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What are we going to present?

• Evaluation design
  • What worked well
  • What could have been better

• Impact Results
  • Poultry vaccination
  • Women's Economic Empowerment
About Propcom Mai-karfi

• One of the oldest market systems development projects
• Phase I started in December 2002.
• Phase II of the project (Propcom Mai-karfi) started in 2012.
• Currently in a 3-year extension ending in March 2021.
• Funded by DFID; total project budget: £51 million.
Our evaluation design
Our evaluation design
Data Collection and Reporting

- **December 15**: Base line Quant
- **July 16**: Wave 1 Qual
- **January 18**: Wave 3 Qual
- **March 16**: Base line Quant
- **October 17**: Wave 2 Qual
- **Jan / Feb 18**: Endline Quant x 2

**Final Summative Report June 18**
Poultry vaccination intervention

• **Constraints:**
  • Limited distribution network
  • Lack of information on the availability of NDV-i2 vaccine
  • Absence of service delivery agents
Results - Poultry

- Flock size increase of 70% with further intent to expand

- Av. price charged per chicken doubled in the intervention group (1072 NGN vs. 2214 NGN). Only 50% increase in the comparison group.

- Intervention gross and net HH income increased in the group

- Net income 2.7x that of baseline

- Household consumption increased
Results - Poultry

- Selling no longer dictated by disease
- Double the proportion of intervention households now sell their chickens at market compared to comparison households
- Investment in land and agriculture – diversification of income streams
- Intervention Poverty Probability Index (2USD/day) decreased from 54% to 31%
Results – Poultry – displaced population

• Households had to sell their assets (including savings made from poultry) and relocated to other villages.

“I had to sell off virtually everything I had including my livestock, farmlands and motorcycle and gave them what I was able to raise before they released [my son] back to us...”

• Took up breeding and vaccinating chickens upon return

• Net income lower than non-displaced, but higher than comparison
Results – Poultry – spend v outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% Total Outreach</th>
<th>% Propcom Spend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ag Cooperatives</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babban Gona</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shea</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grain Storage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEE initiatives</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag Mechanisation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag Inputs</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart shows the percentage of total outreach and Propcom spend across different categories, with Ag Inputs being the highest contributor at 58%.
Results – Poultry – ROI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income (£)</th>
<th>Babban Gona</th>
<th>Ag Mechanisation</th>
<th>Ag Inputs</th>
<th>Grain Storage</th>
<th>Ag Cooperatives</th>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th>Poultry</th>
<th>Soybean</th>
<th>WEE initiatives</th>
<th>Shea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A reminder of the WEE markets
WHAT WAS PROPCOM MAI-KARFI’S APPROACH TO WEE?

• The gender-blind approach – enabling both men and women to increase their incomes without a specific focus on women

• The gender-specific approach (women-specific) – focusing on specifically overcoming the barriers to women’s economic empowerment and participation
WAS WOMEN’S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT ACHIEVED?

1. FEED FINISHING
   - Focused on decreasing the time it takes to fatten livestock to increase the turnover of small farmholders.
   - A gender-blind intervention.

2. CROP PROTECTION
   - Focused on providing information and inputs about good agricultural practices and crop protection to increase yields.
   - A gender-blind intervention.

3. POULTRY HEALTH
   - Focused on vaccinating chickens owned by households to increase the income and improve the financial stability of rural households.
   - A gender-blind intervention.

4. RICE PARBOILING
   - Focused on improving women’s skills and their access to resources, information, and markets to increase their income, agency, and voice.
   - A women-specific intervention.
WAS WOMEN’S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT ACHIEVED?

1. **Feed Finishing**
   - Successful for the women it reached. Its impact on WEE could have been much greater if private sector partners had recognised the valuable role of women.

2. **Crop Protection**
   - Beneficial to the participating women. The intervention had the potential for greater impact on WEE, if it had mobilised more women to use the product.

3. **Poultry Health**
   - Successful, especially for women, who are often the main caretakers of these household livestock.

4. **Rice Parboiling**
   - Empowering for the participating women. More women could be reached if the intervention was supported by private sector partners with more capacity.
Women outreach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total (Thousands)</th>
<th>Women (Thousands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reaching women is resource intensive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost per female reached</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Average*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£42.00</td>
<td>£78.00</td>
<td>£109.80</td>
<td>£124.40</td>
<td>£118.10</td>
<td>£100.70</td>
<td>£95.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Average = £20.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost per female reached resulting in income increase</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Average*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£82.00</td>
<td>£149.00</td>
<td>£212.80</td>
<td>£256.70</td>
<td>£200.70</td>
<td>£148.00</td>
<td>£174.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Average = £33.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender Blind vs Women Specific: What Approach Worked Best?
GENDER-BLIND INTERVENTIONS

• Easier for women to be the ‘end consumer’ rather than the ‘service provider’
• Untapped potential for women to be empowered
• Numbers of women ranged dramatically
• May have inadvertently discounted female beneficiaries
Women-specific interventions:

- Enabled women to make economic decisions,
- Changed the perceptions of some male market players,
- Limited potential impact on broader social and cultural barriers,
- Unclear whether WEE interventions had greater impact than the gender-blind ones.
• Women benefited from both the mainstream and women-specific interventions
• Potential to reach more women
• Potential to create new or secondary markets
• Positive evidence to support the early integration of WEE strategies into mainstream approaches