

INCLUSIVE NARKETSFOR CONNUNTIES (M4C)

Core Project Model Indicators Toolkit

INTRODUCTION

This Indicators Toolkit complements the **Inclusive Markets for Communities (M4C)** Core Project Model (CPM) Handbook. The toolkit is a key resource to stand up the M4C Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) approach. It is envisioned that the toolkit will be used by World Vision Field Offices implementing the model. It provides clear definitions and guidance to ensure consistent and quality measurement across programs. The indicators are organised in relation to the M4C project logic, including the key outcome areas on i) Income generation, ii) Access to Finance, iii) Gender Equality, Disability, and Social Inclusion (GEDSI) & Women's Economic Empowerment (WEE), and iv) Environmental Sustainability and Climate Action (ESCA) & Green Growth (GG). This structure is shown in the M4C handbook Table 19 below.

M4C Handbook Figure 19: M4C MEL Framework and Project Logic Summary

| INCOMENTAL SUPPORTING OF THE VELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN MUSEHOLDS, ESPECIALLY WOMEN & VULNERABLE GROUPS, EXPERIENCE IMPROVED ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT & RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN VINTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN VINTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN VINTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN VINTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN VINTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN VINTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN VINTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN VINTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN VINTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN INTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN INTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN INTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN INTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN INTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN INTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN INTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN INTER A RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN | | J | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Image: | | HOUSEHOLDS, ESPECIALLY WOMEN & VULNERABLE GROUPS, EXPERIENCE IMPROVED ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT & RESILIENCE FOR THE WELL-BEING OF THEIR CHILDREN | | | | |
| Income GenerationAccess to FinanceWEE/GEDSIESCA/Green GrowHHs have improved incomes and productivityHHs have improved access to financeWomen & other vulnerable groups experience improved Agency & Equitable SystemsHHs benefit from improved ecosystem | GOALS | Must Haves CWB: % HHs able to provide well for their children Poverty: HHs living below the national poverty line (PPI) Resilience: % HHs able to raise a large sum of money within 30 days | | | | |
| Bit Bit Shave improved incomes and productivity HHs have improved access to finance Women & other vulnerable groups experience improved Agency & Equitable Systems HHs benefit from improved ecosystem health Market actors invest and scale inclusive & green business models • HHs have improved scale scale inclusive & green business • HHs save for productive activities, emergencies and for the future • Women experience • HHs use improved Agency (decision making, manageable workloads well-being) • HHs use improved conservation) | | Income Generation | Access to Finance | WEE/GEDSI | ESCA/Green Growth | |
| Hardwerd decirib involution or and obtained inclusive & green business models HHs have improved skills and awareness on production, market + business Women experience HHs can access Equitable Systems Equitable Systems Equitable Systems Equitable Systems Induction involution of the obtained optimized o | COMES | HHs have improved incomes and productivity Market actors invest and scale | HHs have improved access to finance | Women & other vulnerable groups experience improved Agency & | HHs benefit from improved ecosystem health | |
| HHs have improved skills and awareness on production, market + business Women experience HHs save for productive activities, emergencies and for the future Women experience Women experience HHs use improved improved Agency (decision making, manageable workloads well-being) HHs use improved Natural Resource Management (NRI (environmental conservation) | OUTO | inclusive & green business models | | Equitable Systems | | |
| improved Economic Advancement & Access Market system actors change their behaviour to be more inclusive of poor women and men /[green] credit HHs have improved skills and awareness on financial literacy Women benefit from more Equitable Systems Women benefit from more Equitable Systems | CORE INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES | HHs have improved skills and awareness on production, market + business Women experience improved Economic Advancement & Access Market system actors change their behaviour to be more inclusive of poor women and men /[green] | HHs save for productive activities, emergencies and for the future HHs can access credit HHs have improved skills and awareness on financial literacy | Women experience improved Agency (decision making, manageable workloads well-being) Women benefit from more Equitable Systems | HHs use improved Natural Resource Management (NRM) (environmental conservation) or sustainable agriculture practices | |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The development of this Indicators Toolkit was led by Tamam Noor from World Vision Australia (WVA) with significant contributions from Vincent Potier from WVA as well as Canopy Lab expert Jessica Rust-Smith in refining indicator definitions. Gratitude is extended to WVA colleagues for their invaluable review support throughout this process. Special recognition goes to Ellie Wong for her leadership in overseeing both the Indicators Toolkit and the Core Project Model Handbook.

The toolkit draws on a variety of resources, including World Vision Australia's Evidence Building Framework (EBF), World Vision International's "Our Impact, Our Story" (OIOS) framework, and Women's Economic Empowerment (WEE) Indicator Guidance and Tools. In relation to these core resources, it is important to also acknowledge Sumera Jabeen contributions on the Evidence Building Framework (EBF), Innocent Takaedza, Hausner Wendo, for the inputs on OIOS and Sumera Jabeen and Samira Saif on WEE.

The contributions of the WVA Economic Empowerment, Impact Evidence Building and WVI Global Livelihoods teams were instrumental in shaping this resource. We would like to acknowledge Rivika Bisht, Diana Johannis, Teddy Mekonnen Demeke, Concetta Scarfiello, Luse Kinivuwai for their key contributions, as well as Saba Mebrahtu Habte and Nami Kurimoto. We would also like to thank Canopy Lab experts Holly Krueger and Clara Garcia Perrera for their additional review.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

There are several key guiding principles when using this manual, which are outlined below.

Use Mandatory and Good Practice Indicators: Indicators in this toolkit are categorized as either mandatory or good practice, with specific tools provided where relevant.

- Mandatory indicators are required for standardized portfolio-level monitoring and evaluation of the model and related technical approaches. Their definitions, calculation methods, and tools must be applied exactly as outlined in this guidance. Mandatory indicators have been developed based on sector good practice and piloting in World Vision projects.
- Good practice indicators are not mandatory, but provide teams with recommended indicator options to
 consider given their project design and context. The definitions, calculation methods, and tools are provided
 as a guidance, and these can be adapted given the impact priorities and context. Project teams may have
 differing articulation of indicators, which is aligned to donor guidance and project requirements.

Prioritise indicator selection: Given the available resources, and to respect the time of the communities and households, it is important to prioritise indicator selection for your project. Key factors that teams might consider are: alignment to the project theory of change and impact priorities; and resource intensiveness.

Indicator selection should support monitoring and evaluation of the pathways of change in the theory of change. If there are not indicators available in this toolkit, then project teams might to choose to add other indicators. For example, in the green growth space, many indicators listed in the toolkit are on agri-food systems and agro-forestry, there are increasing projects in fast moving areas like the circular economy and energy, which might require teams to explore other indicators.

Individual indicator tools will provide teams with key insights as to resource intensiveness. It is also important to understand how often indicators need to be tracked (frequency) and how the data will be collected (modes of verification). Appendix 1: Summary of Indicators with Means of Verification & Frequency. For example, some indicators, such as key indicators measuring women's decision making or social norms, might seem too complex or time-consuming to track at first. However, many indicators like these are only tracked at baseline, midline and endline.

GEDSI Disaggregation of data:

Indicators listed in this handbook are either have household or individual as the unit. GEDSI desegregation of data is outlined below. As noted the M&E section of the M4C manual, it will be important to look at intersectionality and sub-groups, e.g. women with a disability as part of the M&E approach.

| Disaggregation Subject | Household Units | Individual Units |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Gender Disaggregation | To ensure gender disaggregation of HHs, WVA-supported livelihoods projects are required to disaggregate between woman-headed and man-headed HHs. This will help understand and respond to the differentiated challenges faced by these HH types. Projects should consider the country context for the definition. Further disaggregation can be done using USAID categorisation of HH types ie, 1) female and male adults; 2) adult female, no adult male; 3) adult male, no adult female; and 4) child, no adult ¹ . | Gender disaggregation should distinguish between men and women participants. |
| Disability Disaggregation | For disability disaggregation, projects should ensure all indicators distinguish between households with and without persons with disabilities to better address their unique needs and barriers. | Disability disaggregation should separate individuals with and without disabilities. This could be further disaggregate by disability type depending on the project disability focus. ² |

¹ WEE Indicator Guidance and Tools online version.pdf (pg. 7)

2 Depending on project priorities, the recommendation is to ideally administer WGQs at baseline, mid-term and/or endline. Useful resources could be: <u>Home - The Washington Group on Disability Statistics</u> Includes all question sets and instructions. Humanity and Inclusion, <u>Disability Statistics in Humanitarian Action</u> <u>Humanity & Inclusion UK</u>

| Children and [Placeholder monitoring of households with children] youth segregation | For projects that include youth as a target group, it is important to disaggregate data by the age of participants. ³ For youth disaggregation, context-specific considerations should guide the definitions and categories used for all individual-level disaggregation. |
|---|--|
|---|--|

Varieties of Indicators:

- **Numeric indicators:** Indicators that produce a number (through qualitative and quantitative methods) as the final value are categorised as Numeric indicators (i.e. the final value is a number). Examples include percentage, USD value, quantity/amount, and count.
- Qualitative indicators: The descriptive indicators included in this toolkit do not yield a nurmeric value, but produce descriptive findings (e.g. words, phrases, opinions etc.) are categorised at Qualitative Indicators⁴
 ⁵. Examples include "reasons of behaviour change by market actors to ensure do no harm to women". For the purposes of this toolkit, these indicators are labelled as Qualitative. The purpose of these indicators is to capture complex data that cannot be sufficiently quantified such as natures and reasons of change.

^{3 [}Further guidance can be found in MEL Stage: Key considerations of AR T1_ Youth approach for Livelihoods provided as an Annex to the M4C Handbook he definition of Qualitative Indicators have been adopted from: https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNAEB361.pdf (pg 3)]

⁴ Further guidance can be found in MEL Stage: Key considerations of AR T1_ Youth approach for Livelihoods provided as an Annex to the M4C Handbook he definition of Qualitative Indicators have been adopted from: https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNAEB361.pdf (pg 3)

⁵ DCED Standard, Control Point 2.2 on Qualitative Information: <u>https://www.enterprise-development.org/wp-content/uploads/2_Implementation_Guidelines_Defining_Indicators.pdf</u>

ACRONYMS

| M4C | Inclusive Markets for Communities Core Project Model | МА | Market Actor |
|-------|---|--------|--|
| ANCP | Australian NGO Cooperation Program (ANCP) | MDF | Market Development Facility |
| CE | Circular Economy | MFI | Microfinance Institutions |
| СРМ | Core Project Model | MPI | Multidimensional Poverty Index |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee | MSD | Market Systems Development |
| DCED | The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development | MSME | Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises |
| DK | Don't Know (as a potential response from respondents) | NGO | Non-Governmental Organizations |
| DM | Decision Making | NRM | Natural Resources Management |
| DRR | Disaster Risk Reduction | NSVC | ANCP Nutrition Sensitive Value Chains for Smallholder Farmers project in Bangladesh |
| EBF | World Vision Australia's Evidence Building Framework | OECD | The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development |
| EE | World Vision Australia's Economic Empower- ment unit | OIOS | Our Impact, Our Story framework of indicators |
| ESCA | Environmental Sustainability and Climate Action | PPI | Poverty Probability Index |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations | PTE | Part Time Employee |
| FGD | Focus Group Discussion | PWD | Persons with disability |
| FMNR | Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration | S4T | Savings for Transformation |
| FSP | Financial Service Providers | SDG | Sustainable Development Goals |
| FTE | Full Time Employee | SG | Savings Group |
| GBV | Gender Based Violence | SGB | Small and Growing Businesses |
| GDP | Gross Domestic Production | UN | United Nations |
| GEDSI | Gender Equality, Disability and Social Inclusion | UNICEF | The United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund |
| GG | Green Growth | UPG | Ultra Poor Graduation approach |
| GHG | Greenhouse Gas | USAID | The United States Agency for International Development |
| GIFT | Gender Inclusive Financial-literacy Training | USD | United States Dollar |
| GNI | Gross National Income | VC | Value Chains |

ACRONYMS

| нн | Households | VF | Vision Fund |
|-----|---|------|--|
| IGA | Income Generating Activities | VSLA | Village Savings and Loans Associations |
| ILO | International Labor Organization | WASH | Water, sanitation and hygiene |
| ІТТ | Indicators Tracking Table | WEE | Women's Economic Empowerment |
| KII | Key Informant Interview | WV | World Vision |
| KRQ | Key Research Question | WVA | World Vision Australia |
| M4C | Inclusive Markets for Communities core project model | WVI | World Vision International |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Guiding principles | 03 |
|--|----|
| List of Acronyms Used in the Indicators Toolkit | 05 |
| Detailed Indicators Guidance | 10 |
| Goal Indicators | 10 |
| M4C.G1. % households able to provide well for their children | 10 |
| M4C.G2. % households living below the national poverty line (PPI) | 10 |
| M4C.G3. % HHs able to raise a large sum of money within 30 days | 12 |
| M4C.G4. % households reporting good social cohesion | 13 |
| M4C.G5. Total number of children reached by World Vision (WV) Programming | 13 |
| Income Generation (Market Actor) Outcome Indicators | 14 |
| M4C.MA.O1. Amount (in US\$) of private sector investment generated | 14 |
| M4C.MA.O2. Increase in public sector investment as a result of the intervention (Qualitative) | 19 |
| M4C.MA.O3. Proportion of partners reporting an increase in their profit as a result of intervention | 19 |
| M4C.MA.O4. Average business profit in the last 12 months | 21 |
| M4C.MA.O5. Estimated variation in revenue / supply generated by market actors from green business model products and services attributable to programme support | 22 |
| Income Generation (Market Actor) Intermediate Outcome Indicators | 24 |
| M4C.MA.IO1 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting, and then adapting, pro-poor business models promoted by the programme (qualitative) | 24 |
| M4C.MA.IO2 Investments (in US\$) in innovation | 25 |
| M4C.MA.IO3 Investment (in US\$) towards suppliers and customers from the target beneficiaries in their capacity building | 27 |
| M4C.MA.IO4 Number of Joint initiatives implemented | 28 |
| M4C.MA.IO5 Mean diversity of channels score | 28 |
| M4C.MA.W.IO6 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting new business models (promoted by the programme) that ensure do-no harm to women and other vulnerable groups and promote women's access to services/products. (qualitative) | 29 |
| M4C.MA.W.IO7 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting and adapting new business models (promoted by the programme) that promote women's access to services/products, their agency, and equitable systems. (qualitative) | 30 |
| M4C.MA.G.IO8 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting new business models (promoted by the programme) that promote do-no harm to the environment. (qualitative) | 31 |
| M4C.MA.G.IO9 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting and adapting new, environmentally sustainable business models (promoted by the programme) that a) reduce environmental and climate risks (climate adaptation), b) reduce the negative impact of the value chain (mitigation) and c) promote green opportunity (restoration) (qualitative) | 32 |
| Income Generation (Households) Outcome Indicators | 33 |
| M4C.IG.O1 Proportion of households that increased their income as a result of participation in World Vision (WV) facilitated economic development programs | 33 |
| M4C.IG.O2 Average business profit in the last 12 months for the HHs [M4C.MA.O4 calculated for Households] | 33 |

| | M4C.IG.O3 Average yield of target crops | 33 |
|------|---|----|
| | M4C.IG.O4 Number of green jobs supported | 35 |
| | M4C.IG.05 Proportion of women and men having their own regular income | 36 |
| Inco | ome Generation (Households) Intermediate Outcome Indicators | 37 |
| | M4C.IG.IO1 Proportion of women and men adopting recommended business management practices (e.g. engaging in farming as a business) | 37 |
| | M4C.IG.IO2 Proportion of households using technologies that improve productivity and save time in tasks that women traditionally perform | 37 |
| | M4C.IG.IO3 Average # of hours saved due to new technologies/labour- saving devices or strategies | 39 |
| | M4C.IG.IO4 Total cumulative number of women and men with increased access to opportunities | 40 |
| | M4C.IG.IO5 Total cumulative number of women and men with increased access to resources and services | 40 |
| Aco | cess to Finance Outcome Indicators | 41 |
| | M4C.AF.O1 % households that used improved financial services in the past 12 months | 41 |
| Acc | cess to Finance Intermediate Outcome Indicators | 42 |
| | M4C.AF.IO1 % HHs with the means to save money | 42 |
| | M4C.AF.IO2 % target households using loans and/or savings or share-out to invest into productive assets/ inputs/ services | 42 |
| | M4C.AF.IO3 Proportion of women and men with individual and household savings | 43 |
| | M4C.AF.IO4 Average value of member savings per group member | 44 |
| | M4C.AF.IO5 Proportion of households reporting to have access to sufficient sources of credit providers (formal sources) | 45 |
| | M4C.AF.IO6 % households with access to sufficient credit (formal and informal sources) | 45 |
| | M4C.AF.IO7 % of respondents feeling confident in their financial literacy | 46 |
| | M4C.AF.IO8 Nature and reasons for change in terms of supportive attitudes and recognition by household member community and business owners/service providers in the targeted value chain (qualitative) | 47 |
| GED | OSI & WEE Outcome Indicators | 47 |
| | M4C.W.O1 Proportion households with women actively engaged in decision making | 47 |
| | M4C.W.O2 Average # of hours per day spent on leisure and rest/sleep by women and men | 47 |
| | M4C.W.O3 Proportion of community members (adolescents and adults) who support gender equitable attitudes | 48 |
| | M4C.W.O4: % women and men with supportive attitudes towards women's economic participation | 48 |
| | M4C.W.O5 Proportion of households with more equitable decision making in productive sphere | 50 |
| | M4C.W.O6 Proportion of households with more equitable decision making in domestic sphere | 53 |
| | M4C.W.O7 % project-supported groups that are led by a woman | 55 |
| | M4C.W.O8 Proportion of leadership roles in mixed gender project-supported groups held by women | 56 |
| GED | OSI & WEE Intermediate Outcome Indicators | 57 |
| | M4C.W.IOX Nature and reasons for change in terms of supportive attitudes and recognition by household member community and business owners/service providers in the targeted value chain (qualitative) | 57 |
| | M4C.W.IO1 Proportion of women and men confident to take up a leadership role | 57 |

| | M4C.W.IO2 Proportion of women and men involved in rewarding / influential roles in the target value | 57 |
|-----|--|----|
| | M4C.W.IO3 Women's and men's average perceptions (score) of women's contributions to household | 58 |
| | M4C.W.IOX Nature and reasons for change in terms of supportive attitudes and recognition by household member community and business owners/service providers in the targeted value chain | 59 |
| | M4C.W.IO4 Average number of hours spent on paid and unpaid work by women and men | 60 |
| | M4C.W.IO5 Women and men's average perception (score) of men's contribution towards household chores | 61 |
| | PWD.IO1 % respondents reporting they feel comfortable working with someone with disability | 62 |
| | PWD.IO2 % PWD reporting they are able to make their own decisions about what is important to them | 63 |
| | M4C.W.IO6 % of HH using childcare service / childcare related initiatives that are i) accessible, ii) | 64 |
| | M4C.W.IOX WEE 4.5 Nature and reasons for change in terms of supportive attitudes and recognition by household member community and business owners/service providers in the targeted value chain | 66 |
| ES | CA & Green Growth Outcome Indicators | 67 |
| | M4C.GG.O1 Proportion of households with alternative and diversified sources of income | 67 |
| | M4C.GG.O2 Regreening Index score * For projects implementing the Regreening Communities project model. Mandatory for ESCA (Green Growth) targeted projects | 67 |
| | M4C.GG.O3 Number of hectares protected and/or under restoration | 69 |
| | M4C.GG.O4 Proportion of households with sustained or increased agricultural production due to | 69 |
| | M4C.GG.O5 Proportion of HHs with increased income from circular economy activities in waste management | 69 |
| | M4C.GG.O6 Number of HHs involved in organic waste reuse or value addition for energy production | 70 |
| | M4C.GG.O7 Quantity, or % of collected waste that is sustainably valorised (adoption, system level) | 70 |
| ES | CA & Green Growth Intermediate Outcome Indicators | 72 |
| | M4C.GG.IO1 Proportion of households adopting improved agricultural practices | 72 |
| | M4C.GG.IO2 Proportion of households using improved NRM or sustainable agricultural practices | 74 |
| | M4C.GG.IO3: Average value of target product sold in the last 12 months | 75 |
| | M4C.GG.IO4 % of producers feeling more confident in the capacity of their farming system to cope with climate change and natural disasters since programme start | 76 |
| | M4C.GG.IO5 % respondents who observe an increase in soil fertility | 77 |
| | M4C.GG.IO6 % HH who observe that soil erosion has reduced | 79 |
| | M4C.GG.IO7 Proportion of households who faced a disaster but were able to recover and now live at the level they did before | 80 |
| | M4C.GG.IO8 % of HHs adopting circular economy practices (adoption, household level) | 80 |
| | M4C.GG.IO9: % of HHs adopting appropriate solid waste management practices | 82 |
| | M4C.GG.IO10 % of HHs that sort waste regularly (adoption, household level) | 84 |
| | M4C.GG.IO11: Proportion of households who know the early warning signs and know what to do in case of an emergency or disaster | 85 |
| | M4C.GG.IO12 Number of communities with functional committees to assess, prevent, mitigate and prepare for the risks of hazards | 86 |
| Арр | endix: Summary of Indicators with Means of Verification | 87 |
| | | |

Detailed Indicators Guidance

Goal Indicators

M4C.G1. % households able to provide well for their children

[EBF EE G1, OIOS L2 ##]

Definition

Percent of parents or caregivers who are able to provide all the children in the household, aged 5- 18 years, with at least three important items, through their own means (assets, production, income), without external assistance from outside the family, NGO or government. This indicator gives some insight about whether or not parents or caregivers can provide the important items for children without outside support. This distinction is important because it measures the sustainability of the parents or caregiver support if the external assistance was not there. It also gives insight into how well parents or caregivers can provide the things that contribute to child well-being that extend beyond food, water, shelter, education and medical care. These aspects of wellbeing are measured with other indicators. Without external assistance means through own means (like own income, production or exchange). This indicator is a proxy for poverty and vulnerability. If parents or caregivers are unable to provide important basic items for each child, that child is considered vulnerable. It is a means of measuring whether economic gains at the household level actually translate into provision for children, for their wellbeing.

How to measure

At baseline and endline, ask survey respondents the following four questions:

| EBN01. | In the past year, were you able to provide two sets of clothes for all the children (5-18 years) living in your household, without assistance from family, the government or NGO? Yes = 1 No = 0 DK = 88 |
|--------|--|
| EBN02. | In the past year, were you able to provide a pair of shoes for all the children (5-18 years) living in your household, without assistance from family, the government or NGO? Yes = 1 No = 0 DK = 88 |
| EBN03. | In the past year, were you able to provide a blanket/mat for sleeping on for all the children (5-18 years) living in your household, without assistance from family, the government or NGO? Yes = 1 No = 0 DK = 88 |
| EBN04 | In past year, were you able to provide all the children in your household (5-18 years) protection from mosquitoes while they sleep – such as mosquito bed nets, repellent coils, screens etc.? [Optional] Yes = 1 No = 0 DK = 88 |

If the respondent is having difficulty, or responds too quickly, probe: For the children, 6-11 years? For the older children, 12-18 years? Also Check: does this include any orphans or children with a disability in the household?

To calculate the indicator value:

- Numerator: # of respondents able to provide item 1+2+3 and/or 4 for all children aged 5-18 years with no assistance (EBN01, EBN02 and EBN03 and/or EBN04 = 1(Yes))
- Denominator: Total # of households surveyed with children aged 5-18 years

Divide the numerator with the denominator and multiply that with 100 to get the indicator value. Disaggregate by HH head type i.e. male vs female headed households.

References / Notes for Enumerators

The three basic items are suggested by UNICEF, but WVI have added a fourth item and changed the calculation to accommodate contextual variations.

M4C.G2. % households living below the national poverty line (PPI)

[EBF EE G16, Compendium C4B:25047, OIOS L2 ##]

Definition

Percent of households (or for SGB Finance, client employees) who live on less than the national poverty level (in US\$) per day measured using Poverty Probability Index (PPI), disaggregated by sex of head of household where relevant.

The PPI is a country-specific poverty measurement tool available for approximately 60 countries, about 40 of which WV works in. Check <u>https://www.povertyindex.org/about-ppi</u> to see if there is a tool available for your country. The PPI measures the poverty levels of groups and individuals and tracks changes in poverty levels over time. It is compiled of 10 easy-to-collect, country-specific, non-financial indicators. The PPI is derived from representative national household income and expenditure surveys.

The PPI can:

- Estimate the likelihood that an individual household has per capita expenditure below a given poverty line
- Estimate a group poverty rate at a point in time.
- Estimate the change in the poverty rate for a group of households
- Help managers target individuals for programming

Country-specific PPIs can be downloaded from https://www.povertyindex.org/get-started-ppi at no cost. First, sign in or create an account. Next, visit the PPI by Country page to download the PPI for your country. Each country page contains several documents available for download (log-in required), including a design memo with a detailed technical description of the PPI design and construction. Each country also has a scorecard (either within the design memo or as a separate document) listing the country-specific set of PPI indicators and corresponding lookup tables used to generate poverty likelihoods and rates. The PPI provides instructional and online resources for users. Our Learning Materials explain how to properly undergo the stages of the PPI implementation cycle, including how to abide by the Standards of Use. The PPI can be used to determine the proportion of households living below the international and national poverty line.

How to measure

10 questions are asked to each household in a survey – but the questions are country-specific and cannot be altered, and PPI is not available for all countries. If PPI is not available for your country, rely on just MPI. DO NOT TRY TO DEVELOP or ADAPT a PPI TOOL USING ONE FROM ANOTHER COUNTRY.

The PPI can be administered within a household survey (or as part of a monitoring tool where PPI is used for monitoring). All 10 indicators from the tool for your country must be included AND must be measured the same way to collect the same information as on the standard scorecard.

PPI Sample Size Calculator: Use alongside the standard LEAP 3 sample size calculator to help determine the sample size needed specifically for the PPI measurement.

Use the PPI Interview Guide / Interpretation of Indicators: Guidance for each question when designing or training on the PPI questions.

Calculation Steps

- 1. Compute Total Score for each Household using scores assigned for responses on Scoresheet.
- 2. Calculate estimated # of households below poverty level for each Poverty Likelihood (# clients at poverty likelihood level * Poverty Likelihood)
- 3. Calculate Average Likelihood (Total estimated # households below poverty level / Total # households sampled).

In order to track changes in poverty levels over time, organizations must administer the PPI to either the same group of households or two equally representative samples of households at regular intervals. If an individual household's poverty likelihood changes, the organization can infer that the household's economic standing has changed. For example, say an organization in Bolivia administers the PPI today to a particular household and determines that it has a 70% likelihood of living below the country's National Poverty Line. Assume that the organization administers the PPI again to the same household a year later, and determines that the household of living below the same poverty line. The organization can then infer that the household's poverty level has reduced over this period. Similarly, it can assess changes in poverty rates of a group of client households as well. Please keep in mind that PPI data on its own does not help in determining causality. Any measured reduction in poverty levels using the PPI cannot automatically be inferred to be a result of services offered by the organization. The PPI can be used in an impact evaluation, such as a randomized control trial, and is helping lead the way for innovative "lean data" techniques. https://www.povertyindex.org/get-started-ppi/track.

To calculate the indicator value:

- Numerator = Total estimated # household below national poverty level.
- Denominator = Total # households sampled.

Divide the numerator with the denominator and multiply that with 100, to get the indicator value. Disaggregated by sex of head of household

M4C.G3. % HHs able to raise a large sum of money within 30 days

[EBF EE G4, OIOS L2 ##]

Definition

% beneficiary households reporting, if needed, they could raise a large sum equivalent to 1/20 of Gross National Income (GNI)⁶ per capita in local currency within 30 days.

GNI is the total amount of money earned by a nation's people and businesses. It is used to measure and track a nation's wealth from year to year. The number includes the nation's gross domestic product plus the income it receives from overseas sources. GNI is an alternative to gross domestic product (GDP) as a means of measuring and tracking a nation's wealth and is considered a more accurate indicator for some nations (Investopedia, 2020).

The idea of using 1/20 of GNI per capita is to specify a benchmark large sum in the local context. This indicator is part of household financial resilience measurement and is adopted from The Global Findex database (World Bank / Demirgüç-Kunt, 2017).

Notes for Evaluators and Enumerators

Make sure, the GNI per capita amount/figure is calculated and converted to local currency prior to enumerators' training. Decide beforehand if the follow-up question will be asked or not.

How to measure

Calculate the amount in local currency (and USD) equivalent to 1/20 GNI per capita in the country where the project is being implemented. Local currency GNI per capita figures for a particular country can be obtained from the World Bank here: The amount can be adjusted to an appropriate round figure.

Ask a direct question in the household/caregivers survey about the household's ability to raise the amount, equivalent to 1/20 of GNI within the next 30 days.

Q1- Suppose you have an emergency and you need to pay amount (1/20 of GNI per capita in local currency, as a round figure). Is it possible or not possible that you could come up with [amount] within the next 30 days?

0=NO 1=YES

A household is deemed able to raise a large sum within 30 days if they respond 1=Possible to the above question. For the purposes of calculating this indicator, it is irrelevant how the household would be able to raise the funds. However, it is strongly recommended that a follow-up question be asked to determine the source of the funds: savings, family or friends, borrowing from formal or informal establishments, selling assets, etc. an example question could be:

Q2- What would be the MAIN source of money that you would use to come up with [1/20 of GNI per capita in local currency] within the NEXT MONTH? Don't read the options. Let the respondent tell the source and mark the option mentioned

- a. Using Savings =1
- b. Borrowing money from family, relatives, or friends =2
- c. Use money from working/business =3
- d. Use other household income=4
- e. Borrowing money from an MFI or Bank =5
- f. Borrowing money from employer=6
- g. Borrowing money from a private lender=7
- h. Selling Business (productive assets)=8
- i. Selling household non-productive assets (including gold and jewellery) =9

6 World Bank data: <u>https://www.oecd.org/en/data/indicators/gross-national-income.html</u>

- j. Selling product, stocks, or services at much lower unit price than usual (large discounts) =10
- k. Some other source =11 (please specify)
- I. Don't Know=88

Refused to respond=99

To calculate the % households:

- Numerator: # household responding YES to Q1
- Denominator: Total # of HH survey respondents

Divide the numerator by the denominator and multiple with 100 to get the indicator value. Disaggregate by household head type to see if there is a difference between male/female- headed households. Disaggregate by the source for money in Q2 to see if the source indicates financial resilience (e.g. using savings or other household income) or negative coping strategies (e.g. selling an asset or selling product on a lower price) are being used.

References

Both questions have been adapted from: <u>https://globalfindex.worldbank.org/sites/globalfindex/files/</u> databank/2017%20Findex%20questionnaire.pdf

M4C.G4. % households reporting good social cohesion

[EBF EE G5, OIOS L2 ##]

Definition

% of respondents who score agree or strongly agree' on 2 or more of the three Social Cohesion questions of the Adapted Community Capacity questionnaire.

This measures the extent to which community members feel their community cares for each for other, trusts each other and take care of the most vulnerable.

How to measure

The three Social Cohesion questions in the Adapted Community Capacity questionnaire can be included in a Household Survey. The respondent is asked to rate their perception on a four-point scale from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree to the following three questions:

| | Social Cohesion Statements | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|---|-------------------|-------|----------|----------------------|
| 1 | People in this community readily help each other in times of need. | | | | |
| 2 | People in this community tend to trust one another | | | | |
| 3 | People in the community actively take care of those that are poor, weak or marginalized | | | | |

To calculate the indicator value:

- Numerator: Number of respondents who has answered 'agree' or 'strongly agree' to two or more statements.
- Denominator: Total number of respondents

Divide the numerator with the denominator and multiply with 100 to get the indicator value. Disaggregate by sex of the respondent to see if there is a difference between the perceptions of men and women.

M4C.G5. Total number of children reached by World Vision (WV) Programming

[OIOS 1]

Definition

This is a meta indicator. It does not appear in LogFrame but are calculated based on contributing indicators to be defined by OIOS L2 by end of January 2025.

Income Generation (Market Actor) Outcome Indicators

M4C.MA.O1. Amount (in US\$) of private sector investment generated

[Adopted from EBF EE indicator O.EE.28]

Definition

This indicator refers to the investment into an iMSD enterprise by the private sector partner or by Vision Fund/ other banks to project supported businesses. The indicator value will be reported in USD. This investment will include: A) direct cash support to partnership activities or improvement of product or services, and B) indirect support e.g. in-kind support or time spent to train staff. This investment will include the investment by the partners themselves and/or investment leveraged by partners from private funding sources (adapted from MDF/ Cardno,2014 P20). Such investment could be a sign of commitment to change and a proxy to sustainability. The investment can be made directly in partnership activities or in further improvements to products or services even after the partnership is completed. The investment can be made directly by partners or additional investment leveraged by partners from other sources.

The figure reported therefore should capture the amount of expenditure made by the partners (public or private) within and outside of the investment commitment made as per the activity with WV. If program resources permit then WV can also capture data of non-partners- (a) those that have crowded in motivated by WV partners and (b) micro-enterprises or target groups (farmers) who have made additional investment, e.g. in improved practices as a result of WV training or support.

<u>Notes for enumerators / evaluator</u>: MDF considers this an output indicator; however, given the scale and influence of WV projects, WVA EE team will use this as an outcome level indicator. With the help of the project team, prepare a list of private sector partners engaged and the key persons to be contacted before starting data collection.

This indicator is measured every year through KII with private sector partners (formal, semi formal and informal) as part of the regular monitoring activities.

How to measure

This includes the amount (cash and in kind) the private sector partners investing to WV projects. A project can have multiple private sector investors and each partner will/can be asked:

- Q1. Cash: How much have you invested in the past 12 months to the businesses supported by World Vision's inclusive market systems development program/project at--- -- xyz (location). Amount in local currency------ and US\$(Probe, if it involves all types of investments including direct investment, training, capacity building, promotion, packaging, giving away sample, pricing etc.)
- **Q2.** In-kind: How much in-kind investment (staff time etc.) was done in the past 12 months? [For example: if a staff from a market actor partner spends 20% of their time, the equivalent salary can be considered as the investment]

Thematic Disaggregation:

(The project can choose which ones to report)

| Type of investment | US\$ Value |
|---|------------|
| Overall investment | |
| Investment towards Access to Finance [1] | |
| Investment towards GEDSI & WEE [2]* Economic Advancement – Support for women to increase income and/or access new jobs Access – Support for women to access opportunities, resources and services. Agency – Contributed to improving the ability for women to make equitable decisions in the production sphere, domestic and in leadership roles and/or manageable workloads | |
| Investment towards ESCA & Green Growth [3] | |

*Note: For investment towards GEDSI & WEE [2], the information provided here has a gender equality focus, which is reflected in the WEE domains listed below. For projects that have a GEDSI focus on other vulnerable groups, that is, where specific target groups are identified, such as youth, persons with disability, elders, ethnic minorities, etc, this section of the indicator should be adapted accordingly. In those cases, it is recommended using the WEE domains to measure disability and social inclusion.

[1] For the investment to be considered a contributor to Access to Finance, respondents must provide evidence that the investment targets more participants accessing and using formal or informal financial services. A few examples of activities are provided in the table below:

| Access to Financ | e |
|---|---|
| The iMSD approa inclusive business hensive list of fina | ch in the financial services sector involves collaborating with financial service providers (FSPs) to develop s models that better serve marginal poor households with more tailored financial products. For a compre- ancial service providers see Figure 14: Financial Services Spectrum in the M4C Handbook. |
| Service | Examples of activities: |
| New products and Services | Developing financial products for men and women such as microloans, seasonal loans, sector specific loans (e.g. climate), savings or insurance product, digital financial services such as mobile based banking apps and electronic wallets. Piloting and scaling financial products like climate-based crop insurance, gender-based loan products, invoice financing for small business or group lending models for informal sectors. |
| Financial litera- cy training | Develop and deliver tailored financial literacy training (e.g. GIFT) to improve project participants' understanding of planning and managing family finances, including gender inclusive dynamics. Develop and deliver financial literacy training to improve the understanding and use of financial products and services options including digital finance. Collaborate with institutions to deliver financial education products. Conduct workshops on various business training such as business planning, budgeting, profit-loss calculation and/or forecasting income. |

Note: These examples provided in the table above are not exhaustive and should be treated as a guidance. There could be other activities where private sector market actors may invest in to ensure access and usage of financial services that the project team might want to capture.

[2] For the investment to be considered a contributor to WEE, the market actor must provide evidence that the investment is targeting one or more of the areas below, depending on:

Gender inclusive business model

The intentional inclusion of women, a demographic group that is often excluded or under-represented, in various aspects of business and economic activity as producers, consumers and employees. These business models engage women and men living in poverty as producers, employees and consumers.

Examples of activities: Economic Advancement and Access

- Product (goods and services) designed to engage women as suppliers or customers (e.g. agricultural equipment that improves productivity and save time)
- Training and support for women's intermediary service providers to improve their sales and customer base
- New distribution channels to reach women farmers (e.g. women producer groups and/ or mixed groups)

Examples of activities: Agency and Equitable Systems

- Childcare that is i) accessible, ii) affordable, and iii) of adequate quality
- Childcare options (e.g. a factory opening childcare corner to attract women employees or providing vouchers for childcare to their employees)
- Training of company/business/organisational leadership on inclusive decision making, equitable leadership and/or work-life balance
- Improved provisions for parental leave
- Improved provisions and/or initiatives for women's security and safety such as (e.g. improved lighting, establishment/ improvements of referral systems, leave for victims of violence against women , etc)
- Initiatives and/or provisions for breastfeeding room
- Initiatives and/or provisions for sanitary pads
- Provision of sexual and reproductive health services (e.g. mobile clinic)

[2b] For the investment to be considered a contributor of Disability Inclusion, the market actor must provide

evidence that the investment is targeting one of the areas:

- Include People with Disabilities (PWD) as Employees
- Include People with Disabilities (PWD) as Customers

Here below are examples of types of activities that qualify for the disability inclusion marker:

Examples of Activities to Include People with Disabilities (PWD) as Employees

- Invest in infrastructure modifications, such as ramps, elevators, accessible restrooms, and assistive technology, to create an inclusive work environment.
- Develop specialized recruitment drives and training programs aimed at upskilling PWD for various roles (could include partnerships with disability organizations to identify talent and provide on-the-job support).

Examples of Include People with Disabilities (PWD) as Customers

- Design and offer products or services tailored to the needs of PWD, such as accessible banking apps, assistive devices, or inclusive packaging
- Customer service training for staff to enhance their understanding of and ability to effectively serve people with disabilities (PWD), ensuring customer service processes are inclusive, accessible, and respectful of their needs

These examples provided in the table above are not exhaustive and should be treated as a guidance. There could be other activities where private sector market actors may invest in to ensure inclusion of people with disability that the project team might want to capture.

[3] For the investment to be considered a contributor of Green Growth, the respondents must provide evidence that the investment is targeting one or several of the four Rio conventions markers themes (the 4 'Rio markers'), i.e.

- Biodiversity;
- Desertification;
- Climate change mitigation (i.e. reduction in or capture of greenhouse gas emissions);
- Climate change adaptation (including climate risk mitigation and vulnerability reduction).

Here below are examples of types of activities that qualify for each marker:

| Marker | Definition | Types of eligible activities | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Biodiversity | Promotes at least one of the three objectives of the Convention on Biological Diversity: (1) the conservation of biodiversity, (2) sustainable use of its components (ecosystems, species or genetic resources), or (3) fair and equitable sharing of the benefits of the utilisation of genetic resources'. | 'protection or enhancement of ecosystems, species or genetic resources through in-situ or ex-situ conservation or remediation of existing environmental damage; integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services concerns within recipient countries' development objectives and economic decision making (); (support for) developing countries' efforts to meet their obligations under the Convention. | | | |
| Examples of activities | Support for the management of prote Protection of endangered or vulnerab Protection and sustainable management mangroves, wetlands, mountain ecos Sustainable farming practices aimed a Promotion of sustainable marine, coa Development of ecotourism as a way biodiversity and biodiversity-rich econ | port for the management of protected areas and surrounding 'buffer zones'; ecction of endangered or vulnerable species and their habitats; ecction and sustainable management of biodiversity-rich ecosystems such as forests, savannahs, ngroves, wetlands, mountain ecosystems, etc.; tainable farming practices aimed at protecting biodiversity in agricultural ecosystems; motion of sustainable marine, coastal and inland fishing; 'elopment of ecotourism as a way of promoting the protection and sustainable management of diversity and biodiversity-rich ecosystems | | | |
| Desertification | Aims at combating desertification or mitigating the effects of drought in arid, semi-arid and dry sub-humid areas through prevention and/or reduction of land degradation, rehabilitation of partly degraded land, or reclamation of desertified land'. | protection or enhancement of dryland ecosystems or remediation of existing environmental damage; integration of desertification concerns with recipient countries' development objectives (); (support for) developing countries' efforts to meet their obligations under the Convention on Combating Desertification. | | | |

| Examples of activities | Sustainable irrigation for crops and livestock with a view to reducing pressure on land threatened by desertification; Preparation of strategies and action programmes to combat desertification and mitigate the effects of drought; Development of drought early warning systems, strengthening of drought preparedness and management; Research, capacity building, training and awareness raising in relation to combating desertification and land degradation in dry or drought-prone areas. | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| Climate change mitigation | Contributes to the objective of stabilisation of greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system by promoting efforts to reduce or limit GHG emissions or to enhance GHG sequestration. mitigation of climate change by limiting anthropogenic emissions of GHGs, including gases regulated by the Montreal Protocol); protection and/or enhancement of GHG sinks and reservoirs (i.e. forest, soils, etc.); integration of climate change concerns with the recipient countries' development objectives institution building, capacity development, strengthening the regulatory and policy framework, or research; development of countries' efforts to meet their obligations under the (UN Framework) Convention on Climate Change. | | |
| Examples of activities | Development of renewable energy sources; Development or rehabilitation of energy infrastructure to promote fuel switching (e.g. from coal or oil to gas, which although being a fossil fuel emits less carbon per unit of energy generated); Enforcement of fuel efficiency standards; Implementation of waste-to-energy systems involving biogas production or methane recovery and the use of the resulting gas as a source of energy; Adoption of farming practices that reduce greenhouse gas emissions (e.g. through more rational use of fertilisers, manure management with biodigestors) or increase carbon sequestration in agricultural systems (e.g. agroforestry, agroecological techniques, sustainable rangeland management). | | |
| Climate change adaptation | Intends to reduce the vulnerability of human or natural systems to the current and expected impacts of climate change, including climate variability, by maintaining or increasing resilience, through increased ability to adapt to, or absorb, climate change stresses, shocks and variability and/or by helping reduce exposure to them. A '3-steps approach' is recommended as best practice, in particular to justify a 'main objective' score: Setting out the context of risks, vulnerabilities and impacts related to climate variability and climate change in which the intervention takes place; Stating the intent to address climate risks, vulnerabilities and impacts in the project documentation; Demonstrating a clear and direct link between the identified risks, vulnerabilities and impacts (as defined in the context description) and the specific project activities. | | |
| Examples of activities | Promotion of water efficiency, conservation and harvesting in areas subject to increased water stress as a result of climate change; Promotion of climate-resilient agricultural practices (e.g. use of heat-, drought- or salt-resistant crop varieties, adaptation of the agricultural calendar, development of supplementary irrigation in rainfed farming systems, adoption of farming techniques supporting water and soil conservation, etc.); Strengthening of food safety regulations, development of refrigeration and other food conservation systems in areas affected by higher temperatures; Development of insurance mechanisms to compensate farmers and other economic actors affected by climate variability and climate change impacts. | | |
| Examples of activities addressing multiple markers | Promotion and sales of: safely biodegradable mulching film for the agriculture sector, in lieu of conventional plastic-made sheeting that degrades in micro-plastics (sometimes misleadingly called 'mulching paper'), or products in a way that life-cycle impact is minimized (e.g. through reduced and safely biodegradable packaging, or return scheme, etc.) bio-fertilizers, which have a lower environmental footprint than chemical fertilizers. | | |

In line with the OECD-DAC's methodology, there are 3 possible scores for the investment to environment and Rio markers.

| Score | re Status of the considered theme % of investment value considered theme the theme | |
|-------|--|------|
| 0 | Not targeted | 0% |
| 1 | Significant objective | 40% |
| 2 | Principal (or main) objective | 100% |

In case it is not possible to qualify the investment as per the table above.

Please note: we may not get an accurate figure but we should aim for a reasonable estimate.

Only invested amounts should be tracked rather than announcements or disbursements. Counting investment announcements risks leading to an overestimation, as it is likely that not all investments will materialize. Disbursement data tend to be less readily available than data on commitments. The above information should be supplemented with minutes of meetings, statements or letters of parties that are investing, interview with the parties that have made investments as evidence of causal link between the intervention or investment and the private investments. In addition, the data provided by the private sector partners can be validated by the project manager. To calculate the indicator, sum the total investment by all investors and convert that to USD. Compare with the baseline.

Qualitative / Key Research Questions:

- What proportion of overall annual investment is towards WEE/GEDSI and Green Growth?
- In the proportion increasing or decreasing? Why?

References

Environment and Climate

- Short guide to the use of Rio markers | Capacity4dev (<u>https://capacity4dev.europa.eu/discussions/short-guide-use-rio-markers_en</u>)
- Indicative table for the Rio marker for biodiversity (<u>https://one.oecd.org/document/DCD/DAC/</u> <u>STAT%282018%2926/FINAL/en/pdf</u>)
- Handbook on the OECD-DAC Climate Markers (<u>https://capacity4dev.europa.eu/media/16829/</u> download/0cf22168-a671-48d3-a82c-ea140f4d1665_en)

Disability Inclusion

- Investing for Inclusion: Exploring a Disability Lens, 2024 https://www.ifc.org/content/dam/ifc/doc/2024/ifc-disability-lens-investing-guide-en.pdf
- The business case for disability inclusion in market systems development, 2020, The business case for disability inclusion in market systems development
- Disability inclusion framework & guidance, 2020, Disability inclusion framework & guidance
- Disability Inclusive Agriculture Guidance Note, 2024, <u>https://www.wvi.org/publications/manualtoolkit/growing-disability-inclusiveness-agriculture</u>

Gender Equality

- Providing sexual health services at work example: <u>https://www.ippf.org/blogs/bringing-sexual-and-reproductive-healthcare-garment-factory-workers-cambodia</u>
- Work place responses for sexual abuse and gender-based violence in the home: <u>https://www.ifc.org/en/</u> insights-reports/2019/fiji-domestic-and-sexual-violence-report
- Reducing sexual harassment and abuse at work: https://www.pngbcfw.org/resources/case-studies/
 workplace-responses-to-family-sexual-violence-in-png-measuring-the-business-case
- Childcare: <u>https://www.pngbcfw.org/resources/case-studies/tackling-childcare-in-papua-new-guinea</u>

M4C.MA.O2. Increase in public sector investment as a result of the intervention (Qualitative)

Note: Whenever practical and relevant this qualitative indicator can be disaggregated by thematic marker, as described in the definition given for the indicator M4C.01

Definition

This qualitative indicator measures the extent to which public sector investment has increased as a direct result of the intervention. It captures evidence of financial, in-kind, or policy contributions by public sector entities to sustain, scale, or enhance the intervention's outcomes. Examples include government support for monitoring and follow-up services, integration of beneficiaries into development schemes, or investment in infrastructure, capacity-building, or outreach services, particularly for marginalized groups such as women. Data is collected through interviews, case studies, and documentation review, focusing on confirmed actions rather than future commitments.

How to measure

The Sample questions are given below as examples:

- 1. Have the public sector partner contribute cash or in-kind into the interventions?
- 2. What does their contribution look like? (e.g. sponsoring dissemination event)
- 3. Was there any curriculum / policies
- 4. What investment did Agri-extension services do to increase outreach for women?

References

USAID (2020) Global Climate Change: Standard Indicator Summary Sheet pg. 1.

M4C.MA.O3. Proportion of partners reporting an increase in their profit as a result of intervention

[EBF EE IO.EE.2]

Definition

This indicator measures the % of Market Actor partners who report an increase in profit as a result of intervention. This is not an actual calculation of the profit but a self-report by the partners based on their knowledge of the business. This indicator focus on perception and knowledge and not the actual data because while working with larger partners (like a registered private company), they might not be willing to share their financial records. Also, with large partners, the exact attribution of profit to intervention might not be possible. In addition, this indicator can be calculated for SGB and iMSD businesses as well to: a) triangulate findings from M4C.MA.O4: Average business profit over last 12 months; b) assess changes in business profits where quality/ accurate financial records are not available; and c) at the midline evaluation where actual profits are not being calculated.

Notes for enumerators / evaluator

With the help of the project team, try finding the most appropriate person in the partner company/organization who would have knowledge of company/businesses' financial situation.

If the respondents say too quickly that they don't know, encourage them to go for their best guess. Tell them, you do not expect an accurate figure.

How to measure

A project team would need to decide at the start of the project if they would like to measure this indicator only for partners or both for the partners and businesses.

Part A- For Partners:

Ask the partner representative through a survey/interview:

Q1- How has your company/organization's profit changed since xxx time/partnership with the XXX project?

- 1. Increased
- 2. Decreased

- 3. Remained more or less the same
- 4. Don't know
- 5. Don't want to say/Declined

Q2- If increased, do you think, partnership with XXX project has contributed to this?

- 1. Yes, to a large extent
- 2. Yes, to some extent.
- 3. No
- 4. Not Sure
- 5. No response/Declined

Q3- If decreased, what could be the possible reasons (Do not read the response options to the respondents. Let them think and mark the response options/reasons. If they remain unable to come up with a reason, then probe using the response options below)

- 1. Poor broader economic environment
- 2. A disaster/emergency
- 3. Partnership with the XXX project
- 4. Changes in competitive environment (i.e. increased competition)
- 5. Changes in market demand
- 6. Investment into innovation (e.g. new product line, assets etc causing reduced profit)
- 7. Changes in policies or regulations
- 8. Others, please specify.....

Part B- For Intermediate Service Providers or entrepreneurs

Ask the businesses owners/ representatives in a survey:

- **Q1-** Can you please tell me how has your business profit changed, between the beginning and the end of the SGB loan cycle you have just completed/since your partnership with XXX project?
- 1. Increased
- 2. Decreased
- 3. Remained more or less the same
- 4. Don't know
- 5. Don't want to say/Declined

Q2-If increased, do you think, SGB loan/partnership with XXX project has contributed to this?

- 1. The loan helped to increase profit
- 2. The coaching helped to increase profit
- 3. Positive change in the economic context
- 4. Other reasons, please specify
- 5. Don't know / cannot answer

Q3- If decreased, in your opinion, for what reason(s) your business profit has decreased during your last SGB loan contract/ since your partnership with XXX project? (Do not read the response options to the respondents. Let them think and mark the mentioned response option/write the response. If they remain unable to come up with a reason, then probe using the response options below)

- 1. Poor broader economic environment/ Negative change in the economic context
- 2. The loan was not productive investment and got me in debt
- 3. The loan officer/business coach gave me wrong advice/ made me make wrong decisions
- 4. Others-Please specify-----
- 5. Don't know
- 6. Don't want to say/Declined

To calculate the indicator value:

- Numerator: Total number of Partners choosing option 1 for Q1 and option 1 or 2 to Q2/; Businesses choosing Option 1 for Q1 and option 1 or 2 or any project related reasons under option 4 for Q2
- Denominator: Total number of partners/Businesses surveyed

Calculate the number of respondents reporting decrease in profit, analyse the reasons (Q3) and communicate to the team to help them come-up with corrective measures. The ITT will have separate rows for %partners and businesses reporting increase in profit.

M4C.MA.O4. Average business profit in the last 12 months

[EBF EE O.EE.7]

Note: In case the project wants to report this indicator from Green Businesses, please ensure the business in fully (100%) working in green products (goods & services) as defined in M4C.O1.

Definition

This indicator measures the average business profit over past 12 months. Business profit refers to gross income (earned from the business/enterprise supported by the program, including MSMEs, Intermediate Service Providers, women entrepreneurs) less cash expenses and noncash expenses (such as capital consumption, payments to hired labour, utilities etc). It is a longer-term measure of the ability of the business to survive as a viable income-source.

Notes for Enumerators/Evaluators:

Here are a few screenshots of the VF system to give you an idea what to expect from the VF system.

How to measure

Participants will be asked about cash flow data relating to their business or income generating activity (of the past 12 months) that is targeted by the project. In the case of an iMSD project, a representative sample of participants (e.g. women entrepreneurs or intermediate service providers) will be surveyed at baseline and at endline (and midline if appropriate). In the case of a SGB project, a census of SGB clients will be conducted at the beginning and at the end of each SGB loan cycle. The data is available in VF system (collected as part of the loan application process, i.e. for VF to determine client's solvency, including: Value of Total sales, Costs (Raw Material, Cost of Agri Input, Rent, Utilities, Transportation & Others), Payroll and Assets.

Here is an example of the fields available in the system:

| # | Survey Section | Field | Rq |
|-----|---|---|---|
| А | Employees | Payroll amount | FTE & PTE employees only (no Casual labour) |
| В | Business/ Producer Income Statement | Sale Income | |
| B.2 | Business/ Producer Income Statement | Production volume | Not relevant to SGBs |
| С | Business/ Producer Income Statement | Raw Material | |
| D | Business/ Producer Income Statement | Cost of Agri Inputs (seeds, fertilizers, pesticide) | |
| Е | Business/ Producer Income Statement | Rent (Home/shop) | |
| F | Business/ Producer Income Statement | Utilities | |
| G | Business/ Producer Income Statement | Transportation | |
| н | Business/ Producer Income statement | Labour | Include labour on land preparation, production and post-harvest |
| 1 | Business/ Producer Income Statement | Others | include storage cost |
| J | Business/ Producer Balance Sheet - Assets | Livestock | Assets |
| К | Business/ Producer Balance Sheet - Assets | Machinery | |
| L | Business/ Producer Balance Sheet - Assets | Transport | |
| М | Business/ Producer Balance Sheet - Assets | Building Business | |
| Ν | Business/ Producer Balance Sheet - Assets | Land (Acre:) | |

Using the fields available, profit can be calculated by: b-(a+c+d+e+f+g+h+i).

Some iMSD projects made require collecting more granular data, which is fine as long as the fields can be mapped against the fields listed above (see embedded example from the Moringa project). If such data is not available -Business owners under interventions such as SGB Finance are trained in maintaining records of business income and expenses. They should have a business record book and be able to produce a recent annual profit figure, at least at endline (they may not have had this capability at baseline. Data is to be collected by a trained Vision Fund Micro Finance officer (SGB) or trained enumerators (iMSD), based on record books when available.

If record books are not available the baseline, an approximate figure may be able to be obtained or estimated at baseline: while this may not be the accurate picture, an approximation is better than no data. When business activity is seasonal, an estimate is calculated for each quarter/season of the last year to compute a monthly average.

To calculate the average profit:

- Numerator: Total profit by all businesses
- Denominator: Number of businesses

Convert the value to USD using the exchange rate at the time of survey. Disaggregate findings by male-led and female led business. Compare with the baseline where data is available.

Example

Farm business analysis: To find out the business analysis (Business profit or net income) of maize seeds cultivation

- fill the amount, unit and cost per unit. The total cost will be calculated automatically.
- If the respondent does not spend money for an agri-input or activity, then the number and units are still filled but the cost per unit is filled in with a value of 0 (zero).
- For the labour section, the number of people written is the number of people out of the respondent, whether the person is paid or not. For example, the respondent is assisted by his neighbour with a mutual cooperation system, so the number of people still written even though the neighbour is not paid.

M4C.MA.O5. Estimated variation in revenue / supply generated by market actors from business model products and services attributable to programme support

Note: This is a good practice indicator that can be used along with or as a substitute of M4C.O4: Average business profit in the last 12 months (e.g., Intermediary Service Providers, micro-enterprises etc.)]. In case the business is working closely with the project and it is possible to track their revenues and costs, it is recommended that the project used M4C.O4 (e.g. the entrepreneurs trained, coached, and monitored by projects). Otherwise, when tracking the revenues and costs are not feasible (e.g., non-disclosure policies), use this indicator to get a good estimate.

In case the project wants to report this indicator from Green Businesses, please ensure the business in fully (100%) working in green products (goods & services) as defined in M4C.O1.

For the recall, please find the short definition below.

Green business models are business models based on providing goods, technology and services that contribute to climate change mitigation and/or adaptation, and/or environmental restoration and protection. See the CPM handbook for more details.

Definition

This indicator aims to measure the change in revenue from business models. It targets representatives of market actors who the project is partnering with.

Revenue refers to overall sales / gross revenue generated that is directly and indirectly attributable to the business model being jointly implemented through the project.

This implies that the project (and the evaluator/ enumerator) has a clear common understanding of what are the green business models ventured by the partner market actor.

Revenue generated refers to income achieved by market actors as a result of activities co-designed or agreed upon with the grants project. This includes revenue from providing goods or services both within and outside the target area, whether to participants of the project or others. It also encompasses revenue achieved through the adaptation or replication of a similar business model by the market actor.

How to measure

The respondent is asked to rate his/her perception of the change in sales from green business models in the last 12 months on a five-point scale from 1 to 5.

This is ideally a monitoring indicator intended to be reported on a 6-monthly to annual basis.

Sample questions:

- Intro: We are interested to learn to what extent is your business a green business model. By green business model, we mean providing goods, technology and services that contribute to climate change mitigation and/ or adaptation, and/or environmental restoration and protection.
- Q.0 In this project we are talking about: (in case of green business models specify the green goods and services the project is working with). Can you please confirm you are involved in this business? [single choice answer]
 - 1. Yes
 - 2. No

For Input Selling Market Actors ask:

Q1- How has your company/organization's revenue changed since xxx time/partnership with the XXX project?

- 1. Increased
- 2. Decreased
- 3. Remained more or less the same
- 4. Don't know
- 5. Don't want to say/Declined

Q2- (if response is 1 or 2 from Q1) To what extent did it increase/decrease?

- 1. Yes, to a large extent
- 2. Yes, to some extent.
- 3. No
- 4. Not Sure
- 5. No response/Declined

For Output Buying Market Actors ask:

Q1- How has your company/organization's supply changed since xxx time/partnership with the XXX project?

- 1. Increased
- 2. Decreased
- 3. Remained more or less the same
- 4. Don't know
- 5. Don't want to say/Declined

Q2- (if response is 1 or 2 from Q1) To what extent did it increase/decrease?

- 1. Yes, to a large extent
- 2. Yes, to some extent.
- 3. No
- 4. Not Sure
- 5. No response/Declined

Q.3: Qualitative / Key Research Questions: Please provide examples and the reason for your response. In case of green business model also include understanding of nature positive and climate smart products and services.

To analyse the indicator value:

Discuss the evolution of score for each market actor being monitored. For example, market actor partners responds change from moderate increase to significant increase over time, report it in impact reports.

References

<u>SAMARTH NMDP Results Measurement System User Manual v 2.0 (August 2015)</u> See Annex 7, pg 12 of Annexes (pg 58 in PDF), 'Net return to market players from delivering services (commercial service providers only).

Income Generation (Market Actor) Intermediate Outcome Indicators

M4C.MA.IO1 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting, and then adapting, pro-poor business models promoted by the programme (qualitative)

Definition

This is a qualitative indicator aimed at capturing the reasons and underlying incentives for system actors/service providers to adopt, and then change or adapt a product/service delivery model. Reasons could include financial incentives, enhanced brand value –and many others. Capturing this qualitative change is particularly important for programs that are in the pilot and testing phase so that the specific reasons for change can be used to demonstrate benefit to others and encourage 'crowding in'. This particular indicator is of high relevance to iMSD programs. This indicator is to be measured immediately after the first business cycle when the changed service or product is offered, and at the endline evaluation.

How to Measure

Conduct in-depth interviews with the management of the system actor/service provider to understand: a) how and why they adopted their product/service delivery model, b) how and why they adapted (made changes to) their product/service delivery model, and c) how central the adaptation is to their business model. These questions and the responses provided will allow project teams to determine motivations and incentives to change, thereby indicating signs of systemic change (sustainability).

Examples:

- 1. If an input supplier's business model consists of offering training programs to accompany the sale of agri-inputs to poor farmers, WV could ask questions such as:
 - a. 'How does your business benefit by targeting poor farmers specifically for the training?'
 - b. 'Can you explain how it is being budgeted and delivered?' (The idea is to understand if it is being completely outsourced or budgeted for as part of their regular training and delivery costs.)
- 2. If an input supplier's business model consists of promoting mini-seed packs to poor farmers, or offering savings or loan products specifically focused on poor farmers:
 - a. 'How does your business benefit by targeting poor farmers?'
 - b. 'What changes have you had to make to convince your organisation to target farmers as potential clients?' (assessment of **Adopt**)
 - c. 'Has your organisation made modifications to the original business model ideas (e.g. promoting mini-seed packs to poor farmers) discussed with/promoted by the WVA programme?' (assessment of **Adapt**)

Once the data is collected, summarise the responses under certain categories and code them. For example, 'increased market share' could be coded as 1 (one); 'increased sales' could be coded as 2 (two); 'to improve brand reputation' could be coded as 3 (three). The responses can then be grouped under these codes and analysed to reveal the top/most highlighted incentives (in terms of frequency of responses) reported by system actors.

Reference:

See Annex 1: Indicators of Adopt, Adapt, Expand and Respond (pg 22), in <u>A. Kessler (May 2021) Assessing</u> Systemic Change: Implementation Guidelines for the DCED Standard, DCED.

M4C.MA.IO2 Investments (in US\$) in innovation

[EBF EE O.EE.30]

Definition

The indicator measures absolute value of USD invested in innovation.

Firms invest in innovation to gain market share, reduce costs or, more generally, to become more productive (MDF 2014). Sparkman, Field, & Derks (2016) argues that tracking small changes in business models is likely to be a more accurate measure of innovation. Innovation can be a new product, new process and/or services, or new delivery mechanism, new customer segment (e.g. female customers), new distribution strategy (e.g. female sales agents, female Intermediate Service Providers etc.) Innovation here is defined as something new for the context/ target business, but not necessarily new for the sector.

Notes for Enumerators / Evaluator

- Please change the duration for recall using the most appropriate options. Recommended recall periods are: "in the last 12 months" for iMSD and "during the last loan cycle" for SGB
- Reading the above statements/questions might not help getting the right answers. Make sure, the respondent understands all aspects of a dimension of innovation. Make it conversational and give prompts. Enumerators should be provided with context specific examples of innovations for all four dimensions.
- The amount of investment might not be readily available. Encourage the respondents to provide an estimate. An estimate is better than no data.
- Notes: Examples for items 8 & 10

Item 8: If an aggregator of potatoes wants to also perform as a collector, s/he might have to invest in buying vehicle like a pedal propelled Van. Also, if a retailer of vegetables seed may see the opportunity and approach a private seed company to become a "distributor". Then the retailer may need to expand the storage space, keep more inventory, adapt a record keeping system (notebooks, financial statements, database of customers, inventory records etc.) and hire more staff to perform the role of a distributor and supplying other retailers. These investments can be calculated here. Private sector companies may need to buy more vehicles or hire more staff or train staff to perform functions in other value chain levels. For example, dairy processing firms may adapt a direct milk collection method to have more control over the quality. Investments in this regard, like purchasing refrigerated vehicles etc., can be counted here.

<u>Item 10:</u> Private Sector companies sometimes invest in product training (for input and service companies) or processing training – like post-harvest management (for output collection companies). These are done to increase loyalty among customers/suppliers. Though this is a form of "marketing" or "promotion", this investment tends to have a much longer-term impact in creating the market or ensure smooth supply. For example, seed companies invest in training for seed retailers. WV would like to capture if the investment increased from the previous year after working with the project.

Another example – dairy processing firms can train farmers on how to feed the cows to increase fat content in milk, so that more butter can be made. WV would like to know if there are other investments made to train cattle farmers produce better quality milk after working with the project.

How to measure

Depending on the size of the project i.e. number of businesses/enterprises engaged, the team can choose from the following three methodological options:

- A census of all businesses at the baseline and end-line
- A survey of a representative sample, using systematic random sampling techniques where every Nth business will be interviewed.
- A purposive sample (using criteria such as small/medium/large enterprises OR by type of product/services OR technical team/experts can add a criterion most relevant to the contexts WVA works in and revisiting the same group at the endline.

The proposed tool to measure this indicator is the Innovation index developed by Sparkman, Field, & Derks (2016). As stated above, Sparkman, Field, & Derks, (2016) argues that tracking small changes in business models

is likely to be a more accurate measure of innovation. Therefore, the index they developed looks at incremental innovation in existing business models. Innovation is novelty but Incremental innovation is not necessarily novelty—it could just be copying from others (Sparkman et al. 2016, P.10). This is closer to the realities of the types of enterprises WVA works with and therefore being focused here.

The innovation index asks about 10 aspects of business models, divided into four categories: product/service innovations, process innovations, marketing innovations, and organizational innovations. The specific items have been adapted to fit to WV projects/programs.

Ask the respondents:

| | а | b | С |
|--|------------------------|--------|--|
| 1. Product Innovations | Product Innovations | Yes/No | If yes, what/ Can you pls. estimate the amount you invested? |
| 1. In the last xx months, has your business begun offering a new product (or service) to customers? (including new packaging/ size etc. (more examples to be added depending on the types of businesses) If NO, go to the next question, If YES answer the next two sub-questions in columns b & c. | | | |
| 2. Process Innovations | | | |
| 2. In the last xx months, has your business changed the way it stores final products and/or manages inventory? If NO, go to the next question, If YES answer the next two sub-questions in columns b & c. | | | |
| 3. In the last xx months, has your business changed the way it transports products? If NO, go to the next question, If YES answer the next two sub-questions in columns b & c. | | | |
| 4. In the last xx months, has your business changed the way it controls the quality and grades its products and inputs? If NO, go to the next question, If YES answer the next two sub-questions in columns b & c. | | | |
| 5. In the last xx months, has your business changed the way it accesses information about the market (any information)? If NO, go to the next question, If YES answer the next two sub-questions in columns b & c. | | | |
| 6. In the last xx months, has your business changed the way it accepts payments for its products and/or how it pays to suppliers? (including credit, credit period). If NO, go to the next question, If YES answer the next two sub-questions in columns b & c. | | | |
| 3. Marketing Innovations | | | |
| 7. In the last xx months, has your business changed the way it reaches customers (e.g. advertising, online sales) If NO, go to the next question, If YES answer the next two sub-questions in columns b & c. | | | |
| 4. Organizational Innovations | | | |
| 8.In the last xx months, has your business changed the number of functions it performs in the value chain (increased/decreased vertical integration)? (Please see notes for enumerators/evaluators for more details). If NO, go to the next question, If YES answer the next two sub-questions in columns b & c. | | | |
| 9. In the last xx months, has your business changed its hiring strategy/ investment in staff capacity and retention? If NO, go to the next question, If YES answer the next two sub-questions in columns b & c. | | | |
| 10. In the last xx months, has your business changed the way/amount it invests in supplier and customer capacity? (Please see notes for enumerators/evaluators for more details) If NO, go to the next question, If YES answer the next two sub-questions in columns b & c. | | | |

To calculate the indicator, simply add-up the amount estimates given in column C. An average too can be calculated by adding the amount and dividing the total amount by the number of business surveyed. Convert the figure to USD using the conversion rate at the time of the study/evaluation. Compare with the baseline. Also, using data in Column 'a' level of innovation can be measured. However, in that case, the indicator would need to be changed to 'level of innovation'. We can actually measure two things/ indicators i.e. level of innovation and amount invested using the above tool. For level of Innovation, the cut-offs can be set. Preferably, cut-offs be set at the portfolio level to facilitate aggregation of findings. If portfolio level cut-offs have not been set, project level cut-offs can be set in consultation with the project team.

Here is a suggestion on cut-offs:

- No innovation = if score 0
- Low level of innovation = Score up to 3 even if in the same domain
- Moderate level of innovation= Score between 4 and 6 and at least in two domains
- High level of innovation = score of 7 and above and in all four domains

Compare with the baseline. Data can be further disaggregated by the type of business or ownership (by men and women) for both indicators.

M4C.MA.IO3 Investment (in US\$) towards suppliers and customers from the target beneficiaries in their capacity building

[EBF EE O.EE.31]

Definition

Total cumulated USD value that private partners have invested towards improving capacities of suppliers and customers, in the past 12 months (total per project).

Notes for Enumerators/Evaluator

Examples of Private Sector investment: Private Sector companies sometimes invest in product training (for input and service companies) or processing training – like post-harvest management (for output collection companies). These are done to increase loyalty among customers/suppliers. Though this is a form of "marketing" or "promotion", this investment tends to have a much longer-term impact in creating the market or ensure smooth supply. For example, seed companies invest in training for seed retailers. WV would like to capture if the investment increased from the previous year after working with the project.

Another example – dairy processing firms can train farmers on how to feed the cows to increase fat content in milk, so that more butter can be made. WV would like to know if there are other investments made to train cattle farmers produce better quality milk after working with the project.

How to measure

Data to measure this indicator will be obtained from the item number 10 in the above question i.e.

| | Yes/No | lf Yes, What/ How? | Can you pls. estimate the amount you invested? |
|---|--------|--------------------------|--|
| Q. In the last xx months, has your business changed the way/amount it invests in supplier and customer capacity? (Please see notes for enumerators/evaluators for more details) If NO, go to the next question, If YES answer the next two sub-questions in columns b & c. | | | |

To calculate the indicator value:

Total value reported by those saying YES to Item Number 10 of the adapted version of Sparkman, Field, & Derks (2016) innovation index being used for indicator M4C.MA.IO2/above question. Convert that to US\$.

Compare with the baseline. Disaggregate by the size, type and ownership (men and women owned) of the businesses.

M4C.MA.IO4 Number of Joint initiatives implemented

[EBF EE O.EE.32]

Definition

This indicator measures the number of joint initiatives implemented by the alliances formed/facilitated by the project/program. These initiatives may include exhibitions, campaign, fare etc. Each context will have their own examples of joint initiatives.

Connectivity and Cooperation are characteristics of a resilient systems. Therefore, alliance building is a feature of a resilient market system (Downing, Field, Ripley, & Sebstad, 2018). An alliance is an agreement between two or more market players to pursue a set of agreed upon objectives while maintaining their intendent entity/ organization. Number of initiatives implemented is an indication of functioning of the alliances formed, and one of the signs of a resilient system.

Notes for Enumerators/Evaluator

Unless a documentary evidence is available for each joint initiative, triangulate data from different sources to validate reporting.

How to measure

Data on number of alliances and types of initiatives will be obtained from the project team. Key informant interview will then be conducted with key private sector partners, hosting the alliance to gather information about the joint initiatives implemented by the alliance.

Ask the Key informants:

Q1- How many Initiatives were implemented by the alliance that you are a member of? ------(use examples of initiatives gathered from the team)

Q2- What were they: 1-----2-----3------

Number of joint initiatives will be counted for all alliances. Can be disaggregated by initiative type.

M4C.MA.IO5 Mean diversity of channels score

[EBF EE O.EE.33]

Definition

Indicator measures the level of diversity in input and sale channels and will be reported as % business with changes in their diversity score between the baseline and the end line.

Diversity of channels is an indication of market system's resilience as this reduces dependency on one channel and hedges the enterprise risks. Channels here include both marketing and input channels. If a business relies too much on a particular marketing or input channel, it is left at its mercy. In case of any sudden disturbance to a channel, the business will be impacted adversely. Diversity includes geographical (from and to more than one geographic location), structural (bulk buyers, individual buyers) and categorical (e.g for an agricultural input distributor to have various "types" of customers such as commercial farmers, farming cooperatives, private enterprises like nurseries, smallholder farmers) diversities. To make the measurement easier, Structural and Categorical diversity categories are collapsed. In addition, the level of diversity for inputs and sales is being assessed separately.

Notes for Enumerators/Evaluator

Adjust/change the channels/options based on the context and market assessments and in consultation with the project team

How to measure

Ideally, to ensure data is comparable and there is no sampling bias, this should be administered via panel study (same respondents in repeated surveys). However, it might not always be possible, and a representative sample can be used to calculate average change over time. Ask the target businesses/randomly selected farmers (as applicable) as part of the surveys at the baseline and endline:

Q- Now I will read a few statements, please respond in YES or NO to each one of them in the light of your personal experience/feeling.

| | Statement | Responses |
|----|---|-------------|
| 1 | In the last 6 months, I have transacted with businesses outside of my ethnic group | Yes=0; No=1 |
| 2 | In the last 6 months, I have transacted with businesses outside of my religious group | Yes=0; No=1 |
| 3 | In the last 6 months, I have transacted with businesses outside of community/village | Yes=0; No=1 |
| 4 | In the last 6 months, I have transacted with a business being managed by someone from the opposite sex | Yes=0; No=1 |
| 5 | In the last 6 months, I have transacted with both people with and without a disability | Yes=0; No=1 |
| 6 | I find it more difficult to build trusted business relationships outside of my ethnic group | Yes=1; No=0 |
| 7 | I find it more difficult to build trusted business relationships outside of my religious group | Yes=1; No=0 |
| 8 | I find it more difficult to build trusted business relationships outside of my community | Yes=1; No=0 |
| 9 | I find it more difficult to build a trusted business relationship with someone from the opposite sex | Yes=1; No=0 |
| 10 | I find it more difficult to build a trusted business relationship with someone a) with a disability (if respondent has no disability)/ b) without a disability (if respondent has a disability) | Yes=1; No=0 |

This can be turned into an index by assigning values (to YES=0 and No=1 to first five items and the reverse to items 6-10) and calculating scores for each respondents. A maximum score of ten can be obtained. Cut-offs be set, using levels like low, medium and high, % respondents in each category can be calculated. Preferably, cut-offs be set at the portfolio level to facilitate aggregation of findings. Nevertheless, it can be done at the project level and project team may set the targets/cut-offs. One suggestion is to consider a score of

- 8 and above- High level of perceived barriers
- 4 to 7 Medium level
- 0-3- low level of perceived barriers

To calculate the indicator value:

- Numerator: Total number of businesses with decreased total score on the above index/scoring equal to or lower than the cut-off (in a panel study)
- Denominator: Total number of businesses

Compare with the baseline.

M4C.MA.W.IO6 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting new business models (promoted by the programme) that ensure do-no harm to women and other vulnerable groups and promote women's access to services/products. (qualitative)

Definition

This a qualitative indicator aimed at capturing the reasons and underlying incentives for system actors/service providers to **adopt** a new product/service delivery model such that it i) ensures do-no-harm to women and other vulnerable groups, and ii) promotes women's access to the product/service. Reasons could include financial incentives, enhanced brand value –and many others. Capturing this qualitative change is particularly important for programs that are in the pilot and testing phase so that the specific reasons for change can be used to demonstrate benefit to others and encourage 'crowding in'. This particular indicator can be used for programs that are working to influence other stakeholders who are offering services to women. This indicator is to be

measured immediately after the first business cycle when the changed service or product is offered, and at the endline evaluation.

How to Measure

Conduct in-depth interviews with the management of the system actor/service provider to understand: a) how and why they adopted their product/service delivery model, and b) how central the adopted delivery model is to their business model. These questions and the responses provided will allow project teams to determine motivations and incentives to change, thereby indicating signs of systemic change (sustainability).

Examples:

- 1. If an input supplier's business model consists of offering training programs to accompany the sale of agriinputs to women, WV could ask questions such as:
 - a. 'Has your business considered any risks to women from offering them this new service (e.g. their safety, their time use, effects on 'gatekeepers' like husbands)?' (to assess **do no harm**)
 - b. 'How does your business benefit by targeting women specifically for the training?' (assessment of Access)
 - c. 'Can you explain how it is being budgeted and delivered?' (The idea is to understand if it is being completely outsourced or budgeted for as part of their regular training and delivery costs.)
- 2. If an input supplier's business model consists of promoting mini-seed packs to women, or offering savings or loan products specifically focused on women:
 - a. 'How does your business benefit by targeting women?'
 - b. 'What changes have you had to make to convince your organisation to target women as potential clients?' (assessment of **Adopt**)

Once the data is collected, summarise the responses under certain categories and code them. For example, 'increased market share' could be coded as 1 (one); 'increased sales' could be coded as 2 (two); 'to improve brand reputation' could be coded as 3 (three). The responses can then be grouped under these codes and analysed to reveal the top/most highlighted incentives (in terms of frequency of responses) reported by system actors. Also, code for measures the businesses have taken to promote do no harm.

Reference:

USAID (2022) Social performance management guide: tools for integrating 'do no harm' protections for women's economic empowerment actors.

M4C.MA.W.IO7 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting and adapting new business models (promoted by the programme) that promote women's access to services/products, their agency, and equitable systems. (qualitative)

*Mandatory for targeted GEDSI & WEE projects, to be used instead of M4C.MA.W.IO6

Definition

This is a qualitative indicator aimed at capturing the reasons and underlying incentives for system actors/ service providers to adopt and change/adapt a product/service delivery model. Reasons could include financial incentives, enhanced brand value –and many others. Capturing this qualitative change is particularly important for programs that are in the pilot and testing phase so that the specific reasons for change can be used to demonstrate benefit to others and encourage 'crowding in'. This particular indicator can be used for programs that are working to influence other stakeholders who are offering services to women. This indicator is to be measured immediately after the first business cycle when the changed service or product is offered, and at the endline evaluation.

How to Measure

Conduct in-depth interviews with the management of the system actor/service provider to understand: a) how and why they adopted their product/service delivery model, b) how and why they adapted (changed) their product/service delivery model and b) how central the adaptation is to their business model. These questions

and the responses provided will allow project teams to determine motivations and incentives to change, thereby indicating signs of systemic change (sustainability).

Examples:

- 1. If an input supplier's business model consists of offering training programs to accompany the sale agri-inputs to women, WV could ask questions such as:
 - a. 'How does your business benefit by targeting women specifically for the training?'
 - b. 'What changes have you had to make to convince your organisation to target women as potential clients?' (assessment of Adopt)
 - c. 'Has your organisation made modifications to the original business model ideas discussed with/promoted by the WVA programme?' (assessment of **Adapt**)
 - d. 'Can you explain how it is being budgeted and delivered?' (The idea is to understand if it is being completely outsourced or budgeted for as part of their regular training and delivery costs.)
 - e. 'Are you aware of any barriers affecting the women's ability to attend training? If so, does your company work to address these barriers?' (assessment of **Access**)
 - f. 'When women attend the training, have they made this decision independently?' (assessment of Agency)
 - g. 'Is the training designed to accommodate the women's other work? Does the training also involve engaging men? (assessment of **Equitable systems**)

Once the data is collected, summarise the responses under certain categories and code them. For example, 'increased market share' could be coded as 1 (one); 'increased sales' could be coded as 2 (two); 'to improve brand reputation' could be coded as 3 (three). The responses can then be grouped under these codes and analysed to reveal the top/most highlighted incentives (in terms of frequency of responses) reported by system actors. In addition, code for Access, Agency, and Equitable Systems.

M4C.MA.G.IO8 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting new business models (promoted by the programme) that promote do-no harm to the environment. (qualitative)

Definition

This is a qualitative indicator aimed at capturing the reasons and underlying incentives for system actors/ service providers to adopt a product/service delivery model that minimizes the potential negative impact on the environment. Reasons could include financial incentives, enhanced brand value –and many others. Capturing this qualitative change is particularly important for programs that are in the pilot and testing phase so that the specific reasons for change can be used to demonstrate benefit to others and encourage 'crowding in'. This indicator is to be measured immediately after the first business cycle when the changed service or product is offered, and at the endline evaluation.

How to Measure

Conduct in-depth interviews with the management of the system actor/service provider to understand: a) why they adopted their product/service delivery model, and b) how central the adoption is to their business model. These questions and the responses provided will allow project teams to determine motivations and incentives to change, thereby indicating signs of systemic change (sustainability).

Examples:

- 1. If an input supplier's business model consists of offering training programs to accompany the sale of agri-inputs to poor farmers, WV could ask questions such as:
 - a. 'Has your business considered any risks to the environment from offering this new service (e.g. will the agri-inputs harm the ecosystem, does the training suggest ways to prevent this harm)?' (to assess do no harm)
 - b. 'How does your business benefit by adopting a 'do no harm' approach to the environment?' (to assess 'adopt')

c. 'Can you explain how the new service is being budgeted and delivered?' (The idea is to understand if it is being completely outsourced or budgeted for as part of their regular training and delivery costs.)

Once the data is collected, summarise the responses under certain categories and code them. For example, 'increased market share' could be coded as 1 (one); 'increased sales' could be coded as 2 (two); 'to improve brand reputation' could be coded as 3 (three). The responses can then be grouped under these codes and analysed to reveal the top/most highlighted incentives (in terms of frequency of responses) reported by system actors. Also, code for measures the businesses have taken to promote do no harm.

M4C.MA.G.IO9 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting and adapting new, environmentally sustainable business models (promoted by the programme) that a) reduce environmental and climate risks (climate adaptation), b) reduce the negative impact of the value chain (mitigation) and c) promote green opportunity (restoration) (qualitative)

* Mandatory for targeted ESCA & Green Growth projects, to be used instead of M4C.MA.G.IO8

Definition

This is a qualitative indicator aimed at capturing the reasons and underlying incentives for system actors/service providers to adopt and then change or adapt an environmentally sustainable product/service delivery model. Reasons could include financial incentives, enhanced brand value –and many others. Capturing this qualitative change is particularly important for programs that are in the pilot and testing phase so that the specific reasons for change can be used to demonstrate benefit to others and encourage 'crowding in'. This indicator is to be measured immediately after the first business cycle when the changed service or product is offered, and at the endline evaluation.

How to Measure

Conduct in-depth interviews with the management of the system actor/service provider to understand a) how and why they adopted this new product/service delivery model, b) how and why they adapted (changed) their product/service delivery model, and c) how central the adaptation is to their business model. These questions and the responses provided will allow project teams to determine motivations and incentives to change, thereby indicating signs of systemic change (sustainability).

Examples:

- 1. If an input supplier's new business model consists of offering training in climate-smart agriculture, WV could ask questions such as:
 - a. 'How does your business benefit by providing training in climate-smart agriculture?'
 - b. 'Can you explain how it is being budgeted and delivered?' (The idea is to understand if it is being completely outsourced or budgeted for as part of their regular training and delivery costs.)
 - c. 'What changes have you had to make to convince your organisation to offer training in climate-smart agriculture?' (assessment of **Adopt**)
 - d. 'Has your organisation made modifications to the original business model ideas discussed with/promoted by the WVA programme?' (assessment of **Adapt**)
 - e. How does the training address:
 - i. reducing environmental and climate risks (climate adaptation),
 - ii. reducing the negative impact of the value chain (mitigation) and
 - iii. promoting green opportunity (restoration)?

Once the data is collected, summarise the responses under certain categories and code them. For example, 'increased market share' could be coded as 1 (one); 'increased sales' could be coded as 2 (two); 'to improve brand reputation' could be coded as 3 (three). The responses can then be grouped under these codes and analysed to reveal the top/most highlighted incentives (in terms of frequency of responses) reported by system actors. Also, code for climate adaptation, mitigation and restoration.

Income Generation (Households) Outcome Indicators

M4C.IG.01 Proportion of households that increased their income as a result of participation in World Vision (WV) facilitated economic development programs [OIOS 74]

Definition

The indicator measures the percentage of households that believe they have experienced an increase in their income as a direct outcome of their participation in economic development programs facilitated by World Vision. This indicator assesses the proportion of target households that, through the assistance provided by World Vision, have successfully enhanced their income earning capacity. The focus is on measuring the positive impact of World Vision's economic development programs in enabling households to improve their financial wellbeing.

M4C.IG.O2 Average business profit in the last 12 months for the HHs [O.EE 7 calculated for Households]

Same definition and calculation method as M4C.O4 calculated for households

M4C.IG.O3 Average vield of target crops

[EBF EE O.EE.11, Compendium C4B.14001]

Definition

This indicator measures the average per hectare yield of the target crops.

In Natural Resource Management and Food Security and Nutrition projects, these will include both staple and cash crops that are the project's focus. If a project is not promoting/focusing on any crop in particular, major cash/staple crops in that context will be considered as the target crops. For economic development projects, these will be the target value chain crops grown by participating producers.

Yield is defined here as the amount produced by a particular crop from a fixed area in a fixed time. For example: tons of rice per hectare per season or bags of maize per acre per season. Therefore, a crop yield estimate contains two primary components: crop production (total quantity of farm produce) and area harvested. Crop yield is then defined as crop production divided by area harvested. The unit of measurement is often kg or metric tonnes (MT) per ha (P.53) (FAO, 2018).

Notes for Enumerators/Evaluator

Learn about the local units of measurements both for crops and land and make sure, enumerators are conversant with converting them to the unit being used for the survey. For example, if people usually recall or report yield in buckets or sacks, how many kilograms will it be? Similarly, the enumerators should be familiar with local land units and their conversion to hectares.

As the recall period is last 12 months, make sure all enumerators are aware of number of crops/seasons for the target crops. Calculate the yield for each season and then add-up to obtain the annual total.

Make sure, the enumerators carry a notebook and pen to do the calculations for Q2.

How to measure

Accurate crop yield measurement can be difficult. The most accurate methods can be costly, so farmers' estimates using recall method is recommended and a simple tool is provided. However, if an intervention is exclusively focused on increasing crop production and resources are available, an objective assessment method (e.g. crop cut, whole plot harvest, sampling the harvesting units) can be used to achieve higher accuracy in findings. FAO has developed detailed guidelines on each methods and can be found in the document mentioned in the reference of this indicator.

In addition, while working with small holder farmers who have limited land available for cultivation, mixed cropping and/or intercropping⁷ further complicates the yield measurement. There are several methods available to apportion land to crop (See Chapter 6 in the above FAO guide). However, considering the information need and cost implications, farmers' estimation of the area occupied by each crop is recommended for WV projects.

List the crops the project is promoting/focusing on. Check the number of usual production cycle/seasons and units of measurement. Adjust the question format accordingly:

| | Target product: | 1 (e.g. Onion) | 2 (e.g. Chili) | 3 (etc.) |
|----|---|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Q1 | In the last 12 months, have you/your household grown [read each crop] For Q1=0 responses, no further questions are asked | 0=No 1=Yes | 0=No 1=Yes | 0=No 1=Yes |
| Q2 | [For each Q1=1] About how much (quantity) did you/your household harvest in the last 12 months? Probe: How many harvests did you have? How much for Harvest 1, how much for harvest 2 then add the total figure. Add sub-columns for number of seasons/harvests for each crop in that context to make sure the enumerators do not miss any information. Crop total can be automated if a digital data collection tool is being used | kg | kg | kg |
| Q3 | [For each Q=1] About how much land area was used to grow this crop*? Probe: how much area of land was used for this crop for season 1, season 2? then add the total figure to the relevant field Add sub-columns for land size for each seasons/ harvests for each crop to make sure the enumerators do not miss any information. Land area total for each crop can be automated if a digital data collection tool is being used. | m x m ORHa | m x m ORHa | m x m ORHa |

Please note, using land area to calculate yield can be problematic where the produce referred comes from a tree crop, like coffee or nutmeg or mangoes. If the trees are in one area or plantation, then using land area should be fine even if it is intercropped. However, if the trees are scattered or are very few, it may be better to ask how many trees were harvested or calculate land area by using average number of trees farmers will have on a hectare of land and using that estimate to calculate the land area. For example, if the farmer has 10 scattered Mango trees and in that area, people will usually have 100 Trees/hectare, the land area for this farmer will be 0.10 hectares. Detailed guidance on this issue for objective measurement is available in the FAO guidance document mentioned above.

Yield is calculated kg/Ha in the last 12 months. For example, if a household produced 500 kilograms of a target crop on 2 hectares of land last season, their yield would be 250kg/Ha (response to question Q2 divided by response to question Q3).

- Numerator: Total of average kg per hectare produced by all households (calculate for each crop separately)
- Denominator: Number of HH growing that crop (Yes to Q1, per crop)

Compare with the baseline.

The ITT will require an average yield for each crop/product separately.

References

FAO, Methodology for Estimation of Crop Area and Crop Yield under Mixed and Continuous Cropping, https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/ca36b8c1-99b6-4cad-ad88-ff018647a474/content

⁷ Mixed cropping involves two or more different temporary or permanent crops grown in the same field. An intercrop is a crop that is planted between rows of another crop, while associated crops refer to the combination of temporary and permanent crops planted in the same field (FAO 2018, P.60). Various methods are recommended to apportion the land to each crop to calculate yield.

M4C.IG.O4 Number of green jobs supported

[Adapted from EBF EE O.EE.10]

Definition

This indicator measures the number of full time and part-time jobs maintained and created by the project supported businesses. DCED (2016) definition of this indicator include direct as well as indirect jobs, full-time, part-time, seasonal, contractual, and informal employment jobs supported and created in the sector, value chain or companies targeted by the intervention (SGB enterprises or other supported businesses in WV's case) at the end of the reporting period, converted to full-time equivalent (DCED 2016). However, given the complexity of including all the above types and resultant difficulty in measurement, WVA is targeting only full-time and part time jobs maintained and created by the program. Part time Jobs will not be converted to FTE as this overcomplicates the measure. This indicator should always be disaggregated by gender of employees.

Green Jobs:

According to the ILO definition: Green Jobs reduce the environmental impact or contribute to the regeneration of natural capital at enterprises and economic sectors, ultimately to levels that are sustainable, through environmental protection, climate change mitigation or climate change adaptation.

For jobs to be considered as green jobs, the respondents must provide evidence that the job is targeting one or several of the four Rio conventions markers themes (the 4 'Rio markers'), i.e.

- Biodiversity;
- Desertification;
- Climate change mitigation (i.e. reduction in or capture of greenhouse gas emissions);
- Climate change adaptation (including climate risk mitigation and vulnerability reduction).

To be counted as a green job, the supported job must be for 100% green activities. For more examples of green activities refer to Investment indicator (M4C.O1)

A useful way of framing a green job is linked to whether it's a job in a green sector that produces environmental goods and services which can be broadly defined as goods and services helping measure, prevent, limit, minimise or correct environmental damage; or whether it's a job that is located in a "traditional" sector which in their current practices contribute to climate change, but where there is room to improve (e.g. agriculture, construction, manufacturing..). There is room to create and maintain green jobs in both and for projects to support skilling, reskilling and upskilling initiatives.

For example, suppose that through our project, the agro-input supplier what is partnering with us creates a new team of extension officers to promote and sell (only) greener products such as compostable mulching film (as opposed to plastic mulching film), these new jobs will be considered as green job created.

How to measure

Data on jobs created can be self-reported by the targeted businesses/enterprises by using before/after census of all businesses/enterprises. The number of part-time and full-time employees at the payroll, at the beginning and end of the loan cycle of the businesses/enterprises disaggregated by sex, will be obtained from the businesses/enterprises. Number of employees from all supported businesses, disaggregated by sex and employment type (full/part time) at the beginning of the project is considered as baseline.

To calculate the indicator i.e. number of jobs supported, one can subtract the baseline number of jobs (i.e. number of people on the payroll of the targeted businesses at the start of the project) by the number of jobs in the relevant reporting period/end of the project. Disaggregate by full-time and part-time job categories.

Number of jobs supported = Number of full-time jobs at the end of the project (end line) - Number of full-time jobs at the start of the project (baseline).

References

Green Jobs definition: <u>https://www.ilo.org/media/274571/download#:~:text=ILO%20definition%20of%20</u> green%20jobs,enterprises%20and%20economies.

M4C.IG.O5 Proportion of women and men having their own regular income

[EBF EE O.EE.4]

Definition

This indicator measures the % of women and men reporting having a regular income. 'Regular' refers to a source of income where the respondent will have money/income at fixed or uniform intervals (could be daily, fortnightly, monthly, or seasonal) from any source (e.g. family enterprise, own enterprise or employment), separate from sources of income of other family members.

Own income is one indication of women's economic advancement and empowerment. If this indicator is included as WEE Indicator, the % of men and women with their own regular income becomes a way to assess the gap between men and women and changes over time in proportion of women with their own income.

Notes for enumerators / evaluator

- If a man and a woman have a joint enterprise i.e. a farm where the other is also helping, level of control over income will be used to determine if a woman/man has an income by asking further questions about control over use of the income: whether it can be spent at their discretion. Q- Is there a portion of money that you have decision making power over use, regularly/ when you receive this money, do you decide how some of it is spent? If YES, mark the family enterprise as the regular source of income; If NO, don't mark the family enterprise as the REGULAR source of income
- This does not include money received from male family member to spend on domestic needs even if women have complete power over spending it. Regular income is the money a woman/man earns.

Examples of 'regular' income have been given in the measurement table, but other examples may also be relevant in context. For example, if a woman goes to the market every Saturday to sell surplus produce, this counts as regular income, but if she goes once or twice in a season, this is not regular. Similarly, if a woman is paid for helping someone in domestic work occasionally, this is not regular income, but if she works and is paid every month, it is regular.

How to measure

Use the format below.

Do you have your own regular source of income for last 12 months? This could be the family enterprise or an independent source.

Yes = 1. If Yes, select from the options below. Multiple selections are possible. No=0. If No, skip to next question

| | 1 | 2 |
|---|--|----------------------------|
| | If yes, what is it? | Mark the applicable option |
| 1 | Own enterprise (including but not limited to production or post-harvest processing, working as intermediate service provider) =1 | |
| 2 | Contribution to family enterprise (including production or post-harvest processing) =2 | |
| 3 | Regular employment (where a person gets an agreed remuneration after an agreed period of time on ongoing basis =3 | |
| 4 | Wage labour (where one gets paid as per the number of days/hours of their labour =4 | |
| 5 | Others =5, please specify | |

Calculation Method

- Numerator: # respondents answering 1 (Yes)
- Denominator: Total # of survey respondents

Divide the numerator with the denominator and multiply with 100 to get the indicator value.

Disaggregate by sex, and then numbers/% in each category can be calculated. Compare with the baseline (and control/comparison group where applicable). If this indicator is included as WEE indicator, calculate the gap between men and women from baseline to endline.
Income Generation (Households) Intermediate Outcome Indicators

M4C.IG.IO1 Proportion of women and men adopting recommended business management practices (e.g. engaging in farming as a business)

[EBF EE O.EE.29]

Definition

% respondents adopting business management practices recommended by the project/intervention. This indicator measures the change in business practice as a result of access to opportunities and or training on

Notes for Enumerator/Evaluator

- Be clear on the recommended practices
- Be clear on the minimum number of recommended practices required by the program to be adopted by the participants.

List of practices will vary project to project and should be based on the gender sensitive market assessment and associated program strategy and interventions. Prepare the list/s involving project team, particularly the sector specialist/s.

How to measure

- List the recommended business management practices with the help of the project team.
- Possible business management practices may include but will not be limited to the following (this list will have to be adjusted based on what the project is seeking to promote/achieve):
 - Set a clear goal for the business
 - Keep records of transactions
 - Seek feedback from customers
 - Periodically review and proactively search for areas of improvement
 - Follow the farm business cycle
 - Create linkage with input suppliers, farm service providers and output buyers
 - Adapt cash management and forecasting practice
 - Check price from more than one selling option
 - Proactively learn from and share with other farmers
- During the HH survey, ask the if they are using any of those.
- Adoption can be calculated by category/option (i.e. % of people using each category/option) as well as by setting a cut-off point (i.e. if a program is promoting five practices and adopting at least three are deemed essential. % of HH reaching the desired level will be the indicator value).
- To calculate the indicator value
 - Numerator: sum of the responses for each business practices, with a "Yes" response=1 OR total number of respondents scoring equal to or above the cut-off (choose as appropriate)
 - Denominator: total number of respondents
- Disaggregate by sex where specific practices are introduced for particular value chains for men and women.
- If the respondent is not at all using recommended business management practices, ask a follow-up question to explore why. If overall level of adoption of certain practices remain low, explore further in Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).

M4C.IG.IO2 Proportion of households using technologies that improve productivity and save time in tasks that women traditionally perform

[WEE 3.13]

Definition

This indicator measures the percentage of HHs using technologies introduced by the program/intervention that improve productivity and save time in tasks traditionally performed by women (eg, weeding and hoeing, manual irrigation, food processing, crop transportation).

It is expected that access to low-cost agricultural and non-agricultural labour-saving tools, equipment and technologies will improve the efficiency of farming HHs and assist women in their respective roles in production

- saving them from being further time-poor. Such devices are also expected to improve outputs and thus increase benefits in terms of efficiencies and time saved.

While, each program/intervention will have their own list of technologies being promoted for this purpose, a few examples may include low-cost hand implements or simple machines that increase labour productivity and save time eg, seeders, weeders, threshing and winnowing tools and animal-powered machinery.

How to measure

Prepare a list of productivity enhancement and time-saving technologies and devices introduced or being promoted by the project/program. Include both on-farm and off farm technologies and devices being promoted by the project. Then ask the following questions:

| Sr. No | Q1 - Do you (if respondent is a woman)/women in your HH (if respon- dent is a man) use any of the following technologies when performing related tasks: | Yes = 1 No = 2 (Skip to next technology/ device | Q2 - And now could you please tell me when is the last time you have used the device? 1. Today 2. Yesterday 3. Less than seven days ago 4. Less than one month ago 5. More than one month ago 6. In the most recent cropping season /production cycle 7. Cannot remember | Q3 - When used, do you think the device improves productivity and saves you/them any time? 1. Not at all = 0 2. Only a little bit = 1 3. Somewhat/to some extent = 2 4. A lot/to |
|-----------|--|--|---|--|
| 1 | Technologies | | | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 5 | | | | |

To simplify measurement, Q2 and Q3 can be dropped. They are not needed to obtain indicator data but are additional information. If Q2 and Q3 are included in the measurement, respondents should be asked to provide answers about the technologies saving themselves time and not those applicable to their spouse/other family members as they might not be able to provide an accurate estimate.

To calculate indicator value:

- Numerator: # of HHs reporting 'Yes' to Q1
- Denominator: Total # of surveyed HHs/respondents

If the project is also interested in understanding people's perceptions of the benefits of new technologies/ devices, then the indicator will be calculated:

- Numerator: Total # of HHs/respondents saying 'Yes both to Q1 and Q3 (option 3 or 4)
- Denominator: Total # of HHs/respondents surveyed

Responses can be disaggregated by technology ie, Percentage of HHs using each technology. Also, calculate the percentage of those who answered 'No' to Q3 (option 1 and 2) ie, labour-saving devices and technologies are not saving time. If the proportion of responses in this category is high, use FGDs to explore reasons for this scenario in order to help the project team make corrective measures.

Notes for enumerators/evaluators

- The list of technologies/device needs to be project-specific and will ideally be identified via various assessments undertaken during the assessment phase and included in the project design/intervention package.
- Change criteria under Q2 (most recent use) according to the list of technologies being promoted by the project. Add or delete response options for this question as relevant.

Reference

This indicator is an adaptation of the following indicators:

- DCED: # of hours per day saved due to intervention.
- WEAMS: # of hours that women save a day as a result of an agricultural innovation.
- WVA GPoP Project, Bangladesh): # of women and men who report increased time available from labour saving devices/assets/inputs.

M4C.IG.IO3 Average # of hours saved due to new technologies/labour- saving devices or strategies

[WEE 3.12]

Definition

This indicator measures the time saved due to labour-saving devices or new techniques introduced by the program/intervention. It is expected that access to low-cost agricultural and non-agricultural labour-saving tools, equipment and technologies will improve the efficiency of farming HHs and assist women in their respective roles in production, saving them from being further time-poor. Such devices are also expected to improve outputs and thus bring increased benefits in various areas, including in productivity.

How to measure

Prepare a list of labour-saving technologies and devices introduced or being promoted by the project. Include both on-farm and off-farm technologies and devices being promoted by the project. Then, ask respondents the following questions:

| Sr. No | Q1 - Do you use any of the follow- ing? | Yes = 1 No = 2 (Skip to next technology/ device) | Q2 - If Yes, how often do you use it? Daily = 1 Weekly = 2 Monthly = 3 Seasonal = 4 | Q3 - When used, do you think it saves you any time? Yes = 1 No = 2 (Skip to next technology/device) | Q4 - If yes, can you estimate, on average, how many hours per year? |
|-----------|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Technologies | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |
| 4 | Devices | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |

Respondents should be asked to provide answers about the devices saving themselves time – not for their spouse/other family members as they might not be able to provide an accurate estimate for others.

To calculate the indicator

Calculate the average number of hours saved both for men and women from all devices and technologies.

Data can be disaggregated by technology/device ie, average time saved by each device/technology. To calculate average by technology/device, use the total number of respondents who answered 'Yes' to Q3 and not the all the respondents.

Calculate the percentage of those who said 'No' to Q3 ie, labour-saving devices and technologies are not saving them time. If the proportion of responses is high, explore through FGDs the reasons for this feedback in order to help the team make corrective measures.

Notes for enumerators/evaluators

- Change the frequency of use options in the survey according to the list of technologies and devices being promoted by the project. Add or delete options as relevant.
- To calculate the number of hours saved per year, ask about the time saved per use in hours and then multiply it with the frequency. Do not ask respondents to provide you the answer/exact number of hours per year. However, you can share the number of hours that you have calculated and ask respondents if they think it is correct.

Notes for adaptation

The list of technologies/devices needs to be project-specific and will ideally be identified via various assessments undertaken during the project assessment phase and included in the project design/intervention package.

References

This indicator is an adaptation of the following indicators:

- DCED: # of hours per day saved due to intervention.
- WEAMS: # of hours that women save a day as a result of an agricultural innovation.
- WVA (GPoP Project, Bangladesh): # of women and men who report increased time available due to laboursaving devices/assets/inputs.

M4C.IG.IO4 Total cumulative number of women and men with increased access to opportunities

[WEE 2.1]

Definition

This is the cumulative total of the number of men and women who have improved access to opportunities for skills development, knowledge transfer and networks related to the IGA that WV is influencing (either directly or through facilitation).

How to measure

If this is a direct intervention delivered by the project, then collect cumulative sex-disaggregated data of participants or beneficiaries reached by WV.

If this is an indirect iMSD intervention, the following steps need to be taken:

Step 1: With the help of project team, list the types of opportunities for skills development, knowledge transfer and improved networks that WV is trying to influence either directly or through project partners. This may include training on business management, financial literacy, new networks or groups created etc. Adjust as relevant for the project. Also identify the partners and activities involved to get an aggregate list.

Step 2: Collect aggregate data from those activities and partners ie, participant lists from partners and list of farmers/suppliers enlisted under a particular company as suppliers or under any financial institution that WV is influencing.

Steps 1 and 2 will give an indication of the cumulative figure of access.

M4C.IG.IO5 Total cumulative number of women and men with increased access to resources and services

[WEE 2.8]

Definition

This is the cumulative total of the number of men and women who have improved access to resources and services related to the IGA that WV is influencing (either directly or through facilitation).

How to measure

If this is a direct intervention, then collect cumulative sex-disaggregated data of participants or beneficiaries reached by WV.

If this is an indirect iMSD intervention, the following steps need to be taken:

Step 1: With the help of the project team, list the types of resources and services that WV is trying to influence either directly or through project partners. This may include training on production practices, embedded extension services, market linkages, aggregation services, introduction to new inputs (seeds/ tools) etc. Adjust as relevant for your project. Also identify the partners and activities involved to get an aggregate list.

Step 2: Collect aggregate data from those activities and partners ie, participant lists from partners and lists of farmers/suppliers enlisted under a particular company as suppliers that WV is influencing. Steps 1 and 2 will give an indication of the cumulative figure of access.

Access to Finance Outcome Indicators

M4C.AF.O1 % households that used improved financial services in the past 12 months

[EBF EE IO.EE.1, Compendium C4B.25259]

Definition

% beneficiary households that used improved financial services (e.g. savings groups, bank accounts, mobile money account, microfinance, credit, agricultural insurance) in the past 12 months.

Note for Enumerators / Evaluators

While translating the tool, make sure the term financial services are translated appropriately.

How to measure

The following questions will be asked to the survey respondents at baseline, midline and endline (evaluations). The question should be placed in the relevant section of the HH survey and options be tailored depending on the services available in the context understudy.

| | Q1 - Now I want to know about your/your HH's use of financial services. In the last 12 months, did you or any member of your household: | Yes=1; No=0 |
|---|--|-------------|
| 1 | Participate in a savings group | |
| 2 | Use (transact i.e. deposit/withdraw/transfer) a savings account with a bank/credit union/cooperative/ microfinance institution | |
| 3 | Use (transact i.e. deposit/withdraw/transfer) a mobile money account | |
| 4 | Take a loan from a bank/credit union/cooperative/ microfinance institution | |
| 5 | Hold an insurance policy (e.g. life, health, agricultural insurance, property) | |

While calculation for this indicator is not needed, the project team might be interested in knowing use of 'less desirable' financial services/options. In that case, context specific options can be added after the above options and % respondents using them can be calculated. A few examples include:

- Borrowing from a money lender,
- Borrowing from a Pawnshop
- Borrowing from a relative or friend
- Keeping savings at home
- Asking a trusted person to keep savings
- Others....

To calculate the indicator value:

- Numerator: Total number of respondents using one or more services listed above in the table
- Denominator: Total number of respondents

Disaggregated by sex. Use by category/service too can be calculated to see the most and least used services. This information can be used to modify activities. % respondents by number of categories (e.g. using 2, 3, 4 etc. at the same time, can be calculated.

If use of 'less desirable' categories is being calculated at the midline, and use of certain categories are quite high as compared to 'desirable' services categories e.g. taking a loan from a money lender as compared to a bank or MFI, explore through FGDs why this the case is to help the implementation team design corrective measures.

Access to Finance Intermediate Outcome Indicators

M4C.AF.IO1 % HHs with the means to save money

[EBF EE O.EE.36, Compendium C4B.0069]

Definition

Percent of households who report being able to save money in a formal savings account with a bank, credit union or saving group (SG)/Village Savings and Loans Association (VSLA) (disaggregated by sex of head of household).

Notes for Enumerators/evaluator

List all formal means to save in the context under study and incorporate into the survey tool.

How to measure

To measure this indicator, at the baseline and the endline, respondents will be asked a direct question, in the relevant section of the household/caregiver survey. An example question could be:

| Q- Do you, or any member of your household, have a | No=0 |
|---|---|
| formal means of saving money? | Yes \rightarrow Bank=1; Credit Union=2; Saving Group/VSLA=3, Others |
| | (e.g. post office) 4; DK=88 |

Percent HH with any means to save money will be calculated.

- Numerator: respondents saying Yes to above question
- Denominator: Total number of respondents

Disaggregate by HH head type i.e. male vs female headed HH. Change in % HH by type of means to save too can be calculated. This can help us understand not only this indicator, but we can explore further if there have been any changes in terms of access to opportunities over time e.g. more people saving with SG now as compared to the baseline.

M4C.AF.IO2 % target households using loans and/or savings or share-out to invest into productive assets/ inputs/ services

[EBF EE O.EE.40, Compendium C4B.25452]

Definition

This indicator seeks to measure the use of savings or share-out and /or loans from saving groups and/or from any other financial service provider to invest into productive assets, or to buy inputs or to avail services, demonstrating the productive use of the savings.

Notes for Enumerators/Evaluators

If a project is particularly interested in investment to a priority value chains, Option C in all questions can be adapted or a new response option specifically asking about investment to priority value chain be added.

How to measure

Ask the following five questions to the respondents who are members of savings groups that is supported by World Vision. If the responding HH is not a member of a savings group supported by World Vision, only ask Q2a and Q2b.

| Q1a. Have you or your spouse/partner borrowed money/taken a loan from your World Vision supported savings group during last 12 months? | | Yes = 1; No = 0 If No, skip the next questions |
|---|---|--|
| Q1b. What did you use the money for? If the amount is spent equally on two or more categories, mark both. Otherwise mark the option where the most part of the amount was spent. | | |
| А | Household consumption (food, water, cooking fuel,) | |
| В | To meet other household costs (education or health costs) | |

| С | To invest in a business or income generating activity | |
|--|---|--|
| D | To prepare for or respond to an emergency (household level) | |
| E | Other uses: Specify | |
| Q2a. ⊢ suppor | lave you or your spouse/partner borrowed money/taken a loan from a savings group not ted by World Vision or any formal financial service provider during last 12 months? | Yes = 1; No = 0 If No, skip the next questions |
| Q2b. What did you or your spouse/partner use the money for? If the amount is spent equally on two or more categories, mark both. Otherwise mark the option where the r amount was spent. | | |
| А | Household consumption (food, water, cooking fuel,) | |
| В | To meet other household costs (education or health costs) | |
| С | To invest in a business or income generating activity | |
| D | To prepare for or respond to an emergency (household level) | |
| Е | Other uses: Specify | |
| Q3. What did you or your spouse/partner spend the Savings share-out amount for the most recent Savings Cycle of your WV supported Savings Group? If the amount is spent equally on two or more categories, mark both. Otherwise Mark the option where the most part of the amount was spent. | | |
| А | Household consumption (food, water, cooking fuel,) | |
| В | To meet other household costs (education or health costs) | |
| С | To invest in a business or income generating activity | |
| D | To prepare for or respond to an emergency (household level) | |
| F | Other uses: Specify | |

To calculate the indicator:

- Numerator: Total number of respondents choosing:
 - Option C for Q1b OR:
 - Option C for Q2b OR:
 - Option C for Q3
- Denominator: Total number of respondents

Disaggregate results for:

- Respondent HHs who are member of a WV supported Savings Groups and who are not a member of a WV supported Savings Group
- Use of a loan from saving group vs loan from an MFI vs savings share-out.

M4C.AF.IO3 Proportion of women and men with individual and household savings

[EBF EE O.EE.37]

Definition

The indicator has two levels i.e. household savings, and the Individual has their own savings independent of HH savings and is measured in terms of percent of women and men reporting having both types of savings. This indicator assesses respondents' progress on economic advancement process. Having both an individual and household savings can be considered a manifestation of both improved women's (and men's) and HH economic capacities.

How to measure

If savings are being tracked in an iMSD project, track this indicator in conjunction with that. If no, ask the respondent following two questions.

| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|--|----------------|---|
| 1 | Has anyone in your household saved any money in the past 12 months for the household use? Including IGA and for consump-tion/meeting basic needs includ-ing health and education? | Yes=1; No=2 | If yes, who was it: Respondent=1 Spouse=2 Spouse and I/respondent jointly=3 Other family member/s & I jointly=4 Other family members=5 |
| 2 | Do you have any other savings independent of the above men-tioned household savings? (in-cluding saving for own business and non- business expenses e.g. to buy something that you want for yourself? | Yes=1; No=2 | |

Q1 Calculation

- Numerator: Q1: Number of respondents saying YES
- Denominator: Total number of respondents

Calculate the % women and men who says, their HH has savings. Disaggregate for male/female headed households.

Q2 Calculation

- Numerator: Q2: Number of respondents saying YES
- Denominator: Total number of respondents

Calculate the % of respondents who have their own savings. Disaggregate by Sex.

Overall indicator calculation:

- Numerator: Number of women and men with YES to both Q1 and Q2.
- Denominator: Total number of women and men surveyed

Divide the numerator with the denominator and multiply by 100 to get the % women and men having individual and HH savings. Disaggregate by Sex . Compare with the baseline.

Note: Additional information under Q1 on who the HH savings belong to, can be used to further understand that who in the HH often save for HH needs.

M4C.AF.IO4 Average value of member savings per group member

[EBF EE O.EE.38, Compendium C4B.22842]

Definition

Measures the average value/amount of savings per group member in \$US, in one cycle/in the most recent cycle interpreted according to the most current exchange rate.

How to measure

If Savings MIS is being used by the project (Col method):

Data for the MIS is captured using the Savings Group MIS Data Survey Tool and MIS Performance Report.

- Numerator: Cumulative savings by all the Savings Groups in US\$
- Denominator: Total number of current Savings Group Members

Disaggregate data by number of loan cycles. e.g. for those finishing the 1st, 2nd or 3rd etc. cycles.

If the savings MIS is not being used:

- a. In projects using Savings as a key criterion (e.g. Ultra Poor Graduation Approach), robust monitoring systems should be in place and would be the data source. The project team should be able to provide the 'average savings per member' figure.
- b. Where the above two options are not viable, in the household survey, following questions will be asked

to the survey respondents who are members of a savings group. The questions should be added to the relevant section of the survey i.e. savings/savings groups related activities.

Q- At the time of the last share-out, how much savings did you have? OR in the last savings cycle, how much money/amount did you save with your savings group?

----- Amount in Local Currency

Add up the amount for all the respondents

- Numerator: Total amount reported by all respondents
- Denominator: Total number of respondents responding to the above question

Convert the amount in US\$ to report the indicator value. Disaggregate by sex.

M4C.AF.IO5 Proportion of households reporting to have access to sufficient sources of credit providers (formal sources)

[OIOS 72]

Definition

The indicator measures the percentage of households who report being able to access credit from three or more sources when needed. This includes accessing credit for business investments or addressing cash-flow issues for household needs. Sources of credit include Family or Friends; Micro-Credit Agencies or organisations, Bank or Credit Union, Money lenders etc. The indicator reflects the availability and accessibility of credit sources for households, which is crucial for financial stability and economic opportunities.

M4C.AF.IO6 % households with access to sufficient credit (formal and informal sources)

[EBF EE O.EE.41, Compendium C4B.0068]

Definition

Percent of households who report that they are able to access credit from three or more sources, when needed for investment in business or for cash-flow problems to pay for household needs.

This indicator seeks to measure the availability of and access to credit for households living at the 'bottom of the pyramid'. Three sources are identified to establish whether there are more sources of credit than friends/ family and local money lenders. Are there other formal sources of borrowing? Additional items are added for respondents to identify whether households do not need to or do not want to get credit.

How to measure

To measure this indicator, following two questions will be asked to household survey respondents/S4T group members.

| Q1. If you or someone in the household need to borrow money, where do you go to access credit? (Select all relevant items) | | | |
|--|---|--------------|--|
| А | Family and friends | | |
| В | Micro credit agency or organization | | |
| С | Bank or credit union | | |
| D | Money lender (individual) | | |
| Е | Other (specify) | | |
| F | I don't need to borrow money (skip next question) | | |
| G | I don't want to borrow money (skip next question | | |
| Q2. Are | e you able to access the credit you need – borrowing money when needed and the amount | you need it? | |
| А | Always/All of the time | | |
| В | Most of the time | | |
| С | Some of the time | | |
| D | Never | | |
| E | Don't Know | | |

For scoring:

- If HH chooses at least 3 sources from Q1 and choose answer options 1 or 2 from Q2 that will be considered as having access to sufficient credit i.e. YES.
- If Household does not meet either of the above two criteria, it will be considered as not having access i.e. No.
- If the response to Q1 is F or G, (don't need or want to borrow) exclude the respondent from the analysis

To calculate the indicator value

- Numerator: # households meeting criteria for YES
- Denominator: Total # of Households surveyed

Divide numerator with the denominator and multiply with 100, to calculate the %HH having access to sufficient credit. Disaggregate by sex of the HH head i.e. Male vs female headed households.

Suggested Key Research Question (Qualitative): Why they do or do not have access to credit?

M4C.AF.IO7 % of respondents feeling confident in their financial literacy

[EBF EE IO.EE.8]

Definition

Percent of women and men who report feeling confident in managing transactions, borrowing money, saving money.

How to measure

A representative sample of participants will be asked the question below at baseline and endline (and at midline if appropriate).

| # | Question | Answer |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | How confident do you feel in your financial literacy (for example, about managing financial/ transaction matters pertaining to borrowing, savings etc.)? | Not confident at all A little bit confident Somewhat confident Quite confident |
| | On a scale from 1 to 5 (where 5 means 'very confident' and 1 means 'not confident at all'), how would you rate yourself? | 5. Very confident |

Depending on the project interests, results can be disaggregated by various categories including but not limited to:

- Respondents who participated in specific project package/ approach (e.g. GIFT, financial literacy training, etc.)
- Respondents who did not participate in specific project package/ approach (e.g. GIFT, financial literacy training, etc.)
- Male vs Female respondents
- Respondents who completed one S4T group cycle
- Respondents who completed two S4T group cycles
- Respondents who completed three S4T group cycles

The project can choose and apply a cut-off point to determine what answer choice stands for 'feeling confident'. By default, the cut-off point can be set on four (4) i.e. quite confident

- 1. Not confident at all = 1
- 2. A little bit confident = 2
- 3. Somewhat confident = 3
- 4. Quite confident = 4
- 5. Very confident = 5

To calculate the indicator value:

- Numerator: number of respondents scorig equal or above the cut-off point
- Denominator: total number of respondents

Divide the numerator with the denominator and multiply by 100 to get the indicator value. Disaggregate by sex.

M4C.AF.IO8 Nature and reasons for change in terms of supportive attitudes and recognition by household member community and business owners/service providers in the targeted value chain (qualitative)

[WEE 4.5]

Definition

This is a follow-up to indicators 4.1 and 4.3: Percentage of women and men with supportive attitudes towards women's economic participation, and Percentage of respondents reporting their economic roles/contributions within the HH and the community are recognised.

This indicator tries to better understand how members of the HH and community are supporting women and what has triggered this change. This indicator seeks to unpack the reasons for, and nature of the changes linked to norms: the role of women as economic actors; the role of women and men in care work; the role of women and men linked to HH decision making; and attitudes towards GBV. This indicator is to be measured at both the midline and endline evaluations

How to measure

A sample of in-depth interviews should be conducted with relevant stakeholders in order to better understand the nature of changes. These could also be done through gender-disaggregated FGDs. Regardless of the choice between in-depth interviews or FGD, two separate groups need to be targeted: a) women, and b) male HH members or community members. These would need to be further disaggregated based on understandings of local gender and social inclusion dynamics. For example, there were specific FGDs in WV's NSVC Project for mothers-in-law, who play a strong role as influencers in Bangladeshi society. This can be supplemented by Key Informant Interviews with elders of the community or community chiefs (if applicable).

GEDSI & WEE Outcome Indicators

M4C.W.O1 Proportion households with women actively engaged in decision making [OIOS 93]

Definition

This indicator measures the proportion of households with women who are actively engaged according to Household Decision-Making Index score (Indikit) in the top third of the 0-1 range – i.e. 0.67 and higher.

M4C.W.O2 Average # of hours per day spent on leisure and rest/sleep by women and men

[EBF EE O.EE.25]

Definition

This indicator measures the time spent by men and women on leisure and sleep on a typical day and is reported as average number of hours per day.

Measuring leisure is to capture women's time poverty. Leisure time is typically defined as any time left over after all paid and unpaid work has been completed, or time spent not working, such as time for personal care and sleep.

Note: Leisure and sleep time is calculated as part of WEE iMSD indicator on workloads. Given the time required to measure that indicator, a simple indicator and measure are being suggested for the projects not exclusively WEE oriented.

Notes for Enumerators/Evaluator

List example of context specific leisure activities for men and women to probe the respondents.

How to measure

There might be a large difference in leisure and sleep time available on a weekday and over the weekend. Therefore, the indicator will capture both and an average will be calculated. Ask the following direct questions to the respondents both men and women

| Q1 - I understand, you have busy days. So generally on a typical workday, how many hours of sleep do you get during the 24 hours? Probe if they have any naps. Add only the number of hours mentioned as a routine | Number of hours |
|---|-----------------|
| Q2 - How much time do you daily (on a weekday) spend on leisure activities? (e.g. so-cializ- ing with neighbours/friends, watching TV) | Number of hours |
| Q1a - How many hours of sleep do you get during the 24 hours over a weekend? | Number of hours |
| Q2a - How much time do you spend on leisure activities over the weekend? (e.g. so-cializing with neighbours/friends, watching TV) | Number of hours |

Calculate the average number of hours spent on sleep by a respondent Q1x6+Q1a/7 ((e.g. 7 hours a day x 6days i.e. Monday to Saturday) +8 hours over the weekend i.e. Sunday)/7 days of the week).

Repeat the same for leisure time (Q2x6+Q2a/7). Combine the two i.e. average sleep and leisure hours.

To calculate the indicator:

- Numerator: Total number of hours spent on leisure and sleep by women respondents
- Denominator: Total number of women respondents

Calculate the same for male respondents. Compare with women to assess the gap. Compare with the baseline to assess changes, if any, on men and women's sleep and leisure time.

M4C.W.O3 Proportion of community members (adolescents and adults) who support gender equitable attitudes

[OIOS 60]

Definition

This indicator measures the proportion of respondents, disaggregated by sex (male and female) and age (ages 12-18, ages 18+) in the targeted group or population with gender equitable attitudes as measured by the Gender-Equitable Men (GEM) Scale. The scale is a globally validated scale that provides information about the prevailing gender norms in a community. Gender equitable attitudes are attitudes that respect all people without discrimination, regardless of their gender.

In this scale, someone holds "gender-equitable" attitudes if they:

- 1. Think relationships between women and men, girls and boys should be based on equality, respect, and intimacy rather than on sexual conquest.
- 2. Think men (and boys) to be involved in household chores and child-care, meaning that they support taking both financial and care-giving responsibility for their children and household.
- 3. Think men and boys have some responsibility for sexually transmitted infection prevention and reproductive health in their relationships.
- 4. Are opposed to violence against women under all circumstances, even those that are commonly used to justify violence (e.g., sexual infidelity).

M4C.W.O4: % women and men with supportive attitudes towards women's economic participation

[EBF EE O.EE.18, Compendium C4B.25450]

Definition

This indicator measures the % women and men scoring equal to or above the cut-off point set by the project to assess in changes in attitudes towards women's economic participation.

Negative community attitudes informed by harmful gender norms and beliefs is a common barrier to women's economic empowerment. Therefore, this indicator measures:

• SUPPORTIVE ATTITUDES: community beliefs and attitudes on gender defined roles.

ECONOMIC PARTICIPATION includes fair workloads, women's mobility, type of work for IGA, women's
involvement in decision making at the household and community levels and gender based violence. This is
to be measured at the intermediate as well as outcome levels so that the corrective measures can be taken if
the change in attitude is low at mid-line.

From WV experience, asking people to choose one of two statements they agree with is the most user friendly methodology. Our tool is adapted from Indikit (https://www.indikit.net/indicator/78-gender-equality/329-attitudes-towards-women-s-economic-participation).

Notes for Enumerators /Evaluator

The list provided includes all WEE domains. Statements can be modified, but it is best to maintain all domains when modifying.

In contexts where women's mobility is not an issue, remove item two. However, consider other local gender norms that are barriers to women's economic empowerment. However, in contexts where mobility is a barrier to WEE, keep item two and another less relevant item can be replaced with another mobility related item e.g. a). It is ok for a woman to avail an opportunity away from her home to develop knowledge and skills; b). Women should not avail any opportunities if it involves travel or staying away from home.

In integrated livelihood approaches like nutrition sensitive agriculture, consider including gender norms related to gender-based food distribution. e.g. a). Men and boys should always eat first and most as they need more nutrition; b) Women and girls need diverse nutritious food [please add examples of food items relevant to the context] just like men and boys.

In integrated livelihoods programs like ultra-poor graduation (UPG), consider including gender and social norms related to relevant child protection issues. e.g. a) It is a man's decision not a women's whether or not a child should enter child labour or child marriage for the sake of the family, b) women and men should jointly decide important decisions that affect their children (child marriage & child labour)

Adjust language or items as appropriate, based on the issues and barriers identified in gender-sensitive market assessment or other gender assessment, focusing on those that will be targeted by the project.

While coding and scoring, be careful. To avoid a pattern in responses, sometimes the first statement is positive, and sometimes the second. Miscalculating this will lead to serious data misreporting.

How to measure

Respondents are asked to choose one of two paired statements reflecting different attitudes to women's economic participation; suggested script: "Now I am going to read a series of statements which come in pairs. Please tell me which of these two statements you agree with more." Explain before commencing that one response should apply to both single and married women.

The respondent should not agree with both, but choose a single statement they agree with most. Give the respondent time to consider carefully; DO NOT comment on the choice.

| 1 | a/ Women's work on the farm is as important as men's work for the farm business (add context specific examples, e.g. post-harvest processing and manual work/ploughing respectively) | a/ = 1 b/ = 0 | |
|---|--|------------------|--|
| | b/ Men's work on the farm is always more important than women's work (add context appropriate examples, e.g. post-harvest processing and manual work/ploughing re-spectively) | | |
| 2 | a/ It is acceptable if a woman works outside home to support her family economically | a/ = 1 | |
| | b/ Women should be working at home and let their husbands earn money for the family | b/ = 0 | |
| 3 | a/ If a woman gets the right opportunities, she can be as good a businessperson as a man | a/ = 1 | |
| | b/ A woman cannot be as good a businessperson as a man, even if she gets the right opportunities. | b/ = 0 | |

| 4 | a/ It is acceptable for women to take up roles that conventionally are considered a man' jobs (add appropriate examples for each context e.g. women taking on the marketing role in the value chain, | a/ = 1 b/ = 0 | |
|----|--|------------------|--|
| | other professions) | | |
| | b/ Women should only take up professions that are considered as women's professions (add context specific examples) | | |
| 5 | a/ A man should decide how her wife's income is spent | a/ = 0 | |
| | b/ A woman can decide independently how she wants to spend her own income /her enterprise income | b/ = 1 | |
| 6 | a/ Men can/should look after children as well as women do | a/ = 0 | |
| | b/ Looking after children should only be women's work | b/ = 1 | |
| 7 | a/ Men should determine how women/their wives spend their time | a/ = 0 b/ = 1 | |
| | b/ Women and men should jointly discuss workloads for the business and the domestic work | | |
| 8 | a/ Women should always accept her husband's opinion | a/ = 0 | |
| | b/ A woman can disagree with her husband if she thinks he is wrong | b/ = 1 | |
| 9 | a/ It is ok for a man to hit his wife if he thinks, she has done something wrong/ there are times when women deserve to be beaten | a/ = 0 b/ = 1 | |
| | b/ A man should never hit his wife/woman | | |
| 10 | a/ Men are natural leaders in our community | | |
| | b/ Both women and men can be leaders and participate in business and community matters | b/ = 1 | |

Calculate a total score for each respondent (10 maximum).

To calculate levels of supportive attitudes, a scale is needed. The following is recommended:

- Up to 5 out of 10 (or score up to 50%): low supportive attitudes for women's economic participation
- 6 to 8 out of 10 (or score above 50% and up to 80%): moderately supportive attitudes for women's economic participation
- 9 to 10 out of 10 (or score above 80%): highly supportive attitudes for women's economic participation
- In some fragile or extremely unequal contexts (eg. Somalia, Afghanistan), the scope and standing of attitudinal barriers is likely to require adjustments both to statements and to the scale used: eg. a moderately supportive attitude may be set at 4 or 5.

To calculate the indicator value:

- Numerator: Number of respondents scoring equal to or above the project set-cut-off
- Denominator: Total number of respondents

As a default, report the proportion of respondents with highly supportive attitudes. However, conclusions and recommendations can also be drawn from understanding proportion of respondents at low or moderately supportive attitudes. Disaggregation of men's and women's attitudes is always required. Parity can be calculated by comparing average score of women with average score of men and changes from baseline onwards.

M4C.W.O5 Proportion of households with more equitable decision making in productive sphere

[EBF EE O.EE.21]

Definition

% households scoring equal to or above the cut-off score set by the project. This indicator measure changes in decision making in productive sphere only and does not include other HH decisions e.g. related to health, education, HH expenditures etc.

As per the WEE conceptual framework, equitable decision making is defined as where women and men both have a say in the decisions that impact that family and income generation activities. This will look different in different families, but it can be considered equitable where there is dialogue on the issue and family member' views are considered.

Many of World Vision's projects, work on agriculture and involves family enterprise, WVA WEE Framework aims at promoting joint decision making at the HH level (as well as in producer groups and in the market system more broadly). Therefore, this household focused indicator measures the % households with equitable (defined as joint) decision making (DM). However, the tool has been designed in such a way that it also captures men and women's decision-making power. Decision making power is defined as making decisions themselves or participate equitably in decisions related to IGA. Level of equity we want to achieve i.e. cut offs, can be context/ project specific.

This indicator can apply to different types of households:

- Male headed Households. HH where there is a husband/man and wife/woman (male headed household);
- Single headed household: This is a household where there is man or woman heading that household. It could be a widower living with an adult daughter, mother, or mother-in-law.
- Female headed households. A female headed household maybe include those households headed by a woman. This may include those women who may be divorced, separated, widowed or whose spouse has migrated. This sub-category of single headed households are a particularly vulnerable sub-group. Female headed households often live with male members like father in laws, father, son or brother. The gendered dynamics between women and men can be considered in this context.

Notes for enumerators/Evaluators

- Depending on the context, examples can be added to various categories. For example, what type of mechanized tools are being used. If a category is not applicable to a context, an alternative category be added. Reducing the number of categories is not recommended as this will reduce the capacity of the tool of capturing decision making on various aspects of an IGA. Similarly, categories should remain the same for the baseline and endline surveys.
- Most of the decision categories are applicable to various types of enterprises. Nevertheless, some changes might be needed to align them more precisely with the IGA being promoted in an iMSD project.
- While asking Q2 i.e. 'how much say everyone has in decision making', make sure the enumerators understand the concept. Please see the footnote for explanation. For this and other WEE indicators on decision-making, it is best to make it a conversation instead of just reading a question and the response option.

How to measure

Ask the following questions to each respondent. Respondents are men and women from randomly selected households. 50% of the survey respondents will be men and 50% will be men. For the women headed households, any adult member will be the respondents. Context specific examples can be added to existing categories or categories can be adapted. However, keep them consistent between baseline and the endline.

| | Now, I would like to know about decision making in your household around income generation activity. So, please tell me who decides about | Q1- Who decides Self =1 (Move to next item) Partner/Spouse = 2 Self & spouse/ other jointly = 3 (Move to next question) Other HH Member = 4 Not Applicable = 99 | Q2- if the decision is made jointly, how much SAY everyone has? Q2- If the decision is made jointly, how much SAY everyone has Q2- If the decision is made jointly, how much SAY everyone has my spouse has more say=1 we both have a fair ⁸ say/influence=2 I have more say=3 |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | Input choice & purchase (improved seeds, fertilizer & pesticides) | | |
| 2 | How much and what business priorities to reinvest/ Starting a new IGA | | |
| 3 | Purchase/hiring of mechanized and non- mechanized tools | | |
| 4 | Division of labour/who will do what | | |
| 5 | Use of new technologies or devices | | |

8 WVA WEE approach aims for equitable say i.e. where men and women have a dialogue about a decision and both feel their views are valued

| 6 | Hiring farm help/labour | |
|----|---|--|
| 7 | How much to sell / which buyers to sell to agriculture products/ when to sell (if price change over time) | |
| 8 | Large Livestock raising/ selling | |
| 9 | Medium livestock selling | |
| 10 | Your own wage or salaried employ-ment | |

To Calculate indicator value i.e. % of Household with equitable DM:

1-Score the responses: if the response is Q1 option 3+ Q2 option 2, Then score it as 1, otherwise 0. Maximum possible total score per respondent is 10.

2-Set cut-offs OR DM can be categorized as LOW (up to 33%), MEDIUM (Up to 66%) and Highly (67% and above) equitable.

3- In line with the project decision on a cut-off or categorization, calculate the indicator value

- Numerator: number of households scoring equal to or above the cut-off/OR each category
- Denominator: Total number of respondents

Calculate % change from baseline to endline. Disaggregate by the sex of the respondents. This indicator should be disaggregated not only by the sex of the respondent but also by different types of household, eg:

- Male headed households: a husband/man and wife/woman live together (usually, the male is considered head of the household)
- Single headed household: a man or woman heads the household without a resident spouse: eg. widower with female dependents; . It could be a widower living with an adult daughter, mother, or mother-in-law.
- Female headed households. A female headed household may include women who may be divorced, separated, widowed or whose spouse has migrated. This sub-category of single headed households are a particularly vulnerable sub-group. Female headed households often live with male members like father in laws, father, son or brother. The gendered dynamics between women and men can be considered in this context.

Gap between men and women's decision making power (calculation instructions below), too can be used to conclude if decision making power is equitable i.e. smaller the gap in women and men's DM powers, more equitable the decision making is at the HH level.

To Calculate men and women's Decision Making power:

Score the responses

- Decisions made by 'self' will be scored double the score of 'joint' decision making. For example, if a respondent can decide on hiring labor themselves, it will be scored 2 (Two);
- If they claim joint decision making and report having a fair say in joint decision making, they will be scored 1 (one);
- If the spouse or others decide, this will be scored as Zero;
- If the respondent has chosen joint decision making but then in the next question, chooses spouse has more say, then they will be scored as Zero and not one;
- If the respondent has chosen joint decision making but then in the next question if they choose, they have more say than the spouse/others, they will be scored 2, and not one.

Set a cut off. For example, out of possible score of 20, using three categories of low, medium and high level of DM power:

- Scores Up to 33% i.e. 0-7 out of 20 in this case = Low level of DM power
- Up to 66% i.e. 8-13 out of possible score of 20 in this case = Moderate level of DM Power and
- 67% and above i.e. scores 14 and above in this case = High level of DM Power

Calculate % changes from baseline to endline for men and women.

Parity in men and women's decision making scores will be calculated by comparing average score of women with average score of men. Larger the gap between men and women's DM power, lower the HH equitable DM.

NOTE: Please be consistent in setting up of cut-offs i.e. levels for LOW, MEDIUM and HIGH should not be very different for various indicators within the same project as these indicators are measuring interrelated concepts.

M4C.W.O6 Proportion of households with more equitable decision making in domestic

sphere [EBF EE O.EE.22]

Definition

% households scoring equal to or above the cut-off score set by the project.

DECISION MAKING is defined as the power to make your own decisions, or to participate equally in decisions affecting you. The DOMESTIC SPHERE is household decisions, especially those regarding spending. EQUITABLE DECISION MAKING is JOINT decision making by men and women. Therefore, the indicator measures the % households with equitable (defined as JOINT) decision making. However, the tool has been designed in such a way, it captures men and women's decision making power too. As very few contexts reflect true equity, the level of equity we want to achieve is project-specific.

Notes for enumerators/evaluator

- Make sure that all enumerators have similar understanding of different categories of expenditure to ensure consistency.
- Categories can be added or changed. However, do not make them fewer than 5 as this will make the ranges for DM levels too narrow
- Broader decision-making categories should remain the same for the baseline and endline. Context specific
 examples of each category can be added. In contexts, where basic education is free, the question will focus
 on higher education. In nutrition sensitive agriculture or integrated projects, project teams could consider
 adding a decision-making question on the gendered dynamics of food/nutrition/child nutrition/infant young
 child and feed practices (IYCF) related decisions. If the project team is going to add the child marriage
 question, please refer to the legal definition in the country concerned.
- While asking Q2 i.e. 'how much say everyone has in decision making', make sure the enumerators understand the concept. Please see the footnote for explanation. For this and other WEE indicators on decision-making, it is best to make it a conversation instead of just readings a question and the response option.

How to measure

Each respondent will be asked to respond to the following questions:

| | In your household, who normally makes most of the decisions about the activities listed below? | Q1- Who decides Self =1 (Move to next item) Partner/Spouse = 2 Self & spouse/ other jointly = 3 (Move to next question) Other HH Member = 4 Not Applicable = 99 | Q2- If the decision is made jointly, who has most say? my spouse has most say=1 we both have a fair say/influence=2 I have more say=3 |
|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | Major household purchase like house/ reno-vation, vehicle, electronic items e.g. TV, Mo-bile etc.) | | |
| 2 | HH expenditures - Food | | |
| 3 | HH expenditure - Clothing etc. | | |
| 4 | Children's education | | |
| 5 | Health related expenses | | |

| 6 | Irregular household expenditure/ events (mar-riages, funerals, cultural celebrations) | |
|----|---|--|
| 7 | Number of children the couple/family will have | |
| 8 | Child marriage | |
| 9 | How much food to store for coming months | |
| 10 | Please add one context specific decision mak-ing need | |

To Calculate indicator value i.e. % of Household with equitable DM:

1-Score the responses: if the response is Q1 option 3+ Q2 option 2, Then score it as 1, otherwise 0. Maximum possible total score per respondent is 10.

2-Set cut-offs OR DM can be categorized as LOW (up to 33%), MEDIUM (Up to 66%) and Highly (67% and above) equitable.

3- In line with the project decision on a cut-off or categorization, calculate the indicator value

- Numerator: number of households scoring equal to or above the cut-off/OR each category
- Denominator: Total number of respondents

Calculate % change from baseline to endline. Disaggregate by the sex of the respondents. This indicator should be disaggregated not only by the sex of the respondent but also by different types of household, eg:

- Male headed households: a husband/man and wife/woman live together (usually, the male is considered head of the household)
- Single headed household: a man or woman heads the household without a resident spouse: e.g. widower with female dependents; . It could be a widower living with an adult daughter, mother, or mother-in-law.
- Female headed households. A female headed household may include women who may be divorced, separated, widowed or whose spouse has migrated. This sub-category of single headed households are a particularly vulnerable sub-group. Female headed households often live with male members like father in laws, father, son or brother. The gendered dynamics between women and men can be considered in this context.

Gap between men and women's decision making power (calculation instructions below), too can be used to conclude if decision making power is equitable i.e. smaller the gap in women and men's DM powers, more equitable the decision making is at the HH level.

To Calculate men and women's Decision Making power,

Score the responses,

- Decisions made by 'self' will be scored double the score of 'joint' decision making. For example, if a respondent can decide on health related spending, it will be scored 2 (Two);
- if they claim joint decision making and report having a fair say in joint decision making, they will be scored 1 (one).
- If the spouse or others decide, this will be scored as Zero
- If the respondent has chosen joint decision making but then in the next question, chooses spouse has more say, then they will be scored as Zero and not one
- If the respondent has chosen joint decision making but then in the next question if they choose, they have more say than the spouse/others, they will be scored 2, and not one

Set a cut off. For example, out of possible score of 20, using three categories of low, medium and high level of DM power:

- Scores Up to 33% i.e. 0-7 out of 20 in this case = Low level of DM power
- Up to 66% i.e. 8-13 out of possible score of 20 in this case = Moderate level of DM Power and
- 67% and above i.e. scores 14 and above in this case = High level of DM Power

Calculate % changes from baseline to endline for men and women. Parity in men and women's decision making

scores will be calculated by comparing average score of women with average score of men. Larger the gap between men and women's DM Power, lower the equity in DM at the household level.

NOTE: Please be consistent in setting up of cut-offs i.e. levels for LOW, MEDIUM and HIGH should not be very different for various indicators within the same project as these indicators are measuring interrelated concepts.

M4C.W.O7 % project-supported groups that are led by a woman

[EBF EE O.EE.15, Compendium C4B.21086]

Definition

Percent of project supported groups (e.g. Producers Groups, Savings Groups, Cooperatives, Water User Associations-WUA, School Management Committees- SMCs, and/or Forest Management/ FMNR groups) that are led by a woman. 'Led by' is defined as having a female producer/SMS member etc. in the highest position e.g. Chairperson/ President's role. If a man is the president and women is a vice president, the group is led by a man, and not counted.

This indicator measures change in women's decision making ability or power. This also indicates change in acceptance (at community and HH level), for women to be a leader. Groups should be disaggregated by group type i.e. single Sex (women and men only) and mixed groups.

Notes for enumerator/ evaluator

The project team provides this information directly. It should be ready at the start of the evaluation, so that the evaluator can review and can ask for any missing information e.g. sex or designation of a person. The head of the group will not always be clear; designations and titles are different. The project team should identify who is considered the leader.

How to measure

The project team provides the most recent lists of leaders for all groups supported by the project with a clear mention of designations. The lists should not be more than two months old. Here is an example format, collecting only the name and sex of the leaders (rather than every member) to keep data collection simple. In this example, the group has a woman in the chairperson's role, which is the leader, and the group is counted as 1.

| | Name of the producer groupLocationDate of list preparation Group Type: Mixed-gender group Yes/No; Women Only group Yes/No | | |
|--------|--|--------|-------------|
| Sr. No | Name | Sex | Designation |
| 1 | Shahida | Female | Chairperson |
| 2 | Anwar | Male | Treasurer |
| 3 | | | |

To Calculate the indicator:

- Numerator: Total number of Groups where women hold the highest position/president/ chairperson
- Denominator: Total number of groups

Divide the numerator with the denominator and multiply with 100 to get the indicator value. Disaggregate by group type i.e. mixed and women only groups and Categories i.e. savings groups, producer groups etc.

In cases of a group currently without a chairperson, the sex of the most recent chairperson should be included.

M4C.W.O8 Proportion of leadership roles in mixed gender project-supported groups held by women

[EBF EE O.EE.16]

Definition

% of mixed-gender project supported group that are led by a women. For this indicator, mixed gender project supported groups include any type of groups (e.g. Producers, Savings, Cooperatives, Water User Associations-WUA, School Management Committees- SMCs, and/or Forest Management/ FMNR groups) that has mixed gender membership. Men only and women only groups are not included here.

'Leadership' includes everyone in the project/program supported groups who have a position in the governance structure such as chairperson, vice chairperson, treasurer or secretary. The number of leadership roles in a producer group or a cooperative will vary.

Long-held social norms in various contexts have dictated that community affairs and administration are men's domain and men are the decision maker. Women usually have little voice in decision making within agricultural value chains and other governance structures within a market system. Having more women in leadership positions is considered a manifestation of women's decision making ability/power.

Notes for enumerator/ evaluator

The project team provides this information directly. It should be ready at the start of the evaluation, so that the evaluator can review and can ask for any missing information e.g. sex or designation of a person.

How to measure

This can be measured in conjunction with the M4C.W.O7: women in leadership roles, using the same data provided by the project team: the most recent lists of leaders for all groups supported by the project with a clear mention of designations. The lists should not be more than two months old. Here is an example format, collecting only the name and sex of the leaders (rather than every member) to keep data collection simple. In this example, the group has two women and one man in leadership roles and the proportion of leadership is 66.6% female.

Note that this indicator only includes mixed-gender groups.

| | Name of the producer groupLocationDate of list preparationMixe gender group - Yes/No | | f list preparationMixed- |
|--------|--|--------|--------------------------|
| Sr. No | Name | Sex | Designation |
| 1 | William | Male | Chairperson |
| 2 | Lucy | Female | Treasurer |
| 3 | Elizabeth | Female | Secretary |

The full data set can be analysed as follows:

- Numerator: Number of leadership roles held by women
- Denominator: Number of total leadership roles in all mixed-gender groups

In cases of a group currently without a chairperson, the sex of the most recent chairperson should be included. % of roles held by me too can be calculated ad compared with those held by women. Roles can be analysed by position e.g. what % of treasurers are women.

GEDSI & WEE Intermediate Outcome Indicators

M4C.W.IOX Nature and reasons for change in terms of supportive attitudes and recognition by household member community and business owners/service providers in the targeted value chain (qualitative)

[WEE 4.5] Use M4C.AF.IO8 qualitative indicator "Definition" and "How to measure" here.

M4C.W.IO1 Proportion of women and men confident to take up a leadership role

[EBF EE O.EE.14, WEE 3.5]

Definition

This indicator measures women and men's perception of their confidence to take up a leadership role in their group. Group here refers to project/program supported groups e.g. Producers, Savings, Water User Associations, School Management Committees- SMCs or any other group. This indicator assesses progress towards the outcome indicator W.O7 (i.e. % groups led by a woman) and depending on the findings, corrective measures would need to be taken along the way to ensure achievement of the outcome.

Notes for enumerators / evaluator

While asking for reasons, record the response in a few words that can be converted to categories later.

How to measure

Prepare a list of leadership roles in the project supported groups with the help of the project team. Ask the respondents, if they feel confident to take up a leadership role.

| | Do you think, given an opportunity, you have confidence to take on the following roles | Feel fully confident Somewhat confident Not confident- ask further for reasons. |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | e.g. Chairperson of Your Group | |
| 2 | Secretary | |
| 3 | Treasurer | |

Note: all categories can be merged in a single question to align it with the outcome indicator of % groups where women are in a leadership role.

To calculate the indicator:

- Numerator: Number of respondents feeling 'Fully confident' to take up a leadership role.
- Denominator: Total number of respondents

Disaggregate by Sex. Calculate the % women and men in each category/role and the extent of confidence. Analyse the response categories to summarize the reasons to help project team take corrective measures.

Disaggregate by Sex.

M4C.W.IO2 Proportion of women and men involved in rewarding / influential roles in the target value chain

[EBF EE O.EE.17]

Definition

This indicator measures change in inclusion through access to high value roles. Roles are contextual and specified with the help of the project team and value chain analysis. For instance, in a rural economic development context, leading a producer group would probably be considered rewarding / influential; in an inclusive value chain, a market facilitation or buyer role would be considered rewarding / influential. This should be closely linked to the gender sensitive market assessment and the associated project and WEE strategy. Leadership roles in Producer Groups is one example.

Notes for evaluator / enumerator

List of high influence roles needs to be tailored to the context. Use information from gender-sensitive market assessment and the proposed strategy for the selected sub-sectors and the WEE strategy in this context.

Make sure: a) the enumerators have similar understanding of the roles e.g. service providers; b) context specific examples have been added to each category.

How to measure

To prepare the list of highly influential or rewarding roles, we need to understand the distinction between 'influential' at two levels:

- 1. the different business functions, levels, roles played by men and women small holder farmers i.e. who buys inputs, who does the negotiation with buyer or accepts the payment etc.
- 2. the different roles in a VC/market system, played by different market actors and which sex holds those roles. i.e. local service providers, aggregators, banking agents, etc.

For this indicator, we are looking at the second type/level of roles and therefore, while preparing the list, consider only the second level. These roles will vary in various contexts and for various value chains.

Using the list prepared with the help of the project team, ask the respondents if they have been involved in any of the highly rewarding/high influence roles in the past 12 months.

| | List of high rewarding/high influential role | Involvement 1- Yes 2- No |
|---|--|--------------------------------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |

To calculate the indicator value:

- Numerator: Total number of respondents saying YES to any category. If a respondent is involved in more than one roles, this will be considered only once. However, when analysing by role category, all responses will be considered.
- Denominator: Total number of respondents

Disaggregate by Sex. Track change over time by comparing the results at midline and endline with the baseline. Also compare the gap between men and women.

Further calculation: Calculate the % women and men in each category/role by using/dividing with the total number of women and men surveyed.

M4C.W.IO3 Women's and men's average perceptions (score) of women's contributions to household income/fund

[EBF EE O.EE.26, WEE 4.2]

Definition

Average of percent scores allocated to women's contribution to HH economy.

This indicator measures the proportion of perceived contribution made by a woman to total household income. The focus is on perceived contribution or an estimated contribution made by a woman to total household income. This could be women's contribution to the joint family enterprise or it could be contribution from income generated from women's own income generation activity. This does NOT calculate the actual income contribution as any such estimates would need to monetize the unpaid care work which is not easy. Higher women's contribution is a proxy for women's improved economic capacity.

Notes for Enumerator/ Evaluator

Help the respondent by prompting them with examples e.g. think about all the ways that women contribute to the household fund. This could be paid and unpaid. Or think about all household expenses and think about all the resources accumulated regularly or in bulk. Give respondent some time to come up with their estimate. Do Not Rush.

In case of women headed households, ask about the contribution of the main adult male income earner, if any. For widowers, ask about the contribution of any main adult female income earner/s. It could be a sister, daughter or mother etc.

No need to use stones or seeds to get the proportion contribution if respondents are literate and is comfortable with mental calculation.

'Adult' (adult income earner) should align with the UN definition or the national legal definition depending on the context.

How to measure

The respondent (both, men and women in a survey- not from the same household) will be asked to estimate women's contribution to total household income from all sources (including crops, cash and services). This could be women's contribution to the joint family enterprise and resultant benefits to the HH income or it could be contribution from income generated from woman's own income generation activity. Oxfam GB has suggested two ways to measure this indicator- one for the literate (asking directly for % of contribution) and the other for illiterate respondents. The latter is adapted here.

The respondents will be given ten stones or seeds and asked to think about the total household income and indicate how many of the seeds or stones reflect women's contribution. In addition to income, respondents can be asked for the contribution in terms of spending in the household.

| Q- Now can you please help me understand your/your spouse's contribution to household income. Here are ten seeds/stones. You can divide them as your/your spouse's contribution. | Number of SEEDs or stones allocated to woman & men WomenMen |
|---|--|
| You can add the other male members contribution to 'Men' category and other female members contribution to 'Women' category | |

Record the number of seeds/stones placed for women's contribution and convert to % i.e. 4 stones out of 10 means 40%.

To calculate the indicator value i.e. average contribution:

- Numerator: Sum % (contributions) by all women
- Denominator: number of respondents.

Disaggregate by the sex of the respondents. Compare men and women's perceptions. Also compare with the baseline.

M4C.W.IOX Nature and reasons for change in terms of supportive attitudes and recognition by household member community and business owners/service providers in the targeted value chain (qualitative)

[WEE 4.5]

Use M4C.AF.IO8 qualitative indicator "Definition" and "How to measure" here.

M4C.W.IO4 Average number of hours spent on paid and unpaid work by women and men

[WEE 3.9]

Definition

This indicator measures the distribution of paid work and unpaid HH work among women and men. It also assesses whether there have been any changes in HH workloads between men and women, or any redistribution of time spent on activities as a result of the project/intervention.

How to measure

Collecting information regarding the allocation of time spent on paid and unpaid work is particularly challenging and time-consuming. Here, an effort is being made to strike a balance between the accuracy of data collected and time required to collect this information. Activities or tasks have been grouped together to minimise the number of categories.

All respondents will be given 20 larger stones (each representing an hour) and eight smaller stones (each representing half an hour). They will then be asked to distribute them against the activities listed below and presented pictorially on cards to indicate how many hours they spent in various types of activities the day prior to the interview/on a typical day.

Part A. Ask the respondent the following question:

Q - Here are stones representing the 24 hours in a day and night and here are cards that represent different kinds of activities. Thinking of yesterday/[x] day, from the time you woke up until this morning/the next morning, please can you distribute the stones among the activities based on the proportion of time that you spent per activity? Use larger stones to show an hour and use smaller stones if the time spent was less than an hour/around half hour.

| Broader category | Specific category | Time spent in hours |
|-----------------------|--|---------------------|
| Unpaid work | Care of children, elderly or other HH members | |
| | House work/domestic chores eg, cooking, cleaning, washing, ironing, mend-ing/stitching clothes etc. | |
| | Fetching water | |
| | Fuel wood collection | |
| | Food crop production/homestead gardening | |
| | Travel/shopping/participation in group meetings | |
| Paid work/work to | Production and processing/own business work | |
| generate money | Formal employment/paid labour and other work | |
| | Informal labour/other business activities (eg, collecting wild honey, forest fruits, making charcoal etc.) | |
| | Livestock rearing/animal husbandry (all animals)/fishing | |
| | Travel and commuting for selling produce or buying inputs and other services | |
| Personal care/leisure | Personal care, learning and religious activities (eating, drinking, personal hy-giene, praying, studying etc.) | |
| | Leisure time (socialising with neighbours/friends, watching TV) | |
| | Sleeping | |

Part B. When the respondent has finished the above task, give them 10 stones and ask:

| Can you please give us an estimate of both your and your | Record the number of stones allocated to women and men. |
|--|---|
| spouse's share of the total time spent on childcare? | Woman [x] Man [x] |

To calculate the indicator

The average number of hours spent on each type of work can be calculated separately – as well as for paid and unpaid work categories. The third category (personal care/leisure) will be used to calculate Indicator 3.7 if both are part of the same logframe. Also calculate the percentage of time spent by men and women on childcare.

- Numerator: Total # of hours spent by men and women on paid and unpaid work
- Denominator: Total # of men and women respondents

Notes for enumerators/evaluators

- You can trial various options in terms of the number of stones given to respondents and then choose the
 option best suited to your context. For example, instead of 28 stones (20 hourly/large and eight half-hourly/
 small), you might give 23 'one-hour' stones and two 'half-an-hour' stones. Be mindful of striking a balance
 between knowing the details vs time expended. Men's contribution to care work, for example, is important to
 capture and might need to be measured in small blocks of time. However, it is not necessary to capture the
 details of all that people do under the category 'leisure'.
- Let respondents think about their time allocations. If people want to change an allocation, let them do it. When they have finished the task, ask them to check their responses and then record the data.
- If the period of reference is the last 24 hours ('yesterday'), verify that yesterday was not an unusual day (ie, a celebration etc.). If the day was out of the ordinary, ask instead about 'a typical day in the past month'.

Notes for adaptation

- If certain categories are not applicable to a given context, change them. For example, if water collection is not a major time-consuming activity, it might be better grouped under the heading 'other domestic chores'.
- If the project's focus is food security alongside economic development and the project is promoting home gardening and livestock, add these activities to the 'unpaid work' category. If, however, these activities are intended primarily for income generation, categorise then as 'paid work'. In cases where the activities are intended for both food security and income generation, categorise them according to their primary purpose/ benefits for families.

References

This indicator is an adaptation of:

- DCED: Number of hours spent on domestic chores per day.
- ICRW: Equity of domestic duty load.
- J-PAL: Domestic labour: Time dedicated to HH tasks, participation of various family members.
- MDF: Hours a day working in HH and community (average).
 - Hours a day working in fields or other agricultural productive/activities (can be done according to agricultural cycle – paid and unpaid – could be disaggregated.
 - Hours a day on non-agricultural labour or IGAs.
- Oxfam: Distribution of workloads/time use and workloads.
- UN-ESCAP: Average number of hours spent on unpaid domestic work AND Average number of hours spent on childcare and other unpaid care work by sex.
- WEAI: Time use (changes in time use).
- WVA: Median number of hours per day engaged in IGAs AND Median hours per day spent on unpaid domestic and care work (iLIVE Project, Sri Lanka).
- WVA: Average number of hours per day (in the past week) spent on childcare by men and women (NSVC Project, Bangladesh).

M4C.W.IO5 Women and men's average perception (score) of men's contribution towards household chores

[EBF EE O.EE.24 /WEE 3.11]

Definition

The indicator measures the relative volume and value of men's contribution to unpaid work or domestic chores, using a 10 seed or similar scoring system, reported as average of percent scores.

By reporting the average score on perception of proportion of men's contribution to HH chores, the indicator shows if there have been any changes to men's role in domestic sphere. This is a WEE intermediate indicator, tracking change in practices rather than targeting full equity results.

This indicator is most relevant when Mencare or a similar component targets engagement of men and women on the importance of men helping women within unpaid care and other household work.

Notes for Enumerators/Evaluator

In some countries, long-held social norms dictate gendered roles and responsibilities linked to paid and unpaid work, with women often disproportionally engaged in unpaid care work. Men might not like to tell other people if they help in domestic chores. Therefore, during household survey, try interviewing people alone.

How to measure

The respondents, both men and women, will be asked of their perception of men's contribution to unpaid work/domestic chores. Using ten seeds/stones, the respondents will be asked to allocate the proportion of contribution by the respondent, spouse and others to HH chores.

Q- Think of the total time spent on the household chores in your household. Using ten stones, can you help us understand how much time the following members contributes?

| You/Respondent | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Spouse | |
| Other male family members | |
| Other female family members | |

Record the number of seeds/stones placed for MEN's contribution (seeds allocated to Respondent OR Spouse as appropriate and other male family member categories) and convert to % i.e. 4 stones out of 10 means 40%. To calculate the indicator value i.e. average contribution:

- Numerator: Sum % (contributions) by all men
- Denominator: Number of respondents

Disaggregate by men and women respondents to see the difference in perception. Also compare with the baseline.

PWD.IO1 % respondents reporting they feel comfortable working with someone with disability

Definition

This indicator measures the proportion of respondents (i.e. participants, market actor partners including intermediate service providers) who feels comfortable to work with a person with disability.

The definition of disability can be contextual based on the project priorities and target groups. A working definition for persons with disability is provided below:

People who have long term physical, intellectual, sensory, psychosocial or neurological impairments which in interaction with barriers in society may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others.

Working with" refers to any form of professional, operational, or collaborative interaction with persons with disabilities (PWDs), in a workplace, market system, or community-based environment. This includes direct and indirect roles such as employment, partnership, service delivery, supply chain activities, training, or cooperative projects. Examples include:

- Hiring a person with a disability as an employee.
- Buying products or services from an entrepreneur with a disability.
- Partnering with a person with a disability in a business venture.
- Supervising or managing a person with a disability in a workplace.
- Collaborating on a project or task with a colleague who has a disability.
- Receiving training or services delivered by a person with a disability.
- Engaging a person with a disability as a supplier or distributor.

How to measure

(The following questions are suggested only, and based on availability of specialists projects can use their own tools.)

Ask the following questions to the respondents:

Q1. Have you ever worked with or considered working with

- A. Yes
- B. No (Skip Q2)

Q2. On a scale of 1-5 (1 being least comfortable) would you score your comfort level when considering working with a person with disability?

- 1. Not comfortable at all
- 2. Somewhat uncomfortable
- 3. Indifferent
- 4. Somewhat comfortable
- 5. Very comfortable

Additional Key Research Question to understand the reason:

- A. Why did you choose the score?
- B. What do you think would help in increasing the score for yourself and people around you/in your community?

Calculation:

- Numerator: number of respondents responding "Yes" for Q1 putting a score above the cut off point (recommended cutoff point is 4) for Q 2
- Denominator: number of total respondents
- Divide the numerator by denominator to get the indicator value

References

GESI DME Toolkit - <u>https://wvi365.sharepoint.com/sites/Community-GESI/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AA%20</u> Library%20management.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2FCommunity%2DGESI%2FShared%20

$\mathsf{PWD}.\mathsf{IO2}~\%$ PWD reporting they are able to make their own decisions about what is important to them

Definition

This indicator measures the proportion of respondents, who are persons with disabilities (PWDs), reporting that they feel empowered to make their own decisions about matters that are important to them. This includes decisions related to their personal lives, economic activities, professional roles, or participation in community and market systems.

The definition of disability can be contextual based on the project priorities and target groups. A working definition is provided in Indicator PWD.IO1 of this Indicators Toolkit.

How to measure

(The following questions are suggested only, and based on availability of specialists projects can use their own tools.)

Ask the following questions to the respondents:

Q1. Do you feel that you are able to make your own decisions about things that are important to you? A. Yes

B. No (If "No," skip Q2 and proceed to Q3.)

Q2: On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being the least empowered and 5 being the most empowered), how empowered do you feel to make your own decisions about important matters in your life?

- 1. Not empowered at all
- 2. Slightly empowered
- 3. Neutral/Somewhat empowered
- 4. Mostly empowered
- 5. Fully empowered

Additional Key Research Questions

- A. Why did you choose the score you provided in Q2?
- B. What factors support your ability to make decisions independently?
- C. What challenges or barriers make it difficult for you to make your own decisions?

References

GESI DME Toolkit - https://wvi365.sharepoint.com/sites/Community-GESI/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AA%20 Library%20management.aspx?id=%2Fsites%2FCommunity%2DGESI%2FShared%20

M4C.W.IO6 % of HH using childcare service / childcare related initiatives that are i) accessible, ii) affordable, and iii) of adequate quality

[EBF EE New IO.EE.WEE.16]

Definition

This indicator refers to the proportion of households participating in the project that utilize childcare services or initiatives. These services are either directly facilitated by the project or influenced by it but are run sustainably (e,g, as a viable business or a subsidized public service offering) by local communities, private providers, or government bodies.

The childcare sector is constituted of four key institutional actors – the State, markets, households, and communities.⁹ In the project's context it could be paid or unpaid childcare service.

Project should consider the types of childcare services for the context and tailor the indicator:

- Young children (0-3 years): community-based childcare centres, crèches, preschools and other informal spaces where young children gather. – nurturing care including health, nutrition and WASH matching the national guideline – e.g. separate toilets for boys and girls, handwashing facilities etc.
- Pre-school pre-primary age children (3-6 years): formal and informal set-up with an additional focus on a curricula on learning roots to build on earlier stages of speech and literacy development. At this age bracket WASH and other health practices are also continued.
- Primary school age children (6-9 years): This age group often requires before and after-school care and structured learning support that complements their formal education. Programs can be both formal and informal, with a focus on academic assistance, social development, and recreational activities.

The childcare services¹⁰

- Accessible means that childcare services are physically accessible within a reasonable distance and cater to the needs of households. Consider the extent to which these services are accessible to different types of households - e.g. female headed, minor ethnic groups, and types of children - girls, boys, children with disability. Also consider timing which refers to childcare services open at optimal times for HHs to support working parent(s).
- Affordable indicates that the cost of these services is manageable for low-income households and does not impose a financial burden.

^{9 &}lt;u>https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/wcmsp5/groups/public/@asia/@ro-bangkok/documents/publication/wcms_887517.pdf</u> (Figure 1, conceptual framing linked to the type of care that exist).

¹⁰ Investments in Childcare for Gender Equality in Asia and the Pacific

- Adequate Quality refers to the standards of care, including the safety, educational value, and well-being of children, being consistently met according to locally agreed benchmarks or regulations. Consider at least 3 quality areas especially when the project has more control over the quality (e.g. project is directly supporting establishing / enhancing the care service rather than just creating linkage):
 - 1. Education program is child centered, age appropriate and promotes health & safety,
 - 2. The physical environment is safe and suitable and
 - 3. staff are qualified and experienced that meets national guidelines.

How to measure

A representative sample of women participants will be asked the question below at baseline and endline (and at midline if appropriate).

| Q1 – Are you using a childcare service? – | a. Yes (go to Q2)b. No (skip all next questions) |
|--|---|
| Q2 – How many children are you taking to a childcare service? | (in number) |
| Q3 – How old is (name, the child)?* (record the response on the youngest child) | a. 0-under 3 b. 3-6 c. Above 6+ |
| First ask the respondent how many children they are taking to the child- care service. Then, if there are more than 1 child and are from different age groups, select one child (either the youngest or another, depending on the project's context), and ask, 'How old is [name of the selected/referred child]?' | |

| Q4,5,6,7,8 – Score these statements on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being most favourable. Put Ticks: | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-----------------------|
| | Strongly Disagree (1) | Disagree (2) | Neutral (3) | Agree (4) | Strongly Agree (5) |
| Q4: Accessibility: I currently access childcare services that are located within a reasonable distance, open at optimal times that meets the needs of my household and is open to all members of the community. | | | | | |
| Q5: Affordability: I currently access childcare services or initiatives that are affordable for my household, with costs that are manageable and do not impose a financial burden. | | | | | |
| Q6,7,8 on Quality – alternative statements or [For Q2 respondents who answered: A, ask Q6A, B, ask Q6B C, ask Q6C] | I | | | | |
| Q6A: I currently access childcare services (Year 0-3 years) that provide this age group appropriate nurturing care framework and learning with focus on the child's development (development toys and verbal cues) | | | | | |
| Q6B: I currently access childcare services (Year 3-6 years) that provide this age group appropriate curriculum and learning materials that focus on learning roots (e.g. recognizing alphabets etc.) | | | | | |
| Q6C: I currently access childcare services (Year 6+ years) that provide this age group appropriate curriculum and learning materials that focus primary school curriculum. | | | | | |

| Q7: I currently access childcare services that pro-vide this age group appropriate safe conditions and facilities (E.g. Physically safe and child friendly, acceptable child to caregiver ratio) and WASH practices and facilities. | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| Q8: I currently access childcare services that pro-vide this age group appropriate trained caregivers/teachers. | | | |

Calculation

- Set a cut off point for Numerator for Q4-8. Suggested cut off point is 4 Agree
- Numerator: Respondents who answered "Yes" to Q1, and scored above cut off in Q4-8
- Denominator: Total number of respondents/households surveyed who have the option to access childcare service facilitated by the project with a child 0-18 years old
- Divide the numerator with the denominator and multiply by 100 to get the indicator value.

Qualitative/KRQ:

In addition to assessing this quantitatively ('% of HH accessing care') also ask qualitative questions to assess accessibility, affordability and quality. Suggested qualitative / key research questions are given below:

- **Accessibility:** How do parents and caregivers perceive the availability of childcare services in their community? What specific needs do they feel these services should meet and is it accessible for everyone on the community? Is the location of childcare service within a reasonable distance? Are the operating hours of the service work for the family in particular working parents(s).
- **Affordability:** What factors influence families' perceptions of affordability when accessing childcare services, particularly regarding additional costs like meals or activities?
- **Quality:** Consider specific questions for quality if the project has more control over the quality (e.g. project is directly supporting establishing / enhancing the care service rather than just creating linkage):
 - o Are the services formal (established public or privately run by paid staff) or informal (run by community volunteers) in nature? How does the care service's education program prioritize children's developmental needs while promoting their health and safety?
 - o In what ways is the physical environment of childcare facilities designed to be safe and suitable for children? What specific features are considered essential?
 - How do the qualifications and experience of teachers/caregivers contribute to the quality of care and education provided in childcare services? What aspects do parents value most in staff capabilities?

Reference

The World Bank (2022) Women Business and the Law: Toward Available, Affordable, and Quality Childcare Services, table 2.2 on pages 57-58

Investments in Childcare for Gender Equality in Asia and the Pacific Pages 40-93

https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/wcmsp5/groups/public/@asia/@ro-bangkok/documents/publication/ wcms_887517.pdf (Figure 1: Conceptual framing linked to types of care)

UNICEF guidance - <u>UNICEF-Programme- Guidance-for-Early-Childhood-Development-2017.pdf</u> (types of care relevant for various age groups of children)

<u>Operationalizing-NC.pdf</u> (nurturing-care.org) (operational guideline for optimal child growth and development)

M4C.W.IOX WEE 4.5 Nature and reasons for change in terms of supportive attitudes and recognition by household member community and business owners/service providers in the targeted value chain (qualitative)

[WEE 4.5]

Use M4C.AF.IO8 qualitative indicator "Definition" and "How to measure" here.

ESCA & Green Growth Outcome Indicators

M4C.GG.O1 Proportion of households with alternative and diversified sources of income

[OIOS 63]

Definition

Percent of households who report having at least one alternative source of income to rely on, or switch to, should the main income source be lost because of loss of employment, death, illness or other climate related shocks and disasters. shock or disaster.

Alternative income sources refer to any other source of income that is not derived from the Household's traditional income generation activity. Risk diversified income sources refer to having multiple income sources that are not dependent on a single source. By having alternative sources, a household is able to spread out risk and protect themselves against any financial losses.

M4C.GG.O2 Regreening Index score * For projects implementing the Regreening Communities project model. Mandatory for ESCA (Green Growth) targeted projects

Definition

The Regreening Index helps communities describe and evaluate the condition of their land or sea scape and how it is changing as a result of their regreening efforts. The Regreening Index builds on the community's Regreening Plan and Monitoring plan and is used to evaluate if the planned activities are successfully improving the condition of the aspects of the environment that are of most significance to them.

The Regreening Index provides a framework to interpret community monitoring data, as well as any external data available, to describe the progress being made. By using this standard framework to evaluate community regreening monitoring, we are able to compare & potentially aggregate the progress made towards Regreening Goals across different communities and projects.

The Regreening Index is implemented in 3 parts:

- 1. Baseline assessment This can be done during the Regreening Action Planning Process, once the priority domains or spheres are known based on the Root Cause analysis.
- 2. Monitoring Community led monitoring as per the Regreening Monitoring Plan, will gather relevant data on the areas that the community would like to see changes in as a result of their regreening efforts

The condition and trend of the prioritized aspects of the landscape is assessed at the baseline and endline

3. Annual reflection & evaluation - These events will present the regreening monitoring data

by the community through observations, existing knowledge, discussion, and review of external data. Monitoring via field measurements and observations by the community is used to assess annual progress and outcomes of the restoration activities being implemented through the Landscape Restoration Plan. For each of the domains where change may be observed, a number of example indicators are provided. The community is also welcome to identify alternative indicators related to the changes they Diversity want to see as a result of their restoration efforts. By the community leading the monitoring and assessment of these changes, they are observing and engaging with their environment, building stronger connections and understanding of how the environment interacts with their lives.



How to measure

Establish a baseline of these domains through community based, participatory self-assessment of the condition of each aspect of the landscape (on a scale of 1-5 where 1 is degraded and 5 is the condition desired by the community, ideal condition) and then the trend of how it is changing over time. Score is to be based on local knowledge, and where possible combine this with external evidence such as remote sensing, mapping, secondary data and expert opinions. The community should interpret and validate any the data presented to inform the final assessment and scoring in each of the targeted domains.

| Score of current conditions (5) Ideal condition desired by community (4) Good condition (3) Average condition (2) Degraded | Trends of condition ↑ Upward trend → No change ↓ Downward trend |
|--|--|
| (1) Very degraded | |

This can be reported on a spider diagram to show the current state and the change in the environment that the community is managing.

Work with community to identify goals/outcomes most relevant to their landscape and livelihood needs and prepare the Regreening Action Plan. Align the goals with the specific domains of the regreening index, selecting up to 3 that are most relevant. This should build on the community mapping and root cause analysis processes.

Identify up to 2 indicators per domain that are practical to be monitored by the community, and are likely to show the changes that the community hopes to see within the project period as a result of the planned activities in the Regreening Action Plan. Work with the Regreening Committee or a Monitoring Sub-Committee to document a Regreening Monitoring Plan (including the identified indicators, who will do the monitoring how and when) and provide progress

Example Regreening Index



updates annually. Example indicators per theme/domain can be found in the table below. An example of how these indicators align with the Regreening Action Plan is shown below:



Example Regreening Index



Towards the end of the project assess the endline condition of the communities environment by repeating the assessment of condition and trend of the prioritised domains as was done in the baseline, through community discussion and scoring. Ensure that the monitoring data that is collected by the community is considered in these discussions and any external data sources also available.

References

Regreening Communities Handbook-compressed.pdf

M4C.GG.O3 Number of hectares protected and/or under restoration [OIOS 104]

Definition

Size of areas in hectares protected and/or restored or rehabilitated including environmental protection, watershed protection or restoration, sustainable forest management and restoration and rehabilitation (FMNR and enrichment planting).

M4C.GG.O4 Proportion of households with sustained or increased agricultural production due to climate-resilient agricultural practices

[OIOS 68]

Definition

This indicator measures the percentage of households reporting sustained or increased yield for the same crop(s), over a period of not less than three successive years during which climate variability or weather extremes were experienced, as a result of adopting climate-resilient agricultural practices. These include practices such as Climate Smart Agriculture, Agroforestry, Agro-ecology, Natural Resource Management, Farmer Managed Natural Regeneration etc)

- Extreme climate variability includes droughts, floods, extreme heat or cold etc., not usual for the normal • climatic context of the area the farmer is located.
- Climate-resilient agricultural practices include climate-smart agriculture e.g. utilizing recommended drought/flood/heat resistant crop varieties; climate-resilient livestock breeds (including for aquaculture and apiculture); pest and disease resistant crops and livestock; efficient water-saving technologies; moisture protection techniques; clean energy for agricultural activities etc.

M4C.GG.O5 Proportion of HHs with increased income from circular economy activities in waste management

Definition

This indicator measures the levels of participation and income generation from circular economy activities in waste management. Circular economy is a system where things are made and consumed in a way that minimizes our use of the world's resources, cuts waste and reduces carbon emissions. People participating in circular economy keep products in use for as long as possible, through repairing, recycling and redesign – so they can be used again and again. Circular economy activities include activities such as recycling, collection and sale of certain types of waste, being employed in waste management activities that include recycling or processing for extraction of value from waste etc.

How to Measure

Data Sources: Project monitoring; surveys; Data collection will be conducted through a mixed qualitative and quantitative survey based on questionnaire administration to household heads.

Q1: Do you or any of your household members participate in waste management activities for money? (Yes/No); If yes to Q1) Q2. Compared with the previous year/before the project start, how was your/ your HH annual income from waste management this year? (Much higher/ Higher/ Same/ Lower/ Much lower/ Don't know-unsure-decline)

Indicator Calculation:

- Numerator: Sum of all HHs that responded 'Yes' in Q1, and responded "Much higher" or "Higher" in Q2
- Denominator: total number of households sampled in the study area.
- Divide the numerator by the denominator to get the indicator value.

Reference:

This indicator has been defined by WVI ESCA Team. Please reach out to Hausner Wendo hausner_wendo@wvi. org and YukikoYamada_Morovic@wvi.org for clarification and further guidance.

M4C.GG.O6 Number of HHs involved in organic waste reuse or value addition for energy production

Definition

This indicator measures the proportion of project participants practicing conservation agriculture in their farms; conservation agriculture is defined by FAO as a farming system that can prevent losses of arable land while regenerating degraded lands. It promotes maintenance of a permanent soil cover, minimum soil disturbance, and diversification of plant species. It enhances biodiversity and natural biological processes above and below the ground surface, which contribute to increased water and nutrient use efficiency and to improved and sustained crop production.

How to Measure

Data Sources: Project monitoring; surveys; Data collection will be conducted through a mixed qualitative and quantitative survey based on questionnaire administration to household heads.

Question: Do you implement any organic waste reuse or value addition for energy production in your home? (e.g. biogas from organic waste or manure) (Yes/No); if 'Yes' please list some of the practices you implement. Calculation: List the organic waste reuse or value addition for energy production that are provided and count all the households that apply them.

Reference:

This indicator has been defined by WVI ESCA Team. Please reach out to Hausner Wendo <u>hausner_wendo@wvi</u>. org and <u>YukikoYamada_Morovic@wvi.org</u> for clarification and further guidance.

M4C.GG.O7 Quantity, or % of collected waste that is sustainably valorised (adopt, system level)

Definition

This indicator measures the quantity or proportion of solid waste that is diverted from landfill or unsafe disposal by local government operators, private market actors or community-based organisations. This indicator is mostly applicable to urban areas or camp settings (e.g. organized camp of refugees or internally displaced persons). The indicator is aligned with the SDG target 12.5 "By 2030, substantially reduce waste generation through prevention, reduction, recycling and reuse" and the SDG indicator 12.5.1 "National recycling rate, tons of material recycled".

This indicator can be used when a project is partnering with local actors to improve or establish a new waste management system aiming to increase the rate of sustainable valorisation.

Sustainable valorisations include recycling, composting or anaerobic digestion (e.g. conversion into biogas). In some contexts it may include incineration with energy recovery (e.g. in case that is considered a good practice as per national regulations, plans and policies).

Given that the evidence tells us there is an imperative to reduce both the proportion of waste going to landfill, together with the overall quantity of waste, we encourage projects to enquiry about the changes in total amounts as well as the proportions.

How to measure

Each project will have to adapt the definition depending on the type of actors that are partnered with, and the type of wastes targeted by the project.

Representatives of partnered actors will be asked the questions below at baseline and endline (and at midline if appropriate). The format will be key informant interview, and whenever possible, supporting evidence will be collected, such as monitoring reports.

Make sure that the respondent is clear about the target community or geographic area that is supported by the project.

| # | Question (Q) | Answer (A) |
|-----|---|------------|
| 1 | Can you tell me about the total quantity of solid waste that was collected in the past 12 months, in the target area of the project? | |
| | Record the value in the most practical unit used by the actor (e.g. volume in cubic meter, number of truck loads, metric tonne,) as well as the unit used in the interview. | |
| 2.a | Now can you tell me about the quantity of collect waste that was sorted for recycling? | |
| | If possible, record the value using the same unit use for responding to Q.1. If not possible record the value and the unit used by the respondent. If the value is un-known to the respondent, record "Don't know". | |
| 2.b | Can you describe in few words what type of waste was sorted for recycling? | |
| 3 | for composting | |
| | If possible, record the value using the same unit use for responding to Q.1. If not possible record the value and the unit used by the respondent. If the value is un-known to the respondent, record "Don't know". | |
| 3.b | Can you describe in few words what type of waste was sorted for composting? | |
| 4.a | for anaerobic digestion (biogas) | |
| | If possible, record the value using the same unit use for responding to Q.1. If not possible record the value and the unit used by the respondent. If the value is un-known to the respondent, record "Don't know". | |
| 4.b | Can you describe in few words what type of waste was sorted for anaerobic digestion? | |
| 5.a | Which quantity was safely disposed in a specific facility/ storage system? (e.g. a specific tank that was designed to store used oils without contaminating the soil, water and air) | |
| | If possible, record the value using the same unit use for responding to Q.1. If not possible record the value and the unit used by the respondent. If the value is un-known to the respondent, record "Don't know". | |
| 5.b | Can you describe in few words what type of waste was sorted for safe disposal? | |

| 6.a | Which quantity was dumped in a landfill? | |
|-----|---|--|
| | If possible, record the value using the same unit use for responding to Q.1. If not possible record the value and the unit used by the respondent. If the value is un-known to the respondent, record "Don't know". | |
| 6.b | Can you describe in few words what type of waste was sent to landfill? | |
| 7.a | Which quantity was disposed in other ways? (e.g. left around the farm or business premises, dumped into river streams or gutters) | |
| | If possible, record the value using the same unit use for responding to Q.1. | |
| | If the value is un-known to the respondent, record "Don't know". | |
| 7.b | Can you describe in few words what type of waste was disposed in other ways? | |

Calculation method

Refer to available secondary data or information provided by the respondent to convert the results to each question into the same unit, so that we can calculate a percentage figure.

- Numerator:
 - o If only the values for Q.1 and Q.6 are known, the numerator is the difference of A.1 minus A.6
 - o If the value for Q.2 or any other type of valorisation of interest is known, the numerator will be the sum of all relevant answers (A.2, A.3, A.4 and A.5)
- Denominator: Total quantity of solid waste that was collected in the past 12 months, in the target area of the project (value A.1)

Suggested Qualitative/KRQ:

- What are the current challenges for increasing the proportion of recycled wastes in the target location?
- Which initiatives have you recently implemented to decrease the amount of waste that ends in landfills?

References

Global indicator framework for the Sustainable Development Goals and targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (<u>https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/Global-Indicator-Framework-after-2024-refinement-English.pdf</u>)

Common indicators for municipal waste management | Green Best Practice Community (europa.eu) (<u>https://greenbestpractice.jrc.ec.europa.eu/node/178#block-views-block-bemp-indicators-block-1</u>)

ESCA & Green Growth Intermediate Outcome Indicators

M4C.GG.IO1 Proportion of households adopting improved agricultural practices

[EBF CAR O.FSN.2]

Definition

% HHs adopting improved agricultural practices in any season during past 12 months. This includes agricultural practices that primarily aim to improve yield/increase production.

Please note: this indicator is more about adoption and the effectiveness of the extension methodology. It is possible to adopt and NOT experience increased yields (due to drought or locusts, or inability to properly execute) – but knowing adoption and uptake is occurring builds confidence in the approach, and may provide supporting evidence in instances where yields have increased

Notes for Enumerators / Evaluators

• Make sure, the promoted technologies/practices by crop are listed clearly.
• Instead of reading the list of options by crop, make it more conversational e.g. when growing maize, do you use improved seeds or local seeds? Have you tried zai-pits?

How to measure

Project promoted/recommended agriculture practices in the implementation context will be listed with the help of the project team. These may include:

- adopting improved crop varieties or a promoted commodity (such as a superfood crop, or drought tolerant crops)
- adopting certified seeds
- safe use of farm chemicals (synthetic pesticides,
- adequate use of mineral fertilizers
- adopting integrated pest management principles
- planting in rows
- observing adequate sowing density
- using recommended grain or seeds storage practices

During the HH survey, respondents will be asked if they (themselves or any other adult family member) are using any of the improved practices. In case of agriculture projects involving several crops, there will be a specific list of recommended practices for each crop and the question will be repeated for each project target crop produced by the respondent. Certain concepts e.g. safe use of farm chemicals and adequate use of mineral fertilizers too would need to be defined with the help of the project team and or/and using recommendations by the government. Also specify the seasons for recall e.g. past 12 months or last two seasons etc. If this indicator is to be measured for the targeted crops only, and the above indicator on Target crops grown (% HHs growing target nutritious crops/products) too is part of the logframe, the two can be linked and only those Crops should appear here that the respondents has reported above.

Q1- Now I would like to know about your agricultural practices/technologies for various crops. In the last 12 months, have you/any of your family members used any of the following:

| Сгор | Technology/practice | | | | | |
|--------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Crop 1 | Tech/Prac1: Yes=1; No=0 | Tech/Prac2: Yes=1; No=0 | Tech/Prac3: Yes=1; No=0 | | | |
| Crop 2 | | | | | | |
| Crop 3 | | | | | | |
| Crop 4 | | | | | | |

Adoption can be calculated by category/option (i.e. % of people using each category/option) as well as by setting a cut-off point (i.e. if a program is promoting five practices and adopting at least three are required, % of HH reaching the desired level will be the indicator value).

To calculate % by practice/category:

- Numerator: Total number of respondents saying YES to an agriculture practice
- Denominator: Total number of responses/respondents for that option/practice

Divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply with 100. Report the percentage of those have adopted that practice. Disaggregate by HH head type. The ITT should have a separate row for each category.

To calculate % by cut-off:

The project team has to set-up a cut off either at the start of the project as target or at the start of an evaluation.

- Numerator: Number of respondents ≥ the cut-off
- Denominator: Total number of respondents

Divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply with 100. You will have the % of HH who have adopted the practices. Disaggregate by HH head type.

If the respondent is not at all using recommended practices/adopting recommended technologies, ask a followup question to explore why. If overall level of adoption of certain practices remain low, explore further in Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).

M4C.GG.IO2 Proportion of households using improved NRM or sustainable agricultural practices

[EBF CAR O.NRM.2]

Definition

% HHs adopting improved natural resource management (NRM) or sustainable agriculture practices that for instance, improve soil quality/fertility and water management

Notes for Enumerators/Evaluator

Make sure the context specific and project promoted agriculture practices are listed clearly, and that your enumerators understand the different practices and can code appropriately if required.

How to measure

Project promoted/recommended agriculture and NRM practices that improves soil fertility and water management in the implementation context will be listed with the help of the project team. These may include:

- Conservation farming approaches e.g". crop rotation and intercropping, minimum tillage and soil cover)
- Climate-smart agriculture approaches
- Erosion control with live barriers
- Use of trench bunds
- Stump and shrub regeneration (FMNR)
- Agroforestry
- Fallowing
- Terraces
- Cut-off drains

During the HH survey, respondents will be asked if they (themselves or any other adult family member) are using any of the listed practices. Seasons or time for recall e.g. past 12 months or last two seasons etc. will be specified and Yes/No responses will be recorded. Here is an example question:

Q1- Now I would like to know about your practices related to soil fertility. In the last 12 months, have you/any of your family members used any of the following:

| NRM Practice 1 | 1=Yes; 0=No |
|----------------|-------------|
| NRM Practice 2 | 1=Yes; 0=No |
| NRM Practice 3 | 1=Yes; 0=No |
| etc. | |

Adoption can be calculated by category/option (i.e. % of people using each category/option) as well as by setting a cut-off point (i.e. if a program is promoting five practices and adopting at least three are required, % of HH reaching the desired level will be the indicator value).

To calculate % by practice/category:

- Numerator: Total number of respondents saying YES to an agriculture/NRM practice
- Denominator: Total number of responses/respondents for that option/category/ practice

Divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply with 100. Report the percentage of those have adopted that practice. Disaggregate by HH head type. The ITT should have a separate row for each category.

To calculate % by cut-off:

The project team has to set-up a cut off either at the start of the project as target or at the start of an evaluation.

- Numerator: Number of respondents ≥ the cut-off
- Denominator: Total number of respondents

Divide the numerator by the denominator and multiply with 100. You will have the % of HH who have adopted the practices. Disaggregate by HH head type.

If the respondent is not at all using any recommended practices, ask a follow-up question to explore why. If overall level of adoption of certain practices remain low, explore further in Focus Group Discussions (FGDs).

M4C.GG.IO3: Average value of target product sold in the last 12 months

[EBF EE O.EE.13, Compendium C4B.15737]

Definition

Average (Mean) value of product sold in last 12 months for target crops/enterprises to all sources. This will include all target crops and products (that is, crops and products the project is targeting) regardless of to whom or how the product is sold. Allocate a separate line in the ITT for each target crop/product. Note this measures gross value before expenses are taken into account. A separate indicator should be used for measuring profit.

Notes for Enumerators / Evaluator

Prepare a list of all products/crops being promoted by the project, number of cycles/harvest per year and the market prices and add them to the questions to help enumerators.

Focus on target crop only. For instance, if the project is supporting chili and the HH is selling groundnut, we do not need to know about groundnut. This may be captured by other indicators (e.g. HH income).

How to measure

Measurement of this indicator is based on direct questioning and recall by households/respondents. The respondent will be asked to recall value of each target crop/produce sold for all seasons/cycles in the last 12 months and an average (Mean) will be calculated for each Crop/product separately. A project specific list of crops/produce will be prepared and added to Q1.

| Q | Target Crops/Product: | 1 | 2 | 3 | |
|---|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| 1 | In the last 12 months, have you/your household grown/produced/ harvested any[read each product category] | 0=No 1=Yes | 0=No 1=Yes | 0=No 1=Yes | |
| 2 | [For each 1=1] Did you/your household sell any [product] in the last 12 months? Note: This include selling to all sources/markets. | 0=No 1=Yes | 0=No 1=Yes | 0=No 1=Yes | |
| 3 | [For each 2=1] About how much (value in local currency) did you/ your household earn from selling [product] in the last 12 months? This includes all seasons for each crop | Value | Value | Value | |

Question 3 is used to obtain the value sold of each crop/product, among those households who sold the crop (Q2). It is recommended to use an appropriate stepwise method for the particular crop/product to determine the value of product sold over the 12-month period. This may require additional questions and (post) calculation to get to an annual figure: e.g. a 2-step method asking how many harvests in the last 12 months, and then how much sold (value) in each harvest. The key for measurement here is 'harvest' as this is a more defined point in time than a growing period and indicates that a crop/product reached maturity.

For crops/products sold perennially, ask how many months in the last 12 did you sell the crop/product, and about how much earned per month, then add them to become a total (annual) amount. Note that the value is gross (amount received), not net (amount earned after expenses). If a value is unknown, prompt: more than \$10? More than \$100? etc in local currency. An estimate is better than nothing. If still unable to respond, step out/move to next question.

To calculate the indicator value:

- Numerator: Total value of crop sold by all Households (sum of the amount under Q3)
- Denominator: All households that sold particular crop/product (i.e. among those responding 1=Yes to question 2).

Note: Repeat the process for each crop/product. Also, the ITT will require a MEAN value for each crop/product separately.

Disaggregate by sex. Compare with the baseline and the control group if any.

M4C.GG.IO4 % of producers feeling more confident in the capacity of their farming system to cope with climate change and natural disasters since programme start

[EBF EE IO.EE.GG.13]

Definition

This indicator refers to the proportion of farmers who report an increased sense of resilience and confidence in their farming practices to withstand or adapt to the effects of climate change (e.g., droughts, floods, temperature changes) and natural disasters (e.g., flash floods, storms, wildfires). This indicator seeks to measure the perceived improvements in preparedness, sustainability, recovery and adaptive capacity of farming systems that have been introduced or supported by the program.

This indicator is associated with the following types of broad activities and expected behaviour changes related to coping strategies:

- Producers gain knowledge of the costs, benefits, and trade-offs of climate smart practices, enhancing resilience and productivity.
- Producers proactively seek information about potential impacts on farming from climate change and natural disasters; and create strategies to prepare for shocks.
- Producers actively engage with extension services to ensure informed decision-making and achieve desired impacts.
- Producers adopt strategies for improving income, such as diversification and access to financial services.
- Producers access new markets and value chains, boosting income, food security, and sustainable livelihoods.
- Producers adopt climate-smart agriculture practices and inputs like appropriate seeds, soil fertility irrigation and pest management, and farm management tools.

Climate change and natural disasters can be slow onset and rapid onset.

- **Slow-onset** effects like rising global temperatures lead to gradual impacts on ecosystems, biodiversity, and livelihoods, especially in agriculture and fisheries. Shifts in seasons and erratic rainfall, soil erosion and fertility loss can be observed over a couple of years. Desertification and prolonged droughts develop over months or years, leading to reduced water availability, loss of arable land, and increased food insecurity.
- **Rapid-onset** climate events, such as intense heatwaves or flash floods, are driven by extreme weather patterns resulting from climate change, causing immediate harm to communities and infrastructure. Events like earthquakes, tsunamis, and hurricanes occur without much warning, leading to swift and severe destruction, necessitating urgent emergency response and relief efforts.

How to measure

A representative sample of participants will be asked the question below at baseline and endline (and at midline if appropriate).

| # | Question | | Answer |
|---|---|----------------------------|---|
| 1 | How confident do you feel in your farming system's ability to cope with the impacts of climate change and natural disasters (e.g., droughts, floods, changing temperatures, shift in seasons and erratic rainfall) compared to be-fore the program started? On a scale from 1 to 5 (where 5 means 'very confident' and 1 means 'not confident at all'), how would you rate yourself? | 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. | Not confident at all A little bit confident Somewhat confident Quite confident Very confident |

Depending on the project interests, results can be disaggregated by various categories including but not limited to:

- Producers who participated in specific project interventions (e.g., climate-smart agriculture training, risk management workshops)
- Producers who did not participate in specific project interventions (e.g., climate-smart agriculture training, risk management workshops)
- Producers who have been involved for one growing season under the program
- Producers who have been involved for two growing seasons under the program
- Producers who have been involved for three or more growing seasons under the program

Note: The project can choose and apply a cut-off point to determine what answer choice stands for 'feeling confident'. By default, the cut-off point can be set on four (4) i.e. 'Quite confident'.

To calculate the indicator value:

- Numerator: number of respondents scoring equal or above the cut-off point the question
- Denominator: total number of respondents

Divide the numerator with the denominator and multiply by 100 to get the indicator value. Disaggregate by sex.

Example ANCP NSVC

Since you say that your farming practices have changed since you joined the NSVC project, how confident are you that your farming system can cope with extreme climatic events and natural disasters, compared to before joining the NSVC project? (Single choice – choose only 1 answer)

- 1 = Feeling less confident now compared to before
- 2 = No difference now compared to before
- 3 = Feeling a little bit more confident now compared with before
- 4 = Feeling somewhat more confident now compared with before
- 5. = Feeling much more confident now compared with before joining the project

Reference

- <u>World Bank (2016) Climate-Smart Agriculture Indicators (page 10)</u> This document explains the logic behind activities that can be measured through this indicator.
- García Parra, C (2023) Greening the MSD approach in agricultural programmes, The Canopy Lab (pg 34)
- Similar indicator measuring confidence: WVA Evidence Building Framework Economic Empowerment pillar document (IO.EE.8: % of women and men who report feeling confident in their financial literacy)
- ANCP NSVC Project in Bangladesh (2018-2022) used this indicator.

M4C.GG.IO5 % respondents who observe an increase in soil fertility

[EBF CAR O.NRM.6, Compendium C4D.034424]

Definition

This indicator measures the percent of respondents (households) who observe that soil fertility has increased (as a result of practicing FMNR, or other soil fertility management practices (e.g., composting, manuring, biocharing or other organic enhancements). This is not a laboratory assessment of the soil quality but farmers' experiences as the former can be expensive to undertake. Soil fertility is the ability of soil to sustain plant life and crops by providing the nutrients and water needed for their growth. This includes good drainage, soil depth for root growth, absence of toxins, balanced acidity, adequate amounts of nutrients, and the presence of biodiversity, such as soil bacteria, fungi and worms (Rinaudo, Muller & Morris 2019). An increased tree cover through the implementation of FMNR or soil fertility management practices is expected to improve soil quality and fertility in that area.

Choose the context specific soil fertility practices.

For Q1, first, let the farmer tell the practices they use. Then you can ask about the other practices in your list. For Q3, indicators of soil fertility are indicative and can be changed with the locally recognized indicators of soil fertility, based on farmers' knowledge.

How to measure

Ask following questions to the survey respondents if they are practicing FMNR, and other targeted soil fertility management practices.

Q1- Which of the following soil fertility management practices do you use on your farm? Options to be tailored to specific project activities and local context.

FMNR

- Planting of fertiliser shrubs
- Green manure crops
- Composting
- Manuring,
- Addition of biochar
- Addition of other organic enhancements

If this indicator is being measured with O.NRM.2: % HHs using improved NRM or sustainable agriculture practices, the above data will be obtained from there and only following questions will be asked:

Q2- In the farm plot/s where you practice FMNR, have you observed any changes in soil fertility since xxx years/ start of practicing FMNR?

- Yes, improved=1
- Yes, deteriorated=2
- No change/it is the same=3
- Don't Know

If Yes, ask a follow up question:

Q2- What made you think so/ How did you conclude this¹¹? DO NOT READ THE LIST OF INDICATORS. LET THE RESPONDENTS SHARE THEIR OBSERVATIONS. PROBE IF THEY MENTION ONLY ONE ASPECT. Mark as many as a respondent mentions.

- Improved crop performance (colour of leaves of growing crops, crop growth rate and crop yield, or improved root structure)
- Improved soil structure and texture (soil hardness, water infiltration rate, moisture holding capacity, soil friability or workability, soil depth, stoniness of soil)
- Improved biological characteristics (presence of worms or worm casts, presence of soil macro-fauna, presence of indicator weeds, freshly turned soil having an "earthy" or humus-rich smell)

To calculate the indicator value i.e. Percent of respondents (households) who observe that soil fertility has increased.

- Numerator: Total number of respondents saying Yes, improved=1 to Q2
- Denominator: Total number of survey respondents practicing FMNR (or other practices as applicable i.e. depending on the soil fertility practices being promoted by the project.

Disaggregate by sex.

Responses to Q3 can be analyzed to calculate the most common indications of soil fertility from farmers' perspective.

¹¹ This categorisation of soil fertility indicators is based on the work by Dawoe, Quashie-Sam, Isaac, & Oppong, (2012)). Exploring farmers' local knowledge and perceptions of soil fertility and management in the Ashanti Region of Ghana. Geoderma. s 179–180. 96–103.

Further Analysis: Correlate the perception on Soil quality (Q2) with number of improved practices being used under indicator O.NRM.2 OR using data from Q1.

M4C.GG.IO6 % HH who observe that soil erosion has reduced

[EBF CAR IO.NRM.1, Compendium C4D.034425]

Definition

This indicator measures the percent of households who are practicing FMNR, or other soil conservation practices (e.g. contour banks, agro-forestry, planting of vegetation banks, low erosion watering practices) and report a decrease in soil erosion. Soil erosion is a naturally occurring process that takes place in agricultural fields, where topsoil wears away from the physical forces of water and wind, or through forces associated with farming activities, such as tilling (Rinaudo, Muller & Morris 2019). This is not a scientific assessment of changes in the level of soil erosion but based on farmers' observation as the former can be expensive to undertake.

How to measure

Ask the survey respondents, the following questions. Q1 is not required for the indicator calculation but is being asked to see if the respondent is using any soil conservation practices. For Q2, indicators of soil erosion are indicative only and should be contextualized using the most common forms of soil erosion in the context under study.

Q1- Which of the following soil conservation practices do you use on your farm? Options to be tailored to specific project activities and local context.

- FMNR
- Contour banks
- Agroforestry
- Planting of vegetation buffer zones/banks
- Low erosion watering practices
- Groundcover crops
- Windbreaks
- None

Now ask a direct question to the survey respondents who are practicing FMNR or other targeted soil conservation practices.

Q2- At the farm plot/s where you practice FMNR/ soil conservation, have you observed any changes in soil erosion since xxx years/ start of practicing FMNR/ soil conservation?

- Yes, decreased=1
- Yes, increased=2
- No change/it is the same=3
- Don't Know

If Yes, ask a follow up question:

Q3- What made you think so/ How did you conclude this¹²? Do not read the list of indicators/changes. Let the respondents share their observations. Probe if they mention only one aspect. Mark as many, as a respondent mention.

Observed changes in:

- Bare soil
- Rills
- Exposed tree roots
- Thin topsoil, coarse gravelly soil

¹² These soil erosion indicators are taken from New South Wales Department of Primary Industries, available at: http://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/agriculture/resources/soils/erosion Accessed on 1st December 2020

- Tunnels and gullies
- Muddy run-off water
- Cracks across the slopes
- Soil organic matter
- Ground cover
- Dust & dust storms

To calculate the indicator value:

- Numerator: Total number of respondents saying Yes, decreased=1 to Q2
- Denominator: Total number of survey respondents practicing FMNR

Responses to Q1 can be analyzed to see what are the common practices when responses to Q2 is DECREASED. Responses to Q3 can be analyzed to calculate the most common changes in soil erosion from farmers' perspective.

M4C.GG.IO7 Proportion of households who faced a disaster but were able to recover and now live at the level they did before

[OIOS 75]

Definition

This indicator measures the perception of households who believe they have encountered a disaster, whether natural or man-made, in the past 12 months. It specifically focuses on their ability to recover and maintain or improve their living conditions. Recover means the ability of households to return to the same or better living conditions they had before experiencing a disaster. Disasters refer to significant disruptions that surpass a community's capacity to cope with its own resources. They can be classified as natural events like floods, droughts, tornadoes, hurricanes, cyclones, landslides, etc., or man-made events such as violent conflicts, cultural upheavals, and structural violence.

M4C.GG.IO8 % of HHs adopting circular economy practices (adopt, household level)

[EBF EE IO.EE.GG.20]

Definition

This indicator measures the extent to which target producers including households and businesses are adopting practices that contribute to the circular economy.

A circular economy is an economic system aimed at eliminating waste and the continual use of resources. It contrasts with the traditional linear economy, which follows a 'take, make, dispose' model. Here are the key principles of a circular economy:

- 1. Eliminate Waste and Pollution: By designing products and systems that minimize waste and pollution from the outset.
- 2. Circulate Products and Materials: Keeping products and materials in use for as long as possible through maintenance, reuse, refurbishment, remanufacturing, and recycling.
- 3. Regenerate Natural Systems: Ensuring that natural systems can regenerate and sustain themselves by returning valuable nutrients to the soil and other ecosystems.

This is an example to frame the circular economy with the 10 following strategies (often referred to as the '10R') relevant to the production sector:

| | RO | Refuse | Make product redundant by abandoning its function or by offering the same function with a radically different product |
|---|----|---------------|---|
| Smarter product use and manufacture | R1 | Rethink | Make product use more intensive (eg. through sharing products or by putting multi-functional products on market). |
| | R2 | Reduce | Increase efficiency in product manufacture or use byu consuming fewer natural resources |
| | R3 | Reuse | Re-use by another consumer of discarded product which is still in good condition and fulfils its original function |
| | R4 | Repair | Repair and maintenance of defective product so it can be used with its original function |
| Extend lifespan of product and its parts | R5 | Refurbish | Restore an old product and bring it up to date |
| | R6 | Remanufacture | Use parts of discarded product in a new product with the same function |
| | R7 | Repurpose | Use discarded products or its part in a new product with a different function |
| Useful application of | R8 | Recycle | Process materials to obtain the same (high grade) or lower (low grade) quality |
| materials | R9 | Recovery | Incineration of material with energy recovery |

How to measure

Each project will have to define which one of the CE strategies and which practices are relevant to the project, and adapt the proposed tool accordingly.

A representative sample of women and men participants (including households and market actors) will be asked the questions below at baseline and endline (and at midline if appropriate). It may be useful to add an introduction to the survey so the respondent understands what we're interested to talk about.

| # | Sample Questions | Answer/Score |
|-------|--|---|
| Intro | We would like you to tell us about the economic practices that you have adopted to help waste and pollution generated, increasing the lifespan of products and materials, and reg | reducing the amount of generating ecosystems. |
| 1 | In the past 12 months, how often did Consider environmental factors when making a decision to purchase a product? Probe: For instance, how often do you decide to buy products that are more environmentally friendly than other options? | Never Rarely Sometimes Quite often Very often |
| 2 | Consider the lifespan of product as a key criteria when purchasing a product. For example, how often did you decide to buy more durable, higher quality products compared with other options, even though it was more expensive, because you thought it would last longer? | Never Rarely Sometimes Quite often Very often |
| 3 | Invest in repair or refurbishing services or parts to extend the lifespan of a product, or purchase a refurbished (second hand) product instead of a brand new one? | Never Rarely Sometimes Quite often Very often |
| 4 | Sort and manage your solid waste so that it can be recycled through accessible systems in the area? | Never Rarely Sometimes Quite often Very often |
| 5 | Sort and manage your organic waste so that it can be composted , or valorised as feed for livestock, by yourself or through any accessible systems in the area? | Never Rarely Sometimes Quite often Very often |

Calculation method

The project can choose and apply a cut-off point to determine what answer choices stand for 'adopting circular economy principles'. By default, the cut-off point can be set on a total of fifteen (15) out of a maximum possible score of 25, by adding up the score obtained for each of the five questions

- Never = 1
- Rarely = 2
- Sometimes = 3
- Quite often = 4
- Very often = 5

According to the value found at baseline, the project may decide to revise the cut-off point so we can observe a reasonable change over time.

- Numerator: Number of respondents scoring equal or above the cut-off score
- Denominator: Count the total number of respondents that participated in the survey, regardless of their responses to the questions.

In case the survey is interviewing both households and market actors, it may be relevant to disaggregate results accordingly.

Suggested Qualitative/KRQ:

- What challenges do you and other community members or market actor face to reduce the amount of waste and pollution and increase the lifespan of products and materials?
- What are the availability of services and facilities?
- What challenges do you face to manage your solid wastes?

Reference

- What is a circular economy? | Ellen MacArthur Foundation (<u>https://www.ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/</u> topics/circular-economy-introduction/overview)
- Targets for a circular economy ScienceDirect (<u>https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/</u> S0921344919304598)
- Role of consumers in the Circular Economy European Environment Agency (europa.eu) (<u>https://www.eea.europa.eu/publications/influencing-consumer-choices-towards-circularity/role-of-consumers-in-the-ce/view</u>)

M4C.GG.IO9: % of HHs adopting appropriate solid waste management practices

[EBF EE IO.EE.GG.18]

Definition

This indicator measures the proportion of urban and rural households participating in the livelihoods project that are utilizing appropriate solid waste management services or systems, promoting environmental sustainability. This indicator applies to various types of household solid waste, including organic waste, and should be tied to specific project activities aimed at improving solid waste management practices tailored to the needs of urban and rural contexts.

- Appropriate practices include solid waste sorting and segregation at the household level, the organized waste collection, treatment, material recovery through re-utilization or recycling, composting, energy recovery (e.g., biogas) or safer disposal.
- Organic waste treatment could include converting solid waste into energy or fertilizer (e.g. through composting) in both rural and urban settings through household level or larger scale systems.

How to measure

A representative sample of participants will be asked the question below at baseline and endline (and at midline if appropriate).

If do-able, the project may consider getting the data collected by the market actor, since they have an interest of improved solid waste management at the household level for their business model.

| # | Sample Questions | Answer/Score |
|----|---|--|
| Q1 | Do you currently have access to any improved household solid waste management options, such as waste sorting, recycling, treatment, composting, energy recovery (e.g., biogas) or safe disposal, that are suitable for your household and aligned with local practices? | Yes = 1 No = 2 (skip the question 2 and 3) Don't know = 3 (skip the question 2 and 3) |
| Q2 | Which improved solid waste management option do you currently have access to? [Select all that apply] | A. Self-Managed Waste Treatment (e.g., home-based composting or energy recovery system) B. Private Waste Collection Services C. Government or Municipality Waste Collection D. Community-Led Waste Management E. Recycling Initiatives run by project F. Other G. Don't know which organization is providing the service |
| Q3 | Do you currently use any of the improved waste treatment or disposal options? (e.g. have you used any in the past month?) [Select one answer]. | Yes = 1 No = 2 |
| Q4 | Which improved waste management option have you used in the past month? [Select all that apply] | A. Self-Managed Waste Treatment (e.g., home-based composting or energy recovery system) B. Private Waste Collection Services C. Government or Municipality Waste Collection D. Community-Led Waste Management E. Recycling Initiatives run by project F. Other |

To calculate the indicator value:

- Numerator: # of households where the answer is "Yes" to both Q1 and Q3 (i.e., households that have access to waste treatment/disposal options and actively use them)
- In Denominator: Total # of households surveyed, sampled from
- Divide the numerator with the denominator and multiply by 100 to get the indicator value.

Suggested Qualitative/KRQ:

- Why do you think is the service option available? Do they charge you for the service? Is the service affordable without putting a financial burden?
- How do you access the waste treatment or disposal options? (e.g., through local services, self-managed methods, or community-led initiatives)
- Why do you or do you not use the available waste treatment or disposal options? What motivates or prevents you from using these options?
- How do you make use of the waste treatment or disposal options available to you? (e.g., separating waste, composting, or recycling)? What specific practices do you follow?

Reference

<u>JICA (undated) Financial Assistance Projects / Indicator Reference (Solid Waste Management)</u> e.g. indicator '(1) Population covered by waste collection services' EC (undated) Common indicators for municipal waste management

M4C.GG.IO10 % of HHs that sort waste regularly (adopt, household level)

[EBF EE IO.EE.GG.21]

Definition

This indicator applies to projects aimed at improving waste management practices tailored to the needs of target communities. This indicator is mostly applicable to urban areas or camp settings (e.g. organized camp of refugees or internally displaced persons).

This indicator measures the proportion of target households that sort their waste in a way that allows further reutilization, repair, refurbishing, remanufacture, repurposing, recycling, recovery in terms of energy or fertilization or safer disposal.

Waste sorting on household level allows to implement 7 of the 10 common circular economy strategies (often referred to as the 10-R), as well as safer practices for disposing hazardous wastes with currently no other opportunity available in the context.

How to measure

Each project will have to define which type of waste target households need to sort in order to be considered 'sorting waste'. This will depend on the improved waste management services available and supported by the project in the target location.

A representative sample of women and men participants will be asked the questions below at baseline and endline (and at midline if appropriate).

| # | Sample Questions | Answer/Score |
|---|---|--|
| 1 | There are different types of waste that local households need to dispose of, such as food waste, plastic, cans, glass, paper, old clothes, electronic wastes, and other waste. Can you please tell me if there is any type of these wastes that you regularly sort in a dedicated container or collection point? | Yes = 1 No = 2 (skip question 2 if no) |
| 2 | Please can you tell me which type of waste are you regularly sorting? Keep probing: Is there any other type of waste or place where you regularly dispose of the household waste? Select all that apply | A. Organic (food scraps, garden wastes, wood) B. Paper (including carboard) C. Plastic (bottles and containers) D. Soft plastics and packaging E. Glass F. Metal G. Electric or electronic equipment and waste, batteries H. Textiles, clothes I. Other – specify: |
| 3 | If selected C. Organic and garden wastes in Q2: Can you tell me how you are managing organic or garden wastes after sorting them? Select all that apply | A. Burying B. Burning C. Home-based composting D. Feeding livestock E. Collected by waste management service |

Calculation method

- Numerator: total number of households that:
 - Answered "Yes" to Q.1, and
 - Selected all the relevant choices to Q.2, for which there are dedicated sorting and recycling services available and supported by the project, and
 - If 'Organic wastes' is one of the type of wastes targeted by the project, that selected C or D or E to Q.3 (burying or burning organic wastes is not considered a desired practice).

• Denominator: Count the total number of households that participated in the survey, regardless of their responses to the questions.

Suggested Qualitative/KRQ:

- What challenges does your household face to manage your solid wastes?
- What do you think about the waste sorting options currently accessible to your household?
- What measure do you think would encourage your household and other community members to increase the amount of waste that is sorted and managed more sustainably?

Reference

Waste Sorting | IndiKit (https://www.indikit.net/indicator/768-environment/3985-waste-sorting)

Targets for a circular economy - ScienceDirect (<u>https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/</u>S0921344919304598)

M4C.GG.IO11: Proportion of households who know the early warning signs and know what to do in case of an emergency or disaster

[Compendium C4A.23802]

Definition

Awareness of Early Warning Signs involves the recognition of early warning signs that suggest a disaster may be imminent. Examples include:

- Natural Disasters:
 - Flooding: Signs of heavy rainfall over an extended period or rapid rise in water levels.
 - Earthquakes: Unusual animal behavior, vibrations, or rumbling sounds before a quake.
 - Wildfires: Dry conditions, strong winds, and smoke visibility.
- Health Emergencies:
 - Disease Outbreaks: Unusual increase in illness in a community, symptoms common in outbreaks (e.g., fever, cough).
 - Food Safety Concerns: Reports of unclean water or food sources, contamination alerts.

Preparedness to Take Action: This includes knowing what steps to take when an early warning is observed. Examples of actions could be:

- Knowing evacuation routes and having a family evacuation plan.
- Stocking emergency supplies (food, water, first aid kits).
- Reporting signs of impending disasters to local authorities.
- Participating in community safety drills and training.

How to measure

• A list of potential responses/options may be developed based on the context involved and the likely risks AND the type of action that would be required.

Calculation:

- Numerator: Number of respondents who are able to identify at least 1 early warning sign for relevant disaster(s) in their context AND at least 1 action to take when that early warning sign is observed.
- Denominator: Total number of respondents
- Calculation: Divide the numerator by the denominator to get the indicator value

M4C.GG.IO12 Number of communities with functional committees to assess, prevent, mitigate and prepare for the risks of hazards

[Compendium C4A.14017]

Definition

This indicator measures the number of communities that have a CBDRM committee that actively meets and includes members equipped to assess, prevent, mitigate and prepare for risks. Assess refers to the ability to identify potential or impending risks, prevent refers to taking actions to stop risks from materializing, mitigate refers to taking steps to lessen the destruction or damage caused by a risk, and prepare refers to taking appropriate measures at community level to ensure people and infastructure are positioned as best as possible to limit the impact of impending risks. To be functional, a committee should be regularly meeting, actively participating in CBDRM activities, networking with government stakeholders, participating in community anticipatory monitoring and evaluation activities, and should typically have a constitution.

How to measure

For the area of intervention, count the number of communities that have a functioning CBDRM Committee by counting the number of committees functioning. As per the definition, functioning CBDRM committees are those that meet regularly and for which meeting minutes are available (at least annually) as are training reports. Count the total number of communities within the area of intervention with at least 1 functioning CBDRM Committee.

Note- this is an output only (number of) indicator and does not have a numerator/denominator.

APPENDIX 1 SUMMARY OF INDICATORS WITH MEANS OF VERIFICATION AND FREQUENCY

| Indicator Name | Indicator Type | Means of Verification | Data Source | Suggested Minimum Frequency of Reporting |
|--|----------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|--|
| G1 Child Well-being (CWB): % households able to provide well for their children | Mandatory | HH Survey | Women and men respondents of the | Baseline, Midline & Endline Evaluations |
| G2 Poverty: % households living below the national poverty line (PPI) | Mandatory | | survey | |
| G3 Resilience: % HHs able to raise a large sum of money with-in 30 days | Mandatory | | | |
| G4 Social Cohesion: % households reporting good social cohesion | Good Practice | | | |
| G5 Total number of children reached by World Vision (WV) Programming | Mandatory | | | |
| MA.O1 Amount (in US\$) of private sector investment generated | Mandatory | Regular Monitoring | Project monitoring data | 6-monthly |
| MA.O2 Increase in public sector investment as a result of the intervention (qualitative) | Mandatory | Regular Monitoring | | Annual |
| MA.O3 Proportion of partners reporting an increase in their profit as a result of intervention | Good Practice | / KII | | 6-monthly |
| MA.O4 Average business profit in the last 12 months (e.g., Intermediary Service Providers, micro-enterprises etc.) | Good Practice | Regular Monitoring | | 6-monthly |
| MA.05 Estimated variation in revenue / supply generated by market actors from green business model products and services attributable to programme support | Good Practice | | | Annual |
| MA.IO1 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting, and then adapting, pro-poor business models pro- moted by the programme (qualitative) | Mandatory | Regular Monitoring | Project monitoring data | 6-monthly |
| MA.IO2 Investments (in US\$) in innovation | Good Practice | | | |
| MA.IO3 Investment (in US\$) towards suppliers and customers from the target beneficiaries in their capacity building | Good Practice | | | |
| MA.IO4 Number of Joint initiatives implemented | Good Practice | | | |
| MA.IO5 Mean diversity of channels score | Good Practice | | | |
| MA.W.IO6 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting new business models (promoted by the programme) that ensure do-no harm to women and other vulner-able groups and promote women's access to services/ products. (qualitative) | Mandatory | | | |

| MA.W.IO7 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting and adapting new business models (promoted by the programme) that promote women's access to ser-vices/products, their agency, and equitable systems. (qualitative) *Mandatory for targeted GEDSI & WEE projects, to be used instead of MA.W.106 | Mandatory | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|---|--|
| MA.GG.IO8 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting new business models (promoted by the pro- gramme) that promote do-no harm to the environment. (qualitative) | Mandatory | | | |
| MA.GG.IO9 System actors/service providers change behaviour by adopting and adapting new, environmentally sustainable business models (promoted by the programme) that a) reduce environmental and climate risks (climate adaptation), b) re-duce the negative impact of the value chain (mitigation) and c) promote green opportunity (restoration) (qualitative) *Mandatory for targeted ESCA & Green Growth projects, to be used instead of MA.G.IO8 | Mandatory | | | |
| IG.O1 Proportion of households that increased their income as a result of participation in World Vision (WV) facilitated economic development programs | Mandatory | HH Survey | Women and men respondents of the survey | Baseline, Midline & Endline Evaluations |
| IG.O2 Average business profit in the last 12 months for the HHs [M4C.MA.O4 calculated for Households] | Mandatory | Regular Monitoring | Project monitoring data | 6-monthly |
| IG.O3 Average yield of target crops | Mandatory for Ag-ricultural Project | HH Survey | Women and men respondents of the survey | Baseline, Midline & Endline Evaluations |
| IG.O4 Number of green jobs supported | Good Practice | Regular Monitoring | Project monitoring data | 6-monthly |
| IG.05 Proportion of women and men having their own regular income | Good Practice | HH Survey | Women and men respondents of the survey | Baseline, Midline & Endline Evaluations |
| IG.IO1 Proportion of women and men adopting recommended business management practices (e.g. engaging in farming as a business) | Good Practice | Regular Monitoring | Project monitoring data | 6-monthly |
| IG.IO2 Proportion of households using technologies that improve productivity and save time in tasks that women tradi-tionally perform | Good Practice | HH Survey | Women and men respondents of the survey | Baseline, Midline & Endline Evaluations |
| IG.IO3 Average # of hours saved due to new technologies/labour-saving devices or strategies | Good Practice | | | |
| IG.IO4 Total cumulative number of women and men with increased access to opportunities | Mandatory | | | |
| IG.IO5 Total cumulative number of women and men with in-creased access to resources and services | Mandatory | | | |

| AF.O1 % households that used improved financial services in the past 12 months (M) | Mandatory | Regular Monitoring | Project monitoring data | 6-monthly |
|--|---------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| AF.IO1 % HHs with the means to save money | Good Practice | HH Survey | Women and men respondents of the | Baseline, Midline & Endline Evaluations |
| AF.IO2 % target households using loans and/or savings or share-out to invest into productive assets/ inputs/ services | Good Practice | | survey | |
| AF.IO3 Proportion of women and men with individual and household savings | Good Practice | | | |
| AF.IO4 Average value of member savings per group member | Good Practice | | | |
| AF.IO5 Proportion of households reporting to have access to sufficient sources of credit providers (formal sources) | Good Practice | | | |
| AF.IO6 % households with access to sufficient credit (formal and informal sources) | Good Practice | | | |
| AF.IO7 % of respondents feeling confident in their financial literacy | Mandatory | | | |
| AF.IO8 Nature and reasons for change in terms of supportive attitudes and recognition by household member community and business owners/service providers in the targeted value chain (qualitative) | Mandatory | FGD, KII | | |
| W.O1 Proportion households with women actively engaged in decision making [Alternatively projects can use W.O5 and W.O6 below] | Mandatory | HH Survey | Women and men respondents of the survey | Baseline, Midline & Endline Evaluations |
| W.O2 Average # of hours per day spent on leisure and rest/sleep by women and men | Mandatory | | | |
| W.O3 Proportion of community members (adolescents and adults) who support gender equitable attitudes | Mandatory | | | |
| W.O4 % women and men with supportive attitudes towards women's economic participation | Mandatory | | | |
| W.05 Proportion of households with more equitable decision making in productive sphere | Good Practice | | | |
| W.O6 Proportion of households with more equitable decision making in domestic sphere | Good Practice | | | |
| W.O7 % project-supported groups that are led by a woman | Good Practice | | | |
| W.08 Proportion of leadership roles in mixed gender project-supported groups held by women | Good Practice | Regular Monitoring | Project monitoring data | 6-monthly |

| W.IOX Placeholder (Option 1) for the WEE indicator AF.IO8: The same indicator can be used here | Mandatory | FGD, KII | Women and men respondents of the survey, KII and FGDs | Baseline, Midline & Endline Evaluations | | |
|---|---------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| W.IO1 Proportion of women and men confident to take up a leadership role | Good Practice | HH Survey | | | | |
| W.IO2 Proportion of women and men involved in rewarding / influential roles in the target value chain | Good Practice | | | | | |
| W.IO3 Women's and men's average perceptions (score) of women's contributions to household income/fund | Good Practice | | | | | |
| W.IOX Placeholder (Option 2) for the WEE indicator AF.IO8: The same indicator can be used here | Mandatory | FGD, KII | | | | |
| PWD.IO1 % respondents reporting they feel comfortable working with someone who has a physical or sensorial disability | Good Practice | HH Survey | | | | |
| PWD.IO2 % PWD reporting they are able to make their own decisions about what is important to them | Good Practice | | | | | |
| W.IO4 Average number of hours spent on paid and unpaid work by women and men | Mandatory | | | | | |
| W.IO5 Women and men's average perception (score) of men's contribution towards household chores | Mandatory | | | | | |
| W.IO6 % of HH using childcare service/ childcare related ini-tiatives that are i) accessible, ii) affordable, and iii) of adequate quality | Mandatory | FGD, KII | | | | |
| W.IOX Placeholder (Option 3) for the WEE indicator AF.IO8: The same indicator can be used here | Mandatory | | | | | |
| GG.01 Proportion of households with alternative and diversi-fied sources of income | Mandatory | HH Survey | Women and men respondents of the survey | Baseline, Midline & Endline Evaluations | | |
| GG.O2 Regreening Index score * For projects implementing the Regreening Communities project model. [Mandatory for ESCA (Green Growth) targeted projects] | Mandatory | FGD, KII | | | | |
| GG.O3 Number of hectares protected and/ or under restoration | Good Practice | HH Survey | | | | |
| GG.O4 Proportion of households with sustained or increased agricultural production due to climate-resilient agricultural practices | Good Practice | | | | | |
| GG.O5 Proportion of HHs with increased income from circular economy activities in waste management | Good Practice | | | | | |
| GG.O6 Number of HHs involved in organic waste reuse or value addition for energy production | Good Practice | | | | | |
| GG.07 Quantity, or % of collected waste that is sustainably valorised (adoption, system level) | Good Practice | | | | | |

| GG.IO1 Proportion of households adopting improved agricultural practices | Mandatory for Agricultural Project | Regular Monitoring | Project monitoring data | 6-monthly |
|---|--|-----------------------|---|--|
| GG.IO2 Proportion of households using improved NRM or sustainable agricultural practices | Mandatory for Agricultural Project | | | |
| GG.IO3 Average value of target product sold in the last 12 months | Good Practice | | | |
| GG.IO4 % of producers feeling more confident in the capacity of their farming system to cope with climate change and natural disasters since programme start | Good Practice | HH Survey | Women and men respondents of the survey | Baseline, Midline & Endline Evaluations |
| GG.IO5 % respondents who observe an increase in soil fertility | Good Practice | | | |
| GG.IO6 % HH who observe that soil erosion has reduced | Good Practice | | | |
| GG.IO7 Proportion of households who faced a disaster but were able to recover and now live at the level they did before | Good Practice | | | |
| GG.IO8 % of HHs adopting circular economy practices (adoption, household level) | Good Practice | | | |
| GG.IO9 % of HHs adopting appropriate solid waste management practices | Good Practice | | | |
| GG.IO10 % of HHs that sort waste regularly (adoption, house-hold level) | Good Practice | | | |
| GG.IO11 Proportion of households who know the early warn-ing signs and know what to do in case of an emergency or disaster | Good Practice | | | |
| GG.IO12 Number of communities with functional committees to assess, prevent, mitigate and prepare for the risks of hazards | Good Practice | | | |

