

## **Terms of Reference**

#### Third Party Verification of ICI's Community Development Data in 48 ICI-assisted Communities

### **Background**

Established in 2002, the International Cocoa Initiative (ICI) is a leading organisation promoting child protection in cocoa-growing communities. ICI works with the cocoa industry, civil society, farmers' organisations, communities and national governments in cocoa-producing countries to ensure a better future for children and contribute to the elimination of child labour. Operating in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana since 2007, ICI has promoted holistic child protection measures in more than 600 cocoa-growing communities benefiting over 1 million people, 682,500 of whom are children.

## **Introduction**

ICI is currently implementing the <u>CocoaAction</u> <u>community development package</u> for 48 Nestlé communities (44 in Côte d'Ivoire and 4 in Ghana).

CocoaAction is a voluntary industry-wide strategy that aligns the world's leading cocoa and chocolate companies, origin Governments, and key stakeholders on regional priority issues in cocoa sustainability. CocoaAction convenes the sector in order to align complementary roles and responsibilities, leverage scale and efficiency through collaboration, and catalyse efforts to accelerate sustainability in the cocoa sector.

The WCF member companies committed to CocoaAction include Barry Callebaut, Blommer, Cargill, Ferrero, The Hershey Company, Mars Incorporated, Mondelēz International, Nestle and Olam.

CocoaAction companies have committed to an aligned sustainability strategy and are accountable to CocoaAction for the data submitted. In order to verify the credibility and reliability of any external reporting, CocoaAction decided to approach joint verification criteria. Verification is realized through a two-tiered system at individual company member level and at the aggregate CocoaAction level.

### **Objective of the Third Party Verification**

ICI is seeking a third party verifier to verify the community development data collected for Nestlé communities (44 in Côte d'Ivoire and 4 in Ghana). Please see annex 1 for the CocoaAction Results Framework and the relevant ICI data collection tool for which each indicator is being collected and the CocoaAction monitoring and evaluation guide for further information on the indicator definitions and reporting numbers.

| Long Term Outcome  | Result           | 2) In the originally targeted CA communities women are empowered, child protection is enhanced, children are attending primary school and child labor is significantly decreased  |  |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------|------------------|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Long Terr          | Indicator        | 2.a) [working statement] Percentage of originally targeted CocoaAction communities that improve across all three community results areas.   |  |   |   |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|                    | Result Statement | <b>2.1) Education</b> Increased number of primary schools, that are 'functioning effectively'   |  | 2.2) Child Labor Increased child protection in CocoaAction communities and significantly reduced child labor in CocoaAction farming households andCocoaAction communities |   | educed child<br>ouseholds   | <b>2.3) Women's Empowerment</b> Increased capabilities and opportunities of women to generate increased income and influence decisions   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Short Term Outcome | Indicator        | Learning indicators: 2.1a) # girls and boys enrolled in schools that have received CocoaAction education interventions  2.1b) #/ % of primary schools that have received CocoaAction interventions and are meeting specified functioning effectively requirements | 2.1c) # SMCs or equivalent that have received CocoaAction support that are effectively functioning | 2.2a) #/% of<br>CA<br>communities<br>with a CPC or<br>similar<br>structure<br>demonstrating<br>effectiveness  | 2.2b) #/% of children living in CA farmers' households participating in child labor (cocoa-related or other) as defined per ILO 138 and ILO 182  2.2c) Learning indicator: #/% of children living in non-CA farmers' households participating in child labor (cooa-related or other) as defined by ILO 138 or ILO 182 of assisted child labor cases | 2.2e) #/% of CocoaAction farmers' households covered by an effectively functioning child labor monitoring and remediation systems (CLMRS) | 2.3a) Learning Indicator: # and/or % of women and farmers org./community org. in CocoaAction communities contributing to decision making | 2.3b) Learning Indicator: # and/or % of women in CocoaAction communities who report on increased income as a result of IGA | 2.3c) # and/or % of women in CocoaAction communities who report an increased control of income |  |  |  |

|  |                  |   |  | found that<br>no longer<br>child lab<br>(cocoa-rela<br>or other) a<br>the assista  | or<br>ated<br>after   |   |   |  |  |                            |
|--|------------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|--|--|----------------------------|
|  | Result Statement | 2.1.1) Improved educational infrastructure, equipment or materials based on community needs                                   | 2.1.2) School management or equivalent committees are strengthened, and where absent or not functioning are advocated to be established  | <b>2.2.1)</b> Increased number of operatingchild labor monitoring and remediation systems and CPCs (or similar structure)  |   | 2.3.1) Increased awareness among community and farmer organizations on women's empower-ment   | 2.3.2) Increased participation by women in farmer, community and/or women organizations                           |  | 2.3.3) Increased capacity of women to undertake IGAs       |                            |
| Output                                       | Indicator        | 2.1.1a) # of primary schools benefitting from CocoaAction educational infrastructure, equipment and/or material interventions | 2.1.2a) # school<br>management or<br>equivalent<br>committees that have<br>received support  | 2.2.1a) #/% of CocoaAction communities with an operating child protection committee (CPC) or similar structure   | 2.2.1b) #/ % of<br>CocoaAction<br>farmers'<br>households<br>covered by<br>operating CLMRS | 2.3.1a) # of<br>farmer and/or<br>community<br>facing people<br>trained through<br>gender<br>awareness or<br>sensitivity<br>programs   | 2.3.2a) # and/or % of women members in farmer org. and/or community org.  | 2.3.2b) # and/or % of women members in community governance structures | 2.3.3a) # 6<br>supported to u<br>strength                  | ındertake or               |
| Community Core<br>Interventions (Activities) |                  | Education A. Carry out improvements to existing formal schooling infrastructure, materials and equipment                      | Education B. Support for formation and/or strengthening of community-based school management committee (SMC) or equivalent structure, including support for their ability to monitor attendance and enrollment | Child Labor  A. Raise awareness in community on child labor  B. Form and/or train Child Protection Committee (CPC) or other community - based structure or person  C. Build and operationalize child labor monitoring and remediation capabilities (CLMRS) |   | Women's Empowerment A. Train on gender sensitivity for women, men, implementing program staff, farmer organizations and the community | Women's Empowerment B. Support participation of women in farmer organizations and community governance structures |  | Women's Em<br>C. Support<br>Generating Act<br>as requested | t Income<br>tivities (IGA) |



#### **Assessment Methodology**

The data verification exercise consists of interviews with relevant ICI staff, document and data review.

The verification focus rests on the following main aspects

- Assessing the credibility of the total farmer/ community population figure. At a minimum it
  needs to be established that the estimation of the total farmer and community count is based on
  CocoaAction definitions (i.e. farmers participating in relevant activities and communities where a
  community needs assessment has been implemented), that the estimation is based on
  documented evidence, and that the estimation does not overstate traceable counts from
  evidence.
- 2. Assessing the representativeness of data collection samples. At a minimum it needs to be established that the sampling processes introduced in the 2017 CocoaAction M&E Guide have been followed (i.e. total sample size at least equivalent to the result of the precision based calculation, generally randomized farmer selection & gender adjustment of the sample).
- 3. Assessing the credibility that inputs for output results have been provided to the **claimed degree**. At a minimum it needs to be established that reliable evidence about claimed activities exists (e.g. training records, a photograph of the school improvement, etc.), and that the evidence confirms the overall dimension of claimed activities.
- 4. Assessing the credibility that individual head -counts are representative. At a minimum, it needs to be established that claimed participant or member counts (e.g. women participating in IGAs, training participants, individuals in governance structures) are based on documented evidence, and that claimed participant or member counts are within a realistic order of magnitude or that other evidence supports deviations.
- 5. Assessing the credibility that data has been collected by skilled individuals. At a minimum, it needs to be established that the data was collected by enumerators who either attended the CocoaAction 2018 enumerator training or they were trained by individuals who attended the training. If this criteria cannot be met due to the timing of data collection and the timing of the training, then the CocoaAction company must discuss appropriate follow up with the Secretariat. It is highly recommended that the CocoaAction verifier interviews the enumerators to gauge their knowledge of applying the 2017 CocoaAction M&E Guide requirements consistently.

Recommendations for Verification Methods per CocoaAction Data Segment (in accordance with "2018 CocoaAction Data Submission Template")

| Data Segment      | Suggested Verification    | Suggested 2017         | Recommendations            |
|-------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| (compare to "2018 | Focus                     | minimum Approach       | beyond                     |
| CocoaAction Data  | (compare sub-points to    | (these suggestions can | the minimum                |
| Submission        | "2018CocoaAction Data     | be modified in         | (these suggestions go      |
| Template")        | Submission Template")     | accordance with        | beyond                     |
|                   |                           | individual program     | 2018 minimum criteria,     |
|                   |                           | realities)             | but                        |
|                   |                           |                        | improve the credibility of |
|                   |                           |                        | claims)                    |
| Cover             | Assessing the credibility | Review existing        | Follow the documented      |
|                   | of the total farmer/      | documentation on the   | paper-trail to             |
|                   | community population      | number of community    | implementers and           |
|                   | figure                    | needs assessments      | interview involved         |
|                   | o Total # of Farmers      | implemented and        | actors to inquire about    |
|                   | o Total # of Communities  | number of farmers who  | documentation &            |
|                   |                           | receive relevant       | implementation             |
|                   |                           | sustainability         | practices                  |
|                   |                           | interventions          |                            |

| Community<br>Descriptive Data       | Assessing the representativeness of da ta collection sample o Community name  | Compare documented numbers against Cocoa Action claim—the claim should be equal or below documented numbers  Confirm from datatemplate review and documentation that all claimed Cocoa Action communities have been included in the data submission  | No current suggestion   |
|-------------------------------------|---|--|---|
| Community Education                 | Asses sing the representativeness of da ta collection sample o School name Assessing the credibility that inputs for output Results have been provided to the claimed degree.  o Intervention conducted in reporting year Assessing the credibility that individual head-counts are representative o Enrollment | Confirm from datatemplate review and documentation that all claimed CocoaAction communities have been included in the data submission Confirm that implemented activities are documented and establish if available documentation supports the claims about the scope of activities realized (i .e. primary school support has been provided, IGA activities are implemented etc.) Review if the head-count of claimed activities and group membership is within an expectable range (i.e. typical school enrollment ranges from a few hundred to a few thousand children, IGA groups typically have up to 100 members )—if ranges appear unrealistic, investigate if justification exists | Select a sub-sample of the total CocoaAction sample, for example , and re-establish the data collection procedure on this ubsample for comparison to the Cocoa Action claim Follow the documented paper-trail to implementers and interview involved actors to inquire about documentation & implementation practices Spot-check activities via visits to confirm their scope (i.e. head-counts) and implementation |
| Community<br>Women's<br>Empowerment | Assessing the representativeness of da ta collection sample o Community name Assessing the credibility that inputs for output results have been provided to the claimed degree. o IGA interventions   |  |   |

|           | T                                       |  |
|-----------|---|--|
|           | Assessing the credibility               |  |
|           | that individual head-                   |  |
|           | counts are                              |  |
|           | representative                          |  |
|           | o Community Women                       |  |
|           | o IGA Participants                      |  |
|           | o Successful Women                      |  |
| Community | Asses sing the                          |  |
| Outputs   | representativeness of da                |  |
|           | ta collection                           |  |
|           | sample                                  |  |
|           | o Community name                        |  |
|           | o School Name                           |  |
|           | Assessing the credibility               |  |
|           | that inputs for output                  |  |
|           | results have been                       |  |
|           | provided to the cl aimed                |  |
|           | degree.                                 |  |
|           | o Intervention value                    |  |
|           | o Intervention type                     |  |
|           |   |  |
|           | o Intervention timing o SMC/ Equivalent |  |
|           | •                                       |  |
|           | Support                                 |  |
|           | o CPC/ similar operating                |  |
|           | o Gender awareness/                     |  |
|           | sensitivity training                    |  |
|           | Assessing the credibility               |  |
|           | that individual head-                   |  |
|           | counts are                              |  |
|           | representative                          |  |
|           | o Farmers covered by                    |  |
|           | CLMRS                                   |  |
|           | o Gender awareness/                     |  |
|           | sensitivity training                    |  |
|           | o Members of farmer/                    |  |
|           | community orgs.                         |  |
|           | o Members of                            |  |
|           | community governance                    |  |
|           | structures                              |  |

## **Deliverables**

Report covering the following aspects: Overall observation & findings focusing both quantitative & qualitative aspects in accordance with the data requirements of CocoaAction.

# **Timeframe**

ICI estimates that the assignment will last approximately 12-14 days and the assignment should be completed by the 11<sup>th</sup> January 2019.

## **Verification consultant/verifying organisation**

- The organisation/consultant should have experience in data verification and monitoring and evaluation (preferably of community development programmes)
- The organisation/consultant should have undertaken at least 2 similar exercises

- Basic data analysis skills
- ISO 65 accredited (desirable)
- Advanced level of French and English

## **Application information**

Interested consultants/verifiers should send a technical and financial proposal, describing the consultant's/team's relevant experience and capacity to undertake the verification. The proposed budget and technical proposal should be submitted by email with the email subject: ICI External Verification Proposal to <a href="mailto:hr@cocoainitiative.org">hr@cocoainitiative.org</a> by the deadline of Thursday 30<sup>th</sup> November, 2018.

#### The offer must include:

- Technical and financial offer, including the total amount offered in Swiss Francs (include the exchange rate used).
- The budget should detail the human resources, enumerators, material costs, travel expenses and fees.
- Include the CV for the verification consultant/leader
- List of similar work/projects undertaken
- Brief proposed methodology and work plan
- Data analysis plan
- One referee contact

ICI's vision is of thriving cocoa-growing communities where children's rights are respected and protected, and where child labour has been eliminated. To this end, ICI expects all children assisted or impacted by its operations to be protected from physical, emotional and psychological harm, and all forms of abuse and exploitation.

ICI has **zero-tolerance** for all forms of child neglect, abuse (sexual, physical, emotional, and psychological) and exploitation (sexual and commercial).

ICI commits to put the best interest of the child first, and at the centre of its work, irrespective of a child's ability, ethnicity, faith, gender, sexuality and culture.

ICI recognizes its responsibility to ensure and to promote a safe and secure environment for children. To effectively manage risks to children, ICI requires the commitment, support and cooperation of all staff, associates, partners, suppliers, service-providers and visitors. By applying at ICI, you automatically agree to the above term and uphold the principles described herein