

## Summary of the Result of Evaluation Study

<b>1. Outline of the Project</b>	
Country Name : Republic of Zambia	Project title : Participatory Village Development Project in Isolated Area PaViDIA) Phase 1
Field : Agriculture General	Cooperation Type : Technical Cooperation Project
Department in charge : Rural Development Department and Zambia Office	Cooperation Budget at this Evaluation Study : 710 Million Yen
Cooperation Period	(Phase 1・R/D) : 2002.6.1～2007.5.31
	(Comprehensive note) : 2002.6.1～2009.5.31
	Responsible Zambian Organization (Zambia) : Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives(MACO) Cooperation Organization (Japan) : Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Yamagata Prefecture
	Related Cooperation : Individual Expert (Agriculture and Rural Development)

### 1-1 Background and outline of the project

The Zambian agriculture sector is characterized by some duality in the production system. On one hand there is one category comprising large and medium scale farmers who produce for sale (domestically or in exports), while using capital-intensive agricultural management; On the other hand are small-scale farmers who account for 90 percent of the total number of the farming households, with the majority of them living below the country's poverty datum line. Small-scale farmers engage in production largely for the purpose of attaining food self sufficiency.

Given the large number of small-scale farmers in rural areas, and their high poverty levels, the Zambian government attaches a lot of importance to poverty reduction through the rural development. The focus on small scale farmers particularly needs more attention now that markets are liberalized and the economy is still experiencing the effects of adjustment. Under this scenario, small scale farmers are more likely to be excluded from markets and other support services, like training in farm management skills.

In view of the foregoing background, the Zambian government requested for support from Japan through technical cooperation, aiming to reduce poverty among small-scale farmers and to create self sustaining (independent) villages in remote areas (which are hereby defined as "Isolated Areas") of the country.

Since the Project operated in places that were difficult to access, characteristic of Less Developed Countries (LDCs), the initial implementation period of 5 years was considered to be insufficient. The initial project period was extended by another 2 years. The two periods (which included the first and the extension) of the project became known as Phase 1 and Phase 2, respectively. At its Terminal Evaluation, Phase 1 was considered as being successful, having met some specific impact. The Terminal evaluation also provided a good opportunity prepare the framework for phase 2. The Record of Discussion (R/D) for Phase 2 was prepared based on this terminal evaluation. The participatory nature of the evaluation was another opportunity that facilitated the transfer of knowledge on evaluation execution to Zambian Counterparts (C/Ps).

### 1-2 Content of the Cooperation

The Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives (MACO) in Zambia was the implementing agency. The aim was to enhance the capacity of farmers in rural areas and to strengthen MACO (the organization that supports farmers' capacity advancement). The Project initially started operations in the rural area of Chongwe district of Lusaka province, and

then expanded to Mporokoso and Luwingu districts of Northern Province. Main activities included the execution of: (i) village development activities (that were referred to as micro projects) through the community participation and (ii) the extension activity of the sustainable agriculture. The project established the village development model referred to as the PaViDIA approach, and it intended to be spread out to other parts of Zambia.

(1) Overall Goal

The model for Participatory Village Development in Isolated Areas (PaViDIA Approach) established by the Project is realized and replicated in other areas for poverty reduction.

(2) Project Purpose

(Phase 1) Essential implementation mechanism for PaViDIA is established.

(Total Duration) A practical model for participatory village development in isolated areas is established.

(3) Outputs

Output 1 : Project Management Organization is established.

Output 2 : Sustainable Agriculture technology package (a manual and model farmers) is established.

Output 3 : PaViDIA training programme is established.

Output 4 : Monitoring and risk management methods are established.

Output 5 : PaViDIA implementation guidelines are established.

(4) Input (at the Evaluation Study)

Japanese Side : Total 710 Million Yen

Dispatch of Long-Term Experts	7	Provision of Equipment	26 Million Yen
Dispatch of Short-Term Experts	3	Local Cost Load	122 Million Yen
Acceptance of Trainees	19	Dispatch of Third Country Experts	4

Zambian Side :

Assignment of C/P	37		
Local Cost Load (MACO Budget)		15,650,000 ZMK	(Kwacha)
Local Cost Load (2KR Counter Value Fund)		3,368,830,000 ZMK	(Kwacha)
Others (Provision of Land and Facilities including furniture such as desk etc. in Cooperative college, Insurance of Cars etc.)			

**2. Outline of Evaluation Team**

	Subject	Name	Title
E v a l u a t o r	Leader	Mr. Makoto KITANAKA	Group Director, The Third Group (Arid and Semi-arid Areas), Rural Development Department, JICA
	Participatory Rural Development	Mr. Shiro KODAMAYA	Professor, Faculty of Social Development, Hitotsubashi University
	Planning Management	Mr. Yusuke MORI	Program Officer, Management Division, Rural Development Department, JICA
	Evaluation analysis	Mr. Takahiro MIYOSHI	PaViDIA Long-term Expert (Participatory Farmers' Activities Promotion) *Join from Zambia
Duration of Study		2005.10.14 ~ 2005.10.21	Type of valuation : Terminal Evaluation

**3. Outline of the Evaluation Results**

**3-1 Confirmation of results**

The purpose of this project (phase 1) was: "Essential implementation mechanism for

PaViDIA is established."The training program and the manuals, etc. were developed based on field experiences. "Guidelines" that make the execution mechanism clear were completed at the end of Phase 1.

It is considered that some level of reasonable capacity was built and enhanced the organization level abilities among participating villages and farmers involved with demonstrations. In Chongwe, there were 29 village micro project and 22 farmers involved with demonstrations on sustainable agriculture.

The achievement for each of the five result areas of the PDM (i.e. institutionalization, sustainable agriculture, training for extension officers, monitoring, and the production of execution guideline) was described as successful using some achievement index.

On institutionalization, the POR (PaViDIA Operation Room) which was the project management was set up in MACO. Resources were allocated in terms of input cost (amount of the local cost load from MACO: 15.65 million ZMK) and staff (of an average of 37 people during the project period). Most required activities were realistically performed, given that the human resources available were not working fulltime in the Project.

In sustainable agriculture, the manual that covers the agricultural technology that should be recommended is completed and the verification experiments revealed that incomes of the farmer, on average, increased. Recommended agricultural technologies have been adopted in half of the micro project areas. However, some problems, on the other hand, were discovered; for example, the agro-forestry activity was stagnant and this was discontinued.

In the training for extension officers, the training manuals and other materials were completed. Three trainers have been trained and they are now able to competently implement and manage this type training on their own.

In monitoring, the method was established, and the manual was completed. As an effect in the activity, continuation of the system in micro-project areas was evident. However, due to the fact that MACO does not bear the activity expense of the monitoring currently, it was evaluated that long-term sustainability of applying the system after the project termination is uncertain.

As regards the development of implementation guidelines, the draft manual of the guidelines concerning the approach (PaViDIA approach). The manual built on the foundations laid by the wider framework of the Participatory Approach to Sustainable Village Development (PASViD). PaViDIA is a participatory rural development method relevant to isolated areas in Zambia. It is judged that the purpose of Phase 1 was basically achieved with respect to the five results areas mentioned above.

### **3-2 Summary of evaluation result**

#### **(1) Validity**

Validity is very high from the following five points.

- 1) The purpose of this project is to pay attention to the polarization of the agricultural sector, and to work on the reduction of poverty in the isolated areas, where a large portion of the population lives below a poverty line. Poverty reduction is assumed to be the critical factor in the present national development policy of Zambia. This can be attested by the reference to poverty reduction in many policy documents including, the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), the Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP), and National Agriculture Policy (NAP), among others. This project conforms to the policy priorities for national development in Zambia.
- 2) MACO also evaluates this project as an important activity that contributes directly to rural development for poverty reduction and enhancing food security at the household level.
- 3) "Poverty reduction through the rural development" is one of the categories of JICA's

support towards developing countries. The direction of this project conforms to JICA's support strategy and Zambia's policy.

4) According to interviews with village beneficiaries, the villagers supported all the micro projects that were implemented. This means the project was relevant to the needs of the beneficiaries.

5) Support from the villagers was consistent; this is particularly so, given that it remained high even when a problem arose in practice. This is because sustainable agriculture constituted new knowledge or technology that answered villagers' problems (such as lack of the agricultural inputs, among others).

#### (2) Effectiveness

It is high. Necessary documents such as the training texts and manuals were developed and are being utilized. The activities of most micro projects are being managed by the villagers.

Whereas participatory the approach has contributed to development, there are still some issues that need to be improved upon. These include the problem-solving oriented planning, increasing the role of monitoring and the review of participatory development.

The effectiveness of technologies that are promoted is also evidenced by an increase in incomes of the farmers that participated in the demonstrations. These approaches and agricultural technologies are being recognized by the villagers and other people as being effective. The establishment of "Execution mechanism of PaViDIA" which was the purpose of Phase 1 was translated into reality as it was used to implement Phase 2.

#### (3) Efficiency

It is slightly high. It was considered that the budget from Japan and provision of machinery were well utilized for the implementation of project activities. The dispatch of Japanese experts was also considered to be quantitatively and qualitatively appropriate, based on interviews with relevant personnel.

However, human input from Zambian side, especially the staff of the MACO headquarters was inadequate. This is because they were involved with management of projects supported by other donors, while at the same time there was inadequate budget from government to enable them cover the daily subsistence allowances and other expenses at various levels (including the headquarters, district and up to the camp). This therefore means that their participation in the project was physically limited and thereby constrained the effective transfer of technology to the counterparts in the project.

Moreover, delays in the disbursement of capital for micro projects affected the progress of the project at village level, due to lengthy procedure requirements. The purpose of project was still met despite the partial problem in the administration of this input. In view of this, it was considered that result was less efficient than expected.

#### (4) Impact

It is considered that positive impact was confirmed in various ways. Among these were: (i) the reduction of labour among women and children, (ii) accumulation of community capital, and (iii) expansion of area cultivated for crop production. On the overall these types of impact, that arise from the executing the micro projects in the target villages, contribute to the poverty reduction in the long term.

However, the achievement of the overall goal, stated as "The model for participatory village development in isolated areas (PaViDIA Approach) established by the Project" is realized and replicated in other areas for poverty reduction.) is difficult. To realize this goal, it is necessary to formulate a concrete expansion strategy and to allocate a budget with

necessary human resources and so on, to ensure nationwide development.

Currently the counter value funds of 2KR (Grant Aid to Increase of Food Production) were secured for this project, and it was therefore possible to expand the PaViDIA Approach to other areas (in Northern Province) using the budget. Moreover, POR is making efforts to secure funds from other donors (such as the World Bank JSDF), and it is considered that these efforts will realize a positive impact.

#### (5) Sustainability

Technological and institutional sustainability are high. The fact that the POR was approved as a part of the organization of MACO, it can be expected to continue, institutionally and technically, to operate and manage the expansion of PaViDIA to other areas after the project ends. Moreover, the trained MACO staff, including their trainers, are expected to continue cooperating with the project.

Financial sustainability is uncertain. It would be necessary to overcome the financial problem for activities to be sustained. The concern over finances is attributed to the fact that the budget of POR management is not enough because of chronic financial difficulties in the MACO headquarters. The budget for implementation of micro projects and monitoring are dependent on the Japanese input. It is necessary to secure the budget from the Zambian government and other donors in order to continue with the project activities in other areas after the cooperation period of the project comes to the end.

### **3-3 Factors contributing to the effect**

#### (1) Concerning the content of the plan

At first, the purpose was to develop the model (with a view for expansion). The project implementation period was set 7years for this project. The 7years were divided into 2 parts; the 5 years for Phase 1 and 2 years for Phase 2. The ownership of the Project by the Zambian Government was enhanced through the clarification of the direction by laying a foundation for nationwide development through the 2 years of implementing Phase 2, coupled by the initial joint implementation of Phase 1.

#### (2) Concerning the execution process

The district staff and the extension officers positively executed the micro projects using funds from the Project. Of concern is that there was no budget provided for by MACO.

The documentation of progress and other experiences provided the basis for improvement of the operations and management of micro-projects, and for national wide utilization. This contributed to the model's establishment.

### **3-4 Factors that impacted negatively**

#### (1) Concerning the content of the plan

Whereas the initial idea was to spread nationwide, this was not reflected in the initial PDM. Second, the target year for achieving the project purpose was not clear; either in the 5<sup>th</sup> year or 7<sup>th</sup> year. It was necessary to clarify such long term vision from the beginning.

#### (2) Concerning the execution process

The remittance of the budget for the execution of micro projects was not always aligned with the cropping calendar. Due to delays some activities that are weather dependent could not be implemented, leading to their collapse. The budget should be synchronized with the crop calendar.

Although POR is set up and the implementation system for the micro project is being

established, the issue of securing the budget in the future is still uncertain. The situation is particularly more uncertain when one considers that the budget secured from sources that are outside the design.

### **3-5 Conclusions**

This project corresponds to the first phase of the project of seven years and is evaluated as having achieved the purpose of "Implementation mechanism of PaViDIA established," as the foundation (base) for implementation of Phase 2. The outputs were also attained (i.e. outputs of institutional building, agricultural technology, participatory rural development method, and monitoring method).

From the view point of 5 evaluation criteria, this project was evaluated as highly successful, because of its validity, effectiveness, and sustainability, with the exception of the financial aspect. In these respects the project was positive.

Efficiency was also affected adversely as opportunities for transfer of technology were limited. This was caused by shortage of Zambian inputs and finances.

The achievement of the overall goal is still uncertain, and we will be able to judge whether it is achieved or not after implementation of phase 2.

It was going to be better to if it were clear from the beginning that the feature of this project was to have a long-term purpose of seven years, with a view of expanding nationwide, using the the rural development method. The failure to identify the vision at the outset gave rise to some confusion.

The failure to secure operational budgets for local expenses such as the business trip allowances by the Zambian Government worsened the situation.

One of the positive factors that contributed to the achievement of the Project was that both the Japanese and Zambian counterparts were committed to the Project. Because of their enthusiasm, there came a feeling that the Project should be expanded national wide.

### **3-6 Suggestions (concrete measures, proposals, and advice concerning the project)**

(1) It was proposed that Phase 2 be executed based on results achieved in Phase 1.

The target of Phase 1 is establishment of implementation mechanism for PaViDIA, so the purpose will be establishment of practical model for participatory rural development in isolated areas in Phase 2.

(2) Because the target of Phase 2 was achieved, it is proposed that the following four fields of approach should be adopted:

Field 1: The Zambian C/P's capacity strengthening is promoted. This entails that the opportunities for technology transfer should be promoted. The target is MACO staff that are likely to be involved in the nationwide spreading of PaViDIA at all levels (i.e. the district, province, and the headquarters).

Field 2: Need to integrate the institutional system with the finances of PaViDIA by the Zambia government

Field 3: A further improvement of the PaViDIA approach (with new techniques included) is aimed at.

Field 4: The target area of Phase 1 should continue to benefit from the interventions

### **3-7 Lessons (The Project concerned becomes reference for similar projects on: matters pertaining to funding, design, execution, and the operational management)**

(1) Cooperation period

The experience has shown that the pace of the rural development activities is generally slow; as such the achievement of a purpose of this project was planned for a relatively long period of 7 years. It will take more additional time for the results of the participatory approach to bear fruit. In view of this, it is necessary to be time-flexible when implementing rural development activities.

## (2) Development of approach

In this project, the rural development method (village development approach) of the project initiation has been evolving overtime, taking into consideration feedback from the implementation experience and the monitoring activities in practice. The lesson acquired from the process is that a complete and universal approach (one that involves the method, and becomes basic of the model) does not exist but has to adjust according to existing circumstances in the rural setting.

For appropriate adjustment to take place it is necessary to obtain appropriate feedback of the results of monitoring from both internally (in the Project) and externally (through learning from other organizations to develop participatory approaches).

In view of the fact that the existing extension service and the system of government holds a key role in rural development, it is important that the capacity enhancement of the extension service is undertaken.

## (3) Target Beneficiaries of the Project

Through practice and experience in the Project, it was found that the following matters were important as they lead to the project's success:

- Understanding beneficiaries' culture and traditional community structure (traditional leadership)
- Encourage assertive women who are more positive than men to participate in project activities
- Encourage activities that attract the young generation
- There is need to find ways of including the poorest of the poor in the community; otherwise they are left out.

## (4) Counterpart

In this project, the activity budget for the counterpart was not enough because of shortage of budget of Zambian Government. And as lessons from that issue, there is need to provide backstopping support for logistics and facilities necessary to mobilize human resources (MACO staff at district level and extension officers at local level).

There is need for counterpart organizations to not only assign staff but to also consider allocating counterpart budget in order to meet the project purpose. These arrangements should be considered well before hand.

### **3-8 following up situation (frame of content of phase 2 cooperation)**

As for the project purpose of phase 1, achievement is expected in the period of phase 1. Therefore, the content of the cooperation of phase 2 was agreed with Zambian side while keeping in mind that the project purpose was for 7 years, based on the initial cooperation framework. However the purpose of phase 2 was to be met in the remaining 2 years.

#### (1) Super Goal

Poverty in the isolated area in Zambia is reduced.

#### (2) Overall Goal

The participatory rural development model to aim at the poverty reduction in the isolated area established by the project is achieved and developed in other areas.

#### (3) Project Purpose

Practicing PaViDIA model is constructed.

#### (4) Result

Result 1: Reinforcing PaViDIA management room (POR)

- Result 2: Securing of the budget for PaViDIA implementation
- Result 3: Establishment of strategy for spreading
- Result 4: promotion of trainers for micro project implementation
- Result 5: Improvement of synergy effect of sustainable agricultural technology and micro project
- Result 6: Revision of manual

### **3-9 Explanation of Terms**

- "PASViD": Abbreviation of Participatory Approach to Sustainable Village Development. Rural development method originated of "PaViDIA approach" that is rural development method that PaViDIA project developed. The participatory rural development method based on the experience of Asia.
- "PaViDIA approach": Rural development method in Zambia. Thought, a concrete procedure, and the way of the facilitation at the village level are included in that.
- "Implementation mechanism of PaViDIA": It is the one integrated that "Concrete rural development method", "Human resource and lecturer for implementation" to expand PaViDIA approach nationwide.
- "Practical model of PaViDIA": It is the one integrated that "Strategy", "Budget" and "Implementation mechanism" to expand PaViDIA approach nationwide.