

Baseline Terms of Reference

Nutrition Sensitive Value Chains for Smallholder Farmers Bangladesh (NSVC) Project

Version Date: 10 April 2018

World Vision Bangladesh and World Vision Australia

I. Project Details

Project Name	Nutrition Sensitive Value Chains for Smallholder Farmers (NSVC)
Project Number	208164
Country and district(s)	Bangladesh, Jamalpur District
Start and End date of Project	Start Date: 1 September 2017, End Date: 30 June 2022
Proposed Start Date of Baseline Survey	23 April 2018
Expected End Date of Baseline Survey	15 July 2018
Total Project Budget	USD 4.75 million
Source of funding:	Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade ANCP Grant, and private donations from the people of Australia
Estimated Beneficiaries (Direct)	
Total Households:	20,000
Total people:	90,000
Men:	22,500
Women:	22,500
Girls:	22,500
Boys:	22,500

Contents

1. Project Details	1
2. Project Background	5
3. Project Logframe objectives and Indicators.....	6
The objectives of the project are:	6
Outcome and output indicators:	7
4. Purpose the Evaluation	11
5. Evaluation Objectives.....	11
6. Guiding Evaluation Questions	11
7. Evaluation Leaders	14
8. Team Advisors.....	16
9. Travel expectations of lead evaluator and security context of location.....	17
10. Proposed Evaluation Products and Milestone Dates.....	17
11. Anticipated Limitations	18
12. Budget.....	18
Tax and VAT arrangements.....	18
13. Standards of Ethics and Child Protection.....	19
14. Documents to be made available for evaluation preparation.....	19
15. Appendices.....	20

Terms of Reference Approval:

Prepared by: Vincent Potier, Senior Advisor – Evidence & Learning (Economic Development), World Vision Australia
Md Kamruzzaman, Manager, Grants Management, World Vision Bangladesh
Md. Abdul Hannan, Project Manager, NSVC Project, World Vision Bangladesh
Md. Jahadul Islam, Regional DME Coordinator, Greater Mymensingh Region, World Vision Bangladesh
Nikhil Chandra Roy, National Coordinator-DME, MEAL, World Vision Bangladesh
Arnab Kushal Mistry, Monitoring & Evaluation Manager, NSVC Project, World Vision Bangladesh

Version Status: Final for publishing

Date Submitted: 10 April 2018

Approved at National/Country Office by: Chandan Z Gomes, Director-PDQA, NO, WVB **Date Approved:** 11 April 2018

Approved at WV Australia by: Rajesh Pasupuleti, Grant Manager, WVA **Date Approved:** 10 April 2018

I. Acknowledgements

The Terms of Reference for this evaluation was drafted by the Evidence & Learning Team of World Vision Australia, in consultation with the project and programme field teams. The content is based on review of the project design in accordance with World Vision's LEAP requirements.

The parties that contributed to the preparation of this document are:

- Vincent Potier, Senior Advisor – Evidence & Learning (Economic Development), World Vision Australia
- Md. Abdul Hannan, Project Manager, NSVC Project, World Vision Bangladesh
- Arnab Kushal Mistry, M&E Manager, NSVC Project, World Vision Bangladesh
- Md. Jahadul Islam, Regional DME Coordinator, Greater Mymensingh Region, World Vision Bangladesh
- Nikhil Chandra Roy, National Coordinator-DME, MEAL, National Office, World Vision Bangladesh

ii. Affirmation

Except as acknowledged by the references in this paper to other authors and publications, the evaluation TOR described herein consists of our own work, undertaken to describe and advance learning that will guide project implementation, as part of the requirements of World Vision's 'LEAP' Design, Monitoring and Evaluation

Learning System. Evaluative approaches conform to BOND evidence principles, and the standards of DFAT's monitoring and evaluation standards¹.

Primary quantitative and qualitative data collected throughout the evaluation process will remain the property of the communities and families described in this document. Information and data must be used only with their consent.

Md. Abdul Hannan

Project Manager

Nutrition Sensitive Value Chains for smallholder Farmers Project

World Vision Bangladesh

10 April 2018

iii. Glossary

ANCP	Australian NGO Cooperation Programme
BDT	Bangladesh Currency (Bangladeshi Take)
BleNGS	Bangladesh Initiative to Enhance Nutrition Security and Governance
CCA	Climate Change and Adaptation
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
AP	Area Programme
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CED	Community Economic Development
DME	Design Monitoring and Evaluation
DPA	World Vision Development Programme Approach
ECCD	Early Childhood Care and Development
FGD	Focus Group Discussions
HH	Household
IYCF	Infant and Young Child Feeding
KII	Key informant interview
LEAP	Learning through Evaluation with Accountability & Planning
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability & Learning
MUAC	Mid-Upper Arm Circumference
NSVC	Nutrition Sensitive Value Chains
NSA	Nutrition Sensitive Agriculture
MNCHN	Maternal, New-born Child Health and Nutrition
ODK	Open Data Kit
PM	Project Manager
PNGO	Partner Non-Government Organization
RFD	Regional Field Director
PLA	Participatory Learning and Action
TOR	Terms of Reference
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WEE	Women Economic Empowerment
WVA	World Vision Australia
WVB	World Vision Bangladesh

¹ DFAT Monitoring & Evaluation Standards: <http://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Pages/dfat-monitoring-and-evaluation-standards.aspx>

2. Project Background

WVB is implementing NSVC Project in three Sub-districts of Jamalpur district, among them WVB is directly implementing in Sadar and PNGO implementing in Islampur and Dewanganj.. The project aims to improve nutrition and economic empowerment of Smallholder farmers and their families. WVB believes in achieving sustainable well-being of children by tackling causes and addressing effects of poverty, inequalities and injustices through improving health and nutrition status of mothers and children and increasing community (economic and livelihood) resilience. NSVC project is currently in its first year of implementation, consisting of a design phase. Part of this design phase includes collection of baseline data and calculation of pre-program values of project indicators, against which progress towards project goal, outcomes and outputs will be measured at the end of the project. WVB is seeking an experienced consultant to conduct this baseline survey for the project.

The proposed 5-year USD 4.75 million project aims to improve nutrition of 20,000 smallholder male and female farmers and their households (HHs) in Jamalpur district, North Bangladesh. Adopting a nutrition sensitive agriculture (NSA) approach, it aims to improve nutrition through multiple pathways. First, it will increase incomes of male and female smallholder farmers and their HHs, through gender and nutrition sensitive value chain development, which encourages farmers to achieve high yields of agricultural products in market demand. This will provide farmers with the purchasing power to be able to purchase nutritious foods. The growth in production can also keep food more affordable through increased income and market access (*income & market pathway*). Second, it will seek to improve the utilisation and consumption of nutritious food at HH level, by increasing availability of nutritious foods for HH consumption (*Nutrition pathway*). There will also be *nutrition-specific interventions* aimed at creating demand for nutritious food and improving Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF) practices. Third, using the Mencare approach, it will increase gender equitable relations through engaging couples to shift their decision-making practices at the HH level, reducing discrimination against women when accessing nutritious foods (*gender equitable relations pathway*). Fourth, it will increase learning on NSA in Bangladesh, particularly understanding causal relationships between income, spending on nutrition and women's empowerment in Jamalpur. It will develop and implement a new Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning (MEAL) on NSA, exploring mobile technology use for data collection. Direct project beneficiaries will be 20,000 smallholder farmers².

The project **methodology** is NSA, which seeks to maximise agriculture's contribution to nutrition. Consistent with DFAT's *Operational Guidance on Nutrition Sensitive Agriculture (2015)*, the project will improve nutrition through a number of key 'pathways': agriculture as a source of income (*income pathway*), a source of food (*production pathway*), a driver of food prices (*market pathway*); and a way to empower women (*women's empowerment pathway*).³ Key to the project's methodology is its pro-poor market systems development Local Value Chains Development approach, which situates smallholder farmers in agricultural markets while acknowledging that poor farmers need support to connect to markets. The project will also include some nutrition-specific interventions given global and Bangladesh experiences on how to achieve 'quick wins' in improving HH nutrition. Finally, the project will use and adapt Promundo's evidenced-based Mencare model, which recognises that women's empowerment requires changing the power dynamics between both men and women. This is currently being piloted by WVB in a different part of the country.

² According to National Agricultural Extension Policy 2012, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of Bangladesh a farmer who own 50 to 250 decimals of cultivable land is a small holder farmer in Bangladesh. However, this definition has been contextualized in project area context. The project defines a smallholder farmer who cultivates 15 to 75 decimals of land

³ <https://dfat.gov.au/about-us/publications/Documents/operational-guidance-note-nutrition-sensitive-agriculture.pdf>

3. Project Logframe objectives and Indicators

The objectives of the project are:

Goal:	Smallholder farmers and their families have improved nutrition and economic empowerment
Outcome 1:	Male and female producers increase their income from value chain activities
Intermediate Outcome 1.1.	Producers increase collective buying and selling practices and market linkages
Intermediate Outcome 1.2.	Producers increased production yields
Intermediate Outcome 1.3.	Producers apply financial literacy, agricultural and market skills and access to capital
Intermediate Outcome 1.4.	Women and extreme poor farmers are equitably able to participate in value chain activities
Intermediate Outcome 1.5.	Male and female producers are more resilient to climate change and disasters
Outcome 2:	Farming households have improved consumption and utilization of nutritious food
Intermediate Outcome 2.1.	Farming households have increased access to nutritious foods
Intermediate Outcome 2.2.	Farming households increase their knowledge and skills on nutritious foods
Intermediate Outcome 2.3.	Caregivers improve IYCG practices & health seeking behaviour
Outcome 3:	Farmer households have increased gender equitable relations
Intermediate Outcome 3.1.	Farming households have increased equitable decision making on income & nutrition related decisions
Intermediate Outcome 3.2.	Increased community support for women's empowerment in relation to income and nutrition
Outcome 4:	Increased learning on nutrition sensitive agriculture in Bangladesh

Outcome and output indicators:

The indicators to be measured by the consultant at baseline are highlighted in green.

Iteration	Indicator code	Indicator
Goal: Smallholder farmers and their families have improved nutrition and economic empowerment	G.1	G.1 % of producers exercising autonomy, as measured by: (below)
	G.1.a	G.1.a % reporting ability to exercise choice and participate in income-generating activities
	G.1.b	G.1.b % reporting decision-making power over expenditure
	G.1.c	G.1.c % reporting satisfaction over time use
	G.1.d	G.1.d % reporting access to and control over resources needed for income generation
	G.2	G.2 Average household assets index score
	G.3	G.3 % of caregivers reporting feeling able to afford providing healthy diet to their household members
	G.4	G.4 % of caregivers who are able to pay for their children's (0-5 years) health costs (services from medically trained or skilled service provider)
	G.5	G.5 % of caregivers who are able to pay for their children's education costs up to Grade 5
	G.6	G.6 % wasting in children of 0-23 months (using MUAC)
	G.7	G.7 % wasting in women at reproductive age (15-49) (using MUAC)
Outcome 1. Male and female producers increase their income from value chain activities	1.1	1.1 Proportion of household earning income from target crops/products
	1.2	1.2 Median total HH income from sale of target crops/products
Intermediate Outcome 1.1. Producers increase collective buying and selling practices and market linkages	1.1.1	1.1.1 % of producers who sold product collectively during the last 12 months
	1.1.2	1.1.2 % of producers who purchased farm inputs or farm services collectively during the last 12 months
	1.1.3	1.2.3 Median value of target farming HHs' annual production that is sold collectively
Intermediate Outcome 1.2. Producers increased production yields	1.2.1.a	1.2.1.a Average producers' households yield (kg/ha) for target crops (disaggregated per target crop) - AS DECLARED
	1.2.1.b	1.2.1.b Average producers' households yield (kg/ha) for target crops (disaggregated per target crop) - AS MEASURED
Intermediate Outcome 1.3. Producers apply financial literacy, agricultural and market skills and access to capital	1.3.1	1.3.1 % of producers' households who adopted the improved agricultural practices promoted by the project in the previous 12 months
	1.3.2	1.3.2 % of producers who report using financial accounting system transferred by the project [measured at ML & EL]
	1.3.3	1.3.3 % of producers' households who used savings (from own save of from loan from being member of a saving group or client to a MFI) to invest in farming business
Intermediate Outcome 1.4. Women	1.4.1	1.4.1 % of women from producers' households engaged in target value chain activities

and extreme poor farmers are equitably able to participate in value chain activities	1.4.2	1.4.2 % of producers reporting ability to exercise choice and participate in farming related income-generating activities
	1.4.3	1.4.3 % of vulnerable persons (women, PWD and extreme poor using PPI) in Producers Groups' leadership/ management position
Intermediate Outcome 1.5. Male and female producers are more resilient to climate change and disasters	1.5.1	1.5.1 % of producers with improved knowledge and practice in non-structural disaster mitigation
	1.5.2	1.5.2 % of producers who are able to access EW information and know their meaning
	1.5.3	1.5.3 % of producers feeling more confident in the capacity of their farming system to cope with climate change and natural disasters since project start [measured at ML & EL]
Output 1.1. Value Chain Analysis completed		01 ToR developed
		03 workshops on value chain analysis and KAP findings
		02 staff training on LVCD conducted
Output 1.2. Agricultural technical training designed		01 Agricultural technical curriculum in hand
		# of staff grown expertise on crops and vegetable cultivation
Output 1.3. Staff trained and set up key market linkages		# of Key market linkages established (% profit increase, cost of marketing decrease- especially transport, cost of input price decrease)
		# of women actively participated in value chain activities
Output 1.4. Action planning to reach extreme poor and women completed		# of households received farm and non-farm assets
		# of women headed farmer received assets
Output 1.5. Producer groups formed, trained and connected to key market actors		# of new relationships with market actors and PGs in market (LVCD)
		# of producer group members trained in core business/market skill sets (LVCD model)
		# of farmers (households) adopting improved agricultural practices.
Output 1.6. Producer Groups connected to existing disaster management structures in Jamalpur		# of meeting
		# of PG members are members on Union, Sub-district and District level Disaster Management Committees
Outcome 2. Farming households have improved consumption and utilization of nutritious food	2.1	2.1 % of children 6-59 months receiving a minimum meal frequency in the last 24 hours (WHO definition)
	2.2	2.2 % of children 6-59 months receiving a minimum dietary diversity in the last 24 hours (WHO definition)
	2.3	2.3 Average household dietary diversity score (FAO)
	2.4	2.4 % of pregnant women reporting having increased their food uptake since pregnancy
Intermediate Outcome 2.1. Farming households have increased access to nutritious foods	2.1.1	2.1.1 Average frequency of household consumption of grown vegetable (from micronutrient garden, commercial plots or from market) in the past 7 days
	2.1.2	2.1.2 Average frequency of household consumption of flesh food (meat or fish) (from own production or market) in the past 7 days
	2.1.3	2.1.3 % of households reporting an increase in the productivity of their kitchen garden since project started

Intermediate Outcomes 2.2. Farming households increase their knowledge and skills on nutritious foods	2.2.1	2.2.1 % of respondents able to identify at least four food groups out of a scale of seven food groups (using the child MDD scale)
	2.2.2	2.2.2 % of household members demonstrating awareness of the importance of dietary diversity for enjoying a healthy life
Intermediate Outcome 2.3. Caregivers improve IYCG practices & health seeking behaviour	2.3.1	2.3.1 % of children 0-23 months breastfed within first hour after birth
	2.3.2	2.3.2 % of children exclusively breastfed from birth up to 6 months
	2.3.3	2.3.3 % of caregivers hand washing with soap at critical times
	2.3.4	2.3.4 % of mothers of children <5 consuming iron-rich or iron-fortified foods or iron tablets in the last 24 hours.
	2.3.5	2.3.5 % of children 6-59 months consuming micronutrient rich or fortified foods in the last 24 hours
	2.3.6	2.3.6 % of children 6-59 months with acute diarrhea in the past two weeks receiving ORS or Zinc
	2.3.7	2.3.7 % of mothers of children age 0-23 months who had four or more antenatal visits provided by skilled health personnel when they were pregnant with the youngest child
	2.3.8	2.3.8 % of children <5 taken to a health centre when ill
Output 2.1. Formative assessment for Outcome 2 completed		01 TOR for formative assessment developed
		01 formative assessment conducted
Output 2.2. Nutrition behavior change communications materials developed		01 workshop conducted
		IEC/BCC materials developed
Output 2.3. Nutrition awareness raising and food storage training for producer groups conducted		06 FGDs and 01 workshop conducted with PGs at Upazila level
		1400 awareness session conducted
		1400 demonstration session conducted
Output 2.4. Caregivers trained on IYCF, health and hygiene with follow-up counselling and household visits		# List of IYCF beneficiaries developed
		# of training on IYCF, hygiene and health practices
		# number of HH visits conducted
		% of Producer groups (or individuals) with knowledge of IYCF practices increased.
Output 2.5. Females in producer groups are trained on home-gardening and receive inputs		# of training, # of beneficiaries received training
		# of farming households provided with inputs
		# of PG members practicing micro-nutrient gardening in homestead
Outcome 3. Farmer households have increased gender equitable relations	3.1	3.1 % of respondents (women and men) reporting an increase in feeling respected for their paid and un-paid contributions to their household's well-being
	3.2	3.2 % of Women and men have a more equitable division of labor, resulting in more time for women to participate in development opportunities. (Source: Promundo's MenCare Model-Research)
Intermediate Outcome 3.1. Farming	3.1.1	3.1.1 % of households were women and men jointly make key income generation related decisions

households have increased equitable decision making on income & nutrition related decisions	3.1.2	3.1.2 % households where women or men and women jointly make key health and nutrition related decisions.
Intermediate Outcome 3.2. Increased community support for women's empowerment in relation to income and nutrition	3.2.1	3.2.1 % people (men, women, men with disability, women with disability) in agreement with key gender attitude statements.
	3.2.2	3.2.2 % of producers engaged as members/leaders in local government steering committees and/or community level social activities
Output 3.1. Formative assessment for Outcome 3 completed		
Output 3.2. Mencare Adapted for Jamalpur context		01 MenCare curriculum developed considering Jamalpur context
		01 training module developed
		# of staff trained and gained knowledge on Mencare approach
Output 3.3. Community Engagement activities on Gender developed		Thematic areas identified on gender issues through workshop
		Developed community engagement plan
Output 3.4. Implement Mencare with selected couples from producer groups		Final inventory list
		# of trainings
		# of courtyard sessions
Output 3.5. Mother-in-laws trained on nutrition awareness raising		# of courtyard meetings
Output 3.6. Community engagement activities held		# of drama and folk songs events
Output 3.7. Community facilitators are selected, deployed and trained		# of community facilitators deployed
		# of basic training
		# foundation and refresher training
Outcome 4. Increased learning on nutrition sensitive agriculture in Bangladesh	4.1	4.1 Number of lessons learned papers prepared and circulated to stakeholders
	4.2	4.2 Number of learning events organized
	4.3	4.3 Number of stakeholders who participated in learning events organized by the project
	4.4	4.4 Number of practices promoted by the project, adopted by other stakeholders as a result of project efforts
Output 4.1. Introduced MEAL around the Project implementation		# of best practice identified.
Output 4.2. Key partners participated in the learning events		# of partners participated in MEAL process.

ANCP MELF Indicators:

Code Indicator

No MELF indicators are due to be measure at baseline

4. Purpose the Evaluation

- This study is a normative **baseline evaluation**, primarily intended to establish a robust account of the current situation in the target communities in relation to the project objectives. These data will be used to re-test the project assumptions, refine project implementation priorities and establish baseline measures and final targets to monitor progress throughout the project lifecycle.

5. Evaluation Objectives

The principle objectives of the baseline evaluation are:

1. *To generate comprehensive baseline data to measure project progress against outcomes and to set the benchmarks for implementation and impact assessment*
2. *To make plan for supporting implementation team to better understand and ensure the progress and quality impact of the project interventions*
3. *Utilising the baseline values, test the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of project objectives and indicators relative to project stakeholder groups after completion of the project*
4. *Establish baseline values to monitor gender inclusion, disability inclusion and environmental protection*

6. Guiding Evaluation Questions

1.1. What is the current status of community and other stakeholder practices in relation to project goal and outcome-level indicators?

2.1. To what extent do the project objectives address perceived and evidenced community vulnerabilities?

2.2. Do the baseline findings indicate need to rearrange project priorities, implementation approaches or timing?

3.1. Based on design assessments and other assessments, are the appropriate gender, disability and environmental indicators present in the project design?

3.2 Based on design assessments and other assessments, what baseline values should be used for gender, disability and environmental indicators?

For information: below are the KEQs of the project that will guide the monitoring of the project, mid-line and end-line evaluations:

Criteria: EFFECTIVENESS		
KEQ1 How effective was the program in reaching its intended outcomes?		
Sub-questions	Monitoring questions (intermediate outcome)	Timing
<p>(a) Outcome I: To what extent has the project contributed to increased incomes for male and female farmers?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have farmers changed the way they have procured inputs and sold their products over time? • To what extent has the volume and value of products moving through target supply chains changed over time? • To what extent have different sub-groups (male/female, marginal, ultra-poor) benefitted differently from value chain activities (income, roles in value chain, value chain product type) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are producer groups buying inputs and selling collectively? • What is the volume and value of products moving through target supply chains? • To what extent are producer groups adopting improved agriculture techniques, including DRR? • Are producer groups responding to market signals and engaging market actors effectively? • Are farmers re-investing in their businesses with sound investment choices? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 monthly • Annually

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are producer group members (male/female) satisfied with the governance structure? Is this governance structure inclusive? 	
<p>(b) Outcome 2: To what extent has the project contributed to improved consumption and utilization of nutritious food?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the project improved nutrition practices within the household between men and women, children under 5 years old. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did the project contribute to dietary diversity within the household and in particular women of reproductive age (16-49 years old)? To what extent did the project contribute to adoption of exclusive breastfeeding for children 0-5 months? How has the project influenced the demand for nutritious food (buying, growing and preparation of nutritious food) To what extent has the project contributed to improved year-round availability of nutritious food? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent did kitchen gardens vs. commercial crops contribute to availability and access of nutritious food? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the kitchen gardens and input support promoted suitable to the beneficiary needs and context (selected crops, design, beneficiary groups taste etc.) Are the nutrition, IYCF and health seeking behaviour change training key messages and delivery modality leading to the desired behaviours amongst the target group? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 monthly Annually
<p>(c) Outcome 3: To what extent has the program influenced equitable relations amongst farmer households?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the project influenced gender roles in decision making in relation to income and nutrition? To what extent has project positively or negatively redistributed household roles and responsibilities including care? Did this time saved lead to sufficient time for desired participation in economic activities? To what extent has the project positively addressed gender-based food discrimination in the household? Which strategies were successful in increasing women's participation in income generating activities? To what extent did the project positively influence the community acceptance of women's roles to generate income? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the Mencare and mother-in law group sessions (household level) key messages and delivery modality leading to the desired behaviour changes? Are the community level behaviour change materials key messages and delivery modality leading to the desired behaviour changes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 monthly Annually

Criteria: Efficiency		
KEQ2 How efficiently were program activities planned and implemented?		
Sub-questions	Monitoring questions	Timing
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent has the project achieved its intended outputs in the timeframe and sequence proposed? Were the costs and resourcing of the project activities/inputs reasonable (appropriate and justifiable) in light of the context? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project team complete with the necessary staff and skills? And if not, are job descriptions ready, and how are the recruitments progressing? Is the project timeframe reviewed and revised (two monthly)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 monthly Annually

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent, is the current project team resourced sufficiently to achieve effective project implementation? • What were the major challenges and constraints and how (and how well) were these managed? • To what extent did monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly? • What has been the contribution of partners and other organisations to the project outcomes? • How effective have WV project partnerships and cooperation mechanisms been? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the updated timeline (including changes to implementation plans) been communicated to staff and partners? • Is there an updated price and providers list available for products and services commonly procured by the project? • Is the procurement plan up-to-date? • Does each team member (undertaking purchases) master (knows and apply) the procurement procedures? • Are procurements initiated early enough in order to deliver seeds and other seasonal sensitive inputs on time to project participants? • Is the project M&E plan revised (every xx months) and communicated to relevant staff? • Are monthly reports or meetings identifying implementation challenges and issues? Are monthly reports proposing and/ or reporting solutions to overcome challenges? • Are reported challenges & issues given follow-up in the sub-subsequent report? • Are monthly (or quarterly) reports relating to Outputs indicators? • Are partner organisations implementing the agreed actions on time and budget? • Are regular meetings with partner organisations identifying challenges and finding solutions to overcome these challenges? 	
--	---	--

Criteria: Model – Lessons about program design KEQ3: What has been learnt about the NSA model and program design?		
Sub-questions	Monitoring questions	Timing / frequency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What were the most effective strategies applied by the project that contributed to the desired behaviour change to achieve Outcomes 1, 2 and 3? • In relation to nutrition sensitive agriculture, which pathways of change made the biggest impact on nutrition outcomes (income /market (Outcome 1), production (Outcome 1/2), women’s economic empowerment (3))? • What instances of nutrition-sensitive value chain approaches can be shared and what lessons can be learned from project management? • What would be considered as the main barriers to and enabling factors for scaling up through replication, adaptation, and expansion of these models of interventions in relation to nutrition sensitivity and participation and impact on women? • To what extent was the theory of change appropriate to address the key identified problem? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What lessons have we learnt over the last 12 months about how change occurs across the three outcome pathways? • What have been the key barriers to program implementation over 12 months? • To what extent has the project team implemented improved MEAL practices? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6 monthly • Annually

Criteria: Impact KEQ 4: What was the impact of the program on intended beneficiaries and the community?		
Sub-questions	Monitoring questions	Timing / frequency

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What has been the impact on the beneficiaries (men, women, boys and girls, marginal poor, ultra-poor) who are supposed to benefit from the project as per the stated goal of improve nutrition and economic empowerment. • What were the intended and non-intended/positive and negative impacts of the project on the beneficiaries? • Are there any other actors who has benefited from the work in addition to the intended beneficiaries, such as the private sector? • Are there any other actors who are intending to, or are already replicating/ adapting/ extending some of the models developed and promoted by the project? 	NA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EL evaluation
---	----	---

Criteria: Sustainability		
KEQ5: How enduring and sustainable are the program outcomes?		
Sub-questions	Monitoring question	Timing / frequency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent are the project outcomes sustainable over time after the completion of the project? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Outcome 1: Do the producer groups have the capacity to continue to increase their incomes through agricultural value chains after the completion of the project? ○ Outcome 2: Will farming households continue to practice the desired nutrition practices for improved consumption and utilisation, after the completion of the project? ○ Outcome 3: Will farming households continue to improve gender equitable relations and decision making relating to income and nutrition after the completion of the project? • What external factors (climate, government policies, other projects etc.) will affect positively and negatively the project's sustainability? • To what extent are partners committed to providing continuing support to achieve project outcomes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has a sustainability strategy have been developed or implemented by the project? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EL evaluation

7. Evaluation Leaders

Core Evaluation Team			
Name	Role & Expertise	Stage of Design	Specific duties
Lead Evaluator			
I. To be selected (competitive market)	Independent evaluation consultant, specialised in Agricultural Value Chain Development, Women Economic Empowerment, with previous experience in evaluating DFAT funded project	Support all stages of Evaluation Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review project documents. Lead development of a detailed evaluation plan. Planning and timely communicate to WVVB all necessary equipment and logistics needs Develop qualitative and quantitative data collection tools. Conduct training of enumerators and implement data quality checks.

			<p>Oversee and support data collection, especially qualitative activities.</p> <p>Lead qualitative data collection with key stakeholders.</p> <p>Conduct data cleaning and data coding</p> <p>Present preliminary findings to project stakeholders through a 1st workshop (to inform qualitative survey development)</p> <p>Complete data analysis with respect to key evaluation questions.</p> <p>Draft and finalise the baseline/ evaluation report.</p> <p>Present data in tables, charts & figures in the report as relevant and in an innovative way</p> <p>Present findings to the project location level audience in a dissemination workshop setting</p>
World Vision assistant evaluators			
2. Arnab Kushal Mistry	<p>Monitoring & Evaluation Manager, WVB</p> <p>Key Evaluation Facilitator – DME</p> <p>Technical support</p>	<p>ToR development</p> <p>Selection of Lead evaluator</p> <p>Pre-data collection</p> <p>Logistical arrangements</p> <p>Deputy for data collection process</p> <p>Liaison during analysis and writing period.</p>	<p>Write ToR, in consultation with WVA.</p> <p>Select lead evaluator in collaboration with WVA.</p> <p>Organise data collection logistics.</p> <p>Facilitate Staff Evaluation Training</p> <p>Lead delegated aspects of data collection.</p> <p>Coordinate all staff involved in data collection.</p> <p>Oversee data collection process.</p> <p>Track, receive and collate all data via data collection framework.</p>
3. Vincent Potier	<p>Senior Advisor – Evidence & Learning (Economic Development), WVA</p> <p>Evaluation Lead for Priority I evaluations</p>	<p>Support all stages of the Evaluation process (most likely deployed in-country during the inception phase and then supporting remotely from Australia)</p>	<p>Lead approach to project evaluation.</p> <p>Write ToR, in consultation with NO.</p> <p>Select lead evaluator in collaboration with NO.</p> <p>Liaise with NO re data collection logistical arrangements.</p> <p>Review evaluation plan and data collection tools.</p>

			Oversee data collection process (remotely). Guide consultant in data analysis and reporting. Review and accept final report.
4. Md. Jahadul Islam	Regional DME Coordinator, Greater Mymensingh Region, WVB	Planning Data collection Report draft review	Support development of the ToR, Evaluation Plan, and data collection, technical assurance; staff training on data collection; and lead aspects of data collection.
5. Nikhil Chandra Roy	National Coordinator-DME, MEAL, National Office, WVB	Planning Report draft review	Support development of the ToR, Evaluation Plan and data collection, technical assurance; staff training on data collection; and lead aspects of data collection.

8. Team Advisors

WV stakeholders/advisors			
Name	Role	Stage of Design	Specific duties
Rajesh Pasupuleti	WVA ANCP Grant manager	Pre-evaluation Submission of draft	Assist the development of the Evaluation Plan. Review report drafts, and provide constructive feedback for improvement and DFAT compliance.
Ellie Wong	Woman Economic Empowerment Advisor, WVA	Pre-evaluation Submission of draft	Assist the development of the Evaluation Plan. Review report drafts, and provide constructive feedback for improvement
Abdul Karim Howlader	Deputy Director- MEAL, World Vision Bangladesh	Evaluation scheduling and evaluator recruiting. Supervision of ToR fulfilment/contract performance during and after data collection.	Evaluation management and contract commissioner. Evaluation report approver
Md. Abdul Hannan	Project Manager, NSVC Project, World Vision Bangladesh	Pre-evaluation	Evaluation sponsor. Scheduling of evaluation into project implementation plans.

			Facilitation of project staff and community availability.
Md. Kamruzzaman	Manager, Grants Management, World Vision Bangladesh	Pre-evaluation	Capacity assessment of the consultant group Budget negotiation
James Hirok Adhikary	James Hirok Adhikary, Finance & Admin Manager, NSVC Project, World Vision Bangladesh	Pre-evaluation	Assess financial management capacity Orient WVB's payment process Proposal budget line review
Syed Aktaruzzaman	Deputy Director, People and Culture, World Vision Bangladesh	Pre-evaluation	Publish circular Proposal shortlisting Arrange presentation session for evaluating consultants. Final selection

9. Travel expectations of lead evaluator and security context of location

The lead evaluator is expected to be available to spend approximately 20 to 30 days in the project location for data collection preparation, collection and debrief in the months of April – June 2018 (subject to refinement at contract stage).

The evaluation budget will cover the costs of travel, and from their designated home point to the project locations, and accommodation, for the duration of the data collection period. However, the estimated cost of transit will form part of the overall cost consideration for selecting a lead evaluator.

The consultant will be responsible for his or her own insurances, vaccinations, health, and security preparedness.

The current security context of the project country and locations is medium where terrorism, social and economic security situation is quite and calm.

10. Proposed Evaluation Products and Milestone Dates

The following proposed dates will be subject to negotiation and revision, with the chosen candidate.

Products	Due date
Agreement sign off between WVB and Consultant/Consulting Firm	29 th April
Develop Draft Evaluation Design/Plan , including the following documents: (a specific template will be given to the consultant) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Baseline methodology ○ Sampling strategy ○ Data quality assurance mechanism ○ Timeframe (sequencing of baseline activities and data collection) ○ Required resources 	13 th May

○ Draft quantitative data collection tools (on Word or Excel reader friendly format as well as on ODK friendly format) and qualitative data collection tools (i.e. FGD and KII guiding questions and PRA exercises):	
Submit Final Evaluation Design/Plan with final tools	21 st May
Training of enumerator and tools testing	22-24 th May
Proposed data collection dates (Subject to adjustment with lead evaluator): <i>Product will be: All data records whether in soft or hard copy e.g. transcripts, databases, spreadsheets, photographs: Photographs and audio data, by the last day of in-country work. Written and statistical documentation handed to WV Country Office</i>	25 th May-10 th June
Preliminary data analysis presentation workshop	3 rd June
1 st complete draft evaluation report	16 th June
2 nd complete draft evaluation report , incorporating initial feedback	26 th June
Final version evaluation report , incorporating second round of feedback: <i>(Final version to include an executive summary that can stand alone as a self-contained summary report) along with Raw (clean) data files with all variable codes, labels and definitions, along with the final data collection tools in English</i>	5 th July
Facilitate a dissemination workshop (Power point presentation of the findings and the analyses)	July 8 th July

11. Anticipated Limitations

Season/Time of year: The survey will be conducted in Rainy season, and flooding happens due to heavy rainfall which may hamper overall survey.

Electricity supply: in the project area might be irregular power supply during the assessment.

Logistics: All cost associated with accommodations, transportation, food and survey logistics to be beard by consultant.

12. Budget

The evaluation is funded through the project budget under logframe code **NT05.02.01**, which has already been approved. The budget will cover all associated costs of the evaluation, including the consultants' fee, travel and accommodation, field transport and evaluation supplies.

Tax and VAT arrangements

WVB will deduct withholding tax from the consultancy fees which will be in conformity with the prevailing government rates.

13. Standards of Ethics and Child Protection

The lead evaluator will be responsible for ensuring that data collection and analysis approaches are designed to mitigate child protection risks, and protect participants' privacy and wellbeing by establishing and following credible ethical evaluation principles. The lead evaluator must ensure all members of the evaluation team has been oriented in the ethical considerations employed in the evaluation. Ethical principles will include the following:

Voluntarism, confidentiality and anonymity of participants: All participation in interviews must be voluntary, will not create harm to participants during or after the data gathering, and their anonymity and confidentiality will be protected. Voluntary involvement must be assured by a scripted verbal explanation of the survey being conducted. The script must inform respondents that they may choose to not respond to certain questions and may end the survey at any time.

Do No Harm: Project and evaluation themes must be screened for topics and questions that may cause distress to some interviewees. Mitigating approaches and referral options must be developed accordingly.

Integrity: Data from participants must be presented honestly and proportionately, such as the authoritativeness, extent-shared and intensity of opinions across the target population, and aligning quotes with the evaluative themes intended by the informant. Unexpected or contentious findings should be triangulated with other forms of data to gauge significance.

Participant perspective: To the extent possible, given logistical limitations of each context, preliminary findings should be shared with a plenary of project stakeholders to invite their reactions and interpretations. These will be recorded and added to the final report.

Child Protection: If children (under the age of 18) are to be interviewed, it will be in the presence of a responsible adult from the child's family, or other implied guardian from the community. Children will not be exposed to questions of a highly personal, sensitive, potentially distressing or embarrassing nature.

If children are to be interviewed, child protection reporting protocols will be established and all staff made aware of when and how to report any issues that arise from data collection.

Evaluation coordinators must have completed and been cleared by a police check within the last two years. All evaluation coordinators and collectors will be required to review, sign, and adhere to a child protection code of conduct.

The lead evaluation must familiarise him or herself with the following ethical and protection guides (to be supplied to the selected lead evaluator):

- WVI Child Protection Code of Conduct
- DFAT Guidelines for Child Protection
- WVI Guideline of Ethical Principles
- Australasian Evaluation Society Guidelines of Ethical Principals
- BOND Tool for Evidence Principles

14. Documents to be made available for evaluation preparation

- WVA Templates for Evaluation Plan and Evaluation Report
- Project design documents: narrative, logframe and M&E Plan
- BOND Evidence Principles
- Australasian Evaluation Society Ethics Guidelines

15. Appendices

Additional Information document associated with Terms of References (ToR) for Baseline Study of NSVC Project is embedded herewith.



Appendix_Baseline_
Survey_TOR_NSVC_A