



Final evaluation of Fairtrade Finland Development Cooperation Programme 2022-2025

Final Report

16.1.2026

OSMA advisory In collaboration with **Kristiina Mikkola Consulting**

Contact person:

Paula Tommila

paula.tommila@osma.fi

+358 40 538 4813

VAT number: FI29918069

Contents

Executive summary	i
Abbreviations	ix
1. Introduction to the evaluation	1
2. Methodology	2
3. Findings	3
3.1 Relevance.....	3
3.2 Coherence	3
3.3 Effectiveness.....	4
3.4 Efficiency.....	7
3.5 Impact	9
3.6 Sustainability	10
3.7 Management.....	12
4. Conclusions and recommendations.....	15
Annex 1: Terms of Reference of the Evaluation	21
Annex 2: Documents reviewed during the evaluation.....	22
Annex 3: Organizations consulted.....	24

Executive summary

This is the Final Report of the Final evaluation of Fairtrade Finland Development Cooperation Programme 2022-2025. The evaluation was conducted during October 2025 – January 2026. The members of the evaluation team were Paula Tommila (Osma Advisory Oy) and Kristiina Mikkola (Kristiina Mikkola Consulting).

Fairtrade Finland has been implementing its Dignified Opportunities Nurtured through Trade & Sustainability (DONUTS) programme since 2022. The programme complements Fairtrade's (FT's) certification-based system by linking entire value chains to empower small-scale producers and plantation workers to have rights to sustainable livelihoods. The programme focuses on social, economic and ecological sustainability of farmers' and workers' rights and livelihoods, namely on issues beyond certification. The programme also promotes the three cross-cutting objectives of the Fairtrade movement: gender equality, youth and vulnerable persons.

The programme uses the Doughnut Economics Model as the theoretical framework for the programme's problem analysis and Theory of Change. The Theory of Change and the Results Framework of the programme include three interlinked priority areas, that are also the targeted impacts of the programme:

- Social: Inclusive and strengthened civil society
- Economic: Farmers' and workers' economic rights are realized
- Ecological: Farmers and workers live in harmony with the environment and climate.

The programme is implemented through 15 individual projects in Africa and Latin America, as well as through an advocacy and communication component raising awareness about Fairtrade, development issues and the programme's results among the Finnish public.

The overall budget of the programme is 11.9 million Euros, out of which 7.1 million Euros is funded by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA) through its programmatic support instrument, and the rest by Fairtrade organizations and their commercial partners (e.g. HALBA, Mars, Tony's Open Chain).

The purpose of the evaluation was to gain evidence on the impact and achievements of the programme, and to identify key learnings and formulate recommendations at programme and project level on how the programming could be improved during the next programme phase 2026-2029. The evaluation analysed the programme and its components through the six OECD DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. An additional criterion on management was also included in the evaluation criteria with evaluation questions focusing mainly on the general programme management processes conducted by the Fairtrade programme team in Finland. The final evaluation was conducted as a

meta-evaluation of the existing 10 project-level evaluations and two project workshop reports, supported by key informant consultations and other documentation available.

Findings

The project is very relevant to its stakeholders. The objectives, approaches and results of the programme meet the needs of its target communities very well, and the targeted rights-holders and duty-bearers have been sufficiently involved in defining priorities and steering of the projects under the programme. The programme approach is holistic and covers the key FT focus areas related to social, economic and ecological sustainability well. The programme and all its projects are also aligned with relevant global, national, and local priorities.

The overall coherence of the programme is good. The programme is aligned with other Fairtrade operations, especially certification, and it complements them mostly well. The programme has considered other initiatives and programmes operating in the same environments at different levels depending on the project, and there's no sign of duplication or contradiction of other initiatives, and efforts have been made to avoid them. Commercial partners of the programme pay attention to aligning their other activities with the programme activities in target regions. There's some collaboration between programme projects focusing on similar topics. However, a systematic approach to collecting and sharing learnings and recommendations for continuous improvement withing the programme is still underdeveloped.

The programme is considered effective. The programme objectives have been achieved well for the most essential parts, and the programme has managed to build the capacities of its stakeholders. Promotion of sustainable agroforestry practices in cocoa projects has been a success in terms of increases in yields and income.

Related to effectiveness, most significant challenges have been encountered in projects related to clean cooking. Carbon credit income targets for two clean cooking projects were unmet during the programme period, and some clean cooking projects may not reach their objectives. However, the clean cooking component in the Kenyan flower project has provided good results. Other challenges related to effectiveness include e.g. delays in farming inputs deliveries, limited coaching for new farming practice adopters and challenges in educational activities. There's also room for improvement in communicating the results of the programme to donors and public. External factors, such as changes in commodity prices and weather have both contributed to and hindered the achievements, while changes in the regulatory framework, especially EU regulation, have hindered some of the achievements.

Most changes identified can be attributed to the Programme, and resilience of many farms towards climate change has improved thanks to the programme. The programme has gained a flagship position within the Fairtrade network, and the programme practices are followed by other projects and programmes within the network.

Gender issues have been considered across the programme, yet results vary. In some programme areas, cultural and regulatory issues hinder the inclusion of women in key programme activities. Specific attention to gender issues has been paid in several projects outside farming activities. However, needs for more targeted support for women have been raised in different projects. Youth have been targeted across the programme, with mainly positive results.

The programme has managed to reach vulnerable groups in a way that would not be possible through traditional Fairtrade certification processes. Work with vulnerable groups has focused on people with disabilities (PWD), and new approaches to PWD engagement have provided very good results in Ethiopia, and they have been considered exemplary within the Fairtrade network. Challenges in data aggregation per vulnerable groups may limit the information available related to implementation of the cross-cutting objectives.

The programme is efficiently managed and implemented, and no major problems were detected at project or programme level. Fairtrade Africa (FTA) manages programme activities relatively independently. Many members of the Fairtrade network consider the programme so successful, that they rather include their own project efforts under the programme than establish interventions of their own. The flexibility of the MFA financing improves the efficiency compared to many other donor-funded interventions. The programme has managed to make use of existing structures in communities targeted.

Collaboration and communication between Fairtrade Finland, FTA and commercial partners have improved during the programme, and the programme benefits from Fairtrade networks resources in many ways. The programme improves the efficiency and effectiveness of Fairtrade operations outside the programme sphere. The efficiency of monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) has room for improvement. While significant resources have been reserved for MEL in some projects, data collection is not fully aligned with activities in many projects, and some programme level indicators are only relevant to a small number of projects.

According to project evaluations and stakeholder consultations, the programme has contributed to all its key impact areas. Awareness raising is considered as one of the key impacts across the programme. The programme has also increased the income levels for its rights-holders, and environmental impacts have been created through more sustainable farming techniques. Some early indicators of longer-term

contributions to decent work have been identified in projects contributing to workers' rights. Gender impacts have been created through creating new income opportunities for women, by increasing the participation of women in committees and increased awareness of gender-sensitive issues. Youth have got access to new skills and income opportunities.

Even small size projects have been able to create tangible impacts. For example, in the Ethiopian flower project changes have been made to collective labour agreements, that benefit the workers also outside the farms participating in the projects. The adoption of clean cooking solutions has improved especially life of women.

Adequate conditions for sustainability have been created in programme design and by many of the project activities. The long-term viability of the Programme interventions is considered good. In many projects, structures and organisations have been established and strengthened, and it seems likely that many of these will remain active after the programme period.

The programme activities taking place within the Fairtrade system improve sustainability, as does the involvement of commercial partners in projects. Sustainability plans that were prepared for each project towards the end of the programme period address project-specific sustainability. Ecological sustainability is relatively good especially through promotion and commitment to agroforestry and other good agricultural practices.

Some concerns related to sustainability remain, for example regarding institutional and financial sustainability. Sustainability of the efforts targeting youths is not always evident. In many cases, the support for vulnerable groups is at risk after the programme activities are over. In both small producer organizations and plantations, one of the main risks to sustainability relates to leadership turnover. Sustainability of some of the clean cooking interventions is not clear.

Programme management is considered good, yet there is room for development within Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) processes. The programme is considered a flagship programme within FT network. The programme coverage, its sectors and projects are feasible and work well under one programme. FTA carries a large share of the management and administrative responsibilities of the programme, and collaboration between FTA and Fairtrade Finland is strong and positive. Some programme partners hope that FT Finland would take a slightly more active role in programme implementation. The cooperation with co-funding National Fairtrade Organizations (NFOs) and the main implementing partners has improved during the programme period. Sharing of best practices and lessons between the projects happens, but its opportunities are not utilized to the extent possible. The Doughnut Economics Model is a

good fit for the programme’s theoretical framework. The theory of Change (ToC) of the programme builds on Fairtrade processes and addresses the ongoing planetary crises.

Significant resources have been allocated for MEL at project level and good results have been gained in some projects, yet the MEL expertise at project level is insufficient. The impacts, results and outcomes of the programme are not communicated as clearly as could be. At the programme level, the overall programme and its activities are well aligned but the results framework is complex. Limitations exist in allowing the results framework to enable the monitoring and achievement of the programme level results. Specific challenges exist with the indicators. The standard of MEL practices varies across projects; learning and adaptive management is a concern in some evaluations.

Key conclusions and recommendations

Conclusion	Recommendations
<p>1. The programme is highly relevant to its stakeholders, and it meets the needs of the target communities very well. The rights-holders and duty-bearers have been involved well in defining priorities and steering the projects under the programme.</p>	<p>1.1: Continue engaging the target communities in project design and steering and keep the focus of the programme on issues relevant to programme stakeholders (e.g. target communities, FT network, commercial partners, local and national authorities).</p>
<p>2. The programme and its projects are aligned with other Fairtrade operations and relevant government initiatives, and it complements them well. The programme has also considered other initiatives and programmes operating in the same environments at different levels depending on the project. There’s some collaboration between programme projects focusing on similar topics, but there’s room for more.</p>	<p>2.1: Continue aligning the programme with development opportunities identified within the Fairtrade network, and with the government policies and initiatives relevant to the objectives of the programme and individual projects.</p> <p>2.2: Consider strengthening collaboration between the projects under the programme whenever the projects target similar challenges or are otherwise aligned.</p> <p>2.3: Ensure that each project has sufficient understanding of other relevant initiatives taking place in the same surroundings, and that possible synergies are utilized.</p>
<p>3. The MEL system does not fully meet the needs of the programme, and its potential is not utilized to the extent possible. The high number of ToCs, outcomes and indicators</p>	<p>3.1: Simplify the programme level results framework and harmonize indicators to better match with the programme structure.</p>

<p>make the results framework heavy to use. Many of the indicators focus rather on project than programme level, and data for all indicators has not been available. Disaggregated indicators for cross-cutting objectives are not available across all impact areas.</p>	<p>3.2: Focus on building MEL capacities of project and programme staff in incorporating MEL to project interventions. Each project should have a dedicated MEL resource that understands the objectives and circumstances of the project and can interpret between project and programme level MEL needs. One expert could be shared between different projects in the same country or context.</p>
<p>4. The management of the programme is efficient and lean. FTA carries a significant share of programme management responsibilities and does it well. FT Finland has relatively limited resources for programme management and substantial steering. FT Finland’s project steering group leadership is considered very good, yet slightly more stringent approach to partner negotiations and overseeing timely delivery of results within the programme would be appreciated by programme partners. FT International resources, partly located in the Finnish office, contribute to the programme at significant level.</p>	<p>4.1: Ensure sufficient due diligence of potential programme partners and pay attention to expectation management by clearly agreeing upon project objectives, roles and responsibilities among partners, as well as key administrative rules and regulations before committing to collaboration.</p> <p>4.2: Ensure sufficient support for project managers in Finland when dealing with challenging situations with programme partners. Consider e.g. a twin manager model, where each project manager has a support person to share thoughts and views of the projects, or engage Programme Director in key partner discussions.</p>
<p>Consideration of cross-cutting issues varies across the programme. Great work has been done with PWDs in Ethiopia, that is exemplary within the whole FT network. Progress with PWDs and other vulnerable groups is more limited in other countries. Women have been targeted mainly by developing additional sources of income for them and by contributing to working conditions development in large farms. Integration of women to producer organizations has been more limited.</p>	<p>5.1: The cross-cutting issues should be more strategically integrated to project design across the programme. Results indicators should be aggregated per cross-cutting topic whenever feasible to allow follow-up of progress on cross-cutting themes during programme implementation.</p> <p>5.2: Specific focus should be paid on integrating women, youth and vulnerable groups to producer organizations’ activities and leadership positions across programme stakeholders. Institutionalizing inclusion to organizational policies and procedures and considering it in relevant budgeting would strengthen the sustainability of the efforts beyond programme period.</p>

<p>Youth have been targeted across the programme with varying results.</p>	
<p>6. Commercial partners' role in the programme is significant, especially from the perspectives of efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. By targeting issues that are important to both producers and their clients, the programme allows the rights-holders to have more stable access to markets, improving the overall sustainability of the programme.</p>	<p>6.1: Continue engaging commercial partners in the programme. Before committing to collaboration, ensure that all partners share the objectives and plans and understand the implementation rules to ensure smooth collaboration. While it's important that the commercial partners understand the specific requirements donor funding brings to the programme, it's also crucial that the programme staff recognize and accept the motivations and reasoning for the commercial partner's contributions.</p>
<p>Developing good models for clean cooking promotion requires specific expertise, while it is not in the core of FT's strategy and objectives.</p> <p>Carbon credit development has been slow and very resource intensive, and the sustainability of the compulsory monitoring systems is unclear once the project support ends leaving the communities at risk of not accessing the revenue from the credits.</p>	<p>7.1: Focus programme activities on topics that are in the core of FT expertise. If stakeholders express genuine interest in and need for clean cooking technologies and/or carbon trade, consider if another organization specialized in the sector could be engaged to implement the interventions outside FT programme scope.</p> <p>7.2: Should projects that require specific expertise outside the scope of FT be promoted, ensure that expertise is sought from external partners already in project planning phase and engage with them throughout the implementation of the project.</p> <p>7.3: Should clean cooking technology distribution be continued in the future, ensure feasibility and sustainability of the business model and users' access to fuel and maintenance services.</p>
<p>8. Sustainability of the programme is at adequate level. Many of the programme activities have focused on strengthening capacities of existing organisations and structures, and the stakeholders have been mostly pleased with the results. FT organizations and commercial partners' presence in target communities after the programme period strengthens the</p>	<p>8.1: To strengthen future programming, more careful sustainability planning should be integrated into the design phase, with iterative updates throughout implementation to adapt to emerging risks and opportunities.</p> <p>8.2: Already in the project planning phase, consider how presence of FT networks and commercial partners could contribute to project sustainability beyond the project period.</p>

<p>sustainability of many of the programme interventions. Revolving funds have supported the sustainability of activities they have been linked to.</p> <p>Sustainability planning in project development phase could be stronger.</p> <p>Key sustainability concerns within the programme are related to institutional and financial sustainability of programme interventions, leadership turnover in target groups, and incomprehensive understanding of business interventions external to Fairtrade framework (especially clean cooking).</p>	<p>8.3: Usage of revolving funds could be considered wider in projects where rights-holders must do investments.</p>
--	--

Abbreviations

DONUTS	Dignified Opportunities Nurtured through Trade & Sustainability
FT	Fairtrade
FTA	Fairtrade Africa
HREDD	Human Rights and Environmental Due Diligence Process
MEL	Monitoring, evaluation and learning
MFA	Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
NFO	National Fairtrade Organization
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PO	Producer Organization
PWD	people with disabilities
ToC	The theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference

1. Introduction to the evaluation

Fairtrade Finland has been implementing its Dignified Opportunities Nurtured through Trade & Sustainability (DONUTS) programme since 2022. DONUTS is an 8-year programme divided into two four-year phases. The programme complements Fairtrade's (FT's) certification-based system by linking entire value chains to empower small-scale producers and plantation workers to have rights to sustainable livelihoods. The programme focuses on social, economic and ecological sustainability of farmers' and workers' rights and livelihoods, namely on issues beyond certification. The programme also promotes the three cross-cutting objectives of the Fairtrade movement: gender equality, youth and vulnerable persons.

The programme uses the Doughnut Economics Model as the theoretical framework for the programme's problem analysis and Theory of Change¹. The Doughnut model presents the boundaries for sustainable life on earth, based on the social and economic foundation and the ecological ceiling. The Theory of Change and the Results Framework of the programme include three interlinked priority areas, that are also the targeted impacts of the programme:

- Social: Inclusive and strengthened civil society
- Economic: Farmers' and workers' economic rights are realized
- Ecological: Farmers and workers live in harmony with the environment and climate.

The three impact have been divided to five long-term outcomes, for which separate theories of change have been created. The outcomes are More democratic, inclusive & active producer organizations (POs) as members of civil society, Enhanced community resilience to risks, Producers' right to living income is realised, Agricultural workers' right to decent work is realised, and Actors in value chains mitigate climate change & protect nature.

The programme is implemented through 15 individual projects in Africa and Latin America, as well as through an advocacy and communication component raising awareness about Fairtrade, development issues and the programme's results among the Finnish public. Advocacy work has focused on Corporate Responsibility (CR) issues in Finland. Out of the 15 projects, 13 took place in Africa (Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi and South Africa) and two in Latin America (Bolivia and Honduras). Sustainability of cocoa production is targeted by five of the projects, while coffee has been in the focus of four projects and flower farms have been targeted by two projects. Vanilla is in the focus in one of the

¹ Raworth, K (2017). Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist. It is based on a set of nine planetary boundaries defined in 2009 within which humanity can continue to develop and feel good in the future. If we cross these limits, abrupt or irreversible environmental changes can occur with serious consequences for humankind.

projects in Madagascar, as are sugar farmers in Malawi and wine farm workers in South Africa. There's also one regional project that focuses on Human Rights and Environmental Due Diligence (HREDD) in Kenyan flower farms and cocoa production in Ghana. Most of the projects target multiple programme impact areas and theories of change.

The overall budget of the programme is 11.9 million Euros, out of which 7.1 million Euros is funded by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA) through its programmatic support instrument, and the rest by Fairtrade organizations and their commercial partners (e.g. HALBA, Mars, Tony's Open Chain). The budgets of individual projects vary between 140 000 euros to more than 2 million euros the median budget per project being 435 000 euros.

This report presents the final evaluation of the programme period. The evaluation has been conducted by Osma Advisory Oy in collaboration with Kristiina Mikkola Consulting.

2. Methodology

In line with the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the final evaluation, the purpose of the evaluation was to gain evidence on the impact and achievements of the programme, and to identify key learnings and formulate recommendations at programme and project level on how the programming could be improved during the next programme phase 2026-2029. The evaluation analysed the programme and its components through the six OECD DAC evaluation criteria: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. An additional criterion on management was also included in the evaluation criteria with evaluation questions focusing mainly on the general programme management processes conducted by the Fairtrade programme team in Finland.

The final evaluation was conducted as a meta-evaluation of the existing 10 project-level evaluations and 2 project workshop reports, supported by key informant consultations and other documentation available. List of documents reviewed is available in Annex 2 of this report. The methods used included document analysis, 17 interviews and an online questionnaire (8 responses) with Fairtrade Finland, Fairtrade Africa and other project partners, and an evaluation workshop with key programme staff from Finland and Fairtrade Africa. The organisations consulted are listed in Annex 3 of this report.

In this evaluation report, the findings have been presented in the order of evaluation question as they were presented in the ToR of the evaluation. Conclusions and recommendations are drawn from the key issues that emerged during the analysis of the findings.

3. Findings

3.1 Relevance

The objectives, approaches and results of the programme meet the needs of its target communities very well. The projects under the programme have been duly designed by FT Africa and The Latin American and Caribbean Network of Fair Trade Small Producers and Workers (CLAC) in collaboration with the rights-holders and duty-bearers in communities with a bottom-up approach. The MFA funding structure allows hearing rights-holders and duty-bearers in the beginning of each programme period, and the programme has taken due advantage of this opportunity.

The targeted rights-holders and duty-bearers have been sufficiently involved in defining priorities and steering of the projects under the programme. The progress of each project is monitored with right-holders and duty-bearers in annual meetings, and the programme design allows adapting project implementation according to changing circumstances to a sufficient level.

The programme approach is holistic and covers the key FT focus areas related to social, economic and ecological sustainability well. The programme is additional to FT certification operations and supports the producers and the FT system in meeting their objectives especially related to cross-cutting themes.

The programme and all its projects are aligned with relevant global, national, and local priorities. Most of the projects have been assessed to contribute to inclusive, climate-smart, and market-compliant interventions that directly support poverty reduction, gender equity, and sustainable livelihoods.

3.2 Coherence

The programme is aligned with other Fairtrade operations, especially certification, and it complements them relatively well. The programme helps Fairtrade organizations and their stakeholders to understand what is needed among farmers and farm workers, and how critical issues related to but not directly touched by the FT certification processes can be targeted beyond certification.

The programme has considered other initiatives and programmes operating in the same environments at different levels depending on the project. The projects have been well aligned with relevant government policy objectives, and some projects have collaborated with government initiatives at local level. Collaboration with other actors has been somewhat active, but there's room for further collaboration. Project partners feel that there could be potential for more synergies between initiatives if there was time to digest all the information shared among the partners.

There's no sign of duplication or contradiction of other initiatives, and efforts have been made to avoid them. Other relevant projects have been mapped during project preparation phases, and communication with relevant stakeholders has been maintained during implementation.

Commercial partners pay attention to aligning their other activities with the programme activities in target regions. They have close connections to their nearest National FT organizations, and they share views and ideas gained from other projects with FT during joint project implementation.

There's some collaboration between programme projects focusing on similar topics. For example, the projects focusing on reducing child labour share lessons among each other. Additionally, lessons and best practices are shared between programme partners in annual programme workshops. However, a systematic approach to collecting and sharing learnings and recommendations for continuous improvement within the programme is still underdeveloped.

3.3 Effectiveness

The programme objectives have been achieved well for the most essential parts. Most projects have met their objectives very well, and stakeholders consider the programme successful.

The programme has managed to build the capacities of its stakeholders. Some approaches have been so effective, that the stakeholders have expanded them outside the programme activities. For example, dynamic agroforestry practices have been adopted by farmers outside programme focus groups, communities have self-initiated new Village Savings and Loans Association (VSLA) groups inspired by observed benefits in programme activities, and trained youth have informally supported their peers outside the formal project cohorts.

One of the key reasons for the success of the programme is that the activities have met the needs of the rights-holders and duty-bearers. This has encouraged them to engage with and commit to the activities.

Promotion of sustainable agroforestry practices in cocoa projects has been a success in terms of increases in yields and income. For example, in the LEAP project cocoa yields experience a programme-attributable increase of 144 kg/ha compared with the control group. In the project areas, yields have remained relatively stable since 2023 while yields in control areas declined sharply.

Significant delays and shortcomings have been reported for some of the clean cooking related projects. Two of the clean cooking projects have aimed at utilizing carbon trade mechanisms, but project

development has been more resource intensive and slower than anticipated. Another clean cooking project in Malawi has not proven a success yet due to challenges in stove distribution and fuel production.

Carbon credit income targets for two clean cooking projects were unmet during the programme period. The Gold Standard process proved more time-consuming and challenging than anticipated during the projects' design phases leading at least to delays in expected revenues. Towards the end of the programme period project stakeholders have completed preliminary reviews and third-party validation under the Gold Standard, and issuance of the first credits is expected to materialise during the first quarter of 2026. Access to the credits requires ongoing monitoring and verification work from the project stakeholders (mainly producer organizations) after the project periods end.

The clean cooking component in the Kenyan flower project has provided good results. Provision of clean cooking technology financed by salary reductions from the participating workers has been considered a success. While the activities are not directly linked to Fairtrade or farming, they have responded to the everyday needs of farm workers.

Some challenges related to effectiveness have been reported in project evaluations. E.g. delays in farming inputs deliveries, limited coaching for new practice adopters and challenges in educational activities have limited the effectiveness of some of the programme efforts. Additionally, insufficient access to finance among farmers and lack of irrigation solutions for new coffee varieties have reduced effectiveness.

External factors, such as changes in commodity prices and weather have both contributed to and hindered the achievements. Rapid rise in cocoa and coffee prices has increased the income levels for producer organizations, while higher prices of farming inputs have decreased the profitability for some farmers and commercial farms. Unpredicted changes in weather caused by climate change have hindered the production of many products, while favourable weather conditions have contributed to better yields in some sectors and countries.

Changes in the regulatory framework have hindered some of the achievements. E.g. European regulation related to organic farming and deforestation has put pressure on farmers and periodically slowed down their access to markets, when they have made effort to meet with the new guidelines. Some efforts are turning out not to be so efficient, as the EU keeps changing its objectives and watering down its own sustainability frameworks.

Resilience of many farms towards climate change has improved thanks to the programme. In Latin America, cooperatives adapted coffee farming practices to improve climate resilience, while introduction of new coffee varieties e.g. in Kenya has increased yields in the changing climate. In cocoa sector, introduction

of dynamic agroforestry practices has increased income and improved resilience of farmers through a wider variety of products for sale, as well as through improved soil conditions and other environmental benefits.

Most changes identified can be attributed to the programme. However, also external factors, such as the changes in cocoa prices have influenced some positive changes e.g. on smallholders' income levels.

Value chain thinking is related to many of the projects under the programme but they target mainly the early parts of value chains at primary production level. Value chain thinking is most visible in projects where commercial partners play a significant role. Also, the HREDD efforts target value chains by encouraging and increasing dialogue between producers and buyers as well as between farmworkers and farm owners.

Advocacy work in Finland has reached its audience well, but assessing its effectiveness is somewhat challenging. E.g. training events organised by FT Finland in collaboration with Finnish Business and Society (FIBS) targeting Finnish businesses have **attracted** increasing **number** of attendants, but it is challenging to measure if and how the attendees have changed their operational practices thanks to the trainings. The same applies to wider communication efforts among the Finnish public. Thanks to the resources provided by the programme, Fairtrade Finland has reached a position in Finland where organisations ask it for advice and support in questions related to workers' rights and sustainable value chain management.

There's room for improvement in communicating the results of the programme to donors and public. Most of the programme reporting is based on indicators measuring project specific outputs and outcomes, while less information is shared about the programme's impacts on value chains and Fairtrade systems at wider scale.

The programme has gained a flagship position within the Fairtrade network. The programme practices are followed by other projects and programmes within the network. Likely partly thanks to the programme, Fairtrade Finland has gained a strong foothold in the international Fairtrade network, and it has a seat in the Fairtrade Executive Team at the international level.

Gender issues have been considered across the programme, yet results vary. Project evaluations show positive results in meeting gender related objectives, while stakeholders' views on the topic have more variation. In some projects, e.g. in the HREDD project and some projects focusing on producer organizations capacities and cash crops, there have been challenges in engaging women in the activities. Projects focusing on workers' rights have more success in gender inclusion, as a large share of farm workers are traditionally women. However, women are under-presented in leading roles also at commercial farms.

In some programme areas, cultural and regulatory issues hinder the inclusion of women in key programme activities. For example, in some countries land rights, cooperative registration procedures and women's traditional roles in farming communities hinder their participation in producer organizations and related activities.

Specific attention to gender issues has been paid in several projects outside farming activities. For example, VSLAs and many clean cooking activities have targeted mainly women. However, needs for more targeted support for women have been raised in different projects. Some stakeholders expressed their wishes for the programme to take a more gender transformative approach.

Youth have been targeted across the programme, with mainly positive results. Trainings on agroforestry practices, business skills and cookstove production have been provided aiming at new income opportunities for youth. In some projects, the share of youth in core activities, such as producer organizations, has remained low. This is, at least partly, a reflection of the age distribution in producer organizations.

The programme has managed to reach vulnerable groups in a way that would not be possible through Fairtrade certification processes alone. The programme can focus on groups and activities that are beyond certification scheme's operational areas.

Work with vulnerable groups has focused on people with disabilities (PWD). New approaches to PWD engagement have provided very good results in Ethiopia, and they have been considered exemplary within the Fairtrade network. Also, in the Kenyan flower project, awareness on workplace inclusivity and the need for accessible environments has been raised. However, according to evaluation reports, in most other countries, results from working with PWDs have been limited in terms of efforts and effectiveness. In some projects, focus has been paid also on tenant farmers' rights and forced labour. There's more work to be done in encouraging producer organizations to actively work with vulnerable groups.

Challenges in data aggregation per vulnerable groups may limit the information available related to implementation of the cross-cutting objectives. Especially data on PWDs may be challenging to collect, at least partly due to legislative issues related to personal data protection in some countries.

3.4 Efficiency

The programme is efficiently managed and implemented, with no major problems detected at project or programme level. Programme management structure at Fairtrade Finland is very lean. Many

stakeholders appreciate also the efficiency of the programme and project management efforts within Fairtrade Africa.

Fairtrade Africa (FTA) manages programme activities relatively independently. Fairtrade Finland sometimes identifies room for improved efficiency in FTA operations, but as long as no major inefficiencies are identified, FT Finland avoids micro-managing the operations that FTA is responsible for.

Many members of the Fairtrade network consider the programme so successful, that they rather include their own project efforts under the programme than establish interventions of their own. This improves the overall efficiency of the Fairtrade programmatic approach.

The programme has managed to make use of existing structures in communities targeted. Many projects have efficiently made use of existing structures of different committees and teams, for example, farmers cooperatives have been active already before the programme has taken place, and child protection committees that have crucial role in two cocoa projects in West Africa have already been established by law before the programme, yet their operations have been accelerated thanks to the projects.

The flexibility of the MFA financing improves the efficiency compared to many other donor-funded interventions. The possibility of defining activities in detail at the inception phase of the programme, and the ability to change plans according to changing circumstances improves the efficiency of the efforts.

The efficiency of monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) systems should be improved. While significant resources have been reserved for MEL in some projects, data collection is not fully aligned with activities in many projects, and some programme level indicators are only relevant to a small number of projects.

Collaboration and communication between Fairtrade Finland, FTA and commercial partners have improved during the programme. Commercial partners have learned to trust more on FTA's views e.g. on selecting cooperatives to be included in project activities. At the same time, new commercial partners have expressed their interested to join the programme. However, there's still room for development in understanding and meeting the needs of commercial partners in projects and aligning them to the development objectives of the programme.

The programme benefits from Fairtrade networks resources in many ways. E.g. cooperatives and farms participating in the programme are already receiving basic services, such as trainings and support for market access from Fairtrade Africa. Communication materials, such as photos can also be sourced from the Fairtrade systems at no additional cost to the programme, and FT International's expertise is available to the

programme's use. This is especially important for the HREDD work, for which the FT Excellence centre is in the same office with FT Finland in Helsinki allowing smooth collaboration between both organisations.

The programme improves the efficiency and effectiveness of Fairtrade operations outside the programme sphere. For example, risk assessment experts working for the programme can also advise FTA's staff outside the programme activities.

3.5 Impact

According to project evaluations and stakeholder consultations, the programme has contributed to all its key impact areas. There is some evidence, that the programme has e.g. increased income for farmers and workers, contributed to better living conditions among farmers and workers (e.g. through clean cooking solutions), reduced pressure on forests, and contributed to decreasing use of child labour. However, the programme result framework is less positive about the achieved outcomes and impacts. This is at least partly due to the quality of the indicators and the challenges they have in reflecting the change created.

Awareness raising is considered as one of the key impacts across the project evaluation reports. The projects targeting workers' rights have succeeded to raise awareness of workers' rights among both workers and their employers. In the projects focusing on child protection, awareness raising on children's rights has led to visible changes in community attitudes toward child labour and shifting in social and cultural norms towards abuse, violence, and exploitation of children to the positive. At the same time, advocacy work to the wider public has been more limited within the programme activities in Africa.

The programme has increased the income levels for its rights-holders. Many of the projects report significant increases in income levels among farmers, workers and other programme beneficiaries through e.g. improved agricultural production, better working conditions, additional income generating activities and savings through reducing costs of household energy.

Environmental impacts have been created through more sustainable farming techniques. Dynamic agroforestry solutions have contributed to long-term economic and ecological benefits that are already evident in improved soil health, diversified livelihoods, and reduced household vulnerability in several target communities. Clean cooking efforts have reduced pressure on forests by decreasing the use of firewood and charcoal.

Some early indicators of longer-term contributions to decent work have been identified in projects contributing to workers' rights. The programme activities have e.g. strengthened workers' committees, improved grievance systems, and contributed to more transparent communication processes that are likely to support ongoing worker well-being and improved organisational practices beyond the projects' duration.

Gender impacts have been created through creating new income opportunities for women, by increasing the participation of women in committees and increased awareness of gender-sensitive issues. However, women remained underrepresented in leadership roles across the programme.

Youth have got access to new skills and income opportunities. In many projects, youth were engaged in sustainable agricultural practices, entrepreneurship, and business development.

HREDD efforts implemented in the programme have encouraged others to improve their approaches to human rights and environmental risks as well. For example, according to FT representatives, B Lab, the international network behind B Corp responsibility certification, has developed a HREDD system addressing small and medium sized enterprises, inspired by the programme.

Small projects can create tangible impacts. For example, in the Ethiopian flower project changes have been made to collective labour agreements, that benefit the workers also outside the farms participating in the projects. The Anker living wage study in South Africa is another example, as its results are benefiting the entire wine value chain.

The adoption of clean cooking solutions has improved especially life of women. Energy efficient cookstoves have made cooking faster and safer for women, reducing their workload and exposure to smoke. In some cases, clean cooking solutions have also contributed to monetary savings through reduced fuel costs.

3.6 Sustainability

Adequate conditions for sustainability have been created in programme design and by many of the project activities. Especially farmers have gained knowledge and expertise during the programme that helps them to engage with more sustainable production methods, enter markets and get higher income from their farms after the programme period.

The long-term viability of the Programme interventions is considered good. Many of the programme interventions are aligned with and strengthen national priorities and policies.

In many projects, structures and organisations have been established and strengthened, and it seems likely that many of these will remain active after the programme period. For example, in the South African wine project, grievance mechanisms and worker–management forums were established, and they appear likely to remain in place.

Concerns related to sustainability remain, for example some concerns have been identified regarding institutional and financial sustainability. While capacities of farmers have been increased, limited access

to financing limits their ability to invest in larger production volumes and new technologies. In the LEAP project, sustainability challenges have been identified, particularly concerning autonomy and financial viability of the Agripreneur Business Units established as part of the project.

Sustainability of revolving funds has been good. Revolving funds have been used at least in the Kenyan flower project to help flower farm workers to access clean cooking solutions and pay them after purchase through salary deductions. The stakeholders are willing to maintain the fund also after the project period ends, as the fund pays for itself through repayments, and the commercial partner of the project appreciates its functionality. Revolving funds have been suggested to be used also in other projects, including the Ethiopian coffee project.

The programme activities taking place within the Fairtrade system improve sustainability. Many programme interventions remain in use e.g. within producer organizations also after the programme period, and many practices adopted within the programme are taken into use in other FT projects and operations. In some cases, e.g. with child protection committees supported by the programme, the certification scheme supports their sustainability by setting requirements for their existence and operations.

The involvement of commercial partners in the programme increases sustainability in many projects. For example, when a commercial partner engages with monitoring the use of forced or child labour during the programme, they typically continue with the efforts also after the projects end and replicate the approaches also in other countries.

Project-specific sustainability has been addressed by preparing sustainability plans for each project. The sustainability plans identify risks to sustainability of the project objectives and define mitigation actions for those risks. While some project risks have been identified already in project planning phase, the sustainability plans have been prepared only at the end of the programme period limiting the scope of potential mitigation measures during the project.

Ecological sustainability is relatively good especially through promotion and commitment to agroforestry and other good agricultural practices. Among cocoa projects, farmers engaged in agroforestry have been very happy with the results of farming multiple crops instead of cocoa only. According to one of the project evaluations, 69% of farmers surveyed stated that they would “definitely” continue using the improved farming practices and skills they learned.

Sustainability of the efforts targeting youths is not always clear. For example, it is unclear if youth trained in cookstove production have markets and business skills to promote their products after project

incentives end. In some projects working with producer organizations, youth are under-presented, and even if their participation is at significantly good level, it often has not translated into genuine leadership roles for youth posing a major threat to the future social and institutional sustainability of the cooperatives and their ability to ensure generational succession.

In many cases, the support for vulnerable groups is at risk after the programme activities are over.

Without established bodies or regulations that require them being addressed, funding and efforts may decrease after the programme.

In both small producer organizations and plantations, one of the main risks to sustainability relates to leadership turnover. While the current leaders have committed to the programme efforts during the programme period and beyond, changes in leadership may lead to changes in priorities of these organizations.

Sustainability of some of the clean cooking interventions is not clear. Maintaining the carbon credit systems requires a lot of inputs from the project stakeholders after the project ends. In Malawi, it is not certain if the clean cooking technology delivered will be functional, in case pellet fuel production will not be established in a commercially sustainable way. The Kenyan flower project focusing on clean cooking has been progressing well with a strong clean cooking partner, Clean Cooking Association of Kenya involved in the project. Still, the workers are uncertain about the sustainability of their clean cooking solutions, mainly where to obtain affordable spare parts or technical assistance for stoves and solar kits once warranties expire.

3.7 Management

The programme is considered a flagship programme within FT network. Other projects and programmes follow many of the programme practices, and private sector partners are keen to become co-funders of the programme.

The programme coverage, its sectors and projects are feasible and work well under one programme.

Clear and direct connections to the Fairtrade system and its current geographical focus on Africa make it a unite programme. Some of the lessons and practices of projects under the programme can and are adapted to other programme activities across countries and products.

FTA carries a large share of the management and administrative responsibilities of the programme.

Programme partners are happy with their proactive approach and expertise provided for the projects. However, some stakeholders consider that FTA's resources are sometimes too thin, especially when one person covers responsibilities in several projects and countries.

Collaboration between FTA and Fairtrade Finland is strong and positive. Programme and project teams are actively in touch with each other, and communication is considered open.

Some programme partners hope that FT Finland would take a slightly more active role in programme implementation. E.g. more focus could be paid on ensuring that FTA delivers in line with the set timelines. FT Finland's role in chairing project meetings is appreciated by the programme partners, and FT Finland is thanked for making all partners feel themselves welcome and appreciated in project steering meetings.

The cooperation with co-funding National Fairtrade Organizations (NFOs) and the main implementing partners has improved during the programme period. Especially in the beginning of the programme, challenges arose related to funding rules and scope of the activities. Project steering group meetings and other collaboration among project partners are appreciated by co-funding NFOs and commercial partners.

Sharing of best practices and lessons between the projects happens, but its opportunities are not utilized to the extent possible. At project level, learning takes place, but stakeholders are concerned that the messages may not be systematically shared within the programme. The annual programme workshops serve a good platform for sharing and learning, but outside them less collaboration takes place.

Significant resources have been allocated for MEL at project level and good results have been gained in some projects, yet the MEL expertise at project level is insufficient. MEL operations have been coordinated from FTA headquarters in Nairobi, while project staff lack MEL expertise. This leads to MEL processes being designed and implemented somewhat external to actual project activities, which reduces the benefits to project and programme implementation. The same applies for financial administration staff to some extent. It is also hoped that financial administration staff would be more connected to the projects and the circumstances the projects take place in.

The impacts, results and outcomes of the programme are not communicated as clearly as could be. Programme partners and stakeholders would like to see more tangible communication and stories about what has really happened and been achieved thanks to the programme. Currently, the communication focuses more on project activities but tells less stories about the actual results.

The Doughnut Economics Model is a good fit for the programme's theoretical framework. It frames the space where the programme takes place, and it shows how trade done in fair terms can support development at community level and preserve the environment.

The theory of Change (ToC) of the programme builds on Fairtrade processes and addresses the ongoing planetary crises. The ToC is rooted on Fairtrade's certification-based trading system with its standards for producers and workers addressing social, economic and environmental requirements.

At the programme level, the overall programme and its activities are well aligned but the results framework is complex. The programme is structured along five Theories of Change (ToC), two for social sustainability, two for economic sustainability and one for ecological sustainability. The multiple ToCs have pros and cons: The result framework structure building on three priority impact areas is logical and has strong internal coherence between the impact areas, but having five theories of change that are closely linked to each other makes the results frameworks heavy.

Limitations exist in allowing the results framework to enable the monitoring and achievement of the programme level results. The number of different indicators and outcomes is high, while only some of them are relevant to most of the programme activities. The programme result framework includes five long-term outcomes which are further divided into more than twenty intermediate outcomes and immediate outcomes both. To cater for each result level the result framework has a high number of indicators for which all data needs to be collected separately. While the Fairtrade International indicator libraries contain relevant indicators, the Fairtrade system does not automatically produce any monitoring data on those to the programme's use because the certification data is not available on timely basis or with a sufficient level of detail on the programme target communities.

Specific challenges exist with the indicators. Review of the programme result framework suggests several issues with the SMART²ness of indicators. Disaggregated indicators (gender/youth/vulnerability) are not systematically used – they are used under Social Sustainability, but not systematically under Ecological Sustainability and Economic Sustainability. Also, under Ecological Sustainability and Social Sustainability there are other indicator problems because not all indicators are specific, i.e. measuring just one result. For example, % of women and youth among PO management committees is used for both long-term outcome 1.1. and intermediate outcome 1.1.1. and Number of people with enhanced access to clean/sustainable energy for intermediate outcome 3.1.1. and 3.1.2. Under all three priority impact areas quite a few indicators are without a value in the 2024 result framework. It is probable that either issues with measurability or availability exist.

Other indicator and data collection challenges identified are related to informativeness and feasibility of the measures used. The intermediate outcomes have been set at an output level, and the

² SMART stands for Specific, Measurable, Available, Relevant and Timely.

indicators depicting programme achievements related to them are mainly presented in percentages instead of plain numbers making it challenging to understand volumes of the achievements. As an environmental indicator, the one measuring total area reforested or afforested is informative and important for the programme, but number of seedlings planted does not shed much light on programme impact, although it depicts important local achievements in e.g. adoption of agroforestry practices. In several project evaluations, absence of baseline data was noted, even in projects that continue from previous phases. There is also room for improvement in how the results from MEL are used to improve the situation of vulnerable groups. So far, it has not been done systemically.

The standard of MEL practices varies across projects; learning and adaptive management is a concern in some evaluations. The project evaluations and assessment workshop reports provide a valuable data set for this evaluation. Commissioning end of term project evaluation is an excellent initiative.

Not all project evaluation reports include analysis on project MEL but the ones that addressed the issue provide some findings regarding Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning function. There are several projects with MEL systems that were assessed to consist of strong foundations, clear logical frameworks and Indicator Performance Tracking Tables (IPTT) with indicators aligned to the objectives of the project. Even with projects rated as having strong MEL system, baselines were missing (four projects), indicators were not SMART or not disaggregated by gender, age and vulnerability (three projects) or had a weak link to learning (three projects). The lack of a structured learning system limits adaptive management of projects. According to one evaluation report, a jointly developed MEL framework with unions and local government could have improved data quality and accountability.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

Conclusion 1: **The programme is highly relevant to its stakeholders, and it meets the needs of the target communities very well. The rights-holders and duty-bearers have been involved well in defining priorities and steering the projects under the programme.**

Recommendation 1.1: *Continue engaging the target communities in project design and steering and keep the focus of the programme on issues relevant to programme stakeholders (e.g. target communities, FT network, commercial partners, local and national authorities).*

Conclusion 2: The programme and its projects are aligned with other Fairtrade operations and relevant government initiatives, and it complements them well. The programme has also considered other initiatives and programmes operating in the same environments at different levels depending on the project. There's some collaboration between programme projects focusing on similar topics, but there's room for more.

Recommendation 2.1: *Continue aligning the programme with development opportunities identified within the Fairtrade network, and with the government policies and initiatives relevant to the objectives of the programme and individual projects.*

Recommendation 2.2: *Consider strengthening collaboration between the projects under the programme whenever the projects target similar challenges or are otherwise aligned.*

Recommendation 2.3: *Ensure that each project has sufficient understanding of other relevant initiatives taking place in the same surroundings, and that possible synergies are utilized.*

Conclusion 3: The MEL system does not fully meet the needs of the programme, and its potential is not utilized to the extent possible. The high number of ToCs, outcomes and indicators make the programme results framework heavy to use. Many of the indicators focus rather on project than programme level, and data for all indicators has not been available reducing the benefits of the framework for programme reporting, monitoring and development. Disaggregated indicators for cross-cutting objectives are not available across all impact areas.

Recommendation 3.1: *Simplify the programme level results framework and harmonize indicators to better match with the programme structure. Each project should feed into only a handful of programme indicators, but projects can also have other, project specific indicators and extended results frameworks if needed e.g. for partners' purposes.*

Recommendation 3.2: *Focus on building MEL capacities of project and programme staff in incorporating MEL to project interventions. Each project should have a dedicated MEL resource that understands the objectives and circumstances of the project and can interpret between project and*

programme level MEL needs. One expert could be shared between different projects in the same country or context.

Conclusion 3.3: **The management of the programme is efficient and lean. FTA carries a significant share of programme management responsibilities and does it well. FT Finland has relatively limited resources for programme management and substantial steering. FT Finland's project steering group leadership is considered very good, yet slightly more stringent approach to partner negotiations and overseeing timely delivery of results within the programme would be appreciated by programme partners. FT International resources, partly located in the Finnish office, contribute to the programme at significant level.**

Recommendation 4: *Ensure sufficient due diligence of potential programme partners and pay attention to expectation management by clearly agreeing upon project objectives, roles and responsibilities among partners, as well as key administrative rules and regulations before committing to collaboration.*

Recommendation 4.1: *Ensure sufficient support for project managers in Finland when dealing with challenging situations with programme partners. Consider e.g. a twin manager model, where each project manager has a support person to share thoughts and views of the projects, or engage Programme Director in key partner discussions.*

Conclusion 5: **While the strong focus on cross-cutting topics including gender, youth and vulnerable groups distinguish the programme from regular FT certification activities, consideration of cross-cutting issues varies across the programme. Great work has been done with PWDs in Ethiopia, that are exemplary within the whole FT network. Progress with PWDs and other vulnerable groups is more limited in other countries.**

Women have been targeted mainly by developing additional sources of income for them and by contributing to working conditions development in

large farms. Integration of women to producer organizations has been more limited.

Youth have been targeted across the programme with varying results, yet there are different definitions for youth within the programme, thus the target group is not always clear.

Recommendation 5.1: *The cross-cutting issues should be more strategically integrated to project design across the programme. Results indicators should be aggregated per cross-cutting topic whenever feasible to allow follow-up of progress on cross-cutting themes during programme implementation.*

Recommendation 5.2: *Specific focus should be paid on integrating women, youth and vulnerable groups to producer organizations' activities and leadership positions across programme stakeholders. Institutionalizing inclusion to organizational policies and procedures and considering it in relevant budgeting would strengthen the sustainability of the efforts beyond programme period.*

Conclusion 6: **Commercial partners' role in the programme is significant, especially from the perspectives of efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability. While their involvement sometimes generates extra burden on reporting and management, their financial contributions have enabled significantly wider programme approach than would have been possible without them. At the same time, companies' interest to participate in the programme shows that the programme targets issues that are important to the private sector and helps them to improve the sustainability and responsibility of their value chains. By targeting issues that are important to both producers and their clients, the programme allows the rights-holders to have more stable access to markets, improving the overall sustainability of the programme.**

Recommendation 6.1: *Continue engaging commercial partners in the programme. Before committing to collaboration, ensure that all partners share the objectives and plans and understand the implementation rules to ensure smooth collaboration. While it's important that the commercial partners understand the specific requirements donor funding brings to the programme, it's also crucial that the programme staff recognize and accept the motivations and reasoning for the commercial partner's contributions.*

Conclusion 7: Developing good models for clean cooking promotion requires specific expertise, while it is not in the core of FT's strategy and objectives. In Kenya, the results have been good with a strong clean cooking partner (Clean Cooking Association of Kenya) being involved in the project, while results from other projects, especially Malawi, seem less successful.

Carbon credit development has been slow and very resource intensive, and the sustainability of the compulsory monitoring systems is unclear once the project support ends leaving the communities at risk of not accessing the revenue from the credits.

Recommendation 7.1: *Focus programme activities on topics that are in the core of FT expertise. If stakeholders express genuine interest in and need for clean cooking technologies and/or carbon trade, consider if another organization specialized in the sector could be engaged to implement the interventions outside FT programme scope.*

Recommendation 7.2: *Should projects that require specific expertise outside the scope of FT be promoted, ensure that expertise is sought from external partners already in project planning phase and engage with them throughout the implementation of the project.*

Recommendation 7.3: *Should clean cooking technology distribution be continued in the future, ensure feasibility and sustainability of the business model and users' access to fuel and maintenance services. Avoid introduction of new types of fuels, e.g. pellets, unless fuel supply is readily in place, sustainable and affordable to the users.*

Conclusion 8: Sustainability of the programme is at adequate level, yet concerns related to it are evident in most project evaluations and stakeholder consultations. Many of the programme activities have focused on strengthening capacities of existing organisations and structures, and the stakeholders have been mostly pleased with the results, thus it's likely that they are willing to continue with the practices also beyond the programme period. FT organizations and commercial partners' presence in target communities after the programme period strengthens the sustainability of many of the programme

interventions. Revolving funds have supported the sustainability of activities they have been linked to.

While it's a very good practice to prepare sustainability plans, preparing them at the end of each project does not allow adjusting project implementation according to the risks and mitigation measures identified.

Key sustainability concerns within the programme are related to institutional and financial sustainability of programme interventions, leadership turnover in target groups, and incomprehensive understanding of business interventions external to Fairtrade framework (especially clean cooking).

Recommendation 8.1: *To strengthen future programming, more careful sustainability planning should be integrated into the design phase, with iterative updates throughout implementation to adapt to emerging risks and opportunities.*

Recommendation 8.2: *Already in the project planning phase, consider how FT network's and commercial partners' presence could contribute to project sustainability beyond the project period.*

Recommendation 8.3: *Usage of revolving funds could be considered wider in projects where rights-holders must do investments.*

Annex 1: Terms of Reference of the Evaluation

Annex 2: Documents reviewed during the evaluation

Fairtrade documents

DONUTS programme annual reports 2022-2024

DONUTS programme document and its annexes

DONUTS programme project plans

DONUTS programme Project Sustainability Plans

Reilu kauppa ry Toimintasuunnitelma 2025 (Fairtrade Finland operational plan 2025)

Reilu kauppa ry:n strategia 2021–2025 (Fairtrade Finland Strategy 2021-2025)

The future is fair - Introduction to the Fairtrade Global Strategy 2021–2025

External project evaluations and project workshop reports

Anonymous (2025). Workshop Report. Human Rights and Environmental Due Diligence (HREDD) Dialogue Pilot Project Endline Learning and Reflection Workshop. Submission Date: October 23, 2025.

Anonymous (2025). Fairtrade DONUTS Programme in the South African wine sector. Endline Evaluation Report, Draft. December 2025.

Arhin A, Tetteh RO, Fiscian YB & Mensah-Odum Y (2025). End of Project Evaluation Report of the Kuapa Kokoo Child Labour MonitorIng and Remediation (KKCLMRS) Project. Submitted to: Fairtrade Africa/Kuapa Kokoo. Draft, October 2025.

Ask International Ltd (2025). Final Report: End Term Evaluation of the Kenya Roses Project. 11 October 2025.

Azumab SB, Alhassan A-H, Banu MA & Kotchekpe, CR (2025). End-Term Evaluation Report of SANKOFA 2.0 Project in Ghana. ASDEV Consult, Ghana. November 2025.

Chirwa JT (2025). Endline Learning and Reflection Workshop – DONUTS Sugar – Clean Energy Solutions for Sugar Producers in Malawi Project. Endline Learning and Evaluation Report. Prepared for Fairtrade Africa. November 2025.

CLAC & CHPP (2023). Informe de Evaluación Final. Proyecto. “Sostenibilidad de los medios de vida vinculados a las organizaciones de café de Honduras”.

Demissie E & Namera M (2025). DONUTS Sustainable Chain of Ethiopian Coffee Project. End Term Evaluation. Final Report. October 2025.

Frontier i (2025). Ethiopian Workers’ Rights Project (DONUTS Programme), Final Report, Endline Evaluation. October 2025.

J.E Lemuel Consult Ltd (2025). End Term Evaluation for the Children in Rural Cocoa communities are Learning and Empowered (CIRCLE) Project. Draft Report November 2025.

RISOME (2025). LEAP Midline Study Report. Draft Final Report. 24.10.2025

Savannah Energy Ltd (2025). End-Term Evaluation of the Sustainable Chain of Kenyan Coffee Project. Savannah team: Kimari M Patrick, Harrison Rware, Mary-Fridah Kagwiria, Justus Nyabuto, Abigail Wairua, Nicholus Karanja and James Wanaina.

Stanwix B, Monnakgotla J & Voorend K (2025). Living wage report. Cape Winelands Region, South Africa. August 2025. Living Wage Benchmark Series. Anker Research Institute. August 2025.

Tantani V L (2024). Informe Final de Consultoría. Evaluacion Final. Proyecto: Emprendimientos inclusivos de café adaptado al clima en Bolivia.

Annex 3: Organizations consulted

Fairtrade Africa (FTA)

Fairtrade Finland

Fairtrade Foundation (UK)

Fairtrade International

Fairtrade Max Havelaar Switzerland

HALBA

La Coordinadora Latinoamericana y del Caribe de Pequeños (as) Productores(as) y
Trabajadores(as) de Comercio Justo (CLAC) – Fairtrade Latin America

Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland (MFA)

Tony's Open Chain