

Appendix 5: Matrix of the evaluation framework

EVALUATION OF FAO'S PROGRAMMES AND COOPERATION IN ETHIOPIA				
Key Issues/topics	Key Questions	Criteria of judgment/Indicators	Data Collection Methods and Sources	Where
I. RELEVANCE: Are the components of FAO's Cooperation with Ethiopia addressing beneficiaries' short and long term needs, Government's priorities and donors' policies that motivated it?				
1.1 Implementing FAO's own Ethiopia strategy	<p>Are the interventions based on the PASDEP and UNDAF strategies, and the Draft NMTPF?</p> <p>Has FAO analyzed its comparative advantages?</p> <p>Did FAO develop strategic thinking as to how its interventions are related to both the short term responses and the long term development needs of Ethiopia?</p> <p>Are there any missed opportunities?</p>	<p>FAO's strategy for Ethiopia</p> <p>Consistency of FAO's objectives and intended results with FAO's broader policies and strategies</p> <p>Consistency of FAO's objectives and intended results with PASDEP policies and strategies.</p> <p>Analysis done, documented and shared</p> <p>Strategies that were defined.</p> <p>Reflections on missed opportunities.</p>	<p>Interviews with FAO's Officials (HQ, FAOR, Regional Office) and partners in Addis Ababa and the regions;</p> <p>Document analysis</p>	Rome, Addis Ababa
1.2 Addressing Donors' priorities	<p>What are the Donors' priorities in the context of the FAO's comparative advantage in Ethiopia, and how are they taken into account?</p>	<p>Priorities and policies of relevant Donors.</p>	<p>Discussions in the Consultative Group meetings;</p> <p>Document analysis.</p>	Rome, Addis Ababa

1.3 Addressing GoE priorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To what extent has FAO played the “honest broker” supporting dialogue between the GoE and other stakeholders (donors, private sector investment, etc)? – How does GoE view different activities of FAO in Ethiopia? Are there areas of divergence with FAO? – What is the place of FAO in policy advice in Ethiopia in the context of emergency responses and long term development? How has it evolved? Did it open doors for future FAO sustainable development initiatives? – How appropriate have FAO’s responses been to priority sectoral issues (Agriculture, Livestock, Forestry, Fisheries, water, Land tenure)? – How well does the FAO’s programme fit GoE current and emerging development strategies and priorities? 	<p>FAO’s leadership and status in Ethiopia</p> <p>Transition from humanitarian to development assistance</p> <p>Specific sectoral (Agriculture, livestock, natural resources) and land tenure approaches, strategies and priorities supported.</p> <p>Specific new and emerging issues</p>	<p>Interviews of GoE officials and FAO officials;</p> <p>Portfolio review</p> <p>Document analysis;</p> <p>Discussions in the Consultative Group meetings;</p> <p>Field visits.</p>	<p>Rome, Addis Ababa</p>
1.4 Addressing beneficiaries’ short and long term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Do the FAO interventions address the needs and priorities of the beneficiaries? – Is FAO’s strategy relevant to 	<p>Evidence of primary stakeholders participation in projects’ identification;</p> <p>The intervention strategies</p>	<p>Document analysis;</p> <p>Interviews of FAO officials, FAO’s partners, primary stakeholders and other</p>	<p>Ethiopia: Addis Ababa and field visits</p>

needs	<p>provide answers to deal with food insecurity and poverty of the most vulnerable in a sustainable manner?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – How are women involved in the needs analysis and design of the projects? – Given the scale of the problems it had to address, did the FAO cover the expressed needs? 	<p>address the problems and needs analysis;</p> <p>Beneficiary profiles influence the choice of strategies.</p> <p>Needs of primary stakeholders are reflected in the planning.</p> <p>Consideration of gender issues</p> <p>Extent of needy groups and regions out of the reach of the influence of the FAO</p> <p>Needs in relation to the means made available.</p>	<p>stakeholders;</p> <p>Field visits</p>	
1.5 International context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – How do the interventions relate to MDGs (eradication of extreme poverty and hunger; promote gender equality and empower women, ensure environmental sustainability)? – How have the FAO programmes affected indicators of the relevant MDGs? – How did the FAO interventions relate to UNDAF? 	<p>Relevant MDGs indicators;</p> <p>Relevant MDGs indicators</p> <p>Relevant indicators.</p>	<p>Interviews of FAO and GoE Officials;</p> <p>Review of FAO's documentation on MDGs accomplishments for Ethiopia.</p>	Addis Ababa
2. FCS/PROJECT DESIGN: Are formal FAO/project concepts clear and achievable? Do they include desired and predicted outcomes?				
2.1 FAO and project design:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Does the FAO strategy document provide a Logical Framework that 	<p>Indicators effectively allow measuring the results; where</p>	<p>Collection and analysis of information on food security</p>	Addis Ababa;

	<p>includes a logically valid causal chain from activities to outputs, outcomes and objectives, verifiable indicators and sources of verification, assumptions and risks?</p> <p>Are budgets broken down by outputs?</p>	<p>relevant;</p> <p>Indicators also allow disaggregation by gender, age, and other relevant variables?</p> <p>Logical Framework includes realistic assumptions</p> <p>Realistic planning of the interventions and in appropriate detail</p> <p>Budgets.</p>	and vulnerability in Sudan.	field visits
2.2 Coverage of the interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Has FAO's work targeted the most vulnerable areas and groups in the design and implementation of interventions? – Thematic coverage 	<p>Relevance of geographical and group targeting.</p> <p>Internal and external constraints to achieving coverage</p> <p>Covered thematic areas</p>	Review of level of activity by geographic area and by target group compared to existing situation analysis available. Re-analysis of beneficiary assessment databases.	Rome, Addis Ababa
2.3 Linkages of interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Are individual projects linked to higher levels (regional and national – micro and macro) and across sectors? – Are field interventions aimed at promoting changes at 	<p>Strategies for making projects contribute synergistically to FAO's higher level results.</p> <p>Approaches and planned activities</p>		

	<p>beneficiaries level linked with efforts for changes at policy level?</p> <p>– Are there thematic linkages within the FAO's strategy?</p>	<p>to inform policy processes with information from field interventions.</p> <p>Approaches and guidelines for effective thematic linkages.</p>		
3. EFFECTIVENESS: Extent to which the FAO achieves its specific objectives on the basis of the delivery and use of its outputs by the beneficiaries, within its planned duration.				
	Achievement of the objectives and outcomes; innovativeness and learning			
3.1 Meeting the objectives and intended results	<p>– How has FAO helped to strengthen the capacity of the GoE to exercise leadership in developing and implementing their strategies?</p> <p>– To what extent the intended outcomes were reached?</p> <p>– Do the results address sector issues (agriculture, livestock, forestry, fisheries, land, water) and feed into GoE strategies?</p>	<p>FAO's Response to critical issues in Ethiopia (Food Security, Land tenure).</p> <p>Timely and effective implementation;</p> <p>Stakeholders perceive improvements.</p> <p>Perceptions of GoE and other stakeholders.</p>	<p>Interviews of GoE Officials and FAO Officials;</p> <p>Portfolio review with key stakeholders and partners.</p>	Rome, Addis Ababa
3.2 Policy dialogue	How did FAO handle policy dialogue with GoE on important development issues?	<p>Issues and dialogue outcomes.</p> <p>Advocacy activities and outcomes.</p>	Interviews with FAO, GoE officials.	Addis Ababa, regions.
3.3 Coordination and partnership	– How was coordination of work organized between HQ, FAOR,	Mechanisms of coordination (vertical and horizontal) as set-up	Interviews with FAO officials and of partners;	Addis Ababa;

<p>with stakeholders</p>	<p>SFE, Nairobi and Accra? Is there a clear approach of formalized division of labour?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Which partnerships with stakeholders did FAO develop and for which purpose and on what basis were these partnerships developed? – Which mechanisms for coordination and partnerships with stakeholders were put in place? – Which partnership processes were developed? <p>What are the partnerships outputs and outcomes?</p>	<p>and practiced in the FAO;</p> <p>Partnerships in which stakeholders are involved in the FAO national programme: type (strategic, operational, consultative, advisory, policy, etc.), geographic coverage, sector of activity (public, private, civil society)</p> <p>Partnership processes: leadership, resources, characteristics of members, training.</p> <p>Operational elements: agreements or MoUs on defined purpose, reporting, meetings, decision making.</p> <p>Numbers, diversity, and participation of partners in each type of partnership, achievements.</p>	<p>Documents analysis</p>	<p>field visits.</p>
<p>3.4 Innovations, lessons learnt and good practices</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Did FAO stimulate innovation (new approaches, methodologies, technologies, etc.)? – Was the FAO effective in using up to up to date knowledge in order to reach the outcomes (good practices in development, poverty reduction, food security, environment, etc.)? – Is there an effort in identifying and 	<p>Pilot projects and initial results; new approaches;</p> <p>Information dissemination strategy</p> <p>Use of FAO's existing normative work</p> <p>Existence of particular thematic reflections or publications</p>	<p>Interviews of FAO staff and partners</p>	<p>Rome, Addis Ababa, field visits.</p>

	<p>documenting the FCS's innovations, lessons learned and good practices?</p> <p>– Are lessons learnt feeding into global practices (and vice versa)?</p>	<p>summarizing experiences.</p> <p>Use of standards that FAO promotes;</p>		
3.5 Gender	<p>– Is the FAO gender sensitive and does FAO have a gender mainstreaming strategy for its interventions in Ethiopia?</p> <p>– How the gender strategy is implemented and what are the outcomes?</p> <p>– Does FAO monitor achievements as far as gender is concerned?</p> <p>– Did gender related experience in the FAO inform GoE policy?</p>	<p>Commitment and proactive leadership at project level and in project area.</p> <p>Gender related advocacy activities.</p> <p>Existence of gender expertise in the projects</p> <p>Adequate resources are allocated to implementation of gender strategy.</p> <p>Dissemination and use of gender related lessons learned.</p>	Interviews of FAO staff and partners	Rome, Addis Ababa, field visits.
3.6 Monitoring and Evaluation System	<p>– What M&E arrangements are in place?</p>	<p>Existing Monitoring and Evaluation System and Plans;</p> <p>Evaluation capacity in place;</p> <p>Regular information from M&E.</p> <p>Clearly assigned responsibility to do monitoring and evaluation; staff and means.</p>	<p>FAO Officials and staff interviews;</p> <p>Documents analysis.</p>	Rome, Addis Ababa.

4. EFFICIENCY: How well the FAO programme was implemented technically, organizationally, procedurally, and financially.				
4.1 Technical aspects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To what extent has the project delivered the planned outputs? – Was the intervention well targeted? – Were activities implemented and outputs delivered on schedule and within budget? – Were the outputs delivered economically (i.e. were the most cost effective resources and processes used)? – Were there any technical constraints (ex. roads, quality seeds availability, etc...) – What is the role played by each level (HQ, FAOR, Regional Office,) in project approval, launch and implementation. 	<p>Insights from project officials and beneficiaries.</p> <p>Target beneficiary groups and regions</p> <p>Work plans and budgets</p> <p>M&E systems and monitoring plans;</p> <p>Factors that might have contributed to costs (where it may apply).</p> <p>Roles at each level.</p>	<p>Interviews of FAO officials, project staff, partners and stakeholders;</p> <p>Document analysis;</p> <p>Evaluations;</p> <p>Review missions reports</p>	Rome, Addis Ababa, field visits.
4.2 FAO national Project Management and coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Have the overall Project management and field coordination mechanisms been adequate? – What decision-making processes have impacted positively/negatively the 	<p>Overall management coordination;</p> <p>Relationships with partners;</p> <p>Role of HQ, FAOR and Regional Office;</p> <p>Impacts of the mechanisms for Stakeholders participation (Steering committees, advisory committees, technical committees, etc.);</p>		

	<p>implementation of projects?</p> <p>– How is the FAO working with GoE partner agencies, civil society organizations, and the private sector</p>	<p>Monitoring and self-evaluation mechanisms and effective use of ME information for FAO adaptive management.</p> <p>Approaches and modalities of collaboration and partnerships and results obtained.</p>		
4.3 Organizational and logistical aspects	<p>– Were personnel, finance and materials provided as planned and timely and were they adequate to meet the requirements?</p> <p>– Were the quality of FAO's inputs and services (expertise, equipment, training, approaches and methodologies) provided as planned?</p> <p>– Was coordination between different levels and services of FAO involved (horizontally and vertically) adequate?</p> <p>– Were coordination and the harmonization of FAO's activities</p>	<p>Work plans and their implementation;</p> <p>-ditto-</p> <p>Overall coordination and management;</p> <p>Relationships at different FAO levels and with partners;</p> <p>Steering committee and other committees/groups (consultative,</p>		

	<p>with other national, regional, and local development interventions conceptualized and implemented?</p> <p>– Was partners' institutional capacity sufficient?</p>	<p>advisory, technical, etc.)</p> <p>Experts and staff;</p>		
4.4 Project termination	<p>Which factors were considered to decide on project termination? Was the post-project scenario decided based on a consensus among stakeholders?</p>	<p>Conclusion of planned outputs; achievement of outcomes and objectives; availability of funds; handover strategies.</p>	<p>Interviews of project staff and stakeholders.</p>	<p>Addis Ababa.</p>
5. IMPACT: Wider effects of the FAO programme/project on individuals, gender, community groups, and institutions.				
5.1 Planned changes	<p>What are the impacts on beneficiaries at household and community levels (food security, production, income, access to markets, gender equality, etc...)?</p> <p>What are the programme/project impacts on the capacities of partners in the working areas and at different levels (government agencies, civil society, and private sector)?</p> <p>How is the programme/project already affecting the broader society at relevant levels and what are the likely future impacts?</p>	<p>Indicators defined in the Logical frameworks.</p>	<p>Interviews of Project staff, partners and other stakeholders.</p> <p>Document analysis.</p> <p>Individual project evaluations and impact studies.</p>	<p>Addis Ababa, field visits.</p>

	<p>How much did the programme/project contribute to reaching the Development objective?</p> <p>What are the impacts on GoE policy processes and implementation?</p>			
5.2 Wider planned or unplanned changes attributable to the project	<p>Were there any wider impacts attributable to the programme/project, considering: poverty alleviation, gender issues, environmental impact, employment opportunities, value chain actors, etc.?</p>	Criteria determined depending on type of change	Interview of project staff, partners and stakeholders.	Addis Ababa, field visits
6. SUSTAINABILITY: Whether programme/project results and impacts are likely to continue after the completion of FAO's respective intervention.				
6.1 From emergency to development	<p>How does the FAO implement the transition from emergency to development?</p>	<p>How emergency and recovery strategies are harmonized.</p> <p>A vision of sustainability of recovery based on longer term development strategies.</p> <p>Recovery and reconstruction efforts seek to address root causes of vulnerability depending on the context.</p>	Interviews of FAO and Governments officials, project staff, partners and other stakeholders.	Addis Ababa, field visits.
6.2 Durability of results	<p>Are the outcomes likely to last for a long time after project termination?</p> <p>(If applicable) Did partners at national and local level make the necessary arrangements and take necessary</p>	<p>Conditions of handing over counterparts; ownership.</p> <p>Measures taken by Government for sustainability of project results.</p>	Interviews of project staff, partners and other stakeholders.	Addis Ababa, field visits.

	<p>decisions to ensure sustainability of the programme/project's results?</p> <p>Are results technically and economically sustainable?</p> <p>Does the government conduct post-project follow-up?</p>	<p>Beneficiary organizations technical preparedness.</p> <p>Practices and examples.</p>		
6.3 Ownership of programme/ project results	<p>Has beneficiaries' involvement in the identification and implementation of project activities given them a sense of ownership?</p> <p>To what extent will the processes initiated by the programme/project continue after its termination?</p> <p>Are the beneficiaries using the outputs of the respective projects with a view of achieving the intended</p>	<p>Leaders of beneficiary groups perceive changes in their capacity to plan and manage local development.</p> <p>Partners' preparedness to manage post-project situations: organizational, technical, capacities.</p> <p>Status of the use of outputs for impacts.</p>	Interviews of project staff, partners and other stakeholders.	Addis Ababa, field visits.

	outcomes and impacts?			
6.4 Financial sustainability	<p>What financial mechanisms are there to sustained project results if FAO's financial resources were stopped?</p> <p>Have beneficiaries' organizations reached financial sustainability and are members willing to pay for the services provided by the project?</p>	<p>Existence of locally managed funding mechanism.</p> <p>Payment of services by users.</p>	Interviews of project staff, partners and other stakeholders.	Addis Ababa, field visits.
6.5 Institutional sustainability	Did the project build sufficient capacity at local level to help sustain the results?	Capacity that has been built.	Interviews of project staff, partners and other stakeholders.	Addis Ababa, field visits.
6.6 Use of acquired experience and methods developed after projects completion	<p>Were they used in further assessment of needs? Did they feed in policy processes?</p> <p>Was there a systematic learning process based on a good information collection and valid reporting?</p>	<p>New needs assessments;</p> <p>Examples of use in policy processes.</p>		