The Transforming Education in Cocoa Communities (TRECC) initiative aims at improving the living conditions of children and youth in Côte d'Ivoire by promoting quality education in cocoa-growing communities. Via its Grant Matching Mechanism round 2 (GMM2), 13 pilots-to-scale projects are being co-funded with 12 cocoa companies and implemented by 14 implementing organizations in the sectors of Early Childhood Development, Primary Education and Vocational Training.

The role of Innovations for Poverty Action (IPA) is to provide technical support to the companies and implementing agencies to design and implement sound monitoring systems to closely monitor and learn from these pilots. In parallel, IPA conducts its own independent and complementary data collection. IPA will use these two sources of information – the administrative data collected by the implementing organizations through their own M&E system and the independent data collection – to feed into an independent evaluation matrix to assess each pilot.

The final scale up report will therefore be based on the evaluation matrix that was agreed upon all partners.

IPA has used this data to make recommendations on the potential scale-up of the HKI pilot to other relevant cocoa-growing communities. In addition, TRECC may consider whether certain pilots are feasible for future scale-up beyond such communities, for example to the regional or national level, though this has not been a central focus of this evaluation given the existing contractual arrangements of GMM2.

The report is divided into the following five sections:

1. Relevance;
2. Results (outputs and immediate outcomes);
3. Costs & Operations management;
4. Capacity to learn, improve and innovate; and
5. Sustainability.

For each section, we are describing the key findings based on quantitative and qualitative evidence.

Following the setup of the evaluation matrix, we are using a color system to provide an overall assessment against each of the 11 criteria: green means that the pilot is compliant with the criteria requirement for potential scale-up, red means that it is not, and orange means that it does partially comply and that eligibility for scale-up should be conditional on corrective measures to be taken in that area. As per the initial plan, our final overall recommendation is then decided as follows: pilots with green assessments on all 11 criteria receive an unconditional recommendation for eligibility for a scale-up proposal; pilots who have only green and orange criteria (no red), and among these a majority of green criteria, receive a conditional recommendation for scale-up – i.e. conditional on the various corrective measures being mentioned in the orange criteria. Pilots with any red criteria are not recommended for scale-up.

The Assessment signs used throughout the document are the following:
Acronyms:

**IGA**: Income Generating Activity

**VSLA**: Village Savings and Loans Associations

**IPA**: Innovations for Poverty Action

**M&E**: Monitoring and Evaluation

**TRECC**: Transforming Education in Cocoa Communities

**YFFS**: Youth Farmers Field School
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Executive Summary

General assessment and recommendation
The HRNS holistic approach addresses an important need in cocoa communities which is to better equip youth with financial and agricultural skills. The project was successful in engaging the community and creating a group dynamic within each Farmer Field Schools. Beneficiaries feedback about the program was positive and HRNS diligently delivered the program providing regular feedback on the project implementation. Finally, the project showed some signs of sustained benefit through the creation of specific structures such as Village Loan and Saving Associations (VSLA) and Income Generating Activities (IGA).
Overall, the HRNS pilot has earned a conditional recommendation for scale-up. Eight of the eleven evaluation criteria were rated as green and three as orange. Therefore, this recommendation comes with important conditions on those three criteria, which we believe should be addressed for the program to be well positioned to go to scale:

1. Relevance
This project addresses specific important needs in targeted communities. These encompass low access to financial services, agricultural know-how, and access to farmlands. We do not observe strong evidence that there is a need to change youth's opinions around agriculture, as many youths do report seeing agriculture as a viable source of income at the baseline. This result should however be interpreted with care since qualitative evidence suggests that agriculture is a default choice for young people without much education, and therefore might reflect a lack of alternative options rather than a sense of optimism about agricultural livelihoods. In general, the project theory of change is in line with the key barriers identified by beneficiaries during the needs assessment. In addition, we observe that those who signed up for the intervention have a comparable level of need with the rest of the community.

2. Results: output and direct outcomes
Important outputs such as facilitator training and the organization of gender seminars have been achieved at expected levels. However, due to the variable participation rate, only 30% of beneficiaries (90) were exposed to at least 80% of the training sessions, compared with a target of 300 youths. Nevertheless, we do observe a notable improvement on agricultural knowledge among the participants, even if according to qualitative interviews with participants, opportunities to implement what they learned was limited by youth's lack of decision-making ability in the fields where they work, raising the prospect that this knowledge may not be put to practice and retained. Concerning the gender component, despite organizing gender seminars, IPA cannot consider that the entire cascading program was rolled-out. In fact, IPA did observe that 40 “change agents” were fully trained and organized awareness campaigns. In turn, we saw only marginal effects on participants' views on women's role in household decision-making.

The holistic approach of HRNS has proven to be successful in some dimensions, namely in increasing positive perceptions towards agriculture and creating functioning Village Savings and Loan Associations (VSLA) and Income Generating Activities (IGA). VSLAs have been performing beyond expectations and seem to be an appropriate mechanism to mobilize youth and give access to small loans. The ambition to create an entire ecosystem that would support youth in their engagement in agri-business is promising but obviously would require more than 10 months of implementation.

Most beneficiaries reported being satisfied with the way the training was conducted and feedback on the trainers was very positive. Focus groups revealed that youth learned new agricultural techniques that they try to put in practice, in turn changing their perception towards agriculture.
Recommendations for scale-up:

**Gender component:** The project didn’t manage to roll-out the full cascading model of change agents who would influence gender norms around household decision-making in their communities. “Change agents” were enrolled, but were not trained, nor did they carry out planned awareness campaigns in their communities. In turn, we saw only marginal effects on men’s views on women’s role in household decision-making, and no changes in women’s views of their own role. We therefore encourage HRNS to review the operational model for this component of the program if it is considered as a core aspect.

**Land advocacy committees:** HRNS planned to establish land advocacy committees in all ten communities to advocate for youth access to land and conduct 40 training sessions for these committees. However, in three of the six communities’ beneficiaries were not aware of any advocacy committees being established, and we do not believe that all planned 40 training sessions took place. If expanding youth access to land is to continue as a core objective of the program, HRNS should revisit this strategy at scale.

**Income Generating Activities:** As HRNS exceeded expectations in creating one IGA per community, no clear framework was set around how we would bolster and measure success of these activities. IPA therefore recommends thinking in advance how we measure progress and IGAs’ success.

3. **Costs and operations management**
We observe good cost management, as far as we are able to tell. HRNS managed to present a quite linear version of the scale-up, meaning increasing outreach while keeping the same staff structure. The clear advantage of this approach is that it will lead to economies of scale. Two criteria will however play an essential role in the cost structure of the project: first the choice of the location that will determine the need for HRNS to train new staff, and second the type of support HRNS wants to deliver to their Income Generating Activities (IGA). Multiplying the number of IGA will have an impact on the in-kind contributions HRNS delivers, thereby increasing costs.

4. **Capacity to learn, improve and innovate**
Overall, HRNS demonstrated strong commitment to learn and share their experience through the very regular feedback from the field presented during the operational calls. The project collected credible real time data on the progress of the pilot. However, we did not receive data on some activities of the pilot as planned in the M&E plan. A strong recommendation would be to better track beneficiaries that left the program. We recommend following the M&E plan and record the attendance rate of all beneficiaries including those who left.

5. **Sustainability**
With the creation of specific structures such as IGAs and VSLAs, there are some signs of sustained benefits in communities. Beneficiaries are already engaged in activities to maintain the IGAs and VSLAs. However, the short period of implementation and the possibility of scale-up didn’t encourage communities to think of the IGAs and VSLAs as being theirs to implement in the absence of ongoing support from HRNS. In addition, beneficiaries foresaw many challenges to being able to maintain the IGAs profitably, given the scarcity of financial and natural resources in the region.

Trained facilitators declared that they are willing to continue to provide advice on agricultural practices to their communities, and there were strong effects on knowledge about agricultural best practices. However, the lack of decision-making power of many beneficiaries over the agricultural practices employed on the
plots where they work, is likely to impede their ability to remember and continue to apply much of what they learned about agriculture.

To date, few prospects have emerged with governmental counterparts for the scale-up of components of the program. There may be a chance that the financial component of the program could be adopted by government, but this prospect is far from concrete at this stage. In turn, the most promising way forward appears to be through the cocoa value chain, but we are not aware of any significant potential for adoption by other companies, beyond COMPANY PARTNER’ relatively small reach.

**Recommendation for scale-up**

**Potential for scale-up:** Currently, there is no clear pathway to scale for this program. While there are some early signs of government interest in the program, there is no concrete prospect of the program being taken up in the near future. In the absence of this, the most promising avenue toward scale is through the cocoa company value chains; but we are not aware of any current interest from other cocoa companies in adopting the model. We recommend that HRNS pursue prospects of scale-up through the cocoa companies or potentially different value chains.
Snapshot of specific assessment against each pre-defined evaluation criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Targets an important need in the community</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Aligns with the priorities of the donors</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Results: outputs and direct outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Delivers outputs at high quality</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Improve the delivery of the gender cascading component with change agents and revise the advocacy comitee strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Achieves direct outcomes</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Better define success criteria for Income Generating Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Beneficiaries’ feedback about the program is positive</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Costs and operations management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Costs are well managed/cost scale-up vision</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Project management is successful</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Capacity to learn, improve and innovate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Project collects credible monitoring data</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Monitoring is used to learn and improve</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Sustainability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Provides sustained benefit to community</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 There are prospects of scale-up beyond GMM2</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Explore scale-up pathways through value chains beyond Caboz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project summary

Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung (HRNS) has partnered with COMPANY PARTNER and COMPANY PARTNER NGO through the Transforming Rural Education in Cocoa (TRECC) initiative to test implementation and effectiveness of life skills and financial education in increasing and diversifying incomes of youth in Ivorian cocoa-growing communities.

The project aimed to improve young people’s attitudes towards agriculture to help them become modern, professional farmers, and at the end increase and diversify their income from farming. The program’s objective was to encourage young people to contribute and benefit from several agricultural value chains in their community using Youth Farmers Field School (YFFS). The training started on March 2018 and had 10 modules.

The pilot targeted ten communities within the Soubré region in Ivory Coast. 10 YFFS facilitators were to deliver the training to 300 beneficiaries. Target beneficiaries were young people from 16-26 years living in the project area and motivated to learn about modern and professional agriculture. The YFFS facilitators were intended to be those among them who can read and write, who can be a model for other young people, have a business mind attitude, are able to inspire others and live in the project area.

The pilot combined the training with other activities organized in the communities: youth were encouraged to participate in Village Savings and Loans Associations (VSLA) and to create collective and/or individual Income Generating Activities (IGAs). The pilot also planned to establish gender norms “change agents” to spur improvements in women’s involvement in household decision-making, and land advocacy committees to seek greater access to land by youth.
1. Relevance

The relevance section will include the following two criteria:

- The program is targeting important needs in the community
- The program is aligned with donors' priorities

1.1 Targets an important need in the community

This project addresses specific important needs in targeted communities. This encompasses low access to financial services, agricultural training and access to farmlands. We however observe a more nuanced opinion around agriculture from parents and local representatives that present agri-business as a default choice. Nevertheless, overall the project theory of change is in line with the key barriers identified by beneficiaries during the needs assessment, and those who receive the intervention don't have a greater but at least a comparable level of need with the rest of the community.

This section focuses on the relevance of the program in the community. The data analyzed in this section includes the needs assessment made by HRNS and baseline quantitative and qualitative data collected by IPA. Baseline respondents' characteristics are available in the annex.

Criteria 1.1.1 HRNS needs assessment report shows evidence of a need being addressed

HRNS needs assessment was carried out between the 26 of April and the 3 of May 2018 in 11 communities of the Soubré region where the pilot takes place. It includes information collected through individual interviews with 15 youths of the community, 8 parents and 7 customary authorities. In addition, 15 group discussions were organized. Three specific “needs to be addressed” were put forward in HRNS’ report and will be discussed in the following section.

“Young women and men do not see agriculture as a viable income-earning opportunity”

Young people generally believe that agriculture is a viable income-earning opportunity; but this appears to be mainly because they have few alternative viable options outside agriculture.

Young women and men from target communities who participated in HRNS’ needs assessment see agriculture as a viable income-earning activity, even if they are not necessarily proud of or satisfied with their work. 87% believe that people that are truly knowledgeable about agriculture can succeed. 73% reported that they are or would be proud to be farmers. And, in IPA’s own
baseline, only 56% of beneficiaries who are currently working in agriculture are “satisfied” or “very satisfied” with their job.

Triangulating youth’s answers with other sources of information, such as parents and community representatives, we discover that young people are primarily interested in agriculture because they have no other alternative. A father declared “Youth who are interested in agriculture are those who have failed at school”. According to the community, youth are generally reluctant to work in agriculture because the profitability in this sector is low and because they do not have access to land.

✓ “Youth lack the necessary know-how to practice farming as a professional business”

Although 75% of the baseline sample have already worked in agriculture, there is evidence that youth lack knowledge about good agricultural practices targeted by HRNS. In fact, only a third of beneficiaries scored a passing grade (above 50%) at IPA’s baseline, using a knowledge test based on the HRNS agricultural practices curriculum¹. In addition, youth in the communities would like to improve their knowledge on those topics. 86% of youth interviewed during baseline declared they are interested in professional trainings focusing on agriculture. During focus group discussions with members of the communities, IPA got the same feedback: “we need training because we know nothing about it (agriculture), even if we know, but there are experts in these fields, it is to be better qualified”. One caveat about this stated need is that youth’s level of knowledge about basic agricultural concepts (as opposed to specific good agricultural practices) is already moderate at baseline; 72% scored a passing grade on an agricultural concept test that IPA administered at baseline.

✓ “Youth have limited access to land and finance to start their own farming business”

In the target communities, a significant portion of youth appear not to have access to land, and access to finance to start their own farming businesses is limited. The problem is well illustrated by the following quote from a young man who was willing to participate in the pilot: “Today, we decide to integrate a project, but we have no land, so we need land, so we need financing to buy land or rent it.”

Information gathered through needs assessment suggests that a significant portion of youth do not have anyone in their household who owns land. IPA’s baseline found that only 22% of youth beneficiaries interviewed are land owners, while another 53% have parents (or another household member) who owns land. The remaining quarter of our sample do not have anyone in their household who owns land, suggesting that their access to land is likely limited, unless they are able to rent or borrow land from another source. Those who have no land acknowledge

¹ The details of these tests can be found in Annex 5 and is discussed in the outcome section
that acquiring a piece of land is difficult. Moreover, available land is scarce in the pilot communities: "The land is insufficient. The plots originally given were used for cocoa plantations".

Baseline data on access to financial services shows that the same young people have no or very low access to financial services. Only 4% of them have a bank account; only 5% of beneficiaries participate in a Village Savings and Loans Associations (VSLA).
Criteria 1.1.2 Beneficiaries’ description of their needs and needs assessment are in line with the pilot’s theory of change:

First, youth interviewed during the needs assessment reported that they need training on good practices in the agriculture sector. They believe good knowledge is key to succeed and be profitable in agriculture. The project aims to respond to this demand. More precisely, it is intended to have this effect through the provision of training on good agricultural practices. The training includes both theoretical and practical sessions on demonstration plots.

Secondly, youth interviewed report that one of their main challenges to start an agricultural business is the limited access to land in their communities. As discussed in the previous section, we found out that few of them have land or access to land.

Finally, youth pointed out that they have low access to financial services to invest in agribusinesses. The training encompasses a component on budgeting and saving. Furthermore, HRNS will encourage the creation of VSLAs across members of the trainings. Knowledge acquired through trainings on financial literacies will allow them to save their income from their farms and create other Income Generating Activities (IGAs).

Criteria 1.1.3 Those who received the intervention have a comparable or greater level of need compared with the rest of the community:

Both beneficiary and non-beneficiary interviewed in the pilot communities during IPA baseline data collection have similar educational levels, experience working in agriculture, employment status, and access to land.
The overall education level is low in pilot communities. There is no significant difference between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries in terms of education level. 67.2% of beneficiaries (74.6% non-beneficiaries) have never attended school and around 2% of beneficiaries (0% of non-beneficiaries) reached university level.

In sub-Saharan Africa, unemployment rates remain relatively low, as most of employable active youth cannot afford not to work. This is even more true in rural areas where agricultural activities remain a central pillar of households’ livelihood. In line with this trend, most youth reported having a job and therefore being in the labour force, 89% in the beneficiary group. Indeed, most youth are employed in the informal sector as very few formal contracts are available in rural areas. This often results in poor working conditions with very low paid salaries. We find the same trend among beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. Overall, more beneficiaries (86.5%) reported being engaged in income generating activities in cocoa producing communities than non-beneficiaries (79.7%).

Beneficiaries’ households have relatively similar average monthly income: 146,756.7 XOF for beneficiaries against 103,928.5 XOF for non-beneficiaries, but the difference is not statistically significant. The perception of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries on their poverty status differs depending on the level of poverty asked. On the one hand, more beneficiaries (30%) believe they are poor than non-beneficiaries (22%). On the other hand, less beneficiaries (1.5%) perceive themselves as being very poor, in comparison with non-beneficiaries (3%) who do.

Comparison of the main project outcomes between those who receive the training and the rest of the community

On knowledge about agriculture methods and agricultural practices, respondents were asked during the baseline survey to define different agricultural processes from a list of options. They were also given pictures and asked to identify the corresponding agricultural activity from a list of options. On average, the percentage of beneficiaries (79.7%) and non-beneficiaries (71.7%) who scored above 50% is similar. On the agriculture-related practice test, about 30% in both groups scored above 50%.

The percentage of persons who work in the agriculture sector and reported having a positive attitude towards agriculture is also similar in both groups. However, a higher percentage of non-beneficiaries working in the agriculture sector reported being satisfied with their job compared to beneficiaries also working in agriculture.

Regarding gender attitudes, we asked respondents what level of involvement they believe men and women should have in six different types of household decisions. On average, both males and females in the beneficiary and non-beneficiary groups reported that men should be involved in “most” household decisions. Beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries share common beliefs about women’s level of involvement in certain decision making. Generally, they don’t tend to believe that women should be involved in all decisions directly linked to households’ finances. Regarding decisions in relation to child education, around 50% of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries report that women should be involved in all decisions.
On access to land, a similar percentage of beneficiaries (77.2%) and non-beneficiaries (78.0%) reported having access to land. Respondents in both groups reported having access to land through their parents/heads of household.

On savings practices, a higher percentage of beneficiaries reported saving money in the last three months, having a bank account, or having a mobile money bank account. More beneficiaries reported saving cash or via a mobile money bank account, and most frequently. However, the percentage of people who save via VSLA group is low and similar in both groups.

Both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries have very similar observable characteristics in term of household structure, education, access to land, agricultural knowledge and perception towards gender involvement in decision making. We observe small differences in the number of people that had previous access to agricultural training.

![1.2. Aligns with the priorities of the donors](image)

1.2. Aligns with the priorities of the donors

Despite genuine interest from Company partner around the implementation of the project at scale, program funders raised concerns about the sustainability of scale-up without strong government and partner support. The intervention as implemented aligns with donor priorities, through its objective to allow young people to contribute to and benefit from several agricultural value chains.

[Details removed]
2. Results: output and direct outcomes

This section will include the following three criteria:

- Delivers output at high quality
- Achieves direct outcomes
- Beneficiaries’ feedback about the program is positive

2.1 Delivers outputs at high quality:

Important outputs such as facilitators training and the organization of gender seminars have been achieved at expected levels. However, due to the heterogeneous participation rate a lower number of youth than expected was exposed to 80% of the training. Concerning the gender component, despite organizing the gender seminar, IPA did not receive a proof that HRNS did roll-out the entire cascading program, meaning the training of 40 change agents and the organization of their awareness campaign.

Criteria 2.1.1 Key outputs from the proposal log-frame were achieved

Section 2.1.1 discusses HRNS’ achievement on the pilot’s key outputs. Results were described in the HRNS endline report and observed by IPA during field visits.

10 facilitators trained

10 Youth Farmers Field School (YFFS) facilitators were trained in April 2018. HRNS registered 25 potential candidates for the facilitator positions in the 10 pilot communities. Based on pre-set criteria described by HRNS (such as literacy, age, leadership skills etc...), one person was selected in each community. Crosschecking the information of the HRNS-prepared final report with interviews we did with facilitators, we found that targets in terms of number of facilitators trained were achieved as described in the proposal.

Facilitators reported following a two-week training in Soubre. HRNS’ Youth Project Manager came from Uganda to help local staff for the YFFS facilitators’ initial training.

Table 1: Key outputs 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitators trained</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Endline report and interviews with facilitators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 youth to youth exchange visits organized
As specified in the evaluation matrix, 5 exchange visits among youths were to be organized. In total, 12 exchange visits between youths took place. Such visits are particularly important as they present an opportunity for youth to meet, share experiences and learn from each other.

Table 2: Key output 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 youth to youth exchange visits organized</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>HRNS endline report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 advocacy committees training sessions organized
Initially, HRNS planned to establish an advocacy committee in each community and train them through 4 training sessions each.

HRNS described in its final report that 10 advocacy committees with 100 members (13 female and 87 male) had been established and received training. Each committee was to have received 4 training sessions from HRNS, for a total of 40.

However, during the data collection, IPA was not able to observe the establishment of the committees in several communities. Indeed, IPA had planned to meet the members of advocacy committees in 6 communities at endline for Key Informant Interviews. But, in 3 communities, the supposed members – named by the facilitators in the community- were not aware of the creation of advocacy committees or their part in them. In the rest of the communities, supposed members interviewed did not receive trainings. As the results of these interviews, we find that the target in terms of advocacy committee trainings was not achieved – and any effects of these committees on access to land, the next step in the theory of change, would be unlikely.

Table 3: Key Outputs 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Committee training sessions organized</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Interviews with members of the committees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40 change agents trained
The initial idea of change agents is to identify couples that have positive spouses’ practices and support them during specific trainings to trigger more widespread systemic changes in their community. HRNS reported that 48 couples and 120 single people registered as change agents at the end of the gender seminar. In fact, people may have registered, but this does not indicate that they were trained as initially planned in the proposal. HRNS also indicated in their final report that 10 change agents’ trainings were conducted, one in each community. In the initial proposal
three phases of training were planned for each community. IPA received an attendance list for only one session in each community. During Key Informant Interviews HRNS also acknowledged they had no enough time to really deliver all trainings on this component.

Table 4: Key outputs 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change agents trained</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>HRNS endline report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80 awareness sessions organized by change agents

The role of change agents is to sensitize and advocate for equal gender relations in their community. To achieve their goals, change agents were expected to organize awareness sessions in the communities. However, no clear indication that those sessions were organized is available in HRNS’ final report. In addition to this in the endline evaluation, beneficiaries didn’t report participating in these awareness sessions. Finally, answers from Key Informant Interviews with HRNS’ management were also vague and HRNS acknowledged their limited time to fully deliver awareness campaigns.

Table 5: Key output 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awareness sessions organized</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation for scale-up: In the next phase of the project the role of change agents should be more carefully addressed and a more realistic plan about when to engage and backstop those activities should be laid out. More intense cascade trainings of closer mentoring could be potential avenues forward.

Criteria 2.1.2 Beneficiaries’ participation rate

300 youths trained

IPA used administrative data collected and shared by HRNS at the end of the program to check the total number of youths trained. The administrative data describes a participation of 306 beneficiaries to the main 13 training sessions.2

2 The quality of the administrative data collected by the partners are discussed in the section 4.1.
Initially, HRNS’ target was to train 300 youths. A person is defined as trained if he/she participated to at least 80% of the training sessions. 80% of the training corresponds to 10.4 sessions over 13. It implies that we should consider a person as trained if she/he attended at least 11 sessions. Following this line of reasoning, only 90 youths in the administrative data (29.5% of beneficiaries) did attend at least 11 training sessions. As a result, the output objective was not reached.

Table 6: Key outputs 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trained Youth (participate to at least 80% of the trainings)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>HRNS administrative data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, beneficiaries participated to 65% of the training (average of 8.4 sessions, out of 13 in total). All beneficiaries participated to at least 2 sessions and 8.5% never missed a session. Figure 3 describes the distribution of the number of sessions attended by beneficiary.

Figure 3: Distribution of number of sessions attended
Administrative data shared by HRNS at the end of the program shows that about half of beneficiaries were trained (i.e. participated in at least 80% of the sessions) by the end of the training; but that there is a large disparity across communities.

Figure 3 shows that 52% of beneficiaries attended 80% of the training (or 9 sessions). The percentage of beneficiaries who attended a satisfactory number of sessions differs widely from one community to another. For instance, there are 80% of beneficiaries who participated to at least 80% of training in X, in comparison with only 20% of beneficiaries in X where three sessions (session 11 to 13) did not happen. There are the only three sessions registered with no participant in the entire training and all communities. According to HRNS one of the main drivers for this heterogeneity is the level of trust within communities. In fact, communities with a high level of internal trust have more abilities to cooperate with each other and function as a group as opposed to communities with a higher level of distrust.

The analysis of beneficiary participation uses the administrative data shared by HRNS at the end of the program. However, individuals included in the administrative data shared at end of the program differs from the persons included in the administrative data at the beginning of the program. Indeed, if we merge both lists of beneficiaries we find that 57% of beneficiaries are in both lists. Therefore, we believe that beneficiaries who were initially enrolled in the program were replaced. If they were replaced because they never attended or dropped out of the
program, the real participation rate is overestimated. This issue will be discussed in more details in the section 4.1.

200 participants to gender seminar

According to HRNS endline report, 10 awareness campaign sessions and 12 gender seminars have been conducted in the pilot communities. Beneficiaries interviewed confirmed the seminar took place in all localities. Administrative data does not contain participation on the gender seminar, but our independent survey indicates that 70% of our sample participated to the gender seminar. Extrapolating this result to the entire sample results in approximately 200 beneficiaries. Qualitative interviews also confirmed that youth participated to these seminars, so IPA is confident in saying that the output has been met.

Gender seminars consist of a group discussion over men's and women's roles inside and outside the household. The idea is to sketch a typical day for woman and a man and discuss differences. Solutions to improve intra household decision-making and planning are then identified and discussed. At the end of the seminar, on a voluntary basis, some couples agree to become “agents of change”. This means that they will apply positive practices in their own households and promote these practices within the community.

Table 7: Key outputs 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Targeted</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>Data source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants to gender seminar</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Approx. 200</td>
<td>Endline data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Achieves direct outcomes

The holistic approach of HRNS answering to the complex problem of youth disengagement in cocoa culture has proven to be successful in some dimensions, namely in increasing positive perceptions towards agriculture and creating operational VSLA and IGA structures. However, the ambition to create a group of change agents to bring about shifts in norms about household decision-making gender dynamics was not fully realized in the pilot timeframe.
Criteria 2.2.1. Change in beneficiaries’ knowledge, behavior and practices

Figure 1: Pilot timeline

Methodological section:
IPA has carried out three waves of data collection. The first one was implemented before the beginning of the program is so called a baseline.

During the baseline, IPA collected data on beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries to assess the effectiveness of beneficiaries' targeting. The effective start of the program occurred two months after the baseline. During the baseline, IPA collected data on 180 beneficiaries, randomly selected out of the 299 people on the initial list shared by HRNS. The second wave of data collection is called the midline and was informing programs stakeholders on the overall implementation. The last wave of data collection at the end of the program is so called endline. This data collection occurred one week after the end of the program and aims at surveying the exact same people as during baseline. The following analysis will compare the results on program outcomes. Due to many reasons (travels, unavailability of the beneficiaries) the field team was unable to find the entire baseline population, as is common for field surveys. IPA was successful in surveying 144 people from the baseline sample in the community at the endline (80% of the sample). To avoid attrition that would in turn weakens the analysis, IPA organized a phone tracking to increase response rate. The phone tracking allowed IPA to survey 17 additional beneficiaries. The current response rate therefore reached 89.5%. The total baseline-endline panel sample therefore includes 161 people.

As HRNS did some replacement of beneficiaries between the start and the end of the program not all 161-youth surveyed at endline followed the entire program. Out of the 161 respondents we are sure that 91 were exposed to the entire program. For the rest of beneficiaries, it is not clear when they dropped out as they are not part of HRNS beneficiary list anymore.

Change in Direct Outcomes
To avoid the misuse of data during our analysis, a joint effort was made with all partners to come up with a clear pre-analysis plan. Setting the key variables to measure and being specific about

---

3 By start of the YFFS program IPA refers to the effective start of the training sessions, as we are interested by measuring changes in outcomes related to learning. The very first training session was indeed delivered the 6 of July 2018, but significant work has been carried out up front to create those groups.
how we measure them helps us to avoid picking only the outcomes that are significantly positive during the final analysis.

Key families of direct outcomes were identified before project roll-out and explicitly included in the project evaluation matrix. They encompass the following dimensions:

- young people’s attitude towards farming
- young people’s involvement in agri-business
- land access
- women’s involvement in household decision-making.

Youth attitude and knowledge towards agriculture

Key Indicator:

✓ **20% of youth improved their attitude towards agriculture**

Perception towards the agricultural value chain has been identified as an important indicator of success for the project stakeholders. Indeed, both indicators reflecting the perception towards agriculture experienced a significant change between the start and the end of the program. In fact, the percentage of youth having a positive attitude towards agriculture changed from 56% to 74%. Looking at youth that are mainly involved in agricultural activities, this improvement is even stronger. In fact, at endline 84% of youth working in agriculture declared being satisfied with their job against 40% at baseline. Several factors can explain the increase in satisfaction, this includes farm yields, price increases and other external shocks. Given that the period between the two data collections is relatively short, we assume that the variation of the satisfaction is mostly due to the training provided. However, despite these findings we cannot rule out the fact that respondents declared being more satisfied with their job because they know it is the answer they are supposed to provide. As a result, and to provide a better picture of the training implementation we will cross-check this information with complementary indicators and qualitative interviews.

Table 8 Outcome 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2: Perception of agriculture</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>baseline</th>
<th>endline</th>
<th>diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- % youth having a positive attitude towards agriculture among those who are seeking a job or whose main economic activity is agriculture</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>17%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- % of youth with main activities in the agriculture sector since the baseline who are satisfied with their job</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>44%***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HRNS program has put a special emphasis on the Good Agricultural Practices (GAP). A detailed manual and training were delivered to youth with a very strong focus on cocoa cultivation. In fact, the 8 GAP sessions (see annex 2) were mostly focusing on cocoa culture. Data shows improvement from baseline to endline in knowledge about agriculture related concepts.

Our baseline included two types of knowledge assessment. First, we tested the knowledge of beneficiaries asking questions about general agriculture concepts. The set of target concepts was drawn from the different modules delivered by HRNS and specifically tailored to the local Ivorian context. This includes questions such as “What is a tree nursery” or “what is tree pruning”. The details of these questions with the correct related answers can be found in the annex 5.

Secondly, to test specific information retention, based on HRNS training material, IPA drafted a series of questions addressing the key good practices presented during the training. This includes questions such as “What is the proper period to do the planting?” or “How often in the year do you weed your plantation?”. The details of these questions can also be found in the annex 5. For each type of question, the respondent had to pick an answer from an option list.

We observe no improvement in the agriculture knowledge around best practices. The key insight from these results is that youth seem to have increased their awareness around general agricultural practices such as tree pruning. However, when asking more specific questions about good agricultural practices in the cocoa culture we found mixed results. Qualitative evidence suggests that one important learning barrier could be that youth are not decision makers in cocoa fields. In turn, only older heads of households decide which practice they want to implement in their cocoa fields. This lack of ability to apply new techniques could in turn impact information retention, if participants don’t perceive a practical use for them to memorize precise agricultural practices.

Table 9 Knowledges and practices about cacao farming

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1: Knowledges and practices about cacao farming</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>baseline</th>
<th>endline</th>
<th>diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- % of youth who scored above 50% in agriculture-related concepts test</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>10%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- % of youth who scored above 50% in knowledge around best practices test</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically significant differences marked with asterisks: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Involvement in agri-business

Key indicator

☑️ 20 % of youth become involved in agri-business
One of the overarching goals of the HRNS program is to equip youth with the necessary skills for setting-up profitable agri-businesses. As this program only lasted for less than a year there will be not enough time to thoroughly assess the profitable dimension of each individual project. However, a first step for the youth would be to be more involved in agri-business. The term “agri-business” can of course encompass a wide variety of situations ranging from an activity that is carried out outside the household (such as selling fertilizers) to an activity that is embedded into households’ farming (such as growing bananas on the family plot for sale).

Using the Decent Work framework developed by the ILO, work is any activity performed to produce goods or provide services with a market value, for use by others, or for one’s own-use. There are five mutually exclusive forms of work: (1) own-use production work; (2) employment; (3) unpaid trainee work; (4) volunteer work; and (5) other.

Table 10 Involvement in agricultural work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% youth working in agriculture (last 7 days)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>baseline</th>
<th>endline</th>
<th>diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- % youth working in agriculture (last 7 days)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>9%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- % man working in agriculture (last 7 days)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- % women working in agriculture (last 7 days)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically significant differences marked with asterisks: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Looking at table 10 we observe an increase in the percentage of youth working in agriculture of 9 % from baseline to endline. Looking at the within gender difference we don’t observe any statistically significant change. For the women group the lack of statistical difference is mostly due to the small sample size. While trying to capture all the different types of work our survey didn’t allow us to make a clear conclusion on the distribution of youth involvement between subsistence farming and/or cash crops farming. Despite not being able to clearly reach a 20 % increase in agri-business activities, we observe a significant 9% increase in youth engagement in

4 Guidelines for measuring youth employment and Decent Work in agriculture within developing countries FAO 2018

5 Includes the 5 types of work according to ILO (1) own-use production work; (2) employment; (3) unpaid trainee work; (4) volunteer work; and (5) other
agricultural work. This is an encouraging result as it might set the foundation of future engagement for youth.

One important caveat to this analysis concerns the before/after approach of the analysis. Indeed, youth employment is greatly seasonal as during the cocoa harvest more labor force is needed. One advantage of this study is that data collection was done nearly a year after the baseline ruling out large seasonal effects. However, one cannot completely rule out other factors that could have played in favor or against youth agricultural employment, this includes climatic shocks, large changes in commodity price.

**Gender Awareness**

**Key indicator**

☑️ **40% of couples see an improvement in women's involvement in household decision making**

Empirical evidence suggests that resource allocation within households is not gender-neutral. It is the result of a bargaining process in which partners may have different preferences, control and power. In this respect, HRNS approach aims at fostering equal opportunities for men and women while supporting young couples to develop a “joint vision” for their household. This could be achieved via allowing both spouses to plan jointly and take decisions together. In this respect IPA measured bargaining power within the household. To do this we asked the following question “To which extent do you think women/men should be involved in the decision making over ...”. Five dimensions were tested, food, cash crops, work, income, expenses and education. Answers could go from 0 (no involvement) to 5 (full involvement). As a result, we present the average score of gender involvement in households’ decision-making.

When asking questions about gender involvement in household decision making we observe that on average, respondents consider that men should be more involved than women. Men, in the second part of the figure 5 reached a higher score, around 4 out of 5, for each question while women are around 3. Looking at the different dynamics between baseline and endline we observe two clear patterns. First women don't seem to change their perception towards their own situation. In fact, contrary to men, women didn't report significantly different scores in terms of attitude towards involvement in decision making. However, both genders seem to change their perception towards the opposite gender. In fact, during endline, man reported that women should take a bigger role in the decision making within the household, but we observe the same pattern for women. In fact, women reported that men should be even more involved in decision making. This result might support the common household vision fostered by HRNS that recommends higher implication of both man and women in household decisions.
Women’s empowerment is a multidimensional concept and this analysis chose to focus on one dimension: decision-making involvement within the household. Narrowing our indicator to couples in the current context isn’t appropriate, given that 57% of respondents declared being single and the program enrolled singles as well as couples. On average we observe a small increase in men attitude towards women involvement in decision making going from 2.7 to 2.9. Only looking at the subsample of couples we do not observe a statistically significant change in attitudes for both men and women.

Despite observing some shifts related to how men see women’s involvement in household decisions, most changes have been observed around men involvement. In addition to this, we can’t say that 40% of couples saw an improvement in the attitudes towards women’s involvement in household decision making. Despite positive preliminary results, deeper changes in social norms and intra household bargaining power might take more time.

**Land Access**

Key indicator:
During baseline we asked the question that follows: *Do you or someone of your family own farmland?* We concluded that the youth had access to land if
- He/she owns farmland
- Someone in the household owns land.

We observe a significant increase in the proportion of youth who report that themselves or someone from their household owns land – from 76% at baseline to 92% at endline. Youth who previously reported not knowing any household member who owned land, now report that they do; half of this increase is because the youth themselves now report owning land; and half is because they now report household members land (figure 6 for more details). Looking at the figures displayed in table 11 we do observe a significant improvement in the percentage of youth having access to a “piece” of land.

Most likely, the youth in the program have sought out access to land from those around them, particularly to pursue the IGAs which are part of the program. With the rapid expansion of agriculture in Ivory Coast very few farmlands are now available. Land is locally viewed as belonging to the lineage and is transferred according to the rules and norms of customary law. The projects encouraged parents to handover pieces of land to practice new agricultural techniques.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 4: Land ownership</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>baseline</th>
<th>endline</th>
<th>diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- % of youth who own land (or someone in the household owns land)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>15%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- % of men who own land (or someone in the household owns land)</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>23%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- % of women who own land (or someone in the household owns land)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>8%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistically significant differences marked with asterisks: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01

Despite the observed increase in beneficiary youth who report owning or knowing household members who own land, this does not appear to have been a product of the land advocacy committees which were originally proposed in the theory of change. In the outputs section (2.1.1), we reported that in three communities there was no advocacy committee established, and the planned 40 advocacy committee training sessions never took place. In addition, in the feedback section (2.3.2), we show that youth in focus groups do not believe that the program helped them get access to land but did so via their own initiative. Nevertheless, HRNS deserves credit for inspiring youth to seek access to land via their own means, even if the advocacy committees were not the mediating cause of this.
Qualitative interviews suggested that having access to a piece of land does not mean that youth are the primary decision holders on how to conduct agricultural activities. This access encompasses a wide variety of situations. In some cases, during focus groups, beneficiaries described that the household head gave them the possibility to try new techniques on a dozen of trees. In some other cases beneficiaries started growing vegetables on a small piece of land.

In fact, looking at the figure 7 that describes who is using the first plot mentioned by the survey respondent\(^6\), we observe that respondents are the only plot user in only 33% of the cases. It is important to note that being the only plot user does not necessarily mean being the primary decision maker in the conduct of cropping. No specific detailed information about decision holder for each cultural activity and plot was gathered during endline.

\(^6\) In Africa, farmlands are often divided in different plots that are located in different geographical areas. As a result, for the sake of clarity, our analysis we only focus on the first and most important declared.
We developed a section to gather information on land access during the endline. A more detailed analysis of the type of plots, average size, type of cultivation and land tenure is available in Annex 3.

According to our analysis, we do observe a change in reported access to land by beneficiaries (when defined as ownership or knowing somebody who owns land). However, given the initial high level of access, the current indicator was unrealistic; a 30% change would require going beyond 100%. In this respect we can consider that the HRNS project meets the expected ambition as 92% of beneficiaries now declared that themselves of someone from the household owns land.

**Recommendation for scale-up:** Access to land is a very broad concept that can encompass a wide variety of realities. The project might benefit from defining what type of specific access and control on the agricultural techniques implemented they want to achieve. This is a paramount issue as land tenure and choices of culture are at the center of rural household’s livelihood strategies.

**Implementation of VSLA**

**Key indicator**

\checkmark **10 Village Savings and Loans Associations (VSLAs) mobilize 3 000 000 in savings**

A Village Savings and Loan Association (VSLA) is a group of people who save together and take small loans from those savings. Creating VSLAs is part of the pilot strategy: one VSLA has been
created in each community to enable young people to save and then implement an individual or collective Income Generating Activity (IGA). The participation in the VSLA is voluntary. Data collected by IPA at the end of the project shows that 77% of beneficiaries participated in VSLAs and that associations went beyond expectation in terms of amount of money collected.

Overall, 40% of participants to IGAs are women. Participation to VSLAs varies across locality. In 3 localities, all beneficiaries participated in the VSLAs, while in 2 other localities less than 40% participated. Figure 8 describes the percentage of beneficiaries who joined a VSLA per community.

VSLA groups meet weekly and groups save through a contribution decided at the community level at the beginning of the program. The contribution varies from 200 XOF to 500 XOF, as determined by each VSLA. VSLAs also impose penalties on members who have a delay on payment. Any delay in the payment entails a penalty of 100 XOF. A number of VSLAs also created a solidarity fund to support members who encountered difficulties or setbacks, such as illness or death in the family, fire, or other disasters.

Overall, the 10 VSLAs mobilized 3,848,200 XOF of savings and solidarity funds collected 204,350 XOF.

Table 12: Direct outcomes
VSLAs collect savings and provide interest loans to their members from the pool of savings on the requirement that the money be used for productive (income-generating) uses. Overall, 1,442,500 XOF (37% of the total amount of savings) were granted in loans. In X and X, no beneficiary asked for a loan because it is badly considered in the region (associated with poverty).

Table 13: Credit and saving in VSLA

VSLAs have been a central piece of HRNS’ program, enabling youth to have access to a saving mechanism and, in the meantime, strengthening financial literacy through practice. Mobilization of youth through this mechanism has exceeded expectations and has set the foundations for future group collaboration.
**Income Generating Activities (IGAs)**

Key outcome not clearly defined in the matrix

All IGAs made in kind of cash investment\(^7\)

The pilot combines the VSLAs with collective Income Generating Activities (IGAs). Members are also encouraged to invest in productive assets through individual IGAs. Collective IGAs are managed by the VSLAs groups to increase their income through livelihood diversification. Data collected by IPA's agent at the end of the program shows that 12 collective IGAs have been implemented in 9 communities.

At the end of the program, the number of collective IGAs was beyond the initial expectation of the pilot. In its inception HRNS ambition was to implement one IGA per community. In the end, there were three communities which implemented two collective IGAs each. However, the vegetable garden implemented by the VSLA group in X has not been successful. This is partly due to the poor quality of the soil and to the low engagement of the group. Regarding engagement, in group IGAs, information gathered during spot-check and qualitative data collection suggests the existence of what economists would term “free riders” behavior. Key informants reported that certain persons did not participate in the collective IGA because they believed that they could benefit from collective effort without having to spare their time. “In IGAs some people were not coming. They thought others would have the same money as those who did not participate.”

**Recommendation for scale-up:** Linking an IGA to a VSLA is core to the theory of change as it enables small IGAs to start with a first loan. However, it should not be mandatory that beneficiaries take advantage of both the IGA and the VSLA, as some beneficiaries might be interested to save but not to start an activity. We therefore recommend HRNS to reconsider how these IGA groupings are created. One way forward could be to select the most motivated participants to take part of the IGA. This would in turn reduce the risk of opportunistic behavior.

6 out of 12 collective IGAs were cassava fields which is the most common crop in the region. On average, groups invest 177,750 XOF per community on those collective IGAs. The investment came mostly from HRNS Only one community and one VSLA group contributed financially to the projects. However, the plot where the IGAs have been implemented were often donations from the communities; 10 were donated and 4 leased. The pieces of land donated or leased are less than a hectare in all communities.

\(^7\) This indicator was not originally in the matrix
Table 14: Collective IGAs, per community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Number of IGAs</th>
<th>Type of IGAs</th>
<th>Money Investments</th>
<th>IGA functioning at the end of the program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cassava and rice</td>
<td>370 000</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>48 000</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poultry farming</td>
<td>425 000</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>80 000</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cassava and groundnut crops</td>
<td>80 000</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vegetable garden</td>
<td>45 000</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>50 000</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cocoa nursery</td>
<td>324 000</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cassava</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the cyclical nature of the agricultural activities, it’s hard at this stage to really draw a conclusion on the profitability. However, the spirit of these IGA was to create a structure where youth could put in practice their skills.

One important factor to consider during the implementation of these IGAs is the seasonality. In fact, there is a higher chance to successfully grow crops if the planting is done during the best season. Therefore, we recommend HRNS to align the start of the IGA with the agricultural calendar as much as possible. One specific example where this did not happen was the start of the cassava activities during the dry season, which in turn represents nearly 70 % of the IGA.

**Recommendation for scale-up:** To better follow the development of IGA, HRNS should think about key indicators that are describing how operational is the IGA and how much money and time people invest in this activity.

**2.3. Beneficiaries’ feedback about the program is positive**

Most beneficiaries reported being satisfied with the way the training was conducted and feedback on the trainers was very positive. Focus groups revealed that youth learned new agricultural techniques that they try to put in practice in turn changing
their perception towards agriculture. Finally, beneficiaries reported many important barriers to sustained activities. This includes access to financial and natural resources that are scarce.

**Criteria 2.3.1 Beneficiaries provide positive feedback on the delivery of outputs**

Through our quantitative questionnaire we observe a large buy-in for the program from the beneficiaries’ perspective. We asked multiple questions to obtain respondents’ opinion on coaching sessions and the way they were conducted. All our questions can be grouped into four areas: (1) overall satisfaction with sessions, (2) satisfaction with facilitator’s performance and coaching practices, (3) satisfaction with the location of coaching sessions, and (4) satisfaction with personal participation in sessions.

Regarding the overall satisfaction with sessions (figure 9), 98% agreed that the sessions were clear and understandable. In addition to this, almost all respondents agreed that sessions were pleasant; 94% of the respondents were willing to recommend the training sessions to their friends and family. Moreover 89% of the sample had already spoken about the training sessions around them.

**Figure 9  Overall satisfaction with sessions**

On facilitators’ engagement and friendliness, all participant agreed that facilitators had good listening skills and were well trained. However, as is common in group sessions, 59% of participants reported that the training sessions are dominated by some participants.

**Criteria 2.3.2 Beneficiaries provide positive feedback on the main immediate outcomes**
IPA collected qualitative feedback about the program through the endline survey in the following way:

- We asked the opinion of the respondents about this statement: “Would you recommend this program to a friend or a family member?”
- “Have you already talked about the program to your family and friends?”
- “What did you tell them (friends and family)?”; this question is relevant if the respondent had already talked about the program.

For these types of questions with very high scores it is important to keep in mind the possibility of a Hawthorne effect. Meaning that individuals will modify their answers because they know they are part of an evaluation. Therefore, quantitative data should be thoroughly backed-up with qualitative research.

We reported the percentage of people who agreed to the statement and then display the respondents’ feedback through what they told about the program around them. We did this to counteract Hawthorne effects.

**Figure 10: Respondents who agree that they may recommend this program to their friend or a family member**

We assume that people have a positive feedback about the program if they can recommend it around them. 89% of the respondent spoke about the program to friends and family. To identify the respondents’ perception about the program, we asked the beneficiaries to report what they said about the program.
As displayed above beneficiaries, gave precise recommendations about the program. The program is reported to be a good way to learn. In fact, for 49% of the respondents this program is the way to improve the plots productivity by learning agricultural techniques. 3% said “This program is the way to improve living conditions”.

Criteria 2.3.2 Beneficiaries describe positive experiences with the program

Near the end of the pilot, IPA held focus group discussions with program beneficiaries. The goal of these discussions was to gather information regarding beneficiaries’ perception of the pilot. Respondents in all communities were grateful for the project. They report that it has helped them to improve their various farming activities. Most respondents also report it has changed their perception of agriculture: they now see the potential of agriculture. However, beneficiaries face difficulties to put their knowledge into practice. The difficulties are financial and material.

Training on agricultural practices

In general, participants report that they put the knowledge acquired during the training sessions into practice on parcels that belong to their parents or themselves. "We created a small place in the fields to implement our new knowledge”. Putting these techniques in practice seem to have had a positive impact on beneficiaries’ perception towards agriculture. Furthermore, seeing others having success using agricultural techniques that are new to the respondents has contributed to reducing scepticism amongst the beneficiaries as to the effectiveness of these techniques.

However, they acknowledge that difficulties arose when they attempted to put these skills into practice. For instance, they report that they lacked financial resources and material to implement these strategies. “We do not have machines to spray to destroy the green moss that is in our fields,
there is no money to pay salt and machines, so we look at it like that (meaning that they are powerless) we cannot "we do not have clothing, glove and glasses... it is risky ".

Training on income Generating Activities (IGA)
In all communities, participants reported growing food crops such as cassava, rice and food products. In addition, respondents from a community stated that they practice livestock and local trade (via shops).

Some of the participants declared they received material and financial donations from HRNS and COMPANY PARTNER for the implementation of their activities. However, in three communities, respondents declared the pilot has played no role in their Income Generating Activities. Also, those communities reported that they do not consider the collective IGA to be successful. "The IGA was not a success; the rice field was not too successful because of the rain (meaning lack of rain) "," we did not have (access to) water to water (the field) as we should. The water and the rice field were too far apart ".

Concerning the difficulties, they encountered the participants reported lack of water, agricultural materials and financial means to buy equipment necessary in this line of work. "The difficulties we have encountered are financial and material - money for renting land, buying crop protection products, fertilizer and seeds."

Access to land
According to participants, in their communities, young people access land through renting or through donations. They specify that they can benefit from land donations from people within their families but also from people outside their families. “We rent the land, the parents also give but rent dominates.... If a young person wants to buy a piece of land, he can acquire it within his family by donation or outside his family by donation or lease.”

Regarding the existence or not of an advocacy committee in their communities, in three communities out of four, participants say they are not aware of the existence of such a committee in their village. They say that they themselves have taken the steps to acquire the land they work. For this reason, some beneficiaries consider that the project has not made access to land easier for them. “the project did not play any role in facilitating access to the land"; [8/8]8 "the project had no effect in facilitating the land".

Criteria 2.3.2 Beneficiaries report that the pilot was meaningful for them:
The beneficiaries seem to appreciate the project. They report that it has helped them to improve their various farming activities. They state that the project has helped them by teaching them how to maintain their fields more efficiently and increase their production. During this project we

---

8 This refers to the number of focus group participants that agree with the statement 8 out of 8 in this case so 100%
learned good agricultural practices "during this project, we learned how to maintain our fields, how to maintain the size to have a good production and how to do well its plantation, how to work well in the field, how to spread fertilizer ", "to get the money from our crops, we have been taught how to make fertilizer, agroforestry, trees that we must cut or not to allow our cocoa to produce well...". Some respondents report the skills they acquired during the program make their work easier and increased their productivity. "Now, I find my work in the field is less painful. I do not suffer anymore today. My cocoa field is good right now. It's big and also it produces well".

They report that through their involvement in the project they have learned that the practice of agriculture can be lucrative. “The project has changed our perception of agriculture "We know that the work of the field can give money". More precisely, they cited that the involvement in several agricultural activities generates more profits. "We know that we can do several crops, you make eggplant, okra or you rubber plants you can have money " “Now I know we can have money in cultures. If you put seriousness in the work, you can make a good harvest”.

The respondents also highlighted that their incomes are limited. For this reason, they are not able to invest sufficiently in agriculture because otherwise they would not be able to take good care of their families. "At home, there are charges, family, children so we cannot put all the money we earn in the plantation." Finally, a few beneficiaries reported that the lack of water posed a problem to lead agricultural activities successfully. “There is the lack of water, it does not rain so nothing works ”.

This suggests that the beneficiaries' success in agriculture not only depends on the acquisition of new skills and change of perception about work in agriculture. It highlights that the practice of agriculture as a business is also contingent on the availability of certain resources whether it be financial, material or natural resources.
3. Costs and operations management

This section will include the following two criteria:

- Costs are well managed
- Project management is successful

3.1. Costs are well managed

We observe good cost management, as far we are able to judge. HRNS have proposed a fairly linear vision of the scale-up with an increase in the number of beneficiaries of the training holding management costs fixed. Two components will however play a big role in the cost structure of the project. First, the choice of the location will determine whether HRNS need to train new staff or not; and secondly the type of support HRNS wants to deliver to IGAs. Multiplying the number of IGA will have an impact on the level of in-kind contributions HRNS delivers, in turn increasing expenses.

[Details removed]

3.1. Project management is successful

Project implementation went according to road map and cooperation between different partners went well.

[Details removed]
4. Capacity to learn, improve and innovate

This section will include the following two criteria:

- Project collects credible monitoring data
- Monitoring is used to learn and improve

4.1. Project collects credible monitoring data

Overall, the project collects credible real time data on the progress of the pilot. However, we did not receive data on some activities of the pilot as planned in the M&E plan. Plus, we believe the data on participation were not fully valid, mainly to inform for scale-up.

Recommendation for scale-up: We recommend to follow the M&E plan and keep the attendance rate of all beneficiaries including those who left. In addition to this HRNS should pay more attention on how programmatic aspects of the the program such as the gender awareness campaign are colleted.

According to the pilot’s M&E plan, HRNS planned to collect information on the performance of the different components of the project. The following sections will mainly discuss three sets of data: administrative data on trainings attendance, data on the VSLAs (creation, credits and savings), and data on IGAs.

Few documents were shared on the other components of the project such as the agents of change or gender seminars. Data collected on collective IGAs were qualitative. As a result, we will not discuss them in this section.

Criteria 4.1.1 Routine monitoring data are collected and shared on time with stakeholders

Data on the progress of the pilot (in particular, VSLAs and IGAs) were collected and shared regularly with stakeholders during operational committees.

First, HRNS did a good job in collecting real time information on the performance of the main pilot activities in all communities. HRNS reported real time, detailed and useful information through power-point presentations during operational calls. For instance, detailed data on the progress of the VSLAs (savings and credits taken by beneficiaries) and collective IGAs were described and discussed during each call.

However, detailed administrative data on attendance were only shared at the end of the program with some missing relevant information. 57% of beneficiaries who were in the list of beneficiaries
shared at the beginning of the program did not appear by endline in the administrative dataset, and some new persons were enrolled in their place. However, HRNS did not share any information on the new persons enrolled and as they were not in the initial list, they are not part of IPA independent data collection. We were unable to confirm if HRNS collected data on their characteristics to verify if they meet the selection criteria.

Criteria 4.1.2 IPA’s spot-check visits confirm the quality and accuracy of data

To assess whether the project was successful in collecting accurate data, IPA conducted two unexpected visits - named spot-check visits - in the pilot communities. The objective of those missions was to check the quality of administrative data, M&E system and collect beneficiaries’ feedback. We found that data reported was accurate, but IPA flagged the discrepancy between the initial list of beneficiaries and attendance lists. The recommendation to collect information on beneficiaries that dropped out of the program was not taken into account.

The first spot-check visit was conducted on September 16th to 18th. Following this a three page spot-check report was shared with HRNS and project partners. IPA’s M&E Assistant visited all 10 pilot communities and interviewed 10% of beneficiaries. We collected data on the program logs and compared them with the information presented during HRNS calls. The number of sessions organized in each community was consistent with the figures reported by HRNS. We observed that VSLA groups and collective IGAs were established and operational as described by HRNS. Administrative data of those associations (amount of savings and credits) were accurate. Beneficiaries interviewed also confirmed the progress of the pilot activities.

IPA recommended that HRNS collect data on those who left early and data on the entrance day of those who join during the program. Moreover, we think it is important to keep track of the attendance of all beneficiaries during the entire program for two reasons. First, to compute the “real participation rate” of the program which reflects the interest and enthusiasm of the targeted youth in the community. Secondly, precise data on beneficiaries who left and enter, at which point and why, can help to inform decisions during the pilot and for scale up.

The second spot check visit was conducted on February 8th to 12th. A restitution meeting with HRNS was then organized by IPA. During the second spot-check, IPA’s M&E Assistant visited again all pilot communities to observe pilot progress and monitor data accuracy. Comparing data shared by HRNS to data collected by IPA’s agent on the field, we found that HRNS’s data on savings and credits were still consistent. During the second visit, IPA noticed that a few VSLAs had difficulties managing their money, which could lead to reporting errors on the project logs. Computing loan installments can be challenging especially if beneficiaries do some early repayments. In turn this is impacting the total amount of money available. The progression of the different collective IGAs was also observed and confirmed on the field.

Criteria 4.1.3 Monitoring data is actionable and aligned with program management

To assess the credibility of data collected we will use three key concepts:

- **Validity:** Valid data accurately captures the core concept one is seeking to measure
• **Reliability**: implies that the same data collection procedure will produce the same data repeatedly.

• **Unbiased**: Measurement bias refers to the systematic difference between how someone responds to a question and the true answer to that question.

*Saving and credit*

For the data on VSLAs, we are confident on the quality and accuracy of the information collected and reported by HRNS. The data on VSLA shared captures the total amount of savings that all members have given, per VSLA; and the total amount of credits that they have taken out, per VSLA. Although we notice some difficulties for the treasurer to collect and report savings in some VSLAs, we believe errors were not significant. Spot-checks confirmed the validity of those amounts: IPA's agents produced the same data in terms of amount saved and given for credit as HRNS's agents. As it is sensitive data (money) and that they are collected for internal purpose, we believe there is no measurement bias. Therefore, we consider VSLAs' credits and savings data valid, accurate and unbiased.

*Attendance*

Concerning attendance data, we believe there is some threats to validity on those data. Although participation was collected routinely by the facilitators – as confirmed by the two spot-checks conducted by IPA - the dataset shared at the end of the project did not include all beneficiaries. But the core concept on collecting attendance data is to record data on all beneficiaries including those who left the program in order to compute attendance. During the spot-check, we have checked the reliability of the data collected by the facilitators. We believe again there is no measurement bias. Therefore, we consider data on attendance not fully valid, accurate and unbiased.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credible data criteria</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Reliable</th>
<th>Unbiased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VSLA</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IGA</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participation rate</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 12: credible data criteria*
4.2. Monitoring is used to learn and improve

Overall the project management team used the data collected in the field to improve the program. In response to monitoring data, some actions were taken into account during the operational calls.

Criteria 4.2.1 Program improvements in response to monitoring
As described in the previous paragraph, HRNS did a good job in collecting and reporting data on the pilot progress during the operational calls. The transparency and regularity with which HRNS shared routine monitoring data allowed the pilot management team to take informed and quick decisions to respond to the challenges encountered in the field. Actions taken during operational calls were then implemented in the field by HRNS agents.

During the pilot, there were several examples of program changes or improvement decided on operational calls in responses to monitoring. For instance, in November 2018, the results of a test post-training were presented during an operational call. Because the rates were low in some localities, it was decided to organize catch up sessions in those localities. Another example is the re-scheduling of the training sessions in response to low attendance rates.
5. Sustainability

The sustainability section will include the following two criteria:

✓ Provides sustained benefits for community
✓ There are prospects of scale up beyond GMM2

5.1. Provides sustained benefit to community

With the creation of specific structures such as IGAs and VSLAs there a strong signs of sustained benefits in communities. Facilitators declared being ready to support their community as agricultural experts in the future, and beneficiaries are already engaged in activities to maintain IGA.

However, the short period of implementation and the possibility of including the pilot villages as part of the scale-up means that communities are not expecting to have to take responsibility for the ongoing operation of the VSLAs and IGAs in the absence of ongoing HRNS support.

Criteria 5.1.1. Signs that the intervention from the pilot will continue to benefit the beneficiaries/community members over time

At the end of the program, IPA administered individual qualitative interviews with all facilitators and focus group discussions with beneficiaries. This section discusses the perspectives of facilitators and beneficiaries on the project's sustainability.

Prospects of facilitators continuing to share knowledge over time:

All facilitators declared that they were willing to maintain their activities over time. COMPANY PARTNER facilitators have been chosen on specific criteria within each community and they know that supporting the progress made by the current program and to a larger extent being a focal point for agricultural questions from young people in the community is a valuable position that could also position them for participation in future projects with NGOs or agriculture companies.

All facilitators also declared that they were ready to support the effort of the community in the IGA and presented new ideas on how to better develop those activities.

Prospects of beneficiaries maintaining practices over time:

Beneficiaries are willing to continue what they started through the project by participating in the operation of VSLAs, including by making contributions and mobilizing other people to participate.
in the project. In addition, a few beneficiaries have already made efforts to keep the IGAs alive by continuing the agricultural work of those businesses.

However, despite beneficiaries' willingness to continue with the project, they do not acknowledge the primary role their communities would have to play in the future for this to happen. They rather seem to expect external support to keep the project alive. More precisely, they tend to believe that it is the role of the pilot's initiators to maintain the project, including the IGAs and VSLAs. “It was they who asked us to choose and we did it. So, we think they will come continue”.

**Actions taken by HRNS**

HRNS has put special emphasis in maintaining the youth group dynamic within the farmer field schools' programs since the inception. HRNS started to talk about project continuity in the last quarter of 2018. To maintain activities and functioning VSLAs in the different communities, HRNS signed a project extension in the pilot communities until the end of June 2019.

---

**5.2 There are prospects of scale-up beyond GMM2**

To date, HRNS has been unable to secure concrete opportunities for government adoption of the program, beyond the prospect of take-up of the financial component for national financial inclusion. In turn the most promising path to scale appears to be through the cocoa value chain, but we have limited evidence that other cocoa companies have interest in the model.

HRNS however demonstrated strong capacity to manage the current pilot and seem to have the capacity to operate at the scale described in the proposal.

---

**Criteria 5.2.1 Evidence of government/partners buy-in**

Despite some efforts by HRNS, there has been limited progress to date in gaining buy-in from government agencies for the different program components. To anchor the pilot in the local institutional context, HRNS has organized different meetings with governmental authorities. A first round of meetings was organized during the third quarter 2018 to present the project to local authorities, this included the prefect and other local representation of the Ministry of Youth and Employment. However, according to our key informant interviews, HRNS has not been able to identify government counterparts to progress the possibility of take-up by government. Part of the reason for this may be that the comprehensive approach of the HRNS pilot does not fit any one ministry's scope of work.

One potential avenue of scale-up relates to the VSLA component of the program. “l'Agence pour la promotion de inclusion financière” is waiting for the evaluation results to consider the possibility of integrating the financial component of the program in the national strategy for financial inclusion.
COMPANY PARTNER through their NGO COMPANY PARTNER Action has expressed interest in the roll-out of the program. One avenue forward would also be for COMPANY PARTNER action to continue implementing the program with their own means.

In the absence of concrete government interest, one of the most promising avenues forward would be to roll-out the program within the value chain of a company. However, to our knowledge no other partners (e.g. cocoa companies) have been identified outside the GMM2 project to implement the project.

Criteria 5.2.2 Organizational capacity to implement at scale

HRNS has led the current project in a very professional manner, respecting timelines and transparently communicating information with all project stakeholders during operational calls. Many challenges have been discussed during operational calls and HRNS has proven to be responsive to inquiries. The extensive experience of the organization around the implementation of projects in rural areas is a strength for the scale-up as they can adequately offer solutions to challenges faced in the field. One open question however is related to the change in the status of the current structure. In fact, HRNS Ivory Coast will not benefit anymore from the extensive support of the foundation in Germany. A clear legal status for the organization in the current project still needs to be defined and all stakeholders need to agree on the new distribution of responsibilities.
The pilot and scaling plan included a number of strengths that should help to facilitate scaling and sustainability, including:

- Clearly articulated problem the initiative seeks to address;
- Clear vision for scaling within the next phase of GMM2;
- Strong buy-in from beneficiaries, particularly around income generating activities (IGAs);
- Openness to learning in real-time and using this data to make adaptations and course corrections to improve the intervention, including considering a primary purpose of monitoring and evaluation to be informing continuous improvement efforts;
- Exciting to see adaptations made to the intervention in reaction to experiences during the pilot, such as reducing the size of the IGA groups, combining similar meetings for greater cost effectiveness, and improving the quality of data collection by changing the format of attendance sheets;
- At the same time, excellent to see the pilot team identifying the core aspects of the intervention that need to remain the same during expansion to maintain impact.

Rather than highlight all the strengths of the proposal, we have focused below on areas where additional information or thinking could be useful:

- **Long-term scaling vision.** The scaling goal and plans for the next phase of GMM2 were clear and well-articulated, with specific targets included, which was excellent. However, it would be beneficial for the plan to also include a discussion of scaling vision and goals beyond GMM2—what is the long-term vision for the intervention? Is the aim national implementation, government take-up, further expansion through the company supply chain, etc.? Articulating these longer-term aims in greater detail will help to inform what activities will be needed in this upcoming phase in order to begin laying the groundwork for the longer-term goals. For example, if one potential pathway to long-term scale is government financing of the intervention, it might be beneficial to already build outreach and engagement with key government actors into the current project activities, to start building those relationships and laying the foundation for future collaboration.
- **Building external outreach and engagement directly into project activities.** Building off the previous point, while CUE fully agrees with the plan’s assessment that it
will be important to pursue potential partnerships and champions in the next phase, including with key government actors, it appeared that these actions were not included in the planned activities for the project, but instead left under the purview of TRECC HQ. Certainly, collaboration with TRECC HQ makes good sense; however, taking into account considerations of long-term sustainability, CUE feels it will be important to build this outreach and engagement directly into the project activities and include project team members in this process as well.

- **Additional discussion of enabling or constraining factors in the environment would be beneficial.** In both the final pilot report and the scaling plan, one potential threat to the project that was mentioned was the CCC’s decision to suspend sustainable project activities. Additional information about the specifics of this event and the ways in which it might constrain or impact project activities (both in this phase and regarding the long-term vision) would be useful to incorporate into the discussion on how the enabling environment might impact scaling plans. Similarly, the scaling plan also mentions a CCC project that aims to integrate young people into cocoa culture; further consideration of how this aligns with the intervention and where there might be potential synergies or opportunities to leverage moving forward will also be important to consider and incorporate into the section on the enabling environment.

- **Cultural barriers to scaling not addressed.** Both the final report and the scaling plan mentioned that the notion of borrowing money remains culturally unpopular in some communities where the intervention was piloted, which required additional time and resources to build local buy-in for the VSLAs. This seems to be a very important learning that will continue be a consideration in the next phase of expansion and beyond. For this reason, it would be helpful to incorporate additional discussion of how this cultural barrier might play out in the expansion phase and how implementation plans may be tailored or adapted to take it into account.

- **More consideration of the capacity constraints of facilitators might be needed.** The plan details that in the expansion phase, the original 10 facilitators from the pilot will increase their facilitation activities to cover 33 Youth Farmer Field Schools, expanding the number of beneficiaries from 300 to 1000. Certainly, there are clear financial benefits to this scaling approach, since many more beneficiaries are reached with the same number of facilitators, as well as potential benefits to having more experienced facilitators delivering the intervention in this next phase (rather than employing a new set of freshly trained facilitators). However, these new activities do represent a significant increase in the scope of work for the facilitators and may stretch their capacity, even with the additional support from the original beneficiaries that is mentioned. It would be helpful to include further consideration of the capacity constraints these facilitators may face in the next phase of work and potential challenges to anticipate and try to mitigate, such as whether the quality of training might diminish with their additional work load. It was excellent to see that facilitators will undergo a retraining, which could help provide them additional support and ensure quality. Further, while the intention for beneficiaries from the pilot to support the facilitators through coaching new beneficiaries is well noted and a potential approach to addressing these capacity constraints, additional detail on how this support might play out would be useful. Given that this element was not tested in the first round of the
pilot, it will be important to take into consideration how this new approach might affect project outcomes.

- **Gender imbalance of facilitators not addressed.** One aim specified in the initial pilot proposal was a balanced gender ratio for the facilitators, with not less than 30% of trainers being male/female. However, ultimately the pilot was only delivered with one female facilitator (out of ten), and this ratio will persist in the next phase given the facilitators remain the same. It would be useful to include some discussion of why this original target was not reached (was it an unrealistic target? What were the specific barriers to recruiting female facilitators?) and whether changes might be made in the future to try to recruit more female facilitators. If this gender ratio is no longer a priority for the project team, it would similarly be helpful to understand why.
Annex 1 Baseline tables

Table 1: Baseline characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>25.34</td>
<td>6.231077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of men</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0.4179586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% that went to school</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>0.4736045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0.4972752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0.4334607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concubinage</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0.3802173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.1111068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.3572671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allochtone</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>0.413758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allogene</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.2530865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have children</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>0.489565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has a job</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>0.282651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has experience in agriculture</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>0.3955302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household size</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>4.852522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household member above 15</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>3.410107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household member above 15 with job</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.704506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved in agricultural activities</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>0.1360667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main crop cultivated</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocoa</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0.4334607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0.337832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of a cooperative</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>0.5028011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perception towards agriculture</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested by a training in cocoa farming</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>0.3633009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2: Modules Good Agricultural practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Module name</th>
<th>nb de sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Modules BPA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Création d'une cacaoyère (y compris multiplication des rejets de banane).</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Entretien de la plantation.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Gestion du sol et fertilisation.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lutte intégrée.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Récolte et opérations post-récolte.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Réhabilitation- régénération et replantation cacaoyère.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Approche Champ Ecole Paysan CEP : L'analyse de l'agro écosystème, matrice de priorisation par paire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Connaître les unités pour connaître ses ressources et le calendrier cultural</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Modules Education financières</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arbre des dépenses et des revenus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Connaître les entrées et sorties d'argent pour savoir si vous faites une bonne affaire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mise en place et gestion d'une AVEC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>saisir les opportunités de diversifier l'exploitation agricole pour plus de revenu annuel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Gérer l'exploitation agricole pour assez de nourriture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 3: Land Access
The results presented in this section are a description of the land access during the endline. The analysis focuses on the two first plots despite the fact many respondents have several plots. 99% of the respondents’ household have at least one plot, 84% of the household have one or two plots.

The first plot all used the cocoa for 92% of the household, the proportion of self-consumption crop is relatively high is the second plot.
In terms of plot size, most beneficiaries have 0-5 hectares plots. The plot size is a self-reported values. 74% of the beneficiaries said they are involved in the farming of the mail crop, while 51% of the respondents are involved in the second land. We note that more than a quarter of the respondents work on at least on one plot independently.
Distance from the household to the plot

Most plots are located less than 3 kilometers from the household. The distances collected during the survey are self-reported distances.
Annex 4: Application of learned techniques

We asked a set of questions to respondents. The aim of these questions was to know if people applied the techniques learned during the training, the second purpose of these questions is to gather information on the reason why people applied or did not apply what they learned.

Why did you apply the techniques learned on "tree nursery"?

Why did you not apply the techniques learned on "tree nursery"?
Why did you apply the techniques learned on "weeding"?

Why did you not apply the techniques learned on "weeding"?

Why did you apply the techniques learned on "shape pruning"?

Why did you not apply the techniques learned on "shape pruning"?

Why did you apply the techniques learned on "fertilization"?

Why did you not apply the techniques learned on "fertilization"?
Why did you apply the techniques learned on "removing of all unnecessary shoots"?

Why did you not apply the techniques learned on "removing of all unnecessary shoots"?
Annex 5: Knowledges test
We computed scores with the answers gave by the respondents. The results on page () displays the percentage of respondents who got more than 50% of the test. In fact, the respondent gets 1 point if he provides the good answer or 0 point if not. The good answers are colored in blue. One question is randomly selected from each set of question, so the respondent is evaluated on four questions.

We used the first and the last set of questions to compute the knowledge test. The second and the third set of questions were used for the practice test.

First set of questions:

B.37. A tree nursery is:
an operation to disinfect the discards before planting them.
is the operation that gives the cocoa tree the recommended form
is an operation that consists in raising young cocoa seedlings under shade for 6 to 8 months before transplanting.
provide the nutrients needed for growth.
the operation of eliminating weeds growing in the cocoa farm.

B.37. The weeding is:
an operation to disinfect the discards before planting them.
is the operation that gives the cocoa tree the recommended form
is an operation that consists in raising young cocoa seedlings under shade for 6 to 8 months before transplanting.
provide the nutrients needed for growth.
the operation of eliminating weeds growing in the cocoa farm.

B.37. The shape pruning is:
an operation to disinfect the discards before planting them.
is the operation that gives the cocoa tree the recommended form
is an operation that consists in raising young cocoa seedlings under shade for 6 to 8 months before transplanting.
provide the nutrients needed for growth.
the operation of eliminating weeds growing in the cocoa farm.

B.37. Fertilize to cocoa tree is:
an operation to disinfect the discards before planting them.
is the operation that gives the cocoa tree the recommended form
is an operation that consists in raising young cocoa seedlings under shade for 6 to 8 months before transplanting.

provide the nutrients needed for growth.

the operation of eliminating weeds growing in the cocoa farm.

Second set of questions

B38. What is a popper period to do the plating?
early in the morning or late afternoon
at noon or during the hot hours
Do not know
Refusal to answer

B38. How often in the year do you weed your plantation?
Never
between 1 and 2 times
between 2 and 3 times
between 3 and 4 times
between 4 and 5 times
Do not know
Refusal to answer

B38. When doing ground maintenance what are the essential actions that you do?
Put fertilizer
Eliminate weeds by mowing with a machete or using herbicides.
Put pesticides / insecticides
Nothing
Do not know
Refusal to answer

B38. How many days after the harvest do you do the skinning?
At once
Less than 3 days
Less than a week
Less than two weeks
Less than a month
Do not know
Refusal to answer

B38. How many days after the skinning do you ferment?
At once
Less than 3 days
Less than a week
Less than two weeks
Less than a month
Do not know
Refusal to answer

**B.38. How many days after fermentation do you dry the beans?**
At once
Less than 3 days
Less than a week
Less than two weeks
Less than a month
Do not know
Refusal to answer

**Third set of questions:**

**B.39. What do you think when you look at this picture?**

The skinning
Harvest
Manufacture of an organic fertilizer (compost)
Weeding
Fermentation
Other
Do not know

**B.39. What do you think when you look at this picture?**
The skinning
Harvest
Manufacture of an organic fertilizer (compost)
Weeding
Fermentation
Other
Do not know
Refusal to answer

B.39. What do you think when you look at this picture?

![Image of skinning process]

The skinning
Harvest
Manufacture of an organic fertilizer (compost)
Weeding
Fermentation
Other
Do not know
Refusal to answer

Fourth set of question:

B.40. Which of these pictures shows pods with brown rot?

![Picture 1]  ![Picture 2]

B.40. What is the right area (in orange) to spread fertilizer around the cocoa tree?
The skinning
Harvest
Manufacture of an organic fertilizer (compost)
Weeding
Fermentation
Other
Do not know
Refusal to answer
Annex 6: Cost analysis Jpal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program ingredients</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program administration</td>
<td>Includes staff hired to work throughout the implementation of the intervention, costs of facilities, and any overhead costs incurred.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting costs</td>
<td>Includes any costs incurred to target, identify, and raise awareness of the program among potential participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff training</td>
<td>Includes the costs of training staff responsible for implementing the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User training</td>
<td>Includes any costs incurred to train participants or beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation costs</td>
<td>Includes all costs directly associated with the implementation of the intervention, such as the cost of items distributed to participants, the cost of staff who worked solely on implementation activities, or the cost of creating and maintaining resources developed for the intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User costs</td>
<td>Includes any costs incurred by program participants, such as the cost of goods users were required to purchase or the opportunity cost of participants’ time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averted costs</td>
<td>Includes the costs that were replaced or discontinued as a result of the intervention. These costs should be subtracted from the total cost of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring costs</td>
<td>Includes any costs incurred due to oversight, monitoring, or tracking program participants and staff. These are costs that would be incurred as part of the program’s ongoing M&amp;E strategy, not part of the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is also critical to consider for scale the different dimensions of each type of cost:

1. **The frequency of the activities (Start-up vs. ongoing costs).** In general, costs can be divided into two large categories: development or start-up costs and recurring costs. Development costs are incurred once at the beginning of a program to set up program operations while recurring costs are continually incurred for ongoing activities throughout implementation.

2. **The quantity of participants (Fixed vs. variable costs).** Another dimension of ingredients is how the cost is influenced by the quantity of participants. This depends on whether a cost is fixed versus variable. Fixed costs do not scale with the number of participants or implementation sites. Variable costs are incurred for each additional person, school, district, and so forth, included in the program. These costs might include salaries, trainings, and materials.
3. **The stream of cost across time.** It is also important to track when costs are incurred. Laying out the timeline of when costs are incurred makes it easier to understand the structure of the program.

Annex A: IPA General methodology

1. **Introduction**
   The Independent Data Collection (IDC) is led by IPA in the context of the TRECC-GMM2 project in order to inform the Evaluation Matrix. This comes in complement to the administrative data collected by the respective M&E team of each pilot. The objective is to better understand the context in which the pilots are being implemented, learn and provide feedback and recommendations to TRECC, implementers and companies.

   This document presents the protocol guiding our independent data collection. It is organized in two main parts: first, the methodology (this document) and second, its application to the specifics of each pilot. The methodology part includes 5 main sections about: i) the different waves of data collection; ii) the data collection methods; iii) the sampling strategy; iv) data quality; and v) the regulatory requirements. The part on the pilots includes as many sections as the number of pilots.

2. **Sampling for quantitative survey**

   **Sampling of beneficiaries**
   The beneficiaries are the principal source of information which will be used during each round of IDC. They will be selected from a list provided by the implementer, using a sampling method specific to each pilot, detailed in the separate sections for each pilot.

   **Sampling of non-beneficiaries**
   In addition of the beneficiaries, we may need to interview non-beneficiaries at baseline if the targeting of the program to a specific segment of the population is an important part of the program. In those cases, non-beneficiaries (similar to the beneficiaries except that they are not taking part to the program) will be selected using a systematic choice from a listing done with village chief, Community agent etc. In most cases it won't be necessary to survey non-beneficiaries during follow-up or endline surveys, because baseline data will be sufficient to assess the program's success in targeting the beneficiaries most in need.

   **Sample size**
   Determining a sample size to have credible and reliable results is very important. Thus, the main criteria to determine our sample size will be to achieve a representative sample within the budget, and ensure that we have adequate statistical power to detect target changes on key
indicators between baseline and endline for immediate outcomes. The default parameters for our sample size calculations are:

- Margin of error: We will use the standard margin of error of 10% percent, where the budget allows.
- Confidence interval: we will use the standard rate of 95%.

This means that we will be able to say with 95% confidence that the true value of variable of interest is within 5 percentage points of our sample estimate.

The general formula we use in our Sample size calculator is:

\[
 n \geq \frac{\alpha * N}{N + \alpha - 1} \text{ avec } \alpha = \left(\frac{Z}{\varepsilon}\right)^2 * p * (1 - p) \quad (E.1)
\]

\( n \): The sample size
\( N \): The population size
\( \varepsilon \): The margin error
\( p \): The estimated proportion of people having the studied characteristic.
\( Z \): z score with 95% confidence

3. Data Quality
IPA has strong requirements regarding high data quality and will implement a Data quality insurance plan.

The plan defines all data quality protocols and steps in processing the data that should be done during the data's lifetime.

Focus group discussion
Design

This survey will be done at the village/community level with a group of 8-12 people. Depending on the data collection wave to be conducted, the FG could be direct/indirect beneficiaries/non-beneficiaries.

The goal will be to get qualitative data on:

- Perceptions of the community members regarding the problem the pilot is seeking to address,
− Community members’ current practice as compared to what the intervention is seeking to bring
− Beneficiaries’ description of their needs links to the outcomes delivered by the pilot
− Beneficiaries describe positive experiences with the program
− Indications that the community are likely to continue with the practices or program activities
− General feedback about interventions (current and past/future);
− General ideas on local behaviors and beliefs.

Implementation

Staffing
− A focus group moderator (1)
− A focus group moderator-assistant (1-2)

Focus groups moderators (and assistants) will be selected from the IPA database or from a recruitment process. We will require previous experiences in focus group and Key Informant Interviews, with focus on strong qualitative data collection experiences. Once selected, they will be trained to use the research instruments of this project.

Number and composition of focus group discussions

The number of discussion sessions will depend on the characteristics of the pilot (number of village, size of the population, number of community/ethnic group etc.). Depending on the local culture and in order to increase interactions / discussions, it may be possible to re-organize people in order to have a homogenous discussion group.

Key informant interviews

IPA will run key informant interviews in other to complete the evaluation matrix regarding questions like alignment with priorities, sustainability and operations. It will consist of individual structured interviews with key people for each pilot.

Those interviews will be led by the facilitators, the Field managers or the M&E staff depending on the level of the people to be interviewed.

4. Regulatory requirements

Language concerns/accommodations

There are many local languages and not one main language in Cote d’Ivoire. Therefore, it may be useful for the team to have guides/translators. Together, team leaders / enumerator who speak the language and the guides will agree translations of questions. In addition, some regularly used words / expressions in some local languages could be added in the electronic form.

Regarding the focus group, teams could take translators (who are not participants) to help them during the interview if needed.
Confidentiality and privacy

We strongly care about the privacy and the confidentiality. The name of the companies associated with the implementers and other details from other pilots should not be mentioned during interviews or any other moment outside IPA office.

Information from interviews should not be discuss outside / after interviews even in another village or location. We remind that all interviews are strictly confidential.

Consent

As this project is a M&E project, we are not required to submit for approval by an Institutional Review Board (IRB). However, we still ask consent from respondents to whatever survey they are taking part in.

To be able to interview children aged under 18 involved in an intervention (for example, primary school students), consent from their parents/ legal guardian is needed as well as consent (verbal or written) from the child and youth themselves.

For the specific case of the focus group, they should be done whenever the minimum number is achieved and people consent to be part of it. However, this should be done with sensitivity to cultural expectations – for example, we will notify the relevant community or group leader about the focus group if appropriate.

Personal data protection

Collecting and/or sharing personal data (personal data are those that can allow to identify an individual; this includes name, first name, phone number, GPS coordinates, etc.) in Côte-D’Ivoire is regulated by the recently created Autorité de Régulation des Télécommunication en Côte-D’Ivoire (ARTCI). Although the regulation is quite new and its application still has some ambiguities, it appears that in order to collect and share such data in conformity with national rules and regulations, an organization needs to comply with the Law No. 2013-450 of 19 June 2013 regarding the protection of personal data of ARTCI. Since companies, implementing agencies and IPA will be collecting and sharing personal data, it is important that each partner investigates whether it needs to comply with ARTCI.

IPA has submitted a request to ARTCI for an authorization and has designated its M&E coordinator as “ARTCI data protection correspondent“. The process is still ongoing, and we are waiting for ARTCI approval. As far as the process is ongoing IPA can legally start the data collection.