

Terms of Reference (ToR)

Final Evaluation

| | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Project/Programme Title: | Coffee Alliances for Ethiopia (CAFÈ) |
| Country: | Ethiopia |
| Project/Programme Number: | 2550-14/2014 |
| Name of Partner Organisation: | Austrian Development Agency (ADA) |

1. Introduction/Background

Ethiopia is one of the most important coffee producing countries worldwide and the largest producer of coffee in Africa. Apart from its significance in view of a continuous growing consumption of coffee in Ethiopia and worldwide, it is the geographic origin of Arabica coffee.

It is estimated that 4 million smallholder farmers in Ethiopia are engaged in coffee farming. The livelihood of about 20 million people - more than one fifth of the population, depends on coffee production and other activities along its value chain. Smallholder coffee farmers are facing a wide range of substantial problems concerning the social, ecological and economic dimensions of sustainability which jeopardize the families' livelihood.

The expected **outcome** of the project is to improve the livelihoods of 2,500 smallholder-farming households (1,000 in Amaro and 1,500 in Amhara) by enhancing their production and adding value to their coffee as well as to other crops in a sustainable way.

The project is clustered into five components:

- 1) Enable farmers' access to extension to significantly improve coffee production and quality in a sustainable way and enhance the resilience of the production system to the effects of climate change.
- 2) Improve farmers' access to services and marketing performance through the establishment of adequate and capacitated farmer structures and market linkages.
- 3) Improve gender relations in the farming households so that both women and men equitably participate in business planning, decision making on the generation and use of income.
- 4) Strengthen the food security situation of households through training on food crop production and diversification
- 5) Demonstrate an effective, efficient and high-impact development and investment model for the smallholder coffee sector in Ethiopia to relevant stakeholders and position the project for expansion, scaling-up and replication.

The project had an initial run time of 48 months starting in November 2014 and ending in October 2018. However, ADA and the private co-funding partners decided to extend the project duration until April 30, 2019. During this 'no-cost extension', remaining funds are used from the original project budget. The total project budget is 988,800 EUR of which 50% are contributed by the ADA and the other 50% being contributed by the three foundations Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung (HRNS, 12,5%), Fondazione Giuseppe e Pericle Lavazza Onlus (Lavazza Foundation, 25%) and the Löffberg Foundation (12,5%).

The project is implemented by HRNS which is coordinating the implementation with the Ethiopian Coffee and Tea Authority, Regional Agricultural Bureaus, the Cooperative Agencies and the Trade Agencies as well as other public institutions in Ethiopia, from regional to woreda (district) level. Institutional partners include Bahir Dar university, the Amhara Coffee Farmers Cooperatives Union and Jimma Coffee Research Institute. Private partners include Amaro Gayo, Coffee Ethio CEFT, NKG Ethiopia and Mamo Kacha Plc.

The beneficiaries of the project are the supported coffee co-operatives and the Amhara co-operative union as well as 2,500 smallholder coffee farming households and their family members.

The project planning overview is attached to these ToR, while other documents as annual reports are available upon request.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this final evaluation is to establish whether the CAFÈ project has met the targets laid out in the project planning framework outlined in the Coffee Alliances for Ethiopia - CAFÈ; Annex A of the Agreement documents; project number 2550-14/2014. The evaluation shall inform the planning for a potential second phase of the project by identifying key learnings from implementing the project.

3. Objective

This final evaluation shall provide the three foundations, ADA, as well as partners with relevant information for the planning of a potential second project phase. The main objective of the evaluation is to assess the project's performance and present findings, conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations.

Applying the relevant OECD DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability) the evaluation team will pay particular attention to the following questions:

- a) the design and coherence of the project (project planning matrix and underlying implicit or explicit theory of change and its assumptions) also in light of the opportunities and constraints resulting from government policies and development plans related to the sector.

- b) the extent to which the project has already achieved its results, including the extent to which people have already benefited from the project's intervention (direct beneficiaries) and whether the livelihoods of the final project beneficiaries (smallholder coffee farmers as well as all household members) have already been improved.
- c) the strengths and weaknesses of the three foundations and its partners in terms of planning, management, implementation and monitoring.
- d) opportunities and challenges encountered in the process of engaging private sector players in supporting mainly (farmers/rural) development efforts and outcomes planned in the project
- e) the extent to which cross-cutting issues and principles (such as gender equality, environmental protection, social inclusion as well as equality, equal and inclusive participation,) were addressed appropriately.
- f) based on the above findings, lessons learned etc. the evaluators should lay out, which elements, aspects are missing and provide recommendations which ones should be considered in a possible future project

4. Subject and Focus

The evaluation shall assess the project according to its planning framework, including an assessment of the validity of the made assumptions by making the underlying logic transparent. The evaluation team shall assess the project using the OECD/DAC criteria for evaluations (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability), specifically assessing potential changes in programming for a potential second project phase.

This final evaluation should assess the project performance along the impact pathway, ranging from its implementation management and activities, to its effect on the final beneficiaries (farming households).

The timeframe that should be covered is from the project's start in November 2014 up to the time of evaluation.

5. Specific Evaluation Questions

Based on the project documents, particularly with reference to the project approach, outcomes and outputs, the consultant will assess the following:

Relevance

- To what extent are the objectives of the project still valid for key stakeholders, target groups and the beneficiaries?
- To what extent do Public Sector Institutions, including the Ethiopian Coffee & Tea Authority and the Regional Government authorities of Amhara and Amaro) want to continue pursuing enhancement of smallholder coffee farming and value addition as development priority?
- To what extent is the project's underlying Theory of Change coherent and appropriate to achieve the envisaged objectives?

Effectiveness

- To what extent has the project already achieved its expected outputs?
- To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s)?
- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the outcome and expected outputs? (Also, consider any factors which were possibly beyond the control of the project)
- What have been the key challenges and/or risks hampering implementation of the project? How have these been addressed by the programme management? Which steering and/or mitigation measures have been taken? Have these been the right ones? How effective was the decision-making process?
- How did stakeholder cooperation contribute to the achievement of the project's results? To what extent have all project stakeholders collaborated as planned? If not, what issues occurred and why? How were they remedied/has this been addressed adequately by the project (team)?
- To what extent were gender equality, environmental protection and social inclusion included in the project design and implementation)? Has the project adequately addressed them in all five components?

Efficiency

- To what extent have interventions been cost/time-effective?
- If applicable, to what extent were all items/equipment purchased and used as planned under this project (procurement)?

- Was the project implemented in the most efficient way (time, personnel resources)? Have any issues emerged, if so which ones and why?
- What has hampered efficiency, if anything? How well have related challenges been remedied?

Impact

- How many people (disaggregated by gender and age) have already benefited from the project (immediate impact)?
- What exactly has already changed in the lives of the population (disaggregated by gender and age) (immediate impact)?
- Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of gender equality and environmental protection, equality and equity, inclusive participation, social inclusion can possibly be attributed to the project?
- How many women are in leading positions/ management positions in the union and in the farmers' cooperatives? Can this or part of this be attributed to the project?
- Which institutions have already benefitted from the project and how? What has changed for whom (immediate impact)?
- How have supported co-operatives and other actors of the coffee supply-chain benefited from the intervention?

Sustainability

- To what extent are the outcomes of the CAFÉ project likely to continue producing effects after the end of the intervention?
- Which elements furthering sustainability did the project design include, if any?
- What were the major factors which influenced the achievement or non-achievement of sustainability of the project? How have challenges / obstacles been addressed?
- What should be done to ensure that initiated change processes are continued?
 - in terms of improved farm management practices of farmers,
 - in terms of joint decision-making by men and women etc.),

- What should be done to ensure the functionality and sustainability of the cooperatives and the union?
- What should be done to motivate the younger generation to continue coffee farming?

6. Approach and Methods

The evaluation consists of several phases:

Area of Coverage

The evaluation will be undertaken in Ethiopia. Field visits will be conducted as part of this evaluation. The field visits will take place in Addis Ababa and at other locations in Ethiopia, mainly in the Amhara region.

Furthermore, communication and exchange of information should be established with the ADA Headquarters in Vienna as well as with Lavazza Foundation in Torino (Italy), Löffberg Foundation in Karlstad (Sweden) and HRNS Headquarters in Hamburg (Germany) and HRNS Uganda office (providing direct coaching and support to HRNS Ethiopia). The project will assist the evaluators in identifying relevant contact persons in these organisations mentioned above if requested.

Contract and Kick-off meeting: Contract is signed and a discussion of the assignment takes place. First documents, including available data, are provided to the evaluation team.

Desk Study: The evaluation team studies all necessary project/programme documents; re-constructs and analyses the intervention logic/programme theory and theory of change, its assumptions and existing data.

Inception-Phase: In the inception report the evaluators will describe the design of the evaluation and will elaborate on how data will be obtained and analysed. The use of a data collection planning worksheet or a similar tool is required. First interviews take place. Data triangulation and quality control are very important and need to be discussed in the inception report.

The field trip will only take place upon official approval of the inception report by the contractor.

Field-phase: Data needs to be gathered, analysed and interpreted. It is expected that the evaluation will include quantitative and qualitative data gender and age disaggregated, where feasible.

Presentation: Presentation of key findings (feedback workshop) at the end of the field trip.

Final Draft Report: Submission and presentation of final draft report, inclusion of comments from partners and contractor.

Final Report: Submission of final report (see reporting requirements under point 9). Presentation of the final Project Report at the premises of HRNS in Hamburg (Germany), ADA premises or HRNS Ethiopia depending on origin of lead consultant.

The evaluation methodology will include desk review. For the different phases it is expected that data and information will be obtained through different methods such as: analysis of documents, structured interviews, semi-structured interviews face-to face or by phone and group discussions.

It is expected that the evaluation team will present concrete recommendations which are addressed to the specific stakeholders.

The Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluations developed by the Austrian Development Agency need to be considered throughout the entire evaluation process.

Also see: http://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Evaluierung/Evaluierungs_Leitfaeden/EN_Leitfaden_Evaluierung.pdf

7. Timetable

Optional: A total of 21 working days is currently estimated for this assignment.

| Action | Days | Responsible | Date |
|--|------|--|-------------|
| Submission of bid (electronically) | | Contractor | 26/10/18 |
| Contract signed and documents provided | | Contract signed with the evaluation team | 02/11/18 |
| Kick-Off meeting and first interviews (possible online/telcon) – 2 working days | 2 | Meeting between contractor and the team leader | 09-10/11/18 |
| Desk Study – 2 working days | 2 | Team leader | 11-12/11/18 |
| Preparation and submission of draft inception report | 1 | Team leader | 13/11/18 |
| Inclusion of feed-back comments and submission of final inception report | 1 | Team leader | 14/11/18 |
| Field Visit, interviews etc. and feedback workshop – 10 working days (including travel) | 10 | Evaluation Team | 15-25/11/18 |
| Preparation and presentation of final report | 3 | Evaluation Team | 26-28/11/18 |
| Inclusion of feedback in final draft report | 1 | Team leader | 29/11/18 |
| Submission of final evaluation report (hard copy and electronic copy) to contractor & Presentation at either the EUD premises, ADA premises or HRNS Ethiopia depending on origin of lead consultant. | 1 | Team leader | 30/11/18 |

8. Budget

The total budget available for covering all costs related to this project evaluation is EUR 20.000

9. The Evaluation Team

The evaluation team will consist of 2 members (national and international), while the offer should indicate which tasks can be covered by which evaluator.

Key Qualifications in the team should ideally be:

- Relevant academic degree (master level) e.g. in agriculture, rural development or business administration
- Team leader has a minimum of seven years' experience and expertise in the field/sector of rural development and agriculture
- Team leader has conducted at least five evaluations in the last five years ideally in a relevant field
- Team member has participated in at least three evaluations ideally in a relevant field
- Knowledge of Ethiopian coffee producing regions with focus on topics such as rural development and agriculture, farmer livelihoods, value chain development, cooperatives
- Working experience in East Africa
- Experience in project cycle management
- Experience and expertise in cross-cutting issues and principles (such as gender equity and environmental sustainability)
- Excellent oral and written English skills and knowledge of Amharic (either through a national expert or a translator)
- Sound MS Office and IT skills

The consultants must not have been previously involved in the design, implementation or monitoring of this project/programme.

10. Reports

The consultants will submit the following reports: All reports need to be written in English.

- an inception report (10-15 pages without annexes),
- a final draft evaluation report (about 25-30 pages without annexes), including a draft executive summary and the results-assessment form (part of the reporting requirement)
- and the final evaluation report (25-30 pages without annexes), the final executive summary and the results-assessment form (part of the reporting requirement)

The executive summary should summarize the evaluations purpose, objectives, subject and methods and give an overview of key findings, lessons learned and recommendations (three to five pages) and needs to be submitted as part of the final draft report.

The findings and recommendations of the draft final report and final report have to be structured according to the evaluation questions. An outline of the report's structure needs to be agreed upon during the inception phase.

The quality of the reports will be judged according to the following criteria:

- Is the project planning matrix format part of the report?
- Does the report contain a comprehensive and clear executive summary?
- Were the Terms of Reference fulfilled and is this reflected in the report?
- Is the report structured according to the OECD/DAC criteria?
- Are all evaluation questions answered?
- Are the methods and processes of the evaluation sufficiently documented in the evaluation report?
- Does the report describe and assess the intervention logic (e.g. logframe, program theory) and present/analyse a theory of change and its underlying assumptions?
- Are cross-cutting issues and principles analysed in the report?
- Are the conclusions and recommendations based on findings and are they clearly stated in the report?
- Does the report clearly differentiate between conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations?
- Are the recommendations realistic and is it clearly expressed to whom the recommendations are addressed to?
- Were the most significant stakeholders involved consulted?
- Does the report present the information contained in a presentable and clearly arranged form?
- Is the report free from spelling mistakes and unclear linguistic formulations?
- Can the report be distributed in the delivered form?

11. Co-ordination/Responsibility

Mr. Stefan Cognigni, head of HRNS Uganda and Supervisor of HRNS Project Team Ethiopia will be the contact person for this evaluation.

Contact details: stefan.cognigni@hrnstiftung.org

12. Annexes:

- Guidelines:http://www.entwicklung.at/fileadmin/user_upload/Dokumente/Evaluierung/Evaluierungs_Leitfaeden/EN_Leitfaden_Evaluierung.pdf
- Results-Assessment Form, to be filled in by the evaluation team
- Project Planning Matrix
- Format inception report: see Guidelines page 37
- Format evaluation report: see Guidelines page 39

The following documents will only be made available to the successful bidder:

- Main project document
- Project Theory of Change
- Project work plans
- Project reports
- Specific project studies

Annex 1: Results-Assessment Form for Mid-Term and Final Project Evaluations/Reviews

This form has to be filled in electronically by the evaluator/reviewer. No evaluation report will be accepted without this form. The form has to be included at the beginning of the evaluation/review report.

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Title of project/programme (please, spell out): | | | |
| Contract Period of project/programme: | | | |
| ADC number of project/programme: | | | |
| Name of project/programme partner: | | | |
| Country and Region of project/programme : | | | |
| Budget of this project/programme: | | | |
| Name of evaluation company (spell out) and names of evaluators: | | | |
| Date of completion of evaluation/review: | | | |
| Please tick appropriate box: | | | |
| a) Evaluation/review managed by ADA/ADC Coordination Office | | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| b) Evaluation managed by project partner: | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| Please tick appropriate box: | | | |
| a) Mid-Term Evaluation | b) Final Evaluation | c) Mid-Term Review | d) Final Review |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Others: please, specify: | | | |
| Project Outcome (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix): | | | |
| | | | |

For Final Evaluation/Review¹: Project Outcome: To what extent has the project already achieved its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix? Please, tick appropriate box

Outcome(s) was/were:

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Fully achieved: | Almost achieved: | Partially achieved: | Not achieved: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|

Please, also explain your assessment: What exactly was achieved and why? If not achieved, why not? (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators)

For Mid-Term Evaluation/Review²: Project Outcome: To what extent do you think the project will most likely achieve its outcome(s) according to the Logframe Matrix Please, tick appropriate box

Outcome(s) will most likely be:

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Fully achieved: | Almost achieved: | Partially achieved: | Not achieved: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|

Please, also explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of outcome and relevant indicators)

Project Outputs: To what extent has the project already achieved its outputs³ according to the Logframe Matrix ? Please, tick appropriate boxes

Output 1 (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):

Output was:

¹ Please, only fill in in case this is a final project evaluation/review.

² Please, only fill in in case this is a mid-term evaluation/review.

³ In case there are more than three outputs, please, add them.

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Fully achieved: | Almost achieved: | Partially achieved: | Not achieved: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

Output 2 (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):

Output 2 was:

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Fully achieved: | Almost achieved: | Partially achieved: | Not achieved: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

Output 3 (Please, include as stated in the Logframe Matrix):

Output 3 was:

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|
| Fully achieved: | Almost achieved: | Partially achieved: | Not achieved: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|

Please, explain your assessment: (Please, consider description of output and relevant indicators)

In case there are more than three Outputs please, state as above.

Impact/Beneficiaries:

How many women, men, girls, boys and people in total have already benefited from this project directly and indirectly? Please, explain

What exactly has already changed in the lives of women, men, girls, boys and/or institutions from this project? Please, explain:

Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of gender can be possibly be attributed to the project? Please, explain:

If applicable, which institutions have benefitted from this project/programme and how?

Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues:

Gender: To what extent was gender mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations - if any- from the ADA internal gender-assessment considered and implemented?

Environment: To what extent was environmental mainstreaming included in the project? To what extent were the recommendations - if any- from the ADA internal environment-assessment considered and implemented?

Which positive and/or negative effects/impacts in terms of environment can be possibly be attributed to the project? Please, explain

Social Standards: To what extent were the social standards monitored by relevant partners? Have any issues emerged? Please, explain

Overall/Other Comments: