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1. Background and rational of the program
   a. Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

In this regard, two value chain analyses and market analyses undertaken in the Programme Inception Phase generated an informed understanding of how the two market systems function and identified key sector competitiveness factors and inter relationships with key market players and facilitators that need to be further developed to address these challenges.

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

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

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

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

- **Priorities 1, “Production and productivity improvement in crops, livestock and fisheries” and 2, “Food and nutrition security improvement”, within FAO’s country strategy**

The Programme is funded by the Government of Sweden through a Standard Administrative Arrangement (ILO-Sweden Financing Agreement) signed on 29th August 2013 in which it was agreed that Sweden would finance the Joint Programme to the sum of the USD equivalent of SEK 46,075,000. An initial twelve (12) months Inception Phase was implemented from 1st September 2013 to 31st August 2014, for which USD 2,639,232 was disbursed. Subsequent funding for a thirty six (36) months Implementation Phase was approved by SIDA after submission of an Inception Phase Report in July 2014 and positive outcome of review meeting between main Programme Partners.

**b. Program snapshot**

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

2. Project Management
   a. Implementation arrangement

The programme is jointly implemented by ILO and FAO in consultation with the tripartite ILO constituents: Government of Republic of Zambia; employers (Zambia Federation of Employers) and workers (Zambia Congress of Trade Unions).

ILO HQ also acts as Administrator of the project funds and passes on a prescribed portion of the overall budget to FAO. The project implementation team comprises staff from both ILO (5) and FAO (2) sitting within the ILO Lusaka offices under the leadership of an ILO Chief Technical Advisor (CTA).

The ILO Director is the principle staff responsible for programme implementation. The CTA supervises the staff, allocates programme budgets, prepares progress reports, maintains programme relations with institutional partners, elaborates the final programme document and develops work plans.

A Project Steering committee is established, chaired by the Ministry of Youth, Sport and Community Development with representation of other relevant GRZ Ministries (Agriculture; Livestock and Fisheries; Commerce Trade and Industry, Labour and Social Security; the ILO Social partners (ZFE) and ZCTU); SIDA and the heads of ILO and FAO.

The project is directly backstopped by the Decent Work Team (DWT), ILO Pretoria and in particular the Specialist on Job Creation and Enterprise Development, and at HQ level by the Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) unit of the Enterprise Department. The project also draws on technical expertise from the FAO HQ in Rome and the FAO Regional office in Harare.

b. Program approach and methodology of delivery

The program follows making markets work for the poor (M4P) approach. The approach basically seeks to play a facilitative role to unlock the systemic constraints that are prohibiting the young poor’s gainful participation in the market. By playing a facilitative role to act on key systemic constraints, the program supports market actors to innovate and act in the market so that all the parties involved will benefit from the market sustainably.

Thus Yapasa emphasises the facilitative role, sustainability and systemic solutions and works with the market actors that have legitimate roles in the market system. These actors might be the public and
private agencies as well as the associations, research institutions and other representative bodies assuming a key role in the market.

In order to avoid market distortionary effect of traditional development programs Yapasa has partnered with Private players in the market and has been working closely with key government agencies as a project collaborator. The project supports its ultimate beneficiaries, or rather active participants through the partner market players.

The Yapasa programme was set up to operate in two phases; first an inception phase to identify appropriate sector and subsectors for projected impact on youth employment, enterprise and food security followed by an experimental pilot and scale-up phase to test innovations in the selected market systems through small scale pilots followed by scale up to spread the innovation throughout the market system. The programme is innovating and expanding to achieve the set objectives by adopting the learning in the pilot phase.

3. Purpose, scope and justification of the evaluation
   a. Purpose of the evaluation

   The aim of evaluation in ILO and FAO is to support improvements in the program and policies and to promote accountability and learning. The independent mid-term evaluation serves two main purposes:

   i. To independently assess progress to date of the project across the four Major components (outcomes); assessing performance as per the foreseen targets and indicators of achievement; strategies and implementation modalities chosen; partnership arrangements, constraints and opportunities in Zambia;

   ii. To provide strategic and operational recommendations as well as highlight lessons to improve performance and delivery of project results. This includes assessing whether the strategies and tactics adopted by the programme are appropriate to the project environment, both internal and external, and the economic context in which the programme is working

   b. Scope of Evaluation

   The independent evaluation covers entire aspects of project including the project environment, project organization, project relevance and efficiency of resource utilization and effectiveness. Above all, sustainability and contribution to broader sectoral impact are crucial. The evaluation will assess all key results that were to have been produced since the start of the project.

   Apart from these technical aspects it also covers organizational and managerial aspects including appropriateness of the design of the program and its strategic fit with the implementing organizations for Zambia, implementation arrangement of the program and its value addition to the implementing organizations and also the appropriateness of the program approach and framework in the economic context of the Zambia. So this evaluation is expected to look largely into:

   - Project achievements and progress towards achieving the programme targets
   - Adherence to the plans of key stakeholders including the Government, donor and the private stakeholders (market players specifically) as well as ILO and FAO within the UN country team.
• Adherence to the systemic approach adopted by the program, M4P approach for the program delivery in line with the DCED standard for results measurement (for which a separate audit will be conducted shortly after this evaluation)
• Prospects for replication and sustainability of the interventions
• Strategic fit of the program for ILO, FAO, SIDA and government stakeholders in the host country
• Relevance, feasibility and desirability of the innovation planned through the intervention
• Influence of the intervention over donors, development communities and other development collaborators
• Existence and use of the project management system including, result measurement, change management, risk management etc.
• Strategic analysis of the program in terms of analysis of internal factors (strengths and weaknesses) as well as external factors (opportunities and threats)

c. Timing of the Evaluation

The independent evaluation of the program and its performance and progress is long overdue. It was originally planned for August 2015, after the first pilot, but in agreement with SIDA it had been agreed to defer it initially to January 2016, then later to after the soya harvest season (August 2016) by which time there would be more results from the ground to evaluate.

4. Clients for evaluation

The primary client for this evaluation is the Embassy of Sweden, as the donor, and Government of Republic of Zambia as the recipient government. In addition, the two implementing UN agencies; Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and International Labour Organization (ILO) are the major clients for evaluation both for the progress of the programme itself and for the organisational learning on the use of M4P approaches to systemic market change within UN systems. ILO and FAO offices and staff involved in the project (project staff, departments at HQ – in particular The ILO Lab (a special project within ILO, supporting DWCPs around the world to adopt M4P approaches), the technical backstopping department and the Regional Office for Africa (ROAF) will use the findings of the report. Tripartite constituents and other parties involved in the execution of the project would use, as appropriate, the evaluation recommendations and lessons learnt.

5. Evaluation criteria and questions

The evaluation will cover the following evaluation criteria:

a) Relevance and strategic fit of the program
b) Validity of M4P approach, design and strategies adopted by the program
c) Project progress and delivery of results
d) Efficiency of resource use, set up and value for money
e) Organisational Management arrangements
f) Impact orientation and sustainability as defined in ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation¹.

¹ ILO policy guidelines for results-based evaluation: Principles, rationale, planning and managing for evaluations, 2012
Gender concerns will be based on the ILO Guidelines on Considering Gender in Monitoring and Evaluation of Projects (September, 2007). The evaluation will be conducted following UN evaluation standards and norms\(^2\) and the *Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results-based management* developed by the OECD’s Development Assistance Committee (DAC). In line with the results-based approach applied by the ILO, the evaluation will focus on identifying and analysing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation concerns and the achievement of the outcomes/immediate objectives of the project using the logical framework indicators.

6. **Key Evaluation Questions**

In line with the results-based approach applied by the ILO, the evaluation will focus on identifying and analyzing results through addressing key questions related to the evaluation criteria and the achievement of the outcomes/objectives of the project using the indicators in the logical framework of the project. The evaluator shall examine the following key issues:

**A. Relevance and strategic fit of the program,**

- to what extent is the project relevant/consistent to the development priorities for Zambia’s agricultural sector in the Revised 6th National Development Plan
- To what extent is the project relevant to Sweden’s results strategy (2013-17), the ILO DWCP of Zambia and country assistance strategies of FAO for Zambia?
- Is the project relevant to achieve the targets set in the Decent Work Agenda for Africa (DWAA) and ARM conclusions?
- To what extent does the project complement and fit with other on-going Swedish initiatives, ILO and FAO programmes and projects in the country?
- Is the intervention an appropriate solution to the development problem at hand? Does it target the main causes of the problem?
- Is the intervention consistent with the livelihood strategies and living conditions of its target group? How urgent is it from the point of view of the target group?

**B. Validity of M4P approach, design and strategies adopted by the program**

- Is the project right to apply an M4P approach in the current thin-market context in Zambia?
- What have been the advantages/disadvantages of implementing the programme as a joint ILO/FAO programme?
- Has the design appropriately defined outcomes, outputs and performance indicators and targets?
- Was the project design realistic?
- How have gender issues have been addressed in the project document?

**C. Project Progress and delivery of results**

\(^2\) ST/SGB/2000 Regulation and Rules Governing Programme Planning, the Programme Aspects of the Budget, the Monitoring of Implementation and the Methods of Evaluation
• To what extent have the expected outputs and outcomes been achieved or are likely to be achieved in relation to its results framework or operational objectives?

• To what extent can the identified results be attributed to the activities of the Project intervention?

• Were outputs produced and delivered so far as per the work plan/results framework?
  • Has the quantity and quality of these outputs been satisfactory?
  • How do the stakeholders perceive them?
  • Do the benefits accrue equitably to women and men?

• In which area (geographic, component, issue) does the project have the greatest achievements so far? Why and what have been the supporting factors?

• Do observed innovations, if any, have potential for replication? Are there any unintended results of the project?

• What can be done to make the intervention/programme more effective

D. Efficiency of Resource Use

• Could ILO and FAO’s work have been implemented with fewer resources without reducing the quality and quantity of the results? Could more of the same results/outputs have been produced with the same resources?

• Was the intervention economically worthwhile, given possible alternative uses of the available resources? Should the resources allocated to the intervention have been used for another, more worthwhile, purpose?

E. Organisational Management Arrangements

• Are the available technical and financial resources adequate to fulfil the project plan?

• Is the management and governance arrangement of the project adequate? Is there a clear understanding of roles and responsibilities by all parties involved?

• How effectively has the project management monitored project performance and results? Is a monitoring & evaluation system in place and how effective is it? Is relevant information systematically collected and collated? Is the data disaggregated by sex (and by other relevant characteristics if relevant)?

• Is the project receiving adequate administrative, technical and - if needed - political support from the implementing organizations (ILO and FAO)? Does the program get necessary support from the implementing organizations in Zambia and their headquarters?

• Is the project receiving adequate political, technical and administrative support from its national partners?

• Are all relevant stakeholders involved in an appropriate and sufficient manner?

• Do ILO and FAO administrative and financial rules and regulations enable the implementation of an M4P approach and do admin and finance turnaround times facilitate a quick response to market opportunities?
F. Impact Orientation and Sustainability

- Is the programme strategy and programme management steering towards impact and sustainability?
- Is the intervention compatible with a sustainable use of natural resources? Or is it harmful to the natural environment?
- Are requirements of local ownership satisfied? Did agricultural stakeholders participate in the planning and implementation of the intervention?
- Is the technology utilised in the intervention appropriate to the economic, educational and cultural conditions in the partner country?

G. Lessons Learned

- What good practices can be learned from the project that can be applied in the next phase and to similar current and future projects?
- What should have been done differently, and should be avoided in the next phase of the project or other similar projects?
- Have interventions been designed to consider learnings from within the project or from other projects within Zambia or using the market systems approach?

7. Methodology

The evaluation will be carried out through a desk review and field visit to some of the project sites to meet the market player partners and beneficiaries. Meeting and consultations with ILO and FAO management and staff, ILO technical back stopper of the program ILO-LAB in Geneva, Representatives of SIDA and the concerned government agencies will be undertaken. Evaluation team will develop checklist for the consultation, ensuring the key evaluation questions are covered and undertake thorough discussion with these agencies.

The independent evaluation team will review inputs by all ILO/FAO and non-ILO/FAO stakeholders involved in the project, from project staff, constituents and a range of partners from the private sector and civil society.

The draft evaluation report will be shared with all relevant stakeholders and a request for comments will be asked within a specified time (not more than 5 working days). The evaluation team will seek to apply a variety of evaluation techniques – desk review, meetings with stakeholders, focus group discussions, field visits, informed judgement, and scoring, ranking or rating techniques. Subject to the decision by the evaluation manager a guided Open Space workshop with key stakeholders may be organised in Lusaka.

- Desk review

A desk review will analyse project and other documentation including the approved Program document. The team will also review various technical backstopping reports and relevant program documents including the intervention guides, Annual and semi-annual reports provided by the project management and Field and Technical Backstopping offices (ILO-Lab). The desk review will suggest a number of initial findings that in turn may point to additional or fine-tuned evaluation questions. This
will guide the final evaluation instrument, which should be finalized in consultation with the evaluation manager. The evaluation team will review the documents before conducting any interview.

- **Interviews with ILO and FAO staff**

The evaluation team will undertake group and/or individual discussions with project staff in Lusaka, Zambia. Considering the joint implementation modality of the program, the evaluation team will also meet with both relevant ILO and FAO staff.

Since ILO has taken responsibility of overall administration of the program, the evaluation team will interview key staff responsible for the project administration including financial management, administrative management and communication. Apart from the Officials in Lusaka office, the evaluation team will also discuss with the technical backstopping officials both at the DWT in Pretoria and at HQ level such as the SME unit, including the lab. The project management team will furnish a list of the individuals to be interviewed in ILO upon the request from evaluation team committee.

- **Interviews with key stakeholders in Lusaka**

Evaluation team will interview the key stakeholders including those representing the steering committee of the program and other important stakeholders including business membership organizations, relevant government bodies. The evaluation manager and the project management unit will furnish the list of all stakeholders to the evaluation team. The evaluation team will select respondents based on proper sampling technique from the list.

- **Interviews with the project participants**

Evaluation team will also meet with the project participants including the market players and beneficiaries to understand their feeling about the project results and approach adopted by the program. The project team will provide the list of interviewees.

- **De-briefing**

After the data collection and before producing the first draft report, the Evaluation team will present initial comments at a de-briefing session to a group including the ILO and FAO Country Directors, project management team, Project Steering Committee and SIDA.

**Main Outputs**

1. Inception report (with detailed work plan and data collection instruments)
2. A concise Evaluation Report (maximum 25 pages) as per the following proposed structure:
   - Cover page with key project and evaluation data
   - Executive Summary
   - Acronyms
   - Description of the project
   - Purpose, scope and clients of the evaluation
   - Methodology
   - Clearly identified findings for each criterion
   - Conclusions
   - Recommendations
   - Lessons learned and good practices
   - Annexes:
     - TOR
     - Project Data Table on Project Progress in achieving its targets
     - Project Work plan: Level of completion of key activities
- List of Meetings and Interviews
- Any other relevant documents


All draft and final outputs, including supporting documents, analytical reports and raw data should be provided to the evaluation managers in electronic version compatible with Word for Windows.

Comments from stakeholders will be consolidated and incorporated into the final reports as appropriate, and the Lead Evaluator will provide a response to the evaluation managers, in the form of a comment matrix (comments log), including explanations as to how comments were addressed or why any comments might not have been incorporated.

While the substantive content of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the report shall be determined by the Evaluation Team, the report is subject to final approval by ILO in terms of whether or not the report meets the conditions of the TOR.

8. Management arrangements, work plan & time frame

- Evaluation team

The evaluation team will consist of one international evaluation consultant and one independent national consultant, who will accompany the international evaluator in the Zambia. The international consultant will be the team leader and will have full responsibility for the evaluation report. The team leader will be responsible for resolving any outstanding disagreements that may arise between the two evaluators. The team leader will work closely with the evaluation manager as needed to produce and submit one evaluation report in accordance with the deliverable schedule and contract specifications. S/he will be a highly qualified senior evaluation specialist with extensive experience from evaluations and ideally also the subject matter in question: Youth Entrepreneurship and Decent work creation. The national consultants will have particular experience in the areas of Agriculture and youth and food security with very high degree of understanding of the Zambian economy and society. Both the consultants should have an understanding of the Market System Development approach to development particularly the M4P approach. Consultants should have good understanding of the DCED standard for result measurement and should be familiar with the ILOs Policies for evaluation. The evaluation team will agree on the distribution of work and schedule for the evaluation and stakeholders to consult.

- Evaluation Manager

The evaluation team will report to the evaluation manager (Mr. Gugsa Yimer Farice, farice@ilo.org) and should discuss any technical and methodological matters with the evaluation manager should issues arise. The evaluation will be carried out with full logistical support and services of the Decent Jobs for Youth and Improved Food Security through the Development of Sustainable Rural Enterprises (YAPASA) Project, with the administrative support of the ILO Office in Lusaka. ILO chief technical advisor for the YAPASA program Mr. Steve Morris and Assistant FAO Representative (Programmes) Gregory Chilufya will support the evaluators during the mission period

- Work plan & Time Frame

The total duration of the evaluation process is estimated to be 25 working days over an 8 weeks period from 15 August to 6 October 2016.

- Evaluation Phases
The evaluation will happen in the following main phases and time period aiming for submission of the final evaluation report to the donor no later than 6 October 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Responsible Person</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>• Preparation of TOR</td>
<td>Evaluation managers</td>
<td>1- 30 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>• Identification of independent international evaluator</td>
<td>Evaluation manager</td>
<td>25 July – 8 August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Entering contracts and preparation of budgets and logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>• Telephone briefing with evaluation managers</td>
<td>Evaluators</td>
<td>11 - 19 August (7 days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Desk review of project and related documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inception report, including evaluation matrix</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation instruments designed based on desk review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>• Consultations with Project staff/management in Zambia</td>
<td>Evaluation team with logistical support by the Project</td>
<td>22 August – 1st September (9 working days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultations with ILO and FAO HQ Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consultations with stakeholders and beneficiaries of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Debriefing and presentation of preliminary findings in Zambia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>• Elaboration of draft report</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>2-9 September (6 working days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>• Draft evaluation report submitted to Evaluation Manager for quality &amp; completeness review</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>9 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>• Circulate draft evaluation report to key stakeholders</td>
<td>Evaluation managers</td>
<td>Circulate 12 September Deadline for comments 26 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consolidate comments of stakeholders and send to evaluation team leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>• Finalize the report. Provide explanation on comments that were not included</td>
<td>Evaluation team</td>
<td>27-30 September (3 working days)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>• Approval of report by EVAL</td>
<td>EVAL</td>
<td>3- 4 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>• Final report submitted to</td>
<td>Evaluation managers</td>
<td>6 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o the donor through PARDEV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Stakeholders through the ILO Lusaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this independent midterm evaluation, the final report preparation and submission procedure will be followed:

- The evaluation team leader will submit a draft evaluation report to the evaluation manager.
- The Evaluation Manager will carry out a rapid review to ensure quality and completeness of report and highlight any issue to be addressed by the evaluator if needed.
- The evaluation managers will then forward a copy to all other key stakeholders for comment and factual correction.
The evaluation managers will consolidate the comments and send these to the evaluation team.

The evaluation team will finalize the report incorporating any comments deemed appropriate and providing a comment matrix explaining how the comments were addressed and why any comments might not have been incorporated.

The evaluation team leader will submit the final report and comment matrix to the evaluation managers.

If questions or concerns remain about how comments were or were not addressed, the evaluation manager may request further explanation or response from the Evaluation Team Leader.

The evaluation manager officially forwards the approved evaluation report to PARDEV (who will submit the report officially to the donor) and other stakeholders as appropriate.

9. Key qualifications and experience of the Evaluation Team

The international consultant should have the following qualifications:

- Master’s degree in Business Management, Economics or related graduate qualifications
- A minimum of 10 years of professional experience specifically in evaluating international development initiatives in the area of skills, employment, micro enterprises, entrepreneurship, rural development and management of development programmes, preferably in Africa.
- Demonstrated expertise and capability in evaluating M4P projects.
- Proven experience with result based program monitoring and evaluation approaches and other strategic planning approaches. Hands on skills for using M&E methods and approaches (including quantitative, qualitative and participatory), information analysis and report writing is essential.
- Consultant should demonstrate the clear understanding of Market system development approach particularly the M4P approach. S/he should have at least 5 years’ experience of managing/advising/evaluating M4P projects.
- Consultant should have familiarity with the DCED standard for result measurement and ILOs result measurement and evaluation policies
- Knowledge and experience of the UN System.
- Understanding of the development context of the project country (Zambia) would be an added advantage.
- Excellent communication and interview skills.
- Excellent report writing skills.
- Demonstrated ability to deliver quality results within strict deadlines.

The National consultant should have the following qualifications:

- Master degree in Business Management, Economics or related graduate qualifications
- A minimum of 5 years of professional experience, specifically in the area of monitoring and evaluation of international development initiatives and development organizations.

- A minimum of 5 years of professional experience specifically in evaluating development projects/programmes in the area of Agriculture, food security, Decent job creation, youth employment, entrepreneurship, rural development and management of development programmes, preferably in Africa.

- Demonstrated expertise and capability in working with the private sector organizations particularly following the market system development approach.

- A track record of conducting various types of evaluations, including process, outcome and impact evaluations in Zambia and preferably in the area of Entrepreneurship, Youth empowerment and agriculture development.

- Knowledge and experience of the UN System.

- Excellent communication and interview skills.

- Excellent report writing skills.

**Expression of Interest**

Consultants are invited to submit an expression of interest to the Evaluation Manager (Mr. Gugsa Yimer Farice (farice@ilo.org)), by no later than 8th August 2016, by means of a CV, a detailed breakdown of the cost of the assignment and a note expressing previous experience and evaluations conducted which would be of relevance and added value to the assignment (no more than 3 pages). Submission of an example of a previous evaluation conducted will be off added value.