

# Evaluation Terms of Reference



## Evaluation of the Impact of Food for Assets on Livelihood Resilience in Bangladesh

### Bangladesh FFA Profile:

#### FFA projects (2002-2012):

- 2 Country Programmes

#### Transfer Modality:

- FFA/CFA

#### Main FFA Interventions:

- Water management
- Access Infrastructures
- Flood Protection

#### Geographic Coverage

Between 2008 and 2011, 13 districts and 45 upazillas were assisted by FFA programmes.

#### Partners

- Government of Bangladesh
- UN Agencies
- Local & International NGOs.

#### Donors

Australia, European Commission, Canada, Bangladesh, Japan, UK, USA, Netherlands, UN CERF, Private donors.

### Subject and Focus of the Evaluation

Foods for Assets (FFA) programmes form one of WFP's largest areas of investment over time. Measured by food tonnage, and level of direct expenses between 2006-2010, FFA programmes were the second largest of WFP's food distribution modalities, after General Food Distribution.

FFA programmes are intended to restore or build specific assets that contribute to livelihoods improvement, resilience and food security. Typical examples include rebuilding infrastructure, supporting access to markets, restoring the natural resource base, or protecting the environment, and reclaiming marginal or wasted land among others. Many FFA interventions also aim to reduce risk and increase the capacity of households to manage shocks.

Some FFA activities aim to improve impoverished and depleted natural environments by arresting soil erosion, reducing floods, increasing moisture into the soil profile, improving water management, and increasing vegetation cover, thus enhancing the land's capacity to withstand stresses without losing productivity. By improving the environmental base upon which many people depend for agricultural and forestry related livelihoods FFA can help strengthen the ability of food-insecure people to manage future risks and withstand shocks. If applied at a significant scale, FFA may also contribute to reduce climatic risks or foster adaptation of communities to climate change induced effects.

Not all food transfers conditional on work can be considered to be asset building. Some do not create durable productive assets, but rather address the immediate food insecurity of the participants by providing food for a non-asset producing activity.

Some FFA activities may focus on lighter activities or simple repair of assets (such as in the case of low-technology, low-risk interventions). Where higher –technology, higher risk interventions are planned, more sophisticated and integrated approaches are needed that bring in the necessary technical capacity on the ground.

### FFA in Bangladesh

WFP has worked in Bangladesh since the 1970s and has implemented Food for Assets activities since 1976. Bangladesh is one of the most disaster-prone countries in the world. Frequent natural disasters, such as cyclones and floods disrupt lives and livelihoods, exacerbate food insecurity and undermine poverty reduction efforts because of extensive damage to crops, homes, and household or community assets.

Between 2002 and 2011, FFA has continued mainly under 2 Country Programmes. The FFA components aimed to protect existing livelihoods assets providing short term employment during the lean seasons and reducing the risk and exposure of vulnerable groups to shocks by building assets that served income-generation and disaster preparedness purposes.

## Objectives of the Evaluation

The evaluation serves both accountability and learning purposes. The main objectives are to:

- Evaluate the outcomes and impact achieved so far (intended or unintended) by FFA on livelihood resilience;
- Identify changes needed to enable fulfilment of the potential impact of FFA on livelihoods resilience;
- Provide information about how FFA activities can be better aligned with new policies and guidance.

This evaluation is one in a series of five country evaluations to be carried out from 2012-2014.

The evaluations will assess the medium term impact (impacts seen after 5-7 years) of past WFP operations where Food for Assets activities aimed to maintain or recover livelihoods and build livelihood resilience. In these evaluations impact is defined as the “lasting and/or significant effects of the intervention – social, economic, environmental or technical – on individuals, gender and age-groups, households, communities and institutions. Impact can be intended or unintended, positive and negative, macro (sector) and micro (household).” The evaluations will focus on creation or recovery of natural resource assets (soil, water, agricultural and forests) but also recognize the contributions of infrastructure and access assets to livelihoods resilience.

## Users of the Evaluation

Key stakeholders include those directly involved in the design and implementation of FFA projects including the FFA participants themselves. The Government of Bangladesh at the national and sub-national level is one of the key partners with WFP in the planning and implementation of FFA interventions. In addition, a large number of cooperating partners, UN agencies, and local NGOs work together with WFP to implement FFA activities, provide inputs and technical assistance. Donor agencies that support FFA activities have a direct interest in the findings of the evaluation.

## Evaluation Questions & Methodology

The following three main evaluation questions will be addressed by the evaluations:

**Question 1:** What positive or negative impacts have FFA activities had on individuals within participating households and communities?

**Question 2:** What factors were critical in affecting outcomes and impact?

**Question 3:** How could the FFA activities be improved to address findings emerging from the analysis in Key Questions 1 and 2?

The impact evaluation takes a mixed method approach. The four main components are:

- Quantitative survey of impacts at the household and community level;
- Qualitative assessment of impacts at the household and community level;
- Technical appraisal of assets and associated biophysical changes;
- Social and institutional analysis of networks and linkages.

Secondary data e.g. national household level surveys, census data and WFP monitoring data on inputs and activities will be used where possible to complement primary data collected.

## Roles and Responsibilities

The evaluation team, from the firm Baastel includes both internationally and nationally recruited members and has a strong technical background in conducting independent evaluations of this nature. The team is complemented by a local company that will conduct the field surveys.

The evaluation is funded and managed by WFP’s Office of Evaluation. Jamie Watts is the WFP evaluation manager.

## Timing and Key Milestones

**Inception Phase:** 11<sup>th</sup> Feb-25<sup>rd</sup> Mar 2013

**Fieldwork Dates:** 7<sup>th</sup> April – 5<sup>th</sup> May

**Reports:**

- Draft evaluation report available for comments by June 2013.
- The Summary Evaluation Report will be presented to WFP’s Executive Board in November 2013.

Findings will be actively disseminated and the final evaluation report will be publicly available on WFP’s website.



Reference:  
Full and summary reports of the Evaluation and the Management Response will be available at <http://www.wfp.org/evaluation>