

**Project Evaluation Series**

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

**Project code: GCP/ETH/089/EC**

**Annexes 1-3**

# Annex 1: Online survey findings

## 1. Methodology

1. The mission travelled to Ethiopia from May 19 to 31, 2019. The mission team undertook field visits to meet with the stakeholders. Face-to-face interviews were organized with the stakeholders and project partners in Somali, Amhara and Oromia. Because of the time constraints and accessibility issues, the mission team arranged telephone interviews with other stakeholders and project partners, including stakeholders based in SNNPR, and international consultants that contributed to specific studies or former FAO staff that were involved in the project design.
1. The mission team launched an online survey in June 2019 to collect more information about the project's results and implementation, triangulate the information collected by the evaluation team and complement the data collected in the country mission, particularly from stakeholders and partners that were not interviewed. The online survey was closed on July 15, 2019.
2. The online survey tool was Survey Monkey. One online survey including nine questions was sent to about sixty partners and stakeholders. The link to the online survey was sent to the partners and stakeholders by email. 21 partners and stakeholders replied to the survey (i.e. the response rate was approximately 34 percent). The main constraints the evaluation team faced in conducting this online survey were: (i) some email addresses were not active anymore, (ii) after the launch of the online survey, partners and stakeholders could hardly respond to the survey because of a large scale internet disruption,<sup>1</sup> (iii) the variety of stakeholders and partners involved in the project at different levels (national, regional, zonal, district) and having differentiated needs hampers the viability of these results and, (iv) Oromia and Addis Ababa were not represented (evident from the responses to question 1) and this has probably distorted the results of the online survey.

## 2. Analysis of the responses

### Question 1. Which region are you working in?

3. Most of the respondents are working in Somali Region (More than 50%). Almost 30% of the respondents are working in SNNPR, and 22% in Amhara and Afar. No response was provided by stakeholders or partners working in Tigray. 4 respondents skipped the question, probably because they could not find the option of working in Oromia or Addis Ababa.

### Question 2. What type of organization do you work for?

4. Eighty (80) percent of respondents work for NGOs, whereas 10 percent work for governments organizations and 10 percent work for UN organizations.

### Question 3. Please select the resilience coordination platform in which you participate (you may select more than one, if applicable).

---

<sup>1</sup> Internet connectivity was shut down nationwide for several weeks in June 2019 following an attempted coup in the Amhara region.

5. More than 50 percent of the respondents participated in the RESET cluster platform at zonal level, whereas 24 percent attended the meetings of DRM-ATF regional platform and respectively, 15 percent attended the DRM-ATF meetings at zonal level and 9 percent attended other regional coordination platforms' meetings.

**Question 4. Have you noticed an improvement in any of the following areas since 2016?**

6. Information sharing is by far the most highly improved area with thirty-nine (39) percent of respondents reporting an improvement. Nineteen (19) percent of the respondents have noticed an improvement in both, joint implementation, and in the identification of geographic and thematic complementarities. Joint decision making and innovation, or new practices identified through experience sharing are still limited as respectively 14 percent and 9 percent of the respondents have noticed an improvement in these 2 areas. There was no improvement recognised in terms of Joint design or the joint submission of proposals, nor was there an improvement in the timeliness of response, according to the respondents.
7. This question included an open-ended 'other' option for comments. Comments show that respondents have noticed some improvements in other areas: (i) information is shared in most cases at zonal and woreda levels, (ii) uniform implementation modalities are developed at zonal level, (iii) improvement in project implementation approaches and definition of cash for work modalities, (iv) the use of the consortium approach in other EU-funded projects, (v) experience and information sharing among different implementing clusters, e.g. Bale and that of Siti or CARE East Hararge, (vi) mapping of partners and interventions takes place, meaning the duplication of effort is avoided, and geographic and thematic complementarities are identified, (vii) during our coordination meeting at zonal level respondents share assignment on identification of gaps and intervention based on geographical as well as thematic elements, (viii) sharing of emergency and long-term development updates, early warning and weather forecast information from different platforms and, (ix) ARC-D, resilience measure technique has been shared. Comments show that the coordination effort is more effective at zonal and woreda level.

**Question 5. Have you noticed any instance(s) where overlaps (geographically or thematically) have been identified as a result of the coordination platform(s)?**

8. The majority of respondents (64 percent) have not noticed any instances where overlaps (geographic and thematically) have been identified as a result of coordination platforms. On the other hand, 33 percent of respondents have noticed instances overlaps have been identified as a result of the coordination platforms. Comments of respondents show that situations are differentiated: (i) in some instance, two NGOs found they were implementing the same activities in the same target kebele, (ii) in another instance, two NGOs found they were implementing the same activities in the same target kebele but managed to target another community in addition to the first one, (iii) sometimes, different organizations are implementing resilience projects in the same geographic areas, e.g. Borena Zone in Oromia but are not integrating their efforts/approaches and, (iv) the NGO-GO Forum is used to avoid such overlaps.

**Question 6. In your view, which of the following has been the main focus of discussions in the coordination platform? (select one)**

9. Sixty-seven (67) percent of respondents consider long term resilience and development has been the main focus of discussions in the coordination platform. Emergency response and early recovery/rehabilitation have been the main focus of discussion in the coordination platform for respectively 38 percent and 19 percent of the respondents.

**Question 7. Have you used the tools and learnings from the training in your day-to-day activities?**

10. Sixty-two (62) percent of respondents have used the tools and learnings from the training in their day-to-day activities against 38 percent that have not used them.
11. Comments show that the tools and learnings used from the training in the respondents day-to-day activities are: (i) Joint planning, monitoring and decision making skills, (ii) knowledge learning and management tools, (iii) Hazard ranking at community level and vulnerability assessment when designing a project and assessment in collaboration with government, (iv) Coordination plan, meeting facilitation, joint Monitoring, annual review of coordination practice, (v) Case study development, Monitoring and Evaluation and Knowledge Management Tools, (vi) Information sharing, actors' mapping, joint field monitoring, quarterly coordination meetings, joint review meetings, (vii) Communication and facilitation skill in the coordination, joint monitoring visits and, (viii) case studies development.

**Question 8. In your view, how likely will the coordination mechanisms be sustained in the future?**

12. The majority of respondents rated the sustainability of the coordination mechanisms as being likely, with 5 percent rating it as highly likely, 47 as likely, and 33 percent as moderately likely. On the other hand, about 10 percent and 5 percent of respondents consider that coordination mechanisms are moderately unlikely or highly unlikely, respectively, to be sustained in the future.

**Question 9. What are the most critical challenges to improving coordination on resilience? (please number in the order of importance)**

13. Following the order of importance, the most critical challenges to improving coordination on resilience are the lack of commitment amongst different actors and the limited ownership by government-led organizations. Second, there is still too much focus on emergency and relief and resources are limited for experience sharing and elaboration of case studies. Third, the staff turnover of Government and non-governmental organizations is high and there is a lack of capacity to sustain coordination activities. Fourth, there is no common understanding of the definition of resilience.

**3. Conclusion**

14. Responses from NGO staff are prominent in this online survey and the sample of respondents include a high number of partners and stakeholders working in the Somali region. Responses show that the respondents were attending mostly meetings of RESET clusters platform and therefore it indicates, they are working at zonal or woreda level.

15. Most of the Respondents concur that information sharing is the area where improvements were made, whereas improvements are also highlighted in joint implementation and geographic and thematic complementary. Because of the nature of the respondents' sample made mostly of NGO staff working at zonal and woreda level, this indicates that the project contributed somehow to improve joint implementation and setting up geographic and thematic complementarities. This corroborates a finding of the evaluation mission showing that there is a substantial demand for coordination at zonal and woreda level.
16. Thus, overlaps (geographically or thematically) have been unevenly identified as a result of the coordination platform(s): in some instances, NGOs could expand the target areas and avoid duplication and in other cases, NGOs could not integrate their approaches/efforts yet. Long term resilience and development has been the main focus of discussions in the coordination platform. Respondents confirmed they were still using some of the tools that were provided to them in the training sessions. This corroborates a finding of the evaluation mission and the information included in the proceedings of the training sessions on resilience coordination and MEAL, where participants confirmed some tools could be very useful such as the facilitation skills and the case studies.
17. Most of the respondents assessed that the coordination mechanisms will be sustained in the future. This can be due to a bias because of the nature of the respondents' sample: most of them are NGO staff, which organizations are members of RESET clusters, the EC SHARE program being implemented for one more year and its results will be probably up scaled in 2 or 3 regions.
18. Still, the challenges hampering the coordination mechanisms are the lack of ownership from government led organizations and the lack of commitment amongst different actors. This corroborates the finding of the evaluation mission showing the limited commitment of development partners in coordination mechanisms at regional level and the lack of capacity of government led organizations, precisely to sustain the DRM-ATF monthly meetings.
19. *Respondents skipped questions.* Table 1 shows which questions have been skipped in the online survey. This distorts the online surveys results. Skipping a question means either: (i) the question was not well understood, (ii) the question was well understood but respondents did not face a situation that can substantiate the reply and (iii) the question was not well displayed. Because of a technical issue, the first question was not well displayed and 2 options were missing: (i) Oromia was not included among the response options and, (ii) Addis Ababa was not included either among the response options for the organizations based at federal level.

**Table 1: Questions that were skipped**

	<b>Survey</b>		
	<b><i>Answered</i></b>	<b><i>Skipped</i></b>	<b><i>Ratio</i></b>
<b>Question 1</b>	17	4	19%
<b>Question 2</b>	20	1	4,7%
<b>Question 3</b>	21	0	0%
<b>Question 4</b>	21	0	0%
<b>Question 5</b>	21	0	0%
<b>Question 6</b>	21	0	0%
<b>Question 7</b>	21	0	0%
<b>Question 8</b>	21	0	0%
<b>Question 9</b>	21	0	0%

## Annex 2: Evaluation matrix

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
<b>RELEVANCE</b>					
1. Is the project aligned with National policies/strategies?		National level	Ministry of agriculture/Ministry of Livestock	Government policies and strategies on resilience	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
2. Is the project aligned with National coordination policies/strategies?		National level	Ministry of agriculture/Ministry of Livestock, National coordination groups	Government policies and strategies on coordination	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
3. How relevant was the project to the needs?	Is the project relevant to the needs of the Government at national level?	National level	Ministry of agriculture/Ministry of Livestock	Government policies and strategies on coordination	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Is the project relevant to the needs of the Government at regional level?	Regions	Regional Branches of the Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock	EU funded project documents and evaluations	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Is the project relevant to the needs of the Government at Cluster level?	Zones/clusters	Local branches of the Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock	EU funded project documents and evaluations	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
4. Is the project streamlined with the strategies of other partners in the country such as IGAD, UA and the UN?		National level	National Offices of IGAD and UA, UN Coordination	UNDAF, any other UN document on resilience, documents from IGAD and UA on resilience	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
5. Is the project streamlined with the strategies (including coordination) of main donors in the agricultural sector (IFAD, World Bank and African Development Bank)?		National level	National Offices of IFAD, World Bank and African Development Bank	AFDB, IFAD and World Bank country strategies	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
6. What were the expectations and understanding of the stakeholders (including FAO different departments) of the project? Were these expectations coherent and aligned?	What were EU expectations?	National level	EU delegation in Addis Abeba	Project Document (SHARE), project MTR and evaluations (SHARE) or progress reports (SHARE)	Semi-structured interview or group meeting, Interview guide
	What were different FAO departments' expectations?	National level and corporate level	FAO management in the Country Office, Technical Officers in the country office and eventually line divisions at SFE and HQ	FAO's resilience strategy (SFE), FAO Country program framework	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	What were the Government expectations at National level?	National level	Ministry of agriculture/Ministry of Livestock or higher level Committee/Body	Various donors 's project documents and evaluations, outputs of existing coordination mechanisms (Humanitarian aid and resilience)	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	What were the Government expectations at Regional level?	Regions	Regional Branches of the Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock	Various donors 's project documents and evaluations, outputs of existing coordination mechanisms (Humanitarian aid and resilience)	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	What were the Government expectations at Cluster level?	Clusters/Zones	Local branches of the Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock	Various donors 's project documents and evaluations, outputs of existing coordination mechanisms (Humanitarian aid and resilience)	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide



Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
	Is the project design capturing various stakeholders' expectations?	National level and regional/local level	EU delegation in Addis Abeba, High Government Committee/body, FAO management	Project Document and MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Was the initial concept of the project clearly defined and was there a clear/shared understanding of this concept?	National level and regional/local level	EU delegation in Addis Abeba, High Government Committee/body, FAO management	Project Document and MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
7. To what extent is the project design consistent with the local situation and coherent with other activities in support of resilience coordination?	Are the project's overall objective and development objectives clearly defined?	National level and regional/local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, regional and cluster level	Project Document and MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Is the design consistent with the overall objective of the project?	National level and regional/local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, regional and cluster level	Project Document and MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Are activities coherent and likely to contribute to reach the project objectives after implementation and to have an impact?	National level and regional/local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, regional and cluster level	Project Document and MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Has the project taken into consideration the existing coordination mechanisms?	National level and regional/local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, regional and cluster level	Project Document and MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
	Is the project building on existing coordination mechanisms?	National level and regional/local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, regional and cluster level	Project Document and MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Were the project activities flexible enough to be adapted to an evolving context?	National level and regional/local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, regional and cluster level	Project Document and MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
8. To what extent has the context of the project intervention changed since the project was formulated and how has this affected implementation?	How the EU portfolio has evolved since 2011? Have new operations been designed and implemented? Are there major operations that were completed before or after the mid term period of the project	National level and project target regions/clusters	EU delegation in Addis Ababa and EU technical staff in charge of resilience and agriculture	EU Annual report, EC SHARE project document and EC SHARE progress reports	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Is EU using the same Cluster model in the new projects (the once that started up after the mid term period of the project)?	National level and project target regions/clusters	EU delegation in Addis Ababa and EU technical staff in charge of resilience and agriculture	Annual report of EU Delegation (11th FED), EC SHARE project document and EC SHARE progress reports	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	What were the main changes in government organizations? At national, regional and cluster/zonal level?	National level and project target regions/clusters	Ministry of agriculture/Ministry of Livestock	Documents describing institutional changes, Official Gazette, Ministries' Organigrams	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Have the context of Humanitarian Aid/Development or Resilience changed since the project was formulated?	National level	Ministry of agriculture/Ministry of Livestock	Mid Term Review/Evaluations of CAADP or National Agricultural Investment Program	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
	Have investments in resilience/development projects increased since the project was formulated?	National level	Various donors (IFAD, AFD and World Bank)	IFAD, AFDB and World Bank country strategies, annual reports	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Has EU increased investments in resilience/development projects since the project was formulated and did it have any incidence on implementation?	National level and project target regions/clusters	EU delegation in Addis Ababa and EU technical staff in charge of resilience and agriculture	Annual report of EU Delegation (11th FED), EC SHARE project document and EC SHARE progress reports	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
9. 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?	Did the project team elaborate an exit strategy?	National level and project target regions/clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, regional and cluster level	Project MTR and project document, project progress reports	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	What were the arrangements made to ensure project sustainability?	National level and project target regions/clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, regional and cluster level	Project MTR and project document, project progress reports	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	What are the main stakeholders that should stay involved in coordination at national, regional, zonal/cluster level to ensure project sustainability ?	National level and project target regions/clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, regional and cluster level	Project MTR and project document, project progress reports	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
10. Are the indicators relevant and likely to measure project results and impacts?					
<b>EFFECTIVENESS</b>					

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
11. 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?	What are the main results achieved? And how the results were achieved?	National level and project target regions/clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, regional and cluster level	Project MTR and project document, project progress reports	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	How many coordination mechanisms were strengthened at national level? And how?	National level	Project team, Ministry of Agriculture/Livestock, National coordination mechanisms	Project progress reports, MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	How many coordination mechanisms were strengthened at regional level? And How?	Regional level	Project team, Regional branches of the Ministries of Agriculture/Livestock	Project progress reports, MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	How many coordination mechanisms were strengthened at cluster level? And How?	Clusters/Zones	Project team, Project Regional coordinators, Local branches of the Ministries of Agriculture	Project progress reports, MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	How many communication mechanisms were improved? What are the main features and how to describe communication flows from cluster to regional to national level? And how?	National level and project target regions/clusters	Project team, Project Regional coordinators, Chairs of coordination mechanisms, regional /local branches of the Ministries of Agriculture/Livestock	Minutes of coordination meetings at various level	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	How many research/training curriculae were developed and adopted in target universities/research centres?	National level and project target regions/clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level, Universities and Research Centres	Project progress reports, MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
	How research products were used to develop curriculae?	National level and project target regions/clusters	Project team, Universities/Research centres	Curriculae, Project progress reports	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Are the coordination mechanisms at regional level and cluster level still active?	Regional level and cluster level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Last annual Project progress report	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	What were the main decisions taken in these coordination mechanisms at cluster level? Did these decisions turn into actions?	Clusters/Zones level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster level	Minutes drafted after coordination meetings at cluster level	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	When decisions coming from consultation and coordination mechanisms are applied, which organization or groups of organizations are leading the application of such decisions?	National level and project target regions/clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster level	Minutes drafted after coordination meetings at cluster level	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Are decisions made in the coordination mechanisms more about resilience or more about humanitarian aid?	National level and project target regions/clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster level	Minutes drafted after coordination meetings at various level	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Are these decisions about setting up geographic/thematic complementarities among NGOs activities or about designing/implementing common projects?	Cluster/Zones	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster level	Project Document and MTR, project progress reports of stakeholders involved in the coordination mechanisms	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
12. Did any implementation challenges or other contextual factors positively or negatively affect the outcomes?	What are the contextual factors that affected positively the outcomes of the project? In which project area and at which level (National, Regional, at cluster level?)	National level and regional/local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, cluster and regional level, FAO management, EU delegation	No cost extensions, Minutes of Coordination mechanisms' meetings, MTR, project progress report	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Were there institutional changes in government organizations that affected positively the project outcomes?	National level and project target regions/clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, cluster and regional level; FAO management, EU delegation	No cost extensions, Minutes of Coordination mechanisms' meetings, MTR, project progress report	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	What are the contextual factors that affected negatively the outcomes of the project? In which project area and at which level (National, Regional, at cluster level?)	National level and project target regions/clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, cluster and regional level, FAO management, EU delegation	No cost extensions, Minutes of Coordination mechanisms' meetings, MTR, project progress report	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Were there institutional changes in government organizations that affected negatively the project outcomes?	National level and project target regions/clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, cluster and regional level; FAO management, EU delegation	No cost extensions, Minutes of Coordination mechanisms' meetings, MTR, project progress report	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
13. 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?	What were the main actions undertaken by the project team to adapt to external factors to ensure results would be achieved?	National level and regional/local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster, regional, national level	No cost extensions, Minutes of Coordination mechanisms' meetings, MTR, project progress report	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Were these actions easily feasible and how long did it take to make the decision after consulting EU and FAO's senior management to make the decision and to go back to implementation?	National level and regional/local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster, regional, national level	No cost extensions, Minutes of Coordination mechanisms' meetings, MTR, project progress report	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	How main stakeholders such as EU and FAO's management have dealt with these uncertainties?	National level and regional/local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster, regional, national level	No cost extensions, Minutes of Coordination mechanisms' meetings, MTR, project progress report	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Was the project team involved in all coordination fora at national and regional level and informed enough to be able to anticipate and overcome the negative effects of unforeseen external factors?	National level and regional	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster, regional, national level	No cost extensions, Minutes of Coordination mechanisms' meetings, MTR, project progress report	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
14. To what extent was the balance of responsibilities between the various stakeholders appropriate?	In the absence of a steering committee, how were the decisions made to overcome the negative effects of the unforeseen factors?	National	Project team, EU delegation, FAO management, Ministry of Agriculture	Progress reports, MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
	Were the decisions made by EU and FAO only? Or was the decision made through a consultation process conducted in the coordination mechanisms that were strengthened at various level (cluster, regional, national)?	National level and regional/local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, cluster and regional level	Minutes drafted after coordination meetings at various level; Progress reports; MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
15. 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? 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?	What are the main outcomes of the project?	National, regional, local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at national, cluster and regional level	Progress report, final report, MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide, online survey
	Is there more consultation/coordination between stakeholders at regional and cluster level while implementing their activities?	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Progress report, final report, MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide, online survey
	Is there any prioritization of activities to be implemented at regional/cluster level because of the project?	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Progress report, final report, MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide, online survey
	Is the priority given to resilient actions/interventions rather than humanitarian actions at cluster/regional level?	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Progress report, final report, MTR	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide, online survey



Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
	Has the project's outcomes contributed to influence the debate about Resilience/Humanitarian aid at national level in various fora (with UN, IGAD, UA)?	National level	EU delegation; FAO management, UN, IGAD and UA	Final report	Semi-structured interviews, Interview guide
16. How well is the project contributing to institutional and management capacity?	How do you assess the capacity of the government chairs in coordination mechanisms at the beginning of the project and at the end of the project at cluster and regional level?	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Minutes of coordination meetings	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide, online survey
	Who is leading the coordination mechanisms at cluster/regional level? How are annual plans elaborated? How are they reviewed at the end of the year?	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Annual workplans, Review of annual workplans, any documents showing the process of preparation of coordination activities	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide, online survey
	Have the government led coordination mechanisms taken ownership of the coordination mechanisms set up at cluster and regional levels?	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Annual workplans, Review of annual workplans, Minutes of coordination meetings, any documents showing the process of preparation of coordination activities	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide, online survey
	How do you qualify the relationship between the Government chairs at cluster and regional level and the project team? Were government chairs proactive and innovative or just responsive to the project team) requests?	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Annual workplans, Review of annual workplans, Minutes of coordination meetings, any documents showing the process of preparation of coordination activities	Group meeting, Semi-structured interview, Interview guide, online survey

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
<b>EFFICIENCY OF IMPLEMENTATION</b>					
17. 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?	When was the project team in place at start up?	National, regional, local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Progress reports, final report, MTR	Group meeting, semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	How long did it take to set up the project coordinators in the 6 regions?	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Progress report, final report, MTR	Group meeting, semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Were the project coordinators at regional level able to interact with stakeholders on a regular basis at cluster level?	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Progress report, final report, MTR	Group meeting, semi-structured interview, Interview guide
18. To what extent were activities implemented as per the original time-frame of the project?	Were there any delays that impacted negatively project implementation?	National, regional, local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster, regional and national level	Progress report, final report, MTR	Group meeting, semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	What are the main implications of these delays if any on project results and outcomes?	National, regional, local level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster, regional and national level; EU delegation, FAO management, Ministry of Agriculture	Progress report, final report, MTR	Group meeting, semi-structured interview, Interview guide

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
19. Were activities monitored regularly by the project and were corrective measures applied as necessary?	Was the project framework/logframe used for decision making? To identify corrective measures?	National, regional, local level	Project team, EU delegation, FAO management	Progress reports, final report, MTR	Semi-structured interviews, Interview guide
	Was the project framework/logframe updated and included in each of the project progress report?	National, regional, local level	Project team, FAO management	Progress report	Semi-structured interviews, Interview guide
	Were progress reports elaborated and submitted to the donor timely?	National, regional, local level	Project team, EU delegation, FAO management	Progress report, final report, MTR	Semi-structured interviews, Interview guide
	Were financial reports elaborated and submitted timely to the donor? Were there any delays in this regard and how it impacted project implementation?	National, regional, local level	Project team, EU delegation, FAO management	Progress reports, MTR, Final report	Semi-structured interviews, Interview guide
20. 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?	How many NGOs/stakeholders were involved in the coordination mechanisms at regional level?	Regions	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms at regional level	Mapping, project progress reports, minutes of coordination meetings	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	How many NGOs/stakeholders were involved in the coordination mechanisms at cluster level?	Clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms at cluster level	Mapping, project progress reports, minutes of coordination meetings	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	What are the implementation arrangements of the SHARE project in each of the target regions and at cluster level?	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms at cluster and regional level, EC SHARE project team	Project document or MTR of EC SHARE project	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Which NGOs are involved in the project at cluster/regional level? Are they implementing resilience	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms at cluster and regional level	Minutes of coordination meetings, annual workplans	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
	projects or humanitarian aid projects?				
	Are the NGOs involved benefiting from the most higher funding from the SHARE project?	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms at cluster and regional level, EC SHARE project team	Minutes of coordination meetings	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	How do you assess the relationship between the Bureau of Agriculture at regional level and the project team?	Regions	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms at regional level, regional branches of Ministry of Agriculture at regional level	MTR, progress reports	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	How do you assess the relationship between the EU and FAO?	National level	FAO management, EU Delegation, Project team	MTR, progress reports	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	How do you assess the relationship with the DRM TF at national level and with RED FS?	National level	Project team, Ministry of Agriculture, EU delegation, FAO management	MTR, progress reports	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
21. Were implementation arrangements with regards to institutional arrangements, staffing, project implementation strategy efficient enough to reach project objectives?	Was there any institutional arrangement similar to the steering committee?	National level	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level and Ministry of Agriculture	Minutes of meetings between FAO management, Ministry of Agriculture and EU delegation	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	How were project progress reports, annual plans reviewed and validated?	National level	Project team, EU delegation, FAO management, Ministry of Agriculture	Minutes of meetings between FAO management, Ministry of Agriculture and EU delegation	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
	Knowing the funds available, was it efficient to target 6 regions and 8 clusters?	National, regional, local level	Project team, EU delegation, FAO management and Ministry of Agriculture	Prodoc, final report	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	What was underpinning the project implementation strategy? What was the rationale behind it?	National, regional, local level	Project team	Prodoc, Final report, progress report	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Did the project implementation strategy evolve between design and implementation stage?	National, regional, local level	Project team	Prodoc, Final report	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	What is the allocation of project funds by result?	National, regional, local level	Project team	Table showing the expenditures by results	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
22. 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?		National level	FAO management, Project team, SFE	Internal correspondence, timeline of decision making	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
<b>LIKELIHOOD OF IMPACT</b>					
23. What is the likelihood of the assumptions in the log-frame being realized, so that project impact is not jeopardized by external factors?	What is the impact of the project? Did the resilience agenda make progress at regional and cluster level?	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Progress reports, MTR, Final report, any other document showing the progress of projects/programs of donors at regional level	Group meeting, semi-structured interview, Interview guide, online survey

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
	Did the strengthening of coordination mechanisms at regional and cluster level impact positively the implementation of the resilience projects and enhanced the resilience of communities and contributed to improve livelihoods?	Regions and clusters	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Progress reports, MTR, Final report, any other document showing the progress of projects/programs of donors at regional level	Group meeting, semi-structured interview, Interview guide, online survey
24. Going forward, how can opportunities in the changing context be taken into account to ensure impact?	What are the main trends in the current contexts with regard to resilience?	National, regional, local level	Ministry of Agriculture, FAO Ethiopia, EU delegation,	Strategies/Policies that are being designed	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	How is evolving the resilience agenda?	National, regional, local level	Ministry of Agriculture, FAO Ethiopia, EU delegation,	Strategies/Policies that are being designed	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Are there any changes that are planned in government institutions at regional or cluster level?	National, regional, local level	Ministry of Agriculture, Regional Bureaux of Agriculture	New organigrams	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Are there any changes that are planned in EU business model and implementation arrangements of EU funded projects and programs at regional or cluster level?	Regional and cluster level	EU delegation, EC SHARE project team	New FED	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
<b>GENDER &amp; EQUITY</b>					
25. To what extent has the project taken into account UN normative values and principles such as equity, gender mainstreaming and the inclusion	Are the indicators included in the project framework/logframe gender sensitive?	National, regional and cluster	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Project document, updates of the project framework	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
of marginalized and vulnerable groups in its design and during implementation?	Were any measures taken to include partners who mainstreamed activities benefiting gender and vulnerable groups in their projects?	Regional and cluster	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Composition of Platforms, mapping, Project documents/MTR implemented by partners	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
26. Wherever relevant, were cross-cutting issues such as gender equity and environmental sustainability appropriately accounted for and managed from the outset of the project?	Were any measures taken to include partners who were tackling issues such environmental sustainability?	Regional and cluster	Project team, Chairs of Coordination mechanisms, partners involved in the project implementation at cluster and regional level	Composition of Platforms, mapping; project documents/MTR implemented by partners	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
<b>PARTNERSHIPS AND COORDINATION</b>					
27. To what extent did the project create partnerships for strengthening coordination?	What were the main partnerships created by the project?	National, regional, local level	Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Livestock, Regional Bureaux of Agriculture; Partners involved in coordination mechanisms	Mapping, Documents on platforms, progress reports, MTR and final report, minutes of coordination meetings	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	Were there any missed opportunities with regard to potential partnerships?	National, regional, local level	Other actors operating in the same regions/clusters	Project documents/MTR of main actors operating in the area of resilience	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
	how could other partners have been more engaged with the project?	National, regional, local level	Other actors operating in the same regions/clusters	Project documents/MTR of main actors operating in the area of resilience	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide
<b>LESSONS AND SUSTAINABILITY</b>					
28. To what extent is there ownership of the project activities and outcomes by beneficiaries at all levels?		National, regional, local level	Project team, Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock, Chairs of coordination mechanisms and partners at regional and cluster level	MTR, Report on capitalization	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide, online survey

Questions	Evaluation sub-questions	Project areas	Target organization/actor to be contacted	Other source of information	Method/Instrument
29. To what extent have beneficiaries and partners/stakeholders been involved in planning, design processes, and project implementation, regular review, M&E?		National, regional, local level	Project team, Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock, Chairs of coordination mechanisms and partners at regional and cluster level	Project document, progress reports, reviews	Semi-structured interview, Interview guide, online survey
30. 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?		National level	EU delegation, EC SHARE project team, FAO Ethiopia, Other actors involved in resilience programming, Ministry of Livestock and Ministry of Agriculture	National Agricultural Investment Program, Other donor funded projects and programs	Semi-structured interview, interview guide
31. Is there a phase-out strategy defined?	Are there clear and detailed plans for its implementation?	National, regional, local level	Project team, Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock, Chairs of coordination mechanisms at regional and cluster level	Exit strategy, arrangements or plans of the exit strategy	Semi-structured interview, interview guide
	Have project partners been properly trained to facilitate handover of the project - technically, financially and managerially?	National, regional and cluster	Project team, Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock, Chairs of coordination mechanisms at regional and cluster level	Reports of the trainings conducted under project implementation	Semi-structured interview, interview guide
32. 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?		National, regional, local level	All partners and actors that were evolved in the project	Report on capitalization, progress reports, final report and MTR	Semi-structured interview, interview guide



### Annex 3: Logical Framework (as per the original project document)

	<b>Intervention logic/Narrative Summary</b>	<b>Verifiable Indicators</b>	<b>Sources of information/M&amp;E</b>	<b>Assumptions and Risks</b>
Overall Objective	To enhance the drought resilience and food and nutrition security of vulnerable populations in southern and eastern Ethiopia			
Specific Objective	To establish effective sub-national coordination structures and harmonization mechanisms (relief and development) with linkages to grass root and federal coordination structures	Government-led coordination structures operational at regional state and zonal levels (except Afar) in all EU Cluster Areas		Government interested to lead the coordination structures
Result 1	Decentralized (at cluster, zonal and regional level) Government-led coordination structures involving both relief and development endeavours supported			
Activity 1.1	Conduct mapping of all Government coordination structures at woreda, zone, regional state and federal level, especially those that contribute to improved coordination and harmonization of resilience building interventions in the project operational area	Review document ready by month 8 from the start of the project	The mapping document itself	
Activity 1.2	Asses and propose widening the scope of the existing DRM ATF task forces at zonal and regional state levels as well as increasing the zonal coverage of these task forces	TOR (with widened scope of regional and zonal DRM ATF) for the coordination structure adopted by Government At least 5 more zones have established a Government led zonal coordination structure with regular monthly meetings as of month 6	Document that proposes to widen the scope and adoption by the Government	Regional Governments interested to widen the scope of existing coordination structures
Activity 1.3	Support the regular (monthly DRM ATF) consultative meetings and workshops to improve the institutional capacity in building resilience and to review performance of the planned activities at national and regional state levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At least 10 coordination meetings conducted at federal (DRM ATF) and each regional level (Afar, Somali and SNNPR) per year</li> <li>• 50% of the EU cluster meetings attend by FAO staff based in the regions</li> </ul>	Project reports, Minutes of the coordination meetings	

	<b>Intervention logic/Narrative Summary</b>	<b>Verifiable Indicators</b>	<b>Sources of information/M&amp;E</b>	<b>Assumptions and Risks</b>
Activity 1.4	Adopt a common monitoring and evaluation system with agreed indicators to enhance coordination and harmonization and build the institutional capacity to monitor these indicators	M&E guideline adopted and shared to all relevant sectors	The common M&E system document	
Activity 1.5	Organize joint monitoring missions to assess the status of implementation of planned activities, harmonization of approaches and stimulate joint learning and drawing of lessons learned	At least one joint learning mission per cluster conducted per year	Mission reports	
Activity 1.6	Strengthen the existing DRM-ATF at Federal and regional levels to address the issues related to Government resilience policy, strategy processes	At least one two day training conducted per regional state on resilience issues	Training reports	
<b>Result 2</b>	<b>Regular communication and information flows and reporting between the coordination bodies institutionalised.</b>			
Activity 2.1	Develop guidelines to strengthen effective communication and information flow coordination	Guideline developed and institutionalized by the end of year 1.	Guidelines document and project performance reports.	
Activity 2.2	Ensure the sub-national coordination platforms guided by mutually accepted guidelines and annual work plans through regular follow up	Annual work plans agreed and in place by the start of each year	Agreed annual work plans	
Activity 2.3	Support for the establishment of communication mechanisms between regional and the federal coordination structures, between regional coordination structures and between regional and zones/woredas in order to provide quality information	Agreed Communication Mechanisms and email lists established by the end of year one and maintained during the rest of the project life	Agreed Communication document and mailing lists.	
Activity 2.4	Assist regional coordinating body members attend federal policy making platforms to share lessons learned in the region and help for effective implementation of resilience building programmes in the target areas	Number of Member attending Federal level meetings At least 80% of the documented lessons learnt shared at a federal platform	Reports by participating members	

	<b>Intervention logic/Narrative Summary</b>	<b>Verifiable Indicators</b>	<b>Sources of information/M&amp;E</b>	<b>Assumptions and Risks</b>
Result 3	Technical capacity of at the coordination structures at regional, zonal, woreda levels built			
Activity 3.1	Provide technical backstopping for regional and zonal coordination structures in the area of programme design, implementation and monitoring of resilience projects and programmes	At least two technical backstopping mission conducted per cluster per year	Back to Office reports	
Result 4	Create Linkages with universities and research institutions to conduct applied research to improve resilience and LRRD approaches			
Activity 4.1	Assess and review the resilience programmes and activities that are included in the curricula or research programmes of the various universities and research organisations	Assessment report ready by the end of year 1	Assessment Report	
Activity 4.2	Identify 3 applied research topics for funding	Three research topics identified and funded, at least one by the end of year one and the other two by the end of year 2	Contracts and Research papers	
Activity 4.3	Organise presentations of research findings in annual "resilience forum"	Research papers	Proceedings	
Result 5	Forums organised to promote sector experience sharing for all stakeholders (humanitarian and development actors) and promote scaling up of best practices			
Activity 5.1	Identify, compile and organize good practices on harmonization and in building institutional capacity at all levels	At least two good practises identified, compiled and shared at the annual conference	Project report, Workshop report	
Activity 5.2	Support and organize study tours/experience sharing visits for policy makers, senior level federal and regional public officials and stakeholders on institutional coordination and harmonization in resilience building	At least one experience-sharing visit conducted per year ( 5 days for 5 officials)	Field mission report project performance report	
Activity 5.3	Hold forums and promote sector experience sharing and dialogue in Ethiopia for all stakeholders for cross-learning and scaling up of tested best practices	One Two-day Resilience Forum organised at national level per year	Workshop proceedings	

	<b>Intervention logic/Narrative Summary</b>	<b>Verifiable Indicators</b>	<b>Sources of information/M&amp;E</b>	<b>Assumptions and Risks</b>
Activity 5.4	Support the institutional capacity of public sectors on the use of web based information for better coordination and harmonization at all levels	Web page and hosting agreed with the Government by the end of year one	Project report and actual web page	