

10.1 Terms of Reference (ToR)



Terms of Reference for Hiring a Firm to Conduct Final Evaluation of Agriculture and Food Security (AFSP III) and CHT Climate Resilience (CCRP) Projects of SID-CHT

The Terms of Reference (TOR) has been designed to conduct final evaluation for the Agriculture and Food Security Project (AFSP III) and CHT Climate Resilience (CCRP) Projects of SID-CHT.

This evaluation aims to measure the impact level changes; intended outcomes, and outputs-level results of the projects; various interventions based on evaluation criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, coherence, impact, and sustainability to identify causes of success and/or failure with recommendations.

Job : Final Evaluation of Agriculture and Food Security (AFSP III) and CHT Climate Resilience (CCRP) Projects

Duration : 60 days over 4 months period

Location : 26 Upazilas under 3 Chittagong Hill Tract (CHT) districts

Start : January 2022

1. Overall Background and Rationale:

The Chittagong Hill Tract (CHT) is a unique region of Bangladesh in terms of its topography, culture, and agricultural practices. It consists of 3 Hill Districts of Rangamati, Khagrachari, and Bandarban, located in the southeast corner of Bangladesh with a total area of 13,344 square kilometers and covering a population of 1.58 million. The CHT region is home to 11 different ethnic groups and the Bengali people, and has a population of 1.6 million, of which 70% of whom live in the rural areas. More than two decades of conflict, ending with a Peace Accord in 1997, have left most of its inhabitants in extreme poverty conditions. Moreover, communities in the region are increasingly experiencing the impact of environmental and climate changes on their livelihoods, deforestation, landslide, seasonal water scarcity, soil erosion, and flash flood during monsoon.

About two decades after the signing of the Peace Accord, the CHT communities continue to confront challenging social, economic, and political environments with endemic poverty, occasional bouts of violence, and fragile communal relations. These challenges are further compounded by the local institutions' limited capacity to deliver required services per the Peace Accord. The challenges to socio-economic recovery also impact the integration and cohesion among different ethnic communities, as they feel the strain placed by increased resettled populations on already limited resources, facilities, and services.

In collaboration with UNDP and other Development Partners, the Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs (MoCHTA) has implemented several projects in 3 Hill Districts during the last

decade. The key interventions of these projects mainly strengthened community stability and supported communities to build resilience and collective actions.

This joint development effort has officially been accelerated through implementing the Strengthening Inclusive Development in CHT (SID-CHT) project. This project's primary outcome is "Citizen expectations for voice, development, and accountability are met by strengthened institutions to deliver universal access to basic services". This outcome will be achieved through 3 outputs below:

Output 1- Strengthened community land, resource, and livelihood management

Output 2- Increased participation and influence to shape decision-making

Output 3- Democratic governance strengthened with responsive institutions and effective services.

Agriculture and Food Security Project (AFSP III) and CHT Climate Resilience (CCRP) are the major two on-going projects under the SID-CHT programme. The explicit project's outcomes and outputs are as follows:

AFSP III

The objectives of AFSP III are to increase pro-poor inclusive agricultural growth and sustainable employment creation for marginal and small farm households with enhanced Food Security in CHT and to enhance Hill District Councils' (HDCs) capacity to manage transferred agricultural services in line with CHT Peace Accord. AFSP III suggests that adult agricultural education leads to increased productivity and profits, thus, contributing towards the empowerment of marginal and small farmers and enabling them to be better in charge of their lives and circumstances. Moreover, the increased capacity of local institutions in terms of Hill District Councils (HDCs) are intended to better handle the transferred agricultural services in line with the CHT Peace Accord. Two inter-linked outputs of the project focus on communities and institutions' empowerment and capacity, respectively. The Agriculture and Food Security Project in CHT gradually established 1,000 new Integrated Farm Management- Farmer Field School (IFM-FFS) in 23 Upazilas. The project is being implemented in partnership with 3 HDCs. There are two major outcomes of this project as follows:

Outcome 1: Agricultural productivity of female and male marginal and small farm households increased and diversified through IFM-FFS in the Chittagong Hill Tracts

Outcome 2: Hill District Councils are managing transferred agricultural services in line with the CHT Peace Accord

The AFSP III established 997 Integrated Farm Management – Farmer Field Schools with around 23,900 farmers (62% female) through mobilization and facilitation of Farmer Field School learning approach in respective communities. To run the IFM-FFS properly, the project has developed 333 new Farmer Facilitators and 28 Master Trainers. The project has also produced 11 modules comprising 60 sessions, including preparatory, vegetable gardening, fruit gardening, rice cultivation, poultry rearing, pig rearing, cattle rearing, fish culture in pond/creek, marketing, nutrition and high-value crop modules.

To engage the government line department with the project, GoB line department officials were trained on AFSP III and FFS implementation. The project also arranges regular monitoring visits of the GoB line department officials to look after the project initiatives after the project period.

Along with the production increase, the project has also worked on the market linkage of the marginal farmers. To improve the access to agricultural inputs, 485 farming input suppliers (11% women) were trained on the quality farming inputs, preventive measures, and general advice during the selling of inputs. This project has also developed 101 Community Livestock Workers (CLWs) to vaccinate FFS farmers' livestock animals. Moreover, this project has established a market linkage initiative where the community manages 95 market collection points by linking farmers and traders for competitive sales and mutual benefits. The Agriculture and Food Security component also developed knowledge and skills of Hill District Councils and GoB line department officials on improved coordination mechanism and

management functions of transferred agricultural services through different platforms and formally conducted training events.

CHT Climate Resilience Project (CCRP)

CHT Climate Resilience Project (CCRP), a component of Strengthening Inclusive Development in Chittagong Hill Tracts (SID-CHT) of Ministry of CHT Affairs and UNDP, is being implemented in three Hill Districts since March 2018. This project is being implemented in 10 Upazilas across 3 Hill Districts of Rangamati, Khagrachari, and Bandarban. The main objective of this project is to improve the climate resiliency of the community livelihoods and watersheds in the Chittagong Hill Tracts.

The project helps build the resilience of the local communities (with priority to the marginalized sections, including poor and women), areas affected by Rohingya influx and traditional institutions (such as karbaries and headmen), and climate-induced risks and natural disasters such as landslides, soil erosion, and floods. The areas were selected at the initial stage of the project based on climate vulnerability assessment and resilience analyses and intensity of vulnerabilities remaining within the selected areas.

The outcome aims at achieving results through 3 inter-related outputs. First, the project supports rural communities and institutions in the CHT to conduct site-specific Community Climate Vulnerability Assessments (CCVAs) and prepare Local Resilience Plans (LRPs). Second, the project helps communities and institutions to undertake priority actions in identified micro- and small-watersheds emphasizing community resource management of forests, conserving the watersheds including forests and their associated watersheds, and diversifying resilient livelihoods with a focus on improved natural resources-based income-generating opportunities. Third, the project develops the CHT institutions, leaders, and community's capacity to enable them to fully discharge the expected planning, field implementation, and other responsibilities. The project also supports some of the planned activities of Local Resilience Plans (LRPs). In contrast, the Union Parishads were approached to include remaining activities under the Annual Development Programme (ADP) of the Government of Bangladesh. During the implementation, the Para Development Committees (PDCs), Para Nari Development Groups (PNDCs), and different networks were engaged. The Hill District Councils (HDCs), are implementing the LRPs by supporting the Union Parishads.

2. Geographical Coverage:

The table below includes the number of project-specific beneficiaries as well as the IFM-FFS.

AFSP Project location-wise beneficiary				
HDC	Upazila	Union	IFM-FFS	Beneficiary
Bandarban	5	17	146	3,747
Rangamati	10	53	441	11,620
Khagrachari	9	38	398	10,935
Total	24	108	985	26,302
CCRP Project location-wise beneficiary				
HDC	Upazila	Union	Climate Resilience Committee (CRC)	Beneficiary
Bandarban	3	6	6	4,369
Rangamati	4	8	8	6,989
Khagrachari	3	6	6	8,058
Total	10	20	20	19,416

3. Evaluation Purpose, Objectives and Scope:

Purpose:

The main purpose of this evaluation is to collect the endline data/ information of these two DANIDA-funded projects to measure the most significant changes and results at the output/outcome level for beneficiaries, institutions, and communities with a focus on the overall implementation process and progress towards project targets. The key findings of this evaluation will be used for future project design and policy implications at UNDP and the Government of Bangladesh.

Specific Objectives:

The specific objectives of the study are:

8. To assess to what extent AFSP III and CCRP have contributed to addressing the needs and problems identified during programme design
9. To measure Impact level changes of the projects
10. To measure intended outcomes of the projects
11. To assess the efficiency and effectiveness of various project interventions and to identify causes of success and/or failure with recommendations
12. To measure the value addition of the project after continuing over decades, specially for AFSP III
13. To examine how the initiatives of the projects are mainstreamed in the government process.
14. To measure the Value for money
15. To provide forward-looking programmatic recommendations (for any course correction) to achieve the intended results/outcomes

The evaluation employs OECD evaluation criteria (Relevance, Efficiency, Effectiveness, Impact, Sustainability, and Coherence).

The final evaluation aims at critically reviewing and identifying what has worked well in the project, what challenges have been faced, what lessons can be learned to improve future programming. The evaluation will also generate knowledge for wider uses, assess the scope for scaling up the current programme, and serve as a quality assurance tool for both upward and downward accountability.

The evaluation should provide credible, useful, evidence-based information that enables timely incorporation of its findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes of UNDP and key stakeholders.

Scope of Evaluation:

This endline evaluation covers the project implementation of these two projects from May 2018 to June 2021. The evaluation will be conducted from July-September 2021 and August-January 2022 for AFSP III and CCRP, respectively. The timing has been agreed upon with the donor.

Utilization:

The primary users of the evaluation results will be UNDP, but the evaluation results will equally be useful to relevant GoB ministries, development partners, and donors.

UNDP will consider all useful findings, conclusions, and recommendations from the evaluation, prepare a systematic management response for each recommendation, and implement follow-up actions as per UNDP Evaluation Resource Center guidance/policies.

4. Evaluation Approach and Questions:

4.1. Evaluation Questions

As part of the evaluation, the firm needs to address evaluation questions. The following evaluation questions in light of these two projects are key but not limited to:

Relevance:

- ✓ To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and the SDGs?
- ✓ To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome?
- ✓ To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design?
- ✓ To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes?
- ✓ To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, women's empowerment, and the human rights-based approach?
- ✓ To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

Effectiveness

- ✓ To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and national development priorities?
- ✓ To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
- ✓ What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes?
- ✓ In which areas does the project have the ,most significant achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- ✓ In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- ✓ What would be bottlenecks and changes if the project is not achieving the results as planned? (it should consider both external and internal factors)

Efficiency

- ✓ To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
- ✓ To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
- ✓ To what extent has there been an economic use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
- ✓ To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supported the strategy been cost-effective?
- ✓ To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered on time?
- ✓ To what extent do the Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?

Sustainability

- ✓ To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- ✓ Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures, and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project benefits?
- ✓ What is the risk to ensure the level of stakeholders' ownership will be sufficient to sustain the project benefits?
- ✓ To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, women's empowerment, human rights, and human development?
- ✓ To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- ✓ To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?

Coherence

- ✓ To what extent do other interventions (including policies) support or undermine the intervention and vice versa? It includes internal coherence and external coherence.

Impact

- ✓ Have the projects brought changes in the lives of the people and their communities stated in the result framework of the SID-CHT?
- ✓ Is there any positive/ negative change in target beneficiaries, their communities, and duty bearers as a result of the projects? How many were to benefit?

Leave no one behind

- ✓ To what extent have the projects' response and recovery initiative(s) been inclusive in supporting the most vulnerable and marginalized group in the implementing area.

Lessons learned

- ✓ What are the lessons that the projects have had learned so far?
- ✓ What are the challenges that the projects have faced during their implementation?
- ✓ What measures have already been taken to mitigate those challenges?

Way forward

- ✓ Have any good practices, success stories, or transferable examples been identified? Please describe and document them.
- ✓ Based on the achievements to date, provide forward-looking programmatic recommendations.

4.2. Gender and Human Rights-based Approach:

As part of the requirement, the evaluation must include assessing the extent to which the design, implementation, and results of the project have incorporated a gender equality perspective (questions/issues related to gender equality are discussed in the previous section)

and rights-based approach. The evaluators are requested to review UNEG's Guidance on 'Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation'² before initiating this assignment.

In addition, the methodology used in the programme evaluation, including data collection and analysis methods, should be human rights and gender-sensitive to the greatest extent possible, with evaluation data and findings disaggregated by sex, ethnicity, age, etc. Detailed analysis on disaggregated data will be undertaken as part of evaluation from which findings are consolidated to make recommendations and identify lessons learned for the project's enhanced gender-responsive and rights-based approach.

These evaluation approaches and methodology should consider different groups in the SID-CHT project intervention – women, youth, minorities, and vulnerable groups. Persons with disabilities (PwD) also need to be considered in the evaluation, following the new UNDP evaluation report checklist.

The evaluation covers the following questions in relation to gender equality and human rights:

Gender equality

- ✓ To what extent have gender equality and women's empowerment been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project?
- ✓ Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
- ✓ To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?

Human rights

- ✓ To what extent have poor, indigenous, and physically challenged women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country?

5. Evaluation Methodology and Approach:

5.1. Proposed Methodology

The selected firm shall adopt mixed methodologies, including Key Informant Interviews (KIIs), Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), and Household (HH) survey. Survey questionnaires need to cover all indicators in the results framework (in Annex). The questionnaires should also keep a minimum percentage of data coverage as the baseline survey to ensure robust comparison between baseline data and end-line data. However, the selected firm is strongly expected to improve data collection tools, including survey questionnaires and data analysis methodologies. The firm shall also conduct desk-based review of relevant project documents such as project proposals, Implementation Manual, project progress reports, etc to respond to specific evaluation questions.

The bidders need to calculate the sample size with proper sampling method. It will be further elaborated in the inception report of the selected firm and determined in consultation with UNDP and relevant stakeholders during the inception phase. Total population of both the projects are 26,302 farmers of AFSP-III and 19,416 community members of the CCRP project. To

² UNEG's Guidance on 'Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluation'
http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=980

keep comparability between baseline and end-line data, it is expected that the firm refers to the following range of the sample size, but the firm needs to come up with exact figure per each unit (HDC, Upazila, Union, FFS, CRC) with robust sampling method.

AFSP Project location-wise beneficiary					Proposed samples of beneficiary for Final Evaluation	
HDC	Upazila	Union	FFS	Beneficiary	Teartment	Control
Bandarban	5	17	146	3,747	1,000 - 1,300	550 - 650
Rangamati	10	53	441	11,620		
Khagrachari	9	38	398	10,935		
Total	24	108	985	26,302		
CCRP Project location-wise beneficiary						
HDC	Upazila	Union	CRC	Beneficiary		
Bandarban	3	6	6	4,369	1,000 - 1,300	500 - 600
Rangamati	4	8	8	6,989		
Khagrachari	3	6	6	8,058		
Total	10	20	20	19,416		

The bidders are also requested to propose the appropriate number of FGDs and KIIs to be conducted per geographical areas in the proposal. FGD and KIIs also requires semi-structured questionnaires and/or checklists to make data collection process as structured as possible.

Use of Electronic-based data collection tools (i.e. web-based household questionnaires/data collection apps) is highly encouraged, in case if the firm has already had the tablets and any other necessary equipment which can be used for this evaluation.

The data collection process should be participatory engaging senior government officials, implementing and donor partners, project concerns, key stakeholders and a wide cross-section of staff and beneficiaries incorporating a gender equity approach.

The firm is expected to conduct quantitative analysis using the Statistical software. Other qualitative data collected through KIIs and FGDs will also be analysed extensively to provide a picture of project's impacts. Data and evidence will be triangulated to large extent to address evaluation questions.

The current situation of the COVID-19 crisis in the country needs to be considered when proposing data collection tools. The bidders are expected to propose alternative means of data collection as viable options. Particularly, if the COVID-19 crisis continues at the time of data collection, FGDs might be difficult due to concerns about exposure to risk against social distancing. If the situation does not allow, there is an option to incorporate in-depth qualitative-based questions to the household survey questionnaires instead of conducting FGDs. The detailed methods will be decided in consultation with UNDP during the inception phase.

The selected firm is requested to identify a few case studies to look into the qualitative changes in beneficiaries and key stakeholders made by the project. Details will be discussed during the inception phase and data collection phase. Case studies need to be elaborated in the evaluation report together with infographic and photo.

In the technical proposal, the firm is requested to elaborate:

- 1) Overall evaluation study strategies
- 2) Detailed work plan
- 3) Evaluation matrix
- 4) Sampling strategies based on the total beneficiary
- 5) Data collection methodologies & protocols
- 6) Data quality control methods
- 7) Data analysis methodologies and
- 8) Gender assessment plan

It should be detailed out to a significant extent. All of the methodologies described above in the proposal will be assessed rigorously, which will heavily affect the scoring of the proposal.

5.2. Available Data Source:

For the study, the evaluation team is expected to collect relevant information from the Project Document, Annual Work Plans, Financial reports, Event database, M&E plan, periodic progress reports, donor reports, policy documents, produced IEC/BCC materials, facts sheets, case studies, meeting minutes, study reports, baseline report, and any other relevant documents.

For primary data collection, the following sources should include (but not limited to):

- At the national level: National Project Director (SID-CHT), Deputy National Project Directors (SIDS-CHT), Staff of Project, Donors, other relevant government as stated in the stakeholder list in the Background section.
- At the field level: HDCs, District and Upazila Administration including Deputy Commissioner (DC), Deputy Director (DD-LG), UNO, Upazila Parishads (UZP) Representatives of Upazila Parishads and Union Parishads (UPs), Steering Committee Members, Ward Committee Members, and Secretaries, Gram Police, Community Livestock Workers, Farmer Facilitator, Para Development Committees (PDCs), CRC members, and project beneficiaries.

5.3. Evaluation Ethics

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'³. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees, and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

6. Scope of Work and Evaluation Timeline:

6.1 Scope

The following tasks will be accomplished by the firm within the timeline.

³ UNEG, 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation', June 2020. Available at <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/2866>

i. Detailed methodological notes of evaluation: The complete assessment will be based on the mixed method of data collection. Therefore, the firm will develop detailed methodologies, including 1) overall evaluation study strategies, 2) detailed work plan, 3) evaluation matrix, 4) sampling strategies, 5) data collection methodologies & protocols, 6) data quality control methods, 7) data analysis methodologies, and 8) gender assessment plan. Evaluation matrix also needs to be developed. Methodologies will be finalized in consultation with UNDP during the inception stage.

ii. Detailed sampling frame of evaluation:

The firm will calculate the sample sizes for both projects considering the table in '5.1. Proposed Methodology' part of the ToR. The proposed sample size will be determined by the area/union wise project beneficiary.

- d) Key Informant Interview (KII):** The firm will conduct several KIIs relevant to this project intervention. The firm will propose the sample to be considered. The most KIIs respondents will be the key project staff, HDC staff, PNGO staff, GoB frontline officials, and others directly involved with SID-CHT.
- e) Focus Group Discussion (FGD):** The firm is also expected to conduct enough FGDs in the treatment group. The prospective firm will propose the number of FGDs to be conducted by geographical coverage in the proposal.
- f) HHs Survey:** The firm will collect several household data based on the objectives and results framework's need. The sample size determined by the prospective firm will cover both quantitative and qualitative data collection. The firm will decide what would be the sample percentages for quantitative and qualitative data collection.

iii. Development of Data Collection Tools: The firm needs to design qualitative tools to collect data from different stakeholders and households. All tools will be linked with the key objectives and key questions of the study. This should include 1) household survey questionnaire, 2) Key Informant Interview (KII) checklist, 3) Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and KII checklist, 4) case study guideline as well as 5) survey protocols and 6) data quality assurance mechanism.

iv. Field Test of Data Collection Tools: To avoid non-sampling error, the firm will conduct field tests of data collection tools and methodologies and adjust them based on learning/ feedback of field testing.

v. Field Data Collection: The firm will hire the required number of researchers/surveyors/data entry personnel with sufficient experience in data collection. They will collect data from households, local governance institutions, and any other relevant organization with appropriate data collection methods/tools. In order to ensure the quality of data, experienced field coordinators and enumerators should be engaged in collecting the data from the field. The firm shall organize training for field coordinators and enumerators before deployment to familiarize them with data collection tools and data quality assurance mechanism

vi. Data Entry/Data Quality Control/Data Management: The firm will design and implement a system for data entry and data management. He/She needs to ensure data quality with a robust quality assurance mechanism in the whole data entry/management process.

vii. Data Analysis: The firm will analyze and interpret data through relevant statistical software and triangulate qualitative data with other sources. Gender analysis on the data collected will also be conducted.

viii. Report: The firm will provide a draft report and share its findings with UNDP and other relevant stakeholders through the presentation. The feedback received will be incorporated into the report. The final report should include programmatic recommendations on what needs to be considered for the remaining project period of SID-CHT. The reporting language is English. The evaluation report shall follow the structure outlined in Annex 3/ Evaluation Report Template and Quality Standards (Page 55-59) of Section 4/ Evaluation Implementation of UNDP

Evaluation Guideline. All evaluation reports will be quality assessed by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO). Details of the IEO's quality assessment of decentralized evaluations can be found in Section 6 (Page 8-12) of the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines[2].⁴

6.2 Timeline

Duration of this assignment will be 60 days (4 months).

Scope of Bid Price and Schedule of Payments

Phase	Duration	Proposed time
Inception work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Review necessary documents - Prepare inception reports and detailed methodologies notes, including 1) overall evaluation study strategies, 2) detailed work plan, 3) evaluation matrix, 4) sampling strategies, 5) data collection methodologies & protocols, 6) data quality control methods, 7) data analysis methodologies, and 8) gender assessment plan. - The inception report should include the coordination and mode of engagement of team members. - Develop a time-bound work plan. - Submit draft inception reports to UNDP - Organize an inception meeting with UNDP and SID-CHT to finalize evaluation framework and methodologies - Submit final inception reports and obtain approval from UNDP, including detailed methodologies 	7 days	Within two weeks of signing contract
Data collection tools development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Develop data collection tools and protocols (i.e., survey questionnaires, checklist, survey protocols, data quality assurance mechanism) - Presentation of data collection tools to UNDP/ SID-CHT management - Field test data collection tools - Finalization of data collection tools incorporating the feedback of field testing 	7 days	Within two weeks of signing the contract
Field data collection/ Data management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide training to onboard enumerators on data collection tools and methods - Collect data from the agreed sources using agreed tools and methods - Conduct data quality assurance 	30 days	Within ten weeks of signing the contract

⁴ [1] Evaluation Report Template and Quality Standards of UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2021), Section 4: Evaluation Implementation, available at <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml>

[2] Quality Assessment Questions of UNDP Evaluation Guidelines (2021), Section 6: Quality Assessment, available at <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/index.shtml>

Phase	Duration	Proposed time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Data entry into the software - Data processing - Conduct data analysis - Triangulate/ analyze findings from desk review, stakeholders' interview, and KIIs - Debrief key findings to the UNDP CO and the stakeholders 		
Reporting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Draft evaluation reports - Organize a sharing meeting for UNDP and relevant stakeholders - Incorporate feedback and comments from UNDP and stakeholders - Submit final reports to UNDP together with other deliverables 	16 days	Within sixteen weeks of signing the contract

The firm/organization will be expected to present a draft report in both written form and oral - presentation to the UNDP/SID-CHT and relevant stakeholders within one month of completion of field data collection. The UNDP/SID-CHT and relevant stakeholders will then give their written comments for incorporation in the final report after submitting the draft report. The team leader should be available to discuss findings with management before the presentation of the draft report. The final report (MS Word format) and clean data (excel/SPSS) on a flash drive should be presented within 2 weeks of getting the comments on the draft report.

7. Deliverables:

The firm will be responsible for ensuring the following outputs/deliverables to UNDP Bangladesh as per the agreed work plan:

- Inception reports and detailed methodologies notes, including 1) overall evaluation study strategies, 2) detailed work plan, 3) evaluation matrix, 4) sampling strategies, 5) data collection methodologies & protocols, 6) data quality control methods, 7) data analysis methodologies, and 8) gender assessment plan.
- A set of data collection tools, including survey questionnaires, checklists, and survey protocols in English and Bangla.
- Softcopy of all collected data, including cleaned datasets.
- Evaluation reports in English, including case studies and audit trail.

8. Implementation arrangements

The firm will independently conduct the evaluation but shall take necessary assistance from SID-CHT and UNDP. The Deputy Resident Representative and Assistant Resident Representative, UNDP Bangladesh, will be responsible for managing the evaluation throughout the entire process. The SID-CHT team led by National Project Manager and Team leader – PMR will provide necessary support in the evaluation's day-to-day operation. The consultant will also seek technical guidance from Programme Specialist - Disaster and Resilience, R&IG Cluster, and M&E Specialist/Analyst at UNDP Bangladesh Country Office. The programme evaluation report needs to be cleared by the M&E Specialist/Analyst at UNDP Bangladesh Country Office and approved by the Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP Bangladesh, and RBM/ M&E focal point, UNDP Bangkok Regional Hub.

9 Scope of Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The remuneration of the successful contractor will be fixed, and bids should be submitted on this basis. No adjustment will be given for the period and determined by the specified outputs as per this ToR. The price should consider all HR costs and professional fees, travel costs, subsistence, and ancillary expenses. The financial proposal shall specify the total lump sum amount and must be all-inclusive (professional fees, travel costs, living allowances, medical allowances, communications costs, etc.)

UNDP shall affect payments by bank transfer to the consultancy firm's bank account upon acceptance by SID-CHT/UNDP of the deliverables specified in the ToR. Payments will be based on milestone deliverables upon submission of invoice and upon certification of the work completed.

Deliverables	% of payment
Inception reports and data collection tools cleared by SID-CHT and UNDP before starting evaluation. *A set of survey questionnaires and KII/FGD checklists/semi-structured questionnaires (both in English and Bengali) should be attached with the inception report as Annex.	25% of total value
Draft Evaluation Report: Draft reports will be submitted to SID-CHT, UNDP for feedback and comments. The reports will present gender-disaggregated data with a summary matrix as per the result framework and recommendations/lessons learned/good practice. The firm will organize a validation workshop with different stakeholders in CHT based on the findings.	45% of total value
Final Evaluation Report: The contracted agency will submit both hard and soft copy of the final reports reflecting SID-CHT feedback, and the validation workshop's feedback on the draft reports/findings.	30% of total value
Datasets: The contracted agency will also submit the complete cleaned data file(s) in MS Excel /SPSS or suitable statistical package format, including variables labeled in English.	

13. Recommended Presentation of proposal

Technical Proposal:

- I. Name of firm/organization and details of registration, address and bank account, business registration certificate and corporate documents (Articles of Association or other founding authority), description of present activities, and most recent annual report (including audited financial statements)
- II. Description of experience in projects of a comparable nature, with a specific description of technical specialization of the firm in the required area
- III. List of current and past assignments of the firm/organization
- IV. References from a minimum of 3 previous clients receiving similar service

- V. Methods and approaches to be adopted in delivering this assignment, including work plan and implementation timelines
- VI. CVs of the proposed key personnel need to be included in the technical proposal. Please note that proposing firms will be expected to deploy the service staff listed in the proposal; substitutions will only be accepted with the prior consent of SID-CHT.

Key results of AFSP-III and CCRP Projects:

Results Framework:

The selected firm needs to use the following **Results Frameworks below** to measures the key results progress and deviations so far. **AFSP III Project:**

Outcome indicator 1		Agricultural production of female and male marginal and small farm households increased and diversified through IFM-FFS in the Chittagong Hill Tracts	
Baseline	Year	2018	The end outcome of AFSP II will be the baseline
Target	Year	2021	% increase in yields and production of beneficiary Households (HH) (Vegetable, Fruits, Eggs, Chicken, Pig, Goat, Cow and Fish) % HH intake of diversified nutritious food % of beneficiary HH in target communities with increased access to decentralised extension services % of HH which adapted climate resilient technology
Output indicator 1.1		Community groups and stakeholders mobilized through establishment of IFM-FFS	
Baseline	Year	2018	The end outcome of AFSP II will be the baseline
Target	Year	2021	# of FFS formed/established, including women (50%) and men participated in mobilization initiatives
Output indicator 1.2		IFM-FFS Curricula Developed and Promoted	
Baseline	Year	2018	The end outcome of AFSP II will be the baseline
Target	Year	2021	# of Modules developed with inclusion and testing of relevant farming HH's reliance on climate change issues into FFS curriculum
Output indicator 1.3		Knowledge and skills of CHT stakeholders [Master trainers, FFS Facilitators, Government of Bangladesh (GoB) Officers] enhanced	
Baseline	Year	2018	The end outcome of AFSP II will be the baseline
Target	Year	2021	# of FFS trainers trained (at least 30 % women) % of trained CHT stakeholders who believe their knowledge and skills on IFM-FFS have increased after training

Output indicator 1.4		IFM-FFS implemented through participatory and 'learning by doing approach'	
Baseline	Year	2018	The end outcome of AFSP II will be the baseline
Target	Year	2021	% of IFM-FFS participants graduated (disaggregated by sex and age) 50 % women % of IFM-FFS graduates applying sustainable and climate resilient intensification (increased yield levels, enhanced soil fertility, averting loss of stock/crops) % of GoB Line Department Officers that provided follow up support
Output indicator 1.5		Access to market linkages (input-output) promoted and facilitated	
Baseline	Year	2018	The end outcome of AFSP II will be the baseline
Target	Year	2021	# of FFS linked to traders/buyers for selling their agricultural produces (collection centres and group marketing) % of HHs with access to quality agricultural inputs
Outcome indicator 2		Hill District Councils (HDC) are managing transferred agricultural services in line with CHT Peace Accord	
Baseline	Year	2018	The end outcome of AFSP II will be the baseline
Target	Year	2021	Sustainable agricultural policies and strategies developed and in place at HDC Coordination mechanism among the transferred departments related to agriculture services strengthened with functional Agricultural Planning Unit under the leadership of HDCs
Output indicator 2.1		Coordination enhanced and HDC strengthened to manage transferred agriculture services and monitor Local Resilience Plans	
Baseline	Year	2018	The end outcome of AFSP II will be the baseline
Target	Year	2021	# of coordination meetings organised # of consultative workshops organised # of Local Resilience Plans supported

CCRP Project:

Outcome Indicator		Percentage of households in targeted communities able to improve their livelihoods in identified watersheds	
Baseline	Year	2018	0%
Target	Year	2021	50%
Output 1 Indicators		Percentage of communities that have completed Community Climate Vulnerability Assessments	
		Percentage of selected communities with Local Resilience Plans	
Baseline	Year	2018	0% and 0%

Target	Year	2018	40% and 0%
Target	Year	2019	80% and 40%
Target	Year	2020	80% and 60%
Target	Year	2021	80% and 60%
Output 2 Indicators		Percentage of communities (with nearly 50% women participation) that implemented prioritised and selective risk reduction actions	
		Percentage of community members perceiving difference in levels of risks	
Baseline	Year	2018	0% and 0%
Target	Year	2018	0% and 0%
Target	Year	2019	40% and 0%
Target	Year	2020	80 and 40%
Target	Year	2021	80 and 60%
Output 3 Indicator		Percentage of communities supported (technical and/or financial) by CHT institutions	
Baseline	Year	2018	0%
Target	Year	2018	0%
Target	Year	2019	10%
Target	Year	2020	40%
Target	Year	2021	50%

10.2 Evaluation Matrix

Table 1A: Detailed matrix for final evaluation of AFSP III

Relevant Evaluation Criteria	Specific objectives	Key Questions	Specific Sub-Questions	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods/Tools	Methods for Data Analysis
The Relevance of AFSP III's project design, with a specific focus on its theory of change and how the project outputs realistically and effectively contributed to its overall objective.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SO-01 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent was the project in line with the national development priorities, the country programme's outputs and outcomes, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and the SDGs? To what extent does the project contribute to the theory of change for the relevant country programme outcome? To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project's design? To what extent were perspectives of those who could affect the outcomes and those who could contribute information or other resources to the attainment of stated results, taken into account during the project design processes? To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, women's empowerment, and the human rights-based approach? To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How does the project align with related national strategies? How does the project align with related UN/ UNDP strategies in Bangladesh, UNDP Strategic Plan, and SDGs? What is the theory of change for the relevant country program outcome? Did the project contribute to it? What were the lesson learned from other relevant projects? Were the lessons learned considered during the project design? Were any stakeholder inputs/concerns addressed at the project formulation stage? (Both beneficiary and other stakeholders) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans ✓ UNDP strategic documents (e.g., UNDAF) ✓ Relevant documents of similar studies (e.g., CPD) ✓ Relevant country program documents from UNDP ✓ AFSP III project documents, annual work plan ✓ AFSP III progress reports incl. Baseline ✓ AFSP III & CCRP Quality Assurance report, monitoring reports, and field visit reports ✓ Implementing partners progress reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary document review Focus group discussion Key Informant interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative analysis Data synthesis Thematic coding Framework analysis Triangulation

		<p>legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does the project address the human development needs of intended beneficiaries? • What analysis, in particular of the gender equality and gender norms was done in designing the project? • How did the project contribute to conflict mitigation surrounding the inter-ethnic violence and security context; as well as gender-based violence? • Were the project interventions able to reach the most marginalized segments of the population including women, youth, minorities, persons with disabilities (PWD) and other vulnerable groups? • Was the project able to adapt to evolving needs/changing context? • What project revisions were made and why? • Was a stakeholder analysis conducted as part of the project development phase? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Human rights standard (e.g., Sphere handbook) ✓ Gender policy/guideline of GoB. ✓ Gender policy/guideline of UN <p>Stakeholders including</p> <p>Local government authorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upazila Parishad (UZP) • Union Parishad (UP) <p>Govt. Line Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE) • Department of Livestock Services (DLS) • Department of Fisheries (DoF) <p>Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs</p> <p>Hill District Council/District Council (Zila Parishad)</p> <p>UNDP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Project Directors, SID-CHT 		
--	--	--	---	--	--	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there any gap between the project reality and pathway to achieve the results, hypothesis, assumptions, and risks identified when developing the Theory of Change? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP- AFSP III Project officials and staffs, M&E officials, Implementing partner staffs <p>Beneficiaries</p> <p>AFSP III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor, marginalized farmers • Farmer facilitators • Para Development Committee (PDC) • Steering Committee Members 		
<p>Effectiveness – The overall effectiveness of the implemented project activities towards the expected results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO-01 • SO-03 • SO-04 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent did the project contribute to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and national development priorities? • To what extent were the project outputs achieved? • What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended country programme outputs and outcomes? • In which areas does the project have the most significant achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project been on track towards achieving its planned outcomes and outputs as per the Results Framework (following the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and national development priorities)? • What factors such as management, human resources, financial aspects, regulatory aspects, implementation modifications or deviation from plans, quality of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans ✓ UNDP strategic documents (e.g., UNDAF) ✓ Relevant documents of similar studies (e.g., CPD) ✓ Relevant country program documents from UNDP ✓ AFSP III project documents, annual work plan ✓ AFSP III progress reports incl. Bseline 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary document review • HH Survey • Focus group discussion • Key Informant interviews <p>Beneficiaries</p> <p>Farmer Facilitators</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Statistical analysis (Descriptive & Inferential) • Process tracing • Triangulation

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome? • What would be bottlenecks and changes if the project is not achieving the results as planned? (it should consider both external and internal factors) 	<p>implementation, have contributed to the achievement or non-achievement of the outcomes and outputs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the most significant achievements of the projects? <p>What are the supporting factors acted behind the achievement such as management, human resources, financial aspects, regulatory aspects, implementation modifications or deviation from plans, quality of implementation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the areas of fewest achievements of the projects? <p>What are the constraining factors acted behind the deviation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are there any bottlenecks? What are the bottlenecks? What are the internal and external factors acted behind the bottlenecks? • Has the project encountered any challenges in implementation of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ AFSP III Quality Assurance report, monitoring reports, and field visit reports ✓ Implementing partners progress reports ✓ AFSP III Project Document, annual work plan, financial reports, IEC/BCC materials, fact sheets, case studies, meeting minutes, study reports, household database and training database. ✓ AFSP III Progress report ✓ Baseline report ✓ AFSP III Quality Assurance report, monitoring reports, and field visit reports. ✓ Implementing partners progress reports <p>Stakeholders includes</p> <p>Local government authorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deputy Commissioner (DC) 		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

			<p>activities and achieving its targets?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deputy Director (DD-LG) • Upazila Parishad Chairman • Upazila Development Co-ordination committee (UzDCC) • Upazila Nirbahi Officer • Union Parishad Chairman • Union Development Co-ordination committee (UDCC) <p>Govt. Line Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE) • Department of Livestock Services (DLS) • Department of Fisheries (DoF) <p>Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs</p> <p>Hill District Council/District Council (Zila Parishad)</p> <p>UNDP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Project Directors, SID-CHT 		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP- AFSP III & CCRP Project officials and staffs, M&E officials, Implementing partner staffs <p>Beneficiaries</p> <p>AFSP III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor, marginalized farmers • Farmer facilitators • Para Development Committee (PDC) • Steering Committee Members 		
<p>Efficiency –</p> <p>The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO-04 • SO-05 • SO-07 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results? • To what extent have the UNDP project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective? • To what extent has there been an economic use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes? • To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supported the strategy been cost-effective? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were appropriate choices made and trade-offs addressed in the design stage and during implementation? • Were the human and financial resources used as planned? • Were the human and financial resources fully utilized? • Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective? • Were there any misuse of human and financial resources? (resources misallocated, budgets underspent, overspent)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ UNDP strategic documents (e.g., UNDAF) ✓ Relevant documents of similar studies (e.g., CPD) ✓ AFSP III project documents, annual work plan ✓ AFSP III progress reports incl. Baseline ✓ AFSP III Quality Assurance report, monitoring reports, financial reports, event database and field visit reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary document review • Key Informant interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Process tracing • Triangulation

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered on time? • To what extent do the Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the project funds been delivered in a timely manner? • Were the timeframe of the project realistic or appropriate? What efforts were made to overcome obstacles and mitigate delays, as the situation evolved? • Were resources redirected as needs changed? • How the risks were managed? • Were decisions taken which helped to enhance efficiency in response to new information? • Were the logistics and procurement decisions optimal? • Was the M&E system efficient and functional in supporting the effectiveness of project management and implementation? 	<p>✓ Implementing partners progress reports</p> <p>🔄 Stakeholders including:</p> <p>Local government authorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upazila Development Co-ordination committee (UzDCC) • Union Development Co-ordination committee (UDCC) <p>Govt. Line Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE) • Department of Livestock Services (DLS) • Department of Fisheries (DoF) • Hill District Council/District Council (Zila Parishad) <p>UNDP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Project Directors, SID-CHT • UNDP- AFSP III Project officials and staffs, M&E officials, 	
--	--	---	---	--	--

				Implementing partner staffs		
Sustainability – The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue or are likely to continue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO-05 • SO-06 • SO-08 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project? • Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures, and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project benefits? • What is the risk to ensure the level of stakeholders' ownership will be sufficient to sustain the project benefits? • To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, women's empowerment, human rights, and human development? • To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives? • To what extent do UNDP interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were financial and economic resources made available to the beneficiaries which has the potential for sustainability? How much? • What are the potential risks posed by the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures, and processes for the sustainability of project benefits? • Are there any risks for the continuation of the positive effects generated by the intervention for key stakeholders, including intended beneficiaries, after the end of intervention? • Do the existing mechanisms, procedures and policies on gender equality, women's empowerment, human rights, and human development allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans ✓ UNDP strategic documents (e.g., UNDAF) ✓ Relevant documents of similar studies ✓ AFSP III project documents, annual work plan ✓ AFSP III progress reports ✓ AFSP III Baseline reports ✓ AFSP III Quality Assurance report, monitoring reports, financial reports, event database and field visit reports <p>☞ Stakeholders including:</p> <p>Local government authorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deputy Commissioner (DC) • Deputy Director (DD-LG) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary document review • Case studies • HH Survey • Focus group discussion • Key Informant interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Statistical analysis (Descriptive and Inferential) • Data synthesis • Process tracing • Triangulation

			<p>attained on this areas? How much?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much the stakeholders engaged with the projects' designing, planning, and implementation phase? How much do they support projects activities and long-term goals? How opportunities to support the continuation of positive effects from the intervention have been identified, anticipated and planned for, as well as any barriers that may have hindered the continuation of positive effects? How appropriate the exit-strategies planned for the project interventions were? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Parishad Chairman Upazila Development Co-ordination committee (UzDCC) Upazila Nirbahi Officer Union Parishad Chairman Union Development Co-ordination committee (UDCC) <p>Govt. Line Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE) Department of Livestock Services (DLS) Department of Fisheries (DoF) Hill District Council/District Council (Zila Parishad) <p>UNDP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Project Directors, SID-CHT UNDP- AFSP III & CCRP Project officials and staffs, M&E officials, 	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				Implementing partner staffs Beneficiaries AFSP III <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor, marginalized farmers • Farmer facilitators • Para Development Committee (PDC) • Steering Committee Members 		
Coherence – The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions by the government or other organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO-06 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent do other interventions (including policies) support or undermine the intervention and vice versa? It includes internal coherence and external coherence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How the projects' activities (AFSP III & CCRP) are internally compatible with each other? • How the intervention supports or undermines policy goals of the government in relation to enhancing the livelihood of small-scale farmers and development in host communities? • What is the coordination mechanisms between the AFSP III & CCRP project and other UNDP interventions in the project areas? • How supports are provided– are there overlaps or gaps? Does the intervention add 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans ✓ Relevant documents of similar studies (Both thematic and contextual) ✓ AFSP III project documents (Project proposal, work plan) ✓ AFSP III Quality Assurance report, monitoring reports, financial reports, event database and field visit reports <p>Documents incl. CPD, UNDAF Reports.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary documents review • KII • FGD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Triangulation

			<p>value in relation to other implementers and how duplication of effort is avoided?</p>	<p>➡ Stakeholders including:</p> <p>Local government authorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upazila Development Co-ordination committee (UzDCC) • Upazila Nirbahi Officer <p>Govt. Line Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE) • Department of Livestock Services (DLS) • Department of Fisheries (DoF) • Hill District Council/District Council (Zila Parishad) <p>UNDP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Project Directors, SID-CHT • UNDP- AFSP III & CCRP Project officials and staffs, M&E officials, Implementing partner staffs <p>Other Organizations</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Officials from other INGOS, NGOs working in similar thematic areas 		
Impact – The extent to which the intervention has generated significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO-01 • SO-02 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the projects brought changes in the lives of the people and their communities stated in the result framework of the SID-CHT? • Is there any positive/ negative change in target beneficiaries, their communities, and duty bearers as a result of the projects? How many were to benefit? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the intervention caused a significant change in the lives of the direct beneficiaries and their communities? • How did the intervention cause higher-level effects (such as changes in norms or systems)? • Did all the intended target groups, including the most disadvantaged and vulnerable, benefit equally from the intervention? • Is the intervention transformative – does it create enduring changes in norms – including gender norms – and systems, whether intended or not? • How will the intervention contribute to changing society for the better? Was there any positive/ negative change in target beneficiaries, their communities, and duty 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans ✓ Relevant documents of similar studies ✓ AFSP III project documents, annual work plan ✓ AFSP III progress reports ✓ AFSP III Baseline reports ✓ AFSP III Quality Assurance report, monitoring reports, financial reports, event database and field visit reports <p>☛Stakeholders including:</p> <p>Local government authorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upazila Parishad Chairman • Upazila Development Co-ordination committee (UzDCC) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary document review • Case studies • HH Survey • Focus group discussion • Key Informant interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Process tracing • Triangulation

			<p>bearers as a result of the projects? How many were to benefit?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upazila Nirbahi Officer • Union Parishad Chairman • Union Development Co-ordination committee (UDCC) <p>Govt. Line Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE) • Department of Livestock Services (DLS) • Department of Fisheries (DoF) • Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs <p>UNDP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Project Directors, SID-CHT • UNDP- AFSP III & CCRP Project officials and staffs, M&E officials, Implementing partner staffs <p>Beneficiaries</p> <p>AFSP III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor, marginalized farmers 		
--	--	--	---	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmer facilitators Para Development Committee (PDC) Steering Committee Members 		
<p>Leaving no one behind (LNOB) – The extent to which the interventions have reached the poorest of the poor, and also combats discrimination and rising inequalities, and their root causes.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SO-01 SO-02 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have the projects' response and recovery initiative(s) been inclusive in supporting the most vulnerable and marginalized group in the implementing area. <p>Human Rights</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have poor, indigenous, and physically challenged, women and other disadvantaged and marginalized groups benefited from the work of UNDP in the country? <p>Gender Equality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent have gender equality and women's empowerment been addressed in the design, implementation, and monitoring of the project? Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality? To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did the project use any tools to assess who is left behind and why when designing the project? Was the project able to meet the needs of the most vulnerable and marginalized group? Did the project use any mechanism to sequence & prioritize solutions; tracking and monitoring progress; and for ensuring follow-up and review to ensure inclusive in support to the most vulnerable and marginalized group? Did the project use any particular tools to ensure gender responsiveness and gender mainstreaming in their activities? Has AFSP III & CCRP been able to promote any best practices in relation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans ✓ Relevant documents of similar studies ✓ AFSP III project documents, annual work plan ✓ AFSP III progress reports ✓ AFSP III Baseline reports ✓ AFSP III Quality Assurance report, monitoring reports, financial reports, event database and field visit reports <p>Stakeholders including:</p> <p>Local government authorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Parishad Chairman 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary document review Case studies HH Survey Key Informant interviews <p>Union Parishad (UP)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative and quantitative data analysis Data synthesis Process tracing Triangulation

			<p>to gender equality and gender responsiveness?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the project encountered any challenges in applying a gender sensitive approach? • Was there any hindrance to adopting a gender responsive approach and making gender equality an integral part of the project? • How much the projects ensured gender responsiveness and gender mainstreaming in their activities? • How well the gender marker data assigned to this project represents the reality of the project areas? • Was the project able to promote positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women among the key stakeholders, including target beneficiaries and their communities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upazila Women Affairs Officer • Upazila Development Co-ordination committee (UzDCC) • Upazila Nirbahi Officer • Union Parishad Chairman • Union Development Co-ordination committee (UDCC) <p>Govt. Line Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE) • Department of Livestock Services (DLS) • Department of Fisheries (DoF) • Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs <p>UNDP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Project Directors, SID-CHT • UNDP- AFSP III & CCRP Project officials and staffs, M&E officials, 	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Implementing partner staffs</p> <p>Beneficiaries</p> <p>AFSP III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor, marginalized farmers • Farmer facilitators • Para Development Committee (PDC) • Steering Committee Members 		
<p>Lessons learned - learning gained from the process of performing the project</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the lessons that the projects have had learned so far? • What are the challenges that the projects have faced during their implementation? • What measures have already been taken to mitigate those challenges? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the positive and negative experience of the project? What went right? What went wrong? What needs to be improved? • What are the challenges and bottlenecks the project have faced during implementation? • How the project responded to mitigate those challenges? Were appropriate measures taken? Is there any challenge left unaddressed? How the project plans to mitigate those challenges that are unaddressed? • Is the project planning and design adaptive and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Relevant documents of similar studies ✓ AFSP III project documents, annual work plan ✓ AFSP III progress reports ✓ AFSP III Baseline reports, and field visit reports <p>🔄Stakeholders including:</p> <p>Local government authorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upazila Parishad Chairman • Upazila Women Affairs Officer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary document review • Case studies • HH Survey • Focus group discussion • Key Informant interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative and quantitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Triangulation

			<p>flexible to address future challenges? Is the project on track to mitigate future challenges?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upazila Development Co-ordination committee (UzDCC) • Upazila Nirbahi Officer • Union Parishad Chairman • Union Development Co-ordination committee (UDCC) <p>Govt. Line Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE) • Department of Livestock Services (DLS) • Department of Fisheries (DoF) • Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs <p>UNDP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Project Directors, SID-CHT • UNDP- AFSP III & CCRP Project officials and staffs, M&E officials, Implementing partner staffs 	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				Beneficiaries AFSP III <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor, marginalized farmers • Farmer facilitators • Para Development Committee (PDC) • Steering Committee Members 		
Way forward - the best course of action for future programming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SO-04 • SO-08 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have any good practices, success stories, or transferable examples been identified? • Provide forward-looking programmatic recommendations based on the achievements to date,. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the good practices identified in the project life cycle, including project designing, monitoring and implementation? • Are there any success stories identified? • What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples were identified? • What are the programmatic recommendations based on the achievements to date following the Five Ws and one H approach (who, what, where, when, why and how)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans ✓ Relevant documents of similar studies ✓ AFSP III project documents, annual work plan ✓ AFSP III progress reports ✓ AFSP III Baseline reports ✓ AFSP III Quality Assurance report, monitoring reports, financial reports, event database and field visit reports <p>➡ Stakeholders including:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secondary document review • Case studies • Focus group discussion • Key Informant interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative data analysis • Data synthesis • Triangulation

				<p>Local government authorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deputy Commissioner (DC) • Deputy Director (DD-LG) • Upazila Parishad Chairman • Upazila Women Affairs Officer • Upazila Development Co-ordination committee (UzDCC) • Upazila Nirbahi Officer • Union Parishad Chairman • Union Development Co-ordination committee (UDCC) <p>Govt. Line Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE) • Department of Livestock Services (DLS) • Department of Fisheries (DoF) 		
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs <p>UNDP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Project Directors, SID-CHT • UNDP- AFSP III & CCRP Project officials and staffs, M&E officials, Implementing partner staffs <p>Beneficiaries</p> <p>AFSP III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor, marginalized farmers • Farmer facilitators • Para Development Committee (PDC) • Steering Committee Members 		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

10.3 Results Framework

Outcome Table for AFSP III

Table 2A: Result framework for outcomes of the AFSP III project

Outcome 1: Agricultural production of female and male marginal and small farm households increased and diversified through IFM-FFS in the CHT			
Outcome indicator	Data source/Stakeholders	Data collection methods	Analysis plan
1.1 % Increase in yields and production of beneficiary households (HH) (Vegetables, Fruits, Eggs, Chicken, Pig, Goat, Cow and Fish)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline report Progress reports Project's annual report Upazila level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Agricultural Extension Officer Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer Upazila Livestock Officer Upazila Development Co-Ordination Committee (Upazila Chairman) Community level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor, marginalized farmers (Control group) Poor, marginalized farmers (IFM-FFS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary Documents Review HH Survey KII 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive statistical analysis (Cross tabulation) Inferential statistical analysis (hypothesis testing, t-test, chi-square test, z-test, correlation) Thematic analysis Data synthesis Triangulation
1.2 % HH intake of diversified nutritious food	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline report Progress reports Project's annual report Upazila level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Food Inspector Community level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor, marginalized farmers (Control group) Poor, marginalized farmers (IFM-FFS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary Documents Review HH Survey KII 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive statistical analysis (Cross tabulation) Food consumption score nutrition quality analysis (WFP) Inferential statistical analysis (hypothesis testing, t-test, chi-square test, z-test, correlation) Thematic analysis Data synthesis Triangulation
1.3 % of beneficiary HH in target communities with increased access to decentralized extension services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline report Progress reports Project's annual report Upazila level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary Documents Review HH Survey KII 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive statistical analysis (Cross tabulation) Inferential statistical analysis (hypothesis testing, t-test, chi-square test, z-test, correlation)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Agricultural Extension Officer Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer Upazila Livestock Officer Upazila Development Co-Ordination Committee (Upazila Chairman) Sub-assistant Agriculture Officer (SAAO) <p>Community level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor, marginalized farmers (Control group) Poor, marginalized farmers (IFM-FFS) Community Livestock Workers (CLWs) 		<p>testing, t-test, chi-square test, z-test, correlation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thematic analysis Data synthesis Triangulation
1.4 % of HH which adapted climate resilient technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline report Progress reports Project's annual report <p>Upazila level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Agricultural Extension Officer Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer Upazila Livestock Officer Upazila Development Co-Ordination Committee (Upazila Chairman) <p>Community level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor, marginalized farmers (Control group) Poor, marginalized farmers (IFM-FFS) Farmer Facilitators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary Documents Review HH Survey KII FGD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive statistical analysis (Cross tabulation) Inferential statistical analysis (hypothesis testing, t-test, chi-square test, z-test, correlation) Thematic analysis Data synthesis Triangulation
1.5 % of GoB Line Department Offers that provided follow up support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline report Progress reports Project's annual report <p>Upazila level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Agricultural Extension Officer Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer Upazila Livestock Officer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary Documents Review HH Survey KII 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive statistical analysis (Cross tabulation) Inferential statistical analysis (hypothesis testing, t-test, chi-square test, z-test, correlation) Thematic analysis Data synthesis Triangulation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Development Co-Ordination Committee (Upazila Chairman) Sub-assistant Agriculture Officer (SAAO) <p>Community level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor, marginalized farmers (IFM-FFS) 		
Outcome-2: Hill District Councils (HDC) are managing transferred agricultural services in line with CHT Peace Accord			
<p>2.1: # of guideline on sustainable agriculture policies and strategies and services developed and in place at HDC.</p> <p>2.1.1 # of coordination meetings organized</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents (AFSP III) Relevant Govt. policy documents <p>Upazila level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Agricultural Extension Officer Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer Upazila Livestock Officer <p>District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chief Executive Officers of HDCs Deputy Director of DAE District Fisheries Officer District Livestock Officer <p>National</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Project Director (SID-CHT) <p>Project Officials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AFSP III Project Officials Implementing Partner Officials <p>Community level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmer Facilitators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary document review KII FGD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative data analysis Data synthesis Thematic coding Framework analysis Triangulation
<p>2.2: Coordination mechanism among the transferred departments related to agriculture services strengthened with functional agricultural planning Unit under the leadership of HDCs</p> <p>2.1.1: # of co-ordination meetings organized</p> <p>2.1.2: # of consultative workshops organized</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents (AFSP III & CCRP) <p>Upazila level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Agricultural Extension Officer Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer Upazila Livestock Officer <p>District</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary document review KII 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative data analysis Data synthesis Thematic coding Framework analysis Triangulation

2.1.3: # of local resilience plans supported	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chief Executive Officers of HDCs Deputy Director of DAE District Fisheries Officer District Livestock Officer <p>National</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Project Director (SID-CHT) <p>Project Officials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AFSP III Project Officials CCRP Project Officials Implementing Partner Officials 		
--	--	--	--

Output Table for AFSP III

Table 2B: Results framework for the outputs of the AFSP III project

Outcome 1: Agricultural production of female and male marginal and small farm households increased and diversified through IFM-FFS in the CHT				
Output	Output indicator	Data source/Stakeholders	Data collection methods	Analysis plan
1.1 Community groups and stakeholders mobilized through the establishment of IFM-FFS	1.1.1 # of FFS formed/established, including women (50%) and men participated in mobilisation initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents (AFSP III) <p>Upazila level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Agricultural Extension Officer Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer Upazila Livestock Officer Upazila Development Co-Ordination Committee (Upazila Chairman) <p>District</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chief Executive Officers of HDCs <p>Project Officials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AFSP III Project Officials Implementing Partner Staffs <p>Community level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmer Facilitators Union Development Co-Ordination Committee (Female UP Ward Member) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary document review KII FGD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative data analysis Data synthesis Thematic coding Framework analysis <p>Triangulation</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Para Development Committee (Executive members) Headman/Karbari 		
1.2 IFM-FFS Curricula Developed and Promoted	1.2.1 # of modules developed with inclusion and testing of relevant farming HH's reliance on climate change issues into FFS curriculum.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents (AFSP III) Upazila level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Agricultural Extension Officer Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer Upazila Livestock Officer Project Officials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master Trainers AFSP III Project Officials (District FFS Expert) Community level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmer Facilitators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary document review KII FGD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative data analysis Data synthesis Thematic coding Framework analysis Triangulation
1.3- Knowledge and skills of CHT stakeholders [Master trainers, FFS Facilitators, Government of Bangladesh (GoB) Officers enhanced	1.3.1- # of Master trainers, FFS Facilitators, Government of Bangladesh (GoB) Officers 1.3.2- % of trained CHT stakeholders who believe their knowledge and skills on IFM-FFS have increased after training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents (AFSP III) Upazila level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Agricultural Extension Officer Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer Upazila Livestock Officer Project Officials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master Trainers AFSP III Project Officials (District FFS Expert) Community level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmer Facilitators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary document review KII FGD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative data analysis Data synthesis Thematic coding Framework analysis Triangulation
1.4- IFM-FFS implemented through participatory and learning by doing approach.'	1.4.1 % of IFM-FFS participants graduated (disaggregated by sex and age) with 50% women 1.4.2 % of IFM-FFS graduate applying sustainable and climate-resilient intensification (increased yield levels, enhanced soil fertility, averting loss of stock/crops) 1.4.3 % of GoB Line Department Offers that provided follow up support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents (AFSP III) District <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chief Executive Officers of HDCs Upazila level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Agricultural Extension Officer Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer Upazila Livestock Officer Sub-assistant Agriculture Officer (SAAO) Upazila Development Co-Ordination Committee (Upazila Chairman) Project Officials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary document review HH Survey KII FGD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive statistical analysis (Cross tabulation) Inferential statistical analysis (hypothesis testing, t-test, chi-square test, z-test, correlation) Thematic analysis Data synthesis Triangulation

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AFSP III Project Officials (District FFS Expert) Implementing Partner Staffs Community level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Union Development Co-Ordination Committee (Female UP Ward Member) Poor, marginalized farmers (IFM-FFS) Farmer Facilitators 		
<p>1.5 Access to market linkages (Input-output) promoted and facilitated</p>	<p>1.5.1 # of FFS linked to traders/buyers for selling their agricultural produces (collection centres and group marketing).</p> <p>1.5.2 % of HHs with access to quality agricultural inputs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project documents (AFSP III) Upazila level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upazila Agricultural Extension Officer Senior Upazila Fisheries Officer Upazila Livestock Officer Sub-assistant Agriculture Officer (SAAO) Project Officials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> AFSP III Project Officials (District FFS Expert) Implementing Partner Staffs Community level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agri-business Network Representatives (Paikar, Arothdar, Bapery) Community Livestock Workers Poor, marginalized farmers (IFM-FFS) Farmer Facilitators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secondary document review HH Survey KII FGD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive statistical analysis (Cross tabulation) Inferential statistical analysis (hypothesis testing, t-test, chi-square test, z-test, correlation) Thematic analysis Data synthesis Triangulation

10.4 Study Tools

10.4.1 Quantitative Tools

Final Evaluation of Agriculture and Food Security (AFSP III) Project of SID-CHT

Structured Survey Questionnaire for Households

My name is _____ and I am working with DM WATCH. We are currently conducting an “Final Evaluation of Agriculture and Food Security (AFSP III) Project of SID-CHT” implemented by Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs (MoCHTA) with UNDP and other development partners. I invite you to participate in the survey. Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. If you decide not to take part, or to skip some of the questions, it will not affect your current or future relationship with us. If you decide to take part, you are free to withdraw at any time. The study is conducted by DM WATCH. Please ask any questions you have now.

Statement of Consent: I understand the aforementioned information and I have received answers to any questions I asked. I consent to take part in the study.

Interviewer's Name	Code	
Date of the Interview	Starting Time (24 hour)	End Time (24 hour)
_ _ · _ _ · _ _ _ _ DD MM YYYY	_ _ : _ _ HH MM	_ _ : _ _ HH MM
District Name	1. Rangamati 2. Khagrachari 3. Bandarban	
Upazila	1. Baghaichari 2. Bilaichari 3. Juraichari 4. Rangamati Sadar 5. Dighinala 6. Guimara 7. Khagrachari Sadar 8. Mahalachari 9. Bandarban Sadar 10. Ruma	

	11. Thanchi
Union	unions to be inserted
Type of the Interview Area	1. Treatment group 2. Control group
IFM-FFS Name	<input type="checkbox"/> __
GPS Location	

A. Basic Information

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code
1	Respondent's Name		
2	Respondent's Mobile Number	_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _	
3	Sex of the respondent	Male	1
		Female	2
		Others (specify)	3
4	Age of the respondent	_	
5	Marital status of the respondent	Married	1
		Unmarried	2
		Divorced	3
		Widowed	4
		Separated	5
		Others (specify)	6
6	Ethnicity of the respondent	Bawm	1
		Chak	2

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code
		Chakma	3
		Khyang	4
		Khumi	5
		Lusai	6
		Marma	7
		Mro	8
		Pangkhu	9
		Tanchangya	10
		Tripura	11
		Santal	12
		Bengali	13
		Others(Specify)	14
7	What is your mother language?	_____	
8	Education level of the respondent	Did not attend school	1
		Can only sign	2
		Did not complete primary education	3
		Completed primary education	4
		SSC/equivalent	5
		HSC/Diploma/equivalent	6
		Honors/equivalent	7
		Masters/equivalent	8
		Others (specify)	9
9	Main occupation of the respondent	Farmer	1
		House wife	2
		Business (agriculture related)	3
		Business (non-agricultural)	4
		Shop keeper	5

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code
		Driver	6
		Service	7
		Fish seller	8
		Fisherman	9
		Day labor	10
		Cottage industries	11
		Handicrafts	12
		Others (specify)	13
10	Monthly average income of the household	_____	
11	Family size	Adult male: __	
		Adult female: __	
		Children (below 15): __	
12	Earning members of the family	Male: __	
		Female: __	

B. Farm Size

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code	Indicators
13	Total land area (decimal)	__		Indicator 1.1
14	Total Cultivable land (decimal)	__		
15	Type of cultivable land: (decimal)	Plain land: __		
		Jhum land: __		
		Pond: __		
16	In the last three years (from 2018 to 2021) have you transferred any fellow land into cultivable land?			
17	If yes, amount of cultivated land increased (decimal)	__		

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code	Indicators
18	If no, amount of cultivated land decreased (decimal)	__		

C. IFM-FFS (Outcome 1 and Output 1.4+ sustainability)

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code	Indicator
19	Did you participate in the Integrated Farm Management-Farmer Field School (IFM-FFS)?	Yes	1	1.4.1
		No	2	
20	Did you graduate (completed the learning cycle) from the Farmer Field School?	Yes	1	
		No	2	
21	If yes, does the curriculum include practical sessions (learning by doing)?	Yes	1	
		No	2	
22	Do you share the learnings from the training with other members of your community?	Yes	1	Sustainability
		No	2	
23	If yes, with whom do you share?	Family members	1	
		Relatives	2	
		Neighbors	3	
		Members from other Communities	4	
		Others (specify)	5	
24	Did you attend Farmer Field Days events?	Yes	1	1.4.1
		No	2	
25	If yes, how many Farm Field Days you have attended?		1	
		__	2	
26	If yes, do you influence other members of your community to attend Farmer Field Days?	Yes	1	Sustainability
		No	2	
27	If yes, who do you influence?	Family members	1	

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code	Indicator
		Relatives	2	
		Neighbors	3	
		Members from other Communities	4	
		Others (specify)	5	
28	If no, can you please say why didn't you participate?	Longer distance	1	
		Preoccupied with other works	2	
		Was not interested	3	
		Other reasons (Specify)	4	

D. Resilience against climate and environmental induced hazards (Indicator 1.4)

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code
28	What are the climate and environmental induced hazards do you face in your area? (multiple response)	Flood	1
		Flashflood	2
		Thunderstorm	3
		Landslide	4
		Cyclone	5
		Hailstorm (Shila bristi)	6
		North-wester (Kalboishaki)	7
		Heatwave/Rise in temperature	8
		Changes in seasonal variation	9
		Others (specify)	10
		None	11
29	Does your household was able to reduce loss of stock due to climate and environment induced hazards before participating in this project?	Yes	1
		No	2
30	Does your household is now better able to reduce loss of stock due to climate and environment induced hazards after participating in this project?	Yes	1
		No	2

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code
31	If yes, how?	Use of resilient farming technologies	1
		Improved knowledge and skills	2
		Now are able to take informed decision	3
		Adopting Innovative approaches	4
		Access to information	5
		I don't know	6
		Others (specify)	7
32	Does your household was able to reduce loss of crops due to climate and environment induced hazards before participating in this project?	Yes	1
		No	2
33	Does your household is now better able to reduce loss of crops due to climate and environment induced hazards after participating in this project?	Yes	1
		No	2
34	If yes, how	Use of resilient farming technologies	1
		Improved knowledge and skills	2
		Now are able to take informed decision	3
		Adopting Innovative approaches	4
		Access to information	5
		I don't know	6
		Others (specify)	7

Q.N	D. (i) Yields and Production (Crop)											
35	Note: Respondents will be asked on the types of crop they cultivated in the last 12 months and for each type of crop the land type, crop variety, area, yield in kg or decimal, selling amount in kg, price (tk/kg), method of sowing/planting, type of fertilizer used, use of irrigation, and use of hand pollination.											
	Last 12 months (From February 2021 to February 2022/From Magh-Falgun 1427 to Magh-Falgun 1428)											
	Crop	Land type 1 =Jhum 2=Plain land 3=Vacant or unused land	Crop varieties 1=local 2=hybrid	Area (decimal)	Yield (kg/decimal)	Production cost (tk/decimal)	Sold (kg)	Price (Tk/kg)	Sowing /planting 1 = Mada 2 = Pit	Fertilizer use 1=organic 2=Inorganic 3 =Both 4=None	Irrigated 1=Yes 2=No	Hand pollination 1 =Yes 2= No 3= N/A
1)	Rice											
2)	Wheat											
3)	Maize											
4)	Others (specify)											
■	Vegetables:											
5)	Brinjal											
6)	Sweet gourd											
7)	Marpha											
8)	Tomato											
9)	Radish											
10)	Potato											
11)	Bean											
12)	Yard long bean											
13)	Okra											
14)	Cucumber											

15)	Bottle gourd											
16)	Spinach											
17)	Others (specify)											
■	Spices:											
18)	Chili											
19)	Ginger											
20)	Turmeric											
21)	Other (specify)											

Q.N	D. (ii) Yields and Production (Fruits)											
36	Note: Respondents will be asked on the types of fruits they cultivated in the last 12 months and for each type of crop the land type, number of variety, number of trees, amount of land (decimal), yield (kg/tree), type of fertilizer used, amount sold (kg/tree), and irrigation.											
	Last 12 months (From February 2021 to February 2022/From Magh-Falgun 1427 to Magh-Falgun 1428)											
	Fruits	Land type 1 =Jhum 2=Plain land 3=Vacant or unused land	Number of varieties 1=local 2=hybrid	Number of trees	Amount of land (decimal)	Yield (kg/tree)	Cultivation Cost (tk/tree)	Fertilizer use 1=organic 2=Inorganic 3 =Both 4=None	Sold (kg/tree)	Irrigated 1=Yes 2=No		
1)	Mango											
2)	Lichi											
3)	Banana											
4)	Lemon											
5)	Tamarind											
6)	Malta											
7)	Pine apple											
8)	Papya											
9)	Jackfruit											
10)	Orange											

11)	Other (specify)									
12)	Do you know about Integrated Pest Management system?									1= Yes 2= No
13)	Do you use IPM (Integrated Pest Management)?									1= Yes 2= No
14)	If yes, where?									1 = in crop land 2 = in orchard

Q.N	D. (ii) Yields and Production (Fruits)										
37	Note: Respondents will be asked on information related to livestock they own. Information includes number of animals owned, total value of the livestock they own, number of new-born animal (within last 12 months), number of purchased animals (within last 12 months) and value (tk), number of sold animals (within last 12 months) and value (tk), and number of animal death and cause of death (within last 12 months)										
	Last 12 months (From February 2021 to February 2022/From Magh-Falgun 1427 to Magh-Falgun 1428)										
	Types	No. of owned animals (on the day of the interview)	Total value (taka)	Total cost (taka)	No. of new-born (within 12 months)	Purchased animals (within 12 months)		Sold animals (within 12 months)		Dead animals (within 12 months)	
						No.	Value (tk)	No.	Value (tk)	No.	Cause of death
1)	Milk cow (local breed)										
2)	Milk cow (cross breed)										
3)	Ox (local breed)										
4)	Ox (cross breed)										
5)	Bullock (local breed)										
6)	Bullock (cross breed)										
7)	Heifer (local breed)										
8)	Heifer (cross breed)										
9)	Buffalo										

10)	Wild buffalo										
11)	Goat										
12)	Sheep										
13)	Pig										
14)	Poultry (local breed)										
15)	Poultry (cross breed)										
16)	Duck (local breed)										
17)	Duck (cross breed)										
18)	Pigeon (local breed)										
19)	Pigeon (cross breed)										
20)	Did you use concentrate feed for your livestock in the last 12 months?									1= Yes 2= No	
21)	If yes, give Quantity (kg)									__	
22)	Did you use vaccine for your livestock in the last 12 months?									1= Yes 2= No	
23)	If yes, cost of vaccine (Tk)									__	
24)	If yes, source of vaccine <i>Note: (Private service providers include: Community livestock worker=CLW and Community poultry worker= CPW)</i>									1= Department of Livestock Services (DLS) 2= Private service provider (CLW,CPW, etc.) 3= Others (specify)	

Q.N	D. (iv) Production of milk and egg					
38	Note: Respondents will be asked on information related to production of milk and egg. The information includes number of cow/chicken/duck they own (on the day of the interview), quantity of milk (litre), chicken egg (no.), duck egg (no.) produced and sold in the last 12 months, and also the selling price (tk/litre/No.)					
	Last 12 months (From February 2021 to February 2022/From Magh-Falgun 1427 to Magh-Falgun 1428)					
	Type	No of cow/chicken/duck (on the day of the interview)	Total cost (taka)	Quantity produced (litre/No.)	Amount sold (litre/No.)	Selling Price(tk/litre/No.)
1)	Milk (litre)					
2)	Chicken Egg (No.)					
3)	Duck egg (No.)					

Q.N	D. (v) Fisheries					
39	Note: Respondents will be asked on fisheries related information. Information includes type of fishery, pond size (decimal), total production (kg), selling amount (kg) and selling price (tk/kg)					
	Last 12 months (From February 2021 to February 2022/From Magh-Falgun 1427 to Magh-Falgun 1428)					
	Type fisheries interventions	Pond size (decimal)	Total production (kg)	Total production cost (taka)	Quantity sold (kg)	Selling Price (tk/kg)
1)	Pond aquaculture					
2)	Creek/Lake/Watershed aquaculture					
3)	Capture fisheries					

E. (i) Food security)

Section-(i) FCS Score

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code	Indicators
40	Do your Household produces food?	Yes		1.2
		No		
41	If yes, how long can your household consume with these amount of food? (in Month)	__		
42	Was there any food deficiency in your HH in the last 12 months?	Yes		
		No		
43	If yes, how many days in the last 12 month?	__		
44	What is the cause of this food shortage?	_____		

No.	E. (ii) Food Consumption						
45	What did your family member eat in the last seven days? (Including meals and snacks) that your family member ate during the last seven day and night, whether at home or outside the home?						
■	Last 7 days						
	Food item	Consumed ? 1= Yes 2= No	In one week, Amount consumed (kg)	In one week, Amount purchased for consumption (kg)	In one week, Amount spent for consumption (tk)	In one week, amount produced for consumption (kg)	In one week, amount produced for consumption (tk)
1)	Starchy staples (e.g. rice, wheat, ruti, muri, potatoes, sweet potatoes, maize, khichuri)						
2)	Beans and/or peas (e.g. daal, boiled green bean, cooked dry beans, peas, pigeon peas)						
3)	Nuts and/or seeds (e.g. peanuts, coconuts, seeds of jackfruit, seeds of tamarind, pumpkin seeds, other seeds)						
4)	Dark green leafy vegetables (e.g. Indian spinach, kolmi, kochu, spinach, pumpkin leaves, bottle/ash gourd leaves, fern)						
5)	Red/orange/yellow fruits (e.g. ripe mangoes, papaya, jackfruits, red bell /yellow or orange fruit)						
6)	Red/orange/yellow vegetables (e.g. orange sweet potato, pumpkin, carrot or other						

	yellow or orange vegetable)						
7)	Vitamin C rich fruits (e.g. guava, strawberry, lemon, orange, leeches, pineapple, mango, malta, grapes, amla, olive, lotkon, horitoki, bohera)						
8)	Vitamin C rich vegetables (e.g. ash gourd, broccoli, cauliflower, tomatoes, green cabbage, chalta)						
9)	Other vegetables (e.g. cabbage, turnips, bamboo shoots, tartaric flower, ginger flower, pumpkin flower, mushroom, cucumber)						
10)	Other fruits (e.g. bananas, berry,)						
11)	Eggs (e.g. hen, duck, other birds, koyel, turtle egg, fish eggs)						
12)	Organ meat (e.g. gizzards, liver, kidney,)						
13)	Small fish (small fish eaten whole with bones) or shutki made from these fish (e.g.kachki, mola, dhela, chapila, batashi, small prawn, puti, tengra, baila)						
14)	Large fish or seafood (e.g. large whole fish, shellfish) or shutki made from these fish shark, squid,						

	crab, lobster and snail						
15)	Flesh foods and small animal protein (e.g. beef, pork, veal, lamb, goat, chicken, duck, frog, turtle, crab)						
16)	Dairy products (e.g. milk, cheese, sweet yogurt, sour yogurt, other milk products)						
17)	Edible oil (including any foods containing oil, fat, butter) makhon, ghee, pork oil, fish oil, mustard oil, soybean oil,						
18)	Sugar						
19)	Turmeric						
20)	ginger						
21)	Onion						
22)	Red chili						
23)	Garlic						
24)	salt						
25)	Other (Specify)						

G. Access to decentralized extension services (Indicator 1.3)

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code	Indicators
46	Have you attended any workshop/training arranged by the project on agricultural services where different government line department's extension workers also attended?	Yes	1	1.3
		No	2	
47	If yes, do you think that workshop/training helped to establish better communication with government line department's extension workers?	Yes	1	
		No	2	
48	Do you receive necessary supports from any of the following government line departments? (multiple response)	Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE)	1	
		Department of Fisheries (DoF)	2	

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code	Indicators
		Department of Livestock Services (DLS)	3	
		No	4	
49	Have you received training from any of the following government line departments? (multiple response)	Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE)	1	
		Department of Fisheries (DoF)	2	
		Department of Livestock Services (DLS)	3	
		No	4	
50	Have you received technical support including telephone advice from any of the following government line departments? (multiple response)	Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE)	1	
		Department of Fisheries (DoF)	2	
		Department of Livestock Services (DLS)	3	
		No	4	
51	If 1/2/3, how many times have you received support in the last 12 months?	_____ (open ended)		
52	Have you received vaccination services for your livestock from Department of Livestock Services?	Yes	1	
		No	2	
53	Do you help others to receive support from these government line departments? (if 1/2/3 in the previous question)	Yes	1	
		No	2	
54	If yes, who do you help?	Family members	1	
		Relatives	2	
		Neighbors	3	
		Members from other Communities	4	
		Others (specify)	5	
55	Have you received any assistance (suggestion, advice, telephone base	Yes	1	

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code	Indicators
	service, monthly meeting, etc.) from private service providers (Community Live Stock Workers, Community Poultry Workers, Community Aquaculture Resource Persons, Nursery growers, etc.)?	No	2	
56	If yes, from whom you have received assistance?	Community livestock workers (CLW)	1	
		Community poultry workers (CPW)	2	
		Community Aquaculture Resource Persons	3	
		Nursery growers	4	
		Others (specify)	5	
57	Do you help others to receive support from these private service providers?	Yes	1	
		No	2	
58	If yes, who do you help?	Family members	1	
		Relatives	2	
		Neighbors	3	
		Members from other Communities	4	
		Others (specify)	5	
59	Have you received vaccination services for your livestock from Community Livestock Workers/ Community Poultry Workers?	Yes	1	
		No	2	

H. Follow-up support

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code	Indicators
60	Do you receive follow up support from any of the following government line departments? (multiple response)	Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE)	1	1.4.3
		Department of Fisheries (DoF)	2	
		Department of Livestock Services (DLS)	3	
		No	4	
61	If 1/2/3, how many times have you received follow up support in last 12 months?	Numeric (open ended)		
62	Do you receive follow up support from any of the following private sectors? (multiple response)	Community livestock workers (CLW)	1	
		Community poultry workers (CPW)	2	
		Community Aquaculture Resource Persons	3	
		Nursery growers	4	
		Others (specify)	5	
		No do not receive any support	6	
63	If 1/2/3/4/5, how many times have you received follow up support in last 12 months?	Numeric (open ended)		

I. Access to quality agricultural input

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code	Indicators
64	Do you have access to any quality agricultural inputs (for example seed, fertilizer, sapling, fingerling, animal feeds, fishing net, vermi/warm supplier etc.)?	Yes	1	1.5.2
		No	2	
65	If yes, which inputs do you have access to?	Seed	1	
		Fertilizer	2	
		Sapling	3	
		Fingerling	4	
		Animal feeds	5	
		Fish feed	6	
		Fishing net	7	
		Bucket	8	
		Vermi/warm	9	
66		Yes	1	

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code	Indicators
	Are you satisfied with the quality of agricultural inputs? (For example seed, fertilizer, sapling, fingerling. animal feeds, fishing net, vermi/worm supplier, etc.)	No	2	
67	If yes, from whom have you collected/received the agricultural input?	Open ended for now (Options will be decided upon field test)		

J. Adoption of climate resilient technologies or techniques

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code	Indicators
68	Do you use any of the following technologies for farming? (multiple response)	Homestead space planning	1	1.4
		Preparation and use of Farm Yard Manure (FYM)	2	
		Hand pollination in Cucurbits	3	
		Use of IPM techniques in vegetables, fruits, field crops, Jhum crops	4	
		Use of pruning, training in fruit trees	5	
		Use of fertilizers in fruit trees	6	
		Line sowing/transplantation in rice field	7	
		Prepared and using improved egg hatching pan for chicken	8	
		Laying and broody hen management	9	
		Vaccinated chicken, duck, goat, pig, cattle etc	10	
		Provide supplementary feed to cattle, goat, pig	11	
		Manage good housing for cattle, goat and pigs	12	
		Prepare the pond/creek for stocking	13	

		Utilize the seed treatment technique in ginger and turmeric	14	
		Storing of ginger and/or turmeric seeds	15	
		Cultivating Vegetable in pit/bed	16	
		Covering the roots of trees with straw, leaves, etc. to keep them moist or to control weeds	17	
		Others (specify)	18	
		Piglet/pig fattening	19	
		Pig rearing	20	
		Beef fattening	21	
		Cattle rearing	22	
		Use of soil health management techniques	23	
		Preparation of ideal seed bed for rice	24	
		Fish fingerling stocking and post stocking feed management in pond/creek	25	
		Partial harvesting and restocking of fish/fingerling in pond/creek	26	
69	Utilize the seed treatment technique for any other crop?	Yes	1	
		No	2	
70	if yes, name of crops:	(1) __ (2) __ (3) __ (4) __ (5) __		
71		Very satisfied	1	
		Somewhat satisfied	2	

	Please rate your level of satisfaction in using the farming technologies?	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3	
		Somewhat dissatisfied	4	
		Very dissatisfied	5	

L. Sources of income (Resilient livelihood)

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code
72	Do you or any of your family member have any off-farm income?	Yes	1
		No	2
73	If yes, what are these off-farm source of income?	Handicrafts	1
		Business (off-farm)	2
		Service	3
		Day labor	4
		Machinery rent out	5
		Remittance	6
		Others (specify)	7
74	What is the total monthly income from off-farm sources?	_____	
75	On average how many days do you work in a month? (only for HH head)	Farm: __	
		Off-farm: __	
76	On average many hours do you work in a day? (only for HH head)	Farm: __	
		Off-farm: __	

M. Loan (Leave no one behind-project response and recovery)

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code
77	Did you borrow money in the last 12 months?	Yes	1
		No	2
78	If yes, who made the decision while taking loan?	Male	1
		Female	2
		Both	3
79	If yes, who makes decision while expending loan?	Male	1
		Female	2

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code
		Both	3
80	What is the amount of loan you took in the last 12 months?	__	
81	From whom did you take the loan? (multiple response)	relatives and friends	1
		Money lender	2
		banks	3
		shop keepers	4
		NGOs	5
		PDC	6
		BRDB	7
		Cooperatives	8
		Landlord	9
		other (specify)	10
82	Why did you take the loan? (multiple response)	buy farm and other tools/implements	1
		Buy ag. inputs	2
		buy livestock	3
		pay rent/taxes	4
		start and off-farm business	5
		buy food for the household	6
		pay for travel expenses	7
		pay for housing	8
		pay for health expenses	9
		pay for education expenses	10
		For wedding	11
		For funeral	12
		Other (specify)	13

N. Savings (Leave no one behind-project response and recovery)

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code
83	Do you have any type of savings?	Yes	1
		No	2
84		Cash in hand	1

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code
	If yes, please specify the type of savings? (multiple response) Note: Have to input amount of every type of savings	All types of savings certificates/share bonds	2
		Saving in post office bank	3
		Savings in NGO	4
		Savings in local samity	5
		Insurance (premium paid)	6
		Provident fund, gratuity etc,	7
		Investment in other persons business	8
		Giving credit to other	9
		Others (please specify)	10

O. Decision-making about household affairs (Gender equality)

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code
85	Who make decisions while selling or buying land	Male	1
		Female	2
		Both	3
86	Who make decisions while selling or buying trees	Male	1
		Female	2
		Both	3
87	Who make decisions while selling agricultural produces/ products or buying agricultural produces/ products?	Male	1
		Female	2
		Both	3
88	Who make decisions on spending income from selling agricultural products?	Male	1
		Female	2
		Both	3
89	Who make decisions on Children schooling?	Male	1
		Female	2
		Both	3
90	Who make decisions on marriage?	Male	1
		Female	2
		Both	3
91	Who make decisions while Purchase of household commodities?	Male	1
		Female	2
		Both	3
92	Who usually do Household daily activities (Cooking, Cleaning, fetching water, etc.)?	Male	1
		Female	2
		Both	3
93	Who usually do Daily outside activities (agriculture, social activities, etc.)?	Male	1
		Female	2
		Both	3
94	Who make decisions on spending income from off-farm activities?	Male	1
		Female	2

		Both	3
95	Women should have equal rights, what is your opinion?	Agree	1
		Neutral	2
		Disagree	3
96	Do you think that women in this community have freedom of movement outside home?	Yes	1
		No	2
		I don't know	3
97	If yes, to what extent do you support it?	Strongly support	1
		Moderately support	2
		Neutral	3
		Moderately oppose	4
		Strongly oppose	5

P. Persons with Disabilities

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code
<p>Note: The following questions ask about difficulties you or any member of your household (older than 5 years old) may have done certain activities because of a physical or mental health problem</p>			
98	Do you or any member of your household have difficulties in doing certain activities because of a physical or mental health problem? (for example: difficulty seeing, difficulty hearing, difficulty walking, difficulty remembering or concentrating, difficulty with self-care, etc.)	Yes	1
		No	2
99	If yes, what type of physical or mental health problem you or any member of your household have?	visual impairment	1
		physical disabilities	2
		hearing impairment	3
		speech impairment	4
		mental disability	5
		multiple disabilities	6
		autistic disability	7
		Other disability (specify)	8

Q. Feedback

Q.N	Questions	Response	Code
100	Do you believe AFSPH was successful in CHT?	Yes	1
		No	2
101	If yes, why do you think so? (open ended)	_____	

10.4.2 Qualitative Tools

KII Checklist for Project Officials/Staffs

(National Project Directors, SID-CHT, AFSP III & CCRP Project officials and staffs, M&E officials, Implementing partner staffs)

Consent of the Respondent

My name is _____ and I am working with DM WATCH. We are currently conducting “Final Evaluation of Agriculture and Food Security (AFSP III) Project and CHT Climate Resilience Project (CCRP) of SID-CHT” implemented by Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs (MoCHTA) with UNDP and other development partners. I invite you to participate in Key Informant Interview (KII). If you take part in this, we can include your valuable opinion in the review that will benefit you in future through this project. We also want to learn to improve and your honest feedback (both good and bad) will help us regarding this. If you decide not to take part, or to skip some of the questions, it will not affect your current or future relationship with us. Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. If you decide to take part, you are free to withdraw at any time. Your responses will be kept confidential, and your name with the information you will provide will never be disclosed. After the survey, we will analyze the data and will transfer your valuable suggestions to the project officials to include in to their project intervention where necessary. Please ask any questions you have now.

Statement of Consent: *I understand the aforementioned information and I have received answers to any questions I asked. I consent to take part in the study.*

Name of the respondent:	
Designation:	
District:	Mobile:
Date of interview:	Time:
Name of the interviewer:	

Introduction

1. Can you please tell me about your role in AFSP III and/or CCRP project/s?

Relevance

2. How does the project align with relevant national policy/guidelines/strategies
3. How does the project align with country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan?
4. Were all relevant stakeholders (the most marginalised groups, target groups, partners) involved in the project planning, designing and implementation for identifying core problems to address it?
5. What mechanisms was placed in project planning, designing and implementation to address the needs of the targeted beneficiaries? What approaches were taken to reach and address the needs of most marginalized segments of the population including youth, minorities, persons with disabilities (PWD) and other vulnerable groups? Is data disaggregated according to sex, disability, and other social differences?

6. Do non-project beneficiaries understand and agree with why others were selected? What was done to keep social harmony?
7. What mechanism were placed to capture complaints/feedback from the project beneficiaries, target groups, and other stakeholder? Did the project follow a participatory method for monitoring and accountability?
8. To what extent, and how the project contributed to gender equality and women's empowerment?
9. Was the project able to respond appropriately to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country? Please elaborate
10. Have any new policies/strategies/guidelines been developed or under development that these projects have contributed to? Please elaborate
11. How the project interventions were aligned with the CHT Peace Accord?

Impact

12. How has the project brought changes in the lives of the people and their communities in line with the result framework of the SID-CHT (/areas of agricultural growth, livelihood improvement, and climate resilience building)?
13. To what extent, and how the project addressed vulnerabilities regarding agricultural growth, livelihood, and food security of marginal small farm households in CHT? what has been its impact on the national, sub-national, and individual level? (AFSP III).
14. To what extent and how the project addressed vulnerabilities of communities against climate change in CHT? what has been its impact on the national, sub-national, and individual level? (CCRP)
15. Has the activities and results of the project translated to increased policy and institutional support for marginal small farm households and vulnerable communities? How? Please elaborate.
16. How will the intervention contribute to changing society for the better?

Effectiveness

17. To what extent, and how the project contributed to the country programme outcomes and outputs, the SDGs, the UNDP Strategic Plan, and national development priorities?
18. In your view, what are the main impacts of the project? To what extent has it achieved its objectives and results? What is the evidence for this?
19. What are the most significant achievements of the project? Why and what factors have contributed in these achievements?
20. In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they be overcome?
21. What are the gaps in achievement of objectives and results and what are the reasons some were met while others not? To what extent have outside factors affected results?
22. What are the lessons and learning from the implementation of the project/s? are the lessons learned documented and disseminated to relevant stakeholders? How?

Efficiency

23. Can you provide an overview of the ratio of programmatic/direct to organisational/indirect cost (ratio of programmatic/direct to organisational/indirect cost at least 60/40 with 7% for HQ costs)? Have different alternatives for delivering the project and respective benefits and costs been considered?
24. What monitoring and evaluation mechanism were placed to monitor the quality of implemented activities? Was realistic and clear milestones and targets following a baseline study?
25. How the project monitored output cost ratios? How costs of results were analysed (cost per unit result)? Did results and costs vary from expectations? If so, was there any explanation?
26. What were the learnings from monitoring in implementation? Were the learnings captured systematically and reflected upon?
27. How resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) were allocated and managed (budget planning and monitoring, procurement, inventory, transport, office rent and staff) to achieve the outcomes? Was the resource allocation based on previous performance data in a similar context?

Coherence

28. How have the project coordinated and worked with other organizations/institutions? If so, what have been the results of this joint work?

29. What are the other projects working on similar thematic area in the CHT (agricultural growth, livelihood improvement and climate resilience)? Do you think that AFSP III and/or CCRP projects are complementing other projects programmatically? Please elaborate.
30. Do you engage in joint efforts with other entities (GOs, I/NGOs) for advocacy and policy influencing work?

Sustainability

31. What measures were taken to ensure the sustainability of the project activities and impact? What was the exit strategy to ensure that the impact from the programme is long term and sustainable?
32. Do the existing legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures, and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project benefits?

Recommendation

33. Is there anything else about the AFSP III and/or CCRP project that you would like to talk about?
34. Do you have any recommendations for future programming in these areas?
35. Do you have any questions for me?

KII Checklist for Government Stakeholders

(Ministries, Government line departments, Hill District Councils, Local Government institutions)

Consent of the Respondent

My name is _____ and I am working with DM WATCH. We are currently conducting “Final Evaluation of Agriculture and Food Security (AFSP III) Project and CHT Climate Resilience Project (CCRP) of SID-CHT” implemented by Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs (MoCHTA) with UNDP and other development partners. I invite you to participate in Key Informant Interview (KII). If you take part in this, we can include your valuable opinion in the review that will benefit you in future through this project. We also want to learn to improve and your honest feedback (both good and bad) will help us regarding this. If you decide not to take part, or to skip some of the questions, it will not affect your current or future relationship with us. Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. If you decide to take part, you are free to withdraw at any time. Your responses will be kept confidential, and your name with the information you will provide will never be disclosed. After the survey, we will analyze the data and will transfer your valuable suggestions to the project officials to include in to their project intervention where necessary. Please ask any questions you have now.

Statement of Consent: *I understand the aforementioned information and I have received answers to any questions I asked. I consent to take part in the study.*

Name of the respondent:	
Designation:	
District:	Mobile:
Date of interview:	Time:
Name of the interviewer:	

Introduction

1. Can you please provide an overview about what your department/office does?
2. What are your main responsibilities in the department?
3. What do you know about AFSP III and/or CCRP project?
4. How have you and your department worked with AFSP III and/or CCRP project?

Relevance

5. Did anyone talk with you about how the programme should be designed, either before or during the programme?
6. How does the project align with relevant national policy/guidelines/strategies?
7. Do you think that the project was designed according to the needs of the targeted beneficiaries? was it able to reach most marginalized segments of the population including youth, minorities, persons with disabilities (PWD) and other vulnerable groups? Was the project able to address the needs of the targeted beneficiaries?
8. Do you think that project was able to contribute to gender equality, women's empowerment? If yes, how?
9. Do you think that the project has been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country? If yes, how?
10. Have any new policies/strategies/guidelines been developed or under development that these projects have contributed to?
11. Do you think the project interventions were aligned with the CHT Peace Accord? If yes, do you think the HDCs are managing transferred agricultural services in line with CHT Peace Accord?

Impact

12. Have there been any changes in national/local policy/strategies/guidelines and practice in support of climate resilient agricultural technology, livelihood improvement, resilience building against climate change because of your department's engagement with AFSP III or CCRP project?
13. Do you think that the project has helped your department in strengthening capacity and skill on climate resilience, agricultural services, sustainable livelihood? If yes, how?
14. Have you noticed any shifts in institutional policy and practice (for instance, modality of providing services, institutional set up, etc.) because of project interventions (sub-national, national, regional, or international levels) since the project started?
15. To what extent do local and national duty bearers understand the importance of addressing vulnerabilities regarding agricultural growth, livelihood, and food security of marginal small farm households in CHT? (AFSP III).
16. To what extent do local and national duty bearers understand the importance of addressing vulnerabilities of communities against climate change in CHT? (CCRP)
17. Was there any negative changes or consequences resulted from any of the project interventions? What can be done to mitigate such consequences? Please elaborate.

Effectiveness

18. Do you know about the overall objectives (goals, outcomes, etc.) of the projects? In your opinion, what are the most significant achievements of the project? Why and what factors have contributed in these achievements?
19. In your opinion, which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
20. Do you think that there were any bottlenecks which resulted in not achieving any project outcomes?

Efficiency

21. Do you think the project has allocated financial and human resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) strategically to achieve the outcomes? Please elaborate.
22. Do you think the project activities were timely? Did the project delivered necessary funds in the activities where your department took part?

■

Coherence

23. What coordination mechanisms exist in country for donors, INGOs, and national civil society organizations working on agricultural growth, livelihood improvement and climate resilience to come together?
24. What are the other projects working on similar thematic area in the CHT (agricultural growth, livelihood improvement and climate resilience)? Do you think that AFSP III and/or CCRP projects are complementing other projects programmatically? Please elaborate.
25. Do you engage in joint advocacy and policy influencing work?

Sustainability

26. Do you think the positive outcomes of the project will sustain in long-term? Please elaborate
27. Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures, and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project benefits?
28. Do you think that the relevant stakeholders (such as your department/office) have developed a sense of ownership regarding the project activities and its outcomes? Please elaborate
29. Do you support what the project aimed to achieve, its goals, and long-term objectives?
30. Can you tell us about how the project was inclusive in addressing gender, human rights and human development issues?
31. Are you aware that the AFSP III project and/or CCRP project has ended in 2021? Have you had conversation with UNDP on how to sustain its activities and results (exit strategies)?

Recommendation

32. Is there anything else about the AFSP III and/or CCRP project that you would like to talk about?
33. Do you have any recommendations for the programme?
34. Do you have any questions for me?

Checklist for Focus Group Discussion (FGD)

(Farmer Field School (IFM-FFS) Facilitator, Para Development Committees (PDCs), Climate Resilient Committee (CRC))

Consent of the Respondent

My name is _____ and I am working with DM WATCH. We are currently conducting “Final Evaluation of Agriculture and Food Security (AFSP III) Project and CHT Climate Resilience Project (CCRP) of SID-CHT” implemented by Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs (MoCHTA) with UNDP and other development partners. I invite you to participate in Key Informant Interview (KII). If you take part in this, we can include your valuable opinion in the review that will benefit you in future through this project. We also want to learn to improve and your honest feedback (both good and bad) will help us regarding this. If you decide not to take part, or to skip some of the questions, it will not affect your current or future relationship with us. Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. If you decide to take part, you are free to withdraw at any time. Your responses will be kept confidential, and your name with the information you will provide will never be disclosed. After the survey, we will analyze the data and will transfer your valuable suggestions to the project officials to include in to their project intervention where necessary. Please ask any questions you have now.

Statement of Consent: *I understand the aforementioned information and I have received answers to any questions I asked. I consent to take part in the study.*

FGD location:

District _____ Para _____ Date of discussion: __

Upazila _____ Union _____

Time _____

General guidelines for Focus Group Discussion facilitation:

Time: Maximum time selected for each session is 1 hour. Facilitator must have to remember that any session must not be longer than 1 hour.

Facilitator has to be very much keen to ensure maximum participation of all

Participants: Number of participants should be at least 6 and maximum 8. While selecting participants it has to be remembered that there should be 50% male and 50% female

Participant list:

SL.	Participant Name	Gender	Occupation	Mobile Number

Issues to be discussed:

Introduction

1. Do you know about the AFSP/CCRP project implemented by UNDP in your location? Can you tell us about the project (overall objectives, goals, outcomes, interventions)?
2. Can you please tell me about your role in AFSP III project? Can you elaborate the IFM-FFS implementation process, monitoring and role of PDCs? (AFSP – only for PDCs)

Relevance

3. Did anyone talk with you about how the programme should be designed, either before or during the programme? What was discussed?
4. Do you think that the project activities were aligned with the needs of you/r community people? was it able to reach most marginalized segments of the population including youth, minorities, persons with disabilities (PWD) and other vulnerable groups? Was the project able to address the needs of the targeted beneficiaries?

Impact

5. How has the project brought changes in the lives of the people and their communities in the areas of agricultural growth, livelihood improvement, and climate resilience building?
6. Do you think the project have contributed to changing society for the better? Please elaborate.

Effectiveness

AFSP

7. In your area, what are the local/traditional agricultural methods/practices? What climate resilient agricultural technology and management practices have the project introduced? How have you/r community adapted these practices? Were there any challenges? (AFSP)
8. The AFSP III project had organized several trainings and workshops with the Farmer Field Facilitators (FFs). What was your learnings from the trainings/workshops? Have you shared your learnings with other famers (from your community or other communities)?

Sustainability

9. Do you think the positive outcomes of the project will sustain in long-term? Please elaborate
10. In your area, do you think that the community people have developed a sense of ownership regarding the project activities and its outcomes? Please elaborate

11. Do you support what the project aimed to achieve, its goals, and long-term objectives? If yes/no, why/why not?

Recommendation

12. Is there anything else about the AFSP III and/or CCRP project that you would like to talk about?
13. Do you have any recommendations for the programme?
14. Do you have any questions for me?

Checklist for Focus Group Discussion (FGD)

(Project Staffs)

Consent of the Respondent

My name is _____ and I am working with DM WATCH. We are currently conducting “Final Evaluation of Agriculture and Food Security (AFSP III) Project and CHT Climate Resilience Project (CCRP) of SID-CHT” implemented by Ministry of Chittagong Hill Tracts Affairs (MoCHTA) with UNDP and other development partners. I invite you to participate in Key Informant Interview (KII). If you take part in this, we can include your valuable opinion in the review that will benefit you in future through this project. We also want to learn to improve and your honest feedback (both good and bad) will help us regarding this. If you decide not to take part, or to skip some of the questions, it will not affect your current or future relationship with us. Taking part in this study is voluntary. You may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. If you decide to take part, you are free to withdraw at any time. Your responses will be kept confidential, and your name with the information you will provide will never be disclosed. After the survey, we will analyze the data and will transfer your valuable suggestions to the project officials to include in to their project intervention where necessary. Please ask any questions you have now.

Statement of Consent: *I understand the aforementioned information and I have received answers to any questions I asked. I consent to take part in the study.*

FGD location:

District _____ Para _____ Date of discussion: _____

Upazila _____ Union _____

Time _____

General guidelines for Focus Group Discussion facilitation:

Time: Maximum time selected for each session is 1 hour. Facilitator must have to remember that any session must not be longer than 1 hour.

Facilitator has to be very much keen to ensure maximum participation of all

Participants: Number of participants should be at least 6 and maximum 8. While selecting participants it has to be remembered that there should be 50% male and 50% female

Participant list:

SL.	Participant Name	Gender	Occupation	Mobile Number

Issues to be discussed:

Introduction

1. Can you please tell me about your role in AFSP III and/or CCRP project/s? Please elaborate the implementation processes of the project activities?

Relevance

2. Were all relevant stakeholders (the most marginalised groups, target groups, partners) involved in the project planning, designing and implementation for identifying core problems to address it?
3. What mechanisms were placed in project planning, designing and implementation to address the needs of the targeted beneficiaries? What approaches were taken to reach and address the needs of most marginalized segments of the population including youth, minorities, persons with disabilities (PWD) and other vulnerable groups? Is data disaggregated according to sex, disability, and other social differences?
4. Do non-project beneficiaries understand and agree with why others were selected? What was done to keep social harmony?
5. What mechanism were placed to capture complaints/feedback from the project beneficiaries, target groups, and other stakeholder? Did the project follow a participatory method for monitoring and accountability?
6. To what extent, and how the project contributed to gender equality and women's empowerment?
7. Was the project able to respond appropriately to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country? Please elaborate
8. Have any new policies/strategies/guidelines been developed or under development that these projects have contributed to? Please elaborate
9. How the project interventions were aligned with the CHT Peace Accord?

Impact

10. How has the project brought changes in the lives of the people and their communities in line with the result framework of the SID-CHT (/areas of agricultural growth, livelihood improvement, and climate resilience building)?
11. To what extent, and how the project addressed vulnerabilities regarding agricultural growth, livelihood, and food security of marginal small farm households in CHT? (AFSP III).
12. To what extent and how the project addressed vulnerabilities of communities against climate change in CHT? (CCRP)
13. Has the activities and results of the project translated to increased policy and institutional support for marginal small farm households and vulnerable communities? How? Please elaborate.
14. How will the intervention contribute to changing society for the better?

Effectiveness

15. In your view, what are the main impacts of the project? To what extent has it achieved its objectives and results? What is the evidence for this?
16. What are the most significant achievements of the project? Why and what factors have contributed in these achievements?
17. In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can they be overcome?
18. What are the gaps in achievement of objectives and results and what are the reasons some were met while others not? To what extent have outside factors affected results?
19. What are the lessons and learning from the implementation of the project/s? are the lessons learned documented and disseminated to relevant stakeholders? How?

Efficiency

20. Have different alternatives for delivering the project and respective benefits and costs been considered?
21. What monitoring and evaluation mechanism were placed to monitor the quality of implemented activities? Was realistic and clear milestones and targets following a baseline study?
22. What were the learnings from monitoring in implementation? Were the learnings captured systematically and reflected upon?

Coherence

23. How have the project coordinated and worked with other organizations/institutions? If so, what have been the results of this joint work?
24. What are the other projects working on similar thematic area in the CHT (agricultural growth, livelihood improvement and climate resilience)? Do you think that AFSP III and/or CCRP projects are complementing other projects programmatically? Please elaborate.
25. Do you engage in joint efforts with other entities (GOs, I/NGOs) for advocacy and policy influencing work?

Sustainability

26. What measures were taken to ensure the sustainability of the project activities and impact? What was the exit strategy to ensure that the impact from the programme is long term and sustainable?
27. Do the existing legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures, and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project benefits?

Recommendation

28. Is there anything else about the AFSP III and/or CCRP project that you would like to talk about?
29. Do you have any recommendations for future programming in these areas?

10.5 List of Individuals Contacted

SL No.	Name	Designation
1.	Yasmin Parvin Tibriji	Deputy Commissioner, Bandarban
2.	Md. Al Mamun Miah	Deputy Director of Local Government (DDLG), Bandarban
3.	Dr. Md. Shafi Uddin	Deputy Director, Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE), Khagrachhari
4.	Jawaharlal Chakma	Deputy Director, District Artificial Insemination office, Department of Livestock Services (DLS), Khagrachhari
5.	M M Sah Newaz	Deputy Director, Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE), Bandarban
6.	Apru Marma	Additional Deputy Director, Department of Agricultural Extension (DAE), Rangamati
7.	Dr. Md. Golamur Rahaman	District Livestock Officer, Department of Livestock Services (DLS), Bandarban
8.	Dr. Barun Kumar Datta	District Livestock Officer, Department of Livestock Services (DLS), Rangamati
9.	Dr. Moin Uddin Ahmed	District Fisheries Officer, Khagrachhari
10.	Mhafuza Matin	Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO), Khagrachhari
11.	Jitendra Kumar Nath	Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO), Jurachhari, Rangamati
12.	Md. Mamun Shibli	Upazilla Nirbahi Officer, Ruma, Bandarban
13.	Proti Bindu Chakma	Sub-Assistant Livestock Officer, Juraichhari, Rangamati
14.	Ismail Hossain	Sub-Assistant Agriculture Officer (In-charge), Juraichhari, Rangamati
15.	Mukul Kanti Dewan	Sub- Assistant Plant Protection Officer, Rangamati Sadar, Rangamati
16.	Mukta Chakma	Upazila Agriculture Officer, Khagrachhari Sadar, Khagrachhari
17.	Dr. Sarkar Ashraful Islam	Upazila Livestock Officer, Khagrachhari
18.	Md. Abdur Rahim Majumder	Sub Assistant Agriculture Officer, Guimara, Khagrachhari
19.	Sutimol Tanchangya	Sub Assistant Agricultural Officer, Ruma Upazilla, Bandarban
20.	Md Omar Faruque	Upazilla Agricultural Officer, Bandarban Sadar, Bandarban

21.	Mongkatching Marma	Upazilla Livestock Officer, Ruma, Bandarban
22.	Mohammad Zia Uddin	Upazilla Fisheries Officer, Bandarban Sadar, Bandarban
23.	Suresh Kumar Chakma	Upazila Chairman, Juraichhari, Rangamati
24.	Usheyepu Marma	Upazila Chairman, Guimara, Khagrachhari
25.	Ullah Ching Marma	Upazila Chairman, Ruma, Bandarban
26.	Ching Sing Pru Marma	Ward Member, Zilla Parishad, Bandarban
27.	Ruipai Marma	Female Ward Member, Guimara, Khagrachhari
28.	Firoz Faisal	Programme Officer (AFSP)
29.	Aung Sen	Project Official (AFSP-3, CCRP)
30.	SK. Md. Nazim Uddin	District Farmer Field School Expert, Bandarban
31.	Sumanto Chakma	Community Organizer, Rangamati
32.	Doly Chowdhury	Senior Master Trainer, Bandarban
33.	Tarun Joy Tripura	Master Trainer, Khagrachhari Sadar, Khagrachhari
34.	Shamol Kanti	Master Trainer, Rangamati
35.	Ptla Ching Mong Marma	Implementing Partner Staff (AFSP), Khagrachhari
36.	Piplu Marma	Implementing Partner Staff (AFSP), Bandarban
37.	Babul Chakma	Implementing Partner Staff, Rangamati
38.	Kongyo Chowdury	Headman, Khagrachhari
39.	Swu Ching Thwui Marma	Headman, Ruma, Bandarban
40.	Barun Chandra Chakma	Karbari, Juraichhari, Rangamati
41.	Santosh Bikash Chakma	Karbari, Jurachhari, Rangamati
42.	Llaia Ang	Karbari, Ruma, Bandarban
43.	Arun Joty Chakma	IFM-FFS Facilitator, Rangamati Sadar, Rangamati

44.	Mangal Chakma	Moni	IFM-FFS Facilitator, Rangamati Sadar, Rangamati
45.	Sadhan Chakma	Kumar	IFM-FFS Facilitator, Rangamati Sadar, Rangamati
46.	Patan Chakma		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Rangamati Sadar, Rangamati
47.	Bimal Kanti Chakma		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Rangamati Sadar, Rangamati
48.	Kanchana Chakma		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Rangamati Sadar, Rangamati
49.	Nilankur Tripura		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Khagrachhari Sadar, Khagrachhari
50.	Rinesha Khema		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Khagrachhari Sadar, Khagrachhari
51.	Minuching Marma		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Khagrachhari Sadar, Khagrachhari
52.	Bono Chakma	Bikash	IFM-FFS Facilitator, Khagrachhari Sadar, Khagrachhari
53.	Roni Dewan		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Khagrachhari Sadar, Khagrachhari
54.	Subid Chakma		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Khagrachhari Sadar, Khagrachhari
55.	Ulapru Marma		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Khagrachhari Sadar, Khagrachhari
56.	Nikunti Tripura		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Khagrachhari Sadar, Khagrachhari
57.	Sonchita Tripura		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Khagrachhari Sadar, Khagrachhari
58.	Abul Basor		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Bandarban Sadar, Bandarban
59.	Mong Prue Marma		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Bandarban Sadar, Bandarban
60.	Tohidul Islam		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Bandarban Sadar, Bandarban
61.	Urme Akter		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Bandarban Sadar, Bandarban
62.	Sanu Mong Marma		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Bandarban Sadar, Bandarban
63.	Rina Akter		IFM-FFS Facilitator, Bandarban Sadar, Bandarban
64.	Sain Sain Marma	Wong	IFM-FFS Facilitator, Bandarban Sadar, Bandarban
65.	Abul Basar		PDC President, Bandarban
66.	Amena Begum		PDC Member, Bandarban
67.	Asia Begum		PDC Vice President, Bandarban

68.	Khurshida Begum	PDC Member, Bandarban
69.	Sayera Begum	PDC Member, Bandarban
70.	Sahana Akter	PDC Member, Bandarban
71.	Lanu Mong Marma	PDC Secretary, Bandarban
72.	Minu Mong Marma	PDC Member (Treasurer), Bandarban
73.	Anghang Marma	PDC President, Khagrachhari
74.	Mongshi Marma	PDC Member, Khagrachhari
75.	Nengu Marma	PDC Member, Khagrachhari
76.	Ukronkho Marma	PDC Member, Khagrachhari
77.	Wongmra	PDC Member, Khagrachhari
78.	Paishai	PDC Member (Treasurer), Khagrachhari
79.	Anai Marma	PDC Member, Khagrachhari
80.	Shuilapru	PDC Member, Khagrachhari
81.	Gunjon Marma	PDC President, Rangamati
82.	Salma Begum	PDC Member, Rangamati
83.	Farida Begum	PDC Member, Rangamati
84.	Suchitra	PDC Member, Rangamati
85.	Ieching Marma	PDC Member, Rangamati
86.	Farida Begum (2)	PDC Member, Rangamati

10.6 Supporting Documents List

1. 2nd Five-Year Strategic Plan (2016-2020) National Human Rights Commission (JAMAKON), Bangladesh
2. 8th Five Year Plan 2020-205, General Economics Division (GED) Bangladesh Planning Commission
3. AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION MANUAL (4th edition)
4. Country programme document for Bangladesh (2022-2026), UNDP
5. Bangladesh Country Programme Document 2016 – 2021, DANIDA
6. UNDP Strategic Plan, 2018-2021
7. The Chittagong Hill Tracts Peace Accord of 1997
8. The Sustainable Development Goals: Transforming our world, Ministry of Agriculture
9. Impact of Farmer Field Schools on Farmer's Development under Agriculture and Food Security Project-II in Khagrachari Hill District, Bangladesh C. M. Atiqur Rhaman
10. Shifting Cultivation (jhum) in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, Bangladesh: Examining its Sustainability, Rural Livelihood and Policy Implications
11. Gender Inequality Index, HUMAN DEVELOPMENT REPORT, 2020

10.7 Summary table of findings

Outputs and Outcomes	LFA Key Indicators and Targets	Baseline	End line	Remarks
1 Agricultural production of female and male marginal and small farm households increased and diversified through IFM-FFS in the CHT	<p>Indicator 1.1- % Increase in yields and production of beneficiary households (HH)</p> <p>Target: Vegetables: 40%, Fruits: 30%, Eggs: 50%, Chicken Meat: 30%, Pig: 25%, Goat: 25%, Cow: 15% and Fish: 50%</p>	<p>Yields and production:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Winter Vegetable: 1.6 ton/ha; ➤ Fruits: Mango: 4870 Kg/ha, Lichi: 26471 No./ha, Jackfruit: 3888 No/ha ➤ Chicken Eggs: 80 No/hh, Chicken Meat: 24.3 kg/hh ➤ Pig: 3.1 No/hh, Goat: 3.2 No/hh, Cow: 150 Litre/hh ➤ Fish: 4.5 kg/decimal 	<p>Vegetables: Compared to the baseline average, around 68.2% of beneficiary household had increased vegetable yields and production with an average yield of 5.4 ton/ha</p> <p>Fruits: Mango: Compared to the baseline average, around 49% of the beneficiary households had increased yield and production with an average yield of 7948 kg/hh</p> <p>Lichi: Compared to the baseline average, around 27% of the beneficiary households had increased yield and production with an average of 41789 No./ha</p> <p>Jackfruit: Compared to the baseline average, around 95% of the</p>	The endline results indicates the project has achieved the target for yield and production of vegetables, fruits, goats, cow, and fish. Where else, fell short in achieving the target for production of chicken meat, chicken egg, and pig. The evaluation heavily relied on respondent's memory and certain recall periods was set to collect the information. The accurate measurement of yield and production could not be collected due to study limitation

Outputs and Outcomes	LFA Key Indicators and Targets	Baseline	End line	Remarks
			<p>beneficiary households had increased yield and production with an average of 11576 No./ha</p> <p>Livestock:</p> <p>Chicken Eggs: Compared to the baseline average, around 44% of the beneficiary households had increased production of chicken eggs with an average of 231 No/hh,</p> <p>Chicken Meat: Compared to the baseline average, around 20% of the beneficiary households had increased production of chicken meats with an average of 17.2 kg/hh</p> <p>Pig: Compared to the baseline average, around 6% of the beneficiary households had increased pig rearing with an average of 1.74 No/hh</p> <p>Goat: Compared to the baseline average, around 48% of the beneficiary households had increased rearing of goat with an average of 3.92 No/hh</p> <p>Cow: Compared to the baseline average, around 49% of the beneficiary households had increased production of cow milk with an average of 393 Litre/hh</p> <p>Fish: Compared to the baseline average,</p>	

Outputs and Outcomes	LFA Key Indicators and Targets	Baseline	End line	Remarks
			around 100% of the beneficiary households had increased production of fish with an average of 26.34 kg/decimal	
	Indicator 1.2- % HH intake of diversified nutritious food Target: 80% HH FFS diversified nutritious food and average 2,100 Kcal food intake	HH food intake Kcal: 1,904 (per person per day)	HH food intake Kcal: 2,204 (per person per day) Around 99% of the beneficiary households had increased access households (per person per day) consumed diversified nutritious food (households consumed at least 5 food groups, which included milk, cereals, pulses, vegetables and tubers)	Target achieved
	Indicator 1.3- % of beneficiary HH in target communities with increased access to decentralized extension services Target: 75%	55% farmers	Around 67% of the beneficiary households had increased access to government extension services (necessary support 68%, training support 65%, technical support 69%) Around 56% of the beneficiary households had increased access to private services	Target not achieved but progress can be observed from the baseline. (statistically significant difference between baseline and endline results, p<0.001)
	Indicator 1.4- % of HH which adapted climate resilient technology Target: 60%	TBD	Around 98% of the beneficiary households had adapted at least one climate resilient technology	Target achieved
1.1 Community groups and stakeholders mobilized through establishment of IFM-FFS	Indicator 1.1.1- # of FFS formed/established, including women (50%) and men participated in mobilisation initiatives	0 formed/established	A total of 998 IFM-FFS were formed and established, with a total of 26,505 farmers participating (M: 10,035; F: 16,470). Women participated at a rate of 62%	Target achieved

Outputs and Outcomes	LFA Key Indicators and Targets	Baseline	End line	Remarks
	Target: 1200 FFS formed/established, including women (50%) and men participated in mobilization initiatives			
1.2 IFM-FFS Curricula Developed and Promoted	Indicator 1.2.1- # of modules developed Target: 11 modules developed with inclusion and testing of relevant farming HH's reliance on climate change issues into FFS curriculum	0 modules	One curriculum and 11 different types of learning modules (60 sessions) were developed	Target achieved
1.3 Knowledge, and skills of CHT stakeholders [Master trainers, FFS Facilitators, Government of Bangladesh (GoB) Officers]	Indicator 1.3.1- # of Master Trainers, FFS Facilitator, GoB Officers trained Target: 28 MT, 401 FFS Facilitators (at least 30% women), 180 GoB officers trained Indicator 1.3.2- % of trained CHT stakeholders who believe their knowledge and skills on IFM-FFS have increased after training Target: 95%	➤ 0 Master Trainers, 0 FF, 0 GoB officers ➤ 0% of trained CHT stakeholders	28 Master Trainers (31% women), 187 government officials, and 336 Farmer Facilitators (33% women) were trained Around 97% of IFM FFS CHT stakeholders (9% of whom are women) reported that the project improved their knowledge and skills regarding IFM-FFS through comprehensive training.	Target achieved
1.4 IFM-FFS implemented through participatory and learning by doing approach.	Indicator 1.4.1- % of IFM-FFS participants graduated (disaggregated by sex and age) with 50% women Target: 90% of IFM-FFS graduated (disaggregated by sex and age) 50% women Indicator- 1.4.2 % of IFM-FFS graduate applying sustainable and climate-resilient	➤ 0% IFM-FFS participants graduated (52% women) in AFSP II ➤ 0% of IFM-FFS graduates applying sustainable and climate resilient intensification ➤ 6% of GoB Line Department Officers	Around 92% of the people who took part in the IFM-FFS have graduated, with 59 % of them being women and 41% being men Around 64% of the of the beneficiary farmers received follow-up from any of the three Government line departments.	Target achieved for indicator 1.4.1 Target not achieved for indicator 1.4.3. Although the beneficiary farmers reported to have received more follow-up support than the control group farmers, there is room for

Outputs and Outcomes	LFA Key Indicators and Targets	Baseline	End line	Remarks
	<p>intensification (increased yield levels, enhanced soil fertility, averting loss of stock/crops)</p> <p>Target: 60%</p> <p>Indicator 1.4.3- % of GoB Line Department Offers that provided follow up support</p> <p>Target: 71%</p>			improvement in this aspect.
<p>1.5- Access to market linkages (Input-output) promoted and facilitated</p>	<p>Indicator 1.5.1- # of FFS linked to traders/buyers for selling their agricultural produces (collection centres and group marketing).</p> <p>Target: 363 FFS linked to traders/buyers for selling their agricultural produces (collection centers and group marketing)</p> <p>Indicator 1.5.2- % of HHs with access to quality agricultural inputs</p> <p>Target: 60% of HHs with access to quality agricultural inputs</p>	<p>➤ 0 FFS linked to traders/buyers</p> <p>➤ 0 % of HHs with access to quality agricultural inputs (TBD)</p>	<p>349 FFS communities and 282 non-FFS communities are connected to 104 collection points</p> <p>Around 50% of beneficiary farmers had access to quality agricultural inputs</p>	<p>Target achieved for indicator 1.5.1</p> <p>Target not achieved for indicator 1.5.2. Compare to the control group farmers the beneficiary farmers had significantly ($p < 0.001$) greater access to quality agricultural inputs. A trend in the positive direction can be observed.</p>
<p>2 Hill District Councils (HDC) are managing transferred agricultural services in line with CHT Peace Accord</p>	<p>Indicator 2.1- # of guideline on sustainable agriculture policies and strategies and services developed and in place at HDC.</p> <p>Target: 3 guidelines on Sustainable agricultural policies and strategies developed and in place at HDC</p> <p>Indicator 2.2-</p>	<p>➤ Functional District Working Groups (DWGs) in three HDCs.</p>	<p>3 guidelines on sustainable agriculture policies and strategies and services developed and in place at HDC.</p> <p>The three line departments have formed a coordination mechanism between Hill District Councils and within line departments to investigate and extend support for one</p>	Target achieved

Outputs and Outcomes	LFA Key Indicators and Targets	Baseline	End line	Remarks
	Coordination mechanism among the transferred departments related to agriculture services strengthened with functional Agricultural Planning Unit under the leadership of 3 HDCs (qualitative indicator)		another's interconnected needs.	
2.1 Coordination mechanism among the transferred departments related to agriculture services strengthened with functional agricultural planning Unit under the leadership of HDCs	<p>Indicator 2.1.1- # of co-ordination meetings organized</p> <p>Target: 36 coordination meetings organized</p> <p>Indicator 2.1.2- # of consultative workshops organized</p> <p>Target: 6 consultative workshops organized</p> <p>Indicator 2.1.3- # of local resilience plans supported</p> <p>Target: 20 Local Resilience Plans supported</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ 0 coordinating meeting ➤ 0 consultative workshop ➤ 0 Local Resilience Plan 	<p>A total of 335 bimonthly FF coordination meetings, 110 AFSP staff coordination meetings, 45 Project Implementation Committee meetings, and 23 District Working Group meetings were organized</p> <p>68 planning and review meetings/workshops were held in the working areas and 9 trainings were organized on identified areas to manage transferred Agricultural services</p> <p>20 Local Resilience Plans developed and supported for the 20 CRP sites</p>	Target achieved

10.8 Pledge of Ethical Conduct in Evaluation



ETHICAL GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION



UNEG
United Nations Evaluation Group

PLEDGE OF ETHICAL CONDUCT IN EVALUATION

By signing this pledge, I hereby commit to discussing and applying the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and to adopting the associated ethical behaviours.



INTEGRITY

I will actively adhere to the moral values and professional standards of evaluation practice as outlined in the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation and following the values of the United Nations. Specifically, I will be:

- **Honest and truthful** in my communication and actions.
- **Professional**, engaging in credible and trustworthy behaviour, alongside competence, commitment and ongoing reflective practice.
- **Independent, impartial and incorruptible**.



ACCOUNTABILITY

I will be answerable for all decisions made and actions taken and responsible for honouring commitments, **without qualification or exception**; I will report potential or actual harms observed. Specifically, I will be:

- **Transparent** regarding evaluation purpose and actions taken, establishing trust and increasing accountability for performance to the public, particularly those populations affected by the evaluation.
- **Responsive** as questions or events arise, adapting plans as required and referring to appropriate channels where corruption, fraud, sexual exploitation or abuse or other misconduct or waste of resources is identified.
- **Responsible** for meeting the evaluation purpose and for actions taken and for ensuring redress and recognition as needed.



RESPECT

I will engage with all stakeholders of an evaluation in a way that honours their dignity, well-being, personal agency and characteristics. Specifically, I will ensure:

- **Access** to the evaluation process and products by all relevant stakeholders – whether powerless or powerful – with due attention to factors that could impede access such as sex, gender, race, language, country of origin, LGBTQ status, age, background, religion, ethnicity and ability.
- **Meaningful participation and equitable treatment** of all relevant stakeholders in the evaluation processes, from design to dissemination. This includes engaging various stakeholders, particularly affected people, so they can actively inform the evaluation approach and products rather than being solely a subject of data collection.
- **Fair representation** of different voices and perspectives in evaluation products (reports, webinars, etc.).



BENEFICENCE

I will strive to do good for people and planet while minimizing harm arising from evaluation as an intervention. Specifically, I will ensure:

- **Explicit and ongoing consideration of risks and benefits** from evaluation processes.
- **Maximum benefits** at systemic (including environmental), organizational and programmatic levels.
- **No harm**. I will not proceed where harm cannot be mitigated.
- **Evaluation makes an overall positive contribution** to human and natural systems and the mission of the United Nations.

I commit to playing my part in ensuring that evaluations are conducted according to the Charter of the United Nations and the ethical requirements laid down above and contained within the UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. When this is not possible, I will report the situation to my supervisor, designated focal points or channels and will actively seek an appropriate response.

23/06/22

(Signature and Date)