



INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION

DECENT JOBS FOR YOUTH AND IMPROVED FOOD
SECURITY THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT OF
SUSTAINABLE RURAL ENTERPRISES (YAPASA)

DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION
FINAL PROGRESS REPORT (FPR)

Basic Information	
Countries covered:	Zambia
Donor:	SIDA
Budget:	USD 7,604,410 (4,706,010 ILO and 2,898,400 FAO)
TC Symbol:	ZAM/13/04/SID- ZAM/13/08/SID- ZAM/13/09/SID
Administrative unit:	CO Lusaka
P&B Outcome:	580040 - Outcome 4 - Promoting sustainable enterprises
DWCP outcome:	Zambia DWCP 2013-16 (extended into 2017/18) Priority 3: More and better employment opportunities created, with focus on targeted groups;
Start date:	1/10/2012
End date:	28/02/2019

Reporting Information	
Report prepared by:	Steve Morris 14/02/2019
Report reviewed by:	JENS DYRING CHRISTENSEN- ENTERPRISE SPECIALIST DWT PRETORIA <i>I have reviewed the classifications and agree they are a fair and accurate reflection of progress</i> Reviewer initials: <i>JD 22/2/19</i>
Report approved by:	GEORGE OKUTHO, DIRECTOR CO LUSAKA <i>I have reviewed the classifications and agree they are a fair and accurate reflection of progress</i> Approver initials: <i>George 22/2/2019</i>

Instructions

This is the standardized format for final progress reporting. It is completed at the end of every development cooperation intervention to provide an overview of progress and achievements. The Final Progress Report (FPR) is an opportunity to reflect on implementation and draw lessons learned, making an initial self-assessment on the efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and relevance of the intervention.

FPRs should not only include the final status of outputs and immediate objectives, but also explain which factors contributed to or hindered the achievement of results, explain how the intervention was managed, identify what could have been done differently and what methods or strategies can be replicated in other development cooperation activities.

Completing the FPR should be an inclusive process of consultation among stakeholders, implementing partners and constituents. Self-assessments in the FPR should flow from the involvement of constituents in monitoring and evaluation and be based on wrap-up workshops held at the close of an intervention.

FPRs must be submitted as per the schedule outlined in the Approval Minute. All reports should be sent in electronic copy (Word format) to PARDEV for onwards submission to the donor^a. Please delete this instruction box before finalizing the document.

Please note this is the format for final reports only. Interim reports must use a different template.

^a In some Approval Minutes the responsibility for submitting DCPRs directly to donors is delegated to the ILO responsible official if the funding agreement has been signed locally. However, these DCPRs must still be copied to PARDEV in electronic format.

Summary

Zambia has a fast growing (3% annually) population of 17.6m with a significant youth bulge, 45% of the population being under the age of 15. It is a largely rural population with a high urbanization rate 4.35%^a with Lusaka being one of the fastest growing cities on the African continent. There is extremely uneven growth and growing income disparities between the urban elites and the rural poor, the majority of whom remain in subsistence agriculture. Yet, agriculture contributes little to GDP compared to the mining sector and Zambia's 7th National Development Plan emphasizes both diversification out of mining into agriculture, and diversification of the agriculture sector towards commercialization and export orientation.

Zambia's rural population is being left out of the country's recent economic growth. Young people in particular are disillusioned with rural existence and leave for urban life as soon as an opportunity presents itself. In particular they are not inspired by the subsistence agriculture of their parents and grandparents' generations. The rural youth unemployment rate is 12.7% and the rural youth under-employment rate is 6.9% making time related underemployment an associated issue. The vast majority are busy with agricultural activity, but that activity is often not full time, nor does it yield sufficient economic return for young Zambians as a way out of poverty and as a way for a more prosperous and dignified life as compared to the quality of life of their urban peers. And yet there are opportunities for young people to be more entrepreneurial in the agricultural space. It is a space of major opportunity for agribusiness and the Yapasa Project aimed to support the development of rural enterprises that would generate improved employment opportunities for rural youth.

Initial project targets were to support improved performance of 5,000 rural youth-owned enterprises and create decent employment opportunities for 3,000 rural youth. These targets were raised after agreement of a one year cost extension in 2018 to 7,500 enterprises and 4,000 jobs.

Results at the end of 2018 were as follows: 14,626 rural farming enterprises were supported to improve their performance in production and sales, of which 8,057 were youth-owned enterprises (5,500 male and 2,557 female). 5,487^b net additional or Full Time Equivalent (FTE^c) jobs were created of which 2,228 were for youths (1,491 male and 736 female). The proportion of youth among these jobs was 51% which is close to the 52% of youth as a proportion of the labour force. However the proportion of young women among the project beneficiaries has been disappointingly low. 33% of the youth jobs were for young women against a target of 42% and 32% of young enterprises supported were women owned against a target of 40%

The project met and overcame a number of challenges during implementation, as described in detail later in this report. In particular there were challenges of persuading businesses to engage young farmers as agro-entrepreneurs since they traditionally saw young people as high risk. Although the project demonstrated well that inclusive business, engaging smallholder producers in their business models significantly contributed to their bottom line there was less evidence of a specific contribution by engaging young farmers had this been possible results in youth inclusion may have been greater. The project learned that single harvest main-crop commodities, particularly those that were subject to volatile global markets like soya were less attractive to young farmers than those with short production cycles and regular year round sales, and so shifted approach to concentrate on these as drivers of youth enterprise. There were some administrative hurdles in implementing the market systems approach within the UN system and some challenges and opportunities presented by the different operational procedures between the ILO and the FAO. However the project has demonstrated that market systems approaches can be used to effect within the current procedural set up of UN agencies, and that employment opportunities for rural youth can be generated in a sustainable manner.

^a Annual Rate of Change – Urbanization in Zambia – Index Mundi

^b Out of the 5,487 jobs only 4,394 could be disaggregated by age or gender so this total was used for calculating proportions

^c Net additional jobs are calculated by using additional % employment for the farmer, their family members and additional labourers employed during the farming season compared to the previous year. FTE is based on 280 days labour per year as determined by Ministry of Agriculture. Estimated time to prepare for, grow, harvest and sell one main crop in a year.

SECTION A: RESULTS ANALYSIS (Outputs, Immediate Objectives)

1. Outputs

Immediate Objective 1: Improved enabling business environment for young entrepreneurs to start and formalize businesses in soy bean and aquaculture value chains with adequate information on business opportunities in the value chains

Output weighting	Percent completion	Indicator targets (compare planned against actual)	Analysis of output delivery
Output1.1: Policy, legal and regulatory review conducted to promote youth enterprise development in soybean and aquaculture value chains			
0%	100%	<p>Planned: # activities aimed at influencing changes in policy, legal and regulatory provisions for soya and aquaculture value chains</p> <p>Target 5, Actual: 7</p> <p>Planned: # of events undertaken to promote youth entrepreneurship in soya and aquaculture activities</p> <p>Target 6, Actual: 3</p>	<p>In line with the Market Systems Development (MSD) approach, the output was delivered in partnership with the industry representatives including the Aquaculture Development Association of Zambia (ADAZ) and Soybean Policy Action Group (SoPAG). It was done in various forms and formats deemed relevant by the industry players.</p> <p>Yapasa held 3 soya dialogue meetings between government, industry players and support organisations the third of which resulted in the formation of SOPAG.</p> <p>Yapasa supported SoPAG to undertake and validate two studies: 1) <i>Impact of import and export bans in agricultural markets and its implications on smallholder farmers: a case of soybeans</i> and 2) <i>Implications of the introduction of the crop tax/levy being implemented by district authorities.</i></p> <p>Yapasa launched ADAZ during a strategic sector forum and also supported ADAZ to develop their strategic plan for the Association in another forum. The plan contained several policy recommendations which the Association took up through meetings at Ministry level.</p> <p>Yapasa Supported the Department of fisheries to undertake a stakeholder coordination meeting to discuss existing policy provisions and harmonize the efforts from different actors in the aquaculture development</p> <p>No separate policy level events were held but Yapasa supported high visibility youth entrepreneurship events around National Youth Week in 2016 and 2017 and the Youth Forum at the Northern Province Expo in 2018. Yapasa also supported young entrepreneurs and business service provider partners to have a presence at these events</p>

Output 1.2: Increased stakeholder exposure and knowledge on international best practice in supporting young entrepreneurs in aquaculture and soybeans value chains			
0%	100%	<p>Planned: # Study tours conducted Target: 2, Actual: 2</p> <p>Planned: # good practice approaches adopted/adapted Target: 3, Actual: 3</p>	<p>All 10 Soya out-grower operating partner businesses were supported to arrange exchange visits for groups of their lead farmers to commercial soya farming operations.</p> <p>ADAZ was supported to organize a study tour for 20 Fish producing businesses to Kafue Fisheries and to Novatek’s Chiawa farm to observe good practices in Pond fish production and latest feed trials. Other Fish farmers from North-Western were taken to Rivendell Fish Farm in Kitwe and those in Luapula were taken to Miracle Farms in Kasama respectively.</p> <p>A high level international Study Tour to Asian Institute of Technology, in Thailand was supported for 5 private hatcheries and 6 individuals from department of aquaculture responsible for managing hatcheries. The visit aimed at learning better practices for fingerling production and management.</p> <p>The knowledge was spread through production of a hatchery and nursery management manual and follow up training for nursery managers. Several of the businesses have completely overhauled their fingerling production model and practices and much improved efficiency as a result. In addition the practices and principles have been built into some key national projects run by Dept of Fisheries (eg Zambia Aquaculture Enterprise Development Programme ZAEDP)</p> <p>A study tour to South Africa to observe the set up for Small Enterprise Development and in particular models of Agribusiness Incubation was facilitated by the project. Zambia Development Agency (ZDA led the study tour and the follow up processes of building the learning into local Incubation plans)</p>
Output1.3: Social marketing campaigns conducted to disseminate information of business opportunities in soya and aquaculture value chain			
0%	90%	<p>Planned: # of different types of Social Marketing campaigns conducted Target: 4, Actual – 0 (no campaigns as such)</p> <p>Planned: # dialogue/</p>	<p>In the original logframe such campaigns related both to public perception of soya products for human consumption and also to youth perception of economic activity in rural areas as a viable means to make a living. During the project the element on soya consumption was dropped and the focus remained on promotion of soybean and aquaculture as profitable farming opportunities. In this light, the following were the results achieved under this outcome:</p> <p>Aquaculture business opportunity seminars (ABOS) led</p>

		<p>workshop conducted in the targeted locations to promote the awareness on business opportunities in soya and aquaculture value chains.</p> <p>Target 10: Actual: 213</p> <p>Planned: # mass media broadcast on the issues/ opportunities related to the soya/aqua value chains</p> <p>Target: 13, Actual : 133</p>	<p>by ADAZ and YEFI were conducted in 7 districts. These were like aquaculture trade fairs bringing together suppliers, extension staff, businesses and farmers. One key objective was to motivate youth in aquaculture. The final ABOS report showed that among the 494 participants in the ABOS the proportion of youth was at least 40.2% and can be counted as youth inclusive. 31.3% were female.</p> <p>At least 26 Field days (2 per year per outgrower) were held during the soya outgrowing interventions in 2015-17 and at least 90 open days were held by CADs at their demo plots under the Last Mile Distribution intervention. Fish feed demonstrations held about 90 field days (3 per each of the 32 demo sites) and Aggregators held at least one community level promotional meeting for their proposed local aggregation centres. All such activities were aimed at promoting farming opportunities with key information and insights.</p> <p>13 episodes of radio and television program produced and broadcasted on ZNBC TV and local radio by National Agriculture Information Service with the support from Yapasa also serves as a campaign to motivate young people in agribusiness by showcasing successful young Agripreneurs.</p> <p>Also 10 Community Radio Stations each broadcast 12 audio programmes in local language based on the same TV shows. 120 episodes</p> <p>Based on the experience and learning, we believe that a separate commercially driven media intervention aimed at promoting agribusiness is very important for this kind of intervention in the nascent markets and had planned to undertake this in the aborted phase 2.</p>
--	--	--	---

Immediate Objective 2: More young people respond to economic opportunities in soy beans and aquaculture market systems

Output weighting	Percent completion	Indicator targets (compare planned against actual)	Analysis of output delivery
Output 2.1: Effective and efficient input supply systems for the value chains developed			
0%	100%	<p>Planned: # Value chain actors and support service providers serving young entrepreneurs</p> <p>Target 22, Actual: 22</p>	<p>Various value chain actors were engaged by the project: Out-grower operators 12 (Soya 10, Aquaculture 2) Input suppliers: 4 (MRI, Agrifocus, Omnia, Olympic) Hatcheries: 2 (Dept of Fisheries, Pakayeloba); and provided direct services to young farmers among their wider outreach.</p> <p>Effective supply systems for soya inputs (on credit) were developed through the outgrower schemes. Uptake will</p>

			<p>be limited in the absence of any of the key input suppliers acting as scale agents. Although MRI-Syngenta had initially been interested to develop their own networks of Community Agro Dealers the model proved less popular than those developed under agrodealers as they were not restricted to deal in the inputs of only one company.</p> <p>In Aquaculture feed distribution systems are in place although uptake remains slow alongside generally slow development of the smallholder fish farming subsector. Supply system for fingerlings via community nurseries has been a game changer in NorthWestern Province and the model is taken up by Government projects and interest is shown by some hatcheries so it may yet go to scale.</p> <p>The output was broadened in focus in the year 2018 to accommodate provision of inputs beyond the soya and aquaculture value chains to look at more general market functions of last mile input distribution: Agrodealers: 4 (Adsek, Better Changes, Mulestus, Sparrow). This model has been much more successful and although it still remains to be seen how cost effective it is across both main season (mainly grain seed and fertilizer) and off-season (mainly horticultural inputs) most of the partners have indicated they will continue and it just remains to further raise awareness among input suppliers as potential scale agents.</p>
Output 2.2: Increased supply of non-financial business development services to support youth enterprises			
0%	100%	<p># individuals trained as trainers for BDS service provision Target: 15, Actual: 34</p> <p># BDS-trainers successfully servicing young entrepreneurs in the targeted sectors Target: 10, Actual: 108</p>	<p>Contrary to the impression given by the output indicators Yapasa did not take a direct project delivery approach and train formal BDS providers. Rather the project let the market actors develop their own ways of providing business skills to clients and farmers. Yapasa worked with National Union of Smallholder Farmers in Zambia (NUSFAZ) to develop a simplified manual that could be used within the soya outgrower schemes. There was a subsequent TOT for 30 lead farmers and extension staff of Yapasa partners among others. However we have not collected evidence that the participants later went on to use the manual in subsequent schemes or beyond them. In addition 4 staff in Dept of Fisheries were trained as trainers to use the Hatchery and Nursery management Manual (both business and technical management).</p> <p>In 2017/18 season 76 Community Agrodealers received basic training from their parent agrodealers and input suppliers in simple farm business advice to prepare them to pass on this knowledge to farmers buying their inputs. In addition 32 lead fish farmers were trained by Dept of Fisheries staff and technical staff of a feed company to</p>

		<p># <u>young</u> entrepreneurs attending business startup and business management training Target: 1000, Actual: 1047</p>	<p>pass on basic economics of fish farming to the 1,030 farmers attending fish feed demonstrations.</p> <p>The 2017 impact assessment report indicates that 77% of the 2,404 Soybean farmers in 2015/16 and 2016/17 seasons of which 52% youth (962 young farmers) received basic agribusiness management/ economics of production training, like simple gross margins, through lead farmers and extension staff as part of their participation in the soya outgrower schemes. Similarly in Aquaculture 105 fish farmers of which 81% youth (85 young farmers) received basic agribusiness management/ economics of production training</p> <p>Of course with this approach the quality and depth of the training may have been less than the intensive training of BDS providers approach but the reach and impact may have been significantly more. A full impact assessment of such business development advice provision would be needed to ascertain this and such would be costly well beyond the value of return for such a small project.</p>
Output 2.3: Technical skills of young entrepreneurs to use production and processing technologies improved			
0%	100%	<p># <u>young</u> entrepreneurs receiving production skills training in soybean, aquaculture or agriculture related activities. Target: 1,000, Actual: 8055</p>	<p>Up to the end of 2017 a total of 2,505 smallholder soya producers had benefitted from technical training through being involved in soya outgrower schemes. 53% of these were youth (1,323 of which 952 male, 371 female). A further 105 farmers were involved in fish outgrowing of which 81% were youth (85 of which 54 male, 31 female). After broadening the scope of the project beyond the specific value chains into broader market functions significantly larger numbers of producers were supported. From the CAD model alone 10,878 farmers bought inputs and received production information 61% were youth (6,649 of which 4,494 male and 2,155 female). The project was not able to get reliable and disaggregated data on the farmers selling produce through the community aggregation model so has not counted 2,304 further farmers there.</p> <p>Altogether 14,626 producers have now benefitted either from the above schemes or improving their offseason (eg horticultural) enterprises through improved local access to inputs and advice via CADs or through improving the quality of their main crop produce and easier market access through the community aggregation centres. All of these activities provided detailed technical training in production technologies and post-harvest handling. 55% of these were youth.</p>

Immediate Objective 3: Value chain development partners along the Soy Beans and Aquaculture value chains collaborate and coordinate effectively and efficiently

Output weighting	Percent completion	Indicator targets (compare planned against actual)	Analysis of output delivery
Output 3.1: Mechanisms for coordination for soybean and aquaculture value chain development established			
0%	100%	Planned: # value chain stakeholder coordination forums established. Target: 2, Actual: 2 Planned: # value chain dialogue events held in each sector Target: 3 per sector, Actual: 9	Although it was beginning to form before the project the Aquaculture Development Association of Zambia was nascent and it can rightly be claimed that Yapasa launched it in 2015 thus establishing it. In 2016 together with Food Trade ESA Yapasa formed the Soya Policy Action Group out of a wider stakeholder consultative group and it still functions to this day. The launch of ADAZ and a Soya Stakeholder Coordination forum in 2015, ADAZ strategy Development forum and Formation of SOPAG forum in 2016, Soya Policy Dialogue workshop, Validation forum for SOPAG studies and Dept. of Fisheries Stakeholder Coordination forum 2017. In 2018 two forums were held to share business experiences of the Community Agro dealer and Community Aggregation models and the key learning and recommendations are being presented to leading industry players in February 2019.

Rating of output delivery

CLASSIFICATION ^d	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Highly satisfactory Almost all (>80%) outputs were delivered and the quality (>80% of planned indicator targets met) of outputs was good.	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory The majority (60-80%) of outputs were delivered and the quality (60-80% of planned indicator targets met) of outputs was fair.
<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory Some (40-60%) outputs were delivered and/or there was a problem with the quality (40-60% of planned indicator targets met) of outputs.	<input type="checkbox"/> Very unsatisfactory Few (<40%) outputs were delivered and/or there was a serious problem with the quality (<40% of planned indicator targets met) of outputs.
Briefly explain the major factors taken into account to justify the output classification and provide any other comments (2000 characters maximum): All output targets were either met or exceeded. Although there were some challenges encountered in the implementation of the project, as described above and below, adaptive management is one of the characteristics of the Market Systems Development approach and thanks to the rigorous and regular field monitoring the project team were usually aware at an early stage when a planned intervention was not on course towards its targets. Also thanks to the use of a “flexible facility” within the project budget being allowed, even encouraged by the donor, and the ability to allocate project elements between ILO and FAO budgets, changes in course were possible with relative ease.	

^d This is a self-assessment

2. Immediate Objectives and Decent Work outcomes

2.1 Immediate Objectives

Indicator	Baseline	Indicator targets (compare planned against actual)
Immediate Objective1 : Improved business environment (macro and micro) for young rural entrepreneurs to start and expand businesses in Zambian agricultural sectors		
<p>Percentage increase in no. of young people and market actors indicating improved ease of doing business in rural agriculture sector</p> <p>Target: 30%</p>	Not Established	<p>Actual: Not Established</p> <p>Baseline for this indicator was not established. However, a rapid market survey done by YEFI the young Emerging Farmers Initiative for Yapasa in August 2017 reveals that only 52% of the interviewed group of farmers indicated good prospects of engaging in Soybean sector compared to 58% that saw a future in farming maize or other staples. This is hardly surprising given the timing of the survey when the farmers were seeing their profitability eroded by the crash in soya prices that season. Interestingly 54% of farmers indicated Aquaculture as a potential business opportunity but Livestock and Vegetable farming both came out top at 77% - a response that triggered Yapasa to re-think the initial project choice of soya value chain.</p>
<p>Percentage increase in number of target beneficiaries with improved information and knowledge toward business opportunities in rural areas</p> <p>Target: 20%</p>	Not Established	<p>Actual: Not Established</p> <p>Baseline for this indicator was also not established however, the same rapid market survey indicates that only 37% of young farmers felt they could make the initial investment in the business and only 31% felt there was adequate availability of farming inputs in their areas. 51% were concerned about output markets and 58% felt they had sufficient knowledge.</p> <p>In the 2018/19 impact assessment 75% of farmers buying inputs from CADs stated that they were doing it primarily for commercial reasons indicating a good attitude towards business opportunity in their local rural areas. 60% of the young farmers noted an increase in sales compared to the previous year. Among young farmers who sold through Community Aggregation models 85% plan to increase production of main crops next year and 100% plan to sell through the same aggregator.</p>
<p>Analysis of immediate objective achievement:</p> <p>Although the two studies in 2017 and 2019 did not ask the same questions (a mistake in hindsight) it can be noted that attitudes to business are generally strong and possibly stronger.</p>		

Immediate Objective 2: More young people respond to economic opportunities in soy beans and aquaculture market systems		
<p># of young entrepreneurs starting enterprise activities within the soy and fish market systems</p>	<p>Not Established but assume zero</p>	<p>Target: 3,000 (Revised to 7,500 for 2018 extension)</p> <p>Actual: 8,057 (5,500 male, 2,557 female)</p> <p>It would be true to say that all the fish farmers were new enterprises since commercial pond fish outgrowing had not been done in Zambia before. For those in soya or horticultural production few would actually be completely new start-ups as most are already involved in some form of farm enterprise. But all would be transitioning into commercially oriented farming activities marked by the use of commercial crops, with improved agricultural inputs. The figure above included, beyond soybean and aquaculture value chains, 6,649 youths (4,494 male and 2,155 female) ie those doing horticultural production and buying inputs through the CADs in 2018.</p>
<p># of existing youth enterprises whose sales volumes increase after receiving support or being linked with service providers</p>	<p>Not Established</p>	<p>Target: 2,000</p> <p>Actual: 4,841 (no gender disaggregated data available)</p> <p>Among the 1,853 enterprises growing soya in the 2016/17 outgrower schemes 53% (982) were youths. (In the 2017 impact assessment sample 43% were youth but we know over all years it was 53%)</p> <p>Of the 43% youth in the 2017 impact assessment 52% or 1,034 enterprises reported an increase in sales from soya (average sales of 1,512 kwacha) and an average increase of 2,050 kwacha in soya sales compared to the year before. And this is remarkable compared to an average increase in sales of only 179.84 among all age groups and also in a year where sales from all other sources combined actually reduced by 35% on average against the year before.</p> <p>Of all the 10,878 farmers who bought horticultural inputs from CADs in the Last Mile input Distribution intervention in 2018 57% showed an increase in sales compared to the year before and the average increase was 24% or 518 kwacha.</p> <p>However 58% (6,309) were youth and of these 35% (3,807) showed an increase in sales compared to the previous year before the CADs amounting to an average increase of 1,236 Kwacha on the previous year (140%).</p>
<p>Analysis of immediate objective achievement:</p> <p>After generally low numbers and slow results coming out of the earlier outgrowing schemes in both soya and aquaculture the project rapidly made up for lost ground (and exceeded even the revised targets) in 2018 by tackling the more generic market functions beyond the confines of the soya and aquaculture subsectors. This is a key lesson learned by the project: Rather than focussing on a few sub sectors, focus on the broader market functions, that pose the key barriers to target group participation.</p>		

Immediate Objective 3: Value chain development partners along the Soy Beans and Aquaculture sectors collaborate and coordinate effectively and efficiently (cross-cutting)

Existence of effective and functional sector development collaboration mechanisms

Planned: 2

Actual: 2

Analysis of immediate objective achievement:

ADAZ and SOPAG both continue functioning and raising policy or governance issues as and when they become something important for the industry or subsector to rally round.

2.2 Decent Work outcomes

CONTRIBUTION TO DECENT WORK OUTCOMES		
DWCP outcome(s) ^e	IRIS/SM CP code (e.g. LBN103) ^f	Brief summary of contribution (2000 characters maximum)
<p>Outcome 4.2 Promoting sustainable enterprise development through inclusive business practices in selected value chains for the creation of decent and green jobs, particularly for youth, women and persons with disabilities</p> <p>Success Criteria: 4.2.4 Additional resources are committed by member States, governments, social partners or other national entities to scale-up specific enterprise-level interventions using ILO products.</p> <p>Milestone 1: Interventions designed and implemented using Market system approach to decent work</p> <p>Success Criteria: 4.2.4 Additional resources are committed by member States, governments, social partners or other national</p>	ZMB133	<p>In the earlier phases of the project 9 interventions had been designed – see table in the annexe which were implemented through a mixture of partnerships using market system approach – aimed at supporting 5,000 youth owned enterprises and improving 3,000 (Full time equivalent) jobs for rural youth. These covered: formal financing of youth for inputs loans; the soya and aquaculture outgrower models that bundled access quality to inputs, access to entrepreneurship support services and stakeholder coordination.</p> <p>An additional three interventions aimed at supporting a further 2500 farm enterprises and creating a further 1000 jobs were designed for the 2018 extension period: Last Mile Inputs Distribution, Community Level Aggregation models and Supply of Produce to Formal Markets in NW Province.</p> <p>Overall a total of 14,626 enterprises were supported (8,057 of them youth owned – of which 5,500 male and 2,557 female). 5,367 FTE jobs were improved, of which 2,228 were for youth (1,491 male, 736 female). These figures do not include numbers from the Community Level Aggregation intervention in 2018 as data collected from the Impact assessment was patchy and considered unreliable, but potentially a further 2,304 farmers benefitted from easier access to markets</p>

^e Global projects report on their contribution to Global Products under the Outcome-Based Workplans

^f For Global projects this is the Global Product code, e.g. GLO126

<p>entities to scale-up specific enterprise-level interventions using ILO products.</p> <p>Milestone 2: Partner and non-partner market actors leverage their resources to adopt, adapt and expand the business innovations facilitated by the project</p>	<p>through local aggregation – of which 1,014 were youth, 772 male, 242 female (extrapolated data with untested assumptions)</p> <p>Employment figures for Aggregation outreach cannot yet be calculated because it would depend on changes in production (quantity/ diversity) during the 2019 season. Similarly, income effects cannot be ascertained without data from 2019 season.</p> <p>106 enterprises have benefited from project facilitated innovations and in the process created 120 jobs in addition to the FTE figures above.</p> <p>Private sector investment has been leveraged to co-create sustainable and pro-poor business models. Over the life of the project twenty eight such partnerships have committed their own investment of USD 641,912 to revising their current business practices complementing the USD 364,350 invested by the project.</p> <p>Partner market players in general express satisfaction with the business innovations brought out in their business processes. They are optimistic that the innovations will result in profitability and will support expansion of their businesses.</p> <p>Multi-stakeholder engagement has been undertaken to encourage leading industry players to support the business models and encourage additional downstream partners to adopt them.</p>
---	---

2.3 Effectiveness analysis

- a) Based on the achievement of immediate objectives, explain the likely contribution the intervention will make towards the development objective:

The overall development objective of the Rural Youth Enterprise for Food Security Programme (Yapasa) was to facilitate creation of decent jobs for youth and improved food security through the development of sustainable rural enterprises.

There can be little doubt that the project has contributed to an overall improvement in supply of quality inputs and technical knowledge in the practices of soya farming, fish farming and horticultural production. There has been improvement in the supply of basic business advice to enable entrepreneurs to develop their micro-enterprises at farm level.

The key target group were rural youth aged 18-35. By taking a market systems approach the project deliberately avoided specific targeting of young people – ie the project did not impose quotas or requirements that only youth could be served. Instead the approach was youth inclusivity by focusing efforts in areas where youth were more likely to be represented or would gain the most value from their involvement. By taking this approach the project realized it would be necessary for our market partners to exceed targets for numbers of enterprises supported in order for the actual youth proportion among them to reach the targets.

Given that according to the 2017 Labour Force Survey indicates 52% of the labour force are in the age bracket 18-35 our target was that at least 52% of final project beneficiaries should be youth. In fact overall 55% of enterprises supported have been youth. In the first pilot in soya the proportion was 82% reducing to 68% in the second wave and 47% by the third wave. This led the project to change course and in 2018 with the introduction of the CAD model for last mile horticulture inputs distribution the youth proportion rose again to 61%.

Further 51% of the Full Time Equivalent jobs created have been for youth, only just short of the target proportion. Unfortunately the gender disaggregation indicates that the proportion of enterprises supported that were owned by young women was only 17% and similarly the proportion of all new jobs created for young women was 17% and so the efforts have not met with expectations for gender equality.

b) Describe changes that are expected or have already been observed relating to the project's ultimate beneficiaries:

Unemployment is not really the issue in rural Zambia, where almost everyone is involved in some kind of productive activity, rather underemployment is the issue and the ability to earn a sustainable and viable living from that productive activity. The project has contributed to increases in productive hours spent by beneficiaries, their family members and to a lesser extent neighbors (in the form of hired labour) and thus has contributed to reducing underemployment in project areas.

Further there is a connection between the extra hours worked using improved inputs and knowledge and some increases in income. However the value of the increase been generally been insufficient to raise a family enterprise's income above the basic minimum wage for rural general workers and thus it is hard to state that the extra FTE jobs generated constitute Decent work on the basis of income alone.

Smallholder farmers, among them a substantial number of youth, have benefitted from increased association through farmer groupings or networks, opportunities have been observed for skills development and information has been made available on the safety issues associated with use of agricultural chemicals, all of which are also elements of decent work agenda.

c) Describe how the project has contributed to the achievement of national development strategies and other development frameworks such as UNDAF and PRS:

In the original PRODOC it was stated that the project would contribute to 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. This was later superseded by the 7th NDP 2017-2021 and the project has contributed to the pillar on Economic Diversification and Job Creation, especially result area 1: Diversified and export oriented agriculture sector. The project has contributed in strengthening the aquaculture subsector towards local production and import substitution, although the impacts are likely to take some years to become visible, there have also been contributions towards increasing youth involvement in (although not overall production quantities) soya production which is a leading element in Zambia's agricultural exports (mainly though stock feed). A larger number of rural youth have become involved in commercial agricultural / aquaculture production and are earning somewhat improved incomes from these activities in project areas.

Jobs have been created in rural areas, contributing somewhat to expansion of local economies. The proportion of jobs created for youth (56%) is in proportion to their representation in the labour force (52%)

The programme contributed somewhat to UNDAF Outcome 2 on 'Targeted populations in rural and urban areas **attain sustainable livelihoods** by 2015' and more specifically Country Programme Outcome 2.2. Government and Partners provide targeted groups (including youth) with **opportunities for gainful and decent employment** by 2015. However UNDAF was later superseded by the UNSDPF 2016-2021 to which the

project has contributed more in line with Pillar 2: Environmentally Sustainable and Inclusive Economic Development - Transformative Indicator of Success: **% of youth (15-35 years) who state that they have viable choices for employment, as employers and as employees, and can make informed decisions about their future.** It is hard to pin down what proportion of youth in Zambia are in this position and to what extent Yapasa has contributed especially in the absence of any national monitoring data on the indicator.

d) Describe any lessons learned relating to the overall effectiveness of the intervention, taking into account the suitability of the technical approach or intervention model deployed. With hindsight, identify anything that would have been done differently to increase the intervention’s effectiveness:

The Final evaluation of the project, when summing up effectiveness, stated: *“Yapasa has managed to contribute to most of the Outcomes, attracted attention among many institutions and spread knowledge about the marketing systems approach, regarding reaching targets[.....]the lack of an instrument to target youth 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.”* The project team agrees that improved gender analysis and female youth targeting through a greater effort to raise gender and youth awareness among implementing partners and the development of more gender and youth friendly business models would have had a greater impact on young rural women’s position, and this was included in the proposed phase 2 project document (written before the SIDA decision not to fund further activity).

Rating of project effectiveness

CLASSIFICATION [§]	
<input type="checkbox"/> Highly effective Almost all (>80%) of the immediate objectives were achieved and the intervention will make a substantial contribution to the achievement of the development objective and decent work outcomes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Effective The majority (60-80%) of the immediate objectives were achieved and the intervention will make a contribution to the achievement of the development objective and decent work outcomes.
<input type="checkbox"/> Ineffective Some (40-60%) of the immediate objectives were achieved, which will result in a limited contribution to the achievement of the development objective and decent work outcomes.	<input type="checkbox"/> Very ineffective Few (<40%) of the immediate objectives were achieved, and it is unlikely a contribution will be made to the achievement of the development objective and decent work outcomes.
Briefly explain the major factors taken into account to justify the effectiveness classification and provide any other comments (2000 characters maximum):	
<p>The project achieved the results of improving the enterprise support to enable and exceed the target number of rural youth to successfully engage in sustainable enterprises. Job creation targets were achieved and exceeded overall. However fewer were for youth (under target) and especially few for female youth (very much under target).</p> <p>In the earlier soya and aquaculture interventions through outgrowing schemes there was an underlying assumption that most if not all the young farmers were entering into commercial production for the first time and thus there was a strong correlation between an “enterprise supported” and a job created (job</p>	

[§] This is a self-assessment

figures were based on 1 job = 1 person growing 1 Ha of soya, taking 286 person days from preparation, through production to harvest and sale of crop. In some schemes particularly with JEDO Commodities that had by far the largest number of farmers signed-up many of the farmers were growing as little as 0.25 Ha and thus counted as only 0.25 of a FTE job. Similarly for Aquaculture 1 young farmer managing 3 ponds would constitute a FTE job and since in the first pilot, before scale up, each farmer only had one pond then the proportion of jobs created was about one third of the enterprises supported. Using these measures the ratio of jobs created to youth owned enterprises supported was 0.84 (0.88 among male owned enterprises and 0.73 among female owned enterprises.)

For the 2018 interventions the project used a different method to calculate employment and figures were based on net additional time spent on off-season farm activities. Although the last mile inputs distribution intervention supported many more enterprises to improve production the proportion of jobs counted was much smaller at 0.16 per youth owned enterprise (0.14 among male owned enterprises and 0.20 among female owned enterprises).

The project did not count any “enterprises supported” or “jobs created” for the Community Aggregation intervention in 2018 because data coming in from the partners was inadequate to count enterprises and, being the first year of the intervention, it was not possible to do a realistic comparison of time spent against the previous year’s production. It was possible to estimate enterprises supported as noted above but the calculation methodology was not acceptable due to inaccurate data so these were not included in the final figures. It was identified in the impact assessment that the majority of farmers selling through the community aggregation centres were planning to scale up production as a result of the improved ease of access to a reliable market, and thus the jobs would likely be created in 2019. Still there was no methodology established for counting job creation within the first year of the intervention.

It may be that the project has undercounted jobs for the last mile inputs distribution intervention. Since improvements in efficiency were also part of the equation rather than just time spent on activity. Had the project had more time to work on the 2018 interventions job figures may well have been more accurately reflected.

SECTION B: IMPLEMENTATION ANALYSIS

1. Factors affecting implementation

Check key reasons for shortfalls in the delivery of outputs and achievement of immediate objectives:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Implementing partner (constituents or private entities) performance | <input type="checkbox"/> ILO (Office and staff) performance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Difficulties in inter-agency coordination | <input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate cost estimates |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of constituent or implementing partner commitment/ownership | <input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate project design |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ILO policy changes | <input type="checkbox"/> Counterpart funding shortfall |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Budget processing (revision/disbursement etc.) delays | <input type="checkbox"/> Unexpected change in external environment |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community/political opposition | <input type="checkbox"/> HR difficulties (recruitment, contracts) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other - please specify: Gender targeting | |

- a) Explain the major challenges faced during implementation and explain how these were dealt with:

During project implementation, Yapasa faced a number of challenges which can broadly be categorized into strategic, operational and market facilitation.

One **strategic** challenge was the difficulty of getting business partners to target young people. Agribusiness owners still perceive young people as being uncommitted and transitory in the school to work cycle. Yapasa was unsuccessful in developing a specific, commercially sound, business case for including young people as there is no real **evidence** of their involvement contributing to a healthier bottom line. Despite the various efforts by the project to raise the awareness of agribusiness opportunities among young men and women living in rural areas, most young people remain uninterested in agriculture generally and especially in sub-sectors with lengthy cropping cycles and long periods with no income such as soybeans and aquaculture.

Yapasa's initial response to business partners' aversion to include young people in their economic activities and programmes was to make it a condition for partnership in anticipation that they would later buy-in after seeing the benefits (although even with this approach in the very first pilot there were only 82% youth signed into the VSP/NATSAVE soya outgrower scheme). Later, Yapasa let the partners include youth as they preferred but kept pushing a message that there were good business reasons to work with them for example that they would be more adaptable to the new innovations being promoted. The youth proportion dropped further to 68% in the second wave of soya outgrowing and 47% in the third wave. By this time the project team had realized that soya outgrowing was not attracting youth and no amount of encouragement would be likely to change that. Although the youth involvement picture was better in aquaculture, the programme team had been analyzing what rural youth really want from enterprise or employment in the agricultural space, key factors were ease of entry – small land requirements and initial investment, regular short term income, all year round, and opportunity for innovation. So a strategic shift was made for 2018. A new approach promoting off-season horticultural production and making this easier by delivering the required inputs nearby to young farmers. In the process the project shifted from a focus on the sub-sector and toward a focus on youth employment opportunity by addressing wider market functions such as input supply.

In terms of the operational aspects the programme initially attracted very few businesses with reasonable scale to influence wider market system change in the targeted rural areas as reflected in an early call for expressions of interest, which brought out many more NGO oriented organizations than commercial market players. Larger entities which could act as scale agents were reluctant to get involved in the absence of compelling and

documented evidence from the pilots to inform business modelling but their interest began to grow as the project proceeded.

Also the wider macro-economic context, especially the fiscal pressures and high inflation resulting in prohibitive interest rates around 48% in 2015/2016 further placed operational limitations on business activities and investments.

The project responded to the challenge faced by smaller partners by looking further up the supply chains and seeking strategic partnerships at that level, to complement the operational partnerships with smaller entities in the target areas for demonstration purposes. Capacity building of the smaller partners through program staff mentoring was emphasized. The programme initially decided to use bank credit guarantees to test and promote different innovations and to circumvent the challenge of high interest rates, shifted their focus to input supplier credit rather than bank loans. However the project learned that this led to too much of a cushion to partners and was inhibiting innovation. The project therefore later limited their use of credit guarantees to exceptional cases while shifting focus to interventions and business models with minimal credit requirements.

Yapasa had chosen, largely at the request of the Ministry of Agriculture, soybeans as the first subsector of choice. At the time of choice in 2013 the global soya market had been on a stable trend and the outlook was promising. However one factor could have been foreseen: Zambian smallholder agriculture is rain-fed and across Southern Africa rainfall patterns follow approximately 10 year cycles of el-nino induced drought, which occurred more or less on schedule in 2014/15 and 2015/16 greatly suppressing yields in the first two waves of soya-outgrowing pilots and much reducing young farmers ability to repay their input loans. While the bumper harvest due to good rains in 2016/17, added to a global soya surplus and combined with the negative effects of indiscriminate government export restrictions, caused a price crash in 2017 that could not really have been foreseen. In hindsight then Soya was actually a very volatile crop and young smallholder farmers in particular cannot afford to take the associated risks.

The project responded to the soybeans producer price variability and related export bans challenge in two ways. The project facilitated the formation of a soybeans sector stakeholder platform to engage government to limit the arbitrary imposition of export bans. Secondly the project developed a whole new intervention on soybeans aggregation encouraging contractual links between mid-level aggregation partners and large aggregators to demonstrate more effective and farmer focused business models to reduce producer price variability.

In terms of the market facilitation aspect, the Yapasa programme was among the first market systems development programmes implemented within the United Nations. As such the programme faced some challenges with UN systems compatibility to the agility and flexibility requirements of such an approach. Implementing a joint UN project by the ILO and FAO also placed some additional harmonization challenges in the ways of working, whereby the programme had to continuously work within both the FAO and ILO administrative support staff to explain and provide clarity on its approaches and seek support where needed to undertake particular activities, especially where these activities were not common in either organizations. However the upside of these differences, and as a direct effect of structuring: Both organizations working jointly to a single work plan, separate budgets on a pass through mechanism and instituting a flexible facility within both budgets; was that the project had the flexibility to channel particular activities through one or the other organization according to which had the more suitable systems and procedures as needed.

There are only two areas where the project has fallen short on meeting the targets: Improvement of enterprises owned by young women (achieved 85% of the target) and proportion of new FTE jobs created for youth especially for women (achieved 74% of original target and 56% of revised target but of those only 17% were for young women).

As pointed out in the final evaluation the project could have paid more attention to gender and have developed a specific outcome for young women. However, as explained above the lack of interest of especially young women to pursue economic activities in the selected sectors made it difficult for the project to meet these targets.

- b) Describe any lessons learned relating to challenges faced during implementation:
- i. For MSD projects to be successful it is critical to first of all understand market dynamics, but also the pull effect of entrepreneurs into certain economic activities. In the case of Yapasa the profiling of young people their needs, aspirations and opportunities could have been better analysed, before choosing the value chains of intervention. The choice of sectors with the combined focus on young people was not the best choice and was a key reason why the youth employment targets, especially for young women were not fully met.
 - ii. Yapasa used both credit guarantees and grants to enable partners to trial innovations. However these instruments seem rather to have inhibited real innovation as they provided too great a comfort cushion, enabling the partners largely to carry on business as usual without truly absorbing sufficient share of the risk. While these instruments, used judiciously, can have catalytic effects they need to be very clearly justified by the partners' own vision and substantial investment or "skin in the game", and further backed up by technical advice, linkages, mentoring and other facilitation from the project.
 - iii. The 2014/15 and 2015/16 droughts and 2016/2017 soybeans price crash yielded a valuable lesson: If the project is going to work in such volatile commodity markets the business modelling must include appropriate mitigation such as weather indexed insurance and contracting/price mechanisms that enable resilience to such shocks. There was similar learning from the intervention on developing a fish out-grower scheme in Northwestern province that after much effort in establishing a sustainable production model was threatened by the developing market realities. Commodity prices and markets usually undergo cycles that must be constantly monitored, analyzed and planned for.
 - iv. In a market dominated by a few large businesses and multiple very small enterprises, if partnerships cannot be forged with the large businesses and it is inevitable to partner with smaller enterprises, it is vital not only to conduct comprehensive due diligence assessments, but also to develop detailed appropriate capacity building plans based on those assessments. Smaller firms usually exhibit several related capacity weaknesses which will often manifest later during fast tracked growth or expansion. If the program must partner with such low capacity partners, additional capacity building efforts are essential.
 - v. Implementing a market system development approach within the UN system poses particular challenges. These include a limited range of partnership engagement instruments and a tendency towards an institutional common approach. There were three instruments available: Implementation Agreements; (most appropriate for choosing a long terms partner for the whole or a major part of a project); Grant Agreements (that do not encourage co-investment and sense of ownership by a business partner and thus were not deemed appropriate for MSD work; and Service Agreements which are most appropriate for purchasing goods and services, but seemed to be the most adaptable for the MSD approach. However the procurement requirements for competitive tender (three quotes), was less appropriate for identifying partners where vision and innovation can be more important than price alone, although there is technical flexibility of seeking waivers for not sourcing three quotes. However the project management patiently and extensively explained to finance and admin staff, who were used to standard procedures, that the project required greater levels of flexibility than were often accorded and over time found accommodating routes through the systems.

2. Risk management

Key Assumptions	Risk level		Describe any mitigation measures applied
	Start of project	End of project	
Local partners have the required in house capacity to facilitate data collection in line with our stringent DCED standards	Yellow (medium risk)	Green (low risk)	Initially the project asked partners to produce very rigorous data records not reflecting the fact that small enterprises are largely informal, not keeping records even for their own use and very reluctant to share them outside due to trust issues (eg it might get to ZRA). Yapasa developed simple Excel spreadsheets that we asked the partners to maintain in the belief it would be useful for their own business management but still they found them over complicated and resisted. Ultimately the project right sized its whole M&E system (it is a relatively small project in DCED terms) and concentrated only on what we really needed to know and that in turn was based largely on the absolute minimum a business needs to know to measure its own performance. Figures are reported by partners and taken largely on trust but are also triangulated by the project across different sources. Thus we feel confident that what we are reporting is robust enough in a rough and ready way to meet DCED criteria.
Private sector partners ready and willing to partner with the programme to undertake interventions	Green (low risk)	Green (low risk)	This risk originally had two parts, a) availability of partners with sufficient capacity to partner and b) willingness to partner through recognizing the value add in our offer. Initially an EOI attracted low capacity partners mostly looking to UN for free funding. Larger partners with greater capacity to undertake their own new business operations had less incentive to partner with Yapasa with our limited experience, our market offer just did not sell to them. Yapasa later took a more proactive approach to explain the potential benefits to larger partners, based on learning from earlier interventions and this gave the project credibility and attracted more commitment from partners.
Line Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock is willing and able to facilitate regulatory reforms for the facilitation of a Public Private Partnership with ZARI	Red (high risk)	Green (low risk)	Inoculum is a critical input to successful soya production. At the beginning of the project it was only available in liquid form produced by ZARI and not easy to store or distribute. Hence a PPP was proposed. Before that could come to fruition the market had responded privately first by importing powdered inoculum from East Africa and then producing locally so a cheap and reliable source is now widely

			available through input suppliers and agrodealers across the country. No more problem. Risk became irrelevant.
Local financial institutions are willing and able to offer financial products to rural youth	Yellow (medium r	Green (low risk)	At the beginning of the project banks were quite risk averse and interest rates were high and soared above 48% my mid project. Formal FIs are willing enough to lend but their requirements are still too stringent to make it a feasible option even now, with interest rates much lower, the business cost of debt financing is just not an affordable option especially for MSMEs. The project instead developed business models with partners that did not require such formal financial products, instead based on negotiated terms, trade credit and cash payments based on trust.
The UN Joint programme management arrangements enable the programme to move quickly in its procurement of required services	Yellow (medium r	Green (low risk)	There was nothing in the joint programming arrangements that specifically caused delays. Each individual agency has its own procurement and management rules and procedures which taken on their own may well have caused delays. Yapasa in fact, due to a joint work plan but separate budgets, had an arrangement where activities could readily be apportioned or interchanged between ILO and FAO budgets and thus be bound by either set of rules and procedures thus enabling us to pick the most conducive for the specific purpose. That said it took time for the Management team to realize the bounds of how this approach could be implemented and this could also delay other projects taking a similar approach.
The programme will find suitable partners to work with in all targeted provinces	Yellow (medium r	Green (low risk)	The targeted provinces (chosen because they are traditionally less well served, under the UN leave no-one behind approach) have thinner markets with fewer partners of sufficient capacity. In North Western for example there is substantial economic activity due to the mines but many partners lack capacity Yapasa commissioned local BDS suppliers to assess capacity of potential partners and help them establish business development plans. In Luapula there were very few larger scale market actors and although the market is not really thin it had fewer suitable partners able to fulfil competitive selection requirements and the project had to rather proactively identify appropriate and capable partners. An assessment of potential in Eastern Province – originally planned as an intervention area for Soya – determined that the province was

			already saturated with bilateral aid projects and NGOs and it was deemed that Yapasa could add little to the mix there that would not duplicate efforts of others.
The programme will meet its impact targets within the given time frame	Red (high risk)	Green (low risk)	The overall targets set by Yapasa had not been met at the end of 2017, the original project period. However after securing a 1 year cost extension and redesigning the intervention strategies the outreach figures for enterprises supported were much exceeded, even the additional targets, to the extent that the number of youth owned enterprises target was in fact met. The project adopted a youth inclusive approach rather than a youth only approach and would thus expect that the proportion of youth among the final beneficiaries would be at least equal to the proportion of youth among the labour force in general –ie 52% Jobs improved figures are much more promising – although these can really only be assessed a year or two after the implementation period. Yapasa, however, continues to believe that the changes in market system facilitated by the project will benefit a large number of beneficiaries in agricultural value chains in the years to come as demonstrated in a number of success stories being published on the Yapasa website.
Partner market players will select youths as out growers of soybean under out grower operation schemes	N/A Added in 2016 Yellow (Medium F	Yellow (medium)	In the first soya and aquaculture pilots the project asked for 100% youth targeting but only achieved 82%. In the second wave the youth proportion had fallen to 68% which was still deemed reasonable. To test how sustainable the approach would be in the third wave the project merely requested youth –inclusive rather than youth targeted – and as a result the youth proportion reduced even further to 47%. At this point the project realized that soya outgrowing as a model was not that attractive to or accessible by many youth and changed strategy for 2018 to identify instead other areas that might be more appealing to youth, quicker turnover, lower input investment requirements etc and settled on horticulture. In the 2018 models Agrodealers’ CADs reported selling to 61% youth
Partners in aquaculture will make necessary investments to adopt practical	N/A Added in 2016 Green (low risk)	Yellow (medium)	In spite of supportive government policy support there continues to be little investment in smallholder aquaculture especially in the project areas. Most

<p>market innovations in good time – especially in supply of fingerlings and feed.</p>			<p>developments have remained restricted to the commercial production areas in the south where <i>O.Niloticus</i> production is permitted and successful at large scale. The current development model however seems to be that large scale fish producers establish their own hatcheries out of necessity even if they would prefer not to operate their own – purely because entrepreneurs have not seen sufficient business incentive to invest in new hatchery businesses. The entry of Skretting into the feed market as a major producer has made a big difference but only for large scale commercial fish producers. Skretting has still not made significant investments in targeting smallholder producer areas. In spite of this there is evidence of some small scale hatchery and feed production emerging but again mainly in the south around the clusters of larger city generated market demand.</p>
<p>There is a growing number of development actors working in the aquaculture value chain. Early in the project this was not the case and the assumption was that most of the changes in the sector/value chain would be attributable to the Project. Genuine attribution to Yapasa is thus now threatened.</p>	<p>N/A Added in 2016 Green (low risk)</p>	<p>Green (low risk)</p>	<p>In 2016 The African Development Bank funded a \$40m Zambia Aquaculture Enterprise Development Project which, although slow to take off, has now begun implementation through Dept of Fisheries and Citizens Economic Empowerment Commission. It was initially thought that this would reduce the chances of Yapasa claiming attribution for many of the outcomes. However the key areas where other work eg by World Fish Centre and Peace Corps, mainly in Luapula province, a proposed GIZ project in Eastern and Luapula Provinces and the ZAEDP project (developing aquaparks, linking local fish farmers as outgrowers to commercial farms in the aquaparks, development of hatcheries – with associated nursery based distribution models) are working do not necessarily overlap with those of Yapasa – either by geography or approach. Thus Yapasa’s impact may still be partially attributable in addition to our contribution towards this project. It is remarkable though that Yapasa’s footprint (pond based outgrowing, nursery models for fingerling distribution) can be seen in several aquaculture developments (and explicitly so) in the strategies of ZAEDP and GIZ so Yapasa can say that we have handed the torch to other projects to blaze a way forward.</p>
<p>Farm Input Voucher Management System Developed by FAO under the</p>	<p>N/A Added in 2016 Red (High Risk)</p>	<p>Green (low risk)</p>	<p>Since the project moved on from supporting models that depend on the large scale provision of inputs this is no longer a risk factor to the project. The FIVMS has found an</p>

<p>Conservation Agriculture Scaling Up (CASU) project will be tested and adjusted for Yapasa and promoted to input providers and out grower operators for their independent commercial use after the project</p>			<p>institutional home in the Smart Zambia Insitute under the cabinet office as Zambia Integrated Agricultural Information Management System (ZIAMIS) which is the vehicle for the e-voucher within the Farm Inputs Support Programme (FISP). It is not yet useable as Yapasa had intended but is fully useable by government and donor funded projects for accurately recording and managing disbursements and payment for inputs under the e-voucher schemes. Farmers must pay a ZMW400 deposit to activate their cards and then can redeem up to a value of ZMW2,100 (the 100 goes to weather index insurance) against inputs of their choice including legume seed and even fish fingerlings. As such agrodealers across the country have geared up to be registered FISP suppliers, mobilizing particularly in the districts where e-voucher is being implemented. In districts where traditional hard copy vouchers are implemented there are still key governance issues and reselling of inputs by farmers at massively subsidized prices, undermining the market function and crowding out agrodealers.</p>
<p>Input companies are willing to develop fully fledged last mile delivery systems for agricultural inputs using CADs</p>	<p>N/A Added in 2016 Green (low risk)</p>	<p>Green (low risk)</p>	<p>Agro dealers have demonstrated more interest in building up their own networks of CADs rather than them being restricted representatives of specific input supply companies. This of course is better for the farmers as they can access a range of inputs from several companies through the one agro dealer network. However the lack of a significant scale agent means that scale will have to be achieved by replication of the model by many small agro dealers rather than expansion of one model by any one company. The project has proven that the Agrodealer/CAD business model is capable of generating greater sales in smallholder dominated areas and in the final months of the project has been promoting the model with large scale inputs providers to encourage them to support agrodealers they supply to adopt the model.</p>

- a) Provide an overview of how assumptions and related risk levels changed throughout the lifetime of the intervention. Describe the relevance of originally-identified assumptions and highlight any new assumptions identified during implementation:

Assessment of the individual risks and assumptions is described in detail in the table above. The majority of the originally identified risks were relevant and remained so for the life of the project. The key exception was that of partnerships around commercializing the supply of liquid inoculum for soya which soon became irrelevant once the market introduced a ready supply of powdered inoculum. A few risks were identified into the mix later in the project but they were largely specific to certain elements or tools used in the project. Eg issues around the use of the FAO developed FIVMS platform. See above.

- b) Explain the intervention's approach to risk management and how effective the risk monitoring system and mitigation measures proved to be:

Risks were monitored all the time. Such is the nature of market systems development. Constant checking and scanning the market for evolving and trends and hurdles is an essential part of the approach. As a result the project team were at all times very aware of the identified risks and new ones emerging and were able to adjust activities accordingly.

- c) Describe any lessons learned related to risk management:

Market systems development business is a risk taking activity by default. It is about pushing boundaries to see what works, about introducing disruption. Only by taking risks and breaking things does real innovation and progress happen. Clearly in this situation identification and monitoring of the risks has to be done all the time and the weekly partner updates and bi-monthly portfolio review meetings were essential in this regard.

3. Management and Institutional arrangements

a) Describe the adequacy of management arrangements:

The overall project management arrangements were well suited to the delivery. Having the benefit of both FAO and ILO staffing sitting in the same office contributed to the cross fertilization of ideas and tapping into the relative strengths of each organization. This was further enhanced after gathering all staff together into one open plan office where before they had been scattered in individual offices within the ILO Lusaka buildings.

The project lost some ground in the early years through changes in leadership. It took long to recruit the first CTA and then there were a couple of changes until the second CTA was recruited in November 2015. Having a senior FAO staff members as a crucial bridge between the two organizations undoubtedly eased communication and the oversight of administrative and financial matters.

The project availed technical support from the Decent Work Team (DWT) in Pretoria and the FAO technical team in Rome and Harare when requested. There was also institutional support from The Lab – ILO's Market Systems support project – in Geneva.

b) Explain the role that partners, including ILO constituents, played during implementation. Identify any alternative arrangements that may have helped increase the effectiveness, efficiency or inclusiveness of the intervention:

The project's primary implementing partners were private sector entities. ILO's constituents were more involved in an advisory capacity through the Steering committee and technical working group (a sub group of the same constituents).

Involvement of the Department of Fisheries and local level Ministry of Agriculture staff was extremely important and useful in supporting the private sector partners – e.g. in their choice of business location, support with technical training of farmers.

The project might in hindsight have benefitted from some more active involvement of the Ministry of Youth local (District level) structures together with AYE and YEFI on engaging more youth.

It is notable that the project did not manage to gain much traction or commitment from the Ministry of Agriculture at higher levels. Their participation in the steering committee was sporadic. The management could have made greater effort to emphasize the benefits of the project to MoA strategy but at lower levels the project activities were certainly appreciated.

c) Describe any lessons learned related to management and institutional arrangements:

While the Employers and Workers representative bodies were consistently engaged only at the steering committee, there were rather some areas of work done jointly with affiliated entities – such as trade associations or farmers unions. This is largely because the project was dealing primarily with the informal economy and both the Employers and Workers organizations are concerned primarily with the formal economy therefore it is difficult to identify potential entry points for greater involvement in implementation in such MSD projects. From mid-way through Ministry of Commerce Trade and Industry was brought into the Steering committee and towards the end of the project a much deeper involvement of the Zambia Development Agency especially around exploring options for enterprise development programming. Both were beneficial inclusions that might have been useful from the very start.

Rating of project implementation

CLASSIFICATION ^h

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> Highly efficient
Almost all (>80%) outputs were of expected quality and delivered within the budget and schedule set out in the original implementation plan.</p> | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Efficient
The majority (60-80%) of outputs were of expected quality and delivered within the budget and schedule set out in the original implementation plan.</p> |
| <p><input type="checkbox"/> Inefficient
Some (40-60%) outputs were delivered within the budget and schedule set out in the original implementation plan.</p> | <p><input type="checkbox"/> Very inefficient
Few (<40%) outputs were delivered within the budget and schedule set out in the original implementation plan.</p> |

Briefly explain the major factors taken into account to justify the implementation classification and provide any other comments (2000 characters maximum):

As stated in the Final evaluation when summing up efficiency the project was not short of resources and generally used them efficiently but “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.*”

^h This is a self-assessment

SECTION C: SUSTAINABILITY ANALYSIS

- a) Analyze the sustainability of results, taking into consideration the institutional and technical capacities and commitment of constituents and partners:

The project has worked with three key categories of participants: First the ILO tripartite constituents - employers, workers and government, including traditional FAO government partners, and other non-business entities like AYE; secondly the implementing partner businesses who were the direct beneficiaries of the project and thirdly the young women and men they involve and service who are the ultimate project beneficiaries.

The constituents and non-business entities participated at the steering committee level and have developed a good understanding of the project and the role of market based programming in job creation through the trainings and orientations undertaken by the project. They have also become more aware of the policy and governance issues appraised through the various sector dialogue and advocacy processes organized through representative bodies SOPAG and ADAZ, which have also been strengthened to operate better. The project has directly supported and worked with government entities including the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock on development of hatcheries and nurseries and the Zambia Development Agency on SME development and agribusiness incubators respectively and they are continuing these interventions past the project.

The business partners have benefitted from business models developed and tested with support from Yapasa and have reported growth in their outreach, and enterprise profitability. As a result of the growth, the partners have increased employment opportunities for significant numbers of youth among the wider smallholder outreach. In addition, these businesses have had their skills developed as a result of the training opportunities provided through the project which contribute to further improvements in performance of their enterprises.

The young women and men have acquired technical and business skills to enable them run their micro enterprises profitably through the various trainings provided by the businesses supported by Yapasa. They have also developed forward and backward business linkages with input suppliers/agro dealers and commodity aggregators improving their access to quality inputs and commodity markets closer to their farms, resulting in improved productivity, incomes and jobs opportunities.

- b) Describe the intervention's exit strategy and specify agreements in place with constituents and implementing partners to ensure the continuity of project benefits:

As a M4P project, the focus from the start has been to support market actors, support service providers and businesses to improve performance of their enterprises in a manner that is inclusive of young women and men, as a result the exit strategy is inbuilt from the design of the interventions and considered throughout the implementation process. The following actions have been taken throughout the project implementation:

- The project has organized multi-stakeholders workshops both to inform design of the various interventions and to learn from their implementation. Each of the workshops was attended by government officials at national, provincial and district levels, private sector players and farmer organizations with the view of getting the right insights and gaining full support for the work Yapasa has done.
- The project has documented evidence of success and the lessons learnt from all interventions and disseminated to key industry players to influence them as potential scale agents of project results.
- The project has produced communication products including briefs and YouTube videos that are available on the website www.yapasa.org for ease of access by interested parties. Furthermore, successful models from the Yapasa project have been shared on various platforms including the BEAM Exchange and through Webinars.

- The business models that Yapasa supported and promoted were jointly developed with the partners to meet their business interests and capacities, with even greater emphasis on partners taking the lead in later stages of the project for full ownership
 - The project also supported and worked closely with relevant government institutions on specific project activities, with some evidence that they are being incorporated into government implementation programmes: for example the community nurseries and pond based outgrower models into the ADB funded Zambia Aquaculture Enterprise Development Project (ZAEDP). In the addition the Zambia Development Agency is continuing to lead the work around development of agribusiness incubators.
- c) Describe any major internal or external factors that may affect the sustainability of project results in the future:

The internal factors that could affect sustainability of project results are the following:

- 2018 interventions had been designed with two aims – to consolidate gains from earlier interventions – e.g the aggregation for end markets aimed at consolidating the market end of the soya outgrowing interventions, or the last mile distribution of inputs intervention designed to open up and explore new opportunities that had potential to be scaled up in a proposed phase 2 project. Final results gathered from both areas are very good and Yapasa has now certainly reached and exceed target for enterprises supported and full time equivalent (FTE) jobs created for young men although it has missed the target for employment for young women. Anecdotal evidence from all the 7 partners in these interventions is that they will continue the business models either at the same level, or a slight reduction while they sort out some teething issues before scaling up in future. Such signs of systemic market changes could have benefited from further project facilitation to take them to scale. However, the end of the project without new funding for a phase 2 has cut short this growth trajectory and will likely undermine not the sustainability of the results to date but the rate at which the results are scaled up by the business partners.
- The project team had identified new work areas and approaches that, based on extensive learning from the first phase, were thought likely to lead to increased sustainability and had put much work into developing a phase 2 project proposal to take them forward. The decision by SIDA not to consider the desired Yapasa phase 2 project means that other alternative funding sources will need to be found. Failure to secure some alternative programmes to build on the momentum gained may undermine sustainability of some results. For example further support is clearly required to the Zambia Development Agency in its effort to actualize the proposed agribusiness incubation programme emerging from one of Yapasa’s final interventions, otherwise the return to the whole effort may be slow or lost.
- The Yapasa project is the first M4P project in Zambia within the ILO and FAO. While ILO has not implemented many agricultural projects in the country, FAO has implemented several, some with the objective of improving access to quality inputs through provision of subsidized inputs for various purposes through agrodealers. Yapasa has been working with some of these same agrodealers with a much more business oriented approach, encouraging them to see distribution to smallholders from a purely commercial viewpoint and made significant gains in this respect. Therefore the sustainability of this result may be affected if other projects implement contradictory strategies with the same partners. However, there is increased awareness of markets systems development approach within both the ILO and FAO and it is important that such awareness is maintained.

The external factors likely to affect sustainability of the project results include;

One of the reasons Yapasa developed an intervention on community level aggregation services was to build trusted and transparent relationships between smallholder producers and aggregators which in turn, through generating reliable supply quantities of quality produce, would strengthen business relationships with larger grain traders or millers who would have greater confidence in the ability and reliability of the aggregators to supply their needs. In the event of ill-considered export restrictions again causing over supply on the local market and a commodity price crash, as happened in 2017, these improved relationships would also make smallholders less vulnerable to the whims of itinerant grain buyers who, in the face of any shock to the market, would simply stop buying. The very fact of having a stronger relationship with the aggregator and in turn, for example, a local milling company would mean that if any reduction in demand was seen these producers, already having the relationship, would likely be the last to be cut back. Thus while inconsistencies in government policy may distort the performance of the overall market it is likely that the producers benefitting from Yapasa intervention would be less affected.

- Large government and donor programmes have a tendency to distort functioning of the market. For example the FISP offering heavy subsidies and development programmes that provide free inputs to farmers tend to undermine growth of small businesses. This has already been seen in districts where FISP has reverted from e-voucher to the traditional hard copy voucher system and the off-loading or re-selling of heavily subsidized inputs into the local market has led to agro dealers pulling out of those areas, unable to compete. On the other hand the same agro dealers have rallied round and geared up to become registered dealers in the districts with implementation of the e-voucher and having generated significant sales of inputs from their own stock are now left with a massive cash flow problem as government delays payment for the subsidy. This is affecting the ability of the Yapasa partners to sustain their core business and could negatively impact on their plans for continuing the CAD model in future seasons.

Rating of project sustainability

CLASSIFICATION ⁱ

Highly likely
All factors influencing project sustainability have been clearly identified. The sustainability of results has been ensured and there is a firm commitment from constituents and partners to maintain an ongoing flow of project benefits.

Likely
Factors influencing project sustainability have been identified. The sustainability of results is likely and there is an understanding with constituents and partners to maintain an ongoing flow of project benefits.

Not likely
Some factors influencing project sustainability have been identified. There is no consensus among constituents and partners about concrete actions needing to be taken to ensure project sustainability.

Very unlikely
Factors influencing project sustainability have not been identified. The commitment of constituents and partners maintain an ongoing flow of project benefits is unknown.

ⁱ This is a self-assessment

Briefly explain the major factors taken into account to justify the sustainability classification and provide any other comments (2000 characters maximum):

The project was implemented through private sector partners. These entities are in business and have an inherent interest to remain so. Business models introduced or revised should be inherently sustainable and scalable and so the anecdotal intentions of the businesses to continue mean sustainability of the changes is likely – but not firmly committed. Ideas and models have been taken up by other players and projects but as such are now out of the hands of ILO/FAO to influence other than through normal channels with each organization's constituents. Factors that have been considered that could adversely affect this likelihood are other development programmes with conflicting approaches in the same geographical areas or ill-considered application of policy instruments impacting the sectors – eg export bans – However the very presence of SOPAG and ADAZ should guard against this to some extent.

SECTION D: MONITORING, EVALUATION AND KNOWLEDGE SHARING

M&E self-assessment:	YES	NO
Progress was regularly reported both internally (within the ILO) and externally (to donors and partners) against the logical framework	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A progress monitoring system was supported by data collection and analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost effectiveness of activities and outputs was monitored	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Constituents were able to use M&E for discussion and decision-making in their own organizations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Baselines and data were adequate to document progress towards results ^j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- a) Reflect on the approach to performance measurement and describe mechanisms in place for monitoring and evaluation:

A project monitoring system comprising a catalogue of outcome and output indicators and inclusive of performance targets and annual milestones was put in place and was continuously referred to and refined during the inception and implementation phases of the project. This M&E system was aligned to the UNSPDF Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and took inspiration from the performance measurement standard version VI of the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development, and from this standard version a robust Monitoring & Results Measurement (MRM) manual guided by DCED guidance for result measurement for the private sector development programs was put in place.

The Project team acknowledges that the M&E was not a one-off event, to be performed at the start and end of the programme, thus was continuous and on-going and was fully integrated into programme decision making. The result measurement continued using the MRM system, and this improved the project performance. So the focus was not only outward orientation but also introspection. The principles which guided MRM was in measuring, documenting and observing increased economic opportunities and earning potential for poor and marginalized target groups due to better access, stronger linkages and better functioning markets that were attributed to the project interventions.

The Joint Programme produced detailed intervention plans and strategies within an overall plan that guided implementation and annual donor reports and bi-annual progress reports that ensured documentation of implementation. These documents were reviewed by the Project Steering Committee. The monitoring process included partner performance reviews and a high level of field visits as appropriate. The monitoring reviews were adapted to the UNSPDF Monitoring and Evaluation calendar and served as inputs into the UNSPDF annual, mid-term and final reviews.

^j Partially: Some areas had retrospective baselines as those were all that was possible. In some areas such as youth perceptions towards agribusiness there has been insufficient data collected or in one case mentioned earlier the same questions

Commensurate with the value of the project arrangements were made for Independent Internal Evaluations, both mid-term in 2016 and final at the end of 2018.

- b) Outline efforts made to involve a broad range of stakeholders in M&E, including the role played by constituents and implementing partners:

Various efforts were made to include a broad range of stakeholders including implementing partners (both public and private). Engagements began at the inception and implementation phase where the project had made joint field monitoring visits with selected stakeholders and partners. In conjunction with the selected partner private market players testing or piloting new innovative business models, the project assisted them to develop internal monitoring systems that suited their business operations and yielded sufficient data for the project to monitor progress against key indicators.

The project made sure that the lessons learnt from these business models were shared as widely as possible, particularly with those promoting youth employment or supplying goods and services to rural youth who were able to use that knowledge to improve their youth employment strategies and their products and services respectively. This involved a host of different learning and knowledge-sharing activities and workshops as well as various capacity-building efforts.

- c) If any evaluations were carried out, briefly describe how findings and recommendations were addressed by the intervention:

Project evaluations were conducted, midterm and final, as per the ILO's standard evaluation practices. The performance thresholds for each indicator were validated with local stakeholders during the project inception phase. A key recommendation from the mid-term evaluation was the need to ensure adequate year-round income for the beneficiaries. Also since the volatility of the soya sector in 2017 exposed the risks of concentrating on a particular commodity (to which young farmers are particularly vulnerable) and since the early fish harvests also began to meet with market challenges, the project made a shift towards enabling diversified farm enterprise with a focus on value chains with adequate year round income. Having been granted a 1 year cost extension from SIDA, the project designed four new interventions for development and implementation in 2018, all based on collaborative arrangements between a range of market players within a particular location rather than a particular subsector. Of the four new interventions, the last mile inputs distribution directly addressed the year round income for the beneficiaries as the horticulture value chain was introduced and was promoted as a year round income generating enterprise among youth and women in rural areas.

Further, findings from the mid term evaluation indicated that the project team did not have a clear understanding of market dynamics during the inception phase. At the start of the implementation phase the gaps between 'old' logframe and real market situation became clear as the project flexibly adapted its interventions and retained its objectives. This was as a result of the time and resources spent in capacity building of project staff in the 'M4P approach and its implications for designing the right interventions', and this proved to be a worthwhile investment for designing and implementing new interventions effectively.

- d) Describe the approach to knowledge sharing and how key achievements and success stories generated by the intervention will be captured and communicated:

The project contributed to the generation of knowledge by conducting impact assessment surveys, intervention learning workshops, validation and mid-term evaluation workshops. The lessons learned and

guidance extracted from such surveys and learning workshops shaped the project's intervention strategy at all levels.

In addition, the project designed a well thought mix of communication strategies and approaches that increased the impact of market systems development approaches and accelerated achievement of the outcomes of the project; while enhancing the abilities of the market players and youth. The communication strategies included creating a dedicated project web site: www.yapasa.org, publishing fliers, brochures, success stories etc. and as result contributed to greater ILO visibility. The project had a strong advocacy process through different platforms including the Technical Working Group and Steering Committee.

The project leveraged on the ILO Lab's platform for sharing information as well as benefited and contributed to the Lab's market systems and results measurement networks, such as the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development and the BEAM Exchange.

ANNEXES

Include any other documentation or information that may contribute to a better understanding of progress.

- A final report of constituents and/or implementing partners, describing the role they played in implementation and an overall assessment of benefits.
- A table/ timeline of all project interventions showing the partners involved
-
- A list of all deliverables produced by the intervention (publications, training materials, leaflets, communication etc.)
- Table of Narrative Success stories from the intervention that can be used for communication/public information purposes

NB the latter two tables are just lists showing the deliverables, impact stories and videos. All these materials are being uploaded on www.yapasa.org by 28th February 2019