



**Behind the Brands
Independent Evaluation
on the Implementation of
Gender and Cocoa Commitments**

**Dr. Ritu Mahendru
2021**

Photo Credit: Dr. Ritu Mahendru

Commissioned by Oxfam's Behind the Brands Initiative (February 2021)

BIOGRAPHY

Dr. Mahendru is a seasoned professional with over 18 years' experience in promoting women's rights and empowerment, preventing gender-based violence and child poverty, and fostering child rights, value chains in rural economic development, social protection and human rights in international development and humanitarian environment. Ritu is a Senior Research Associate at the School of Media, Art and Design of Canterbury Christ Church University. Ritu has worked with several international organizations providing policy and evaluation advise to the WHO, UNAIDS, Save the Children, Plan International, Swedish Committee for Afghanistan, Ethical Trade Initiative as well as government agencies in Southern and Western Africa, South Asia, South-East Asia, Eastern Europe and United Kingdom. Her work has been published in peer-reviewed journals, publications and book chapters, and project reports. Ritu is currently advising UNESCWA on the policies and measures taken by Arab countries and advise on their linkages to gender equality and care economy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my friend and colleague Siobhan Warrington for her valuable inputs and analysis of the data. Our discussions were fruitful and thought provoking. Thank you for reviewing some of the companies' data and providing a much-needed analysis when I needed support the most.

The completion of this report would not have been possible without Dr. Emma Fawcett and Sarah Zoen from Oxfam America who trusted me with this evaluation. Thank you so much for your insights, feedback, and the regular follow up.

I would also like to thank Martha Rainer Opoku Mensah from Oxfam Ghana and Care International for signposting me to some of the key documents.

Last but not least, I would like to thank the representatives of the three companies -- Inge Jacobs, Darrell High, Nathan Bello, and Cathy Pieters -- for providing feedback and recommendations on the analysis. The feedback helped me strengthen this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BIOGRAPHY	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	7
CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION	9
1.1 Purpose of the evaluation	9
1.2 Literature Review	10
1.2.1 Labour and income inequality	11
1.2.2 Access to land and Financial Inclusion	12
1.2.3 Sexual harassment and abuse	12
1.2.4 Women’s Leadership and Participation	12
1.2.5 Health inequities	12
1.3 Evaluation Methodology	13
1.3.1 Semi-structured interviews and identification of documents	13
1.3.2 Desk review and situational analysis	13
1.3.3 How the GAs and APs were scored	14
1.4 Limitations of the evaluation	14
1.4.1 Independent GAs and APs	14
1.4.2 Complex evaluation framework	14
1.4.3 Lack of information in Brands GAs and APs	15
1.4.4 Subjective scoring	15
CHAPTER 2: MONDELĒZ EVALUATION	16
2.1 Introduction	16
2.2 Evaluation of the specific recommendations made to Mondelēz in 2014	16
2.3 Evaluation of recommendations made to Mondelēz relating to other sourcing countries in 2014	17
2.4 Key Observations on Mondelēz’s Gender Assessment for Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana and Action Plans for Côte d’Ivoire	18
2.5 Mondelēz detailed evaluation of the Gender Assessment - Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana	19
2.5.1 Strength of research methodology	19
2.5.2 Gender assessment – coverage of relevant gender issues	21
2.6 Mondelēz detailed evaluation of the Cote d’Ivoire Action Plan	22
2.6.1 Action plan: extent to which key gender issues are addressed	22
2.6.2 Action Plan: Overall Quality	24
2.7 Key Observations on the Mondelēz Action Plan for the Indonesia	24
2.7.1 Action plan: extent to which key gender issues are addressed	25
2.7.2 Action Plan: Overall Quality	26
2.8: Key Observations on the Mondelēz Action Plan for Ghana	27
2.8.1 Action plan: extent to which key gender issues are addressed	27

2.8.2 Action plan: overall quality	29
CHAPTER 3: NESTLÉ EVALUATION	30
3.1 Introduction	30
3.2 Evaluation of specific recommendations made to Nestlé relating to the Côte d'Ivoire cocoa supply chain in 2014	30
3.3 Evaluation of recommendations made to Nestlé relating to other sourcing countries in 2014	31
3.4 Key Observations on Nestlé Gender Assessment and Action Plan for Côte d'Ivoire	31
3.5 Nestlé detailed evaluation of the Gender Assessment for Côte d'Ivoire	32
3.5.1 Strengths of research methodology	32
3.5.2 Gender assessment – coverage of relevant gender issues	33
3.6 Nestlé detailed evaluation of the Action Plan for Côte d'Ivoire	34
3.6.1 Extent to which key gender concerns are addressed	34
3.6.2 Action plan – overall quality	36
CHAPTER 4: MARS EVALUATION	38
4.1 Introduction	38
4.2 Evaluation of specific recommendations made to Mars relating to the Côte d'Ivoire cocoa supply chain in 2014	38
4.4 Evaluation of recommendations made to Mars relating to other sourcing countries in 2014	39
4.4 Key Observations on Mars Gender Assessment and Action Plans for Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Indonesia	39
4.5 Mars detailed evaluation of the Gender Assessment - Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Indonesia	40
4.5.1 Strengths of research methodology	40
4.5.2 Gender Assessment: coverage of relevant gender issues	41
CHAPTER 5: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: GENDER ASSESSMENTS AND ACTION PLANS	43
CHAPTER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK	46
6.1 Observational Recommendations	46
6.2 Operational Recommendations	46
6.3 Technical Recommendations	47
CHAPTER 7: SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE BRANDS	48
7.1. Recommendation for the Brands	Error! Bookmark not defined.
CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION	49
REFERENCES	50

<u>APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY EVALUATION FRAMEWORK</u>	51
INTRODUCTION	55
1. GENDER ASSESSMENT: METHODOLOGICAL CRITERIA	55
2. GENDER ASSESSMENT: ISSUES CRITERIA	59
3. ACTION PLAN (AP): ISSUES CRITERIA	63
4. ACTION PLAN: OVERALL QUALITY	67

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of an independent evaluation carried out by Dr. Ritu Mahendru. The evaluation, commissioned by Oxfam's Behind the Brands (BtB) initiative, provides an analysis of gender assessments and action plans published by Mars, Mondelez, and Nestlé from the top three (3) cocoa producing countries namely Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, and Indonesia.

Oxfam's BtB campaign aims to provide consumers with the information they need to hold the world's biggest food and beverage companies to account for what happens in their supply chains. This specific evaluation focuses on finding out the level of effort companies are making to support female cocoa workers (waged and unwaged). The aims of the evaluation are to assess how socially responsible the companies are in promoting women's rights and addressing structural inequalities by making their reporting transparent on gender rights in cocoa farming through gender assessments (GAs) and action plans (APs). A main component of this commitment is that each of these three companies would publish an impact assessment in one or more sourcing countries to assess the opportunities and challenges facing women cocoa producers in their supply chains. The companies pledged to step up their commitment in this area to enable them to be more accountable and to allow independent observers to judge their progress. The companies committed to publish action plans tied to the results of the gender assessments by 2020.

Consequently, Oxfam commissioned an **independent gender and social expert** to evaluate the GAs and APs produced by the three Brands to analyze opportunities and weaknesses in these documents and identify areas of recommendations to strengthen their current initiatives. A rapid desk review of the literature and a situational analysis were carried out to assess the situation of women in the cocoa sector, as well as the gender commitments made by Nestlé, Mars and Mondelez, which informed the research tools used to interview representatives of the three companies. This also included reviewing whether information/literature is available publicly and if so, what is available. Based on the desk review of the three companies and discussions with Nestlé and Mars, the consultant evaluated only the most recent GAs and APs related to the Brands' gender related projects using the [assessment framework](#) produced in 2014. This approach allowed the evaluation process to be accurate in ensuring the scoring was not abnormally higher or lower. To further clarify, if the consultant had considered every single report and document produced by the companies that refers to gender indicators, it would have affected the overall scoring.

Overall, the Brands are doing significant amount of work to improve the gender realities of many women cocoa farmers on the ground. Despite the shortcoming highlighted in this evaluation, the consultant recognizes and understands the amount of work carried out on a day-to-day basis by the companies to influence the role women in their communities. The purpose of this evaluation report is to review the gender assessments (impact evaluations) and action plans associated to a specific project/program on gender where the companies have publicly demonstrated the impact they have made based on evidence generated by a third party.

All three companies presented consolidated GAs of the three countries, which did not appear to have any connections with the APs produced, nor were they produced in the sequence expected. The evaluation inquiry suggests that the overall quality of Mondelez's and Nestlé's gender assessments has declined in comparison to the 2014 evaluation. While Mars has made significant steps towards mainstreaming gender in its 2020 gender assessment, significant weaknesses remain in addressing the needs of waged and unwaged female cocoa workers.

Gender Assessments	Mondelez	Nestlé	Mars
Brands' average score in 2014 evaluation	4.3	6.5	4.5
Brands' average score in 2020 evaluation	3.1	3.8	6.0

Action Plans	Mondelēz			Nestlé
	Cote D'Ivoire	Indonesia	Ghana	Cote D'Ivoire
Brands' average score in 2014 evaluation	5.8	N/A	5.7	3.8
Brands' average score in 2020 evaluation	5.4	4.3	5.3	4.8

Based on a detailed review and analysis of the 2014 Assessment Framework, a list of indicators and criteria, recommendations, alternatives, and modifications are proposed at the Operational, Technical and Observational levels. The basis of these recommendations is drawn after reviewing each indicator specified in the assessment framework, designed to review the level of effort the three Brands have made to engage women in the cocoa sector. The recommendations suggest using a more practical and simplified menu of indicators to improve public reporting by the Brands on the impact they are making in women's lives in the cocoa sector.

In the consultant's discussions with the Brands and other stakeholders, it was clear that following the 2014 evaluation, the companies have carried out a significant amount of work on gender equality. However, some of this work and data is not available publicly. Therefore, it is the consultant's recommendation that the Brands consciously and willingly make this information available and the data transparent for the purpose of learning, sharing and accountability.

The Brands are suggested to follow the recommendations listed in section 7.1, which highlights the importance of making assessments participatory and transparent, clearly linking it to the action plans. It recommends new areas of engagement for future programming and assessments to promote female sexual and reproductive health, address sexual harassment at workplace, and clearly specifying gender equality and women empowerment related Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and targets in the action plans, which are largely missing in the Brands' GAs and APs.

The consultant concludes that while the Brands have the technical capacity to address challenges faced by female cocoa workers, an explicit focus on women's and girls' lived realities and voices is required in their APs and GAs. It is the consultant's emphasis that if we do not include women and support multi-dimensional pathways for their empowerment, there will not be any sustainable development. There is no single solution to address vulnerability faced by women in the cocoa sector. It requires an intersectional approach ensuring the principles of social inclusion and equity, unpacking gendered and racial power relations to support multiple interventions. If the Brands are seriously committed towards lifting women and their families out of poverty, it is essential that they review their reports through an intersectional feminist lens.

CHAPTER 1: BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

Behind the Brands is part of Oxfam’s Grow Campaign, helping to create a world where everyone has enough to eat. Right now, nearly one in eight people on earth go to bed hungry. Most of these people are farmers or farm workers supplying the same food system that is failing them. Globalization of the supply chains of the Big 10 food and beverage companies has drawn millions of women into paid employment across the developing world. At the bottom of these supply chains many of the small-scale farmers and plantation workers are women. In general, while women’s work in the agricultural sector is fueling valuable export and domestic growth, as well as critical commodities for the Big 10, their jobs are rarely lifting them and their families out of poverty. Instead, women are often systematically denied their fair share of benefits. Addressing (i) the gender risks, and (ii) harnessing opportunities presented in the Big 10’s global supply chains, will require that these companies uphold women’s rights and foster economic opportunities in both the supply chain and their business models – and in particular ensure that suppliers themselves have sustainable and gender fair practices.

1.1 Purpose of the evaluation

In 2013, Oxfam initiated a ground-breaking campaign, Behind the Brands, to challenge 10 of the largest food and beverage companies to improve their economic, social, and environmental performance. This initiative drew the support of almost a quarter of a million advocates and spurred well-known companies to make unprecedented commitments. Following this, in the spring of 2013, Nestlé, Mars and Mondelez committed to address women’s empowerment in their supply chains by introducing measurable actions. Since then, Oxfam has been engaging with companies to ensure that they follow through on their commitments, through the Behind the Brands Implementation Initiative. A main component of this commitment is that each of these three companies would publish an impact assessment in one or more countries to assess the opportunities and challenges facing women cocoa producers in their supply chains. It was agreed that the companies would be sharing their experience of promoting women’s rights and addressing structural inequalities by making its reporting transparent on gender rights in cocoa farming through gender assessments and action plans. The companies pledged to step up their commitment in this area to enable them to be more accountable and to allow independent observers to judge their progress (see table 1). The companies also committed to publish action plans tied to the results of the gender assessments by 2020.

Table 1: Commitments made by Mars, Mondelez, and Nestlé

Company	Commitments
Mars and Nestle	<p>Oxfam (2013) welcomes Mars and Nestle’s commitment to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conduct impact assessments on women in their cocoa supply chains to understand and show how women are faring. Both companies will begin by conducting impact assessment in Cote d’Ivoire, the highest cocoa producing country within the next year but have committed to conducting assessments in the rest of their supply chain in the years following. Impact assessments will be conducted by third party organizations. 2. Put in place a specific action plan within a year’s time that will address issues raised by the assessments and lead to the improvement of poor conditions. Oxfam expects that these action plans will deliver better capacity towards a sustainable livelihood to women farmers and workers, along with stronger corporate policies and practices that encourage women’s empowerment throughout their cocoa supply chain. 3. Work to sign onto the UN Women’s Empowerment Principles. The principles demonstrate the companies’ commitment at the CEO level to the empowerment of women across their entire operations by among other things being willing to measure and publicly report on gender equity. 4. Engage with other powerful actors in the cocoa industry to develop sector-wide programs to address gender inequality. Both Mars and Nestle will work with industry sector organizations like the World Cocoa Foundation

	<p>Specifics on the two companies' commitments can be seen here:</p> <p>Mars: http://cocoasustainability.com/2013/03/mars-chocolate-and-oxfam-america-agree-to-intentional-approach-to-empower-women</p> <p>Nestlé: http://www.nestle.com/csv/ruraldevelopment/women</p>
Mondelēz	<p>Mondelēz confirmed the following commitments:</p> <p>Conducting and publishing third-party impact assessments, including gender-based impacts based on interviews with women stakeholders, via a process of Data Gathering Reporting and Verification measuring the impact of cocoa production on women across the majority of our cocoa supply, starting with Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire by 2014.</p> <p>The Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and approach for this system will be published by July 2013 and our first impact assessment will be published by April 1, 2014.</p> <p>The Cocoa Life Community focus area will have a specific measure addressing women's empowerment: an increase in community-level women's participation in decision-making processes.</p> <p>KPIs addressing other areas where gender differences are relevant will be split by gender. So, for example, farming indicators will measure incomes and productivity by men and women.</p> <p>Producing action plans for our origin countries, and refining our Ghana action plan, to address the most critical obstacles faced by women in the cocoa supply chain.</p> <p>Specifics on the company's commitments can be seen here: https://ir.mondelezinternational.com/news-releases/news-release-details/mondelez-internationals-cocoa-life-extends-its-leadership?ReleaseID=758357</p>

Oxfam commissioned its first [independent evaluation](#) of the three companies' progress on these commitments in October 2014. Six years later, Oxfam has commissioned another evaluation to provide independent and expert analysis of the progress Mars, Mondelēz and Nestlé have made against their gender commitments. This independent evaluation was conducted by Dr. Ritu Mahendru who has expertise in mixed-methods research and evaluations on women empowerment, supply chains and rural development. The evaluation captures the progress of the three companies since the last independent evaluation Oxfam commissioned (in October 2014) – both new impact assessments and progress against the action plans since that time.

This evaluation report includes a rapid review of literature presenting some key challenges faced by female workers/farmers¹ in the cocoa sector. The purpose of the evaluation report is to assess the extent to which:

- 1) Nestlé, Mars, and Mondelēz have made progress on the recommendations listed in Oxfam's independent evaluation in 2014;
- 2) Nestlé, Mars, and Mondelēz have improved their reporting on gender equality through publicly available gender assessments and action plans;
- 3) Formulate further recommendations on how companies might improve their reporting and address women's empowerment in their supply chains beyond 2020.

This report also includes a list of recommendations on improving the 2014 assessment framework.

1.2 Literature Review

¹ Please note that the term female farmer and female worker will be used interchangeably throughout the report

In addition to the key themes (sex-disaggregated data, women in leadership positions, access to credit and resources, working with the government etc.) recognized by Oxfam to measure the impact on women cocoa farmers (Marston, 2016), the consultant has further identified five key thematic areas affecting women in the cocoa sector based on the literature review and interviews with Mars and Nestlé. These thematic areas should be considered by Oxfam and the three Brands to strengthen their commitment when conducting future gender assessments (GAs) and developing evidence-based action plans (APs) using the new evaluation framework. The themes identified below are in some part being included by the Brands and the consultant concludes that, while the Brands have the technical capacity to address challenges faced by female cocoa workers, an explicit focus on women and girls' lived realities and voices is required in their APs and GAs. It is the consultant's emphasis that if we do not include women and support multi-dimensional pathways for their empowerment, there would not be any sustainable development. There is no single solution to address vulnerability faced by women in the cocoa sector. It requires an intersectional (Crenshaw, 1989) and a feminist approach ensuring the principles of social inclusion and equity, unpacking gendered power relations to support multiple interventions (Mahendru, 2014 and Mahendru, 2016). If the Brands are seriously committed towards lifting women and their families out of poverty, it is essential that they review their reports through an intersectional feminist lens. The feminist theory of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989) is central to reconceptualizing gender-disadvantaged positions in different locations, widely used by feminist in African and Asian contexts, the theory lends itself to extension beyond economic and biological fitness. In this context, the social categories of gender, race, and class itself are not the only feature of justice. Other issues such as geography, location, history, disability, sexuality, caste, class, religion etc. influences greater understanding of how inequalities are produced historically and spatially. Intersectionality theory is concerned with discrimination in circumstances where these inequalities intersect at the same time. This framework has been useful in making social inequalities that influence the social and economic status of both women and men visible (Mahendru, 2014). Therefore, it is vital that the private companies take these different disadvantaged positions of women and collect data on the stated categories.

1.2.1 Labor and income inequality

Women in cocoa-growing communities continue to face multiple barriers to their equal participation and remuneration in cocoa production. Evidence suggests that women in cocoa production do most of the physical work, including planting and harvesting. They take on significant and multiple direct roles in the cocoa supply-chain, including crop care, fermentation and drying (Barrientos, 2015). Despite carrying out most of the work involved in cocoa production, women have fewer rights than men, receive less money, and are often landless. It is mostly their husbands who transport the crops to market, receive the money from sales, and end up controlling the income. Despite carrying out 68% of the labor, which involves planting and harvesting, hacking cocoa pods, fermenting, drying and bagging up the cocoa beans - as well as domestic and child care duties at home - women in Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana and Indonesia continue to face significant barriers. For example, in Cote d'Ivoire, they own 25% of cocoa farms and form 68% of the cocoa labor force, yet only earn 21% of the income generated from cocoa production (Marston, 2016). The situation is similar in Ghana, where 25% of cocoa farmers are women and women's work are the most frequently used type of family labor on cocoa farms. In both countries, women have unequal access to credit, extension services and production inputs. Moreover, the International Cocoa Initiative (ICI) Labor Market Research Study found that women cocoa farmers in Ghana struggle to afford hired adult labor due to unequal gender power relations and thus use child labor to compensate (Vigneri and Serra, 2016).

In addition, a BBC report in February 2020, demonstrated that female cocoa workers are paid as little as 23p a day. This figure is well below the extreme global poverty line of £1.40 a day, and average farmer pay rate of 75p a day. As it is women who traditionally look after the household, it means the whole family suffers when they are denied spending power. Often the women do more than two thirds of the work for less than a third of the income. They produce 50% of the food but only manage 10% of the income and only

own 1% of the property. This highlights a gender pay gap in the global chocolate industry, feeding into intergenerational cycle of poverty in countries that produce 90% of the world's cocoa.

1.2.2 Access to land and Financial Inclusion

Women make up a large portion of the cocoa labor and farmers in West Africa. In Ghana, 25% of cocoa farmers are women. However, there is significant underreporting of those figures due to a bias towards farmers being defined by land ownership, from which women are often excluded. A Fair Labour Association study (2014) reported that women had less access to land in Côte d'Ivoire and gender gaps also existed in ownership to additional assets, such as livestock, education and agriculture extension services, financial services, and technology. Female cocoa farmers rarely own the land they cultivate, even if this means they have worked on the same farm their entire lives (International Food Policy Research Institute, 2002). With neither land nor access to capital, women find it difficult to obtain loans or credit, severely limiting their buying power to purchase fertilizers, seeds, etc. which could help increase their yields. Another major challenge that most female farmers face is that women on family farms work without any expectation of earning an income, however, women who do own land are often compelled to hire male labor on their farms (also shown in the Mars GA), thus reducing their net income. This clearly demonstrates the ways in which women face intersectional challenges and are multiply burdened. It is also to be noted that there has not been any significant shift in the trends and the women's situation continues to be disadvantaged.

1.2.3 Sexual harassment and abuse

Sexist attitudes, lower gender status and unequal power relations make women working on cocoa farms more susceptible to exploitation, harassment, and abuse. A study carried out by the University of Sheffield revealed female cocoa farmers in Ghana face widespread exploitation, physical and sexual violence, verbal abuse, and food deprivation (University of Sheffield, 2019). The study further reports that female farmers are disproportionately affected by the labor practices in the supply chain and, in the absence of proper redress and access to justice, women will continue to face social, often intersectional, systematic inequalities. There is very little research available on how unequal gender power relations can make female farmers more vulnerable to exploitation and abuse, especially during a pandemic such as COVID-19.

1.2.4 Women's Leadership and Participation

Many of the existing projects by the three companies focus on community development initiatives. However, little attention is paid in addressing the disadvantages women cocoa workers face in the supply chains. There have been few programs that focus on supporting and enabling women farmers' contribution to the productivity, quality, and sustainability of the cocoa supply chain. Although both women and men contribute to and participate in the cocoa sectors, they do not benefit in equal measure. Unless power differences are challenged, including at the household level, no changes will take place. Changing the terms of women's engagement also requires the enforcement of existing constitutions and laws supporting gender equality and equity, while holding both the public and private actors accountable for complying with them. This is why companies advocating the International Labour Organization (ILO) convention 190 is of high importance. The C-190 explicitly states the importance of supporting women workers who face challenges such as gender-based violence, intimate partner violence and domestic violence at household levels. Women participation and leadership can only be ensured when companies fully support its female workers at home and work (FAO, 2019).

1.2.5 Health inequities

According to a study carried out by Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) (2019) in the African region, over a period of one year, women carried an average of 80 tons of fuel, water, and farm produce; the same study found that men carried only one-eighth of this total, an average of 10 tons over a like for like period. Women carry more weight on their daily walk home from work than men, often with a heavy wedge on

their head and a child on their back, while most men carry only a machete. Over time, the physical nature of daily farm work and labor can cause substantial health risks, which are only exacerbated by poor (or even no) access to health care. In addition, women are at further risks posed by lack of sexual and reproductive health facilities, including the lack of prenatal or postnatal services in rural areas, this exposes women to a high risk of reproductive complications. Similarly, pesticides exposure and the use of personal protective equipment (PPE) by cocoa farmers have been cited as a key area of intervention (Okoffo et al, 2016) for pregnant and lactating women, that should be included in the future GAs and APs of the three Brands. While the Brands have taken measures to improve PPE, especially Nestlé, this still “needs strengthening” to cover both lactating and pregnant women.

1.3 Evaluation Methodology

1.3.1 Semi-structured interviews and identification of documents

This evaluation covers three companies (Mars, Nestlé, and Mondelez), and focuses on countries where the companies both source cocoa and have released impact assessments (Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, and Indonesia). To identify the accurate GAs and APs for each of the Brands, a desk review was carried out with the support of the Oxfam teams in the United States and Ghana. The desk review signposted to literature related to the Brands programming in the Cocoa sector. This included annual reports, progress reports, baseline assessments, impact evaluations and action plans. Further to this, the consultant sought to organize semi-structured qualitative interviews with the three Brands. Several discussions were held with Mars and Nestlé, and the latter's implementing partner (IP), CARE-International. Mondelez was invited to participate in this process; however, we received no response before the report was drafted and key publicly available documents were already identified. Mondelez made requests to be interviewed after the deadline; as such the interview did not take place. Therefore, the key sources of data include seeking primary information from Oxfam America, Oxfam Belgium and Oxfam Ghana, Mars, and Nestlé representatives and Care-International (Nestlé's IP), companies and IPs websites, annual reports, research reports, project initiatives/reports and progress reports. Similarly, the recommendations from Oxfam's 2014 independent evaluation were reviewed against the Brands GAs and APs (where available) to appraise the extent to which they followed the specific advice.

1.3.2 Desk review and situational analysis

A rapid desk review of the literature and a situational analysis were carried out to assess the situation of women in the cocoa sector, as well as the gender commitments made by Nestlé, Mars and Mondelez, which informed the research tools used to interview representatives of the three companies (see section 1.2). This also included reviewing whether the information/literature is publicly available and if so, what is available. Based on the desk review and discussions with Nestlé and Mars, the consultant evaluated only the most recent GAs and APs related to the Brands' gender related projects. This approach allowed the evaluation process to be accurate in ensuring the scoring was not abnormally higher or lower. To further clarify, if the consultant had considered every single report and document produced by the companies that refers to gender indicators in a progress or annual report it would have affected the overall scoring.

The following documents were evaluated using the assessment framework² (also see table 2):

- i) Nestlé's [baseline GA](#) of the [Gender Dialogue Project](#) for Cote d'Ivoire
- ii) Nestlé's 2015 [AP](#) for Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana,
- iii) [Mondelez GA](#) for [Cocoa Life Program](#) for Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana
- iv) [Mondelez AP](#) for Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, and Indonesia
- v) Mars's standalone GA of their supply chain Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, and Indonesia

² Please note that the previous GAs and APs by companies for the 2014 evaluation were not evaluated for this report.

Table 2: Access to/availability of GAs and APs

		Action Plans	Gender
Report	Nestlé	Mondelēz	Mars
Ghana: GA		Consolidated GA – Aug 2019	Standalone consolidated – Oct 2020
Ghana: AP	Consolidated AP – Jan 2015	Consolidated AP – Oct 2018	
Cote d’Ivoire: GA	Baseline – July 2015	Consolidated GA – Aug 2019	Standalone consolidated – Oct 2020
Cote d’Ivoire: GA	Consolidated AP – Jan 2015	Consolidated AP – Oct 2018	
Indonesia: GA			Standalone consolidated – Oct 2020
Indonesia: AP		Consolidated AP – Oct 2018	

1.3.3 How the GAs and APs were scored

The evaluation used the scoring system developed in 2014 by [Dr. Man Kwun Chan](#) for transparency and consistency and to meet the Brands’ expectations. Reflecting the scoring system used for the Behind the Brands Scorecard, each criterion was given a score of 1 to 10 (10 being the best), with different sub-scores allocated for each specific indicator. Performance levels against each criterion were classified as follows:

- A score of between 0 to 3 was classified as “needs strengthening” (color code: red)
- A score of between 3.5 to 6.5 was classified as “fair” (color code: amber)
- A score of between 7 to 10 was classified as “strong” (color code: green).

1.4 Limitations of the evaluation

The consultant faced some challenges while evaluating the GAs and APs. These are listed below:

1.4.1 Independent GAs and APs

Nestlé’s GA was conducted at the project design stage as a baseline study (see table 2). However, it is not clear if there was an impact evaluation of the gender dialogue project after its implementation had begun. Therefore, Nestlé’s GA and AP were evaluated as standalone documents. Similarly, the 2015 Nestlé AP appeared akin to a progress report of the 2014 AP based on some of the recommendations made by Oxfam in 2014.

Though Mondelēz has published APs for the top three cocoa sourcing countries, its Indonesian AP was evaluated as a separate document since there is no data available on Indonesia in the Mondelēz GA.

The Mars GA was also reviewed as a standalone document in the absence of APs. In addition, while the Mars GA covers a substantial amount of relevant information, it does not focus on any specific project or program. It is not an assessment of any project; rather it is a research study of cocoa communities in the top cocoa sourcing countries.

The GAs and APs produced by the three companies are based on their current need or requirement rather than what Oxfam had asked them to produce as part of their commitment.

There is an intended link between GAs and APs. GAs are expected to surface gaps/issues in the companies’ current programs that the APs are then designed to address. Therefore, the GA should come first and, when they are not done in tandem, it undermines the utility of both documents. It is clear from Table 2 that the Brands did not get the sequencing and purpose of these documents right.

1.4.2 Complex evaluation framework

The consultant found the existing 2014 evaluation framework highly complicated. Based on a detailed review and analysis of Oxfam’s Assessment Framework 2014, it was found that the assessment has a list of overcrowded indicators citing similar requirements, which can be grouped together, and not all indicators

are clear and relevant. In addition, some of the indicators needed further conceptual clarity, e.g. clearly defining unwaged female family laborers. It is to be noted that the Independent consultant in 2014 stated that the framework would need further testing. Therefore, on reflection the consultant found limitations in the framework and has made specific recommendations. However, this should be seen as a natural progression, as it is likely that the evaluation framework would evolve. Even though the framework is complex, the 2014 evaluation tool is used for consistency and transparency in how the companies are evaluated, which further allowed comparisons between 2014 and 2020 scores. For further discussion on this, see chapter 6 of this report.

1.4.3 Lack of information in Brands GAs and APs

The Brands' GAs and APs are not detailed enough. The consultant looked for clues and searched other related documents such as progress and annual reports to pass certain criteria as an indicator to score the Brand "Strong" or "Fair". Similarly, the structure of the GAs and APs made it difficult to identify key indicators, which might have introduced some unintended errors.

1.4.4 Subjective scoring

The scoring was added manually into an excel sheet where the score depended on the consultant's opinion and interpretations of the indicator. Where an indicator definition was missing or not clear, the consultant remained self-reflective without undermining the evaluation's reliability and validity, scoring the companies GAs and APs based on her best judgement and publicly available evidence.

CHAPTER 2: MONDELÈZ EVALUATION

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the Consultant’s evaluation of Mondelēz GA for its cocoa supply chain in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana³, and its AP for the cocoa supply chain in Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana, and Indonesia.

The chapter is structured as follows:

- Section 2.2 reports on the list of recommendations made by Oxfam’s independent evaluation in 2014 for Côte d’Ivoire
- Section 2.3 relates to the recommendations relating to other sourcing countries
- Section 2.4 and 2.5 present the detailed evaluation of Mondelēz’s GAs and APs against the common evaluation framework as described in Appendix 1.

2.2 Evaluation of the specific recommendations made to Mondelēz in 2014

Mondelēz has made some improvements since the last evaluation in 2014. Some recommendations made at that time have been taken on board. It is clear from Mondelēz’s reports that it has made efforts to address gaps highlighted by Oxfam. However, only two recommendations have been partially addressed by the Brand (constraints faced by female suppliers in becoming direct suppliers and making a commitment to commission independent reporting of progress) and not enough progress was seen on the recommendations. The key issues that remain unchallenged based on the analysis of the Gender Assessment and Action Plan are: i) predominance of women as unpaid female family labour and unequal share of costs (I2.4.1-5); ii) promoting women as suppliers, iii) addressing gender discrimination experienced by waged workers (I-3.5.1 – 5); iv) information relating to I-2.5.1 – 7 (employment status, sexual harassment and health), v) improving conditions for unpaid female family workers and female waged workers (C3.4 and 3.5). The Brand scored ‘0’ in all the relevant indicators listed to these themes/components.

Below is the list of specific recommendations made by the independent evaluator in 2014 to strengthen the Mondelēz Action Plan. Some of the recommendations are also relevant to strengthening the GA in Côte d’Ivoire. From the seven recommendations made below, Mondelēz has not fully followed up on the suggestions made by Oxfam in 2014. The analysis shows that the Brand needs to make significant efforts and prioritize the female labor (waged and unwaged) agenda to lift them out of poverty and increase their social and economic status. It is the consultant’s suggestion that the Brand follows up on the comments made below and commissions an independent assessment of the Cocoa Life program, ensuring the evidence contributes to learning how several constraints faced by female laborers can be addressed.

Mondelēz has not fully met any of the recommendations made in the 2014 evaluation. These have been marked in Table 3 below. Oxfam recommended Mondelēz to strengthen/supplement its existing AP for Côte d’Ivoire in the following areas:

Table 3: Evaluation of the specific recommendations made to Mondelēz in 2014

Recommendations from 2014	Consultant’s comment
MC-R-1a Collection of relevant information on female waged labor (i.e., information relating to I-2.5.1 – 7), and consultation with a wider range of relevant stakeholders (i.e., information relating to I-1.3.1- 8).	The Brand has not met this recommendation and scored “2” out of 10 for information relating to I-2.5.1 – 7 and “1.5” out 10 for information relating to I-1.3.1- 8 in the assessment criteria. The Brand needs significant strengthening in these areas.

³ While the GA claims that it carried out an assessment of Indonesia no data from this country was presented in the report. Hence, the consultant did not evaluate this.

MC-R-1b Expand the data gathering/assessment of intra-household impacts to take place to cover all areas outlined in I-2.4.1 – 5.	The Brand has not met this criterion fully. The 2014 recommendation suggested the Brand was to collect data on the “predominance of women as unpaid female family labor & unequal share of costs”. However, the Brand has scored “1” out of 10 and needs significant strengthening to ensure this issue is dealt with. The Brand also scored “1” under this criterion in the 2014 evaluation. While there was some literature provided in this category in the 2014 evaluation, the Brand did not provide data related to female family workers. However, the 2018 gender assessment collected quantitative data, for both Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana, on the women’s role in making decisions about children’s education, and who holds responsibility for making major purchases and control over their own income. However, no direct link between these and unpaid female family workers was drawn.
MC-R-1c Add an additional activity area to address underlying reasons for women’s lack of participation as direct suppliers and as members of cocoa producer groups, in particular women’s weak access/rights to land and cocoa trees. I2.2.1 – 5.	One of the specific recommendations made to the Brand included collecting data on “Women’s lower participation as direct cocoa suppliers”. However, the Brand has scored “0” out of 10 in this category. This is significantly lower than the 5.5/10 score that the Brand had achieved in the previous evaluation.
MC-R-1d In order to improve the distribution of costs and benefits to unpaid female family workers, strengthen relevant existing activity areas to ensure that key elements outlined in I-3.4.1 – 3 are addressed.	The Brand has scored “0” under this category in its 2018 assessment. This score is similar to what Mondelez scored in the 2014 evaluation.
MC-R-1e Add an additional activity area to address gender discrimination experienced by waged workers, covering key elements outlined in I-3.5.1 – 5.	Mondelez has scored “0” under this category. Please refer to the evaluation of C-3.4 and C3.5 in section 2.6.
MC-R-1f Review and strengthen the gender KPIs to ensure that progress in improving conditions for unpaid female family workers and female waged workers is captured (i.e., reflecting issues outlined in C-3.4 and C3.5).	
MC-R-1g Add an explicit commitment to commission independent assessment(s) and carry out public reporting of progress, outcomes and impacts of the AP specifically.	The Brand commissioned an assessment through an external party, IPSOS, to carry out the gender assessment. However, it seems from the publicly available document that the assessment was not carried out and written independently by IPSOS.

2.3 Evaluation of recommendations made to Mondelez relating to other sourcing countries in 2014

In 2014, Oxfam made specific recommendations to Mondelez when commissioning future GAs in other cocoa sourcing countries. It was advised that Mondelez should take significant measures to ensure the quality of the gender research and assessment by addressing key gaps/weaknesses in the Côte d’Ivoire assessment. These include the following:

Table 4: Evaluation of recommendations made to Mondelez relating to other sourcing countries in 2014

Recommendations from 2014	Consultant’s comment
MC-R-2a Ensure full independence of the research team. Whilst implementation partners could play an important role as key informants and help facilitate the research process, the research team should be led by an individual/organization which is fully independent from Cocoa Life and Mondelez	Mondelez commissioned the research to an independent agency IPSOS. However, it appears that the GA report was jointly written and researched by Mondelez and IPSOS. It is the consultant’s advice to specify the role of each agency involved in carrying out the gender assessment for the purpose of clarity.
MC-R-2b Give greater attention to recruiting a research team with the full mix of skills and field experience required to conduct the GAs effectively, including in particular knowledge/experience in supply chain labor standards and familiarity with the concerns of unpaid female family labor	IPSOS seems to have reasonable expertise in gender/social development, smallholder agriculture, global agricultural supply chains and key stakeholder engagement at the institutional level. Although the researcher seems to have these skills, their role and note on professional background is missing in the report.

MC-R-2c Provide more detailed guidance to researchers on the desired scope of the gender assessment	It is not clear if this recommendation was taken on board.
MC-R-2d Ensure that the scope of the GAs reflects the entire supply chain, and not only those communities directly involved in Cocoa Life	The scope of the AP is entirely limited to Cocoa Life communities/beneficiaries. However, public commitments made in Cocoa Life Guidance document indicate that, by 2022, Cocoa Life will reach the majority of Mondelēz. It also appears that the Brand has made explicit commitments to reach communities beyond the Cocoa Life program.
MC-R-2e Build in consultation with a wider range of stakeholders (see MC-R-1a) as part of the research methodology	While Mondelēz included and consulted various representatives and stakeholders in the Village Savings and Loan Associations (VSLA) and livelihood training in the Cocoa Life Programme, the baseline assessment failed to engage or demonstrate the involvement of different stakeholders since the assessment process. Mondelēz should have followed the stakeholder mapping to draw out a proper study sample to collect data from different population groups, especially identified in the theory of change.
MC-R-2f Disaggregate information by women's employment status	No data was collected on employment status or gender differences. This recommendation also relates to the criteria on 'Predominance of women as unpaid female family labour & unequal share of costs.' Unfortunately, the Brand has not met this recommendation.

2.4 Key Observations on Mondelēz's Gender Assessment for Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana and Action Plans for Côte d'Ivoire

Overall, Mondelēz International's GA is fair (albeit leaving considerable room for improvement) with 41% of the criteria rated as "fair" or "strong". The Brand has the potential to make a significant contribution in promoting gender equality within Mondelēz International's cocoa supply chain in Côte d'Ivoire. Having said this, the consultant recognizes company's efforts to generate data from Indonesia reflected in [Cocoa Life: Impact In Indonesia Outcome Assessment Report](#) (Jones et al, 2015) and a case study published in the International Finance Corporation's (IFC) 2016 report on [Investing in Women along Agribusiness Value Chains](#).

The Gender Assessment achieved an average score of 3.14/10 ("needs strengthening") as compared to their last report in 2014, which was 4.3/10, with 4 (33%) of the criteria scored as "fair", 1 (8%) criteria as "strong" and 7 (58%) as "needs strengthening". The Brand has made significant improvements in areas where it appeared weak in the 2014 evaluation. For example, Mondelēz was scored "fair" in "Gender assessment – strength of research methodology" in 2014 and have scored 7/10 in the current evaluation. Significant progress was also seen in the criteria for "underlying gender inequalities," where the Brand's score went up to 6.25/10 as compared to 3.5/10 in 2014. Despite these achievements the overall quality of the GA has significantly declined and several weaknesses exist, including insufficient attention given to 'unpaid female family labor' and the lack of concrete and substantive evidence provided towards the recommendations made in 2014 (see table 3 and 4). Thus, it is the consultant's view that the assessment is not robust enough and the GA does not include all the information required to evaluate its quality and progress on Mondelēz's commitments towards improving gender equality and female empowerment. The Brand needs significant evidence for learning and impact in Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana for the following areas:

1. Women's lower participation as direct cocoa suppliers
2. Female direct suppliers' poorer access to production inputs
3. Engagement of stakeholders in the GA at the design and implementation stage
4. Predominance of women as unpaid female family labor & unequal share of costs
5. Female waged labor - discriminatory employment practices
6. Lack of gender mainstreaming in community development interventions

The Action Plan achieved an average score of 5.4 (“fair”), with 46% of the criteria scored as “strong”, 31% scored as “fair”, and 23% scored as “needs strengthening”. Notable strengths of the AP include: extent to which gender concerns are addressed (I-3.1.1-7), improving female direct suppliers’ access to production inputs (I-3.3.1-7), and mainstreaming gender in community development programs I-3.6.1-7). Overall, the consultant’s view is that the AP constitutes a well-considered and relatively comprehensive plan that has the potential to make a significant contribution to improving gender equality in Mondelēz’s supply chain in Côte d’Ivoire. Nevertheless, there are several important gaps that need to be addressed including: improving distribution of costs and benefits for unpaid female family workers (C-3.4) and addressing gender discrimination experienced by waged workers (C-3.5).

2.5 Mondelēz detailed evaluation of the Gender Assessment - Côte d'Ivoire and Ghana

2.5.1 Strength of research methodology

Evaluation criteria and indicators

1.1 Experience, skills, and qualities of research team	7 (10)
I-1.1.1: It is not clear if the IPSOS wrote the report independently. Although IPSOS was brought on board to carry out the GA. It appears it was researched and developed with Mondelēz Evaluation Leads.	1 (2)
I-1.1.2: Reasonable expertise in gender/social development, smallholder agriculture, global agricultural supply chains and key stakeholder engagement at the institutional level. Although the researcher seems to have these skills, it is not specified in the report.	2 (2)
I-1.1.3: The external agency seems to have the relevant experience and expertise in the smallholder agriculture sector.	1.5 (1.5)
I-1.1.4: The external agency seems to have the relevant experience and expertise in global agricultural supply chains	0.5 (1.5)
I-1.1.5: It is not clear if stakeholders were consulted. Also see I.1.3.1-1.3.8.	0.5 (1.5)
I-1.1.6: The external agency seems to have the relevant experience and expertise in the supply chain labor conditions	1.5 (1.5)
1.2 Data collection methods used	4 (10)
I-1.2.1 and I.2.2.4: No desk review was presented. The study collected very limited quantitative data from the field research.	0 (4)
I-1.2.2: It appears that the researcher used qualitative research methods. However, it is not clear whether the limited data generated was from FGDs or interviews.	1 (2)
I-1.2.3: Not clear as if ethical considerations were observed. There is no reference to interviewee safety or confidentiality in report.	1 (2)
I-1.2.5: Collected a baseline to build a profile of women in cocoa farming communities. The data presented in the report is baseline data.	2 (2)
1.3 Range of respondents/stakeholder views consulted	1.5
I-1.3.1: It is not clear if women cocoa farmers who are direct [registered] suppliers to the Brand's cocoa supply chain were consulted. There is no reference to the term 'suppliers' in report. 'Women in cocoa farming communities' were interviewed.	1 (2)
I-1.3.2-4 & I.3.3.6-8: It is not clear if female unpaid laborers were consulted. There is no reference to this category in report.	0 (7)
I-1.3.5: Men were consulted e.g. there is quote from a male farmer. However, qualitative data presented is limited and it is not clear how many men were consulted.	0.5 (1)
1.4 Strength of analytical framework and presentation of findings	6 (10)
I-1.4.1: The GA has presented a very strong analytical framework as part of their theory of change	2.5 (2.5)
I-1.4.2: The GA has clearly identified a very strong analytical framework. However, not sure if this was context or location specific as per the indicator's definition	1 (2.5)
I-1.4.3: While the data was presented with clarity and used a conceptual and analytical framework, it is limited.	2.5 (5)
1.5 Geographical scope of assessment	3 (10)
I-1.5.1: Report includes data from the top two sourcing countries: Ghana, and Cote d'Ivoire.	3 (3)
I-1.5.2-4: The assessment does not include the sample size. Therefore, it is not possible to assess the number of farmers representing a significant proportion of the Brand's total cocoa supply chain within the focus country	0 (7)
1.6 Robustness of assessment of any on-going activities and achievements	4 (10)
I-1.6.1: The GA relates to the Cocoa Life Program and it is clear that VSLA and Livelihood Training activities were assessed. However, it is not clear if there is any attempt to assess gaps and limitations of the training.	4 (4)
I-1.6.2-3: This is the first in a line of several GAs that the Brand wants to carry out on Ghana. The Brand has clearly stated that the analysis conducted may not be sophisticated. However, it aims to establish an understanding of which interventions work and the ones that do not. While findings have been presented, no recommendations were made.	0 (6)

2.5.2 Gender assessment – coverage of relevant gender issues

Evaluation criteria and indicators

2.1 Underlying gender inequalities	6.25 (10)
I-2.1.1 & 2.1.5: Such detailed information may have been collected but not presented in the GA.	0 (2.5)
I-2.1.2: Country specific top-level literacy related data was presented. This included recording data on 'no formal education' received for both countries. For example, 65% of the women did not receive formal education in Cote D'Ivoire and 30% in Ghana.	1.5 (1.5)
I-2.1.3: Data on decision-making roles and negotiating power at household and community level was collected using the multi-dimensional women's empowerment framework. However, data presented was limited.	1.5 (1.5)
I-2.1.4: Majority of the women reported in two countries contributed to the household income and feel their work is valued e.g. 91% in Côte d'Ivoire and 76% in Ghana "contributes to household income". However, gender differences on this indicator were not recorded.	0.75 (1.5)
I-2.1.6: The Cocoa Life program trained women on learning new skills, such as soap-making and beekeeping, which they have leveraged into new income generating sources managed by the group. However, no data on food security and nutrition was presented.	0.5 (1)
I-2.1.7: The GA mentioned and provided data on community cultural norms, women's self-perception, and women's objective reality focusing on issues around self-confidence, worthiness, woman's role in a household, freedom to express opinions etc.	2 (2)
2.2 Women's lower participation as direct cocoa suppliers	0 (10)
I-2.2.1-5: GA does not address underlying constraints preventing women from becoming direct suppliers/group members or from taking up leadership positions	0 (10)
2.3 Female direct suppliers' poorer access to production inputs	3 (10)
I-2.3.1: No gender-disaggregated data was collected.	0 (4)
I-2.3.2: The GA mentioned and provided data on the cultural norms of a woman's community, her self-perception and her objective reality focusing on issues around self-confidence, worthiness, woman's role in a household, freedom to express opinions etc. However, it did not explicitly state these as constraints on women's access to training and extension. Some women are able to access training through Cocoa Life, but baseline assessment did not appear to link participation in Cocoa Life activities (savings/training) with women's empowerment.	1 (2)
I-2.3.3: The Cocoa Life Program focuses on VSLA training and establishing them at community level for women, which will allow them to access credit and savings for income generation purposes. However, the GA did not assess the impact of this activity. "For both VSLAs and livelihoods training, impact is limited by the membership capacity of the groups".	1 (2)
I-2.3.4: The GA mentioned and provided data on the constraints faced by women at individual, household and community levels that restrict their access to labor. However, the study failed to make an explicit link between 'access to labor' and 'multi-dimensional challenges' faced by women at all levels.	1 (2)
2.4 Unpaid female family labor: predominance & unequal distribution of benefits	1 (10)
I-2.4.1-4: There was no mention of the type of labor and the study did not focus on unpaid female family workers.	0 (8)
I-2.4.5: The GA has collected quantitative data for both countries on three indicators, which include decisions about children's education, responsibility for making major purchases and control over women's own income.	1 (1)
2.5 Female waged labor: discriminatory employment practices	2 (10)
I-2.5.1-4 and 2.5.6: The GA has not collected information on the type of employment. No data on gender discrimination in pay and conditions were reported in the GA. The GA did not collect data on the nature of any health and safety concerns that specifically affect women workers.	0 (7.5)
I-2.5.5: The GA has presented quantitative data on women's ability to move around without harassment at community level. However, the data provided is limited.	1 (1.5)
I-2.5.7: The GA has clearly identified the gender concern related to the study in their Theory of Change.	1 (1)
2.6 Lack of gender mainstreaming in community development interventions	0 (1)

I-2.6.1-4: While the GA of the Cocoa Life Program make reference to baseline and states that it has built "built a set of indicators for women cocoa farmers, women in cocoa farming households and communities, and for the wider community", it is not clear what these indicators are. It is also not clear if women were effectively consulted in initial needs assessment and whether appropriate targets are set for gender participation in all relevant activities.	0 (10)
---	--------

2.6 Mondelēz detailed evaluation of the Cote d'Ivoire Action Plan

2.6.1 Action plan: extent to which key gender issues are addressed

Evaluation criteria and indicators

C-3.1: Extent to which key gender concerns are addressed		8 (10)
I-3.1.1	Since 2016 the Brand has provided 2600 community members with training on women's empowerment. AP does not refer to any specific training but does refer to sensitizing women and men farmers to the importance of passbooks and land ownership.	1 (2)
I-3.1.2	From the AP, it appears that the Brand did train community members (see I.3.1.1). However, it is not clear if these members included women cocoa farmers. Since the Brand initiated training on gender and gender transformative approaches, it can be assumed that gender discrimination might have been covered in the training.	1 (2)
I-3.1.3-7	The AP has a clear specific objective to tackle the issue of land ownership in their Cocoa Life Program through increased "women's access to training, farm inputs & access to land/land ownership" along with specific action of increasing women's access to passbooks. Under the Youth theme, Mondelēz has clearly highlighted youth education as a priority area. It committed to "support literacy programs through reading clubs and community centres in collaboration with Cote d'Ivoire's Education Ministry." The Brand encourages financial inclusion of local development policies in general but not specific to a country, it is not clear if they were at suppliers' level or community level. The Brand has set some specific objectives and activities to "ensure inclusion of women in environmental programming, particularly against deforestation and for the preservation of forest resources", to better mainstream gender into core standards/policies and implement gender-specific programs. It would also mean working with government extension services and exploring collaboration with UN agencies and others. While it's not clear what specific advocacy efforts were made, Mondelēz has partners with Ministry of Women, Children, and Solidarity Social Protection on gender awareness and women's empowerment in Côte d'Ivoire. Similarly, it as an action point Mondelēz commits to form partnerships with UN agencies such as UNDP and UN Women in support of strengthened gender-transformative environmental programming.	6 (6)
C-3.2: Improving women's participation as direct cocoa suppliers		4.5 (10)
I-3.2.1 & I-3.2.3:	The 2018 AP has listed some women empowerment activities, including engaging women in decision-making process. However, there is no clear target or a KPI that states that the Brand will proactively source from producer co-operatives or groups where women make up a high proportion of membership and/or are well represented in leadership positions/roles. The AP does not include any explicit activities and targets to promote women as direct suppliers. Though it is believed that the financial inclusion, land ownership and promotion of women as leaders activities can contribute towards women become as active agents, it is unclear if this was the outcome that AP expects to achieve.	0 (4)
I-3.2.2 & I-3.2.4:	Under the community theme, Mondelēz commits to ensure women are equally represented in leadership positions at the committee levels such as the chairperson. Similarly, it aims to "promote leadership positions for women as part of the Community Development Committees and Community Action Plan processes and include a floor of 30% (at least) for women in the process". The 2018 AP has a clear objective to increase women's access to land as owners through training. It includes sensitizing both women and men as farmers on the importance of land ownership. It is assumed that the training content covers encouraging men to give a share of their land/cocoa trees to their wives.	3 (3)

I-3.2.5: Women are undoubtedly are being encouraged to take up leadership position in several community groups. While it is not explicitly mentioned if they are encouraged to hold these positions with producer groups, it is assumed that this is one of the activities of the program	1.5 (3)
C-3.3: Improving female direct suppliers' access to production inputs	7 (10)
I-3.3.1: The 2018 AP has a clear objective and related actions to Increase women's access to training and farm inputs.	1.5 (1.5)
I-3.3.2: While the Brand works in partnership with government agencies, it can be assumed that this would translate into government capacity and awareness of the constraints faced by female farmers.	1.5 (1.5)
I-3.3.3: The AP states several activities to increase female participation. It aims to "promote leadership positions for women as part of the Community Development Committees and Community Action Plan processes and include a floor of 30% (at least) for women in the process."	1 (1)
I-3.3.4: There is no specific reference to women-friendly training methods however there are indications that training is being developed specifically for women. The AP commits to a review of all current farm-training materials to ensure that they are best in class for gender and environment and are inclusive for illiterate farmers. And there is a commitment to improve cocoa production training specifically for female farmers and women working on the farms.	1 (1)
I-3.3.5 & I-3.3.8 - 11: It is not clear if female extension and training officers were recruited. There is no mention of health & safety in the AP. It does not make any reference to PPE.	0 (3)
I-3.3.6: There are no specified targets/quotas for women in credit/input schemes while this is listed as a key objective with useful sub-activities.	1 (2)
I-3.3.7: It is clear that the credit schemes are women-friendly. The four actions listed are gender-sensitive.	1 (1)
C-3.4 Improving distribution of costs and benefits for unpaid female family workers	2 (10)
I-3.4.1-2 & 3.4.4: The AP aims to develop and offer a financial scheme for women entrepreneurs to access credit and saving opportunities along with promotion/sensitization activities. However, there is no mention of unpaid female family workers in the AP. There is no mention in the AP about sharing and/or equitable distribution of any profits and benefits from Cocoa farming between women and men.	0 (8)
I-3.4.3: Women were encouraged to register as farm owners. The AP clearly states an action to "increase women's access to passbooks as a critical enabler to be recognized as cocoa farmers, and access to inputs and resources"	2 (2)
C-3.5 Addressing gender discrimination experienced by waged workers	0 (2)
I-3.5.1-5: Mondelēz commits to enhance female farmers health and have listed achievements (%) in the program's annual report. However, there is no mention of sexual harassment in the AP and any other publicly available document related to the program. There are no objectives, activities, and targets on establishing grievance mechanism for women in the AP.	0 (2)
C-3.6 Mainstreaming gender in community development programs	7.5 (10)
I-3.6.1-4, I-3.6.6 and I-3.6.8: It is clear that the program was set up to generate awareness on gender amongst individual, household and community levels. Therefore, it can be said that some measures were put in place to mainstream gender. The AP also aims at promoting gender transformative approaches, which is a key gender-mainstreaming component. The AP on p13 does reference training for Cocoa Life Team and partner staff on gender programming and mainstreaming. In addition, under the Youth theme, the AP stated a clear action to "explore innovative new gender transformative programs through existing and new partners." There is clear objective on Mondelēz's 2018 AP to increase women's access to "finance and development of additional livelihoods". Similarly, the AP states "strengthening the participation of women in decision-making roles and extending opportunities for women to access knowledge, skills, productive resources and income". The Brand is committed to promote and support the development of financial services for women. This includes "developing and offering a financial scheme for women entrepreneurs to access credit and saving opportunities along with promotion/sensitization activities." The AP also refers to include "financial products tailored to women's needs."	7 (8)
I-3.6.5: Mondelēz realized that sustainability and household resilience in cocoa farming communities does not depend on cocoa alone. And while infrastructure is not clearly mentioned, the Brands aim to promote community development plans and processes. This can include, as stated in the annual report, transport infrastructure, safe drinking water. This has been highlighted a learning in the annual report and it important to see this commitment reflected in the next AP.	0.5 (1)
I-3.6.7: There is no mention of any additional support services.	0 (1)

2.6.2 Action Plan: Overall Quality

Evaluation criteria and indicators

C-4.1: Does the AP address the GA's recommendations?	5 (10)
A GA was carried out in 2018 (published in 2019), there appears to be a link between this and the 2018 AP. The research agency (IPSOS) who undertook the GA developed a multi-dimensional Women's Empowerment framework which has informed evaluation and the development of a theory of change. There is, however, no explicit reference to any specific recommendations in the GA reviewed.	5 (10)
C-4.2: Does the AP include new or strengthened commitments/activities?	10 (10)
The AP includes new and strengthened commitments and activities towards gender equality, by increasing women's access to a range of resources and ensuring they are included in decision-making in different arenas.	10 (10)
C-4.3: Are individual actions robust, appropriate, and sustainable?	7 (10)
I-4.3.1-2: The actions listed are concrete and achievable but are not time-bound. Only 4 out of 17 actions are linked to specific results/targets.	2 (5)
I-4.3.3-4: The actions listed are likely to achieve the desired development impacts. The Brand takes a community level approach to its initiatives with a focus on sustainability.	5 (5)
C-4.4: Are adequate monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment mechanisms included?	1 (10)
I-4.4.1 Mondelēz is putting concerted effort into addressing the challenge relating to the lack of gender-disaggregated data, however there are no specific references to baseline data in this AP.	1 (2.5)
I-4.4.2 It is not clear from the AP how progress against key gender-related performance indicators will be measured	0 (2.5)
I-4.4.3 There is no detail on review mechanisms or commitment to address under-performance	0 (2.5)
II-4.4.4: There is no indication of a provision for an external assessment of the AP's outcomes and impacts.	0 (2.5)
C-4.5: Consultation with relevant external stakeholders	5 (10)
I-4.5.1-2: It is clear that Mondelēz will be working in partnership with the government on a number of activities and it is therefore assumed this is a result of consultation with those relevant stakeholders. The AP does not mention any mechanisms for ensuring regular consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the implementation of the plans	5 (10)
C-4.6: Transparency and dissemination of gender-related learning	6 (10)
I-4.6.1: Key documents related to the Cocoa Life program are available covering the reporting of activities.	6 (6)
I-4.6.2: There is no specific mention of any gender advocacy efforts with other Brands and stakeholders	0 (4)
C-4.7: Proportion of cocoa supply chain covered by proposed interventions	8 (10)
I-4.7.1: All gender-focused activities in the AP appear to cover the whole CL program in Cote d'Ivoire. The AP states that CL operates in 453 communities and has helped to form 653 women's groups across those communities.	2.5 (2.5)
I-4.7.2: The scope of the AP is entirely limited to Cocoa Life communities/beneficiaries. However, public commitments made in Cocoa Life Guidance document indicate that, by 2022, Cocoa Life will reach the majority of Mondelēz. It also appears that the Brand has made explicit commitments to reach communities beyond the Cocoa Life program. AP reports that Cocoa Life advocates for women's empowerment through engagement with governments and local communities, e.g., exploring innovative new gender transformative programs through existing and new partners.	1.5 (2.5)
I-4.7.3 The 2018 Mondelēz Action Plan includes for the first time, Indonesia and Dominican Republic, and acknowledges that "Two other countries from which we source cocoa: Brazil and India, are not included in this report at the current time."	4 (5)

2.7 Key Observations on the Mondelēz Action Plan for the Indonesia

We commend Mondelēz for taking initial steps to publish their first action plan for Indonesia based on the commitment made in the April 2013 AP. This is a noble step towards strengthening their commitments and

transparency on gender equality. **The Action Plan** achieved an average score of 4.3 (“fair”), with 23% of the criteria scored as “strong”, 46% scored as “fair”, and 31% scored as “needs strengthening”. The Action Plan makes some specific recommendations, especially related to gender mainstreaming at community levels. It commits to increase women’s participation in local development planning from village to district level, increase women leadership in community meetings or community associations, conduct gender awareness seminars at community level including farm households and village leaders, and continue the gender dialogue platforms at village and district level. Similarly, by publishing a renewed and strengthened commitment to achieve gender equality, the AP focused on Indonesia represents Mondelēz’s positioning on gender equality, ensuring women inclusion and giving women a voice.

Though these achievements are welcomed, it still leaves a significant room for improvement in several areas that needs attention. This includes areas where the Brand has scored “0” against some criteria: Improving distribution of costs and benefits for unpaid female family workers (C-3.4), addressing gender discrimination experienced by waged workers (C-3.5), and engagement of external stakeholders such as CSO and community members (C-4.5). In addition, significant efforts are required in the following areas where the Brand has score “fair” i.e. a score between 3.5-6.5:

- Extent to which key gender concerns are addressed (C-3.1)
- Improving women’s participation as direct cocoa suppliers (C-3.2)
- Improving female direct suppliers’ access to production inputs (C-3.3)
- Are adequate monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment mechanisms included? (C-4.4)

2.7.1 Action plan: extent to which key gender issues are addressed

Evaluation criteria and indicators

C-3.1: Addressing underlying gender inequalities	4 (10)
I-3.1.1: The AP commits to 'gender awareness seminars at community level' and 'gender awareness training for youth'.	2 (2)
I-3.1.2 - 3: There is no specific reference to gender awareness training for women cocoa farmers. There are, however, many references to women having equal access to training. Similarly, the AP plans to 'conduct mapping and baseline on financial literacy and land ownership sensitization to set the target (PILOT)'	2 (4)
I-3.1.4 - 7: No references to literacy/education, adopting and implementing gender policies, engage with any sector initiatives, and any specific advocacy work in the AP.	0 (4)
C-3.2: Improving women's participation as direct cocoa suppliers	4 (10)
I-3.2.1 - 3: There is no reference to proactively sourcing from producer groups with strong women's representation, ensuring women's representation related to partner companies, and ensuring gender-equitable eligibility criteria for becoming a direct supplier.	0 (5)
I-3.2.4: Mapping and baseline planned in relation to land ownership sensitization.	1 (2)
I-3.2.5: A commitment to increase women's leadership in community meetings and community associations	3 (3)
C-3.3: Improving female direct suppliers' access to production inputs	4 (10)
I-3.3.1: Numerous actions in the AP are listed relating to the provision of training for women, and a commitment to "continue to provide equal opportunities for men and women to access training and opportunities.'	1.5 (1.5)
I-3.3.2: Gender awareness training for Cocoa Life team and partners' staff. However, there is no reference to build capacity of relevant government and NGO.	0.5 (1.5)
I-3.3.3 and I-3.3.6 - There are no quotas specified for female participation in any of the actions within the AP. It is not clear what proportion of members are women, and no planned quota in relation to introduction of female participation in credit/input provision schemes.	0 (3)
I-3.3.4 - 5: There is a reference to tailoring training to include women 'through women Farmer Field School (PILOT). However, it is unclear whether actions related to women Farmer Field School and women youth champions in cocoa-related business are relevant to this indicator.	1 (2)
I-3.3.7: There is reference to ensuring that entry & guarantee requirements for credit schemes are women-friendly, but it can be assumed that VSLA scheme is women-friendly.	1 (1)

I-3.3.8 - 11: The AP does not provide any information about improving women's access to pesticide application equipment and PPE, effective provision of information to women on pesticide application and health risks, protection of pregnant and breast-feeding women from pesticide exposure and promoting alternative soil and pest management approaches.	0 (1)
C-3.4 Improving distribution of costs and benefits for unpaid female family workers	0 (10)
I-3.4.1 - 4: AP recognizes three categories 1) female farmers; 2) women in cocoa farming; 3) women in cocoa growing households. It is which of these would be considered 'unpaid' and there is no reference to encouraging participation and registration of farm owners' spouses as joint direct suppliers.	0 (10)
C-3.5 Addressing gender discrimination experienced by waged workers	0 (10)
I-3.5.1 - 5: No references to Equal Opportunities and Sexual Harassment policies. The AP does not discuss about establishment of women's committees and grievance mechanisms. It does not refer to the health and safety concerns of the women workers and provision of childcare facilities for children of women workers. Although the AP takes step to empower women, there is little, or no information provided to address the gender discrimination issues experienced by the waged workers.	0 (10)
C-3.6 Mainstreaming gender in community development programs	8 (10)
I-3.6.1 - 4: The emphasis on mapping/baseline data and the importance of disaggregated data to inform PILOTs would be relevant in measuring the improvement of gender mainstreaming in program design. Similarly, under the Youth objective there is a commitment to "explore innovative new gender transformative programs". The AP includes an overall commitment to 'train community leaders and implementing partners' staff in applying a gender lens to all programming. In general area of work for Cocoa Life in Indonesia is to increase 'the capacity of women to start their own businesses outside of cocoa', and there is a specific action to continue to improve women's business skills	5 (5)
I-3.6.5 & I-3.6.7: The AP does not address the issues of basic services and infrastructure that would help free up women's time. It does not make any reference to facilitate women's access to relevant local support services.	0 (2)
I-3.6.6 & I-3.6.8: The AP aim to expand access to VSLAs, but also to conduct mapping/baseline on financial literacy training. Further to this, the AP refers to including "other financial products tailored to women's needs" under the Livelihoods Objective. In addition, the AP commits to increase women's participation in local development planning from village to district level, increase women leadership in community meetings or community associations, conduct gender awareness seminars at community level including farm households and village leaders, and continue the gender dialogue platforms at village and district level.	3 (3)

2.7.2 Action Plan: Overall Quality

Evaluation criteria and indicators

C-4.1: Does the AP address the GA's recommendations?	5 (10)
This AP states that its focus areas are based on the results of the 2014 gender and needs assessments conducted by IFCC Indonesia "gender gaps in access to resources and benefits and gender inequality in local decision-making and community-level participation."	5(10)
C-4.2: Does the AP include new or strengthened commitments/activities?	10 (10)
The AP clearly represents new or strengthened commitments towards gender equality ensuring women inclusion and giving women a voice. This is first time an action plan of Indonesia is developed by the Brand.	10 (10)
C-4.3: Are individual actions robust, appropriate, and sustainable?	7 (10)
I-4.3.1-2: The actions listed are concrete and achievable but are not time-bound. Only 4 out of 17 actions are linked to specific results/targets.	2 (5)
I-4.3.3-4: The actions listed are likely to achieve the desired development impacts. The Brand takes a community level approach to its initiatives with a focus on sustainability.	5 (5)
C-4.4: Are adequate monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment mechanisms included?	2.5 (10)
I-4.4.1 It is clear that Mondelēz is putting concerted effort into addressing the challenge relating to the lack of gender-disaggregated data, there is one specific action in the Indonesia AP relating to baseline data	1.5 (2.5)
I-4.4.2 It is not clear from the AP how progress against key gender-related performance indicators will be measured, however, there is one action dedicated to improving the "monitoring of effectiveness of women-focused and gender-focused interventions."	1 (2.5)
I-4.4.3 There is no detail on review mechanisms or commitment to address under-performance	0 (2.5)

I-4.4.4: There is no indication of a provision for an external assessment of the AP's outcomes and impacts.	0 (2.5)
C-4.5: Consultation with relevant external stakeholders	0 (10)
I-4.5.1-2: The Indonesia AP does not refer to any collaboration or consultation with external stakeholders. This may reflect the fact that programming is at an earlier stage than in Ghana and Cote d' The AP does not mention any mechanisms for ensuring regular consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the implementation of the plans.	0 (10)
C-4.6: Transparency and dissemination of gender-related learning	6 (10)
I-4.6.1: Key documents related to the Cocoa Life program are available covering the reporting of activities.	6 (6)
I-4.6.2: It is not clear if advocacy efforts were made as a result of the implementation for sharing good practices to other Brands and stakeholders.	0 (4)
C-4.7: Proportion of cocoa supply chain covered by proposed interventions	6.5 (10)
I-4.7.1: There are no references to scale of the work in Indonesia	0 (2.5)
I-4.7.2: The AP include references to a number of new initiatives (including women as youth champions; a gender-transformative green livelihoods program) suggesting an extension of benefits beyond the scope of existing community development programs	2.5 (2.5)
I-4.7.3: The 2018 Mondelez Action Plan includes for the first time, Indonesia and Dominican Republic, and acknowledges that 'Two other countries from which we source cocoa: Brazil and India, are not included in this report at the current time.'	4 (5)

2.8: Key Observations on the Mondelez Action Plan for Ghana

The Action Plan achieved an average score of 5.3 (“fair”), with 38% of the criteria scored as “strong”, 38% scored as “fair”, and 23% scored as “needs strengthening”. The Action Plan makes some specific recommendations, especially related to gender mainstreaming at community levels. It commits to increasing women’s participation in local development planning from village to district level, increase women leadership in community meetings or community associations, conduct gender awareness seminars at community level including farm households and village leaders, and continue the gender dialogue platforms at village and district level.

Though these achievements are welcomed, it still leaves a significant room for improvement in several areas that needs attention. This includes areas where the Brand has scored “0” out of 10: Improving distribution of costs and benefits for unpaid female family workers (C-3.4) and addressing gender discrimination experienced by waged workers (C-3.5). In addition, significant efforts are required in the following areas where the Brand has scored “fair” i.e. a score between 3.5-6.5:

- Improving women’s participation as direct cocoa suppliers (C-3.2)
- Improving female direct suppliers’ access to production inputs (C-3.3)
- Does the AP address the GA’s recommendations? (C-4.1)
- Consultation with relevant external stakeholders (C-4.5)
- Transparency and dissemination of gender-related learning (C-4.6)

2.8.1 Action plan: extent to which key gender issues are addressed

Evaluation criteria and indicators

C-3.1: Addressing underlying gender inequalities	7 (10)
I-3.1.1: The Cocoa Life includes gender awareness and empowerment of women in the cocoa farming communities. However, the AP has limited information regarding how it will create gender awareness/training for male members of the community.	1 (2)
I-3.1.2: The AP acknowledges the introduction of 450 women Community Animators in 447 Cocoa's Life operational areas where local female leaders are trained to support themselves and empower other female members in the community in decision-making and accessing resources they need and related benefits.	2 (2)
I-3.1.3: One of the key objectives of the AP focuses on increasing women's access to land through specific measures such as "increase women’s access to finance, farm inputs, land ownership and membership of producer groups and cooperatives". However, the AP does not provide details on 'specific measures'.	1 (2)

I-3.1.4: Mondelez is committed to include youth into its programming and engage with Ghana Education Service and Community reading clubs to support literacy programs however it is not clear how this will improve girls' access to education or their literacy.	1 (2)
I-3.1.5 -7: The Brand is committed to working with gender and environmental experts to ensure the extension of services are aligned with current environmental best practices to mainstream gender in core standards/policies. It will collaborate with Oxfam to pilot SIWEE in selected districts in Ghana.	2 (2)
C-3.2: Improving women's participation as direct cocoa suppliers	6.5 (10)
I-3.2.1: Although the AP does not make any explicit commitment/target to source from women's producer groups, it offers women business and entrepreneurial skills. The Brand has a specific action to ensure that women have "documentation of sale of beans as a critical enabler" in getting women recognized as cocoa farmer and along with that access to inputs and resources.	0.5 (1)
I-3.2.2: Although the AP commits to women's representation at all levels, it has not committed to any specific targets with supply chain partner companies.	0 (1)
I-3.2.3-4: The AP does not include any objective relating to gender-equitable eligibility criteria for women to become a direct supplier. However, the AP lists actions relating to financial inclusion, land ownership and promotion of women as leaders' activities which may contribute to greater gender-equity among suppliers). The Brand also promotes the vision of increasing women's access to training to improve business and entrepreneurial skills, have increased access to finance, and land ownership.	2.5 (5)
I-3.2.5: The AP "promotes leadership positions for women as part of the Community Development Committees and Community Action Plan processes and includes a floor of 30% for women representatives in the process". The AP also stated a mentorship program to support women to take up leadership positions.	3 (3)
C-3.3: Improving female direct suppliers' access to production inputs	6.5 (10)
I-3.3.1-2: The AP commits to increasing women's access to inputs and resources. While the 2018 AP has identified government and Oxfam as key partners, it is not clear how Mondelez will build capacity of local government institutions such as NGOs and government. However, it is assumed that working with the government closely will build its capacity.	2.5 (3)
I-3.3.3: Although the AP commits to increase women's access to training, it does not have any specific quotas/targets for them. It does, however, have a 30% participation quota for young women under the Youth objective.	0.5 (1)
I-3.3.4-5: The Cocoa Life program includes female community animators to train and support women within the community. Therefore, it can be assumed that women-friendly training methods were used.	2 (2)
I-3.3.6: Although the AP commits to increase women's access to training, it does not specific quotas/targets for women. It does, however, have a 30% participation quota for young women under the Youth objective.	0.5 (2)
I-3.3.7: The AP commits the expansion of the access to VSLAs and includes financial products tailored to women's needs.	1 (1)
I-3.3.8-11: The AP does not provide any information about Improving women's access to pesticide application equipment and PPE.	0 (2)
C-3.4: Improving distribution of costs and benefits for unpaid female family workers	0 (10)
I-3.4.1-4: The AP does not make any references to unpaid female family workers to participate in training/extension activities.	0 (10)
C-3.5: Addressing gender discrimination experienced by waged workers	0 (10)
I-3.5.1-5: The AP does not refer to anti-sexual harassment policies, establishment of women's committees and grievance mechanisms, and health and safety concerns of women workers.	0 (10)
C-3.6: Mainstreaming gender in community development programs	8 (10)
I-3.6.1-2: The AP commits to including youth in the programming to "explore innovative new gender transformative programs". It also commits to "train the Cocoa Life team and implementing partners on gender programming and mainstreaming". Therefore, it can be said that gender mainstreaming is included in the program.	3 (3)
I-3.6.3 -4: The AP has paid special attention to the credit schemes that target women and intends to help those that particularly need to diversify income streams. It also refers to improving business and entrepreneurial skills	2 (2)
I-3.6.5: The AP does not address the issues of basic services and infrastructure that would help free up women's time.	0 (1)

I-3.6.6: The AP highlights increasing women's access to finance under the Livelihoods Objective i.e. "include other financial products tailored to women's needs".	1 (1)
I-3.6.7: Facilitating women's access to relevant local support services has not addressed	0 (1)
I-3.6.8: The AP "promotes the leadership positions for women as part of the Community Development Committees and Community Action Plan processes".	2 (2)

2.8.2 Action plan: overall quality

Evaluation criteria and indicators

C-4.1: Does the AP address the GA's recommendations?	5 (10)
A GA was carried out in 2018 (published in 2019), there appears to be a link between this and the 2018 AP. The research agency (IPSOS) who undertook the GA developed a Women's Empowerment framework which has informed evaluation and the development of a theory of change. There is, however, no explicit reference to any specific recommendations in the GA reviewed.	5(10)
C-4.2: Does the AP include new or strengthened commitments/activities?	10 (10)
There are specific commitments/actions outlined in the AP clearly representing new or strengthened commitments towards gender equality, ensuring women's inclusion and giving women a voice.	10 (10)
C-4.3: Are individual actions robust, appropriate, and sustainable?	7 (10)
I-4.3.1-2: The actions listed are concrete and achievable but are not time-bound. Only 4 out of 17 actions are linked to specific results/targets.	2 (5)
I-4.3.3-4: The actions listed are likely to achieve the desired development impacts. The Brand takes a community level approach to its initiatives with a focus on sustainability.	5 (5)
C-4.4: Are adequate monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment mechanisms included?	1 (10)
I-4.4.1 It is clear that Mondelez is putting concerted effort into addressing the challenge relating to the lack of gender-disaggregated data, however there are no specific reference to baseline data in the Ghana AP.	1 (2.5)
I-4.4.2 It is not clear from the AP how progress against key gender-related performance indicators will be measured	0 (2.5)
I-4.4.3 There is no detail on review mechanisms or commitment to address under-performance	0 (2.5)
I-4.4.4: There is no indication of a provision for an external assessment of the AP's outcomes and impacts.	0 (2.5)
C-4.5: Consultation with relevant external stakeholders	5 (10)
I-4.5.1-2: It is clear that Mondelez will be working in partnership with the government and Oxfam on a number of activities and it is therefore assumed this is a result of consultation with those relevant stakeholders. The AP does not mention any mechanisms for ensuring regular consultation with relevant stakeholders regarding the implementation of the plans.	5 (10)
C-4.6: Transparency and dissemination of gender-related learning	6 (10)
I-4.6.1: Key documents related to the Cocoa Life program are available covering the reporting of activities.	6 (6)
I-4.6.2: There is no specific mention of any gender advocacy efforts with other Brands and stakeholders	0 (4)
C-4.7: Proportion of cocoa supply chain covered by proposed interventions	8
I-4.7.1: All gender-focused activities in the AP appear to cover the whole CL program in Cote d'Ivoire. The AP states that the CL program has "200 Women's Groups formed in all 447 operational areas."	2.5 (2.5)
I-4.7.2: The scope of the AP is entirely limited to Cocoa Life communities/beneficiaries. However, public commitments made in Cocoa Life Guidance document indicate that, by 2022, Cocoa Life will reach the majority of Mondelez. It also appears that the Brand has made explicit commitments to reach communities beyond the Cocoa Life program. AP reports that Cocoa Life advocates for women's empowerment through engagement with governments and local communities, e.g., exploring innovative new gender transformative programs through existing and new partners.	1.5 (2.5)
I-4.7.3 The 2018 Mondelez Action Plan includes for the first time, Indonesia and Dominican Republic, and acknowledges that "Two other countries from which we source cocoa: Brazil and India, are not included in this report at the current time."	4 (5)

CHAPTER 3: NESTLÉ EVALUATION

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the Consultant’s evaluation of Nestlé GA for its cocoa supply chain in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana, and AP⁴ for its cocoa supply chain in Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana, and Indonesia.

The chapter is structured as follows:

- Section 3.2 reports on the list of recommendations made by Oxfam’s independent evaluation in 2014 for Côte d’Ivoire
- Section 3.3 relates to the recommendations relating to other sourcing countries
- Section 3.4 presents the detailed evaluation of Nestlé GA and AP against the common evaluation framework as described in Appendix 1.

3.2 Evaluation of specific recommendations made to Nestlé relating to the Côte d’Ivoire cocoa supply chain in 2014

The 2014 evaluation emphasized that Nestlé substantially strengthened its existing Côte d’Ivoire AP and expanded its scope to cover all key areas of concern for women cocoa farmers, including addressing the following gaps and weaknesses. However, not all the recommendations have been addressed.

The consultant organized two calls with the Brand and sent emails to gather further information on these recommendations. However, the consultant never received a clear response and the Brand did not follow up. It was clear from the interviews that the Brand is committed to achieve gender equality in their work, although the Brand representative believed the recommendations are “outdated” and “not relevant” anymore. This is because the “time has changed” and there are different priorities. Unfortunately, the Brand did not view ‘unwaged female family labor’ as an issue needing significant attention and did not provide any further comments. While this evaluation acknowledges the contribution the company has made on gender in the cocoa sector reflected in the [Nestlé’s Cocoa Plan Progress report 2019](#), [Tackling Child Labor report](#) (Nestlé and ICI, 2019) and the [Cocoa & Forests Initiative Progress report](#), it is to be noted that the purpose of this report is to evaluate companies’ progress on gender in cocoa sector by reviewing their publicly available GAs and APs associated to specific project and/or program in the three focused countries. The Recommendations that the Brand did not meet have been marked in red in the tables 5 and 6 below.

Table 5: Evaluation of specific recommendations made to Nestlé relating to the Côte d’Ivoire cocoa supply chain in 2014

Recommendations from 2014	Consultant’s comment
N-R-1a Identify and add additional activity areas to more comprehensively address key gender concerns outlined in C-3.1 – C-3.6, in particular ensuring that issues affecting waged workers (C-3.5) are addressed. These new activity areas should include a more thorough response to the recommendations made in the GA.	The Brand scored “fair” in 3 of the 6 criteria (C-2, C-3 and C-6) and “needs strengthening” in 2/6 (C-4 and C-5) and has failed to address discrimination affecting the female waged workers. While the Brand scored 8.5/10 in C-1, issues relating to ‘addressing underlying gender inequalities’ in AP were mentioned sparingly, the Brand did not make a concerted effort to describe a theory of change or analytical framework to demonstrate challenges faced by female waged and unwaged workers.
N-R-1b Seek feedback on the current AP from external stakeholders (including women cocoa farmers, relevant female community leaders, women’s rights CSOs and independent gender specialists), in particular feedback on the activities currently proposed under “Giving women a voice” and “Helping increase women’s income”. Address relevant aspects of this feedback when preparing the revised/strengthened AP.	Nestlé did not consult the views of range of stakeholders (see C-4.5). It was not clear if there was a consultation with any external stakeholders in developing this report. However, ICI and FLA have been identified as key partners in implementing the action plans. Therefore, it can be assumed that there was a regular consultation with these two external stakeholders but not with women’s rights CSOs and independent gender specialists.

⁴ Indonesia was not included in the baseline assessment of the gender dialogue project

N-R-1c Build in mechanisms to ensure regular consultation with relevant stakeholders throughout the implementation of the AP and make explicit any existing commitments made in this regard.	
N-R-1d Add a specific commitment to commission independent assessment(s) of progress, outcomes and impacts of the AP, and make explicit any existing arrangements that may contribute to this aim (e.g., FLA's annual Independent External Assessments of working conditions).	The Brand did not commission an independent assessment of the gender dialogue program. If it did, the evaluation or impact evaluation was not made public.

3.3 Evaluation of recommendations made to Nestlé relating to other sourcing countries in 2014

In 2014, Oxfam made specific recommendations to Nestlé when commissioning future GAs in other cocoa sourcing countries. It was advised that Nestlé should take steps to address the following gaps in the Côte d'Ivoire assessment:

Table 6: Evaluation of recommendations made to Nestlé relating to other sourcing countries in 2014

Recommendations from 2014	Consultant's comment
N-R-2a Ensure that the research methodology includes more substantial consultation/interviews with male cocoa farmers, as well as representatives of Nestlé and other key private sector actors	The baseline study was not participatory in nature and communities, including male cocoa farmers, as well as representatives of Nestlé and other key private sector actors were not consulted.
N-R-2b Provide more detailed guidance to researchers on the desired scope of the gender assessment, and encourage researchers to develop a clear analytical framework that focuses more tightly on the key gender issues within this scope	It is not clear if the researchers, in this case Fair Labour Association, were provided 'all' the information since the Brand has scored quite poorly in C-2.4-2.6.
N-R-2c Include a rapid assessment of the key gender components and impacts of Nestlé's existing community development interventions, including relevant aspects of the Nestlé Cocoa Plan, and provide specific recommendations on how key gender gaps/weaknesses could be addressed.	Nestlé did not conduct any impact evaluations.

3.4 Key Observations on Nestlé Gender Assessment and Action Plan for Côte d'Ivoire

The Gender Assessment achieved an average score of 3.8 out of 10 ("fair") as compared to 6.5 in 2014, with 2 (17%) of the 12 relevant criteria scored as "strong", 5 criteria as "fair" and 5 as "needs strengthening", as compared to 1 in the last Oxfam evaluation. This demonstrates a significant decline in the quality of the GA (see chapter 5 on comparative analysis). Some of Nestlé's GA is reasonably comprehensive and robust, and by far the strongest of the 3 company assessments. The most notable strength of Nestlé's GA includes, engaging an experienced and skilled research team where the Brand scored 10/10. Nestlé also demonstrated reasonable coverage in 5 main areas of concern (I-2.1.1 – 7) showing they remain on track since the last report. However, the coverage of issues affecting 'unpaid female family workers' and 'lack of gender mainstreaming in community development interventions' which were two of Nestlé's notable strengths in 2014 needs significant strengthening as the Brand has scored '0' in this evaluation. Importantly, it is to be noted the reason the Brand has scored '0' in 'community development interventions' is because I.2.6.1 - 4 indicators are not relevant to the current GA, since the publicly available document was a baseline study and not an impact evaluation. The consultant could not locate an evaluation of the Gender Dialogue program. Nestlé should have made a more recent evaluation of the program public as part of the commitment to Behind the Brands. For this reason, it is understood that this criterion was not met. Similarly, the assessment did not specifically and explicitly collect data on the employment status of female workers. According to the GA, 3.8% of total interviewees were sharecroppers. It appears the rest worked on their own, or their family/partners' farms. However, this has not been disaggregated by gender and it is not clear how

this information was used to analyze the data and conclude the GA or make recommendations. While the collected data focused on the tasks women are involved in (frequency and average), and their overall labor input compared to that of male cocoa farmers, as per the indicator's definition, it was not clear how much labor unpaid female family workers contribute to cocoa farms.

The Action Plan achieved an average score of 4.8 (“fair”) with 2 of the 13 evaluation criteria scored as “strong”, 8 scored as “fair”, and 3 scored as “needs strengthening”, as compared to the scores 3.8, 5 and 6 in 2014, respectively. Whilst the individual actions included in the AP are reasonably robust, they are limited in scope. For example: there was no assessment/evaluation of the gender dialogue program, there was an initial baseline however no other project evaluations have been made public, and the baseline study, which was analyzed (for the purpose of this evaluation) as a gender assessment, was published after the Action Plan in 2015 when it should have preceded it. Some of the content of the 2015 Action Plan is part of a progress report published in 2014, where the Brand has provided an update on the progress made since 2014. Similarly, KPIs and targets for many commitments and recommendations made by the Fair Labor Foundation are largely missing. For this reason, Nestlé has scored ‘0’ out of 10 in C-4.1. In addition, the Brand has not fully addressed the gender discrimination experienced by female waged workers (I-3.5.1-5), it has scored **3/10** for this criterion and has received the same score for I-3.4.1-4 on ‘Improving distribution of costs and benefits for unpaid female family workers’. The Brand would need to make concerted efforts to address where they have scored between 0-3.

Although Nestlé seems to have made headway in the Action Plan since the 2014 evaluation, overall, the quality of its reports has comparatively declined due the reasons outlined above. The Brand would need to make significant efforts and create a substantial plan to achieve their commitments and report on the indicators where the scores are low. This means the Brand should be focusing and generating evidence on the following criteria with a clear plan, targets and KPIs:

- C-3.4 Improving distribution of costs and benefits for unpaid female family workers
- C-3.5 Addressing gender discrimination experienced by waged workers
- C-4.1: Address the GA’s recommendations in the AP
- C-4.4: Include adequate monitoring, evaluation, and impact assessment mechanisms

3.5 Nestlé detailed evaluation of the Gender Assessment for Côte d'Ivoire

3.5.1 Strengths of research methodology

Evaluation criteria and indicators

C-1.1: Experience, skills, and qualities of research team	10
I-1.1.1 - 6: The gender assessment report was prepared by Fair Labour Association who has significant experience in gender and social development issues. With help from Nestlé, FLA staff held an introductory community visit to engage the two target communities. During the community visit, FLA staff consulted with stakeholders, defined the project’s indicators, set up the sample size, and pilot-tested the SIA tools.	10 (10)
C-1.2: Data collection methods used	4
I-1.2.1: While the gender assessment covers the geographical context well. No external literature was added or referred.	0 (2)
I-1.2.2 - 3: The research methods used were not participatory in nature. The gender assessment collected data using questionnaires and structured interviews and visited the community during the design stage. However, it is not clear if the questionnaire included was closed or open-ended questions. In addition, there was no mention of the ethical issues considered during the research process.	0 (4)
I-1.2.4 - 5: The methodology used in the study was mainly quantitative in nature. Hence, it can be said that appropriate quantitative data was collected. The gender assessment is a baseline study.	4 (4)
C-1.3: Range of respondents/stakeholder views consulted	2

I-1.3.1 & 1.3.5: It is clear that women cocoa farmers who are directly [registered] suppliers to the Brand's cocoa supply chain were included and consulted in the study during and before the data collection process. The sample size for men in the study was calculated based on the number of cooperative male members.	2 (2)
I-1.3.2 - 4: While the study has collected data on the frequency and average hours of female farmers, it has not specified whether women were paid or unpaid. In the assessment, it is stated that none of the women cooperative members interviewed held any leadership roles. Thus, it can be concluded that the study did not capture this information.	0
I-1.3.6 - 8: The assessment team selected 37 percent of women's association members (such as AFEDÉZ) that are linked to Nestlé and this allowed for collection of data from direct beneficiaries. Therefore, it can be said that the GA did not include consultation with relevant CSOs, Brand/private sector representatives or other relevant institutional stakeholders beyond the members of the cooperatives and associations involved directly in the program's baseline assessment. Brand representatives, other key private sector/supply chain actors and no other additional stakeholders were consulted as per the definition of the indicators.	0
C-1.4 Strength of analytical framework and presentation of findings	2.5
I-1.4.1 - 2: The GA has not clearly identified the gender concerns related to the study, and an analytical framework is missing.	0 (5)
I-1.4.3: The data was presented with clarity and included components such as community profiling, involvement of women in local governance structures etc. However, it did not include conceptual and analytical framework	2.5
C-1.5 Geographical scope of assessment	4
I-1.5.1: The study was carried out in Côte d'Ivoire	3 (3)
I-1.5.2 and I-1.5.4: In the baseline assessment, FLA carried out stratified sampling in two selected camps. The assessment did not include any communities outside the Brand's initiatives.	0 (5)
I-1.5.3: The baseline assessment collected quantitative data from a group of community members in two locations (Yaokouakoukro and Zaranou) of the focus country. Further, it included supply chains and women's associations in the study. It can be said that there was a cross section of the community studied according to the focus of the assessment. However, the sampling method in Zaranou, might mean some poorer and more marginalized members of community may not have been included, as it only interviewed existing members of associations and cooperatives).	1 (2)
C-1.6: Robustness of assessment of any on-going activities and achievements	5
I-1.6.1: The assessment used quantitative methods to collect data. The learning from the study indicates that gaps were highlighted in the project activities. However, it did not capture all information related to the gendered realities of women. For example, study failed to collect information from and on unwaged female workers, which remains one of the huge challenges in the cocoa supply chain until today.	2 (4)
I-1.6.2: This indicator is not relevant to this study since it was a baseline and it appears that the project activities had not been carried out when this study was published.	0 (3)
I-1.6.3: Based on the findings of this study, FLA has recommended that the project should develop and implement a comprehensive training plan to address the agro-technical training needs identified for the two project communities. It also makes recommendations on engaging women and promoting community level communication for associations, cooperatives, and community groups to improve gender equality using the Gender Action Learning at Scale methodology.	3 (3)

3.5.2 Gender assessment – coverage of relevant gender issues

Evaluation criteria and indicators

C-2.1: Underlying gender inequalities	7
I-2.1.1 - 3: The assessment collected data on cocoa farm ownership by gender. For example, it is clear that there were significantly less (8.3%) female farm owners as compared to the men (69%). Overall, the study collected data on land ownership by gender and its usage in cocoa farming. In addition, detailed literacy related data was presented by gender, including length of time in education, and percentage of women who have not received any education and data on women's leverage in decision-making process at household level was collected. For example, 70.8% in Yaokouakoukro, said they were not consulted by their partner in managing family income while in Zaranou, by contrast, 51.5% of partnered women were consulted on management of family income.	4.5 (4.5)

I-2.1.4: The study found that women spend more time on reproductive work (housework, spending time with their children, caring for others), while men spent more time doing other remunerative work (6.5 hours per day). On average, men spent more time (2.9 hours) on leisure and community activities than women (2.1 hours). Suggesting women are more time poor than men, due to multiple roles of working on cocoa farms, producing family food, and caring/household responsibilities.	0.5 (1.5)
I-2.1.5 - 6: While the GA stated that 80.3% of the interviewees owned plots of one to two hectares where they grew food crops to satisfy their living needs and to supplement their income, it is not clear if data on food security was collected and no data was collected on employment status.	0 (2)
I-2.1.7: The GA provided data on gender inequalities mainly around domestic work and childcare, woman's role in a household, women's lack of access to training opportunities etc.	2 (2)
C-2.2 Women's lower participation as direct cocoa suppliers	6
I-2.2.1 - 2: It appears that study did include cocoa farmers from women associations. However, it's not clear if these women were also suppliers even though they were linked with Nestlé supplier cooperative USCRG. The assessment did not break down direct suppliers by gender. The interviewed groups included women who were part of cooperative members. Assessment does provide details on membership of cooperatives by gender.	2 (4)
I-2.2.3 & I-2.2.5: The study engaged female farmers in general through registered supply chains. However, in the assessment it is mentioned that none of the women cooperative members interviewed held any leadership roles. The GA did collect data on the constraints and challenges faced by women to take leadership positions. For example, woman stated that they were usually not invited to agricultural trainings provided by cooperatives.	4 (4)
I-2.2.4: Not mentioned. The GA did not capture data on barriers faced by women in becoming direct suppliers/group members. While it is open to interpretation, there were no explicit linkages established between challenges faced by women on becoming direct suppliers and other constraints stated in the report.	0 (2)
C-2.3 Female direct suppliers' poorer access to production inputs	4
The GA collected some gender-disaggregated data on women's access to training. However, this data was limited. In addition, no data on credit and other components under this indicator was collected. The GA mentioned and provided some data on constraints restricting women's access to training e.g., women's greater domestic responsibilities, women's lower education levels, and predominance of male trainers/extension staff. There are significant differences in Yaokouakoukro, between women and men's participation in training (only 1 woman out of 17) and 1/3 of the training participants women in Zaranou. "One woman said usually women are not invited". It would seem that the survey did not ask why women do not attend training - otherwise there would have been data presented on barriers to training. Moreover, the GA covered some aspects of I-2.3.4 and not all. For example, intra-households power dynamics continue to remain a major challenge for female farmers.	4 (8)
Nestlé Gender Dialogue projects did not focus on the key underlying constraints preventing female farmers from accessing credit and other inputs e.g. lack of collateral, poorer access to pesticide application equipment)	0
C-2.4 Unpaid female family labor: predominance, unequal distribution of benefits	0
No data on employment status was collected. Nestlé did not collect data on how much labor do unpaid female family workers contribute to in cocoa farms. No data was collected on unpaid female family workers	0 (10)
C-2.5 Female waged labor: discriminatory employment practices	1.5
I-2.5.1 - 5: The GA has not collected information on the type of employment, data on gender discrimination in pay and condition and women's ability to move around freely and sexual harassment in public and private spaces.	0 (7.5)
I-2.5.6: The GA did not collect data on nature of any health and safety concerns that specifically affect women workers apart from the usage of PPE.	0.5 (1.5)
I-2.5.7: The GA has not clearly identified gender concern related to the study in the assessment (refer to C-1.4)	1 (1)
C-2.6 Lack of gender mainstreaming in community development interventions	0
I-2.6.1 - 4: These indicators are not relevant to the GA since it was a baseline study. However, the consultant believes that Nestlé should have made a more recent evaluation of the program public as part of the commitment to Behind the Brands. For this reason, it is understood that this criterion was not met. (See table 2)	0 (10)

3.6 Nestlé detailed evaluation of the Action Plan for Côte d'Ivoire

3.6.1 Extent to which key gender concerns are addressed

Evaluation criteria and indicators

C-3.1: Addressing underlying gender inequalities	8.5
I-3.1.1: Gender awareness-training will be rolled out to 20 cooperatives in 2015 and ultimately to all cooperatives. Those who attended previous sessions included: cocoa producers, cooperative leaders, and women's representatives.	2 (2)

I-3.1.2 - 3: The AP does not specify targets for women cocoa farmers, but it can be assumed that women's representatives (see above) include some women cocoa farmers. Under the Give Women a Voice pillar, there is a commitment to encourage the registration of cocoa farms under name of landowner and their spouse. This remains a planned action, but without a specific target.	2 (4)
I-3.1.4: While literacy is mentioned just once under pillar 2 of the AP, Give Women a Voice, there is no detail on a specific initiative to address this. However, this is not sufficient. Education has been cited as an independent global theme e.g. the SDGs and as such needs a special attention and specific target to increase female literacy rate and improving their access to education. This should be targeted separately especially when Nestlé has committed to the 17 Global Goals.	0 (2)
I-3.1.5: The AP references suppliers being involved in the gender awareness training but there is no reference to support to implement gender policies.	0.5 (2)
I-3.1.6 - 7: Nestlé took Oxfam's recommendation on board and introduced a target to mainstream gender in core standards/policies through the 'Help change in sector' initiative working with World Cocoa Foundation on training gaps for women and improve curriculum.	4 (4)
C-3.2: Improving women's participation as direct cocoa suppliers	6.5
I-3.2.1: The AP does not make any explicit commitment/target to source from women's producer groups or to ensure women's representation in management of supply chain partner companies. However, the Brand is engaged in activities which aim to increase women's representation in producer groups, specifically in relation to establishment of women's associations linked to coops, and 'finding solutions to the constraints that prevent women from becoming direct cocoa suppliers.'	1 (1)
I-3.2.2: While women are being trained and encouraged to have leadership positions in the supply chain, no explicit targets were set to proactively source from cooperatives or groups where women make up high proportion of members/representatives.	0 (1)
I-3.2.3 - 4: The AP highlights the importance of including women in coop management and decision making; and inclusion of female spouses in the coop register with specific targets had a target for 2015. In addition, the Brand committed to run a campaign for men to handover some land to their wives. However, no specific target to achieve this indicator was set and it's not clear how this will be measured.	2.5 (5)
I-3.2.5: The 2015 AP clearly set targets to train women twice a year in each of the 20 coops to have leadership positions in the supply chain. This will be evaluated by measuring % Women in leadership positions by 2017.	3 (3)
C-3.3 Improving female direct suppliers' access to production inputs	5
I-3.3.1: The AP commits to support and facilitate women farmers' access to relevant training and appropriate certification. The AP also commits to providing women with other inputs such as: fertilizers to improve yields and access to Nestlé nurseries through Copaz coop with 70% of all plants allocated to women.	1 (1.5)
I-3.3.2: The 2015 AP does not commit to improving gender capacity of local institutions such as NGOs and government. While it has identified government as one of the key partners, it is not clear if government's capacity will be assessed/built.	0 (1.5)
I-3.3.3 - 4: Some training sessions have specific targets (e.g. see I-3.2.5). Similarly, Olam project aims to target 25%+ women. The Brands committed to train women using local women's associations connected to their supply chain, using innovative methods e.g. Cocoa farm training, through use of video in Olam project (e.g. Digital Green), and having some training close to villages at suitable times for women. It also plans to review training curriculum for relevance for women.	2 (2)
I-3.3.5 & I-3.3.7: FLA specifically recommended recruitment of women trainers to create awareness in the GA. However, this is not part of the AP. The AP does not make any reference to women friendly credit schemes.	0 (2)
I-3.3.6: The AP specified targets for input provision schemes for women, including training sessions. However, no specific credit schemes were listed as a target (see I-1.3.1).	1 (2)
I-3.3.8: The AP through women's associations aims to investigate the causes for women not wearing PPE, and then investigate solutions. This could include training women on the use of PPE. Based on Nestlé 2014 AP results, it appears that the coops training in 2015 would have included the importance of women to wear PPE.	1 (1)
I-3.3.9 - 11: No information on the application of pesticide and associated health risks are mentioned anywhere in the AP. There is no reference in the AP to plan for sharing information on how pregnant and breastfeeding women can manage the pesticide exposure and protect themselves and their children.	0
C-3.4 Improving distribution of costs and benefits for unpaid female family workers	3
I-3.4.1 & I-3.4.4: There is no mention of if and how unpaid female workers will be engaged and/or empowered, and about sharing and/or equitable distribution of any profits and benefits from Cocoa farming between women and men.	0 (5)

I-3.4.2 - 3: The AP highlights the importance of capturing information and training farmers on "issues facing unpaid women workers" and lists impact for unpaid female family labors. The awareness raising session includes session on "including women workers (waged and unwaged) in mainstream training and extension activities; and awareness raising about issues facing unpaid women workers". Also see I-3.1. The Brand committed to finding solutions to the constraints that prevent women from becoming direct cocoa suppliers in their supply chain. The AP has a specific target on supporting women becoming direct suppliers under 'Promote Equal opportunities'. Similarly, there is specific target to register spouses in cocoa farms under name of the landowner and spouse as joint direct suppliers. Also see I-3.2.3.	3 (5)
C-3.5 Addressing gender discrimination experienced by waged workers	3
I-3.5.1 - 2 & I-3.5.4: There is no mention of anti-sexual harassment policies in the document. Similarly, equal opportunities have been listed as a key pillar within KPIs. None of these make an explicit remark on the development of such policies as well as value of having these. Similarly, the Brand is "encouraging cooperatives, who are already fully certified, to go further and involve workers in farmer training, extend grievance procedures to workers, and train lead farmers in these issues". However, it is not clear if they are specific to women. In addition, there is no mention of providing childcare facilities to support female farmers and workers.	0 (6)
I-3.5.3: The AP has a specific KPI on health and safety under "Sector wide changes, health and safety" pillar. The Brand commits to ensure provision of first aid kits in communities	2 (2)
I-3.5.5: While Nestlé has made significant efforts to challenge gender discrimination faced by women in becoming land owners, becoming direct suppliers etc., the Brand has not effectively dealt with the challenges faced by unwaged female farm workers, including issues around childcare, sexual harassment, and domestic work.	1 (2)
C-3.6 Mainstreaming gender in community development programs	5
I-3.6.1 - 2, I-3.6.5 & I-3.6.7: Nestlé has made efforts to mainstream gender using three action pillars: Promoting Equal Opportunities, Giving Women a Voice, Helping Increase Women's Income in program design and implementation. The Brand is committed to running gender awareness-raising for all their coops; All plan nurseries are encouraged to include women recipients of plants; and all coops encouraged to register spouses. However, in general, the recommendation 'encouraging' is a hard target to measure. Further to this, the Brand has listed setting up counselling and support services for women, regarding their income generating activities with the help of an NGO International Cocoa Initiative as part of the FLA recommendation. However, no targets have been specified to achieve this. Also see I3.5.4	0 (5)
I-3.6.3 - 4: The Brand has made provision of alternative income generating activities for women, which includes establishment of Cassava nurseries which aim to provide higher –yielding varieties of this staple food (for home-use and sale) to women farmers.	2 (2)
I-3.6.6 & I-3.6.8: In the ICI report within the AP, it appears that women are provided with appropriate training on saving plans.	3 (3)

3.6.2 Action plan – overall quality

Evaluation criteria and indicators

C-4.1: Does the Action Plan (AP) address the researchers' recommendations?	0
There was no assessment/evaluation of the gender dialogue program. There was an initial baseline, but no other project evaluations have been made public. The baseline study, which was analyzed as a gender assessment, was published after the Action Plan in 2015 when it should have been published before. Some of the content of the 2015 Action Plan is part of a progress report published in 2014, where the Brand has provided an update on the progress made since 2014.	0 (10)
C-4.2: Does the AP include new or strengthened commitments/activities?	5
There are specific commitments/actions outlined in the AP that clearly represent a new or strengthened commitment towards gender equality, ensuring women's inclusion and giving women a voice. For the remaining actions/KPIs, information on how they would be measurement is missing and it is not clear how are they would ensure commitment to the actions.	5 (10)
C-4.3: Are individual actions robust, appropriate, and sustainable?	7
I-4.3.1 - 2: Some of the actions listed are not detailed but appear to be concrete, time-bound, and achievable. Similarly, some of the AP mentioned specific KPIs to be achieved in 2015 but some of this information was missing	2 (5)
I-4.3.3 - 4: The KPI listed are output and outcome based and are likely to achieve the desired development impacts such as % Women in leadership positions, % women running Nestlé nurseries etc.	5 (5)
C-4.4: Are adequate monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment mechanisms included?	4.5
I-4.4.1: The AP has plans to collect baseline data from two women's associations, using a participatory approach, in order to build capability in the association to meet the real needs of women, including helping to build dialogue platforms.	2.5 (2.5)

I-4.4.2 - 3: It is not clear how the KPIs listed in the 2015 will be measured i.e. what tools will be used to capture information on the indicators in the AP. No targets are set and there is no specific commitment to address under-performance	2 (5)
I-4.4.4: There is no reference to provision for external independent assessment of AP's outcomes and impacts	0 (2.5)
C-4.5: Consultation with relevant external stakeholders	5
I-4.5.1 - 2: It was not clear if there was a consultation with any external stakeholders in developing this report. However, ICI and FLA have been identified as key partners in implementing the action plans. Therefore, it can be assumed that there was a regular consultation with these two external stakeholders.	5 (10)
C-4.6: Transparency and dissemination of gender-related learning	6
I-4.6.1: Key documents related to the gender dialogue project are available where the Brand has shared the implementation activities and its reports. These are available at: https://www.fairlabor.org/report/gender-dialogue-project-ivory-coast	6 (6)
I-4.6.2: It's not clear if advocacy material was produced as a result of the implementation for sharing good practice with other Brands and stakeholders	0 (4)
C-4.7: Proportion of cocoa supply chain covered by proposed interventions	5
I-4.7.1: All activity areas in the AP appear to cover supply chains associated to the program. Program activities will be progressively extended to more groups and beneficiaries throughout the Nestlé Cocoa Plan (NCP) cooperatives that are part of the child labor monitoring and remediation system (CLMRS).	5 (5)
I-4.7.2-3: It is not clear if the Brand has any plans to reach communities beyond the existing community development programs. Similarly, the AP commits to update and publish core KPIs, which cover Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Indonesia and will be extended to Ecuador. However, no targets have been set.	0 (5)

CHAPTER 4: MARS EVALUATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the Consultant’s evaluation of Mars’s GA 2020 for its cocoa supply chain in Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana, and Indonesia.

The chapter is structured as follows:

- Section 4.2 reports on the list of recommendations made by Oxfam’s independent evaluation in 2014 for Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana, and Indonesia.
- Section 4.3 relates to the recommendations relating to other sourcing countries
- Section 4.4 present the detailed evaluation of Mars’s GA against the common evaluation framework as described in Appendix 1.

4.2 Evaluation of specific recommendations made to Mars relating to the Côte d’Ivoire cocoa supply chain in 2014

In 2014, Oxfam made specific recommendations to Mars to strengthen its GA and AP. Mars is the only company amongst the three Brands who have met some of the recommendations. The recommendations led to Mars commissioning supplementary field research with selected Vision for Change (V4C) communities, to address the main information gaps and methodological weaknesses in the original GA (See table 7). It was also recommended that Mars should compile and publish a revised AP for Côte d’Ivoire that addresses the following concerns listed under table 6 and 7 (Ma-R-2a-c). Similarly, it is to be noted that as a direct result of the previous independent evaluation of Mars’s GA and AP by Oxfam led to the company partnering with CARE, implementing the VSLA program in Côte d’Ivoire, which is now being expanded into Ghana. The partnership with CARE was a direct consequence of the GA done in 2013. The company further states that “building on an initial pilot in Vision for Change, and seeing the impact of the program, we decided to roll it out in our supply chain and committed to scaling it up in Côte d’Ivoire and Ghana with an additional \$10M commitment”

Table 6: Evaluation of specific recommendations made to Mars relating to the Côte d’Ivoire cocoa supply chain in 2014

Recommendations from 2014	Consultant’s comment
Ma-R-1a Collection of relevant quantitative data on key indicators covering the main gender issues described in the evaluation framework (in particular C-3.1 – C-3.6), including collection of data that can be used as a baseline against which future V4C progress on gender equality can be assessed.	This information relates to the AP, which is currently unavailable.
Ma-R-1b Collection of more detailed qualitative information on the following key gender issues: women’s lower participation as direct cocoa suppliers (C-2.2), female direct suppliers’ poorer access to production inputs (C-2.3), the predominance of and constraints faced by unpaid female family workers (C-2.4), and discrimination faced by female waged workers (C-2.5)	The GA does not provide gender-disaggregated data on proportion of women who are direct cocoa suppliers and group/co-operative members. While the 2020 GA states several community and household factors affecting women directly earning any income, it does not directly present constraints preventing women from becoming direct suppliers and taking up leadership positions. This recommendation has been partially met given that Mars has collected some information on challenges faced by female workers, including access to income as compared to men.
Ma-R-2a The range of issues covered under “Basis of Action Plan” should be substantially expanded to more comprehensively address all relevant gender areas of concern as per C-3.1 – C-3.6. Specifically, it should respond more thoroughly to the recommendations made by the researchers in the original GA, covering at least all the main areas of proposed intervention if not all the detailed recommendations. The “Basis of Action Plan” should also specifically respond to the main additional gender constraints identified in the supplementary GA.	This information relates to the AP, which is currently unavailable.
Ma-R-2b The monitoring and evaluation aspects of the AP should be strengthened, in particular increasing the range	This information relates to the AP, which is currently unavailable.

of gender-related key performance indicators (KPIs) to be monitored to cover the main gender issues outlined in C-2.1 – C-2.6	
Ma-R-2c The Phase 2 “Action Plan Steps” should incorporate consultation with a wider range of relevant stakeholders when preparing the detailed intervention plan for Phase 3. More concrete commitments should also be made regarding what this detailed intervention plan will include.	This information relates to the AP, which is currently unavailable.

4.4 Evaluation of recommendations made to Mars relating to other sourcing countries in 2014

In 2014, Oxfam made specific recommendations to Mars when commissioning future GAs in other cocoa sourcing countries. It was advised that Mars should take steps to address the following gaps when commissioning future GAs in other cocoa sourcing countries, Mars should also take adequate steps to ensure the quality of the research.

Table 7: Evaluation of recommendations made to Mars relating to other sourcing countries in 2014

Recommendations from 2014	Consultant’s comment
Ma-R-3a Give greater attention to recruiting researchers with the full mix of skills and field experience required to conduct the GAs effectively (see General Recommendation G-R- 2a)	Mars successfully recruited skilled and experienced team of researchers who have mixed skills of labor issues and an understanding of key concerns faced by unpaid female family workers. Mars has scored 10 i.e. strong in C-1.1: Experience, skills, and qualities of research team.
Ma-R-3b Provide more detailed guidance to researchers on the desired scope of the gender assessment (see General Recommendation G-R-2b)	It appears that Mars has not drawn attention of the researchers to the evaluation framework. The GA does not cover all the criteria listed under C-1.6 and C-2.6. While the GA has addressed key methodological considerations (C-1.1 – C1.6), the GA does not emphasize sufficient attention to women as unpaid family labor and as waged workers, and the importance of disaggregating all relevant findings by women’s employment status where feasible.
Ma-R-3c Allocate sufficient funds to ensure the quality of field research (including allowing for enough time to be spent on conducting all relevant field interviews and surveys)	It appears that the research team spent enough time to conducting all relevant field interviews and surveys.
Ma-R-3d Address the specific methodological gaps and concerns outlined under Ma-R-1.	This has been partially met. Please see table 6 (Ma-R-3a-c)

4.4 Key Observations on Mars Gender Assessment and Action Plans for Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana, and Indonesia

The GA titled as the Empathy report is a consolidated analysis of the three countries and provides contextual data wherever relevant. The GA looks beyond women cocoa farmers in cocoa growing communities. Mars states that “all women in those communities have a link to cocoa one way or the other, be it as wives or daughters of cocoa farmers, or as cocoa farm owners, as teachers of children of cocoa farmers, etc., which allowed us to dig deeper to better understand the realities of women in cocoa growing areas.” The GA clearly includes a focus on understanding social norms and traditions, power structures and other factors as the deeper root causes to understand why women do not have access to training, finances, etc. The GA states “Despite the vastly different cultural and socio-economic contexts, the gender inequalities that women face appeared to be quite similar across countries.” In addition, the GA is a standalone assessment of Mars’s supply chain and is not linked to any specific project or program. Therefore, some of the indicators, especially I-2.6.1-4, utilized to assess Mars’s progress on gender are deemed irrelevant. Consequently, Mars has scored 0 in C.6: *Lack of gender mainstreaming in community development interventions*.

The Gender Assessment achieved an average score of 6.0 out of 12 (“fair”) as compared to 4.5 in 2014, with 4 (25%) of the 12 relevant criteria scored as “strong”, 6 criteria as “fair” and 2 as “needs strengthening”, as compared to 5 in the last Oxfam evaluation. Mars is by far the strongest GA amongst all

three companies and has made significant progress since the 2014 evaluation. Mars has taken Oxfam’s recommendations seriously while it has made notable strides in C-1.1 (Experience, skills and qualities of research team), C-1.4 (Strength of analytical framework and presentation of findings), C-2.1 (exploring underlying gender inequalities) and C-2.3 (Female direct suppliers’ poorer access to production inputs) where Mars had scored as “need strengthening” and “fair” previously, it has now scored “strong”. Despite these achievements, significant gaps remain that needs further strengthening, especially in C-1.6 (Robustness of assessment of any on-going activities and achievements) and 2.4 (Unpaid female family labor: predominance & unequal distribution of benefits) where the Brand has scored 3 and 1. This is because the GA is a standalone document and not connected to any project. Similarly, while the Brand has explored underlying gender inequalities in the GA, this is not an indicator of its successful implementation. A detailed action plan is needed with KPIs to ensure the recommendations and learning from the GA is being implemented.

The Action Plan is currently not available. In the consultant’s discussion with a Mars representative, it is clear the company is making significant efforts to improve its gender programming and the AP following the 2020 GA is underway. The Brand states that they will embed and operationalize the report of the empathy findings in the Cocoa for Generation strategy:

“The insights and findings from the country qualitative field research (Empathy phase) served as the starting point to develop new ideas to engage both men and women to improve gender equality in their households and communities. With the aim of developing viable and feasible recommendations for the Cocoa team at Mars Wrigley, the ideation phase considers how to address the four prioritized inequalities through the Cocoa for Generations strategy and action plans. Realizing that Cocoa for Generations is deployed through cocoa’s male dominated first-mile operational channel and reaches mainly male farmers, embedding the Resilience Journey into existing programs and partnerships will further strengthen ongoing efforts towards gender equality in the cocoa supply chain. The Resilience Journey recommendations will be ready by the end of 2020, but the road won’t end there. The outcome of this “Resilience Journey” will inform further strategies and approaches with Mars’ suppliers and implementation partners, as part of its Cocoa for Generations strategy.”

4.5 Mars detailed evaluation of the Gender Assessment - Côte d’Ivoire, Ghana, and Indonesia

4.5.1 Strengths of research methodology

Evaluation criteria and indicators

C-1.1: Experience, skills, and qualities of research team		10 (10)
I-1.1.1	The researchers are independent consultants; from the information provided there is no reason to question their independence from MARS	2 (2)
I-1.1.2	Researchers have strong experience in gender and social development issues	2 (2)
I-1.1.3-4	Based on the information provided, the researcher seems to have prior experience of the smallholder agricultural sector or global agricultural supply chains	3 (3)
I-1.1.5-6	The researchers have prior experience of engaging with relevant institutional stakeholders	3 (3)
C-1.2: Data collection methods used		4 (10)
I-1.2.1	No literature review or contextual analysis was presented in the GA	0 (2)
I-1.2.2	The data collected was not participatory in nature	0 (2)
I-1.2.3	It appears the that GA sought informed consent (verbal or written) before collecting the data	2 (2)
I-1.2.4	The GA has presented appropriate quantitative data	2 (2)
I-1.2.5	No baseline data was collected since the study is a research and not an evaluation	0 (2)
C-1.3: Range of stakeholders consulted		5 (10)

I-1.3.1	It is clear that women cocoa farmers who are direct [registered] suppliers to the Brand's cocoa supply chain were consulted	2 (2)
I-1.3.2	It is not clear if female unpaid laborers were consulted	0 (2)
I-1.3.3	The research team collected data from the female waged laborers	1 (1)
I-1.3.4	No reference to this category in report	0 (1)
I-1.3.5	It appears that male community leaders and workers were consulted	1 (1)
I-1.3.6-8	CSOs, women rights groups, worker rights groups, and trade unions and key private sector/supply chain actors were not consulted as per the indicator definition	0 (3)
I-1.3.7	It is not clear that the consultation with Brand representatives and other private sector actors were held	0 (1)
I-1.3.8	The research involved consultation with some external stakeholders	1 (1)
C-1.4: Strength of analytical framework and presentation of findings		10 (10)
I-1.4.1-3	The GA has presented a strong analytical framework. The data is presented with clarity and used a conceptual framework	10 (10)
C-1.5: Geographical scope of assessment		10 (10)
I-1.5.1	Report includes data from Top 3 cocoa sourcing countries	3 (3)
I-1.5.2	The research included 200 respondents across the three countries during our fieldwork. They included young women and adolescent girls, but also many of their influencers, such as parents, partners, siblings, teachers, nurses, and cocoa's first-mile service providers	2 (2)
I-1.5.3		2 (2)
I-1.5.4	The report is a research study and not an assessment of a specific project/intervention. However, the study aimed to look at Mars's supply chains and it included coverage beyond community development initiatives	3 (3)
C-1.6: Robustness of assessment of Brand's progress to date on gender issues		3 (10)
I-1.6.1	The GA does not relate to a specific program. Hence, no assessment of projects' gaps and limitations of the training and activities were carried out	0 (4)
I-1.6.2		0 (3)
I-1.6.3	The study makes specific recommendations to Mars's Cocoa for Generations strategy and action plan	3 (3)

4.5.2 Gender Assessment: coverage of relevant gender issues

Evaluation criteria and indicators

C-2.1: Underlying gender inequalities		8.25 (10)
I-2.1.1	Gender differences in access to land was collected	1.5 (1.5)
I-2.1.2	The GA presented data on education and literacy impacting on women's livelihood and earning power	1.5 (1.5)
I-2.1.3	Data on decision-making roles and negotiating power at household and community level was collected	1.5 (1.5)
I-2.1.4	Gender differences in responsibilities for reproductive work were collected. However, time poverty was not mentioned or explored	0.75 (1.5)
I-2.1.5	Some data on employment status and gender differences was collected	0.5 (1)
I-2.1.6	Data on gender differences in food security status was not collected	0.5 (1)
I-2.1.7	The GA mentioned and provided data on community cultural norms, women's self-perception, and women's objective reality focusing on issues around self-confidence, worthiness, woman's role in a household, freedom to express opinions etc.	2 (2)
C-2.2: Women's lower participation as direct cocoa suppliers		(6) 10
I-2.2.1	There was no mention of direct cocoa suppliers who are women	0 (2)
I-2.2.2	There was no mention of group/co-operative members who are women	0 (2)
I-2.2.3-5	GA address underlying constraints preventing women from becoming direct suppliers/group members and from taking up leadership positions	6 (6)
C-2.3: Female direct suppliers' poorer access to production inputs		(6) 10
I-2.3.1	No gender disaggregated data was collected	0 (4)
I-2.3.2	The GA underlines the constraints restricting women's access to training and extension	2 (2)
I-2.3.3	The GA underlines the constraints restricting women's access to credit	2 (2)
I-2.3.4	The GA underlines the constraints restricting women's access to labor	2 (2)
C-2.4: Predominance of women as unpaid female family labor & unequal share of costs		1 (10)
I-2.4.1	No data was collected on employment status	0 (2)
I-2.4.2	There was no mention of the type of labor and the study did not focus on unpaid female family cocoa workers	0 (2)
I-2.4.3	No data was collected on unpaid female family cocoa workers	0 (2)

I-2.4.4	No data was collected on unpaid female family cocoa workers	0 (2)
I-2.4.5	The GA has collected quantitative data for both countries on three indicators, which include decisions about children's education, responsibility for making major purchases and control over own income. However, no direct link between these and unpaid female family workers were drawn.	1 (2)
C-2.5: Female waged labor - discriminatory employment practices		4 (10)
I-2.5.1	The GA has not collected information on the type of employment	0 (1.5)
I-2.5.2	The GA has not collected information on the type of employment	0 (1.5)
I-2.5.3	No data on gender discrimination in pay and conditions were reported in the GA	0 (1.5)
I-2.5.4	Not clear if this was covered in the GA and data was collected	0 (1.5)
I-2.5.5	The GA reports data on women's and girls' safety and security	1.5 (1.5)
I-2.5.6	The GA collected data on health and safety concerns that specifically affect women workers	1.5 (1.5)
I-2.5.7	The GA has clearly identified the gender concern related to the study in the study	1 (1)
C-2.6: Lack of gender mainstreaming in community development interventions		(5) 10
I-2.6.1-4	The GA does not assess a specific project or program, which makes it difficult to assess the extent to which gender concerns are mainstreamed in any program design. However, the GA makes specific recommendations for the Cocoa Generation Strategy with an effort to ensure its effective implementation.	5 (10)

CHAPTER 5: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS: GENDER ASSESSMENTS AND ACTION PLANS

Based on evidence provided by the three companies, this chapter presents a comparative analysis of Mars, Mondelēz and Nestlé's GAs and APs for the three countries (wherever available).

The chapter is structured as follows:

- Section 5.1 provides a comparative analysis of the GAs of the three Brands.
- Section 5.2 provides a comparative analysis of the APs of Mondelēz and Nestlé

Key observations

5.1 Gender Assessments

The Brands are clearly doing a significant amount of work to improve the gender realities of many women cocoa farmers. All three companies presented consolidated GAs for the three countries, which did not appear to have any connections with the APs produced, nor were they produced in the sequence expected (see table 2). The data provides an analysis of whether each company's progress has declined or improved since the 2014 assessment and how they have scored against each other based on criteria listed in the evaluation framework.

Mars has scored by far the highest with 6.0 out of the 12 indicators and Mondelēz is the weakest (3.14) as compared to the other two companies. Nestlé remains significantly behind with a score of 3.8 and its progress has notably declined since the 2014 evaluation. The Mondelēz GA clearly states, "Since we have only one time-point (baseline) and no change data, we are limited in the analysis that can be done at this time." (p6)⁵

The reason the Brands have scored a lower number is because of lack of transparency, i.e. not enough information is being made available publicly. In the consultant's opinion, and following discussions with the Brands and Care International, it was clear that internal evaluations reports are available for Mondelēz Cocoa Life program and Mars's VSLA program. However, these are not being made public. Some of the significant observations are below:

1. All brands scored 0 for (C-2.6) lack of gender mainstreaming in community development interventions. The reason brands scored 0 here is because the GAs for Nestlé was a baseline study, Mondelēz's assessment lacked substantial data, and Mars's assessment was a standalone research of the company's overall supply chain and not an assessment of a gender project or program, as expected by Oxfam.
2. All brands have scored "fair" for (C-1.2) Data collection methods used. This is because gender disaggregated data was not provided, and assessments were not participatory in nature.
3. (C-2.4) 'Unpaid female family labor: predominance & unequal distribution of benefits' remain a critical challenge where Mondelēz and Nestlé scored "need strengthening" and Mars "fair." This relates to an important question of how 'unpaid female family labor' is defined and what are the associated key sub-indicators to ensure unpaid female family workers are being consulted and their problems are being addressed accordingly. The definition of the concept must come from the ground rather than taking a top-down approach.
4. In relation to 'consulting a wide range of stakeholders', Mondelēz and Nestlé "needs strengthening" and Mars scored "fair". This means that the Brands need to ensure direct consultation with a substantial number of women in this category, including a reasonable cross-section in terms of age, wealth/social status, and marital status. The brands need to provide disaggregated data. (See I-1.3.1-8).

⁵ <https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/ct/publication/documents/2019-08/empowering-women-for-more-sustainable-cocoa-communities-2019.pdf>

5. Overall, Mondelez would need to make significant efforts in making information available for C-1.3, C-1.5 and C-2.2-6 addressing issues affecting female waged labor and discriminatory employment practices in the cocoa supply chain.
6. Similarly, Nestlé needs significant efforts on a range of issues, in particular C1.3- and 2.4-2.6, addressing discrimination faced by female waged labor in the cocoa supply chain.

Assessment Criteria	Mondelez	Nestlé	Mars
1.1 Experience, skills, and qualities of research team	7	10	10
1.2 Data collection methods used	4	4	4
1.3 Range of respondents/stakeholder views consulted	1.5	2	5
1.4 Strength of analytical framework and presentation of findings	6	2.5	10
1.5 Geographical scope of assessment	3	4	10
1.6 Robustness of assessment of any on-going activities and achievements	4	5	3
2.1 Underlying gender inequalities	6.25	7	8.25
2.2 Women's lower participation as direct cocoa suppliers	0	6	6
2.3 Female direct suppliers' poorer access to production inputs	3	4	6
2.4 Unpaid female family labor: predominance & unequal distribution of benefits	1	0	1
2.5 Female waged labor: discriminatory employment practices	2	1.5	4
2.6 Lack of gender mainstreaming in community development interventions	0	0	5
Brands' average score based on Oxfam's 2014 evaluation	4.3	6.5	4.5
Average Score	3.1	3.8	6.0

5.2 Action Plans

This section provides comparative analysis of Mondelez Cote D'Ivoire, Mondelez Indonesia and Nestlé Cote D'Ivoire APs.

- All brands scored between 0-3, i.e. “needs strengthening” on C.3-4-5. The brands are failing to address issues concerning unpaid female family workers and discrimination experienced by female waged workers.
- There was a variation in scoring on C-3.2, i.e. improving women's participation as direct cocoa suppliers, amongst the three APs, although they were all within the “fair” range. Unfortunately, none of the brands have made significant efforts to improve women's participation as direct cocoa suppliers. While Nestlé made efforts to train/encourage women and men to register as joint suppliers, the associated key targets were missing in the AP.
- All brands scored “fair,” i.e. 6/10 in C-4.6 ‘Transparency and dissemination of gender-related learning.’
- Nestlé published its GA (a baseline study) after the 2015 AP and it is not clear if there was another public facing gender assessment available. Hence, they have scored 0 for C-4.1.
- While Mondelez has identified the government and Oxfam as key stakeholders, it is not clear if they were consulted during the design and implementation of the Cocoa Life Programme.
- None of the brands consulted communities prior to the design of their programs and have hence scored either “needs strengthening” or “fair”.
- Progress for Mondelez Cote D'Ivoire and Ghana has declined from an average score of 5.8 and 5.7 in 2014 to 5.4 and 5.3 in 2020 while Nestlé's progress has improved from 3.8 to 4.8.
- While all brands have scored fair in transparency since the companies shared their GAs and APs (where available) publicly. However, the APs are not detailed enough, outdated and/or lack significant information. The APs do not always include KPIs with appropriate timeline and it is not clear if the recommendations from the GA were taken into consideration.

Assessment Criteria	Mondelēz			Nestlé
	Cote D'Ivoire	Indonesia	Ghana	Cote D'Ivoire
C-3.1: Extent to which key gender concerns are addressed	8	4	7	8.5
C-3.2: Improving women's participation as direct cocoa suppliers	4.5	4	6.5	6.5
C-3.3: Improving female direct suppliers' access to production inputs	7	4	6.5	5
C-3.4 Improving distribution of costs and benefits for unpaid female family workers	2	0	0	3
C-3.5 Addressing gender discrimination experienced by waged workers	0	0	0	3
C-3.6 Mainstreaming gender in community development programs	7.5	8	8	5
C-4.1: Does the AP address the GA's recommendations?	5	5	5	0
C-4.2: Does the AP include new or strengthened commitments/activities?	10	10	10	5
C-4.3: Are individual actions robust, appropriate, and sustainable?	7	7.0	7	7
C-4.4: Are adequate monitoring, evaluation & impact assessment mechanisms included?	1	2.5	1	4.5
C-4.5: Consultation with relevant external stakeholders	5	0	5	5
C-4.6: Transparency and dissemination of gender-related learning	6	6	6	6
C-4.7: Proportion of cocoa supply chain covered by proposed interventions	8	6.5	8	5
Brands' average score based on Oxfam's 2014 evaluation	5.8	N/A	5.7	3.8
Average Score	5.4	4.3	5.3	4.8

CHAPTER 6: RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

Based on a detailed review and analysis of the 2014 Assessment Framework, a list of indicators and criteria, recommendations, alternatives, and changes are proposed at the Operational, Technical and Observational levels. These recommendations were developed after reviewing each indicator specified in the assessment framework and are designed to review the level of effort the three brands have made to engage women in the cocoa sector.

6.1 Observational Recommendations

While the Assessment Framework provides a systematic structure to cover a range of issues affecting women cocoa farmers, it is to be noted human realities are never linear. Rather they are complex and complicated. The Assessment Framework is underpinned by a kaleidoscopic range of indicators aimed to examine the discursive initiatives on gender and women rights of the three brands. The feedback received from the brands suggested the assessment tool is “not comprehensive.” The current tool requires a lot of attention to pull out useful information; the result is that readers are left to draw their own conclusions without much guidance. To achieve the highest score, the brands would need to put specific concentration, effort, and resources into meeting all criteria listed in the assessment framework. Some of the criteria listed would constitute a study in itself and are too broad to be covered under a single report. Therefore, the recommendation is to revise the framework and provide thematic indicators that can be explored fully to avoid ticking boxes under a single study by brands. Similarly, in order for Oxfam to support sector-wide change, it is recommended that the organization put a strategy in place to be able to access additional documents and accompanying reports and provide advisory support to the companies to make this happen.

6.2 Operational Recommendations

A more simplified version of the assessment framework needs to be developed with reduced and revised indicators insofar as possible, as suggested under the technical recommendations. The framework needs to be easily understood, applicable and user friendly. We need to ask ourselves why the brands thought it was not a priority for them to use the assessment framework. Why did progress decline? It was clear that the brands did not report on all the indicators. Therefore, the consultant’s advice is to reduce the list of indicators, which should not exceed more than 2-3 pages and should be developed in consultation with internal and external stakeholders (the brands). The revised assessment framework should aim to incorporate a proposed menu of indicators below:

- 6.2.1 ‘Must have’ and ‘could have’ indicators:** set achievable targets with the ‘must have’ and ‘could have’ indicators and score separately ensuring that the overall rating is not a mix of the two. This would mean that the brands would be rated based on the ‘must have’ and ‘could have’ and the brands should justify why they were not able to include the ‘could have’s.’
- 6.2.2 Aim for policy, program, and project level indicators:** this should focus on whether the brand has specific and standalone gender policies, strategies, and resources in place. The interviews with brands showed that while they are making progress in mainstreaming gender, a company level policy and action plan on gender equality for female cocoa workers with specific targets does not exist.
- 6.2.3 Set timeline and targets:** the review of the gender assessments and action plan showed that while Mondelez published 3-4 for assessment in the past 6 years, Mars has only just begun its work. Therefore, the advice is to set targets with a timeline for the brands. For example, the brands should make their gender action plans available by 2022 ensuring they include and address the issues around gender transformative approaches, gender mainstreaming, gender and social equity, women’s access to public and private places.
- 6.2.4 Consultations:** the revised tool should be designed in consultation with internal and external stakeholders. The process would need to make sure it engages the brands’ gender and human rights focal points.
- 6.2.5 Concepts:** agree on the key concepts and ideas. For example, what do we mean by ‘female unwaged laborer’, ‘employment status,’ etc.?

6.2.6 Guidance: an easy to understand and user-friendly ‘how to’ guide should accompany the revised framework, including clear set of indicator definitions and purpose.

6.2.7 Training for brands: ensure that there is an offline and online training available for brands and relevant stakeholders to learn about the revised tool, its benefits, and advantages.

6.3 Technical Recommendations

Specific recommendations on which indicators need to be revised and can be removed are below:

Gender Assessment		
Indicator	Reason	Revise/Remove/Add
I-1.3, 1.4 & 1.6	Advise to group I-1.3, 1.4 and 1.6 together	Revise
I-1.2.2	Define what participatory means under this indicator	Revise
I-1.2.4	The indicator definition insists on assessment of the scale, distribution and relative importance of the key issues identified through the qualitative (participatory) research. However, sequence is not must here	Revise
I-1.3.2	Define female unpaid family labor and split into sub-indicators	Revise
I-1.4.1 – 4	Define gender concern	Revise
I-2.1.6	Gender differences in food security status – the title of the indicator needs to be revised	Revise
I-2.5.6	Clarify specifically what is expected of health and safety. Is sexual and reproductive health part of it? Breastfeeding? If it’s only personal protective equipment, then state the issue, and have a separate indicator for pregnant and lactating women’s protection.	Revise
I-3.6.5	Define what so we mean by ‘basic services’ and ‘infrastructure’ to help free up women’s time	Revise
I-1.2.5	Provision of adequate baseline dataset - not sure if this is required if there is a general GA	Remove
Action Plan		
I-3.1.7	Other relevant advocacy work – not a ‘must have’ since there are already advocacy related indicators	Remove
I-3.4.4	Other relevant activities to promote more equitable distribution of costs and benefits	Remove
I-3.5.5	Other relevant activities addressing gender discrimination by waged workers	Remove
Proposed indicator themes	Equal pay, sexual and reproductive health, pregnant and lactating women, intimate partner violence and domestic violence, and racial power relations.	Add

CHAPTER 7: SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE BRANDS

Address weaknesses: Brands must address criteria and indicators where they have scored “fair” and “needs strengthening” to increase accountability, transparency and knowledge on challenges faced by female cocoa workers (paid and unpaid) and cocoa communities.

Link between the GAs and APs: Brands should clearly demonstrate the linkage between the GAs and APs where a GA of a project or program (impact evaluation) should be conducted using both qualitative and quantitative methods. It should ensure communities and workers are part of the design process and are being engaged meaningfully in the process using participatory approaches. The findings from the GA should systematically inform the AP for each of the sourcing countries.

Key performance indicators (KPIs): The APs should clearly lay out a gender action/operational plan and assessments for a specific country with dates, KPIs, targets and adequate monitoring, evaluation, and impact assessment mechanisms.

Unpaid female family labor and discrimination faced by waged workers: It is the consultant’s advice to clearly define and conceptualize ‘Female unwaged labor’, especially when women are working on family farms (C.2.4.1-5). For brands to strengthen their reporting in ensuring the discrimination and challenges faced by female farmers (waged and unwaged) are included, it would be useful to carry out specific studies to better understand this issue.

Participation of women: In general, qualitative studies include elements of participatory approaches. A study cannot be considered participatory if the research participants are treated as subjects of research rather than collaborators who inform the study design, research questions, and review the data analyses. Therefore, it is consultant’s advice to include beneficiaries as individuals who “can co-create knowledge as collaborators rather than seeing them as passive subjects of a program or an evaluation” (Mahendru, 2020 and Mahendru, 2010). In addition, the brands would need to make sure that they consult a range of respondents and stakeholders in the GAs to address structural inequalities across the supply chain.

Make data transparent: From the consultant’s discussions with the brands and other stakeholders, it was clear that following the 2014 evaluation, a significant amount of work on gender equality is being carried out. However, some of this work and data has not been made available for the public. Therefore, it is the consultant’s recommendation the brands consciously and willingly make the information available for the purpose of learning, sharing and accountability.

Focus on sexual harassment: Sexual harassment is an extremely sensitive and taboo issue to address and tackle. The worldwide data and the #metoo movement laid the realities of millions of women across the world bare, i.e. each one of us has at some point faced sexual harassment and its degree and extent varies based on the spaces women occupy. It is a woman’s social position and their ability to negotiate social power structures and relations that define their realities. Brands should make an explicit commitment to explore and understand sexual harassment faced by female cocoa workers.

CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION

Overall, the brands are doing a significant amount of work to improve the gender realities of many women cocoa farmers. All three companies published consolidated GAs of the three sourcing countries, although these assessments did not appear to have any connections with the APs produced, nor were they produced in the sequence expected. The evaluation inquiry suggests that the overall quality of Mondelēz's and Nestlé's GAs has declined in comparison to the 2014 evaluation. While Mars has taken significant steps towards mainstreaming gender in its 2020 GA, significant weaknesses remain in addressing the needs of waged and unwaged female cocoa workers.

In the consultant's discussions with the brands and other stakeholders, it was clear that following the 2014 evaluation, a significant amount of work on gender equality is being carried out. However, some of this work and data has not been made available for the public. Therefore, it is the consultant's recommendation the brands consciously and willingly make information available and make data transparent for the purpose of learning, sharing and accountability.

The brands are suggested to follow recommendations under section 7.1, which highlights the importance of making assessments participatory and transparent, clearly linking them to the action plans. The consultant also suggests introducing new and important areas of engagement to promote female sexual and reproductive health, address sexual harassment at workplace, and clearly specifying KPI and targets in the action plans, which are largely missing in brands' reports.

The consultant concludes that while the brands have the financial and technical means to address challenges faced by female cocoa workers, a special focus on women's and girls' lived realities and voices through an intersectional lens is required. This should cover challenges faced by girls and women at home and in the workplace that affect their productivity, also being supported by ILO Convention No. 190. It is the consultant's emphasis that if we do not engage women and their communities as contributors and address multi-dimensional inequalities, there will not be any sustainable development. Rather, we are at risk of contributing towards intergenerational poverty. There is no single solution to address vulnerability faced by women in the cocoa sector. It requires an intersectional approach ensuring the principles of social inclusion and equity and unpacking gendered and racial power relations to support multiple interventions.

If the brands are seriously committed towards lifting women and their families out of poverty in cocoa sourcing countries, it is essential that they review their reports through an intersectional lens. The consultant's recommendation is that the companies consciously hire women of color to carry out gender assessments in the cocoa sourcing countries to address the gender and racial power relations that are often omnipresent in research settings. Where there are challenges in accessing the right capacity, it is encouraged that researchers from the global north partner with local agencies and/or research institutions in the global south. The companies must actively use participatory methods to understand women's lived realities in the cocoa sector to make GAs more actionable and realistic. Similarly, it is advised that this recommendation is included in the revised evaluation framework produced by Oxfam.

REFERENCES

- [Barrientos, S. \(2013\) "Women in cocoa production: where is the gender equity?" *The Guardian*.](#)
- [BBC \(2020\) "Female cocoa farmers paid as little as 23p a day"](#)
- [Crenshaw, K. \(1989\) "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics," *University of Chicago Legal Forum*](#)
- [Fair Labor Association \(2014\) *Assessing Women's Roles in Nestlé's Ivory Coast Cocoa Supply Chain*](#)
- [FAO \(2019\) *Changing the terms of women's engagement in cocoa and coffee supply chains*](#)
- [IFC \(2016\) *Investing in Women along Agribusiness Value Chains*. World Bank Group](#)
- [International Food Policy Research Institute \(2002\), *Empowering Women and Fighting Poverty: Cocoa and Land Rights in West Africa*.](#)
- [Jones, M., Petrin, R. and Scott, L. \(2015\) *Cocoa Life: Impact In Indonesia Outcome Assessment of 2015 Cohort*. Ipsos](#)
- [Mahendru, R. \(2016\) *Intersectionality in addressing gender-based violence: a global perspective, International Journal of Human Rights in Healthcare*, Vol. 9 No. 3, pp. 149-150.](#)
- [Mahendru, R. \(2014\). *Gender Analysis and Use of Intersectionality in Health*. In: Regmi, K. *Decentralizing health services: a global perspective*. London: Springer.](#)
- [Mahendru, R. and Tasker, M. \(2020\) *Mixed Method Approaches in Child Sensitive Social Protection Evaluations*. *Global Social Policy Journal*, 20\(1\): 10–14.](#)
- [Mahendru, R \(2010\) *Pure and impure spaces: A qualitative study on the social and sexual lives of young British Indians living in South West London*. PhD Thesis, University of Kent, Kent.](#)
- [Marston, A. \(2016\) *Women's Rights in the Cocoa Sector: Examples of Emerging Good Practice*. Oxfam Discussion Papers.](#)
- [Nestle \(2019\) *Nestlé Cocoa Plan Progress report*](#)
- [Nestlé and ICI \(2019\) *Tackling Child Labor 2019 Report*. Nestlé and the International Cocoa Initiative \(ICI\)](#)
- [Oxfam \(2013\) *Oxfam food company campaign delivers win for women cocoa farmers*](#)
- [Okoffo, ED., Mensah, M. and Fosu-Mensah, B. \(2016\) *Pesticides exposure and the use of personal protective equipment by cocoa farmers in Ghana*. *Environmental Systems Research*, 5\(17\)](#)
- [University of Sheffield \(2019\) *Cocoa industry relies on forced labour and exploits women workers, research shows*](#)
- [Vigneri, M. and Serra, R. \(2016\) *Researching the Impact of Increased Cocoa Production on the Child Labour Risk and Labour Market in Ghana and Côte d'Ivoire*.](#)

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

C-1.1 – 6: Gender assessment – strength of research methodology

I.D.	CRITERION/INDICATOR – DESCRIPTION	MAX SCORE
C-1.1	Experience, skills and qualities of research team	10
I-1.1.1	Independence from the Brand concerned	2
I-1.1.2	Expertise in gender and social development issues	2
I-1.1.3	Field experience in the smallholder agriculture sector	1.5
I-1.1.4	Knowledge and experience of global agricultural supply chains	1.5
I-1.1.5	Prior engagement with relevant stakeholder groups	1.5
I-1.1.6	Expertise in supply chain labour conditions	1.5
C-1.2	Data collection methods used	10
I-1.2.1	Inclusion of comprehensive literature review	2
I-1.2.2	Use of appropriate participatory research methods	2
I-1.2.3	Interviews conducted under safe and confidential conditions	2
I-1.2.4	Collection of appropriate quantitative data	2
I-1.2.5	Provision of adequate baseline dataset	2
C-1.3	Range of stakeholders consulted	10
I-1.3.1	Consultation with female direct suppliers	2
I-1.3.2	Consultation with female unpaid family labour	2
I-1.3.3	Consultation with female waged labour	1
I-1.3.4	Consultation with female community leaders/representatives	1
I-1.3.5	Consultation with <i>male</i> direct suppliers, workers and community leaders	1
I-1.3.6	Consultation with relevant CSOs	1
I-1.3.7	Consultation with Brand representatives and other private sector actors	1
I-1.3.8	Consultation with other relevant institutional stakeholders	1
C-1.4	Strength of analytical framework and presentation of findings	10
I-1.4.1	Appropriateness of analytical framework	2.5
I-1.4.2	Comprehensiveness of analytical framework	2.5
I-1.4.3	Presentation of findings - clarity and consistency with analytical framework	5
C-1.5	Geographical scope of assessment	10
I-1.5.1	Focus country is a Top 3 cocoa supplier and/or high risk	3
I-1.5.2	Coverage of significant number/proportion of farmers in focus supply chain	2
I-1.5.3	Coverage of significant cross-section of communities, regions	2
I-1.5.4	Coverage beyond Brand's community development interventions	3
C-1.6	Robustness of assessment of Brand's progress to date on gender issues	10
I-1.6.1	Assessment of gaps and limitations in scope of relevant activities	4
I-1.6.2	Identification of negative (as well as positive) outcomes and impacts	3
I-1.6.3	Identification of appropriate recommendations to identify gaps/limitations	3

C-2.1 – 6: Gender assessment – coverage of relevant gender issues

I.D.	CRITERION/INDICATOR – DESCRIPTION	MAX SCORE
C-2.1	Underlying gender inequalities	10
I-2.1.1	Gender differences in access to land, land use and land tenure	1.5
I-2.1.2	Gender differences in access to education, literacy and qualification levels	1.5
I-2.1.3	Gender differences in access to decision-making, negotiating power	1.5
I-2.1.4	Gender differences in responsibilities for reproductive work, time poverty	1.5
I-2.1.5	Gender differences in employment status	1
I-2.1.6	Gender differences in food security status	1
I-2.1.7	Underlying patriarchal attitudes and practices	2
C-2.2	Women's lower participation as direct cocoa suppliers	10
I-2.2.1	Proportion of direct cocoa suppliers who are women	2
I-2.2.2	Proportion of group/co-operative members who are women (where relevant)	2
I-2.2.3	Women's representation in leadership positions within groups/co-operatives	2
I-2.2.4	Constraints preventing women from becoming direct suppliers/group members	2
I-2.2.5	Constraints preventing women from taking up leadership positions within groups	2

C-2.3	Female direct suppliers' poorer access to production inputs	10
I-2.3.1	Gender differentials in access to labour, training, extension, credit and other inputs	4
I-2.3.2	Underlying constraints restricting women's access to training and extension	2
I-2.3.3	Underlying constraints restricting women's access to credit and other inputs	2
I-2.3.4	Underlying constraints restricting women's access to labour	2
C-2.4	Predominance of women as unpaid female family labour & unequal share of costs	10
I-2.4.1	No. of women cocoa farmers disaggregated by employment status	2
I-2.4.2	Amount/type of labour contributed by unpaid female family workers	2
I-2.4.3	Other costs of cocoa production borne by unpaid female family workers	2
I-2.4.4	Proportion of cocoa income received directly by unpaid female family workers	2
I-2.4.5	Extent to which unpaid female family workers have a say in how cocoa income is spent	2
C-2.5	Female waged labour - discriminatory employment practices	10
I-2.5.1	Number of women working as waged labour in/on cocoa farms and co-operatives	1.5
I-2.5.2	Women workers' employment status	1.5
I-2.5.3	Gender discrimination in pay and conditions	1.5
I-2.5.4	Whether women are paid directly	1.5
I-2.5.5	Prevalence of sexual harassment and abuse	1.5
I-2.5.6	Health and safety concerns specifically affecting women workers	1.5
I-2.5.7	Other gender-related concerns affecting women waged workers	1
C-2.6	Lack of gender mainstreaming in community development interventions	10
I-2.6.1	Extent to which gender concerns are mainstreamed in programme design	2.5
I-2.6.2	Extent to which efforts are made to ensure effective implementation of above	2.5
I-2.6.3	Extent to which women's own priorities (including strategic needs) are addressed	2.5
I-2.6.4	Extent of women's participation/benefits from interventions to date	2.5

C-3-1 – 6: Action plan – extent to which key gender concerns are addressed

I.D.	CRITERION/INDICATOR - DESCRIPTION	MAX SCORE
C-3.1	Addressing underlying gender inequalities	10
I-3.1.1	Gender awareness-raising/training for male family and community members	2
I-3.1.2	Gender awareness-raising/training for women cocoa farmers	2
I-3.1.3	Specific measures to increase women's access to land	2
I-3.1.4	Initiatives to improve women's literacy rates and girls' access to education	2
I-3.1.5	Engaging with suppliers to adopt and implement gender policies	2 ⁶
I-3.1.6	Engaging with sector initiatives to mainstream gender in core standards/policies	
I-3.1.7	Other relevant advocacy work	
C-3.2	Improving women's participation as direct cocoa suppliers	10
I-3.2.1	Proactively sourcing from producer groups with strong women's representation	1
I-3.2.2	Ensuring women's representation in management of supply chain partner companies	1
I-3.2.3	Ensuring gender-equitable eligibility criteria for becoming a direct supplier	3
I-3.2.4	Encouraging men to give a share of their land/cocoa tress to their wives	2
I-3.2.5	Encouraging more women to take up leadership positions with producer groups	3
C-3.3	Improving female direct suppliers' access to production inputs	10
I-3.3.1	Improving women's access to local/national training and other input provision schemes	1.5
I-3.3.2	Improving gender awareness/capacity of relevant local institutions	1.5
I-3.3.3	Introduction of female participation quotas/targets in training programmes	1
I-3.3.4	Ensuring that training methods used are women-friendly	1
I-3.3.5	Recruitment of female extension/training officers where possible and appropriate	1
I-3.3.6	Introduction of female participation quotas/targets in credit/input provision schemes	2
I-3.3.7	Ensuring that entry & guarantee requirements for credit schemes are women-friendly	1

⁶ A max. sub-score of 2 will be awarded if any of I-3.1.5 – 7 are addressed

I-3.3.8	Improving women's access to pesticide application equipment and PPE	1 ⁷
I-3.3.9	Effective provision of information to women on pesticide application and health risks	
I-3.3.10	Protection of pregnant and breast-feeding women from pesticide exposure	
I-3.3.11	Promotion of alternative soil and pest management approaches	

C-3.4	Improving distribution of costs and benefits for unpaid female family workers	10
I-3.4.1	Unpaid female family workers encouraged to participate in training/extension activities	2
I-3.4.2	Coverage of unpaid female family workers' concerns in relevant gender training	3
I-3.4.3	Encourage registration of farm owners' spouses as joint direct suppliers	2
I-3.4.4	Other relevant activities to promote more equitable distribution of costs and benefits	3
C-3.5	Addressing gender discrimination experienced by waged workers	10
I-3.5.1	Encouraging adoption of equal opportunities and anti-sexual harassment policies	2
I-3.5.2	Encouraging establishment of women's committees and grievance mechanisms	2
I-3.5.3	Raising awareness of health and safety concerns specifically affecting women	2
I-3.5.4	Encouraging provision of childcare facilities for children of women workers	2
I-3.5.5	Other relevant activities addressing gender discrimination by waged workers	2
C-3.6	Mainstreaming gender in community development programmes	10
I-3.6.1	Measures to improve gender mainstreaming in programme design	1.5
I-3.6.2	Measures to improve gender mainstreaming in programme implementation	1.5
I-3.6.3	Supporting development of alternative income-generating activities for women	1
I-3.6.4	Providing business and marketing skills training for women (and men)	1
I-3.6.5	Providing basic services and infrastructure that help free up women's time	1
I-3.6.6	Supporting the development of appropriate financial services for women	1
I-3.6.7	Facilitating women's access to relevant local support services	1
I-3.6.8	Other relevant activities that support gender mainstreaming in comm. dev. progs	2

C-4.1 – 7: Action plan – overall quality

IID	CRITERION/INDICATOR - DESCRIPTION	MAX SCORE
C-4.1	Does the Action Plan (AP) address the researchers' recommendations?	10
	<i>Compliance with this criterion will be assessed based on the proportion of the researchers' specific recommendations that are appropriately addressed in the AP.</i>	
C-4.2	Does the AP include new or strengthened commitments/activities?	10
	<i>Compliance with this criterion will be assessed based on the proportion of the actions outlined in the AP that represent new or substantially strengthened activities introduced in direct response to the Gender Assessment's (GA's) findings and/or recommendations</i>	
C-4.3	Are individual actions robust, appropriate and sustainable?	10
I-4.3.1	Are actions concrete, time-bound and achievable?	2.5
I-4.3.2	Are actions linked to specific results and targets?	2.5
I-4.3.3	Are proposed actions developmentally appropriate?	2.5
I-4.3.4	Are proposed actions sustainable?	2.5
C-4.4	Are adequate monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment mechanisms included?	10
I-4.4.1	Are mechanisms in place to ensure collection of adequate baseline data?	2.5
I-4.4.2	Mechanisms to monitor progress against key gender-related performance indicators?	2.5
I-4.4.3	Regular review mechanisms including commitment to address under-performance	2.5
I-4.4.4	Provision for external independent assessment of AP's outcomes and impacts	2.5
C-4.5	Consultation with relevant external stakeholders	10
I-4.5.1	Consultation prior to finalisation and implementation of AP	5
I-4.5.2	Consultation on a regular basis throughout duration of AP	5
C-4.6	Transparency and dissemination of gender-related learning	10
I-4.6.1	Transparency, i.e., public sharing of activities and progress against KPIs	6

⁷ A max. sub-score of 1 will be awarded for inclusion of any activities relevant to I-3.3.8 – 11

I-4.6.2	Gender advocacy, i.e., promoting/sharing good practice with other brands, stakeholders	4
C-4.7	Proportion of cocoa supply chain covered by proposed interventions	10
I-4.7.1	Proportion of Ivorian cocoa supply chain covered by proposed interventions	2.5
I-4.7.2	Extension of benefits beyond scope of existing community development programmes	2.5
I-4.7.3	Gender mainstreaming in other cocoa sourcing countries	5

Evaluation framework

Purpose and status of this document

This document presents the full evaluation framework used by the independent evaluator to assess the cocoa gender assessment and action plans published by Mars, Mondelez International and Nestlé in Summer 2014.

Introduction

Overview of criteria

The evaluation framework consists of four sets of criteria, two sets relating to the evaluation of the gender assessments (GAs) and two relating to the action plans (APs):

- Criteria C-1-1 to C-1.6 assess the strength of the research methodology used for the GAs
- Criteria C-2.1 to C-2.6 evaluate the extent to which the GAs covers the range of gender constraints known to affect women in cocoa supply chains
- Criteria C-3.1 to C-3.6 evaluate the extent to which the AP addresses the key gender concerns identified by the GA
- Criteria C-4.1 to C-4.7 assess the overall quality and comprehensiveness of the AP

The specific indicators

For each criterion, there is a set of specific indicators covering the range of relevant issues to be considered when assessing compliance against each criterion. The inclusion of specific, concrete indicators helped ensure that the process of scoring each GA and AP was rigorous, objective and fair.

Scoring system

Reflecting the scoring system used for the Behind the Brands (BtB) Scorecard, each criterion was given a score of 1 to 10 (10 being the best), with different sub-scores allocated for each specific indicator. Performance levels against each criterion were classified as follows:

- A score of between 0 to 3 was classified as “needs strengthening” (colour code: red)
- A score of between 3.5 to 6.5 was classified as “fair” (colour code: amber)
- A score of between 7 to 10 was classified as “strong” (colour code: green)⁸

How the evaluation criteria and indicators were developed

The criteria and indicators used in this evaluation framework have been identified from a review of relevant reference documents, including the **Behind the Brands Scorecard “Women” Indicators** and the **UN Women Empower Principles**. The full list of references reviewed is provided at the end of this document. To aid comparison, where the evaluation criteria or indicators used relate directly to either of the above frameworks, the relevant BtB Scorecard Indicators (“BtB”) and/or UN Principles (“WEP”) are referenced in [square brackets]. Criteria C-2.1 – C-2.6 and C-3.1 – C-3.6 are intended to cover the main gender concerns that are commonly found in export cocoa supply chains, particularly in Côte d’Ivoire and/or Ghana

1. Gender assessment: methodological criteria

Criterion C-1.1: Experience, skills and qualities of research team

Explanation of criterion

C-1.1 assesses the extent to which the GA research team had the relevant experience, skills and qualities required to do the assessment. In assessing this criterion, consideration was given to how the relevant

⁸ Note however that the **performance classification** system differs from that used in the main BtB Scorecard

skills/experience were distributed within the team (eg, a GA was scored more highly against this criterion if the main researcher doing most of the actual field research was highly experienced in gender issues, compared to a GA which only drew on gender expert(s) as peripheral advisers to the core research team).

Specific indicators

The GA's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which the research team had the following characteristics:

- **Indicator I-1.1.1:** Independence from the target Brand. Where the assessment included a review of the Brand's past or current programme/project activities in the focus country, the researcher should also have been independent of any partner organisations involved in designing and/or implementing these activities **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**. [BtB WOM 2.2.2.2]
- **I-1.1.2:** Expertise in gender and social development issues, including field experience of these issues **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**.
- **I-1.1.3:** Field experience in the smallholder agriculture sector **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**.
- **I-1.1.4:** Knowledge and experience of global agricultural supply chains (and ideally cocoa supply chains) **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**.
- **I-1.1.5:** Experience of direct engagement with most of the following stakeholder groups: women smallholders, female agricultural workers, female community leaders, managers and field staff of global corporations, national level women's NGOs and related CSOs, and relevant government officials. **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**.
- **I-1.1.6:** Experience/expertise in international labour standards and supply chain labour conditions, and awareness of key conditions and constraints faced by unpaid female family labour **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**.

Criterion C-1.2: Data collection methods used

Explanation of criterion

C-1.2 assesses the extent to which the data collection methods used were appropriate and reliable. Note that the extent to which specific stakeholder groups were directly consulted is addressed separately under C-1.3.

Specific indicators

The GA's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which the assessment methodology involved:

- **I-1.2.1:** Inclusion of a reasonably comprehensive review of relevant literature **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-1.2.2:** Use of a range of appropriate participatory research methods **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-1.2.3:** Ensuring that interviews with cocoa farmers and workers were conducted in situations that were considered safe and confidential by the respondents [BtB Media Briefing Feb 2013³] **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-1.2.4:** Collection of relevant quantitative data that would allow a reasonable assessment of the scale, distribution and relative importance of the key issues identified through the qualitative (participatory) research **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-1.2.5:** Ensuring that the qualitative and quantitative data collected would provide a reasonable set of "baseline" data against which future progress could be measured **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**

Criterion C-1.3: Range of respondents/stakeholder views consulted

Explanation of criterion

C-1.3 assesses the extent to which the GA involved direct consultation with different types of

women and men cocoa farmers and with other relevant stakeholders.

Specific indicators

The GA's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which the assessment involved:

- **I-1.3.1: Consultation with female direct suppliers** (ie, women cocoa farmers who are direct [registered] suppliers to the Brand's cocoa supply chain). Did the assessment include direct consultation with a substantial number of women in this category, including a reasonable cross-section in terms of age, wealth/social status, and marital status? [BtB WOM 2.2.2.4] **Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-1.3.2: Consultation with female unpaid family labour.** Did the assessment include direct consultation with a substantial number of women in this category, including a reasonable cross-section in terms of age, wealth/social status, and marital status? [BtB WOM 2.2.2.4] **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-1.3.3: Consultation with female waged labour (where relevant).** Did the assessment include direct consultation with a substantial number of women in this category, including a

³ The Media Briefing specifies that interviews should be "off-site", but this specification has been adapted in the relevant indicator above to take into account the differing context of women working on family/smallholder farms as opposed to women working on commercial farms/plantations.

reasonable cross-section in terms of job type and employment status (including casual, temporary and seasonal workers, and third party contracted workers)? [BtB WOM 2.2.2.4]

{Maximum sub-score: 1}

- **I-1.3.4: Consultation with female community leaders/representatives.** eg, female leaders/representatives of primary level farmers' co-operatives or groups, leaders/members of other community-level women's groups (eg, savings and credit groups) [BtB WOM 2.2.2.4] **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-1.3.5: Consultation with *male* direct suppliers, unpaid family workers, waged workers and community leaders.** Whilst the main emphasis of the assessment should have been on women, it is also important that the views of men in each of these categories should have been sought and considered **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-1.3.6: Consultation with relevant CSOs (beyond community-level groups).** eg, women's rights groups, relevant development NGOs, workers' organisations (including trade unions where relevant) [BtB WOM 1.1.6] **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-1.3.7: Consultation with Brand representatives and other key private sector/supply chain actors.** ie, relevant Brand representatives on the ground and at HQ level (eg, sourcing managers and technicians/outreach staff), input/service providers, producer group managers and staff **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-1.3.8: Consultation with other relevant institutional stakeholders,** including representatives of relevant government departments and services/schemes **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**

Criterion C-1.4: Strength of analytical framework and presentation of findings

Explanation of criterion

C-1.4 assesses the extent to which the analysis and presentation of findings were based on a comprehensive and appropriate conceptual framework.

Specific indicators

The GA's compliance against this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which the analytical framework being used was:

- **I-1.4.1:** Appropriate to the issues being assessed, ie, gender concerns in the context of smallholder farming and rural livelihoods? **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**
- **I-1.4.2:** Comprehensive, ie, allowed investigation of the range of gender concerns that were likely to be existent in the focus location(s) **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**

I-1.4.3: The GA will be assessed on how clearly the collected data/findings were presented, and the extent to which the presentation was consistent with the analytical framework used **{Maximum sub-score: 5}**.

Criterion C-1.5: Geographical scope of assessment

Explanation of criterion

C-1.5 assesses the geographical scope of the GA, and the extent to which the scope meets the BtB Scorecard stipulations in this regard.

Specific indicators

The GA's compliance with this criterion was assessed against the following indicators:

- **I-1.5.1:** Is the focus country of the GA a Top 3 cocoa sourcing country and/or assessed by the Brand as high risk (in terms of prevalence and gravity of gender rights violations)? [BtB WOM 2.2.2.3] **{Maximum sub-score: 3}**
- **I-1.5.2:** Did the GA cover a significant *number of farmers* representing a significant proportion of the Brand's total cocoa supply chain within the focus country? **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-1.5.3:** Did the GA cover a significant *cross-section* of communities and production regions representative of the Brand's total cocoa supply chain within the focus country? **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-1.5.4:** Specifically, did the GA cover a significant number and range of cocoa farmers and parts of the supply chain that are *not* directly involved in the Brand's community development interventions? **{Maximum sub-score: 3}**

Criterion C-1.6: Where assessment relates to an on-going programme, is the assessment of the programme's progress/achievements sufficiently robust?

Explanation of criterion

C-1.6 assesses the robustness and objectivity of any assessment of the Brand's existing initiatives to engage/support women cocoa farmers in the focus country. BtB commitments do not refer specifically to providing a critical assessment of achievements and limitations of the Brand's gender-related programme activities to date. However, to the extent that the GA does include a review of such activities, it is expected that this review should be balanced and robust.

Specific indicators

Where relevant, the GA's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which it:

- **I-1.6.1:** Assessed gaps and limitations in the scope of on-going and planned activities regarding their coverage of key gender issues **{Maximum sub-score: 4}**
- **I-1.6.2:** Attempted to identify at least some of the positive and negative outcomes or impacts of gender-related programme activities to date **{Maximum sub-score: 3}**
- **I-1.6.3:** Identified appropriate recommendations aimed at overcoming existing gaps and limitations in gender coverage **{Maximum sub-score: 3}**.

2. Gender assessment: issues criteria

Criterion C-2.1: Underlying gender inequalities

Explanation of criterion

C-2.1 assesses the extent to which the GA explores the existence and nature of underlying gender inequalities that affect women's access to the benefits and opportunities arising from the Brand's commercial and community development activities.

Specific indicators

The Brand's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on whether the GA explored gender differences in the following characteristics:

- **I-2.1.1:** Access to land, land use and land tenure, including specific differences in access to land for growing tree (perennial) crops⁴ [BtB WOM 1.1.2] **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**
- **I-2.1.2:** Access to education, and hence gender differences in literacy and qualification levels **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**
- **I-2.1.3:** Decision-making roles and negotiating power at household, community and local/national institutional level [BtB WOM 1.1.4] **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**
- **I-2.1.4:** Responsibilities for reproductive work, and hence gender differences in time poverty [BtB WOM 1.1.7] **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**
- **I-2.1.5:** Employment status on smallholder cocoa farms, ie, proportion of women vs. men engaged as (a) farm owner-managers, (b) unpaid family labour, and/or (c) waged (hired labour) [BtB WOM 2.1.2] **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-2.1.6:** Food security, including nutritional status and diversity of food and income sources [BtB WOM 1.1.5] **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**

I-2.1.7: Under this criterion, the Brand was also assessed on the extent to which the GA explored the underlying patriarchal attitudes and practices that underpin all of the above inequalities **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**.

Criterion C-2.2: Women's lower participation as direct cocoa suppliers

Explanation of criterion

C-2.2 assesses the extent to which the GA explored the gender differences in participation as direct suppliers in the Brand's cocoa supply chain. By "direct suppliers" is meant cocoa farmers who are recognised as the named supplier by the direct cocoa buyer (eg, cocoa processing or trading company, farmer co-operative).

Specific indicators

The Brand's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which the GA explored the following characteristics:

- **I-2.2.1:** The proportion of direct cocoa suppliers who are women [BtB WOM 2.1.1] **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-2.2.2:** Where sourcing is via producer groups or co-operatives, the proportion of group members who are women **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-2.2.3:** The degree of women's representation in leadership/governance structures of these groups (where relevant) **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-2.2.4:** The key constraints preventing women from becoming group members/registered suppliers (eg, poor access to land, credit and other agricultural inputs; inappropriate group membership criteria; women's greater reproductive responsibilities; cultural constraints) **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-2.2.5:** Where relevant, additional constraints preventing women from taking up leadership positions within producer groups (eg, discriminatory cultural beliefs/practices, women's lower education and literacy levels, women's greater household responsibilities) **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**.

⁴ Women's access to land to grow cocoa and other tree crops can often be even more restricted than their access to land to grow annual food crops. Due to the perennial nature of tree crops, male community leaders/family heads responsible for allocating land are often particularly reluctant to allocate land to women for growing tree crops, since it means effectively giving them the right to use the land for multiple years.

Criterion C-2.3: Female direct suppliers' poorer access to production inputs

Explanation of criterion

C-2.3 assesses the extent to which the GA explored gender differences in access to training, extension services, credit and agricultural inputs (eg, fertilisers and pesticides).

Specific indicators

The GA's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which it explored the following issues:

- **I-2.3.1:** Differential access by male and female farmers to labour, training, extension, credit and agricultural inputs (including those services/inputs provided by the Brand and/or its supply chain partners, eg, cocoa traders, processors, and also those services/inputs provided by others, eg, government, local/private input suppliers, local NGOs) **{Maximum sub-score: 4}**
- **I-2.3.2:** The key underlying constraints preventing women farmers from accessing training and extension (eg, women's greater domestic responsibilities, women's lower education levels, predominance of male trainers/extension staff) **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-2.3.3:** The key underlying constraints preventing female farmers from accessing credit and other inputs (eg, lack of collateral, poorer access to pesticide application equipment) **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-2.3.4:** The key underlying constraints that restrict women's access to labour (own labour – eg, time poverty due to reproductive and subsistence farming responsibilities; family labour – eg, lower status within household and extended family/community; waged labour – eg, less monetary income/savings) **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**

Criterion C-2.4 Unpaid female family labour: predominance of women as unpaid family workers and their unequal share of costs/benefits from cocoa farming

Explanation of criterion

C-2.4 assesses the extent to which the GA identifies/explores: (a) the proportion of women involved as unpaid family workers on cocoa farms; and (b) the distribution of costs and benefits from cocoa farming between (male) farmer-owners and (female) unpaid family labour working on these farms.

Specific indicators

The GA's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which it explored the following specific issues:

- **I-2.4.1:** How many women working on cocoa farms are primarily working as: (a) unpaid family labour, (b) waged labour, and (c) farmer-owners (direct suppliers)? **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-2.4.2:** How much labour do unpaid female family workers contribute to cocoa farms? What tasks are they involved in, and how does their overall labour input compare to that of male cocoa farmers? **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-2.4.3:** What other costs of cocoa production do unpaid female family workers bear? (including opportunity costs – eg, to what extent does the time spent working on male-controlled cocoa farms prevent women from spending time on their own income-generating activities?) **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**

- **I-2.4.4:** What proportion of the income from cocoa sales is given directly to unpaid female family workers? What other benefits/rewards do they receive for their labour? **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-2.4.5:** To the extent that cocoa income remains in the control of male farmer-owners, to what extent do unpaid female family workers have a say in decision-making over how that income is spent? **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**

Criterion C-2.5 Female waged labour: discriminatory employment practices

Explanation of criterion

C-2.5 assesses the extent to which the GA explores: (a) the prevalence and characteristics of female waged labour on/in cocoa farms, plantations and producer co-operatives/groups; and (b) the existence and nature of gender discrimination experienced by these workers.

Specific indicators

The GA's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which it explored the following specific issues:

- **I-2.5.1:** The number of women working as waged labour in/on smallholder cocoa farms, cocoa plantations (where relevant), and cocoa producer groups/co-operatives **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**
- **I-2.5.2:** Their employment status (eg, casual versus permanent) **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**
- **I-2.5.3:** Gender discrimination in pay and conditions, including whether women and men receive the same wage/piece rate for the same work, and the extent of horizontal and vertical occupational segregation by gender **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**
- **I-2.5.4:** Whether women workers are paid directly, or indirectly via a male family member or other arrangement **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**
- **I-2.5.5:** The prevalence of sexual harassment and abuse in the workplace **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**
- **I-2.5.6:** The nature of any health and safety concerns that specifically affect women workers **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**
- **I-2.5.7:** Any other key gender-related concerns **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**.

Criterion C-2.6: Lack of gender mainstreaming in community development interventions

Explanation of criterion

C-2.6 assesses the extent to which the GA explored: (a) the degree of gender mainstreaming within community development programmes/activities supported by the Brand; and (b) the extent to which women's strategic priorities are addressed by these programmes.

Specific indicators

The GA's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which it analysed the following aspects of the Brand's existing community development programmes/activities:

- **I-2.6.1:** Extent to which gender concerns are mainstreamed in the design of interventions (eg, whether women are effectively consulted in initial needs assessment [WEP Principle 6], whether appropriate targets are set for gender participation in all relevant activities [WEP Principle 1]) **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**

- **I-2.6.2:** What efforts are made to ensure effective implementation of “on-paper” gender components (eg, recruitment of gender experts, provision of gender training to all key project staff, ensuring project committees/governance structures have strong female representation, adequate financial resourcing of gender components, gender disaggregation of project monitoring data) **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**
- **I-2.6.3:** Extent to which women’s own priorities, including their longer-term strategic needs, are being addressed by these programmes? **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**
- **I-2.6.4:** The extent to which women have actually participated in and benefited from the Brand’s community development interventions to date **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**.

3. Action plan (AP): issues criteria

Introduction

For Criteria C-3.1 to C-3.6, the Brand received points for a specific indicator *either* if: (a) the current gender action plan (AP) includes activities that address the indicator in question; *or if* (b) the relevant activities are already being implemented or are planned as part of a pre-existing work programme or action plan.

Criterion C-3.1: Addressing underlying gender inequalities

Explanation of criterion

C-3.1 assesses the extent to which the AP addresses the underlying gender inequalities identified in the GA, and any additional underlying gender inequalities likely to be present in the focus country/supply chain (see Criterion 2.1).

Specific indicators

The AP was assessed based on whether it includes the following types of activities to address identified or likely⁵ gender inequalities:

- **I-3.1.1:** Sensitisation/awareness-raising/training with male family heads, husbands, and male community leaders on the key underlying gender inequalities and the benefits of reducing these inequalities **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-3.1.2:** Training for women themselves on women’s discrimination and empowerment [BtB Media Briefing Feb 2013] **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-3.1.3:** Specific measures to increase women’s access to land, including eg, support for land registration/documentation where women have *de facto* ownership or access to the land they farm **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-3.1.4:** Initiatives to increase women’s literacy rates and improve girls’ access to and participation in education **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-3.1.5:** Encouraging or requiring the Brand’s key supply chain partners (ie, cocoa traders and processors) to adopt and implement policies and principles that support the reduction of underlying gender inequalities [BtB Media Briefing Feb 2013]

⁵ For all criteria under Section 3, APs were assessed not only on whether the proposed actions address gender concerns identified in the corresponding GA. To compensate for weaknesses or gaps in coverage of the GAs, the APs were also assessed on whether they address gender concerns that are known to be widespread in the cocoa sector in the focus country and/or globally (*unless* there is specific evidence from the GA or external sources that indicate these concerns are not relevant to the Brand’s supply chain).

- **I-3.1.6:** Working with key sector initiatives and sustainability certification schemes to better mainstream gender into core standards/policies and implement gender-specific programmes [BtB Media Briefing Feb 2013]
- **I-3.1.7:** Other relevant advocacy work to reduce underlying gender inequalities within cocoa sourcing communities and at district, regional and national institutional levels [WEP Principle 6] **{A sub-score of 2 will be awarded if any one of I-3.1.5, 6 or 7 is addressed}**.

Criterion C-3.2: Improving women's participation as direct cocoa suppliers

Explanation of criterion

C-3.2 assesses the extent to which the AP addresses the key constraints to (a) women's participation as direct suppliers in the Brand's cocoa supply chain, and (b) women's representation in governance structures of producer groups (where relevant) (see Criterion 2.2).

Specific indicators

The AP's compliance against this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which the Brand plans to work with key supply chain partners in the focus country (ie, cocoa traders and processors) to implement the following types of activities:

- **I-3.2.1:** Proactively sourcing from producer co-operatives or groups where women make up a high proportion of membership and/or are well represented in leadership positions/roles [BtB WOM 1.2.2; WEP Principle 5] **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-3.2.2:** Ensuring women are well-represented in relevant management positions within relevant supply chain partner companies, in particular within those companies who buy cocoa directly from farmers and/or farmers' groups [WEP Principle 2] **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-3.2.3:** Ensuring that the eligibility criteria for becoming a direct cocoa supplier and/or producer group member (where relevant) offer equal opportunities for women and men **{Maximum sub-score: 3}**
- **I-3.2.4:** Encouraging men to give a share of their land or cocoa trees to their wives, so that women can become direct suppliers and/or members of cocoa producer groups in their own right **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-3.2.5:** Where cocoa is purchased from producer co-operatives or groups, encouraging more women to take up leadership or management positions within these groups by, eg, introducing quotas for women's representation on relevant committees or boards, explaining the importance and benefits of women's representation to men [BtB Media Briefing Feb 2013] **{Maximum sub-score: 3}**.

Criterion C-3.3: Improving female direct suppliers' access to production inputs

Explanation of criterion

C-3.3 assesses the extent to which the AP includes activities to address the key constraints preventing women farmers from accessing key production inputs (see Criterion 2.3).

Specific indicators

The AP's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which it includes the following types of activities:

- **I-3.3.1:** Supporting and facilitating women farmers' access to relevant training, extension, credit and input provision schemes run by national/local institutions, including relevant government departments, NGOs and educational institutions **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**
- **I-3.3.2:** Building the capacity of relevant government and NGO training etc. programmes to improve the gender awareness of staff, gender sensitivity of delivery mechanisms etc. **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**

WITH RESPECT TO COCOA-RELATED TRAINING AND EXTENSION DIRECTLY PROVIDED BY THE BRAND:

- **I-3.3.3:** Introduction of quotas/specific targets for female participation rates in training sessions **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-3.3.4:** Ensuring that the training methods used are appropriate for women as well as men **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-3.3.5:** Recruiting female extension officers where possible and appropriate, and ensuring that an appropriate proportion of farmer-trainers (where used) are female **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**

WITH RESPECT TO CREDIT AND INPUT PROVISION SCHEMES DIRECTLY SUPPORTED BY THE BRAND:

[BtB WOM 3.3.3 and 3.3.4; WEP Principle 5]

- **I-3.3.6:** Introduction of quotas/specific targets for female participation rates in credit and input provision schemes **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-3.3.7:** Ensuring that entry and guarantee requirements for credit schemes are women-friendly **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**.
- **I-3.3.8:** Improving women's access to pesticide application equipment and personal protective equipment (PPE).
- **I-3.3.9:** Ensuring that information and training about pesticide application and health risks is provided directly and accessible to women
- **I-3.3.10:** Ensuring that pregnant and breast-feeding women are not exposed to pesticides
- **I-3.3.11:** Promoting alternative approaches to crop protection and soil improvement that are more affordable for women, and have less adverse health impacts **{Maximum sub-score of 1 for inclusion of activities relevant to any of the last 4 indicators}**.

Criterion C-3.4: Improving the distribution of costs and benefits for unpaid female family workers

Explanation of criterion

C-3.4 assesses the extent to which the AP includes activities to ensure that unpaid female family workers on cocoa farms receive a fairer share of the income and benefits from cocoa farming (see Criterion 2.4).

Specific indicators

The AP's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on its inclusion of the following types of activities:

- **I-3.4.1:** Women working as unpaid family labour on cocoa farms are directly and proactively invited to participate in Brand-supported cocoa training and extension activities (ie, these activities are not limited to direct suppliers/farmer owners) **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**

- **I-3.4.2:** Advocacy, training and awareness-raising activities under Criterion 3.1 include a focus on the unfair distribution of costs and benefits to unpaid female family labour, and highlight the advantages of sharing the benefits more equally **{Maximum sub-score: 3}**
- **I-3.4.3:** The Brand works with its key supply chain partners (eg, cocoa processors, traders and other companies buying directly from farmers) to encourage joint registration of contributing spouses alongside their farmer-owner husbands as direct suppliers to the Brand's cocoa supply chain (and/or joint membership of producer groups) **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-3.4.4:** Any other relevant activities that promote more equitable distribution of income and benefits to unpaid female family workers **{Maximum sub-score: 3}**

Criterion C-3.5: Addressing gender discrimination experienced by waged workers

Explanation of criterion

C-3.5 assesses the extent to which the AP addresses gender discriminatory practices experienced by waged workers in/on smallholder cocoa farms, cocoa plantations and cocoa producer groups/co-operatives (see Criterion 2.5).

Specific indicators

The AP's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which it includes the following types of activities:

- **I-3.5.1:** The Brand works with its key supply chain partners (eg, cocoa traders, processors and other companies buying directly from cocoa farmers) to encourage the adoption of equal opportunities and anti-sexual harassment policies by cocoa plantations and producer groups in the Brand's supply chain, and to provide training on these policies [BtB WOM 4.1.1, 4.1.4] **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-3.5.2:** The Brand works with its supply chain partners to encourage the establishment of women's committees and women-accessible grievance mechanisms by cocoa plantations and producer groups in the Brand's supply chain [BtB WOM 4.1.2-3] **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-3.5.3:** The Brand works with its supply chain partners to raise awareness of health and safety concerns specifically affecting women workers in cocoa plantations and farms [BtB WOM 4.2.1] **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-3.5.4:** The Brand works with its supply chain partners to encourage cocoa plantations and producer groups to provide/improve childcare facilities for women workers [BtB WOM 4.2.2] **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**
- **I-3.5.5:** Any other relevant activities that address gender discrimination experienced by waged workers **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**

Criterion C-3.6: Mainstreaming gender in community development programmes

Explanation of criterion

C-3.6 assesses the extent to which the AP includes activities to improve the mainstreaming of gender priorities in the Brand's community development programmes (see Criterion 2.6).

Specific indicators

The AP's compliance with this criterion was based on assessing the extent to which it includes the following types of activities:

- **I-3.6.1:** Measures to improve the mainstreaming of gender priorities/concerns in project design (see Criterion 2.6) **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**
- **I-3.6.2:** Measures to improve the mainstreaming of gender priorities/concerns in project implementation (see Criterion 2.6) **{Maximum sub-score: 1.5}**
- **I-3.6.3:** Supporting the development of alternative income-generating opportunities for women **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-3.6.4:** Providing business and marketing skills training for women (and men) **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-3.6.5:** Providing basic services and infrastructure that help women free up time to invest in new income-generating activities **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-3.6.6:** Supporting the development of appropriate financial services that help women better manage and leverage their savings and reduce financial risk **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-3.6.7:** Facilitating women's access to relevant local government or NGO programmes, structures or schemes that provide relevant support to women **{Maximum sub-score: 1}**
- **I-3.6.8:** Any other relevant activities that support mainstreaming of gender priorities in community development interventions **{Maximum sub-score: 2}**

4. Action plan: overall quality

Criterion C-4.1: Does the AP address the GA's recommendations?

Explanation of criterion

C-4.1 assesses the extent to which the AP addresses any specific recommendations made by the GA researchers. (These recommendations should of course directly reflect findings from the GA; however in practice they were not always fully consistent with the research findings.)

Specific indicators

The AP's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the proportion of the researchers' specific recommendations that are appropriately addressed in the AP, with greater weight given to those recommendations that are perceived to be most critical in terms of improving gender equality. Where the researchers' recommendations are not addressed by the Brand's AP, consideration was also given to the credibility of any explanation given as to why these recommendations were not addressed **{Maximum score: 10}**.

Criterion C-4.2: Does the AP include new or strengthened commitments/activities?

Explanation of criterion

C-4.2 assesses the extent to which the AP includes a commitment to initiate new activities, as opposed to simply reporting on what was already being done prior to the GA being conducted.

Specific indicators

The AP's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the proportion of the activities outlined in the AP that represent new or substantially strengthened activities which have been introduced in direct response to the GA's findings and/or recommendations **{Maximum score: 10}**.

Criterion C-4.3: Are individual actions robust, appropriate and sustainable?

Explanation of criterion

C-4.3 assesses the extent to which individual actions in the AP are robust, appropriate and sustainable.

Specific indicators

The AP's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which actions included in the AP are:

- **I-4.3.1: Concrete, time-bound and achievable.** Are proposed activities discrete, with a clear indication of how, by whom and by when they will be implemented? Are activities likely to be achievable within the designated timeframe? **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**
- **I-4.3.2: Linked to specific results and targets.** Does the overall AP include a clear set of desired results and associated targets? Are individual activities linked directly to the achievement of these results and targets? **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**
- **I-4.3.3: Developmentally appropriate.** Are proposed activities likely to achieve the desired results and development impacts (ie, improved gender equality)? **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**
- **I-4.3.4: Sustainable.** Are the proposed actions and delivery mechanisms likely to help ensure the sustainability of the desired development results and impacts over time? **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**

Criterion C-4.4: Are adequate monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment mechanisms included?

Explanation of criterion

C-4.4 assesses the extent to which the AP includes activities, mechanisms and/or procedures to ensure that the outcomes and impacts of planned activities on women and men cocoa farmers are adequately monitored and reviewed on a regular basis [WEP Principle 7].

Specific indicators

The AP's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which it includes activities, mechanisms and/or procedures to:

- **I-4.4.1:** Ensure collection of adequate baseline data against which future progress and achievements can be measured **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**
- **I-4.4.2:** Ensure on-going collection of data relating to key gender-related performance indicators (KPIs) throughout the duration of intervention (eg, number/percentage of female and male members of cocoa producer groups, share of income and benefits from cocoa farming received by unpaid female family workers) **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**
- **I-4.4.3:** Ensure regular internal review of monitoring data, including a commitment to address any substantial failures to meet gender-related performance targets by making appropriate changes to activities **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**
- **I-4.4.4:** Provide for external and independent assessment of the outcomes and impacts of the AP at appropriate intervals **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**.

Criterion C-4.5: Consultation with relevant external stakeholders

Explanation of criterion

C-4.5 assesses the extent to which: (a) relevant external stakeholders were consulted in the preparation of the AP; and (b) the AP includes measures to consult such stakeholders on an on-going basis throughout implementation of the plan [WEP Principle 1; BtB Media Briefing Feb 2013]

Specific indicators

The AP's compliance with this criterion was assessed based on the extent to which the stakeholder groups listed under Criterion 1.3 have been or will be consulted:

- **I-4.5.1:** Prior to finalisation and implementation of the AP **{Maximum sub-score: 5}**
- **I-4.5.2:** On a regular basis throughout the duration of the intervention (eg, via establishment and adequate resourcing of a multi-stakeholder steering group) **{Maximum sub-score: 5}**

Criterion C-4.6: Transparency and dissemination of gender-related learning

Explanation of criterion

C-4.6 assesses the extent to which the Brand commits to publicly sharing information about its activities, achievements, challenges and lessons arising from implementation of the gender AP.

Specific indicators

The AP's compliance with the criterion was assessed based on the extent to which it commits to:

- **I-4.6.1: Transparency**, ie, publicly sharing information about its activities and progress against KPIs, including the results of internal and external project evaluations and impact assessments? [BtB Media Briefing Feb 2013] **{Maximum sub-score: 6}**
- **I-4.6.2: Gender advocacy**, ie, dissemination of good practice and lessons learnt with a view to promoting improved gender awareness and action amongst other brands, suppliers and other relevant stakeholder groups (within the focus country) **{Maximum sub-score: 4}**

Criterion C-4.7: Proportion of cocoa supply chain covered by proposed interventions

Explanation of criterion

C-4.7 assesses: (a) the proportion of the Brand's overall cocoa supply chain in the focus country and other sourcing countries that is addressed by the AP; and (b) the extent to which the AP include commitments to mainstream gender equality policies and/or practices in the wider cocoa supply chain, beyond the target communities directly participating in the Brand's community development programmes.

Specific indicators

There are two aspects of this criterion: (a) coverage of the supply chain in the focus country of the GA, and (b) gender mainstreaming in other cocoa sourcing countries. Compliance with (a) will be assessed based on:

- **I-4.7.1:** The proportion of the total cocoa supply chain in the focus country covered by planned gender interventions **{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}**

- **I-4.7.2:** Whether or not the AP includes specific efforts to extend the reach of interventions beyond the direct beneficiaries of the Brand's community development programmes

{Maximum sub-score: 2.5}

I-4.7.3: Examples of the types of commitments/activities that would contribute to compliance with (b) include **{Maximum sub-score: 5 (1 point to be allocated per relevant activity)}**:

- Commitment to collect (and publish) gender disaggregated data on key performance/impact indicators across the Brand's cocoa supply chain (or at least in more than one sourcing country)
- Commitment to conduct GAs in other sourcing countries
- Activities to promote gender-related good practice and learning from the focus country with key stakeholders in other sourcing countries.