

General Issues Regarding Matching Grants

Stakeholders were asked on their general perceptions on matching grants. The following is a summary of the issues that came up:

- (i) There was inadequate thought given to the appropriateness of project interventions, for instance, there was not much consideration given to the source of project inputs – such as who would supply what, from where and when?;
- (ii) Value chain analysis was not done that would have informed input requirements at various stages/levels;
- (iii) Inadequate farmer training in technical issues/inadequate thought on technical backstopping of farmers – evidenced by the various technical challenges groups faced, and;
- (iv) The assumptions were not given much thought – as evidenced by unstructured cash-flow. Deliberate measures should have been put in place deal with erratic financial flows.

Matching Grant Application Process

Beneficiary farming groups were asked what they felt about the application process of the matching grants. Their responses are summarized below:

- (i) The form was too difficult (English is hard and the form involves lots of paper-work), the application form is lengthy and very involving;
- (ii) Linked to the above point, those who found it easy, were either retirees or hired someone to do it for them hence had to part away with money (one community had to pay someone K2,500 to fill in their form and complained that it was expensive);
- (iii) Approval process is too long;
- (iv) Linked to the above point, once application forms were launched, there was no feedback given in terms of what was going on (not even letting the group know whether the form was wrongly filled in or not);
- (v) The matching contribution is not always easy to mobilize

Perceptions on procedures for improving application process for the matching grant were also solicited from beneficiary groups whose responses are summarized below:

- (i) Application forms should be in local language for farmers to understand more easily;
- (ii) Farmers should be trained on how to apply for the grants by having separate, deliberate and specific sessions for that purpose;
- (iii) Time for approval of the application form should be reduced;
- (iv) Funding should be in time, and;
- (v) Clarity should be given on which offices receive application forms instead of taking forms to wrong places as has been the case.

Respondents were asked what works well in the process of applying for a grant. The following were cited by the stakeholders:

- (i) Advertisements on radio and notice board at the district veterinary offices were helpful in providing information about the grants;
- (ii) The help received from veterinary assistants on how to apply was helpful.

Beneficiary Perceptions on Benefits

Beneficiaries were asked about what they perceived to be benefits which had accrued to them from matching grants. The perceived benefits were as follows:

- (i) As farmers they had acquired additional livestock leading to increased animal population in their respective areas;
- (ii) Animal diseases had reduced during the implementation of the project;
- (iii) They had additional income to share which had helped the farmers even get farming inputs;
- (iv) Farmers had received training/capacity building in livestock production;
- (v) Farmers now had linkages with livestock input suppliers such as those dealing in vaccines, drugs, dip, etc. and;
- (vi) Farmers had received veterinary services through the project.

Beneficiary groups were also asked on how the matching grant services could be improved. Their perceptions are summarized below:

- (i) More frequent visits to farmer groups by Veterinary Assistants;
- (ii) More training of farmer groups in animal husbandry;
- (iii) Better facilitation of field officers (with fuel and other logistics) to enable them to more effectively offer their extension services;
- (iv) Build households for Veterinary Assistants at community level to reduce what is paid to them for their transportation, and;
- (v) Increase number of field officers.

The Most Challenging Sub-project

Out of the four sub-projects that were supported under matching grants, the one which had the most challenges is pig production. The key challenges related to pig production cited by stakeholders were:

- (i) Poor husbandry – basic management practices were largely not followed such as scrubbing the floor of the piggery pens twice a day - though piggery units are supposed to be constructed with clean water within a radius of 100 meters, this was not the case;
- (ii) Many pigs were emaciated due to the poor feeding regime, some pigs (including piglets) were seen scrounging for food outside piggery pens;
- (iii) The disease burden was quite high partly due to non-compliance to the vaccination schedule, leading to high mortality, and;
- (iv) The piggery project was allowed even in areas with very inadequate market for products such as Western province.

Additional Services Related to Matching Grants

Farmer groups were asked to cite any additional services which would improve the performance of the community sub-projects. The following were the key areas that were cited:

- (i) Training in artificial insemination (AI);
- (ii) Technical and financial support towards construction of store room for feed;
- (iii) Training in animal health;
- (iv) Training in improved animal breeds;
- (v) Training in animal husbandry (involving the various targeted animal types);
- (vi) Provision of foot and mouth vaccines, and;
- (vii) Heightened support towards animal disease control.

Stakeholder groups were asked about how they hoped to sustain project activities beyond the project life. A summary of practical steps cited on sustainability is presented below:

- (i) Start pass-on so that benefits get down to individual members, where the pass-on has already been started, it should be accelerated;
- (ii) Value addition ventures such as processing milk should be embarked on;
- (iii) Let all budgeted funds that have not yet been disbursed to the various projects be disbursed;
- (iv) Continuation of training;
- (v) Improving livestock breeds, and;
- (vi) Open savings accounts so they can build solid financial base.

5.2.4 Other Matters Incidental to Matching Grants

5.2.4.1 Ownership of Target Livestock

Respondents were asked about their ownership of the targeted livestock types (i.e. cattle, pigs, goats and local chickens). In all the 4 livestock types, there were higher proportions of the target population who cited ownership of the livestock under consideration. The gap between the target and control populations was widest in case of pigs (42% compared to 27% respectively), see **Table 15** for details. This suggests that ordinarily households are not in the habit of engaging in pig production except through project influence.

Table 15: Percentage of Respondents Owning Targeted Livestock Types - 2018

Livestock Type	Target	Control
Cattle	48	35
Pigs	42	27
Goats	14	12
Local chickens	73	63

An assessment of the average number of targeted livestock types owned by responding households was also undertaken. Again, in all the four livestock types, the average number of livestock owned by the targeted population was greater than that owned by the control

population. The largest gap (of 9) was in the case of local chickens (i.e. 30 compared to 21) in favour of the target population. Similarly, the higher numbers of livestock owned by the target population compared to the control population may be as a result of the influence of the project, see **Table 16** has details.

Table 16: Average number of selected livestock owned by household at endline

Livestock type	Target	Control
Cattle	13	8
Goats	16	10
Pigs	11	9
Local chickens	30	21

An important implicit area of project concern is to increase the sources of household income, including livestock sales. In this regard, the respondents were asked about their various sources of income. Implicitly, the project sought to increase the proportion of the targeted population who sold their livestock as this would translate into increased household income. Out of all the four sources of income cited by the respondents (see **Table 17**), the gap between the target and control population (in percentage terms) who cited various sources of income was widest in case of sale of livestock (43.6% compared to 26.8%). This may be as a result of the influence of the project (see **Table 17** for details).

Table 17: Percentage Respondents who Cited Selected Sources of Income - Endline

Income source	Target	Control
Sale of livestock	43.6	26.8
Sale of rain-fed crops	60.1	51.1
Gardening/Irrigated agriculture	29.9	25.5
Beer brewing	1.6	1.2

An assessment was undertaken regarding the proportion of responding households who sold various targeted livestock types in the past 12 months. In percentage terms, more households under the target population sold each of the four livestock type under focus than those in the control population. The widest gap was in case of local chickens (51.3% compared to 43.7% - which translates to 7.6 percentage points in favour of the target population), followed by cattle (35.5% versus 29.3% - a gap of 6.2 percentage points). Goats were third (51.6% compared to 45.9% - a difference of 5.7 percentage points), see **Table 18**.

The positive results in favour of the project beneficiary population across all the four targeted livestock types may be linked to the contribution of the project.

Table 18: Percentage of respondents who sold various livestock the past 12 months (endline)

Livestock type	Target	Control
Cattle	35.5	29.3
Goats	51.6	45.9
Pigs	52.6	48.1
Local chickens	51.3	43.7

6. EFFICIENCY

6.1 Cost-efficiency of Activities

Efficiency is an economic term which signifies that the intervention uses the least costly resources possible in order to achieve the desired results. This generally requires comparing alternative approaches to achieving the same outputs, to establish whether the most efficient process has been used.

However, due to a number of factors including inadequate time, it was not possible to undertake a comparative analysis relating to alternative approaches of similar projects. This required the Review Team (RT) to carefully study various similar projects as the LDAHP within the country and beyond and examine each project's output and the approach employed to achieve that particular output. A quick review of projects in the livestock sub-sector with similar objectives as LDAHP showed that no similar project has been undertaken in Zambia. Consequently, this meant looking elsewhere beyond the country's borders which as noted above needed more time.

6.2 Timely Achievement of Objectives

The LDAHP has four objectives as highlighted above. The four objectives relate to: prioritization of technologies that reduce livestock mortality particularly among young stock; improvement of reproductive efficiency in livestock to accelerate the attainment of optimum slaughter weight; supporting rehabilitation of animal production and veterinary services through provision of equipment, rehabilitation or construction of critical public or community infrastructure and; improvement of producers' access to services by encouraging the formation of groups and providing essential livestock infrastructure among others.

The review of each one of the four objectives shows that the level of achievement at Mid-Term was far much below expectation, justifiably so on account of a number of factors that were beyond the project's control. For instance in a number of cases farmer groups had just gotten their funding; others had just started to construct infrastructure; while others still were yet to procure animals or had just done so, and hence it was unrealistic to expect the project to achieve reasonable results at mid-term. The four objectives clearly require adequate passage of time for their fruition. Based on the Review Team's judgment, the estimated level of achievement relating to each one of the objectives at mid-term was less than 20%. The expectation was to have at least not less than 35% achievement level at mid-term.

7. SUSTAINABILITY

7.1 Sustainability Measures

A review was undertaken related to the existence of the exit strategy that had been put in place to facilitate sustainability of project activities. There was no clearly defined exit strategy that was noted. The key sustainability issues identified that had been incorporated into the project were: (i) Implementation of the project through existing structures; (ii) Inclusion of a matching grant;; (iii) Provision of extension/capacity building, and; (iv) Incorporation of environmental considerations in the project document at design stage. Each of these is discussed below in succession.

7.1.1 Implementation through Existing Structures

The design of the project took into account sustainability issues relating to the use of existing structures for project implementation. This was done in two major ways. *First*, the project is being implemented through the Ministry of Fisheries and Livestock Development structures at national, provincial, district and community levels. This was aimed at promoting ownership of project activities as the Ministry would incorporate project activities into its Annual Work Plans and Budgets at various levels of implementation. Though presently the financing of project activities is primarily through the project, this is expected to increasingly change to government funding as the project draws to its end, with full government funding expected after project phase out.

Second, the implementation of the project through farmer groups/cooperatives was meant to primarily address sustainability issues. The idea was to enhance the capacity of the farmer groups/cooperatives through the implementation of project activities as the groups would be expected to gain knowledge, skills, expertise and experience. With such knowledge, skills, expertise and experience, the groups would be strategically positioned to source any project funding from different sources, including the banking sub-sector. The latter would be more desirable in terms of promoting project sustainability relating to financing.

7.1.2 Matching Grant

The design of the project required communities through their farmer groups/cooperatives to provide at least 25% matching grant in terms of labour, local materials (e.g. sand and stones) in case of construction projects. This was aimed at promoting project ownership by community members. Though this was not strictly adhered to on account of inadequate monitoring and appraisal of farmer groups/cooperatives who had applied, the concept was designed in good faith.

The project design allowed farmer groups/cooperatives to select viable projects that would facilitate income generation aimed at improving the financial base of the farmer groups. Eventually, the individual members of these farmer groups/cooperatives were expected to benefit from the improved financial resource base of their respective groups/cooperatives. Though most of the projects that were under implementation were ill-planned and implemented thereby prompting serious questions relating to their sustainability, nonetheless, the idea of financing Income Generating Activities was in good faith.

7.1.3 Provision of Extension/Capacity Building

The project design included provision of extension to farmer groups/cooperatives, targeting selected strategic improved technologies that would enhance productivity and production levels of smallholder livestock farmers. This was meant to enhance the skills base and knowledge of smallholder livestock farmers to enable them appreciate the value of project interventions. This was expected to further lead to improved adoption rates of technologies that would make a difference in terms of their positive impact on smallholder livestock productivity and production levels, thereby further translating into increased household income and eventually improved livelihoods. However, the Endline Review Team notes inadequate training of extension staff.

7.1.4 Environmental Considerations

As part of the design of the project, an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) was prepared which outlined a screening process to facilitate an effective identification of environmental and social impacts arising from the anticipated increase in animal population and the construction of infrastructural subprojects in order for the impacts to be appropriately mitigated against. The appropriate monitoring and management measures that were incorporated as part of the ESMF included the following:

- (i) checklists of potential environmental and social impacts and their sources;
- (ii) recommended procedures for participatory screening of proposed activities at the subproject sites and their environmental and social aspects;
- (iii) institutional arrangements for mitigating, preventing, and managing the identified impacts;
- (iv) recommendations for a typical environmental management planning process for addressing negative externalities in the course of project implementation;
- (v) the proposed system for monitoring the implementation of mitigation measures; and
- (vi) recommended capacity building measures for environmental planning and monitoring.

The above measures are deemed adequate environmental considerations for the LDAHP to fulfill its environmental sustainability if these processes are to be implemented as envisaged.

8. CONCLUSIONS AND LESSONS LEARNT

8.1 Conclusions

7. Project management and coordination had a number of challenges which contributed to the limited project performance.
 - (i) The project office in Lusaka at times transmitted money directly to the farmer groups, without the knowledge of the provincial and livestock coordinators. Such a system gave an opportunity for farmer groups who had not met the benchmarks to access funds; and also made it difficult for the district coordinators to monitor implementation of the activities because by the time the district coordinator was made aware, money would already have been spent;
 - (ii) There was no baseline data collected at the beginning of the project implementation upon which to base the assessment of the impact of the project on disease control and livestock productivity;
 - (iii) There was poor communication between the provincial office and the district office. Sometimes activities would be happening in the district without the knowledge of the district stakeholders;
 - (iv) The district focal points reported excessive delays in receiving feed-back from the coordination office in Lusaka, and;
 - (v) Interaction between the district focal point person and the farmer group was limited because of lack of logistical support. Most focal point persons complained of not having fuel for the vehicles and motorbikes.
8. Most sub-projects have performed below expectation for the following reasons.
 - (i) Funding was largely late on average by 1 year after application. For instance, some groups have not yet received funding from the second call. They are being advised that they cannot get any money because the project has ended;
 - (ii) A number of groups cited high inflation from the time they applied for funding up to the time they got funding. This reduced what and how much they could procure;
 - (iii) Stakeholders at subnational level (provincial and district) were not adequately involved in the implementation of project activities (Ministry of Livestock players). Most of them went as far as sensitizing the farmers. They were not involved in the final selection of successful projects for funding even though they knew better in terms of which groups had the capacity to successfully implement the projects.
 - (iv) Inadequate cooperative management skills: the concept of a cooperative was not well understood;
 - (v) There was poor record keeping by most farmer groups;
 - (vi) Weaning-off period for community level sub-programmes was too short given the delays in the commencement of sub-project activities, and;

- (vii) Those farmers who provided land to the cooperatives wanted to have an upper hand in the operations of the cooperatives and in some cases ran the project like a single ownership enterprise
9. The process of accessing matching grants was generally a challenge for the majority of farmer groups.
- (i) The proposal forms were too difficult for the groups. Only the retirees or those who had someone who had sufficient education managed. Some groups had someone to help out with preparing the proposal (some of whom were demanding 5% of the budget);
 - (ii) Those groups who were successful, a number of them failed to perform to expectation because they did not have the pre-requisite knowledge in livestock;
 - (iii) Communities liked the matching grant model for the following reasons:
 - a. They were able to access funding which they would not otherwise have managed to obtain from a commercial bank on account of demands for collateral in case of commercial banks;
 - b. They felt this model gave them some sense of ownership because they had to contribute something either in cash or kind, albeit with some struggles sometimes. In general, they were happy with the mode of contribution given that it was not restrictive to cash, hence there was some flexibility.
10. Sustainability is premised on a weak foundation.
- (i) Most of the groups do not have sufficient benefits to sustain or propel going forward. A considerable proportion of groups were still waiting for animals to come to their community (e.g. 3 groups in Mazabuka and 1 group in Kaoma – their animals have just been procured and are still under quarantine). Other groups (e.g. 3 groups in Kafue just have a slab in terms of the structure for piggeries).
11. There are a few success stories which underscore the fact that given more time, the project would have delivered considerable benefits to communities and consequently to the beneficiary households. For such projects to be clearly notable, a three year no cost extension would have been ideal.
- (i) Most of the groups that were successful were primarily women groups. On the other hand, more than 90% of the groups whose membership is predominantly male have not been successful. Examples of women groups that have been successful:
 - a. Garry Bruce Women's Multipurpose Cooperative in Kabwe, a group which produces close to 70 trays of eggs a day from over 2,000 layers (got funding from the second call). They have had enough resources raised to construct a second chicken run to create more space (41 birds died due to trampling), they also sank a borehole using proceeds from the project. The group intends to increase the number of layers by almost double. The group currently has over ZMW 50,000 in the bank. The group wants to

- further expand the business before they can start providing benefits to individual members.
- b. Kabwadu Women's group in Kafue was the first group in the district to finish construction of the goat improved housing. They were funded for 105 goats. Currently they have 300 goats. Their account has been very stable and healthy. Their expansion plan is to make more cooperatives under them in order to have the wider community benefit.
 - c. New Kafue Cooperative. They do broilers. They started with 600, now they have 1,000.
12. The matching grant model through farmer groups is a good model. However, for it to be successful it needed to have the following characteristics:
- (i) Strong farmer groups with active members who understand the basic principles of a cooperative and how it functions;
 - (ii) An effective Monitoring and Evaluation system at community level (through the Veterinary Assistant); at district level (through the Focal Point person); at provincial level as well as at national level;
 - (iii) Farmer groups and their respective members needed to have been adequately trained in technical issues related to livestock production;
 - (iv) The matching grant application process needed to be easy and short;
 - (v) Funds needed to be disbursed timely.

8.2 Lessons Learnt

8.2.1 Project Management and Coordination

- (i) The project was not advertised well enough to allow farmer groups in distant areas from veterinary districts to access the formation;
- (ii) The application form should be simplified to ensure that the target group, who in most cases had no advanced education, understands and completes the form with ease;
- (iii) The bureaucratic procurement procedures and lengthy disbursement of funds delayed project implementation resulting in non-completion of several infrastructural projects;
- (iv) Monitoring and evaluation was not well structured. It lacked mechanisms to detect and make timely intercessions when the implementation of activities either slowed down or deviated from the designed plan;
- (v) The personnel at low structural levels such as veterinary assistants and Livestock officers should have been trained and assigned roles to supervise the projects since they are in daily contact with the community level;
- (vi) Generally the project model was rated to be good, but was not implemented according to the plan, especially the livestock production component;

- (vii) Since it was easy to spend money on disease control activities such as procurement of vaccine and disbursement of field allowances for staff; this disadvantaged infrastructure construction given that it is normally slow moving, and;
- (viii) Most of the district contact persons were veterinarians who at times did not have technical skills to guide farmer groups on matters related to livestock production.

8.2.2 Matching Grants

- (i) The application process should have been streamlined to shorten the processing periods; and simplified for easy understanding;
- (ii) The identified beneficiary groups should have some experience in livestock production;
- (iii) Cooperatives which had been formed earlier and had been functional performed relatively better than those that were formed just to access the matching grant resources;
- (iv) There was need to put in place measures to verify the validity of the pledged 25% matching funds from the cooperatives given that this was not forth-coming in a number of cases;
- (v) Leadership/governance at cooperative level was a major contributor to success or failure of the matching grant;
- (vi) Pig production projects should have been done by cooperatives with enough pig rearing skills and stable financial base;
- (vii) Projects should have been approved for cooperatives based on their previous experience in the enterprise they wished to invest;
- (viii) A system should have been put in place to compel cooperatives to access technical assistance at critical stages of project implementation such as construction of animal housing and purchase of livestock. Ordinarily, this could have been linked to disbursements to force all the groups to comply;
- (ix) There was need to invest in pasture production to support other livestock enterprises with stock feed;
- (x) The design of the project should have included youths, whose involvement was not adequate;
- (xi) Enough technical manpower should have been enrolled, trained (including livestock veterinary assistants and Livestock assistants) and facilitated to provide technical support to the beneficiaries;
- (xii) Capacity building in cooperative governance was needed prior to commencing of the implementation of sub-project activities;
- (xiii) There should be penalties for cooperatives failing to utilise the funds properly such as blacklisting and prohibition from accessing funds in the future. For instance, CEEC has implemented some measures such as grabbing properties belonging to defectors;
- (xiv) There is need to train Livestock Assistants and Veterinary Assistants to perform artificial insemination so that they can assist dairy farmers more effectively;

- (xv) There is need to get a qualified person to help chose animals before purchase, and;
- (xvi) With adequate management and technical support, small scale farmers groups and individual farmers can rear exotic cattle breeds such as Friesian and Brahman.

8.2.3 Disease control

- (i) Baseline data on disease profiles and livestock populations should have been collected at the start of the project as part of preparation for impact assessments;
- (ii) Approval of certain livestock projects located in disease endemic areas such as piggery in Eastern province where Swine Fever is endemic should have been avoided;
- (iii) Adequate vaccines for NCD, FMD and CBPP should have been provided according to schedules;
- (iv) Veterinary support service during and after project period should have been planned for and facilitated to assure survival of livestock;
- (v) An exit-strategy for disease vaccination meant to prepare the farmers should have been put in place long before the project phased out;
- (vi) Farmers should have been asked to contribute even a small amount towards vaccinations. The mentality of thinking that Government should provide free things was observed to be prevalent and was making farmers not to be responsible for their livestock health, and;
- (vii) There are not enough quantities of vaccines to cover the targeted population and meet the planned vaccination frequency.

8.2.4 Infrastructure development

- (i) The slow pace at which infrastructural projects are implemented require good prior planning including a well-thought through financial disbursement plan. This would lessen the temptation of re-directing resources to disease control activities which was the quickest activity to spend money on given the limited project implementation period;
- (ii) Linked to the above point, funds ear-marked for infrastructure development should be ring-fenced to avoid the temptation of spending such resources on activities that were initially not money for such monies;
- (iii) The project should have incorporated some caveats to allow project extension, and;
- (iv) In terms of sustainability ranking, the dairy projects were ranked highly, followed by goats based only on those in the first call. Those in the second call were difficult to assess because they had not yet purchased the animals.

Appendices