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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Cost Benefit Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBT</td>
<td>Community-Based Trainer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DHS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLT</td>
<td>Eliminating Child Labour in Tobacco Growing Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NER</td>
<td>Net Enrolment Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QALY</td>
<td>Quality Adjusted Life Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REALISE</td>
<td>Realizing Livelihood Improvements Through Savings and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SROI</td>
<td>Social Return on Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBOS</td>
<td>Uganda Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPE</td>
<td>Universal Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USE</td>
<td>Universal Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWESO</td>
<td>Uganda Women’s Effort to Save Orphans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSLA</td>
<td>Village Savings and Loans Associations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive summary

This report presents a social return on investment (SROI) analysis of the Village Savings and Loans Association (VSLA) and Skills Training programmes of the Realizing Livelihood Improvements Through Savings and Education (REALISE) Project (2013-2016). The REALISE Project was a child labour programme implemented by Uganda Women’s Effort to Save Orphans (UWESO) in five tobacco growing sub-counties in Hoima district, Uganda.

Whether VSLAs and skills training programmes generate positive social value is a topic of particular interest to ECLT Foundation and to the greater international development community as these programmes are increasingly used to empower the world’s rural poor. Unlike many livelihoods programmes, VSLAs and skills training are market-driven and do not create long-term dependency between the donor agency and beneficiaries.

The calculations of social value in this SROI report have been reviewed and validated by Envoy Partnership, a UK-based SROI accredited firm.

Brief project description

The overall goal of the REALISE project was to reduce child labour in targeted tobacco growing areas of Hoima. The project model mainly focused on improving farming households’ access to finance and providing skills training to children above the minimum working age (14 years).

In the VSLA programme, adult community members were organized into groups of 15-30 members, and trained in VSLA methodology, business management and entrepreneurship. The Skills Training programme, on the other hand, focused on children above the minimum working age (14 years) that were at risk or performing hazardous work. They were trained in various skills such as motor mechanics, tailoring, welding and bricklaying, plumbing, hairdressing and motorcycle repair, based on local market demand. Community-Based Trainers (CBTs) employed by the implementing partner (UWESO), coached and mentored VSLA groups and Skills Training participants throughout.

The VSLA programme reached 21’410 households with 71,738 children aged 5-17 years, while 240 children aged above 14 years were equipped with skills.

Social return on investment methodology

The SROI framework was used to estimate the value of the changes that VSLA and Skills Training participants experienced as a result of the REALISE project being implemented. This included understanding the changes or outcomes that they experienced, measuring the reach of these outcomes and estimating their financial value. The value is expressed in Uganda Shillings (UGX).

VSLA and Skills Training participants were surveyed on the changes they had experienced, the reach of these changes and their value. Data from secondary sources was also reviewed to inform the process.

Primary outcomes experienced by programme participants included an increase in their financial situation, and social and economic wellbeing. VSLA members pointed out that by using REALISE strategies, they were able to earn extra income from their income generating activities. They spent this extra income on nutritious food for their families, education of their children and/ or dependents and health services, improved housing and savings. This resulted in better social and economic wellbeing and sustainable reduction of child labour.

Skills Training participants, on the other hand, reported that they were employed or became self-employed. They were also trade-tested and certified as skilled workers by the Uganda Board of Education. As a result, they realized regular and higher income which they used to access better diet and housing, educate their children, dependents and/ or siblings, among other things.

Both VSLA members and Skills Training graduates also identified a heightened sense of empowerment,
pride and improved optimism and aspirations as a result of being involved in the REALISE project. The skills they gained and the ensuing increase in income increased their self-confidence and social standing in the community.

Social value created

Using data collected through qualitative in-depth interviews, focus group discussions and quantitative surveys with stakeholders, analysis of secondary data, as well as various techniques to determine financial proxies, values for each of the outcomes have been estimated for a benefit period of ten years for the VSLA members and Skills training graduates, and twenty years for their children and/or dependents. The adjusted values per outcome per person are shown in Table 1.

To present a more accurate view of the actual value created through the REALISE project, SROI analysis takes into account the deadweight, drop off and duration, attribution and displacement of project outcomes. This ensures that changes that could have occurred as a result of external factors are accounted for and not attributed to the REALISE project. In accordance with the SROI principle of not over claiming, a conservative SROI ratio of 12:1 has been calculated for VSLA members, and 2:1 for Skills Training graduates, based on a duration period of ten years for VSLA members and Skills graduates, and twenty years for their children and/or dependents. Figure 1 shows a summary of the SROI calculation.

Table 1: Value experienced by VSLA and Skills Training participants in the REALISE project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Total adjusted value per outcome per person, in UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VSLA members</td>
<td>Improved financial position</td>
<td>25'550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>82'443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved wellbeing</td>
<td>364'784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in schooling of children and dependents</td>
<td>60'151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills training graduates</td>
<td>Improved financial position</td>
<td>914'468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>341'014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved wellbeing</td>
<td>2'258'451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in schooling of children and dependents</td>
<td>2'692'930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: The SROI ratio calculation for VSLA members

\[
\frac{UGX \times 6'100,000,000}{UGX \times 520,000,000} = 12
\]

Figure 2: The SROI ratio calculation for Skills Training graduates

\[
\frac{UGX \times 1'400'000'000}{UGX \times 700'000'000} = 2
\]

To present a more accurate view of the actual value created through the REALISE project, SROI analysis takes into account the deadweight, drop off and duration, attribution and displacement of project outcomes. This ensures that changes that could have occurred as a result of external factors are accounted for and not attributed to the REALISE project. In accordance with the SROI principle of not over claiming, a conservative SROI ratio of 12:1 has been calculated for VSLA members, and 2:1 for Skills Training graduates, based on a duration period of ten years for VSLA members and Skills graduates, and twenty years for their children and/or dependents. Figure 1 shows a summary of the SROI calculation.

Table 1: Value experienced by VSLA and Skills Training participants in the REALISE project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Total adjusted value per outcome per person, in UGX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VSLA members</td>
<td>Improved financial position</td>
<td>25'550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>82'443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved wellbeing</td>
<td>364'784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in schooling of children and dependents</td>
<td>60'151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills training graduates</td>
<td>Improved financial position</td>
<td>914'468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>341'014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improved wellbeing</td>
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</tr>
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<td>Increase in schooling of children and dependents</td>
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</tr>
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</table>

1Values have accounted for drop off, attribution and deadweight
2Deadweight refers to what probably would have happened anyway without the project. Drop off and duration (or benefit period) refers to the reduction in outcome in the future. This reduction in outcome might come about because, for example, project participants abandon the practices they learned through the project or losing their benefits. Attribution refers to the proportion of change that ECLT can take credit for. Displacement refers to any changes that may be supplanted from outside of the project area or from other stakeholders.
3See Appendix for attribution and drop off rates.
4An annual discount rate of 10 percent was used to calculate the present value of the benefits created. There is a lot of debate on how high discount rates should be. The guide to Social Return on Investment references the 3.5% discount rate that is advised in the UK by the HM Treasury (this resulted in ratios of 16:1 for the VSLA programme and 3:1 for the Skills training programme). We decided on a higher, thereby more conservative, discount rate, which is more common in SROIs in developing countries. For the HM Treasury discount rate see: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/685903/The_Green_Book.pdf
Conclusions and recommendations

The overall SROI analysis shows a positive social return on investment ratio of UGX 12:1 for VSLA members, and 2:1 for Skills Training participants, respectively. This means that for every UGX1 invested in the REALISE project, approximately UGX 12 and UGX 2 worth of social and economic value was created and experienced by VSLA members and Skills Training graduates, respectively. Therefore, the REALISE project yielded a positive return on investment.

The social value created by the REALISE Project is by no means homogenous. Our study found that VSLA groups that are located near major trading centres have higher incomes than those that are further away. Furthermore, VSLA participants are predominantly females who tend to allocate resources to savings and income generating projects. As such, the benefits of VSLA may accrue to women than men. From a child labour perspective, this may be a good thing, as the literature shows that women are more likely to invest extra income in children’s education and household improvements.

For the skills training programme, gender and type of trade were also sources of income and social value heterogeneity. In brief, female skills graduates who were involved in hairdressing, tailoring and catering had lower income compared to their male counterparts who are involved in, for example, motorcar maintenance, plumbing and welding. Therefore, female participants must be encouraged to take up non-traditional trades, which pay more and generate higher social value.

Three main conclusions can be derived from this study. First, the SROI analysis shows that the ECLT programmes are working. The VSLA programme has a remarkably high social value ratio compared to the Skills Training programme. If further SROI studies in other countries bear this out, then ECLT might consider prioritising micro-finance programmes like VSLA in the future. However, it is important to highlight that the skills training programme has more direct impact on reducing child labour than VSLA, in that most of the impact goes to the children (who later become young adults) themselves. Hence, one could speculate that the skills training programme has higher likelihood to break intergenerational poverty and may prove to be less costly over generations. Our study also shows that the value per stakeholder is lower for VSLA compared to skills graduates. However, the Skills training programme has a higher investment and lower reach, and therefore has a lower SROI ratio. Consequently, these trade-offs between VSLA and skills training programmes must be kept in mind in efforts to streamline or prioritize livelihoods programmes. Secondly, the stakeholder outcomes identified in this study must be integrated in the Foundation’s M&E framework in order to capture the wider changes experienced by project beneficiaries. Finally, the gender dimensions must be considered in the design of programmes if child labour is to be sustainably eliminated.
1. Introduction

This report shows the value created by the Realizing Livelihoods Improvements through Savings and Education (REALISE) project funded by ECLT Foundation and implemented by Uganda Women’s Effort to Save Orphans (UWESO) in Hoima district, Uganda. This value has been calculated by ECLT Foundation with consultancy advice from Envoy Partnership, an independent accredited social return on investment (SROI) assurance firm, using SROI analysis methodology.

The report covers the 2013 to 2016 investments and assesses the benefits to Village Savings and Loans Association participants and graduates of REALISE’s skills training programme and their children and/or dependents.

1.2 Project context

The REALISE Project was implemented in 5 sub-counties (Buhanika, Kyangwali, Bugambe, Kitoba and Kigorobya) of Hoima district. The sub-counties were identified and prioritized based on local expert opinion on high tobacco production and perceived child labour prevalence.

There are few large employers in Hoima, so the family is the primary production unit, especially in agriculture. The main outputs are cash crops and agricultural produce for family consumption. Children frequently participate as unpaid family labour in the planting, weeding and harvesting of a variety of crops.

In addition to tobacco, other crops grown include rice, tea, coffee, maize, sugar, cotton, sorghum, millet, groundnuts, sunflowers, sweet potatoes and beans. Fishing on Lake Albert also employs several hundred people. The recent discovery of petroleum in the district is increasingly attracting people to the district.

During the project duration, Hoima was also home to over 40,000 refugees, mainly from the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Kyangwali Refugee Settlement Area that lies on the banks of Lake Albert is in the REALISE project catchment area.

While the government has introduced Universal Primary Education (UPE) and Universal Secondary Education (USE), many children from poor rural households in Hoima are still left out. However, primary and secondary education are not compulsory, nor truly free, since parents were still expected to contribute pens, exercise books, clothing, examination fees, and even bricks and labour for classroom construction. Particularly the older children - the 14-17-year olds who have graduated from UPE but are - for various reasons - unable to continue to USE or vocational training (of which there is a lack) often work alongside their parents.

The primary school enrolment rate for Hoima District is 79.8%, which is slightly below the national average at 83%.

1.2.1 Project background

A project baseline study carried out by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS) in 2012 showed an estimated 78 percent of total economically active 5-17-year-olds in the district worked in other agriculture-related activities excluding tobacco, against 17 percent in tobacco growing and just 5 percent in non-agriculture sectors.

In tobacco growing, about 24% of the children aged 5-17 years who performed tobacco-related activities were in child labour, as defined Uganda national legislation. Other key findings included:

- Children from households whose main source of livelihood is agriculture were 9 percent less likely to be attending school compared to those whose main source of livelihood is non-agriculture.
- Children in tobacco growing households were 35% more likely to be working and attending school compared to children in households not growing tobacco.
Overall, 23 percent of the households had a member that owns a savings account, thus underscoring the limited access to finance.

77 percent of the tobacco growing households were registered. Unregistered tobacco growers present a major concern as they are not known to the ultimate buyer. Therefore, they do not get support in their daily work to ensure safe and fair working environments consistent with buyer standards.

The proportion of the secondary school age population (13-18 years) that was enrolled in secondary schools in Hoima district was 17%. The low net enrolment rate (NER) in secondary education underscored that most children fail to continue to secondary education after completing the primary cycle.

Due to the complex nature of these problems, ECLT Foundation invited UWESO to propose a package of services and actions to achieve five objectives:

a. Sustainable withdrawal of children from child labour;

b. Improving access to quality education and other basic social services;

c. Counteracting the acceptance of child labour in tobacco growing areas;

d. Strengthening capacities to address child labour; and

e. Strengthening livelihoods at community and household levels.

1.2.2 Project description

The REALISE project model was designed to improve the economic prospects of communities and individuals so that child labour can be reduced.

The formal and non-formal skills training programme targeted 240 former child labourers (at least 15 years) for apprenticeship/ artisanship training in trades such as motor mechanics, tailoring, welding and bricklaying, plumbing, hairdressing and motorcycle repair, based on local market demand. At the end of the course, the trained artisans would be provided with start-up toolkits, and linked with potential employers and self-employment opportunities.

The Village Savings and Loan Associations (VSLAs) programme was targeted at 18’000 parents and guardians of children (5-17 years) at risk of child labour in tobacco growing areas. Income generating activities such as retailing, poultry and beekeeping would also be promoted to diversify income sources and to increase food access and availability for the household.

In the short-term, the two programme interventions aimed to increase incomes for beneficiaries so that they could hire adult labour for agricultural activities. Ultimately, increase in income and livelihood options was expected to lead to alternative reduction of child labour in tobacco growing areas.

During four years of implementation, the skills training project reached 240 youths, as planned. A total of 21’410 parents and guardians were enrolled in 700 VSLA groups, potentially benefiting 71’738 children aged 5-17 years. Strategies employed included:

- Mobilizing youths to enrol for skills training;
- Providing start-up toolkits to skills training graduates;
- Linking graduates to employment and self-employment opportunities;
- Mobilizing parents and guardians into VSLA groups and building the functional capacity of the groups;
- Training groups in VSLA methodology and core business management skills; and
- Providing ongoing coaching and mentoring to VSLA groups through Community Based Trainers (CBTs).
2. Methodology

SROI is a method for measuring and accounting for the value or benefits which social programmes create. It goes beyond conventional accounting and cost benefit analysis (CBA) which focus on the needs of the entity making the investment. SROI captures the perspective of beneficiaries to understand what changes for them (positive or negative) and the value: i.e. how important the changes are for them over time.

To illustrate how SROI differs from traditional accounting and CBA, consider an NGO that provides antiretroviral drugs worth $1’000 to HIV+ patients. In financial accounting terms, the value of benefit delivered to the patients is $1’000. From a CBA perspective, the focus is on the net present value of benefits and costs which have a market price. Thus, and traditional accounting do not account for externalities and are less suitable for evaluating investments that are aimed at advancing the public good.

SROI takes standard measures of economic return a step further by placing a monetary value on social returns. To continue our example above, SROI methodology requires asking the patients what changes they are experiencing as a result of taking the medication (e.g. improved health and quality of life, increased hope for the future, long life etc.), the monetary value they place on those outcomes and compares it to the cost. This enables a ratio of benefits to costs to be calculated. For example, a ratio of 5:1 indicates that an investment of $1 delivers $5 of social value.

Value is about how important things are for a person, and is therefore, inherently subjective. Often the changes that beneficiaries experience as a result of programme interventions do not have a market price, for example, a change in self-confidence, change in feelings of hope and personal health. An improvement in personal health, for instance, can be really important for a person who has a chronic illness and therefore valued higher compared with a person who already is healthy and values the improvement much lower.

The same is true for products and services that have a market price. Take, for example, a Ferrari supercar. There are certain people (for example high-income executives) who are willing to pay the market price, say $200’000, for this car. This price represents the value that the car creates for them: style, speed, presence, sophistication and ambition. And therefore, they are willing to pay this amount. However, if you would ask a small-scale farmer living in a remote rural area in Uganda, he/she may not value the car the same way. If anything, the car would probably create negative value for the small-scale farmer due to frequent breakdowns caused by rural roads, high fuel consumption, high maintenance costs and limited practical use in his/her rural setting.

SROI analysis also acknowledges that value changes over time. For instance, the benefit of a primary school-leaving certificate becomes less important as one proceeds with education. Therefore, it is important to understand who the beneficiaries of a programme are, what changes because of the products and services they access in the programme, when these changes take place and how valuable this is for these beneficiaries.

2.1 SROI description

As it is in the field of financial accounting, SROI is based on a set of principles and standards which guide the process and analysis (please sidebar for the SROI principles).

The principles were established by SROI Network, an international membership group of individuals and organizations committed to better understanding the value of social investments.

Applying the SROI begins by developing an understanding of the programme, how it meets its objectives, and who the beneficiaries are. Critical to this process is the development of an impact map showing the programme theory of change i.e. the links between inputs (what is invested by the programme), activities (what is done), outputs (what is produced or delivered), outcomes (changes as a result of interventions) and impact (long-term changes to which the programme contributes). The process also involves identifying indicators for the outcomes, so that we can measure if the outcome has been achieved. The next step is to use financial proxies to value the outcome.

---

In economics, externalities are consequences that affect a party that did not choose to incur that cost or benefit.

Now Social Value International (SVI)
Determining the value of each outcome to a beneficiary involves them and programme managers estimating of how long each outcome lasts and applying filters to assess whether the outcomes result from the activities being analyzed. Four filters are applied to each outcome to establish the impact of the activities:

- Deadweight - what would have happened anyway?
- Displacement - were other outcomes displaced to create the outcome?
- Attribution - who else contributed to the outcome?
- Drop-off - how much does the outcome reduce, or drop-off each year?

### 2.2 Steps of SROI

SROI analysis is a step-by-step process involving six stages:

1. **Establishing scope and identifying key stakeholders:** Defining the boundaries about what the SROI analysis will cover, identifying project beneficiaries to be involved in the process and how.

2. **Mapping outcomes:** through stakeholder consultations, developing a programme theory of change, which shows the relationship between inputs, outputs and outcomes.

3. **Evidencing outcomes and giving them a value:** collecting individual data on positive and negative outcomes that stakeholders have experienced and then valuing those outcomes.

4. **Establishing impact:** through stakeholder interviews, identifying the changes or outcomes that would have happened anyway or are a result of other factors and eliminating them from consideration.

5. **Calculating the SROI:** involves summing up all the benefits, subtracting any negatives and comparing the result to the investment. Sensitivity analysis is also carried out at this stage.

6. **Reporting, using and embedding:** Developing a dissemination plan and integrating the results in the organization’s programming.

In the present study, the first two steps were carried out through qualitative interviews in October 2018. Steps 3-6 were accomplished during the first quarter of 2019 through a quantitative survey.

### 2.3 Scope

The SROI analysis covered in this study is evaluative because it conducted retrospectively and is based on retrospectively collected outcomes data. The scope includes the activities undertaken by REALISE Project during the four-year project implementation period. Specifically, the study focuses on understanding and measuring the value created by (i) improving access to quality formal and non-formal skills training; and (ii) promoting community savings and training in business skills.

---

**SROI principles**

1. **Involve stakeholders:** Stakeholders who have experienced the outcomes must be involved to inform the process on what outcomes should be measured, and how this is measured and valued.

2. **Understand what changes:** Both positive and negative changes need to be identified and the way the change comes about articulated clearly.

3. **Value the things that matter:** Use financial proxies to recognize the value of the outcomes identified.

4. **Only include what is material:** Determine what information and evidence must be included in the analysis to give a true and fair picture, such that stakeholders can draw reasonable conclusions about impact.

5. **Do not over claim:** Only claim what the organization is responsible for and err on the side of being conservative.

6. **Be transparent:** Demonstrate the basis on which the analysis may be considered accurate and honest and show that it will be reported and discussed with stakeholders.

7. **Verify the result:** Ensure appropriate independent assurance.

_Nicholls, Lawlor, Neitzert, & Goodspeed, 2012._
2.4 Stakeholder groups

SROI is a stakeholder-informed methodology that requires engaging closely with stakeholders to identify and understand the changes that they experience as a result of a programme or activity and estimating the value of those changes. In our case, stakeholders refer to those individuals that experienced change, whether positive or negative, through the REALISE Project interventions.

Based on an end-of-project evaluation of the REALISE Project in 2017, stakeholders were identified and included in this analysis if they experienced a unique and material change as a result of the project interventions.

2.4.1 Material stakeholders

Stakeholders judged to experience material outcomes in this SROI analysis were:

- **VSLA participants:** parents and guardians who participated in the REALISE Project’s VSLA programme were identified as the primary stakeholders affected by the intervention.

  VSLAs are self-governed groups that combine regular savings deposits into a fund from which loans are issued to group members. It is hoped that with improved access to finance, the participants can increase incomes and consequently, reduce household poverty and enact better outcomes for children.

  In the REALISE Project, VSLA participants were organized into VSLA groups of 15-30 members according to their geographical location and their preferences. In total, 700 groups with 21’410 members were formed.

  The project was implemented in five tobacco growing sub-counties in Hoima district: Buhanika, Kyangwali, Bugambe, Kitoba and Kigorobya.

- **Skills training graduates:** these are youths (aged 15 years and upwards), who were withdrawn from hazardous work in the 5 sub-counties and facilitated to undergo artisanship training in trades such as motor mechanics, tailoring, welding and brick-laying, plumbing, hairdressing and motor cycle repair, based on individual preferences.

  Skills training took two forms:

  - Formal skills training which occurred in a local training institution and led to certification by the institution.
  
  - Non-formal skills training where participants were attached to a skilled artisan as apprentices.

  In total, 240 youths underwent skills training for six months, of whom 231 were assessed by the Directorate of Industrial Training in the Ministry of Education and issued with certificates.

- **Children and/or dependents of VSLA members and Skills training graduates:** Children and/or dependents of the VSLA members and skills training graduates were the indirect beneficiaries of the REALISE Project, as they benefitted from the programmes via their parents/guardians. They mainly benefitted from the improved financial position of their parents/guardians, which enabled them to attend school, thereby improving their own long term prospects.
2.4.2 Excluded stakeholders

Stakeholders excluded from the SROI analysis were:

- **Government**: The Ugandan Government was involved in project implementation to an extent. National and district steering committees helped to encourage schools and communities to participate. During the implementation period, government staff also participated in project monitoring. However, the government was not included in this analysis because it did not experience material outcomes.

- **Community based trainers (CBTs), UWESO and project staff**: CBTs are the primary vehicle through which the REALISE Project formed VSLA groups, delivered training and support and recruited skills training participants. As their title suggests, CBTs are known to their local communities and trusted, and act as the link between groups and the project secretariat. However, although CBTs, project staff, UWESO (the implementing partner) and other project structures (such as Community Child Labour Committees) exert enormous influence on the success or failure of the project and how beneficiaries experience outcomes, they were excluded from the analysis because they did not personally experience material outcomes.

2.5 Data collection methods

Data for this SROI analysis was carried out in two phases. The first phase was qualitative in nature. It focused on identifying stakeholders and mapping outcomes through focus group discussions (FGDs), using a semi-structured questionnaire. The FGDs were focused on understanding the changes (positive and negative) that different stakeholders experienced as a result of the REALISE project. This was carried out in October 2018. During the qualitative phase, we carried out four FGDs involving 30-50 VSLA members, and 10-20 Skills Training graduates in each of the four sub-counties visited. Furthermore, we interviewed three CBT’s and conducted four FGDs with ten children who were withdrawn from child labour and were benefitting from school feeding.

The second phase was quantitative in nature and involved conducting individual face-to-face surveys. The surveys were conducted in all sub-counties in January 2019, amongst 236 VSLA members and 66 Skills Training graduates. In addition, we carried out FGDs involving 20-30 people. Secondary data from a 2016 end-of-project evaluation of the REALISE project and other data sources were also used to inform the SROI analysis. These are referenced and listed in the bibliography.

VSLA participants completing the questionnaire during the quantitative research phase under the supervision of enumerators
3. Realise Project Interventions

This section outlines the way in which the key stakeholders were involved in the REALISE project and the outcomes they experienced as a result of participation.

3.1 VSLA members

The primary purpose of a VSLA is to provide simple savings and loan facilities amongst their members. The VSLA model also includes a social fund which provides small but important grants to members in distress.

In the REALISE Project, VSLAs are implemented in three phases: preparatory phase, intensive phase and a supervision phase. At the end of the cycle, VSLA groups become independent from the REALISE Project and manage their own savings, credit and insurance activities.

The preparatory phase takes 4 to 6 weeks during which the CBT conducts a community needs assessment, select communities of intervention, provide general information to local leaders and prospective VSLA members, and forms the VSLA groups to be trained. The Intensive Phase takes 14 weeks during which the VSLA groups formed during the preparatory phase undergo training on six modules, elect their leaders, establish their constitution, set out the rules and procedures that will govern their activities and start saving and lending activities. They also learn to manage their social fund and share-purchase/ savings-and-loan meetings. The CBT attends all meetings during this phase and is actively involved in guiding the process. At the end of this phase, the CBT conducts a short evaluation of the group to determine their readiness for the next phase.

Lastly, the supervision phase lasts up to 36 weeks and is sub-divided into a development stage and a maturity stage, each lasting about 18 weeks. During the development stage, the CBT worker visits groups at least twice a month, giving members more space to manage their activities. At the end of the development stage, the CBT conducts a short evaluation to assess the group’s readiness to move onto the maturity stage. During the maturity stage, the CBT conducts at least two monitoring visits to check on group progress and sets a date for the end of the cycle and the share-out of funds. The CBT will attend a third meeting at the end of the cycle to facilitate the share-out process and celebrate the groups’ accomplishment over the VSLA savings cycle. If the group chooses to continue to operate for a second cycle, an evaluation will help determine the level of organization support.

With support from the CBT, VSLA members also identify and invest in different income generating activities suited to their area, such as pig-rearing and beekeeping. Most of the VSLA members are farmers who are already growing commercial crops (i.e. they have the basic entrepreneurial propensity). VSLAs often help them to access to finance for purchasing inputs, diversifying their income sources, bridging the funding gap between production and marketing of the produce, and to hire adult labour when needed.

The REALISE Project also used VSLAs as community platforms for training in other aspects of livelihood improvement such as imparting skills in nutrition and food security, children’s rights, life skills for youth, HIV/ AIDS prevention and so on.

3.2 Skills graduates

The REALISE Project facilitated skills training for 240 youths, based on the belief that poverty is one of the main reasons for child labour. Child labour in turn perpetuates poverty across generations by keeping children of the poor out of school and limiting their prospects for upward social mobility. This lowering of human capital has been linked to slow economic growth and poor social development.

In Uganda, children who, for one reason or the other, drop out of school have limited opportunities to join tertiary institutions for formal skills development programmes. This lack of skills for gainful employment and livelihoods also exposes them to child labour. Accordingly, the REALISE Project prioritized skills training as one of the strategies to equip rural youths with marketable and high value skills as a means to improve their livelihoods and break the cycle of poverty.

CBTs, working closely with local communities, identified out of school youths (15 years and above) who were involved in child labour in tobacco growing areas or were at risk, and enrolled them into REALISE
The REALISE Project’s vocational skills programme. Trades on offer included motor mechanics, tailoring, welding, bricklaying, plumbing, catering, hairdressing and motorcycle repair. These trades were chosen on the basis of local labour market needs assessment by the REALISE Project, as well as individual preferences.

After six months of training, REALISE Project linked the graduates with employers and/or apprenticeships in order for them to practice their trade. A total of 231 were further assessed by the Directorate of Industrial Training and issued with certificates by the Uganda Education Board. The REALISE Project also provided graduates with startup toolkits, enabling them to start their own enterprises or get further training, if they so wished. By the end of the project, more than 95% of the graduates were practicing their new trade and relying on it as the principal source of income.

### 3.2 Project investments

Investments in the REALISE Project included design and funding, monitoring, evaluation and technical support from ECLT Foundation. The project received US$1’000’000 direct funding over four years, of which US$80’000 and US$110’000 was directly spent on the VSLA and skills training programmes, respectively. In addition, UWESO indirect costs related to VSLA and skills training amounted US$106’935 and US$78’990, respectively. Therefore, the in-country total expenditure was US$161’530 and US$218’675 for the VSLA and skills training programmes, respectively, over the four years. For a detailed overview of the project budget and investments, see Annex.

ECLT Foundation technical and administration staff assisted local staff during field visits and through desk-based support, including commissioning annual audits, an internal mid-term evaluation and an independent summative evaluation of the REALISE Project. In total, the cost of the technical and design, audit, monitoring and evaluation support for the VSLA and skills training programmes by ECLT was US$72’545 over four years.
4. Stakeholder Outcomes

4.1 Outcomes experienced by VSLA members

VSLA participants experienced four main final outcomes: (i) improved financial position; (ii) increase in schooling of children and dependents; (iii) improved health; and (iv) improved wellbeing.

Figure 4. VSLA Programme Logic, timeline of activities, outcomes and impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Activities</th>
<th>Main Outputs</th>
<th>Immediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Final Outcomes</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Trainers (CBT) sensitize communities about VSLAs</td>
<td>VSLA Groups formed</td>
<td>Greater knowledge of VSLA methodology</td>
<td>Improved income, savings and ownership of productive assets</td>
<td>Improved financial position</td>
<td>• Increased income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training on VSLA methodology, business management and investment</td>
<td>VSLA Groups trained and start saving</td>
<td>Improved entrepreneurial skills</td>
<td>Increased stability of income and financial independence</td>
<td>Increase in schooling of self, children and / or dependents</td>
<td>• Improved long-term financial situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased access to finance</td>
<td>Improved diet, housing and ability to cope with emergencies</td>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>Improved wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversified income sources</td>
<td>Improved social status, social cohesion, and friendships</td>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>• Happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greater motivation to pool savings</td>
<td>Strengthened social bonds</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-worth and confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased skills to cope with group dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Optimism and aspirations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Households have improved capacity to reduce child labour; child rights violations sustainably reduced.
4.1.1 Improved financial position

VSLA members reported that they experienced improvements in their financial position as a result of the additional income and access to finance from VSLA participation, which increased household wealth and provided a safety net due to savings and/or access to the social fund. Following the approach used in Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) in developing countries, the present SROI study operationalized household wealth in terms of economic resources, which are assets and services available in the household such as type of flooring, water supply, electricity, radio and refrigerator. The acquisition of these productive assets or material possessions is associated with an increase in household income in rural settings.

During the individual surveys, 75 out of the 236 surveyed VSLA members (32%) reported that they used VSLA proceeds to install solar power in their household:

“I used the first loan from the VSLA group to purchase solar equipment and to hire a technician to install it. Now my children have clean light to do their homework and to study late at night. I got a second loan to buy a fridge. I am now able to store food for longer, and to store my fresh farm produce for sale later when the prices are favorable.”

Woman in a VSLA group

In the same survey, 61 out of 236 members (25.85%) used VSLA proceeds to acquire a cellphone:

“I acquired a cellphone. I have now access to my friends and family throughout the day, every day. More importantly, I get information on prices of agricultural inputs in Kampala, Hoima and other markets. I also get latest information about where I can get the highest price for my produce”.

Man in VSLA

53 out of 236 members (22.5%) used VSLA proceeds to acquire a radio:

“I bought a radio. I like to follow current affairs, and as a farmer in these days of unpredictable weather, I need to know the weather forecast in order to plan for my agricultural activities. Children also have educational programmes that they listen to, which helps to improve their academic performance.”

Man in VSLA

22% of the respondents reported that they used VSLA proceeds to rent additional agricultural land or purchase housing land. Included in this category are other survey respondents who improved their housing by, for example, roofing with tiles or iron sheets, plastering walls and/or through cement or tile flooring.

“Personally, I have no husband. So, I have to provide for everything. I have now bought two plots and hope to start building houses so that I can further improve my living standards.”

Woman in VSLA group

“I had a grass thatched house. Now my house is roofed with iron sheet, thereby improving my standard of living.”

Woman in VSLA group

“I used the share-out from the VSLA to rent additional land for growing tobacco. With more land, I can achieve economies of scale and earn even higher income.”

Man in VSLA

Finally, 8.5% of the survey respondents reported that they used VSLA proceeds to invest in transportation, such as bicycles and motorcycles.

“In Uganda, there is demand for cheap, quick transport. I used the money I got from the VSLA to buy a motorcycle and a bicycle which I hire out for a fee. This way, I am guaranteed a minimum amount of money per month and no longer rely on agriculture. My income is more regular.”

Man in VSLA

Other wealth-enhancing uses of VSLA income that were mentioned by survey responses include constructing or extending a house; buying a car and starting a business.

4.1.2 Increase in schooling of children and dependents

Although primary and secondary education is free in Uganda, there are many extra school requirements to pay. From brooms to schoolbooks and uniform and smart shoes, each child must turn up at the gates with everything asked of them, or else risk being sent back home. In agricultural communities, parents often do not have the resources to pay for these costs, less so when the household has more than one child. It is also preferable to send children to boarding school where children are provided with a much better education, as students get to receive extra classes in the evenings and class sizes are smaller.

VSLA enable an increase in schooling of children and dependents by making it easier for parents/guardians to access finance to buy uniforms, school supplies, pay for school trips and other expenses related to children’s education. Furthermore, some parents/guardians can send their children to fee-paying boarding and private schools, which are expensive but provide better quality education.

In our study, 210 out of 236 VSLA members (89%) mentioned that they could not afford to pay for school trips or events that cost money before joining the VSLA in 2013. By the time of the SROI interviews in 2018, 79 out of 236 VSLA members (34%) still reported that they could not afford to pay for school trips or events that cost money. In other words, the number of VSLA participants who were able to pay for school trips or events that cost money increased from 26 in 2013 to 157 in 2018 (388%). On the other hand, the number of parents who can afford to buy books for their children increased from 101 to 189 (87%), respectively, thanks to the VSLA.

“I have been able to educate my child to college. My children have a brighter future than I had.”

Woman in VSLA group

4.1.3 Improved wellbeing

VSLA members reported that they experienced an increase in social and economic wellbeing as a result of the additional income they had to spend on food for the family, health, education, housing improvements and an increased capacity to save. These measures are collectively called living standards, which comprise basic material requirements for decent life, according to an individual’s judgement. In the literature, the main components are housing, nutrition, clothing, health care, education, mobility and freedom to air views.

During the individual interviews, 162 out of 236 VSLA members (68.6%) reported that their living standards have improved ‘a little more’, while 73 (30.9%) reported that their living standards have improved ‘much more’.

“Previously, I would wear gomesi to public meetings. Now I put on modern clothes and do not feel ashamed to interact with other people in this community and beyond.”

Woman in VSLA group

“I eat what I want, when I want. I now have a regular source of income. Even if I want to eat meat four times a week, I can do so.”

Woman in VSLA group

“As women, we did not have authority over household income. Now we have capacity to buy land, build homes. Now our husbands love us more because of what we are contributing to the household.”

Woman in VSLA group

“I no longer ask for money for salt from my husband.”

Woman in VSLA group

9The average household size in the REALISE Project areas is 5.2, according to a 2012 baseline report prepared by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics.

10Traditional women’s attire in Uganda, made of colourful but heavy fabric.
“I bought a motorcycle and built a house, which has improved my social standing and living standards. This would have been impossible without VSLA, as I am not a tobacco farmer.”

Man in VSLA group

According to VSLA members, the social fund contributed to overall improvement in living standards because they no longer needed to sell productive assets to respond to emergencies.

“I did not have some form of insurance to deal with illness, bereavement or other emergencies in the family. Before the VSLA, we would sell off our assets and livestock if an emergency occurred in the family. How do we make progress in life when we deplete our productive assets each time there is a problem? That’s why I am grateful for this initiative: we set aside 5% of our savings to help the members in times of need. The money is not distributed at the end of the year. It is our insurance.”

Community leader in a VSLA group

Stakeholders also mentioned that VSLA participation increased their self-esteem and improved their confidence to express views.

“I now feel like a person. I am now more confident because of the increased income and group participation.”

Woman in VSLA group

Lastly, stakeholders mentioned that they see VSLAs as having a wider impact in their communities. VSLA members were seen as role models in the community, and this social pressure created a virtuous cycle where they have to keep improving their living standards.

“VSLA has improved our social standing in the community: we are seen as responsible people.”

Man in VSLA group

“If you had come here 10 years ago, you would have seen only one or two houses roofed with iron sheets. Now almost everyone in this village has a house roofed with iron sheets and cement floor. VSLA has opened our eyes by giving us knowledge to save and improve our lives. Members compete to improve their living standards, while at the same time supporting and encouraging each other. Gone are the days when we got a little bit of money and spent it on beer and other things. Now everyone knows I have received a loan, or I have got a huge share-out. So that gives me pressure to do something meaningful, otherwise I will be the laughingstock of the whole village.”

Community leader in VSLA group

“I have a safety net in the event of drought or crop failure.”

Man in VSLA group

“Each group member has access to finance to pay school fees, to buy food, make home improvements and money to deal with illness, bereavement and other emergencies. This gives us peace of mind.”

Woman in VSLA group

The VSLA members also reported that they have cultivated new friendships, solidarity and a sense of community by saving together, thereby improving social cohesion.

“I am HIV-positive. I had lost face and love in this community. I found love in this group. With income from VSLA participation, I now have 300 broilers. I can look after myself and my family.”

Man in VSLA group

“As women, we could not access loans from banks due to distance and collateral requirements. Now we have our own savings. If I fail to repay, I am treated humanely, and my assets are not repossessed because fellow members guarantee my loan.”

Woman in VSLA group
“As women, rumor-mongering has now reduced as we are always busy.”

Woman in VSLA group

“...This group has members from 12 tribes. Previously, these people would find it hard to work together and tribal conflict was common. In the VSLA, these members now have a common interest, which strengthens social cohesion.”

Man in VSLA group

### 4.1.4 Improved health

Stakeholders reported that VSLA membership affects health outcomes through improved housing and enabling them to have a more varied, healthy diet. Improved access to finance means that the VSLA member could build a better house and/or improve existing roof, walls and floors, thus reducing the risk of dust-borne illnesses. Furthermore, participants were able to diversify their diet, as well as access private and public health services and buy medication, if necessary. An important mechanism through which health outcomes for VSLA members and their immediate family experienced improved health is the VSLA scheme social fund. The social fund is an emergency insurance scheme which covers members and their immediate families in the event of illness or bereavement. The social fund cushions members from income shocks caused by financing a funeral or medical crisis such hospitalization and medication costs.

In the present study, some 73% of VSLA members reported that their health has improved ‘a little more’ as a result of VSLA participation, while 25% said it had improved ‘much more’ and 2.5% said their health is still the same.

“...The main thing which I feel has changed for me is that I can afford to pay for emergencies. For example, my BP17 shot up recently and I had to be hospitalized in Kampala. My medical costs were paid out of the social fund; thus, I did not divert resources from my children’s school fees, borrow or starve my family in order to receive good medical attention. Previously, I had to sell livestock to cover my medical bills. A long stay in hospital could leave me in poverty. Now, my bill is covered by the social fund and my fellow VSLA members even visited me in hospital, which helped with my recovery.”

Woman in VSLA group

“We are what we eat. Poor nutrition leads to many illnesses, especially among children. With the VSLA money and income from my projects, I have a balanced diet and no one in my family gets sick frequently.”

Woman in VSLA group

“I used the money from my share-out to improve the flooring of my house, and to plaster the walls with cement. This has reduced dust and the quality of air in the house.”

Woman in VSLA group

---

17Blood pressure or hypertension
4.2 Outcomes experienced by skills training graduates

Skills training graduates experienced four main final outcomes: (i) improved financial position; (ii) improved health; (iii) improved wellbeing; and (iv) improved education.

Figure 5. Skills training programme logic, timeline of activities, outcomes and impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Activities</th>
<th>Main Outputs</th>
<th>Immediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Final Outcomes</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selection and enrolment of youths 15-17 y withdrawn from child labor in areas where tobacco is grown into (marketable) skills training e.g. car maintenance, motorcycle maintenance, hotel and catering, construction, tailoring and welding</td>
<td>Youths complete training, are trade-tested and certified by Uganda Board of Education</td>
<td>Graduates have improved (marketable) skills and sense of pride</td>
<td>Graduates have regular income and diversify livelihoods</td>
<td>Improved financial position</td>
<td>• Increased income&lt;br&gt;• Increased savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates provided with starter kit</td>
<td>Graduates have improved knowledge of safe work practices</td>
<td>Graduates acquire productive assets, improved diet and housing</td>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>• Better diet and housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Graduates obtain work or are self-employed</td>
<td>Graduates have improved capacity to save</td>
<td>Improved wellbeing</td>
<td>• Happiness&lt;br&gt;• Self-worth and confidence&lt;br&gt;• Optimism and aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased ability to cope with emergencies</td>
<td>Increase in schooling of self, children and / or dependents&lt;br&gt;• Improved long-term financial situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased capacity to send children and dependents to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child labour among children above minimum age of employment reduced

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Up to 1 year</th>
<th>1 year</th>
<th>2+ years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4.2.1 Improved financial position

Graduates mentioned that they have improved their financial position as a result of the skills training that they received. Before the training, all the graduates did not have regular monthly income, if at all. After the training, the medium minimum monthly income of graduates stood at UGX 305'000, and the maximum of UGX 840'000. 12 Graduates who trained in welding and motor mechanics tended to earn higher than those in construction, catering, hairdressing or motorcycle mechanics. Furthermore, there were gender bias in incomes: male graduates earned higher than female graduates. This was due to the type of employment they chose (i.e. they chose professions along gender lines and the traditionally male professions earned more).

“Now I have certainty of income throughout the year.”
Male youth, motorcycle mechanic graduates

“The situation would have been unbearable. I mean, I was not even able to finish school. Life would have been really hard for me without this training and the starter kit.”
Male youth, mechanics graduate

“I started a business, now my income is regular and certain unlike in the past when I relied solely on agriculture which is seasonal.”
Female youth, tailoring graduate

“Life is much better because out of my sweat, I get the more money. I am happier because I can get whatever I want. I also get more rest, eat well and can now afford decent accommodation.”
Female youth, hairdressing graduate

4.2.2 Improved health

Graduates mentioned that the skills training programme improved their health as a result of increased incomes, which enabled access to better, more varied diet and improved housing. During the quantitative phase, we asked respondents how their health had changed. We hypothesized that if the graduates experienced an increase in income, they would be able to improve their living standards (e.g. housing) and also access a wider variety of foods, thereby improving their health. 30% of graduates reported that their living standards had improved ‘much more’, while 70% said they had improved ‘a little more’. Concerning variety of diet, 44% and 51% of graduates reported that their diet was ‘much more’ and ‘a little more’ varied, respectively. Consequently, 39% and 48% of graduates indicated that their health had improved ‘much more’ and ‘a little more’, respectively.

“My breakfast, lunch and dinner mainly consisted of matoke 13, binyebwa 14 and other local vegetables. I would eat bread, eggs, milk and meat on special occasions. Now that I have higher income, it is the opposite. I eat what I want, when I want. I feel healthier and less prone to illness.”
Female youth, hairdressing graduate

“It was common for me to have one meal a day, maybe with wild fruits in between. Now when I am too busy, I have two meals a day.”
Male youth, welding graduate

4.2.3 Improved wellbeing

Skills graduates mentioned that they experienced an improvement in their wellbeing as a result of the additional income that they spend on food for their family, health, education, housing improvements and an increased capacity to save. Consequently, they were more optimistic about the future, they had higher aspirations and an increased sense of pride emanating from certification, recognition, having a skill and their improved financial situation.

During qualitative interviews, the skills graduates mentioned that their living standards have improved as a result of increased incomes from practicing...
their trades. In the face to face interviews, 70% of the respondents mentioned that their living standards had improved ‘a little more’, while 30% said that their living standards had improved ‘much more’.

“I am recognized by the Uganda Education Board as a skilled welder. For someone who did not complete secondary school, I am proud to have this certificate. I am making money. I have built two houses already. I am renting out one of them. I am now able to look after my mother and siblings. I feel like a man.”

Male youth, welding graduate

“I now have hope. I plan to open my own welding shop.”

Male youth, motor mechanics graduate

The improvement in wellbeing of the graduates was also due to an increased sense of self-worth and confidence. A sense of empowerment was also expressed by girls who were equipped with vocational skills. Examples of behavior that demonstrates increased empowerment as described by girls included:

• Being recognized in the community as a skilled artisan;
• Being a role model in the community;
• Earning own income;
• Being confident to express views, negotiate and sell products; and
• Having a marketable skill.

67% of skills graduates mentioned that they are now ‘much more’ optimistic about the future, while 30% said they were ‘a little more’ optimistic than before.

“I dropped out of primary school because my parents did not have money for me to continue with my education. I had no alternative than to work in the fields and do some odd jobs to earn a little money, if I could. So, I was excited to be selected for the vocational skills training. I have always wanted to be a welder, so it was easy for me to choose the course I wanted, and to stay on it even if the training got tough. At the end of the course I was trade-tested by the Ministry of Education, and now I am a proud holder of a recognized certificate in welding! I am currently working at a workshop at this shopping centre. In a good month, I can get more than UGS 1 million.\(^\text{15}\) I have since bought two pieces of land. On one, I have built a house for my mother and my siblings. I will develop the other one for rent-out accommodation. I can look forward to the future with much hope and confidence than before.”

Male youth, Welding graduate

“I am recognized by the Uganda Education Board as a skilled welder. For someone who did not complete secondary school, I am proud to have this certificate. I am making money. I have built two houses already. I am renting out one of them. I am now able to look after my mother and siblings. I feel like a man.”

Male youth, welding graduate

“Life is much better because out of my sweat, I get the more money. I am happier because I can get whatever I want. I also get more rest, eat well and can now afford decent accommodation.”

Female youth, hairdressing graduate

\(^{15}\)$270 at January 2019 exchange rates
As women, we did not have authority over household income. Now we have capacity to buy land, build homes."

Female youth, catering graduate

“I now have a certificate of competency issued by the Uganda Board of Education, which makes me proud and opens a new world of possibilities for me.”

Female youth, tailoring graduate

“I have always wanted to be a designer. I am now trained and make clothes for sale. I have now managed to buy my own sewing machine and can now make beautiful clothes.”

Female youth, tailoring graduate

“I now have higher, diversified income. I am more food secure. I am empowered. I am my own boss.”

Female youth, hairdressing graduate

“I am now certified as a skilled person by the Uganda Education Board, which makes me proud and competitive on the job market.”

Male youth, motor mechanics graduate

“We have seen how the discovery of oil can cause problems in communities when local people feel left out; feel that they are not benefitting from resources that are being extracted in their backyard. We are being realistic here – we have to prepare our young people to participate in this (oil) industry which requires skilled people. I sit on the committee of local leaders that was formed to facilitate dialogue with the oil industry – I need names of REALISE Project skills graduates who are interested so that I can submit to them for consideration.”

Female local leader

---

### 4.2.4 Improved education

Skills graduates reported that the certificate that they received from the Ministry of Education increased their employability and prospects for long-term financial security. More importantly, the graduates were now able to send their children and/or dependents to school, thereby starting a virtuous cycle which potentially leads to improved long-term financial situation and generational transformation.

During focus group discussions, the graduates drew attention to the industrialization of Hoima that was taking shape due to the discovery of oil in the Albertine region. They emphasized that youths in Hoima district could only meaningfully benefit from this industrialization by attaining market-relevant skills and qualifications. Against this background, the trade-testing and certification by the Ministry of Education was even more important:

“I now have a certificate of competency issued by the Uganda Board of Education, which makes me proud and hopeful.”

Male youth, Motor mechanics graduate

“I am certified as a skilled person by the Uganda Education Board. I am competitive on the job market. Before this, my only certificate was a birth certificate.”

Male youth, motor mechanics graduate

“...I can now support my siblings. I am now happier. I now have hope to establish my own garage’

Male youth, motor mechanics graduate
5. Outcome measurement and valuation

The present SROI study identified four primary outcomes to value as material outcomes for the VSLA members and their children and/ or dependents, and four outcomes for the skills training graduates and their children/ and or dependents. This section describes the indicators for each of these key outcomes measured, shows which of the stakeholders experienced them and to what extent. The value of each outcome is then calculated using appropriate financial proxies.

5.1 Outcome calculations: VSLA programme

The VSLA programme impacted members and their children and/ or dependents in a variety of ways. However, not all measured outcomes have been valued in the final SROI ratio. Table 2 presents the outcomes of the VSLA programme that were monetized. To avoid double counting of outcomes, only increased income has been used as a proxy for the improved financial position. For the same reason, the ‘Improved living standards’ outcome has not been valued as increased income enabled members to improve their living standards. Only the final outcome – improved health - has been valued as housing, variety of diet, and improved nutrition all lead to this. The different aspects of well-being have each been valued as one third of the overall outcome, as these all represent different dimensions of well-being. Finally, for the children and/ or dependents of VSLA members, long-term improved wellbeing has been excluded, as this is for a large part the result of their improved financial situation, which has been included in the SROI calculation. Moreover, we would likely be overclaiming as many other factors impact their long-term well-being.

A duration period of ten years has been used for the outcomes for VSLA members, and a duration period of twenty years for the outcomes for their children and/ or dependents to acknowledge that the impact on these stakeholders only comes into effect later on, when they finish Secondary School.

Table 2: Key outcomes measured for the VSLA programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Sub-outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VSLA members</td>
<td>Improved financial position</td>
<td>Increased income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSLA members</td>
<td>Improved health – through diet and housing</td>
<td>Improved health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSLA members</td>
<td>Improved wellbeing</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSLA members</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSLA members</td>
<td></td>
<td>Optimism and aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children/dependents of VSLA members</td>
<td>Increase in schooling of children and dependents</td>
<td>Improved long-term financial situation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Outcome calculations: Skills training programme

The social value of the skills training programme has been established by use of financial proxies for four outcomes for the graduates and their children and/or dependents. Table 3 presents the outcomes of the skills training programme that were monetized. Savings and income data have been used to estimate the financial proxy for improved financial position. The other sub-outcomes have not been valued to avoid double counting. The ‘Improved living standards’ outcome has not been valued as increased income enabled skills graduates to improve their living standards. Improved health has been valued and not housing and variety of diet to avoid double counting. Each of the three measured well-being dimensions have been valued as one third of the overall outcome, as these all represent different aspects of well-being. Improved long-term financial position has also been measured, although the impact only comes into effect after three years, when improved financial position is not valued anymore. Long-term improved position for the children and/or dependents of skills training graduates has been excluded, as this is for a large part the result of their improved financial situation, which has been valued. Furthermore, many other factors impact long-term position of the children and/or dependents of the skills graduates.

The benefit period for long-term improved financial situation for skills graduates and their children and/or dependents is twenty years. All other outcomes have a benefit period of ten years.

Table 3: Key outcomes measured for Skills Training programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Sub-outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills training graduates</td>
<td>Improved financial position</td>
<td>Increased income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills training graduates</td>
<td>Improved health – through diet and housing</td>
<td>Improved health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills training graduates</td>
<td>Improved wellbeing</td>
<td>Happiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Optimism and aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills training graduates</td>
<td>Improved education</td>
<td>Improved long-term financial situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in schooling of children and dependents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 Impact considerations

In establishing the impact to be accurately attributed to the REALISE Project, five filters were applied to the financial proxies used in this SROI analysis. These are deadweight, displacement, attribution, drop off and duration.

5.3.1 Deadweight

Deadweight is an estimate of how much of an outcome would have happened anyway even if the activity had not taken place (Nicholls et al., 2012). For example, what proportion of the outcome of improved household wealth experienced by farmer households would have happened anyway if the REALISE project had not been implemented? This is expressed as a proportion and deducted from the outcome.

Deadweight values for all outcomes can be found in the Appendices and are based on benchmarks for similar groups. The values are justified in section 5.5 for the VSLA members and 5.6 for the skills graduates.

5.3.2 Displacement

Displacement can be defined as the relocation of changes from one stakeholder to another. For example, in this SROI analysis, could it be that the increased incomes amongst the VSLA members and skills graduates result in other people seeing decreased incomes, because when VSLA members and skills graduates gain jobs, other stakeholders lose out on those jobs?

In this SROI analysis, the displacement is estimated to be zero percent. Based on interviews with beneficiaries, project staff and local government staff, no displacement of changes occurred as a result of the REALISE project.

5.3.3 Attribution

Not all change created is due to the VSLA programme or skills training; other factors can impact the outcome too. The percentage of each outcome that is due to the programme – the attribution - is therefore estimated. All attribution rates can be found in the Appendices, and they are justified in section 5.5 and 5.6.

5.3.4 Drop-off and duration

Duration (or ‘benefit period’) refers to the length of time an outcome lasts, and can be attributed to the intervention, after the intervention has ended. For example, how long will VSLA participants continue to experience improved living standards beyond the end of the project in 2016 when training and mentoring ceased?

Ten and twenty-year duration periods have been used in this analysis. Stakeholder consultation conducted more than three years after REALISE project activities ceased revealed that they were still experiencing all the primary project outcomes. The project management also projected that VSLA participants and skills graduates would continue to experience these outcomes beyond 10 years even without further interventions. At the time of reporting more than 8,000 VSLA participants and 200 skills graduates were participating in income generating activities and therefore potentially experiencing increased social and economic wellbeing.

Drop off is the rate at which outcomes experienced by beneficiaries reduce each year after the organization’s investment in them ceases. According to Nicholls, Lawlor, Neitzert & Goodspeed in future years the amount of an outcome experienced by stakeholders is likely to be less or, if the same, will be more likely to be influenced by other factors. Therefore, attribution to the organization is lower.

---

5.4 Calculations: VSLA programme

5.4.1 Outcome 1: Improved financial position

The indicator chosen to show that VSLA members experienced an improved financial position is the increase in amount of income that they reported. VSLA members were asked to indicate on a five points scale (from ‘Much better’ to ‘Much worse’) on how their monthly income had changed since participating in the VSLA programme. These answer categories were converted to scores (from 1 to -1) to calculate the change (0.699).

The local partner organisation, UWESO, and ECLT estimated the increased weekly income based on data collected by CBTs, savings and share-out records. This figure was annualized and used as the financial proxy (UGX 104,286).

The annual value per person for increased income was therefore 0.699 x UGX 104,286 = UGX 72,896

Deadweight was calculated by annualizing the change in average nominal monthly household income in the Bunyoro region over the period of 2012/13 to 2016/17.

5.4.2 Outcome 2: Improved health

Change in health was measured by asking VSLA members if their health changed (from ‘Much better’ to ‘Much worse’) since participating in the programme. Their answers were converted to scores (1 to -1) to calculate the change (0.610).

QALYs have been used to estimate the impact of changes in physical health in the SROI model. The QALY value is based on Gross National Income 2013 (GNI) multiplied by two. Multiplying GNI by 2 equals UGX 4,553,586 (based on 2019 exchange rate from USD, amount in current USD = 1,240). Change in physical health is taken as change from ‘severe’ to ‘slight’ in the ‘Pain/Discomfort’ domain from the EQ5D scale, equal to 0.213 QALYs.

The annual value per person for improved health was therefore: 0.213 x 4,553,586 x 0.610 = UGX 591,647

5.4.3 Outcome 3: Improved wellbeing

Three measures were used to operationalize improved wellbeing for VSLA members, namely (i) happiness; (ii) social wellbeing; and (iii) optimism and aspirations. Each of these measures was weighted at 1/3 of the overall value of improved wellbeing.

The SROI survey included questions on changes on happiness, wellbeing and optimism and aspirations. Respondents were asked to rate the changes they have experienced on a scale from 1 to 5, from ‘Much more’ to ‘Much worse’.

Impact of changes in mental health are expressed in QALYs in the SROI model. The QALY value is calculated in the same way as improved health (twice GNI of Uganda) and multiplied by 0.207 which is the change in mental health from ‘severe’ to ‘slight’ in ‘Anxiety / depression’ domain from the EQ5D scale.

Therefore, annual value per person of improved overall well-being = 0.207 x UGX 4,553,586 = UGX 942,592

The (annualized) change in Uganda’s overall score on the Happiness Index of 2013 and 2018 was used as an estimate for deadweight for all three dimensions of well-being.
Estimate of impact of improved optimism and aspirations

VSLA members were asked about change in optimism about and aspirations for the future (from ‘Much better’ to ‘Much worse’) since participating in the savings programme. The scores were converted (1 to -1), and this returned a value of 0.762.

The annual value per person for improved optimism and aspirations was therefore: 0.762 x UGX 942,592 = UGX 718,255.

5.4.4 Outcome 4: Increase in schooling of children and dependents

VSLA members were asked if they had used VSLA money (e.g. borrowing from the group or using VSLA savings) to pay for school fees and equipment for their children/dependents. Almost half of the members (0.458) had used VSLA money for school fees and school equipment. However, this was over all years that they had participated in the programme and did not necessarily mean that they only used VSLA money to pay for school fees and equipment.

VSLA members were asked how many children/dependents of school age were currently in school versus primary school graduates (630 dollars)35, which is UGX 2,313,515, based on 2019 exchange rate.

The financial proxy was calculated by use of the annual financial situation was therefore: 0.023 x UGX 2,313,515 = UGX 718,255.

The annual value per person for increased long-term financial situation was therefore: 0.023 x UGX 2,313,515 = UGX 53,211

The deadweight was calculated by annualizing the change in the rate of people aged 15 and older who finished some or completed secondary school in rural areas between 2012/1337 to 2016/1738.

The full scale was: ‘Much better’, ‘A bit better’, ‘The same as before’, ‘A bit worse’, ‘Much worse’ (Similar answer categories were used for almost all survey questions)

The scores were converted (1 to -1), and this returned a value of 0.762.

Not all children/dependents would have been in the same year of school and they have therefore been equally divided over the 13 years of schooling. As the increase is equal to about 5% of children/dependents, the model uses 5% of 0.458 as the change (0.023)

The deadweight was calculated by annualizing the change in the rate of people aged 15 and older who finished some or completed secondary school in rural areas between 2012/1337 to 2016/1738.

Estimate of impact of improved optimism and aspirations

VSLA members were asked about change in optimism about and aspirations for the future (from ‘Much better’ to ‘Much worse’) since participating in the savings programme. The scores were converted (1 to -1), and this returned a value of 0.762.

The annual value per person for improved optimism and aspirations was therefore: 0.762 x UGX 942,592 = UGX 718,255.

5.4.4 Outcome 4: Increase in schooling of children and dependents

VSLA members were asked if they had used VSLA money (e.g. borrowing from the group or using VSLA savings) to pay for school fees and equipment for their children/dependents. Almost half of the members (0.458) had used VSLA money for school fees and school equipment. However, this was over all years that they had participated in the programme and did not necessarily mean that they only used VSLA money to pay for school fees and equipment.

VSLA members were asked how many children/dependents of school age were currently in school versus primary school graduates (630 dollars)35, which is UGX 2,313,515, based on 2019 exchange rate.

The financial proxy was calculated by use of the annual financial situation was therefore: 0.023 x UGX 2,313,515 = UGX 718,255.

The annual value per person for increased long-term financial situation was therefore: 0.023 x UGX 2,313,515 = UGX 53,211

The deadweight was calculated by annualizing the change in the rate of people aged 15 and older who finished some or completed secondary school in rural areas between 2012/1337 to 2016/1738.
5.5 Calculations: Skills training programme

5.5.1 Outcome 1: Improved wellbeing

Three sub-outcomes were used to estimate the impact of the Skills graduates’ improved well-being: I) happiness, II) self-worth and confidence, III) optimism and aspirations. Each of the three subsets of well-being is treated as an equal indicator for the overall well-being outcome. Therefore, each of the three subsets is weighted at 1/3. All sub-outcomes have the same calculation for the financial proxies and deadweight, but different survey questions are used to measure change (see below).

Impact of changes in mental health are expressed in QALYs in the SROI model. The QALY value is calculated in the same way as for improved health (twice GNI of Uganda). However, it is multiplied by 0.207 which is the change in mental health from ‘severe’ to ‘slight’ in ‘Anxiety / depression’ domain from the EQ5D scale.

Therefore, the annual value per person of improved overall well-being = 0.207 x UGX 4,553,586 = UGX 942,592.

The (annualized) change in Uganda’s overall score on the Happiness Index of 2013 and 2018 was used as an estimate for deadweight for each of the three dimensions of well-being.

Estimate of impact of improved happiness

The skills graduates were asked to estimate the change in their happiness since participating in the training (from ‘Much better’ to ‘Much worse’), and their answers were converted into scores (1 to -1) to calculate the change in happiness (0.833). The annual value per person for improved happiness was therefore 0.833 x UGX 942,592 = UGX 785,179.

Estimate of impact of improved self-worth and confidence

Changes in self-worth and confidence were also measured using a question on a five-point scale (from ‘Much better’ to ‘Much worse’) on how/if their self-worth and confidence had changed since participating in the training. The converted scores (1 to -1) showed a change of 0.841.

Estimate of impact of improved optimism and aspirations

A question on optimism about and aspirations for the future (‘Much better’ to ‘Much worse’) was used to understand change in improved optimism and aspirations. As with the other dimension, the scores were converted (1 to -1), and this returned a value of 0.818.

The annual value per person for improved optimism and aspirations was therefore: 0.818 x UGX 942,592 = UGX 771,040.
5.5.2 Outcome 2: Improved education

Estimate of impact of increase in schooling of Skills training graduates leading to improved long-term financial situation

To estimate change in long-term financial situation, the findings of the survey question on change in monthly income was used (from ‘Much better’ to ‘Much worse’). The converted scores showed a change of 0.667\textsuperscript{44}.

The financial proxy was calculated by use of the annual increase in earnings for people finishing secondary school versus primary school graduates (630 dollars)\textsuperscript{45}, which is UGX 2,313,515, based on 2019 exchange rate from USD\textsuperscript{46}. The Skills training is not technically secondary school, but a) no data was available on the increase in earnings from vocational training, and b) research shows that specialized (vocational) training results in higher earnings than finishing secondary school\textsuperscript{47}, meaning that this is a conservative estimate.

The annual value per person for increase in schooling of Skills training graduates leading to improved long-term financial situation was therefore: \(0.667 \times \text{UGX 2,313,515} = \text{UGX 1,543,115}\).

The deadweight was calculated by annualizing the change in the rate of people aged 15 and older who finished some or completed secondary school in rural areas between 2012/13\textsuperscript{48} to 2016/17\textsuperscript{49}.

5.5.3 Outcome 3: Improved financial position

The improved financial position of the Skills graduates is estimated by two sub-outcomes: increased income and increased savings. The calculations for each sub-outcome are described below.

Estimate of impact of increased income:

Change in income was estimated by asking Skills graduates on a five points scale (from ‘Much better’ to ‘Much worse’\textsuperscript{51}) how their monthly income had changed since participating in the training. These answer categories were converted to scores (from 1 to -1) to calculate the change (0.667).

Skills graduates were also asked how high their income was per month before participating in the training, and how high their current monthly income was, and this was used to estimate the financial proxy. To avoid outliers impacting these findings too much, the median income per person was used (UGX 1,620,000) rather than mean. Median yearly savings were deducted to avoid double counting (UGX 521,429).

The annual value per person for increased income was therefore \(0.667 \times \text{UGX 1,098,571} = \text{UGX 732,747}\).

The deadweight was calculated by annualizing the change in average nominal monthly household income in the Bunyoro\textsuperscript{52} region over the period of 2012/13 to 2016/17\textsuperscript{53}. The 465 children/dependents have been equally divided over 7 groups, each at another stage of primary school\textsuperscript{50}, namely those with 7 years of primary schooling remaining (and thus also 6 years of secondary school remaining), down to 1 year of primary school remaining (and 6 years of secondary school).

The value for the children/dependents only comes into effect once they have finished secondary school. There is therefore a delay in gaining the value which is reflected in the attribution and deadweight values in the Appendices.

The annual value per person for impact of increase in schooling for children/dependents of Skills training graduates was therefore: \(1 \times \text{UGX 2,313,515} = \text{UGX 2,313,515}\).
Estimate of impact of increased savings overall:

Skills graduates were asked to indicate on a five points scale (from ‘Much better’ to ‘Much worse’) how their weekly savings had changed since participating in the training. These answer categories were converted to scores (from 1 to -1) to calculate the change (0.720).

In addition, Skills graduates were asked how high their savings were per week before participating in the training, and how high their current weekly savings were. The median weekly savings per person were annualized and used as the financial proxy for increased savings (UGX 521,429).

The annual value per person for increased savings overall was therefore 0.720 x UGX 521,429 = UGX 375,429. Data from the Global Findex Database54 showed the percentage of young adults (15-24) in Uganda who saved any money in the past year. Data was available for 2014 and 2017; the difference was annualized and used to estimate deadweight.

5.5.4 Outcome 4: Improved health

Skills graduates were asked how/if their health has changed (from ‘Much better’ to ‘Much worse’) since participating in the programme to estimate the change in health. Their answers were converted to scores (from 1 to -1) to calculate the change (0.629).

QALYs have been used to estimate the impact of changes in physical health the SROI model55. The QALY value is based on Gross National Income 2013 (GNI) multiplied by two56. Multiplying GNI by 2 equals UGX 4,553,586 (based on 2019 exchange rate from USD57, amount in current USD = $1,240)58. Change in physical health is taken as change from ‘severe’ to ‘slight’ in the ‘Pain/Discomfort’ domain59 from the EQ5D scale60, equal to 0.213 QALYs61.

The annual value per person for improved health was therefore: 0.213 x 4,553,586 x 0.629 = UGX 610,076

The (annualised) change between 2012/13 to 2016/17 in illness/injury suffered in the Bunyoro region62 was used to estimate deadweight.

---

54 This scale has been tested and successfully used in developing economies before, see for example: B. Robberstad & J.A Olsen (2010) Cost Effectiveness and Resource Allocation https://resource-allocation.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1478-7547-8-1.
6. SROI ratio

6.1 Social value created

The SROI ratio measures the value of the programme benefits relative to the costs of achieving those benefits using a common, and therefore comparable, unit of measurement, in this case the Ugandan Shilling (UGX). It is a ratio of the net present value of benefits to the net present value of the investment. For example, a ratio of 3:1 indicates that an investment of UGX1 delivers UGX 3 in social value.

\[
\text{SROI} = \frac{\text{Net present value of benefits}}{\text{Net present value of investment}}
\]

Using the above formula, the SROI ratio for the Village Savings and Loans Association programme was found to be 12:1; that is, every UGX invested in the VSLA programme yielded about UGX 12 in value for stakeholders. A main reason for this relatively high ratio was the high number of stakeholders that were impacted (21,400 VSLA members and 71,738 children and dependents) with an investment that was even lower than the investment in the skills training programme. The calculation is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: SROI ratio VSLA programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total present attributable value</th>
<th>UGX 6,100,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>UGX 520,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SROI ratio</td>
<td>1:12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SROI analysis of the Skills Training programme also shows a positive return on investment, with a ratio of 2:1. This means that for every UGX invested in skills training, UGX 2 benefits are created. The calculation is shown in Table 5. The skills training programme only reached 240 people, whilst the investment was higher than the VSLA ratio. This is an important reason why this SROI ratio is considerably lower than the ratio for the VSLA programme.

Table 5: SROI ratio Skills Training programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total present attributable value</th>
<th>UGX 1,400,000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investment</td>
<td>UGX 700,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SROI ratio</td>
<td>1:2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Skills Training programme has much lower ratio than VSLA programme, but a more direct impact with regards to avoiding child labour as the Young People themselves are not engaging in child labour anymore. Moreover, as they are all still of a young age, their future is much brighter now, whilst VSLA members were on average considerably older. Also, it is potentially easier to change the norms/views on child labour of these younger people, than of older VSLA members.

The VSLA programme has a lot of positive impact on members (who were almost always women and parents), and generally of an older age, but they could in theory choose not to use their money to send children to school. As such, it has a more indirect impact on reducing child labour compared to the Skills Training programme.
6.2 Sensitivity analysis

A sensitivity analysis was conducted to identify which data and assumptions had the biggest impact on the results. The tables below show the data and assumptions that have the biggest impact on the ratios; they include data and assumptions that, when halved, affect the ratio by 20% or more. Some of the data and assumptions that have large changes on the ratio are as expected. The financial investment in a project, the exchange rate used to calculate investments and outcome values, and the numbers of stakeholders are always likely to have a significant impact on the ratio.

The sensitivity analysis is useful because it helps identify assumptions and data where ECLT may want to conduct extra research in the future. It helps target additional research at the areas that make the most difference to the results. For these SROIs, levels of attribution and attribution drop off have large impacts on the ratio; this suggests that measurement of attribution and attribution drop off are important in this SROI and that this is one area where further work could be conducted to develop the methodology. In addition, the valuation for QALYs, method for calculating mental health, and the change in income for skills graduates also have large effects.

Table 6: Skills Training programme: Sensitivity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Impact on ratio if value is halved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate for 1 US$, as of January 2013 (used for converting the investment in the project)</td>
<td>UGX 2,684.2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLT’s investment the project</td>
<td>UGX 698,965,532.16</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of skills training graduates</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate for 1 US$ as of January 2019 (used for converting financial data for some of the outcomes created by the project)</td>
<td>UGX 3,672.25</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution drop-off for Outcome: Improved long-term financial situation</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportional increase in monthly income</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QALY value (2x GINI 2013 value)</td>
<td>UGX 4,553,585.61</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: VSLA programme: Sensitivity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Impact on ratio if value is halved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate for 1 US$, as of January 2013 (used for converting the investment in the project)</td>
<td>UGX 2,684.2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLT’s investment the project</td>
<td>UGX 516,304,989.10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of VSLA group members</td>
<td>21,410</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exchange rate for 1 US$ as of January 2019 (used for converting financial data for some of the outcomes created by the project)</td>
<td>UGX 3,672.25</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution drop-off Outcome: Improved well-being</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QALY value (2x GINI 2013 value)</td>
<td>UGX 4,553,585.61</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution drop-off Outcome: Improved health</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in mental health (based on change from severe to slight &quot;Anxiety/depression&quot;)</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution level for Outcome: Improved well-being</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This figure shows the change in either direction. So, 50% could represent an increase in 50%, or a decrease of 50%. The magnitude of change is important in this instance, rather than the direction of change.
7. Lessons learnt

The present SROI involves considerable investment in terms of time for desk reviews, two rounds of stakeholder consultations and reporting. The present study was undertaken in under one year. More time and staff allocation would be imperative for future studies.

Communities that ECLT Foundation and its implementing work with usually have low levels of literacy and operate in a low cash economy. As such, it is a challenge to get them to think of the value of project outcomes they experience in monetary terms. Consequently, the evaluation team had to spend extra time and effort to enable the respondents to come to a common understanding of the monetary value they placed on changes experienced as a result of the REALISE project.

The present study found that there are differences in value of outcomes between skills training graduates engaged in different trades, with some (e.g. motorcar maintenance, plumbing and welding) making more money than others (e.g. construction, motorcycle maintenance, hairdressing, tailoring). Furthermore, professions chosen by males (e.g. motorcar maintenance, motorcycle maintenance, plumbing, construction) generally made considerably more money than professions chosen by female participants (e.g. catering, tailoring and hairdressing). Thus, a key lesson learnt in this study is that gender norms play a fundamental role in the heterogeneity of project outcomes. As such, future project efforts should aim to increase female participation in high income trades such as motorcar maintenance, plumbing and welding. The literature shows that when females have higher incomes, they invest more in children and household improvements than male participants. Therefore, a shift female participation towards high-paying trades is likely to improve outcomes for children as well.

Finally, SROI methodology still a new method that has not been used much in developing economies. As such, limited data is available on value of different outcomes. For example, in our study we only value found secondary data for the value of finishing secondary instead of primary education.
8. SROI conclusions, implications and next steps

The VSLA and Skills Training programmes of the REALISE Project delivered positive social returns on investment of 12:1 and 2:1, respectively. The SROI analysis indicates that for every UGX invested in the VSLA programme, twelve times worth of social and economic value was created for VSLA members. For skills training graduates, two times of social and economic value was created for every UGX invested. The positive value created was in the spheres of improved financial position, social and economic wellbeing, health and increased capacity to send children to school. It is worth noting that outcomes such as these may generate other positive changes in the REALISE communities now and in the future, but these are beyond the scope of this analysis.

The present study has four main conclusions and implications. First, based on the results of the current SROI, it is imperative to conduct baseline surveys incorporating the outcomes outlined in this report for future projects. Furthermore, more focus should be towards wider impact than purely economic outcomes as a failure to do so may underestimate the benefits of programmes and lead to under-provision. For example, project impacts on personal wellbeing and health must be incorporated in the design from the start of the programme (not as unexpected/unintended consequence, as is the current case).

Second, the skills training programme has heterogenous effects on participants, based on gender and the type of trade. This study found that trades like welding, plumbing and motorcar maintenance pay significantly more than other trades. Furthermore, the trades sought by female participants, such as tailoring, hairdressing and catering, pay significantly less than those predominantly involving men, such as motorcar and motorcycle maintenance, plumbing and construction. As such, future project efforts must be directed towards increasing female enrollment in high-paying trades, as well as streamlining the number of courses in favor of those that pay better.

Third, the SROI analysis shows that ECLT programmes are working. The VSLA programme has a remarkably high social value ratio compared to the Skills Training programme. If further SROI studies in other countries bear this out, then ECLT might consider prioritising micro-finance programmes like VSLA in the future. However, it is important to highlight that the skills training programme has more direct impact on reducing child labour than VSLA, in that most of the impact goes to the children (who later become young adults) themselves. Hence, one could speculate that the skills training programme has higher likelihood to break intergenerational poverty and may prove to be less costly over generations. Our study also shows that the value per stakeholder is lower for VSLA compared to skills training. However, the Skills training programme has a higher investment and lower reach, and therefore has a lower SROI ratio. Consequently, these trade-offs between VSLA and skills training programmes must be kept in mind in efforts to streamline or prioritize livelihoods programmes.

Finally, this study found that VSLA groups that are located near major trading centres have higher incomes than those that are further away. Furthermore, VSLA participants are predominantly females who have more time to allocate to savings and income generating projects. As such, the benefits of VSLA may accrue to women than men. From a child labour perspective, this may be a good thing, as the literature shows that women are more likely to invest extra income in children’s education and household improvements.

As next steps, similar studies will be carried out in Malawi, Mozambique and Tanzania. A meta-analysis of the findings of in all the programme countries will also be carried out to extract broad trends and salient features of the current programme portfolio. This will form the basis for the streamlining of the Foundation’s package of services. Furthermore, the changes experienced by stakeholders, as outlined in this report, will be integrated in the Foundation’s monitoring and evaluation framework.
8. Annexes

Skills training programme

### Table 8: Skills training programme: total change and attributable change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-outcome</th>
<th>Amount of change per person</th>
<th>Deadweight per person</th>
<th>Total change per person after deadweight</th>
<th>Attribution (credit due to Skills training)</th>
<th>Attributable change per person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change shown by quantitative research</td>
<td>Change that would have happened anyway</td>
<td>Change in outcome minus deadweight</td>
<td>Proportion credit due to Skills training</td>
<td>Total change after deadweight and attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased income</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased savings</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worth and confidence</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism and aspirations</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved long-term financial situation Skills training graduates</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 7Y PS remaining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 6Y PS remaining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 5Y PS remaining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 4Y PS remaining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 3Y PS remaining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 2Y PS remaining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 1Y PS remaining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*YP = Young Person, SS = Secondary School, PS = Primary School

---

### REALISE Project expenditures (inputs) 2013-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Actual direct expenditure</th>
<th>Actual indirect expenditure</th>
<th>Total project expenditure used in SROI calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VSLA</td>
<td>82'540</td>
<td>109'810</td>
<td>192'350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Training</td>
<td>111'740</td>
<td>148'660</td>
<td>260'400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

©ECLT 2018 all rights reserved | Page 39
### Table 9: Skills training programme: Financial proxies and value created

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued sub-outcome</th>
<th>Total change per person after deadweight</th>
<th>Attributable change per person</th>
<th>Financial proxy</th>
<th>Value created per person</th>
<th>Attributable value created per person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in outcome minus deadweight</td>
<td>Calculated in Table</td>
<td>Value of outcome expressed in monetary terms</td>
<td>Financial proxy * Total change per person after deadweight</td>
<td>Financial proxy * Attributable change per person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased income</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>UGX 1,098,571</td>
<td>UGX 637,171</td>
<td>UGX 573,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased savings</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>UGX 521,429</td>
<td>UGX 378,557</td>
<td>UGX 341,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>UGX 969,914</td>
<td>UGX 654,692</td>
<td>UGX 327,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>UGX 942,592</td>
<td>UGX 838,907</td>
<td>UGX 755,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worth and confidence</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>UGX 942,592</td>
<td>UGX 845,505</td>
<td>UGX 761,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism and aspirations</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>UGX 942,592</td>
<td>UGX 824,768</td>
<td>UGX 741,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved long-term financial situation Skills training graduates</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 1,552,369</td>
<td>UGX 1,397,363</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*YP = Young Person, SS = Secondary School, PS = Primary School

**Improved long-term financial situation children/dependents of Skills training graduates**

Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 7Y PS remaining

Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 6Y PS remaining

Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 5Y PS remaining

Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 4Y PS remaining

Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 3Y PS remaining

Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 2Y PS remaining

Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 1Y PS remaining
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Table 10: Skills training programme: Attribution drop off rates per year (excluding children/dependents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued sub-outcome</th>
<th>Total change per person after deadweight</th>
<th>Attribution (credit due to Skills training)</th>
<th>Attributable change per person</th>
<th>Attribution drop off per year of previous year’s amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in outcome minus deadweight</td>
<td>Proportion credit due to Skills training</td>
<td>Calculated in Table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased income</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased savings</td>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.654</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worth and confidence</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism and aspirations</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved long-term financial situation</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>0.604</td>
<td>0.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills training graduates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The attribution drop-off rates for the children/dependents of the skills training graduates are calculated using the formula \( \frac{6}{6+Y} \), where \( Y \) is years in employment. The attribution rates thus reflect that secondary education takes a greater share of the credit (or attribution) earlier on in a person’s career, whilst later in a person’s career the person’s years of experience of work take an increasing share of the credit. For the years in which the children/dependents are still in school, attribution is 0% as they have not started earning money yet.

Table 11: Skills training graduates: Attribution drop off rates per year for children/dependents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued sub-outcome</th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>Y4</th>
<th>Y5</th>
<th>Y6</th>
<th>Y7</th>
<th>Y8</th>
<th>Y9</th>
<th>Y10</th>
<th>Y11</th>
<th>Y12</th>
<th>Y13</th>
<th>Y14</th>
<th>Y15</th>
<th>Y16</th>
<th>Y17</th>
<th>Y18</th>
<th>Y19</th>
<th>Y20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 7Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 6Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 5Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 4Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 3Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 2Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 1Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*YP = Young Person, SS = Secondary School, PS = Primary School

**The attribution drop-off rates for the children/dependents of the skills training graduates are calculated using the formula \( \frac{6}{6+Y} \), where \( Y \) is years in employment. The attribution rates thus reflect that secondary education takes a greater share of the credit (or attribution) earlier on in a person’s career, whilst later in a person’s career the person’s years of experience of work take an increasing share of the credit. For the years in which the children/dependents are still in school, attribution is 0% as they have not started earning money yet.**
### Table 12: Skills training programme: Outcome drop off rates per year (excluding children/dependents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued sub-outcome</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>Y4</th>
<th>Y5</th>
<th>Y6</th>
<th>Y7</th>
<th>Y8</th>
<th>Y9</th>
<th>Y10</th>
<th>Y11-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased income</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased savings</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worth and confidence</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism and aspirations</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved long-term financial situation Skills training graduates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13: Skills training graduates: Drop off rates per year for children/dependents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued sub-outcome</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>Y4</th>
<th>Y5</th>
<th>Y6</th>
<th>Y7</th>
<th>Y8</th>
<th>Y9</th>
<th>Y10</th>
<th>Y11-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased income</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased savings</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worth and confidence</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism and aspirations</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved long-term financial situation Skills training graduates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The outcome drop-off for the children/dependents of the skills graduates are 0% when the children/dependents are still in school, and 100% when they have finished secondary school, as the financial proxy gives the increased earnings per year after finishing secondary school.
Table 14: Present values: Skills training graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued sub-outcome</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Present value per stakeholder</th>
<th>Present attributable value per stakeholder</th>
<th>Total present value</th>
<th>Total present attributable value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people impacted</td>
<td>Value per stakeholder once a discount rate has been applied</td>
<td>Attributable value per stakeholder once a discount rate has been applied</td>
<td>Total value once a discount rate has been applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased income</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>UGX 1,583,351</td>
<td>UGX 1,118,272</td>
<td>UGX 380,004,289</td>
<td>UGX 268,385,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased savings</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>UGX 941,887</td>
<td>UGX 665,226</td>
<td>UGX 226,052,908</td>
<td>UGX 159,654,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>UGX 3,077,628</td>
<td>UGX 553,284</td>
<td>UGX 738,630,677</td>
<td>UGX 132,788,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>UGX 1,550,015</td>
<td>UGX 605,280</td>
<td>UGX 372,003,499</td>
<td>UGX 145,267,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-worth and confidence</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>UGX 1,564,011</td>
<td>UGX 610,746</td>
<td>UGX 375,362,614</td>
<td>UGX 146,578,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism and aspirations</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>UGX 1,522,022</td>
<td>UGX 594,349</td>
<td>UGX 365,285,268</td>
<td>UGX 142,643,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved long-term financial situation Skills training graduates</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>UGX 214,489,556</td>
<td>UGX 6,415,091</td>
<td>UGX 2,039,768,226</td>
<td>UGX 297,997,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Improved long-term financial situation children/dependents of Skills training graduates

| Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 7Y PS remaining | 66 | UGX 43,344,669 | UGX 3,484,122 | UGX 178,340,656 | UGX 9,869,039 |
| Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 6Y PS remaining | 66 | UGX 88,092,842 | UGX 6,662,916 | UGX 178,340,656 | UGX 8,844,020 |
| Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 5Y PS remaining | 66 | UGX 88,833,109 | UGX 5,829,394 | UGX 227,563,647 | UGX 12,053,849 |
| Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 4Y PS remaining | 66 | UGX 89,647,404 | UGX 5,205,962 | UGX 281,708,936 | UGX 15,234,970 |
| Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 3Y PS remaining | 66 | UGX 90,543,128 | UGX 4,726,473 | UGX 341,268,755 | UGX 18,479,068 |
| Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 2Y PS remaining | 66 | UGX 91,528,424 | UGX 4,350,551 | UGX 406,784,555 | UGX 21,853,167 |
| Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 1Y PS remaining | 66 | UGX 92,612,250 | UGX 4,052,220 | UGX 478,851,936 | UGX 25,411,493 |

**Total value**

| Total value | UGX 1,405,060,309 |

*YP = Young Person, SS = Secondary School, PS = Primary School

*The applied (annual) discount rate is 10%

**465 children/dependents of Skills training graduates in total.
### Table 15: VSLA programme: Total change and attributable change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-outcome</th>
<th>Amount of change per person</th>
<th>Deadweight per person</th>
<th>Total change per person after deadweight</th>
<th>Attribution (credit due to VSLA programme)</th>
<th>Attributable change per person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased income</td>
<td>0.699</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social well-being</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism and aspirations</td>
<td>0.762</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved long-term financial situation children/dependents of VSLA members</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 7Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 6Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 5Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 4Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 3Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 2Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 1Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS remaining</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 5Y SS remaining</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 4Y SS remaining</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 3Y SS remaining</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 2Y SS remaining</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 1Y SS remaining</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*YP = Young Person, SS = Secondary School, PS = Primary School*
Table 16: VSLA programme: Financial proxies and value created

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued sub-outcome</th>
<th>Total change per person after deadweight</th>
<th>Attributable change per person</th>
<th>Financial proxy</th>
<th>Value created per person</th>
<th>Attributable value created per person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increased income</strong></td>
<td>Change in outcome minus deadweight</td>
<td>Calculated in Table 10</td>
<td>UGX 104,286</td>
<td>UGX 63,823</td>
<td>UGX 25,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improved health</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UGX 969,914</td>
<td>UGX 547,031</td>
<td>UGX 82,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Happiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UGX 942,592</td>
<td>UGX 760,672</td>
<td>UGX 114,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social well-being</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UGX 942,592</td>
<td>UGX 901,118</td>
<td>UGX 134,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Optimism and aspirations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UGX 942,592</td>
<td>UGX 771,040</td>
<td>UGX 115,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 7Y PS remaining</strong></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 62,465</td>
<td>UGX 4,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 6Y PS remaining</strong></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 62,465</td>
<td>UGX 4,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 5Y PS remaining</strong></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 62,465</td>
<td>UGX 4,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 4Y PS remaining</strong></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 62,465</td>
<td>UGX 4,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 3Y PS remaining</strong></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 62,465</td>
<td>UGX 4,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 2Y PS remaining</strong></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 62,465</td>
<td>UGX 4,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 1Y PS remaining</strong></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 62,465</td>
<td>UGX 4,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain for YP with 6Y SS remaining</strong></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 62,465</td>
<td>UGX 4,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain for YP with 5Y SS remaining</strong></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 62,465</td>
<td>UGX 4,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain for YP with 4Y SS remaining</strong></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 62,465</td>
<td>UGX 4,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain for YP with 3Y SS remaining</strong></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 62,465</td>
<td>UGX 4,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain for YP with 2Y SS remaining</strong></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 62,465</td>
<td>UGX 4,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gain for YP with 1Y SS remaining</strong></td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>UGX 2,313,515</td>
<td>UGX 62,465</td>
<td>UGX 4,627</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*YP = Young Person, SS = Secondary School, PS = Primary School
### Table 17: VSLA programme: Attribution drop off rates per year (excluding children/dependents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued sub-outcome</th>
<th>Total change per person after deadweight</th>
<th>Attribution (credit due to VSLA programme)</th>
<th>Attributable change per person</th>
<th>Attribution drop off</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change in outcome minus deadweight</td>
<td>Proportion credit due to VSLA programme</td>
<td>Calculated in Table 15</td>
<td>Attribution drop off per year of previous year’s amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased income</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>0.564</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social well-being</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.143</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism and aspirations</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18: Attribution drop off rates per year: children/dependents of VSLA members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued sub-outcome</th>
<th>Attribution drop off % (Percentage of attribution remaining for each year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 7Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 86 75 67 60 55 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 6Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 86 75 67 60 55 50 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 5Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 86 75 67 60 55 50 46 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 4Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 86 75 67 60 55 50 46 43 40 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 3Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 86 75 67 60 55 50 46 43 40 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 2Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 86 75 67 60 55 50 46 43 40 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 1Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 86 75 67 60 55 50 46 43 40 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS remaining</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 86 75 67 60 55 50 46 43 40 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 5Y SS remaining</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 4Y SS remaining</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 3Y SS remaining</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 2Y SS remaining</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 1Y SS remaining</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*YP = Young Person, SS = Secondary School, PS = Primary School

*These attributions drop off rates are calculated using the formula 6/(6+Y), where Y is years in employment. Attribution starts in the year that children/dependents are old enough to enter employment. The attribution rates therefore reflect that secondary education takes a greater share of the credit (or attribution) earlier on in a person’s career, whilst later in a person’s career the person’s years of experience of work take an increasing share of the credit. For the years in which the children/dependents are still in school, attribution is 0% as they have not started earning money yet.
Table 19: VSLA programme: Outcome drop off rates per year (excluding children/dependents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued sub-outcome</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>Y4</th>
<th>Y5</th>
<th>Y6</th>
<th>Y7</th>
<th>Y8</th>
<th>Y9</th>
<th>Y10</th>
<th>Y11-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased income</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social well-being</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism and aspirations</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20: Drop off rates per year: children/dependents of VSLA members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued sub-outcome</th>
<th>Y1</th>
<th>Y2</th>
<th>Y3</th>
<th>Y4</th>
<th>Y5</th>
<th>Y6</th>
<th>Y7</th>
<th>Y8</th>
<th>Y9</th>
<th>Y10</th>
<th>Y11</th>
<th>Y12</th>
<th>Y13</th>
<th>Y14</th>
<th>Y15</th>
<th>Y16</th>
<th>Y17</th>
<th>Y18</th>
<th>Y19</th>
<th>Y20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 7Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 8Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 9Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 10Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 11Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 12Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 13Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain for YP with 6Y SS and 14Y PS remaining</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*YP = Young Person, SS = Secondary School, PS = Primary School

These attributions drop off rates are calculated using the formula \( \frac{100}{Y} \), where \( Y \) is years in employment. Attribution starts in the year that children/dependents are old enough to enter employment. The attribution rates therefore reflect that secondary education takes a greater share of the credit (or attribution) earlier on in a person’s career, whilst later in a person’s career the person’s years of experience of work take an increasing share of the credit. For the years in which the children/dependents are still in school, attribution is 0% as they have not started earning money yet.
### Table 21: Present values: VSLA programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valued sub-outcome</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Present value per stakeholder</th>
<th>Present attributable value per stakeholder</th>
<th>Total present value</th>
<th>Total present attributable value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people impacted</td>
<td>Value per stakeholder once a discount rate has been applied</td>
<td>Attributable value per stakeholder once a discount rate has been applied</td>
<td>Total value once a discount rate has been applied</td>
<td>Total present value once a discount rate has been applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased income</td>
<td>21,410</td>
<td>UGX 359,441</td>
<td>UGX 32,983</td>
<td>UGX 7,695,624,970</td>
<td>UGX 706,170,686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved health</td>
<td>21,410</td>
<td>UGX 2,699,589</td>
<td>UGX 79,497</td>
<td>UGX 57,798,205,057</td>
<td>UGX 1,702,025,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>21,410</td>
<td>UGX 1,265,391</td>
<td>UGX 44,040</td>
<td>UGX 27,092,022,018</td>
<td>UGX 942,894,983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social well-being</td>
<td>21,410</td>
<td>UGX 1,515,138</td>
<td>UGX 52,732</td>
<td>UGX 32,439,114,623</td>
<td>UGX 1,128,992,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimism and aspirations</td>
<td>21,410</td>
<td>UGX 1,283,333</td>
<td>UGX 44,664</td>
<td>UGX 27,476,166,266</td>
<td>UGX 956,264,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55,18</strong></td>
<td><strong>UGX 6,130,380,522</strong></td>
<td><strong>UGX 1,247,421,166</strong></td>
<td><strong>UGX 6,130,380,522</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*YP = Young Person, SS = Secondary School, PS = Primary School

**The applied (annual) discount rate is 10%**

**5518 children/dependents of Skills training graduates in total**
1. Are you...?
   - Male
   - Female

2. What is your marital status?
   - Single
   - Married
   - Divorced
   - Widowed
   - Other

3. How many years ago did you join the VSLA programme?
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4
   - 5
   - 6

4. Are you still part of a VSLA group?
   - Yes
   - No

5. Monthly savings

6. Easy of borrowing money
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8. Increase in monthly income

| ++ | + | = | - | -- |

9. New income sources thanks to joining VSLA programme

10. Schooling of children/dependents of school going age – before

| Not in school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| In school     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |

11. Schooling of children/dependents of school going age – now

| Not in school | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| In school     | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |

12. How many of your children finished school?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |

13. Independence

| ++ | + | = | - | -- |

14. Social connections

| ++ | + | = | - | -- |

15. Social security

| ++ | + | = | - | -- |
16. Living standards

[Emoji with ++, +, =, -, --]

17. Since taking part, have you used VSLA money to buy any of the following:

- Radio
- Improved roof of house
- Improved floor of house
- Own/personal mobile phone
- Solar system
- Bicycle
- Motorcycle
- Other...
- Other...
- Other...

18. Health

[Emoji with ++, +, =, -, --]
19. Average number of meals a day

**BEFORE**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOW**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Less than 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Variety of diet/food

![Rating scale with increments]

21. Can you afford to pay for/buy the following for your children?

**BEFORE**

- Visit to a health facility and all the necessary medication
- Participation in school trips or events that cost money
- Children’s books
- Two pairs of clothing for each child
- Own blanket for each child

**NOW**

- Visit to a health facility and all the necessary medication
- Participation in school trips or events that cost money
- Children’s books
- Two pairs of clothing for each child
- Own blanket for each child
22. Future

23. Happy

End
Skills training graduates questionnaire

1. Are you...?

[ ] Male  [ ] Female

2. How old are you?

18  19  20  21  22  23  24  25

3. What is your marital status?

☐ Single
☐ Married
☐ Divorced
☐ Widowed
☐ Other

4. How many children/dependents do you have?

0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8

5. How many years ago did you start the trainings programme?

3  4  5  6

6. Which track did you do?

☐ Tailoring
☐ Brick laying
☐ Welding
☐ Car mechanics
☐ Motorcycle mechanics
☐ Catering
☐ Hairdressing
☐ Other
7. Have you had work related to your training in the past three months (that gave you income)?

☐ Yes
☐ No

8. Have you had any other sources of income in the past three months?

☐ A lot of other income sources
☐ Some other income sources
☐ None

9. Would you have been able to get these income sources without having participated in the training programme?

☐ Yes, all of them
☐ Only some of them
☐ None of them

10. Stability of income

11. Increase in monthly income

12. Savings
15. Self-confidence

16. Social security

17. Living standards

18. Health

19. Variety of diet/food

20. Future

21. Happy
The ECLT Foundation

The ECLT Foundation is committed to collaborative solutions for children and their families that combat the root causes of child labour in tobacco-growing communities.

We advocate for strong policies, share best practices to multiply our impact, and engage rural families so they can benefit from farming while ensuring that their children are healthy, educated, safe from exploitation, and encouraged to reach their full potential.