

Project Evaluation Series

**Final Evaluation of the project
“Strengthening Institutionalized
Subnational Coordination Structures
and Harmonization Mechanisms” in
Ethiopia**

Project code: GCP/ETH/089/EC

Annex 4. Terms of reference

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2020**

Contents

Acronyms and abbreviations	iii
1. Background and Context of the Project/Program	4
1.1 Introduction.....	4
1.2 Background.....	4
1.3 Results achieved.....	7
2. Evaluation purpose.....	8
3. Evaluation scope	9
4. Evaluation objective and key questions	10
4.1 Evaluation questions	10
5. Methodology.....	13
6. Roles and responsibilities	14
7. Evaluation team composition and profile.....	15
8. Evaluation products (deliverables)	16
9. Evaluation timeframe	17
Appendix 1. Self-reported results of the project	18
Appendix 2. Quality assessment grid	20

Acronyms and abbreviations

BH	Budget holder
CPF	Country Programming Framework
EM	Evaluation Manager
EOI	Expression of Interest
ET	Evaluation team
ETL	Evaluation team leader
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FPMIS	Field Project Management Information System
FR	Follow-up Report
LTO	Lead technical officer
LTU	Lead technical unit
MR	Management Response
OED	FAO Office of Evaluation
PC	Programme Committee
PEC	Project Evaluation Coordinator
PTF	Project Task Force
SO	FAO Strategic Objective
SRO	Sub-regional office
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference

1. Background and Context of the Project/Program

1.1 Introduction

1. This document outlines the terms of reference for the final evaluation of the project GCP/ETH/089/EC – “Strengthening Institutionalized Subnational Coordination Structures and Harmonization Mechanisms”, implemented by FAO and funded under the European Union “Supporting Horn of Africa Resilience” (SHARE) programme.

1.2 Background

Title: Strengthening Institutionalized Subnational Coordination Structures and Harmonization Mechanisms

FAO Project ref: GCP/ETH/089/EC SHARE

Contribution Agreement Reference Number: European Union EDF/2014/354-294

Project Budget: 2.5 Million Euros (100% EU contribution)

Duration: 19 December 2014 – Currently ends on the 19 June 2019 (original duration: 35 months + two no-cost extensions of 12 and 7 months)

The European Union SHARE programme

2. Following the 2011 drought in the Horn of Africa, a new initiative "Supporting Horn of Africa Resilience – SHARE" was launched by the EU to advance food security, sustainable agriculture and resilience in the Horn of Africa. The SHARE programme is a joint initiative of the humanitarian and development services of the Commission. It aims at addressing drought resilience through a combined humanitarian and development approach. The strategic objective of the SHARE programme is to contribute to addressing the underlying causes of food insecurity through integrated actions and by Linking Relief, Rehabilitation and Development (LRRD) to support the sustainable livelihoods of the vulnerable rural population in drylands and agro-pastoral areas of the Horn of Africa.
3. Resilience building is a long-term commitment that needs to be firmly embedded in national policies and strategies, and should be well integrated in the overall development process. The emergence of the resilience-building agenda following the 2011 food crisis in the Horn of Africa offers an opportunity to move from the historical division between long-term development and short-term emergency programming, to a more holistic, integrated and complementary approach for tackling the root causes of recurrent crises.
4. In line with the framework of the overall SHARE programme, the SHARE Ethiopia programme – *Accelerating Resilience Capacity* (ARC-E) in Southern and Eastern Ethiopia – aims to enhance drought resilience and food and nutrition security. SHARE Ethiopia strategically links development interventions to short-term humanitarian action, in line with LRRD principles.
5. The SHARE Ethiopia programme (total Euro 50 million) is part of the on-going EU Ethiopia Resilience Building Programme (RESET), covering a number of complementary actions with funding above Euro 240 million since 2013 to address the recurrent humanitarian needs and long-term aspirations of approximately 2.8 million vulnerable people in eight

geographical clusters, located in five regional states (Amhara, Afar, Somali, Oromia and SNNPR).

The project

6. The “Strengthening Institutionalized Sub-national Coordination Structures and Harmonization Mechanisms” project is one of the components of the SHARE programme with the specific objective of establishing effective sub-national coordination structures and harmonization mechanisms (covering both relief and development) with linkages to grass root and federal level coordination structures. The project attempts to strengthen coordination mechanisms at cluster, zonal, regional, and federal levels and especially the links between them. The project is expected to offer the Government and development partners including FAO an opportunity to contribute to aid effectiveness, effective coordination and information sharing among stakeholders at zonal, regional and federal levels structures to avoid duplication of efforts/overlapping and enhancing complementarities and synergies.
7. The overarching goal of the project is to enhance the drought resilience and food and nutrition security of vulnerable populations in southern and eastern Ethiopia.
8. The specific objective of this project is to support and reinforce the existing coordination mechanisms at the regional states and zonal administration levels and particularly enhance linkages between short-term humanitarian interventions and long-term development initiatives. This project was also intended to enhance effectiveness of linkages between the federal level coordination platforms with coordination mechanisms at the EU Cluster, Zone and Regional administrative levels. Moreover, the project sought to provide technical support to existing coordination platforms and partners, and undertake ad-hoc relevant studies and surveys for informed decisions, in line with the LRRD approach.
9. The project sought to promote the organization of regular and structured experience-sharing and dialogue forums among government institutions, development partners, CSOs and other actors involved in the area of short-term and long-term food security, nutrition and rural - pastoral development initiatives.
10. The project will support lessons learning, linking the zonal and regional Disaster Risk Management Agricultural Task Forces (DRM-ATF) and other relevant structures, and feeding any information from there to other national-level coordination mechanisms such as the Federal DRM-ATF and the various Rural Economic Development and Food Security (RED & FS) technical committees and taskforces.
11. The five intended results of the project are:

Result 1: Decentralized (cluster, zonal and regional level) government-led coordination structures involving both relief and development endeavours supported;

Result 2: Regular communication and information flows and reporting between the coordination bodies institutionalised;

Result 3: Technical capacity of EU consortium partners and the coordination structures at regional and zonal levels built;

Result 4: Linkages with universities and research institutions created to conduct applied research to improve resilience and LRRD approaches;

Result 5: Forums organized to promote sector experiences sharing for all stakeholders (humanitarian and development actors) and promote scaling up of good practices.

12. The results framework was revised in July 2017, and although the five overarching results areas remained as per the original project document signed between EU and FAO, the outputs/activities under each of these results were reformulated.

The project implementation approach

13. The Government of Ethiopia (GoE) established task forces for key sectors including agriculture, health, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) and nutrition in 2001-2002. The sectoral task forces are led by the Disaster Risk Management Technical Working Group (DRMTWG) and bring together key actors, including Government, UN, NGOs and donor agencies engaged in humanitarian assistance for key activities such as information sharing, coordination and joint assessments. FAO staff at national and regional level support the Agricultural Task Forces at zonal, regional and federal level. The modality for implementation is through Letters of Agreement with the various regional Agricultural Bureaus, as well as with universities or research institutions.
14. The main focus of the project is to strengthen the coordination mechanisms at:
 - i. EU RESET 8 clusters level (the clusters are administratively at zonal level);
 - ii. other zones where DRM-ATFs are established and functioning;
 - iii. the six target National Regional States (Tigray, Amhara, Afar, Somali, Oromia and SNNPR), and;
 - iv. federal levels such as the government-led RED&FS platform, including reinforcing their links with other levels.
15. The project also supported the organization of coordination, experience-sharing and lessons-learning events such as inter- and intra-regional experience-sharing workshops and tours, in particular the resilience experience-sharing forum organized jointly with the EU Delegation, RED&FS and other partner organizations at federal and regional levels.

Implementation status:

16. The project contract was signed on 19 December 2014 for a 35 month implementation period, but the inception workshop was launched later than anticipated on 27 and 28 April 2015 in Adama Town, Oromia. The International Project Manager arrived in mid-November 2015, an 11-month lag which delayed implementation of the project activities. This led to the project being extended by 12 months, November 2017 up to November 2018, and again by a further 7 months up to 19th June 2019.
17. So far, the project has no official agreement (LoA) with the concerned federal government partners, and the planned steering committee has not been established. However, LoAs were signed with the six targeted regional governments. A revised action plan was developed in 2017, and again for the last extension period from December 2018 to June 2019, with revision/cancellation of some of the initially planned activities. A mid-term

review with all stakeholders was conducted during October 2017 and suggestions and recommendations were forwarded including new complementary activities, and considered in the revised action plan of November 2018, such as: support to the RED&FS, monitoring and evaluation support to RESET II partners by a consultant, etc. Project implementation was also affected by the El Nino crisis and ensuing humanitarian response.

1.3 Results achieved

18. The main achievements during the past 48 months of project implementation are summarized in Appendix 1, under the headings of coordination capacity development; experience-sharing; and supporting research for decision-making. The project helped strengthen & develop resilience coordination attitudes, capacities (aptitudes) and practices through: (1) resilience coordination advocacy, technical assistance, action planning & specific workshops and visits, (2) resilience coordination training of trainers and trainings, learning by doing and participating in the coordination spaces; and (3) by supporting monitoring, evaluation and learning capacities and providing evidences for decision making. Most of the activities of the project are focused at the regional and zonal levels, although some activities also concern the federal level (REDFS and at lower level federal ATF).

2. Evaluation purpose

19. The final evaluation aims to provide accountability to the European Commission, FAO, and the Government of Ethiopia (Federal and Regional Government) on outputs and outcomes achieved. It will also seek to draw lessons from the implementation processes that could inform future decision by the project stakeholders.

3. Evaluation scope

20. The final evaluation will review the entire implementation period of the project, from December 2014 to the completion of project activities in June 2019. It will cover all the key activities undertaken within the framework of the project across the five results areas, with a particular focus on outcomes.
21. This is a summative evaluation and is intended to provide a synthesis of the project's results, taking into account the different perspectives of various stakeholders. Furthermore, the evaluation will seek to identify implementation challenges or other contextual factors that positively or negatively affected the outcomes.

4. Evaluation objective and key questions

22. The objective of the final evaluation is to assess the achievement of the project against expected results, and more specifically to:
- i. Review the Relevance of the project and its approaches in the context of the resilience coordination needs and existing structures;
 - ii. Verify the Efficiency and Effectiveness of the results achieved, trace back to project activities the changes observed in the improvement of the food security and resilience coordination mechanisms and structures, as appropriate, and identify implementation challenges or other contextual factors that positively or negatively affected the outcomes;
 - iii. Critically examine the continuing validity of the assumptions on which the project's Impact hypotheses were based;
 - iv. Analyse the Sustainability of the project initiatives from the point of view of relevant partners and stakeholders, as well as the links and harmonization of project initiatives with other relevant government and donors led coordination platforms;
 - v. Draw Lessons and provide strategic recommendations for future similar actions.
23. The evaluation team shall furthermore examine the extent to which cross-cutting issues such as gender equality and environmental sustainability were taken into account at formulation and implementation stage.

4.1 Evaluation questions

The questions included here will serve as a guide, and may be adapted, prioritised and reorganised by the Evaluation Team in developing the evaluation matrix, to be presented in the inception report.

Relevance

- How relevant was the project to the needs?
- What were the expectations and understanding of the stakeholders (including FAO different departments) of the project? Were these expectations coherent and aligned?
- To what extent is the project design consistent with the local situation and coherent with other activities in support of resilience coordination?
- To what extent has the context of the project intervention changed since the project was formulated and how has this affected implementation?
- In light of any changes in the context, what issues need to be taken into account for the future sustainability and continuation of the project?

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the project achieved or is expected to achieve its stated objective under the project results framework? How satisfactory are the results that have been achieved?
- Did any implementation challenges or other contextual factors positively or negatively affect the outcomes?
- If the assumptions and risk assessments at results level turned out to be inadequate or invalid, or unforeseen external factors intervened, how flexibly has the project adapted to ensure that the results would still be achieved?
- To what extent was the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders appropriate?
- Are there any unintended (positive or negative) outcomes from the project, and if these have impacted on the results, to what extent were such outcomes foreseen and managed?
- How well is the project contributing to institutional and management capacity?

Efficiency of implementation

- How efficiently and timely were resources and inputs made available for the implementation of activities, and was this monitored regularly to allow for cost-effective implementation of activities?
- To what extent were activities implemented as per the original time-frame of the project?
- Were activities monitored regularly by the project and were corrective measures applied as necessary?
- Are the inter-institutional structures adequate to allow for efficient project monitoring and implementation, and have all partners been able to provide their contributions to the project, and are there good relations between the project management and with existing partner institutions?

Likelihood of impact

- What is the likelihood of the assumptions in the log-frame being realized, so that project impact is not jeopardized by external factors?
- Were there any unplanned negative effects on the target groups and to what extent did the project management take appropriate corrective measures?
- Going forward, how can opportunities in the changing context be taken into account to ensure impact?

Gender and Equity

- To what extent has the project taken into account UN normative values and principles such as equity, gender mainstreaming¹ and the inclusion of marginalized and vulnerable groups in its design and during implementation?
- Wherever relevant, were cross-cutting issues such as gender equity and environmental sustainability appropriately accounted for and managed from the outset of the project?

Partnerships and coordination

- To what extent did the project create partnerships for strengthening coordination? Were there any missed opportunities with regard to potential partnerships, and how could other partners have been more engaged with the project?
- To what extent did partners, government and other stakeholders support the project?
- How has the FAO organisational structure (programme, operations, administration and finance teams) supported the implementation of the project? Were there any coordination challenges, and how were these challenges overcome?

Lessons and sustainability

- To what extent is there ownership of the project activities and outcomes by beneficiaries at all levels?
- To what extent have beneficiaries and partners/stakeholders been involved in planning, design processes, and project implementation, regular review, M&E?
- What will be the likelihood of sustainability of the project initiatives after the end of the project support? Is there financially and economically viable prospects for the continuation and institutionalisation of results?
- Is there a phase-out strategy defined and are there clear and detailed plans for its implementation? Have project partners been properly trained to facilitate handover of the project - technically, financially and managerially?
- Given the evolving national context and FAO's existing organizational structure, what are the main conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations for the sustainability in terms of implementation process and structure?

¹ Particularly with regard FAO's Gender Equality Objectives: i) Equal decision-making; ii) Equal access to productive resources; iii) Equal access to goods, services and markets; iv) Reduction of women's work burden. FAO Policy on Gender Equality, 2013. <http://www.fao.org/docrep/017/i3205e/i3205e.pdf>

5. Methodology

24. The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the process. Triangulation of evidence will underpin its validation and analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation will adhere to UNEG Norms & Standards.²
25. The final evaluation external team is encouraged to use a programme theory evaluation approach as part of the methodology during the inception, implementation and communication phases. A theory of change for the project should be elaborated in the inception report. This should include a description of the theory of change (ToC) of the project (intended ToC and ToC in practice): (1) Diagram linking Context, Design, Process (activities), Outputs and Outcomes; (2) What were main assumptions, drivers, and barriers for the implementation in terms of linking Context, Design, Process (activities), Outputs and Outcomes.
26. The following methods are to be used, to be further elaborated in the inception report:
 - a. **Desk review and secondary data collection analysis**, the project documents and projects review - interim reports, project document, annual reports of progress, mid-term review, minutes of coordination meetings, workshops and meetings reports and surveys, capitalisation documents and other project documentation.
 - b. **Self-administered surveys**: surveys may be administered amongst partners in Addis Ababa (including FAO staff, EU and other development partners and the government) as well as stakeholders in the six regions covered by the project.
 - c. **Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussion**: key informant interviews will be conducted with stakeholders so as to validate and triangulate information and findings from the surveys and the document reviews.
 - d. **Field visits**: The evaluation team will visit and meet key stakeholders in some of the regions with a view to gauging the opinion of high-level officials and authorities (like Regional DRM-ATF chairs) with regards to the impact, relevance and efficiency of the project. At least two regions should be visited by the evaluation team (one of which should be an emerging region i.e. Somali or Afar).
 - e. **Field visit workshop**: The main actors will meet in a workshop that will take place during the field mission and that will permit the involvement of the main stakeholders. This workshop will be facilitated jointly by the project management team but the responsibility will be under the evaluation team. The preparation and correct approach will be also an input from the evaluation team

² United Nations Evaluation Group, <http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards>

6. Roles and responsibilities

27. The **FAO Office of Evaluation (OED)**, in particular the Evaluation Manager develops the first draft ToR. The FAO Budget Holder (BH) and Lead Technical Officer assists the Evaluation Manager in drafting the ToR, in the identification of the consultants and in the organization of the mission. The Evaluation Manager is responsible for the finalization of the ToR and of the identification of the evaluation team members. The Evaluation Manager shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for Quality Assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the ToR and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations in the evaluation report.
28. OED also has a responsibility in following up with the BH for the timely preparation of the Management Response and the Follow-up to the Management Response.
29. The **Project Task Force (PTF)**, which includes the FAO Budget Holder (BH), the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and the Team of the project to be evaluated, are responsible for initiating the evaluation process, providing inputs to the first version of the Terms of Reference, especially the description of the background and context chapter, and supporting the evaluation team during its work. They are required to participate in meetings with the evaluation team, as necessary, make available information and documentation, and comment on the terms of reference and report. Involvement of different members of the PTF will depend on respective roles and participation in the project. The BH is also responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the FAO Management Response and the Follow-up Report to the evaluation, fully supported in this task by the LTO and others members of the PTF. OED guidelines for the Management Response and the Follow-up Report provide necessary details on this process.
30. The **Evaluation Team (ET)** is responsible for further developing and applying the evaluation methodology, for conducting the evaluation, and for producing the evaluation report. All team members, including the Evaluation Team Leader (ETL), will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final draft and final report. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the template provided by OED. The ET will also be free to expand the scope, criteria, questions and issues listed above, as well as develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available and based on discussions with the EM, consults the BH and PTF where necessary. The ET is fully responsible for its report which may not reflect the views of the Government or of FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although OED is responsible for Quality Assurance of all evaluation reports.
31. The ETL guides and coordinates the ET members in their specific work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and prepares the final draft and the final report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own.
32. The evaluation will be guided by a reference group comprising representatives from FAO Ethiopia, the European Commission in Ethiopia. The reference group will be kept informed of the progress of the evaluation at as per the timeframe outlined in Section 9 of this document. The reference group will also review and provide guidance and comments on the draft inception report and the draft evaluation report.

7. Evaluation team composition and profile

33. The evaluation team will comprise one international evaluation consultant (Evaluation Team Leader) and one national consultant expert (Evaluation Team Member). Both the Evaluation Team Leader and the Evaluation Team Member should have experience in resilience programming, early warning and disaster risk reduction, and should be familiar with resilience coordination structures at the national and sub-national levels.

8. Evaluation products (deliverables)

34. **Inception Report:** An inception report will be prepared by the evaluation team before going into the fully-fledged data collection exercise. It will detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: sub-questions, judgment criteria and indicators, proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures. The inception report should include a proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product. In addition, the inception report should include an elaborated theory of change for the project, as well as a detailed evaluation matrix, outlining the data sources, and chosen methodologies for answering each evaluation questions, and any-evaluation sub-questions.
35. **Draft evaluation report:** OED will review the zero draft of the evaluation report submitted by the evaluation team to ensure it meets the required quality criteria. The draft evaluation report will then be circulated among key stakeholders for comments before finalisation; suggestions will be incorporated as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team.
36. **Final evaluation report:** should include an executive summary and illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues and/or questions listed in the ToR. The report will be prepared following the OED template for project evaluation reports. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report. Annexes should include, but are not limited to: ToRs for the evaluation, profile of the team members, list of institutions and stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation team, and the final evaluation mission schedule.

9. Evaluation timeframe

37. This section lists and describes all tasks and deliverables for which evaluators or the evaluation team will be responsible and accountable, as well as those involving the commissioning office, indicating for each the due date or time-frame (e.g. briefings, draft report, final report), as well as who is responsible for its completion.

Task	Dates	Responsibility
Launch of the evaluation	6 months before the project NTE	BH/PTF
ToR finalization	March-April 2019	PTF and OED for comments and quality control
Team identification and recruitment	Early April 2019	PTF
Mission organization	Early April 2019	PTF
Reading background documentation provided by PTF	April 2019	ET
Briefing of ET	April 2019	PTF, supported by OED when necessary
Organization of the Evaluation Mission (travel arrangements, meetings arrangements with project stakeholders and partners, field visits, etc.)	April 2019	PTF
Evaluation mission	April-May 2019	ET
Evaluation Report first draft for circulation	May – June 2019	PTF and OED for comments and quality control
Evaluation Report final draft for circulation	June 2019	PTF and OED for comments and quality control
Validation of the recommendations	June 2019	ET to the PTF (OED may attend)
Final Report, including publishing and graphic design	July 2019	PTF
Management Response	1 month after the Final report is issued	PTF
Follow-up report	1 year after the MR is issued	PTF

Appendix 1. Self-reported results of the project

(A) Coordination Capacity Building (Results 1, 2 and 3)

1. Coordination support has been provided to the six Regional DRM ATF (namely the Oromia, Amhara, Tigray, Somali, Afar and Southern Nations Nationalities and People Regions) through an endorsed resilience plan, and to the EU RESET Clusters (through an EU RESET/FAO joint plan). The EU RESET/FAO joint plan implied (1) coordination capacity development, (2) MEAL (Monitoring Evaluation and Learning) capacity development, (3) experience sharing.
2. Initiatives to link relief, rehabilitation and development interventions in order to increase the coordination scope of regional DRM-ATF beyond humanitarian activities by:
 - i. Revising/reviewing government coordination structures, mapping and resilience projects at regional level;
 - ii. Discussing resilience mapping and advocacy for capacity building at regional DRM ATF level; and
 - iii. Forming a common understanding of resilience by selecting and sharing topics that are relevant for resilience capacity building, to be discussed during regional DRM ATF meetings.
3. In coordination with the FAO Agriculture Sector Coordination team, a new regional situation update reporting template has been developed within this project, which could be helpful to prepare pictorial reports of the regional agricultural situation. This reporting format was shared with the project regional field monitor and coordination support staff. These reports are still being fine-tuned.
4. Jointly with EUD, the project launched the process of establishing a regional food security resilience-building platform (in Amhara and Oromia). The project also initiated the establishment of a regional FS RB platform in SNNPR. However, after long efforts to make this platform functional, it was discontinued due to a lack of ownership from the SNNPR Disaster Risk management and Food security Directorate to have an additional forum since there is already a nominal DRM-ATF platform in the region.

Resilience Coordination Capacity Development:

- i. Resilience Coordination Training: Following the training of trainers (ToT), led by EU RESET cluster coordinators, Coordination Capacity building trainings were conducted for Zonal RESET partner organizations in all RESET zones (in South Omo, Wollayita, Waghimra, Borena, Bale, Afar Liben and Siti) during this reporting period as per the FAO-EU RESET Joint plan at zonal level. FAO staff supported the EU RESET cluster coordinators in this training.
- ii. Review of Coordination Practices: As part of the follow up of the Coordination training, an annual review of coordination practices was conducted at all regional DRM-ATF levels. Additionally, an annual review of coordination practices was proposed for the respective EU RESET clusters.

Communication materials:

- i. A booklet (entitled "A practical coordination booklet for resilience building") was produced in January 2019 using the resilience coordination training materials used during the project capacity development process.

- ii. A Two page project information sheet (entitled "Reinforcing coordination for achieving collective impact") was produced with inputs provided from the EUD RTR team, to communicate the context and main objectives, components and achievements. This sheet explains the approach of the project (strengthening (1) leadership (attitudes), (2) capacities (aptitudes) and (3) practices)
 - iii. As a non-anticipated output, the EU/FAO FIRST (Food and Nutrition Security Impact, Resilience, Sustainability and Transformation) used the coordination materials for their nutrition coordination capacity development initiatives.
5. An agreement (work plan) has been signed with the Rural Economic Development and Food Security Secretariat (RED&FS) and a detailed joint action plan has been developed. This action plan was revised at the end of 2018 (Monitoring and Evaluation capacity development, International Visiting tour and support for communication and experience sharing).

(B) Experience sharing (Result 5)

6. Two rounds of National, Regional and Bi-regional experience sharing forums were conducted at federal level and in the six regions. For three times the project support the annual experience sharing of RESET clusters.
7. With the lead of EUD RTR team a RESET Experience Sharing Workshop on nutrition was co-facilitated.

(C) Research support for decision-making (Result 4)

8. The project entered into an agreement with three research institutions (ILRI, Tufts University and OXFAM) in end -2017 to conduct studies on three resilience research topics (aimed at gathering evidence on resilience for decision-makers). The research institutions have completed an inception and fieldwork; and have drafted a final report which is currently in the process of validation.
9. Following the final report of the study on the status of disaster risk management education in agricultural universities and colleges of Ethiopia from 2013 to 2016 (including needs, interventions and gaps), a consultant was commissioned for the second phase of the survey. This survey intended to review the resilience programme and activities that are included in the curricula or research programmes of selected universities and research organizations (namely BahirDar, Jimma, Jigjiga, Hawassa, Mekelle and Semera universities). A draft report was submitted by the consultant and is currently in the process of reviewing/validation.
10. With the support of EUD, the project developed an exit strategy which is a planned approach for ending or sustaining major project activities

Appendix 2. Quality assessment grid

This grid is appended to the ToRs for information to the consultants.

The quality of the final report will be assessed by the management of the implementing organization and the EU Delegation using the following quality assessment grid where the rates have the following meaning:

- 1 = unacceptable = criteria mostly not fulfilled or totally absent
- 2 = weak = criteria partially fulfilled
- 3 = good = criteria mostly fulfilled
- 4 = very good = criteria entirely fulfilled
- 5 = excellent = criteria entirely fulfilled in a clear and original way

Concerning the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is rated:	1	2	3	4	5
1. Meeting needs:					
a) Does the report precisely describe what is evaluated, including the intervention logic in the form of a logical framework?					
b) Does the report clearly cover the requested period of time, as well as the target groups and socio-geographical areas linked to the project / programme?					
c) Has the evolution of the project / programme been taken into account in the evaluation process?					
d) Does the evaluation deal with and respond to all ToR requests. If not, are justifications given?					
2. Appropriate design					
a) Does the report explain how the evaluation design takes stock of the rationale of the project / programme, cause-effect relationships, impacts, policy context, stakeholders' interests, etc.?					
b) Is the evaluation method clearly and adequately described in enough detail?					
c) Are there well-defined indicators selected in order to provide evidence about the project / programme and its context?					
d) Does the report point out the limitations, risks and potential biases associated with the evaluation method?					
3. Reliable data					
a) Is the data collection approach explained and is it coherent with the overall evaluation design?					
b) Are the sources of information clearly identified in the report?					
c) Are the data collection tools (samples, focus groups, etc.) applied in accordance with standards?					
d) Have the collected data been cross-checked?					
e) Have data collection limitations and biases been explained and discussed?					
4. Sound analysis					
a) Is the analysis based on the collected data?					
b) Is the analysis clearly focused on the most relevant cause/effect assumptions underlying the intervention logic?					
c) Is the context adequately taken into account in the analysis?					

Concerning the criteria and sub-criteria below, the evaluation report is rated:	1	2	3	4	5
d) Are inputs from the most important stakeholders used in a balanced way?					
e) Are the limitations of the analysis identified, discussed and presented in the report, as well as the contradictions with available knowledge, if there are any?					
5. Credible findings					
a) Are the findings derived from the data and analyses?					
b) Is the generalisability of findings discussed?					
c) Are interpretations and extrapolations justified and supported by sound arguments?					
6. Valid conclusions					
a) Are the conclusions coherent and logically linked to the findings?					
b) Does the report reach overall conclusions on each of the five DAC criteria?					
c) Are conclusions free of personal or partisan considerations?					
7. Useful recommendations					
a) Are recommendations coherent with conclusions?					
b) Are recommendations operational, realistic and sufficiently explicit to provide guidance for taking action?					
c) Do the recommendations cater for the different target stakeholders of the evaluation?					
d) Where necessary, have the recommendations been clustered and prioritised?					
8. Clear report					
a) Does the report include a relevant and concise executive summary?					
b) Is the report well structured and adapted to its various audiences?					
c) Are specialised concepts clearly defined and not used more than necessary? Is there a list of acronyms?					
d) Is the length of the various chapters and annexes well balanced?					
Considering the 8 previous criteria, what is the overall quality of the report?					