agency in the community to county-level decision making related to climate-resilient natural resources management.

4.2 Effectiveness

The project had one overall objective, one outcome, three results (outputs) and several activities. Available project M&E data indicate that the expected outputs and activities have been largely met.

The Angaza Project addressed issues of accountability and collective action by bringing together multiple CSOs networks on KPCG to work with other stakeholders including state and non-state actors in finding sustainable solutions to climate change and its impacts in Kenya, both at the county and national levels. Further, the project tackled the issue of accountability in the management of climate finance as a public good. It has solidified broad partnerships with key government entities including the National Treasury, NEMA, the Climate Change directorate and the University of Nairobi through Wangari Mathaai Institute of Peace and environmental studies.

A vast majority of the evaluation participants viewed the project favorably, observing that it made an important contribution to climate change matters especially improving CSOs' voice and engagement in CCG at the national level. The dominant view is that the project services are needed in Kenya because "no other development actor is doing serious climate change advocacy work at the national level". Words such as "thanks to PACJA" were common across the respondent categories, pointing to a widespread appreciation of the achievements of the project.

Box 2: Major achievements of the Angaza Project

- 1. Platforms:** Established the KPCG platform, with 5 thematic working groups which has positioned them at the center of climate change discourse at national and county levels. Platforms being developed and strengthened (KPCG and its TWGs), which led to enhanced and collective voice among CSOs on climate issues. CSOs became focused and actively participated in national-level climate change governance processes and policy development and were able to interact with key policymakers.
- 2. Climate change processes:** National conference on climate change in 2018 attended by all 47 counties of Kenya.
- 3. Government – CSOs relations:** Improved relations between CSOs and CCD leading to increased participation of CSOs in NCAP II (2018-2022) and collaboration in the preparation of pre-COP and post-COP activities. *Government actors (National Treasury, CCD, NEMA, and KIE) showed increased interest to work with and involve CSOs in climate change governance processes. They opened up space for CSOs in climate change discussions/engagements e.g. invited PACJA and KPCG to discussions on climate financing matters. They also tapped into the expertise of the project into their key processes/activities and kick-started some of the policy processes that had stalled e.g. the GCF strategy.*
- 4. Climate policies and laws:** Several policies and laws developed or contributed to national and county levels.
- 5. NSAs collective action and voice:** Communities and CSOs are taking action to mitigate their problems, such as the charcoal burning issue in Kitui and Makueni counties. Also increased public participation in CCG. Increase in recognition and practice of public participation in climate change governance processes

at county and community levels e.g. in Kitui and Makueni counties.

- 6. Linkages:** Some level of national – county linkages were established through outreach activities of TWGs leading to county-level policies and momentum on climate change issues e.g. in Samburu, Isiolo, Kitui and Makueni counties. Some of the *counties (Kitui and Makueni)* pursued linkages with relevant national-level officials and agencies such as climate finance department of the National Treasury, and CCD. It also contributed to better coordination among county CSOs for engagement with county governments.
- 7. Contribution to DDP programme goals:** Include contribution to IPF indicators, and some level of collaborative working with some of the DDP CCG partner projects e.g. in Samburu and Turkana counties.
- 8. Climate awareness, knowledge and response:** The project played a catalyst role, opened stakeholders' eyes on climate agenda, in many cases gave impetus to on-going work. Communities starting to understand their problems associated with climate change better; and taking actions to adapt to climate risks and impacts. A wide range of local climate adaption actions was carried out such as rainwater harvesting, livelihood activities, among others. The *Media (PAMAAC, Journalists)* gained knowledge and skills in climate change journalism and became more interested in climate change matters and wrote various climate change stories.
- 9. Gender and inclusion:** The project made efforts to include women, youth and marginalised groups in its activities.
- 10. Increased interest and involvement of the private sector in climate change matters:** The private sector (SMEs, KEPSA, etc) became more interested and involved in the project activities and climate change matters. They gained more knowledge on climate change matters through training workshops organised by the project.

However, the project did not create strong linkages in terms of supporting the cascading of national and county level climate policies and processes such as the National Climate Change Act 2016. This was due to inadequacies in project design especially sustainability measures that did not have adequate funding for the county outreach component. Even where TWGs reached out to some of the counties, limited funding constrained the ability to conduct effective follow-up activities including tracking of emerging outcomes.

While the project would have penetrated more counties (Kitui, Makueni, Isiolo, Marsabit, Uasin Gishu, Taita Taveta, Turkana, Samburu, and Tharaka Nithi) through the work of other DDP climate change governance partners, there was limited collaborative work with these partners. Some collaboration with DDP Partners was achieved only in Samburu and Turkana where the project worked with DDP projects implemented by Child Fund Kenya in the two counties. This gap and essentially a missed opportunity was an issue of lack of coordination as explained by one of the project stakeholders:

Lack of close working relationship between Angaza Project and DDP Partner projects in the counties was a missed opportunity. The other DDP partners were at the counties while Angaza operated at the national level. Even in counties where the project ventured and there were DDP Partners, not much contact and working together was achieved, pointing to a lack of coordination. There was a need to structure the DDP work better to promote national – county-level linkages through the projects. This would have expanded the impact and sustainability of Angaza Project work.

Concerns were raised by some of the project stakeholders that the project duration was short for realizing concrete results of national-level advocacy work that involve many actors and processes. Further, some of the project stakeholders noted that due to time constraints as a result of things beyond the control of the project, some of the project activities were rushed during the last 3 months of project implementation. Other stakeholders felt that important results and impact of the project will emerge only after the end of the project, yet these may not be fully monitored and immediately leveraged for longer-term impact.

4.3 Efficiency

Over two years, the project had a total budget of Ksh 38,000,000 Million which was fully donor contributed. There is evidence of linkages between budgets and outputs, and value for money. Although there were low staff numbers, with most of the work being undertaken by and the five TWGs, a lot had been achieved.

There had been regular budget amendments, almost every year during the evaluated period. The amendments were made to take care of activities that had not been done; hence re-allocation of funds was justifiable. There are several notable under-expenditures in the financial reports, due to delays in implementation of planned activities.

The burn rate for the first year of the project was low with the main reasons for variance being delays and slow implementation of the government activities which were unpredictable and unreliable. Some of the activities planned jointly with the government or depending on the cooperation of government departments did not take place in time or were delayed because of government bureaucracy. For instance, the NCCAP 2018-2022 had been launched officially at the time of the evaluation thus making it impossible for the project to assess the incorporation of the platform's inputs and further engage in the implementation process.

The project faced several challenges related to its design; it was largely organized along legislative and policy framework of the government due to unpredictability of implementation plans by the government and the multiplicity of actors within the larger Kenyan governance system. In some instances, the project was prone to politics related to the constitution of the National Climate Change Council (NCCC). Aligning activity plans to unpredictable government plans proved a difficult leading to frequent rescheduling or even canceling of some jointly planned activities. Some activities planned jointly with the government or depending on the cooperation of government departments did not take place in time or have been greatly delayed because of the unpredictability of government operations. The project used adaptive project management methodology, and substantial changes in work plan execution happened in the course of implementation. In all cases of change, authorization was sought from DDP and the revised and approved work plans guided the implementation.

Several cost-efficiency mechanisms were employed in the Angaza Project. These included the following:

- Splitting the budget for activity enabled consultations with stakeholders to be achieved thus deepening participation and inputs into the climate policy processes. For example, budget line on “CSOs strategy workshop on engagement with State Actors on Climate Change Act 2016 and implementation of NCCAP 2018 – 2022” was used to support three separate workshops for inputs in the NCCAP 2018 – 2022 organized in partnership with the Ministry of Environment & Forestry/ Climate Change Directorate: Youth consultative meeting, Marginalized communities consultative meeting, and gender consultative meeting.
- Collaboration with key partners such as Trocaire, CARE Kenya within the Climate Finance Thematic Working and SNV within the Gender, youth and marginalized Groups thematic working groups outreaches enhanced broad participation in CSOs in key processes such as GCF conversations, and input in NCCAP 2018-2022. Smaller in-group training were customized to the needs of the groups and enhanced member participation, and these formed a better foundation for future capacity building workshops involving all groups together.
- PACJA’s procurement policy was adhered to and procurement processes have recently been strengthened and staff trained.
- Percentages of overhead and programmatic costs have been adhered to as reflected in the project budget.

4.4 Sustainability

The project’s sustainability was assessed by focusing on financial, institutional and benefits sustainability dimensions³⁰. Although there was a lack of documented sustainability plan, the project documents indicate that PACJA committed to pursuing the sustainability of the Momentum Committee (KPCG) as a priority matter. Also, PACJA plans to support the committee in the coming five years through alternative resources to enable it to pursue its agenda beyond 2019. Despite this commitment, the financial sustainability of the Angaza Project is uncertain because there was no dedicated funding had been secured by PACJA at the time of the evaluation.

Some level of institutional sustainability of project gains beyond the life of the project was noted. One important aspect was a strong emphasis on diversity of KPCG membership which was cascaded up to the county level. The formation of thematic working groups also ensures that members found value in their engagement with KPCG. Another important aspect of institutional sustainability was good strategic leadership and coordination at PACJA. There is also a cordial and effective working relationship between PACJA and KPCG and TWGs.

³⁰ The financial sustainability looked at the ability of PACJA and KPCG to continue financing similar project interventions beyond 2019 and in absence of the donor support. Institutional sustainability was examined in terms of the relevance of the project activities to the key stakeholders who may then be expected to continue programme work post-project period. This dimension also looked at the extent to which the Angaza Project has formed strong collaborative partnerships and networks with other actors with interest in climate justice work. The benefits sustainability was assessed at two levels; the likelihood of project stakeholder groups continuing having interest in and possibly utilizing the services and benefits provided by the project if these were still available post-2019; and the probability of these services and benefits continuing to flow if the donor funding stopped.

The services and benefits provided by the project have long term appeal to CSOs and other stakeholder groups as they address core issues of climate change which remains a major challenge in Kenyan society. As such, it is highly likely that the project stakeholder groups, especially the KCPG and county government officials and departments that are responsible for climate change, environment and NRM issues will continue having interest in and utilizing the services and benefits provided by the project. These sentiments were expressed by stakeholders involved in Kitui and Makueni counties. Also, journalists indicated they will continue to engage with climate change issues in their work.

The government officials at the national level, especially the CCD mentioned a willingness to continue engaging PACJA and KPCG in their climate change activities. What is not clear, is the extent to which the willingness of stakeholders to carry on the initiated engagement the structures, systems, and gains will be upheld, monitored and built on in the absence of support from PACJA.

Overall, the sustainability of the project will be influenced by the activities that PACJA, KPCG, TWGs, and government actors undertake during the post-project period. Changes in the national and county level context will have some influence on the scale of climate justice work that PACJA and its partners are likely to undertake at national and sub-national levels.

4.5 M&E Practice

The project had an M&E plan, risk management and mitigation measures developed at the design of the project and updated every quarter. There were various monitoring and evaluation opportunities and events built into the project M&E system. These included project monitoring visits by DDP, KCPG meetings, and quarterly donor reporting. The project staff had monthly meetings to discuss achievements, challenges, and plans and these meetings provide opportunities for reflective learning. Project staff also participated in grant learning events organised by DDP.

The project M&E documentation reviewed in the evaluation, notably the donor reports, minutes of the project stakeholder meetings, stories of change, were found to be useful sources of information on the project.

However, the evaluation noted several weaknesses in the M&E practice which PACJA should consider when designing and implementing future projects. Firstly, there was a lack of adequate follow up of county outreach activities or capacity building activities organized for the journalists. There were notable positive developments that occurred from these activities, yet these were not adequately monitored and hence not captured in the project's records. The M&E component was disrupted severally by high staff turnover in the project.

4.6 Gender and Social Inclusion

The outcomes harvested show that different special groups such as youth and women actively participated in the project and that the project was sensitive to the issues of gender and social

inclusion. In particular, gender and special groups considerations were taken into account during the design and formulation of NCCAP 2018-2022. After reviewing the validation process for NCCAP (2013 – 2017), PACJA organised consultative meetings with CSOs and marginalised groups to ensure their voices were included in the NCCAP (2018 – 2022) validation process. Among key priority areas for the 2018-2022 NCCAP are a disaster risk management, food, and nutrition security. The inputs from the marginalised groups shaped the actions under these two priority areas as well as ensuring NCCAP integrates a gender perspective and proposed ways for effective youth participation in adaptation and mitigation

Further, social inclusion was achieved in the process of development and validation of in-depth gender analysis in the context of NDC, CSOs engagement and coordination framework for implementation of NCCAP 2018-2022, National Post and pre-COPs Consultative Workshops where through Angaza project all key social interest representing all genders within state and non-state actor sectors actively participated.

The CSO's Engagement and Coordination Framework for implementation of NCCAP 2018-2022 (NDC) was validated on 21st August 2019. KPCG Working group in Collaboration with Climate Change Directorate (CCD), Trocaire, SNV and county stakeholders held one-day meeting to validate this important document. This event attracted 36 participants in which 25 were males while 11 were females. 60% of the participants were below 35 years while 40% of the participants were above 35 years.

The Angaza Project pursued gender mainstreaming, equality and social inclusion by creating a specific thematic working group of KPCG targeting Gender, youth, and marginalized groups. The project conducted outreach and target other CSOs working on Gender and Climate Change Working Group with a clear advocacy strategy. The thematic working group provided guidelines for gender mainstreaming for each working group.

The Gender Youth and Marginalized thematic working group closely worked with the Ministry of Environment through Climate Change Directorate on in-depth Gender analysis in the context of Kenyan NDCs. One of the most successful gender and social inclusion activities in the project happened during the development of NCCAP 2018-2022. Unlike the previous process (NCCAP (2013 – 2017), CSOs, Youth, and Marginalised communities had a better opportunity to directly provide their inputs through consultative meetings conducted for the three groups through a partnership between the Angaza Project and the CCD. Three separate consultative meetings were organized for the three groups with experts and community representatives from different counties being invited to review the draft documents and provide key recommendations touching on various issues affecting the groups.

4.7 Partnerships and relationships with key stakeholders

PACJA lived up to its reputation as a respected and influential continental coalition of climate justice actors by emphasizing effective partnership working in the Angaza Project. A wide range of social actors was involved in the project as direct targets for influencing or partners and supporters in bringing about the desired changes. These social actors

included government agencies (CCD, County governments, Council of Governors, MET, KEFRI, KFS, KIE, NDMA, NEMA, and the Presidency/NCCC), NSAs (CSOs at national and county level), coalitions (KPCG and county-level networks), Journalists, donor (DDP), DDP CG Partners, among others³¹.

The levels of engagement with the different stakeholders varied, but overall the project has been successful in uniting various agencies and organizations around advancing and advocating for solutions in climate change. This allowed for a more concerted, collective approach towards climate change advocacy and engagement which has, in turn, exerted more influence on climate change policy processes.

Review of project and donor reports as well as field data shows there was a cordial and good working relationship between the project team and other key stakeholders. The multi stakeholder's engagement at different levels enabled the needed synergy and support for the work of the project. There were an appreciation and respect for the project and a supportive relationship with key stakeholders. The relationship with the donor was good and was characterized by mutual respect.

Interviews with KPCG and other stakeholders involved in the project implementation appreciated PACJA for giving them the "space" to operate in the project. The use of a collaborative model with KPCG organisations helped to achieve efficient implementation of planned activities. The widespread view among the project staff, M&E reports and other stakeholders involved in this evaluation indicated that the project was implemented transparently.

Some of the stakeholders (mainly CSOs, journalists and county government officials involved in this evaluation) were concerned that the project did not make sufficient follow up of its activities, pointing that the project team planned and implemented activities but made little follow up work as well lacked coordination and collaboration with other DDP CCG grantees. Also, there were concerns that the project did not contribute significantly to climate change integration, climate change knowledge and local adaptive capacity in counties it reached because it did not work more closely with other DDP CCG partner projects in those counties. This represented a limitation of the project in terms of achieving significant national – county-level linkages in climate laws and policies and climate financing. Also, the Angaza Project was implemented in a detached manner from other DDP Climate change governance projects hence there was limited cross-learning and collaborative work.

Box 3: Stakeholder views on the Angaza Project

The project was relevant and it achieved a lot viewed in the context of climate change impacts in Kenya, and lack of unified and collective voice and actions of CSOs on climate matters at policy.

The project was the only one among the DDP climate change governance partner projects that had a

³¹ Other NSAs mentioned as having been reached, collaborated or supported the project included ADS-Eastern, Child Fund Kenya, Caritas, Christian Aid, CARE Kenya, WWF, Europe Aid, Farm Practice, Wote Youth Development Project, and Self Help Groups particularly in Kitui and Makueni counties.

national focus. Therefore, its work and focus remain relevant even during the post-project period.

The KPCG is the most important output of the project. Its activities should be better funded and upscaled to have CSO membership across all the counties and with a lean but efficient national secretariat. This will enable CSOs in Kenya to speak with one voice, coordinate and network better, pool resources and build each other's capacity through KPCG as a national coordination mechanism CSOs working on climate change governance.

PACJA gave the KPCG "space" and respect to operate in the project as there was no undue pressure but an effort to create a good working relationship.

The project management and staff were respectful and paid attention to suggestions made by the donor in reports and feedback.

Angaza Project made a significant contribution to DDP objectives, especially on the IPF indicators, initiating collective climate governance actions, influencing climate policy at the national level, and being able to convene and work effectively with climate actors (including CSOs) at the national level.

The achievements of the project are many and important and should be properly documented and shared beyond PACJA and DDP.

The project design and implementation should have allowed stronger collaboration with other DDP climate change governance partners' projects at the county level through the work of the KPCG and TWGs.

Angaza Project should have pursued stronger national – county linkages in climate work to increase the impact and sustainability of its advocacy work. It should have done more county level rather than inadequate outreach activities to a few counties yet these were not properly funded.

PACJA should consider doing more awareness-raising on national and global climate commitments and actions especially the NDCs so that they are better placed to monitor and audit its implementation.

The project should have had activities targeting special interest groups particularly women and marginalized communities concerning their voices in implementation and monitoring of the NCCAP 2018 – 2022 and the NAP nationally and in counties.

Although PACJA engages largely in climate advocacy, it should consider supporting practical actions/pilot projects on climate issues at county and community levels, perhaps through CSOs.

The project duration was short and hence the results will occur after the closure of the project.

Heavily policy and advocacy-based projects such as the Angaza project need to conduct capacity development activities for core staff and implementing partners on policy influencing and communication. This includes capacity development for KPCG which is a critical structure for the continuity of Angaza's achievements during the post-project period.

PACJA should address issues that resulted in high staff turnover for the Angaza Project. It is also important that roles and responsibilities in project management be clarified and give staff titles that are commensurate to work done.

The project needed to have adequate tracking and follow up of activities and outcomes.

The recommendations from the various studies conducted by the project should be implemented in future projects.

DDP did not balance the funding well because it gave a small amount first and then came and upscaled

the work plan which constrained the ability of the project to spend the budget on time.

We thought the project would support us (journalists) to publish stories and even do documentaries but this was not forthcoming; communication with the project team was scanty.

4.8 Factors that enhanced or hindered the performance of the project

Enablers

- Robust climate change policies, legal framework and institutions (Climate change act 2016; NDCs; CCD; and National climate change council).
- Cooperation and support of stakeholder groups including Government actors (CCD, MET, KIE, CoG, National Treasury; CSOs; and Journalists).
- DDP Programme (CCG Partner projects in the counties; lessons learning; on-going programme support).
- Role of KPCG and its five thematic working groups (member of KCPG; CSOs; networks).
- Role of PACJA (other on-going climate projects; wide experience in climate advocacy; networking ability).

Challenges and areas for improvement

Financial constraints: Funds were not adequate to cater for all activities of the project. For example, there was a little allocation for KPCG and TWGs and hence were not able to undertake substantial outreach work in the counties. Also, the project operated with a constrained M&E capacity due to inadequate funds to support M&E activities at the county level. Staff development needs could not also be adequately met.

Human resources: The project had few staff in the beginning and most of the core staff had left the project in the course of the implementation period. This contributed to a low burn rate is particularly 2018.

Short project period: The project was implemented for two years, which the evaluation results showed to be short for realising and sustaining climate change governance changes pursued by the project.

Unpredictable Government plans and bureaucracy: Some activities planned jointly with the government or depending on the cooperation of government departments did not take place on time or were delayed because of the unpredictability of government operations. A good example is activities under Output 2 on Climate finance, where the National treasury delayed the whole process of launching Climate Fund regulations 2018 hence affecting training on budget coding tracking and reporting process. Aligning activity plans to unpredictable government plans proved a difficult leading to frequent rescheduling, restructuring or cancelling of some jointly planned activities.

CHAPTER 5: GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED

5.1 Good Practices

Network development: To build the Kenya Platform on Climate Governance, the project reached out to multiple networks in different sectors to have a platform truly representative of multi-sectoral, cross-cutting and trans-disciplinary interests; this enhances the quality of deliberations and policy outputs and outcomes which is good for national climate governance. By strengthening the CSO platform for climate governance into a wide-based, inclusive, structured and focused platform for climate policy advocacy and influence, the project promoted inclusive participation as good practice for the CSO oversight mandate.

Partnerships and collaboration: PACJA collaborated with State and Non-State actors on the implementation of strategies and activities leading to different outputs and outcomes. Examples include the National Climate Change Governance Conference which was planned and executed by the project in collaboration with the Council of Governors and the Ministry of Environment. Others are the National Post-Cop 24 stakeholders' consultative workshop organized by the project in partnership with the Ministry of Environment and Forestry/ Climate Change Directorate and other organizations to review the outcome of the Katowice Climate Change Conference, COP 24 and its implication to country climate governance and policy processes. The project collaborated with National Treasury Facilitating CSOs and private sector to input to Climate Change Budgeting and Coding (CCBC) manual developed by National Treasury in collaboration with Climate Change Directorate (CCD). The Gender thematic working group collaborated with the Climate Change Directorate in influencing CSO inputs in-depth gender analysis in the context of NDC which targets three main sectors Energy, Water, and Agriculture. This collaboration was used as a learning forum regarding NCCAP 2018-2022 priority areas dealing with gender equity in climate governance.

Capacity building: As the KPCG kept growing with new membership and networks, the platform realized that not all members had the same capacity for policy advocacy and governance in climate change. Capacity building through training and participation in key meetings was thus employed as a strategy to fill this gap. Apart from the Angaza Project, several other projects at PACJA had different capacity building opportunities that were utilized to train KPCG members on aspects such as climate information systems and climate resilience. The project team restructured the in-group capacity building training sessions to have monthly training sessions for the whole platform based on a properly structured curriculum on climate governance.

Participatory, evidence-based policy influence and engagement: Through collaboration with academia and research institutions as well as making use of various individual experts, the project conducted successful research on climate finance and climate policy in Kenya, which was useful in generating findings to support evidence-based policy influence.

Developing rights and evidence-based advocacy strategy: KPCG developed a clear advocacy strategy that highlighted the advocacy goals and how to achieve them. The advocacy strategy was used by the platform as a guideline in its advocacy activities hence making the platform more effective. The use of rights and evidence-based advocacy strategy promoted a lobby and advocacy strategy that is based on law, where CSOs and citizens demand and claim their rights while offering solutions rather than mere complaints to the duty bearers. The strategy was non-confrontational. This further enhanced cooperation and collaborative working with these entities.

Non-confrontational policy influencing: Overall, the project used a non-confrontation approach to engage and influence positive action among government actors which improved relations and cooperation. Improved relations between the CSO platform (KCPG) and State, and also with Non-State actors enabled it to influence climate change policy and accountability and collaborate in planning and executing key activities such as the National Climate Governance Conference in 2018³².

Adaptive programme: The project used adaptive project management methodology, and substantial changes in work plan execution happened in the course of implementation in response to the external and internal context of the project. In all cases of revision and amendments to work plans, adequate consultations were made with other key stakeholders and authorization sought from the donor. In this way, the project was implemented transparently and collaboratively.

5.2 Lessons Learned

- **County-level climate outreach is core to effective climate governance:** With devolution, climate action has moved to the local level at the counties where most of the climate governance initiatives are expected to take root. The Kenya CSO Platform on Climate Governance thematic working groups focused their outreach and advocacy activities to eight counties (Uasin Gishu, Kitui, Makueni, Embu, Taita Taveta, Isiolo, Marsabit and TharakaNithi) where they targeted county government officials and local CSOs to push for various climate policies and actions or to build their capacity through knowledge and information sharing. Although the outreaches went well, there was a lack of follow-up of the activities beyond the initial contact. This was attributed to the fact that many activities were focused on the national level and not the county level.
- **Building relationships with state and state actors is an enabler of climate actions:** During the implementation, building relationships at the individual level and institutional level with both state and non-state actors worked as an enabler for engagement and partnership. This included collaboration with state actors to enable

³² The conference was principally organized and hosted by Angaza Project, Council of Governors, and the Climate Change Directorate to chart the way forward on county-level implementation of climate response policies and plans including the NDCs, NAP and the new NCCAP (2018 – 2022).

scaling of activities that would otherwise have small outputs/outcomes to have greater magnitude and produce stronger, more credible policy outcomes. Although this was successful, some activities planned jointly with the government or depending on the cooperation of government departments did not take place on time and in some instances were greatly delayed because of bureaucracy in government operations. Aligning activity plans to unpredictable government plans proved difficult leading to frequent rescheduling or even canceling of some jointly planned activities.

- **Collaboration and partnership building:** Collaborating with the Climate Change Directorate, National Treasury Finance Unit, NEMA to build the capacity of County governments and local CSOs on effective implementation of the National Adaptation Plan, Climate Finance governance and Nationally Determined Contributions was crucial in mainstreaming National policies to CIDPs. Despite complications in joint planning and joint implementation of major activities with key stakeholders, both non-state and state actors such as the Climate Change Directorate was essential for Climate Governance outcomes to be effectively realized. Addressing climate change effects cannot be successful if undertaken in silos by different actors. Rather, collaboration and partnership building with all players is important especially in the implementation of NDCs.
- **Need to address project challenges, including those on sustainability early enough in the project cycle.** Thinking through sustainability issues at the project design and implementation stage and not towards the end of the project is critical for ensuring the project gains can be continued beyond donor funding.

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Conclusions

The Angaza Project contributed positively towards changing the original situation captured in the project proposal and by the baseline status report of 2017³³. This included the fact that CSOs had degenerated into various formations mostly based on their sectoral and thematic areas which undermined the civil society-led catalytic role in influencing change. The project made an important contribution towards addressing this gap by enhancing climate change governance at the national level through increased coordination among non-state actors so that they can engage and advocate for a transparent, accountable, participatory climate response mechanisms.

The outcomes contributed by the project were highly significant as they addressed the core needs among the targeted social actors and general climate justice context that were identified at the project design and by the political economy analysis conducted at the beginning of the project implementation. The most notable changes contributed by the project involved increased CSOs' engagement in climate change policy matters at the national level attesting to successes of the project in CSOs organizing and strengthening as a credible voice for climate advocacy strengthen the CSOs capacity. Other changes were achieved concerning activities around ensuring there were accountable climate change policy processes; and climate finance monitoring and tracking. Several outcomes were also realized at the county level through the outreach activities of the KPCG and its five thematic working groups.

The project contributed to outcomes identified in this evaluation through various approaches, notably facilitation of civic engagement and public participation, capacity development and technical knowledge enhancement of CSOs, joint actions and collaborative efforts with government agencies, lobbying, and advocacy of key relevant government ministries to advance a common agenda on climate governance.

The project was a relevant and beneficial intervention that was in line with the needs and priorities of CSOs engagement in CCG in Kenya, and had a strategic fit with PACJA's and DDP's goal for enhanced CCG in Kenya. Its work is properly aligned with PACJA's and DDP's programmatic goal for improved climate change governance in Kenya. It focused on critical climate governance legal instruments that are shaping the discourse on national level climate actions.

The project met the objectives and targets set out in the logframe to a large extent³⁴. It also used the available resources responsibly in pursuit of the desired results. The institutional

³³ This refers to the Political economy analysis report.

³⁴ The evaluation results show that broader outcome level changes pursued by the project were at various emergent states and hence not fully developed, especially concerning national policies and policies. For example, the National Treasury is yet to finalize on the draft climate finance regulations to enable the establishment of the national climate change fund which is linked to the ongoing work of on county climate change fund mechanisms. Also, the National Climate Change Council is yet to be properly constituted and to commence its sittings.

arrangements for implementing the project were appropriate although several challenges were encountered and these led to the underutilisation of project budget and delays in project activities particularly during 2018.

Gender and social inclusion were undertaken throughout the project implementation period. In particular, there was direct targeting of youth and marginalized groups CSOs working on climate change governance. This led to the formation of the Gender and Climate Change Working Group and development of a gender and climate change advocacy strategy. Also, gender equality was deliberately promoted in all activities of the Angaza Project and monitored every quarter.

The achievements of the project were aided by a variety of factors, most importantly what emerges to be the wide experience and networking ability of PACJA in climate justice matters. Its use of rights-based and non-confrontation approach when engaging with government officials at national and county levels improved their cooperation and participation in the project.

Although there is the existence of the KPCG and PACJA's expressed commitment to make efforts to seek dedicated funding that can support the gains of the Angaza Project, there is uncertainty regarding the financial sustainability of the interventions and benefits of the Angaza Project without continued financial support. Project sustainability is one of the main challenges PACJA might grapple with during the post-project period.

The project demonstrates numerous best practices, such as participatory, evidence-based policy influence and engagement, which should be replicated by other climate change governance actors including government and NSAs in Kenya, and beyond. However, the project's numerous best practices are yet to be documented comprehensively in a form that can be utilised widely beyond PACJA.

On balance, the Angaza Project has been a successful climate change governance intervention. It represents an important contribution towards ensuring that CSOs have a unified voice and took collective action in advocating and influencing decision making processes at national and sub-national levels in Kenya.

6.2 Recommendations

Four key recommendations emerge from the evaluation findings and conclusions. These are at both strategic and practical levels and are addressed to PACJA and other key stakeholders of the Angaza Project or similar interventions. These recommendations revolve around potential future work, project design, implementation and management arrangements, and sustainability issues.

Recommendation 1: Develop a follow-up intervention to consolidate the gains of the Angaza Project. This is important for boosting the momentum of KPCG, TWGs, CSOs, journalists and other key stakeholders reached by this project; and for upscaling the work of the project from national to county levels. There is a strong relevance of the project interventions, marked by expressed high demand for its services at both national and

county levels. The results of the Angaza project have only started emerging and these should be supported to take root. The work of PACJA, and Angaza Project, in particular, has been the main CSO intervention engaging in climate change justice issues at the national level. This work is still needed and the existence of KPCG makes PACJA an important player. Further funding will enable the PACJA to consolidate the gains so far made; tightening the loose ends such as sustainability; scaling up advocacy especially at county levels; and building a critical mass of climate change actors (at national and county levels) to take climate change governance work to the next level. The abrupt end of donor funding will greatly affect KPCG activities. Also, the work of the project is yet to take root in the counties. Potential activities for the new intervention include the following workstreams:

- (a)** Raising awareness on climate change including national and global climate commitments and actions especially among the CSOs and grassroots communities. Currently, information on all developed policy documents and legislations is scattered all-over singular different documents. Also, different sectors (such as forest, agriculture, and energy) have their policy guidelines that add to the melee. This evaluation recommends a comprehensive long-term training manual on climate governance in Kenya to all non-state actors should be developed to comprehensively address governance and policy influence opportunities. The NDC is an international commitment with significant domestic implications yet it is not well understood by CSOs. There is a need to create more awareness amongst non-state actors on NDCs so that they are better placed to monitor and audit its implementation. This can be done in partnership with relevant government institutions such as the NCCC and CCD, and international partners and donors.
- (b)** Ensuring direct targeting of marginalized and special interest groups in climate work: There is a need to increase focus on activities targeting special interest groups particularly women and marginalized communities to enhance their role in the implementation and monitoring of the NCCAP 2018 – 2022 and the NAP nationally and in counties. The marginalized and special interest groups need to understand how the national and county governments operate if they are to effectively engage with them to influence policy.
- (c)** Developing stronger national – county linkages: Develop activities that cultivate stronger national – county linkages in climate work. This is important for increasing the impact and sustainability of climate justice work for any organization. PACJA’s nation-wide climate justice projects should allow in the design for development for the development of strong national and county linkages.
- (d)** Addressing the immediate needs of stakeholders through practical climate actions (pilot projects) within the counties reached. While Angaza’s advocacy work was highly appreciated by stakeholders and useful, there were concerns at the County level that it lacked practical actions that addressed urgent climate change issues faced by county and county actors. Many stakeholders felt that its purely “software” focus was inadequate.

- (e) Follow-up work on the National Climate Change Council (NCCC): NCCC is an important engagement mechanism, yet CSOs feel that the CSO representative position is presently not well constituted. The contestation of the NCCC constitution is still in court and therefore the CSOs should not lose momentum but continue to agitate for the right membership. Further to this, non-state actors must push for finalization of the formation process and immediate convening of the first NCCC meeting.
- (f) GCF application Process: Collaboration between KPCG finance working group has established a taskforce in all Kenyan economic blocks to develop feasible projects on behalf of all counties. These groups require extra support to finish this important process that will address key climate challenges at the county level. With the improved relationship between KPCG and National Treasury, there is an opportunity to work more with the CSOs to develop a tool for tracking non-state actors Climate finance flows. Also, there is a need to facilitate the Climate Finance working group to work with Treasury climate finance unit, National Implementing Entity and the climate change directorate to develop a simplified guideline on access to climate finance and related accountability mechanisms in Kenya based on the new climate finance policy and regulations.
- (g) Supporting the role of SMEs in the implementation of NDCs and key government interventions: SMEs will play an important role in implementing (NCCAP 2018-2022) and helping Kenya achieve its NDCs target. There is a need to support the Technology Thematic working group to continue engaging Small Medium Enterprise (SMEs) through Kenya Industrial Estate (KIE) in practical actions towards implementing climate policies in Kenya especially Green Economy Strategy Implementation Plan (GESIP).
- (h) Support monthly dialogue forums for climate change governance bringing together State actors and non-state actors (CSOs, Private Sector, and Trade Unions) with focus on mainstreaming climate policies and plans in implementation of the government plans especially Big 4 Agenda.
- (i) Support Climate Finance Thematic Working Group to work with other partners including Treasury climate finance unit, Climate Change Directorate and Council of Governors to build the capacity of County governments, CSOs, and Private Sector on access and management of climate finance. Climate finance transparency and accountability remains a potential area that should be exploited to achieve Climate governance in Kenya. This will also involve the development of Green Climate Fund (GCF) bankable projects for economic blocks in Kenya to enhance the resilience of vulnerable communities at the local level.

Recommendation 2: Strengthen the design of future projects. This can be achieved by instituting the following measures:

- a) Design and finance activities that have a greater focus on the counties. This includes implementing a bottom-up advocacy approach that is informed by the needs of the counties and cascade climate policy reports to the counties. This is also informed by the reporting requirements of the National Climate Change Act, 2016, and the shift of focus from development to implementation of NCCAP 2018 -2022 which is highly anchored on the county actions. Furthermore, this is also justified by the regular global stocktake for NDCs that will be required from the county level upward from 2020.
- b) Although PACJA engages more in climate advocacy, it may help to consider ways of supporting practical actions/pilot projects on climate issues at county and community levels, perhaps through effective Partnership arrangements with CSOs.
- c) Consider the project cycle for future climate change governance projects with heavy advocacy and policy influencing work to run for 3 - 5 years to ensure changes can be realized during the project period and sustainability mechanisms put in place.
- d) Develop realistic project budgets that support smooth project implementation. This includes an adequate budget for the M&E function, capacity building activities, and sustainability initiatives.

Recommendation 3: Strengthen the sustainability of future climate change governance projects. Specific measures include the following:

- a) Plan project sustainability early enough in the project cycle. This should be followed by the development and implementation of a clear exit and sustainability plan.
- b) Review and support the implementation of sustainability measures that have been identified in the sustainability plan.
- c) PACJA should initiate discussion and efforts towards the financial and institutional sustainability of KPCG.

Recommendation 4: Strengthen implementation and management arrangements.

Specific measures include the following:

- a) Continue working collaboratively with national and sub-national organisations including CSOs and policymakers on climate change governance and climate resilience issues at national and sub-national levels.
- b) Work more with the media/journalists. There is a need to continue supporting journalists to report Climate Governance processes because they play an important role in simplifying the language used and the policy processes and implementation.
- c) Undertake capacity development initiatives for staff and key stakeholder groups such as on advocacy skills, policy influencing and communication, and on effective CCG approaches.
- d) Implement measures that promote staff capacity, retention, and motivation which include improved staff welfare and working environment. Further, ensure that roles and responsibilities in project management are clear. For example, staff who manage projects could be given clear titles such as "Project Manager" rather than

“project officer” which do not accurately reflect their actual roles and responsibilities.

- e) Enhance M&E practice. There is a need to adequately track and follow up of activities and outcomes, and have adequately resourced M&E system in terms of staffing and finances. Also, there is a need to develop and implement appropriate M&E systems. For instance, an M&E system that utilizes the outcome harvesting approach as a core component would have been more appropriate for the Angaza Project.
- f) Improve knowledge management and learning. There is a need to put mechanisms for strengthening organizational learning and knowledge management practices. This may require integrating knowledge management with the M&E function in the post-2019 work and ensure that learning is a core theme in all implementation processes. Also, information about the project needs to be properly documented and kept and recommendations from studies undertaken during project implementation be implemented. If funds allow, PACJA should document and replicate best practices and lessons learned and share these widely as an advocacy and awareness-raising tool.

ANNEXES

1. Terms of Reference
2. Project Logframe
3. Documents reviewed
4. Angaza Project Outcomes
5. Data Collection Tools



Some of the Participants of the First-ever National Climate Governance Conference in Kenya held at Safari Park Hotel, Nairobi, Kenya. October 2018.