



ILO EVALUATION

- Evaluation Title: **Decent jobs for Youth and Improved Food Security through the Development of Sustainable Rural Enterprises (YAPASA PROJECT)**

- ILO TC/SYMBOL: **ZAM/13/04/SID**

- Type of Evaluation : **Independent final evaluation**

- Country : **Zambia**

- Date of the evaluation: **19 December 2018**

- Name of consultant(s): **Lotta Nycander and Mushiba Nyamazana**

- ILO Administrative Office: **ILO Country Office for Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique**

- ILO Technical Backstopping Office: **Decent Work Team (DWT), ILO Pretoria, Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) unit of the Enterprise Department, ILO Headquarters, Geneva, and FAO Headquarters in Rome and Harare**

- Date project ends: **31 January 2018**

- Donor: country and budget US\$ **Sweden USD 8,2m**

- Evaluation Manager: **David Dorkenoo**

- Key Words: **Youth, Women, Small scale enterprises (SME), Soybean, Aquaculture, Horticulture, Marketing Systems Development, Making markets work for the Poor (M4P), Aggregators, Agro-dealers**

This evaluation has been conducted according to ILO's evaluation policies and procedures. It has not been professionally edited, but has undergone quality control by the ILO Evaluation Office

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
1 BRIEF ON SOCIAL, ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL CONTEXT	11
2 EVALUATION FRAMEWORK	14
2.1 THE PURPOSE, SCOPE AND CLIENTS OF THE FINAL EVALUATION	14
2.2 TASKS AND DELIVERABLES.....	14
2.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA	14
2.4 EVALUATION INSTRUMENT	15
2.5 METHODOLOGY	16
2.6 LIMITATIONS TO THE STUDY.....	18
3 THE YAPASA PROJECT IN BRIEF.....	19
3.1 THE PROJECT ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORK.....	19
3.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES, OUTCOMES AND OVERALL TARGET	20
3.3 PROJECT PARTICIPANTS AND PARTNERS	20
4 ASSESSMENT	22
4.1 ASSESSMENT OF STRATEGIES AND ACHIEVEMENTS	22
4.2 EVALUATION FINDINGS BY KEY EVALUATION CRITERIA	27
4.2.1 <i>Validity of project design</i>	27
4.2.2 <i>Relevance</i>	29
4.2.3 <i>Effectiveness</i>	30
4.2.4 <i>Efficiency</i>	35
4.2.5 <i>Likelihood of impact and sustainability</i>	36
4.3 GENDER EQUALITY AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC ISSUES	37
4.4 GOOD PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNT	38
5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	40
ANNEX I. TERMS OF REFERENCE	45
ANNEX II. LIST OF MEMBERS OF THE PROJECT NSC.....	48
ANNEX III. DOCUMENTS CONSULTED	49
ANNEX IV. PERSONS INTERVIEWED AND CONSULTED	51
ANNEX V. ATTENDANTS IN VALIDATION MEETING, 2 NOVEMBER 2018	53
ANNEX VI. GOOD PRACTICES	54
ANNEX VII: LESSONS LEARNED	56

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ABOS	Aquaculture Business Opportunity Seminars
ADAZ	Aquaculture Development Association of Zambia
AfDB	African Development Bank
CAD	Community Agro Dealers
CAADP	Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme
CASU	Conservation Agriculture Scaling Up
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CEEC	Citizens Economic Empowerment Commission
CSO	Central Statistical Office
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
DCED	Donor Committee for Enterprise Development
DFA	District Farmers Association
DoF	Department of Fisheries
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FDG	Focus Group Discussion
FISP	Farmer Input Support Programme
IAPRI	Indaba Agricultural Policy Research Institute
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies
IDE	International Development Enterprises
ILO	International Labour Organisation
JfYA	Jobs for Youth in Africa Strategy
M4P	Making Markets Work for the Poor
MCTI	Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MoLSS	Ministry of Labour and Social Security

MSME	Micro Small and Medium Enterprises
MTEF	Medium Term Expenditure Framework
MTR	Mid Term Review
NEPAD	New Economic Partnership for African Development
NSC	National Steering Committee
NUSFAZ	National Union of Smallholder Farmers in Zambia
OECD-DAC	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development - Development Assistance Committee
PM	Portfolio Manager
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisals
R-SNDP	Revised Sixth National Development Plan
RCA	Reality Check Approach
ROAF	Regional Office for Africa
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SECO	State Secretariat for Economic Affairs
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
TCPR	Technical Cooperation Progress Report
ToT	Training of Trainers
VC	Value chain
ZCTU	Zambia Congress of Trade Unions
ZDA	Zambia Development Agency
ZDWCP	Zambia Decent Work Country Programme
ZFE	Zambia Federation of Employers

Acknowledgements

We wish to extend our heartfelt appreciation to all the partners, stakeholders and participants/beneficiaries to the Yapasa project who agreed to meet with us during the evaluation process. We are indebted to the officials of the Government of the Republic of Zambia, officials of Employers' Federation, Chamber of Commerce, and Trade Union, Research institutions, who attended meetings, interviews and discussions. Our sincere gratitude goes to all participating private sector actors in small and medium enterprises, social enterprises and civil society organisations.

Many thanks to ILO and FAO officials at regional and headquarter levels for sharing valuable information. Our heartfelt appreciation goes to Mr. Alexio Musindi, ILO Director (for Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia) and Mr. Stephen Morris, the Project's Chief Technical Adviser. We are very grateful for the excellent cooperation to all the Yapasa project staff members who greatly assisted with logistics and documentation, took part in long interviews, answered questionnaires and gave us useful feedback on our first draft report – including the driver who safely took us to different parts of the country on our field visit.

Last but not least, Mr. David Dorkenoo, Evaluation Manager has been attentive in the process, for which, we are also very thankful.

Lotta Nycander and Mushiba Nyamazana.

Evaluation Team

Executive Summary

This is final draft report of the Independent Final Evaluation of the **Yapasa** project in Zambia with official title **Decent Jobs for Youth and Improved Food Security through the Development of Sustainable Rural Enterprises**¹. Yapasa is a private sector UN Joint Project, aiming at facilitating the creation of sustainable employment opportunities for young women and men in rural areas through the promotion of sustainable micro, small scale enterprises (SMEs). The International Labour Organisation (ILO), the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) are the implementing agencies, working together with the Zambian Government and many other stakeholders and partners presented in this report. ILO is the lead agency and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) is the development partner. In total, the joint budget is USD 8,2m (ILO and FAO).

The project duration was four years (2013 to 2017) and included an Inception phase with implementation from September 2014 to August 2017 followed by “no-cost extension” from September to December 2017, which in turn was followed by cost extension phase with a new budget allocation from Sida, from January to December 2018. The Project team consists of a Chief Technical Adviser (CTA), four Portfolio Managers (PMs) of which two are employed by ILO, and two by FAO; one Performance Measurement Manager, one Assistant, one Administrative and Finance Assistant and two Drivers. All are based housed in the ILO Office in Lusaka.

A Project National Steering Committee (NSC) was established to guide the Project’s implementation, chaired by the Ministry of Youth, Sport and Community Development. The Steering Committee has oversight over the Programme and is responsible for providing strategic direction and guidance on programme implementation through its bi-annual meetings. The NSC is also responsible for approving the programme revisions, Annual Work Plans and Budgets. A Project Technical Committee was formed under the NSC and has met more frequently. The NSC Members are listed in Annex II.

The purposes of the evaluation are i) an independent assessment on project achievements (performance against plans, strategies and approaches applied, partnership arrangements, constraints and opportunities); and ii) Recommendations and lessons learned provided to the clients who can use the results of the evaluation, in particular GRZ, ILO and its constituents (MoL, Employers, Workers organisations), FAO, as well as private sector Partners (the clients/audience). The scope is the Project in its entirety and the clients are the Government of Zambia, the Development Partner (Sida/Embassy of Sweden), the ILO and FAO (Project staff, the Lab² at ILO Headquarters, technical departments and regional offices of both ILO and FAO).

The evaluation has looked at the validity of the design, strategies applied and major achievements and challenges. It has applied the standard OECD-DAC evaluation criteria for evaluations, i.e. relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and (likelihood of) impact and sustainability. Cross-cutting concerns have been analysed, such as gender equality/gender responsiveness, youth involvement and disability in the programming and field implementation.

¹ This is the long version of the project title in the ToR.

² The lab is a three-year research and knowledge generation project on how to measure and maximise labour market outcomes while working in value chains and sectors. The project is implemented by the ILO with funding from Swiss SECO. Source: https://www.ilo.org/empent/Projects/the-lab/WCMS_326500/lang-en/index.htm.

Overall assessment

Yapasa has played a facilitative role in stimulating agro-market systems to innovate and serve rural populations living in poverty. The Project has also addressed market constraints to stimulate systemic change and help the project participants to identify their own solutions to these constraints. It has reached out to farmers and rural youth through its private sector Partners/SMEs with whom working relationships were formed through Service Contracts with specific conditions for accessing grants and other support.

The Project has developed capacity and raised interest among stakeholders specifically regarding aquaculture and the MSD approach, and also developed capacity of the staff through training, exchange visits/study tours, and attendance in workshops, that has developed their knowledge in several technical fields. The evaluation has the firm impression that the Partner companies, with few exceptions, appreciated the way the Project team has worked with them through coaching and mentoring. The Yapasa project team has stated that it received very good technical and administrative support - on a needs basis - from ILO and FAO, respectively.

In order to help create improvements for the actors on the market that are sustainable, and reach the Outcomes, the predominant strategy applied is the Market Systems Development (MSD) approach/Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P). Through MSD, the Yapasa project has addressed constraints within markets to stimulate systemic change and made efforts to adapt it to the particular context and circumstances in the selected rural areas. Using this strategy jointly was bold but valid. It was a first for the ILO and FAO in a joint rural programme and as such has provided valuable lessons. The results were mixed (see Lessons Learnt for more reflections). Another key strategy was to learn and adapt, and move from pilot activities in the first phase, to reach larger scale impact in the implementation phase - closely with private sector companies/entrepreneurs in selected provinces. (Conclusion 1.)

Assessment by key evaluation criteria

Validity of project design

It is clear that the original project design needed to be changed and was thus not valid at the start. The Outcomes were revised in each new Logframe that was developed (and subsequently also the supporting Outputs) - as the Project gained more experience and knowledge about the marketing situation in the Provinces. This also necessitated challenging some of the early assumptions in the original Project design - such as the focus on soybean cultivation at the beginning. It is also clear that the many changes were a bit confusing both for the staff, stakeholders and the evaluation team. (Conclusion 2.)

Relevance

The Project has been relevant vis-à-vis the relevant national policies as well as the strategies of the relevant development partners. The Project has been less relevant for youth, the ultimate beneficiaries, in terms of *choice of value chains* as this report has mentioned. Learning is an important part of any project, in particular on a pilot project in which new methods and strategies are experimented with. The Project has been able to improve on the original design, adopt a flexible approach vis-à-vis the MSD and learn from experiences throughout the various phases. For instance, when realising the soybean was not as successful as anticipated, it turned to aquaculture and (latest) horticulture both of which seem to be more feasible for the target group. (Conclusion 3.)

Effectiveness

Yapasa has managed to contribute to most of the Outcomes, attracted attention among many institutions and spread knowledge about the marketing systems approach. **a)** Regarding reaching targets: The cumulative jobs result was 2,484 at the end of December 2017 (i.e. 93% of the target of 3,000 jobs). During the first six months of

2018 the situation significantly improved with 1,725 jobs (58% of Project target) recorded. **b)** However, the proportion of jobs and incomes generated for the actual ultimate target groups (youths including young women) were much lower during this period - than in 2017. The lack of an instrument to target youths in general and young women in particular was still apparent in 2018. *This situation could very well change for the better with continued support for the aquaculture and horticulture value chains, and for rural entrepreneurs determined to engage more youth and women.* (Conclusion 4 a and b.)

Efficiency

The Project was not fully efficient in terms of utilising resources at the start. Funds at the inception could have been used to thoroughly explore what priorities and interests unemployed youth, including young women have, and the role that (diverse) economic and socio-cultural norms play in the different areas. In hindsight, using resources to acquire more knowledge at the start could have created a more solid platform for involvement of youth and the reach of outcomes sooner. (Conclusion 5.)

Likelihood of impact and sustainability

a) Project impact is found in the increased knowledge and technical know-how e.g. in the aquaculture field and the business growth of commodity aggregators, agro-dealers and processors, fish feed and fingerling suppliers. The setting up of Community Agro Dealers (CAD), as well as the District fish nurseries, appears fruitful as well, and if continued, more impact is likely to be identified in this area – as these are appreciated by the farmers and has (among other things) brought agricultural inputs nearer to the remote areas farmers, and has cut the farmers’ cost of doing business.

b) The likelihood of sustainability in meeting farmers’ and entrepreneurs’ needs for improved and more efficient production and marketing with e.g. the systems of input delivery placed nearer the farmers - depend on many factors including Partners’ willingness to continue the CAD arrangement and District nurseries. It may also depend on potential future support from Department of Fisheries (DoF) and the Department of Agriculture (DoA) and other government agencies, to serve the entrepreneurs/youth. (Conclusion 6.)

Adherence to gender equality and women empowerment

a) Gender responsiveness in Yapasa is mainly manifested as encouragement (through Partnership with the companies) of women to take part in soybean, fish as well as horticulture activities and also ensuring a gender balanced project team for which the Project is given much credit. Still, the participation of youth, including young women, was lower than anticipated;

b) The Project would have benefitted from undertaking field socio-economic studies at the inception; and

c) The gender analysis report produced through Yapasa is not available. Such studies could have helped the Project to determine the needs and divergent roles that women, men and youth have in rural areas and among different ethnic groups that might impact on their level of participation in value chains *before these were selected* (Conclusion 7 a,b, and c.)

Good practices and Lessons Learnt

The following are assessed to be good practices:

- The Last Mile Distribution approach constituted a good practice – but was reliant on the satellite system, which was part of the pilot activities initiated during the latter part of the Project, as well as the partnership with the companies.

- Yapasa’s support in establishing district fish nurseries is another example of a good practice in North Western Province that has resulted in an increased number of hatcheries and has had a good impact in this province.
- Project staff’s ability to learn from its experiences in the field and take action is another good practice and clearly account for the “thinking behind” Project strategies, in particular the MSD through reports/presentations submitted to the NSC and in workshops.
- Having a project team consisting of staff from two different UN agencies working well together is another good practice and has enabled the Yapasa team in Lusaka to draw from technical expertise from both ILO and FAO regional and headquarter offices.

Regarding [lessons learnt](#), both ILO and FAO have worked for many years with private sector actors. An important lesson from Yapasa, is:

- UN’s attempts to attract donor resources (and contribute to impact through its support activities) should include empowerment and enhancement of youth’s productive participation in value chains *on their own terms*.
- The digital divide is a serious concern in particular regarding young people and minimizing this gap should be central in any new project design catering for the youth in rural areas. The project could have benefitted from promotion of some form of modern Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) (internet, wireless networks, cell phones, and other communication mediums) for the youth in the farming communities to help them be computer literate in addition to other project activities including conventional agriculture production (internet problems could have been solved through setting up business development service cafés in semi-urban areas combined with training). The use of new apps could have been worked on for business development services, bringing agricultural services closer to farmers, providing real-time information on weather, livestock care, markets, and nutrition-related aspects of food production . Possibly, some lessons could have been learnt from the experiences of Kenyan smallholder farmers and traders using ICT quite successfully.
- In the absence of in-depth socially oriented studies the Project could have carried out more rapid rural assessments, such as Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA) or some rural rapid Reality Check method to increase the Project’s appreciation of what women and youth would like to be engaged in to improve their situation and earn some income in rural areas.

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions, good practices and lessons learnt, the recommendations are as follows:

1. The UN agencies (ILO and FAO) should be repositioned to increasingly target catalytic projects that empower and enhance the youth’s productive participation in value chains on their own terms.
2. The Government of the Republic of Zambia should promote financial products catering to youth in agriculture and consider allocating more funds to the District of Fisheries to improve operations and enhance the output of small-scale farmers in the aquaculture sector.
3. Implementing agencies and projects supporting youth oriented causes in diverse socio-cultural settings in rural areas - should ensure that adequate information (participatory field studies, gender analysis) is available about the people who

will be involved/affected prior to major decisions being made about directions, activities and funds.

4. In the future, private sector projects (similar to the one evaluated), as well as implementing and development partners should ensure that gender analysis studies are carried out and recommendations are appreciated and followed because gender relations to a large extent still determine access to assets and resources as well as decision-making – and are likely to have an impact on governance of value chains.
5. To increase relevance of future similar development projects, the implementing and development partners should appreciate that young people living in poverty in rural areas are disadvantaged and need various other support to farm. The basics for empowering them should be that *they are market players in their own right* and have different perspectives that distinguish them from those of their parents/caretakers.
6. A central concern in any new project design catering for the youth in rural areas should be to facilitate overcoming the digital divide and ensure that ICT possibilities are fully explored and if possible implemented. This could help raise their interest and productivity and assist them to exploit other niches e.g. logistics and/or agro-processing/packaging in the agricultural value chains (this recommendation emanates from the lessons learnt, mainly).

1 Brief on social, economic and political context

This is the report of the independent Final Evaluation of the UN Joint Project in Zambia, entitled **Decent Jobs for Youth and Improved Food Security through the Development of Sustainable Rural Enterprises**. It describes the objectives and scope of the evaluation study and gives a brief overview of the socio-political context, as well as a brief of the evaluated Project. It accounts for the evaluation criteria applied as well as the evaluation instrument (the questions) to aid the evaluation team through the data/information collection process. The evaluation methodology and approaches are described, as well as the key documents that were consulted.

It is estimated that 70.9 million young people are unemployed globally. Globally, also, unemployment, or employment in precarious jobs, is much higher for youth than for adults. The global youth unemployment rate for 2017 is 13.1 per cent³. About 25 million young workers aged 15–29 are likely to enter the labour force in search for jobs (up to 2030) and by then 77.0 per cent of the youth labour force aged 15–24 will be in the developing countries of Africa and Asia and the Pacific.⁴

In many African countries, high levels of unemployment, vulnerable employment and working poverty persist. A report in 2016 estimated that the Sub-Saharan African (SSA) countries had the highest youth working poverty rates globally, at almost 70 per cent that year. This means that in 2016, 64.4 million working youth in that region were living in extreme or moderate poverty earning less than \$3.10 per day. The report states that in the last twenty-five years the number of working youth living in poverty has increased by *as much as 80 per cent in this region*.⁵

Some international organisations are specifically addressing youth unemployment and poverty in SSA, e.g. the African Development Bank's (AfDB) programme Jobs for Youth in Africa Strategy (JfYA Strategy) (2016-2025), set to contribute to the achievement of inclusive growth, productive employment and decent work for all for in Africa (Sustainable Development Goals - SDG 8)⁶. Furthermore, AfDB's programme on Youth Entrepreneurship and Innovation Multi-Donor Trust Fund also contributes to the achievement of this goal in Africa.

In Zambia, the unemployment rate in 2017 was estimated to be 7.79 per cent with a small increase (from 7.78 per cent) in 2016. *Youth* unemployment in Zambia is at 28% in the age group 20-24 years and 16% in the age group 25-29 years. Young people living in rural areas are particularly affected and it can be assumed that it is even higher in rural areas. The Project Document for the implementation phase of the Yapasa Project states “while statistically significant evidence from rural areas is scarce, from ample case-specific evidence it can be safely stated that the unemployment figures for rural areas are higher, particularly if underemployment is also measured”.

Zambia had a fast economic growth rate between 2000 and 2014, with an annual average growth of 7.3 per cent, and a per capita GDP growth rate of 4.3 per cent, this growth has not been shared among the poorer segments of the population, or contributed in reducing

³ Source: *ILO 2017 Global Employment Trends (GET) for Youth*

⁴ Source: *Green Jobs for Youth, A Technical Note to guide programme design and implementation ILO*, Kees van der Ree, Geneva, 2018 (draft)

⁵ The *World Employment and Social Outlook 2016: Trends for Youth Africa* (Source: https://www.ilo.org/addisababa/media-centre/pr/WCMS_514566/lang--en/index.htm)

⁶ It constitutes one of the largest efforts to tackle youth employment on the continent today along with the Bank's efforts to support African countries to scale up responses to the youth unemployment and underemployment crisis on the continent. Also of note is that this is not only geared towards actual job opportunities but helping governments to identify the “right” sectors where jobs can be created (Source: *Mapping study: Productive Employment with Decent Working Conditions within Swedish bilateral and regional development cooperation strategies in Sub-Saharan Africa*, by Lotta Nycander, FCG, 2018).

income poverty as 60 per cent of the country's population (2015 Living Conditions and Monitoring Survey) live on less than USD 1.25 a day and for rural areas the equivalent figure is about 80 per cent. The Government has committed to tackling poverty and promoting more broad based wealth through creating more jobs and a conducive environment with more opportunities for young job seekers both women and men⁷. Its Vision 2030 document emphasises that job/employment creation is a priority for Zambia to become a middle-income country by 2030. Social and economic goals and targets that need to be achieved are set out in this document, as well as the challenges and obstacles⁸.

The national development plans in Zambia, aim at achieving the objectives of the Vision 2030 - to transform the country into a middle-income country by 2030: The 6th National Development Plan (and its revision 2013-2016) that was in place when the programme started as well as the 7th National Development Plan – all have outcomes to various degrees related to job creation, economic diversification, investments in the rural economy and inclusion - as measures to reduce vulnerability and poverty as well as investments in the rural economy, among other outcomes⁹. The 7th NDP emphasises that economic diversification strives to have competitive growth and integrated sectors reducing the dependence on copper - which is a limited resource.

The recently released Government document “2018 - 2020 Green Paper” (the Medium Term Expenditure Framework - MTEF), links the medium term development goals of the Government to their budgetary implications. It states that the Government has set a platform for higher inclusive growth, employment and wealth creation in the medium to long term - and the sectors agriculture, mining, manufacturing and tourism are targeted as strategic sectors for the creation of decent employment opportunities and inclusive development¹⁰.

The Government has also acknowledged, and committed to the Decent Work Agenda through the Zambia Decent Work Country Programme¹¹ (ZDWCP), developed by the tripartite constituents; the Government, Employers' and Workers' organizations – to which the ILO provides technical support. As regards environment and climate change impact/aspects, the Government intends to ensure that the agriculture sector is more resilient to climate change, and has thus harmonized the National Agricultural Policy and the Climate Change Policy. The concept of climate-smart agriculture (CSA) is part of key policy documents related to climate change.¹²

The key drivers of economic growth during 2016 were mining, wholesale and retail trade, and construction and manufacturing. These four sectors accounted for two-thirds of total growth during the year. Macroeconomic stability has largely been the result of the growth in the capital-intensive copper mining sector, on which the country has been heavily dependent. The poor integration between copper mining and other sectors, and the lack of investment has resulted in insufficient growth in job rich sectors such as transport, manufacturing, tourism and agriculture.

⁷ Zambia's National Youth Policy has defined “youth” as those who are between 18 – 35 years old. Source: *Zambia Green Jobs Programme Brochure*, a UN Joint Project in Zambia.

⁸ Vision 2030, *A Prosperous Middle-Income Nation by 2030*, December 2006, Republic of Zambia

⁹ *Revised 6th National Development Plan 2013-2016* and *7th National Development Plan 2017-2021*, Ministry of National Development Planning, Zambia.

¹⁰ *Zambia Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF)*. Immediate media release, Sunday, 10 September, 2017.

¹¹ *Zambia Decent Work Country Programme (ZDWCP) 2013-2016*, ILO

¹² Examples are the Zambia REDD+ Strategy (2015), Zambia's Nationally Intended Contribution (2016) plan, and the draft Implementation Plan for Seventh National Development Plan. Source: *Zambia and FAO, Partnering for improved livelihoods and climate change mitigation* (Factual brochure)

The majority of working age population in Zambia is employed in the informal economy, i.e. 83 per cent with only 17 per cent having employment in the formal economy – thus, the majority of workers/employees in the country lack social security/social protection¹³. The private sector has been identified as being strategically important in boosting employment with particular emphasis on the development of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSME) and their need for easier access to skills training and business finance. SMEs account for 70% of Zambia’s GDP and 88% of the employment. In order to help create job opportunities and enhance economic growth a number of agencies have pledged to support (through loans) SMEs in the country during the last 2-3 years, e.g. the Industrial Development Corporation (IDC) of South Africa and the Development Bank of Zambia (DBZ) in 2016; the African Development Bank (AfDB).¹⁴

There are many challenges in the rural areas. The agricultural sector, in which 57 per cent of the labour force is employed, contributes only 9 per cent of the GDP - one reason being that financial capital for infrastructure development to reduce supply chain costs for manufacturing and agriculture is lacking. Although this sector has the potential to increase incomes and employment it suffers from inefficient value chains and limited access to markets, lack of access to skills and technology development as well as limited funding for business entrepreneurs/entrepreneurship.¹⁵

¹³ Source: *2014 Labour Force Survey report, Central Statistics Office, Lusaka, Ministry of Labour and Social Security*

¹⁴ Source: <http://www.zambiainvest.com/economy/entrepreneurial-scheme-smes> and follow us on www.twitter.com/zambia_invest

¹⁵ *Results strategy for Sweden’s international development cooperation in Zambia 2013–2017*, Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

2 Evaluation framework

This section brings out the framework for the evaluation study including the purpose, scope and clients, a description of the tasks and deliverables, evaluation criteria and the evaluation instrument used (consisting of the questions to guide the process). It also mentions the organisations consulted/interviewed, as well as the overall qualitative approach used in gathering information and data.

2.1 The purpose, scope and clients of the final evaluation

These are the two **purposes** for the final evaluation:

- i) An independent assessment on project achievements (performance against plans, strategies and approaches applied, partnership arrangements, constraints and opportunities); and
- ii) Recommendations and lessons learned provided to the clients who can use the results of the evaluation, in particular GRZ, ILO and its constituents (MoL, Employers, Workers organisations), FAO, as well as private sector Partners (the clients/audience).

The **scope** of the final evaluation is the Project in its entirety, including its environment, project organisation, results and challenges. The **clients** are the Government of Zambia, the Development Partner (Sida/Embassy of Sweden), the ILO and FAO (Project staff, the Lab at ILO Headquarters, technical departments and regional offices of both ILO and FAO).

2.2 Tasks and deliverables

The evaluation team participated in a virtual briefing with the Project Chief Technical Adviser (CTA) at the start of the documentation review phase. An Inception Report was submitted followed by the information collection period in Zambia for more than two weeks in October-November 2018. The evaluation team participated in Project briefing sessions, attended meetings and held in-depth interviews with the relevant Government ministries, research institutions, Employers and Workers federations (ILO tripartite constituents), as well as private sector companies including Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs). Interactions with farmers, youth/women in the rural communities, were mainly done through focus group discussions.

The team presented the preliminary findings in a Stakeholders Validation Workshop in Lusaka on 2nd November 2018, followed by submission of the draft report one week later. This is the final evaluation report in which the written comments received from the Evaluation Manager on 27 November 2018 are addressed.

2.3 Evaluation criteria

The standard international OECD-DAC evaluation criteria applied in project evaluations are relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. The ToR specified these as follows: Relevance and strategic fit of the program; Validity of M4P approach, design and strategies adopted by the program; Project progress and delivery of results; Efficiency of resource use, set up and value for money; Organisational Management arrangements; and Impact orientation and sustainability as defined in ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation. It was noted in the Inception Report of the evaluation, that effectiveness is not specifically mentioned in the ToR, however, the evaluation stated in the report that it would interpret “Project progress and delivery of results” as falling under the effectiveness criteria.

2.4 Evaluation instrument

The evaluation instrument consists of a number of questions to be posed to different categories of stakeholders. Most were brought up in the ToR, some are added while some have been rephrased to be more open-ended (not rhetoric). The questions are listed under the standard OECD-DAC criteria for the sake of consistency, after which validity of project design and organisational management arrangements, as mentioned in the ToR, follows. The below-mentioned questions are examples that were further specified and adapted for each category of respondent, as the data gathering process proceeded.

Relevance and strategic fit

- To what extent was the project relevant/consistent with the national development priorities in relation to the agricultural sector – for instance the Revised 6th National Development Plan?
- What is the relevance of the Project to the DWCP of Zambia and country assistance strategies of FAO for Zambia, and the Sida's results strategy (2013-17)?
- How was the Project relevant to the Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA) and ARM conclusions?
- To what extent are the Project activities relevant in tackling youth unemployment and poverty in rural areas – and are the interventions based on the assessed needs of this ultimate target group?
- To what extent did the project leverage partnerships (with constituents, national institutions and other UN/ Development agencies) that enhanced project relevance and contributed to priority SDGs (e.g. 2,5 and 8)?

Effectiveness (“progress and delivery of results” mentioned in the ToR)

- To what extent have the expected outputs and outcomes been achieved or are likely to be achieved in relation to its results framework or operational objectives?
- Which factors have contributed or influenced *successful* achievements /alternatively *unsuccessful* achievements?
- What can be determined as regards quality of produced outputs/outcomes?
- What unintended results (if any) could be assessed/observed - negative or positive?

Efficiency

- How appropriate were ILO's and FAO's interventions/activities in terms of resource use? Could less/fewer resources have been used with the same goals in mind – with the same or better results?
- To what level were technical and financial resources adequate to implement the Project?
- How economically worthwhile were the Project interventions/activities?
- To what extent did the project budget factor-in the cost of specific activities, outputs and outcomes to address:
 - Gender equality and non-discrimination?
 - Inclusion of people with disabilities?

Impact orientation and sustainability

- To what degree can it be assessed that programme strategy, programme management and implementation addressed and/or enabled impact and sustainability (including environmental sustainability)?
- What is the likelihood that sustainability will be achieved at the end of the Project?

Validity (of the project design and approaches/strategies used)

- To what extent was the Project design (Logframe, Theory of Change) valid, realistic, logical/coherent, in particular the relationship between outputs and outcomes/objectives?
- How has the project designed/used the performance indicators, or indicators of achievement?
- What changes were made of the logframes over the years and were the changes justified?
- What is the validity in applying the M4P approach in the ILO/FAO (joint) environment?
- How appropriate was it to promote/apply an M4P approach in the current thin-market context in Zambia?
- What have been the advantages/disadvantages of implementing the programme as a joint ILO/FAO programme?
- How is gender addressed in the Project Document and logframe?

Organisational Management Arrangements (these also fall under some of the criteria above, e.g. under effectiveness)

- How adequate were the Project's management arrangements, role/tasks distributions, M&E system and overall governance arrangements of the project?
- What was the perception of the stakeholders and partner organisations in relation to the management arrangements, communications with the Project and clarity regarding distribution of roles in the implementation of activities?
- To what extent has the Project staff received administrative, technical and - if needed - political support when needed from ILO and FAO, respectively?

Cross-cutting issues

- How has the Project design, planning, implementation and M&E system addressed gender equality/gender mainstreaming disability and other areas where discrimination may occur?
- To what extent have women and men, respectively, been actively involved and/or benefitted from Project interventions?
- To what extent, and in which way, has the Project taken into account SDG targets and indicators?

2.5 Methodology

In order to look for any trends or evidence of achievement and/or performance and determine their relative contribution to Yapasa's stated objectives, data was collected through several means from many different sources, i.e. through a mix of methods to gather both qualitative and quantitative data and information (quantitative data was drawn from secondary sources). These methods were documentation review; in-depth

semi-structured interviews; formal meetings; informal discussions and focus group discussions; e-mail correspondence; and questionnaire survey.

The evaluation team applied methodological triangulation regarding responses and information received which served the purpose of ensuring credibility and validity of the results and crosschecking information to minimize any bias. It also deepened the evaluators' understanding of the Project and the circumstances that impacted on the performance and results. Qualitative content analysis was also used to analyse the gathered information and "rival" explanations. The data collection process was participatory in the sense that all key actors were encouraged to share information, experiences and knowledge. The evaluators have adhered to relevant ethical standards in the analysis of the gathered data and paid attention not to let conclusions be influenced by statements or views given by any particular party.¹⁶

Representatives of the following organisations (stakeholders) were interviewed:¹⁷

- Yapasa Project staff (and former staff);
- Embassy of Sweden/Sida Zambia;
- FAO country representative in Zambia and Headquarter technical team (Rome, Italy);
- ILO Enterprise Department, Headquarters, Geneva, Switzerland;
- ILO Country Director for Zambia, Malawi and Mozambique;
- Cooperative Department, Ministry of Commerce and Trade;
- Ministry of Labour;
- Ministry of Youth and Sports;
- Ministry of Fisheries, Department of Fisheries;
- Ministry of Commerce and Trade (Cooperatives Department);
- Solwezi District Farmers Association (DFA);
- National Aquaculture Research Development Centre;
- Zambia Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ZACCI);
- Zambia Federation of Employers (ZFE);
- Zambia Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU);
- Alliance of Young Entrepreneurs (AYE);
- Private sector Partners and Micro, Small and Medium Entrepreneurs (MSMEs); and
- Smallholder farmers (youth and elderly – both women and men).

The evaluation team has interviewed and discussed with the Yapasa Project staff, government ministries and partner organisations (including ILO tripartite partners) in Lusaka. It embarked on a 9-days field visit that covered all the provincial operational areas of the Project i.e. Central, Copperbelt, Luapula, Lusaka, Northern and North

¹⁶ The evaluation team has also been mindful of international ethical norms and standards: OECD-DAC's quality guidelines for evaluations; DECD Standard for Measuring Results in Private Sector Development, control points and compliance criteria; Code of conduct spelled out in UNEG's ethical Guidelines for UN evaluations; and ILO Evaluation policy 2017, GB.331/PFA/8, Geneva; and ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-based Evaluation.

¹⁷ See Annex IV for details on interviewees.

Western provinces and discussed with many stakeholders at different levels. Representative sampling was the basis for selection of the places to visit in these provinces. Thus, the team was exposed to many different aspects of Yapasa in terms of Partners' appreciation of the marketing model, differences in socio-economic and geographical conditions among the rural population, as well as differences in size and services that the MSMEs and Partner companies rendered.

A Stakeholders Validation Workshop was held on 2 November 2018 in Lusaka where the evaluation's preliminary findings were presented followed by a question and answer session, and discussion (see list of the attendants in Annex V).

2.6 Limitations to the Study

The evaluation team would have appreciated a discussion/interview with a representative of the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA), however this did not materialise despite efforts made to arrange a meeting. The evaluation attempted to mitigate the absence of perspectives on Yapasa from this Ministry by reviewing documentation, discussing with other organisations and project managers that have partnerships with MoA, including FAO¹⁸ in Lusaka - and its Conservation Agriculture Scaling Up (CASU) project.¹⁹

¹⁸ FAO is in a formal partnership with this ministry.

¹⁹ CASU aims at contributing to reduced hunger, improved food security, nutrition and income while promoting sustainable use of natural resources in Zambia.

3 The Yapasa Project in brief

This chapter gives a summarised picture of the Project's administrative arrangements in terms of donor funding, implementing agencies, and staff arrangements as well as the governance arrangements. It states the objectives and outcomes to be obtained as well as the strategies chosen to reach these. The key Project partners, stakeholders and participants are named.

3.1 The Project administrative framework

The Project Document for the phase that followed the Inception Phase states that the Project is named Rural Youth Enterprise for Food Security. However, the Project has used the name Yapasa, which means "Just Do It" in Bemba, a name taken early on that also will be used in this report.

Yapasa is a private sector UN joint project aiming at facilitating the creation of sustainable employment opportunities for young women and men in rural areas through the promotion of sustainable micro, small and medium enterprises (MSME). The International Labour Organisation (ILO), the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) are the implementing agencies working together with the Zambian Government for the past five years in address youth employment issues. ILO is the lead agency and administrative agent and responsible for the implementation. The funds are managed according to a "pass-through" system.

The Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), through the Embassy of Sweden, is the Development Partner. It has SEK 46,075,000 (approximately USD 6.9m) with an additional allocation of SEK 12,000,000 at the end of 2017. In total, the joint budget is USD 8,2m (ILO and FAO).

The duration was 48 months (4 years) from August 2013 to August 2017, included an Inception phase which was planned to last six months but which lasted one year. The inception phase was devoted to desk and field research, dialogues and validation with stakeholders and development of market system strategies. A pilot implementation from September 2014 to August 2017 – followed by "no-cost extension" from September to December 2017 which, in turn, was followed by "cost extension phase" from January to December 2018.

The Project team consists of one Chief Technical Adviser (CTA), four Portfolio Managers (PMs) of which two are employed by ILO, and two by FAO; one Performance Measurement Manager, one Assistant, one Administrative and Finance Assistant and two Drivers. All are based housed in the ILO Office in Lusaka.

The CTA is the principal staff responsible for programme implementation, supervising staff, allocating budgets, preparing progress reports and maintaining relations with government, ILO constituents and partner organisations as well as the private sector actors and organisations. He is also responsible for the working relationship with the FAO, although the senior FAO Portfolio Manager has been a crucial bridge in these contacts. The first CTA worked for almost 1 ½ year. He joined the Project in May 2014 and left his post in June 2015, which created a management gap of four months that was filled by one of the national portfolio managers, who acted as Programme Manager.²⁰ The new CTA was recruited in November 2015 and has remained on his post to date.

Two of the Project staff members (one PM and one Driver) have been in the Project from the start. None of the PMs, or the CTA has worked for ILO earlier, and only a few had worked for FAO earlier.

²⁰ Yapasa TCPR 2015.

A Project National Steering Committee (NSC) was established to guide the Project's implementation, chaired by the Ministry of Youth, Sport and Community Development. Meetings are convened twice yearly. The Steering Committee has oversight over the Programme and is responsible for providing strategic direction and guidance on programme implementation through its bi-annual meetings.

The NSC is also responsible for approving the programme revisions, Annual Work Plans and Budgets. A Project Technical Committee was formed under the NSC and has met more frequently. The NSC Members are listed in Annex II.

3.2 Project objectives, outcomes and overall target

The development challenge that the Project is addressing is unemployment and underemployment of youth in rural areas. The Project rationale is thus to address this through facilitating young women and men in rural areas to attain sustainable livelihoods through the promotion of micro, small and medium-scale enterprises (MSMEs).²¹ Thus, while its ultimate target groups are the youth (women and men between 16 and 35) - the direct beneficiaries are the companies that Yapasa is partnering with who in turn involve people in rural areas in various agribusiness activities. There were four outcomes in the first implementation pilot phase.²²

- Outcome 1:** Improved public perception and demand for soybean products and of rural economy as a source of youth employment (meta-level)
- Outcome 2:** More enabling business environment for young entrepreneurs to start and formalize businesses in soybean and aquaculture value chains (macro-level)
- Outcome 3:** More young people respond to economic opportunities in soybean and aquaculture market systems (micro-level)
- Outcome 4:** Value chain development partners along the soybean and aquaculture value chains collaborate and coordinate effectively and efficiently (cross cutting).

The overall quantitative targets in the original Project Document were the start up of 5,000 youth owned/managed enterprises (or improved operations) and the creation of 3,000 new decent jobs for young men and women.

3.3 Project participants and Partners

The **direct** project participants (beneficiaries) are governmental, non-governmental and private sector organisations, including the Ministry of Labour, Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock (MoLF), Ministry of Commerce and Trade, Ministry of Youth and Sports (MoYS) and Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) as well as the Federation of Employers and Congress of Trade Unions and Civil Society Organisations (CSO), such as the Youth Alliance. Last but not least, the business companies involved are partners to the Project, providing support services to the targeted farmers and smallholders at district level.

The ultimate project participants (beneficiaries) are young women and men living and working in selected rural districts in which economic activities relate to the agricultural value chains that the Project has focused on, namely bean and aquaculture and, possible also horticulture.

²¹ The Project is aligned to Priority 3 of the Zambia Decent Work Country Programme (ZDWCP) on "More and better employment opportunities created, with focus on targeted groups" and Priorities 1, "Production and productivity improvement in crops, livestock and fisheries" and 2, "Food and nutrition security improvement", within FAO's country strategy (ToR).

²² These Outcomes are also the ones referred to in the ToR.

The project Partners are, among others: Outgrower operators (soybean and aquaculture), business membership organizations, fish hatchery enterprises, aqua feed suppliers, agricultural input suppliers:

- Vyazala Crops limited, Solwezi
- Regitech Enterprises, Kasama
- Mpongwe Bulima Organic Cooperative, Mpongwe
- WAMIS Agro seed company, Kabwe
- Mulestus General Dealers, Mansa
- Sparrow General Dealers, Solwezi
- ADSEK Enterprises Limited (agri-inputs distribution), Mansa
- Department of Fisheries - Grant agreement Lusaka and Kitwe
- Better Changes Enterprises, Kasama
- Pakeyeloba General Dealers, Solwezi
- Olympic Milling, Ndola
- Mbowa Fisheries Fish Feed Model, Nchelenge
- Chiwila Farms, Kitwe
- JEDO Commodities, Kasama
- Makombe farm, Kabwe
- Solwezi District Farmers Association, Solwezi
- ADOKA Agro-dealer, Kasama
- Sindazi Wiza Enterprises (SWE)
- Kawombwa Manyika traders, Lusaka
- Wind of Change, Kasama
- MRI Syngenta, Lusaka
- Victor Series Productions, Lusaka
- Palabana Fisheries Limited

4 Assessment

This chapter gives an overall assessment of the Project's strategies, approaches, key achievements and results. It also provides the evaluation team's assessment using the key evaluation criteria, reflecting on the validity of the Project design expressed in its LFA and Theory of Change and the changes made, in particular those that relate to the three value chain components - soybean, aquaculture and horticulture. It attempts to distinguish between those for which it has made contributions, and those that reasonably can be attributed to its actions.

The Project's consideration for some key cross cutting issues is discussed, including socio-cultural diversity and responsiveness in terms of gender and equity integration in the programming. Finally, the evaluation has assessed the extent of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency and the *likelihood* of sustainability and impact – taking into account internal and/or external factors that may have affected achievements. Challenges and constraints, and/or shortcomings, are also brought up.

4.1 Assessment of strategies and achievements

Yapasa has played a facilitative role to stimulate agro-market systems to innovate and serve rural population living in poverty. The Project has also addressed market constraints to stimulate systemic change and help the project participants to identify own solutions to these constraints. It has reached out to farmers and rural youth through its private sector Partners/SMEs with whom working relationships were formed through Service Contracts with specific conditions for accessing grants and other support.

The Project has developed capacity and raised interest among stakeholders specifically regarding aquaculture and the MSD approach, and the Project staff have participated in various training events, exchange visits/study tours, and workshops which that has developed their knowledge significantly in various technical fields. The evaluation has the firm impression that the Partner companies, with few exceptions, appreciated the way the Project team has worked with them through coaching and mentoring.

The Yapasa project team has acknowledged that they have received very good and adequate technical and administrative support - on a needs basis - from ILO and FAO, respectively.

The Project selected a few sectors and subsectors in rural areas in which youth could be involved in activities that would impact positively on their attainment of jobs and incomes - and find a way out of poverty. These are primarily soybean and aquaculture production and marketing and, since 2017-2018, also horticulture. Out of the two Yapasa Portfolio Managers recruited under FAO, one is working on the soybean and the other on the aquaculture value chains - with the same set up for the two Portfolio Managers recruited under ILO; one focusing on soybean and the other on aquaculture.

The operational areas selected are Solwezi and Kalumbila (North Western Province); Kasama, Luwingu and Mungwi (Northern Province); Chibombo, Kapiri Mponshi and Mumbwa (Central Province); Chongwe (Lusaka Province); and Mansa, Kawambwa and Nchelenge (Luapula Province).

The Project undertook a few field studies. During the inception phase a market study on the soybean value chain was commissioned to the Indaba Agricultural Policy Research Institute (IAPRI). A study on aquaculture value chain was also carried out, commissioned to WorldFish.²³

²³ A draft report was received from theProject.

The predominant strategy applied to reach the outcomes is the Market Systems Development (MSD) approach, notably the Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) to address constraints within markets and stimulate systemic change in order to help create improvements for the actors on the market that are sustainable - particularly for people living in poverty.²⁴ M4P is intended to facilitate, rather than directly provide, services and support to help identify solutions to market constraints. Thus, Yapasa assumed the role to facilitate agro-market systems with the aim to innovate and serve rural youth living in poverty in rural areas. Another key strategy has been to work closely with private sector companies/entrepreneurs in selected provinces and learn and move from pilot activities in the first phase, to reach larger scale impact in the implementation phase/s.²⁵

Much of the strategies were on tried out on a pilot basis. The evolving knowledge about the realities in the rural areas during the first years, in particular regarding the realities concerning the job and market situation on the ground for young people, necessitated a number of revisions not only of the original Logframe and Theory of Change but also some presuppositions made at the design and inception phases. In applying MSD the Partner companies that the Project tied its implementation to, at district centre level, were regarded as the key agents of change responsible for ensuring that the entry point (target group) were youths (men and women). They were also responsible for their interactions with the local level actors, the commissions given to the CADs (during the latter part of the Project period), as well as the services the CADs provide to the farmers/youth.

From the beginning the Project made it clear that the majority of the participants in the rural areas should be youth including both men and women but later adopted a more hands-off attitude vis-à-vis its Partners on this issue, as to avoid imposing directives on the Partners, which also would contradict the MSD and not be sustainable. Instead the Project staff assumed the role of a discussion partner, periodically monitoring the progress and the functioning of the MSD model but not interfering with Partners' priorities or monitoring activities on the ground. Reporting requirements to Yapasa were kept to a minimum so as not to pose too great a burden on their businesses.

In 2014, the Project carried out value chain analysis after which two were chosen, soybeans and aquaculture. It was believed that these would be attractive enough for the ultimate target group (young people) to generate earnings from, although they were not much involved in these areas earlier. An initial strategy was thus designed, on how to reach and convince youth in selected rural areas about potential jobs and earnings this could offer.²⁶ Much efforts were made in attempting to convince commercial banks and credit institutions to accept youth and farmers to borrow money for their enterprises, however the attempts eventually failed as they would not lend money without collateral.

The 2014-2015 pilot activities included the development of the Access to Finance model, and 2015-16 was a period where a Support Services model was followed, in

²⁴ The Lab, based at ILO Headquarters in Geneva, has assisted the Project to promote the M4P in Zambia.

²⁵ The development community has increasingly included/referred to this approach to reflect market systems development in its policies and strategies. A number of donor agencies, private organisations as well as NGOs/Civil Society have invested in learning about the M4P and have been guided by its ideas/framework. M4P was developed by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and the UK Department for International Development in cooperation (DFID) among others. Sida writes in a brochure: "It represents good practice, is useful for productive employment and holds great potential for several more qualitative aspects of decent work". It has supported several M4P programmes - including the YAPASA in Zambia and a project in Liberia - to increase employment and incomes among people living in poverty in rural areas through inclusive development of agricultural markets and value chains. Using this approach often meets challenges as it puts to doubt/questions traditional ideas thinking about how to assist people living in poverty and who are vulnerable/disadvantaged.

²⁶ Source: Interview with a former Project staff member.

which it developed and implemented various service activities. These two models were followed by three intervention models, namely: i) Access to quality inputs; ii) Access to entrepreneurship support services; and iii) Stakeholder coordination.²⁷ An input supply model was piloted out intended to help improve young farmers' and entrepreneurs' access to inputs finance.

The staff initially approached nine companies in the targeted provinces and convinced them to become Project Partners and develop outgrower activities, according to specific youth-inclusive models²⁸ (some of these companies were in fact SMEs). These enterprises are agricultural commodity aggregators and are involved in agro-dealerships, soybean processing, commercial soybean farming, seed multiplication – and one is a social enterprise (not-for-profit entity). The District Farmers Association (DFA) in Solwezi, a large producer cooperative society in Mpongwe, as well as a local trader are also involved as agents in the soybean value chain supported by the Project through formal agreements.

In 2017 the Project broadened its activities in aquaculture and soybean areas. Partnership agreements were signed with eighteen different companies (ten in soybean and nine in the aquaculture). Cooperation with the Department of Fisheries took off in order to support the business performance of three hatcheries in the Copperbelt and North Western Provinces.²⁹ The idea was also to attract attention from larger businesses with multinational input suppliers with national coverage.

Each of these private sector Partners were contracted through Service Agreements as vehicles to operationalize Yapasa's Market System Development approach (M4P). The service agreements are detailed and contain specific market system development conditions that were to be met and verified before resources could be released. They provide for an integrated and holistic approach for each value chain and address identification and mobilization issues, i.e. of young farmers for engagement in soybean, aquaculture and horticulture; distribution of agricultural inputs on seasonal credit; supply of fish fingerlings and feed; training of smallholder farmers; as well as aggregation of produce to realise economies of scale.

Regarding inputs for aquaculture, Yapasa partnered with a large milling company (also through a service contract agreement) specialised in producing quality livestock feed. The company had shown interest in serving the smallholder farmers and started packing fish feed in smaller packages in 2016, as a result of the new business opportunities provided through its engagement with Yapasa. The Project supported the company to promote its fish feed at fishpond demonstration events open to the public through the formation of partnerships with such farmers – and led by selected Lead Farmers. The milling company provided fish feed free of charge as part of its marketing drive for most of such demonstrations.

The Project's initial focus on the soybean for youth was, in hindsight, found to be misplaced but at the start of the Project it was NEPAD³⁰'s priority. Soybean is prone to weather and unstable price change shocks and require hard physical work. It provides income on annual basis but no income in the off-season periods, thus it proved not to be attractive to the youth. The risks for farmers to concentrate on one particular commodity became apparent in 2017 and the Project therefore decided to shift its strategy towards promoting and helping farmers to diversify.

²⁷ Written statement from a Yapasa project staff.

²⁸ The models were presented at the Lab, ILO Headquarters in Geneva in February 2016 to raise donor community appreciation for the MSD approach (source: Annual progress report 2017).

²⁹ Source: Yapasa Annual Report 2017, May 2018.

³⁰ New Economic Partnership for African Development (NEPAD). Source: Interviewee at FAO Headquarters, Rome, who had been involved with the Project design.

In 2018, after the donor agency had approved and decided to fund a one-year extension a new strategy involving more Partners, was formed with the expectation that there would be further extensions approved. This entailed a) Aggregation for End markets; b) Last mile inputs distribution; c) supply of fish and horticulture produce to the mine canteens of Solwezi; and d) the functioning of municipal open markets.

The evaluation appreciates the reasoning for not wanting to interfere among the players and disturbing the market forces – however the hands-off strategy adopted under the MSD approach has clearly highlighted a dilemma for the Project as the major benefits to date have not been directed to youth or women (the ultimate target group) but rather to the intermediary level of stakeholders, namely the companies who have managed to enlarge their markets and incomes/profit margins.

The strategy including the mechanism chosen to ensure involvement of the designated target group should have been clarified and transparently explained during the inception and pilot phase.

The Project informed that it had estimated the proportion of youth involved. During the first implementation season (2015-16), it ensured that 100 per cent of the participants (ultimate beneficiaries) were youth (15-35 years of age). The second season (2016-17), when the Project had adopted a more hands-off approach as not to make decisions for the Partners, the proportion of youth had dropped to 68 per cent. The subsequent third season (2017-18) saw even fewer youth involved as the proportion was down to 38 per cent.

The evaluation has understood that Yapasa was not trying to promote youth models but instead *encourage youth inclusive models*. However, since the designated ultimate beneficiaries are in fact youth, including young women, the Project was responsible for ensuring that youth and women actually were *targeted* as such, and not part of a group of older established farmers who also had shown interest in soybean, aquaculture or horticulture value chains. If it had been known from the start that soybean cultivation, for instance, generally is not an interesting occupation for unemployed youth living in poverty in rural areas – another crop/value chain or occupation could have been identified including any income-generating activities during the off season - as soybean that would only give an income once a year and for many fish pond owners as well, as documented in an annual report. When choosing horticulture for 2018 this opened up opportunities that could generate income for a larger part of the agricultural season than the previous crops.

Yapasa's cost extension period January to December 2018 has three Outcomes:³¹ 1) Improved business environment (macro and micro) for young rural entrepreneurs to start and expand businesses in Zambian agricultural sectors; 2) Service providers innovate and create market opportunities in the rural agriculture sector; and 3) More young people to respond to economic opportunities in agriculture sector.

Regarding the soybean, the price in 2016 had been record high, while in 2017 it was very low. Yapasa's internal soya impact assessment found that 55% of the soybean farmers, supported through the Project, reported some form of return from cultivating soybean – i.e. some farmers managed to pay-off their seasonal loans and the surplus retained for their respective enterprises. The report of the assessment states that the results at company level also were mixed with some having profited and some had experienced losses.

The Project decided to shift its focus to diversify from crop production (soybean and fish) made explicit in a new Project Document enclosed with a revised Logframe. Two

³¹ Yapasa Log frame Extended Project period Jan to December 2018. However, *the actual Project document emphasis that only 2 Outcomes are to be focused on; Outcome 1 and Outcome 2.*

models were developed. The “Last mile distribution” (of inputs) model was to provide support to agro dealers and enabling them to better serve farmers in remote areas. This is a pilot entailing setting up shops in rural areas, run by Community Agro Dealers (CADs), who mainly are young farmers or entrepreneurs selected by the Partners. The other model is crop aggregation for end markets, enabling smallholders to bring their produce to reliable market and be less vulnerable vis-à-vis unscrupulous farm gate buyers. This change generated significant improvements in results. Over the January to June 2018 period, the project reached 5,020 farmers – a figure that is 34% higher than that recorded over the 2014-2017 period of 3,747 farmers reached. The productivity among target farmers from adopting certified seeds, chemicals and improved agronomic practices also increased average yields – especially among a few young farmers met by the evaluation team - who recorded the highest productivity gains.

The second rapid monitoring feedback system for both CADs³² and Farmers³³ show high satisfaction rates (92%) among CADs regarding training and support from their respective agro-dealers’ field officers – especially on application of chemicals, different inputs and the practical aspects of the training. With regard to the commission paid to them, nearly 40% of the CADs were however not satisfied – the commission was either smaller than the workload involved or they had not yet been paid the commission. With regard to sales to farmers during the off-season, about 63% of the CADs were satisfied with the sales to farmers and were looking forward to higher sales in the coming season so long the issues of commission were resolved first.

The farmers’ dashboard shows that only about a third of the smallholder farmers reached were youths and that two-thirds were above the age of 35 years, and that 35% of farmers that were reached cultivated less than one hectare. The farmers’ feedback further shows that purchases from CADs were mostly (vegetable) seeds (top), followed by pesticides, fertilizers and herbicides/fungicides. The farmers were very satisfied with both the prices and location of inputs that were brought to their communities which had cut their transportation costs as well as reduced the losses as the CADs offered a total package that also included chemicals and some advisory services, all of which were not available prior to CADs’ operations in their respective areas.

Yapasa signed new service agreements with its Partners, and their extension staff as well as CAD agents, respectively, were trained to deliver quality and timely technical advisory services to beneficiary farmers (young women and men). The Partners provide commissions to the CAD agents based on sales volumes for both agricultural inputs sold, and the value of the crops aggregated from the local communities.

The evaluation team’s discussion with the various agro-dealer firms (Partners) found high satisfaction levels in terms of increased turnover and geographic footprints following the introduction of satellite CADs in various communities. The evaluation study in the five operational areas/provinces found that the companies that still were involved as Partners in soybean, aquaculture and horticulture value chains, expressed - with only a few exceptions - that they had made large gains, in terms of expanding their reach to the rural areas as well as financial gains.

Through Yapasa’s support, the companies received grants, motorcycles and some equipment (crop aggregation, aquaculture and horticulture). Some received support to recruit extension staff for 3-4 months in order to establish and support the Community Agro Dealers (CADs) who in turn provided inputs to the farmers, or acted as aggregators. It is too early in the day to know the level of effectiveness of this system and benefits to the farming community, or whether it will generate any decent income as such to the CADs to make it sufficiently attractive for them to continue.

³² CAD Dashboard round 2.

³³ Farmer Dashboard round 2.

The evaluation found some difficulties of attribution. The results and outcomes cannot be entirely attributed to the Yapasa Project. Other actors such as Musika, Citizens Economic Empowerment Commission (CEEC) and iDE, among other, have also provided assistance to some of Yapasa's Partners in the form of working capital (e.g. grants or loans), trucks, tractors, motor vehicles, edible oil processing mills).

4.2 Evaluation findings by key evaluation criteria

4.2.1 Validity of project design

The original Project Document and Logical Framework Analysis (here referred to as the Logframe) stated that the Project would work against a development (long term) objective that reads: "To facilitate creation of decent, sustainable jobs for young women and men and improved food security in rural Zambia". The food security part was later abandoned and it now reads: "To facilitate creation of decent, sustainable jobs for young women and men in rural Zambia". The Project has gone through several phases and currently there exists three different Logframes.³⁴

- Inception Phase 2013-2014³⁵ which was *part of* the phase 2013-2017³⁶ which included changes to the Logframe in 2016³⁷ following the recommendations of the Mid Term Review the same year and finally; and
- Current "cost extension" phase January – December 2018.³⁸

Changes in Outcomes from 2013-14 to end 2018

There were four Outcomes in the first implementation pilot phase, as follows:

- Outcome 1:** Improved public perception and demand for soybean products and of rural economy as a source of youth employment (meta-level)
- Outcome 2:** More enabling business environment for young entrepreneurs to start and formalize businesses in soybean and aquaculture value chains (macro-level)³⁹
- Outcome 3:** More young people respond to economic opportunities in soybean and aquaculture market systems (micro-level)
- Outcome 4:** Value chain development partners along the soybean and aquaculture value chains collaborate and coordinate effectively and efficiently (cross cutting).

The Outcomes were revised in each new Logframe that was developed (and subsequently also the supporting Outputs) - as the Project gained more experience and

³⁴ Currently there exists three different Logframes with the following headings: i) Program Log frame Original 2014-2015 - according to the Mid Term Evaluation 2016 report (p. 6) some of the performance indicators also changed and "The project objective was kept the same with the same performance indicators, but the means of verification changed to reflect the way DCED monitoring system is applied. All these changes were made to reflect the realistic market situation that was somewhat missing in the logframe developed at the end of the inception phase."

ii) Revised log frame detailed version 2016-2017; and Log frame, Extended Project period January to December 2018.

³⁵ Source: Inception Project Proposal and LFA 2013-2014

³⁶ Source: Project Document and LFA 2013-2017

³⁷ Source: Revised LFA 2016 and Mid Term Review report 2016.

³⁸ Source: Project Document January – December 2018 and the revised LFA.

³⁹ Aquaculture is acknowledged as a means to promote youth employment and improve rural smallholder household income – and taken centre stage in Zambia's development agenda. The issues to tackle in this area are e.g. lack of technical skills in fish farming, non-availability of fish farming inputs, high investment costs, poor road infrastructure, especially feeder roads (source: <http://epaper.daily-mail.co.zm/>). The INDABA Agricultural Policy Research Institute (IAPRI) has called on Government to consider allocating more funds in the DoF to improve operations and enhance the output of small-scale farmers in the aquaculture sector.

knowledge about the marketing situation in the Provinces. This also necessitated challenging some of the early assumptions in the original Project design - such as the focus on soybean cultivation at the beginning. *Thus, every phase had a revised and more realistic logframe on what was to be achieved in terms of outcomes, outputs.* The Project also adapted its strategies to realities and experiences made e.g. how to achieve the set outcomes - *for instance* towards the end of 2017, preparations were made for a new component in its MSD strategy, to help Partners set up inputs distribution and Community Agro Dealers (CADs). The list below shows the Outcomes as they have changed throughout the Project:⁴⁰

Original Outcomes 2013-14 period

1. Increased public appreciation of soybeans as a food crop of strategic relevance..
2. A more conducive policy, legal and regulatory framework..
3. Strengthened supply with, and increased demand for, value chain specific products..
4. Synergies and scale effects through better coordination..

Revised Outcomes for 2013-14 period

1. Improved public perception and demand for soybean products..
2. More enabling business environment..
3. More young people respond to economic opportunities..
4. Value chain development partners collaborate and coordinate effectively and efficiently..(cross-cutting)

Revised Outcomes for 2014-17 period

1. A more enabling business environment for young entrepreneurs to start and formalise businesses in soybean and aquaculture..
2. More young people respond to economic opportunities..

Revised Outcomes for 2018 period

1. Improved business environment (young rural entrepreneurs macro and micro) for young rural entrepreneurs to start and expand businesses in *Zambian* agricultural sectors (to be reached through attaining 3 outputs);
2. Agriculture and related service providers innovate to create market opportunities in the rural agricultural sector (to be reached through attaining 2 outputs); and
3. More young people respond to economic opportunities in the agricultural sector (to be reached through attained 3 outputs).

The Project has treated the current cost extension phase, starting in January 2018, as a transition year in the expectation that the donor agency will endorse another phase.⁴¹ It has focus has been on consolidating activities/results from earlier phases but also explored new areas with potential for significant scale up an anticipated new phase. Thus is has widened its focus beyond the soybean and aquaculture value chains and promoted the horticulture value chain. It is currently aiming to attain three Outcomes, instead of four, as follows:

Indicators are not used as intended in RBM/Logframe system, namely as *measurement instruments*. The MTE report uses the term indicator similarly, as shown in this example: “The performance indicators against the outputs and outcomes are unlikely to be achieved by YAPASA within the project duration.” This evaluation adheres to the understanding that indicators are not *achieved* – it’s targets, outputs, outcomes and objectives that are achieved– while *indicators should be used as a tool to assess to what extent these are achieved*.

⁴⁰ The long wordings of the Outcomes are here shortened.

⁴¹ Source: The Project CTA in a briefing discussion. Correspondence also exists on this issue between the ILO Office and the Embassy of Sweden.

Some of the results of the Project have been affected by circumstances beyond its control such as weather conditions resulting in poor harvests and lack of good governance affecting the chosen crops and value chains. In the 2016 Project Logframe has a number of “assumptions” (one for each output). These are examples: i) Partner market players will select youths; ii) The Project meeting its impact targets within the given time frame; iii) The Project partners adopting the business practice changes and adapt them to suit their organizational needs; and iv) Value chain actors are interested to use the extension service as a means to improve the diversity and quality of the agricultural produce from farmers in a sustainable way.

These issues are important to consider *before making decisions on strategies* but makes no sense as assumptions in a Logframe context. Assumptions in a LFA should be *outside the control of the Project itself*. Another observation is that in the 2016 changes in the Logframe, the Project uses the term Objective instead of Outcomes – however in this report Outcome is used consistently.

Due to the changes made in the LFA and Theory of Change throughout the Project, quite some effort had to be devoted to appreciate and sort out “what is what” regarding what exactly was to be accomplished. The MTE report mentions that information about producing the *Outputs* were not always available to the team in 2016. This evaluation team has noted that there are discrepancies also regarding the *Outcomes*; a case in point is the discrepancy in the 2018 Project Document (two Outcomes) and LFA (three Outcomes) for 2018. Another is that the cross-cutting Outcome of 2016-2017 (coordination and cooperation among value chain actors) is only mentioned as an Outcome for that particular year.

4.2.2 Relevance

Relevance is here understood as the extent to which the Project’s is consistent with national priorities, development partner/donor policies and strategies, and the beneficiaries’ requirements.⁴²

National policies and development partners’ policies

The evaluation found that the Project is relevant. Yapasa’s long-term objective to contribute to decent, sustainable jobs for young women and men in rural areas are well in line with the national development priorities in Zambia. The GRZ has committed to tackling poverty and promoting more broad-based wealth through creating more jobs and a conducive environment with more opportunities for young job seekers both women and men. The 7th NDP has acknowledged the need for development of a culture of entrepreneurship and self-employment among the youth by facilitating market-driven training and skills development in entrepreneurship. It mentions the lack of equitable access to land for youth as well as gender inequality and challenges faced by people living with disabilities.

Youth unemployment is stated as one of the major challenges in the Revised 6th National Development Plan (NDP) and the subsequent 7th NDP. In 2014, more than 80 per cent of the employed in Zambia were in the informal economy, which has low levels of productivity, capital investments and technology. Self-employment is common and many are engaged in subsistence agriculture or in other small-scale enterprises. Issues and problems related to youth unemployment are resulting from many factors, such as lack of appropriate skills and access to finance, few available opportunities to generate an income, in particular in some of the rural areas of the country. They are also caused by systemic factors such as lack of overall strategies that integrate, or mainstream, young people’s concerns and needs (unemployed or underemployed, male and female).

⁴² Source: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2754804.pdf>, revised in 2010.

Relevance vis-à-vis the Sustainable Development Goals

Regarding the Project's ability to make contributions to the SDGs (priorities 2, 5 and 8) mentioned in the ToR, the Project has been able to leverage partnerships with ILO constituents at national level (Employers, Workers), several government ministries and national institutions, as other Sida funded organisations such as e.g. Musika.⁴³ The evaluation has assessed that focus has primarily been on Priority 8, related to sustained economic growth.

Development partner/donor policies and strategies

The Project's goals are also compatible with Sweden's Country Strategy for Zambia (2013-2017), which had been extended and was still valid at the time the Project took off (the evaluation team has not been able to access the new Strategy document). Among the aims of the strategy are to contribute to creating the conditions for sustainable growth in the country and better opportunities for people living in poverty to support themselves in rural and semi-urban areas. Thus, starting and running productive businesses, improving living standards and improved health of women and children are central. The Strategy had an ambitious target of 120,000 people having "productive work in the agricultural sector", as well as increased access to financial services for small-scale farmers, entrepreneurs and businesses⁴⁴.

The Project is also in line with the Zambia Decent Work Country Programme (ZDWCP)⁴⁵, i.e. priority 3 "More and better employment opportunities created, with focus on targeted groups" as well the Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA).⁴⁶ It is also in line with FAO country strategy Priority 1, "Production and productivity improvement in crops, livestock and fisheries" - but only to some extent with Priority 2 mentioned in the ToR; "Food and nutrition security improvement" as the Project early on removed food security as an outcome.

Beneficiaries

Regarding the value chains focused on, the aquaculture value chain was more relevant for the beneficiaries than soybeans but also had constraints with a single income per year as well; and problems with fingerlings supply and access to quality fish feed.

4.2.3 Effectiveness

Effectiveness is here understood as the extent to which the Project's outcomes and objectives are achieved – or expected to be achieved - taking into account their relative importance.

A more enabling business environment for young rural entrepreneurs in agriculture⁴⁷

The following section gives a more detailed account of Yapasa's work, achievements and results in support of the key Outcomes.

One of the planned Outcomes in the first LFA and Project Document was to generate a more conducive policy, legal and regulatory framework and, thus, the Project was

⁴³ Musika is a not-for-profit company funded by UK Dfid and Sida that works to stimulate private sector investment in the smallholder markets. It helps businesses develop commercial relationships with smallholders. Recently a new agreement with an allocation of US \$20 million was signed with Sida for the period 2018-2021.

⁴⁴ Source: Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Zambia 2013 – 2017, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden.

⁴⁵ Zambia Decent Work Country Programme (ZDWCP 2013-2016);

⁴⁶ Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA), ILO 2007-2015, Eleventh African Regional Meeting, Addis Ababa, April 2007, ILO.

⁴⁷ This Outcome herein phrased as "enabling business environment for young rural entrepreneurs in agriculture" is a combination of two versions of Outcome 1 that the Project aims for in the two last periods (2016-2017 and 2018).

prepared to carry out review specifically in this area. However, the two policy dialogues fora (established with Yapasa's assistance) namely the Soya Policy Advocacy Group (SOPAG) and the Aquaculture Development Association (ADAZ), found that there were no specific legal issues that affected the two original value chains of soybeans and aquaculture. Instead they focused on identifying governance-related issues that affected each of these value chains and worked around those issues with Project support.

They determined that the grain and legumes sub-sectors were adversely affected by Government's un-coordinated policy actions in 2017 i.e. setting the maize price below the cost of production; imposing ban on maize exports despite the country recording a bumper harvest; and administrative restrictions on soya exports - as officials were not clear as to whether the export ban was maize specific or generic.

A report commissioned by Yapasa and East and Southern Africa (ESA) Food Trade in 2017 on the export bans and their implications on the soya sub-sector - found that such uncoordinated policy shifts had adverse impacts on local soybeans market that disadvantaged both Yapasa partners and smallholder farmers.

In the aquaculture sub-sector, the policy restriction on confining specific fish species to the two river basins (Congo basin and upper Zambezi basin above the Victoria Falls) confined to indigenous species and the southern half of the country and the Zambezi basin (below the Victoria Falls) confined to exotic commercially oriented species were - for environmental reasons - unlikely to change. Thus the Project focused on assisting ADAZ to finalize its strategic plan that included some policy recommendations e.g. introducing a system for regulating and certifying private hatcheries to ensure standards, and lobbying for youths and smallholder farmers to access government supported aquaculture development funds. *(The above refers to [Output 1.1 Policy, legal and regulatory review conducted to promote youth enterprise development in soybean and aquaculture value chains](#))*

To increase knowledge management and build capacity among of stakeholders, the Project sponsored eleven officials for aquaculture training at the Asian Institute of Technology in Bangkok, Thailand, in 2016. The acquired knowledge and new perspectives on quality fingerling production and distribution methods have already been applied in the production of a hatchery and nursery management Manual and follow up training for nursery managers. The hatchery operators have, *reportedly*, improved their efficiency especially for private hatcheries like Msekese Fisheries, Palabana Fisheries and Chiwila farms (however these were not visited by the evaluation team and can therefore not be validated).

Some Project stakeholders also benefited from applied learning through exchange visits that focused on both soybean and aquaculture value chains. Training outside Zambia included Songhai (China) for 5 men and women; South Africa for 12 government and private officials on MSME development and business incubation; Kenya for training of 5 youth on MSME operation; and Malawi (1), Zimbabwe (1) and South Africa (1) for training of youth. In addition the project brought an international consultant from FAO to share best practices on aquaculture. *(The above relates to [Output 1.2 Increased stakeholder exposure and knowledge on international best practice in supporting young entrepreneurs in aquaculture and soybeans value chains](#))*

The Project's intention of conducting a social marketing campaign suggests that it sought to influence behaviours in relation to marketing concepts – in line with the MSD approach. Although no official campaigns as such were conducted, some soybean and aquaculture operators organised localised events to mobilise potential youth entrepreneurs to be recruited into their schemes. In 2017 Yapasa supported ADAZ in its awareness-raising seminars in the targeted districts known as aquaculture business opportunity seminars. These gathering were aimed at increasing farmers' interest for aquaculture farming. It also supported trade fairs to showcase and demonstrate fish

farming products and services, some of which were promoted via local radio. It was also noted that the field days regarding soybean farming and fish feed demonstrations were open to the public. Television was also used as a means of promoting messages, and a Website (www.yapasa.org) was set the same year aimed at reaching out to a broader public - but first and foremost to the development partners and communities.⁴⁸ *(The above relates to [Output 1.3 Social marketing campaigns conducted to disseminate information of business opportunities in soya and aquaculture value chains](#))*

Economic opportunities, including market opportunities, for young people

Regarding inputs for soybean cultivation, Yapasa reached out to unemployed rural youths and farmers during 2016-2017 season, based lessons in the previous season. The Project strived to raise farmers' interest and share lessons on the inclusive business models it was promoting, and had many discussions with Micro Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) in the project areas involving farmers including youth and women in rural communities. Regarding inputs for pond fish cultivation/aquaculture, the results showed that quality fish feed produced better fish growth results than traditional feed for both in sex reversed and mixed sex fingerlings – with the sex reversed fish ponds registering the highest growth rates when compared to mixed sex fingerlings. Despite challenges, Pakeyeloba fish hatchery in Solwezi spoke highly of the Yapasa intervention that helped to establish district fish nurseries in North-Western **province** that has had a great impact in increasing hatcheries for the benefit of the entire province, and also in the two neighbouring countries (Angola and Democratic Republic of the Congo). *(The above relates to [Output 2.1 Effective and efficient input supply systems for the value chains](#).)*

The Project developed a simplified agribusiness manual and facilitator's guide for the Outgrowers, intended to be used in the training events for 30 selected lead farmers and extension staff (the latter recruited by the Partners SMEs). However, no information is available on the use of this manual⁴⁹. An Impact Assessment, organised internally by Yapasa concluded that the majority of the soybean farmers (77% - of which 46.6% are youth) had received some kind of training although basic.

Because of the very small-scale operation of the aquaculture entrepreneurs in the year 2017, only 51 jobs were created in the sector that year. *(The above relates to [Outputs 2.2 and 2.3 Increased supply of non-financial business development services to support youth enterprises and technical skills of young entrepreneurs to use production and processing technologies](#).)*

Collaboration and coordination among value chain partners

*This Outcome (the third in 2016-2017 LFA) is a cross-cutting Outcome: Value chain development partners collaborate and coordinate effectively and efficiently (cross-cutting). The Project has tried to contribute to a raised profile of the National Union of Smallholder Farmers in Zambia, and cooperated with SOPAG and ADAZ in order to strengthen coordination mechanism among the soybean and aquaculture value chain Partners but the efforts to produce this output has reportedly not progressed much.⁵⁰ *(The above relates to [Output 3.1 Mechanisms for coordination for soybean and aquaculture value chain development established](#).)**

Overall, the majority of the Project's stakeholders and partners that the evaluation team discussed with at central level, province and district level expressed goodwill vis-à-vis Yapasa's intentions and activities. Several of the Partners in the field (mainly Outgrower

⁴⁸ Source: Yapasa Technical Cooperation Progress Report (TCPR) 2017 and interviewees.

⁴⁹ The Manual was developed in cooperation with the National Union of Smallholder Farmers in Zambia (NUSFAZ). Source: TCPR 2017.

⁵⁰ Source: TCPR 2017.

companies mainly) emphasised that they appreciated the learning they had acquired through their working relationship with the Yapasa, stating that the partnership had contributed to an improved and expanded business and had facilitated increased delivery of services to the farming communities of high quality inputs and technical know-how involved in soybean production, aquaculture and, lately, also horticulture.

Yapasa has applied DCED Standard result measurement and also gauged how the overall MSD model is functioning. It has collected data through staff field monitoring visits, up-dates from its Partners and through farmer focus groups/interviews, sales records, internal impact evaluation with baseline and comparison group (through SenseMaker).

The evaluation's overall assessment is that the effectiveness in reaching the Outcomes has been mixed. Globally, young people wish to move from rural areas and agriculture to urban areas but Yapasa model is challenging this trend. The evaluation has found that young unemployed or underemployed persons have not participated in the project, or benefitted *to the extent intended*, in response to the economic opportunities offered through the Project's activities. Even when they have - it was found that with no assets (in terms of land and money) they are finding it difficult to pay the down-payments for agro input packs and for constructing their own fish ponds – which has constrained their participation in the two value chains focused on; Soya and Aquaculture. Regarding horticulture, which could present a more lucrative occupation if catering to the large mining canteens - young people (including young women) also have to operate on the fringes as they depend on the land of their parents or guardians to cultivate their vegetable gardens.

The Project has however made quite some contributions to a more enabling business environment for the Partner companies in soybean and aquaculture with whom they mostly have collaborated effectively. Some of these Partners are SMEs who stated that they are determined to continue to provide services to the farming communities also after the closure of the Project.

The evaluation has analysed Project's strategies, plans and budgets and looked into implementation, monitoring and follow-up processes to be able to assess the extent of benefits accrued to women, men and youth resulting from Project activities.

Results in figures

This section provides some of the quantitative results. [Table 1](#) shows results up to end of 2017, data which is compiled through the Project's Performance Measurement system. It demonstrates the following:

1. The Project targets of reaching 5,000 farm enterprises and creating 3,000 full-time equivalent jobs were not realized; and
2. As the learning curve improved, the number of farmers/enterprises was reached and the number of jobs generated also improved significantly.

Table 1. Yapasa enterprise outreach, total number of farmers reached and full-time equivalent jobs created from 2014/16 to 2016/17 seasons

Season	Partners (# of partner enterprises)	Number of farmers reached			o/w youth owned farms	Youth owned farms (%)	Full-time equivalent jobs created
		Soya	Aquaculture	Total			
2014/15	1			100	100	100.0	100
2015/16	5	551	59	610	430	70.5	675
2016/17	13	1,853	1,184	3,037	1,439	38.4	1,709

Source: Yapasa Project, October 2018. NB: The figures for 2018 had not been validated at the time of the evaluation.

As Yapasa’s understanding of the smallholder farmers’ market development system evolved and evidence based interventions were implemented, the numbers of enterprises reached increased very significantly.

A gender and age comparative analysis of the outreach and jobs created results for the 2017 calendar year (January to December) against the Project’s cumulative performance (2014 – December 2017) shows that the M4P requires a long period for results to show. Table 2 shows the proportion of calendar year 2017 results to the cumulative totals – except for enterprises that were supported that has a lowest percentage at 38%, all the other indicators show that results improved more steeply in 2017 than in any other year since the Project started in 2014. For the employment creation target the Table shows a score of 75% at the end of December 2017.

Table 2. Calendar year 2017 results compared to Cumulative results (2014 up to December 2017)

Indicator	Result 2017 (no)	Cumulative to Dec 2017 (no)	Comparative Analysis (%)			
			Cumulative/Target	2017/ Cumulative	2017 structure	Cumulative structure
Project Target (5,000)		3,747	75			
Enterprises reached	3,037	3,747		81	100	100
o/w Enterprises supported	1,030	2,717		38	34	73
o/w Enterprises with profits	1,173	1,250		94	39	33
o/w Youth owned	909	1,439		63	30	38
o/w Women owned	493	695		71	16	19
o/w Young women owned	252	416		61	8	11

In terms of the other indicators in relation to enterprises reached, table 4 shows that for both calendar year 2017 and Project cumulative results over the 2014-2017 period the target groups of youths in general and young women in particular have seriously been under-represented – i.e. 8% for young women in 2017 and 11% for the duration of the Project from 2014 to 2017. The share of women in general is below 20% for the two periods while that of the youths is below 40% for both periods. The proportion of firms that have recorded some profits also seem to be low at 39% and 33% for 2017 calendar year and the Project cumulative period, respectively. As we argue below, these outcomes show that sustainability of the results post project closure might not be guaranteed.

A recent YAPASA Programme Report, dated 17th August 2018, states that the Project has partnered with ten businesses during the year and has continued partnership activities with the Department of Fisheries. For the period January to June 2018, the Project reached 5,020 farm enterprises through different interventions. The following is pointed out in the report: “this figure is only a measure of reach and not of job creation It is more realistic to expect impacts at enterprise performance level (decent jobs with improved enterprise income) to be seen only after the project period.” The Project’s Technical Cooperation Progress Report (TCPR) of May 2018 estimates a cumulative (from August 2013 to December 2017) outreach figure of 3,747 farm level enterprises. In all, about 8,767 farm enterprises have been reached from Project inception up to June 2018.

In terms of the number of jobs generated in 2018, Table 3 shows a similar pattern as that shown by the outreach numbers in table 4 above for 2017. While the cumulative jobs result was 2,484 at the end of December 2017 (i.e. 93% of the Project target of 3,000 jobs), during the first 6 months of 2018, 1,725 jobs (58% of Project target) were recorded over such a short period. However, the proportion of jobs generated for youths, women and young women were much lower during the first 6 months of 2018. The

Project’s pattern of having no instruments to target youths in general and young women in particular continued into 2018.

Table 3: Job created during January – June 2018 vs. Cumulative totals up to end 2018

Indicators	2018 Result	Cumulative up to 2017	Logframe target
Total jobs created	1,725	2,484	3,000
Total jobs created for youths	656	1211	
Total jobs for women	344	567	
Total jobs for young women	133	258	

It is clear that the Partner companies acknowledged Yapasa’s contribution to their results and outcomes especially the introduction of new knowledge and concepts as well as extending their operational geographic footprint as a result of the introduction of CADs in 2018. For North-Western Province, Yapasa was the first project ever to introduce a fish Outgrower model with Vyazala Cropping Limited⁵¹ – a model that has since been adopted by another commodity and horticulture company to replicate the same model in the province. Yapasa has also been credited with scaling up soybean production at MBOC; supporting Pakeyeloba Fish Hatchery in Solwezi; and restocking of fishponds in North-Western, Luapula and Lusaka Provinces.

Some constraints affecting the producers/beneficiaries

The following are some of the challenges and constraints that the stakeholders and farmers faced:

- Lack of access to loans/credit (be it financial or agricultural inputs) for unemployed youth and young farmers. The decision was made by Yapasa to either provide credit risk guarantees (in some instances of up to 50 per cent) or write-off input packs outstanding debt for the farmers involved in the Project, to continue their participation in the various value chains.⁵²
- Input distribution of fingerlings had been problematic, in the Northern half of the country that is restricted to native fish species.
- Problems related to transport - specifically the need for refrigerated trucks for transporting harvested fish to the markets and the transportation of fingerlings over longer distances from hatcheries.
- Agricultural sectors’ vulnerability to unstable policy shocks (maize export bans and its adverse effects on soya prices in 2016/17);
- External shocks (weather); and
- Following the MSD/M4P in an environment where infrastructure, regulatory and government fiscal crises accentuate market failures in rural areas where agricultural activities are concentrated.

4.2.4 Efficiency

Efficiency is here understood as the extent to which the resources were adequate to achieve the desired outcomes and results (qualitative and quantitative) including cost-efficiency and efficiency in implementation compared to alternatives.

⁵¹ Vyazala Cropping Limited did not undertake any adequate project appraisal (i.e. market scan and demand analysis relative to the projected fish pond production levels) or logistics planning – which gave rise to serious fresh fish over-supply once the fish harvest season was underway. The lack of a cold chain infrastructure arrangement caused some crisis in fish marketing in the Solwezi municipality area.

⁵² The Project management has explained that “the reasons the project gave credit guarantees were not simply because commercial finance was not available. Rather, this was meant to demonstrate to these same commercial finance houses that young entrepreneurs such as farmers were loanable. The writing off of input packs was a moral question driven by the idea that it is unethical to leave young farmers indebted through factors that were clearly outside of their control.”

There has been no indication that the Project overall suffered from inadequate resources. In May 2017 Sida granted a “no-cost extension” up to 31 December that year. For 2018 more funds were received (SEK 12,000,000) which enabled the Project to shift its approach with the last mile distribution and CAD operations, and explore the horticulture value chain and the potential for MSMEs to cater for larger markets, particularly the mining canteens.

However, in hindsight, using resources to acquire more knowledge at the start could have built a more solid platform for more efficient results to emerge sooner. Thus, the evaluation has assessed that Yapasa would have been more efficient if resources already from the inception were allocated to groundwork that could help the explore more attractive job options for youth, including young women, - in terms of occupations or income-generating activities that could bring incomes more frequently than yearly (as with soya and to some extent also aquaculture). Funds could have been used to thoroughly explore what priorities and interests unemployed youth in rural areas have – as these may vary in different parts of the country.

4.2.5 Likelihood of impact and sustainability

Impact is here understood as positive and negative changes generated by the Project, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. Sustainability is understood as systems, knowledge and ideas that are likely to continue after the project ends.

Project impact

Yapasa’s impact has been evident in the increased knowledge and technical know-how among many Partners and producers involved in the activities, e.g. in the aquaculture field and the business growth of commodity aggregators, agro-dealers and processors, fish feed and fingerling suppliers. The setting up of CADs as well as the District fish nurseries appears fruitful and appreciated by the farmers and have brought agricultural inputs nearer to the farmers, and has cut the farmers’ cost of doing business. The level of impact was too early to determine at the time of the evaluation – as the new growing season for some crops had just begun.

While the above benefits are acknowledged, the Project impacts on the various target groups are not even. The market systems development approach under M4P implies that Yapasa would play a facilitative role and be “invisible” to the ultimate beneficiaries (young farmers in the rural areas) - refraining from intervening “on the ground”, letting “market forces do its job”. This has given rise to some challenges. Yapasa technical team members provide regular mentorship and other intensive support services to partners than they do to beneficiary farmers. The evaluation team found that the majority of beneficiary farmers have outstanding input packs debts to suppliers. Several of the Partners facilitated under the Project, on the other hand, reported that their turnover, gross margins and, in some cases, the geographic foot prints increased after through their partnership with Yapasa.

Sustainability

Regarding sustainability – the Mid Term Evaluation report (optimistically) states that the “goal of sustainability will be ensured even after project phase out, and numbers reached upon completion of project – as it had gained a deeper market insight and established sound partnerships”. This evaluation is assessing that the sustainability of the CADs as a satellite system for last mile delivery to farmers in remote areas as well as and district fish nurseries - is unclear at this point.

The Project Partners’ arrangement and support to the CADs is dependent on Extension Officers, employed by the Partner companies, as well as continued data gathering for the Partners to know what’s happening at these rather remote station. Regarding horticulture it would be too early to know whether this component is sustainable without any back up

from the Project, it would also depend on the actions of the Partners and the improvements in marketing conditions for the farmers.

There is potential for continued service to rural entrepreneurs/farmers and sustained operations after the Project ends - if the companies continue the deployment of the extension staff and continues to expand their network as some of them stated they wish to do after the Project closes. Regarding sustainability related to the (physical) environment, the Mid Term Evaluation assessed that the project has considered environmental sustainability of all the interventions⁵³. This final evaluation found that this has not been an important consideration for the producers, with some exceptions e.g. one Partner, a social enterprise, that promoted crop residue from the farmers to be converted into organic fertilizers and high quality fuel bricks for cooking.

4.3 Gender equality and socio-economic issues

The Sustainable Development Goal No. 5 is about achieving gender equality and empower all women and girls. Gender equity needs to be considered in development programmes, to make sure that development projects, as well as research connected to interventions are inclusive, equitable in process and outcome, and meet the specific and often divergent needs of men and women and youth.

The ultimate target group of this Project resides in remote rural areas in the country under diverse socio-cultural contexts (e.g. languages, ethnic identities and belief systems). Women mostly do not enjoy the same land rights as men. Zambia's Lands Act does not apply to customary land and most land is held under custom – and many of the customary tenure systems do not protect women's land rights - although there are exceptions even in customary rights among some ethnic groups in the population.⁵⁴

As gender relations to a large extent still determine access to assets and resources as well as decision-making – these have a direct impact on the value chains of soya bean, fish and vegetables as well as the governance of these value chains. Socio-cultural norms influence the division of labour including in value chains and in the labour market. In small-scale fisheries and aquaculture, for instance, the circumstances, involvement, constraints, barriers, options, and benefits are often different for women and men.

Yapasa has aimed at influencing opportunities for young women and men to have a better life in terms of jobs and incomes. It was found that gender responsiveness in the implementation mainly has been manifested as encouragement of women and youth in particular to participate in various activities so as and not be left out as beneficiaries⁵⁵. The Project thus made clear to the Partners that they should involve female participants and the evaluation can confirm that both women and men are taking part in soybean, fish as well as horticulture; and when recruiting staff to the team in Lusaka, this was also an important consideration which we would like to give the Project team credit for.

The participation of youth, including young women, however has been lower than anticipated which the Project team acknowledged. The management stated that although this is not a desired situation, it is determined by the Project's selection of the value chain. With the increased focus on horticulture in 2018 it would seem likely that more women would be attracted to take part. However, as explained by the management, the Project is aiming for large scale entrepreneurship and marketing, catering to the significant needs of large mining companies (their canteens), and thus it is unlikely that

⁵³ Source: MTE report, p. 8.

⁵⁴ Source: Brief: Custom, Law and Women's Land Rights in Zambia, <http://www.focusonland.com/fola/en/countries/brief-custom-law-and-womens-land-rights-in-zambia/>

⁵⁵ This was also the assessment by the MTE in 2016. Its report was not specified though but referred to “a good number of women were selected by the implementing partners because of Yapasa”. Source: Final DRAFT report of MTE of YAPASA Project October 2016 (p. 23).

many women more would be involved in this value chain. In 2018, the Project carried out two rounds of fast feedback exercises bringing out information regarding farmers' responses to the CADs, e.g. the input services provided by them since its start in May 2018⁵⁶. In one of the exercises, 90 per cent of the farmers who responded (on telephones) were male, and in the other exercise 81 per cent were male. The ages of the respondents do not seem to be recorded.

So how did the Project prepare to address gender as a cross-cutting issue? It was found that the early plans included a Gender Analysis study to be carried out the first years but it was never carried out for reasons that are unknown to the Project staff, and the MTE. A thematic baseline study undertaken in the area of soybean value chains lacks any reference to either socio-economic or gender issues. Yapasa then commissioned a study on gender issues in soy-bean value chains but the report is not available neither in Lusaka nor at ILO or FAO headquarter levels - only a Power Point presentation and a one-page "gender checklist".

A gender study in soybean value chain did take place but the report is nowhere to be found (neither ILO, nor FAU has got the report). However, a Power Point Presentation was found as well as a one-page checklist. Finally, a study on aquaculture in 2014 found that both men and women participate in this value chain. One of the very many recommendations⁵⁷ in the Aquaculture study simply reads: "Gender issues have to be addressed so that the employment of women and youths are encouraged" - which does not seem very helpful.

The ToR requested the evaluation to explore whether disability issues had been addressed by Yapasa but there is no information that this issue has been specifically addressed, however, one of the Partner representatives in the Northern part of the country whom the evaluation talked with reported that he had employed several persons who have various disabilities.⁵⁸

4.4 Good practices and lessons learnt

Good practices

The Last Mile Distribution approach is dependent on the satellite system initiated through the Project's partnership with the companies. It's a good practice as it clearly benefits farmers in remote areas but needs continued support from private sector companies, primarily, and possibly other development partners as it is not yet a proven sustainable arrangement. The system should also be supported by government departments e.g. provision of extension services. Yapasa's support in establishing district fish nurseries is another example of a good practice in North Western Province that has resulted in an increased number of hatcheries and has had a good impact in this province.

Project staff's ability to learn from its experiences in the field and take action is another good practice, as well as the Annual and DCED narrative reporting (during the last couple of years in particular). Having a project team consisting of staff from two different UN agencies working well together is another good practice and has enabled the Yapasa team in Lusaka to draw from technical expertise from both ILO and FAO regional and headquarter offices.

⁵⁶ CAD Dashboard 1 and 2, October 2018.

⁵⁷ Recommendation No. 26 out of 28 recommendations. Source: Decent Jobs for Youth and Improved food security, Analysis of market system underpinning the fish market chain in Zambia, by Worldfish (Lusaka) 2014.

⁵⁸ The issues is recognised in The 7th NDP which mentions the lack of equitable access to land for youth as well as gender inequality and challenges faced by people living with disabilities.

During the last years of implementation the Project has narrated the progress with its ups and downs and clearly accounted for the “thinking behind” its strategies, in particular the MSD, in e.g. Annual reports, reports submitted to the NSC and in workshops.

Lessons learnt

Both ILO and FAO have worked for many years with private sector actors. A UN Joint Programme might not provide the best framework for a MSD/M4P project given the elaborate procurement and other bureaucratic procedures that are not in unison with quick decision-making protocols of the market systems. Further, the UN is perceived by some stakeholders to choose easy solutions that are not sustainable – e.g. the tendency to train women in business management without providing business development services (including finance) and other necessary reforms by host governments to improve the business environment for women enterprises to thrive.

The digital divide is a serious concern in particular regarding young people in rural areas and minimizing this gap should be central in any new project design catering for the youth in rural areas. The project could have made use of and promoted some form of modern Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) to **attract the interest of youth in the rural farming communities**, such as internet, wireless networks, cell phones, and other communication mediums. It could have contributed to making rural youth computer literate, in addition to other the production/marketing-oriented support. The use of new apps could have been used in semi-urban settings combined with bringing agricultural services closer to farmers; for providing real-time information on weather, livestock care, markets, and nutrition-related aspects of food production⁵⁹. Possibly, some lessons could have been learnt from Kenyan smallholder farmers’ and traders’ ICT experiences.

Aquaculture offers a good return in investment potential for the youths. However the cost of stepping into the business is relatively high and there are several challenges to overcome. It has a round the year production *potential*, however, current practice of production undermined that potential with annual production cycle.⁶⁰ Supply of the key production inputs is an issue in the rural areas. Weak demand of the inputs and poor production and supply network of the key inputs, fingerling and feed, is resulting in the low input - low output trap to the producers.

The importance of thematic studies to increase stakeholders’ knowledge should not be underestimated, regarding which directions to take in implementation for instance which value chains to support, to generate/facilitate employment opportunities and incomes for youth in rural areas. Inception studies for MSD interventions should include socio-economic, socio-cultural and gender aspects. In the absence of in-depth socially oriented studies the Project could have carried out more rapid assessments, such as Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA) or some other *participatory* rapid Reality Check method to increase the Project’s appreciation of what women and youth would like to be engaged in to improve their situation and earn some income in rural areas.

⁵⁹ Agricultural services and digital inclusion in Africa, FAO Brochure.

⁶⁰ Source: 2017 narrative Annual report/donor report.

5 Conclusions and recommendations

This chapter provides the conclusions of the final evaluation. They are based on the findings in Chapter 4, mainly. The recommendations are in turn based on some of these conclusions – however it should be noted that all conclusions have not warranted a recommendation.

Conclusion 1. Project strategies

In order to help create improvements for the actors on the market that are sustainable, and reach the Outcomes, the predominant strategy applied is the Market Systems Development (MSD) approach/Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P). Through MSD, the Yapasa project has addressed constraints within markets to stimulate systemic change and made efforts to adapt it to the particular context and circumstances in the selected rural areas. Using this strategy jointly was bold but valid. It was a first for the ILO and FAO in a joint rural programme and as such has provided valuable lessons. The results were mixed (see Lessons Learnt for more reflections). Another valid key strategy was to learn and adapt, and move from pilot activities in the first phase, to reach larger scale impact in the implementation phase - closely with private sector companies/entrepreneurs in selected provinces.

Conclusion 2: Validity of project design

It is clear from the above that the original project design needed to be changed and was thus not valid at the start. The Outcomes were revised in each new Logframe that was developed (and subsequently also the supporting Outputs) - as the Project gained more experience and knowledge about the marketing situation in the Provinces. This also necessitated challenging some of the early assumptions in the original Project design - such as the focus on soya cultivation at the beginning. It is also clear that the many changes were a bit confusing both for the staff, stakeholders and the evaluation team.

Conclusion 3. Relevance

The Project has been relevant vis-à-vis the relevant national policies as well as the strategies of the relevant development partners. The Project has been less relevant for youth, the ultimate beneficiaries, in terms of *choice of value chains* as this report has mentioned. Learning is an important part of any project, in particular on a pilot project in which new methods and strategies are experimented with. The Project has been able improve on the original design, adopt a flexible approach vis-à-vis the MSD and learn from experiences throughout the various phases. For instance, when realising the soya was not as successful as anticipated, it turned to aquaculture and (latest) horticulture both of which seem to be more feasible for the target group.

Conclusion 4. Effectiveness

- a) Yapasa has managed to contribute to most of the Outcomes, attracted attention among many institutions and spread knowledge about the marketing systems approach.
- b) Regarding reaching targets: The cumulative jobs result was 2,484 at the end of December 2017 (i.e. 93% of the target of 3,000 jobs). During the first six months of 2018 the situation significantly improved with 1,725 jobs (58% of Project target) recorded.
- c) However, the proportion of jobs and incomes generated for the actual ultimate target groups (youths including young women) were much lower during this period - than in 2017. The lack of an instrument to target youths in general and young women in particular was still apparent in 2018. *This situation could very well change for the better with continued support for the aquaculture and horticulture value chains, and for rural entrepreneurs determined to engage*

more youth and women - such as catering to the mining canteens which was part of the plan if the Project is to be extended or if a new Project proposal is submitted to development partners or the Government.

Conclusion 5. Efficiency

The Project was not fully efficient in terms of utilising resources at the start. Funds at the inception could have been used to thoroughly explore what priorities and interests unemployed youth, including young women, and the role that (diverse) economic and socio-cultural norms play in the different areas. In hindsight, using resources to acquire more knowledge at the start could have created a more solid platform for involvement of youth and the reach of outcomes sooner.

Conclusion 6. Likelihood of impact and sustainability

a) Project impact is found in the increased knowledge and technical know-how e.g. in the aquaculture field and the business growth of commodity aggregators, agro-dealers and processors, fish feed and fingerling suppliers. The setting up of CADs, as well as the District fish nurseries, appears fruitful as well, and if continued more impact is likely to be identified in this area – as these are appreciated by the farmers and has (among other things) brought agricultural inputs nearer to the remote areas farmers, and has cut the farmers' cost of doing business.

b) The likelihood of sustainability in meeting farmers' and entrepreneurs' needs for improved and more efficient production and marketing with e.g. the systems of input delivery placed nearer the farmers - depend on many factors including Partners willingness to continue the CAD arrangement and District nurseries. It may also depend on potential future support from DoF and DoA, and other government agencies, to serve the entrepreneurs/youth.

Conclusion 7. Adherence to gender equality and women empowerment

a) Gender responsiveness in Yapasa is mainly manifested as encouragement (through Partnership with the companies) of women to take part in soybean, fish as well as horticulture activities and also ensuring a gender balanced project team for which the Project is given much credit. Still, the participation of youth, including young women, was lower than anticipated.

b) The Project would have benefitted from undertaking field socio-economic studies at the inception

c) The gender analysis report produced is not available. Such studies could have helped the Project to determine the needs and divergent roles that women, men and youth have in rural areas and among different ethnic groups that might impact on their level of participation in value chains *before these were selected*.

Conclusions on Good Practices and Lessons Learnt

The following are assessed to be good practices:

- The Last Mile Distribution approach constituted a good practice – but was reliant on the satellite system, which was part of the pilot activities initiated during the latter part of the Project, as well as the partnership with the companies.
- Yapasa's support in establishing district fish nurseries is another example of a good practice in North Western Province that has resulted in an increased number of hatcheries and has had a good impact in this province.
- Project staff's ability to learn from its experiences in the field and take action is another good practice and clearly account for the "thinking behind" Project

strategies, in particular the MSD through reports/presentations submitted to the NSC and in workshops.

- Having a project team consisting of staff from two different UN agencies working well together is another good practice and has enabled the Yapasa team in Lusaka to draw from technical expertise from both ILO and FAO regional and headquarter offices.

Regarding lessons learnt, both ILO and FAO have worked for many years with private sector actors. An important lesson from Yapasa, is:

- UN’s attempts to attract donor resources (and have sustained impact through its interventions) should include empowerment and enhancement of youth’s productive participation in value chains *on their own terms*.
- The digital divide is a serious concern in particular regarding young people and minimizing this gap should be central in any new project design catering for the youth in rural areas. The project could have benefitted from promotion of some form of modern Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) (internet, wireless networks, cell phones, and other communication mediums) for the youth in the farming communities to help them be computer literate in addition to other project activities including conventional agriculture production (internet problems could have been solved through setting up business development service cafés in semi-urban areas combined with training). The use of new apps could have been worked on for business development services, bringing agricultural services closer to farmers, providing real-time information on weather, livestock care, markets, and nutrition-related aspects of food production. Possibly, some lessons could have been learnt from the experiences of Kenyan smallholder farmers and traders using ICT quite successfully.
- In the absence of in-depth socially oriented studies the Project could have carried out more rapid rural assessments, such as Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA) or some rural rapid Reality Check method to increase the Project’s appreciation of what women and youth would like to be engaged in to improve their situation and earn some income in rural areas.

The **recommendations** are as follows:

Recommendations <i>(NB: All recommendations have high priority)</i>	Resource implication	Time frame <i>(all are for 2019)</i>
1. The UN agencies (ILO and FAO) should increasingly target/design catalytic projects that empower and enhance the youth’s productive participation in value chains <i>on their own terms</i> .	Allocations to be made in future new Project budgets	When new project designs are developed for the same target group
2. The Government of the Republic of Zambia should promote financial products catering to youth in agriculture and consider allocating more funds to the District of Fisheries to	Allocations to be made in in next annual work plans in the relevant ministries	When annual budgets are prepared in the relevant ministries

Recommendations <i>(NB: All recommendations have high priority)</i>	Resource implication	Time frame <i>(all are for 2019)</i>
improve operations and enhance the output of small-scale farmers in the aquaculture sector.		
3. Implementing agencies and projects supporting youth oriented causes in diverse socio-cultural settings in rural areas - should ensure that adequate information (participatory field studies, gender analysis) is available about the people who will be involved/affected prior to major decisions being made about directions, activities and funds.	Budget allocations to be made for undertaking in-depth social /socio-cultural studies. Budget allocations for staff who have expertise and experience on <i>social</i> issues (Project staff should be involved and made to understand gender issues)	This should be taken into account when new project designs are developed
4. In the future, private sector projects (similar to the one evaluated), as well as implementing and development partners should ensure that gender analysis studies are carried out and recommendations are appreciated and followed - because gender relations to a large extent still determine access to assets and resources as well as decision-making – and are likely to have an impact on governance of value chains.	Budget allocations to be made for undertaking in-depth studies. Budget allocations for staff who have gender expertise and experience (Project staff should be involved and made to understand gender issues)	This should be taken into account when new project designs are developed
5. To increase relevance of future similar development projects the implementing and development partners should appreciate that young people, living in poverty in rural areas, are disadvantaged and need various other support to farm, such as funding and intense capacity development and or skills training. The basics for empowering them should be that <i>they are market players in their own right</i> and have with different perspectives that distinguish	No particular resources other than what is mentioned above	At the time of project design

Recommendations <i>(NB: All recommendations have high priority)</i>	Resource implication	Time frame <i>(all are for 2019)</i>
them from those of their parents/caretakers.		
6. A central concern in any new project design catering for the youth in rural areas should be to facilitate overcoming the digital divide and ensure that ICT possibilities are fully explored and if possible implemented. This could help raise their interest and productivity and assist them to exploit other niches e.g. logistics and/or agro-processing/packaging in the agricultural value chains. This recommendation has emanated from the Lessons Learnt (section 5.4.2)	Resources for various ICT components need to be budgeted for <i>specifically</i> . Project staff with knowledge/experience of ICT issues should be recruited (could be M&E expert).	At the time of project design

Table 4. Recommendations with resource implications and timeframe.

Annex I. Terms of Reference

Independent Final Evaluation of Decent jobs for youth and Improved Food Security through the Development of Sustainable Rural Enterprises (YAPASA Project) October 2018

1. Background and rationale of the program

a. Introduction

The Rural Youth Enterprise for Food Security RYE-FS initiative (branded as Yapasa) is part of broader programmes of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) and Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) to promote decent work for the rural youths in Zambia. Interventions seek to exploit the distinct competitive advantage of local sector-specific production systems to unlock youth entrepreneurship as an engine of employment creation, for example by seeking to boost production quantities through commercial young farmer development. The organizations and donors have agreed to keep the focus of program to decent rural employment and exclude the food security from the beginning of implementation of the program.

The development challenge being addressed in Zambia through this UN Joint Programme (UNJP) is youth unemployment in rural communities. The programme facilitates attainment of sustainable livelihoods for young women and men in rural areas of Zambia through the promotion of sustainable micro, small and medium-scale enterprises (MSMEs). The initiative contributes to the broader effort of the Government of Zambia to implement the Comprehensive African Agricultural Development Programme (CAADP) of the African Union at national level; it furthermore responds to the call from the Rural Futures Initiative launched by the AU-New Economic Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) planning agency for alternative development models that “promote broad-based rural economic development and reduction of poverty and inequality including securing decent jobs and sustainable livelihoods.

The direct recipients of the programme are selected national-level and sector-level governmental, non-governmental and private sector intermediary organizations with a mandate to promote sustainable business in the rural economy of Zambia, among them prominently the Ministries of Agriculture and Fisheries & Livestock and their executing agencies, national level employers’ and workers’ federations and their respective sector associations, and district-based business development support service providers. The ultimate programme beneficiaries are young women and men living and working in rural districts of the country where economic activities related to the prioritized agricultural value chain concentrate.

During the first four years (2014-2017), the programme focused on the two value chains of soy beans and aquaculture. Soy beans have been classified by NEPAD as a strategic crop for boosting national food security. The production and processing of soy beans already provides income to ninety one thousand (91,000) rural households in Zambia, with volumes set to increase on the back of fast growing regional and global demand. Similarly, aquaculture is also a sector of strategic importance to Zambia, with the country facing pressure on capture fisheries resulting in an annual fish deficit of 100,000mt. Aquaculture is the most viable option for arresting this supply shortage. There are only 6,500 smallholder fish farmers contributing less than 15% of the 13,000mt of

aquaculture fish. The two sectors are mainly rural based and have scope to absorb youth at different levels of the value chain. In order to unlock the employment creation potential along the aquaculture and soy beans value chains, though, numerous competitiveness challenges need to be overcome - including poorly functioning input supply systems for fingerlings and fish feed, low productivity and market linkages, low volumes of processed soy bean and negative consumer perceptions on the nutritional value of soy bean. These development challenges present opportunities for youth employment creation in rural areas.

Yapasa obtained an initial 4 months no-cost extension to December 2017 and then a one year cost extension (Jan-Dec 2018). The program used the extension period and extra resources to develop scaled up interventions from the first phase pilots as well as to explore some new, but related interventions that could have potential for a desired phase 2 programme. The programme thus considered the extension period as a transition to the second phase. The results from the additional one year project will contribute to the total results envisaged in the developmental outcome of the project

The overall development objective of the Rural Youth Enterprise for Food Security Programme is to facilitate creation of decent jobs for youth in rural areas through the development of sustainable rural enterprises. The Programme is designed to contribute to the achievement of the following strategic frameworks:-

a) **Zambia's Revised Sixth National Development Plan (R-SNDP)** overall goal of attaining accelerated infrastructure development, economic growth and diversification; promoting rural investment and accelerated poverty reduction and enhanced human development. Pursuant to the above objectives, the SNDP focuses on policies, strategies, and programmes that contribute to addressing the challenges of realising broad based pro-poor growth, employment creation and human development as outlined in the Vision 2030.

b) **Outcome 2 of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)** on "Targeted populations in rural and urban areas attain sustainable livelihoods by 2015"

c) **Priority 3 of the Zambia Decent Work Country Programme (ZDWCP)** on "More and better employment opportunities created, with focus on targeted groups"

d) **Priorities 1, "Production and productivity improvement in crops, livestock and fisheries" and 2, "Food and nutrition security improvement"**, within FAO's country strategy

The Programme is funded by the Government of Sweden through a Standard Administrative Arrangement (ILO-Sweden Financing Agreement) signed on 29th August 2013 in which it was agreed that Sweden would finance the Joint Programme to the sum of the USD equivalent of SEK 46,075,000. An initial twelve (12) months Inception Phase was implemented from 1st September 2013 to 31st August 2014, for which USD2, 639, 232 was disbursed. Subsequent funding for a thirty six (36) months Implementation Phase was approved by SIDA after submission of an Inception Phase Report in July 2014 and positive outcome of review meeting held by the main Programme Partners of the Programme.

Towards the end of 2017 additional funding of SEK 12,000,000 was provided for the one year extension period and this, together with any remaining underspend from 2017 constituted the programme budget for 2018. The new funds were shared with the FAO and the Administrative unit in Geneva in the same proportions as the original grant.

b. Program snapshot

Project code	ZAM/13/04M/SID
Funding/Donor	SIDA
Budget	SEK 46,075,000 (approximately US \$ 6.9m) Plus 12,000,000 (extra budget)
Duration	October 2013 August 2017 plus extension to Dec 2018
Geographical coverage	Selected districts in Zambia – Active project sites in: North Western Province: Solwezi, Northern Province: Kasama, Luwingu and Mungwi; Central Province: Chibombo and Mumbwa; Lusaka Province: Chongwe; Southern Province: Chirundu
Key Log frame targets (impact performance)	<input type="checkbox"/> 3,000 decent jobs created for rural youth and 5,000 enterprises with improved performance <input type="checkbox"/> 10% increase in incomes for targeted rural youth <input type="checkbox"/> 20% increase in production yields from soybeans and aquaculture
Major components (outcomes)	<input type="checkbox"/> Improved public perception and demand for soybean products and of rural economy as a source of youth employment (meta-level) <input type="checkbox"/> More enabling business environment for young entrepreneurs to start and formalize businesses in soybean and aquaculture value chains (macro-level) <input type="checkbox"/> More young people respond to economic opportunities in soybean and aquaculture market systems (micro-level) <input type="checkbox"/> Value chain development partners along the soybean and aquaculture value chains collaborate and coordinate effectively and efficiently (cross cutting)

The original project had fallen slightly short of the high level targets in decent jobs creation and Enterprise improvement and the extended phase was expected enable the project to reach if not exceed them.

Annex II. List of Members of the Project NSC

Name	Designation	Organization
Mr. Zoole Newa	National Programme Officer	Embassy of Sweden
Ms Karin Sverken	Head of Development Cooperation	Embassy of Sweden
Mr. Joe Kapembwa Chair	Permanent Secretary	Ministry of Youth and Sport
Mr. Muma K. Mukupa	Chief Youth Officer	Ministry of Youth and Sport
Mr. Justin Mwansa	Registrar of Cooperatives	Ministry of Commerce Trade and Industry
Ms. Georgina Kasapatu	Director, Domestic Trade & Commerce	Ministry of Commerce Trade and Industry
Mr. Louis Chikopela	PMEO	Department of Agriculture
Mr. Ian Habulembe	Chief Fisheries Officer	Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock
Ms Priscilla Mali Siamubi	Senior Planner	Ministry of Labour and Social Security
Mr Hilary Hazele	Manager – Economics and Policy	Zambia Federation of Employers (ZFE)
Mr. Evans Chongo Musonda	Director of Finance	ZCTU
Mr Andrew Hachibe	Enterprise Development Officer	ZDA
Mr Jack Chongola	Director	AYE
Mr. George Okech	Country Representative	FAO
Mr Alexio Musindo	Director	ILO

Source: Yapasa Management Report, 16th August 2018.

Annex III. Documents consulted

Project Documents/LFAs, Project Budgets/technical reports

- YAPASA Annual Reports
- Yapasa Progress Reports submitted to the National Steering Committee/Technical Committee
- Meeting Minutes from YAPASA Project Steering Committee
- Independent Mid-term Evaluation Report on Decent jobs for youth and Improved Food Security through the Development of Sustainable Rural Enterprises (YAPASA), by Sadruddin Imran, Ivan Stubbs and Ben Haagsma, 2015
- The DECD standard for measuring results in private sector Development, control points and compliance criteria, Version VII, April 2015.
- ILO Evaluation policy 2017, GB.331/PFA/8, Geneva
- Decent Jobs for Youth and Improved Food Security through the Development of Sustainable Rural Enterprises Programme. Analysis of market system underpinning the Fish Value Chain in Zambia, ILO, 2015
- Soybean value chain and market analysis, by Munguzwe Hichaambwa et.al., Indaba Agricultural Policy Research Institute (IAPRI), June 2014 (for Yapasa, ILO)
- Zambia Decent Work Country Programme (ZDWCP 2013-2016);
- Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA), ILO 2007-2015, Eleventh African Regional Meeting, Addis Ababa, April 2007
- Report of the Director-General
- International labour office geneva
- Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Zambia 2013 – 2017, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden.
- National Agriculture Investment Plan (NAIP)
- National Aquaculture Development Plan
- Aquaculture Sector Strategy and Intervention brief 2016/17, Sept 2016, YAPASA project
- Private Sector Development Synthesis Note, Youth Employment, DCED, March 2018
- Vision 2030 - A Prosperous Middle-Income Nation by 2030, December 2006, Republic of Zambia
- Revised 6th National Development Plan 2013-2016, Ministry of National Development Planning, Zambia
- 7th National Development Plan 2017-2021, Ministry of National Development Planning, Zambia.
- The Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise Development Policy, Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry, November, 2008
- The 2018-2020 Medium Term Expenditure Framework & the 2018 Budget, Immediate media release, Sunday, 10 September, 2017

- ILO 2017 Global Employment Trends (GET) for Youth
- The World Employment and Social Outlook 2016: Trends for Youth
- The Operational Guide for the Making Markets Work for the Poor (M4P) approach, 2nd edition, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), August 2015
- Value Chain Development for Decent Work, How to create employment and improve working conditions in targeted sectors, Second edition, ILO 2015, by by Roel Hakemulder, together with the Value Chain Development team of the ILO Small and Medium Enterprises Unit, ILO, Geneva
- ILO Action Plan for Gender Equality 2018-21
- FAO Policy on Gender Equality, Attaining Food Security Goals in Agriculture and Rural Development
- The Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise Development Policy, November 2008, Ministry of Commerce trade and industry
- “More funding vital to fisheries, says IAPRI”, Article in <http://epaper.daily-mail.co.zm/>
- Developing gender-sensitive value chains, Guidelines for practitioners, FAO Rome, 2018
- Mid-term Evaluation of Small-holder Agriculture Reform through Enterprise Development (SHARED) Project, iDE, Zambia, Final Report, Eric Buhl-Nielsen, Mimi Groenbech, Stephen Tembo, Emelie Pellby, June 2018
- Agricultural services and digital inclusion in Africa. Working together for Zero Hunger through digital innovation. Web Brochure, FAO.

Annex IV. Persons interviewed and consulted

Name	Title	Organisation
Mr. Alexio Musindo	Director	ILO Office, Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique
Mr. Steve Morris	Chief Technical Adviser	Yapasa, ILO
Mr. Gunjan Dallakoti	Monitoring and Result Measurement Manager	Yapasa, ILO
Mr. Sworo Yopesi	Portfolio Manager	Yapasa, ILO
Mr. Brian	Portfolio Manager	Yapasa, ILO
Ms. Orient Muloongo	Portfolio Manager	Yapasa, ILO
Mr. Mpulu Makayi	Portfolio Manager	Yapasa, ILO
Ms. Mukuka	Assistant MRM	Yapasa, ILO
Mr. Merten Seivers	Value Chain Development and Entrepreneurship Coordinator	Enterprise Department, ILO Headquarters, Geneva
Ms. Francesca Dalla Valle	Youth Employment and Institutional Partnerships Specialist	FAO Headquarters, FAO
Mr. Adam Seketani	Director	ADSEK Fish Feed distribution (agro-inputs distribution), Mansa
Mr. Damian Mukelwa	Adsek Community Agro Dealer	Samfya Road
Ms. Aneshi Chipungu	Director	Better Changes Enterprises Kasama
Ms. Beenzu M. Langi Ms. Chanda D. Mumba	Research Officer – Aquaculture Aquaculturist	Department of Fisheries, National Aquaculture Research Development Centre
Mr. G. Mapani Mugatha Ms. Esnart Shamfuti (and 6 other cooperative members)	Cooperative Chairperson Accounts and Admin officer	Mpongwe Bulima Organic Cooperative Mponge
Mr. Mulenga Sichilima Ms. Rosemary Besa	Director Extension Officer	Mulestus General Dealers, Mansa
Mr. Ronie Mutengerere	Technical Manager	Olympic Milling, Ndola
Mr. Abby Chabala Mr. Dickens Kaunda	Director Hatchery Manager	Pakeyeloba General Dealers, Solwezi
Mr. Daniel M. Bwalya	Managing Director	Regitech, Kasama
Mrs. Merian Kalala	Chairperson	Solwezi District Farmers, Association (DFA), Solwezi
Mr. Shadunka Mweemba	Partner	Sparrow General dealers, Solwezi
Mr. Alan Mbale (and 8 members of Vyazala's two groups of fish pond farmers)	Director	Vyazala Crops Ltd, Solwezi
Mr. Abraham Susiku Ms. Dorca Banda Ms. Elizabeth Chikuni	Director Operations Manager Lead soya seed grower farmer/crop buyer supervisor	WAMIS seed company, Kapiri Mponshi

Name	Title	Organisation
Mr. Mutale	Social Business Proprietor	Wind of Change, Kasama
Mr. Alick Mbewe Mr. A. Jeremy	Provincial Fisheries Officer District Fisheries Officer	North-Western Province Provincial Fisheries Office Solwezi and Kalumbila Districts Fisheries Office
Mr. Mukuka Mulenga	Project Accounting Officer	North-Western Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Mr. Golden Mahove	Consultant (former Yapasa CTA)	South Africa
Chimba Community Agro Dealers Focus Group Discussion (13 attended meeting – of which 7 were women and 6 were youths)	CAD and 12 other beneficiary farmers	Chimba area, Mungwi
Mr. Jack Chongola	Advocate	Alliance of Youth Entrepreneurs – Lusaka
Mr. Evans Musonda Mr. Luke Makininshi	Director Finance Director Education and Training	Zambia Congress of Trade Unions – Lusaka
Mr. Hilary Hanzele	Economist	Zambia Federation of Employers – Lusaka
Ms. Priscilla Mali	Senior Planner	Ministry of Labour and Social Security
Mr. George Okech Mr. Geoffrey Chomba Mr. Mtendere Mphatso	Resident Representative Assistant Representative Program Coordinator	FAO – Lusaka
Mr. Zoole Nawa	Program Manager – Inclusive and Economic Growth	Embassy of Sweden, Lusaka
Mr. Shadreck Mungalaba	Director, Department of Cooperative	Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry
Mr. Joe Kapembwa Mr. Musheke Kakuwa	Department of Youths	Ministry of Youths and Sports
Mr. John Mwango	Deputy Director	Department of Fisheries Headquarters, Chilanga

Annex V. Attendants in Validation Meeting, 2 November 2018

The below are the attendants in the Yapasa Project Evaluation Validation meeting, held at the ILO main board room on 2 November 2018. The Evaluation Team presented the **preliminary findings** only, which was followed by a **Question & Answer session**.

No.	Name	Designation	Organisation
1	Mushiba Nyamazana	Consultant	Independent
2	Lotta Nycander	Consultant	Independent
3	Gunjan Dallakoti	MRM	ILO - Yapasa
4	Priscilla Mali	Senior Planner	MLSS
5	Justin Mwansa	Register of Cooperatives	MCTI
6	Andrew Hachibe	Enterprise Development Officer	ZDA
7	Mpulu Makayi	Programme Officer	FAO - Yapasa
8	Ian Habulembe	Aquaculture Economist	DOF
9	Brian Chipili	PM	ILO - Yapasa
10	Orient Muloongo Sakala	PM	ILO - Yapasa
11	Steve Morris	CTA	ILO - Yapasa
12	Sworo Yopesi	PM	FAO - Yapasa
13	Mukuka Nkunde	PA	ILO - Yapasa
14	George Okech	Country Representative	FAO
15	Vivienne Mbulo	FAA	ILO- Yapasa
16	Alexio Musindo	Director	ILO

Annex VI. Good Practices

ILO Emerging Good Practice Template	
Project Title: Yapasa, Zambia Project TC/SYMBOL: ZAM/13/04M/SID	
Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander	
Date: 19/12/2018 The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text can be found in the full evaluation report.	
Last Mile Distribution approach	
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	The Last Mile Distribution approach is dependent on the satellite system initiated through the Project's experiment and partnership with the Private sector companies (it would need more time, support and efforts to be sustainable, however).
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	When applying market systems development approaches, e.g. the Making markets work for the Poor.
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	It's a good practice as it clearly benefits farmers in remote areas but needs continued support from private sector companies, primarily, and possibly other development partners as it is not yet a proven sustainable arrangement. The system should also be supported by government departments e.g. provision of extension services. Yapasa's support in establishing District Fish Nurseries is another example of a good practice in North Western Province.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	Last Mile Distribution approach was initiated late in the Project but gave initial good results (not yet measurable). The District Fish Nurseries have resulted in an increased number of hatcheries and has had a good impact in this province (not measured).
Potential for replication and by whom	All organisations/stakeholders or bodies providing (input or aggregating) support to farming communities
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO's Strategic Programme Framework)	Sustainable Development Goals (SDG): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 2 - aiming at seeking sustainable solutions to end hunger in all its forms by 2030 and to achieve food security). • Goal 8 - aim to encourage sustained economic growth by achieving higher levels of productivity ZDWCP goals and Sida's Country Strategy for Zambia (up to 2018): Contributing to creating the conditions for sustainable growth in the country and better opportunities for people living in poverty to support themselves in rural and semi-urban areas. Thus, starting and running productive businesses, improving living standards and improved health of women and children are central.
Other documents or relevant comments	

ILO Good Practice

Project Title: Yapasa, Zambia

Project TC/SYMBOL: ZAM/13/04M/SID

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander

Date: 19/12/2018

The following emerging good practice has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text is found in the full evaluation report.

Accounting for the thinking behind project strategies in a transparent way	
Brief summary of the good practice (link to project goal or specific deliverable, background, purpose, etc.)	During the last years of implementation the Project has narrated the progress with its ups and downs and clearly accounted for the “thinking behind” its strategies, in particular the MSD, in e.g. Annual reports, reports submitted to the NSC and in workshops.
Relevant conditions and Context: limitations or advice in terms of applicability and replicability	(See below)
Establish a clear cause-effect relationship	Key Project staff’s approach was to be transparent.
Indicate measurable impact and targeted beneficiaries	The evaluators could appreciate why changes in design and implementation in the field were necessary.
Potential for replication and by whom	All technical cooperation (TC) projects
Upward links to higher ILO Goals (DWCPs, Country Programme Outcomes or ILO’s Strategic Programme Framework)	
Other documents or relevant comments	

Annex VII: Lessons Learned

ILO Lesson Learned

Project Title: Yapasa project, Zambia

Project TC/SYMBOL: ZAM/13/04M/SID

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander

Date: 19/12/2018

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson is included in the full evaluation report.

Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) for Youth

<p>Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)</p>	<p>The project could have made use of and promoted some form of modern Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) to attract the interest of youth in the rural farming communities, such as internet, wireless networks, cell phones, and other communication mediums. It could have contributed to making rural youth computer literate, in addition to other the production/marketing-oriented support. E.g. the use of new apps could have been explored in semi-urban settings combined with bringing agricultural services closer to farmers; for providing real-time information on weather, livestock care, markets, and nutrition-related aspects of food production. Possibly, some lessons could have been learnt from Kenyan smallholder farmers' and traders' ICT experiences.</p>
<p>Context and any related preconditions</p>	<p>The digital divide is a serious concern in particular regarding young people and minimizing this gap should be central in any new project design catering for the youth in rural areas.</p>
<p>Targeted users / Beneficiaries</p>	<p>Youth (women and men) in rural areas</p>
<p>Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors</p>	<p>One challenge cited by stakeholders and project staff is the lack of infrastructure in rural areas, such as lack of internet connections.</p>
<p>Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors</p>	<p>When discussing the issue with stakeholders, including project staff, there was an agreement that this issue is important.</p>
<p>ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)</p>	<p>All projects designed to benefit youth should consider how elements of modern technology (ICT) can help youth be part of the digital revolution – even (or perhaps especially) in rural areas.</p>

ILO Lesson Learned

Project Title: Yapasa Project, Zambia

Project TC/SYMBOL: ZAM/13/04M/SID

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander

Date: 19/12/2018

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson is included in the full evaluation report.

Market systems development and Making Markets work for the Poor (M4P)

Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	A UN Joint Programme (ILO and FAO) might not provide the best framework for a Market Systems Development (MSD)/ Making Markets work for the Poor (M4P) project given the elaborate procurement and other bureaucratic procedures that are not in unison with quick decision-making protocols of the market systems.
Context and any related preconditions	Both ILO and FAO have worked for many years with private sector actors.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Youth (women and men) in rural areas
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	
Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	The Yapasa project experimented with MSD/M4P and was able to apply a flexible approach as much as possible to mitigate some of the bureaucratic hurdles. Regarding focus, Project staff and Partners learned from experiences (e.g. shifting away from crops and value chains that provided incomes on a yearly basis only) and introduced Community Agrodealers (CAD) on an experimental basis.
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	A prerequisite in a project design for field-oriented activities, is that some form of needs assessment vis-à-vis the ultimate target group is undertaken (latest) during the inception phase.

ILO Lesson Learned Template

Project Title: Yapasa Project, Zambia

Project TC/SYMBOL: ZAM/13/04M/SID

Name of Evaluator: Lotta Nycander

Date: 19/12/2018

The following lesson learned has been identified during the course of the evaluation. Further text explaining the lesson is included in the full evaluation report.

Learning about socio-economic/socio-cultural diversity before implementation

Brief description of lesson learned (link to specific action or task)	The Project staff learnt that studies should have been fielded in the inception phase that could have generated more learning about diverse socio-economic/cultural aspects in the five provinces. Regarding gender, a gender analysis was not made and a gender study report was not found – which was a lost opportunity Projects could learn about people’s (beneficiaries) priorities through Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRA) or some other participatory rapid Reality Check method to understand about youth’s (women and men) job interests in rural areas.
Context and any related preconditions	The change in Project’s focus from one value chain to another (soya, aquaculture, horticulture) was made through experimenting, as the more understanding/knowledge was generated about the conditions for the target group - associated with each value chain.
Targeted users / Beneficiaries	Youth (women and men), Partners
Challenges /negative lessons - Causal factors	Regarding gender, a Gender Analysis was never made as planned, and a gender study report is not to be found - which was a lost opportunity in the Project’s efforts to build a needs based field programme.

Success / Positive Issues - Causal factors	
ILO Administrative Issues (staff, resources, design, implementation)	The importance of this issues should be reflected in project designs, staffing, resources and implementation in the future.