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1 Why this paper?

The founders and foundations united within SUSTAINEO have gathered many years of practical experience in the conduct of hands-on development projects, above all, but not limited to countries where cotton, cocoa and coffee are produced. Most of these projects were implemented in close cooperation between private sector actors, NGOs and development cooperation with the overall objective to strengthen farming communities to produce more and better products, leading to better and more stable supply on the world market while at the same time increasing the income on community level and thus ultimately leading to social benefits for the involved communities, specifically for children and youth, the future generation. The approach of all our interventions makes use of a strong entrepreneurial focus which is going back to the core values of the founders.

It is our conviction that there is enormous potential to be realized when an efficient cooperation between multidisciplinary public and private partners is put to work. The basis for unlocking this potential, however, is good understanding on both sides about work approaches, perceptions of success and how to measure success.

This guide is intended to provide a practical reference for interested private sector companies, specifically from the agricultural raw material sector, on how to plan and implement meaningful and impactful cooperation with smallholder communities. Additionally, it demonstrates proven approaches how to measure the effects. The guide is not intended to be a prescription for success, since all projects have to be tailored to the specific circumstances and situations.
2 SUSTAINEO – an initiative of three founders

Our initiative for more sustainability and partnership in development cooperation is based on our insights as entrepreneurs and founders. It is our aim to improve the living conditions of smallholders in coffee, cocoa, and cotton-producing countries by working together and networking with others. For this purpose, we want to utilize our experiences and expertise gained in project work of our foundations. We believe that linking entrepreneurial approaches with the know-how and means of international development cooperation will promote the development processes in rural areas of so-called developing countries in the best possible way.

With the goal of improving the living conditions of smallholders, SUSTAINEO bundles practical experiences from projects which are executed by the three foundations Aid by Trade Foundation, Jacobs Foundation and Hanns R. Neumann Stiftung and uses the experiences to facilitate a dialogue with the sector stakeholders on pressing topics.

- **Facilitation of stakeholder dialogue**: SUSTAINEO seeks wide public-private cooperation in order to create strategic and broad-based interventions for the benefit of smallholder communities.

- **Exchange of experiences**: SUSTAINEO draws from the wealth of practical experience from field projects which is consolidated to facilitate internal learning and enrich external dialogue.

- **Project implementation**: Whenever potential synergies in the implementation of projects between the foundations can be achieved, SUSTAINEO naturally uses these opportunities.
SUSTAINEO is convinced that the limitations of natural resources along with an increasing growth of population and demand for agricultural products call for sustainable action. Sustainability can only be generated when approach, understanding, and cooperation occur on a level-playing field along the value chain. Therefore, we support smallholder families in our projects while promoting an integrated development model. Our vision is composed of the following dimensions:

**Vision of SUSTAINEO**

- The **economic situation** (income, assets, etc.) of small producers of coffee, cocoa, and cotton and their families has improved.
- The **working conditions** (safety, health, participation, etc.) in smallholder agriculture of coffee, cocoa, and cotton have improved.
- The **living conditions** and opportunities of **children and youths** in farming communities have improved.
- The conservation of **natural resources** (soil, water, etc.) has improved.
- Coffee, cocoa, and cotton products produced sustainably by smallholders are **available on the market** in high quality and for affordable prices, and their **demand** is increasing.

The foundations have agreed upon the following principles as guidelines for their project work.

**The ten principles of SUSTAINEO**

1. **Seek and realize win-win situations with target groups and partners** – designing co-operations for the mutual benefit.
2. **Build relationships based on “level playing field”** – participative and partnership based collaboration with partners and target groups.
3. **Avoid parallel structures** – utilizing and strengthening local (public and private) organizations and structures.
4. **Recognize smallholders as entrepreneurs** – enabling informed, entrepreneurial decisions and promoting market access.
5. **Follow an integrative approach** – contributing to the improvement of the living conditions of smallholders.
6. **Focus on the future** – strengthening and supporting children and youths.
7. **Think sustainably** – fighting environmental degradation and actively counteracting and adapting to the effects the climate change.
8. **Think projects through from the end** – enabling a scaling up of successful innovations.
9. **Learn together** – promoting dialog and network building.
10. **Prove impacts** – applying efficient (impact) monitoring and evaluation.
Part I – Our Goals and How We Measure Them
3 Goals and approaches of SUSTAINEO

The projects implemented by the three foundations aim to improve the living conditions of small producers who cultivate commodities such as cotton, cocoa, and coffee on a long-term and sustained basis. As approaches are targeted on sustainability, we pursue the improvement of income, the conservation of natural resources, the assurance of agricultural production, food security, as well as a better access to key markets. Through investment in training and education and protection of children’s rights, we contribute to the local and regional social development. Currently we reach around 360,000 people in Africa, Latin America, and Asia.

Through our projects we want to achieve the following specific objectives:

1. Improvement of productivity and facilitation of market access for small producers of coffee, cotton, and cocoa
2. Establishment of farmers’ organizations as important service providers for small producers of coffee, cocoa, and cotton
3. Increasing competitiveness of supply chain actors through growing productivity of smallholders and sustainable production methods
4. Facilitating access to quality education for children and youth in rural communities
5. Providing life skill and entrepreneurship training to (high risk) youth and women as a basis to develop income generating activities
6 Strengthening local, regional and national structures (including on a policy or regulatory level) that contribute to the development of children and youths in agricultural communities

7 Developing approaches taking into account national frameworks and policies and inform these by sharing widely what worked and what did not work

8 Increasing the awareness of retailers and end consumers of coffee, cocoa, and cotton in industrialized countries in relation to the importance of sustainable and smallholder production as key criteria for purchasing decisions.

9 SUSTAINEO practices are increasingly seized and applied by other stakeholders (German development cooperation, private sector companies, NGOs, etc.)
4 Impact orientation of interventions

“You can’t manage what you can’t measure” – this quote from economics is fundamental for both a successful entrepreneurship and development cooperation. Quality, relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency of work have to be reassessed on a regular basis in order to perform possible adjustments and improve effects.

Projects – how to plan activities
The various activities with partners on-site are bundled into projects. Projects are aimed at the needs of small producers and their families and communities and the planning process is oriented towards reaching clearly defined and measurable results. Objectives are expressed as “effects” that we want to achieve through our projects. Our involvement lies on different levels and is presented in a results chain in order to create a logical hierarchy from activities to expected impacts. With the help of indicators we regularly check if we really achieve our goals. Thereby, we create the basis for a transparent assessment of our performance.

“Plans are the current state of error” – for this reason we regularly check if underlying assumptions still hold true and adaptations are necessary.

Continuous monitoring and selective evaluations (M&E) serve to follow the developments of a project and are the groundwork of joint learning processes: they help to establish if the defined goals can be achieved with the chosen course of action, and to determine which unintended (positive or negative) secondary effects may be triggered by the project – this way the project planning can be improved continuously.

Monitoring and Evaluation – what is the difference?
Monitoring and Evaluation are analytically complementary tools. Whereas monitoring is a continuous internal process to check on the status and progress of a project, evaluations take place during important points in time in the course of the project. Evaluations can be carried out before, during or after a project.
Project planning as well as Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of all three foundations are based on the impact logic of the OECD-DAC:

- Project activities produce outputs (e.g. introduction of new field practices)
- The implementation of outputs leads to a direct effect ("outcome", e.g. higher yields or improved income).
- As an indirect effect ("impact") projects should contribute to the improvement of living conditions (e.g. by using additional income for the education of children).

The results chain helps us to systematize planned effects of our projects and to get a better understanding of the project dynamics (see figure 3).

**The results chain – annotations**

First section:
- Here, we find activities (e.g. training in Good Agricultural Practices [GAP]) and outputs (e.g. farmers have learned new techniques).
- Project managers can generally control this level of the project.

Second section:
- Describes the effects of the project and thereby the use of output, i.e. how the target group utilizes the services of the project (e.g. farmers apply GAP).
- The direct benefit (outcome) describes the project result for the target group.
The project can’t completely control the achievement of the direct benefits. The project can, for example, not guarantee that GAPs are applied or that applying GAP will finally lead to an improved income.

Third section:

- The indirect benefit or impact describes the influence of the project on higher development objectives, such as the improvement of living conditions.
- The contribution of the project to an indirect benefit can be deduced in a plausible way. However, it can’t be assumed that the indirect benefit arises solely through the project (e.g. it is hard to verify if an improvement in living conditions (e.g. better health) of a small holder farmer can be attributed solely to the project (e.g. more income leading to more spending on health) or if other factors, such as the construction of a health center or hygiene training have partly or entirely contributed to reach the impact. This effect is sometimes called the “attribution gap”.

The results chain of the program is corroborated using indicators that measure whether objectives have been achieved.

Approaches and Methods

During our long-standing experience in the implementation of projects we have learned that a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods (Mixed Methods Approach) is most effective for our purposes. Hard facts such as production data require quantitative methods; qualitative methods (e.g. focus group discussions) provide valuable data, especially in the field of subjective evaluation. The costs of the various survey methods depend on the size of the target group and don’t differ too much between qualitative and quantitative methods.

The following table offers an overview of the pros and cons of quantitative and qualitative methods. The additional annex also provides a table presenting the advantages and disadvantages of specific methods such as surveys and focus group discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Quantitative methods</th>
<th>Qualitative methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quantifiable results</td>
<td>Due to an open approach, previously unknown facts can be uncovered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determination of statistically significant context</td>
<td>Participation: allows the target group to have a say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possibility to examine large samples and obtain representative results</td>
<td>No requirements are set for the participants, so that true and complete information about the subjective view of the respondent can be collected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Objectivity and comparability of results</td>
<td>High content-related validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cons</td>
<td>Perspective depends on the predefined questionnaire</td>
<td>High demands on the qualifications of the interviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little flexibility through standardization of the research situa-</td>
<td>Only limited numerical quantities can be derived from qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Limited participation: no opinions or suggestions for improvement are possible
- Surveys about control groups encounter the problem of interviewees being hard to locate after several years for the purpose of an ex-post evaluation. Also, the situation of the target or control group may have changed through project-unrelated interventions

Examples
- Surveys
- Standardized questionnaires
- Focus group discussions
- Workshops

Subjectivity of results


A specific mixture of methods can be used in order to better describe and understand complex interrelations, which can increase the validity of results. When selecting a method a reasonable balance of survey costs and expected benefits is essential.

**What is important for us?**

When collecting data, it is of particular importance to us that we are able to measure our impact in an efficient and economical way. Elaborate and statistically representative surveys do not always deliver the desired insights in a cost-effective way. For this reason, we try to keep surveys as compact and simple as possible, but also as solid as necessary. It requires a lot of experience to find the exact balance between (statistical) accuracy and necessary resources.

The involvement of the target groups in the development and evaluation of surveys is an important factor to reflect reality and meet the demands of the target group. Apart from using standardized questionnaires and surveys, e.g. for monitoring productivity/yield, school enrollment ratio, etc., we widely apply open discussions. Qualitative data generates rich information and has the advantage of directly involving the target group. This generates ownership for the project which is a key for success. We believe that through methods such as focus group discussions and participatory workshops, we do not only gain valuable insights for our work, but can also provide a platform to exchange for our target groups to promote critical reflection about our own work as well as promote collaborative learning.

With the help of simple but effective indicators, we want to enable NGO staff with minimum background on M&E to collect data which can be assessed in an easy and quick manner.

**M&E approaches in our work**

At SUSTAINEO we have learned that information collected in M&E needs to have a high degree of relevance for the target group in order to allow for joint learning. For this reason, self-reporting and self-evaluation of farmers and their families in projects forms an important component of project planning and monitoring.
Regular recordings of production data by farmers (e.g., “Farmer Field Books”) provide farmers with a better understanding of the production system and enable them to perform independent adaptations. Simultaneously, the data serves the project team to improve their work. And finally, production data can also serve as the basis for (external) donor reporting.

**Indicator Categories**

The context of our projects varies. However, we work with a set of indicators that represent the various dimensions of our projects. Not all of these standard indicators are suitable for every project therefore relevant indicators need to be chosen depending on the project and adapted to the context (see examples in the figure below).

**Economic Dimension**

**Categories**
1. Revenue and market access
2. Legislative and regulatory framework conditions
3. Demand for smallholder products

**Indicators**
1. Revenue (per hectare), labor productivity
2. Possession of assets
3. Provision and relevance of services by farmers’ organizations
4. Proportion of production marketed by farmers’ organizations

**Social Dimension**

**Categories**
1. Rights and education for children and youth
2. Working conditions for smallholders

**Indicators**
1. Access to quality formal and non-formal primary and secondary education
2. Vocational training (employment and viability)
3. Community participation and life skills
4. Frequency of typical occupational accidents and prevalence of typical work-related illnesses

**Ecological Dimension**

**Categories**
1. Conservation of natural resources
2. Climate

**Indicators**
1. Measures implemented by smallholders for the protection of ground, water, and climate

---

Figure 4: Overview – target dimensions and basis for standard indicators
Part II – Our Fields of Work
5 Improved income situation for smallholder households by application of sustainable practices

In order to improve the economic situation of small producers we focus on the following fields of work:

- “good practice” technologies in cultivation and harvesting (4.1),
- strengthening of farmers’ organizations (4.2) and
- process verification and labeling (4.3).

How can the overall impact of our work with small producers be measured?
The mentioned fields of work serve the goal of improving the economic situation of small producers. With the help of the following indicators we are able to trace the effectiveness of our programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>What can this indicator provide?</th>
<th>Possible challenges</th>
<th>Level of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assets of smallholder households (key asset endowment)</td>
<td>This indicator can measure the improved economic situation of smallholder households. For specific core products and services (transport, production, communication, education), possession and value can be inquired, e.g. bicycle, car, TV, radio, stereo system. Objects to be taken into account must be determined on a regional basis.</td>
<td>Statistically speaking, the indicator can only establish a definite causality between changes of possession and performance of the project, if control groups are used in the statistic design of the evaluation. To accomplish this, an elaborate evaluation procedure is ideally necessary. It is also possible to acquire a good impression of changes in respect to assets during group discussions.</td>
<td>Effects (impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, residence</td>
<td>This indicator evaluates the economic situation of smallholder households. It is fairly easy to comprehend core values: e.g. main materials of floor, wall and roof; number of rooms, access to drinking water, electricity, waste water disposal. To survey with the help of e.g. rapid rural appraisals.</td>
<td>Requires a good knowledge of the respective regional context. Indicators and core values need to be adapted accordingly. Due to large differences in value attributions e.g. for materials, transnational comparison can often be difficult.</td>
<td>Effects (impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>What can this indicator provide?</td>
<td>Possible challenges</td>
<td>Level of impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food security</td>
<td>Months of Adequate Household Food Provisioning (MAHFP) – an easy to survey and approved indicator to determine if and for how long a household didn’t have enough food in the past year. Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) – also a simple standard indicator that determines the diversity of nutrition of a household via surveys.</td>
<td>MAHFP doesn’t provide information about diversity and quality (nutritional value) of food. This can be surveyed with the HDDS (below). Neither MAHFP nor HDDS provide any information about the distribution of meals within the family.</td>
<td>Effects (impact)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.1 Implementing „Good Agricultural Practices“

Challenges related to agriculture differ from region to region. One of the main problems that small producers face is low productivity which is the root cause for limited income. Our projects have a focus on conveying know-how and techniques to small producers to improve their performance on the farm. It is the **objective** to enable farmers to apply **Good Agricultural Practices** that have a positive effect on soil fertility, climate protection, and biodiversity.

Our focus is on the following topics:

- intensive trainings, especially in the scope of Farmer Field Schools (farming techniques, diversification of production systems, soil fertility, adaptation to climate change);
- introduction of Farmer Field Books and Farmer Business Schools to strengthen entrepreneurial skills;
- occupational safety measures (safe handling with pesticides);
- training on post-harvest technologies (drying, storing, etc.).

**Practical example: Farmer Field Schools**

The Farmer Field School (FFS) is a method originally developed by the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in Indonesia in 1989. The Farmer Field School **unifies concepts and methods from agro-ecology, experiential education, and community development.**

In contrast to classroom teaching, the FFS involve farmers and uses their experiences. Instead of following strict instructions, in FFS **critical thinking and understanding of the relationships in agriculture, e.g. between soil, climate, and yield are promoted.** The approach of “learning by doing” is practiced in study groups on
the field to exercise and discuss insights. Working in study groups simultaneously promotes a **social dynamic that leads to growing trust and collaboration among the farmers**, which goes beyond agricultural aspects.

All three foundations work using FFS as a central element to train farmers in growing raw materials such as cotton, coffee, and cocoa.

How can the success of our work in mediating *Good Agricultural Practices* be measured?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>What can this indicator provide?</th>
<th>Possible challenges</th>
<th>Level of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yield (average yield per hectare)</td>
<td>Measures the direct impact of the project which the farmers address directly. Can be evaluated through surveys, rapid rural appraisals, and „self-reporting“.</td>
<td>The indicator doesn’t examine the external factors (soil conditions, climate, etc.) that can have an impact on the yield, additionally to the project services.</td>
<td>Outcome and direct effect (outcome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity (labor productivity of smallholders)</td>
<td>Based on the net income from cultivating coffee, cocoa, or cotton and the amount of work assumed by the farmer and his family (net income: amount of work).</td>
<td>Data is collected directly at farm level based on information provided by farmers. Farmer Field Books can be used in which data are regularly recorded. The data is dependent on the accuracy of the farmers.</td>
<td>Outcome) and direct effect (outcome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of typical occupational accidents and illnesses</td>
<td>The occurrence of typical occupational accidents can be inquired by surveys. The changes of frequency over time deliver information about improvements in regard to operational safety.</td>
<td>A list of typical occupational accidents and illnesses must be defined according to the type of work. Representative statements presuppose random sampling.</td>
<td>Use of output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation of natural resources</td>
<td>Measures if smallholders apply the measures conveyed by the project for the conservation of water, soil, biodiversity in the production system, farm management, and processing. Application rates are surveyed with the help of different instruments: surveys, self-assessment of farmers and “Farmer Field Books”.</td>
<td>It is only observed if the farmers apply the measures; actual effects on soil, water, biodiversity, and climate are not monitored.</td>
<td>Use of output</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Strengthening of farmer organizations

In many countries of Asia, Latin America, and Africa, smallholders are organized in cooperatives, associations, or loosely structured forms of co-operations. The advantages of getting organized in farmer organizations lie in many aspects, such as strengthening the bargaining position towards suppliers of e.g. fertilizers and seeds and buyers (exporters, processors). In joint operations, farmers can access financing that would not be accessible to individual farmers. In addition, smallholder organizations assume important functions in the community, for instance, act as partners for schools and educational institutions and can provide access to health services. Such structures can also be utilized to host and convey information about rights of children within the community. We have learnt that farmers’ organizations are important structures in the rural environment which play an important role for many aspects of rural development.

For these reasons, the strengthening of farmers’ organizations presents an important component of our projects. The aim is to establish viable forms of farmers’ organizations as important service providers for small producers of coffee, cocoa, and cotton.

In order to achieve our goals, we focus on:

- enabling farmers to build new organizations or to strengthen existing producer organizations in rural communities through specific training;
- supporting farmers’ organizations with the development of services and products for their members and the rural communities through specialist advice;
- improving coordination and increasing the integration into the value-added chain;
- facilitating the access to financial and non-financial services for smallholder producers and farmer organizations;
- supporting the positioning of farmers’ organizations in the local sector policy through specialist and policy advice.

Practical example: support of farmers’ organizations in Uganda

In Uganda coffee is one of the most important export goods. Coffee is an important and major source of income for approximately 500,000 families in Uganda and is cultivated almost exclusively by smallholders in so-called “inter-cropping” systems together with food products.

The HRNS has been supporting coffee farmers’ organizations in central Uganda since 2005. At the beginning of the project the productivity of smallholder coffee cultivation was very low due to inefficient production practices. At the same time, smallholders didn’t have access to training, plus functioning farmers’ organizations didn’t exist in the region. Smallholders were lacking both capacities and necessary infrastructure in order to compete with the highly flexible but in-transparent intermediaries.

Through the project farmers organized themselves into organizations, which made smallholders less dependent on intermediaries. Through joint processing and marketing of products as well as joint purchasing of fertilizers, costs for the individual farmer were reduced and added value was generated. The project still supports the setup and functioning of such organizations and uses them as platforms for versatile trainings. The following approaches were followed:
- Building an APEX structure - on field level, farmers have joined producers’ organizations which are commercially registered in “depot committees” (DC’s). DC’s organize coffee processing quality control and the transport to the capital. The “Coffee Farmer Alliance Uganda” (CFAU) acts as the APEX structure, providing market information and services as well as represents smallholders in the political arena.
- Internal audits of farmers’ organizations involving the members - this process creates transparency, ownership, and trust of farmers in their organization.
- Farmer Field Schools (FFS) – FFS are important to exchange knowledge and experiences while facilitating joint learning – not only about farming, but also about social topics.
- Alliances along the supply chain: communication between the supply chain players is important to promote common understanding of activities and objectives.

**How can the success of our work with farmers’ organizations be measured?**

Setting performance indicators of complex interventions such as organizational development, and measuring these accordingly is not an easy task; smallholder organizations can’t be planned on the drawing board as they result from complex processes based on the respective requirements of the stakeholders and the given environment. For this reason, a multitude of indicators are defined on a case-by-case approach.

Overall, SUSTAINEO tries to determine generic monitoring parameters for every project. These are specified in the following overview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>What can this indicator provide?</th>
<th>Possible challenges</th>
<th>Level of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmer organizations that offer a specific service for their members.</td>
<td>The provision of services marks a crucial step in the development process of a farmers’ organization because it contributes to the empowerment of their members.</td>
<td>It is difficult to assess the quality and relevance of services to farmers.</td>
<td>Use of performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farmers that use new services.</td>
<td>This indicator provides information on the relevance of services offered. It does not just measure the offer of a service, but also if the farmers make use of it.</td>
<td>Information is based on statements by farmers’ organization and therefore remains subjective.</td>
<td>Benefit (outcome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with a specific service that is stated by all farmers making use of it.</td>
<td>Indicator for the quality and relevance of the service. This indicator is based on statements by farmers, i.e. the users of</td>
<td>Runs the risk of statements being falsified by farmers on purpose because they might hope for a benefit from the survey</td>
<td>Benefit (outcome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of production being marketed via the newly established market channel.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Value added along the supply chain.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Benefit (outcome)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good indicator for the trust of smallholders in their own structure, the partners and the added value they subjectively perceive.</td>
<td>“Hard” measure for the monetary value, e.g. by adopting specific processing steps, improved quality, and elimination of the middlemen.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3 Process verification, labeling and certification

The significance and demand for responsibly produced and certified products (Organic, Fairtrade, etc.) has increased significantly over the past years. In this context, cocoa, coffee and cotton are closely connected to development projects in which responsible products are promoted in connection with wider aspects of development cooperation.

SUSTAINEO takes the view that certifications have had great influence on the consumption habits and awareness of end-consumers; however, they are so far only a part of the solution for the enormous challenges of rural areas in developing countries. Models have to be found that reach the large number of unorganized farmers in developing countries which have little access to services and markets and are the most vulnerable players the supply chain.

The stepwise improvement approach of verification can add significant value to development processes on farm level while providing market awareness through a label. In the textile sector for example, verified products find an increasing outlet. The goal on a producer’s level is to **improve yield and market access of smallholders** and to simultaneously **preserve the environment**. The compliance of guidelines is regularly checked and independently audited and can be identified with a quality seal in form of a product tag.
**Cotton Made in Africa (CmiA) Verification in Zambia**

In order to increase outreach, CmiA utilizes existing networks and services of cotton processors. In Zambia, the initiative works amongst others with the company Du-navant which procures cotton from smallholders.

The CmiA standard incorporates ecological and social criteria and checks sustainable cotton production at smallholder level. The verification of the standard is performed by the ginning companies. In this way, the costs for the verification can be kept low. Additionally, the ginners have long-lasting relationships with the farmers or the farmers’ organizations respectively, as well as with the extension services and can therefore provide further important support through their existing partner networks.

The Aid by Trade Foundation (AbTF) generates funds through licensing revenues of CmiA with which it supports the implementation of CmiA sustainability standards through:

- Use of existing extension services, e.g. for training on agricultural topics, credit systems, health services, etc.
- Introduction to the CmiA verification system
- Organization of annual meetings of farmers, cotton processors, retailers, charitable organizations and others for an exchange of “best practices” and mutual learning

The system is useful for all parties involved: farmers benefit from training and increased productivity as well as an outlet market. Cotton ginneries can strengthen their supplier relations, and sales of CmiA-verified cotton to retailers are conducted through a well-functioning service network that offers an easy access to the co-financing of training programs.

---

**How can the success of our work be measured with regard to process verification and labeling?**

As this intervention area is also aimed at an improved economic situation of smallholder households, the productivity, yield, etc. also form part of important measures. Specific indicators that measure the success of process verification and labeling are listed in the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>What can this indicator provide?</th>
<th>Possible challenges</th>
<th>Level of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of companies that become members and regularly pay their membership fees.</td>
<td>Measures the commercial interest of companies in medium to long-term production and in the sale of sustainably produced products and thereby the relevance of the topic for companies.</td>
<td>Benefit (outcome)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of farmers that utilize a specific service of a</td>
<td>Indicator for the quality and relevance of the</td>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ginning company.</th>
<th>service</th>
<th>(outcome)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction of farmers with a specific service utilized by all these respective farmers.</td>
<td>Indicator for the quality and relevance of the service</td>
<td>Benefit (outcome)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Rights and education for children and youths

According to Unesco in Sub-Saharan Africa today more than three in four children attend primary school. The attendance rate of girls has gone up dramatically; in many countries almost as many girls attend primary school as boys. All this represents good progress. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that the progress developing countries are making in improving the quantity of education is not being matched by a rise in quality. Many children in primary schools in developing countries do not even learn to read or do elementary arithmetic.

Whereas attendance rates in primary schooling have gone up, the situation looks different in secondary schools. Almost half the youths in developing countries don’t attend secondary school, most of them are girls. The lowest rates are found in Eastern and Southern Africa where only about 24 percent of boys and 22 percent of girls attend a secondary school. Besides the missing access to high-quality and affordable education, the main challenges in the cultivation regions of cotton, coffee, and cocoa from a children and youths’ development perspective are child protection issues, especially in regard to the necessity, the benefit and the risks of child labor and mobility. Around 150 million children between the ages of 5 and 14 have to partly work under the most severe conditions. Furthermore, for those that have not finished schooling as well as for those that have, there is a lack of employment opportunities in the local markets.

Our projects deal with the improvement of living conditions and educational opportunities for children and youth in rural communities as well as integration into labor markets for the latter.

The objectives are to:

- facilitate access to quality education for children and youth in rural communities
- provide life skill and entrepreneurship training to (high risk) youth and women as a basis to develop income generating activities
- strengthen local, regional and national structures (including whenever appropriate on a policy or regulatory level) that contribute to the development of children and youths in agricultural communities

Here, not only NGOs and schools play an important role, but also farmers’ organizations and processing businesses for instance are central actors in taking measures to avoid child labor and strengthen children’s rights.

Within the foundations of SUSTAINEO great value is placed upon the following aspects:

- improvement of access, quality, and affordability of primary and secondary education
- promotion of opportunities via formal vocational training programs and supplementary vocational training for youth (second chances & informal education) based on the existing potential in the labor market as well as establishment of links with the private sector

1 Source: UNICEF (2011): “About the situation of children in the world 2011”.
- development and implementation of extracurricular activities to strengthen “life skills” of children and youth
- establishing mechanisms for child protection and avoiding the worst forms of child labor
- strengthening existing local structures and organizations by supporting them in setting up efficient internal systems and thus enabling them to deliver successful interventions beyond the life span of a project.

**How can the success of our work be measured in regard to rights and education of children and youths?**

Standard indicators in regards to education and rights of children and youth can be sub-dived into the following dimensions. For each dimension the indicators that best fit the specific context have to be chosen and adapted:

- Access to formal and non-formal primary and secondary education
- Vocational training
- School management and participation
- Life skills

### 6.1 Formal and non-formal primary and secondary education

Indicators at this level check at the same time access to education and quality of education at primary and secondary level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>What can this indicator provide?</th>
<th>Possible challenges</th>
<th>Level of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled children, completion and dropout rates</td>
<td>Number (absolute and relative) of children/youth enrolled over time and having completed school cycle (before and after the project).</td>
<td>Measures the number of children benefitting from the project. Is relatively easy to measure.</td>
<td>Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement levels</td>
<td>Analysis of school performance of children/youth.</td>
<td>Relatively easy to assess on the basis of school reports but can be easy to manipulate. For objective assessment of school performance, neutral tests need to be administered (at least pre/post-intervention).</td>
<td>Output/outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 Vocational training

To measure the impact of vocational training measures, we look at the number of (project) participants that are integrated into the labor market after completing training. However, at the same time, we also monitor the viability and quality of formally employed and self-employed youth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>What can this indicator provide?</th>
<th>Possible challenges</th>
<th>Level of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment/self-employment</td>
<td>Shows the number of trained youth who are (formally) employed or started their own business/enterprise.</td>
<td>Measured by tracer study at least 6 and ideally 18 months after completion of training.</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viability of employment (formal employment or self-employed)</td>
<td>Measures for employment: type of contract, duration, working hours, formality, working conditions, social security, etc. Measures for self-employment type of business (formal/informal), number of employees (paid or unpaid family members, external staff), etc.</td>
<td>Measured by tracer study at least 6 and ideally 18 months after completion of training.</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in income/assets</td>
<td>Measures salary for employed youth and average income for self-employed and/or change in assets (housing, investments -&gt; see page16)</td>
<td>Requires relatively complex evaluation techniques and well-trained interview staff.</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 School management and participation

To ensure sustainability of an education project beyond the life span of the project, our projects closely cooperate and build on local official and traditional structures. At the same time, we work with school management and parents’ associations to increase transparency with regards to school funds spent.

Practical example: Youth and Child Development Project Uganda

Since mid-2012, the HRNS and JF have been carrying out a joint project in the coffee-growing areas in Mityana, Uganda. The goal of the project is to train youth in sustainable agriculture, with an emphasis on coffee farming. Furthermore, youth are trained in professional skills relevant to the local market, as well as important social skills that shall provide them with a solid basis for a professional life.

These measures aim at creating and strengthening structures in rural areas that allow young people to secure their livelihood on the countryside and thereby counteract migration into the cities. On the other side, they provide young people with expertise that will offer them better opportunities if they migrate to the cities.

The project builds on structures created by HRNS for agricultural training and marketing to support youth. The project closely cooperates with a vocational school training people in IT skills and overall works with approximately 1,600 youths between the age of 16 and 25.

Supporting Youth and agriculture

We involve unemployed youth in rural areas into organizational and economic processes of the coffee sector by offering hands-on courses about various subject matters in a HRNS-approved format of Farmer Field Schools (FFS): agriculture, environmental protection, economic aspects of coffee cultivation, financial literacy, leadership training, gender issues, etc.

Vocational training

In partnership with a local vocational training center a curriculum specifically geared towards youth is developed that provides young people of rural areas with customized skills to better enter careers, as well as with concepts of modern entrepreneurship.

- Training on topics ranging from drafting business plans to implementing business ideas;
- Courses to enhance PC and respective software skills;
- Courses that provide entrepreneurial skills.

The pilot project will deliver valuable knowledge about how to best integrate topics about youth and education in agricultural projects in the future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transparency and efficiency of school management</th>
<th>Measures whether there are personnel, processes and structures in place for transparent allocation of funds, committees for solving problems, etc.</th>
<th>Relatively complex, analyzing existing documents, interviewing staff and observing procedures at school. Substantial experience with public school system required.</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of participation of key actors (in school management or vocational training)</td>
<td>Measures to what extent key actors in the community (parents, community representatives, employers, farmers, etc.) are implicated in important decision making processes.</td>
<td>Relatively complex, analyzing existing documents, interviewing staff and observing procedures at school. Substantial experience with public school system and/or vocational training required.</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.4 Life skills

Measuring success in training around soft skills is a difficult task. Since projects in this field of work have to be particularly adapted to the respective context, it is not easy to determine standard indicators. Indicators from the table below need to be selected per project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children and youth have acquired the relevant life skills to take important decisions and actions concerning their health, education, personal and professional life</th>
<th>This set of indicators depends on project focus and measures youths’ decision making skills, awareness of their rights (education, physical integrity etc.), decisions and behavior concerning reproductive health, personal relationship, self-regulation, awareness of skills and strengths, etc.</th>
<th>Very difficult to measure and requires solid experience with psychosocial assessment methods. For more information, please refer to: Monitoring and evaluating life skills for youth development (Guidelines and Toolkit), developed by the Jacobs Foundation.</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
7 Developing approaches taking into account national frameworks and policies and inform these by sharing lessons widely

We view projects as models that, apart from delivering results for the target group, also deliver important insights and lessons learned on what works and what doesn’t work for local stakeholders and the sector as a whole.

Projects should be planned and implemented taking into account national frameworks and policies. They should coordinate closely with local institutions in order to share lessons and prepare for scaling of successful project approaches. Round tables and steering committees with involvement of a wide basis of stakeholder are a useful tool to achieve wider involvement, acceptance and possibly scaling.

However, it has to be taken into account that working on the macro level, i.e. advising policy processes within a country, does require very specific skills and detailed knowledge of national legislative and regulatory processes. These skills are generally not the same needed for working with farming communities on the micro level. Furthermore, policy processes are sometimes long and subject to political processes within a country which may or may not be foreseeable.

Practical example: Preparation for a coffee policy dialogue, Vietnam

On the basis of various projects of HRNS in Vietnam, a policy dialogue was introduced to systematize the insights gained from different projects and develop a national coffee strategy based on them. The Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD) was in charge of the working group, numerous representatives of various interest groups from the Vietnamese coffee sector were implicated in order to work out a national coffee sector program for the purpose of promoting sustainability.

The process oversees three thematic core areas

1. Development of a **functioning management structure** that controls planning and implementation of the dialog
2. Creation, implementation, and **standardization of technical recommendations** for the implementation of sustainable strategies on the level of production and processing
3. **Implementation through relevant partners and training for these** in order to create a bridge between recommendations and the actual implementation

Despite a mandate for leading a policy dialogue, it is important to pay attention to keeping a required distance to maintain the role as advisor. It must be avoided to get into the driver’s seat as an external organization, as a longsome process might be necessary to accomplish important political coordination processes. Being an organization that is usually strongly committed to the implementation on the field level, one switches the role in the policy dialog to a neutral advisor. In the case of Vietnam the process has still not been completed.
How can the success of our work be measured within the topic of regulatory and legislative framework conditions?

Through practical examples of project work, SUSTAINEO can try to encourage the policy dialog in partner countries and point to successful models in the hope that they are being adopted or integrated into national programs.

The following sample indicators reflect the set-up of structures to start a policy dialogue. They are thus at the very beginning of the results chain and do not measure whether an intervention at the macro level was successful but can only show if the necessary platforms have been set up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>What can this indicator provide?</th>
<th>Possible challenges</th>
<th>Level of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment and allocation of a Project Steering Committee</td>
<td>This indicator merely helps to verify if a structure was created that allows for a policy dialog. Creating the steering committee is already important to consider different interests.</td>
<td>This indicator does not offer informative value about the participants of a steering committee, nor about the quality of work that is performed in the steering committee. Setting up the steering committee, as well as the quality of the documents which are used to inform the steering committee, are significant for success. Project team members experienced in dialogue at the macro level (policy level) are required to initiate this project.</td>
<td>Output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stakeholder Workshops</td>
<td>This indicator only provides information about the frequency of activities</td>
<td>Neither does the indicator provide information about the quality of workshops, the participants, nor about the implementation of recommendations.</td>
<td>Performance (output)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of recommendations adopted in national programs</td>
<td>Adopting recommendations in national frameworks or strategies is partly measurable if there is a clear assignment and reference in hand.</td>
<td>The direct relationship between recommendations coming out from a project and a national guideline is extremely difficult to establish.</td>
<td>Benefit (outcome)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 Demand promotion in consuming countries

Companies worldwide increasingly realize that sustainable economic activity is becoming an important factor for economic success. Meanwhile, sustainable production has become a relevant purchase criterion for many consumers whereas the demand for “sustainable products” from smallholders must still be further expanded. Hence, it is important to continue to promote the demand for sustainable and smallholder-produced products to retailers and end consumers in industrialized countries.

For this purpose, the AbT Foundation is building a “demand alliance” consisting of major manufacturers of brand-name products and retailers in order to boost the supply of sustainable cotton products in the market. Thereto, the inherent benefit of smallholder-produced cotton (less pesticides, no artificial irrigation, etc.) is marketed systematically in western consumer markets under the label “Cotton made in Africa” (CmiA). Using this approach, CmiA producers are linked with manufacturers of brand-name products and retailers and the cotton is licensed as CmiA.

The AbTF supports the set-up of a demand alliance through:

- acquisition of producers of brand-name products and retailers
- utilization of existing networks and contacts
- use of textile supply chains, i.e. procurement of spinning companies that purchase cotton from CmiA cultivation areas and then in turn offer CmiA to their customers
- PR activities and placement of the topic in relevant media

**Practical example: Establishment of a demand alliance for Cotton made in Africa (CmiA)**

Cotton made in Africa (CmiA) deals with the systematic marketing of the inherent benefit of smallholder-produced cotton (i.e. less pesticides, no artificial irrigation, etc.) from Africa in Western consumer markets under this label.

CmiA is based on a social business model that generates its revenues through economic activities of its partner organization ATAKORA Development Fund who on the other hand licenses interested textile companies and producers of brand-name products with the CmiA label. Through their supply chains the companies generate demand for sustainably produced cotton, integrate it into their value-added chains and can thereby offer products with a social and ecological added value to their customers. The license fee corresponds to the ordered quantity; the average is 0.05 EUR. ATAKORA is responsible for the acquisition of partners in Europe and the USA.

The licensing revenues shall finance the activities of the initiative on-site in the target countries on a long-term basis and thereby make them widely independent from external support.

CmiA started in 2007 with 400,000 pieces. In 2012, already 15 million commodities were traded in CmiA quality. 20 spinning companies in all relevant production markets are involved so that CmiA cotton can be processed there.
How can the success of our work in strengthening demand be measured?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>What can this indicator provide?</th>
<th>Possible challenges</th>
<th>Level of impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of participating companies</td>
<td>Indicator for interested producers of brand-name products and retailers in the topic</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of licensed products</td>
<td>A good indicator for demand/assessment of potential through producers of brand-name products and retailers</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sold products</td>
<td>Indicator for the actual demand by consumers</td>
<td>The AbTF can’t survey these numbers by itself</td>
<td>Effects (impact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues from license fees per participating smallholder</td>
<td>Measuring the efficiency of the overall program</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activities (input) / Use of performance (output)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part III – Annex
## 9 M&E - pros and cons of selected approaches and methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach/method</th>
<th>Short description</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Examples of application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Focus group discussion**      | • Moderated discussion between multiple participants (5 – 12), mostly guideline-oriented. Based on the following principles: communication, openness, familiarity, and foreignness as well as reflexivity.  
  • When planning a discussion it should be considered that on the one hand the group is large enough to allow for a controversial discussion, but still small enough to be easily handled by the moderator (for moderation and taking notes of the discussion). | • Inspiration for further, more elaborate, and deeper contemplations and statements  
  • Transparency of the interview partners’ world of thoughts and experience  
  • Also "unfinished" products and drafts, for example drawings, can be tested  
  • Gaining new information: the group interaction and group dynamic can lead to deeper information being generated when group members hear the answers from others  
  • Development of hypotheses about the participants’ motives | • Possible dominance of individual participants  
  • Greater complexity with too many participants, difficulty of a coordinated moderation  
  • Due to the qualitative method and the small number of cases it is not representative  
  • Extremely complex analysis of the material when having a scientific ambition | • Perspectives of women, men, and young people (in separate groups) in regard to the prevalence and reasons for violence towards children and youths  
  • Perspectives of smallholders in regard to the application and usefulness of soil protection measures (additionally to the survey questioning, it can deliver reasons for a possible non-adaption) |
### Participative Workshops
- Workshops that deal with the opinions and perspectives of the participants. Therefore, they should be laid out methodically: room for discussions in small groups and plenum, documentation of discussion results, etc. In contrast to focus group discussions, in workshops topics are precisely developed in the group and are visually presented.

- Similar advantages as the focus group discussion regarding the openness and the explorative approach, but a little less, as it is more structured (the moderator usually has more precise concerns)

- Recommended when joint decisions are made or a consensus about statements is desired respectively.

- No representative statements
- More limited openness than in focus group discussions
- Requires good moderation skills

### Key Informant Interviews
- This method assumes that there are people within the target population that have better access to certain information due to their social position in the community or due to their special social role.

- Key informants are not questioned about themselves, but rather as “experts” about information regarding their social environment. During the conversation the interviewer should only use a general framework of the topics to be discussed and control the questioning in a way that allows mainly the informant to talk.

- Especially suitable for the survey of unexpected effects of the range of services in the target population as well as for the survey of local obstacles regarding the participation in the project.

- Utilizing the insights of these people about specific subject matters can in many cases substitute elaborate wide-ranging analyses about qualitative questions.

- Can also generate distorted information: often the informants can propagate misinformation or provide interest-based opinions. Such distorting influences can only be controlled by questioning persons with diverse standpoints.

- No representative statements

### Discussion of evaluation results from other methods (e.g. survey) with the target group and joint decision-making about resulting consequences for the project (joint planning)
### Quantitative Questioning (Survey)

- A particular distinguishing criterion for the forms of questioning is the communication medium, while the degree of standardization and structure, besides the differentiation between qualitative and quantitative research, mostly refers to the type and setup of the questionnaire. Depending on the type of communication with the interviewees, the following approaches are distinguished: personal, by phone, written (“self-administered”), and online surveys.

- Exactly quantifiable results
- Identification of statistically significant connections/differences is possible
- Possibility to examine large random samples and receive representative results (external validity)
- Greater objectivity and comparability of results

- Through standardization and strong structuring there is often no openness for unexpected or unintended changes
- Little flexibility through standardization of the examination situation
- The causes for a finding are hard to determine (e.g. through open questioning)
- No suggestions for improvement (if necessary through open questioning)

- When comparable values are needed in regard to yield, productivity, etc. with the objective of making representative statements
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