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PROVISIONAL TERMS OF REFERENCE:
External Evaluation of the EU/UNICEF Partnerships on Nutrition Security:
Final Evaluation,
Africa’s Nutrition Security Partnership (ANSP)
to take place from August 2015 until April 2016

Requesting Section: Nutrition

***************************************************************************

1. Background Information, Context and Justification:

Malnutrition continues to be one of the most important problems in the world. More than one billion people - nearly a sixth of the world’s population - suffer from chronic hunger. In Africa, there has been relatively little reduction in the levels of stunting in the past 20 years, and around 40% of African children are stunted (a very high prevalence by WHO classification). To help give more children in Asia and Africa the best start in life, the EU has teamed up with UNICEF to support two new initiatives to tackle maternal and child undernutrition between 2011 and 2015.

The Maternal and Young Child Nutrition Security Initiative in Asia (MYCNSIA, 2011-14) and the Africa’s Nutrition Security Partnership (ANSP, 2012-15) are designed around four interrelated Result Areas: (1) Up-stream policy work regarding nutrition security, (2) Capacity building of decision-makers, service delivery personnel and communities, (3) Data analysis and knowledge sharing, and (4) Scale up of key proven interventions. MYCNSIA activities are implemented in five targeted countries of Bangladesh, Indonesia, Laos, Nepal and the Philippines. The ANSP is targeted in four countries including Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Mali and Uganda. Through the MYCNSIA and ANSP, UNICEF works to improve child growth and development in Asia and Africa by improving nutrition security using intersectoral approaches. The MYCNSIA and ANSP focus on key evidence-based interventions for women and young children, specifically during the critical window of opportunity, between conception and up to two years of life (the “1,000 days” approach). Efforts to potentiate results by strengthening systems and complementing the work of partners who are implementing inter-sectoral programmes are also being made. For example, this includes selection of MYCNSIA and ANSP sites where other efforts are being made to improve access to water and sanitation facilities, provide access to social protection programmes (e.g. conditional cash transfers), and food security programmes (e.g. animal husbandry, agriculture extension programmes, home gardening, etc.).

The 4-year MYCNSIA programme in Asia aims to directly benefit some 30 million children and 5 million pregnant and lactating women in the five targeted countries. In Africa, the ANSP aims to reach another 25 million children and 5.5 million pregnant and lactating women. There are also plans for cross fertilization to strengthen nutrition programmes in the two regions through sharing of experiences on capacity building activities, lessons learned, and good practices developed through the MYCNSIA and ANSP.

The collaboration between UNICEF and the EU for the Support to the Nutrition Strategy in East and West Africa Programme was signed in October 2011. The stakeholders and partners contributing to this collaboration have since called themselves the Africa’s Nutrition Security Partnership (ANSP). With a focus on improvement of nutrition security among women and young children in Africa, the initiative will add value at continental and regional levels and cross-fertilize what is being done at country level to improve nutrition security. The four-year project will directly benefit children and pregnant and lactating women in four target countries (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Mali and Uganda). Women and children living in other countries will also benefit from the regional efforts. In the long run, countries in Africa will benefit from the improved health and nutrition status of their population. Being an integral part of Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement and the Renewed Efforts Against Child Hunger and Undernutrition through Partnerships (REACH), UNICEF applies principles of working on proven, high impact nutrition specific interventions that can be scaled up and develop and strengthen linkages with nutrition sensitive development. UNICEF’s nutrition strategy, which follows the concepts of addressing undernutrition across the window of opportunity of 1,000 days between pregnancy and when a child turns two years old, makes the organization particularly well positioned to implement this programme.
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Capitalizing on the political commitments which exist to implement plans and strategies at country and regional level, sustainability is inbuilt in the design of the MYCNSIA and ANSP. Key government bodies are directly involved in the planning and implementation of the MYCNSIA and ANSP; the interventions are not stand alone projects but rather support the regular national and sub-national nutrition programmes.

2. Purpose of the Evaluation:

UNICEF has entered into a Long-Term Agreement with ETC Nederland BV for a series of external evaluations of two EU/UNICEF joint action programmes on nutrition security: the Maternal and Young Child Nutrition Security Initiative (MYCNSIA), in Asia and Africa Nutrition Security Partnership (ANSP) for East and Western Africa. For both these programmes, the two mid-term evaluations (MTE) were implemented in 2013 after two years of programme implementation.

As a part of the reporting protocol to the donor European Union, the present terms of reference (TOR) is developed to engage ETC Nederland BV for the ANSP external endline evaluation i.e., fourth of four evaluations to be executed under the LTA.

The overall purpose is to undertake independent evaluations, the results of which (at mid-term) will improve the implementation during the remainder of the programme, and (at final) will generate knowledge and identify best practices and lessons learned which can be transferred to other programmes and inform global policy on nutrition security. The evaluations (mid-term and final) will assess the relevance, effectiveness, impact, efficiency and sustainability of the MYCNSIA in five targeted countries in Asia and of the ANSP in four targeted countries in Africa as well as regional and continental efforts (in Asia and in Africa) at mid-term and after the four years of implementation. **An additional criteria for adaptability is added to the final evaluation of the ANSP.**

This external evaluation is being commissioned to (1) obtain an unbiased assessment of whether or not the planned inputs have led and/or contributed to the achievement of the anticipated results (outputs, outcomes, impact), (2) identify the reasons why or why not the achievements have been made, and (3) examine any unintended positive or negative results of the programs.

Intended users of the evaluation include the implementing partners in the evaluated countries as they stand to gain insight and have a thorough assessment of what was achieved in relation to planned results, including recommendations for future programmes which may serve for advocacy efforts to scale up interventions and modes of action.

The primary donor of the two Joint Actions, the EU, will be another key user of the evaluation, which will serve as a robust assessment of results achieved in the nine programme countries. The evaluation will also help the EU prioritize funding decisions and make recommendations for similar programmes in the future. Other donors who contribute to these two Joint Actions will similarly benefit from the mid-term and final external evaluations.

The UNICEF regional offices will not only use the evaluation for reporting purposes in fulfillment of their grant requirements with the EU, but will mainly utilize lessons and learnings coming out of the reports to feed into current and future programmes. UNICEF regional and other country offices also stand to gain insight for the optimal implementation of scaling-up of nutrition programmes with strong intersectoral links.

**Global Logframe:**

A Mid-Term Evaluation of the ANSP was done at the start of the third year of implementation with field visits occurring from October to November 2014 conducted by the ETC Nederland BV. As part of the evaluation, it was found that the global logframe for the ANSP did not adequately capture all the activities being done and the results being achieved. The ANSP team has since worked with all partners, with support from monitoring and evaluation experts, to prepare a more explicit global logframe for the ANSP. In addition, the evaluation framework for the final external evaluation was slightly revised to include a seventh criteria on adaptability to highlight where the ANSP has promoted and supported collaborative planning, learning and adaptation to accommodate the dynamic opportunities and challenges in the context at continental, regional and national levels. A revision of the Description of Action for the ANSP was submitted to the EU Delegation and approved.
The 4-year global logframe for the ANSP is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Objective</th>
<th>Specific Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To contribute to the achievement of the MDG 1, 4, 5 and 8 targets related to nutrition in West and East Africa ensuring that the rights of all children and women are protected from the adverse consequences of the volatile food prices.</td>
<td>To improve the institutional environment at continental, regional and national levels contributing to a reduction in maternal and child undernutrition in Africa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes per Result Area:</th>
<th>Result Area 1 Outcome:</th>
<th>Result Area 2 Outcome:</th>
<th>Result Area 3 Outcome:</th>
<th>Result Area 4 Outcome:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>National policies are aligned to impact nutrition by integrating nutrition as a key objective across different sectors</td>
<td>National nutrition programmes are strategic and have the capacity to adapt to changing contexts that influence nutrition programming in the country</td>
<td>Strong national oversight for nutrition with relevant and sustainable nutrition information systems available at all levels for decision-making</td>
<td>Communities, families, mothers and children in focus areas have access to quality nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outputs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outputs per Result Area:</th>
<th>Overall Outputs per Result Area:</th>
<th>Result Area 1 Overall Output:</th>
<th>Result Area 2 Overall Output:</th>
<th>Result Area 3 Overall Output:</th>
<th>Result Area 4 Overall Output:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Enabling political environment for nutrition with strong continental, regional and national leadership, multisectoral coordination and joint accountability</td>
<td>Strong commitment from political continental bodies that function to advocate, convene and promote implementation of nutrition scale-up</td>
<td>Strong strategic, managerial and technical capacity at country level to provide quality nutrition interventions across sectors</td>
<td>Strengthened quality, relevance and institutionalization of continental, regional and national information systems to monitor results and track performance around nutrition</td>
<td>Comprehensive nutrition programmes implemented in a coherent, coordinated manner involving multiple sectors and stakeholders in focus areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Continental Outputs per Result Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continental Level Outputs per Result Area:</th>
<th>Result Area 1 Continental Output:</th>
<th>Result Area 2 Continental Output:</th>
<th>Result Area 3 Continental Output:</th>
<th>Result Area 4 Regional Output:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Strong commitment from political continental bodies that function to advocate, convene and promote implementation of nutrition scale-up</td>
<td>Functional continental and regional bodies that provide guidance, frameworks, norms or standards on nutrition to their Member States</td>
<td>Monitoring system with nutrition indicators in place at continental level</td>
<td>Country nutrition programmes have taken into account international standards, best practices and evidence-based high-impact nutrition interventions through direct technical country support from regional resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Outputs per Result Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Level Outputs per Result Area:</th>
<th>Result Area 1 Regional Output:</th>
<th>Result Area 2 Regional Output:</th>
<th>Result Area 3 Regional Output:</th>
<th>Result Area 4 Regional Output:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Strong alignment of regional stakeholders on nutrition to support increased political, technical and financial commitments towards scaling up nutrition</td>
<td>Strengthened strategic, leadership and technical capacity at national and sub-national level that supports multisectoral coordination in nutrition</td>
<td>Strengthened monitoring and implementation at country level through direct country support from regional resources and horizontal learning from experiences, lessons learnt or innovations of other countries</td>
<td>Country nutrition programmes have taken into account international standards, best practices and evidence-based high-impact nutrition interventions through direct technical country support from regional resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Country Outputs per Result Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Level Outputs per Result Area:</th>
<th>Result Area 1 Country Output:</th>
<th>Result Area 2 Country Output:</th>
<th>Result Area 3 Country Output:</th>
<th>Result Area 4 Country Output:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Strong national nutrition leadership and ownership and coordination to support scale-up of nutrition programmes across sectors</td>
<td>Availability of skilled and capable workforce across sectors that can provide quality nutrition interventions and services</td>
<td>Oversight, decision-making and programme implementation have access to relevant and timely nutrition information</td>
<td>Comprehensive nutrition interventions are available at community level in focus areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this global logframe, the outputs from each of the three levels (continental, regional and country levels) lead to the overall outputs per result area. The outputs align and complement each other in order to bring about the outcomes per result area and the overall objective of a stronger political environment for nutrition at the continental, regional and national levels.

### 3. Objectives

The **Objectives** of the ANSP final evaluation are:

1. To assess the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, equity-focus, and adaptability of the ANSP;
2. To assess the effectiveness of the institutional framework and partnerships at continental, regional and national levels;
3. To determine the appropriateness of the strategies in place for the achievement of the planned results;
4. To determine whether ANSP efforts in relation to all 4 Result Areas of the logframe have been implemented with sufficient quantity, quality and timeliness (i.e. adequacy of programme inputs, against the predefined targets);
5. To distill any Lessons Learned or Good Practices, and identify barriers to effective implementation, in order to make recommendations for modifications for the subsequent planning period and programme cycle;
6. To identify any broader consequences, positive or negative, intended or unintended, which have occurred as a result of the ANSP.

4. **Scope of the Evaluation**

This TOR is for the **ANSP external endline evaluation**. This evaluation will be from August 2015 to March 2016 (with a final presentation to be made tentatively in March 2016; see detailed timeframe in Section 7). The final evaluation will require travel to all four countries of the ANSP (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Mali and Uganda), to the two regional offices and the UNICEF Liaison Office in Addis Ababa. The final evaluation will review all four years of the project (September 2011- December 2015).

Within each of the four countries, the geographical areas (provinces, districts, etc.) of program implementation are diverse and spread out across the country. Therefore, time and resources will not allow for visits to each of the many project sites within each country. Instead, the contracted institution/individuals should decide which program areas to visit in conjunction with the relevant UNICEF Country and Regional Offices, and EU delegations. It is estimated that 8-12 working days in each country will be sufficient to meet the stated evaluation objectives.

**Potential Limitations:**
- The final evaluation fieldwork will start in October 2015, after four years of implementation and two interim reports. Challenges due to the complex crisis in Mali and the Sahel drought that affected Burkina Faso, however, may have limited full programme implementation especially in the first year. The relatively short duration of the implementation will mean that it may be difficult to show impact.
- Internet connectivity is problematic in many areas covered by the ANSP. Thus, interviews over the internet will have limited usefulness. The field visits will be crucial in complementing the information from records.

5. **Reasons why the assignment cannot be done by a UNICEF staff member**

The evaluation must be independent, in line with UNICEF evaluation policy and the contractual requirements of the EU. As an independent evaluation, it will also benefit from the external perspective of the qualified agency or individuals.

6. **Evaluation Methods**

The objectives stated above have informed the selection of the seven evaluation criteria: **impact, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, equity and adaptability**. The **Annex** poses a set of relevant questions for each of the criteria, and the methodology should be subsequently developed around the evaluation questions. While the detailed methodology (including as much detail and clarity as possible on the data collection methods, sampling strategies, data collection tools and the analysis framework [i.e., how data triangulation will be done for both qualitative and quantitative information]) so that there is a clear understanding on how the findings will be synthesized from the data collected) will be fleshed out in the proposal, and finalized in the inception period, the following minimum standards should be taken into account with regard to the methodology.

**Phase 1: Inception Phase**

**Tasks:** (1) Revisit the overall approach, methods, and core elements to the evaluation (as implemented in the mid-term evaluation in Asia and Africa as well as the final evaluation in Asia), and make any modifications as agreed with UNICEF and the Evaluation Reference Group. Outline how the ANSP final evaluation will help to inform the common themes and lessons learned from Asia and Africa. (2) Finalise the detailed protocol and workplan for the ANSP final evaluation based on desk review of ANSP documents, teleconference calls with the Evaluation Reference Group1.

---

1 An Evaluation Reference Group composed of staff from UNICEF, EU and Nutrition Advisory Services will be established to guide the process, review and comment on inception and final reports.
Overall method: Review to what extent the approaches and methods of the previous midterm evaluations (in Asia and Africa) and the final evaluation of MYCNSIA (in Asia) are applicable, or need to be modified and improved based on those experiences, as well as the anticipated specific needs of the ANSP final evaluation. For the sake of consistency, the core elements (e.g. evaluation criteria, common themes, etc.) should be maintained as much as possible.

The inception report should contain a proposed protocol for the final evaluation in Africa, with a clearly articulated evaluation framework, evaluation questions, detailed methodology, analysis plan, a proposed workplan with detailed timeline, clearly defined roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team members, and a general outline of the expected evaluation report (see Note at the end of this Section on UNEG Evaluation Report Standards).

Roles and responsibilities:
- Contracted agency: as above.
- UNICEF ESARO and WCARO to provide background documents for ANSP/Africa, as well as names and contact details of the Evaluation Reference Group and of implementing partners at all three levels;
- Evaluation Reference Group: review and provide timely feedback to the proposed protocol, methods, etc. Full clarity and agreement from all the ERG members on the inception report and methodology before the data collection phase begins.
- The Evaluation Reference Groups for both the MYCNSIA and ANSP to advice on the elements and approaches for the overall global analysis of the MYCNSIA and ANSP (see Phase 5 below).

Phase 2: Data Collection Phase
Tasks: Collect the necessary qualitative and quantitative information through both distance correspondence and visits to each of the four ANSP countries, and UNICEF Regional Offices of ESARO and WCARO as well as the UNICEF Liaison Office to the AUC and UNECA. This phase must include collection of qualitative and quantitative information from other stakeholders (other than UNICEF) and should include the African Union Commission, the New Partnership for Africa’s Development, Regional Economic Communities and other regional bodies (including IGAD and CILSS).

Estimated 8-12 days in each implementing country and up to 2 days in each of the regional offices.

Overall methods: Review of available reports and relevant documents. Interviews with key partners and stakeholders; review of baseline and endline data from the four focus countries; review programme monitoring data; field visits and interviews with national and local implementing partners (government and/or non-governmental, as relevant); semi-structured interviews with programme beneficiaries. Triangulation of various data collection methods will help to inform the full picture as per the evaluation objectives and criteria.

Briefing meetings at country, regional (for both ESARO and WCARO) and continental levels will be done. Debriefing presentations and summary trip reports (discussing the meetings participated in, the people met, the activities observed during the field visit, the issues discussed, and the recommendations) will be prepared and discussed at the end of each field visit in each of the countries, regions and at continental level.

Tools for data collection
The following tools are proposed for data collection during the external endline evaluation:
- Desk review can be conducted based on documents provided by the Regional and Country Offices. The documents shared with the contracting agency will include Annual Interim Reports, monitoring frameworks and monitoring data during the four year programme period, endline survey data from the focus countries and their reports, comparisons of baseline and endline survey data, financial data for the focus countries and regional office, and any other information needed for the desk review.
- Semi-structured interviews at the regional and country level during visits to the country and regional offices to assess and review the programme outputs, outcomes and results. The meeting at regional level and the country visits will start with a full briefing at the Regional Offices. It will be an opportunity to further acquaint the evaluation team with the country settings, apprise them of the ANSP programme and understand how the ANSP interventions are linked to other nutrition security interventions by UNICEF and other agencies. Semi-structured interviews are also a good opportunity for the evaluators to fill-in information gaps (if any). For each type of organisation to be interviewed, the team will have a semi-structured checklist. The checklists will be derived from the evaluation framework. The checklists will be adapted for each of the levels of operation of the ANSP programmes: (a) regional; (b) national; (c) district and local levels.
- Group meetings with stakeholders (e.g. some donor agencies together, various NGOs together) are particularly suited for a joint context analysis. It also will be a good venue to pose questions on programme design and regarding nutrition security interventions being implemented by partners and stakeholders. Similar group meetings can take place at district level during the field visits.
- Field visits: the selection of sites to be visited will be need to be based on purposive sampling in discussion with the country offices. The choice of areas to be visited will need to be made on a mixture of what is feasible within a short timeframe (accessibility, security conditions, etc.) and the opportunities in the various
localities to assess a large number of key issues on a sub-set of activities. The team will need to be split so that in each country, in addition to the meetings in the capital, at least two implementation sites can be visited. Even so, in countries with a large and varied programme the site visits will offer only a glimpse of the total programme. The two sites will be chosen to represent different realities, either because the contexts are so different (e.g. other stakeholders, level of remoteness, presence of ethnic groups, etc.) or because there is a different set of programme interventions. The selection of the sites to be visited will be done in consultation with the nutrition focal points in the UNICEF Country Offices, and will be checked with the regional ANSP managers.

- Focus Group Discussions (FGD) to discuss with a group of stakeholders on common issues and get additional information on the programme, outputs, outcomes and results.

The data gathered can be triangulated and cross-checked using (i) Written information from various sources including web-sites; (ii) Findings from the desk review with those obtained during interviews and field visits; (iii) Statements and opinions across (groups of) stakeholders within one country or region; (iv) Findings from field visits to different locations (within countries and between countries).

**Roles and responsibilities:**

- Contracted Agency: As above including travel arrangements to countries.
- UNICEF Regional, Liaison and Country Offices: provision of requested data, reports, and documents; facilitate logistical support at country level to schedule meetings, field visits, etc.; arrangement of translation services as needed.
- Evaluation Reference Group role: any technical and strategic support, as needed.

**Phase 3: Analysis**

**Tasks:** Analyse all available information and prepare a first draft report of the ANSP final evaluation. Verify information as needed. Submit first draft reports to UNICEF and the Evaluation Reference Group.

**Overall methods:** Analysis, triangulation, and synthesis of the information collected in the field visits and through correspondence. Preparation of a first draft report of the ANSP final evaluation. The draft report should meet the stated objectives of the final evaluation, and address all seven evaluation criteria. Analysis should follow the detailed analysis plan that was proposed in the Inception Report; any modifications to this approach should be discussed with the Evaluation Reference Group.

The format of the report should include the following:

1. Synthesis and summary of the overall ANSP progress, lessons learned, best practices, challenges and recommendations. This will include an Executive Summary which should be available in both English and French.
2. Policy brief summarizing key findings and recommendations of the evaluation (2-3 pages).
3. Specific, separate reports, case studies and recommendations (from 10-15 pages each) for:
   a. Each of the four focus countries
   b. Regional level implementation
   c. Continental level implementation
4. Overall global analysis of the good practices and lessons learned for both MYCNSIA and ANSP (20- to 30-page report and one synthesis PowerPoint presentation). See Phase 5 below.

Findings and recommendations relating to the 7 evaluation criteria (impact, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, equity and adaptability) within the scope of the ANSP programme should be clearly and explicitly demarcated from recommendations beyond the scope of the ANSP programme. Three to five priority actionable items for each level should be identified.

**Roles and responsibilities:**

- Contracted agency: As above.
- UNICEF Regional, Liaison and Country Offices: Provide any additional information requested by the contracted agency that may have been missed during the data collection phase, or would be needed to aid in triangulation and/or verification.
- Evaluation Reference Group role: Advise on any adjustments to analysis plan that might be warranted.

**Phase 4: Reporting and Dissemination**

**Tasks:** Finalization of the report. Dissemination of the findings to UNICEF, EU, the African Union and other key partners and stakeholders at all levels (national, regional, global).
Overall methods: UNICEF and the Evaluation Reference Group shall provide timely review and feedback on the draft report, and this shall be followed by systematic and responsive revisions by the contracted agency. At least two rounds of feedback and revision may be expected: first draft and final draft shall be submitted to the Evaluation Reference Group for review and feedback prior to finalization. The draft and final reports will be shared with UNICEF and partners in each of the four countries. Country-level teams (including UNICEF, government and other partners) will be given approximately one month to digest the recommendations of the evaluation, and to outline any steps that should be taken to strengthen programme implementation following the closure of ANSP and into any subsequent planning cycle for governments, donor programmes, etc.

Following the finalization of the report, a 2-day dissemination workshop will be held with key stakeholders at all levels during the ANSP Final Review Meeting. PowerPoint presentation(s) by the contracted agency should highlight the methodology and key findings and recommendations, focusing on the sharing of Lessons Learned and Good Practices that will inform the next programme cycle, and multi-sector efforts for Nutrition Security in general. The dissemination workshop will also include presentations from each of the four countries, the regions and at continental level including their reactions to the evaluation, the proposed plans, and the needs for the next programme cycle. The dissemination workshop should include ample time for discussion and feedback from key stakeholders, and building of consensus and commitment on actions to be taken to strengthen the existing programmes of governments.

Roles and responsibilities:

- Contracted agency: Prepare first and final drafts of the report, and incorporate relevant feedback sufficiently to finalize the report of the ANSP final evaluation. Prepare PowerPoint presentations, with inputs from UNICEF and the Evaluation Reference Group. Contribute to the development of the Dissemination Workshop Agenda. Deliver presentations and contribute to discussions at the workshop.
- UNICEF Regional, Liaison and Country Offices: Provide timely feedback to the contracted agency for finalizing the report and any subsequent PowerPoint presentations. Make the logistical arrangements for the dissemination workshop, and the dissemination of the report itself (or a Summary Document) to key partners and stakeholders at all levels.
- Evaluation Reference Group role: Provide timely feedback to the contracted agency for finalizing the report and any subsequent PowerPoint presentations. Identify appropriate facilitator/s for the dissemination workshop.

Phase 5. Overall synthesis and analysis of Lessons Learned and Good Practices for MYCNSIA and ANSP (global learning)

Tasks: To draft and finalize a 20- to 30-page report and accompanying PowerPoint presentation that provides an overall synthesis of both UNICEF-EU Nutrition Security partnerships, MYCNSIA and ANSP. Depending on discussions and agreements from the Inception Phase, the structure of the report may include a highlight of the main outcomes, findings, conclusions, recommendations, lessons learned and/or good practices of both partnerships.

Overall methods: Report to be drafted by ETC as it was proposed in the Inception Report. First draft to be reviewed and commented upon by the Evaluation Reference Groups of ANSP and MYCNSIA.

Roles and responsibilities:

- Contracted Agency: Prepare first and final drafts of the report and PowerPoint, and incorporate relevant feedback sufficiently to finalize the report and PowerPoint presentation.
- UNICEF Regional Office (ESARO, as contract holder): manage the process of sharing drafts with ANSP and MYCNSIA ERG members, consolidating feedback to ETC, and securing ERG approval for the final versions (report and PowerPoint),
- Evaluation Reference Groups (ANSP and MYCNSIA): provide timely feedback to ETC.

7. Evaluation Work Plan

7.a. Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Africa (ANSP) Final Evaluation</th>
<th>Key Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Within 2 weeks contract signing | Phase 1a. Inception Report including:  
(contract signature is expected no later than 15 August 2015)  
- Proposed evaluation design, evaluation framework and the draft protocol for the ANSP final evaluation, with detailed evaluation questions and methods  
- Proposed detailed workplan with timeline  
- Identification of potential data sources and assessment of the quality of the information |
| September 2015 | Phase 1b. Final protocol for final evaluation. |
| Late October-December 2015 | Phase 2. Data collection and analysis (field work) for final evaluation of programme implementation completed. |
| Mid-February 2016 | Phase 3 and 4a. Draft report of final evaluation, ANSP |
| Late March 2016 | Phase 4b. Final report of final evaluation ANSP including an Executive Summary (in French and English). |
| March 2016 (to be confirmed) | Phase 4c. Dissemination Workshop (back-to-back with the ANSP Final Review Meeting) |
| April 2016 | Phase 5. Overall global learning report and PowerPoint presentation on the overall analysis of MYCNSIA and ANSP |

7.b. Expected Deliverables:

1. **Inception Report** including, (i) the overall approach, methods and core elements for the final evaluation, building on the previous experience of the mid-term evaluation and reflecting any modifications as agreed with UNICEF and the Evaluation Reference Group. Outline how the ANSP final evaluation will help to inform the common themes and lessons learned from Asia and Africa, and (ii) proposed protocol for the final evaluation in Africa, with evaluation questions, detailed methodology, analysis plan, a proposed workplan with detailed timeline, clearly defined roles and responsibilities of the evaluation team members, and a general outline of the expected evaluation report.

2. **Debriefing PowerPoint Presentations and Trip Reports** for the countries, regions and at continental level during the data collection field work. The Trip Reports should include details on the meetings participated in, the people met, the activities observed during the field work, the issues discussed and recommendations. The Trip Report should also include people who were not met and meetings not attended as planned as well as reasons why and an analysis of how this could have affected the findings.

3. **Final evaluation first and final draft reports**, including separate and specific analyses and recommendations for each country, for regional level ANSP activities and for continental level ANSP activities, as well as a broader synthesis and summary of the overall ANSP progress, lessons learned, best practices, challenges, and recommendations for the remaining programme period (see Phase 3 above). The reports should meet the stated objectives of the final evaluation, and address all seven evaluation criteria, and they should be guided by the UNICEF-adapted UNEG Evaluation Report Standard (as mentioned in Section 6). Findings and recommendations within the scope of the ANSP programme should be clearly delineated from recommendations beyond the ANSP scope.


The deliverables will be linked with the payment schedule in the Request for Proposals.
All materials which will be developed by the selected institution and their affiliates through the course of this evaluation will become the property of UNICEF and will need to be submitted to UNICEF in an appropriate format (e.g. hard and/or electronic copy), these include, but are not limited to:

- All methodical materials submitted as part of the inception report for the Evaluation
- All materials developed to undertake the evaluation (e.g. questionnaires, templates, etc.)
- Raw data of any data collection exercises, interviews, questionnaires implemented (hard copies of the filled questionnaires, electronic copy of entered data, etc.)
- Draft and final reports and presentations.

7.c. Management arrangements:
Overall coordination of the final evaluation will be the responsibility of ANSP Senior Management, with the support of the ESARO Regional Nutrition Specialist, Monitoring and Evaluation.

The Evaluation Reference Group will provide technical guidance to the process as well as review and quality assure the deliverables. The payments (section 12) to the ETC Nederland BV will be linked to the approval of the quality of the deliverables by the Evaluation Reference Group.

The Evaluation Reference Group will include:
1. Chair of the African Task Force for Food and Nutrition Development
2. UNICEF Regional Nutrition Advisor or Specialist, ESARO
3. UNICEF Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Chief, ESARO
4. UNICEF Regional Nutrition Advisor or Specialist, WCARO
5. UNICEF Regional Monitoring and Evaluation Chief, WCARO
6. UNICEF Regional Nutrition Advisor or Specialist, EAPRO
7. UNICEF Regional Nutrition Advisor or Specialist, ROSA
8. Programme Manager, Delegation of the European Union to the African Union
9. Conditional upon the request of the Delegation of the European Union to the African Union, the Nutrition Advisory Service (NAS) to the European Union

8. Duration of Contract:
ANSP final evaluation: August 2015 – April 2016

9. Qualifications or Specialized Knowledge/Experience Required:
Institution must have staff with:
- PhD in Nutrition/Public Health/Epidemiology or a related field.
- Extensive experience in conducting large-scale programme evaluation
- Excellent knowledge of UNICEF’s and the EU’s policies, programmes and priorities in Nutrition, and good understanding of the global movement on “Scaling Up Nutrition” (SUN).
- Very knowledgeable about the Asia and Africa regions, and of ongoing nutrition security initiatives
- Expertise in gender equity and human rights

It is understood that the agency identified may use sub-contractors to complete the work. However, the team leader for each assignment must be a full-time staff of the agency.

10. Evaluation Assessment Criteria (criteria for assessing applicants):

Key expertise
Qualified institutions must meet the following requirements:
- Working in the area of nutrition, food security and other related disciplines for at least 15 years.
- Undertaking research and evaluations on topics related to Food and Nutrition security and other related disciplines for at least 15 years.
- Experience with and/or close knowledge of multisectoral nutrition programmes in Asia and Africa.
- Experience with and/or close knowledge of cash transfer interventions and linkages of nutrition and cash transfer programmes.
- Expertise in gender equity and human rights

Technical
- Quality and relevancy of the proposed methods to answer main evaluation questions
- Scope of the work well-defined and all important aspects of the TORs have been addressed.

Financial
- Overall budget proposed
- Completeness of the financial proposal (ensuring that all costs such as travel, salaries, insurance, communication costs are included in the price offered)

11. Travel and Other Logistics Arrangements:
For the ANSP final evaluation, the consultancy requires travel to all four countries in which ANSP is implemented (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Mali and Uganda), and to the regional offices of UNICEF for Eastern and Southern Africa (ESARO, in Nairobi, Kenya) and West and Central Africa (WCARO, in Dakar, Senegal) as well as to the UNICEF Liaison Office to the AUC and UNECA (in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia).

12. Payment Schedule
Payment shall be linked to approval of final deliverables as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable/Milestone</th>
<th>% of total payment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Inception Report and Final Protocol for the final evaluation (for the ANSP endline evaluation and the synthesis MYCNSIA and ANSP report)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 First Draft ANSP Report</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Final ANSP report and presentations</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Final Overall Global Learning Report for MYCNSIA and ANSP, and presentation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Estimated cost of the contract:
$185,000 USD

Requested/Prepared by:

______________________
Name: Joan Matji
Regional Nutrition Adviser
UNICEF ESARO
Date:

Reviewed by:

_____________________
Name: Edward Addai
Regional M&E Adviser
UNICEF ESARO
Date:

Approved by:

_____________________
Name: Leila Pakkala
Regional Director
UNICEF ESARO
Date:
Annex – Evaluation Criteria and Questions

The following questions are meant to help examine the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, equity and adaptability of the ANSP. The questions should be refined, and specific indicators specified, as part of the proposal submission and eventually finalized with the selected firm and the Evaluation Reference Group to be established for the evaluation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 1: Relevance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Was the ANSP programme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• appropriate to address the longer-term problems of stunting and anaemia in the targeted communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• appropriate to achieve the planned results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• comprehensive from a multisectoral perspective (agriculture, education, health, social protection, water, sanitation and hygiene)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• builds upon appropriate research, studies and assessments that had already been conducted?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• of added value, complementary and/or in harmony with plans/actions of other agencies/donors working on related inter-sectoral initiatives in the same geographic areas at different levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• aligned with continental/regional/country priorities and national plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent and in which ways has the implementation of the ANSP to date been in line with country level efforts to meeting the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) targets?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 2: Efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Were the inputs/activities conducted/provided, and outputs delivered in a timely and efficient manner?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Were the resources (funds, expertise, and time) made available through this multi-donor action appropriate to support the planned activities and results to date?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the overall financial expenditure rate of the programme consistent with the planned progress at the end of the programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was the coverage of the programme commensurate with the resources provided, could it have done more?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Has the ANSP funding been instrumental in leveraging other resources (via UNICEF or via other partners) to contribute to the overall goals of stunting and anaemia reduction? To what extent?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 3: Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Were efforts in the 4 result areas of: upstream work, capacity building, knowledge management and scale up of interventions been implemented with sufficient quantity, quality and timeliness and adequacy (i.e. are they meeting identified targets) to lead to the planned results? What, if any, recommendations can be made to improve the quantity, quality and timeliness of implementation in support of achievement of planned results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What key results were achieved? Did any unexpected results occur? Consider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent are the 4 Result Areas’ outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to produce development results?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How did the programme stakeholders contribute to the programme outcomes when the programme was being implemented?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Could the programme have benefitted from more effective partnerships in achieving its results at different levels (continental, regional and national)? Consider how the programme could have been designed or delivered more strategically to achieve the objectives of the action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 4: Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Based on the findings of the baseline and endline survey results, and other qualitative information, what were the key outputs, outcomes and impacts for the ANSP?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Were there any broader unintended effects, positive or negative, direct or indirect, at any level? (e.g. environmental, economic, social, political, or technical).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 5: Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Have the interventions created capacities for sustained results? At which levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have the programme activities been sufficiently integrated into existing national, regional and continental efforts to combat malnutrition? In what ways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is the level of ownership of programme activities by government partners and/or other partners? What are the lessons and good practices that can be transferred to other countries?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Final Evaluation

4. During the ANSP intervention, to what extent has the programme’s upstream policy and advocacy contributed to an enabling environment for comprehensive and intersectoral stunting reduction strategy – with respect to adoption/revision of key policies, strategies, coordination mechanisms, funding allocations, etc.?

### Criteria 6: Equity

1. What efforts were made to promote reduction of stunting and anaemia with an “equity” approach (i.e. geographic, gender, income, and ethnicity)?

2. To what extent has the programme design and implementation responded to barriers and bottlenecks to inequalities in access and coverage of key nutrition interventions. For instance, in the following aspects of the programme:
   1. Selection of the focus sites
   2. Roll-out of the interventions
   3. Monitoring log frame, systems and analysis
   4. Identification and level of participation of different stakeholders of deprived populations
   5. Communication strategies and community mobilization

### Criteria 7: Adaptability: Collaborative Planning, Learning, Action and Adaptation

1. To what extent has the programme promoted and supported the norms and practices of collaborative planning, learning, action and adaptation in order to accommodate the dynamic opportunities and challenges in the context at continental, regional, national and sub-national levels?

   Consider whether the ANSP was able to contribute to the following:
   a. Created and/or strengthened functional multisectoral platforms and partner alliances
   b. Promoted and supported reflection, learning and decisions in these platforms and alliances
   c. Fostered common understandings of multisectoral nutrition
   d. Clarified and promoted a common agenda
   e. Promoted greater alignment with the common agenda
   f. Clarified the roles and responsibilities of various sectors, structures and partners
   g. Stimulated positive changes in strategy, planning and implementation
   h. Promoted, established and/or supported an effective core implementation team
   i. Generated and disseminated learnings on multisectoral nutrition for global, continental and country audiences

2. To what extent has the programme benefitted from adopting a continental/regional approach and what has it achieved from this perspective that could not have been achieved through regular funding through national programmes? Consider whether the ANSP had a sufficient vision and strategy to engage and support institutional structures at the continental and regional levels.

The UNICEF conceptual framework, which the nutrition community has been using for programming for the past 25 years, identifies three levels of causes of undernutrition.

**Immediate causes operating at the individual level**

Maternal and child undernutrition

Disease

**Underlying causes influencing households and communities**

Household food insecurity

Inadequate care

Unhealthy household environment and lack of health services

**Basic causes around the structure and processes of societies**

Income poverty: employment, self-employment, dwelling, assets, remittances, pensions, transfers etc.

Lack of capital: financial, human, physical, social and natural

Social, economic, and political context

*modified by Black et al., Lanoet 2008*
### Key Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Docs</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Field visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To what extent is the programme design (logical models, results matrices) relevant and appropriate for meeting overall and specific objectives and priorities at regional and country-level? Is there sufficient internal cohesion in the programme? How does the programme complement other efforts to reduce undernutrition? To what extent and in which ways has the implementation of the ANSP to date been in line with country level efforts to meet the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) targets?</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To what extent are the continental, regional and country-level programme monitoring frameworks appropriate tools for tracking progress from inputs to results?</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>a, b, d</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Was the ANSP programme design:</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b, d, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• appropriate to address the longer-term problems of stunting and anaemia in the targeted communities?</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• appropriate to achieve the planned results?</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• comprehensive from a multisectoral perspective (agriculture, education, health, social protection, water, sanitation and hygiene)?</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• builds upon appropriate research, studies and assessments that had already been conducted?</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent and in which ways has the implementation of the ANSP to date been in line with country level efforts to meeting the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) targets?</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Equity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Docs</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Field visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do the implemented strategies have an equity focus?</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>a, b, d, e</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What efforts were made to promote reduction of stunting and anaemia with an “equity” approach (i.e. geographic, gender, income, and ethnicity)?</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>a, b, d, e</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Docs</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Field visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. To what extent has the programme design and implementation responded to barriers and bottlenecks to inequalities in access and coverage of key nutrition interventions. For instance, in the following aspects of the programme:</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b, c, d</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Selection of the focus sites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Roll-out of the interventions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Monitoring log frame, systems and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identification and level of participation of different stakeholders of deprived populations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication strategies and community mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Efficiency

1. Have UNICEF and its partners managed to implement the programme at continental, regional and national levels as per action plan?

2. Has the ANSP funding been instrumental in leveraging other resources (via UNICEF or via other partners) to contribute to the overall goals of stunting and anemia reduction? To what extent?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Were the inputs/activities conducted/provided, and outputs delivered in a timely and efficient manner?</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Were the resources (funds, expertise, and time) made available through this multi-donor action appropriate to support the planned activities and results to date?</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b, c, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Is the overall financial expenditure rate of the programme consistent with the planned progress at the end of the programme?</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b, c, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Was the coverage of the programme commensurate with the resources provided, could it have done more?</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Has the ANSP funding been instrumental in leveraging other resources (via UNICEF or via other partners) to contribute to the overall goals of stunting and anaemia reduction? To what extent?</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Were efforts in the 4 result areas implemented with sufficient quantity, quality and timeliness and adequacy</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Effectiveness

1. Have resources and efforts been effective in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness to lead to the planned results?

2. To what extent are the 4 Result Areas’ outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to produce development results?

3. Can any unexpected results be foreseen?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What key results were achieved? Did any unexpected results occur? Consider:</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• To what extent are the 4 Result Areas’ outputs and outcomes synergistic and coherent to produce development results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How did the programme stakeholders contribute to the programme outcomes when the programme was being implemented?</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Could the programme have benefited from more effective partnerships in achieving its results at different levels (continental, regional and national)? Consider how the programme could have been designed or delivered more strategically to achieve the objectives of the action.</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Can any unexpected results be foreseen?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impact

1. Do programme targets for reduction of anaemia and stunting appear feasible taking into account the findings of the

2. Based on the findings of the baseline and endline survey results, and other qualitative information, what were the key outputs, outcomes and impacts for the ANSP?

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do programme targets for reduction of anaemia and stunting appear feasible taking into account the findings of the</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td></td>
<td>a, b, d, e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Docs</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Field visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Govt.</td>
<td>b. UNICEF</td>
<td>c. others</td>
<td>a. Govt.; b. UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baseline survey and other qualitative information?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What have been broader unintended effects (positive or negative, direct or indirect), at any level of implementation, ranging from activities to impact? (environmental, economic, social, political, or technical)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Were there any broader unintended effects, positive or negative, direct or indirect, at any level? (e.g. environmental, economic, social, political, or technical).</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sustainability

| 1. What capacities and ownership have been created for sustained results? At which levels? | 5. Have the interventions created capacities for sustained results? At which levels? | a, b, c | a, b | a, b, c, d | a, b, c |
| 6. Have the programme activities been sufficiently integrated into existing national, regional and continental efforts to combat malnutrition? In what ways? | | a, b, c | a, b | a, b, d |

| 2. To what extent is the programme contributing to an enabling environment for comprehensive and inter-sectoral stunting reduction strategies? | 7. What is the level of ownership of programme activities by government partners and/or other partners? | a, b, c | a, b | a, b, c, d, e | a, b |
| 8. During the ANSP intervention, to what extent has the programme’s upstream policy and advocacy contributed to an enabling environment for comprehensive and inter-sectoral stunting reduction strategy – with respect to adoption/revision of key policies, strategies, coordination mechanisms, funding allocations, etc.? | | a, b, c | a, b | a, b, c, d | a, b |

### Adaptability

| New (only for ANSP ETE) | 2. To what extent has the programme promoted and supported the norms and practices of collaborative planning, learning, action and adaptation in order to accommodate the dynamic opportunities and challenges in the context at continental, regional, national and sub-national levels? | a, b, c | a, b | a, b, c, d, e |
| 3. To what extent has the programme benefitted from adopting a continental/regional approach and what has it achieved from this perspective that could not have been achieved through regular funding through national programmes? Consider whether the ANSP had a sufficient vision and strategy to engage and support institutional structures at the continental and regional levels. | | a, b, c | a, b | a, b, c |