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A. Purpose

(A.1) Purpose

This evaluation will provide an overall, independent assessment of the EU’s Approach to Building Resilience to withstand Food Crises in African Drylands (Sahel and Horn of Africa regions) 2007 – 2015. This period will provide a perspective from the previous EU budgetary period (2007-2013), include the period in which the EU Food Facility was implemented, and include the inception of the current programme cycle (2014-2020). This overall period will enable a meaningful analysis of policy and strategy evolution. It will identify key lessons learned, and give recommendations for future policy and practice.

More specifically this evaluation will assess the strengths and weaknesses of the EU’s approach to building resilience to withstand food crises in African drylands to date, including whether the approach is appropriately scoped, pitched and applied with regard to the Sahel and Horn of Africa regions, and the extent to which the approach can be adapted to either changing contexts, or applied in other contexts.

The outputs of the evaluation will be used to:

- Provide evidence to inform any review of current policy and approach;
- Inform the future development of the major initiatives underway, and any new initiatives in this area;
- Contribute to the evidence base for a major EU evaluation on resilience scheduled for 2018.

(A.2) Justification

The justification for this evaluation is –

- The significant focus and financial disbursement by EU (both long term development and humanitarian assistance) on food security resilience means this is a priority area for learning and building EU’s knowledge and hence a priority for evaluation. Inter alia, the two recent, sizeable and innovative initiatives in the African Drylands: Supporting Horn of Africa Resilience (SHARE)1 and Alliance Globale pour l’Initiative Résilience

---

1 Commission Staff Working Document SEC (2012) 102 of 11 April 2012:  
as well as the major innovative programmes which have been developed to address resilience as part of the focal sector in National Indicative Plan (NIP), Regional Indicative Plan (RIP), thematic lines or other EU budget lines in some of the countries of the Sahel and the Horn of Africa.

- In the 2015-2019 work programme for strategic evaluations to be commissioned by the Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (DG DEVCO), there are a number of sectoral evaluations envisaged to provide information and analysis on the intervention of the EU in aspects of sustainable agriculture and food and nutrition security. This evaluation is the first of these which are designed to contribute to a major evaluation on resilience, scheduled for 2018.

- The legal basis: Article 12 of the Common Implementing Regulation (CIR) 2014\(^2\), which requires the Commission to "evaluate the impact and effectiveness of its sectoral policies and actions and the effectiveness of programming, where appropriate by means of independent external evaluations."

- Article 18 of the 10\(^{th}\) European Development Fund (EDF) implementation Regulation requires assessment of effectiveness and efficiency\(^3\).

- The Commission's humanitarian aid evaluations are based on\(^5\):
  o Articles 18 and 20 of the Humanitarian Aid Regulation – Council Regulation (EC) No 1257/96 of 20 June 1996, and;
  o Article 30.4 of the Financial Regulation\(^6\), and Article 18. of its Rules of Application.

### B. Content and subject of the evaluation

(B.1) Subject area

The Communication on the EU Approach to Resilience (2012)\(^7\) sets out the subject area: "Recent and recurrent food crises in the Sahel region and in the Horn of Africa, where more than 30 million people are suffering from hunger, have underscored the need to work on a long-term and systematic approach to building the resilience of vulnerable countries and populations. The effects of economic shocks, rising and fluctuating food prices, demographic pressure, climate change, desertification, environmental degradation, pressure on natural resources, inappropriate land tenure systems, insufficient investment in agriculture, have, in many parts of the world, resulted in greater exposure to risk, notably from natural hazards. The impact of these global trends is manifested in the increasing number and intensity of natural disasters and human-made crises. The poorest households are the most vulnerable and in many instances this vulnerability is compounded by political instability and conflict. In the case of food insecurity, despite some progress, one billion people are still suffering from hunger and the issue is particularly acute in drought-prone areas where most of the population depends directly on agriculture and pastoralism".

Resilience in this context is understood by the EU to be the ability of an individual, a household, a community, a country or a region to withstand, to adapt, and to quickly recover from stresses and shocks. The approach has four major characteristics:

i) country ownership - with the importance of aligning humanitarian and development aid to national resilience strategies and frameworks as a precondition for sustainable results;

ii) people centred - where the resilience approach must bring sustainable benefits to the most vulnerable populations and households;

iii) ensuring coherence, complementarity, co-ordination, continuity between humanitarian and development


partners in order to achieve results.

iv) multi-level involvement – resilience should be built at all level from individuals, to households, local communities, sub-national areas, countries, regions, continents up to the global.

In addition the approach recognises the role of women, particularly (but not exclusively) in building resilience in households and communities, and that building resilience is not only about strengthening agricultural production, but also about better functioning of food markets and empowerment of vulnerable groups and civil society.

The EU is one of the world’s largest donors providing life-saving assistance to people affected by various crises. Over recent years the demands for such assistance have increased substantially, far outstripping the resources available. Such assistance is vital, but it is aimed mainly at coping with emergency situations and needs to be supplemented by support to populations at risk to withstand, cope with and adapt to repeated adverse events and long-term stress.

Building resilience is a long-term effort which needs to be firmly embedded in national policies and planning. It is a part of the development process, and genuinely sustainable development will need to tackle the underlying causes of recurrent crises, rather than just their consequences. Working with vulnerable populations to build their resilience is also a fundamental part of poverty reduction which is the ultimate aim of EU development policy, as has been reaffirmed by the EU in the Agenda for Change.

Building resilience, by its very nature, must be a multi-sectoral approach. Resilience strategies contribute to different policies, in particular food and nutrition security, climate change adaptation, and disaster risk reduction. The EU has supported prevention and preparedness for crises in the most vulnerable countries over the period, and identified the need to integrate disaster risk reduction and adaptation to climate change, notably into both development cooperation and the humanitarian response.

The EU also views investing in resilience as a cost effective measure. Addressing the underlying causes of recurrent crises is not only better, especially for the people concerned, than only responding to the consequences of crises, it is also much cheaper. When the world is experiencing an economic and budgetary downturn, the budgets of both partner countries and donors are coming under increased pressure to show that they deliver the maximum impact for the funds that are made available.

In response to the most recent massive food crises in Africa, the approach of the Commission has been to develop frameworks focusing on resilience building with two regional initiatives: Supporting Horn of African Resilience (SHARE) and l’Alliance Globale pour l’Initiative Résilience Sahel (AGIR), and a number of large resilience building programmes developed and implemented as part of the focal sectors of the National Indicative Plans for the 10th European Development Fund or with other EU interventions in some of the countries of those regions.

Against this background, this evaluation focuses on the food and nutrition security and sustainable agriculture dimensions of resilience. It examines what can be learned from EU’s approach to building resilience to withstand food crises in the African Drylands, focusing on the Sahel and Horn regions in the period 2007-2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(B.2) Original objectives of the intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The objective of the approach is to build and/or strengthen resilience mechanisms at regional, national and sub-national level to address the needs of vulnerable populations affected in the countries of the Sahel and Horn regions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(B.3) How the objectives were to be achieved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The objectives are expected to be achieved by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Support to robust analysis and system to analyse risks and to anticipate crisis :</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1. Assessing food security situation using Early Warning Systems combining market information, climatic records, remote sensing information, vegetation assessments, sample households and individual surveys and any other relevant data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Understanding and modelling the dynamic of risks and vulnerability particularly, but not only, the factors affecting the food systems and of the social protection mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supporting the development of the resilience framework</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1. Support the formulation of country owned resilience policies and operating framework that are coherent with the regional policy such as the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD) Heads of States commitment to end Drought Emergencies, the AGIR roadmap adopted by ECOWAS/UEMOA/CILSS, with the regional objective of “Zero Hunger” in the Sahel, and more generally to the principles of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP).

2.2. Support the operationalisation of the resilience framework linking data to implementation particularly at local authority level in order to reach communities.

2.3. Address the coordination needs at different levels

3. Focusing on prevention and preparedness – risk analysis, better dissemination of learning, better governance of disaster management, better use of public-private partnership to enhance productive systems, more integrated approach to tackling root causes of food insecurity – food availability and access to food, integration of the nutrition dimension and of the specific role of women

4. Enhancing crisis response – joint intervention frameworks prepared by both humanitarian and long term development actors, setting strategic priorities, flexible funding, ensuring donor co-ordination and strengthening national and regional capacities to respond, ensuring resilience is a dimension in all interventions in related areas such as social protection, sustainable agriculture, climate change, food security and nutrition, disaster risk reduction, linking relief rehabilitation and development.

A schematic outline of the intervention logic for how the EU understands the change process engendered by the 2012 Communication is set out below.

---

4 Economic Community of West African States; West African Monetary Union, Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control
C. Scope of the evaluation

(C.1) Topics covered

The evaluation will cover EU interventions on food security resilience in African drylands – Sahel and Horn of Africa - over the period 2007-2015. This region has benefited from two major initiatives supported by the EU - SHARE in the Horn, and AGIR in the Sahel – which began in 2012/2013 respectively, as well as a number of important 10th European Development Fund programmes implemented as part of the National Indicative Plans, (e.g. a major resilience programme in Ethiopia) and other development cooperation interventions in some of the countries in the region, (e.g. Drought Contingency Fund and Common Programing Framework to End Drought Emergency in Kenya, Support to IGAD in Djibouti, Support to Karamoja cluster in Uganda).

The evaluation will cover the EU approach, policy and implementation to build resilience in face of food crises in the Sahel and Horn regions. This will also involve examination of the contribution and interface of the main services involved (DG ECHO and DG DEVCO and the European External Action Service (EEAS)); and an assessment of the contribution of a range of programmes which promote agricultural sustainability, maximise agriculture’s contribution to economic growth, reduce chronic malnutrition to enable governments and people to withstand food crises.

The evaluation will be based on the criteria defined in the Better Regulation guidelines (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence and EU added value) and complemented by two additional OECD-DAC criteria – impact and sustainability.

(C.2) Issues to be examined

The following are issues to be examined. They will be further developed in the Terms of Reference and during the inception phase of the evaluation

Relevance

1. What ‘driving influences’ have affected the institutional development pathway and its relative priority in the development agenda, of EU’s current approach to building resilience to withstand food crises during the period?

What are the different approaches to building resilience to food crises which the EU has used during the period, and in what ways have they shifted in nature? To what extent were these different approaches adapted to their...
2. To what extent does the current EU approach to building resilience to food crises match the needs context and capacities on the ground in the Sahel and Horn regions to enable governments and populations to withstand food crises?

Is it appropriately pitched? i.e. appropriate level, to the appropriate partners, to meet the needs of the appropriate people. Is it appropriately scoped?

Have underlying causes of food insecurity been addressed through the approach?

**Effectiveness**

3. To what extent has the approach delivered against the Agenda for Change?

With respect to its reach, and results delivered? (e.g. the programme and initiatives AGIR, SHARE results over the period; the process involved, partnerships and progress in political and policy dialogue)

With respect to the design of interventions – do they adequately reflect the approach?

With respect to what we can concretely learn about designing for and measuring resilience capacity?

4. To what extent was the mix of delivery mechanisms, including budget support, adequate and complementary?

To what extent does the budget support instrument fit with the concept of resilience, since resilience is not a sector but an objective?

Were synergies achieved between budget support, project approach and other instruments? What is the value added of individual modalities?

**Added value, coherence and coordination**

5. To what extent does the EU approach add value and complement efforts already being undertaken on resilience to withstand food crises?

(Efforts by Governments, regional institutions, donors – Member States, international organisations such as World Food Programme (WFP), Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) - other actors). Do any of these – especially EU Member States - add particular value to the EU approach?

Is the approach coherent with other EU policies?

To what extent is the approach co-ordinated amongst donors, amongst national governments, amongst all players?

6. To what extent has the EU approach been visible and catalytic?

Is the resilience approach sufficiently known across DG DEVCO and DG ECHO? Is it embedded in DG DEVCO and DG ECHO processes and procedures, including learning systems?

To what extent has the EU approach managed to move forward the regional resilience agendas conveying additional resources towards the same strategic objectives?

**Efficiency**

7. To what extent has the approach to building resilience to withstand food crises been delivered with a view to cost effectiveness for all parties, including pooling efforts where appropriate, and including the DG DEVCO-DG ECHO interaction/way of working together? What inefficiencies could be eliminated?

**Sustainability**

8. To what extent is the approach embedded in commitments, processes and procedures in the concerned regional organisations and countries?

To what extent is the approach replicable in changing contexts in the areas where it is now, and in other contexts? and under what conditions?

**Impact**

9. To what extent have the EU resilience policy, the approach, and its initiatives on the ground, particularly the parts related to food crises, influenced key stakeholders and key beneficiaries? (e.g. in terms of their policy, priorities, budget allocation, practice)?

To what extent are demonstration and communication about the approach and implementation used to leverage greater effect?
### D. Evidence base

#### (D.1) Evidence from Monitoring

For this evaluation, data will be drawn from the following sources (not exhaustive):

- Internal end of year reporting on resilience relevant activities
- Results oriented monitoring reports of resilience relevant activities
- European Development Fund National Indicative Plans and monitoring reports.
- Field visits will be undertaken during the course of the evaluation for in-depth study of a number of interventions. These will be selected on the basis of clear criteria during the Desk Phase

#### (D.2) Previous evaluations and other reports

There are a number of evaluations and reports which are important to consult to establish a good understanding of the issues and key perspectives for this evaluation. This includes in particular:


#### General

- Progress and evaluation reports from the resilience programme implemented under 10TH European Development Fund National Indicative Plan and other DG DEVC0 or DG ECHO financing.
- Evaluations on building resilience in the Horn and Sahel from others organisations active in the field such as Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), World Food Programme (WFP), Non-Government organisations (e.g. Oxfam, Care and others operational in the region).
- DG ECHO evaluations on building resilience in the region.

#### (D.3) Evidence from assessing the implementation and application of legislation (complaints, infringement procedures)

**Not applicable**

#### (D.4) Consultation

The objective of the consultation process of the evaluation is to ensure all relevant views are taken into account enabling a robust exercise.

The key stakeholders for consultation include:

- EU Member States
- African regional institutions and individual Partner country stakeholders, including non-state actors
- International Organisations working on resilience in the region
- Relevant private sector and civil society organisations working on resilience in the region

The precise stakeholders will be further defined in the terms of reference and in the early days of the evaluation.

An outline consultation strategy is as follows:

- During the process of the evaluation, consultation will be as follows:
  - **Desk Phase**, where documentation is reviewed and hypotheses are developed – key stakeholders will be consulted on the full range of issues, by the evaluation team (using individual face to face semi-structured interviews, group discussions, e-mail);
  - **Field Phase** – the evaluation team will consult key players in the region, including those involved in the areas for in-depth study. They will be selected during the early part of the overall evaluation;
  - **A Dissemination Seminar** on the Final Report will be held with key stakeholders and a wider audience in Brussels.

This outline will be further developed with the evaluation team in the early stages of the evaluation.

(D.5) Further evidence to be gathered

Evidence from other donors and partners will be gathered during the process of the evaluation.

### E. Other relevant information/ remarks

This is a joint evaluation DG DEVCO and DG ECHO. It is managed by DG DEVCO.

Given that there will be an overarching evaluation on all aspects of resilience in 2018 to which this evaluation will feed in, the better regulation guidelines will not fully apply to this evaluation. In particular:

- instead of a 12-week open public consultation, there will be targeted consultations as outlined in section D above.
- there will be a management response to the final evaluation report and a short summary of the final evaluation in the Annual Report on the European Union’s Development and External Assistance Policies and their implementation.