



2012:7

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

Sanne Chipeta
Christian Chileshe
Bo Overgaard

External Review of Core Support under Joint Financial Agreement to Zambia National Farmers Union

Final Report

External Review of Core Support under Joint Financial Agreement to Zambia National Farmers Union

**Final Report
May 2012**

**Sanne Chipeta
Christian Chileshe
Bo Overgaard**

Authors: Sanne Chipeta, Christian Chileshe and Bo Overgaard

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2012:7

Commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in Zambia

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: May 2012

Published by Citat 2012

Art. no. Sida61522en

urn:nbn:se:sida-61522en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

Postgiro: 1 56 34-9. VAT. No. SE 202100-478901

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms	3
Executive Summary	4
1 Introduction.....	8
2 About the Mid Term Review.....	11
3 Findings.....	14
4 Conclusions	33
5 Recommendations.....	39
6 Outlook for the future.....	44
Annex 1 – Terms Of Reference	49
Annex 2 – Evaluation Matrix	57
Annex 3 – Semi-structured interviews	64
Annex 4 – Time Schedule.....	66
Annex 5 – List of people met	68
Annex 6 - Categories of farmers.....	77
Annex 7 - Prioritised achievements in policy lobby and advocacy	78
Annex 8 - Unintended impacts of the maize market and ZNFU's role	79
Annex 9 - Outreach services provided.....	81
Annex 10 - Challenge in harmonisation of practises.....	84
Annex 11 - Brief Analysis of ZNFU Strategic Plan	85
Annex 12 – Inception Report.....	86

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ASC	Agribusiness Service Centre
ASP	Agricultural Support Project
CA	Commodity Association
CSP	Core Support Programme
DAC	District Agricultural Coordinator
DC	District Commissioner
DDC	District Development Committee
DFA	District Farmer Association
EU	European Union
FISP	Farm Input Subsidy Programme
FRA	Food Reserve Agency
HIV	Humane Immune defect Virus
HQ	Headquarter
IC	Information Centre
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
JFA	Joint Financial Agreement
LIMA	Lima Credit Scheme
MASP	Market-Based Agricultural Support Programme
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NAP	National Agricultural Policy
OECD/DAC	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development /Development Assistance Committee
SC	Study Circle
SCC	Swedish Cooperative Centre
SEK	Swedish Kroner
ToR	Terms of Reference
USAID	United States Aid Agency
USD	United States Dollars
ZANACO	Zambia National Commercial Bank
ZEMA	Zambia Environmental Management Agency
ZMK	Zambia Kwacha
ZNFU	Zambia National Farmers Union

Executive Summary

Background

The Zambia National Farmers Union's (ZNFU) mission is to promote and safeguard interests of its members as individual farmers, corporations, companies and other organisations involved in the business of agriculture and related activities, in order to achieve sustainable economic and social development. The principal functions of ZNFU include:

- Lobby and advocacy
- Member service provision and outreach
- Information dissemination and communication to members

ZNFU is currently operating based on a Strategic Plan for 2009 to 2013 with the overall objective to contribute towards improved food security, farm incomes, employment opportunity and reduced poverty levels. The strategic plan is strongly framed to mobilise small scale and emergent farmers for active membership and thereby increase ZNFU's constituency as a voice for all farmers.

Sweden, the Government of Finland, the Kingdom of the Netherlands¹ and Swedish Cooperative Centre (SCC) have agreed through a Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA) to provide core support to the implementation of the ZNFU Strategic Plan for the five year period 2009 to 2013.

About the Mid Term Review

The present report is an external Mid Term Review (MTR) of the Core Support programme (CSP). The MTR focuses on the evaluation areas, which follows the specific objectives of the ZNFU Strategic Plan 2009 – 2013:

- Overall programme
- ZNFU research, lobbying and advocacy outreach
- Farmer's access to demand driven member services
- Mainstreaming of crosscutting issues: Gender and HIV sensitive agro-initiatives and environmental sustainability/climate change mitigation and adaptation among members
- ZNFU sustainability
- CSP management, organisational and institutional arrangements

Approach and methodology

¹ Support from KNL was phased out after 2009.

The evaluation criteria used are according to the OECD/DAC standards: Relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. The MTR used an appreciative approach to a combination of focus group discussions with target group members, farmer leaders, ZNFU staff and interviews with senior ZNFU staff, one ZNFU board members and other stakeholders in 7 districts in three provinces of Zambia. The MTR moreover consulted with stakeholders at the national level and some of the commodity associations affiliated to ZNFU.

Findings

The findings from the fieldwork and the consultations are described in chapter three according to the seven evaluation areas mentioned above. The conclusions are:

The Core Support is breaking new ground and there have been strong overall achievements of organising farmers

The CSP takes the principles of harmonisation and alignment to their fullest scale and has strengthened the organisation in areas of high strategic importance. The most important areas that have been strengthened are that numbers of members have increased by 93.2 % since 2009. In 2012, ZNFU has more than 70.000 due paying members of which the large majority are small scale farmers, the voice for lobby and advocacy has increased, services to all farmers have been strengthened and a mechanism has been developed for collecting issues from small scale farmers for policy research, lobby and advocacy of ZNFU.

The medium and short term results of the CSP that are directly related to the outcome areas have mostly been satisfactory. The outcomes to be measured by increased income and productivity have been positive for the members. The outcomes are still fragile and consideration is needed regarding strategies for sustainability of the results.

The overall results in terms of national level results have not yet been visible.

ZNFU has developed an effective voice for farmers but need to identify a more strategic policy focus

ZNFU has strengthened its policy research capacity and thereby improved the credibility of its lobby and advocacy work for the farmers. The level of activity has been high particularly at the HQ level, where a number of successes have proven the effectiveness of the function. At the grass-root levels, there are still weaknesses in awareness and also in the capacity to identify strategic needs, develop positions and engage in lobby and advocacy.

The long term results in terms of impacts at national level regarding poverty and food security are largely invisible. ZNFU needs to identify a more strategic policy focus in order to influence the policy environment for the long term benefit of the agricultural sector in Zambia.

The services are highly appreciated but capacity is overstretched

A major motivation for small scale farmers, particularly the women farmers to be members of ZNFU through the DFAs is the access to services. The satisfaction among members for the services that they receive is high and has increased during the CSP. The farmers are satisfied with the facilitation that has been provided by ZNFU both for their access to the FISP but even more to the LIMA. The benefits from LIMA are an important reason for the farmers to be members of the ZNFU. The facilitation of output marketing is only partly effective.

The rapid growth in membership that the organisation has experienced has stretched the available capacity to a point where action needs to be taken if the positive developments in service provision are to be sustained.

Crosscutting issues do not get sufficient attention

The aim of mainstreaming crosscutting issues: Gender, HIV/AIDS and Environment into the ZNFU organisation and activities have generally not had sufficient attention and the results are unsatisfactory.

Sustainability is a joint result of institutional, financial and human resources

Institutionally, from grassroot to national level, there is a high level of awareness, commitment and ownership towards the organisation. However, the fast growth of the membership has left some of the DFAs fragile. Financial sustainability has increased over the CSP period, particularly at the headquarters level, where income has steadily grown. At the DFA level the picture is more varied and appropriate instruments for increasing financial sustainability are unclear.

Bottom up planning and flow of information ensure relevance and demand drive

The mechanisms of planning and reporting from the ICs to the DFAs to the national level and feedback mechanisms are effective in ensuring that the services delivered and efforts in advocacy and lobbying are relevant and demand driven.

A web-based system for monitoring is currently under development with assistance from SCC. This is functional in some districts but not others. There is, however, still no institution-wide system for monitoring and evaluation that can ensure completeness of information gathered and systematic utilisation in institutional planning and decision making.

There is a need for more strategic financial management

The financial accounting system appears to be working well and provides for adequate financial data capturing and oversight for both headquarters and field levels. It is not clear if management accounts are regularly prepared and utilised in strategic financial control and decision making.

Core Support strengthens the organisation without losing track of its purpose

The CSP has strengthened the organisation without diverting attention from its core role and functions as a membership organisation. The concept has also lessened the administrative burden that would otherwise be connected with financing from three different donors. It has, however, been a challenge to harmonise the timing of reporting with the donors' different requirements for disbursements.

The additional technical support provided by SCC has been valuable and contributed substantially to the achievements.

Recommendations

Chapter 5 provides recommendations for further development of the CSP and for consideration for the ZNFU strategy. The following is a summary list of these:

- Continue the core support mode of support
- Strengthen the strategic effort towards long, medium and short term goals
- Increase the capacity to consolidate and service the growing membership
- Utilise the current opportunities to influence the policy environment for long term benefits
- Continue developing appropriate instruments for input supply, financial services and output market facilitation
- Initiate serious efforts to mainstream crosscutting issues
- Develop a policy position and a strategy for advocacy on extension reform
- Continue to develop the M&E system and integrate it as a tool in planning and decision making
- Initiate an analysis of the existing financial management system in order to improve the strategic financial management
- Harmonise procedures and timing for progress and financial reporting

1 Introduction

1.1 THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR IN ZAMBIA

The agricultural sector is extremely important and often regarded as key to development of the Zambian economy and particularly to reduction of rural poverty. Agriculture and agro-processing generates more than 40% of the GDP and provides livelihood for more than 50% of the population. The agricultural sector employs 67% of the labour force and is the main source of income and employment for the female population particularly in the rural areas. During the last decade, Zambia has experienced solid national economic growth rates averaging 5 to 6% per year and this has significantly contributed to reductions in urban poverty in Zambia. This growth has, however, primarily been due to increases of prices and effectiveness of the mining industry. The agricultural sector has not performed accordingly well.

The underperformance of the agricultural sector is one important reason behind the fact that rural poverty rates remain extremely, and stubbornly high – it is estimated that 80% of the population in the rural areas live in absolute poverty and malnutrition is still extremely common among Zambian children – it is estimated that 45% of children in Zambia are stunted. Rural poverty can, therefore, be seen as Zambia's greatest development challenge and this is strongly linked to development of the agricultural sector.²

Zambia has very good natural conditions for agricultural production, with areas of potentially arable land still unutilised – it is estimated that only 10% of the arable land in Zambia is under cultivation. In most of the country, the average rainfall is favourable for agricultural production - this is apart from increasing frequency of drought periods in the Southern and partly also the South Western part of Zambia.

The large majority of farmers in Zambia are small scale producers. There are only few large scale farms and emerging commercial farmers are also few. Despite the favourable natural conditions for farming in Zambia, the productivity particularly of the small scale farmers is extremely low, costs of production (particularly fuel and input costs) are high and infrastructure in the enormous country is poor. These fac-

² The statistics in the two paragraphs below are adapted and combined from found the two Programme Documents: ZNFU; 2008; Core Support Proposal and MUSIKA; 2010; Making Agricultural Markets Work for Zambia

tors, combined with unpredictable Government interventions in agricultural markets and lack of access to affordable and appropriate finance continue to be major challenges in promoting growth in the agricultural sector.

There are strong needs for Government investments in extension, livestock development and research for crop diversification to drive the growth of the sector. Government spends more than half of the agricultural budget on just two subsidy programmes, the Farmers Input Support Programme (FISP) and the Food Reserve Agency (FRA), which in the current form basically serve to distort the agricultural markets and crowd out private sector participation in the smallholder input and output market.

1.2 THE ROLE OF ZAMBIA NATIONAL FARMERS UNION IN DEVELOPMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR

The Zambia National Farmers Union (ZNFU) is a farmers' organization whose mission is to promote and safeguard interests of its members as individual farmers, corporations, companies and other organisations involved in the business of agriculture and related activities, in order to achieve sustainable economic and social development. The principal functions of ZNFU include:

- Lobby and advocacy
- Member service provision and outreach
- Information dissemination and communication to members

The above ultimately function to protect the members' interests and promoting agricultural development in Zambia.

The membership base comprises small and large scale farmers, agribusinesses, processors and service providers. ZNFU has 68 affiliated District Farmer Associations (FRA), 19 commodity Associations (CA), 39 corporate members and 23 agribusiness chamber members.

An important challenge for ZNFU over the years, as well as today, is the perception among many stakeholders that it is a union of large commercial farmers in Zambia. This is related to the fact that the organisation was originally established as such. However, as the small scale farmers are the clear majority in Zambia, both in terms of number and in terms of production for food security, ZNFU is making a strong effort to change this perception. The aim is to become a united and strong voice for the whole agricultural sector in Zambia.

The Core Support Programme (CSP) support the Strategic Plan for 2009 to 2013 with the following overall objective: To contribute towards improved food security, farm incomes, employment opportunity and reduced poverty levels. The strategic plan has the following specific objectives:

- Improve ZNFU research capacity and consolidate its lobby and advocacy function
- Improve member service provision and District Farmer Association outreach programmes
- Improve ZNFU sustainability
- Enhance ZNFU organizational and managing for results capacity
- Mainstream Gender, HIV and AIDS and the environment

The CSP is strongly framed to mobilise small scale and emergent farmers for active membership and thereby increase ZNFU's constituency as a voice for all farmers. ZNFU has developed a new Strategic Plan 2012 to 2016, which it is currently operating under. This, furthermore, aims for the Union to position itself in the agricultural sector in Zambia.

1.3 THE ROLE OF THE CORE SUPPORT PROGRAMME

Acknowledging the strategic importance of farmers' organisation and political voice for rural poverty reduction and improved food security, Sweden, the Government of Finland, the Kingdom of the Netherlands³ and Swedish Cooperative Centre (SCC) have agreed through a Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA) to provide core support to the implementation of the ZNFU Strategic Plan for the five year period 2009 to 2013.

The objective of the core support is *“to enable ZNFU realise its vision of establishing an effective and efficient farmer organisation, which is able to satisfy its member service needs, using mostly its own resources, by consolidating in a sustainable manner, ZNFUs main functions of lobby and advocacy, diversified and improved members service provision, and enhanced long term institutional investments, needed for stimulating positive agricultural development”*

ZNFU's principle strategic roles in the Core Support Programme (CSP) are to promote participation and a rights-based approach, putting farmers on the development agenda and promoting the small scale farmers participation and representation directly through the District Farmers Associations (DFA) and indirectly through the Union in decisions that concern their lives. The Union is facilitating demand-driven service provision to its DFA level members, improving small-scale farmers' access to agricultural information, rural finance, inputs, and remunerative markets. It is expected that this will improve the income and livelihoods for poor farmers, both men and women, in Zambia.

³ Support from KNL was phased out after 2009.

2 About the Mid Term Review

2.1 PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW

The present report is a Mid Term Review (MTR) of the above mentioned Core Support Programme (CSP). According to the TOR (Annex 1), the purpose of this mid-term review is “to assess results and the effectiveness and efficiency of the support provided for under the ZNFU Core Support strategic work plan 2009-2013 (CSP). The review gives recommendations about possible adjustments in the programme set up on a short-term and on a longer term taking into consideration:

- Findings from the review of the implementation of the ZNFU CSP,
- The development of a new ZNFU strategy
- The proposed up-scaling of the LIMA credit scheme
- The proposed Market Based Agricultural Support Programme (MASP)”

The midterm review was originally planned for 2011 and it is now slightly delayed. It is however still possible to use the MTR as a basis for adjustment of the programme, particularly for making recommendations to the partners of the JFA for the longer term perspective regarding eventual continued support and to ZNFU regarding their future strategy and planning. But it should be emphasised that the MTR cannot be an assessment for the next phase. There may be several areas that could have been of interest to make a deeper analysis of in relation to the next phase that has been out of the scope of the MTR to address.

The MTR was supposed to inform the new strategic planning for ZNFU. The strategic planning of ZNFU for 2012 - 2016 has, however, already been undertaken, so the present MTR rather provides comments and recommendations to the draft Strategic Plan, as far as it can go considering the findings and the scope of the MTR.

The assignment furthermore includes brief assessments of how the proposed LIMA Credit Scheme and MASP can complement the CSP. For the LIMA Credit Scheme, a review has been undertaken by an external consultant and the findings and recommendations from this are incorporated in the recommendations of the MTR. The MTR, moreover, assesses the potential relevance of MASP in relation to synergies with CSP.

2.2 THE INTENDED UTILISATION

The assignment started with a brief inception period, which had the purpose of clarifying the users and their intended use of the evaluation in order to ensure that the MTR is appropriately focused according to the expressed needs of these users.

During the inception period, the required documents were collected, a briefing meeting was conducted at the Swedish Embassy with the JFA partners and an inception meeting was conducted at ZNFU HQ with senior representatives of ZNFU, DFAs and JFA partners.

The Final Inception Report describes the intended utilisation by the partners, who are decision-makers among the JFA partners: The Swedish Embassy, The Finnish Embassy and Swedish Cooperative Centre in Zambia and ZNFU.

2.3 METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

The MTR is focused on the following evaluation areas, which follows the specific objectives of the CSP/ZNFU Strategic Plan 2009 – 2013, for which the core support was provided:

- Overall programme
- ZNFU research, lobbying and advocacy outreach
- Farmer's access to demand driven member services
- Mainstreaming of crosscutting issues: Gender and HIV sensitive agro-initiatives and environmental sustainability/climate change mitigation and adaptation among members
- ZNFU sustainability
- CSP management, organisational and institutional arrangements

The evaluation criteria used are according to the OECD/DAC standards: Relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability.

It should be noted that results and impact of the implemented activities so far are preliminary, and the present evaluation concentrates on identifying outcomes and judging the trends towards results. The time and budgetary limits of the assignment mean that a real deep organisational assessment and impact study has not been possible. The MTR makes use of the available data from the monitoring system developed in a few districts by SCC together with ZNFU, and collects the stakeholders' perceptions and views of contribution towards objectives, i.e. improved food security, farm incomes, employment opportunities, poverty alleviation, agricultural productivity and competitiveness of small scale farmers. The Evaluation Matrix, describing the evaluation areas, questions, indicators and method or source of information is found in annex 2.

The MTR used an appreciative approach, which identifies the best of what has been done and the outcomes of this along with analysing the factors that have made this possible in order to be able to provide recommendations that are future oriented in that they will take forward the best practices. This was combined with thorough discussions with the target group as well as other stakeholders of how they have benefitted from the successes. Gaps were identified and related to the potential and capacity for the organisation to fill the eventual gaps. The semi structured guides for discussions and interviews are attached in annex 3.

The evaluation used a combination of focus group discussions with target group members, Executive DFA council members, DFA staff and interviews with regional managers, senior ZNFU staff, and one ZNFU board members. In all districts, there discussions with the District Commissioner and the District Agricultural Coordinator on how they see the role of the DFAs in their districts and how they collaborate and complement their own efforts.

The MTR team visited 5 districts in three provinces of Zambia. The districts were:

- In Eastern Province: Katete and Petauke
- In Northern Province: Mbala
- In Southern Province: Mazabuka and Choma

In total seven Information Centres were visited⁴ and focus group discussions carried out in these. Where possible, women were interviewed separately from men as focus groups.

The MTR team consulted with some commodity associations:

- Cotton Association of Zambia
- Dairy Association of Zambia
- Honey Council of Zambia

The team had a separate interview with SCC concerning their particular role in the CSP providing technical assistance, and also had discussion with other stakeholders active in agricultural development in Zambia such as the Norwegian Embassy, USAID and Conservation Farming Unit (CFU).

The time schedule for the MTR is attached as annex 4 and the list of people met as annex 5.

⁴ Note that the districts visited were chosen by the MTR team and represents both near and very remote districts, however, the team travelled extremely long distances and the time available did not make it possible to select the ICs at random. This means that the team has most probably seen the “cream of the crop” in the districts.

3 Findings

3.1 THE OVERALL PROGRAMME

The Core Support Programme (CSP) differs in several ways from traditional development cooperation and also from former ways of giving membership organisations support to implement particular projects. The CSP is ground-breaking because it takes the principles of harmonisation and alignment to the fullest scale and has, as the main aim, to strengthen the organisation ZNFU as a whole in its aim to promote the members' interests in society by providing a "packet" of support that integrates institutional support and support for membership activities. A consequence of this is the recognition of ZNFU's broader role as a political organisation to be strengthened through the support.

3.1.1 Targeting – who are the target groups?

The target group for the CSP is not explicitly stated as the nature of core support is to support ZNFU as an organisation with its large and small scale farmers and along with the strategic core functions of ZNFU. By doing so, it is envisaged that ZNFU can contribute to:

1. Reduce Zambia's overall poverty level by 5%
2. Increase average household income nationally by 3%
3. Reduce the number of food insecure households at national level by 5%

It is assumed that strengthening ZNFU and its strategy will contribute to grow in the agricultural sector, which will have positive outcomes for all categories of farmers and address the development needs of the farmers that are target groups of the CSP JFA partners – namely small and emergent farmers.

The majority of farmers (approximately 800. 000) in Zambia are small scale farmers cultivating less than 5 Hectares. There are fewer (around 50.000) emergent farmers cultivating from 5 to 20 Hectares and very few large farms around (700). Annex 6, the table 1 shows the definition of the categories of farmers, as they were estimated in 2005.

ZNFU has the clearly stated aim to keep these different categories of farmers together in one organisation, despite the obvious challenges this poses in terms of different and in, some cases, conflicting interests. From the stakeholders interviewed it is clear that the large scale farmers' main interests are credits, taxes, export policies and electricity, whereas small scale farmers mainly have no access to credit and are much more concerned with food security, local market conditions and access to services such as information, training and subsidised inputs. The difference is also seen in what the different categories of farmers value about their membership in ZNFU. The large farmers mainly see ZNFU as a "policy lobby machine" and the small scale farmers firstly value the outreach services.

In ZNFU headquarters, the dominating perspective still tends to be that of the large scale farmers, and there is also a tendency toward advocacy and lobby focusing on issues of highest relevance for this group. However, there is an undergoing transformation and the period of the CSP has seen much change in the perspective of the organisation due to the changing focus on provision of tangible services that are relevant to small scale farmers. The logic is, roughly speaking, that the large farmers bring to the table finances and also human capacity and the small scale farmers bring the strong constituency that is the key to political influence and negotiating power.

Membership grew since 2009 to 2012 by 93.2% to more than 71.000 members with the majority of members being small-scale farmers (99%).

During the MTR interviews and focus group discussions it, however, became clear that when members register as small scale farmers, this covers for huge variations that do not reflect the official categories above. Table 2 in Annex 6 shows the average hectares cultivated by the farmers in the focus groups.

It was noted that despite the fact that some of the farmers were cultivating substantial sized farms, all the farmers (except for the Chairman of Mazabuka DFA, who is a large scale commercial farmer) identified themselves as small scale farmers.

The farmer members express the need for good definition of criteria for the categories and a good framework for monitoring progression of farmers as they move towards the goals.

3.1.2 Relevance

Alignment to the NAP

The main thrusts of the National Agricultural Policy 2004 – 2015 (NAP) are increased production, sector liberalisation, commercialisation, promotion of public and private sector partnerships and provision of effective services to ensure sustainable agricultural growth. It is stated in the NAP that the Government will not intervene in input distribution or crop marketing in a way that will undermine or undercut private sector participation. The NAP recognises the fact that in Zambia, the majority of farmers are small scale resource poor farmers with low production and productivity and are usually food insecure. The vision for the agricultural sector is: “to promote development of an efficient, competitive and sustainable agricultural sector, which assures food security and increased income”.

The ZNFU CSP aligns well to the NAP and it directly responds to the 14th of the 19 sectoral strategies: *Promotion of and strengthening Cooperatives and Farmer Organisation as a vehicle for agricultural development*. The ZNFU CSP, moreover, contributes to the other five sectoral strategies in the NAP.

Relevance of the outcome areas to the target group

The DFA executive members are well aware of the outcome areas and are in agreement with the need for these foci. The ordinary farmer members primarily appreciate the services provided such as training, facilitation of input supply, credits and markets. These match well with their needs and respond to their aspirations. They regard the crosscutting areas as part of the services, but they have not been given high priority.

HIV/AIDS awareness is seen as important, but not as a part of ZNFU support. However, in Choma the farmer leaders particularly emphasised the need for more priority attention to gender and HIV/AIDS because these factors particularly affect poverty in the communities. In terms of environment sustainability, conservation farming practices have been taken on and are appreciated in some areas, and in others not. All the farmers have a weak understanding of the concept of environmental threats and climatic changes. The relevance of gender equity is understood and recognised in Eastern and Southern Provinces but much less in Mbala. There is a gender policy in the organisation and the farmers are aware of it, but there are clear problems in the implementation, which the members also confirm.

Several farmers – both executive and ordinary members - mention that they would like ZNFU to engage more strongly in issues related to land policy. They express strong needs for rights to title deeds and women's rights to land – information and facilitation in this regard is missing at the DFA level.

3.1.3 Effectiveness

The overall programme has been effective in terms of achievement of outcomes. There has been extremely rapid growth of membership (93.2%), increase in number of districts affiliated from 60 in 2009 to 68 in 2011. The satisfaction of members with the services and the many successes in terms of lobbying and advocacy speaks for itself regarding an organisation that is capable of utilising upcoming opportunities and responding effectively to members' changing needs.

3.1.4 Impact/outcomes

According to the core support intervention plan and expected results⁵, the expected results are divided in long, medium and short term results.

Long Term Results (impacts)

According to the CSP/ZNFU Strategic Plan 2009 – 2013, the long term results of the core support are to be measured as national reduction of rural poverty levels. As mentioned above, rural poverty continues to be extremely high (80%) in Zambia and there is no significant improvements on this. The root causes of the persistent rural poverty

⁵ See Zambia National Farmers' Union; 2008; Core Support Proposal

in Zambia are extremely complex and it is, therefore, not surprising that the MTR of the five year support to ZNFU cannot track immediate progress that can be attributed to the ZNFU development.

At the level of ZNFU members there are indications of positive trends towards impact. The MTR focus group discussions all indicated improvements in food security, incomes and poverty reduction in the households of the members. This verifies the results of the latest Result Assessment that show very significant increases in food production and incomes for the households from 2009 to 2011. Average increase of farm incomes in the three surveyed districts was 97% (83% for male and 157% for female farmers).

This should be considered in the perspective of the bumper harvest that was experienced during the 2010/2011 farming season for maize, combined with a very high price for maize marketed through the Food Reserve Agency (FRA). Since the period is short and the Results Assessment does not make analyses with comparable control groups, it is not possible to credibly attribute these increases only to the CSP. Nonetheless the members in the focus group discussions did attribute the positive outcomes to their membership of ZNFU. They particularly linked it to increased knowledge and skills, access to input credit programmes and markets through FRA. The high maize price was also perceived to be a result of ZNFU lobbying.

It is also notable that farmers who cultivated a more diversified range of crops, including high value crops, had much higher incomes than other farmers.

During the discussions, youth members mentioned that there have been opportunities that provided them with increased consistency in employment, as they have been farming rather than doing petty trade or jobs.

Medium Term Results (outcomes)

The medium term results are to be measured by:

- Stable/sustained macroeconomic environment and other legislative frameworks for agricultural industry growth
- Improved agricultural productivity
- Improved agricultural competitiveness
- Improved farmers' access to demand driven member services

For the first outcome related to macroeconomic environment, as with the long term results for the national level above, results at that level are not visible. The policy environment and legal framework for agricultural sector growth are extremely complex in Zambia and has not been very enabling in the period in focus. The macroeconomic environment is characterised by a high degree of uncertainty and unpredictable conditions as heavy political interference in the markets causes major distortions for private sector actors to operate.

Productivity is measured in the programme as yield per hectare of the different crops. According to the latest Results Assessment, this has increased in the period of 2009 to 2011 for most crops. Again, there are problems with attributing this only to ZNFU interventions. It is, however, very likely that the increased access to inputs has contributed to this.

For improved competitiveness, there is a lack of good indicators that are relevant to the CSP target group and could be tracked by the MTR. It is commonly understood that the indicator is competitive prices on the export market, which is mostly relevant for the large scale commercial farmers. In this respect the result has been unsatisfactory, as costs of inputs and fuel are still quite high in Zambia and the price of maize is higher than the neighbouring countries, despite the fact that some of these have serious shortages.

Short term results (Outputs)

The sections below describe the assessments of both outputs and outcomes as they relate to the different outcome areas. For the development of capacity in the organisation, the following are the main findings:

An important capacity achievement is the impressive growth in number of members, which provides the organisation with the basic capacity – a large constituency - but also challenges in terms of leadership and staff capacity to service the membership.

Moreover, ZNFU has played an important role in the development of commodity associations that are affiliate members. Some of them are still young and are just starting their organisational development process, but have interesting prospects for provision of sustainable services to the farmers now and particularly in the future.

The capacity has been increased in the DFA's leadership in terms of awareness and skills. The leadership training has been well received and brings out important results as several of the executive members in the DFAs provide substantial volunteer efforts to the DFAs functioning and also to their outreach work. Some of the DFAs have lost staff in the period – particularly the Market Facilitators that were employed under the former Agricultural Support Project (ASP). This has not been as a result of the CSP, but this fact combined with the rapidly increasing membership mean there are serious strains on the capacity in terms of the human resources required to meet the needs for services from members and programmes. At the time of the MTR, ZNFU was in the process of recruiting 13 more Field Facilitators to serve more of the DFAs. In the ICs there are serious differences in capacity and awareness between the contact farmers and the general membership.

3.2 POLICY LOBBY AND ADVOCACY

3.2.1 Relevance

The relevance of the policy research work, lobbying and advocacy is assessed at two levels - in relation to the expressed needs and priorities of the target group and in relation to ZNFU's own strategy and ideology.

In relation to the needs and priorities of the target group, the MTR found that the ordinary members have little awareness of this part of ZNFU's work. A large majority of the small scale farmers do not understand the potential of policy lobbying and advocacy for their lives or how it "happens". Moreover, the members are more aware of the lobbying that is taking place at the DFA level than at national level. It is probably not surprising that the members recognise the results that directly affect them in the short term and are not overly concerned with the long term perspective. The achievements that were recognised in the districts as results of ZNFU work are listed in Annex 7.

Looking at the ZNFU lobbying activities for 2011, as reported in the Progress Report from January 2012, the level of activity has been very high and with notable successes both at national and district levels. This means that the ZNFU influence on policy decisions and public operations at several levels is commendably high. It is, therefore, also notable that there is very little relation between this and the responses that the MTR received from the districts, where the awareness among ordinary small scale and emergent farmer members is rather low. Apart from the challenges in disseminating information regarding the policy work to the small scale farmer members, the above can also signal the fact that the policy positions lobbied for are to a high degree concerns of and therefore priorities of large scale farmers.

The target group of small scale and emergent farmers expressed needs for increased attention to particularly two policy concerns: 1) Secure land tenure systems for both men and women, and 2) policies that would increase their access to training and extension services. Apart from this it is obvious also from the list of recognised results that the target group view their need for policy lobbying and advocacy wider than the current priorities of ZNFU – to include more concerns also for social needs (e.g. health clinics and HIV treatment).

The relation of the current policy work to ZNFU's own ideology of private sector development and to Zambian farmers' long term interests in terms of influencing and creating opportunities for economic and social growth, was a question that was discussed and reflected on during the MTR with several stakeholders, including senior staff at ZNFU. It is recognised that Zambian agriculture is strongly political and acting in the policy environment of Zambian agriculture is a real challenge. During recent years, former liberalisation efforts have been reversed and government interventions in the fertiliser and seed markets as well as the maize market have effectively crowded out private sector participation, particularly in the small scale sector. Some of the interventions may look attractive to small scale farmers in the short term – subsidised inputs

delivered almost to their doorstep and a fixed maize market to benefit those who are well organised to access it. But in the long term they remove from the farmers the potential longer term benefits that a vibrant private sector industry can provide, such as competition, variety and choice that can ensure a market and reduce transaction costs for farmers.

The list of policy lobby activities in the progress report from 2012 tells a story of ZNFU struggling to serve farmers' short term interests in this difficult environment of challenges as it forces the union to be continuously attentive to the need to avoid the most immediate negative impacts of overregulation of the markets.

An example is the role of ZNFU in the maize market during the last two seasons. Here ZNFU became quite involved as it first lobbied to push the price of maize to a very high level⁶ and then actively participated as warehouse managers for FRA in several districts. The involvement was much appreciated by the farmers that benefitted from the market, but several stakeholders emphasise that it does not serve the long term interests of Zambian farmers, particularly not the large part of small scale farmers that had no access to these markets or those that are net buyers of maize for their food security (43%).

3.2.2 Effectiveness

The key target for ZNFU advocacy and lobbying is policy makers in the Government – primarily in the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development but also other ministries are targeted depending on the issues at stake. The organisation has strengthened its policy research in order to improve credibility in the lobby and advocacy work.

All stakeholders find that this part of the programme is very effective and has strengthened during the period under review. The ZNFU influence on the former Government was very strong and, according to many opinions, it is expected that the new Government will as well be attentive to the positions of ZNFU. The crucial factor here is the constituency of 71.000 small scale farmers and the majority of the large scale farmers in the country, but also the reputation for having capacity to do credible policy research is important.

The major successes, according to the senior management at the ZNFU Headquarters are listed in Annex 7.

⁶ There have been different opinions regarding ZNFUs role in the price setting of maize and also in the Government's decision to purchase the major part of maize produced. However, all stakeholders consulted have attributed the price to ZNFU lobby intervention.

At the micro level, the target group see effective and fast responses to their needs in terms of influencing important actors in the political environment, but at the same time there is need for more capacity at the IC and DFA levels for identifying and voicing more strategic needs for policy advocacy.

3.2.3 Outcomes

Despite the successes, as mentioned above, the long term results in terms of impacts on national level poverty and food security are not achieved.

The immediate short term outcomes of the lobbying and advocacy in terms of benefits to the target group members are quite direct and also substantial. The inclusion of the members in the FISP and the LIMA credit scheme has provided the members with access to inputs for producing maize, which has increased the yields with maize producing farmers. At the same time the favourable price for maize and getting the market closer to the farmers has directly contributed to increased farm incomes among ZNFU members. Moreover, the cancelling of production levies has direct income increasing effects for the farmers that are selling produce out of the district, which is the case for some of the target group farmers, but has a much larger effect for the large scale farmers.

A large part of the lobby and advocacy work, particularly at the national level, has outcomes that are more beneficial to large scale farmers than to the small scale farmers.

Whilst other important issues for the agricultural sector are being researched and worked on, the results of these was overshadowed by the immediate unintended impacts of the Government intervention in the maize market through the FRA in terms of expected loss on the National Treasury, crowding out possibilities for developing private sector engagement in the market and possible negative impacts for farmers that are net-buyers of maize. Many stakeholders had concerns regarding the current problems of the maize market and there were diverging views regarding ZNFU's role in this. The findings on this are elaborated in Annex 8.

3.3 FARMERS ACCESS TO DEMAND DRIVEN SERVICES

3.3.1 Relevance

Throughout the MTR, members have expressed great appreciation for the services provided through the ZNFU DFA system. They particularly appreciate the knowledge that they receive through study circles, information and training. These are particularly strong priorities for the female farmers, whereas male farmers are more concerned with the access to credits – here the LIMA Credit Scheme, and the market facilitation.

In relation to the market facilitation, the members have found it important that the DFAs have ensured their access to the market for maize and have also assisted in putting pressure on the payments to farmers – although there are still many farmers who are not yet paid.

There is, therefore, good evidence suggesting that the services provided respond well to needs and priorities of the target group.

3.3.2 Effectiveness

Through the ZNFU membership, the target group farmers receive services such as.

- Information
- Training
- Study Circles
- Market Facilitation
- LIMA Credit Scheme
- Other services such as E-transport and E-extension

The services are listed and the main findings are described in Annex 9.

The farmers, particularly the female farmers, rate the above services that have to do with increasing their knowledge and skills on issues that are of direct use for their daily work to be the most important part of the ZNFU membership. They have, however, seen that the level of training activities has dropped and they are pressing for more emphasis on training and skills development. In this connection all the groups included wish for ZNFU to be more active in providing knowledge and skills through extension activities. Suggestions for this were to use ICTs more, for example community radio and E-learning systems. It should also be noted that the MTR team observed several cases of farmers implementing skills they had obtained from the study circles, but direly in need of more direct advice to implement it properly – this is often most needed in the case of new types of livestock production such as broilers, exotic breeds of pigs and dairy production.

The latest Result Assessment survey found that the members' satisfaction with the services provided has steadily increased since the baseline study in 2008 and this was confirmed by the level of appreciation expressed by the members during the MTR focus group discussions.

The system used by ZNFU for reports and feedback from the field level is that the ICs have monthly meetings, where they discuss the new information and make reports of their activities plus plans for the coming months. The reports and plans are sent to the DFAs, who take up the suggestions that are relevant for them and pass on to the headquarters issues which need the attention from there. Apparently all the farmers regard this as a strong system and during the MTR they provided many examples of how their needs and concerns are effectively responded to amid changing demands. .

3.3.3 Outcomes

The small scale farmers attribute outcomes such as improved farming systems, higher yields, increased household incomes, better living standards, etc. to the increased knowledge and skills that they have obtained and the improved access to inputs, technologies and markets – all perceived as results of services that they receive from ZNFU.

3.4 MAINSTREAMING OF CROSSCUTTING ISSUES

3.4.1 Gender equality

ZNFU has a formulated gender policy for the whole organisation. It has, however, not been made available to the MTR team. From the discussions with members it is confirmed that gender sensitisation training has been conducted for DFA executive members and that study circle materials are available and have been used in some areas for training in the ICs.

There is a rather big variation in the gender awareness in the different areas visited. The concept of gender equality and the policy were, for example, well understood in the groups interviewed in Eastern Province where both Katete and Petauke were visited and also in Mazabuka in Southern Province, the awareness was high. However, in other districts e.g. Mbala the awareness was so low that it was difficult for the team even to get access to interview female members of the groups.

Despite the existence of the policy and the awareness of gender as a concept, all indications are that the policy has not been implemented to any substantial degree. The representation of women in the general membership has increased and is rather high – 42.4%, but in the ZNFU structures the outcomes in terms of increased representation have been lacking. In 2011 9% of members of the Board were women, 5% in the council and average 22% of the executive members of the DFAs are women.

In general, it is unclear to the MTR team if the roles of men and women are considered in planning and implementation of activities in the ZNFU system.

From the discussions in the executive groups and the focus groups with women, it was clear that women have different concerns for their farming activities which are mostly not main concerns of ZNFU. Some of the main concerns of women that were expressed are in the box below:

<i>Women's main concerns as expressed in the MTR</i>
<i>Diversification</i> Women are generally not very involved with production and marketing of maize or cotton at a commercial scale. They made strong request for services related to other crops, such as sunflower and legumes, fruits and vegetables and also to livestock production, including financial and marketing services related to these. <i>Value addition</i> Women were also forceful in their suggestions for increasing services related to value addition (processing). <i>Advocacy for women's land and property rights</i> This is a great concern for women in terms of enabling their progression into commercial agriculture. The team met with women who had established good agricultural businesses, just to lose everything with divorce or the death of their husband.

3.4.2 HIV/AIDS

In the discussions with farmers it was emphasised that HIV/AIDS is an important issue to address as it is of major importance for reduction of poverty in their communities.

Training has been conducted for farmer leaders in HIV counselling and in many ICs there has been awareness raising training. The DFA mostly link with other organisations in their area that are specialised in dealing with issues of HIV and AIDS. This may be a good strategy, but it should be noted that some farmer leaders felt that the issue could also be better and more creatively mainstreamed into DFA activities, such as, for example, the Study Circles.

Outcomes that could be identified were mostly in terms of increased awareness among the members and for one district (Katete), they had lobbied for getting access to mobile HIV treatment.

3.4.3 Environmental sustainability and climate change adaptation

Environmental sustainability and climate change adaptation do not receive much attention in Zambia in general. A National Policy on Environment⁷ was developed in 2005 and approved in 2007. The policy document raises important issues and broad principles but does not seem to have contributed to the creation of a policy framework within which stakeholders can operate. The responsibility for environmental management has been placed with Zambia Environmental Management Agency (ZEMA), but the link to agriculture is weak.

The main intervention that was mentioned, when the MTR team asked about the mainstreaming of environmental sustainability⁸, was the promotion of Conservation Farming, which is not handled by ZNFU as such, but by the Conservation Farming Unit (CFU). Conservation farming practises have been well received in some parts of the country, e.g., Eastern and parts of Southern Provinces, but much less in the high rainfall areas in Northern Province such as Mbala, where it is not perceived as relevant.

The actual relationship between the ZNFU CSP and the CFU however is unclear to the MTR team, as the information from the interview at the CFU is that CFU is not a member of ZNFU – only loosely affiliated and there is no connection between CSP and CFU activities. If this is correct, it means that the MTR cannot establish outcome in terms of environmental sustainability that is related to the CSP. It should be noted that the perception among the membership and at the DFA is that there is a connection in terms of collaboration.

⁷ Republic of Zambia, Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources, Environmental Policy Development Secretariat; 2005; National Policy on Environment

⁸ and also in the ZNFU CSP documents reviewed

Concerning the perception of relevance from the farmers, it was clear that it is difficult for farmers to relate and respond to a potential threat for the future, which is how it currently appears for Zambian farmers. The conservation farming practising farmers that the team talked to were mainly motivated by practises that reduced their labour input through better implements and less tillage and provided increased yields through improved soil fertility management.

What mainstreaming of environmental sustainability into ZNFU activities means in practice is still unclear to the MTR team, and therefore it was also not possible to assess the outcomes.

3.5 SUSTAINABILITY

3.5.1 Relevance and concern

The primary focus of the CSP in terms of sustainability has been to increase the organisation's own part of the financing of activities through increase of assets, income generation and investment revenues. The indicator is a sustainability index that is the proportion of the funds flow that comes from the organisation's own sources. This is the aim at both headquarters and DFA levels.

The MTR find this to be an insufficient and also inappropriate way of looking at sustainability of an organisation like ZNFU. A strong focus on this indicator creates a risk that the organisation's focus on income generation may divert attention from its original vision and mission, and may even compromise its role as a farmer organisation. Moreover, it may discourage efforts to attract external funding whilst one can argue that exactly the ability of a membership organisation to attract external funding is an important key to sustainability.

The MTR has looked at sustainability from the perspectives of institutional, financial and human resources.

3.5.2 Institutional sustainability

The institutional sustainability was assessed based on the motivation that the members expressed for their participation and the level of ownership they displayed towards the organisation.

The DFAs and ICs that the MTR team met with were very explicit about the motivation for participation being the possibilities for learning, access to information and other services as well as collective action. They are well aware of the organisational structure and its operations, and expressed strong appreciation of the fact that ZNFU responds effectively to their needs and they mostly talked about ZNFU/their DFA as their own organisation. In addition, the direct link that they get to the headquarters and other DFAs through the Friday Brief contributes to the sense of ownership. Farmer leaders, such as executive members, contact farmers and study circle coordinators, all deliver substantial volunteering contribution in terms of labour to keep the organisation functioning.

The fast growth that has taken place in the membership will naturally be a challenge to sustainable institutional development and it is likely that some of the fastest moving districts are fragile and may have issues of sustainability as many members are less well integrated into the organisation. One factor that could be a potential threat to the ownership is that many new members' primary motivation for their membership is the access to the LIMA credit scheme. In a few of the focus groups the members talked about ZNFU almost as if it was an aid organisation. The prospects for continuous institutional sustainability will, to a strong degree, depend on the ability to maintain a sound balance in the membership growth that correspond the capacity to integrate the new members and maintain the role of a membership organisation.

3.5.3 Financial sustainability

DFAs

According to the last Results Assessment, the sustainability index in the sampled districts varies a lot between districts as well as between years because their income fluctuates considerably.

In the DFAs visited there were different strategies for obtaining financial sustainability. All the DFAs have membership fees that provide only a small amount of funding. Apart from that, some use facilitation fees for services such as linking to market actors and take direct commission on both inputs and produce in some cases. Some make investments in building structures that they expect to provide them with rental incomes in the future. However, several DFAs have used the FRA marketing of maize as warehouse managers as a main strategy for income generation. The sustainability and even appropriateness of this arrangement is highly questionable as, firstly, it is not known what position the new Government will take on the maize marketing. There have been signals that the role of FRA will be substantially reduced for the coming seasons. Secondly, the direct involvement in purchasing farmers produce is a very likely source/risk of conflicting interest that can eventually jeopardise the role of a farmer organisation.

The opportunities for more appropriate instruments for increasing financial sustainability are unclear to the MTR team.

ZNFU

According to the latest Result Assessment, the Sustainability index in ZNFU headquarters was 35%, and there has been no significant change since 2009. However the income has steadily increased.

According to information from ZNFU, the financial Sustainability index for 2012 is expected to be around 52%. Income from own sources are: Subscription fees from members, service fees for some of the policy research, revenues from capital investments and, like the DFAs, ZNFU has participated in the FRA marketing in the past season and received commission fees as income from this. As described in section 3.7 below, the ZNFU's own income has steadily increased over the last four years and this change may be an alternative indicator of increasing financial sustainability.

There is currently an arrangement where external expertise assists in investment processes. This is commendable, as most investments can be of a specialised nature (e.g property, financial securities, etc). The finance function seems to be the primary internal link to investment, with the new strategy stating that this function would be expected to engage even more so as to go beyond “been counting”. However, investments are more than a finance function and can have far reaching implications on ZNFU’s core business. As the finance function still has capacity challenges in fulfilling their primary role (see section 3.6.4), such added responsibility may not be in ZNFU’s best interest.

3.5.4 Human resources sustainability

The visited ICs have well-trained contact farmers and study circle coordinators, which adds to the capacity sustainability. There are, however, in some areas significant differences in the capacity of the farm leaders and the ordinary members.

The executive members of the DFAs are well aware of their roles and responsibility and provide crucial volunteering human resources to the sustainable functioning of the DFA towards supporting the membership.

Regarding staff, ZNFU has well qualified and committed staff (Regional Managers, Field Facilitators and Office Managers), who deliver a tremendous and commendable contribution to the functioning of the regions and DFAs. There is, however, a serious lack in the districts and regions in terms of number of staff to provide the increased number of members with quality services.

3.6 ORGANISATIONAL AND MANAGEMENT FOR RESULTS CAPACITY

3.6.1 Mandates, roles responsibilities

Between the CSP partners

The CSP is established and legally directed by a Joint Financial Agreement (JFA) between the donors and ZNFU. Apart from that there are separate bilateral agreements between ZNFU and each of the donors: the Swedish Embassy, Finnish Embassy and Swedish Cooperative Centre. The JFA defines the roles and mandates between ZNFU and the donors. It describes the responsibilities, coordination and communication mechanisms and sets the frame and rules for the flow of funds.

The agreement between the partners is, in many ways, ground-breaking as an avenue to greater harmonisation and alignment in development support. The MTR found the main strength of this being that it has been an effective way of strengthening a membership organisation without it losing track of its mission towards its members’ interests. At the same time it partially eases the organisation’s burdens in dealing with three donors, as the communication and reporting is harmonised toward a coordinated group of donors, where the Swedish Embassy has the lead. That said, it appeared to the MTR team that the dialogue between the partners, particularly between the donor

group and ZNFU has not been strong particularly in relation to the aim of mainstreaming crosscutting issues, where it could have been expected that more of the values of the organisations would have manifested in the CSP.

For most part, the collaboration has been carried out smoothly, there are however a challenge in the harmonisation of practises regarding financial reporting and flow of funds according to the JFA. The details are described in Annex 10.

From grassroot level to DFA to HQ

The mechanisms for getting results and information from field level to DFAs to HQ (reporting and information system) and responding to this is commendable in most areas and is much appreciated by the members⁹. They are particularly appreciative about the fact that they have a voice directly to an organisation that responds effectively to their concerns and also that they get information that links them to farmers in other parts of the country through the Friday Briefs. The web-based monitoring system developed by SCC appears to be working well.

The special role of SCC

SCC has a special role in the CSP partnerships, as it is both contributing to the funding agreement, but also contributes with technical assistance. SCC started collaboration with ZNFU in 1997 with a few districts: Choma, Monze, Petauke and Katete. In the beginning they worked primarily together on establishing the Information centres (IC) and using the Study Circle (SC) concept. Both are today a backbone for the ZNFU services to the small scale farmers.

In 2009 they joined the CSP partnership in order to transcend the past project focus, but at the same time they have continued providing the following forms of technical assistance to ZNFU:

- Development of study circle materials and training of facilitators and study circle coordinators on the study circle methodology
- Development of a web-based monitoring system
- Gender and HIV mainstreaming training of DFA staff and leadership

SCC also collaborated with ZNFU in getting EU funding for the EU Food Facility Action in 12 districts. This was approved as a joint programme, including the development of E-Extension and E-transport. Future plans for collaboration are in the joint proposal MASP, where SCCs role will be strong in providing technical assistance to

⁹ It should be noted that one DFA is lacking a structure that can facilitate the voice of the small-scale farmers.

promotion of agroforestry. In this sense the relationship is gradually moving from the donor project focus to a more equal partnership of joint project ventures.

3.6.2 Planning and monitoring for results

ZNFU programme planning takes place annually and is completed by October of the coming year. DFA programme planning appears unsystematic, with some DFAs doing a better job compared to others. The system that was described to the MTR team in the field is that the ICs have monthly meetings where they make reports to the DFA and plan for their own activities. The ICs report to the DFAs on:

- Membership
- Production and yield forecasts
- Marketing
- Demand for services

With assistance from SCC, ZNFU has developed a web-based system for monitoring, which is functional in some districts but not others¹⁰. The statistics parts of the above reports are included in the web-based monitoring system. Whilst a clear data gathering mechanism therefore exists from headquarters and all the way to IC level, and the web-based system has proven to be an important channel for headquarters in obtaining data on advocacy and farmer service issues from the field, there is really no institution-wide M&E system that can ensure completeness of information gathered and systematic utilisation in institutional (including DFA) planning and decision making. The system needs a better structure to ensure more comprehensive and adequate coverage and completeness of data.

SCC has assisted ZNFU in developing a methodology for outcome and output monitoring through linking the web-based monitoring system with surveys for results assessments that are used for progress reporting. Another issue that was noted during the MRT is that some of the outcomes, such as increases in incomes and yield, are difficult to attribute to ZNFU interventions as long as there is no way of comparing with control groups of farmers. This again is difficult as it is clear that many interventions of ZNFU, e.g., the policy lobbying and advocacy, have outcomes not only for ZNFU members but for all farmers in Zambia.

3.6.3 Financial and institutional efficiency

The MTR sought to ascertain whether the resource inputs in the period 2009 to 2011, mainly finance and labour, can be justified in relation to the results achieved.

¹⁰ It is not in use in some districts - for example Mbala. Training is needed for these areas because of the valuable role it can play.

Financial resource utilisation

Table 2 below presents the overall financial results of operations from 2008 to 2011

Table 2 Financial results 2008 to 2011					
Description	2008	2009	2010	2011*	Last 3-year Totals
	ZMK '000	ZMK '000	ZMK '000	ZMK '000	ZMK '000
Income	1,931,816	10,766,273	13,901,466	18,157,540	42,825,279
Expenditure	2,893,130	8,667,645	13,586,767	17,428,452	39,682,864
Surplus (Deficit)	(961,314)	2,098,628	314,699	729,088	3,142,415

* 2011 Financial Statements are said to still be at "Draft Zero" stage. The figures may therefore change significantly.

The income for 2011 is almost ten times higher than in 2008 with the biggest jump being in 2009 when income was over five times higher than the year before. Whilst the increase in income is not entirely because of funds received through core support, the programme did clearly contribute to ZNFU's ability to forge other funding relationships and also increase its self-generated income. The ratio of headquarters costs to DFA costs averaged 54:46 over the period. Given that most of the programme operations are field-based, it would be reasonable to expect that beyond a certain point, field-related costs should outpace headquarters costs. This pattern is yet to clearly emerge.

By relating the overall growth in financial resources to results achieved by ZNFU in the programme objective and output areas, it is possible to establish the following positive relationships described in the box below.

Relation between results and use of financial resources
Programme Objective level: Farmer income increased, nearly doubling over the relevant period. Programme Outcome level: the following results may to a lesser or greater extent be attributed to access to increased financial resources: • Increase in number of lobbying issues at ZNFU headquarters from two in 2009 to 21 in 2011. Literature and field evidence clearly indicate that the rate of increase at DFA level, where such increase exists, was much lower. • The near doubling in membership between 2009 and 2011 is clearly linked to improved access to member services. With regard to crosscutting issues, notable results are only around the increase in use of conservation farming methods¹¹.

Using the current indicator for sustainability, the increase in donor income over the last 3 years would, at least in the short term, negatively affect sustainability. However, this scenario should reverse as more income is generated from subscriptions and investments currently being made. The rate of change in self-generated income offers an alternative indicator of sustainability. Table 3 below illustrates how this has increased over the years.

¹¹ It should be noted that according to the interview at the Conservation Farming Unit, there is neither financial nor collaborative connection between the CSP and the promotion of conservation farming.

Table 3 Change in own income 2008 to 2011¹²				
Description	2008	2009	2010	2011
Income (Excluding Grants & Donations (K'000))	1,461,419	3,875,395	3,136,030	9,495,271*
Rate of change (with 2008 as base year)	100	265	215	650

* 2011 Financial Statements are still at "Draft Zero" stage, and so figures may change significantly

Human resource utilisation

In the absence of information on staffing over the relevant period, staff costs were used as indicative of changes over time. The table below relates human resource utilisation to overall scale of operations.

Table 4 Change in staff costs 2008 to 2011				
Description	2008	2009	2010	2011
Staff Costs	1,564,708	3,599,320	3,065,846	2,937,896
% of staff costs to total cost	54	42	23	17

Whilst it is expected that the percentage should decline as total costs rise in the above case, the actual staff costs have also declined, suggesting actual staff numbers have reduced. Information from the field not only confirm this, but also highlights the fact that current staff numbers are insufficient in relation to current and anticipated future needs. The MTR therefore appreciated the fact that ZNFU during the review were in the process of recruiting more staff for the fieldwork.

3.6.4 Financial management

Overall institutional system

A well-recognised and appropriate computer-based financial accounting system is in use and this provides for adequate financial data capturing and oversight for both headquarters and field levels. The system has a web-based component for remote data capturing and transmission, allowing for close monitoring of field-level financial transactions. Field staff has been trained in working with the financial accounting system.

The Financial Manual appears outdated and is not comprehensive, especially with regard to defining principal accounting policies that would inform strategic financial management. It does not appear to be serving as the principal reference point for financial management practice within ZNFU. There is evidence of financial planning through annual budgets and also institutional income and expenditure monitoring

¹² This is based on information from ZNFU financial statements. There was insufficient information to undertake similar analysis at DFA level

through semi-annual reports. The information obtained points to the likelihood that the finance department is heavily operation-oriented and is not allocating sufficient space for strategic financial management. This can have a significant effect on ZNFU's ability to implement its strategic plan. There appear to be capacity challenges in the ZNFU headquarters finance department. Currently, there are three finance staff members, who are thinly spread out across the various institutional roles that need to be performed. Additional staffing may be necessary, particularly at accountant level, so that at least technically qualified accountants report to the head of department.

Financial reporting

The process of finalising audited annual financial statements is linked to the ZNFU Annual General Meeting, which is held in the second half of the year. This has practical implications relating to when these financial statements are available. The MTR team was during the mission not able to access management accounting information that shows expenditure classified according to outcome areas. Information received later after the deadline of comments did not provide clear evidence that management accounts are regularly prepared and utilised in strategic financial control and decision making.

DFA Level Issues

While mechanisms for fund flows to DFA level appear adequate, concerns were raised from the field regarding amounts allocated for DFA-level operations. The “dual” structure at district level (ZNFU funds and DFA's own funds) seems to affect the extent to which ZNFU is able to remain financially transparent and accountable at DFA level. The system is primarily tailored to report to headquarters and less to provide accountability to members in the DFAs. Moreover, some DFAs have capacity challenges in financial management. Though the basic accounting systems are being managed by DFA office managers, there is need to ensure that DFA members have the capacity to provide appropriate leadership in financial planning, control and decision-making.

4 Conclusions

4.1 CORE SUPPORT IS BREAKING NEW GROUND

The CSP differs in several ways from traditional development cooperation interventions and also from former ways of supporting membership organisations to implement specific projects. The CSP is ground-breaking because it takes the principles of harmonisation and alignment to the fullest scale and strives to strengthen the ZNFU organisation as a whole in its aim to promote the members' interests in society.

The advantage has been that, not only has the support provided financial support for some activities, but it has strengthened the organisation in areas of high strategic importance without diverting it from its original vision and mission as a private membership organisation. The most important areas that have been strengthened are that small scale farmers are being included, services to all farmers have been strengthened and a mechanism has been developed for collecting issues from small scale farmers for policy research, lobbying and advocacy of ZNFU, and through the increased membership the voice for lobbying and advocacy has been strengthened.

Not much progress has been made in terms of mainstreaming crosscutting issues. Here, it was expected that the dialogue between the partners could have contributed to more of the values of the organisations being manifested in the CSP, which was not the case.

4.2 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LONG, MEDIUM AND SHORT TERM RESULTS

The medium and short term results of the CSP that are directly related to the outcome areas have mostly been satisfactory. The outcomes to be measured by increased income and productivity have been positive for the members, but there are questions related to attribution to the CSP, as it has been a short period that has been characterised by favourable weather conditions combined with attractive prices for the main crop, maize. The outcomes are still fragile and consideration is needed regarding strategies for sustainability of the results.

It is too early to verifiably measure the long and some of the medium term results at the national level and these are dependent on the policy environment and policy implementation to influence the macroeconomic environment. ZNFU has strengthened its policy research and lobbying and advocacy, and has seen several successes in policy influence. However, the overall results in terms of national level results have not been visible.

4.3 STRONG OVERALL ACHIEVEMENTS OF ORGANISING FARMERS

The overriding aim of the CSP to strengthen the small scale farmers' participation and voice in the organisation has been very successful – the membership has since 2009 grown by 93.2%. ZNFU, in 2012, has more than 71.000 due paying members, of which the large majority are small scale farmers. Moreover, the organisation has presence in 68 districts. This means that ZNFU during the period of review have managed to ensure representation in most of the country.

Despite the rapid growth, the local organisations in the DFAs and ICs appear to be relatively well-structured in their functions. The MTR notes areas of concern related to sustainability and also of capacity for operations and financial management, as well as for results based management, which shows that the structure is still fragile and in need of further capacity development. However, the strengths are in the awareness and apparent ownership and volunteering capacity among the local membership.

4.4 EFFECTIVE VOICE FOR FARMERS BUT NEED TO IDENTIFY A MORE STRATEGIC POLICY FOCUS

ZNFU has, during the CSP period, strengthened its policy research capacity and thereby improved the credibility of its lobby and advocacy work for the farmers. The level of activity has been high particularly at headquarters level, where a number of successes have proven the effectiveness of the function.

At the grassroot level (DFAs and ICs), there are still weaknesses in the awareness and also the capacity to identify strategic needs, develop positions and engage in lobbying and advocacy.

Despite the immediate successes, the long term results in terms of impacts on national level poverty and food security are largely unrealised. The policy environment and macroeconomic situation in Zambia are characterised by a high degree of uncertainty and unpredictability, as well as heavy political interference in the agricultural markets. ZNFU as a membership organisation that by nature has to serve immediate interests of the members, has had to follow the political trend of reversing liberalisation and has attended to immediate up-coming issues. Though some of the government interventions may look attractive to farmers in the short term, they severely distort the agricultural input and output markets and in the long term the farmers will miss the potential longer term benefits that a vibrant private sector industry can provide, such as competition, variety and choice that can ensure a market and reduce transaction costs for farmers. This calls for increased attention to policy research and advocacy that serve long term interests of farmers and also to issues that are strategic concerns for small scale farmers, such as secure land tenure systems for men and women and policies that would increase their access to effective training and extension services.

With the increased constituency and strengthened capacity, ZNFU is now strategically extremely well positioned and has, with the new government, a unique and very timely opportunity to influence the policy environment for the long term benefit of the agricultural sector in Zambia.

4.5 INFORMATION AND KNOWLEDGE IS HIGHLY APPRECIATED BUT CAPACITY IS OVER-STRETCHED

A major motivation for small scale farmers, particularly the women farmers, to be members of ZNFU is the access to services. The satisfaction among members for the information and knowledge that they receive is high and they attribute several of the outcomes of improved farming systems and welfare of their families to this. They also see these services as responding well and quickly to their demands, but they want more such services and they are concerned that training activities have recently decreased. The rapid growth in membership that the organisation has experienced has over-stretched the available capacity to provide the services.

4.6 INPUT AND CREDIT SYSTEM NEEDED BUT DIRECT ENGAGEMENT IS ALSO PROBLEMATIC

The MTR shows that a good credit and input system is needed and the farmers are satisfied with the facilitation that has been provided by ZNFU both for their access to the FISP but even more to the LIMA. The benefits from LIMA are an important reason for the farmers to be members of the ZNFU and the scheme is, therefore, essential for the ZNFU membership growth in the future. The farmers all request that the LIMA is expanded to include farming equipment and other crops than maize. Some also request a choice of finance institutions to provide this service.

There are, however, also problems related to the direct engagement of ZNFU in the input and credit system. Firstly the implementation of the LIMA is a heavy burden on the field capacity of the organisation as the field facilitators spend most of their time facilitating the programme. Apart from the fact that these tasks reduce the time that the facilitators have for supervision and training in the ICs, one can also question the appropriateness of the ZNFU staff engaging directly in activities that can at some point lead to conflicts of interests with the members.

The period after harvest where the LIMA has to be repaid is quite short, this means that the farmers have to sell their maize at the same time and in a more private driven market this is likely to drive the market price down.

4.7 THE FACILITATION OF OUTPUT MARKETING IS ONLY PARTLY EFFECTIVE

Some of the activities related to output marketing are successful and the farmers make good use of them – this includes the SMS Market and Trade Information Service called ZNFU 4455. Farmers that have relevant commercial commodities to sell use the service and are satisfied with it.

The DFAs have facilitated the farmers' access to the maize market through FRA and there are cases of the DFAs successfully facilitating farmers' links to other commodity traders. It is, however, in this area that the farmers emphasise the need for more attention, particularly for facilitation of other commodities than maize. ZNFU's facilitation of establishment of Commodity Associations is a promising avenue for sustainable marketing services.

4.8 CROSSCUTTING ISSUES DO NOT GET SUFFICIENT ATTENTION

The mainstreaming of crosscutting issues: Gender, HIV/AIDS and Environment into the ZNFU organisation and activities has received little attention and the results are unsatisfactory.

Gender awareness training has been carried out, the concept of gender equality is more or less understood and the general participation of women as members has increased, although this has not yet had impact at leadership level. Real mainstreaming of gender equality requires that the different roles of men and women are considered in planning and implementation of activities. This has not been done.

For HIV/AIDS, training has been conducted on awareness and HIV counselling through links with other organisations that are more specialised in this. Real mainstreaming of the issues would, for example, require that the needs of HIV affected people and households were included in the planning and implementation of activities. This has not been done.

Documents and discussion around environmental sustainability have centred on the promotion of conservation farming, which is handled by the CFU. There has been no real attempt to mainstream the issues into CSP. Again, real mainstreaming would require inclusion of environmental concerns in the planning and implementation of activities at all levels, for example ensuring that environmental sustainability is included in all training (e.g., SC) materials and making a strategy for how the organisation, through its services, can assist farmers in adapting to the changing climate. Currently, it appears that all climate change related attention (and funds) in Zambia is going to scattered projects trying to promote climate smart farming systems. The agenda seems to be driven from outside Zambia without inclusion of Zambian farmers' needs and views on this. There could be an important role for ZNFU to play in terms of promoting justice in the agenda by including the voice of farmers.

4.9 SUSTAINABILITY IS A JOINT RESULT OF INSTITUTIONAL, FINANCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES

The MTR has looked at sustainability as a combination of institutional, financial and human resources.

In all the structures of ZNFU, from grassroot to national level, there is a high level of awareness, commitment and ownership towards the organisation. However, the fast growth of the membership has left parts of the DFAs fragile as not all members are well integrated into the organisation. The fast increasing membership has placed high pressure on the human resources. ZNFU has well qualified and also committed staff but there is a serious challenge in ensuring that resources in terms of number of staff, particularly at field level, match the increased size of the organisation.

Financial sustainability has increased over the CSP period, particularly at the headquarters level, where income has steadily grown. At the DFA level the picture is more varied and appropriate instruments for increasing financial sustainability are unclear. Sustaining and further developing the capacity to provide services to the members will depend on the ability to innovate new services and new ways of cost recovery of the services.

The MTR team questions the appropriateness of the use of the current Sustainability Index as a measure for sustainability for two reasons:

- The indicator may divert attention from the core business of the organisation in favour of income generation, which can jeopardise the role of the organisation
- The ability to attract external funding may be an important very key to sustainability for a membership organisation

4.10 BOTTOM UP PLANNING AND FLOW OF INFORMATION ENSURE RELEVANCE AND DEMAND DRIVE

The current situation is that the functioning mechanisms of planning and reporting from the ICs to the DFAs to the national level and feedback mechanisms the other way have proven to be effective in ensuring that the services delivered and efforts in advocacy and lobbying are relevant and demand driven. It also has a tremendous impact on farmers' awareness of the aims and functions of the organisation and their sense of ownership towards the same.

What is still lacking is a monitoring system that is fully integrated into learning and planning structures that enables full participation and accountability of the stakeholders in the organisation. A web-based system for monitoring is currently under development with assistance from SCC. This is functional in some districts but not oth-

ers. The system still needs a better structure to ensure comprehensive and adequate coverage and completeness of data. As a data gathering mechanism it has, however, proven to be an important channel for headquarters in obtaining data on advocacy and farmer service issues from the field, but there is still no institution-wide system for monitoring and evaluation that can ensure completeness of information gathered and systematic utilisation in institutional planning and decision making.

4.11 NEED FOR MORE STRATEGIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

The financial accounting system appears to be working well and provides for adequate financial data capturing and oversight for both headquarters and field levels. However, the “dual” structure at district level of separate accounting for ZNFU provided funds and DFA’s own funds seems to affect the extent to which ZNFU is able to remain financially transparent and accountable at DFA level.

It is not clear whether management accounts are regularly prepared and utilised in strategic financial control and decision making. The MTR team was not able to access management accounting information that shows expenditure classified according to outcome areas.

4.12 CORE SUPPORT STRENGTHENS THE ORGANISATION WITHOUT LOSING TRACK OF ITS PURPOSE

The CSP has been useful and also effective in strengthening the organisation without diverting attention from its core role and functions as a membership organisation. The concept has also lessened the administrative burden that would otherwise be related to financing from three different donors as ZNFU reports to the groups of donors and these coordinate their communication with ZNFU.

There are, however, still issues of harmonisation that are challenging to the collaboration and particularly to the smooth and effective flow of funds. It has been a challenge to harmonise the timing of reporting with the donors’ different requirements for disbursements.

The technical support provided by SCC has been valuable and contributed substantially to the achievements. The relationship between ZNFU and SCC gradually moves towards a more equal relationship of mutual benefits and joint ventures.

5 Recommendations

5.1 CONTINUE THE CORE SUPPORT MODE OF SUPPORT

It is strongly recommended that the Core Support mode of supporting ZNFU is continued and expanded where this would be feasible. The CSP features good practises of harmonisation and alignment of donor support to a membership organisation that has a good potential to serve the interest of large groups of small scale farmers.

It is, however, also recommended that the partners extend the degree of mutual dialogue concerning basic values and ideologies and practises related to these – this could for example strengthen the interventions in terms of mainstreaming the cross-cutting issues. In this respect it is also recommended that SCC and ZNFU continue developing their relationship as the competences of SCC complement ZNFU well and the gradual move towards joint ventures is of much mutual benefit.

5.2 STRENGTHEN THE STRATEGIC EFFORT TOWARDS LONG, MEDIUM AND SHORT TERM GOALS

In order to be more effective in contributing to the long, medium and short term goals, particularly the goals that relate to nation and sector wide impact, of which the macro-economic framework and regulation are extremely important, it is recommended that ZNFU strengthen its strategic effort in analysing policy issues as well as investment in services with a focus on the wider perspective of long term impact on the development of the agricultural sector. This should explicitly reflect recognition that policies or services that help farmers in the short term may harm the sector and thereby also the farmers in the long term.

5.3 INCREASE THE CAPACITY TO CONSOLIDATE AND INNOVATE SERVICE TO THE GROWING MEMBERSHIP

The CSP has contributed tremendously to the growth of membership in ZNFU. It is now crucial to put in place the necessary tools to sustain this membership and the commitment of both small and large scale farmers to the organisation. It is presumed that this will depend on particularly two factors:

- Continuous capacity building of leadership and other members at DFA and IC levels
- Ability to continue providing the essential services and responding to the upcoming needs for services

It is, therefore, recommended to increase the staff capacity at the field level and at the same time be active in designing and redesigning services with a good potential for cost recovery. The new LIMA and the proposed MASP implementation should be carefully analysed with the perspective to determine whether they provide this capacity or if it may effectively drain the organisation of more capacity than it provides and adjustments should be made accordingly.

However, since ZNFU has natural limits in terms of capacity to provide services in all areas, it is recommended that the organisation increases the effort to develop linkages with other organisations that can complement the efforts and also pay more attention to addressing systemic failures in service delivery such as for example advocating for reform of the extension policy (see 5.7).

5.4 UTILISE THE CURRENT OPPORTUNITIES TO INFLUENCE THE POLICY ENVIRONMENT FOR LONG TERM BENEFITS

The agricultural sector firstly needs a more stable and predictable policy environment that allows for the private sector to increase its participation in the input and output markets. ZNFU is strategically well positioned and has with the start up of a new Government, a unique and very timely opportunity to influence the policy environment for the long term benefit of the small and large scale farmers in Zambia. This should be utilised and it is, therefore, strongly recommended that ZNFU use the research capacity to join with other relevant private sector actors to create an advocacy voice that is strong, coherent and competent in influencing the outline of the future policy framework.

It is, moreover, recommended that ZNFU strengthen the capacity for lobby, advocacy and negotiations at grassroot level through training, which will furthermore improve its capacity to better identify and analyse the particular concerns and interests of the small scale farmers. In this connection it is crucial to strengthen policy advocacy on ensuring appropriate and secure land tenure systems and provide the small scale farmers, men and women with legal assistance to deal with issues of land rights and environmental risks.

5.5 CONTINUE DEVELOPING APPROPRIATE INSTRUMENTS FOR INPUT SUPPLY, FINANCIAL SERVICES AND OUTPUT MARKET FACILITATION

It is recommended that ZNFU within the CSP continue to develop the appropriate instruments for facilitating farmer members' access to input and financial services that do not contribute to market distortion and where ZNFU's role is facilitative and not engaging directly in input supply or delivery of financial services. The particular recommendations with regard to the proposed up-scaling of the LIMA are provided in

6.1. Alternative mechanisms for input supply and financial services should be considered such as for example warehouse receipt arrangements with companies who are able to store and sell the commodities as appropriate, notably to deal with environmental and price volatility and risk.

It is recommended that ZNFU continue and possibly strengthen its facilitation of small scale farmers' access to output markets through linkages to private companies but avoid direct engagement in the marketing of produce. The continued development of commodity associations is strongly recommended. ZNFU should develop a strategy for working practically with these associations in a complementary fashion.

Furthermore, the Agribusiness Service Centres that has now started with assistance of EU funding is a very interesting concept for clustering the required services from the private sector and for building synergies around them, it is strongly recommended to continue this development and eventually roll out to more districts.

5.6 INITIATE A SERIOUS EFFORT TO MAINSTREAM CROSSCUTTING ISSUES

Mainstreaming of gender equality, HIV/AIDS and environmental sustainability may appear somewhat secondary for a traditional farmer organisation. It is, however, of crucial importance for the achievement of the results of the ZNFU strategy, because these are focussed around poverty reduction and particularly inclusion of small scale farmers. Main streaming means that the issues involved are effectively considered and included in the planning and implementation of activities. It is, therefore, recommended that the new strategy (ZNFU Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016) is analysed, reviewed and amended with the particular focus on effective mainstreaming of the crosscutting issues.

Gender equality

The planning and implementation of activities must consider the different roles of men and women. This is recommended to be done by increasing attention to services and advocacy work that address women's concerns. The MTR found that these are 1) Knowledge development 2), Diversification of crops and inclusion of livestock and 3) Attention to women's land rights. Moreover, it is recommended to strengthen the implementation of the ZNFU gender policy in terms of increasing women's participation in leadership in the organisation at all levels.

HIV/AIDS

It is recommended that the particular needs of HIV affected people and households are included in the planning and implementation of activities. Depending on the outcome of the review of the strategy this may include promotion of labour saving technologies, increased promotion of small livestock production – for example a credit facility for restocking in households that have lost their livestock, lobby for priority to HIV/AIDS affected households in the FISP and LIMA and legal aid to widows regarding their rights to land and property inheritance.

Environmental sustainability

It is recommended that the review mentioned above ensures that issues of environmental sustainability is included in the planning and implementation of activities at all levels, by ensuring that environmental sustainability is included in all training (e.g. SC) materials and by including a strategy for how the organisation through its services can assist farmers in adapting to the changing climate.

It is, moreover, recommended that ZNFU uses its policy research function to upgrade the understanding in the organisation around global climate change, its causes and its impacts globally and in Zambia and also that it engages in discussion with the Government and Development Partners in order to advocate for clearer policy and/or its application in agriculture.

5.7 DEVELOP A POLICY POSITION AND A STRATEGY FOR ADVOCACY ON EXTENSION REFORM

The lack of access to effective extension services for Zambian farmers continues to be a major constraint for the farmers to increase productivity and effectively commercialise their production. Different attempts through programmes such as the ASP and others have provided solid evidence of the impact that good practises of extension can have. The institutional aspects of providing such services have, however, not yet been dealt with to a degree that can be called a sustainable solution. It is strongly recommended that ZNFU realise their members' interest in this and take a stand by preparing a policy position on the need for a reform of extension in Zambia and a strategy for advocacy towards a Government policy that will effectively reform the provision of extension to all farmers in the country¹³. Extension reform can furthermore be an important vehicle for operationalising work related to the crosscutting issues noted above.

5.8 REVISE THE EFFORTS TO DEVELOP FINANCIAL SUSTAINABILITY

The MTR recommends that the current use of the Sustainability Index is replaced with a more appropriate measure such as, for example, increasing own income.

¹³ There is assistance to be found in the CAADP's Framework for African Agricultural Productivity (FAAP) and through the African network: African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (AFAAS) www.afaas-africa.org

It is also recommended that a strategy is developed for increasing income that carefully considers the core business of ZNFU (and the DFAs) to serve the members' interest. The strategy should ensure that the income generating activities do not distort the core business. It is suggested that three lines are included in this:

- Developing and innovating member services that have good potential for cost recovery
- Developing an investment guide that can optimise desired outcomes of the investments without compromising ZNFU core business. An investments committee should be established at ZNFU management level, with finance function probably serving as secretariat and providing their technical finance & accounting input
- Continue to develop service concepts of strategic importance for the members that can attract funding from Government and Development Partners

5.9 CONTINUE TO DEVELOP THE M&E SYSTEM AND INTEGRATE IT AS A TOOL IN PLANNING AND DECISION MAKING

It is recommended that the web-based system for monitoring is introduced in all districts and completed with a structure to ensure comprehensive, gender disaggregated and adequate coverage and completeness of data. It is also recommended that this becomes the basis for an institution-wide M&E system that ensures that the information gathered is effectively utilised in the organisation's planning and decision making at all levels.

5.10 IMPROVE THE STRATEGIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

It is recommended that the donor partners and ZNFU enter into a dialogue and initiate a more comprehensive analysis of the financial management system, with the aim to determine how the financial management and reporting can be improved in order to be of better use for ZNFU's own management and also for better accountability towards the members and fund providers.

5.11 HARMONISE PROCEDURES AND TIMING FOR PROGRESS AND FINANCIAL REPORTING

Clause 13 (55 and 56) in the JFA describe how the signatories should review and amend the procedures in order to ensure the effectiveness of these for implementation. It is, therefore, recommended that the JFA is reviewed in order to harmonise the different clauses for procedures and that the donors and ZNFU together look into possibilities for harmonisation. It is strongly recommended that ZNFU amend the administration/management procedure and the governance system in such a way that they will be able to complete the audits and circulate the reports before the second disbursement. Apart from enabling the collaboration on the flow of funds, this will also affect the value of the report as a management tool and thereby have positive impact on the outcomes.

6 Outlook for the future

6.1 ZNFU STRATEGIC PLAN AND BUDGET 2012-2016

The Draft ZNFU Strategic Plan 2012 -2016 is a successor to the ZNFU Strategic Plan 2007 to 2011, on which the CSP was based. The 2012 – 16 strategic planning process appears to have taking deliberate account of the CSP and has therefore better accommodated the programme in the revised ZNFU vision, mission, strategic objective and key activity and outcome areas.

The 2012 – 2016 Result Areas are closely aligned to the CSP:

1. Reinforced and sustained lobby prowess and policy influence
2. Optimised ZNFU visibility, image, inculcated ownership and improved intra-intercommunication (enhanced outreach)
3. Improved and increased member services and support
4. Sustained effective and efficient management capacity (managing for results)
5. Improving the ZFM efficiency and annual profit margins to ZMK1 billion by 2016
6. Enhanced ZNFU financial sustainability
7. Enhanced ZNFU capacity to mainstream gender, HIV/AIDS and environmental conservation

Annex 11 provides a brief comparison of the two strategies related to the result areas of the CSP.

Probably the biggest challenge with analysing the current strategic plan (as may have been the case also with the previous one) is the way the content is structured.

- It seeks to cover discussion of broad/high level issues, some of which would have been best contained in policy documents, and very specific procedural issues, some of which may need to be contained in procedural manuals. A lot of important information therefore become obscured by the sheer breadth of discussion and volume of content, and makes the document more difficult to be utilized at various points in time and different levels in the organization.
- A second structural issue relates to the manner in which the content is organised. Whilst it is important to review performance according to functional areas and to identify specific plans pertaining to them, a strategic plan seeks to bring all this together in an institutional-wide manner. The document appears rather weak in this latter aspect. It is therefore not easy to see how on the plans and intentions come together to facilitate attainment of desired institutional outcomes, and to pick out any areas of possible conflict or gaps.

It should be emphasised that the above concerns are not only for the sake of easy review by outsiders but also a concern for the utility as a strategic and guiding document internally in the organisation.

It would have also been useful if the new strategic plan had included clearer evidence-based learning from the previous strategic plan to inform/justify key strategies in the current one for example around the form of institutional structure, focus of member services etc. This would have, however, required an M&E system that is able to methodically track specific relevant indicators on which such learning and justification would be based. As mentioned above, there is need for improvement on the M&E front if such a system is to be in place.

The Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016 addresses several of the aspects that have been raised in the MTR - such as organisational visibility and ownership among the members through increased communication, strong focus on strategically focused research lobby and advocacy, increased capacity building for lobby and advocacy at grassroots levels, redesigning and innovations on service delivery including cost recovery through service provision commission, expansion of staff at local levels. The M&E process is also more clearly defined, though there is still no elaboration on the specified function and system to ensure that the process does actually work.

In terms of policy research, lobby and advocacy, it does however not elaborate much on how to identify the relevant topics for the different categories of farmers and also when it comes to the outreach services it is not easy to see how it is secured that these are relevant to small scale farmers.

The mainstreaming of crosscutting issues is stated as a specific result area, but it is not described how it will be addressed. It, therefore, appears unlikely that the strategic plan in its current form allows for serious attention to this.

6.2 THE LIMA CREDIT SCHEME

The LIMA is a very effective tool for extending the ZNFU's policy work around fostering a stronger private sector within the farming industry due to the fact that the scheme provides access to large quantities of farming inputs. The clear connection between ZNFU policy work and the service provided by the organisation should continue to be cultivated for the growth of the organisation and the farmers.

ZNFU is proposing a four year expansion program. The proposal has been submitted to the Finnish Embassy for funding. During the proposed period ZNFU together with its partners will:

- Expand the scheme from the current 25 DFAs to 40-50 DFAs. This will lead to increase in small-scale farmers accessing LIMA credit to 35 000 (at least 35 % female farmers)
- Incorporate into the LIMA other field crops, livestock, vegetables and asset finance
- Leverage the 50% LIMA farmer deposit (ZMK 9 billion/US \$ 1.8 million in the current 2011/12 season) for more competitive LIMA loan provision by the private sector financing institutions, to expand the number of LIMA financial services partners beyond ZANACO

- Create more competitive financial service packages for small-scale farmers that not only provide access to seasonal credit but also provide access to short, medium and long term inputs and asset finance
- Enhance the ZNFU LIMA development and management capacity through establishment of LIMA development at ZNFU headquarters level and strengthening LIMA support capacities at DFA and IC level

This responds well to some of the issues that the MTR team identified as it will promote diversification in terms of commodities as it incorporates other crops, livestock and vegetable, which was an expressed wish from almost all the farmers and it provides an opportunity to leverage for larger and more competitive loan provision by more than one financial service partner. It also seems to expand the possibilities for financial services beyond the traditional rain season credit that will increase flexibility and thereby farmers' option, which were other issues that were raised to the MTR. To create a vital private sector that can supply loans and farming inputs on market terms to the farmers, there is a need for some degree of competition between the suppliers of finance and farming inputs, which may be encouraged with this programme.

An external review was prepared for the proposal of the expanded LIMA scheme. It provided the following recommendations:

- Move towards a more transparent and secure maize marketing environment by reducing the domination of FRA and its market distortion so as to enhance the role of the private sector
- Find solutions to lower transportation costs for both inputs and produce e.g suppliers delivering closer to farmers or DFA/ICs negotiating bulk transportation to benefit from economies of scale
- Strengthen the flow of information between ZANACO and ZNFU/DFAs and ICs, between seed companies and DFAs/ICs and farmers. Promote use of modern technology e.g. mobile phone to pass vital information (training, payments) to cut Costs
- Lobby FRA to prioritize payment to LIMA farmers with loans.
- Diversify LIMA by including other segments of farmers cotton, Soya, Sunflower, groundnuts, livestock (dairy, poultry, piggery, beef)
- Broaden the LIMA pack to accommodate other farms requirements including: herbicides, packaging, oxen, ploughs etc.
- Develop savings products for rural/small-scale farmers to help defray some of the risks faces by farmers
- Incorporate more farmers training in financial literacy, Business Planning and empower them to aspire to progress. Train, equip and facilitate contact farmers to be able to perform their responsibilities better.
- Strengthen links with other government and donor funded programs from where farmers can acquire small farm implements without overburdening them with debt.
- Build the income base of DFA/ICs to reduce dependency on member fees only. Initiate savings mechanism table banking programs among members to mobilize savings for income generating activities

- DFAs/ICs and farmers should work closely with extension services/DACO and camp/managers to benefit from extension services
- Build Capacity of DFA /ZNFU to conduct more awareness and outreach exercises to recruit membership into the DFA's/IC's for LIMA. Build capacity of IC's to set up small front offices

The MTR team essentially agrees with these recommendations. In the LIMA set up operational work is heavily focused towards the DFAs, and therefore the expansion of the programme will assist in building capacity at this level. But the finances to make the capacity sustainable are not visible in the programme. It is recommended that ZNFU make a strategy on how to strengthen the resources and capacity at DFA level. It is therefore required that ZNFU take a stand on whether they should maintain their current role in the LIMA in the future. It should be possible to build a sound and sustainable business case around the financial institutions and insurance companies paying for the services the regional ZNFU offices provide in terms of crop reviewing and payment collections.

6.3 MARKET-BASED AGRICULTURAL SUPPORT PROGRAMME IN ZAMBIA (MASP) 2012-2015

ZNFU and SCC have in November 2011 submitted a joint proposal to the Swedish Embassy for a programme Market Based Agricultural Support Programme in Zambia (MASP) 2012- 2015.

The MASP is formulated with the overall goal to reduce rural poverty in Zambia and the immediate objective is to: *“Facilitate sustainable increase in small scale female and male farmers’ agricultural productivity and to strengthen their capacity to efficiently participate in agricultural markets”*.

MASP is a four year programme that will be implemented 2012-2015 with a total budget of 168 million SEK.

MASP will build on the concept developed in the ASP (2003-2008) and be complementary to on-going programmes such as MUSIKA, the ZNFU CSP and the SCC FOFPI.

MASP will be implemented in 22 districts and 200.000 farmers will benefit from the programme that will use a commodity approach. Capacity will be strengthened in eleven commodity associations to address producers’ and processors’ needs. ZNFU DFAs will be strengthened in the districts to provide services that will enable small scale farmers to increase their productivity and practise sustainable agricultural practices. SCC will act as a service provider in study circles, agroforestry and gender and HIV mainstreaming.

The programme will enable the farmers to learn about farming as a business and participate in the facilitation cycle concept that was developed during the ASP (2003-

2008). It will work closely with the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAL) and support MAL to provide the extension services to both study circles and individual households.

The programme will, moreover, support ZNFU lobbying for land policies and legislation that provide security from land to small scale farmers, both men and women. It will also enable increased knowledge about land rights, legal representation on land rights issues and increased titling of land for small scale farmers by support for land surveys. The programme will provide access to legal advice both at headquarters and local levels it will establish land committees in the DFAs for promotion and protection of land rights, establish a facility as a watchdog on implementation of land policies and speed up titling by supporting land surveys.

It is planned that MASP will be managed by a Programme Management Unit (PMU) that will operate under the supervision of a ZNFU/SCC consortium in which ZNFU will be lead organisation. Implementation of most activities will be carried out by service providers such as ZNFU, SCC and MAL.

As foreseen in the MTR Inception Report, the time allocated to the MTR did not allow for a thorough assessment of the MASP proposal. However, the MTR sees the potential relevance of MASP in relation to synergies with CDP as the following:

MASP takes up the positive experiences of the ASP (2003-2008) with focus on entrepreneurship development with small scale farmers and intends to build on the successful approaches to extension that were developed under ASP: The farming as a business, the Household approach and the Facilitation Cycle. This will certainly strengthen the capacities in the DFAs and provide the farmer members – and many more small scale farmers, with the extension support that they have been lacking.

The MASP interventions on land policies, land rights legal support and speeding up the titling process through support to surveys will massively increase the capacity of ZNFU to address this area that is so crucial for the small scale farmers ability to secure their property and access finance for their growth in the future.

It, therefore, appears that there is a potential for valuable synergies between the MSAP and the CSP goals and objectives. It should however be emphasised that **the MASP neither confronts nor addresses the need for a sustainable institutional solution for effective extension provision in Zambia.** It is therefore recommended that it be considered that the above recommendation 5.6 be included also in this programme proposal.

As mentioned above, the time allocated did not allow for a real assessment of the modalities of the MASP components or a close examining of how it should be integrated under the SCP. It is therefore recommended that an external consultancy be commissioned for this purpose.

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Case No.:

Date 2012-01-03

UF2008/648

External Review (MTR) of the Zambia National Farmers Union (ZNFU) core support under Joint Financing Agreement (JFA) by Finland, Sweden, and the Swedish Cooperative Centre in Zambia

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 Information about the programme set up, the place of the support to ZNFU Sweden, the Government of Finland, the Kingdom of the Netherlands¹⁴ and Swedish Cooperative Centre (SCC) have agreed through a Joint Financing Arrangement (JFA) to provide core support to the implementation of the ZNFU Strategic Plan for the five year period 2009 to 2013, whose overall objective is: **to contribute towards improved food security, farm incomes, employment opportunities and reduced poverty levels.**

Specifically the Strategic plan will undertake to:

- Improve ZNFU research capacity and consolidate its lobbying and advocacy function;
- Improve member services provision and District Farmer Association (DFA) outreach programmes;
- Improve ZNFU sustainability;
- Enhance ZNFU organizational and managing for results capacity
- Mainstream Gender, HIV and AIDS and the Environment;

ZNFU's principle functions are to promote participation and a rights-based approach, putting farmers on the development agenda and promoting the small scale farmers participation and representation directly through the DFA and indirectly through the Union in decisions that concern their lives. The Union's facilitation of demand-driven service provision to its DFA level members has improved small-scale farmers access to agricultural information, rural finance, inputs, and remunerative markets. This in turn has improved the income and livelihoods for thousands of poor farmers, both men and women in Zambia. Based on the current achievements and the need for the union to best position itself in the sector ZNFU has developed a new Strategic Plan (2012-2016).

1.2 Information about the JFA partners

1.2.1 The Swedish context

Sweden's support to the agriculture sector is founded on the strategic goal outlined in the Country Strategy for Development cooperation with Zambia 2008-2011 extended by one year to 2012: *“de facto implementation of the FNDP agricultural policy focusing on poverty and growth promotion and increased climate adaptation, which in turn will lead to greater and sustainable production,*

¹⁴ Support from KNL was phased out after 2009.

higher productivity and strengthened competitiveness in agriculture. This in order to ensure food security, generate income, create employment opportunities and reduce poverty". The Swedish support focuses on knowledge development and secured access to food for small-scale farmers, as well as development of and access to domestic and regional markets for this category of farmers. Support to the public sector shall be complemented by support to civil society in order to promote a pluralistic and democratic society with a large number of actors that can promote collective interests and take on the role of independent monitors of the Zambian Government. The Swedish focus has been be on supporting the civil society in the follow-up of FNDP and on policy dialogue with the Zambian Government. The Embassy's draft strategy to support CSOs involved in the three main sectors of cooperation with Zambia has prioritised the ZNFU as one of the two most important CSOs in the area of agriculture.

1.2.2 The Finnish context

Finland's development Cooperation in the Zambia Agriculture sector is in line with Zambia's Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP) and Finland's Development Policy Programme. The present Finnish Development Policy programme (2007) stresses the need to promote economically, socially and ecologically sustainable development. Creating new jobs and securing good living conditions even in the remote regions are therefore important. Agriculture and rural development plays an important role in the promotion of economic growth that benefits the poor. As such, Finland's support to the ZNFU CSP is seen as key in contributing to diversifying the Zambian economy and exports, job creation, and improving food security and incomes among the rural poor.

1.2.3 The SCC context

SCC is an International NGO which was established by the cooperative movement in Sweden in 1958. SCC's vision is "A world free from poverty and injustice". Its mission is to:

- Support poor women and men to enable them to increase their incomes, improve their living conditions, defend their rights, and organise themselves,
- Strengthen the democratic and economic development of its partner organisations,
- Contribute to the development of democratic and just societies.

In Southern Africa SCC works in four countries namely Zambia, Malawi, Mozambique and Zimbabwe. Its regional office is located to Lusaka, Zambia. SCC has been active in Zambia for more than 30 years and most of SCC's activities in Zambia are undertaken in cooperation with farmers' organisations that are strategically positioned to address the needs of the small-scale farmers. SCC has a long lasting partnership with ZNFU and the first partnership was established in 1997. SCC's support to ZNFU has over the years contributed to significant strengthening of ZNFU's capacity to influence agricultural policies and to provide outreach services to its members. As a result of a shift from a project to a programme approach, SCC became a signatory in 2010 of the Joint Funding Arrangement (JFA) for budget support to the implementation of the ZNFU CSP. The related programmes/projects and development cooperation activities by the JFA partners are provided in Annex I.

1.3 Current situation in the agricultural sector

Agriculture remains the key priority sector in the growth and poverty reduction agenda of Zambia. Over 60 percent of the population derives its livelihood from agriculture. Despite Zambia experiencing strong economic growth in the recent past, agriculture has not performed well. The agriculture sector suffers from high production costs (as a result of high fuel and inputs costs) and low productivity that has limited the small scale farmers' competitiveness locally and in the region. In addition, unpredictable Government interventions in agricultural markets, lack of access to afford-

able and appropriate finance and poor infrastructure continue to be major challenges in promoting growth in the sector. The two subsidy programmes, the Farmer input support (FISP) and the food reserve Agency (FRA) account for more than half the Ministry's budget and this has hindered efforts in promoting crop diversification and investments in extension, livestock development and research as important drivers of growth in the sector. As a way of addressing some of these challenges in the Sector, ZNFU presented a concept note to the Embassy of Finland on the possibility of increasing Finnish support to the expansion of the LIMA credit scheme in addition to the support that is provided under JFA. ZNFU and the Swedish Cooperative Centre (SCC) have also jointly submitted an application to the Embassy of Sweden for the development intervention of a Market-Based Agricultural Development Programme (MASP) in Zambia.

2 Scope of assignment

2.1 General information and scope of work

According to the JFA of the ZNFU CSP a joint mid-term review should be carried out in 2011. The purpose of this mid-term review is to assess results and the effectiveness and efficiency of the support provided for under the ZNFU Core Support strategic work plan 2009-2013 (CSP). The review shall give recommendations about possible adjustments in the programme set up on a short-term and on a longer term taking into consideration:

- Findings from the review of the implementation of the ZNFU CSP,
- The development of a new ZNFU strategy
- The proposed up-scaling of the Lima credit scheme
- The proposed Market Based Agricultural Support Programme (MASP)

The longer term findings will form part of any future decision for policy level support to the agricultural sector, bearing in mind lessons learned from the current support and its design. The impact of the CSP interventions will be assessed.

2.2 Review areas and questions

More specifically, the scope of the assignment is as follows:

2.2.1 Review of the implementation of the ZNFU CSP

2.2.1.1 Assess progress of the implementation of the ZNFU CSP in regards to:

- i. Key activities carried out and key results achieved in relation to:
 - Outcome area 1: Improved ZNFU research, lobbying and advocacy outreach
 - Outcome area 2: Improved farmers' access to demand driven member services
 - Outcome area 3: Increased gender and HIV sensitive agro-initiatives, and improved environmental conservation/ climate change mitigation among ZNFU members
 - Outcome area 4: Improved ZNFU sustainability
- ii. The CSP's contribution to the strengthening of ZNFU and its affiliates (DFAs and Commodity Associations).
- iii. The CSP's contribution towards improved food security, farm incomes, employment opportunities, and reduced poverty level.
- iv. The CSP's contribution towards improved agricultural productivity and competitiveness among both small and large scale farmers.

2.2.1.2 Assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation of CSP in relation to results achieved, including:

- The cost-effectiveness of the implemented activities and to what extent the results are justifiable in terms of the costs and amount of work.

- To what extent ZNFU/DFAs have been effective in influencing agricultural policy issues and disseminating lobbying and advocacy outcomes to its members and stakeholders in the sector.
- Analysis of eventual unintended effects, both positive and negative as well as the perception of impact among the beneficiary group.
- How the overall objective and the goals of the programme are in line with the needs and aspirations of the beneficiaries.
- How the policy research work, lobbying, advocacy and provision of member services have been consistent with the needs and priorities of the target group.
- The awareness and satisfaction of the policy research work, lobbying, advocacy and member services by the target group and stakeholders in the agriculture sector.
- Analysis of the adaptation and possible changes in the implementation strategy, plans, budgets and schedules.

2.2.1.3 Assess CPS sustainability and the effectiveness of the cross cutting mainstreaming activities, including:

How the DFAs and farmers will continue to benefit from the programme interventions and activities after the planned programme period is over

- Assessment of the capacity of the DFAs (or plans for building it) and resources to provide quality services to members after phasing-out of the programme including the extent to which the programme has contributed towards the building of this capacity.
- Analysis of the adequacy of the instruments and financial mechanisms planned, developed and used to ensure financial sustainability by both the DFAs and ZNFU.
- How the gender policy developed conforms to the National Gender issues and policy including how the policy has been institutionalized by the DFAs.
- How the different needs and roles of both women and men have been fully recognized in the planning and implementation of activities including how effective the gender mainstreaming interventions/activities have affected the relations between men and women in the DFAs, information centres and households.
- How HIV/ AIDS has been effectively mainstreamed in the implementation of programme activities and how synergies have been built with relevant institutions focusing on HIV/AIDS
- To what extent the approaches and activities are environmentally and socially sustainable including the promotion of sustainable use of natural resources and consideration for the implications of climate change.
- How activities targeted at mainstreaming the cross cutting themes in programme activities will be sustained.

2.2.1.4 Assess the efficiency of the CPS management, organisational and Institutional arrangements:

- To what extent the mandates, roles, responsibilities, relationships, coordination and communication mechanisms of the programme personnel and joint financing partners, DFAs, information centres and farmers have been defined and executed in practise.
- How the financial management systems developed and used have been effective and efficient including the funds flow to the DFAs, transparency and accountability by ZNFU and the DFAs,.
- How programme planning and M&E systems developed and used are efficient and effective at both ZNFU and DFA levels.

- Revisit and review the adequacy and /or shortfalls in the joint financing arrangement (JFA) agreement between ZNFU and JFA partners during programme implementation and propose corrections and improvements to the same in light also of the new ZNFU strategic Plan.
- To what extent ZNFU and the JFA have fulfilled the agreed financial and other commitments for the programme.
- Assess changes in the mandates and tasks of the programme personnel, if necessary and any justified needs to improve or change the utilisation of human resources.
- To what extent other programmes managed by or linked to ZNFU, such as the EU Food Facility Action and the Conservation Farming Unit, have been in line and complemented activities of the CSP including management and institutional arrangements.

2.2.2 Recent developments and emerging demands for Future oriented recommendations

Assess the relevance of the program objectives and set up given the changing context of the agricultural sector under the new government, the national and regional policy context, new investments and partners in the sector etc. The review shall focus primarily on the following key areas;

2.2.2.1 Review of the new ZNFU Strategic Plan

ZNFU has developed a new Strategic Plan (2014-2017), therefore, the review shall also assess the new strategy in the light of the JFA and CSP. Analyse the major differences in focus/activities between the current and new strategic plan. Examine and establish if there is a major shift and confirm whether the original objectives of the JFA will still be achieved.

2.2.2.2 Review of the Lima credit scheme

This shall involve undertaking an assessment of the Lima Credit scheme to explore the possibility of rolling out the Lima credit scheme (with modifications) within the core support programme. A separate consultant shall be engaged to specifically cover this aspect with ToRs as per attached Annex 2. The review findings and agreed recommendations shall be taken into consideration as part of the main recommendations as by the Mid-Term Review (MTR) team

2.2.2.3 Review of the MASP

The review team shall assess the relevance of the “Market Based Agriculture Support Programme (MASP)” to the new ZNFU strategic plan focus and objectives. This shall also include assessing the modalities of the MASP components and examining the possibilities of integrating this under the core support programme. The proposal is available upon request.

2.3 Methodology

The methodology will be discussed and agreed upon at commencement of the assignment. The methodology applied will include the following activities:

2.3.1 Desk study

Desk study of all relevant literature and documentation including:

- Joint Financing Arrangement
- Current and proposed ZNFU strategy
- The Core Support Programme
- Baseline study and result assessment reports
- Annual operational plans
- Annual and semi annual CSP review reports
- Studies conducted under the programme
- The MASP programme proposal

- The MUSIKA programme
- Finnish, Swedish, and SCC strategies, policies, and programmes relevant to the CSP programme
- Other programmes/ projects implemented by ZNFU

2.3.2 Interviews

Interviews with representatives of:

- Zambia National Farmers Union (national)
- Swedish Embassy
- Finnish Embassy
- Swedish Cooperative Centre
- Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
- Affiliated Commodity Associations (CAZ, DAZ, BAZ, PAZ)
- Affiliated Corporate members (Zambeef, Parmalat, ZANACO)
- Other funding/ development agencies (EU, Norwegian Embassy)
- Other development actors (Conservation Farming Unit, MUSIKA)

2.3.3 Focus group discussions

Focus group discussions with a cross section of staff, leaders and members in sampled districts

2.3.4 Stake holder meeting

A consultative meeting with major stakeholders shall be held in which findings and recommendations will be presented.

2.4 Review Outputs

- (a) An Aide Memoire (including key findings and recommendations) and its presentation: The Mission will present the aide memoire to the JFA partners and ZNFU including other stakeholders in a consultative workshop.
- (b) The MTR Draft and Final Reports: The report should be logically structured, contain evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations, and should be free of information that is not relevant to the overall analysis. The report should respond in detail to the key focus areas described above. It should include a set of specific recommendations formulated for the programme and identify the necessary actions required to be undertaken, who should undertake those and possible time-lines (if any). The JFA partners and ZNFU including relevant stakeholders will provide comments on the Draft Report, and the Mission will finalize the report in view of these comments.
- (c) Annexes of the major findings and recommendations of the review of the new ZNFU strategic plan, lima credit scheme roll out and the MASP.
- (d) A brief paper documenting changes (if any) to be made to the CSP as an annex to the MTR Report.

2.5 Budget and profile of the consultant/s

The team will be comprised of one international consultant and one local consultant. The consultant/s shall have experience from the agricultural sector, policy development and from carrying out reviews. The tentative time plan is as follows:

Time in Sweden, total 10 days:

4 days preparation, 6 days writing up.

Time in Zambia, total 18 days:

18 days in Zambia with at least 8 days outside Lusaka and a debriefing meeting in Lusaka.

2.4 Schedule

The estimated time for the review is 28 days with a preparatory phase focusing on review of documentation and reports and a second phase involving a trip to Zambia for consultation with stakeholders. The assignment is planned to start in February 2012.

2.5 REPORTING AND DOCUMENTATION

The report shall be written in English and no more than 30 pages.

ANNEX I Related programmes/projects and other development cooperation activities

Programmes supported by Sweden

The current agriculture portfolio consists of the following programmes that are agreed or in process of being agreed:

- Support to the Agricultural Consultative Forum ACF including the Food Security Research Project FSRP, ended December 2011
- Support to the ZNFU 2009-2013, a total of 13,5 MSEK (disbursed 7,9 MSEK)
- Support to Musika, Making Agricultural Markets Work for Zambia, 2011-12, total budget SEK 48MSEK

Support to B4D pilot project on School Milk together with Tetra Pak, WFP, GRZ, Profit-USAID.

Programmes supported by Finland

Other than the ZNFU CSP, Finland supports the Luapula Agricultural and Rural Development Programme (PLARD) that is a long-term cooperation in Luapula Province. PLARD phase II is a four years programme (2011- 2015) that focuses on repositioning and promoting the best practices in the fisheries, Agriculture and Agribusiness sub-sectors to contribute to improved food security and increased incomes in the province. In collaboration with the African Development Bank, Finland contributes to the Small-scale Irrigation Project (SIP) implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock aimed at increasing food production and household income through expansion of irrigation to 1,413 hectares of land.

In addition to the current support in the sector, additional support to the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock to strengthen the monitoring of the agriculture sector performance, as envisaged also in the SNDP will start in 2012. Finland will also from 2012 to 2016 support a joint programme with IFAD, called the Smallholder Productivity Promotion Programme (S3P).

SCC supported programmes

FOFPI is a regional rural development programme managed by SCC. The objective of FOFPI is “Empowered farmer organisations that addresses needs and rights of poor male and female members” and it addresses the following five cluster areas: i) Organisational development; ii) Market access; iii) Sustainable agriculture production; iv) Policy influence; and v) HIV and AIDS and gender mainstreaming.

FOFPI provides financial and technical support to eight Farmers Organisations in four countries in the Southern African region including ZNFU. In Zambia and in addition to the ZNFU CSP, the programme provides support to the following organisations/programmes Cotton Association of Zambia (CAZ), Zambia Honey Council, and Organic Producers and Processors Association of Zambia (OPPAZ).

During the period 4 January 2010 to 4 October, 2011, SCC acted as a partner organisation with ZNFU in the implementation of the ZNFU lead “Improving productivity of small scale agricultural sector in Zambia” action which was financed under the EU Food Facility Programme. The objective of the Action was “improving access to agricultural inputs, information and marketing and other services by small-scale farmers in targeted districts with high potential and strengthening the service delivery capacity of targeted ZNFU affiliated DFAs to their small-scale memberships”.

SCC also provided technical assistance to ZNFU in the following areas:

- Development of a ZNFU web-based result based monitoring system,
- Development of study circle materials and training of facilitators and study circle organisers on the study circle methodology,
- Gender and HIV mainstreaming training of DFA staff and leadership.

Annex 2 – Evaluation Matrix

Review area	Criteria	Key questions	Indicators	Method/source of information
Overall Programme	Relevance	How does the CSP align to the National Agricultural Policy including the CAADP agenda? Who are the target groups of the CSP support? Who have benefitted from the CSP support Are the overall goals and objectives of the programme in line with the needs of the target group?	CSP is aligned to the national policy and the CAADP agenda Expressed needs and aspirations of the target-group correspond the logframe goals and objectives	Discuss the logframe with the stakeholders Identify needs and aspirations of beneficiaries and compare to the logframe
	Efficiency	Are the overall results justifiable in terms of costs and labour?	Fund and labour utilisation matching result	Institutional/financial analysis
	Effectiveness	Adaptation and eventual changes in the implementation (strategy, plans, budgets and schedules)	Appropriate adaptation and changes	Assessment of Progress reports
	Impact	What are the trends in impacts related to the objectives that can be related to the CSP contribution?	• ZNFU, DFAs and CAs strengthened in terms of number and Capacity • Improved food security, farm incomes, employment opportunities, and reduced poverty level • Improved agricultural productivity and competitiveness among both small and large scale farmers	• SCC Monitoring assessments combined with baseline study • Interviews with stakeholders for verification
	ZNFU and DFA Sustainability	Are there mechanisms in place or planned for that can strengthen sustainability?	• Increase in the sustainability index • Appropriate instruments and financial mechanisms planned or used to strengthen ZNFU institutional and sustainability	Analysis of progress and financial reports Interviews with stakeholders

ZNFU research, lobbying and advocacy out-reach	Relevance	Has the policy research work, lobby and advocacy been consistent with the ideology of ZNFU? Has the policy research work, lobby and advocacy been consistent with needs and priorities of the target group?	The actual policy work and results corresponds the ZNFU ideology and expressed needs and priorities of the target group	Assessment of the relations between established ZNFU ideology and strategy and the actual work Stakeholder interviews Focus group discussions
	Efficiency	Are the results and benefits for the target group justifiable in terms of costs and labour involved? At the HQ level and at DFA level	Fund and labour utilisation matching result and benefits for the target group	Institutional/financial analysis
	Effectiveness The extent to which ZNFU/DFAs have been effective in influencing agricultural policy issues and disseminating lobbying and advocacy outcomes to its members and stakeholders in the sector	What have been achieved in terms of policy research, lobby and advocacy activities - at HQ and DFA levels? What have been the outstanding cases of success in terms of influencing agricultural policy – at GQ and DFA levels? How aware and appreciative are the target group members of the achievements and successes? How does ZNFU engage in lobby and advocacy with other actors on platforms such as CAADP?	Number of successes in influencing agricultural policies – at HQ and at DFA levels Target group members are aware of the achievements and perceive them as successes ZNFU use a number of platform to engage in lobby and advocacy with other actors than GOZ	Interviews with members and stakeholders – testing their awareness and perception of success
	Outcomes	What are the long term and short term outcomes of the policy work? How have the target group members benefitted from the successes? Are there unintended effects positive and negative	There is alignment of short and long term outcomes Target group members mentions substantial benefits and outcomes from the policy achievements	Interviews and focus group discussions

	Sustainability	How will target group members continue to benefit after the CSP period is over?	The target group members have the capacity, awareness necessary to voice their needs in terms of policies The organisational structures secure that the target group members can influence the policy work	Assessment of capacity, awareness and organisational structures through reports and stakeholder interviews
Farmers' access to demand driven member services	Relevance	What are the services that have been provided to farmer members? Do the provided services respond to the needs and priorities of the farmers? What are the mechanisms for continuous development of services according to changing demands?	The services provided respond to the needs and priorities of the target group farmers Procedures in place for responding to changing demands and examples that this has happened	Plans, reports compared to interviews and focus group discussions
	Efficiency	Are the results justifiable in terms of costs and labour involved? How much of the funding goes to the DFAs compared to ZNFU – is the distribution justifiable?	Fund and labour utilisation matching the priorities and benefits for the target group	Institutional/financial analysis
	Effectiveness	How has the CSP contributed to developing the capacity of the ZNFU and DFAs to provide demand driven services to the members? How has the CSP contributed to developing demand for services from the target farmers? What services has the target group accessed and made use of?	Number of services provided and capacity of staff trained to provide the services Demand for relevant services from farmers articulated Number of farmers using services and the frequency of use	Interviews and focus group discussions with members and staff Progress reports and results assessments

		How well has the services and their quality been appreciated by the members? What are the successes and gaps?	Farmers expressing appreciation of the quality of services	
	Outcomes	How has the services benefitted the target group? What are the perceived outcomes of the services by the target group members?	Farmers stating benefits from services Outcomes measured in the results assessments Farmers specifying particular outcomes of the services	Interviews with stakeholders and focus group discussions Results assessments
	Sustainability	Has the CSP contributed to build capacity in DFA s to continue providing demand driven services after the CSP period Are the mechanisms in place that secure the voice of the target groups farmers after the CSP period? Are there financial tools planned or used to secure financing of the services?	Number of staff trained and enabled to provide services Sustainable links to partner institutions providing speciality services Organisational structure and procedures in place that ensure the involvement of the target group in planning Financial tools existing to sustain the services	Progress reports Stakeholder interviews Focus group discussions
Gender and HIV sensitive agro-initiatives, and improved environmental conservation/ climate change mitigation	Relevance	How does the gender policy conform to the National Gender issues and policy and how has it been institutionalised by ZNFU and the DFAs? How is the mainstreaming of HIV/AIDS and environmental protection being addressed in the activities and approaches? How relevant is the mainstreaming of the	The ZNFU and DFA mainstreaming policy and implementation in the organisation are aligned with the national gender issues The mainstreaming addresses real issues of HIV/AIDS and environment and climate change as perceived by members The activities correspond members needs	Analyses of plans and progress reports Interviews with stakeholders and focus group discussions

among ZNFU members		HIV/AIDS to the programme and members' needs and aspirations? Are the farmers' needs in relation to climate change being addressed?	The farmers' priority needs correspond with the mainstreaming activities	
	Efficiency	Are the results justifiable in terms of costs and labour involved?	See above	Institutional/financial analysis
	Effectiveness	Have the roles of both men and women been fully recognised in the planning and implementation of activities? Are both men and women represented in the organisation at all levels? How effectively has HIV/AIDS been mainstreamed in the implementation of activities? How has synergies been built with relevant institutions focusing on HIV/AIDS? How effectively do farmers respond to the approaches for environmental sustainability?	Roles of men and women are recognised in planning and implementation? Increased representation of women in ZNFU and DFA HIV/AIDS effectively mainstreamed in activities Synergies with relevant institutions effective Farmers responding to the promotion of environmental sustainable farming approaches	
	Outcomes	How has the gender mainstreaming affected the gender equality in the DFAs, information centres and households To what extent does the mainstreaming of environmental protection contribute to environmental sustainability of the farming systems?	Numbers of women represented and participating at all levels Increased sustainability of farming systems	
	Sustainability	How will the activities targeted at mainstreaming the crosscutting themes be sustained after the CSP?	Crosscutting themes mainstreamed in sustainable activities	

	Efficiency Effectiveness	To what extent have the mandates, roles, responsibilities, relationships, coordination and communication mechanisms of the programme personnel and joint financing partners, DFAs, information centres and farmers been defined and executed in practice? Have the financial management systems been effective and efficient including the funds flow to the DFAs, transparency and accountability at both ZNFU and DFA levels? Are the programme planning and M&E systems efficient and effective at both ZNFU and DFA levels? How has the system developed by SCC in a few district functioned – and how is this information used? Have ZNFU and JFA fulfilled the agreed financial and other commitments for the programme? To what extent have other programmes managed by or linked to ZNFU such as EU Food Facility Action and the Conservation Farming Unit been in line with and complemented activities of the CSP including management and institutional arrangements?	Mandates, roles, responsibilities and relationships are executed in line with the agreement and coordination and communication mechanisms are functional The funds have been dispersed according to plans and the financial information have been disseminated to relevant stakeholders A system for programme planning is in place and functional at both ZNFU and DFA levels A system for M&E is in place and functional at both ZNFU and DFA levels The M&E system developed by SCC has worked to the stakeholders' satisfaction and there is a procedure for integrating the information for learning and subsequently planning The partners perceive the commitments fulfilled The other programmes complement and enhance the CSP activities	Interviews with stakeholders regarding the experiences of collaboration and procedures Detailed analysis of budgets and financial reports Review of operational manuals Interviews with relevant stakeholders Documentation to be requested on how the system works Interviews with SCC and stakeholders in the examined districts Review of the results assessments Interviews with the partners Interviews with the stakeholders, EU Food Facility Action and CFU Request for documentation regarding these programmes
--	-----------------------------	--	---	--

The new ZNFU strategy (2012 – 2015)		How well does it align with the CSP - what adaptations will it require to align the two? Will it require a new assessment of the CSP?		
MASP		How does this proposal align with the new strategy? Capacity issues in SCC, ZNFU and DFAs? Relation to MUSIKA?		
Lima Credit Scheme		Is it possible/desirable to roll out the proposed programme within the current CSP? Do ZNFU/DFAs have the capacity to manage this? How does this scheme complement the MUSIKA concept – does it adequately address issues of market?		

Annex 3 – Semi-structured interviews

Regional Managers and DFA staff

The Log – frame:

Discuss the goals and objectives

What are the important Outcome areas?

- Influencing policy
- Providing services to farmers
- Mainstreaming crosscutting issues
 - Gender equality
 - HIV/AIDS mitigation
 - Environment and climate change
- Increasing ZNFU and DFA sustainability
- Improving organisational Planning and M&E

Which do you find to be the most important – for you and for the members?

For each of the outcome areas – discuss the following:

- What were the major achievements and successes?
- Why were these so successful?
- What were the outcomes?
- Who benefitted and how?
- How do you think these experiences should be taken forward?
- What were the challenges or short falls?
- What have you learned from this – and how can that be taken forward?

How has been the collaboration with the stakeholders, describe how you work together with planning and monitoring:

- Members?
- HQ?
- CSP partners?

DFA Council members

The Log – frame:

Discuss the goals and objectives

In order to reach the goals and objectives - What are the important Outcome areas?

- Influencing policy
- Providing services to farmers
- Mainstreaming crosscutting issues
 - Gender equality
 - HIV/AIDS mitigation
 - Environment and climate change
- Increasing ZNFU and DFA sustainability
- Improving organisational Planning and M&E

Which do you find to be the most important?

For each of the outcome areas – discuss the following:

- What were the major achievements and successes?
- Why were these so successful?
- What were the outcomes?
- Who benefitted and how?
- How do you think these experiences should be taken forward?
- What were the challenges or short falls?
- What have you learned from this – and how can that be taken forward?

How has been the collaboration with the ZNFU and the DFA, describe how you participate in:

- Formulating demands for policy work and services
- Setting priorities for activities
- Planning the activities
- Monitoring the activities

Farmer members

The Log – frame:

Discuss the goals and objectives

In order to reach the goals and objectives - What are the important Outcome areas?

- Influencing policy
- Providing services to farmers
- Mainstreaming crosscutting issues
 - Gender equality
 - HIV/AIDS mitigation
 - Environment and climate change
- Increasing ZNFU and DFA sustainability
- Improving organisational Planning and M&E

Which do you find to be the most important?

For each of the outcome areas – discuss the following:

- What were the major achievements and successes?
- Why were these so successful?
- What were the outcomes?
- Who benefitted and how?
- How do you think these experiences should be taken forward?
- Are you contributing financially to this – or would you be willing to do so?
- What were the challenges or short falls?
- What have you learned from this – and how can that be taken forward?

How has been the collaboration with the stakeholders, describe how you organise as members and participate in planning and monitoring

- Formulating demands for policy work and services
- Setting priorities for activities
- Planning the activities
- Monitoring the activities

Annex 4 – Time Schedule

Date	Time	Activity	Place	Participants
09.02.2012	15:00	Start Inception - Briefing teleconference		Sida Stockholm, Sida Zambia, Finland, SCC, Indevelop, Team leader,
10.02.2012		Desk review		SC and CC
13.02.2012		Desk review and logistic arrangements		SC and CC
14.02.2012		Desk review and logistic arrangements		SC and CC
15.02.2012	04:00 – 23:30	Travel to Zambia	Billund – Lusaka	SC
16.02.2012	10:00 12:00	Team meeting – Preparation of Stakeholder meeting Meeting at Swedish Embassy	Lusaka	SC and CC Eva Ohlsson and Nachili Kaira
17.02.2012	08:00 14.30	Team meeting - preparation Inception work shop ZNFU	Lusaka	ZNFU, DFA regional managers, SCC, Embassy of Finland
18.02.2012		Inception – team meeting	Lusaka	SC and CC
19.02.2012		Inception – travel to Petauke	Lusaka Petauke	SC
20.02.2012	09:00	Submit Inception report Fieldwork Katete	Zambia	SC
21.02.2012	09:00	Fieldwork Petauke	Zambia	SC/ CC
22.02.2012	05:55 – 23:30	Travel to Lusaka BO travels to Zambia	Petauke - Lusaka Billund -Lusaka	SC and CC SC and CC BO
23.02.2012	06:30	Travel to Kasama	Lusaka – Kasama	SC, CC and BO
Friday 24.02.2012		Travel to Mbala Fieldwork in Mbala	Mbala	SC, CC and BO
Saturday 25.02.2012		Teamwork Mbala Travel to Kasama	Zambia	SC, CC and BO
Sundays 26.02.2012		Travel to Lusaka	Lusaka	SC, CC and BO

ANNEX 4 – TIME SCHEDULE

Monday 27.02.2012		Travel to Mazabuka Fieldwork in Mazabuka	Zambia	SC, CC and BO
Tuesday 28.02.2012		Travel to Choma Fieldwork in Choma	Zambia	SC, CC and BO
Wednesday 29.02.2012	16 – 17 hrs	Travel to Lusaka Interviews in ZNFU	Zambia	SC, CC and BO
Thursday 01.03.2012	09:00 12:00 09:00 14:00	Zambia Honey Council Zambia Dairy Association ZNFU Zambia Cotton Association	Lusaka	SC, CC and BO
Friday 02.03.2012	08:00 10:00 14:00 16:00	De-briefing at Swedish Embassy Validation workshop ZNFU Conservation Farming Unit – Peter Aagaard SCC: Göran and Martin	Lusaka	SC, CC and BO
Saturday 03.03.2012		Collating responses	Zambia	SC, CC and BO
Sunday 04.03.2012		Bo travels home Report writing		BO SC and CC
Monday 05.03.2012	10:00 12 -14 15:00	Meeting Norwegian Foreign Affairs and USAID Final team meeting Zambia Honey Council		SC and CC
Tuesday 06.03.2012	11:15	Travel home		SC
28.03.2012		Submission of draft report		
04.04.2012		Responses		
12.04.2012		Submission of final report		

Annex 5 – List of people met

ZNFU HQ Staff

#	Name	M/F	Position/Role
1	Ndambo Ndambo	M	Executive Director
2	Ellah Chembe	F	Deputy Executive Director
3	Coilard Habasimbi	M	Head - Outreach & Member Services
4	Dominic Chanda	M	Senior Economist
5	Nambwenga M Kauseni	F	Head – Finance & Accounts
6	Pride Muleya	M	Accountant
7	Mainza Chibomba	F	Economist
8	Tibone Moyo	F	Economist

ZNFU Trustee

1	Mike Beckett	M	ZNFU Trustee
---	--------------	---	--------------

Cooperating Partners and Other Agencies

#	Name	M/F	Position/Role
1	Eva Ohlsson	F	First Sec. Agric & Food Security, Swedish Embassy
2	Goran Forssen	M	Country Rep, Swedish Coop Centre
3	Martin Sekeleti	M	Study Circle Co-ordinator, Swedish Coop Centre
4	Nachili Kaira	F	Sector Advisor, Finnish Embassy
	Manner Kati	F	Finnish Embassy
6	Mbosange Mwenechanya	M	Technical Advisor, Norwegian Embassy
7	Ballard Zulu	M	United States Embassy
8	Peter Aagaard	M	Conservation Farmers Union

Commodity Associations

#	Name	M/F	Position/Role
1	Bill Kalaluka	M	Executive Director – Zambia Honey Council
2	Mcdonald Kayuuna	M	Programme Manager – Zambia Honey Council
3	Danford Simujika	M	Programme Officer – Cotton Association of Zambia
4	Jeremiah Kasalo	M	Dairy Association of Zambia

Katete DFA – Executive Members

#	Name	M/F	Hectors Under Cultivation	Position/Role
1	Elemia C Phiri	M	21	Chairperson
2	Martha C Banda	F	8	V/Chairperson
3	Rachael C Banda	F	3	V/Secretary
4	Aniya C Banda	F	4	Piggery Representative
5	Joseph Phiri	M	10	Grains Representative
6	Laiva Zulu	F	12	Poultry Representative
7	Simon Njovu	M	6	Cotton Representative
8	Richard L Phiri	M	9	Secretary
9	Goza T Banda	M	15	Oil Seed Representative

Katete DFA – Tionge Information Centre

#	Name	M/F	Hectors Under Cultivation	Position/Role
1	Limited Phiri	M		Committee Member
2	Lighten Banda	M		Member
3	Ainess Miti	F		Member
4	Felesiya Banda	M		Member
5	Maposa Mahongo Chitengi	F		Treasurer
6	Rosemary Njobvu	F		Member
7	Navilesi Banda	F		Member
8	Raphael Miti	M		Contact Farmer
9	Saizi Banda	M		Member
10	Fada Maposa	M		Member
11	Boringo Banda	M		Chairperson
12	Aliness Phiri	F		Member
13	Christine Sakala	F		V/Chairperson
14	Arone Tembo	M		Secretary
15	Landilani Zulu	M		Member
16	Sara Phiri	F		Member
17	Eneless Phiri	F		Secretary
18	Mabvuto Mwale	M		Committee Member
19	Shaundani Njobvu	M		Member
20	Millika Sakala	F		Member

Petauke DFA Executive Members

#	Name	M/F	Hectors Under Cultivation	Position/Role
1	Joseph Lungu	M	25	Secretary
2	Greenford Zulu	M	30	Treasurer
3	Wilson Phiri	M	150	Chairperson
4	Grace Mwale	F	45	Vice Chairperson
5	Chipasuka Mwale	M	26	Poultry Representative

6	Isaac Phiri	M	20	Cotton Representative
7	Anastazia Banda	F	28	Vice Secretary
8	Nyamtowa Sakala	M	20	MMASO

Petauke DFA - Nyampondolo Information Centre

#	Name	M/F	Hectors Under Cultivation	Position/Role
1	Caristo Banda	M	-	Member
2	Tinenenji Phiri	F	12	Member
3	Marien Phiri	F	7	Member
4	Zelesi Phiri	F	8	Member
5	Dorothi Tembo	F	14	Treasurer
6	John L Phiri	M	7.5	Chairperson
7	Lazarus Mumba	M	10	Member
8	Samson Banda	M	10	Member
9	Bwalya Moloti	M	11	Member
10	Sonkesani Tembo	M	5	Member
11	Moses Tembo	M	14	Member
12	Charles Phiri	M	5	Member
13	Joseph Malumbe	M	30	Member
14	Alick Phiri	M	8	Member
15	Royce Zulu	F	11	Member
16	Ezeliya Sakala	F	9.5	Member
17	Rachael Banda	F	6	Member
18	Esileli Phiri	F	5	Member
19	Matthews Banda	M	200	Member

Petauke ZNFU Staff

#	Name	M/F	Position
1	Mr M Mambwe	M	Regional Manager, Eastern Province
2	Mrs J Sakala	F	Office Manager
3	Mr H Daka	M	Field Facilitator

Petauke District Agricultural Office

1	Mr Cheelo	M	Acting Senior Agricultural Officer
---	-----------	---	------------------------------------

Petauke DFA - Chambale Information Centre

#	Name	M/F	Hectors Under Cultivation	Position/Role
1	Christopher Daka	M	6	Member
2	Fredrick Tembo	M	8	Member
3	Moses Banda	M	7	Member
4	Gedion Daka	M	6	Member
5	Sayenela Lungu		7	Member
6	Balackson Mumba	M	5	Member

7	Sangulukani Banda	M	6	Job Master
8	Stephen Tembo	M	6	Member
9	Esau Zulu	M	3	Member
10	Tennis Mwanza	M		Member
11	Sugar Tembo	M	15	Member
12	Fackson Zulu	M	14	Member
13	Paul Tembo	M	5	Member
14	Master Mumba	M	4	Treasurer
15	Sandani Mumba	M	6	Member
16	Joseph Mwale	M	4	Member
17	Fackson Phiri	M	12	Study Circle
18	Andrew Mwanza	M	6	Member
19	Odiliya Mbewe	F	4	Member
20	Anasi Phiri	F	3	Member
21	Mary Banda	F	4	Member
22	Aveless Mumba	F	6	Member
23	Daina Zulu	F	3	Member
24	Esimeli Banda	F	5	Member
25	Jogina Banda	F	3	Member
26	Elizabeth Mwanza	F	3	Member
27	Ester Mwanza	F	3	Member
28	Vainess Phiri	F	10	Member
29	Patronella Lungu	F	10	Member
30	Evalina Zulu	F	5	Member
31	Atless banda	F	4	Member
32	Tivalenji Phiri	F	16	Member
33	Dina Mumba	F	3	Member
34	Eneless Phiri	F	3	Member
35	Enala Zulu	F	6	Member
36	Christina Phiri	F	4	Member
37	Ester Muchikho	F	5	Member
38	Tusuleko Banda	F	4	Member
39	Daisy Kaduwa	F	4	Member
40	Moses Zulu	M	6	Member
41	Joffer Pingilani	M	5	Member
42	Joseph Lungu	M	10	Member

Mbala DFA – Executive Committee

#	Name	M/F	Hectors Under Cultivation	Position/Role
1	Vack Siuluta	M	15	Secretary
2	Godwin Chilela	M	16	Chairman
3	Godwell Mulwanda	M	10	Treasurer
4	Vincent manakubya	M	7	Member
5	Christopher Silutongwe	M	3	Trustee

Mbala District Government Officials

1	Mr Best Kabulembe	M	District Commissioner
2	Mr Mwenya Sikazwe	M	District Cooperatives Dev Officer
3	Mr Mwanza	M	Senior Agriculture Officer
4	Mr Chisulo	M	Crop Husbandry Officer
5	Mr Raphael Phiri	M	Town Clerk

Mbala DFA – Kakungu Information Centre

#	Name	M/F	Hectors Under Cultivation	Position/Role
1	Simusika Edwards	M	1	Member
2	Sikainda Elvis	M	1.5	Member
3	Sikainda Gershom	M	2	Member
4	Siame Cephas	M	2.5	Member
5	Simuchile Lemmy	M	1	Member
6	Nakombe Jane	F	2	Vice Chairperson
7	Naya Roida	F	1	Member
8	Sikazwe Elizi	M	4	Chairperson
9	Simuchimba Chola	M	8	Member
10	Sichula Algum	M	3	Member
11	Sikombe Golden	M	5	Member
12	Mwanakulya vincent	M	6	contact
13	Sinyangwe Masho	M	7	Member

Mbala DFA – Information Centre

1	T D Mwewa	M	8	Secretary
2	Patric Sinyangwe	M	9	Chairperson
3	Willie M Chola	M	4	Contact Farmer
4	Gelly Sichilima	M	5	Treasurer
5	John Sinyangwe	M	15	Commitee member
6	WinterFord Sintanga	M	10	Commitee member
7	Tezen Sinkamba	M	4	Commitee member
8	Robbie M Sichilima	M	8	Commitee member
9	Galileya Sikombe	M	9	Commitee member
10	Peter Sinyangwe	M	5	Member
11	Moses L Sinyangwe	M	10	Member

12	Sunday Sikombe	M	8	Member
13	C O Kafula Cliff	M	4	Camp Officer
14	Moddie Nankamba	F	2	Member
15	Vailet Namwiinga	F	3	Member
16	Charity Nakaumwe	F	2	Member
17	Grace Mayembe	F	2	Member
18	Gradice Namwinga	F	2	Member
19	Evalyne Nachitenda	F	2	Member
20	Lillian Nanyangwe	F	1	Member
21	Failing Namusukuma	F	2	Member
22	Edar Lusale	F	2	Member
23	Reginah Nanyangwe	F	2	Member
24	Florence Muchilima	F	2	Member
25	Gift Nakate	F	2	Member
26	Precious Namusukuma	F	2	Member
27	Kendrick Musukuma	M	2	Member
28	Adam Sintanga	M	4	Member
29	Wigan M Sipande	M	9	Member
30	Maick P Manza	M	2	Member

Mbala ZNFU Staff

1	Mr Moses Mawere	M		Regional Manager, Northern
2	Mr Moses banda	M		Field Facilitator

Mazabuka DFA

1	Adrian Bignell	M		Chairperson
2	L K Malambo	F		Regional Manager, Southern (B)

Mazabuka District Officials

1	Eugene Munyama	M		District Commissioner
2	Emmanuel Mulenga	M		District Market Dev Officer

Mazabuka DFA - Manyama Farmers Association

#	Name	M/F	Hectors Under Cultivation	Position/Role
1	Joseph Nkeete	M	5	Secretary
2	Geofrey M Hakayobe	M	2	Vice Secretary
3	Dailes Moonga	F	6	Treasurer
4	Amoni Shanabwato	M	3	Member
5	Benedict B Chisengele	M	4	Member
6	Royce Munkonze	F	2	Member
7	Fostina Chizunga	F	2	Member
8	Mercy Siabeene	F	1	Member
9	Agness Muukoge	F	4	Member
10	Christine Hakayobe	F	2	Member
11	G Chizunga	M	3	Member

12	Collins Monze	M	5	Member
13	Kingstone Sikachila	M	4	Member
14	Stephen Chilima	M	6	STD Leader
15	Kelvin Kashima	M	5	Member
16	Palanga Kayombo	M	4	Member
17	Bertha Malambo	F	4	Member SCO
18	Patricia Mweemba	F	4	Member
19	Ester Mpimpa	F	2	Member
20	Emmah Chisengele	F	4	Member
21	Paul M Maanya	M	5	Member
22	Sydney Chilokota	M	7	Trustee
23	Chongo Grace	F	3	Contact Farmer

Choma/Kalomo DFA - Executive

#	Name	M/F	Hectors Under Cultivation	Position/Role
1	Isaac Mashoko	M	100	Member
2	Joseph Banda	M	56	Member/ Contact Farmer
3	Request Mulwani	M	690	Grain Representative
4	Keith Hasimuna	M	25	Cotton Representative
5	Jennifer Handoondo	F	30	Oilseed Representative
6	Mutinta Scott	F	985	Member

Choma/Kalomo DFA – Sibanyati Information Centre

#	Name	M/F	Hectors Under Cultivation	Position/Role
1	James Chongo	M	4	Member
2	Jameson Chilundika	M	10	Member
3	P Mwiinde	M	2	Member
4	Amited Kabanze	M	2	Member
	Sydeny Mweetwa	M	3	Member
6	Fred Mweetwa	M	4	Secretary
7	Chibambo namaubo	M	4	Member
8	Layman Chiinga	M	5	Member
9	Kemmy Chilundika	M	3	Secretary
10	Cigarette Gaula	M	1.5	Member
11	Owen Hantuba	M	2	Member
12	Builder Hantulobo	M	1.5	Member
13	Paul Namwanza	M	2.5	Member
14	Peter Haakaloba	M	3.5	Vice Chairperson
15	Edward Mungowa	M	1.5	Member
16	Mess Siachokwe	M	2	Member
17	Brazzwell Siachokwe	M	2	Secretary
18	John Siabwete	M	5	Member
19	Joe Sikwibele	M	3	Member

20	Andrew Simangwe	M	6	Chairperson
21	Joel Sichilembe	M	4	Chairperson
22	Jerome H Chisoka	M	4	Treasurer
23	Karki Hangandu	M	5	Chairperson
24	Pharaoh Siamuda	M	3	Chairperson
25	Donald Chilundika	M	3	Chairperson
26	Clever Chilundika	M	2	
27	D. Kalimbiko	M	5	Chairperson
28	Stia Banda	M	2	
29	B M Chimbwali	M	5	Secretary
30	S Sizyoongo	M	6	Treasurer
31	Stephen Ngala	M	2	Clerck
32	Daniel Buumba	M	5	Member
33	Phinius Hamabwe	M	6	Member
34	Daniel Chikomo	M	2	Member
35	Deacon Choonga	M	2	Member
36	Prince Malumbe	M	3	Chairperson
37	Richard Nchimba	M	5	Member
38	Acklely M Moonga	M	5	Member
39	Fellow Munkombwe	M	1.5	Member
40	Simeon Chibolelo	M	2	Member
41	Brian Haamabwe	M	2	Treasurer
42	G. Machisi	F	3	Farmer
43	B. Siabbwete	F	1	Farmer
44	E. Ndila	F	1	Farmer
45	N. Nasilele	F	2	Farmer
46	N. Kanchwe	F	3	Farmer
47	Julia Mukwi	F	2	Farmer
48	S. Hamutete	F	2	Farmer
49	Enosi Hamakanda	F	2	Farmer
50	Q. Chitombwe	F	1	Farmer
51	A. Habasila	F	2	Farmer
52	E. Mwalusaka	F	3	Farmer
53	R. Musanje	F	3	Farmer
54	L.Muleya	F	2	Farmer
55	D. Hang'andu	F	3	Farmer
56	Carolyn Nyowana	F	2	Member
57	Tidorah Muchindu	F	2	Member
58	Lotirah Siamutete	F	3	Member
59	Lweendo Mweetwa	F	1	Member
60	Gift Munsanje	F	1	Member
61	Iness Mudenda	F	1	Member
62	Anna Munsanje	F	1	Member
63	Florence Mudenda	F	2	Member
64	Matildah Mwiinde	F	2	Member

65	Mary Lukona	F	2	Member
66	Caroline Hang'andu	F	1	Member
67	Queen Chongo	F	1	Member
68	Violet Jongwe	F	2	Member
69	Emmah Katema	F	2	Member
70	Annie H Lubinda	F	3	Member
71	Dorothy Mweemba	F	4	Member
72	Eneles Dombalomba	F	3	Member
73	Lister Lungu	F	3	Member
74	Eneles Muwe	F	3	Member
75	Joyce Kanaile	F	2	Member
76	Charity Banda	F	3	Member
77	Sinmahombe	F	1	Farmer
78	S.Tembo	F	2	Farmer
79	C. Hantuba	F	2	Farmer
80	M. Simasinti	F	2	Farmer

Choma/Kalomo DFA - ZNFU Staff

1	Mwaka Kayula	M		Regional Manager, Southern (A)
2	Hardley Mwenya	M		Field Facilitator

Annex 6 - Categories of farmers

Table 1. Categories of agricultural producers in Zambia¹⁵				
	Approximate number of farms, Households	Approximate farm size, Ha	Technology and labour	Market orientation
Small-scale farmers	800.000	Less than 5, majority cultivating 2 or less	Hand hoe, minimal inputs, household labour	Primarily home consumption
Emergent farmers	50.000	5 -20	Oxen, hybrid seed and fertiliser, few with irrigation, mostly household labour	Home consumption and cash crops
Large scale commercial farmers	700	50 - 150	Tractors, hybrid seed and fertiliser, some irrigation, hired labour	Maize and cash crop
Large corporate operations	10 farms	1000+	Tractors, hybrid seed and fertiliser, irrigation, hired labour	Maize, cash crop, vertical integration

Table 2 Average hectares cultivated by the farmers in the interviewed groups	
Katete DFA Executive members	9,8
Tionge IC (Katete DFA)	No data
Petauke DFA Executive members	43
Nyampondolo IC	20,7 (one had 200 Ha)
Chambala IC	6,1
Mbala DFA Executive members	10,2
Kakungu IC	3,4
Other IC	4,7
Mazabuka DFA Chairman	No data
Manyama IC	3,4
Choma/Kalomo DFA Executive members	314
Sibanyati IC	2,8

¹⁵ Adapted from The World Bank 2005

Annex 7 - Prioritised achievements in policy lobby and advocacy

Listed prioritised results of lobby and advocacy work

From the DFA level:

- ZNFU lobbied for increase in maize prices
- Cancelling of the district councils' levies on crop produce
- Inclusion of members in the Farmer Input Support Programme (FISP), which is normally distributed through the Cooperative Unions
- Facilitated access to the LIMA Credit Scheme
- In some districts the DFA was warehouse managers of the Food Reserve Agency (FRA) that purchased most of the maize produced in the last two seasons. In these districts they also facilitated that the buying points came closer to the farmers through satellite depots
- Several cases of DFAs voicing farmers' needs to other actors such as district councils and traders
- Negotiation of cotton prices
- Mobile services for HIV treatment
- Health clinics

Major results according to senior management staff at ZNFU Headquarters

- An annual increase of taxes on land of 1000% was cancelled, which was probably made by mistake in the first place
- Small scale farmers' increased access to inputs and rural finance through participation in the FISP
- Council levies on agricultural produce were cancelled – a battle over livestock levies is still underway
- Getting DFA Chairmen on the DDCCs and representatives on the DACs
- Strengthening DFA by training on leadership roles and joint action and on how to engage government
- Representation in the Agribusiness Chamber

Annex 8 - Unintended impacts of the maize market and ZNFU's role

Findings regarding the unintended impacts of the Government interventions in the maize market and ZNFU's role in this

The small scale members clearly link the high maize price to ZNFU lobbying, whereas ZNFU senior management states that they have not discussed the maize price since 2008. Research sources¹⁶ see the stabilisation and the increase in maize price as a result of the FRA intervention as such. It is however beyond doubt that ZNFU in the season of 2010/2011 played a strong role nationally and in certain districts as warehouse managers, a role that contributed substantially to the income of the DFAs and therefore also has a stake in the governmental intervention in the maize market.

The bumper harvest during the last season and the FRA intervention of buying up most of it (86%) at a very high price appear to have effectively crowded out any private sector initiative for maize marketing, including possibilities to export excess maize to neighbouring countries where need existed. This has resulted in maize still remaining in large quantities in the depots now, just before a new harvest is ready. Large quantities have been damaged during the rain-season and will go to waste and the maize is finally being sold for export and to millers at a much lower price than what it was purchased for from farmers. The MTR team does not have exact figures, but it is clear that this is likely to impose a tremendous loss on the Treasury and therefore a real problem for the national economy in the coming years.

Therefore, while the intervention in the maize market may at first appear to be a way of transferring economic benefits from the state to the small scale farmers, it should be considered that this venture has serious negative impact on the national economy that may not be of benefit to the same farmers in the long run. Furthermore, there are two overarching questions related to the chances of small scale farmers to benefit:

First, the high price only benefits the 28% of small scale farmers that are better off producers and net sellers of maize¹⁷. The rest either grow only for home consumption or are net buyers of maize for their home consumption. For the latter, the high price will obviously create difficulties in the long run. It is however likely – although not proven – that

¹⁶ Mason, N.M. and Myers, R.J.; 2011; The effect of the Food Reserve Agency on maize market prices in Zambia; FSRP Working Paper No. 60

¹⁷ Ibid

a large part of small scale farmer members of ZNFU belong to the better off part of the small scale farmers that are net sellers of maize and therefore benefit from the high maize price.

Secondly, some stakeholders emphasise that the continuous governmental interference in the market is the very factor that hinders sustainable development of commodity markets and private sector investment – including financial sector investment in agriculture, and therefore discourages private sector investment in marketing infrastructure such as storage facilities, simply because the conditions are uncertain and government intervention unpredictable.

Annex 9 - Outreach services provided

Findings regarding services provided to ZNFU members

Information

The information is disseminated to farmers by a Friday Brief from ZNFU on the internet. The contact farmers can come to the DFA to collect the brief and distribute it in the ICs. Moreover, the Field Facilitators and/or executive members deliver messages, either through the contact farmers or directly to farmers, when they visit the ICs. Many farmers also receive the Monthly Magazine from ZNFU: *Zambian Farmer*.

Training

Training is conducted mostly to executive members and contact farmers, particularly on leadership and organisational management and also in relation to the crosscutting issues. There have, for example, been trainings on both gender equality and HIV counselling.

Study Circles

In most of the DFAs and ICs there are farmers who are trained Study Circle Coordinators and the DFAs have materials available on various relevant topics. The farmers thus take up topics of their interest in groups and collect the materials from the DFA and conduct the study circle on their own.

Market facilitation

ZNFU manages an SMS service providing market information for the farmers through the use of mobile phones for a small fee. In some areas these are used a lot e.g., Eastern Province and Southern, whereas members in Mbala in Northern Province state that they do not have access to the service due to problems of connectivity. A major facilitation of market access has been in districts where the DFAs have been FRA warehouse managers and therefore have ensured their members access to a favourable market for maize. Apart from that, most members mention that the market facilitation services could be stronger on other crops than maize.

As a strategy for developing the services of market facilitation for the future, ZNFU has played an important facilitative role in the establishment of commodity associations such as the Dairy Association of Zambia, Cotton Association of Zambia and Zambia Beef Association, which is the most recent. ZNFU has helped putting governance and basic management mechanisms in place and assisted in building various strategic linkages and sourcing of funds. Most of the commodity associations are still young but seems to have a good potential for further development of the market access for small scale and emerging farmers. It is important that that ZNFU at this point now develop a clear strategy for practically working with these associations in a complementary fashion.

In two districts ZNFU is, with funding from the EU Food Facility Programme, establishing so-called AgriService Centres (ASC). The aim is to establish facilities for input and output marketing and make these to become centres for agribusiness companies that will manage the premises, provide services to the farmers in the areas and pay rent to the ZNFU. The MTR team visited the centre in Choma, which is run by a consortium of companies called Farmarama. The consortium consists of six agribusiness companies that currently start out with sale of different types of inputs to the farms. The future plan for the centre is to establish a livestock auction facility and a grain storage facility for a grain company to manage.

LIMA Credit Scheme

The LIMA Credit scheme has been an impressively successful scheme and is seen as an important and very beneficial service from the ZNFU, which implements the programme in collaboration with the financial partner Zambia National Commercial Bank (ZANACO) and other partners – mainly input suppliers. LIMA has grown from 2 DFAs with a credit exposure of ZMK600 million in 2008/2009 season, to 25 DFAs with a loan exposure of ZMK18 billion in 2011/2012. Benefiting farmers have increased from 200 to 4026 over the same period. The unique feature of the LIMA scheme is the 50% cash collateral on all loans which farmers are required to deposit in an account with ZANACO.

LIMA beneficiary farmers have raised cash deposits of USD1.8 million in the 2011/12 seasons. The LIMA scheme has recorded a 100% recovery rate, a feature not common with agricultural loans, especially small-scale.

The DFAs visited during the review had all been part of the LIMA. The farmers were all satisfied with the services provided by ZNFU within this. For the Regional Managers and the Field Facilitators, the scheme assisted in stretching their resources due to the extent of work that comes with the service.

The farmers saw the LIMA as one of the most important services provided by ZNFU. The access to farm inputs was the main reason for this. Farmers see the LIMA as supplementary to the relatively small packages from the FISP, which in many cases are their only chance to get proper seeds and fertilizer. The LIMA farmers were getting their farming inputs on time, but this was due to the fact that the Regional Managers had put in a lot of lobbying effort for this to happen. The LIMA farmers have in some places not been paid for their maize, which means that they cannot repay their LIMA loans.

The farmers consistently complain that the input credit is only for maize production and not for other crops or farming equipment. They find the interest rate too high in comparison with other financial service providers' interest rates. In the discussions, farmers express the need for a better choice in terms of financing institutions. Farmers often think that if they were able to gain the right to title deeds they could use them as collateral for small bank loans for farm inputs.

The capacities of DFA's are heavily stretched, having large areas to cover with little staff. The LIMA is a heavy program for the DFA staff to handle because the workload is heavily biased to the DFA's and not the LIMA partner - ZANACO and input suppliers. The many reviews and assessments such as crop reviewing and collecting payments are a heavy burden on the time and resources of the DFA staff.

The DFAs rotate the LIMA between villages due to the limited resources available for the program.

Other services

ZNFU also has other services such as E-transport, E-Extension and a mechanisation scheme "on the shelf", but none of the MTR focus group mentioned that they accessed or made use of these. The MTR team assumes that the services are either used by other user groups or still so new that they are not yet in full operation.

Annex 10 - Challenge in harmonisation of practises

Challenge in harmonisation of practises of financial reporting and disbursement of funds

The JFA defines in clause 4.26 the frame for reporting and communication from ZNFU to the donors to be through progress reports and financial reports connected to bi-annual meetings – one in July and one in October. To ensure a smooth flow of funds, the clause 6.34 describes the pre-requisites for the disbursement:

“The disbursements will be done semi-annually. The pre-requisite for the first disbursement is an approved annual work plan and budget for the year 2009. For subsequent disbursements, approved Progress report and Financial statement for the preceding period is required. In the subsequent years, progress report and a satisfactory Annual audit report are required.”

From discussions with the partners it was found that the practice is different from what is outlined above. The current practice, as described by the donor group, is as follows:

First disbursement is made at the start of the year based on the Annual work-plan and budget and final audit report/ management letter of the previous year which would have been approved by the ZNFU council in October and sent to the JFA partners the previous year. E.g., for this year 2012 the first disbursement was based on the Annual Work-plan and budget for 2012 and the 2010 final audit that were received in October 2010. The second disbursement is made mid-year after submission of the draft audit report of the previous year and semi-annual report and financial statement. For instance in June the donors will receive the draft audit report for 2011 and semi-annual progress and financial report for 2012. In October 2012 the donors will then receive the final audit report for 2011.

This practise is in line with clause 8 of this same agreement, but not with the donor's requirements for disbursements as per clause 6 and also not with Zambian law, in which it is required that financial statements of an organisation are audited by 31st March of each year. The donors' difficulty with this is therefore that they need to make the second disbursement based on the final audited report, not just the draft audit report.

Annex 11 - Brief Analysis of ZNFU Strategic Plan

#	Area	2007 – 11 Strategic Plan	2012 – 16 Strategic Plan	Comment
1	Overall Strategic Objective	To develop an effective and efficient organization that is able to satisfy its members, using its own resources - Appropriate institutional structures - Appropriate members services and provision mechanisms - Appropriate resource mobilisation	“a union with strong leadership and organizational structures that effectively and efficiently serve its membership, while fully exploiting its income generating capacity” - consolidated lobby and advocacy function; - enhanced services and support to members - enhance gender and HIV/AIDS mainstreaming and environment conservation - improve the Union’s investments and asset base needed for its sustainability	The shift is towards objectives of Core Support There is a lot more specific reference to the CSP objectives, and an effort to quantify anticipated results (in similar fashion to CSP log frame)
2	Mission	to promote and safeguard the interests of members as farmers, individuals, corporations/companies and other organizations involved in the business of agriculture and related activities in order to achieve sustainable economic and social development	“Promoting and safeguarding the interests of members as individual farmers, corporations/companies, purveyors and other organizations involved in the business of agriculture in order to achieve sustainable agriculture, economic and social development.”	The change was meant to make it “more inclusive and make it to primarily aim at fostering the achievement of sustainable agriculture, before stimulating economic and socio development”
3	Vision	ZNFU became a true membership organization - driven by its members, and whose members were satisfied with and confident of ZNFU services and organizational structures as well as mechanisms guiding the Union’s leadership and Management	“A vibrant, inclusive, influential and self-sustaining nationwide Union, with capacity to sustain its members’ aspirations”	The 2012 – 16 Strategy has a more clearly articulated vision
4	Institutional Development	Very little discussion on M&E	Administration is located under OMA in the Strategic Plan, yet ZNFU has recently moved it to Finance & Accounts. Investment management has been tasked to Finance & Accounts. M&E Process represented in a Log-frame approach. Big improvement from previous	It is not likely that Finance & Accounts has capacity to provide the required leadership in investments. Best may be a committee on which Finance is also a represented There is really still no clearly defined function & system for M&E
5	Cross-cutting Issues	Little discussion	Mentioned as a specific area for ZNFU action	Mainstreaming is mentioned in the log-frame, but ensuing discussion suggests little on activity or actual mainstreaming

Annex 12 – Inception Report

1. Overall scope of the evaluation

The evaluation is a midterm review (MTR) of the ZNFU Core Support Programme that is running from 2009 to 2013. The midterm review was planned for 2011, which means that it is rather late for a midterm review but it is still possible to use as a basis for some adjustment the programme, particularly for making recommendations to the partners of the JFA for the longer term perspective regarding eventual continued support and to ZNFU and regarding their future strategy and planning.

The MTR was supposed to inform the next strategic planning for ZNFU. The strategic planning of ZNFU for 2012 - 2016 has however already been undertaken, so the MTR will rather make comments and recommendations to the draft Strategic Plan considering the findings from the MTR.

The assignment furthermore includes reviews of two other programmes: The Lima Credit Scheme and the Market Based Agricultural Support Programme (MASP), which are proposed. Considering the timeframe and budget for the present assignment, these additional programmes cannot be fully assessed as programmes on their own, which would have required a separate review of the MASP. They will be assessed within the perspective of how they potentially complement the CSP. For the Lima Credit Scheme, a review has been undertaken and the findings and recommendation from this will be incorporated in the recommendations of the MTR. The MTR will assess the potential relevance of MASP in relation to synergies with CDP and present recommendations in relation to this.

The assignment starts with a brief inception period, which has the purpose of clarifying the users and their intended use of the evaluation in order to ensure that the MTR is appropriately focused according to the expressed needs of these users. The MTR team has prepared the methodology based on this.

During the inception period, the required documents have been collected, a briefing meeting has been conducted at the Swedish Embassy with the JFA partners and an inception meeting has been conducted at ZNFU HQ with senior representatives of ZNFU, DFAs and JFA partners.

2. Clarification of users and intended use of the evaluation:

According to the TORs, the purpose of the assignment is to assess the results and effectiveness and efficiency of the support provided under the ZNFU Core Support Strategic work plan and provide recommendations about eventual adjustments in the short as well as the long term.

One group of users are decision makers among the JFA partners, the Swedish Embassy, The Finnish Embassy and Swedish Cooperative Centre in Zambia. They see the MTR to be a little late for re-adjusting the support, but would like to learn more about how the new strategy aligns with the CSP and with the findings of the MTR. This will be for making

decisions regarding the mode of future support. The partners would also use the recommendations of the MTR for revisiting the financing agreement in order to align and harmonise procedures to fit suit all the partners.

The Swedish Cooperative Centre Is a partner in the JFA, moreover it has a commitment to also provide technical assistance to the CSP. There is therefore an expectation that this role is considered in the review to support decisions regarding this further development. The Finnish Embassy specifically want to use the MTR for making decisions regarding the proposed roll out of the Lima Credit Scheme and the Swedish Embassy has a similar need for informing decisions regarding the proposed MASP.

- ZNFU is an important user of the evaluation. They see the CSP to be a new and unique way of funding an organisation and therefore see the evaluation as an opportunity to learn and document what the effect is of this mode of financing. The organisation is concerned with the priority areas and would like to use the MTR for making more informed decisions about how to use resources most efficiently, particularly in terms of the lobby and advocacy work and service provision – where the most important results have been for their members. They also want to use the MTR as an input to their decisions regarding their growth strategy in relation to improving financial sustainability.

3. Focusing the evaluation

The MTR will focus on the following evaluation areas:

- Overall programme
- ZNFU research, lobbying and advocacy outreach
- Farmer's access to demand driven member services
- Gender and HIV sensitive agro-initiatives and environmental conservation/climate change mitigation among members
- CSP management, organisational and institutional arrangements

The evaluation criteria used will be according to the DAC standard: Relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability. This means that sustainability in terms of capacity and finance will be assessed within all the areas, but overall recommendations will be provided.

It should be noted that results and impact of the implemented activities so far are preliminary and the present evaluation will mostly concentrate on identifying outcomes and judging more on the trends towards results. The time and budgetary limits of this assignment mean that a real impact study as part of the MTR is not possible. The MTR will make use of the available data from the monitoring system developed in a few district by SCC together with ZNFU and collect the stakeholders' perceptions and views of contribution towards objectives, i.e., improved food security, farm incomes, employment opportunities, poverty alleviation, agricultural productivity and competitiveness of small scale farmers.

For the overall programme, the evaluation will assess the log frame with regard to the needs and aspirations of the stakeholders, how the CSP has contributed to strengthening the capacity of ZNFU and the DFAs and Commodity Associations and how the trends of results towards impact are.

For the policy research, lobby and advocacy, the evaluation will identify achievements and successes in influencing policy at national and district levels and assess the relevance and outcomes of these to the target group members as far as possible looking at short and long term effects. It will moreover be assessed how ZNFU engages with other actors and platforms for policy influence and also how the actual policy work corresponds with the ZNFU ideology and the expressed needs and priorities of the target group.

For the farmers' access to demand driven services, the evaluation will identify achievements and successes in the service provision and assess the perceived outcomes for the target group. It will also be assessed how the provided services have responded to the needs and priorities of the target group just as the mechanisms for securing the demand drive will be assessed.

For the mainstreaming of crosscutting issues: Gender equality, HIV/AIDS and Environment/climate change, the achievements and successes will be identified. It will be assessed how the actual activities respond to the needs of the target group and the perceived outcomes determined. The MTR will also look at this in the perspective of how the activities have contributed to mainstreaming in the organisation structures.

For the area of organisational and managing results capacity, the division of responsibilities between the partners will be assessed and the efficiency and effectiveness of the financial management and flow of funds as well as the programme planning and monitoring system will be assessed.

Regarding the expectation from SCC mentioned above that their role in technical assistance to the CSP will be included in the review, the MTR will consider this role and provide overall recommendations. It may however not be realistic to make a thorough particular review of SCC's contribution in terms of technical assistance.

4. Evaluation approach and methodology

The MTR will use an appreciative approach, which identifies the best of what has been done (achievements and successes) and the outcomes of this along with analysing the factors that have made this possible – this is in order to be able to provide recommendations that are future oriented in that they will take forward the best practices. This will however be combined with thorough discussions with the target group as well as other stakeholders of how they have benefitted from the successes, and here gaps will be identified and related to the potential and capacity for the organisation to fill the eventual gaps.

The evaluation will use a combination of focus group discussions with target group members, Executive DFA council members, DFA staff and interviews with regional managers, senior ZNFU staff, and if possible ZNFU board members. It will moreover consult with a number of commodity associations such as:

- Cotton Association of Zambia
- Dairy Association of Zambia
- Zambia Export Growers Association

Corporate members such as Zambia Sugar and other actors such as:

- MUSIKA
- Conservation Farming Unit
- CAADP Focal point
- EU Food Facility Action

The MTR will moreover consult with other donors active in the agricultural sector through interviews. This will for example be USAID and EU.

The time schedule for the MTR is attached as annex 1.

The Evaluation Matrix, describing the evaluation areas, questions, indicators and method or source of information is found in annex 2.



EXTERNAL REVIEW OF CORE SUPPORT UNDER JOINT FINANCIAL AGREEMENT TO ZAMBIA NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

The present report is an external Mid Term Review of the Core Support Programme (CSP) by Sida, the Government of Finland, and Swedish Cooperative Centre (SCC) of Zambia National Farmers Union's (ZNFU). ZNFU has through the Core Support made strong overall achievements of organising farmers as the membership has increased to encompass 71.000 farmers of which the majority are smallholder. The organisation has developed an effective voice for farmers but need to identify a more strategic policy focus. The services provided by ZNFU are highly appreciated by members, and bottom up planning and flow of information ensure relevance and demand drive. But capacity to deliver services is overstretched. Crosscutting issues do not get sufficient attention.

The MTR concludes that the CSP has strengthened the organisation. The concept has lessened the administrative burden that would otherwise be connected with financing from three different donors. It has however, been a challenge to harmonise the reporting with the donors' different requirements for disbursements. The MTR recommends that core support to ZNFU continues and makes recommendations for adjustments for the last part of the programme period and suggests areas of adjustments for future programming.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: S-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

Postgiro: 1 56 34-9. VAT. No. SE 202100-478901

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

