



# RESPONSE TO INCREASED DEMAND ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES AND CREATION OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES IN UGANDA (RISE) COUNTERFACTUAL IMPACT EVALUATION



Funded by  
the European Union

## EVALUATION CONTEXT

In the Northern districts of Uganda, particularly exposed to underemployment and migration flows of refugees, the RISE project sought to strengthen local authorities and improve economic opportunities of young people in host and refugee communities.

To do so, the RISE project offered youths two complementary trainings: a Technical Short-Term Training (TSTT) and a Financial Literacy and Entrepreneurial Skills (FLES) training. The TSTT were technical (vocational) trainings in different trades delivered for three months in five vocational training institutions (VTIs). The FLES training provided an intensive course on financial literacy, entrepreneurial- and soft- skills for the trainees. The FLES training was delivered immediately after the completion of the TSTT to half of the trainees in three VTIs for two weeks. Due to implementation capacities of RISE, the trainings were originally planned to occur in two cohorts. However, due to low turnout in the first two cohorts, a third cohort was trained to reach the projects objectives.

## UNDERSTANDING THE IMPACT

A counterfactual impact evaluation (CIE) is being conducted to determine program impact. C4ED is conducting a randomised control trial (RCT) in which members of the host communities and refugees were randomly assigned to (i) a first treatment group of trainees that received Technical Short-Term Training (TSTT), (ii) a second treatment group of trainees that received

## QUICK FACTS

### IMPLEMENTING PARTNER

GIZ – Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit

### LOCATION

Northern Uganda (Adjumani, Arua, Madi-Okollo, Obongi Terego, and Moyo)

### METHODS

Randomized Control Trial (RCT)

### TARGET GROUPS

Host communities, refugees, youth, and women

### FINANCING AMOUNT

10 000 000 EUR

TSTT and Financial Literacy and Entrepreneurial Skills (FLES) training, or (iii) to a control group that did not participate in the trainings. As the candidates were randomly assigned to the different groups, they were, similar on average before the trainings and all differences after the training can be attributed to the project.

After baseline data was collected during the registration of the candidates, the trainings took place. To measure the impacts of the project, C4ED started collecting data 6 and 18 months after the end of the training. However, C4ED faced challenges to find respondents: out of a total of 3,300 respondents from two cohorts, 2,129 (64%) respondents were interviewed at midline, reducing the capacity of the study to detect the impacts of the project. Therefore, C4ED has decided to also collect data on the third cohort in addition to the two first cohorts to reach the planned

sample size. The endline will take place between end of 2023 and beginning of 2024.

C4ED also collected qualitative data in the first quarter of 2023 to gain further insight into the underpinning mechanisms which drove the results observed in the RCT. In total, C4ED conducted 50 interviews consisting of in-depth interviews with beneficiaries and employers of beneficiaries, Focus Group Discussion with beneficiaries, Life Histories with beneficiaries and Key Informant Interviews with trainers and officials of the implementing organisations.

## BUILDING ON SOLID FOUNDATIONS

**Counterfactual impact evaluations (CIEs)** are used to identify the attributable effect of a project on beneficiaries. The “counterfactual” is what life would have looked like in the absence of the intervention. Unlike in simple before-and-after comparisons, CIEs provide a way to separate program impacts from other effects. Since we cannot directly observe a counterfactual, we construct a control group using experimental and quasi-experimental econometric methods to estimate program impacts.

**A randomized control trial (RCT)** is an experimental method in which people from an eligible population are randomly selected to receive the program or serve as a control group. Randomization eliminates systematic differences between program recipients and the control group, allowing researchers to estimate the causal impact of the program.

### HOW WILL A CIE INFORM POLICY?

In support of evidenced-based policy making, the outcomes of the Counterfactual Impact Evaluation (CIE) will provide context and insight into the how and why of the impact observed. The evaluation will inform the effectiveness of these interventions in contributing to the achievement of European Union Emergency Trust Fund

Strategic Objective 1. Findings regarding effects by key subgroups will also inform targeting approaches of policies and programs in future. The CIE will contribute to the literature and fill knowledge gaps regarding the effectiveness of vocational trainings to provide graduates with relevant skills for the labour market.

### TIPS FOR FUTURE PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

To increase take-up, C4ED recommends:

- Assisting applicants in the application process,
- Improving communication with applicants (applications outcome, training content etc.)
- Providing services to facilitate attendance to trainings (transportation, accommodation, childcare, etc.)

- Adapt training period to the seasons (i.e. farming obligations, easier access to training centres...)

To monitor the trainings, C4ED recommends designing and implementing a digitalized user-friendly monitoring system (Kobocollect, Survey CTO, Survey Solutions etc.) for tracking attendance to trainings.