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ABSTRACT

This research aims to evaluate youth-led livelihood programs in largely informal Sub-Saharan Africa economies. It uses a sustainable livelihood framework that places low-income people at the center of poverty reduction strategies. It gives attention to qualitative aspects of deprivation, often missing in conventional monetary poverty assessments. I analyzed primary and secondary data from 133 youth-led organizations and 395 youth entrepreneurs to assess the impacts of UN-Habitat’s Urban Youth Fund and the Youth Employment Network’s Youth-to-Youth Fund on youth access to sustainable livelihood assets: physical, social, economic, human and natural assets.

This study, the first major evaluation of youth-led livelihood interventions, contributes to international development planning policy and practice in youth-led development, youth employment, sustainable livelihood interventions, and sustainable urban development planning and management. It has practical and scholarly implications for mainstreaming youth, gender and informal economies in sustainable urban development planning and management in Sub-Saharan Africa. Findings show that youth-led livelihood projects enhanced youth access to social, physical, financial, human and, to a limited extent, natural assets. Innovative, enthusiastic and dedicated youth entrepreneurs collaborated to overcome many barriers and launch youth-led microenterprises that brought together youth, community members, private and public actors. However, challenges remain: negative youth and community attitudes, inadequate
funding, and limited access to land, workspace, and startup capital, all hindered youth access to decent livelihood opportunities.

I encourage youth-led agencies to develop and strengthen partnerships with city governments to enhance youth access to land and workspace. They should also link youth entrepreneurs to wider community decision making processes to promote micro-macro linkages for integrated poverty reduction efforts. At all levels, sustainable livelihood interventions demand accountability through constant monitoring and evaluation of development projects to promote learning and evidence-based policy making.

I urge urban planners and managers to harness youth innovation and creativity through policies that enhance rather than diminish youth assets. Overall, findings depict promising youth-led livelihood projects but they also underscore the importance and urgency of collaborative long-term funding for project expansion, replication and sustainability.

The form and content of this abstract are approved. I recommend its publication.

Approved Willem van Vliet
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<td>M &amp; E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFIs</td>
<td>Micro Finance Institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPT</td>
<td>Messiah Partnership Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRU</td>
<td>Mano River Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPs</td>
<td>National Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYA</td>
<td>National Youth Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOPRA</td>
<td>Northern Patriots in Research and Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGIIS</td>
<td>Organization for Indigenous Youth Initiatives and Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORO</td>
<td>Operation Restore Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPDA</td>
<td>Polio Persons Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSPs</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Strategies Papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAYM</td>
<td>South African Youth Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPs</td>
<td>Structural Adjustment Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIDA</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLFs</td>
<td>Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLPD</td>
<td>Sustainable Livelihoods for Peace and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMEs</td>
<td>Small to Medium Scale Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEP-UP</td>
<td>Seamstresses Training Enterprise Project for Upper East Region Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUFIGA</td>
<td>Support for Income Generating Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAPEV</td>
<td>Tears Arts and Peace Empowerment Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDFY</td>
<td>Tanzanian Development Forum for Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGK</td>
<td>Tears Group Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVET</td>
<td>Technical and Vocational Educational Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Network for Community Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFPR/G</td>
<td>Support for Training and Promotion in Rural Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOJADD</td>
<td>Solidarity Youth Action for Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UJVC</td>
<td>Union Youth Volunteers of Coyah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPAP</td>
<td>Union for Agro-Pastoral Production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCRC</td>
<td>United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNECA</td>
<td>United Nations Economic Commission for Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN-Habitat</td>
<td>United Nations Human Settlements Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO</td>
<td>United Nations Industrial Development Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UYF</td>
<td>Urban Youth Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UJIV</td>
<td>Youth Union of ILO-Van</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UYOOGOD</td>
<td>Urban Youth in Governance and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VICYOMO</td>
<td>Victorious Youth Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VYF</td>
<td>Voi Youth Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAI</td>
<td>Youth Action International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEFl</td>
<td>Youth Education Foundation Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEN</td>
<td>Youth Employment Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YHFG</td>
<td>Youth Harvest Foundation Ghana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOP-CAM</td>
<td>Youth Outreach Program Cameroon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPPD</td>
<td>Youth Partnership for Peace and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YSOs</td>
<td>Youth Serving Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2Y</td>
<td>Youth-to-Youth Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

This chapter begins by presenting the global youth employment crisis and the responses at the international scale and also at the African scale. The chapter reviews the background to the increasing levels of youth unemployment in Africa including the role of urban planning systems, Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs), HIV/AIDS pandemic, educational skills mismatch and rural-urban migration. I then present the background to two of the most ambitious programs recently launched in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) in an attempt to address youth employment challenges: the United Nations Human Settlements Program (UN-Habitat)’s Opportunities Fund for Urban Youth-Led Development (Urban Youth Fund) and the Youth Employment Network (YEN)’s Youth-to-Youth Fund (Y2Y) in West Africa. I then present the impact evaluation questions that guided the study and briefly outline the significance of the study. I then define and review the key terms that are used in the study including youth, youth-led development, livelihoods, decent work, informal economy, self-employment, entrepreneurship, and low-income countries. I conclude the chapter by presenting my research journey, a brief conclusion and an outline of the dissertation.

The youth employment crisis and global response

The quest for decent youth livelihoods through self-employment, entrepreneurship, small to medium scale enterprises has jumped to the forefront of the international development agenda. Recent protests in the Middle East dubbed the Arab Spring signify the worsening plight of young people in developing communities. Youth-led protests, mostly by frustrated and unemployed youth, resulted in the collapse of political regimes in Tunisia, Egypt and Libya in 2011. The
protests quickly spread to other European countries including Spain and Greece and later as the Occupy Wall Street movement in the USA. Youth unemployment has been cited as the major cause of the 2011 unrests in the Middle East, Spain and Greece and as the fundamental force behind the Occupy Wall Street movement (International Labor Organization, 2012b). There are about 1.2 billion young people in the world today and 85% of them live in the developing world (International Labor Organization, 2012a). The youth population of Sub-Saharan Africa is expected to grow into the foreseeable future and the youth bulge will result in increased unrests and conflicts in the absence of decent livelihoods (International Labor Organization, 2012a). The 2012 and 2013 International Labor Organization (ILO) Global Employment Trends for Youth noted that youth are three times more likely to be unemployed compared to adults. According to the ILO, about 75 million youth aged 15-24 years are currently unemployed in the world, representing an increase of more than 4 million since 2007 (International Labor Organization, 2012b).

At the international scale, there have been several initiatives to address multiple youth development challenges, including youth unemployment: The 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC); the 1995 United Nations World Program of Action for Youth to the Year 2000 and beyond; the 2000 Millennium Summit yielding the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs); the 2001 Youth Employment Network (YEN) formed jointly by the United Nations, World Bank and International Labor Organization; the 2005 International Labor Conference reiterated the need for urgent and comprehensive steps to address global youth unemployment; and the 2007 World Development Report by the World Bank (Development and Next Generation) emphasizing the importance of investing in youth development taking advantage of the “shrinking window of opportunity” offered by the youth demographic dividend.
The 2007 World Development Report also stressed the need for strong partnerships in youth employment and investment and evidence-based youth policy making and programming.

Since 2008 the MDG Goal 1 (Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger) now contains a specific target “to achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all, including women and young people” (International Labor Organization, 2013a; UN-Habitat, 2013). It has been widely agreed that eradicating extreme poverty and hunger may not be met by 2015 as originally planned (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, 2011). Also in 2008, the Global Partnership for Youth Employment was formed to foster a coordinated response to the global youth employment challenge (UN-Habitat, 2010). The United Nations (UN) also began publishing its biannual World Youth Report in 2003 highlighting the socio-economic and political situation of youth in various parts of the globe. The 2011 UN World Youth Report was dedicated entirely to youth employment focusing specifically on youth perspectives on the pursuit of decent work in changing times and in the face of the global financial crisis (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2011). The UN Inter-Agency Network on Youth Development comprising 30 UN agencies was also set up to foster collaboration among UN entities whose work is relevant to youth development issues (International Labor Organization, 2012b). The UN Inter-Agency Network facilitates active youth engagement in the United Nations decision making processes. The World Bank also launched the global youth employment inventory (http://www.youth-employment-inventory.org/) as a means to share promising, best practices and lessons from diverse youth employment programs from several parts of the world.
At the regional level, several African national governments have since signed the 2006 African Youth Charter committing their countries to youth development policies and programs (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, 2011). Following the 2006 African Youth Charter, the African Union declared the years 2009-2018 as the “Decade of Youth Development” to encourage African governments to speed up youth development efforts (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, 2011). The United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (UNECA) also commissioned its first ever biannual African Youth Report in 2009 to highlight youth development priorities in the continent. At the country level, most national governments have National Youth Policies, National Action Plans (NAPs) and designated Youth Ministries addressing youth livelihood challenges in many ways (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, 2011). However, national policies, programs and youth ministries are often poorly funded and adult-driven with little input from youth (Chigunta et al., 2005; Curtain, 2004). The Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) in most countries also lack clear focus and budgetary commitment on youth employment and related challenges (Curtain, 2004). Despite being the demographic majority in Sub-Saharan Africa, youth has not been the focus of the PRSPs (Curtain, 2004).

There has also been a limited effort to integrate youth into the urban economy at the African city or municipal scale. One exception is the Warwick Junction in Durban (South Africa) where the informal economy has been successfully integrated into the Durban economy through designated zones, active public participation in land use planning processes and infrastructural service provision (Skinner, 2008). In cities such as Harare (Zimbabwe), informal youth frequently face evictions from open residential and public city spaces where they are often accused of violating the City’s bylaws and land use planning regulations (Kamete, 2008).
However, even with frequent evictions, harassment and arrests, youth continuously challenge planning authorities through overt and covert livelihood strategies (Kamete, 2010). Frequent clashes between informal youth and urban authorities are also common in several African countries including Tanzania (Kironde, 1995), Lusaka (Hansen, 2010), The Gambia and Ghana (Jones & Chant, 2009), among others. Over the years, African youth, especially male youth, have been viewed as rebels and victims ill-prepared to chart their own life and livelihood trajectories (Sommers, 2010; Sommers, 2003). However, the view of youth victims has faced spirited criticisms from scholars and practitioners who now view African youth as the greatest resource or asset for the continent’s development (Mabala, 2011; Maconachie, Binns, & Tengbe, 2011).

Despite numerous international and regional efforts launched to address youth employment over the years, few programs have yielded desired results. According to the World Bank Youth Employment Inventory, about 40% of youth employment programs do not have any impact on the intended beneficiaries (Betcherman et al., 2007). In some cases, youth beneficiaries and their communities are impacted negatively by programs imposed on them by external inter-governmental organizations (Betcherman et al., 2007). Inadequate youth participation in the design and implementation of youth employment programs has been cited as one of the reasons why most of the initiatives failed. It is against this background that some specialized UN agencies, foundations and inter-governmental organizations recently embraced the youth-led development approach in an attempt to address youth employment and livelihood challenges in developing communities. Specifically, two youth-led livelihood programs have been implemented in Africa recently—the Youth Employment Network Youth-to-Youth Fund (Y2Y) in West Africa and UN-Habitat Urban Youth Fund (UYF). This study evaluates the
utility of the YEN and UN-Habitat youth-led development approach by evaluating the impacts of selected Y2Y and UYF projects implemented by youth-led Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) mostly in West Africa. The YEN Y2Y program in West Africa and UN-Habitat UYF are each summarized in later sections after the review of youth employment challenges in SSA.

Background to the youth employment crisis in Sub-Saharan Africa

*Urban spatial planning, evictions and youth livelihoods*

As a result of strict zoning and land use planning regulations, informal youth livelihoods are generally illegal in most African cities (Hansen, 2010). The informal economy is considered dirty, as the continued adherence to colonial urban planning systems means clean and modern or global cities free of informal economic activities and resembling Western city standards (UN-Habitat, 2009a; Watson, 2009). Outdated colonial-based land use planning systems persist across SSA despite urgent calls for an adaptive and more flexible urban land use planning approach that accommodates the informal economy (Watson, 2009). In rural areas, elders control vast pieces of land and youth often find it difficult to access rural land for agricultural and non-agricultural livelihood activities (Bennell, 2007). Females typically acquire land only in the event of a husband’s death. Rural youth livelihoods are heavily dependent on access to land but land sizes are increasingly smaller due to rapid population growth and urban expansion (Bennell, 2007). Female youth are generally excluded from access to land due to gender discrimination and future marriage expectations. In some SSA cities, rural-urban connections have become stronger as urbanites engage in peri-urban agriculture as a means to supplement meager salaries from formal and informal employment activities (Chirisa & Muchini, 2011; Tacoli, 2003). As more and more urbanites engage in informal livelihood activities, urban evictions have increased over the years. Children and youth are often the most affected by mass and sporadic evictions (Hansen, 2010).
With evictions, youth lose home- and street-based livelihoods. Urban evictions result in loss of physical, social, political, cultural and financial capital. In urban SSA, most poor youth often live in slum areas where they have limited employment opportunities and infrastructural services to conduct viable informal employment activities (UN-Habitat, 2010). The challenge of youth employment programs is to facilitate youth access to secure land for informal activities.

**Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) and the informal economy**

In Sub-Saharan Africa, Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) adopted in the 1980s resulted in massive retrenchments of workers in both public and private sectors (Owusu, 2007; Potts, 2008). This occurred as governments embraced economic liberalization policies centered on reduction in public expenditures tied to a limited role of government in national development and failed private sector expansion in economic development activities. Reduced government expenditure was one of the conditions for developing countries to qualify for International Monetary Fund (IMF) or World Bank loans. The result was the urbanization of poverty from the 1980s in most African countries (Potts, 2008). Following SAPs, it became increasing difficult for inexperienced youth migrants from rural areas to find jobs in urban areas (Porter, Hampshire, Mashiri, Dube, & Maponya, 2010). Consequently, a majority of African urbanites, including youth and women, resorted to informal livelihoods. Lack of formal employment in public and private sectors meant that the informal economy became an alternative option for unemployed youth. In the informal economy, youth work long hours, lack social protection and often lack the ability to organize to demand better working conditions and support from municipal authorities (Chigunta, 2001a; Chigunta, 2001b; Chigunta, 2002; Chigunta, Schnurr, James-Wilson, & Torres, 2005).
In most cases, informal youth workers do not have access to secure workspace or land on which to conduct their informal livelihood activities (Hansen & Vaa, 2004; Sommers, 2010; UN-Habitat, 2010). Informal youth workers also lack access to financial capital to expand their Small to Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs) due to limited collateral (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2011). Youth informal activities are often illegal, unregistered and they lack land tenure security or licenses that can be used as collateral to secure loans and credit from Micro Finance Institutions (MFIs) (Betcherman, Godfrey, Puerto, Rother, & Stavreska, 2007; Cling, Gubert, Nordman, & Robilliard, 2007).

**Skills mismatch, HIV/AIDS pandemic and rural to urban migration**

Formal SSA educational systems inherited from former colonial governments, mostly Britain and France, prepare youth graduates for non-existent or limited formal sector employment (Chant & Jones, 2005; Chigunta, 2002; Cling et al., 2007). As such, there has been a mismatch between skills taught and available jobs. Technical Education and Vocational Training Programs (TVET) implemented by national governments in collaboration with international development agencies, NGOs, and the private sector have also contributed to worsening youth employment challenges in most parts of Sub-Saharan Africa (Chigunta et al., 2005). The TVET continue to focus on narrow and specialized vocational training programs that tend to restrict employment opportunities available to youth after graduation (Chigunta et al., 2005; Cling et al., 2007). Informal employment is generally despised and hence the continued focus on the more respectable formal employment training programs. In most cases, youth are trained for formal sector employment but they often end up in the informal economy where they lack entrepreneurial skills and experience for decent livelihoods compared to adults. Some youth often work for family members or they can start Small to Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs)
where they often earn little to no income despite working for long hours (International Labor Organization, 2005). Informal youth workers, therefore, comprise the majority of the working poor in rural and urban Africa, where they earn $US2 or less per day (International Labor Organization, 2012b). The challenges faced by youth in Africa are centered on unemployment, under-employment and poor working conditions (International Labor Organization, 2012a; International Labor Organization, 2012b).

The HIV/AIDS pandemic has also meant that more and more children and youth become heads of households and this increases pressure on young people as they are forced to engage in multiple livelihood activities to feed themselves and their families (Chant & Jones, 2005; Chant & Evans, 2010). The HIV/AIDS pandemic has also meant that more and more youth drop out of school to engage in informal livelihood activities where there is easy entry and little to no experience required. Such uneducated and inexperienced youth are often trapped in the informal economy where they perpetuate the vicious cycle of poverty in low-income communities.

Continued rural-urban migration has also meant intense competition for fewer jobs in cities (Hansen, 2010; Jones & Chant, 2009). More and more youth are flocking to cities in search of better education, employment and personal development opportunities (Sommers, 2010). Ironically, as more and more youth flock to urban areas and informal employment, poverty reduction efforts continue to focus on rural agricultural development activities and shrinking formal employment training programs (Sommers, 2007). Even so, there are not enough livelihood programs targeting youth in rural Africa and there have been limited youth-specific employment programs in urban areas (Sommers, 2007). Worse still, the few programs that do
target youth generally lack meaningful participation of youth in their design and implementation (Sommers, 2007).

The Opportunities Fund for Urban Youth-Led Development (Urban Youth Fund)

Acknowledging youth as central actors in sustainable urbanization effort and the achievement of the MDGs, the Urban Youth Fund (UYF) was launched by the UN-Habitat Governing Council (Resolution 21/6) in 2007 (UN-Habitat, 2009a; UN-Habitat, 2009b). The overall goal of the Urban Youth Fund is to advance the achievement of the MDGs and the Habitat Agenda (UN-Habitat, 2009b; UN-Habitat, 2009c). The UYF was officially launched at the 4th World Urban Forum in Nanjing, China. Previously, the 3rd World Urban Forum in Vancouver stressed the need for increased access to resources and support structures for youth-led initiatives (see UN-Habitat, 2006). The first round of the UYF was launched in 2009 and it awarded youth-led organizations considered to have the most innovative youth livelihood and development projects, grants of between $US5,000 and $US25,000. Among other things, the Urban Youth Fund has the following objectives (UN-Habitat, 2009b):

- Piloting innovative approaches to youth employment, good governance, adequate shelter and secure tenure;
- Facilitating vocational training and credit mechanisms to promote entrepreneurship and employment for young women and men;
- Promoting gender mainstreaming in urban youth activities; and
- Mobilizing young people to help strengthen youth-related policy formulation.
Given the main objectives of the Urban Youth Fund, successful youth-led projects focus in at least one of the following areas or primary goals (UN-Habitat, 2009b):

- Youth entrepreneurship, youth businesses, vocational training, employment creation for youth and access to credit for youth;
- Youth access to adequate shelter and secure land tenure;
- Establishment of youth networks for sustainable urban development;
- Establishment of partnerships between youth groups and local government and/or private sector that contributes to sustainable urban development and;
- Mainstreaming of gender in urban youth-led development, particularly the inclusion of girls and young women in male dominated sectors; and
- Youth participation in decision making, politics, urban planning or community development;

The UYF directly targets registered urban youth-led NGOs, community-based youth organizations, youth welfare or support groups and student organizations run by and for youth aged 15-32 years. The targeted youth-led organizations are those working in towns and cities with at least 10,000 inhabitants and the end beneficiaries are young women and men needing assistance the most and especially those from urban slum areas (UN-Habitat, 2009b; UN-Habitat, 2009c). The UN-Habitat UYF is a competitive grant scheme for youth-led organizations from all parts of the world but this study focuses on youth-led organizations and projects from Africa, particularly those from West Africa, to enable comparison with the YEN Y2Y in West Africa.
The Youth-to-Youth Fund in West Africa

The Youth-to-Youth Fund (Y2Y) in West Africa is a joint program of the Youth Employment Network (YEN) and United Nations Industrial Development Cooperation (UNIDO). The Youth-to-Youth Fund grant program in West Africa aims to promote the active participation of youth-led organizations in youth employment creation in the Mano River Union (MRU) countries, namely Sierra Leone, Cote d’Ivoire, Guinea and Liberia (United Nations Industrial Development Organization & Youth Employment Network, 2011). The pilot round of the program was launched in 2008 as part of the “Multi-stakeholder Program on Productive and Decent Work for Youth” with support from the World Bank, Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) and Government of Japan. The MRU countries are generally referred to as “no job economies”, that is, countries where available jobs fall far below the number of people seeking jobs and most youth are necessity entrepreneurs as opposed to opportunity entrepreneurs. According to United Nations Industrial Development Organization & Youth Employment Network (2011), the Y2Y program has three main objectives:

- To build the capacity of youth-led organizations and enable youth to move from being passive recipients to become active participants in the promotion and creation of youth employment;

- To facilitate the testing of new innovative ideas and approaches that enable young people to gain experience and decent employment as start-up entrepreneurs; and

- To learn from lessons and significantly expand on approaches and innovative ideas that work
The Y2Y program provides grants of between $US5,000-$20,000 to youth-led organizations considered to have the most innovative youth employment ideas to benefit youth aged 15-35 years. Successful youth-led organizations are also given capacity building support before and during project implementation. In most cases, grantees use the grant to offer comprehensive training to youth beneficiaries including technical and soft skills and entrepreneurship (United Nations Industrial Development Organization & Youth Employment Network, 2011). The Youth-to-Youth Fund in West Africa targets the most vulnerable youth who were denied access to basic education and decent jobs by decades of political conflicts in the MRU countries. Most youth in the MRU region are ex-combatants who completely lack basic skills to engage in productive self-employment or formal employment (United Nations Industrial Development Organization & Youth Employment Network, 2011). Idle youth ex-combatants pose the greatest threat to the security of the MRU region if steps are not taken to address youth unemployment (Sommers, 2003). With about 70% of the MRU population under the age of 30 years, the YEN and UNIDO grant considers MRU youth as assets or active participants capable of generating employment for themselves (United Nations Industrial Development Organization & Youth Employment Network, 2011). At the core of the Y2Y is active youth participation in youth employment through the creation of youth-run cooperatives and microenterprises. The quest for youth cooperatives through the Y2Y follows recommendations made at the 2002 International Labor Organization Conference on “Decent Work Agenda and the Informal Economy” (see International Labor Organization, 2002) and the 2005 ILO resolutions on youth employment creation (see International Labor Organization, 2005). The 2005 International Labor Conference concluded that “the development of Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs) by and for young people represents an essential source of
employment creation for youth…and cooperatives are an attractive option to many young people starting out, particularly if they are unable to enter formal employment or do not wish to do so” (International Labor Organization, 2005). The success of the Y2Y pilot phase saw subsequent rounds being launched in Sierra Leone and Guinea in 2010 and 2011. The Y2Y has also been expanded to East Africa through the Youth Entrepreneurship Facility with support from the Danish-led Africa Commission. This study evaluates the impact of the Y2Y program and projects in West African MRU countries of Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia and Sierra Leone only.

**Research questions**

As a design and planning student, I am mostly interested in evaluating the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y facilitate youth access to land or working space, social capital, and economic or financial capital for improved youth livelihoods and participation in urban planning and development processes. At the same time, I am also interested in depicting the extent to which these targeted youth challenge funds (UYF and Y2Y) reach young women and the most vulnerable youth in slum areas and to what extent youth beneficiaries benefited economically and politically from participation in funded projects. This study also seeks to highlight the fundamental differences and similarities in the UYF and Y2Y approaches to provide broad based lessons, evidence and recommendations for sustainable rural and urban youth livelihood interventions. With these goals in mind, and guided by the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework (presented in Chapter 2) where youth are viewed as central assets in development projects, the study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What has been the impact of the Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund on youth access to;
a) Physical capital (e.g. access to working space or land, infrastructural services, materials and equipment)

b) Social capital (e.g. access to social support networks, youth groups, community decision making processes)

c) Financial capital (e.g. access to start-up capital or credit, employment income)

d) Human capital (e.g. access to skills training, knowledge, health)

e) Natural capital (e.g. access to land, forests, water resources)

2. What were the main challenges faced by Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees in their quest for sustainable youth employment creation?

3. To what extent has the Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund programs facilitated youth access to decent and sustainable livelihoods in the context of informal economies?

4. What lessons and recommendations for youth-led livelihood programs can be derived from the Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund programs?

Significance of the study

The UYF and Y2Y are both recent programs aimed at addressing youth employment challenges in low-income countries using the youth-led development approach and little is known about their effectiveness of the youth-led approach as an alternative to conventional adult-driven youth livelihood programs. As such, this study comparatively evaluates the effectiveness of these two youth-led approaches to the youth employment challenge in an
attempt to provide policy and practice information for urban policy makers, international development agencies, youth-led organizations and local and national governments struggling with youth employment challenges. The study uses evidence-based strategies to stimulate collaboration, coordination and cooperation among international development agencies, policy makers and practitioners concerned with youth employment challenges in the developing world. By drawing on evidence from the UYF and Y2Y projects, the study contributes to the urgent global call for evidence-based youth development policy making, practice and knowledge sharing. To this end, I hope to publish findings from the study on the UN-Habitat Global Youth Help Desk and Global Youth Research Network (www.globalyouthdesk.org); the YEN websites (www.ilo.org/yen; http://www.yenmarketplace.org/), and World Bank Youth Employment Inventory (http://www.youth-employment-inventory.org/) website.

**Definition and review of key terms**

This section defines and review the key terms used in the study.

**Youth**

There is no universal definition as to what youth means as different countries and organizations employ different definitions depending on local circumstances and program requirements. The Y2Y program supports youth-led projects targeting youth aged 15-35 years, whereas the UYF supports organizations led by youth aged between 15-32 years even though the United Nations generally define youth as those aged between 15-24 years. The UN definition implies that youth overlaps with adolescent and extends into adulthood. The strength of the UN definition lies in its ability to capture most out-of-school youth and those facing unemployment and livelihood challenges. However, in most African countries, youth often head households before the age of 15 and others remain “young” as they fail to gain meaningful employment and
independence from their parents. As such, the African Union Youth Charter defines youth as those aged 15-35 years. For the purposes of this study, youth refers to those aged between 15-35 years to encompass both the UYF and UYF definitions and in line with the definition employed in African Union endorsed African Youth Charter.

**Youth-led development**

Youth-led development, which refers to community and business programs and projects designed and implemented by young people, has been seen as a potentially effective means for on-the-job training and considered one of the most effective strategies for passing information, knowledge and skills to young people (Youth Employment Network & United Nations Industrial Development Organization, 2011). Given adequate funding, youth-led development could translate into a bottom-up approach enabling the creation of viable businesses and social enterprises, ensuring self-sustainability, peer-to-peer support, as well as strengthening social capital and trust, a vital element in a sustainable youth employment creation (Youth Employment Network & United Nations Industrial Development Organization, 2011). Successful youth-led development often involves adults working as mentors to help strengthen the capacity of youth-led action for positive social and community change (UN-Habitat). Youth-led social enterprises can help alleviate unemployment while simultaneously benefiting the entire community. Youth-led social entrepreneurship also enables youth organizations to actively participate in youth employment projects through the implementation of innovative and creative community-based projects. Youth-led social enterprises may encompass construction and maintenance, environmental projects and youth entrepreneurship. In the YEN Y2Y, the development of youth networks and cooperatives is a central youth-led development strategy (Youth Employment Network & United Nations Industrial Development Organization, 2011).
Throughout the world, youth are responding to urbanization challenges through diverse social projects and youth-led businesses. Young people’s participation as enshrined in the 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of a Child (UNCRC) Article 12, calls for them to fully express their opinions and to have them taken into account in all matters that affect their lives. Increasingly, youth-led development has been viewed as an integral part in efforts to achieve the MDGs. Youth-led development was first used by Peace Child International and other international development organizations have since embraced and developed the concept in recent years. The UN-Habitat clearly embraced youth-led development through the Urban Youth Fund. According to UN-Habitat (2009a), the five main principles of youth-led development are as follows:

- Youth define their own development goals and objectives;
- Youth have a social and physical space to participate in development and to be regularly consulted;
- Adult mentorship and peer-to-peer mentorship are encouraged;
- Youth act as role models to help other youth engage in development; and
- Youth are integrated into all local and national development programs and frameworks

The UN-Habitat definition puts youth at the center of development projects that impact their lives and acknowledges that successful youth-led development requires physical and social space, adult mentorship and the integration of youth-led initiatives into local and national development programs. This study employs the UN-Habitat definition of youth-led development and the central principles outlined above.
Even though youth-led development is still an emerging concept, there is evidence that youth are capable of initiating and leading successful projects, especially in the area of youth employment creation and entrepreneurship. Youth-led development draws on the untapped creativity, enthusiasm and energy of youth. The concept of youth-led development is particularly useful in the context of post-conflict countries as it tends to bring youth and community members together to build peace and social cohesion. Effective youth-led development has so far been hindered by youth-led organizations’ limited financial and technical capacity. The limitations call upon adults and funding agencies to support youth as leaders and to offer full technical and financial support to youth-initiated and directed interventions. Supporting youth-initiated programs can potentially foster youth integration in local and national decision making processes and structures. Box 1 presents brief examples of successful youth-led livelihood initiatives in Africa. The youth-led initiatives presented in the box are considered successful because youth defined their own development goals and objectives and they had a physical and social space to participate in the development projects. In addition to the specific goal of creating youth employment and entrepreneurship opportunities, the youth-led initiatives also contributed to broad community development.
Box 1.1: Examples of youth-led livelihood programs in Africa

**One Stop Youth Centers**

One Stop Youth Centers are information, training and resources centers in Nairobi (Kenya), Dar es Salaam (Tanzania), Kampala (Uganda), and Kigali (Rwanda). They were originally implemented by UN-Habitat in collaboration with city councils as a means to engage youth in local government decision making processes. The centers act as important avenues for youth vocational skills training, discussion forums, employment programs and slum upgrading initiatives. At the one stop centers, youth set up microenterprises, youth credit and savings associations and community projects that seek to enhance youth employment opportunities. *(Source: http://www.unhabitat.org)*

**Restless Development**

Restless Development (RD) is an international youth-led development organization that empowers youth with leadership and livelihood skills training, information, resources and inspiration to boost sustainable livelihoods at the household and community level. In Africa, it works in Uganda, Tanzania, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Sierra Leone and South Africa. In Sierra Leone, the RD trained 487 youth in computer literacy, and in Zambia, it has reached close to 10,500 youth with financial literacy training in collaboration with local partners. Restless Development’s leadership and skills training, youth development resource centers, advocacy, policy and employment initiatives have reached over seven million young people worldwide since 1987 *(Source: http://www.restlessdevelopment.org)*

**Africa Youth for Peace and Development Waste Program in Freetown, Sierra Leone**

The Africa Youth for Peace and Development (AYPAD) is a youth-led organization that promotes environmental hygiene and youth employment creation and livelihoods through recycling and waste management projects in Freetown and other urban centers in Sierra Leone. It organizes youth into waste collection and recycling groups and the groups provide affordable door-to-door waste collection services. The various youth groups have since acquired office space using the funds that they receive from the recycling business. *(Source: UN-Habitat, 2010)*

**YouthWorks! Project in Accra, Ghana**

YouthWorks! Project is an initiative of Youth Empowerment Synergy Ghana (YES-Ghana)—a youth-led organization based in Accra. Through the project, YES-Ghana sensitizes residents on environmental cleanliness and waste management methods and benefits. It then mobilizes and offers on-job training to youth in solid waste management before equipping them with recycling tricycles that they use to conduct door-to-door waste recycling in Accra metropolitan area. Yes-Ghana also offers entrepreneurship, business development, life skills and mentoring to youth and over 150 youth have benefited from these services. Ten youth have also started their own recycling businesses after receiving training through the YouthWorks! Project.

*(Source: http://www.youth-employment-inventory.org)*
In Chapter 4 and 5, I present best practices in youth-led livelihood development using examples from the UYF and Y2Y projects analyzed in this study.

**Livelihood**

Livelihood refers to ways by which people survive and this includes their skills, assets, income and other resources. Among other goals, the UYF and Y2Y programs aim to enhance youth income, skills, health, and social networks. I use livelihood to refer to youth’s capacity to generate continuous economic, physical and social resources in the face of adverse institutional and regulatory frameworks and rigid urban development and management policies. I therefore, use livelihood to denote a much broader view of youth employment, acknowledging the multifaceted nature of youth poverty, opportunities and constraints youth face in the context of informal SSA economies (Chigunta et al., 2005). Chapter Two presents the sustainable livelihoods theoretical framework used in this study.

**Decent work**

The concept of decent work relates to employment opportunities that ensure freedom, equity, security and human dignity (International Labor Organization 2002, 2005). In most parts of the developing world, youth are mostly engaged in temporary, involuntary part-time or casual work that pays little to no income. The temporary employment activities are mostly in the informal economy where there is often inadequate social protection, rights, representation and inability to organize for higher income and better working conditions. The ILO’s decent work agenda for youth seeks to promote productive employment, social protection, rights, freedom of association and social dialogue for youth informal workers. According to the International Labor Office (2002, 2005), decent work refers to self-employment or entrepreneurship activities in which young people have access to secure working space or land, including having a voice,
legitimate representation and secure licenses and tenure for sustainable livelihood activities free from eviction and harassment from regulatory authorities. This study employs the ILO’s decent work concept.

**Project coordinators**

Project coordinators oversaw the implementation of the UYF and Y2Y projects. They were employees of youth-led organizations that received grants from UN-Habitat and YEN. The UYF coordinators are aged between 15-32 years whilst Y2Y coordinators are aged 15-35 years. An application for the UYF and Y2Y grant should be accompanied by a one page Curriculum Vitae of the project coordinator. UN-Habitat and YEN both reviewed qualifications of project coordinators during grantee selection to ensure that the coordinators were qualified to lead UYF and Y2Y projects. Once grantees are selected, project coordinators receive technical assistance through project planning, management and implementation workshops. UYF and Y2Y officials act as mentors for project coordinators during project implementation whilst project coordinators mentor young people trained through funded projects. In a few cases, project coordinators were also end beneficiaries. However, the project coordinators that I interviewed participated in this study as coordinators and not end beneficiaries. Project coordinators were trained in project management, financial management and monitoring and evaluation. As a result, the coordinators oversaw overall project implementation and also prepared mid-term and final reports submitted to UN-Habitat and YEN. I, therefore, interviewed and surveyed project coordinators because they were the most knowledgeable about the UYF and Y2Y projects.
**Informal economy**

In urban SSA, the informal economy generally denotes a wide range of activities that take place outside the formal regulatory frameworks of central and local governments (Chen et al., 2002; Chen, 2007). The informal economy is typically characterized by easy entry, low start-up capital and small-scale enterprises (International Labor Office, 2007; Chen et al, 2002). Other characteristics of the informal economy that emerge from literature include the tendency for such activities to be concentrated in Central Business Districts (CBDs), along major streets and road junctions, public markets, bus stations and major shopping centers (Hansen & Vaa, 2004; Hansen, 2004; Heintz & Valodia, 2008). The goods and services produced in the informal economy are generally legal but the means by which they are produced could be illegal (Brown, 2006a). The informal economy as used here, excludes activities such as drug dealing, prostitution, money laundering and other criminal activities. Contrary to the traditional view of the informal economy as being temporary and survivalist in nature, the contemporary view acknowledges the informal economy as a permanent and important feature of African urban economies (Chen et al., 2002; Chen, 2007; Hansen & Vaa, 2004; Skinner, 2008; Tostensen et al., 2001). For this study, informal economy or youth informal employment refers to unregulated but legal rural or urban-based income-generating activities.

The central characteristic of the informal economy as used in this study is the lack of ILO decent work principles described in the previous section. This study also acknowledges the fact that livelihood activities in the informal economy generally tend to be gendered. Young women are mostly engaged in home-based enterprises and other low-skilled livelihood activities in which they earn little to no income. On the other hand, young men tend to engage in high-risk and high paying activities in prime urban locations where young women’s access is often
restricted or difficult. Young rural females also tend to be poorly educated compared to young men in most parts of SSA. As such, they tend to have fewer employment opportunities in the formal and informal economy. Overall, SSA women tend to have limited access to land and other livelihood assets and decent work, and they often face restricted access to decision making structures and processes compared to men. As a result, interventions to support youth informal workers should take into consideration the gender gaps and differences in order to promote decent employment opportunities for female youth. Among other things, effective livelihood interventions for women should enhance young women’s education, access to land and credit, and decision making processes. Addressing gender gaps in the formal economy advances low-income countries toward promoting gender equality and women empowerment (MDG3).

Recent anthropological literature on informal economies has focused on the continued failure of the African state in basic service provision (Ugor, 2013); increased role of informal service provision, particularly in recycling and waste management (Katusiimeh et al, 2013; Rockson et al, 2013); coexistence of informal and formal economic services (Jennische, 2012; Owusu et al, 2012); role of informal networks in urban governance including barriers to the institutionalization of informal activities (Nzeadibe, 2012; Lindell & Utas, 2012; Meagher, 2011; Meagher, 2013); and the processes of inclusion and exclusion in the informal economy (Nunzio, 2012; Goodfellow, 2013; Gondwe & Ayenagbo, 2013). The literature shows that rapid urbanization has made it difficult for most city governments to provide basic urban services to the growing number of urban residents.

In many African cities, informal service provision has replaced formal service provision, particularly in recycling and waste management. According to Katusiimeh et al (2013), informal waste collectors play a significant role in solid waste collection in Kampala’s slum areas in
In low-income Kampala neighborhoods, formal waste collection has been limited by accessibilities challenges. As a result, informal waste collectors have taken over door-to-door waste collection. In the Greater Accra Region in Ghana, scavengers play a central role in the recovery of waste from streams (Rockson et al, 2013). However, the co-existence of formal and informal service provisioning has been a major challenge in most African cities despite the centrality of informal waste collection and recycling (Katusiimeh et al, 2013). This is because city governments do not have effective policies and programs to enhance informal service provision and co-existence with formal provisioning systems (Meagher, 2011; 2013; Jennische, 2012).

Informal networks and associations have played an important role in organizing and sustaining informal economic activities in many African cities (Lindell & Utas, 2012; Meagher, 2103). Lack of support and recognition from formal institutions has compelled informal workers to organize themselves in search of sustainable livelihoods and social security. In most cases, social and economic mobilization in the informal economy has had a limited effect on the recognition and institutionalization of informal livelihoods and service provision (Di Nunzio, 2012; Goodfellow, 2013; Meagher, 2011; Nziadibe & Anyadike, 2012).

The sustainability of informal livelihoods and networks has been hindered by poor education among informal workers, high entrance fees to informal networks, corruption and infiltration by elites, and limited awareness on civic participation frameworks (Lindell & Utas, 2012; Meagher, 2013; Owusu et al, 2012; Rockson et al, 2013). The ineffectiveness of informal networks has also been reinforced by inclusion and exclusion based on gender, ethnicity and age (Gondwe & Ayenagbo, 2013). In countries such as Niger (Ugor, 2013), and Cameroon (Lindell & Utas, 2012), youth have successfully mobilized themselves to defend and sustain viable informal economic activities.
**Self-employment**

Self-employment refers to the practice where young people set up and operate their own formal or informal income generating activities on designated or undesignated land or working space (Chigunta et al., 2005, *emphasis added*).

**Youth entrepreneurship**

I use entrepreneurship to denote youth’s way of thinking, reasoning and action that is both opportunity and necessity driven (Chigunta et al., 2005; Schoof, 2006). According to Chigunta et al (2005), entrepreneurship is a process where individuals become aware of their self-employment potential and develop ideas and actions toward setting up their own income generating activities. According to Schoof (2006), there are two main types of youth entrepreneurs: economic entrepreneurs mostly concerned with wealth creation and making a profit and social entrepreneurs who aim to create social value through projects that address community and environmental problems. Social entrepreneurs, therefore, care more about the social return on investment than profit generation and rate of return on investment.

There are also necessity- and opportunity driven entrepreneurs (Schoof, 2006). Necessity entrepreneurs are driven by the economic need to survive and they most found in low-income communities where there are minimum entrepreneurship opportunities in relation to the desire to survive economically. Most informal workers fall into the category of necessity-driven entrepreneurs. In contrast, youth entrepreneurs in the developed world are mostly opportunity driven, that is, they engage in entrepreneurship because easy-entry entrepreneurial opportunities exist. Opportunity-driven is also driven more by an individual’s interest given the existence of alternatives sources of income generation.
There are also barriers to youth entrepreneurship that are more pronounced in developing communities compared to the developed world: regulatory framework that hinders entrepreneurship; cultural beliefs and values that opposes entrepreneurship; limited access to entrepreneurship education and training; limited access to finance; and negative personal attitudes that discourses entrepreneurial behavior. Entrepreneurship has moved to forefront of international efforts to create employment and livelihood opportunities for young people (Schoof, 2006). Even though this study mostly focused on economic youth entrepreneurs, their enterprises sometimes addressed broad community challenges such as waste management. In the process, the necessity-driven entrepreneurs became social entrepreneurs even though their fundamental goal may have been income generation. Their socially acceptable and environmentally-sensitive youth-led businesses fostered community and youth collaboration towards sustainable community development and poverty reduction.

**Cooperatives**

According to Schoof (2006: 9), a cooperative is “an autonomous association of persons united voluntarily to meet their common economic, social, and cultural needs and aspirations through a jointly owned and democratically controlled enterprise.” Enterprises created through cooperatives foster mutual benefit and equality among members. The creation of youth cooperatives is at the center of the Y2Y program in West Africa.

**Low-income countries**

The World Bank classifies low-income countries as those with a Gross National Income per capita income of $1,025 or less in 2011. The extremely poor are those who live below $1.25 a day and the working poor earn $2 or less per day. In this study, I use low-income countries and low-income communities interchangeably. This study employs the World Bank definition and
grouping of low-income countries determined using the Gross National Income per capita. In accordance with the World Bank’s use of the term low-income, this study uses low-income for the purpose of convenience only, acknowledging that “low-income” does not necessarily reflect the development status of the country and also that most countries and their nationals do not necessarily experience similar economic development patterns and conditions.

**Evaluation**

According to Baker (2000), a comprehensive evaluation includes monitoring, process evaluation, cost-benefit evaluation, and impact evaluation. Process or monitoring evaluation is conducted during project implementation to ascertain that project implementation plans are being followed and to address any implementation constraints. An impact evaluation can be carried out during or at the end of the project to determine the outcomes of a project on intended beneficiaries. Impact evaluation seeks to ascertain whether or not the positive or negative project outcomes can be directly attributed to a development intervention. An impact evaluation can be conducted by a simple before and after analysis of the social, economic and political situation of beneficiaries before and after project. An impact evaluation is generally conducted through experimental and non-experimental methods.

Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) are typically the most preferred experimental approach. They involve a random assignment of participants into treatment and non-treatment groups to minimize selection bias. A non-experimental impact evaluation can be carried out through matching methods which involve the selection of a comparison group with similar characteristics from a larger participant sample. The comparison group will ideally comprise those with approximately similar characteristics except that they do not receive project benefits. More reliably, Randomized RCTs are usually employed to track the effects of an intervention on
a large pool of participants with similar characteristics, over a defined time period. Ideally, the participants should be a homogenous group in which a defined group receive program benefits (treatment group) whilst the other group (control group) receive reduced or no program benefits. Ideally, an effective impact evaluation includes both quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods (Baker, 2000). In that case, quantitative findings are qualified to reflect participant’s feelings and experiences. On the other qualitative findings are also quantified to allow for generalizations to similar situations. In this study, I administered surveys to youth organizations to capture quantitative data and conducted in-depth Skype interviews with youth entrepreneurs to capture qualitative data reflecting their opinions, project context and experiences.

According to Hempel & Fiala (2012), there are two main benefits of evaluation in development: learning and legitimacy. Internally, evaluation fosters learning in an organization or project through project management. The lessons from evaluation yield organizational legitimacy through credibility and sustainability. Externally, evaluation generate knowledge that foster provide lessons to donors and policy makers and legitimizes their actions through accountability practices. In this study, I used a before and after analysis of youth beneficiary’s employment and income situation to determine the impact of the UYF and Y2Y on their lives. I also administered a survey to eligible but unsuccessful applicants to the UYF and Y2Y grants—comparison group organizations. Results from the study have practice and policy implications for funding agencies and youth-led organizations concerned with sustainable livelihood interventions.

Conclusion

This chapter presented an overview of the global youth employment crisis and the factors that exacerbates the problem in Sub-Saharan Africa. In the context of Sub-Saharan Africa, youth
unemployment has been fundamentally worsened by the continued adherence to outdated urban planning, Structural Adjustment Programs, ineffective educational systems, the HIV/AIDS pandemic and endless rural to urban migration. Using the largely untested but promising youth-led development approach, the UN-Habitat and Youth Employment Network launched youth challenge funds (Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund respectively) aiming to support the most innovative youth-led livelihood initiatives. The research questions proposed sought to assess the extent to which the youth challenge funds have succeeded in enhancing youth access to decent livelihoods, the challenges faced and the lessons and recommendations to guide future youth-led development practice and policy making. In the chapter, I also defined the terms that used in the study to guide readers. Overall, my dissertation was informed by my personal experience growing up in an extremely poor family, my previous honors thesis research findings and professional planning experience in Zimbabwe where youth livelihoods are unreasonably restricted.

**Dissertation outline**

This dissertation is divided into seven chapters as outlined below.

**Chapter 1** introduces the study by first reviewing the background to the global youth employment crisis and initiatives that have been pursued to address youth unemployment at the international, regional, national and local levels. The chapter then dwells briefly on the most notable recent attempts to address youth employment and economic marginalization in Africa—the Youth Employment Network Youth-to-Youth Fund in West Africa and the globally-oriented UN-Habitat Urban Youth Fund. I then outline the research questions that guided the study followed by the significance of the study and my research journey. I conclude the chapter.
by defining and reviewing the key terms used in the study including youth, youth-led development, livelihood, decent work, self-employment, youth entrepreneurship, informal economy, and low-income countries.

Chapter 2 presents the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework (SLF) in relation to sustainable youth livelihoods. The chapter begins by presenting an outline of the evolution of the Department for International Development (DFID)’s Sustainable Livelihoods Framework. It then discusses the central livelihood assets in the context of informal economies including the impact of urban planning institutions, policies and regulations on youth access to livelihood assets. The chapter concludes by presenting the strengths and limitations of Sustainable Livelihood Approaches.

Chapter 3 details the research methodology, including profiling the Youth-to-Youth and Urban Youth Fund projects included in the study and data collection methods, indicators employed and justification for the data collection methods employed. I begin the chapter by presenting an overview of the main sources of data and data collection methods including a justification for a mixed-methods research design. I then shift to an overview of the UN-Habitat UYF and Youth Employment Network Y2Y grantees included in the study, including comparison group organizations. I then present a justification for comparing UYF and Y2Y grantees using baseline data provided by youth organizations when they applied for the UYF and Y2Y grants. This is followed by a full description of the data collection methods and sources including sampling strategies. I then shift to a discussion of the qualitative and quantitative data analysis techniques and procedures that I followed including the statistical tests that I performed to test the significance of project outcome differences between UYF and Y2Y grantees. The
statistical tests described include descriptive statistics, the chi-square test for independence, independent samples t-test and bivariate correlation. The chapter concludes with a presentation of the limitations of the research design and the ethical issues and considerations that I encountered.

**Chapter 4** presents data analysis and results related to the UN-Habitat Youth Fund. The chapter begins by presenting a qualitative assessment of the impacts of UYF projects on youth access to human, financial, physical and social livelihood assets in the context of informal Sub-Saharan Africa urban economies. I then analyze interview data gathered from youth project coordinators to explore the impacts of the UYF projects on youth organizations, youth beneficiaries, and the communities in which the projects were implemented. I pay particular attention to the challenges faced by grantees and youth beneficiaries, lessons learned, youth aspirations and recommendations to funding agencies. In this chapter, I also present a quantitative assessment of the impacts of the UYF program and projects using survey data from youth beneficiaries, grantees and comparison group organizations. Using the qualitative and quantitative impact assessments, I conclude by assessing the extent to which the UYF created decent and sustainable employment opportunities for youth given the challenges experienced, lessons learned and recommendations for UN-Habitat.

**Chapter 5** presents data analysis and results related to the Youth Employment Network Youth-to-Youth Fund program in West Africa. The chapter follows a similar format used in Chapter 4 to facilitate comparative analysis, discussion and interpretation of findings presented in Chapter 6. The chapter begins by presenting a qualitative assessment of the impacts of Y2Y projects on youth access to human, financial, physical, social and natural livelihood assets in the
context of largely informal West Africa economies of Guinea, Liberia, Ivory Coast and Sierra Leone. I analyze interview data gathered from Y2Y project coordinators to explore the impacts of the projects on youth-led organizations, youth beneficiaries, and the rural and urban communities in which the projects were implemented. Again, I pay particular attention to the challenges faced by grantees and youth beneficiaries, lessons learned, youth aspirations and recommendations to YEN and other funding agencies. In this chapter, I also present a quantitative assessment of the impacts of the Y2Y program and projects using survey data from youth beneficiaries, grantees and comparison group organizations. Using the qualitative and quantitative impact assessments, I conclude by assessing the extent to which the Y2Y created decent and sustainable employment opportunities for youth given the challenges experienced, lessons learned and recommendations for the Youth Employment Network and other funding agencies.

Chapter 6 presents UYF and Y2Y comparisons, discussion and interpretation of findings from the analysis presented in Chapter 4 and 5 respectively. The comparisons between the UYF and Y2Y was necessitated by the need to derive comprehensive evidence-based youth-led practices, lessons learned, challenges experienced, conclusions and recommendations to funding agencies and youth-led organizations. The chapter begins by a qualitative comparison of the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y programs facilitated youth access to livelihood assets given the specific challenges reported by grantees and youth beneficiaries. This is followed by a quantitative comparative impact assessment of the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y facilitated youth access to livelihood assets and decent youth employment opportunities. The comparisons are informed by qualitative views from youth project coordinators and key informants and quantitative survey data from youth beneficiaries, grantees and comparison group organizations.
After the comparisons, I shift to a discussion of the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y embraced fundamental sustainable livelihood principles and the quest for increased access to assets and decent livelihood opportunities. I then present a sustainable youth-led livelihood development framework for informal SSA rural and urban economies given the research findings. I then focus on the implications of youth-led livelihood development for sustainable urban development planning and management in Sub-Saharan Africa. Overall, the discussion is informed by the sustainable livelihood framework, decent work principles, urban development planning systems and informal economy theoretical perspectives. The chapter concludes with a presentation of the contributions and limitations of the study given the research methodology presented in Chapter 3, findings from Chapter 4 and 5 and the comparative discussions.

**Chapter 7** presents conclusions and recommendations to the funding agencies with particular reference to UN-Habitat and the Youth Employment Network. The conclusions and recommendations seek to promote effective youth-led livelihood programs and positive integration of informal youth livelihoods in the context of Sub-Saharan African rural and urban economies. The conclusions and recommendations are informed by findings from the UYF and Y2Y analysis in Chapter 4 and 5 respectively and the comparisons and discussion presented in Chapter 6. These conclusions and recommendations reflect my own perspectives based on research findings and views from youth project coordinators and entrepreneurs. I conclude the chapter by presenting opportunities for future research given the research gaps identified.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction
This chapter expands on the introductory concepts defined in the preceding chapter. In Chapter 1, I defined the meaning of the terms livelihood, youth-led development, informal economy, among other key terms used in this study. In this chapter, I expand on the concept of livelihood by presenting the sustainable livelihoods theoretical framework. The chapter presents the important livelihood assets for successful youth-led livelihoods. In the context of informal rural and urban SSA economies, youth-led livelihoods depend on the availability of physical, social, human, financial and natural assets and youth’s ability to draw on them. The questions presented in Chapter 1 require a comprehensive theoretical framework that allows for the exploration of the several livelihood assets that informal youth employ, the challenges that they face and the points of interventions for livelihood programs. I considered the sustainable livelihoods framework to be the most useful framework to audit the impact of the Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund on youth access to livelihood assets and the factors that facilitated or hindered the success of youth-led initiatives.

The sustainable livelihoods approach to poverty reduction
Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches (SLAs) build and expand on conventional income-based poverty reduction strategies to include the more qualitative and social aspects of people’s deprivation. Unlike narrow income focused poverty elimination approaches, SLAs acknowledge the multidimensional nature of people’s asset deprivations and view low-income people as active agents in successful poverty-reduction efforts. SLAs were championed by Chambers and colleagues during studies on rural poverty and household responses in remote...
rural communities in the early 1990s (Scoones, 1998). Since the 1990s, urban poverty researchers and several international development agencies began applying the sustainable rural livelihoods thinking into studies of urban poverty and low-income people’s responses to poverty (Brown, 2006; Rakodi, 2002a).

The concept of sustainable livelihoods means that poor people or poor youth in low-income rural and urban communities draw on livelihood assets or resources (physical, social, financial, human, and natural assets) to increase income, well-being and reduce vulnerability, among other goals. The sustainable livelihoods framework thus views youth positively (youth as assets) by putting their assets at the center of youth poverty reduction efforts as opposed to the conventional view of poor youth as victims in need of external aid. According to Brown (2006), the sustainable livelihoods framework vividly illustrates the critical relationship between the institutions of city governments and the livelihoods of the urban poor. Livelihood approaches maintain that development interventions should fit into people’s lives and the wider institutional context of government, civil society and private enterprise and that livelihood interventions should ensure short and long-term project sustainability. In the short-term, effective livelihood interventions ensure economic and institutional sustainability but social and environmental sustainability are more important considerations in the long term (Toner et al., 2004).

In SLAs, poor people’s livelihood assets include material, social, tangible and intangible assets (Brown, 2001). SLAs have been used widely by organizations including the World Bank, Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Department for International Development (DFID), Oxfam and CARE International (Carney et al., 1999). The SLAs are centered on an understanding of people’s social, physical,
natural, human and financial assets within the context of existing institutions, regulations and cultural norms. A better understanding of the complex and interlinked nature of poor people’s livelihoods allow for a better understanding of the external vulnerability and shocks that poor people face. Though there are some variations in the livelihoods approaches employed by different multilateral, bilateral and Non-Governmental Organizations, there are strong similarities in the approaches. For example, the DFID, UNDP, CARE and Oxfam approaches all employ an asset-based approach stressing the role of micro-macro linkages and the four approaches are also rooted in the early rural development works of Chambers and Conway (Carney et al., 1999).

This study employs the DFID sustainable livelihoods framework. The DFID approach views livelihood as an outcome of choices people make based on their livelihood assets given the policies, institutions and practices that shape them (DFID, 1999). In the DFID sustainable livelihood framework, effective poverty-reduction interventions seek to connect people’s livelihood activities at the micro-level with policy making at the meso- and macro-levels. In this case, sustainable livelihood projects should not be an “island” of resource in an environment of extreme resource inequality (Toner, 2003:780). In other words, sustainable livelihood interventions should not be divorced from existing institutional policies, programs and practices. Through SLAs, questions of access and rights are addressed through effective engagement with existing institutions and processes. The DFID sustainable livelihoods framework has a long history linked to broader paradigm shifts in development planning thinking and global poverty reduction efforts. The historical evolution of the DFID sustainable livelihoods approach is outlined in Table 2.1 below.
Table 2.1: The evolution of Sustainable Livelihood Approaches and DFID Sustainable Livelihoods Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Major Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>The NGO Oxfam began employing the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The NGO Care International adopts household livelihoods security as a framework for its relief and development programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>The United Nations(UN) World Summit for Social Development is held in Copenhagen and UNDP adopts Employment and Sustainable Livelihoods as one of its top five priorities; The International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) publishes “Adaptive Strategies and Sustainable Livelihoods” (Singh &amp; Kalala, 1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>“Adaptable Livelihoods” (Davies, 1996) is published; DFID invites Sustainable Livelihoods projects; “Participatory Research for Sustainable Livelihoods” (Godoy et al., 1997) is published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>The DFID publishes the first Sustainable Livelihoods Guidance Sheets; Sustainable Livelihoods and Poverty Elimination; and Livelihoods Approaches Compared (Carney et al., 1999). The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) publishes “Sustainable Livelihoods in Practice: Early application of concepts in rural areas” (Farrington, Carney, Ashley, &amp; Turton, 1999). DFID establishes the Sustainable Livelihoods Resource Group of researchers/consultants. “Rural livelihoods and diversity in developing countries” (Ellis, 2000) is published.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>DFID commissions and funds the Institute of Developmental Studies (IDS) Livelihoods Connect, a website serving as a learning platform for Sustainable Livelihood Approach (Institute of Developmental Studies, 2012). FAO organizes an Inter-agency Forum on Implementing Sustainable Livelihoods Approaches, involving DFID, FAO, World Food Program (WFP), UNDP, and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SLAs for development interventions are guided by the following normative and operational principles (Brown, 2006; Chambers, 1995; Chambers & White, 1997; Scoones, 1998; Toner, 2003; Toner et al., 2004; Toner & Franks, 2006): 

**Poor people as focus**

SLAs start with a complex understanding of individual or household livelihood assets and activities and put people at the center of development interventions. “Poor people as focus” implies an investigation of people’s assets, their objectives or livelihood outcomes and the strategies that they use to meet the desired livelihood outcomes (Toner, 2003).
Participation
Poor people play an active role in sustainable livelihood development interventions and they should define development priorities. Poor people’s participation implies that outsiders devise effective ways to fully engage and listen to poor people’s needs.

Partnership
Sustainable livelihood interventions seek effective partnerships with local community but minimize the control and influence of external partners. In this case, sustainable livelihood interventions involve the effective participation of both public and private sectors.

Holistic approach
Sustainable livelihood interventions seek multi-level or cross sectoral approaches to development challenges but should be focused enough to avoid addressing too many challenges through a single intervention. A holistic approach implies that micro-level activities inform macro-level development policies and that macro-level transforming structures and processes fully support poor people’s livelihood assets and strategies at the local level.

Policy and institutional linkages
Effective livelihood interventions connect with relevant institutional structures and processes to avoid duplication and ensure sustainability. In this case, sustainable livelihood interventions work with existing structures to tackle existing problems.

Dynamism and flexibility
Sustainable livelihood interventions learn and adapt from experience. Externally driven interventions must recognize the dynamic nature of poor people’s livelihood strategies and respond flexibly to their needs and changing circumstances, including designing long-term poverty reduction efforts (Carney & Britain, 2003).
**Accounting and responsiveness**

Sustainable and effective livelihood interventions ensure accountability and responsiveness to the poor and other stakeholders.

**Sustainability**

Effective livelihood interventions ensure financial, institutional, environmental and social sustainability (Toner, 2003; Toner et al., 2004; Toner & Franks, 2006). Financial sustainability implies that projects can continue after external funding ends. Institutional sustainability implies that projects are integrated with existing institutions. Environmental sustainability implies the sustainable use of natural resources and limited waste and pollution from development projects. Social sustainability implies that projects are integrated into existing cultural norms and are inclusive of all cultural/social groups.

According to the DFID (1999), the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework is a tool to understand the livelihoods of the poor. The sustainable livelihoods framework can thus be used in planning new development projects or monitoring and evaluation of existing development programs and projects. Applied to youth livelihoods, the DFID Sustainable Livelihoods Framework implies generating employment for youth; enhancing access to financial services, including credit facilities, savings and business skills training; developing institutions, alliances and networks vital to support youth economic interests and opportunities; and promoting social and policy changes to enhance youth livelihood opportunities (Rosen, 2001). The DFID Sustainable Livelihoods Framework is depicted in Figure 1 below. The arrows used in the framework denote dynamic relationships and some influence between the framework components but the arrows do not imply direct causality (DFID, 1999).
Figure 1: Sustainable livelihoods framework

The DFID framework is particularly applicable to this study because both the Youth Employment Network Youth-to-Youth Fund and UN-Habitat Urban Youth Fund fundamentally aim to enhance youth livelihood assets including financial, social, physical and human assets. The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework is a compelling framework to assess the extent to which direct financial provisioning through the Youth-to-Youth Fund and Urban Youth Fund grants bear on youth access to livelihood assets, including social, physical, natural and financial assets. At the same time, it is possible to explore the role of existing institutional structures, policies, regulations and processes on youth livelihood assets, strategies and outcomes through the

Source: (DFID, 1999)
sustainable livelihood lens. The sustainable livelihoods framework posits that access to one livelihood resource can facilitate access to other livelihood resources. Limited access to finance or start-up capital, restricted access to land or work space and exclusion from local decision making processes and organizations are major barriers faced by poor youth in informal businesses in developing communities (Chingunta et al, 2005; Schoof, 2006). The youth challenge funds seek to directly enhance young people’s access to financial and human assets and the sustainable livelihoods framework allows us to audit whether or not the grants and skills training programs subsequently impacted on youth access to physical assets such as land, housing, infrastructure and access to social assets such as peer networks, group memberships, associations and access to decision making processes for self-employment. Using the sustainable livelihoods framework, it is also possible to assess the impact of government policies such as land tenure systems, cultural norms and land use policies on youth livelihoods.

The urban poor working in the informal economy, including youth, are often vulnerable to external shocks arising from evictions, insecure land tenure, inadequate land rights and civil wars as in the context of West Africa. Poor urban youth respond to external threats and shocks in multiple ways depending on livelihoods assets at their disposal. For instance, to cope with urban evictions, informal youth traders can defend their urban livelihoods through political organizing, bribing officials, relocation, among other strategies (Kamete, 2010). To gain access to a selling place, some informal traders may depend on networks of kin and friendships (Hansen, 2010). Youth-led NGOs and funding agencies can partner with local and national governments to support informally employed youth through adequate provision of urban public space and infrastructural services (physical capital). Vocational, entrepreneurial and life skills training and non-formal education programs can be offered to uneducated youth to enhance their employment
skills (World Bank, 2009). Having livelihood assets in the form of physical, financial, social and human capital allow youth to counter external vulnerabilities, shocks and policy processes threatening their livelihoods. Enhancing youth access to livelihood assets and strategies potentially create youth employment opportunities. Increased employment opportunities yield increased income and decent jobs, wherein youth have land rights, secure tenure, adequate representation and voice in the urban economy (International Labor Office, 2005). The major components of the DFID Sustainable Livelihoods Framework are explored in the next sections.

**Vulnerability context**

The vulnerability context denotes the external environment that is mostly beyond poor people’s influence and implies that poor people’s livelihood assets and strategies are impacted by external trends, shocks and seasonality factors over which poor people have limited or no control. Trends include population trends, resource trends (including conflict) and governance trends including political factors. Shocks include health, natural, economic and conflict-induced shocks that impact negatively on people’s livelihood assets and strategies. Seasonality factors include price and production fluctuations and variations in employment opportunities across seasons. The vulnerability context impacts directly on people’s assets and livelihood strategies. Shocks such as floods, evictions and diseases can destroy people’s assets and force poor people to dispose some of their assets prematurely as a coping mechanism (DFID, 1999).

**Livelihood assets**

Livelihoods are composed of tangible assets (such as land, materials, equipment, and cash) and intangible assets (such as social relationships) that people can draw on in pursuit of sustainable livelihoods. People’s ability to draw on livelihood assets is mediated by existing policies, regulations and cultural norms (Toner et al., 2004). In the DFID livelihoods framework,
assets are depicted by a pentagon where the central point assumes zero access to assets and outer points assume maximum access to given assets. The asset pentagon can shift from time to time due to various factors impacting on poor people’s assets. Assets can be destroyed by factors linked to the vulnerability context and transforming structures and processes. Transforming structures and processes such as a government policy can create assets and determine access to assets and rates of asset accumulation (DFID, 1999). Poor people’s livelihood strategies and outcomes depend on the amount and combination of assets they possess at any given time (DFID, 1999).

**Physical capital**

Physical capital includes man-made infrastructure and production equipment. Physical capital is the basic infrastructure such as start-up kits, working space, public space or land, transportation, communication services, water and electricity supplies that enhance poor people’s urban livelihoods (Brown & Lloyd-Jones, 2002; Rakodi, 2002b). Poor people’s sustainable livelihoods depend on access to key physical assets such as affordable transportation, secure shelter and buildings, adequate water supply and sanitation, clean affordable energy and access to information (Majale, 2001). Access to urban public space and shelter is vital for the urban poor working in the informal economy (Brown & Rakodi, 2006; Brown, 2001; Payne, 2002). Studies show that unrestricted and secure access to public space facilitates access to both street and market based informal economic activities (Brown, 2001). Heintz & Valodia (2008) found that lack of access to productive assets such as public space and insecure tenure hinders the urban poor from participating in the informal economy.
Access to urban public space for livelihoods is rarely considered a fundamental human right in most cities of the developing world (Brown, 2006a). The urban poor’s right to public space access should include a right to decent work, transfer and subletting rights as well as managerial rights (Brown & Rakodi, 2006; Brown, 2006a). The right to urban public space thus implies that the urban poor use public space freely without fear of harassment or eviction. Access to urban public space also tends to be gendered given that women’s access to urban public space remains constrained in most parts of the developing world (Satterthwaite, 2002). In most cases, home-based enterprises allow women to engage in income-earning opportunities whilst taking care of the children (Satterthwaite, 2002). In some cases, the urban poor’s access to urban public space may be regulated by ethnic-, religious- and caste-based networks and groups restricting non-member access to specific urban spaces (Varcin, 2000 cited in Pratt, 2006).

Access to secure shelter is an important physical asset for the informal urban poor, both as a productive and reproductive space (Payne, 2002). According to Payne, access to secure housing in the right location, with easy access to sources of employment and public amenities, is a precondition for survival and success in the informal economy. Other studies also show that the urban poor commonly use their shelter for home-based informal economic activities (Kamete, 1999; Kamete, 2001; Kamete, 2004; Mosha, 1999). In those countries where women’s access to public space is restricted due to cultural and social factors, access to secure shelter is important for women who have to rely on home-based informal activities for family subsistence (Miles, 2001).

At the international scale, the right to adequate housing is recognized by the 1948 United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the 1966 International Covenant on
Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (Audefroy, 1994). Article 25 (1) of the UN Declaration on Human Rights was the first to recognize housing as a fundamental human right and the right to adequate housing has since been enshrined in the constitutions of several countries (Audefroy, 1994). The right to adequate housing implies protection against forced evictions; housing accessible to marginalized and disadvantaged groups, housing in the right location (Skinner, 2006) and entitlements through secure tenure and participation in housing-related decision making processes (Audefroy, 1994). International human rights laws require governments to minimize poor people’s suffering through avoiding forced relocations as much as possible (UN-Habitat). The popularity of human rights laws among NGOs and governments led to a shift from a central concern with housing needs in the 1980s to housing rights in the 1990s (Masika, de Haan, & Baden, 1997). There has now been a realization that access to safe and secure tenure is central in effective poverty alleviation efforts (Masika et al., 1997).

Besides access to urban public space, adequate public transportation and secure shelter, access to infrastructural services such as water and energy are also crucial physical assets for those working in the informal urban economy (Ali, 2002; Harpham & Grant, 2002). The urban poor’s livelihoods also depend on easy access to public transportation (Mbara & Maunder, 1997). Limited access to public transportation restricts participation in the informal economy by constraining the urban poor’s access to customer and product markets. The urban poor mostly walk to and from work (Mbara & Maunder, 1997). For instance, about seventy percent of journeys travelled by the poor in Harare were made on foot (Mbara & Maunder, 1997). According to DFID (1999), lack of access to water and energy is a central component of urban poverty. In the absence of water and electricity, the urban poor lose considerable time in non-productive activities, travelling long distances in search of firewood and water (DFID, 1999).
Lack of basic water and sewerage connections negatively impacts on poor people’s human, financial and social assets. Other studies show that the urban poor benefit from easy and unrestricted access to dump sites, where they often engage in informal waste harvesting as an urban livelihood strategy (Masocha, 2006). In the town of Victoria Falls (Zimbabwe), informal waste harvesting at open dump sites is a central livelihood option for the town’s urban poor (Masocha, 2006).

**Social capital**

The exact meaning of social capital is debatable. In the context of sustainable livelihoods, social capital includes networks and social relations that individuals draw on in pursuing livelihoods. Social capital refers to the social resources (networks, membership groups, relationships of trust and reciprocity, access to wider institutions of society) on which poor people draw in pursuit of their livelihoods (DFID, 1999; Rakodi, 2002a). Narayan (1997:56), cited in Brown (2006), defined social capital as “the rules, norms, obligations, reciprocity and trust embedded in social relations, social structures, and society’s institutional arrangements which enable its members to achieve their individual and community objectives”. Social capital is now considered a vital component of the urban poor’s livelihood strategies (Phillips, 2002). In the urban context, social capital develops through associations based on gender and age, religion, political views, neighborhood, kinship, employment, savings and credit groups and links with Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) (Meikle, 2002; Phillips, 2002).

Poor people’s social resources are developed through networks and connectedness, membership in formalized groups, relationships of trust, reciprocity, exchanges and informal safety nets. Social capital is closely connected to transforming structures and processes in a two
way relationship—social capital is often defined by transforming structures and processes and vice-versa (DFID, 1999). The concept of social capital and its usefulness in the urban context has been debated considerably in the development literature. One question raised in the development planning literature is whether or not social capital is higher or lower in urban areas than in rural areas (DFID, 1999; Brown, 2006). Some scholars argue that due to diversity, mobility, high crime levels and dependence on the cash economy, social capital is weaker in urban areas compared to rural areas (Brown, 2006). One important asset for the urban poor working in the informal economy is their intangible social capital in the form of family, neighborhood, and ethnic kinship ties (Phillips, 2002).

In sustainable livelihood interventions, social capital helps poor people increase income and savings as it fosters efficient management of public goods through minimizing free-rider problems (DFID, 1999; Nnkyia, 2006). Social capital also allows for innovation and knowledge sharing which also boosts poor people’s human capital. In some cases, social capital may yield exclusion based on networks, groups and memberships where non-members are excluded and further isolated in the community. Some studies show that the existence of social capital may have both positive and negative consequences for the urban poor. In positive terms, social capital helps the poor in accessing trading places and start-up capital, among other things. In negative terms, social capital may mean exclusion of the urban poor from participation in the informal economy based on ethnic, kinship, social and political networks (Phillips, 2002). A major study of street trading in Dar es Salaam (Tanzania), Accra (Ghana), and Maseru (Lesotho) found that social capital was an important livelihood asset for informal street traders (Brown, 2006a). The study found that informal traders in the three cities often gained trading sites through negotiating with other informal traders, membership in informal traders associations, sharing space with
friends and consulting adjacent informal and formal traders. Brown’s study also noted that social
capital developed through family and kinship networks in Maseru, Dar es Salaam and Accra was
crucial for informal trading viability and in resolving relocation disputes and conflicts among
traders. The study also noted that social capital in most cases, extended beyond a given urban
area boundary to encompass rural-urban networks of exchange. In Ghana and The Gambia,
social networks play an important role in allowing youth to gain employment in cities (Chant &
Jones, 2005). Chant and Jones found that good quality education played a limited role in
guaranteeing youth employment in the informal sector. Instead, familial, ethnic and religious
contacts defined the employment prospects of young Ghanaians and Gambians (Chant & Jones,
2005). Social capital networks are particularly important to women informal traders and new
migrants to the city. Women and new migrants in a city, despite being excluded from major
political decision making processes, often have well established social networks of family and
kin supporting their livelihoods (Pratt, 2006).

Political and cultural capitals are other important livelihood assets important for the
urban poor and both are closely related to social capital. According to Booth et al (1998:97),
cited in Rakodi (2002), political capital is closely linked to social capital and is based on access
to political and decision making processes and is best seen as a gatekeeper asset, permitting or
preventing the accumulation of other assets. The existence of political capital beyond social
capital would likely allow informal groups to influence decision making processes in the wider
urban context. As observed in a recent study of informal Porters in Accra (Yeboah, 2010),
political capital denotes the capacity of individuals and groups to influence informal and formal
decisions that impact on their day-to-day informal economic activities. Political capital can thus
be combined with social capital given that a sound definition of social capital should include power and political relationships (Toner, 2003).

Financial capital

Financial capital denote all the cash resources or equivalent that enables poor people to engage in multiple livelihood strategies, including savings, access to credit and remittances (DFID, 1999). Financial capital is vital for poor people because it can be easily converted into other forms of capital depending on existing transforming structures and processes (DFID, 1999). Financial capital can also be used directly to achieve livelihood outcomes and improve poor people’s participation in policy and governance processes. However, financial capital is often the least accessible form of asset to the poor. Consequently, lack of financial capital is the main reason why poor people need access to non-financial assets in their quest for sustainable livelihoods (DFID, 1999).

According to the DFID, increased financial capital is one of the livelihood outcomes that the urban poor seek to achieve. Studies on the informal economy show that informal economy traders need financial capital to succeed in a cash-based urban economy (Chen, Jhabvala, & Lund, 2002). The fact that the urban poor generally lack financial capital underscores the importance of other livelihood assets for those working in the informal urban economy. One way in which the urban poor can access financial capital is through informal networks and associations (Phillips, 2002). The sustainable livelihood analysis implies that poor people can potentially harness their social, physical and political assets to diversify their livelihood strategies and increase financial capital.
According to Miles, access to financial capital is especially vital for women informal traders in urban Africa (Miles, 2001). Despite the centrality of financial capital resources in the informal economy, Mitullah observed that when the International Monetary Fund (IMF) initiated Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) they completely ignored the financial needs of informal traders (Mitullah, 2005). The PRSPs embraced by several African countries tend to favor manufacturing Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs) at the expense of dominant street-based informal enterprises (Dinye, 2006). The Ministry of SMEs in Zimbabwe, for instance, is obsessed with financing SMEs which they hope would eventually graduate to large-scale formal enterprises. Street and even market-based informal economic activities are rarely considered for financial assistance in urban Zimbabwe. In Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA), savings and micro-credit schemes are largely employed by poor women in their quest for urban livelihoods (Landman & Napier, 2010; Mills, 2007; Mitlin, 2008; Mitlin, 2010). Savings and credit schemes often afford the urban poor access to better quality housing and housing improvement (DFID, 1999; Satterthwaite, 2002). Poor women often find it more difficult to access and control credit compared to poor men even though women are usually considered to present a lower defaulting risk in microcredit schemes than men (Satterthwaite, 2002, DFID, 1999). In some cases, microcredit and savings schemes help the urban poor to mobilize themselves, as in the case of the South African Homeless People’s Federation (Satterthwaite, 2002) and the Kuyasa Fund (Mills, 2007), also in South Africa.

**Human capital**

Human capital denotes poor people’s intangible skills, education and knowledge, physical strength and health status which together contribute to desired urban livelihood strategies and outcomes (DFID, 1999; Harpham & Grant, 2002). In the DFID sustainable
livelihoods framework, the aim is to improve access to high quality education, information, technologies and training and better nutrition and health for poor people. In some cases, the accumulation of human capital may be considered an end in itself given that poverty is often measured using literacy levels and ill-health (DFID, 1999). According to Harpham & Grant (2002) health and livelihood strategies are directly linked—good physical and mental health is a precondition for participation in productive, reproductive and decision making processes. In urban Accra (Ghana), for example, informal porters consider physical strength as their most important livelihood asset (Yeboah, 2010). In Sub-Saharan Africa, the prevalence of the HIV/AIDS pandemic impinges on poor people’s ability to generate sustainable livelihoods. This is because HIV/AIDS yields physical and mental weakness, powerlessness and subsequent loss of human, physical and social capital. In essence, poor people employ human capital to adequately harness all other livelihood assets but human capital per se cannot allow poor people to generate sufficient livelihood strategies and desired outcomes (DFID, 1999).

According to Mitullah (2004), most informal traders (with the exception of youth) in urban Africa have very low levels of education. Youth’s higher educational levels imply that they often engage in informal economic activities temporarily as they seek formal employment elsewhere. Available studies do not show what the implications are for those educated youth who have dedicated themselves to the informal economy. In most parts of SSA, parents generally prefer to educate a boy child to a girl child (Sharif, 1998). In Ghana and The Gambia, unlike young boys, young girls are considered a valuable asset for unpaid domestic chores (Chant & Jones, 2005; Jones & Chant, 2009). The opportunity cost of educating a girl child is often considered to be higher than that of educating a boy child (Sharif, 1998). As a result, female youth in SSA generally have lower levels of school attainment, school enrollment and lower
formal employment levels than males (Garcia & Farès, 2008; Sharif, 1998, emphasis added).

Nonetheless, Sharif observed that female youth are relatively better educated than older women and young females often possess multiple time and resource management skills acquired from unpaid work in family enterprises (Sharif, 1998).

Natural capital

Natural capital includes the natural resource base and environmental services necessary to generate livelihoods. Examples of natural assets include land, forests, water, air quality, wild resources, among others. Natural assets are closely connected to the vulnerability context given that natural resources can be destroyed easily by natural shocks and disasters such as droughts, earthquakes and air pollution (DFID, 1999). Traditional rural development efforts by donors focused disproportionately on building natural capital for the rural poor (DFID, 1999). The sustainable livelihoods framework aims to promote more secure access to, and better management of natural resources beyond just building the natural resources base.

One debatable aspect in the literature is whether or not natural capital exists at all in urban areas (Meikle, 2002). According to Payne, in urban areas, land is best treated as a physical asset as opposed to natural capital applicable to rural areas (Payne, 2002). Whilst the quality of land is obviously important for rural agricultural production, the location of land for poor people’s shelter and associated livelihood strategies is a more important consideration in urban areas (Payne, 2002). The reliance on urban agriculture as a livelihood strategy by many urban households and individuals in urban Africa challenges the assertion that natural capital is insignificant or irrelevant in urban areas. According to the Municipal Development Partnership for Eastern and Southern Africa (MDP-ESA), urban agricultural activities have expanded rapidly in Eastern and Southern Africa over the years (MDP-ESA). The case of Maputo (Mozambique)
clearly challenges the view that urban land cannot be treated as a natural asset in urban areas. In Maputo, secure access to urban land for housing still takes place largely through respected rural-based traditional kinship, family and ethnic ties at little or no cost (Jenkins, 2004).

According to the DFID, access to natural capital in urban areas is gendered—women and men have differential access to natural capital, with men commanding better access than women (DFID, 1999). Examples of natural assets utilized by the urban poor include land, forests, water, air quality, erosion protection and waste assimilation (DFID, 1999). The existence of natural capital in the form of unrestricted access to rivers may reduce the vulnerability of the urban poor by ensuring improved access to water for drinking, informal enterprises and waste disposal (DFID, 1999). Urban authorities should therefore guard against the pollution of natural assets vital in sustaining the urban poor’s livelihoods and everyday activities.

**The impact of regulations, policies and processes on poor people’s access to livelihood assets**

Regulatory frameworks, including rigid land use planning laws, standards and acts are a major impediment to the achievement of sustainable livelihoods by poor people. Planning regulations employed in developing urban centers and inherited from former colonial governments are complex, outdated and do not accommodate poor people’s multiple livelihood strategies (UN-Habitat, 2009; Vanessa, 2009). Various development planning regulations, laws and policies employed by local and central governments in developing communities constrain poor people’s access to land, infrastructure and urban services, informal employment, housing, home-based enterprises and limit access to credit and finance (Majale, 2001). There are several ways in which planning policies and processes impact on the livelihood assets of the urban poor in Sub-Saharan Africa: evictions, relocations and slum upgrading; zoning and land use
regulations; planning standards and procedures; the quest for modern or global cities, among other areas. In the context of sustainable livelihoods, planning policies and processes are part of the local-level transforming structures and processes that define the livelihood strategies of the poor. According to Mitullah (2004), policies provide tools that help protect the general public, consumers and investors in the provision of goods and services.

The regulatory framework for planning has a strong and direct bearing on the livelihood assets of the urban poor. The regulatory framework for planning consists of administrative procedures, planning standards and planning regulations (Lusugga, 2006). According to Lusugga (2006), administrative procedures or processes set out the path for land delivery processes, including defining the role of planners and the general public. Planning standards then dictate the type of the built environment expected, while regulations set out what land uses are permitted and prohibited on a given piece of land (Lusugga, 2006). As observed by the DFID (1999), the local level is one of the many levels relevant to poor people’s livelihoods. International human rights laws and policies of national governments on evictions, relocations and slum upgrading also impact on poor people’s livelihood strategies and outcomes (UN-Habitat, 2009). NGOs and CSOs could also work to shape the livelihood assets of the urban poor at the local and national level. Whereas local level urban planning policies and processes do shape livelihoods in the informal economy to varying degrees depending on context, the wider social, economic and political context in which urban planning takes place is equally relevant (Meikle, 2002; UN-Habitat, 2009).

As observed in the 2009 Global Report on Human Settlements (GRHS), mass and sporadic evictions threaten the livelihood of informal traders and slum dwellers across the developing world. Mass evictions carried out in the name of restoring order or cleaning up the
streets imply that informal traders lose their long accumulated physical, social and political capital. Eviction from public spaces implies loss of trading spaces, income, social and political networks crucial in urban livelihood strategies. In the end, mass evictions completely erode the livelihood assets of the urban poor. When poor people’s assets are eroded, urban poverty is perpetuated through powerlessness, humiliation, vulnerability and isolation (UN-Habitat, 2009). An example of a massive eviction program carried out recently and in which urban planning statutes were invoked was the 2005 Operation Restore Order (ORO) in Zimbabwe (Kamete, 2009). During ORO, some 700,000 informal traders and informal settlers were forcibly removed from their trading spaces and homes, destroying the livelihoods of up to 2.4 million people (Tibaijuka, 2005; Mugara, 2007). During ORO, livelihood and social networks were completely destroyed as most traders moved back to their rural homes. Women, children and youth were the most affected during ORO (Tibaijuka, 2005). At the international scale, and in response to increased squatter settlements and forced evictions, the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions (COHRE) was founded in 1994. The COHRE employs a human rights approach to housing and living conditions throughout the world (www.cohre.org).

The urban spatial planning system in Sub-Saharan Africa still adheres to out-dated colonial zoning and land use regulations, wherein commercial, residential, industrial and open space areas are strictly separated (Berrisford & Kihato, 2006; A. Brown et al., 2010; A. Brown, 2006b; Burra, 2004). The strict enforcement of zoning and land use regulations deter the urban poor from generating informal livelihoods in designated residential and open space areas. Zoning and land use regulations currently in use in most African cities, in some way, reflect Yiftachel’s 1998 notion of the ‘dark side’ of planning. The ‘dark side’ of planning denotes the use of planning as a social control, wherein the weak members of the urban community are segregated
through oppressive zoning and land use controls (Yiftachel, 1998). According to Yiftachel, the ‘dark side’ of planning casts planning as a double-edged sword used by urban elites to achieve both positive and negative outcomes on the urban poor.

Planning standards relating to minimum plot sizes, open space requirements, road widths and buffer zones are unrealistic in relation to the livelihood strategies of the African urban poor. As such, the urban poor often find themselves residing in informal settlements mostly in peri-urban areas, divorced from informal employment opportunities in the Central Business Districts (CBDs). By simply residing in informal settlements with limited or no access to city infrastructural services, the urban poor are excluded from important decision making processes in the wider city economy (Brown & Lloyd-Jones, 2002; Brown & Rakodi, 2006; Brown, 2006a). Lusugga (2006) reported that due to high standards that were set for plot sizes and road reserves in Dar es Salaam (Tanzania), a proposed housing scheme produced only 3,900 plots against the 15,000 plots which would have been produced with more realistic standards. The study also noted that the unit cost per plot with 15,000 plots would have been a quarter of what it ended up costing with just 3,900 plots. Worse still, the few residents who bought the new plots ended up developing the land informally because the land delivery process was too centralized and took a very long time to complete (Lusugga, 2006).

**Strengths of sustainable livelihood approaches**

The sustainable livelihoods framework explores the micro-macro linkages in relation to people’s assets and livelihood strategies allowing for a deep understanding of the underlying causes of poverty and strategic poverty alleviation efforts. The sustainable livelihoods framework is a useful approach to examine the socio-economic impacts of developments projects compared to the narrow-focused income criteria traditionally employed in poverty alleviation
efforts (Krantz, 2001). A major strength of sustainable livelihood approach lies in its ability to show the role of institutional arrangements in facilitating or hindering poor people’s livelihoods assets, strategies and outcomes (Toner, 2003). Applying the SLA to youth livelihoods implies engaging youth in identifying and defining their livelihood priorities; recognizing household, community and wider opportunities that constrain youth livelihoods; advocating for the enhancement of youth assets based on viewing youth as a resource not a problem; and linking youth livelihoods to relevant micro-, meso- and macro-level youth policies and programs (Brown, 2001).

**Criticisms of sustainable livelihood approaches**

The way assets are defined in SLAs tends to be reductionist given the exclusion of linkages between different assets and differential access capabilities among the poor—some people could be in better position to access resources than others (Brown, 2001; Carney & Britain, 2003; Toner, 2003; Toner & Franks, 2006). This leads to unequal power relationships not accounted for by the SLAs. The asset pentagon says nothing about how assets change over time and whether or not abundant access to one asset may compensate for low levels of other assets (Toner, 2003). In the DFID Sustainable Livelihoods Framework, assets are mediated by transforming structures and processes or the organizational and institutional structures of the state, NGOs and private sector and how they interact with individuals. There is therefore an implicit assumption that individuals make strategic decision making based on existing formal institutions and processes and this tends to diminish the importance of individual-state engagement in development planning processes. The DFID approach also ignores the existence of complex informal, family and social institutional structures and processes that impact on people’s access to assets. All institutions should be engaged for sustainable and effective
development interventions (Toner, 2003). The DFID livelihood approach also largely ignores gender relations that often result in disproportionate access to livelihood resources between men and women (Krantz, 2001). Sustainable livelihood approaches do not address the question of how poor people are defined for targeted development interventions (Krantz, 2001).

According to Chigunta et al (2005), the sustainable livelihoods framework provides a fundamental basis from which to understand youth livelihoods and asset enhancement. However, the framework “does not differentiate between an individual as a child, a young person or an adult, that is, the development and expression of youth capabilities and assets across the life-cycle” (Chigunta, Schnurr, James-Wilson, & Torres, 2005: 42). The sustainable livelihoods framework is also silent on the existence or non-existence of youth innovation, experimentation and creativity and the potential effect on youth self-employment and entrepreneurship. Chigunta et al (2005) proposed a complimentary youth livelihood development framework in which youth are also viewed as a central resource. A youth livelihood framework acknowledges the important role of youth, youth-serving institutions, adult mentors and youth-serving government structures. The youth livelihood development framework builds on the sustainable livelihoods framework’s focus on individual youth development by and for youth as depicted in Figure 2 below
Engage & facilitate active participation in public policy dialogue based on recognition of rights & adolescents/youth as a resource

**Adolescent/Youth Stage of Life-Cycle**
- Developmental opportunities based on age & social context
- Vulnerabilities

**Institutions/Sector Structures & Processes**
- Levels of government
- Laws/Policies
- Formal/Informal markets/financial mechanisms
- Education systems
- Family/kinship community
- Culture and norms
- NGOs, international institutions
- Associations,

**Livelihood Assets & Capabilities**
- **H** = Human Assets
- **F** = Financial Assets
- **P** = Physical Assets
- **S** = Social Assets

**Intervention entry points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth development of assets &amp; capabilities based on developmental aptitude &amp; corresponding livelihood opportunities</td>
<td>Engage and mobilize institutions and sector structures to promote &amp; support practitioners &amp; youth enterprise and initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
- P = Physical Assets
- F = Financial Assets
- S = Social Assets
- DW = Decent Work
- H = Human Assets

Source: (Chigunta et al., 2005)

Figure 2: Youth livelihood development framework based on the life-cycle and livelihoods frameworks
From the youth livelihood development framework depicted above, intervention entry point “A” implies that youth livelihood and asset-based programs are more likely to succeed if they design programs based on young people’s age and the individual and community constraints they face. Intervention entry level “B” acknowledges, among other things, the role that youth-serving organizations, youth government structures, associations and adults play in supporting youth livelihood initiatives through capacity building, providing start-up finance, mobilization, investment and engagement. Overall, a youth livelihood development framework implies that successful youth livelihood programs demand that youth, adults and youth organizations work collaboratively, acknowledging youth life stages and the livelihood opportunities and risks youth face as they transition from one life stage to the other. This study is grounded in the DFID sustainable livelihoods framework and the complimentary youth livelihoods development framework developed from the sustainable livelihoods framework.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the evolution of the DFID sustainable livelihoods framework employed in this study. Even though the sustainable framework was originally used in relation to livelihood of low-income households and peasants in remote rural communities, the framework has been widely applied in urban poverty and livelihood studies in SSA over the years. It is clear that the mere existence of livelihood assets does not guarantee access. For youth, access to livelihood resources depends on the existing regulations, policies and institutions. In urban areas, outdated urban planning policies and regulations tend to restrict youth access to livelihood assets such as land and social networks. Successful youth-led livelihoods demand collaboration between youth, adults, youth organizations and all youth development stakeholders.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study seeks to evaluate the livelihood impacts of youth-led projects funded through the UN-Habitat Opportunities Fund for Urban Youth-Led Development (Urban Youth Fund) and Youth Employment Network (YEN) Youth-to-Youth Fund. Specifically, the study seeks to evaluate the impacts of the Urban Youth Fund (UYF) and Youth-to-Youth Fund (Y2Y) on youth access to social, physical, financial, human and natural livelihood assets. The study also seeks to evaluate the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y projects created decent and sustainable jobs for youth in low-income Sub-Saharan Africa communities. The evaluation questions posed in this study and the corresponding research design are guided by the sustainable livelihoods framework for effective poverty alleviation. Using the sustainable livelihoods framework allows for a comprehensive assessment of the impact of development projects beyond conventional income goals.

Traditionally, international development organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations have measured the impact of development programs using quantitative income goals such as the percentage of the population living on one dollar per day or those whose earnings fell below the minimum wage or the national poverty datum line. However, several international development organizations including UNDP, DFID, Oxfam, CARE International and the World Bank have since embraced the sustainable livelihoods approach to poverty alleviation and assessment (Solesbury, 2003). By embracing the sustainable livelihoods approach, international development organizations acknowledge the fact that poor people’s
poverty is multidimensional and that income measures alone cannot adequately capture the complexity of people’s poverty and deprivations. The sustainable livelihoods approach to development interventions and assessments place people at the center of development projects and acknowledge the centrality and inter-connectedness of people’s livelihood assets and strategies. In this case, the sustainable livelihood framework calls for qualitative impact assessments of development interventions to determine their intangible social and political impacts.

This impact evaluation study therefore employed the sustainable livelihoods framework to determine the impact of the UYF and Y2Y projects on youth access to social, economic, political, human and financial livelihood assets. The UYF and Y2Y programs both support youth-led livelihood projects by placing youth at the center of development interventions—an underlying principle in sustainable livelihoods interventions. Through funding youth initiated projects, the UN-Habitat and the YEN acknowledge that sustainable youth livelihoods seek to enhance multiple youth livelihood assets beyond a mere increase in youth income. In addition to youth access to quantifiable financial resources, this study also evaluates the intangible qualitative impacts of the UYF and Y2Y on youth access to social and political networks, livelihood decision making processes, among other outcomes.

This chapter begins by discussing knowledge gaps in conventional youth livelihood development programs and evaluation techniques. A brief justification for a mixed methods research design is then presented followed an overview of the main sources of data and data collection methods, including a recap of the terms “youth-led organizations”, “grantees” and “youth beneficiaries” defined fully in Chapter One. The chapter then proceeds to provide
extensive background information on the UYF and Y2Y programs and grantees included in the study. The Chapter also presents brief background information on the comparison group organizations included in the study. The chapter then summarizes the combined grantee projects included in the study, including justification for comparative analysis. Data collection methods and analysis techniques are presented just after the UYF and Y2Y background information. Finally, the chapter concludes by presenting the limitations of the research design and a brief conclusion paving way for analysis chapters.

**Limited understanding of youth-led livelihood programs**

Available literature shows that Youth Serving Organizations (YSOs), international development organizations, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and national governments traditionally initiated, designed and implemented youth livelihood programs. However, recent studies show that most youth living in low-income countries are already informally employed in their communities and that they often possess skills and resources necessary for day to day survival (James-Wilson, 2008). International development agencies, NGOs and national governments have largely ignored the fact that youth are already economically active in their communities and that they already possess basic skills and resources that can be tapped into when designing youth livelihood programs (James-Wilson, 2008). An important research gap exists in this regard: What happens when youth are put in charge of livelihood programs, that is, when youth themselves initiate, design and implement youth livelihood programs? This study contributes to knowledge generation in this regard by exploring and highlighting the impact of youth-led projects funded by the UYF and Y2Y programs.
In the context of Sub-Saharan Africa, the World Bank Youth Employment Inventory shows that youth employment programs have been initiated mostly by national governments in collaboration with bi-lateral and multi-lateral development agencies (Rother, 2006). The assumption of unskilled and poorly educated youth in need of outside assistance, mostly led to vocational training programs being prescribed for youth (Rother, 2006). Youth beneficiaries were generally not consulted when vocational and skills training programs were being designed and implemented for them. A global World Bank Youth Employment Inventory found that successful youth employment programs were mostly comprehensive approaches combining entrepreneurship, skills training, job placements and development of social networks and resources to improve youth employability and job search skills (Betcherman et al, 2007).

However, we do not yet fully understand the nature of successful youth-led livelihood programs and their impact on youth beneficiaries, youth organizations and the communities in which the projects are implemented.

This study highlights the nature of youth-led livelihood programs and the extent to which such programs and projects create decent and sustainable employment and livelihoods for youth. An impact evaluation of youth-led livelihood programs is vital given that the World Bank’s global Youth Employment Inventory shows that about 40% of youth employment programs have little or no impact on intended beneficiaries (Betcherman et al, 2007). The Inventory found that in some cases, youth employment programs prescribed by outside agencies have had negative impacts on intended youth beneficiaries. The World Bank inventory, for example, cites inadequate youth participation in livelihood programs as one of the reasons for the ineffectiveness of traditional youth livelihood programs. Therefore, we need to know more about the impact of meaningful youth participation in youth livelihood programs as proposed in recent
youth-led livelihood approaches. This study employed a mixed method research design to examine impact evaluation questions that are emerging on a critical global youth-led livelihood development agenda.

**Justification for a mixed method research design**

As explained in Chapter One, this study focused on the UYF and Y2Y projects in the Sub-Saharan Africa region, particularly those implemented in the “no-job economies”¹ of West Africa. Funding of youth-led initiatives by international development agencies is a recent phenomenon. Little is known about the best procedures to evaluate the effectiveness of such initiatives. The World Bank is currently developing its first Monitoring and Evaluation Guide on youth livelihood programs to be published later in 2013. One of the weaknesses of conventional youth livelihood impact evaluations has been their heavy reliance on quantitative data collection methods and statistical analysis (Baker, 2000). The use of qualitative impact measures in social and economic development programs has been limited by a longstanding tradition favoring quantitative impact measurements to meet results-based monitoring and evaluation systems (Bell & Aggleton, 2012). One central principle of data collection is the use of multiple sources of evidence or triangulation to yield data convergence (Yin, 2011). According to Yin (2011), a multiple-case study design is feasible where two or more cases are selected for a study followed by a cross-case analysis examining key components or attributes of the cases.

From the above theoretical perspectives, this study employed a multiple-case study approach where the focus was on gathering data from multiple cases as opposed to a detailed

---
¹ This occurs when the number of available jobs lies far below the demand for those jobs (UNIDO & YEN, 2011)
focus on a single case as in a conventional case study research. Multiple-case studies have the potential to present strong evidence across multiple categories and variables but they cannot substitute for the comprehensiveness of a single case-study (Yin, 2008; Yin, 2011).

Reliance on quantitative impact evaluation techniques has meant that the perspectives of youth on the successes and failures of youth livelihood programs have largely been ignored. According the James-Wilson (2008), whereas YSOs quantitatively assumed access to income to be the most important requirement in successful youth livelihood programs, in-depth qualitative studies increasingly show that youth frequently consider access to social networks and friendships as the most important resource in successful youth livelihoods. From this perspective, an effective impact evaluation of development programs should employ both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods and analysis.

Integration of quantitative and qualitative methods has become an increasingly accepted approach to evaluate development programs (Baker, 2000). Using a mixed method research design allows different sources to be used to examine salient questions. Mixed methods approaches also allow data analysis to be conducted at various levels. The perspectives of project beneficiaries can also be captured comprehensively by using quantitative survey methods to estimate income and other quantifiable variables and qualitative interviews to analyze socio-economic and political processes linked to program outcomes. Because quantitative methods tend to be rigid and standardized, it is important to complement such methods with flexible qualitative methods (Baker, 2000). When qualitative methods are combined with quantitative methods, it becomes possible to gather additional data through follow up interviews and
feedback from beneficiaries to guide the interpretation of findings. Quantitative methods are often useful in testing the prevalence of views obtained from qualitative interviews.

Given the advantages of using mixed methods as described above and the tradeoffs of using one method over the other, I used a mixed-method research design to benefit from the combined strengths of quantitative and qualitative methods. I employed triangulation of data sources, using interviews, surveys and project documents from funding agencies to gather data from multiple sources. I used qualitative methods mainly to capture the feelings and perspectives of participants regarding how the UYF and Y2Y impacted their lives and communities. When research participants described how the UYF and Y2Y projects have impacted their lives, they provided rich information on context and processes linked to project outcomes. At the same time, I used quantitative surveys to gather numerical data from participants. I used quantitative methods because they made it easier to capture and analyze livelihood data such as number of jobs created, income from entrepreneurship activities, prevalence of livelihood themes and outcomes, among other variables. The next section presents an overview of the main sources of data and data collection methods employed in this study.

**Overview of the main sources of data and data collection methods**

Prior to the study, I received approval from the Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board (COMIRB) on May 29, 2012 (COMIRB Protocol # 12-0465). An invitational email was then sent to UYF and Y2Y grantees explaining the purpose of the study and requesting their voluntary participation in it. Appendix 1 shows the invitational email that I sent to research participants.
As introduced in Chapter One, I collected data from key informants and youth-led organizations through project coordinators. The three key informants who participated in the study worked for the UYF and Y2Y program—one from the UYF program and two from the Y2Y program. Youth-led organizations were NGOs, Community Based Organizations (CBOs), Cooperatives, Associations or Networks led by youth aged between 15-35 years old. UN-Habitat and YEN required successful youth-led organizations to be registered by national governments and licensed to lawfully operate in countries where they were based. The youth who coordinated the projects that were submitted for the UYF or Y2Y grant are referred to as project coordinators. Youth-led organizations that received the UYF or Y2Y grant are referred to as grantees. Grantees trained unemployed and underemployed young women and men aged 15-35 years old. The young women and men who were trained by grantees through their funded projects are referred as youth beneficiaries. Youth-led organizations whose projects were not funded by UYF or Y2Y grant are referred as comparison group organizations. Projects submitted by comparison group organizations were eligible to receive the UYF or Y2Y grant but they were competitively unsuccessful.

I collected primary data from key informants and project coordinators through interviews and surveys. Key informants emailed me secondary data in the form of survey data collected from youth beneficiaries and mid-term and final project reports from grantees. Survey data collected from youth beneficiaries are referred to as “youth voices”. In addition to interviews, surveys, youth voices and reports, I also reviewed archival information for all UYF and Y2Y grantees and comparison group organizations. Archival records for grantees and comparison group organizations were mostly in the form of completed grant application forms. The completed application forms indicated important baseline information. Baseline information
provided on the application forms included organizational characteristics and project goals and objectives.

Table 3.1 presents an overview of the main sources of data and data collection methods employed in this study. The table indicates the total number of interviews and questionnaires that I administered to key informants and project coordinators for both UYF and Y2Y programs. The number of youth voices included in the study from UYF and Y2Y programs is also indicated. Data collection methods also included reviewing baseline application forms and youth beneficiary status before joining grantee projects. In later sections, data collection methods are described in detail.

**Table 3.1: Data source, program and data collection method**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source and program</th>
<th>Data collection method</th>
<th>Number of interviews</th>
<th>Number of questionnaires</th>
<th>Number of Mid-term Reports received</th>
<th>Number of Final Reports received</th>
<th>Baseline data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key informants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UYF</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UYF</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee organizations/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project coordinators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UYF</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UYF</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the next several sections, I first present a recap of the UYF and Y2Y programs and then describe grantee organizations and their projects on behalf of youth beneficiaries in greater detail. For both UYF and Y2Y, I also present brief background information on the comparison group organizations included in the study.

**The UN-Habitat Urban Youth Fund program**

The UN-Habitat Governing Council met in April 2007 and resolved to establish the Opportunities Fund for Urban Youth-Led Development (General Council Resolution 21/6). The broad goal of the Opportunities Fund for Urban Youth-Led Development (Urban Youth Fund) is to promote the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the Habitat Agenda. The priority areas of the Urban Youth Fund as per General Council Resolution (GC 21/6) were as follows (UN-Habitat, 2009a; 2009b):

- Promoting entrepreneurship and employment for youth
- Supporting the development of youth networks on sustainable urban development
- Promoting partnerships between youth organizations and the local government or the private sector
- Promoting gender mainstreaming in urban youth development
- Promoting youth participation in urban governance
- Piloting innovative approaches to adequate shelter and secure tenure for youth
- Documenting best practices in urban youth-led development

The UN-Habitat UYF provides grants of between US $5,000 and US $25,000 to youth-led organizations considered having the most innovative ideas and solutions for youth employment
creation, good governance, adequate shelter and secure tenure (UN-Habitat, 2009a; 2009b; www.unhabitat.org). To be eligible for an UYF grant, organizations must be led by young people, aged 15-32 years, and be based in developing cities and towns with a minimum population of 10,000 people. The UYF primarily targets youth-led organizations working to enhance livelihood opportunities and to improve slum conditions for youth growing up in marginalized and impoverished developing urban communities.

UYF grantees are selected annually through a competitive application process, open to youth-led organizations that are legally licensed to operate in low-income communities where they are based. UN-Habitat requests applications for the UYF grant through various means including press releases, Facebook, Twitter, radio announcements and news media. Applicant organizations are first required to register their organizations on the UYF website. Upon registering, organizations then complete an application form posted on the UYF website and submit the application along with all required attachments online. Applicant organizations can either apply for a small grant (up to $5,000) or a large grant (up to $25,000).

The UYF Application form asks applicant organizations to provide a range of organizational and project information including the size of grant being applied for; organizational profile indicating type of organization; whether or not the organization is led by youth aged 15-32 years; gender equality promotion information; organization’s legal licensing details; details of any facilitating organization and partnerships; title and location of project; target groups in terms of number and age of youth and young females; and project summary and problem analysis indicating the project’s expected activities, outputs, outcomes and innovativeness. One important component of the UYF application form requires applicant
organizations to indicate the goal of the proposed project and its relevance to the priorities of the UN-Habitat Urban Youth Fund. Appendix 2 shows a blank UYF application form. Eligible and successful youth-led grantees typically address multiple priority areas of the UYF. Box 3.1 presents examples of successful UYF projects extracted from archived application forms.
Box 3.1: Sample project descriptions from successful Urban Youth Fund grantees

“The proposed project has a “support fund” component to help youths in business to increase their capital leading to expanded businesses. The growth in youth businesses will automatically create further opportunities for employment for other youths. The fund also encourages other youths not yet in business to start businesses. The proposed project will address youth entrepreneurship through its entrepreneurship skills training program and offer practical support to youth entrepreneurship initiatives. The proposed project activities and strategies will address specific objectives under the youth empowerment, entrepreneurship development and youth employment of the 2006 National Youth Policy, Vision 2015. Youth poverty and empowerment will be addressed through youth friendly credit facilities, skills training and youth enterprises to provide basic needs necessary in defeating poverty”.

(2009 Urban Youth Fund grantee)

“Empowering Youth for Sustainable Planned Dar Es Salaam City Project will facilitate sustainable employment opportunities for youth living and doing their business in Dar es Salaam… AUPEF sees the need to mobilize and create networks among youth, particularly petty traders and empowering them to address their problems cooperatively. They (youth) should have a common decision making structure when presenting their demands to the Dar Es Salaam City Council… the project intends to benefit both male and female youth in Dar Es Salaam city.” - (2009 Urban Youth Fund grantee)

“Child mothers will be identified in the community by opinion leaders and peer educators and will be enrolled for practical skills training in cookery, tailoring, metal fabrication and brick laying. After a successful completion of the course, they will be encouraged to form groups and then lectured on business proposal writing and small business management skills and savings. Thereafter, they will be asked to submit proposals which will be funded under the revolving fund scheme and each group will supervise its members. Businesses created will be monitored and evaluated by the organization and groups. They will return interest free cash extended to them as part of start up capital to allow other mothers to benefit.” - (2009 Urban Youth Fund grantee).

“The goal of the Youth in Micro-Enterprise for Change Project is to alleviate poverty among urban youth and their families through skills training for disadvantaged young people aged 15-32 years…the project trains these young people in entrepreneurship/apprenticeships, establishes businesses for them, and finally introduces interventions to ensure expansion of their businesses and make their businesses sustainable.” (2010 Urban Youth Fund Grantee).
Urban Youth Fund grantees included in the study

This study included Urban Youth Fund grantees from the 2009, 2010 and 2011 application cycles. In 2009, thirty-five UYF grantees were from the Africa and Arab States region. I wanted to include all African organizations from the 2009 application round except for those from North Africa and the Arab world. However, I excluded three grantees because their projects did not have a livelihood component even though the grantees were in Sub-Saharan Africa. Two grantees were automatically excluded from the study because they were located in North Africa and the Arab world. Three other grantees were also excluded from the sample because their project documents and reports were all in French and interviewing or surveying them required fluency in French. In the end, twenty seven 2009 grantees were eligible for inclusion in the study. I interviewed fifteen of the twenty-seven 2009 grantees who agreed to participate in the study. Twelve grantees from the 2009 application cycle did not respond to email invitations requesting their participation in the study.

For the 2010 and 2011 UYF application cycles, I was only interested in grantees from West Africa, given the underlying need to compare the UYF with Y2Y West Africa (see later section). In total, there were 25 grantees from the Africa and Arab States region for the 2010 application cycle and eight of the grantees were from West Africa. I invited five 2010 grantees to participate in the study. Two of them agreed to be interviewed via Skype and to complete email surveys. Three of the invited grantees did not respond to the email invitation and the other three were not contacted because they primarily required fluency in French. For the 2011 UYF cycle, 25 grantees were from Africa and the Arab States. Ten of the grantees were from West Africa. Six of the ten grantees that I invited to participate in the study accepted the invitation. Two of the grantees did not respond to the invitation and the remaining four were not invited to participate.
in the study because they required fluency in French. Grantees selected during the 2012 cycle were excluded from the study because the projects had only recently started. Table 3.2 shows the Urban Youth Fund grantees included in the study by country and region and Figure 3.1 depicts the percentage of sample UYF grantees by region.

Table 3.2: Sample Urban Youth Fund grantees by country, number and region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total Number of UYF grantees included</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In total, 31 UYF grantees were included in the study. As shown in Figure 3 below, 16 (54%) of the grantees were from West Africa and 10 (32%) from East Africa and 5 (14%) were from Southern Africa.

Figure 3: Urban Youth Fund grantees included in the study by region

All of the 31 sample UYF organizations contained some form of employment creation or entrepreneurship promotion as part of their project goals. As such, all of the UYF projects had a spatial component in the sense that their organizations needed working space or land to train youth beneficiaries. Youth beneficiaries also needed access to working space for employment or entrepreneurship activities before or after graduation. I, therefore, selected the UYF projects with the greatest potential to answer interview and survey questions related to access to land and working space—a significant component of the study. This allowed me to explore the question of access to land and working space in detail since grantees and beneficiaries were strategically positioned to discuss access to land issues and challenges in relation to their project activities and
livelihood outcomes. Access to secure land for livelihood is an important aspect of sustainable livelihoods and urban development (Brown & Lloyd-Jones, 2002). As an urban planning student, I am interested in assessing the ways and extent to which youth livelihood projects address access to land as it bears on youth livelihood strategies and outcomes.

**The UN-Habitat Urban Youth Fund comparison group**

To compare the impact of the UYF projects on youth access to livelihood assets and outcomes, I included a comparison group comprising eligible but unsuccessful UYF applicant organizations from West Africa. UN-Habitat UYF officials provided the list of all eligible but unsuccessful applicants in the 2011 UYF cycle. I emailed 147 applicant organizations from West Africa, inviting them to participate in the study, 38 of the organizations accepted the invitation. As with the UYF grantees, comparison group organizations proposed projects addressing youth employment, entrepreneurship, skills training, governance, policy, gender equality, youth participation, poverty eradication and empowerment, among other areas. I performed a chi-square test for independence and found no significant differences in the focus areas and fundamental characteristics of the 31 UYF grantees and the 38 comparison group organizations. Table 3.3 presents UYF comparison group and grantee organizations by country, number and region. Chapter 4 presents a quantitative comparative analysis of UYF grantees and comparison group organizations.
Table 3.3: UYF comparison group and grantee organizations by country, number and region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>UYF comparison</th>
<th>UYF grantees</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gambia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>East Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Figure 4 below, 13 (34%) of comparison group organizations were from Ghana, 11 (29%) from Nigeria, 10 (26%) were from Cameroon, 3 (8%) from Liberia and 1 (3%) organization was from The Gambia. Chapter Four presents full comparisons of the UYF grantees and comparison group organizations across questions and thematic areas.
The next section summarizes the Youth Employment Network Youth-to-Youth Fund program and Y2Y grantees and comparison group organizations included in this study.

**The Youth Employment Network Youth-to-Youth Fund program in West Africa**

The pilot round of the Youth-to-Youth Fund (Y2Y) took place in the four post-conflict West African countries of the Mano River Union—Ivory Coast, Liberia, Guinea and Sierra Leone. Out of the 270 applications received during the pilot round, 14 projects that the YEN considered most innovative received grants of between US $2,000 and US $50,000 (YEN & UNIDO, 2011). To be eligible for a Y2Y grant, youth-led projects had to contribute to youth employment creation in the fund’s focus areas including youth entrepreneurship, community projects and services, transition from school to work, vocational training and economic empowerment of women (www.ilo.org/yen). To ensure project sustainability, applicant organizations partnering with relevant stakeholders were given preference in the selection process.
process. As with the UYF, Y2Y grants were similarly awarded through a transparent, competitive and multistage selection process.

*The Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees included in the study*

The Mano River Union Report prepared by the YEN and UNIDO officials contained results from 13 of the 14 projects funded during the Y2Y pilot phase in 2008/2009 (YEN & UNIDO, 2011). The officials visited Y2Y funded project sites and interviewed youth beneficiaries, project coordinators and field officers and prepared a report detailing the impact of the Y2Y pilot projects on grantees, youth beneficiaries and communities where the projects were implemented. I included the 13 pilot projects in the analysis of the Y2Y projects presented in Chapter Six.

The success of the 2008/2009 Y2Y pilot round led to subsequent rounds of the fund in Guinea and Sierra Leone in 2010 and 2011 respectively. During the second Y2Y round, YEN received 127 and 174 applications from Sierra Leone and Guinea respectively. From the combined 301 applications, 23 youth-led organizations, seven from Sierra Leone and 16 from Guinea, received Y2Y grants of up to US $20,000. I invited all Sierra Leone grantees to participate in the study. Two of the grantees completed email surveys and responded to Skype interview questions through email (refer to data collection methods for more on email surveys and Skype interviews). A Children, Youth and Environments Center (CYE) intern translated the email invitation, Skype interview questions and survey questionnaire for Guinea grantees into French. I sent out the translated email invitation to all 16 Guinea grantees requesting their voluntary participation in the study. Five of the 16 grantees agreed to participate in the study and emailed their responses to the Skype interview and survey questions. A CYE intern translated
their responses from French to English. I included all 16 organizations from Guinea in this study because YEN officials collected data from each of the organizations during site visits and emailed me summarized project results from all Guinea grantees. YEN officials also emailed me spreadsheets with data and views from youth beneficiaries trained by Guinea and Sierra Leone grantees.

Similar to the UYF application process, Y2Y applicants are required to provide extensive organizational and project information during the application process. Among other things, Y2Y applicant organizations were asked to provide full details of partnering organisation(s); target groups including young women and/or men, urban and/or rural youth, disabled youth or uneducated youth; project categories to be addressed, selecting relevant categories from: “Agriculture and Food Processing”, “Services Sector/ Skilled Crafts”, “Water and sanitation”, “Energy” and “Health”. Y2Y applicants also provided details about their projects including the problem area their project was addressing, project objective, expected outcomes including total jobs, enterprises or cooperatives to be created and salaries expected, project innovativeness, project implementation capacity and the size of the grant requested. I extracted sample project descriptions from completed Y2Y application forms to understand the kind of projects that were funded by the Y2Y grant. Box 3.2 below presents these sample project descriptions from successful Y2Y grantees included in this study.
Box 3.2: Sample project descriptions from Youth to Youth Fund grantees

“The project will create employment opportunities for youth through cassava processing. Young people with little or no education will be employed and trained to become autonomous in future. On the other hand, the project will allow people in Nzérékoré to buy cassava at a good price. Products derived from cassava processing will be sold in neighboring Conakry and Koundara. In addition, the project will promote personal development of young people and their employability through sport.”

- (2010 Y2YF grantee)

“The goal of this project is to create decent jobs and income for young beneficiaries in order to improve their living conditions and fight against youth unemployment in the Kindia prefecture.”

- (2010 Y2YF grantee)

“The Klin Salone Youth Umbrella Association helps youth to organize themselves into functional groups with view of engaging them in sustainable income generating activities in the private waste management sector. Klin Salone provides technical and organizational assistance to the groups including training in waste management, organizational development, marketing and bookkeeping, coaching of their marketing activities, assistance in obtaining contracts with private and public clients.”

(www.ilo.org/yen).- (2009 Y2YF grantee)

“The project will support a cooperative of young farmers, ICT/industry workers and food producers/suppliers. This will provide hands-on entrepreneurial experience and education by providing youth with the opportunity to work in the state-of-the-art business centre…Through the project, youth will learn about cooperatives/enterprises, some numeracy and basic accounting skills, how to formulate business plans, participate in workshops on social-entrepreneurial leadership and project management skills and learn about feasibility studies and marketing plans… The project will pay special interest to young people who migrated to the city and will support them to return back to their rural communities and start their own business in order to ease the pressure of over-population in the city. And the children hawkers will be placed in the apprenticeship program until they reach mature age to be able to start their own businesses or seek gainful employment.”- (2011 Y2YF grantee)

“The specific project objective is to build the capacity of fifty polio persons in urban and peri-urban Makeni with skills in shoe and paper beads making, and to help them set up, manage and / or be employed in sustainable market driven enterprises”. - (2011 Y2YF grantee)
A closer look at the application details of successful Y2Y applicants reveals that most of them proposed comprehensive youth employment and entrepreneurship projects. The comprehensive element in successful applicants was also a major characteristic of successful UYF projects. Chapter Six presents a full comparative analysis of Y2Y and UYF projects. As shown in Table 3.4 and Figure 5 below, 36 Y2Y grantees were included in this study. By country, 19 (53%) of the grantees were from Guinea, 10 (28%) from Sierra Leone, 4 (11%) from Liberia and 3 (8%) were from Ivory Coast.

**Table 3.4: Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees by country, number and application round**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Y2Y Round</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pilot Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Second Round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pilot Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pilot Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pilot Phase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Second Round</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of the 36 grantees included in this study, 23 (64%) were from the second round of the Y2Y launched from 2010-2011 in Guinea and Sierra Leone. The remaining 13 (36%) were from the pilot phase or first round launched in 2008/2009 in Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia and Sierra Leone. Figure 6 depicts the Y2Y grantees by application round.
Map 1 below depicts the location of the 39 Y2Y grantees in the four Mano River Union Countries of Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia and Sierra Leone since 2008. I excluded three of the organizations shown on the map because project data was not available for all of them.
The Youth-to-Youth Fund comparison group

I included Y2Y comparison group organizations drawn from the 2011 Sierra Leone Y2Y applicants. I excluded eligible but unsuccessful applicant organizations from Guinea because they needed extensive French translations. I emailed 120 eligible but unsuccessful applicants from Sierra Leone inviting them to participate in the study. I used the same email invitation used for Y2Y grantees (Appendix 1). Twenty eighty of the eligible but unsuccessful applicants responded and agreed to participate in the study.

Source: www.ilo.org/yen
An overview of the Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth fund grantees included in the study

Overall, I included a total of 67 Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees in the study. By region, 52 (80%) of the grantees were from West Africa, 10 (14%) were from East Africa and only 5 (6%) were from Southern Africa as shown in Table 3.5 and Figure 7 below.

Table 3.5: Total Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Total Number of UYF and Y2Y grantees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 7: Combined grantees by region

Map 2 depicts the combined Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees by country in the Sub-Saharan Africa region.
Map 2: Location of Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees

Source: Created in Google Maps/https://maps.google.com

Justification for comparing Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees

The basis for comparing UYF and Y2Y programs and projects stems from the fact that both programs target youth-led organizations that they considered to have the most innovative projects and solutions to youth employment challenges in low-income communities. In both cases, successful youth-led organizations are awarded grants to implement youth livelihood projects. In most cases, both UYF and Y2Y youth-led projects offer comprehensive training to youth beneficiaries as means to enhance youth livelihoods. To confirm the qualitative
observations on fundamental characteristics of UYF and Y2Y grantees and projects, I performed a chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction). There was no significant association between grantee type and project focus (for example, “environment”, “job training and skills development”, “entrepreneurship”), Chi-square (df=1, N = 64) = .429, 2.560 and 0.044 respectively; \( p = .513, .110 \) and .835 respectively; \( \phi = -.238 \) (very small effect) and -.068 (very small effect) respectively. To be significant the alpha value (\( p \)) should be equal to or less than .05. I did not perform a chi-square test for independence for the “employment theme” because one matrix cell violated the minimum expected frequency of five, a chi-square rule for a two-by-two contingency table. Generally, both UYF and Y2Y projects are underlined by broad youth livelihood enhancement goals and this fundamentally justifies the comparative analysis of the UYF and Y2Y projects presented in Chapter Six. In the next sections, I describe the sampling strategies used in the study and expand on data collection methods introduced in earlier sections.

**Data collection methods**

I used both primary and secondary data collection methods to gather qualitative and quantitative data for the study. I used semi-structured conversations with key informants and semi-structured interviews and surveys with UYF and Y2Y project coordinators as the main primary data collection methods. The main secondary data sources that I used included youth voices, document reviews and archival records. I collected primary data through in-depth interviews and surveys with project coordinators from June 2012 through December 2012. In the next sections, I present the sampling strategies used in the study and the main data collection methods and analysis techniques employed.
Primary data collection methods

Key informants

I held three peer debriefing sessions with three officials: one from the UN-Habitat UYF and two from YEN Y2Y. I held peer debriefing sessions with each of the three officials via Skype. Their purpose was to discuss the feasibility of the research design and data collection methods given the research questions. The conversations with key informants allowed me to refine interview and surveys questions before conducting the Skype interviews and surveys with grantees. The conversations enhanced my understanding of the UYF and Y2Y programs given that the key informants, who were managing and coordinating the UYF and Y2Y programs, were very knowledgeable about these programs more broadly and the grantees and project activities specifically. It was, therefore, easy for the officials to identify weaknesses in the proposed data collection methods based on their understanding of the situation on the ground and potential data collection challenges. Conversations with key informants were semi-structured to allow for a broad discussion of the UYF and Y2Y programs.

The interviews that I conducted with key informants were unstructured and did not constitute a significant part of this study. My informal conversations with key informants allowed me to broadly understand the UYF and Y2Y programs. For the Y2Y program, key informants or YEN officials prepared mid-term and final project reports in collaboration with Y2Y project coordinators. This was not the case for the UYF program in which project coordinators prepared the reports in collaboration with staff members in their organizations. Key informant views were therefore more important in the Y2Y program compared to the UYF. This is because YEN officials also expressed their views in the mid-term and final projects that they prepared. In addition to the central views of Y2Y project coordinators in Chapter 5, I also
analyzed complimentary key informant views as expressed in Y2Y mid-term and final project reports. Overall, findings from this study largely reflect the views of UYF and Y2Y project coordinators and end beneficiaries. Key informant views are an insignificant part of this study because I did not have an interview or survey protocol to gather specific views from them.

**In-depth Skype interviews**

Interviews gather participants’ opinions, perceptions, background information, practices, beliefs, present and past behaviors and experiences (Emerson et al, 2001). Qualitative interviews acknowledge the complexity of human experience and allow a researcher to directly hear people’s interpretations of their experiences up-close and at the personal level (Emerson et al, 2001). I, therefore, used in-depth Skype interviews to understand the experience of youth-led organizations with respect to access to land, socio-economic and political processes specifically linked to their projects, including an understanding of how access issues related to land, social networks and partnerships bear on youth beneficiaries’ livelihoods. I interviewed project coordinators who oversaw the implementation of the UYF and Y2Y projects. Project coordinators shared their views and project experiences on behalf of grantees and youth beneficiaries. Through Skype interviews, I was able to understand the project impact experiences and perceptions directly from the project coordinators who led the implementation of UYF and Y2Y projects. Interviewing project coordinators also allowed for a broad exploration of the social, economic and political context in which grantees and youth beneficiaries operated.

I developed a Skype interview protocol with 19 open-ended questions. I developed the interview themes and questions using the sustainable livelihoods framework and concepts from youth livelihood development literature. I grouped the questions under eight major themes:
access to working space or land for training and youth livelihood activities; access to cooperatives, networks, partnerships and support groups; access to start-up capital, materials and equipment; access to skills training; impact of project on youth and the community; challenges and opportunities; lessons and recommendations; and current status of project. Appendix 2 shows the Skype interview protocol with a complete list of categorical themes and questions.

According to Hanna (2012), Skype technology with audio and visual recording capabilities advances the power of the internet as a research medium and represents the most feasible alternative to face-to-face or telephone interviews. For this reason, I used Skype interviews as the main qualitative data collection method. Skype was considered the most feasible method to interview participants who were located in various parts of Sub-Saharan Africa. Funding was not available to travel to Africa to conduct face-to-face interviews with Y2Y and UYF grantees and youth beneficiaries. Skype emerged as the cheapest and quickest way to contact participants and gather the required data. However, erratic internet connections meant that video chat was sometimes difficult so that only voice chat was possible in some cases. In the audio only Skype mode, non-verbal communication is lost (Booth, 2008). I encouraged participants to type any questions or responses using Skype’s instant text messaging capability to complement voice and video chat. The Skype text messaging feature proved helpful as it allowed for quick clarifications if there was a misunderstanding. I saved the text chat messages and conversations on the computer and printed them out soon after the chat. Unless deleted deliberately, text chat conversations can be retrieved easily for every chat meeting held in Skype. Recording an interview helps eliminate bias by making it possible to revisit direct quotations during data analysis and report writing (Driscoll, 2011). For this reason, I recorded all Skype interviews using a digital voice recorder and then transcribed them verbatim.
Some grantees provided email responses to the Skype interview questions when audio recording was poor or disrupted by erratic internet connections. Similarly, grantees emailed me responses in cases where it was impossible to conduct Skype interviews due to language barriers (as in Francophone Guinea) or due to limited network/phone infrastructure (as in post-war Sierra Leone). An intern at the CYE Center translated the email invitation, Skype interview and survey protocols and responses from English to French for Guinea Y2Y grantees. I only sent the interview and survey questions to those grantees who beforehand agreed to participate in the study. Emailed Skype interview responses saved time since they did not require transcription but they also required grantees to spend more time typing their responses, especially given that I included potential probes that would have been used during live Skype conversations. This was in line with Driscoll (2011)’s observation that an email or chat interview is already a transcription ready for analysis.

The major advantage in using Skype interviews was the ability to conduct distant interviews with youth participants who were dispersed across Africa. I was also able to draw a diverse sample of research participants from West, East and Southern Africa. It would have been impossible to conduct face-to-face interviews with participants in many countries. It was also easier for me to get informed consent over the internet since participants did not have to physically sign the consent. I simply sent participants an invitational email in which I requested their participation in Skype interviews and email surveys. Participants who had reliable internet access quickly responded indicating their willingness to participate in the study. Face-to-face interviews would have involved locating the participants and asking for manual signatures, something which might have taken a long time. Recent studies have shown that Skype interviews are more appropriate for research with youth because they are often technologically savvy.
(Deakin & Wakefield, 2013; Sullivan, 2013). The youth project coordinators that I interviewed were all enthusiastic to talk over Skype and they all knew how to use it.

However, I experienced challenges in administering Skype interviews because it was not possible to interview participants who did not have internet access. Slow and/or unreliable internet access could not allow some participants to respond timely to the study invitational email. This made it difficult for me to conduct such interviews in a timely manner. One of the challenges of using Skype interviews is that it makes it easy for participants to drop out of the study without giving any reason (Deakin & Wakefield, 2013; Sullivan, 2013). I experienced this challenge when three UYF project coordinators kept postponing scheduled interviews. In the end, the three coordinators did not respond to my reminder emails. I never heard back from them even though they all initially agreed to participate in the study. As observed by Deakin & Wakefield (2013), lack of physical location for the interview often makes it easy for participants to miss or cancel Skype interviews. For me, many participants sent urgent emails requesting interview postponements at the last minute. Whilst I understood that the youth project coordinators were busy, it is possible that the coordinators found it easy to cancel virtual meetings—a scheduled face-to-face interview would have compelled them to attend.

According to Deakin & Wakefield (2013), data quality can be compromised when interviewees are distracted in offices and homes from which Skype interviews are conducted. In some of my interviews, office or home background noises made it difficult for me to transcribe parts of interviews. In such cases, interviewees texted responses during the interview or later clarified responses through email.

As noted by Sullivan (2013), lack of face-to-face interaction often makes difficult or time-consuming to build rapport in Skype interviews. To build rapport for this study, I used a
detailed invitational email that explained the purpose of the study and its benefits to participants. I also expressed that participation in the study was voluntary and assured participants that confidentiality and anonymity principles were guaranteed. Once participants agreed to participate, we communicated frequently over email before the interview. The pre-interview email communications allowed project coordinators to better understand the research and to freely express themselves in subsequent conversations.

The accessibility of mobile internet access in Africa and other developing communities implies that Skype interviews are a promising data collection method for research involving low-income youth. As more and more youth gain access to reliable internet access, Skype interviews will allow researchers to interview many distant youth in a cheaper and faster way compared to face-to-face interviews. However, challenges remain: building rapport through internet research remains a challenge; erratic internet connections may disrupt and deter in-depth interviews; time zone differences make it difficult to schedule international interviews; and internet interviews make it difficult to guarantee anonymity and confidentiality.

**Surveys**

A survey can be conducted through email or it can be posted on the web with a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) provided to known respondents (Ilieva, Baron, & Healey, 2002). Even though a respondent’s anonymity is often compromised, surveys conducted via email often yield faster, reliable and higher response rates compared to a survey administered through a URL (Ilieva, Baron, & Healey, 2002). Unlike web surveys, responses gathered through individual, targeted email messages often yield reliable data from a planned and known sample (Stanton, 2006). I did not use email addresses and individual names as research data for this study and knowing respondent names and email was not a major ethical challenge.
Given the numerous advantages of an email administered survey over a URL-based survey, I used an email survey as opposed to a URL-based survey. The email survey approach helped in overcoming slow internet connections and also improved the response rate since the survey was more personalized. Once grantees and comparison group organizations agreed to participate in the study, I emailed the survey questionnaire to every participant individually and in a personalized manner. I sent individual surveys attached as a compatible word document following peer debriefing observations that reliable internet connections are still a major challenge in most parts of Sub-Saharan Africa and especially in West Africa. While mobile internet connection has recently expanded in Sub-Saharan Africa, participants would have needed to spend forty-five minutes to an hour on a computer with an internet connection to complete a URL-based survey. This was deemed unrealistic during the peer debriefing sessions. Attaching the questionnaire to an email was a more practical approach as it allowed participants to download the questionnaire, complete it offline, and conveniently email responses during periods of uninterrupted internet connection.

I designed the questionnaire mainly to complement views obtained from Skype interviews and to gauge the prevalence of themes and views expressed by project coordinators. The survey protocol contained thirty-four closed-ended questions and three open-ended questions. Open-ended questions allow participants to express their views and feelings more freely (Fowler, 2008). Closed-ended questions simplify data analysis given that participant responses are focused and defined (Fowler, 2008). Given the advantages of closed- and open-ended questions, I included both types of questions in the survey protocol. I grouped the closed-ended survey questions under the same themes used for Skype interviews. Table 3.6 below presents sample of closed-ended questions contained in the survey protocol.
Table 3.6: Sample closed-ended questions and measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey question</th>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In what areas does your project focus? (Select all that apply.)</td>
<td>Baseline data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of training has your organization given to young men and women through this project in the past 12 months? (Select all that apply.)</td>
<td>Human capital, decent employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many youth have you assisted in securing employment or entrepreneurship in the past 12 months? How many youth have you assisted who are self-employed?</td>
<td>Economic capital, decent employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of working space or land are the youth you assisted using for their livelihood activities? (Select all that apply)</td>
<td>Decent employment, physical capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About how much are youth beneficiaries paying per month in total for the space or land that they use for their business activities?</td>
<td>Decent employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the youth have licenses or contracts with land owners for the space(s) that they use?</td>
<td>Decent employment, partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of jobs are the young men and women you have trained or reached through the project doing? (Select all that apply.)</td>
<td>Decent employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your organization been able to assist youth beneficiaries to form cooperatives, or support groups through this project in the past 12 months?</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your project still ongoing?</td>
<td>Project sustainability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The three open-ended questions contained in the questionnaire and used to understand the broad context of the projects were:

- What challenges, if any, has your organization faced trying to attract youth in your community?

- What recommendations would you give to funding agencies to help improve the implementation and impact of youth-led projects?
• Aside from monetary funding, what are the top three needs your organization will need to continue with this project and your organization’s work in general?

Appendix 3 shows the full survey protocol administered to UYF and Y2Y grantees. In addition to the questions contained in Appendix 3, I asked comparison group organizations to indicate one or more of the following actions they took upon unsuccessful UYF or Y2Y grant application: “After your application for a grant from UN Habitat’s UYF or YEN’s Y2Y was not funded, did you (select all that apply)”: “Start the project without funding”, “Apply again in 2012”, “Get funding from another source”, “Abandon the project”, or “Other (specify).” I asked this question to explore opportunities and constraints faced by youth organizations in low-income countries.

Even though online research methods are considered faster and less intrusive compared to offline methods such as telephone or personal interviews (Schillewaert & Meulemeester, 2005), I encountered challenges administering the email survey. Slow and erratic internet connections in most parts of Africa where I sent the survey meant that it took some grantees and comparison group organizations up to three months to return the survey. Project coordinators cited erratic or slow internet connection as the main reason for the delayed responses. As a result, data collection through email survey and also Skype interviews proceeded slowly from June 2012 through December 2012. Table 3.7 below summarizes UYF and Y2Y survey data, including the response rate.
Table 3.7: Overview of survey data collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Emailed</th>
<th>Delivered</th>
<th>Undelivered</th>
<th>Responded</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UYF grantees</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>55%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UYF Comparison</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27%**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2Y grantees</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47%***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2Y comparison</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38%****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

*15 of the grantees who responded were from the 2009 UYF round, 2 grantees were from the 2010 cycle and the final 4 were from the 2011 round. All 2010 and 2011 grantees were from West Africa.

** These were all West Africa applicants to the 2011 UYF round.

*** The 23 grantees included 16 from Guinea and seven from Sierra Leone. Six responses were from Guinea and two from Sierra Leone. Contact details for the 13 Y2Y pilot grantees were not available for invitation to participate in the survey.

**** The comparison group was drawn from Sierra Leone only. Guinea applicants were omitted because they needed French translations which required more time and a committed translator.
Secondary data sources

Secondary data for this study was gathered from youth beneficiary’s voices, document reviews and archival records stored on the Youth Employment Network and UN-Habitat websites. Each of the secondary data collection methods employed is described fully below.

Youth voices

UN-Habitat and YEN officials interviewed the young men and women who benefited from the UYF and Y2Y projects during site visits and emailed me youth responses for use in this study. YEN officials included United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) field officers specifically employed to assist Y2Y project coordinators during project implementation. The Regional Y2Y West Africa Program Coordinator also conducted field visits and interviewed youth beneficiaries as part of mid-term project evaluations. YEN officials recorded the views and perspectives gathered from youth beneficiaries in Sierra Leone and Guinea and emailed me the raw youth voices. During the mid-term field visits, YEN officials asked youth beneficiary the following questions: Grantee Organization Name; gender and age; number of children and age; marital status; when did you start working with (organization name)?; what were you doing before joining the project?; what has the organization done for you since the beginning of the project?; what was your income before the project started?; what is your income now?; are you making as much income as you would want to from the project and why?; wow has the project impacted your life?; what problems are you facing now?; and how could the project be improved for the next time?

UN-Habitat UYF officials also used the above questions to gather the impact of projects on past UYF youth beneficiaries. Appendix 4 shows the youth questionnaire that was used by YEN and UN-Habitat officials to explore the impact of funded projects on youth beneficiaries. The
views from youth beneficiaries were a major secondary data source for this study. Because most of the views were quoted directly from the youth, they were particularly important in highlighting the impact of projects on youth livelihoods, including the challenges that youth beneficiaries were facing. Table 3.8 below summarizes youth beneficiary voices data and remarks.

**Table 3.8: Youth beneficiary voices data summary and remarks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Total youth voices included</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth-to-Youth Fund</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>165 of the mid-term voices were gathered from Sierra Leone Y2Y beneficiaries and 170 voices were from Guinea Y2Y beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Youth Fund</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>The 57 youth voices were gathered from youth beneficiaries trained by 7 past UYF grantees. UN-Habitat officials in collaboration with the 7 UYF grantees collected the voices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Youth beneficiary voices</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document reviews**

Document reviews provide important contextual information and rich qualitative data to complement findings from primary data collection methods (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). In addition to youth voices, I reviewed 11 mid-term reports and 14 final project reports for UYF grantees. YEN officials emailed me seven mid-term reports and 29 final project reports.
(summarized versions only) for Y2Y grantees. For both UYF and Y2Y program, grantees prepared mid-term and final project reports as part of agreements reached during the signing of grantee contracts and project monitoring and evaluation requirements. UYF and Y2Y grantees were generally required to submit mid-term and final reports as a condition for continued funding. For the Y2Y program, the mid-term and final project reports were prepared by the Regional Y2Y Coordinator for West Africa in collaboration with UNIDO field officers and project coordinators. The field officers were permanent UNIDO employees responsible for monitoring and evaluating progress on West Africa Y2Y projects. The mid-term and final reports provided important contextual information to guide data analysis and interpretation. The reports were provided in a standardized format making project comparisons and data extraction easier. For example, Y2Y mid-term reports contained data on the following questions:

- To what extent has the project been able to achieve its objectives?
- To what extent has the project been able to achieve its expected results?
- How does the innovation of the project or the project idea itself help youth to find long term decent employment? How effective is it?
- What are the three main factors that have contributed to the project’s progress?
- What are the three main factors that have prevented the project’s progress?
- Impact on the beneficiaries and organizational capacity
- Sustainability assessment, main recommendations and lessons learned

Mid-term and final project reports for the UYF grantees contained important information on the following questions:
• Please list the key activities that have been undertaken during the project and describe any changes in outputs or time frames compared to your original plan of activities submitted in your application

• Based on your original goals and objectives, what has been the impact of your project?

• What problems have you encountered during the project?

• How did you overcome these problems?

• What is your final assessment of the project?

• Do you plan to continue this project? If so, how will it be funded?

• Any other comments

Mid-term and final project reports from the UYF grantees similarly provided important contextual information and impact of the projects on youth beneficiaries and the community. In both programs, mid-term and final project reports proved useful in complementing the views expressed by project coordinators and youth beneficiaries.

Archival records

The UN-Habitat and Youth Employment Network websites contain important archival records on the UYF and Y2Y programs, respectively. Archival records included newsletters, press releases, completed application forms (UYF only), grantee and project summaries, managerial information and evaluation documents related to the UYF and Y2Y programs. Completed application forms for the UYF grantees included in the study were downloaded from the UN-Habitat administered Global Youth Help Desk (www.globalyouthdesk.org). For the Y2Y grantees, completed application forms were not posted on the YEN website (www.ilo.org/yen) but YEN Y2Y officials emailed completed application forms for the 2010-2011 successful and unsuccessful Guinea and Sierra Leone applicants. UYF and Y2Y completed application forms
provided vital baseline information on the characteristics of funded organizations and the kinds of projects that were funded or not funded. The baseline information was useful in evaluating the project outcomes and activities against originally planned goals and objectives.

Even though official documents stored by organizations often provide useful and unbiased information, they can also present challenges linked to access, format and quality (Gillham, 2000). The major challenge that I faced was the inability to receive some mid-term and final project reports from both UN-Habitat and YEN officials. Failure to obtain some midterm and final project reports meant that it was sometimes difficult to make comparisons based on mid-term or final projects alone. Also, while the mid-term and final project reports provided by UN-Habitat and YEN mostly contained relevant information for the study, there were sometimes information gaps that limited their usefulness. Information gaps existed when grantees left some questions unanswered or provided very brief responses. UH-Habitat and YEN officials also prepared mid-term and final projects in complicated rich text formats and I needed to reformat all reports prior to importation into NVivo.

**Sampling strategies**

*Purposeful sampling strategies*

In purposive sampling, a researcher deliberately selects the most productive sample to examine the research question(s) (Marshall, 1996). A purposive sample is selected based on the researcher’s knowledge of the population, its characteristics and the corresponding research questions. This study sought to gather project data from two groups that were considered significant beneficiaries of the Y2Y and UYF programs: grantees (youth-led organizations) as the intermediate program beneficiaries and trained youth as the end beneficiaries. I selected UYF
and Y2Y projects that focused on youth employment creation and livelihood enhancement. I, therefore, selected the most theoretically relevant grantees for the study, that is, grantees that had projects emphasizing youth employment, entrepreneurship and livelihoods. I presumed that livelihood-focused projects were the most useful in providing relevant data on youth access to livelihood assets and decent employment. Using the same criteria of usefulness and relevance, I selected key informants and project coordinators of the UYF and Y2Y projects for inclusion in the in-depth interviews and surveys based on their presumed ability to answer questions related to the impact of the Y2Y and UYF projects on youth beneficiaries and communities.

**Convenience sampling techniques**

Whilst purposive sampling seeks the most productive sample, convenience sampling seeks the most accessible or convenient sample. I used convenience sampling to interview key informants and project coordinators who were readily accessible by email and Skype. I excluded project coordinators whose emails were not working and who could not be reached by phone as a means to save time. It was difficult to find contact information for all UYF and Y2Y project coordinators. As a result, I ended up interviewing and surveying project coordinators who were readily available and willing to participate in the study (see Skype interviews and surveys in the next section). For the Y2Y pilot round, I could not obtain contact information for project coordinators. I, therefore, analyzed end of project data that was conveniently provided by the Youth Employment Network. I conveniently selected most UYF and Y2Y grantees from West Africa to ensure that selected projects were located in a similar geographical and economic region. In the next sections, I present the specific data collection methods used to collect data from sample grantees and comparison group organizations.
Data analysis procedures and techniques

In-depth interviews, archival records and documents

To analyze Skype interviews, I first recorded them using a digital voice recorder, and then saved the recordings on the computer before transcribing them verbatim. Prior to data analysis, I emailed all transcribed Skype interviews and summaries back to interviewed project coordinators for reviews on accuracy. I loaded each of the twenty-eight transcribed Skype interviews in NVivo as cases by choosing “Save Selection as Case”. I created a folder under “Internals” in NVivo to store the interview transcriptions. I then created two sub-folders to store transcriptions from the UYF project coordinators and those from the Y2Y project coordinators, respectively. I used NVivo to analyze Skype interviews because it made it easier for project interviews to be organized simultaneously and quickly. NVivo also allowed interview data from the UYF and Y2Y projects to be coded simultaneously and systematically within the same NVivo project while retaining primary sources of data.

To code Skype interview data in NVivo, I began by reading and re-reading Skype interviews and assigning provisional labels (Free Nodes) to the themes that were emerging. I derived a provisional start-up list of descriptive codes (access to physical, social, financial, human and natural assets and decent jobs) from the proposed research questions and the sustainable livelihoods framework. I initially explored broad livelihood outcomes reported by project coordinators and youth beneficiaries for all livelihood capital categories. I continued reading and re-reading the interview responses, gradually placing the responses in higher order categories. Higher order categories combined related themes and ideas from the provisional start-up list of codes.
Whilst coding interview data in NVivo, I kept in mind that codes or categories are tags or labels that give meaning to qualitative data and are usually attached to words, phrases, sentences or paragraphs (Basit, 2003). Whereas the initial coding categories or “Nodes” were derived from research questions and the sustainable livelihoods framework, higher level categories and emergent sub-categories were derived using the qualitative principles of inductive coding, reflexivity, flexibility and grounded theory (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Using the inductive coding principle, I derived the meaning of interview data from the stories told by project coordinators, without imposing the sustainable livelihoods framework on their responses. I, therefore, used inductive coding to flexibly analyze interview data so as to avoid imposing my preconceived youth livelihood notions or theories on the data. I let qualitative interview responses from project coordinators speak for themselves (Wolcott, 1994).

I used theoretical memos in NVivo to write notes and to revise coding categories as new themes emerged. Theoretical memos are hypothetical ideas or thoughts that arise during qualitative data analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994). I used theoretical memos to reflect on data ideas related to the sustainable livelihood framework, youth livelihoods development literature and decent jobs concepts. I wrote my reflections under “Memos” in Nvivo. I then used the memos to connect concepts and themes from data during data coding, analysis and interpretation. The analysis procedure for analyzing Skype interviews resembles thematic or pattern coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994). I used pattern or thematic coding to organize the qualitative responses from project coordinators in a more meaningful or structured way. By organizing interview data around themes or pattern exhibited by the data, it became easier to understand the data. I followed the same data reduction process to analyze archival documents, including mid-
term and final projects, except that archival documents did not require any transcription. Chapters Four, Five and Six present detailed analysis and results from Skype interviews.

**Survey questionnaires**

I analyzed survey data collected from project coordinators in SPSS. Quantitative analysis in SPSS involved generating simple frequency distributions, cross tabulations, chi-square tests and t-tests. I began by entering all survey data in excel spreadsheets and then proceeded to import the excel data into SPSS. I then analyzed survey questions individually, followed by extensive analysis across questions, themes, grantees and gender. In SPSS, I generated frequency distributions and crosstabulations showing the prevalence of survey themes and categories for all survey questions. Finally, I did a comparative analysis of UYF and Y2Y grantees and comparison groups. To analyze open-ended survey questions, I created a folder in NVivo and analyzed the responses in the same manner that I analyzed Skype interviews and qualitative documents. Chapters Four, Five and Six present full results from the quantitative analysis of survey data.

**Youth voices**

To analyze responses gathered from trained youth beneficiaries, I imported the excel spreadsheet containing the voices into SPSS. In SPSS, I created themes: “access to physical capital”, “access to social capital”, “access to financial capital”, “access to human capital”, “access to natural capital” and “decent jobs”. I derived the themes directly from the research questions and the sustainable livelihoods framework. Continuing in SPSS, I then read each of the 335 youth voices and coded all the responses quantitatively using the six categorical livelihood variables from the research questions and theoretical framework. I indicated with a “Yes” (1) when a response fell into one of the pre-defined categories and used a “No” (0) when a
response did not reflect the category in question. By analyzing youth voices this way, I intended to generate statistical information on the prevalence of social, physical, financial, human and natural asset outcomes as reported by youth. I also intended to show the extent to which youth beneficiaries reported access to decent jobs and income in quantitative terms.

I created new categories for youth voices that did not fit into the predefined categories. Analysis of youth voices data and survey questionnaires described above largely followed the deductive coding approach. In deductive coding, topics of interest or codes are developed before the data is consulted (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Miles & Huberman, 1994). In this case, quantitative information is extracted from qualitative data, through for example, counting of key words and the number of sentences on a particular topic (Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012; Miles & Huberman, 1994). In using the deductive coding approach, I, therefore, specifically tested the prevalence of livelihood categorical themes in youth voices. Finally, in both qualitative and quantitative terms, youth voices data required a before-and-after comparison to determine the livelihood impacts of Y2Y and UYF projects on youth beneficiaries in the short to medium term. Before-and-after analysis involved comparing the livelihood situation of youth beneficiaries before-and-after the project using baseline data and mid-term and/or end of project results. Results from youth voices analysis are included in the next three chapters.

Statistical tests performed to compare participant and grantee groups

The chi-square test for independence

I performed a chi-square test for independence to test the significance of differences observed between grantees and comparison group organizations across livelihood themes and variables. According to Pallant (2010), the chi-square test for independence is one of the most
useful non-parametric tests to explore relationships between two categorical variables. An effective impact evaluation requires the creation of a specific comparison group with similar characteristics to project beneficiaries except that the comparison group does not receive any program benefit (Baker, 2000). To ascertain if the comparison group for the UYF and Y2Y projects was appropriate, I performed a chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction) and found no significant differences between UYF and Y2Y grantees and comparison groups. I also performed the chi-square test to determine whether or not differences observed between young male and female voices were significant. Chapters Four, Five and Six include full chi-square test results from the UYF and Y2Y projects and youth voices.

**Independent samples t-test**

I performed an independent-samples parametric t-test in SPSS to test the differences between incomes reported by young male and female beneficiaries. I also performed an independent samples t-test to test the difference in number of enterprises and jobs created by UYF and Y2Y projects. An independent samples t-test is used with continuous variables to compare average scores from two different groups of participants (Pallant, 2010). The next three chapters include independent samples t-test results and analysis from UYF and Y2Y projects.

**Bivariate correlation**

I performed simple bivariate correlation in SPSS to determine the effect of grant size on project outcomes including the number jobs created and the number of self-employed youth and women assisted. I used Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation Coefficient and Spearman’s Rho to test the significance of the correlations observed.
**Descriptive statistics**

I performed overview descriptive analysis in SPSS to summarize average responses between two groups. The comparative descriptive statistics included the average differences in the number of jobs created by UYF and Y2Y grantees, average differences in male and female income; differences in average grant sizes; among other variables.

Table 3.9 below presents the research design overview, including proposed research questions, data requirements and indicators used, data collection methods, unit of analysis and data analysis type. To analyze research data, the unit of analysis needed to be defined and the table indicates the unit of analysis linked to specific research questions, indicators and data collection methods. Against the unit of analysis, the table also indicates whether the final data analysis was performed using qualitative or quantitative methods, including the specific statistical tests performed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Data collection methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the impact of UYF &amp; Y2Y programs on youth access to:</td>
<td>- Skype interviews with UYF and Y2Y project coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Physical Capital</td>
<td>- Skype and email conversations with key informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Social Capital</td>
<td>- Grantee and comparison group surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Financial Capital</td>
<td>- UYF &amp; Y2Y youth beneficiary voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Human Capital, and</td>
<td>- Mid-term and final project reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Natural Capital</td>
<td>- Archival records and documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do the UYF and Y2Y programs create decent and sustainable jobs for youth in low-income communities?</td>
<td>- Completed application forms with baseline information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Mid-term and final project reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- UYF &amp; Y2Y youth beneficiary voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Skype interviews with UYF and Y2Y project coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Skype and email conversations with key informants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Archival records and documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What lessons and recommendations for youth livelihood programs can be derived from the UYF and Y2Y programs and projects?</td>
<td>- Semi-structured interviews with key informants and project coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- UYF and Y2Y youth beneficiary voices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next section presents the limitations of the research design and data collection methods presented in preceding sections.

**Limitations of the research design**

The major limitation of the research design was the inability to conduct fieldwork due to limited funds. Fieldwork would have allowed me to interview the project coordinators and youth beneficiaries face-to-face and to personally observe impacts of UYF and Y2Y on the ground. The absence of livelihood data from a youth comparison group (comprising eligible youth who did not receive project benefits) meant that only a before-and-after analysis could be performed to determine the impact of projects on youth beneficiaries. Before-and-after analysis is generally considered less reliable compared to the use of a comparison group in impact evaluation (Baker, 2000). Also, YEN only emailed me youth beneficiary data that was collected during mid-term site visits and indicated that end of project data from youth beneficiaries was not available. The implication was that youth beneficiary data from the YEN was only useful in highlighting the short to medium term impact of projects but not as useful in assessing long term project impacts.

Another limitation of the study was that small samples limited rigorous and systematic statistical analysis. It was not possible to get enough UYF grantees from West Africa for comparison with the YEN West Africa projects. As a result, I conveniently selected UYF grantees from East and Southern Africa to ensure that a reasonable number of UYF grantees could be included in the study. Fortunately, a chi-square test for independence indicated that there was no significant difference between UYF and Y2Y organizational and project characteristics across multiple themes. As reported in previous sections, I was unable to interview Y2Y grantees in Guinea because of language barriers. As a result, I could not conduct
follow up interviews on the Guinea Y2Y interview and survey responses that were sent and received via email. Finally, the UYF and Y2Y projects that I included in the study were implemented between 2008 and 2012. This raised two challenges: it was difficult to track down project coordinators or representatives for those projects implemented during the pilot rounds in 2009; and comparing projects implemented during different time periods was a challenge because some projects were still ongoing whilst others had ended. Whilst, it was possible to track down most of the 2009 UYF grantees, the project coordinators needed time to reflect on the projects since most of the earlier projects had already ended. From this perspective, data provided by such project coordinators could not be easily confirmed by data from other sources.

To improve the quality of data, I used multiple sources of evidence, including surveys, Skype interviews, youth voices and stories, key informant interviews, document reviews and archival records. The limitations presented here do not discredit the study results but they guide readers to interpret the findings, conclusions and recommendations more accurately.

**Ethical issues and considerations**

Primary data collection via the internet can be susceptible to hacking or corruption, especially during data transfer from the respondent’s computer to the researcher’s computer. Physical and electronic security of the server where data is stored once collected should be a major consideration in internet-based research (Benfield & Szlemko, 2006). Some computer programs can record the IP address of the computer being used by the respondent and thus threaten the respondent’s anonymity and privacy (Benfield & Szlemko, 2006). I used the following data management and security procedures to counter hacking and potential file corruption: Windows 7, 64-bit OS with User-Account Control, WPA2-Personal, Advanced Encryption System (AES), Firewalled Private Network, Microsoft Security Essentials Virus...
Protection with Malware/Spyware and Unwanted Software Protection. Also, I was the only person who had access to the local hard drive and the server where all research data was stored.

The issue of informed consent in internet-based research largely depends on the respondent’s integrity as it is not possible to verify that the person responding is the actual participant being targeted or if the respondent actually meets research participation inclusion criteria. I used personalized emails, surveys and Skype interviews to minimize informed consent challenges associated with web-based surveys. I sent an invitational email to participants approved by the COMIRB (Appendix 1) to obtain their informed consent. I gave participants an advance notice indicating that participation in the study was voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study along the way if they wanted to. The project coordinators who participated in the Skype interviews all indicated their willingness to participate in the study before I conducted the interviews and surveys.

Project coordinators may also rarely reveal some information that may be considered discrediting or embarrassing to their organization, such as instances of corruption, bribery and disagreements during project implementation. Some officials from an organization may not want such information revealed to anyone. The project coordinators may also generally feel uncomfortable to report limited success on funded projects fearing that such information may jeopardize their future funding prospects. To ensure transparency and accountability, I sent all transcribed Skype interviews back to project coordinators. The project coordinators then reviewed the transcripts for accuracy before I conducted data analysis and report writing. Also, I did not use individual youth beneficiary names in line with the ethical principles of ensuring anonymity and confidentiality in Human Subjects Research. I used organizational names where
appropriate because details on grantees and comparison group organizations are already publicly available on the websites of UN-Habitat and YEN or individual organizational websites. I also designed Skype and survey protocols employing ordinary everyday impact evaluation questions on the impact of the Y2FY and UYF projects on their respective organizations, community and youth beneficiaries. In other words, I did not ask any cultural or sensitive questions that would have made project coordinators uncomfortable to express their views and opinions.

Conclusion

This chapter presented background information on the UYF and Y2Y programs, the data collection methods and analysis procedures used to gather qualitative and quantitative data to answer the evaluation questions posed by the study within the sustainable livelihoods framework. The chapter presented a mixed-method research design framework highlighting multiple data collection methods and analysis techniques employed to achieve data triangulation and convergence. The ethical issues and considerations relevant to the study were also discussed. Next, Chapter Four and Five present data analysis and findings from the Urban Youth Fund and Y2Y grantees and comparison groups. Chapter Six focuses on comparisons, discussion and interpretation of findings within the sustainable livelihoods framework and related theoretical perspectives. Finally, Chapter Seven presents the conclusions and recommendations from the study.
CHAPTER IV
DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS: UN-HABITAT’S URBAN YOUTH FUND

Introduction

This study offered youth project coordinators and youth beneficiaries an opportunity to share project impact experiences including challenges, lessons, aspirations and recommendations to UN-Habitat and funding agencies. A central part of the global youth-led development agenda is the need for active and full youth participation in development projects from inception to implementation, monitoring and evaluation. In this study, youth beneficiaries of the Urban Youth Fund (UYF) participated in an impact evaluation of projects on their organizations, youth beneficiaries and the community at large. Their feedback through Skype interviews and surveys constituted participatory monitoring and evaluation. Given that youth-led development is still an emerging concept, it was important for me to evaluate and document not only the project outcomes but also the challenges, lessons, aspirations and recommendations from youth entrepreneurs in both qualitative and quantitative terms.

The previous chapter presented the research methods and analysis procedure that I followed in this study. In this chapter, I present the findings from the qualitative data analysis in NVivo and quantitative data analysis in SPSS. Qualitative analysis is centered on findings from the Skype interviews that I conducted with UYF project coordinators and final project reports provided by UN-Habitat. Quantitative analysis is focused on the analysis of survey data from 60 youth beneficiaries, 31 UYF grantees and 38 UYF comparison group organizations. I begin the chapter with an overview of sample grantees and the nature of funded projects. I then introduce the NVivo analysis before shifting to an in-depth analysis of views and perspectives from project
coordinators as expressed during Skype interviews and in the final reports they submitted to UN-Habitat. In this section, I explore the impact of UYF projects on youth access to physical, human, social and economic assets necessary for sustainable youth livelihoods. After presenting the qualitative impact of UYF projects on youth access to livelihood assets, I then shift to an in-depth evaluation of the challenges faced by grantees during project implementation including lessons for youth-led organizations and recommendations for UN-Habitat. In this broad section, I also present five best youth-led livelihood cases to illustrative the nature of some successful sample UYF projects. I selected the five best practice examples based on evidence of working space and land access partnerships, financial and technical partnerships, enhanced social capital through youth working groups, and potential for project sustainability. After the recommendations for UN-Habitat, I turn to an extensive quantitative impact evaluation of UYF projects using survey data from youth beneficiaries, grantees and comparison group organizations. Finally, I conclude the chapter by highlighting the main findings, challenges, lessons and recommendations.

**Thematic focus of funded projects**

Sample UYF projects included broader livelihood goals implemented through various ways: entrepreneurship and employment creation, vocational and skills training, Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) training, recycling and environmental entrepreneurship training, youth participation in governance, young women’s empowerment, urban farming, among others. For example, through the Urban Youth in Governance and Development (UYOGOD), the Northern Patriots in Research and Advocacy (NOPRA) in Ghana promoted youth participation as a way for youth to meet government officials and subsequently access government youth funds.; Youth Outreach Program Cameroon (YOP-CAM)’s Initiative for
Youth Employment and Development (IYED) sought to enhance youth livelihoods in Bamenda through piggery farming; Victorious Youth Movement (VICYOMO) implemented an ambitious tyre recycling project in Limbe (Cameroon) as a means to create youth employment; Concerned Youth Organization (CYO) in Malawi and Kaswesha Housing Cooperative Society (KHCS) in Kenya both offered computer and ICTs skills to out-of-school and school going youth to prepare them for self- and formal employment opportunities; AISEC-Senegal’s Green Young Entrepreneurs Project (GYE) sensitized Senegalese youth on environmental issues and prepared them for social and environmental entrepreneurship; The Voi Youth Forum (VYF) and the Kamaliza Waste Recycling Group (KWRG) projects created youth employment through recycling and waste management training.

There were also projects that focused on enhancing young women’s livelihood skills. For example, the Conscience International (CI-Gambia) project offered computer skills training, sexuality education and gender-based violence awareness to young teenage mothers as a means to enhance their livelihood skills; the Helping Urban Opportunity Neglected Youth (HUONY) in Addis Ababa (Ethiopia) offered communication skills, leadership, team building and financial management to young females from slum areas; Friends of the Habitat (FOH)’s Sustainable Youth Empowerment Project in Maiduguri (Nigeria) provided livelihood and vocational skills to an equal number of young females and males; and the Child Care and Rescue Program (CCRP) supported the income generation efforts of child mothers in Uganda.

Appendix 5 presents the complete list of grantee name and country, project name, location and focus. As can be seen in Appendix 5, sample UYF projects were defined by a broad youth livelihood enhancement goal. They were projects that promoted youth livelihoods through
community waste management and recycling, vocational skills and on-job training, environmental entrepreneurship, and skills training to enhance youth employment opportunities. Youth entrepreneurship was a major component of the projects; they created youth microenterprises that created income generating opportunities for youth and women. In the next several sections, I introduce the qualitative analysis employed and present the qualitative impact of UYF projects from the perspective of project coordinators.

**Qualitative data analysis in NVivo**

As explained in Chapter 3, I analyzed qualitative Skype interview data and project reports using thematic analysis in NVivo. Using this approach, I first organized my interview and project report data according to the research questions. I came up with seven broad data categories from my research questions: access to physical capital (PHYSCAP); access to human capital (HUMCAP); access to social capital (SOCAP); access to economic capital (ECONCAP); access to decent jobs (DECJOB); challenges faced (CHALNG); lessons for youth-led organizations (LESNS); and recommendations for UN-Habitat UYF program (RECOMD). The seven broad categories were my initial “Free Nodes” in NVivo. I then began the data coding process by reading through all data sources in the “Internals” and placing it under the categories for which they belonged. I also created another category “Don’t Know Yet” where I placed all data that did not seem to fit into the eight categories that I initially created. After placing all relevant pieces of data under the eight broad categories, I began reading the data more closely looking for sub-categories within the broad themes. From the eight broad categories, I came up with 148 smaller categories. In line with the qualitative research tradition that calls for flexibility in data analysis in order to “let the data speak for itself”, I continued reading through the data over and over again, refining the categories further. As I read through the data in NVivo, I also did a word
frequency query to get a quick overview of the “big words” evident in the data. I did this as a complementary early coding method and for a quick preliminary analysis. The preliminary analysis was meant to understand the context in which the broad themes or words were used.

Figure 8 shows the NVivo generated tag cloud.

The above tag cloud shows both the variety and frequency of responses: the bigger the size of the word, the greater the frequency associated with that word. For example, project coordinators made frequent references to the impact of the UYF projects and training on youth beneficiaries, their organizations and the community. Reading through the interview and project
data, it was evident that project coordinators felt that the projects offered them project 
management training and also allowed their organizations to train youth who in turn formed 
groups and small businesses. The training also evidently allowed them to gain skills and acquire 
business loans used to engage in income generating activities and other community development 
activities. The next several sections present detailed findings on the impact of UYF projects on 
grantees, youth beneficiaries and the communities in which the projects were implemented. I 
used direct quotations and statements from project coordinators as much as possible to illustrate 
their reported feelings and views.

The Impact of Urban Youth Fund projects on youth access to physical capital: views from 
project coordinators

Access to working space, land, materials and equipment

Project coordinators expressed that the UYF grant allowed their organizations to 
acquire land and working space for project implementation. Studies have shown that urban 
land is a central physical asset for sustainable livelihoods in low-income countries (Brown, 
2006). The FOH, for example, acquired land for its project through partnership with city council 
and community leaders. Other grantees received land donations, whereas others used the UYF 
grant to expand their workspace. The FOH project coordinator explained how they acquired 
land as follows:

“The community leader who is also the district head of the community played a major 
role in determining the choice of the viewing centre for use as the training site. The 
main reason for the choice of the centre was to shorten the travel distance to the site 
and proximity to the workshop of the master trainer. We did not have to pay anything 
for the site. This is because of the perceived importance of the project by the
community who then decided to seek for the Local Government’s permission for us to use the centre for free” - Project Coordinator, FOH

The YHFG used the UYF grant to expand their workspace as remarked below:

“We work from a training and sales centre that was constructed using UN-Habitat funds. The land belongs to the Municipal Assembly and is rented to the project. In the funding application, we proposed to erect two metal containers to house the training and sales center. But a new by-law by the Municipal Assembly forbidding erections of containers in the central business district made it difficult for us to proceed with the containers as planned. We then engaged the Assembly and they provided a suitable land for the construction of a building for the project.” - Project Coordinator, YHFG

The VICYOMO also used the UYF grant to purchase land for the piggery project from the Save the Children Alliance Orphanage Limbe at a cost of $US 160. In cooperation with the Voi City Council, the Voi Youth Forum was granted land to set up a recycling and waste sorting system for their project. The group then offered door-to-door waste collection services for a small fee. The Chief Executive Officer of Voi City Council donated the project site. AISEC-Senegal received free premises to conduct their training, workshops and conferences from Dakar Mayor. The YPPD project coordinator said “the graduation ceremony actually led to a pledge from the Makeni City Council to allocate a piece of land to our organization as a sign of their support to this laudable initiative which aims at uplifting young people within the district.” The FLEP-Club commenced the construction of a Youth Training Center after received the UYF grant:
“Because funding does not come regularly, we have commenced the building of a Youth Training Centre comprising of: A training hall measuring 30 feet by 14 feet. An office room measuring 18 feet by 12 feet, a 14 computer room measuring 18 feet by 12 feet, and a seven roomed hostel measuring 18 feet by 12 feet per room.” - Project Coordinator, FLEP-Club

In addition to allowing youth organizations to acquire land and workspace for their projects, the UYF grant also allowed some trained youth beneficiaries to access secure working space for self-employment activities before and after graduation. For example, through EYA’s HUONY, youth beneficiaries accessed workspace with assistance and permission from small units of government in Addis Ababa called WORDAs. The WORDAs prepared small working spaces which were then given to youth who graduated from the HUONY project. The youth groups who acquired land with the assistance of WORDAs paid lower monthly rentals compared to those who acquired working space from private land owners. For example, dairy groups paid $US 10 per month for working space acquired through the WORDAs compared to US$ 110 per month for the same space obtained through private land owners. More significantly for sustainable urban livelihoods, the WORDAs also assisted youth to acquire trading licenses from Addis Ababa City Council. They also marketed youth products to community members.

In Kenya, the TAPEV project acted as an incubator for youth graduates and offered them advice and linkages to available local resources. Through the IUYD project, the Family-in-Need Trust of Zimbabwe acquired land from Mutare City Council for 30 small youth business. The businesses also received permits from the council to guard against municipal police eviction and harassments. Upon graduation from the Girls to Mothers Project, five young girls secured
permanent working space in Port Harcourt (Nigeria) with the assistance of the G2Mi. The CCRP provided young girls with working spaces for their business during the training:

“We made five modern mobile shelves with stands which are located in the trading centers of Kyengera, Busega, Nateete, Ndeeba and Kibuye. Each group of girls is attached to a specific trading centre where they sell products they make in the evening as part of market training. We obtained 50,000 pockets of printed packing bags with a strategy of beginning to supply products in supermarkets. We purchased a sealing machine used to seal products in the packing bags ready for dispatch to supermarkets. We have imparted complementary life planning and saving skills along with HIV/AIDS prevention and sexual and reproductive health knowledge to the girls.” – Project Coordinator, CCRP

The acquisition of materials and equipment by grantees and youth beneficiaries was another reported outcome of the UYF. Through the UYF grants, some youth organizations bought training materials and equipment and offered various skills training programs to youth. The FOH’s Sustainable Empowerment Project in Maiduguri (Nigeria), for example, continued after the UYF grant ended because the organization bought computers and training equipment during the project:

“Demand from more youths was received after the project has ended. But because the project had acquired durable items such as computers and kitchen equipment which were still new and in good condition even presently, we were able to train more beneficiaries as a result.” - Project Coordinator, FOH

Some organizations such as the YAI-Uganda expressed that the UYF project allowed them to receive training equipment from other international organizations:
“Tool Aid UK donated sewing machines, type writers, kit sewing machines, wood curving machines to the centre and these were used to set up a tool bank which is used by the beneficiaries. We recruited a total of 47 more students as a result. We also bought eight sewing machines and other training materials for the different project activities.” - Project Coordinator, YAI-Uganda

Through the Community Youth Empowerment Project in Kabwe, youth graduates received tools and start-up capital. Following training, CYM formed four carpentry youth business groups and gave the youth start up toolkits.

Access to physical capital in the form of workspace, materials and equipment was a challenge for youth entrepreneurs. Only a few grantees approached city council to facilitate youth access to land given the strategic position of city councils in this regard. In future, grantees could partner more with local government to improve youth access to land. Access to materials and equipment was also limited for youth beneficiaries and this call for more materials and equipment provision.

The impact of the UYF projects on youth access to human capital: views from project coordinators

The project coordinators that I interviewed all indicated that they received project management training from UN-Habitat and that the training equipped them with the knowledge and skills to implement projects successfully. The project management training also included monitoring, evaluation and implementation, report writing skills and financial management. The
CI-Gambia project coordinator had the following to say about the project management training benefit:

“Personally, I am grateful to UN-Habitat for the support they gave me as the Project Coordinator. Between February and March 2012, I benefited from the project implementation training in Cairo (Egypt) which greatly boosted my project management and implementation skills. UN-Habitat also gave CI, guidelines on various aspects of the project such as report writing.” - Project Coordinator, CI-Gambia

Through the various UYF projects, grantees gave youth beneficiaries business creation and management knowledge. The NOPRA sensitized youth on the various funding resources that were available at local and national government levels in Ghana. They organized forums where local government officials educated youth on local governance systems and participatory processes. The ORGIIS project coordinator felt that they gave valuable recycling knowledge to those youth that they trained:

“We shared knowledge on basic business development in the recycling sector. We explored opportunities for financing enterprise development plans. They (youth) have acquired key and basic skills on how to go about establishing and managing a business appropriately. They have also been adequately furnished with information on existing micro-finance institutions, how to obtain microcredit for their business, and how to ensure and monitor the successful evolution of their business.” - Project Coordinator, ORGIIS

AISEC’s Green Young Entrepreneurs graduates developed and implemented five business plans in response to specific environmental issues in Dakar suburbs. The AUPEF offered proposal
writing and business development planning skills to 46 young hawkers in Dar es Salaam. Even more importantly for cities of the South, the AUPEF educated informal youth traders on city planning strategies and the need for them to conduct their businesses in planned areas to avoid clashes with the city council. The Family-in-Need Trust of Zimbabwe and the Community Youth Mobilization both trained youth in housing construction leading to the creation of youth run small scale construction enterprises in Mutare and Kabwe respectively.

Through the ICT for Youth Development Project, 120 (60 females and 60 males) underprivileged students who were attending community day secondary schools received basic computer operation knowledge and skills. The students received extensive training in Microsoft Office programs and internet surfing. After the training, the students received certificates of completion and recommendations from the CYO and Blantyre City Council. Some grantees integrated computer training into overall skills training projects. For example, the TGK initiated a computer training program that allowed youth graduates to apply ICT knowledge in their creative arts projects. The FLEP-Club project equipped 100 young people with internet communication and agro-business management skills. The Kaseshwa project coordinator explained the impact of their project as follows:

“Kaseshwa Resource Center has become a very important asset to the people of Nairobi east. Over the last nine months, the Center assisted many youths who would have otherwise not been able to access basic information technology training. The Center has been able to provide disadvantaged youth with useful educational opportunities to help reduce the digital divide and enhance the capacity of youth from poor households to be successful participants in a knowledge-based society.”- Project Coordinator, KHCS
The Small Holders Foundation’s Urban Development Secondary School Gardens imparted broad skills to youth beneficiaries as expressed by the project coordinator:

“Through the project activities, 300 students acquired lifetime skills in sustainable crop cultivation and livestock rearing, environmental management, entrepreneurship and financial education. Students have been imparted with skills in the marking out and laying out of a garden, soil preparation and management, selecting appropriate crop seeds, seeding and planting of crops, application of fertilizers and insecticides, weeding and making insect traps, pruning, making and maintenance of low cost bucket, drip and treadle irrigation kits, selecting farming tools, effectively using farm tools and equipments, and seed processing and banking.” - Project Coordinator, Small Holders Foundation

Some of the UYF projects also promoted innovation and creativity for self-reliance in response to escalating group conflicts. From 2012, the EYA began working with individual HUONY youth entrepreneurs to encourage creativity and innovation among the graduates. The individual approach was being encouraged following challenges experienced in some youth groups as some youth graduates refused to work in groups citing limited economic benefits from group enterprises. The FOH also encouraged youth graduates to work as individuals when their businesses required low start-up capital. The Tears Group Kenya also explained how they promoted individual creativity through their project:

“The Musical Band has raised their own income from performances and entertainment. Tears Group has been able to offer financial linkages to a few individuals currently working in Television programs earning a modest income. We also encourage work study
for a few individuals as we enhance the culture of self reliance and independence. Our contribution to Nakuru community is both directly and indirectly.” - Project Coordinator, Tears Group Kenya

The above views suggest that at the organizations level, the UYF trained project coordinators and enhanced their project management and capacity building. At the beneficiary youth level, the grantees used the UYF grant and their enhanced project skills and capacity to train youth in various soft and hard skills. Among other things, the knowledge gained by youth included business creation and management skills and practical skills included housing construction, agriculture, and computer maintenance.

The impact of Urban Youth Fund projects on youth access to economic or financial capital: views from project coordinators

Revolving funds and youth micro enterprises

As shown in Chapter 2, economic or financial capital is one of the most important livelihood assets in the context of informal urban economies. In low-income communities, young people engage in multiple income generating activities as a means to increase their economic assets (Chinguta et al, 2005). Access to economic assets in the form of cash or savings often facilitates access to all other livelihood assets. The UYF program was launched to boost the financial capacity of youth-led organizations in low-income countries. One of its key impacts of was the creation of revolving funds that yielded youth-run enterprises and cooperatives. Some grantees used part of this UYF grant to offer business startup loans and cash loans to youth beneficiaries who then used the loans to set up small enterprises. In setting up small enterprises, the youth not only generated self-employment opportunities but they also employed other youth.
Through the HUONY, for example, 25 young women beneficiaries received business startup loans through the Responsive Scholarship Seed Fund (RSSF). The EYA also linked some young women graduates to micro-financing sources elsewhere. Apart from the revolving loans from the project, the HUONY beneficiaries were introduced to a micro finance bank named Yerwa Community Bank, where they received short term loans of up to 20,000.00 ($1,076), depending on collateral. EYA also encouraged its youth graduates to seek collateral from relatives and friends. The HUONY project coordinator explained how the revolving fund changed the lives of beneficiaries:

“Youth are making profit from their businesses and returning the loan and 52 youth benefited from the Responsive Seed Fund. A woman’s hair salon group received the loan and they are doing very well and have since repaid the loan. In addition, the RSSF directly assisted 10 youth groups that created their own jobs and made their dreams came true. At this point, the lives of the beneficiaries have been changed since they are self-employed. Their status has been changed and this helps the community at large. When youth are unemployed, it destroys the community but these HUONY groups have respect from the community where they live.”  – Project Coordinator, HUONY

According to HOUNY project coordinator the coffee making group members doubled their income within two years. They started with a $2,500 seed fund from EYA in 2010 and their capital reached $5,500 in 2012 and they repaid 98% of the RSSF loan.

The FOH also assisted youth beneficiaries to access micro-credit facilities at local banks:
“Each beneficiary has been given a takeoff revolving soft loan of 6,500 naira ($41) which they have to repay while they also train a few youth each, four to six youth for example, and those that they train shall be given the loans repaid by the first groups. All the trainees were also introduced to a micro finance bank based in Maiduguri. The Bank gave them a talk on how each beneficiary can qualify for a loan. The total number of beneficiaries that accessed loans is 11 to date; five have fully repaid their loans and are processing another loan for various higher amounts depending on the requirements of their individual projects. The first amount of loan is up to a maximum of 10,000 naira ($63). After repayment, the beneficiary can apply for a higher amount with an acceptable and proper guarantor.”– Project Coordinator, FOH

The ORGIIS partnered with Nazareth Youth Centre to create a revolving fund to finance tyre recycling enterprises created by youth beneficiaries. A revolving fund set-up through the ABU-YES project benefited 10 youth enterprises. The Community Youth Mobilization established a credit facility that provided loans to youth beneficiaries in an effort to create sustainable youth enterprises:

“The project has established a credit facility for the youth known as the Entrepreneurship Support Fund which supports small businesses run by youth and helps turn their ideas into successful businesses. UN-Habitat funds for entrepreneurship support were invested as a revolving fund and are helping to address part of the challenges. The credit facilities established means that the project impact will continue after UN-Habitat funding as it is a revolving fund which will continue to benefit more youths in various ways.”– Project Coordinator, CYM
Despite the creation of revolving funds and emerging partnerships with local banks, access to credit was still a challenge for many youth beneficiaries. The credit amounts provided through revolving funds was inadequate. Banks also demanded collateral levels that were beyond the reach of many youth. Urban Youth Fund grantees could establish strong financial partnerships with local banks to facilitate youth access to credit. Particularly for young women, the establishment of microcredit and savings schemes could also boost their access to credit. Women-led savings schemes have been an important source of credit and income for low-income women entrepreneurs in most parts of the developing world (see Satterthwaite, 2002).

**Self-employment, young women empowerment and independence**

Urban Youth Fund projects promoted youth **self-reliance and financial independence**. Youth self-reliance resulted from the self-employment opportunities that arose after graduating and receipt of business loans. The project coordinators felt that the UYF promoted youth appreciation from the community members. Self-employment enhanced youth confidence, independence, and promoted young women’s empowerment. To this end, the YPPD project created self-employment opportunities for 40 youth aged 15-35 and the coordinator said:

“**Communities are now able to restore confidence in their young men and women as they are more productive now than before.**”

The UYF also empowered young women financially as explained by the FOH project coordinator:

“**Even during the training, some that are very good and fast in catching up were contracted by members of the communities to prepare cakes and meat for naming and wedding**
ceremonies. This has tremendously increased their incomes even before they completed their training”.

Most project coordinators expressed that the youth who graduated from the projects were mostly self-employed and that an insignificant number secured formal employment in the private or public sectors. The skills training that the youth received allowed them to generate income to meet basic needs and set up savings accounts in a few cases. The case of FOH illustrates a complicated young women empowerment drive:

“For confectionery making, all the beneficiaries were females. They are engaged in confectionery products in their homes during naming and wedding ceremonies as they are not using rented spaces. They offer confectionery making services including baking cakes, doughnuts, and fruits juice for the ceremonies in large quantities. This is done at negotiated fees during weekends when these activities take place. Some also produce confectionery products for sale in their immediate communities. Those that have secured jobs in the formal sector, that is, paid employment are not many. We know of only one female who was employed by a foreign firm in Maiduguri. The rest are engaged in their own businesses using their new skills to earn income on a daily basis. Many of the computer training beneficiaries also fall within this category of self-employed youths.”

Project Coordinator, FOH

Some project coordinators also indicated that the youth that they have trained have opened up savings accounts after launching successful livelihood initiatives. This was best illustrated by the coordinator of the ABU-YES project:
“After 24 months of operating these businesses, the best performing beneficiary has saved up to 200,000 CFA ($397) in his account and his business operation expanded from 100,000 CFA ($199) to over 350,000 CFA ($695). The least performing beneficiary has saved 64,000 CFA ($127) and his business operations have risen from an initial investment of 100,000 CFA ($199) to 110,000 ($219) CFA.” – Project Coordinator, ABU-YES

Many of the Girls to Mothers Project beneficiaries were also said to have earned enough income from street hawking and that they have shunned risky temptations such as street prostitution and premarital sex. The IUYED beneficiaries started 30 small enterprises and were earning an average monthly income of $100 to $500. This was significant considering that the World Bank considers the poor to be those living on less than $1.25 per day (World Bank, 2013). Some FOH beneficiaries also doubled their income after the project:

“In the case of the generator repairs beneficiaries, even during the training some were earning from 100 - 200 naira or about $2 at the time per day. Presently some of these youth are earning from 3000 to 5000 or about $25 weekly by refurbishing unserviceable generators and selling them to people that cannot afford a new one.” – Project Coordinator, FOH

The IUYED and FOH project beneficiaries were clearly earning more than enough to be considered poor by the World Bank standards. Some FOH youth beneficiaries went back to school using the savings that they accumulated from their self-employment activities. The TAPEV coordinator also expressed that graduates from their project were earning enough income even though their earning fluctuated depending on seasons. The YFHG’s project coordinator indicated
that their beneficiaries were satisfied with the income that they earned from their livelihood activities:

“The beneficiaries work with high motivation and enthusiasm. I think it is because the project earns money directly to them. There have been dramatic changes in income levels. Those who used to earn 100 ($50) cedis a month now earn an average of 300 cedis ($150) a month. That is more than double.” - Project Coordinator, YHFG

One youth who benefited from FLEP-Club’s project opened a catfish farm that produced over 300 catfish and generated a monthly income of about N55,000 ($372). Although most FLEP-Club graduates did not have secure working space or permits for their businesses, they continued to use the FLEP-Club office. Three of the graduates secured a 12 month contract to maintain a palm plantation and piggery farm earning an average of $74 each. However, not all project beneficiaries earned enough income to open up savings accounts. For example, YAI-Uganda Project Coordinator said, “At the moment most of our beneficiaries are able to put food on the table, send their children to public school and also cloth their families.” This suggested that their beneficiaries were only earning enough to meet basic needs.

The self-employment opportunities created through UYF projects enhanced youth access to basic income that was enough to cover daily needs. Only a few grantees reported that their youth beneficiaries had opened savings accounts using income from projects. As noted in the preceding section, access to credit was a challenge for most youth graduates. As a result, this limited youth access to self-employment and income generating opportunities.
The impacts of Urban Youth Fund on youth access to social capital

Youth networks, discussion forums, groups and resource centers

A World Bank study found that low-income youth often rank social networks and relationships as the most central livelihood resource in their quest for sustainable development (Betcherman et al, 2007). The study found that even access to financial capital was not considered to be as important as the relationships with friends and family, everyday youth networks, groups and associations. Access to social networks facilitated youth access to income from friends and family members during difficult times (Betcherman et al, 2007).

From this perspective, how did the UYF program impact young people’s access to social capital in their quest for sustainable livelihoods? Project coordinators clearly felt that the creation of micro-enterprises, youth groups, forums and cooperatives and youth resources centers through the UYF boosted youth access to social capital. UYF projects created cooperatives, youth business groups and micro-enterprises where youth beneficiaries met to share ideas, network and collaborate. The youth run enterprises attracted community and parental attention, cooperation and mobilization in the area of sustainable youth employment creation.

The youth cooperatives that resulted from ORGIIS’ project mobilized youth to work together in the recycling sector:

“Thanks to the project, most of the youths in the tyre recycling sector are now aware of the importance and benefits of uniting in cooperatives and Common Initiative Groups (CIGs) for better efficiency and project outcomes. They are now mobilizing themselves and trying to form CIGs.” - Coordinator, ORGIIS
Some project coordinators appreciated the fact that their projects trained youth beneficiaries who in turn engaged in **peer-to-peer training** in their communities. For example, AISEC-Senegal graduates conducted outreach environmental sensitization and training programs in Dakar. They targeted university students and young neighbors living in areas adversely impacted by environmental degradation and pollution. In Kenya, some TAPEV former trainees formed a community theatre group and alumni that recruits other youth from the community. They conducted job training on theatrical and other creative works and shared their skills with other youth and family members. Some coordinators also felt that by conducting peer-to-peer training, youth graduates acted as **role models** toward positive community change. In the words one project coordinator:

“**When you train women you train a family. Women are role models—they look up to their families and children and more needs to be done to help them. Young women are ready and bring change. They need direction and leadership. Being a young female, I can bring light wherever I go.**”—Coordinator, Girls to Mothers Project

UYF projects also created powerful information and discussion forums and resource centers for youth to discuss and **share information**. The Mengo Youth Development Link Project formed a soccer academy where youth beneficiaries played soccer at regional and local level. The soccer games allowed youth to network and share youth development information. The Family-in-Need Trust of Zimbabwe brought together youth organizations to discuss and share best practices in youth employment creation and housing provision. The TDFY’s Vijana Forum acted as an important online discussion for local and diaspora-based young Tanzanians to share and exchange critical youth development information and news. The ORGIIS introduced trainees and graduates
to established tyre recycling companies to facilitate information sharing and discussions centered on productivity and profitability in the recycling business. The Girls to Mothers initiative also introduced their office as resource center for youth graduates:

“Girls to Mother’s initiative has been able to introduce her office as a resource centre and a whisper phone line for young girls to have free and timely access to counseling on sexual prevention, adolescent reproductive health issues and abuse as it affects them.” - G2Mi Project Coordinator

“The self-esteem of all beneficiaries has been built in a way that they can be role models, live a more responsible life through self-discovery and work towards actualizing their dreams in life.” - Coordinator, Girls to Mothers Project

Most of the grantees organized youth into working groups before and after graduation to facilitate knowledge sharing and access to working space and access to credit. The EYA, for example, organized youth into working groups of five to eighty before approaching the WORDAs to secure working space for the groups. The ORGIIS created three youth and trained the groups in financial management before opening a joint microfinance account for the groups. The benefits of having youth graduates work in groups were best illustrated by the ORGIIS project coordinator:

“This model of group work is very efficient both for the youths and sustainability of the projects. First, in groups they can auto control themselves, the group serves as a shock absorber, control mechanism and insurance for those who alone will be very vulnerable and readily give up in the face of adversities. For the project, the group serves as a
guarantee for success, collateral for the loans, easy traceability, monitoring and up
scaling.” - Project Coordinator, ORGIIS

The AUPEF project also created a network group of “Youth of Africa for Africa” to sustain the outputs from project seminars. Working in groups made it easier for TAPEV’s SPEAK and Dance 5.6.7 graduates to access youth focused government resources that allowed them to expand their businesses. The Youth Resources Development Centers created by the KHCS, Girls to Mother Initiative and FLEP-Club all mobilized youth and brought community members together to learn and collaboratively tackle youth employment and broad community challenges. The TDFY’s Vijana Forum in Dar es Salaam was also thought to have facilitated communication and networking among rural and urban youth in Tanzania:

“The coming of the project was timely and it suits the needs of young people in this era of science and technology. We are confident that with the application of the mobile phone technology, the barrier of communication has been surpassed beyond our imagination and a young person in Sumbawanga (southern part of Tanzania), as far as he/she has internet enabled mobile phone, has equal opportunity to access information as a young person in Upanga (Dar es Salaam city center).” – Project Coordinator, TDFY

**Community cooperation, collaboration and development**

Community cooperation, mobilization and development were generally broad outcomes from the UYF projects. Project coordinators perceived that the UYF benefited youth and their communities in many ways beyond direct employment creation for immediate project beneficiaries. Even though some community members did not appreciate the projects initially, community attitudes shifted after noticing project results. The result, as most project coordinators
indicated, was sustained community mobilization and cooperation in support of UYF projects and youth employment creation. As UYF youth beneficiaries became productive members of the community and began to support themselves and their families, they received wide appreciation from parents as remarked below:

“The project has received acceptance and goodwill from both the community and especially by the beneficiaries. For us as an organization, we did not expect the tremendous goodwill that followed the execution of the planned activities. Many parents and community members who did not initially appreciate the project began encouraging their children and especially female youth to join the project.” - Project Coordinator, FOH

After most graduates from the FLEP-Club shunned anti-social acts such as drugs, alcoholism, and violent political activities, the FLEP-Club received a lot of appreciation from parents and the Owerri community at large:

“The appreciation from parents and friends of participants in the form of letters and phone calls indicate that this project brought relief to families and communities and has significantly reduced unemployment.” - Project Coordinator, FLEP-Club

The success of the TAPEV project led to the formation of small business ventures that secured contracts with different private and public companies. Some the community focused businesses established through the TAPEV included street arts studios, events organizing companies, clothing shop, musical band and social welfare groups. The TAPEV music department formed a musical band that coordinated music and poetry in the Nakuru Municipality. The music groups also engaged in different community outreach projects including peace building and
violence prevention through musical performances. The Girls to Mothers Project created a cooperative where beneficiaries contributed US$ 5 per month once their businesses stabilized. The cooperative fund allowed the Girls to Mothers initiative to extend skills training to more females in Port Harcourt. The NAYA women beneficiaries ran a cooperative that provided pastry services to residents of Paynesville City and created cooperatives that saw youth beneficiaries working together to ensure effective project implementation and outcomes.

The ABU-YES project benefited 600 underprivileged persons and the following is how the project coordinator described who the 600 project beneficiaries were and how they benefited from the project:

“These are mainly beneficiaries, their friends and close relatives. The impact is mainly in terms of better nutrition, housing and education for beneficiaries and their relatives. Some of them are now members of their village or community youth associations and they usually raise funds, especially during holiday periods for the development of their community and also organize other activities such as campaigns to clean up the environment in their communities.” – Coordinator, ABU-YES

The NAYA project attracted the participation of community leaders who made the identification and renting of their project site easy. The CI-Gambia project coordinator felt that their organization gained substantial experience working with community leaders and other youth development stakeholders since their project started. The Sustainable Livelihoods through Vocational Skills Training in Freetown was considered a necessary part of the community to the extent that community members mentored and monitored youth beneficiaries before and after
graduation. Some UYF grantees such as the YAI-Uganda mobilized community members during the beneficiary recruitment stage as illustrated below:

“Three community meetings between the staff of Mengo Youth Development Link and the community members and local leaders were held to draw strategies for learners’ recruitment and implementation. Unity and the spirit of working together among the urban slum youth have been achieved so there is a good working relationship center among young people and a lot of support from the community. The tailoring class is registering lots of improvement, we have set perfect mobilization plans and even though the class is already full, community demand is still high; students are now able to make good materials so our marketing department is looking for clients in schools and companies to make uniforms.” - Project Coordinator, YAI-Uganda

Some youth graduates engaged in volunteering activities and strengthened community ties and development efforts. The youth volunteered activities on community services such as civic education and social mobilization on various social issues affecting their surroundings. The FLEP-Club graduates volunteered with the organization until they got an opportunity or startup capital to develop their businesses.

Urban Youth Fund projects yielded youth resource centers and discussions forums that brought together diverse youth and community members. In the process, UYF graduates acted as role models to other community youth, offering peer-to-peer skills training to friends and family members. As a result, parents and community members began appreciating UYF projects and youth more and more. Project coordinators appreciated the added visibility that the resultant community mobilization gave to their projects and organizations.
**Capacity building**

Project coordinators revealed that partnerships initiated by the UYF added visibility to their organizations and projects. The popularity of the organizations and project recognition opened up new external funding opportunities that sometimes allowed for project replication and expansion. For example, the AFCIG felt that the UYF grant strengthened their capacity to secure funding from other organizations:

“This project has increased AFCIG’s opportunities to seek and acquire grants from funders in this domain through the experience gained during project implementation. Through this project, AFCIG has created long lasting partnerships with other organizations and networks for present and future collaborations.” - Project Coordinator, AFCIG

After launching the Green Young Entrepreneurs Project, AISEC-Senegal met an advisor from the Ministry of Environment and forged an internship exchange partnership with AIESEC-Morocco. The CI-Gambia signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Department for Community Development and the partnership helped them to identify key community leaders in Tanji. They also signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Village Development Committee of Tanji and received community assistance in beneficiary recruitment and securing the project venue. The HUONY project also fostered partnerships between the EYA, governmental bodies and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in Ethiopia:

“There are now strong partnerships between EYA and the WORDAs resulting in efficient recruitment and secure working spaces for the graduates. Collaborative activities have also increased between EYA and CSOs such as Live Addis, Emanuel Development..."
Following the UYF project, the FOH partnered with the Mercy Vincent Foundation to draw beneficiaries from Bulumkutu to its skills training center. The wife of the Governor of Borno State also showed interest through her foundation to further train FOH computer operators and confectionery graduates. The Tears Group Kenya attracted a technical partnership with Hewlett Packard (HP) through United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) and Micro Enterprise Acceleration Institute (MEA-I) through the TAPEV Project. In 2012, Tears Group Kenya also partnered with PANGEA (Giving for Global Change), to administer and market products from TAPEV graduates. In Uganda, the Kampala City Council gave the YAI-Uganda a $1, 500 grant which they used to expand the UN-Habitat funded Mengo Youth Link Development Project. The Ugandan Ministry of Youth and Children also embraced and promoted YAI’s work following the successful implementation of the UYF project. The Concerned Youth Organization (CYO) worked with the Blantyre City Council to implement an ambitious ICT for Youth Development Project:

“By design, the project has two main implementing partners: Concerned Youth Organization as the principal implementer; and Blantyre City Council as the financial facilitator. This arrangement took advantage of the already existing cordial and long time working relationship between the two institutions” –Project Coordinator, CYO

Some project coordinators were also happy that the UYF project added visibility to their organizations broadly and the UYF project specifically:
“Another great impact this project created was that it made No. 8 Congo Town Land a very famous location within the Makeni Township, as everyone was just too enthusiastic to know where the Centre was located. Most importantly, the project was officially launched by the Mayor of the Makeni City Council with a keynote address from a representative from the United Nations Country Team in Makeni.” - Project Coordinator, YPPD

In recognition of their UYF project, the FLEP-Club project coordinator was invited to facilitate a Youth Mindset Training program dubbed “Agriculture, Youth and Wealth Creation.” After the program, the FLEP-Club received $1,067 from the Nigerian House Assembly and they expanded their project using the grant. In another case, the Mozambican media widely disseminated the KUWUKA JDA project through numerous TV promotions and the publicity saw several partners coming on board to increase community awareness on environmental challenges in Maputo. The Voi Youth Forum met with the City’s Mayor, Town Clerk, Town Planner and Town Treasurer and mapped a collaborative response to recycling and waste management challenges in Voi. The Love Planet project coordinator expressed that the UYF project improved their relationship with the Nigerian Government:

“A lot of opportunities have opened since the commencement of the project. We have a better relationship with the Government. We have achieved our vision of helping disabled people. We benefited from the trainings which have built our capacity & the society in general has accepted us with open hands.” - Project Coordinator, Love Planet

**External funding opportunities** were also opened up for projects in Ghana, Senegal, Ethiopia, Liberia and Uganda. The YHFG got a $4,500 supplementary funding from Talent Beyond Limits. AISEC-Senegal received a 20% funding portion from the European Union to
expand or replicate the Green Young Entrepreneurs Project. In Ethiopia, international development organizations including Cordaid, CIDA and Finland Embassy funded EYA’s HUONY after the Urban Youth Fund grant ended. The Universal Peace Federation pledged a US$ 3,800 to sustain Good Girls Project after the UYF grant. YAI-Uganda graduates benefited from a 25 billion ($1,000,000) Ugandan Government Youth Fund.

The UYF grant opened new partnership and funding opportunities for youth-led organizations. The partnerships that were created through UYF projects strengthened the capacity of youth-led organizations to better address youth livelihood challenges. Project sustainability through expansion and replication activities will be the end result if the reported partnerships and capacity building trends continue.

**The Urban Youth Fund and sustainable youth employment creation**

The extent to which the UYF program created decent employment and livelihoods for youth should be measured by the extent to which funded projects trained the most disadvantaged youth and women living in slum and informal areas; and the extent to which the projects facilitated access to secure working spaces and rights for self-employment activities (International Labor Organization, 2002; 2005). These are some of the basic goals of the International Labor Organization’s decent work agenda for youth, women and low-income residents. The decent work agenda also encompasses issues of active youth participation in urban livelihood activities, including youth’s right to operate informal enterprises free from harassment and evictions. Most UYF projects targeted those they considered the most disadvantaged youth and women who lived in informal and slum areas with the aim of creating decent employment opportunities for them. The TAPEV project, for example, offered entrepreneurial and business development training to 49
informal youth workers who engaged in street hawking in Nakuru slums. In Liberia, three young women and one man who graduated from the NAYA project secured formal employment jobs—the three women worked as community secretaries and the man became an internet café assistant. In Nigeria, 14 graduates from the FLEP-Club project secured employment through the state government recruitment’s initiative. The CYM provided credit to 40 youth who subsequently employed 35 other youth in their businesses. The CYM graduates secured land for their livelihood activities with the assistance of Ward Councilors and the Community Youth Mobilization. There were several other examples of decent and sustainable youth employment initiatives as shown in previous. A quantitative analysis of the extent the UYF created decent and sustainable employment opportunities for youth is presented in later sections using before and after assessment of youth voices and survey data from grantees and comparison group organizations.

**An overview of the impacts of Urban Youth Fund projects**

In Figure 9, I summarize the key UYF project outcomes described in the preceding sections. The schematic representation shows some of the main themes that emerged from the NVivo analysis. The immediate impact of the UYF grant was capacity building for youth-led organizations through project management training for project coordinators and expanded working space for some grantees. Intermediate outcomes centered on skills training through entrepreneurship, self-employment opportunities, job creation and young women’s empowerment projects. Through job creation and entrepreneurship projects, UYF grantees created revolving funds; youth run micro-enterprises, resource centers, cooperatives and working groups. The youth run micro-enterprises and groups created new employment opportunities for youth beneficiaries who subsequently employed other youth members from the community and produced goods and
services that benefited their families and community members. The recognition of productive UYF youth graduates led the parents and community members to appreciate UYF projects more.

Increased community appreciation fostered community cooperation and mobilization toward sustainable youth employment creation. In the process, some grantees secured external funding to train more and more youth. Local and national organizations including city councils, national governments and NGOs were also motivated to collaborate with UYF grantees in financial, awareness and administrative terms. The broad of the UYF projects was the creation of decent and sustainable youth livelihoods. In later sections, I present a complementary quantitative impact evaluation to gauge the extent to which sample UYF projects created decent and sustainable livelihoods for youth using survey data from youth beneficiaries, grantees and comparison group organizations.
Figure 9: Overview of the impacts of Urban Youth Fund projects

Challenges faced by sample Urban Youth Fund grantees: perspectives from project coordinators

The concept of youth-led development especially as it relates to the creation of youth-focused funds such as the Urban Youth Fund is a recent phenomenon. In the next section, I focus
on the challenges experienced by the UYF grantees during the implementation of projects. A better understanding of the challenges can help funding agencies find ways to address these challenges in collaboration with youth-led organizations and other stakeholders. The challenges described by project coordinators can best be classified as those that occurred before the project started or during the beneficiary recruitment, challenges during the project implementation and finally challenges after the project officially ended or post-training.

**Challenges experienced by Urban Youth Fund grantees before the project started**

**Negative youth and community attitudes towards projects**

The most common challenge faced by most of the grantees before the training started related was beneficiary recruitment. Project coordinators explained that negative community attitudes toward projects sometimes made it very difficult for them to recruit or reach the intended youth beneficiaries. Youth also sometimes lacked interest in unpaid training offered through UYF projects. Many community members and parents were also ignorant about the proposed projects and how they were to benefit youth. Most of the parents preferred that their children went through respectable formal education and employment as opposed to despised informal training and self-employment. The ORGIIS, for example, conducted community outreach and educational campaigns before the project but it was often not very helpful:

“Despite the preliminary sensitization at the start of the project, some individuals who had the potential to benefit from the project were reluctant to do so on the grounds that they were unsure about the source of the grants. Others thought it was a means of eventually extorting money from them.” – Project Coordinator, ORGIIS
The informal youth that ORGIIS targeted did not have legal papers for their enterprises and most of them doubted the intentions of the project as they thought that the project intended to formalize their activities. The VICYOMO also discovered that the youth of Limbe Municipality were initially reluctant to participate in the piggery project. The KHCS, on the hand struggled to convince potential beneficiaries on the validity of the certificates that they would give to youth graduates:

"The biggest problem we faced was influencing the youths in the neighborhoods and to convince them that the quality of knowledge and the certificate that they acquire at the centre are as valid as those issued by big institutions." - Project Coordinator, KHCS

In some cases, youth could not understand the proposed projects at first. This was the case with AISEC-Senegal’s Green Young Entrepreneurs Project. Dakar youth doubted that they were capable of launching a successful environmental entrepreneurship project since they had not seen such a project before. AISEC spent more time on the recruitment stage with the effect that more time was spent recruiting at the expense of the actual training. The VYF and the KWRG also faced a similar challenge as their intended beneficiaries were not interested in waste recycling projects because they considered them dirty jobs. The YAI-Uganda also realized that it was difficult to attract youth to their project because the community looked down upon students who enrolled in what was generally considered informal education. The FLEP-Club and G2Mi both encountered negative community attitudes that tended to delay their mobilization efforts and discouraged some potential beneficiaries from participating. The Nakuru community was also not ready to accept TGK’s theatre and arts project as a reputable profession for their children.
Contrary to the above, the major challenge encountered by the FTZ, TDFY and CYM was an overwhelming youth response to their projects. For these grantees, the project budget was not enough to accommodate all potential beneficiaries. According to the CYM project coordinator “it was simply difficult to train and assist all those who showed interest in the project.” The FTZ also encountered an additional problem related to delays in meeting city council officials and accessing relevant project information:

“The implementation of the project suffered delays related to a lengthy legal procedure to engage the City Council of Mutare as the service provider of the meeting and training venues as well as access to information on housing and youth participation in the area.”

- Project Coordinator, FTZ

In short, UYF grantees’ ability to recruit the most disadvantaged youth was hindered by uninterested youth and parents’ negative perceptions. It was difficult for low-income youth to forgo informal income generating activities in favor of unpaid training sessions. On the other hand, parents preferred that their children attend respectable formal education as opposed to what the parents considered informal education and lowly regarded training through the UYF projects. Extensive educational campaigns by some grantees boosted the recruitment drive but the campaigns unexpectedly required a lot more time than the grantees had planned for.

**Challenges experienced by grantees during project implementation**

**Access to land and workspace**

Grantees also cited fundamental challenges related to access to urban land or working space for their organizations and youth beneficiaries. Access to urban land was limited for most youth organizations due to high rental charges. For instance, KHCS was paying $150 per month.
for an office that it used for training purposes. Faced with unexpected high rental charges in urban Bamenda, ORGIIS relocated to a suburb where office rent was cheaper. Youth Partnership for Peace and Development underestimated the costs of renovating its training center and its project was delayed as it awaited funding release to complete the renovations. Even after receiving the UYF grant, it was unable to finish the renovations because it was more expensive than initially proposed.

Some organizations used their offices as training venues, which limited the number of youth they could train at any given time. Others, such as YAI-Uganda, rented a house to conduct training activities. In some cases, partner organizations donated land for training purposes. However, effective partnerships in land access were lacking in most cases. An exception was the CYO project where a strong partnership with the Blantyre City Council allowed Council to offer a training venue and also financial administration and capacity building.

Access to secure working space was a major challenge also for youth beneficiaries. The EYA project coordinator described how access to land issues impacted their youth groups:

“Access to space has been difficult and expensive for most youth and so far six youth groups haven’t been able to secure working space. The six groups are renting expensive working space from private land owners. It is very much difficult to have land in Addis and renting a place for business is very expensive. In order to address this problem, we are working with local administration to get a place with small price from the government in the form of rent. Having a place of work has been very much difficult for the Opportunity Neglected Groups.” - Project Coordinator, EYA
Access to land working space was also a major challenge faced by young G2Mi female entrepreneurs in the oil City of Port Harcourt. Urban land was highly prized in the City and far beyond the reach of the young females who lived in slum areas.

To sum up, limited access to land and workspace prevented grantees from training all the youth who needed training because they did not have enough space. On the other hand, youth graduates struggled to launch viable microenterprises because access to urban land was difficult and expensive. Ironically, instead of supporting youth entrepreneurs through land donations, some city councils such as the Limbe City Council demolished youth businesses and evicted the entrepreneurs. In the absence of strong workspace and land partnerships between grantees, city council and youth entrepreneurs, access to land will remain a major obstacle to youth access to decent work.

**Irregular youth attendance**

Many youth beneficiaries expected a stipend to attend training sessions regularly but often such stipends were not budgeted for. UYF projects mostly targeted informal youth pre-occupied with income generating activities and it was not always realistic for them to attend unpaid training sessions. The following is how the YPPD project coordinator described the challenge of why youth dropped out of their project:

"Some trainees had to drop out completely after being told (contrary to their expectations) that stipends were not budgeted for during the training period. Many trainees who were recruited for the project initially thought that they would be given monthly stipends to sustain them during the training. When later they discovered that this was not to be, some dropped out while others were reluctant to attend regularly. This posed some constraints..."
on the trainers who had to revisit topics covered in their absence just so absentees would catch up. The issue of stipends to trainees remains challenge because occasionally some trainees have to leave the Centre in search of a living. Sometimes they would be absent for up to two days, causing them to miss out on what is taught at the Centre.” - Project Coordinator, YPPD

Many other projects experienced the challenge of youth dropping out completely or attending training sessions irregularly. The NAYA project, for example, targeted teenage mothers who often complained that it was impossible for them to attend regularly because their kids needed attention in terms of getting enough food, clothing and basic education, all of which required money that they could not raise by simply attending the training. The KUWUKA JDA and CCRP participants, especially young women, were also sometimes stopped from attending the project by guardians who gave them extra housework.

**Delayed project funding**

Besides irregular attendance, most project coordinators were frustrated by the delayed funding release from UN-Habitat. Some of them noted that it was difficult to meet their project objectives or plan effectively. The following quotes illustrate the extent of the challenge:

“We planned to start the project in January 2010 but we actually got the funding in June and that pushed us to start the project in June 2010.” – Project Coordinator, EYA

“The second transfer of the funds was delayed by three months which caused problems on the implementation calendar.” - Project Coordinator, KUWUKA JDA
“Due to late disbursement of funds we had to borrow funds from other programs and that made it difficult to plan effectively.” - Project Coordinator, TGK

“The first tranche of the grant was disbursed late which delayed implementation. This has had a significant impact because implementation of the project was greatly dictated by the school calendar (the events fell out of school’s calendar due to the delay in disbursement).” - Project Coordinator, CYO

“UN-HABITAT’s system of three installment payment was not favorable for the implementation of the project. That was because as an agricultural project, several of our activities were linked to each other. For instance, once chickens were ordered they needed to be fed immediately and we needed to apply life saving vaccines immediately. However, provision for feeding of our chicken was in the second tranche of the payment, whereas the chickens were already ordered. We could not wait until then before we started feeding and applying vaccines to the chicken.” - Project Coordinator, Small Holders Foundation

Delayed funding was mainly raised by the 2009 UYF grantees and this is probably because 2009 marked the first launch of the UYF grant. In recent years, UYF officials conducted monitoring visits that improved communication between grantees and UN-Habitat and consequent improvement in the release of project funding in recent years. The experiences from the 2009 application cycle may have provided important lessons that led to an improvement in the release of funding in 2010 and 2011.

**Price fluctuations**

Linked to delayed funding was the issue of price fluctuations. This was a major problem for the TDFY, CYO, EYA and ORGIIS projects. The coordinators of these projects noted that
funding delays resulted in their project kicking off late and at a time when original project budgets was no longer realistic because of increases in commodity prices. This problem was also linked to poor project budgeting that failed to account for unforeseen changes in prices and currency exchange rates. ORGIIS felt that they were too ambitious when they proposed the project and ended up reducing the number of trainees. TDFY could not buy a scanner that they proposed in the original budget because its price had risen substantially.

**City council and community disruptions**

City councils were also blamed for disrupting some projects. For example, the metal containers proposed by YFHG suddenly became illegal in accordance with a new Bolgatanga Municipal Assembly by-law. YHFG then entered into a lengthy negotiation process with council before they acquired an alternative site for the project. ORGIIS also had its makeshift structures cleared when the Limbe City Council made abrupt building and structural regulatory changes that rendered the temporary structures illegal. They were allocated a different site for the project and lost project funds in the process. The demolition of slum areas by the government was a major challenge faced by G2Mi, especially during beneficiary recruitment. Some grantees, such as FLEP-Club, KUWIKA JDA faced related disruptions but theirs resulted from bureaucratic tendencies by their partners. FLEP-Club spent almost a year applying for a loan from the First Bank of Nigeria. KUWUKA JDA’s community mobilization effort was delayed because the national government took a long time to approve it. Bureaucracy at the University of Pretoria delayed SAYM’s plan to distribute questionnaires to youth participants at the University.

Unusual challenges also occurred during the implementation of some projects. For instance, ethnic related community violence disrupted the FOH project. The CCRP project
coordinator complained about a communication gap between their organization and UYF officials and that they did not receive answers to technical questions in a timely manner. The ABU-YES coordinator also raised an unusual challenge of beneficiaries running away with project funds and some businesses failing:

“Some unscrupulous beneficiaries “disappeared” with the grants shortly after their businesses were set up. This was especially difficult because they were so many qualified applicants who could not benefit because of limited resources. Four project beneficiaries ran away with project funds and materials and the businesses of six more have failed.” – Coordinator, ABU-YES

Harsh weather conditions also negatively impacted the YAI project by reducing the beneficiary productivity and sales during the rain when it became quite warm. The CYO project was unexpectedly disrupted by electrical power blackouts

Project administration

Cultural differences among trainees made it difficult for some grantees such as EYA, to train youth from diverse ethnic backgrounds. Others, such as, KUWUKA JDA in Maputo (Mozambique) found that they did not have enough training and experience to collaborate with multiple partners. These challenges were cited by the EYA, KUWUKA JDA and G2Mi project coordinators. AISEC-Senegal and KUWUKA JDA found it difficult to bring together government and university authorities for scheduled meetings. For the EYA and G2Mi projects, it was challenging to organize multicultural youth into micro-enterprise groups. The following was how the EYA and G2Mi project coordinators described the challenge:
“The challenge was that most youth did not want to work in group but we expected them to do so in order for them to share resources. It was challenging to convince them to do so. Most of the time the groups quarreled each other and we had to give them conflict management training to avoid this but still it was challenging.” – Project Coordinator, EYA

“The young female beneficiaries needed to work in groups to improve their business, but they all came from different communities and did not have the capacity to form strong partnerships: only two of the 15 females who got $US 100 start-up loans worked together. Getting the brothel based commercial sex workers to form quorum was a major setback at the initial stage.”- Project Coordinator, G2Mi

Inadequate public transportation services made it difficult for the G2Mi youth to travel to a common business location. It was also difficult for the G2MI project beneficiaries to join informal market associations in Port Harcourt because they needed to know an influential member or bribe an official to join the markets. Joining the informal market associations would have allowed the young females to access cheaper working spaces and to better market their businesses in strategic locations.

**Challenges faced by grantees after the project ended**

Project coordinators concurred that inadequate funding and business start-up loans hindered youth self-employment and empowerment after the training. The coordinators pointed out that it was not very helpful to train youth in the absence of business start-up capital after graduation. Grantees did not have enough money to provide loans to youth beneficiaries after graduation. As a result, many beneficiaries worked in groups as a means to pull financial
resources together. It was also difficult for youth to access loans from banks due to limited collateral and negative perceptions by financial institutions and the community in general. Some grantees sought partnerships with banks and conducted outreach programs to market their projects to community members, banks and micro-finance institutions but the impact of the outreach and marketing activities remained to be seen.

In some cases, strategic partnerships for project sustainability were completely missing. For example, the relationship between UYF grantees and UN-Habitat ended upon project completion. Yet, many organizations felt the need for continued UN-Habitat follow ups, communication, monitoring and evaluation and funding beyond the stipulated one-year cycle. This was clearly evident in the case of SAYM, where there has not been any communication with UN-Habitat since their project ended in 2011. However, the Southern African Youth Movement officials felt that they wanted to continue with the project, including exploring land use related projects such as urban agriculture but did not know how to proceed once the UYF grant ended:

“We believe we are missing a great opportunity to work closely with UN-Habitat to expand the project or to launch new youth employment projects in the City. There is a great potential to focus on several urban development issues affecting youth in Pretoria. For example, we have the potential to launch youth housing and construction or infrastructural projects in collaboration with the City of Tswane and other organizations dealing with housing issues. However, we have not heard anything from UN-Habitat since our project ended and we do not know who to approach. We have decided to
approach UN-Habitat South Africa and hopefully something will work out.” - SAYM

Project Coordinator

Inadequate project funding

In most cases, Urban Youth Fund project activities slowed down after the one-year project cycle or ceased completely once funding dried up. Project coordinators reported difficulties in expanding or replicating projects in the absence of continued funding from UN-Habitat or other external sources:

“AFCIG has not been able to secure additional funding for the project despite the myriad of applications she continues to receive from potential beneficiaries and numerous attempts made at attracting funding.” – Project Coordinator, AFCIG

“We have not yet secured more funding I call upon donors to invest in our young people.”

YAI-Uganda Project Coordinator

“Addis Ababa is a very big city and addressing the problem at city level requires a very big intervention. EYA is working only in three WORDAs out of 119. But the HUONY project has really benefited the youth in those WORDAs.” - Project Coordinator, EYA

The one year funding rule was thought to be inadequate and unsustainable given the need for project expansion and replication. The FLEP-Club and CYM projects received several applications after their projects ended because more youth became aware of the projects once the first groups graduated. However, both did not have enough funding to expand the projects. The KHCS and CYO planned to expand their projects by offering cutting-edge computer classes for youth graduates but did not have funding. Some grantees also felt that they needed to offer
youth graduates start-up loans and working tools but did not have enough funding to do so. A few projects were still ongoing but with restricted enrollment and brief training sessions. In such cases, projects continued with external donor funding, self-financing from beneficiary loan repayments and limited financial assistance from local partner organizations.

**Limited access to start-up capital**

For youth beneficiaries, the major challenge after training was inadequate collateral to access loans from banks. The FOH encouraged families and friends to offer collateral to their youth graduates but most families and friends did not have the minimum collateral required by banks. The coordinator noted that “the computer training beneficiaries that wanted to establish their own business centers needed take-off seed money that was not easy for them to source from family members or friends.” Access to finance was a challenge because banks sometimes did not trust youth and youth also sometimes did not believe enough in themselves as noted by GYE project coordinator:

> “Banks also don’t trust youth and are concerned that youth will use any loans from banks for other things not related to their projects. There is some sense that youth don’t have adequate training to manage financial resources and implement projects effectively. Sometimes even after receiving all the training they need, young people also still don’t trust themselves—they start something but they can’t implement it fast enough.” - Coordinator, GYE

Even though some grantees such as the EYA gave loans to youth graduates, the loans were still inadequate for some youth businesses:
“The $2,500 RSSF start-up loan was enough for some businesses such as hair salon and coffee making but it was not enough for woodwork, metalwork and large scale dairy businesses. Woodwork, metalwork and dairy farming required expensive machinery and inputs. For the dairy business, the RSSF was only enough to buy three cows. We encouraged metalwork and woodwork groups to buy used materials.” - Project Coordinator, EYA

The EYA and G2Mi also reported that it was difficult for youth to repay loans after graduation especially when their businesses were not doing well. The young female G2Mi beneficiaries found it hard to repay the $100 extended to them because they spent most of their earnings on land rentals. The YOP-CAM also loaned materials and equipment to youth graduates but most youth were unable to repay the loans on time.

**Weak capacity for business registration, marketing, monitoring and evaluation**

Some grantees were unable to register, monitor, evaluate or market graduates. For example, ABU-YES graduates worked in informal market areas because it was expensive for them to register their businesses. The TGK and ORGIIS found it expensive to follow up with beneficiaries, some of whom had relocated. The inability to trace beneficiaries emanated from the grantees’ insufficient monitoring and evaluation capacity:

“The project itself ended and beneficiaries are conducting their activities, adapting and changing. Some are in contact with us; others will need time to be traced because we have an insufficient capacity for M &E.” - Project Coordinator, ORGIIS

The CCRP beneficiaries on the other hand, faced product marketing challenges:
“The market is still small and not all products made by the girls are consumed. This somehow demoralized them but the knowledge they received in small business management about profits and losses being expected in any business especially upcoming, keeps them going.” – CCRP Project Coordinator

Overall, most Urban Youth Fund grantees struggled to continue with projects after the UN-Habitat grant: The Girls to Mothers Project was at a standstill due to inadequate funding, AISEC-Senegal lacked adequate financial resources to expand the project to places outside Dakar, the Initiative for Youth Employment and Development Project and ICT for Youth Development were both ongoing but at a much slower pace due to limited funding, the Youth Participation in Urban Settlement Project in South Africa officially ended after the UYF grant, the Endurance Youth Association worked in three out of the 119 sub-city regions in the populous Addis Ababa, and the Victorious Youth Movement’s Piggery Farming Project officially ended after the UYF grant.

In the next section, I present the lessons and recommendations from youth-led organizations to address the challenges described above.

**Lessons for youth-led organizations: views from Urban Youth Fund project coordinators**

Given the challenges described in the preceding section, project coordinators shared important lessons for other youth-led organizations planning to implement youth livelihood projects in low-income countries. During the implementation, important lessons drawn related to:

- the need to conduct detailed pre-project study;
- the need for a clear beneficiary recruitment plan;
• the need to have basic project needs in place before commencing the project;
• the need to counsel youth beneficiaries;
• the need for an integrated effort that includes parents, youth and community members; and
• the need for youth-led organizations to pay particular attention to project sustainability including having continuity and marketing plans in place before the project started

These lessons are described below using illustrative examples.

**Conduct detailed pre-project studies**

One important lesson suggested by project coordinators for other youth-led organization was the need for them to conduct detailed pre-project studies to avoid duplication and to also fully determine the resources that the project will require. FITZ, for example launched its integrated urban youth-led development project after a thorough review of youth development challenges in the City of Mutare. During the baseline survey, they discovered that most youth were not participating in the housing and construction sector and most urban development projects. They obtained data from council showing that only 2% of the youth population in city was on the housing waiting list. Equipped with enough data and knowledge, FTZ made housing construction by and for youth a major component of its study. It also engaged in extensive educational programs educating youth about housing and unemployment challenges in the city and the need for youth-led action to address the challenges. What FITZ did was exactly what the ORGIIS project coordinator recommended: “Young people should always carry out needs assessments before planning begins and young people must be involved in every step of project
development.” A detailed pre-project analysis could have prevented some of the challenges experienced during the implementation of the ORGIIS project. They initially planned to give grants to beneficiaries but shifted to a revolving fund after the realization that they needed to continue with the project after the UYF grant and that the project was far more complicated than they initially thought:

“The original concept was to provide grants to the beneficiaries but after analysis and consultations, it was agreed that a revolving loan system was better as it would lead to the sustainability of the project, instill discipline, and build youth entrepreneurial spirit.”

**Have a solid beneficiary recruitment plan**

Another important lesson that emerged from my discussions with project coordinators was the need for youth-led organizations to have a clear beneficiary recruitment plan. This was considered important in making sure that the proposed project benefits intended beneficiaries. Many grantees considered that a clear recruitment plan was necessary given the negative youth and community attitudes towards projects. As noted by the FOH project coordinator, community leaders sometimes interfered with the beneficiary recruitment process in the absence of a concrete recruitment plan:

“Grantees should be careful in the selection of beneficiaries particularly when they are assisted by community leaders who would like to influence the selection of less qualified beneficiaries because they are related to them. Procedure for selection should be clearly indicated before selection starts to avoid imposition of unqualified people for training. Otherwise attempts may be made to sabotage the project.” - Project Coordinator, FOH
The FLEP-Club experience also supported the need for a clear beneficiary recruitment plan including visiting places where the beneficiaries lived to verify that the actual beneficiaries were being recruited:

“\textit{When we realized that the candidates mobilized by our target community were either over-aged or relatives not living in Owerri urban, we decided to move into the community to directly access those that the project will benefit significantly.”} - Project Coordinator, FLEP-Club

To deal with the recruitment challenge, YAI-Uganda began by making public announcements on a community radio followed by frequent visits to slum areas where targeted youth lived. In Kampala slums, YAI-Uganda educated parents and potential beneficiaries on the value of entrepreneurship training through its UYF project. Simultaneously, community leaders and their partner, Mengo Youth Development Link, informed the community about existing opportunities. After the announcements, interested youth and their parents came to pick up the forms and filled them. YAI-Uganda then began the final beneficiary selection after the campaigns and counseling sessions. The YAI project coordinator said, “Counseling is very important because beneficiaries come from different backgrounds and also face or have faced different problems.” The TGK also discovered that arts and talent development was such a grey area in Kenya and that parents needed to be educated fully to understand the concept as a possible career choice for their children. The FOH learnt that parents who participated in the project were more likely to act as bank loan guarantor for young people after graduation. The CCRP discovered that the involvement of parents and guardians lowered their beneficiary dropout rates:
“A piece of advice to those organizations facing high dropout rates; involvement of guardians is very instrumental in determining the success of the project as it avoids over expectations and misconceptions. Inviting them to the project site once in a while or visiting homes and giving updates as well as requesting for advice from them would very much do.” - Project Coordinator, CCRP

Be sensitive to young women’s needs

Project coordinators also suggested important lessons for youth livelihood projects targeting young women. The FOH coordinator advised that projects targeting young women should work closely with community leaders given young women’s segregation and delicate husband-wife relations in some developing countries:

“Young women are engaged with the permission of their husbands. We approached some of the community members to allow us to train their women in confectionery making to which they agreed. Community members, especially the elders who participated in monitoring and evaluating the confectionery training have also approached us to train their women in Purdah who have no livelihood skills in baking cakes.” - Project Coordinator, FOH

The G2MI coordinator suggested that youth organizations should focus more on projects that seek to promote gender equality in countries such as Nigeria. In Nigeria, the coordinator said women are often confined to home-based enterprises because of cultural practices that restrict women’s access to public spaces.
Develop strong technical, financial and beneficiary partnerships

Another important lesson was the need for youth organizations to partner with Micro Finance Institutions (MFIs) and established organizations for technical and capacity strengthening. TGK advised other organizations to partner more with Micro Finance Institutions, government ministries, and technical institutions to build their implementation capacity. TGK also advised youth organizations to avoid unhealthy competition:

“Our advice to other youth groups or youth led is specialization to areas of their strengths and avoids unhealthy competition and undercutting. Partnership and collaboration is the way to success and bigger impact.”

The Love Planet, YHFG, KUWUKA JDA and CI-Gambia project coordinators echoed TGK’s sentiments by urging youth organizations to work closely with relevant stakeholders, partners and youth beneficiaries:

“We can only advise them to manage their funds well & make sure they do their best to follow the right implementation plans, and not to have problems with partners and beneficiaries.” - Project Coordinator, Love Planet

“If possible, form a planning group for the project that includes representatives of the key stakeholders and let this group stay throughout the project, meeting to review from time to time. This also comes with costs and should be budgeted for.” - Project Coordinator, YHFG

“The project was a success, it overcame our expectations and we feel that it became sustainable because a lot of people, not only the students but also the community, are engaged in the project objectives to protect our environment. The project was a
learning process and it has proven that when we work in an issue that concerns everyone it is easy to get people interested and involved.” - Project Coordinator, KUWUKA JDA

“Youth-led organizations should make it a point of duty to involve disadvantaged youth from project planning to monitoring and evaluation because only then would they be able to take ownership of the project.” - Project Coordinator, CI-Gambia

The ABU-YES coordinator advised other youth organizations to be persevering, open-minded and to carefully listen to the needs of beneficiaries: “It is only after understanding that all fingers are not equal and placing themselves in the places of those underprivileged youths that they can best understand and work with them.”

Address project sustainability issues early and throughout

Another important lesson that emerged from project coordinators’ views related to project sustainability. Coordinators stressed that youth-led organizations should pay particular attention to project sustainability from start to finish. The YAI-Uganda coordinator recommended that youth-led organizations should replicate projects as much as possible to maximize the impacts of projects. The FLEP-Club coordinator recommended that youth organization pay attention to business strengthening in their project proposals:

“My recommendation to organizations implementing similar projects especially those from the developing world where fundraising is a handicap, is that they should ensure that funding for business empowerment forms part of the initial project funding request. This will go a long way in sustaining the interest and performance of trainees for maximum impact.” - Project Coordinator, FLEP-Club
Be innovative, entrepreneurial, self-reliant and proactive

A powerful lesson and rather general youth-led development recommendation came from the coordinator of the GYE project who urged youth to be innovative, entrepreneurial and proactive for them to achieve sustainability in their projects:

“As young people, we need to know how to face the world issues and that there are many ways to find solutions. The surest way to accomplish our objectives is to identify and implement innovative projects. Youth must give more attention to identify the best way to help us face world issues. The most important thing to know today is youth must be engaged, proactive and develop an entrepreneurship spirit. Be an entrepreneur if you want to make positive impact in your society. Entrepreneurs must be the ones responsible for the forward progress that we make as society. The world needs more projects and that’s why we need more youth entrepreneurs. And the best way to use money efficiently is to make a big positive impact with a small amount of money. If we want to impact sustainability, we must think globally and act locally.” - Coordinator, GYE

Tears Group Kenya graduates formed an alumni network that trained TAPEV trainees free of charge. The alumni’s assistance allowed TGK to enroll more and more community youth as it did not have to hire expensive trainers. This is positive example of youth innovation to enhance youth access to skills training. According to the TGK project coordinator, one way to foster youth innovation is through creative arts that maximize individual and community impact.

The future of sample Urban Youth Fund grantees: aspirations from project coordinators

Project coordinators had ambitious plans to continue with UYF projects despite funding challenges planned. In Box 4.1, I summarize brief quotations from project coordinators
highlighting their future aspirations after the UYF grant ended. From the quotations, it is evident that grantees aspire to expand projects by organizing youth entrepreneurs into cooperatives; collaborating with UN-Habitat; acquiring materials and equipment; fundraising; expanding training centers; employing former graduates; replicating projects; strengthening partnerships and self-financing; strengthening the capacity of youth entrepreneurs for project sustainability through monitoring, evaluation and consultancy services; focusing on specific training programs and components; sourcing external funding for project expansion and replication; and embarking on social entrepreneurship initiatives for project sustainability. Despite major funding challenges that derailed their plans so far, the major theme from the coordinators’ aspirations was the desire to continue with the projects through expansion, replication and capacity building.
Box 4.1: The Future of sample Urban Youth Fund grantees: aspirations from project coordinators

“No cooperatives have been formed but there is a plan to introduce them as a group to the Ministry of Poverty Alleviation and Youths Empowerment as a result of an earlier post-workshop advocacy on youth policy. Computer training shall continue to be offered in the computer laboratory because of demand for computer skills from the youth in the project area.” - FOH

“UN-Habitat is an organization we would love to work with over and over again; they empower less privileged youth & give hope to the hopeless. We really appreciate their effort & recommend them as one of the best UN body.” - Love Planet

“We need to get shops & equipments for all 30 beneficiaries and also assist them with small loan as we will follow them up till the end of the year.” - Love Planet

“Plans are in place to provide commercial services to the public in order to raise funds and continue the project to reach more youth. We are also developing projects targeting the youth with a focus on vocational skills in the next years to come.” - CI-Gambia

“Our project is still ongoing but we have not yet replicated it to other areas; we still want to enlarge the centre to acquire bigger space and also introduce more skills programs such as candle making, soap making, cosmetology, welding, juice and bead making.” - YAI-Uganda

“The project implementation is still on-going. Some of the participants are quite good and will be retained to provide training for the next batch. We are still looking for funding support for the next batch. This will be only a limited amount because the training centre is fully equipped and will not need much money to keep the project going.” - YFHG

“We intend to continue with the project activities and scale up all its activities to other districts. The project will be self-financed as its credit facility can support its operational costs. However, due to high demand, we will contact other donors who may be interested in seeing its services reach other youth who are in need of its support services.” - CYM

“The CYO plans to continue offering the computer training to the youth in the city. The City Council expressed interest to continue partnering with CYO after the idea was shared with Blantyre City Council officials and they promised that we will still use the same room for trainings. In terms of funding, the beneficiaries shall be paying a reasonable amount that will be set for maintenance of computers. Some institutions also expressed interest to support its sustainability.” – CYO

“This project will continue on a consultancy basis to support and make follow ups on the youth that are currently running small businesses as they have requested for support. The project plan to charge a small fee to these businesses for consultant services and other needed support as requested to keep the youth running their micro-enterprises viably and to sustain the projects in the remaining period. More resources will also be sourced in the meantime to support youth that have not benefited from this initiative from other funding sources.” - FITZ
In the next section, I summarize five youth-led livelihood best practice examples from sample UYF grantees. The best practice examples offer important lessons to youth-led organizations aspiring to implement youth livelihood projects in more or less similar contexts.

**Best practices in sustainable youth-led livelihoods promotion**

The best practices highlight the basic characteristics of successful youth-led projects and the approaches that they used to achieve ambitious goals. The five examples described below depict grantees with **comprehensive livelihood projects**. Comprehensive projects offered

---

**Box 4.1 (con’t.)**

“We plan to continue with this project by making it an annual program. The activities we intend to amplify are the ICT training workshop, the Youth Turning Point Forum and media interactive sessions.” - **FLEP-Club**

“We are willing to continue with the project as mentioned above. The project if transformed into a program does not need a lot of funds, as it has been demonstrated by the impact the project had.” ---- **KUWUKA JDA**

“We plan to continue with the project to expand the scope of our questions. This stemmed from the inputs and suggestions collected from the participants during the Review Workshop. Participants suggested that there should be a follow up study that will cover all districts of the City of Tshwane.” - **SAYM**

“As an organization, we plan to continue with the project, and this is possible through its own funds generated to sustain itself and continue its activities.” - **VYF**

“EYA would require additional funding to scale-up and continue with the project. Large scale intervention is required for a remarkable transformation of young people’s lives in populous Addis Ababa. EYA is only working in three out of the 119 WORDAs in Addis Ababa.”- **EYA**

“As an organization, we plan to continue with this project and as a matter of fact this is the second year of this project under our Sustainable Youth Livelihood and Empowerment Program. We are currently working on getting some level of funding from the Youth Employment Network/UNIDO Youth-to-Youth Funding Scheme for Youth Employment.”- **YPPD**

“Currently TEARS is building a social enterprise and innovation program for sustainability and self reliance.” - **TGK**
entrepreneurship, practical and life skills training. Comprehensive projects also focused on youth employment creation and young women’s empowerment. The examples are also characterized by a remarkable focus on the most disadvantaged and vulnerable youth. Another major characteristic of the best practices was a vigorous attempt to facilitate youth access to working space, start-up loans, and materials and equipment for their businesses. There grantees also gave a significant attention to gender equality in their projects, with young women forming as much as 80% of the trainees in YPPD’s Sustainable Youth Livelihoods through Vocational Skills Training Project in Freetown (Sierra Leone).

Financial and technical partnerships arrangements with local and international organizations also characterized the best practice examples. The best grantees sought financial partnership with local banks to facilitate youth access to start-up loans and they aggressively pursued external funding opportunities through fundraising and networking. The best practices cases described below also focused substantially on project sustainability through the involvement of community members in resolving land access and product marketing challenges. They also partnered with city councils to facilitate youth access to urban land for income generating activities. Partnership in land access was strong in the Zambian and Ethiopian examples. The Sierra Leonean and also Zambian examples involved strong partnerships with community members and international development organizations. The Ugandan example illustrates an effective partnership with a local development organization, whereas the Nigerian case study depicts an integrated and innovative effort involving the grantee, local bank and dedicated youth entrepreneurs.
Box 4.2: Helping Urban Opportunity Negelected Youth in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

The Endurance Youth Association (EYA) is a non-profit organization based in Ethiopia and whose mission is to empower disadvantaged urban youth. The EYA is determined to create decent livelihood opportunities for Ethiopia’s youth, who make up 74% of the total population. With support from UN-Habitat’s Urban Youth, the EYA launched the Helping Urban Opportunity Neglected Youth (HUONY) Project to train unemployed youth and support their livelihoods in three of the poorest sub-cities in Addis Ababa. In those three WORDAs, EYA recruited beneficiary youth aged 15-35 years in accordance with the African Youth Charter and the Ethiopian National Youth Policy. The objective of HUONY project was strengthening the capacity of unemployed youth groups through continuous training and capacity building for income generation through the “Responsive Seed Sponsorship Fund (RSSF). The RSSF provided seed money, with flexible repayment arrangement and minimum collateral, to successful micro enterprises initiated by Opportunity Neglected Youth (ONY) groups.

The HUONY beneficiaries accessed working space mainly through the assistance and permission of WORDAs. The WORDAs prepared small working spaces or shades which were then given to organized HUONY youth groups. The EYA collaborated with WORDAs to facilitate access to markets and business licenses for individual and youth beneficiaries.

HUONY youth worked mostly in groups and that made it easier for them to get start-up loans from EYA and to share knowledge and skills. EYA gave youth groups $2,500 business start-up loans through the RSSF and the loan was interest-free. All of the 25 young women beneficiaries have accessed credit from EYA through the RSSF. Eighty youth groups which started in 2010 were repaying the RSSF loan. And the coffee making group members had doubled their income within two years. They started with a $2,500 RSSF in 2010 and their capital reached $5,500 in 2012 and had repaid 98% of the RSSF.

The EYA linked ONY groups with well resourced and influential organizations such as governments, CSOs, private businesses, technical and vocational colleges, pro-youth citizens and Ethiopians in the Diaspora. In this regard and through the HUONY, the EYA partnered with Live Addis, ISD, Emanuel Development Association, and the Ethiopian Department of Transportation. The organizations were all working on various youth issues and they shared experiences, knowledge, and expertise with EYA. The success of the HUONY project saw international organizations such as Cordaid, CIDA, and Finland Embassy funding the project after the UN-Habitat.

The HUONY has been effective and ongoing since 2009 and the EYA planned to replicate the project to other WORDAs.

Source: Skype interview with HUONY project coordinator

12/06/2012
Box 4.3: Mengo Youth Vocational Skills Training Project in Kampala, Uganda

Youth Action International (YAI) is an international nonprofit organization that works to alleviate children and youth poverty in Uganda and other east African countries. It provides education, health care and economic empowerment for children and young people living in post-conflict settings. In Uganda, the YAI-Uganda works with youth living in slum areas of Kampala, and mostly those in the Kisenyi—one of the largest slum areas in east Africa. With funding from the Urban Youth Fund, YAI-Uganda in collaboration with the Mengo Youth Development Link, launched the Mengo Youth Vocational Skills Training Project (MYVST) targeting Kisenyi slum youth aged age 10-32 years. They recruited beneficiaries who included migrant youth from rural areas and other urban centers and others migrated from neighboring countries such as the Democratic Republic of Congo, South Sudan, Somalia, and Eritrea. Some project beneficiaries came from child-headed families, others were orphans, single parents, and they were living in Kisenyi slum.

Through the MYVST Project, they trained youth in wood curving, paper beads making, tailoring, and tie-dye material making. After the training, youth were trained in business skills including business management, marketing, planning and customer care. MYVST graduates were also awarded a UGX 150,000 ($80) business startup loan. YAI and its partner entered into an agreement with youth that required youth graduates to repay a minimum of UGX 10,000 ($5) depending on the viability of their businesses. The HUONY focused more on disadvantaged young women and 140 young women and 60 young men have since benefited from the project. Of those the 120 youth that first graduated from the project in 2010, 40 of them worked in groups, 10 worked as individuals and 20 were attached to different youth development experts working in various field and 10 remained at the centre where they worked as tutors and on product marketing tasks.

The MYVST Project has been highly respected and recognized in Kampala and Uganda at large. Recently, YAI-Uganda and its partner launched a soccer training academy that facilitated regional youth networking and collaboration in the youth development field in east Africa. In support of the project the Kampala City Authority gave them UGX3, 000,000 ($1500) to boost the computer training program. The Ugandan Ministry of Youth and Children also embraced and promoted their work and Tool Aid UK donated sewing machines, typewriters, sewing machines, and wood curving machines to the centre and they used the tools to set up a tool bank that was readily accessible to trainees and graduates.

The MYVST Project was still going even though they were yet to replicate it to other slum areas. They planned to expand the training to increase enrolments and they also expected to introduce new training programs such as candle making, soap making, cosmetology, welding, juice and bead making. They needed supplementary funding from external sources and they were actively engaged in fundraising and local and international networking.

Source: Skype interview with MYVST Project Coordinator

15/6/2012
Box 4.4: Sustainable Youths Empowerment through Skills Acquisition and Advocacy in Maiduguri, Nigeria

Over 23 million Nigerian youth are currently unemployed and the youth unemployment rate is over 28%. The daily lives of urban youth in Nigeria are characterized by violence, crime and poverty. Frequent strikes by teachers at institutions of higher learning constantly disrupt proper youth education. Despite the unbearable employment and security plight of youth in Maiduguri, most youth continue to engage in multiple livelihood activities. With support from the Urban Youth Fund and in an effort to address youth livelihood challenges, the Friends of the Habitat (FOH) launched the Sustainable Youth Empowerment Project (SYE) in Maiduguri. The project sought to empower young men and women with vocational and livelihood skills that would keep them busy and away from political and ethnic related conflicts. The SYE Project brought youth from diverse cultural backgrounds in an effort to promote peace, tolerance and co-existence.

Through the SYE, youth beneficiaries were taught several skills including repairing and servicing small petrol engines; refurbishing of old or scrap metal petrol generators for resale; baking of cakes, meat pies, doughnuts, and making fruit juices such as mango juice, lemon juice, guava juice and mixed fruit juice. Most of those trained through the project were from the slum areas including five male and nine female orphans. Most of the beneficiaries were former political thugs, who without the skills imparted through the SYE, could have been easily manipulated by politicians back into political and ethnic violence. Through the project, all trainees and graduates were introduced to a microfinance bank based in Maiduguri and 11 beneficiaries secured loans from the bank. The first loan amount was up to 10,000 naira ($63). Upon repayment, the beneficiary could apply for a higher loan amount with given successful business or collateral. The bank loans allowed many of computer training graduates to create self-employment opportunities that also benefited family members, friends and communities. Some graduates even went back to school using savings from their businesses. Overall, 40 male and 41 female youth directly benefited from the project.

The equipment and facilities purchased during the project were all in good shape and that allowed the SYE Project to continue after the UYF grant. They planned to train around 400 youth, at a cost of about $34 per trainee, for the period 2012-2014 and using the same old and functioning equipment and facilities.

Source: Skype interview with SYE Project Coordinator

8/20/2012
Box 4.5: Sustainable Youth Livelihoods through Vocational Skills Training in Freetown, Sierra Leone

Youth in post-war Sierra Leone, especially those living in remote areas such as the Makeni region face serious unemployment challenges. Most Sierra Leone youth have little to no education at all. Those youth with some education, mostly primary education, find it extremely hard to secure any meaningful employment in urban areas. In response to worsening youth unemployment in the Makeni region, the Youth Partnership for Peace and Development (YPPD) launched the Sustainable Youth Livelihoods through Vocational Skills Training (SYLVST) project financed through the UN-Habitat Urban Youth Fund. The SYLVST sought to offer vocational skills training to youth and young women at no charge. Through the SYLVST, several young women enrolled in the training compared to young men and the enrolment was 80% female and 20% male. For the February 2011 SYLVST graduates, there were 32 young women and eight young men. All of the 40 youth who graduated from the project were running their own businesses mostly in pairs or small groups. Youth paired themselves up for businesses based on their places of residence. The idea of working in groups was first suggested by youth trainees and YPPD has since embraced the group approach as a means to promote tolerance, facilitate access to loans from microcredit schemes through combined collateral and to allow youth—old and young, an opportunity to share skills and experiences.

Even though access to working space has been a challenge for youth graduates over the years, YPPD has eased the problem by allowing youth graduates to operate their businesses at the training center as they work in collaboration with YPPD to secure access to land elsewhere. YPPD has also improved youth access to land by inviting community members at graduation ceremonies and that resulted in some community members suggesting and offering workspaces for youth graduates. The YPPD also made recommendations to the Makeni City Council to have the City Hall leased for youth skills training and employment activities after graduation. They reached an agreement with the council that allowed them to use the City Hall for graduation ceremonies and they were hopeful that more council driven land access opportunities for youth were on the way.

Even though it was difficult for SYLVST graduates to access business loans or credit due to stringent repayment requirements, YPPD partnered with organizations such as BRAAC and Sierra Leone Microfinance Trust (SLMT) to facilitate young people’s access to business loans. Through YPPD’s partnership with BRAAC and SLMT, some youth secured $50 start-up loans with flexible repayment arrangements. YPPD also forged partnerships in the Northern Province involving DFID, UNDP and local Civil Society Organizations. They partnered with UNDP in the United Nations Millennium Campaign—an anti-poverty initiative targeting unemployed youth. And they worked with the DIFD and grassroots CSOs through the Stand Up and Take Action Campaign—a worldwide initiative to mobilize and encourage youth to fight poverty in their communities.

The SYLVST was ongoing with funding from the Mano Menima Development Foundation. The YPDD also recently launched the “Empowering them for a Lifetime” Campaign as a means to scale up the project, with particular focus on vulnerable young women in post-conflict Sierra Leone. To this end, an online fundraising campaign was launched to raise $5,000 toward “Empowering them for a Lifetime” campaign.

Source: Interview with SYLVST Project Coordinator

10/7/2012
Box 4.6: Community Youth Empowerment Project in Kabwe, Zambia

Most youth in Zambia currently work in the informal economy where little or no skills training is required. Through funding from the UN-Habitat Urban Youth Fund, Community Youth Mobilization (CYM) launched the Community Youth Empowerment Project (CYEP) aimed at offering a range of vocational skills training to poor youth working in the informal economy. The CYEP was designed to help youth with zero income. After the training, the incomes of most graduates doubled since they did not have any regular source of income before the project training.

CYEP graduates accessed land for carpentry activities with the assistance of Ward Councilors and CYM. Ward Councilors negotiated with municipal authorities to facilitate youth’s access to working and trading spaces. In contrast to adult entrepreneurs who paid $50 land rental per year on average, youth entrepreneurs trained through the CYEP did not have to pay for the land that they accessed through Ward Councilors. The CYM submitted quarterly reports to Ward Councilors and that improved youth access to working spaces and also CYM’s relations with Kabwe City Council. Of all the youth who graduated from CYEP, five working groups have been formed. The youth graduates usually started their businesses as a larger group but split their groups into smaller groups along the way as capital permitted.

Through the CYEP, CYM trained young women in dress making, food production and catering services. They trained young males in carpentry and housing construction. Some young women graduates secured business loans from the Entrepreneurship Support Fund (ESF) ran by CYM. A maximum of $400 was provided to graduates with the most innovative business ideas after graduation. The $400 startup constituted about 60% of the required total startup capital requirements and most graduates secured the remaining 40% from other sources easily. The young women who secured business funding through the ESF started tailoring and dress making enterprises, whereas some graduates launched successful housing construction, carpentry and computer training enterprises.

CYM partnered with the UK-based Tools for Self Reliance (TSR) to facilitate the shipment of training tools from UK to Zambia. The CYM also partnered with Kara Counseling, which helped in the various skills training programs. The Zambian National Bank has also partnered with CYM to facilitate business training and opening of bank accounts for youth entrepreneurs. There was also a strong partnership between Ward Councilors and CYM in the area of secure land acquisition, product marketing and business licensing for the CYEP graduates.

Recently, the CYM expanded the UN-Habitat funded CYEP and the project has since been replicated in two other districts beyond Kabwe. The rapidly growing youth empowerment project was renamed Community Empowerment Fund (CEF) in acknowledgment of the positive impact it had on youth and the Zambian community at large.

Source: Interview with CYEP Coordinator

6/9/2012
Recommendations for UN-Habitat and other funding agencies: views from project coordinators

Simplify Urban Youth Fund application and selection process

A few coordinators recommended that the UYF application process needs to be simplified. The CI-Gambia coordinator pointed out that “they (UN-Habitat) should provide easy and accessible methods when applying to the youth fund.” The YHFG coordinator suggested that “UN-Habitat should invite at least two people from each beneficiary organization for the training and not only the project coordinator.” On the other hand, YAI’s project coordinator felt that “a few program coordinators from successful projects can be selected to be part of the selection panel of the final youth opportunity fund beneficiaries depending on funding priorities for each year”, and appealed to funding saying “please trust us with your money; we will make better development for young people.”

Disburse funds timely and develop flexible funding criteria

The main recommendations from sample project coordinators to UN-Habitat were that it should disburse funds timely, employ a flexible funding criterion including funding successful projects beyond one year, fund more job creation projects, fund rural and peri-urban projects and invest more in monitoring and evaluation of funded projects.

The project coordinators recommended that UN-Habitat and other funding agencies should disburse funds timely and also implement a flexible funding criterion taking into account project type, context, and the need for expansion and replication. According to the CI-Gambia project coordinator, “UN-Habitat should work towards expediting their disbursement of funds in order not to create delays in implementing certain project activities which might affect the impact of projects”. Love Planet’s project coordinator also recommended that “funding agencies should
try as much as possible not to delay funds because it slows down the progress of the project which affects the implementing organization, beneficiaries and their community.”

Project coordinators also recommended that UN-Habitat should develop flexible funding criterion to maximize the impact of youth projects. A rigid funding criteria was thought to be unhelpful given the diversity of youth organizations and the countries in which they operate. Project coordinators recommended that UN-Habitat should develop flexible funding that includes funding successful projects beyond the current one year limit. They felt that long-term funding can help them to expand and replicate projects. The following is how the EYA project coordinator described their recommendation:

“UN-Habitat should provide long-term support to youth-led organizations as opposed to short-term support. The issue of youth unemployment is serious and integrated effort between UN-Habitat and beneficiary organizations is required. Small-scale organizations can’t adequately address the issue of youth unemployment alone. If there is an integrated effort we can change the situation.” - Project Coordinator, EYA

Consistent with EYA’s recommendation, the CYO project coordinator recommended that UN-Habitat should “extend funding support to more than a year for high impact youth projects.” The YPPD project coordinator similarly recommended long-term financial support for successful projects. The ORGIIS project coordinator specifically recommended that “the financial assistance should be long term, that is, more than five years.” And the VICYOMO suggested that “we wish that in future, UN-Habitat could scale up this project so that it can impact a greater number of youths in the south west region of Cameroon.” The CI-Gambia project coordinator recommended “core support funds for the day-to-day administration of youth-led organizations.”
perspective of YFHG project coordinator, “funding should not only be money; in some instances, a
bus may be very useful for the training of participants.” The NAYA project coordinator
recommended that “UN Habitat should have administrative costs increased by 20% to cover
technical and logistical support, and institutional and technical capacity building.” In addition, the
NAYA coordinator wanted to see UN-Habitat focusing more on capacity building in future:

“Most youth organizations are dependent on donors – often on one donor – raising the risk
of institutional failure if that donor withdraws; hence specific capacity building is needed
to help them diversify income sources. Capacity building – both technical and institutional
should be considered the fundamental action in achieving sustainability.” - Project
Coordinator, NAYA

Fund more job creation and youth employment projects
Some project coordinators that UN-Habitat should prioritize job creation projects at the
cost of advocacy and awareness campaigns. YAI-Uganda recommended that “UN-Habitat
should also put more focus on projects that focus on job creation rather advocacy or creating
awareness.” The EYA project coordinator supported the YAI view by recommending that “they
(funding agencies) should support organizations that work in youth unemployment and the support
should be long term program support in order to see the impact of the project.” The AISEC-
Senegal project coordinator suggested that funding agencies should focus more on urban
agriculture projects where several financially and technically constrained young women
entrepreneurs are concentrated. The SAYM project coordinator also recommended more support
for rural and peri-urban projects saying that “UN-Habitat should also target rural or semi-urban
youth. It is often difficult to do projects in urban areas without access to land. The urban focus is a
UN-Habitat policy issue that needs to change.” According to Tacoli (2007), rural and urban developments are interconnected and cannot and should not be separated. UN-Habitat should, therefore, consider funding rural-based projects to enhance rural-urban connections and sustainable urbanization processes. Urban development benefits from rural development processes and urban development benefits rural development programs (Tacoli, 2007).

**Monitor and evaluate project beneficiaries**

Finally, and even more importantly, some project coordinators recommended that UN-Habitat needed to invest more in monitoring and evaluation project activities as a means to keep in touch with grantees and youth beneficiaries. Monitoring and evaluation promotes learning, transparency and accountability for grantees and funding agencies (Baker, 2000). Project monitoring can help in the identification of implementation challenges, allowing for corrective action. Impact evaluation can provide evidence of best practices to guide UN-Habitat in future UYF funding cycles. The YAI project coordinator expressed their recommendation as follows:

“I encourage UN-Habitat to monitor and evaluate each opportunity fund beneficiary as this will enable them to see the impact made on the ground. Monitoring and Evaluation is very important; please go on the ground and see whether there is an impact or not.”- Project Coordinator, YAI

The EYA coordinator echoed the need for monitoring and evaluation saying “I would like to invite UN-Habitat representatives to visit our project and to see the actual outcome on beneficiaries’ lives.” The KHCS, Love Planet, YAI and TDFY project coordinators recommended that UN-Habitat should document best practices and create a platform for youth to share project ideas and experiences. However, UN-Habitat already implemented such a platform when it created the

At the time of my interviews with project coordinators, most of them reported that they were unable to access or download the documents posted on the GYDRN because of slow internet connection and online registration requirements.

In the next section, I present views gathered from 60 youth beneficiaries of the UYF to complement the views and perspectives from project coordinators. The views of youth beneficiaries are central in development interventions that target them. As the ultimate project beneficiaries of the UYF program and projects, their views deserve a careful analysis and consideration.

**Evaluating the impact of the Urban Youth Fund program on youth access to decent and sustainable livelihoods: views from youth beneficiaries**

In preceding sections, I presented, from the perspective of project coordinators, a qualitative impact assessment of the Urban Youth Fund program on youth-led organizations, youth beneficiaries and the communities in which the projects were implemented. In this section, I present a quantitative before-and-after assessment of the 60 youth beneficiary views captured by grantees on behalf of UN-Habitat. The youth questionnaire that was used to gather the voices is shown in Appendix 4.

The quantitative assessment is in line with a mixed-methods research design and data triangulation approaches described in Chapter 3. This evaluation of youth voices, presented below, complements the views from project coordinators in an attempt to derive more robust conclusions, lessons and recommendations for youth-led organizations, funding agencies and youth entrepreneurs. It was equally important for me to assess the voices of youth beneficiaries since they were the end beneficiaries targeted by Urban Youth Fund projects.
As described in Chapter 3, I began by loading the youth voices in NVivo for a simple word frequency query. The word frequency query was useful in highlighting the common words that youth beneficiary used to describe how the UYF projects impacted their lives. The tag cloud that was generated in NVivo is shown in Figure 9 below. This tag cloud shows both the variety and frequency of responses: the bigger the size of the word, the greater the number of youth voices associated with that word. From the tag cloud, young people frequently used words such as “business”, “computer”, “life”, “maintenance”, “group”, “project”, “school”, “trained”, “skill”, “open”, “hope”, “management”, “job”, “equipment”, “support”, among others to describe how a particular project impacted their lives. A close reading of the youth responses revealed that most of them noted that the projects helped them to acquire technical skills such as computer skills and maintenance. On the hand, youth beneficiaries noted that they had nothing to do after graduation from high school and that skills training allowed them to open their own businesses, and most of them aspired to start their own business given start-up capital.

In line with the views from project coordinators, there was a frequent reference to group business creation opportunities from participating in UYF projects. Youth beneficiaries also acknowledged networking and access to financial capital and business marketing opportunities facilitated through the UYF projects. Some female voices also pointed out that the project allowed them to acquire life skills and income to support their families and in some cases advance their education. There was also a frequent reference to “job” and “work” in relation to the lack of permanent jobs that saw most youth graduates working part-time.
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Figure 10: Views from Urban Youth Fund beneficiaries
Contrary to broader community and organizational-level outcomes typically expressed by project coordinators, sample youth voices depicted beneficiaries who were more focused on achieving independence and self-reliance through creating their own businesses and securing permanent income generating opportunities.

Following the NVivo word frequency analysis described above, I loaded the youth views in SPSS to calculate the frequencies, averages and related statistical tests. Below, I present a before-and-after analysis of the employment and income status of UYF beneficiaries.

When youth beneficiaries responded to a question on what they were doing before joining the project, 40 (69%) of them said they were out-of-school and unemployed, 8 (14%) were still in school, and 10 (17%) were involved in other activities including farming, self- and informal employment, and community development work. Table 4.1 and Figure 11 present the activities of UYF beneficiaries before the project.

Table 4.1: What were you doing before joining the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response category</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 60)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-school &amp; unemployed</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>82.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4.2, about 22 (58%) of females were unemployed school leavers compared to 16 (42%) of males. These figures are in line with previous observations that youth unemployment is a serious problem for out-of-school youth in SSA. The challenge has always been that formal education systems train youth for formal employment opportunities that do not exist (UN-Habitat, 2013). Young females are particularly disadvantaged because they often have lower educational levels compared to young men (UN-Habitat, 2013). The UYF offers excellent opportunities for unemployed youth to receive practical skills training necessary for them to create microenterprises and self-employment opportunities. This is important because youth entrepreneurship has the potential to address youth employment challenges in low-income communities (Schoof, 2006).
Table 4.2: Activity before the project by gender crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response category</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before the project</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-School &amp; unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.1%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In school</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.4, about 87% of youth beneficiaries indicated that they were out-of-school and unemployed before joining the UYF project. The indication that the youth were earning $0 should be interpreted with caution given the qualitative findings from project coordinators that revealed that they trained youth beneficiaries who were already employed in the informal sector where they earned an income to support themselves and their families. Since most of the youth beneficiaries indicated that they were not making enough money because they did not have a permanent job, it is possible that the reference to “$0” was only used in reference to lack of a permanent or formal job and that the youth were reluctant to indicate how much they earned from informal livelihood activities.

When asked how the UYF project impacted their lives, 14 (23%) said they acquired computer skills, 11 (18%) were offered start-up capital to open their businesses, and 9 (15%) indicated that they acquired business skills. The remaining beneficiaries cited other project impacts including improved job prospects through independence, practical training and opening up their own businesses. Table 4.3 indicates youth responses on how the project changed their lives.
Table 4.3: How has the project impacted your life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquired computer skills</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered start-up capital</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired business and life skills</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made me independent</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made me a role model</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has given me the start in life</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opened my own business</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered practical training</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved job prospects</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the project, the average salary was approximately the same at $63 per month for male and female beneficiaries. The fact that the average monthly income of young women and men was approximately the same after the project suggests that young women benefit more from UYF projects. This is because young women generally earn lower than young men because young women tend to be concentrated in low-risk informal activities or home-based enterprises that pay little to no income (International Labor Office, 2002; 2005). Even though the sample size was small, it is encouraging to see that young women are benefiting economically from the UYF projects. Decent work for youth entails closing income inequalities between men and women and the UYF shows positive signs in this direction.
I also investigated the relationship between age (as measured by individual youth age) and income at the end of project (as measured by monthly income) using Spearman’s Rho. There was a positive correlation between age and monthly income \((r = .448^2, N = 53, p = .001)\) with older youth associated with higher monthly income and younger youth associated lower monthly income. This is consistent with previous studies that showed that inexperienced youth often earn lower than their experienced counterparts and adults because inexperienced youth are concentrated in easy-entry and low paying informal economic activities (Chigunta et al 2005). Inexperienced youth also tend to work for family-owned enterprises, whereas older youth are more to be self-employed (Chigunta et al, 2005). If these results hold true with a large sample, they may suggest that UN-Habitat and youth-led organizations should consider extended skills training opportunities for younger youth and limited training for older youth. Table 4.4 shows the mean salary by age.

\(^2\) For a small correlation: \(r = .10 \) to .29; for medium correlation: \(r = .30 \) to .49; for large/strong correlation \(r = .50 \) to 1.0. Positive and negative correlation coefficients and values indicate the direction of the relationship (Pallant, 2011).
Table 4.4: Mean salary now by age after the project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>57.50</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>79.47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>82.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>91.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>91.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>143.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>215.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60.72</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56.628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most youth beneficiaries also indicated that they were not earning as much as they expected after the project because they did not have a permanent job. This suggests that having a permanent job is considered a source of higher income. As shown in Table 4.5, when youth beneficiaries were asked whether or not they were earning enough income after the project training, 39 (83%) indicated “No” and 8 (17%) indicated “Yes”.

Table 4.5: Are you earning as much as you like after the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are you earning as much as you like after the project?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Youth indicated several reasons as to why they were not earning enough after graduating from the UYF project. Some reasons cited by youth included that they did not have a permanent job, were informally employed, worked part-time, worked outside the city, job was not satisfying, still in school, and that they needed to advance their education to earn more. Others simply indicated that they were not earning enough money without giving any reasons. A handful of youth indicated that they were earning enough income because they were self-employed and that they had a full-time job. Others who indicated “Yes” said it was only enough to cover basic expenses. One youth said “Yes, but it’s not enough” and others simply indicated that they were earning enough but did not give any explanation. Table 4.6 summarizes the reasons given by youth for not earning enough income.

Table 4.6: Are you earning as much income after the project and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response category</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, I don't have a permanent job</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I am informally employed</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I work part-time</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, need to advance education</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I don't have a job</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, still in school</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I make enough to cover daily expenses</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I want to start my own business</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, I work outside city</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, job not satisfying</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but it's not enough</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, I have a full-time job</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, self-employed</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In sum, access to decent work and income was something that the youth had not achieved but clearly hoped for. Most of them cited lack of a permanent job as the reason for their low income. Others, indicated that their income was not enough after the project because they worked part and in the informal economy. These challenges and others noted above, show the fundamental barriers to youth access to decent work and income in low-income communities. The UYF was established to address these challenges and it remains to be seen how youth access to decent work and income will change in the near future.

When youth beneficiaries responded to the question on the benefits that they received from the projects, they gave indications on what their future plans were. Table 4.7 and Figure 11 illustrates the aspirations of UYF youth beneficiaries. Most youth beneficiaries aspired to open their own businesses and be self-employed. This suggests that the need for startup capital recommended by project coordinators deserves a careful consideration by UN-Habitat and grantees in future. Many youth aspired to open new businesses but they did not have enough startup capital to create viable businesses and self-employment opportunities. Some youth also aspired to undergo further training, suggesting that the training that they received through UYF projects may have been inadequate. Previously, some project coordinators also indicated that it was difficult and time consuming to train informal youth because such youth required extended training sessions. Extended training demanded additional financial resources that the grantees did not have. Table 4.7 summarizes youth aspirations.
Table 4.7: Aspirations of Urban Youth Fund beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspiration</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>open own business</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expand business</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be self-employed</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need further training</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look for a permanent job</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manage myself</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support family</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repay loan</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the previous section, youth cited the lack of a permanent job as one of the main reasons why their incomes after the project were below expectation. The youth aspirations reflect that the creation and expansion of own businesses and self-employment are youth’s most preferred ways to enhance income in future. For UN-Habitat, this may mean funding more youth entrepreneurship and business management skills training projects. These youth will need adequate entrepreneurship training opportunities for them to create successful businesses and self-employment opportunities. Figure 12 depicts the youth aspirations.
Overall, youth beneficiaries cited acquisition of technological, life and business skills and startup capital as the main benefits they got from the training. Having acquired the practical skills and business knowledge, a few of them opened up their own businesses and became self-employed. Others worked part-time and full-time, whereas others were not yet employed. The aspirations of most youth beneficiaries reflect that they hope to open new businesses and self-employment opportunities that would generate income to support their families and repay loans. Some of them aspired to advance their education, using income from self-employment. The
youth views indicated that the UYF projects mostly increased youth access to human, financial and social capital in the short-term. In the long term, youth aspired to increase their income by opening and expanding businesses, becoming self-employed, securing permanent jobs and advancing their human capital through further education.

**Evaluating the impact of the Urban Youth Fund program on youth access to decent and sustainable livelihoods: survey findings from grantees and comparison group**

The previous section assessed the impact of the UYF projects on youth beneficiaries using a before and after analysis of 60 views gathered from 2009-2011 UYF beneficiaries. In this section, I focus on a quantitative impact evaluation of the UYF program using survey data that I collected from 31 grantees that received the UYF grant between 2009-2011 and a comparison group including 38 eligible but unsuccessful applicants to the 2011 UYF grant. To be able to attribute project outcome differences to the UYF program, it was necessary to compare grantees with sample organizations that did not receive the UYF grant. The use of a comparison group is one way of determining whether or not project outcomes occurred because of the project or if they could have been a result of other intervening factors such as a general improvement in local economic conditions (Baker, 2000).

To justify the use of the comparison group, I first determined that grantee and comparison group organizations were similar in their basic characteristics. I conducted simple frequency analysis in SPSS and concluded that there were no significant differences in the focus areas and goals of the grantees and comparison organizations. Both grantees and comparison group organizations sought to enhance urban youth livelihoods through entrepreneurship, job and skills training, job creation, environment, recycling, governance and other related projects. I performed a chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction) and there were
no significant differences between grantees and comparison group organizations in terms of their basic characteristics and focus areas (for example, “environment”, “job training and skills development”, “entrepreneurship”, “employment”, “women empowerment”), chi-square (df =1, N = 69) = .008, .688, .324, .760, .830 respectively; $p = .928, .407, .569, .383, and .362$ respectively; $\phi = .041$ (small effect), -.137 (very small effect), -.107 (very small effect), -.135 (very small effect), and .139 (small effect) respectively. For significant differences, the alpha value ($p$) should be equal to or less than .05.

In the next step, I focus on an understanding of the actions that comparison group organizations took after failing to secure the UYF grant. I considered their actions important for comparison and interpretation purposes because the actions taken may reflect on broad opportunities and constraints that youth-led organizations face in low-income countries. Table 4.9 summarizes the actions taken by sample UYF eligible but unsuccessful organizations after their project was not funded.

### Table 4.8: Actions taken by comparison group organizations after projects were not funded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action taken</th>
<th>Frequency (N = 38)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start the project without funding</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get funding from another source</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply again in 2012</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandon the project</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4.9, 14 (37%) of the comparison group organizations started the project without funding, 12 (32%) applied again in 2012, 14 (37%) got funding from other sources and 7 (18%) abandoned the project. Most of those that started their projects without funding subsequently secured funding for the project. These findings suggest that funding opportunities exist for youth with creative ideas. Since half of the comparison group secured funding from other sources, they likely minimized the differences between grantees and comparison group organizations. I present comparative survey findings from the 38 comparison group organizations and 31 UYF grantees.

I began the comparative analysis by computing the average outcomes for all variables or questions of interest to the study (see Table 4.10). The table shows that, on average, UYF grantees created slightly more employment opportunities for young women than the comparison group; UYF youth beneficiaries paid slightly more per month for the working space that they used compared to comparison group youth; UYF youth beneficiaries earned slightly more per month after graduation compared to comparison group youth; and UYF grantee cooperatives had an average number of youth members almost double those in comparison group created cooperatives. On the hand, the fact that 37% of comparison group organizations received funding from other sources implies that most of them were equally capable of creating jobs for youth beneficiaries.

The youth who benefited from UYF projects probably paid more for the space that they used because most 15 (63%) grantees indicated that youth had licenses and contracts with land owners compared to 16 (50%) of comparison group organizations (see Table 4.9). Access to licensed land proved expensive to UYF beneficiaries. Also, 18 (70%) indicated that youth
beneficiaries shared working space with other youth compared to 13 (34%) of comparison group organizations. From this perspective, UYF beneficiaries probably paid more in rental as a group and not as individuals. Those who worked in licensed spaces were probably sharing expensive pieces of land in prime urban locations where their businesses were viable.

I also conducted a chi-square test for independence to determine whether or not there was a significant relationship between grantees and comparison group on the use of shared spaced with other youth and having licenses and contracts with land owners. There was a significant association (chi-square = 7.740, $p = .012 < .05$, $\phi = -.344$) between grantee and comparison group organizations in terms of the use of shared space with other youth by their beneficiaries (see Table 4.10). Table 4.9 presents the average project outcomes for grantees and comparison group organizations across multiple variables.
Table 4.9: Average project outcomes for grantees and comparison group organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of employed youth assisted in the past 12 months</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68.70</td>
<td>71.002</td>
<td>14.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>92.23</td>
<td>167.083</td>
<td>30.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who are women</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>45.577</td>
<td>10.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43.29</td>
<td>92.234</td>
<td>15.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average of self-employed youth assisted in the past 12 months</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39.48</td>
<td>33.998</td>
<td>7.419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69.97</td>
<td>135.402</td>
<td>22.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who are women</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>21.279</td>
<td>5.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.54</td>
<td>100.436</td>
<td>16.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average monthly payment by youth for working space used in $US</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.30</td>
<td>62.074</td>
<td>19.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>26.338</td>
<td>5.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of youth and women reached through programs in the past year</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>167.59</td>
<td>249.996</td>
<td>46.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>232.78</td>
<td>502.841</td>
<td>82.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number who are women</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>80.05</td>
<td>82.870</td>
<td>18.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>130.75</td>
<td>276.376</td>
<td>46.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average youth beneficiary monthly earnings in $US</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>163.00</td>
<td>285.925</td>
<td>79.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>131.54</td>
<td>95.040</td>
<td>17.961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average credit or loan amount to youth in the past year</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1274.25</td>
<td>1163.675</td>
<td>411.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2424.75</td>
<td>4918.252</td>
<td>1738.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of youth in cooperatives created</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>59.75</td>
<td>84.158</td>
<td>24.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>57.646</td>
<td>9.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cash loan to youth in the past year</td>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5479.38</td>
<td>8454.587</td>
<td>2989.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8666.25</td>
<td>9565.018</td>
<td>3381.744</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 shows the statistical tests that I performed and project outcome differences between grantees and comparison group organizations.
### Table 4.10: Outcome differences and similarities between Urban Youth Fund grantees and comparison group organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/ research question</th>
<th>Outcome/ measure</th>
<th>UYF grantees- Comparison group</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Grantee size and its impact on the number of youth and women assisted in securing employment and self-employment |                  | Pearson Correlation (grantees only)  
| p = 839; .834                                                                           |                  | X                               |        |
| In what areas does your project focus? (Select all that apply.)                         | Baseline         | Chi-square test for independence  
| (p = .928, .407, .569, .383,...)                                                        |                  | X                               |        |
| What kind of training(s) has your organization given to young men and women in the past 12 months? | Human capital    | Chi-square test for independence |        |
| How many youth and women have you assisted in securing employment or entrepreneurship in the past 12 months? | Financial capital | Independent samples t-test       | X      |
| How many youth and women have you assisted who are self-employed?                       |                  | Independent samples t-test       | X      |
| About how much are these young men and women earning monthly in their respective employment or livelihood activities? |                  | Independent samples t-test  
| (p = .140)                                                                                |                  | X                               |        |
| Has your organization                                                                  |                  | Chi-square test for independence | X      |
Table 4.10 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>provided cash loans to youth through the project?</td>
<td>independence</td>
<td>(p = .003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From who did youth beneficiaries secure credit?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>(p = .044)</td>
<td>X (microcredit schemes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of jobs are the young men and women you have trained or reached through the project doing? (Select all that apply.)</td>
<td>Decent jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of working space or land are the youth you assisted using for their livelihood activities? (Select all that apply)</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>(p = .001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the youth have licenses or contracts with land owners for the space(s) that they use?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About how much are youth beneficiaries paying per month in total for the livelihood space or land?</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your organization been able to provide youth beneficiaries with the materials and equipment they need to start their businesses through the project?</td>
<td>Physical and natural capital</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of working space or land are the youth you</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (shared space with other youth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Has your organization been able to assist youth beneficiaries to form cooperatives, support groups, or associations in the past 12 months?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>What challenges did your organization face in the past 12 months (Select all that apply.)</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships and capacity building</td>
<td>Has your organization been able to partner with any other organization through the project in the past 12 months?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Whom did you partner with?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What kind of partnership emerged between your organization and the partner(s)</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p = .020)</td>
<td>(p = .042)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project sustainability</td>
<td>Is your project still ongoing?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have you been able to secure funding from elsewhere to continue with the project in the past 12 months?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above statistical analysis point to the following differences between UYF grantees and comparison group organizations:

**Financial Capital:**
- Grantees significantly provided cash loans to youth beneficiaries compared to comparison group organizations
- Grantee youth beneficiaries significantly secured credit and loans through microcredit schemes compared to comparison group organization

These findings suggest that the UYF grant was an opportunity for some grantees to offer cash loans to youth beneficiaries in the form of startup capital. UYF grantees also used their grants to create microcredit schemes that enhanced youth access to financial capital. The provision of cash loans and the creation of microenterprises were limited or impossible for comparison group organizations in the absence of a grant. Alternative funding that the organizations received from other sources was probably not enough to offer cash loans or to create microcredit schemes for youth beneficiaries.

**Physical Capital:**
- Grantees significantly provided youth beneficiaries with the materials and equipment that the youth needed to start businesses through the project
- Grantee beneficiaries significantly used shared space with other youth compared to comparison group beneficiaries (chi-square = 7.740, $p = .012 < .05$, $phi = -.344$).

These differences suggest that grantees used the UYF grant to purchase the materials and equipment that youth beneficiaries needed to start microenterprises. The grantees also organized youth beneficiaries into working groups to facilitate access to workspace. This was reported by EYA in Ethiopia, Voi Youth Forum in Kenya, CYO in Malawi, CYM in Zambia, and FTIZ in
Zimbabwe. For example, among other grantees, CYO partnered with Blantyre City Council, Family-in-Need Trust of Zimbabwe partnered with Mutare City Council, and the Voi Youth Forum partnered with Voi City Council to facilitate youth access land. As a result, most grantee beneficiaries worked in groups because they created joint microenterprises and acquired workspace from city councils with the assistance of grantees and community members. Comparison group organizations did not have the funding to provide youth beneficiaries with the materials and equipment they needed. Inadequate funding may also have hindered the ability of comparison group organizations to forge workspace partnerships with community members and city councils.

**Decent jobs:**

- Grantee beneficiaries significantly engaged in entrepreneurship related income generating activities compared to comparison group organizations (chi-square =11.015, p = .001 < .05, phi = -.445, df = 1, N= 65).

  This finding suggest that grantees focused significantly on entrepreneurship training, with the consequence that their youth beneficiaries concentrated in the creation of new businesses and self-employment opportunities after graduation. UYF beneficiaries were more likely to engage in entrepreneurship given that grantees focused on creating youth-run businesses through revolving funds and were more likely to facilitate youth entrepreneurship through the provision of start-up loans, materials, and equipment. Comparison group organizations did not enough funding to hire entrepreneurship training specialists. Comparison group beneficiaries were therefore, more likely to engage in advocacy and awareness campaigns after the training because those were the types of training activities comparison group organizations gave them.
Partnerships and Capacity Building:

- Comparison group organizations significantly partnered with national government after their projects were not funded
- Grantees significantly forged workspace provision partnerships compared to comparison group organizations

It was significant that 19 (50%) of the comparison group organizations partnered with national government within the past year compared to 5 (19%) of grantees. Perhaps, comparison group organizations sought to strengthen their capacity through partnering with national governments after failing to secure a financial partnership with UN-Habitat. On the other hand, it was probably unnecessary for grantee organizations to establish new partnerships with national government since UN-Habitat and other partners provided capacity and technical support during project implementation. This suggests that national government is a willing partner in youth employment or development projects. UN-Habitat may consider facilitating more partnerships between youth organizations and national government to encourage institutional linkages in sustainable poverty reduction initiatives. As noted above, grantees significantly forged workspace provision partnerships with community members and city councils. This was limited for comparison group organizations without a grant to justify the need for such workspace and partnerships.

Previous studies have shown that access to workspace is a central physical asset for the urban poor (Brown, 2006; Rakodi & Lloyd-Jones, 2002). UN-Habitat should consider partnership with city council and local government a pre-condition for the UYF grant, especially if the proposed project seeks to promote entrepreneurship and employment creation for urban youth. According to Miller (2004), city governments have a comparative advantage in youth
employment creation because they can enhance youth access to land through flexible planning standards and regulations. The success of youth entrepreneurs depends on their ability to access secure land and workspace for self-employment activities. In the absence of secure workspace, youth entrepreneurs are often the most victims of mass and sporadic evictions (Schoof, 2006). To this end, UN-Habitat should facilitate or even require partnerships with local and national governments for all urban youth entrepreneurship and employment creations projects.

Table 4.10 below summarizes the results from the statistical tests that I performed to compare UYF grantees and comparison group organizations.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the above grantee-comparison group findings revealed that UYF grantees had a noticeable impact on youth access to working space, materials and equipment, and the credit and loans for youth-run micro-enterprises. However, access to working space for youth resulted in youth paying higher rentals than those in the comparison group who relied mostly on free vacant lots and public spaces. The use of shared space by UYF beneficiaries did not necessarily lower the costs of land rentals for youth as desired.

Youth beneficiaries also mentioned that UYF projects allowed them to access materials, equipment, loans, and start-up capital after the training. In terms of access to financial capital, the survey indicated that UYF beneficiaries earned higher monthly salaries compared to comparison group beneficiaries even though the difference was not significant. However, project coordinators reported a higher monthly income ($163) average compared to youth beneficiaries ($63). A larger sample would be needed to determine the average income of youth beneficiaries after the UYF. Increased income goal was certainly not met from the perspective of youth beneficiaries given that 65% of sample UYF beneficiaries indicated that they were not earning
as much as they expected after the project. It was also telling that 36 (70%) of youth aspired to expand businesses, open new ones and become self-employed. The goal of the youth was certainly a higher income that would enable them to support themselves, their families and advance their education. Another important finding was that the size of grant was not necessarily a major determinant of project impact and in some cases a higher grant was associated with fewer youth and women beneficiaries, jobs and income. The quantitative analysis that I presented here suffered from a limited sample size but can act as a pilot study for a large scale quantitative assessment in future.

Qualitative views from project coordinators revealed positive UYF project outcomes in the form of increased technical and financial capacity for youth-led organizations to better respond to youth employment challenges. Youth beneficiaries benefited from increased or facilitated access to working space, business startup loans, self-employment and income. Both qualitative and quantitative findings indicated that UYF projects opened up and strengthened networking and collaboration opportunities at the organizational, youth and community level. The collaborative efforts opened up external funding opportunities for some grantees but not as yet for others.

Despite all the positive project outcomes, it was evident that there were far more challenges that hindered the capacity of youth-led organizations and targeted beneficiaries to effectively address youth employment challenges. Potential youth beneficiaries and community members held negative views on projects and that discouraged many of them from participation. Other youth beneficiaries were also pre-occupied with day-to-day survival issues and found it hard to attend the training sessions regularly. Those who graduated from programs found it
difficult to secure working space for decent livelihood activities and often lacked adequate collateral to secure bank loans. On the other hand, grantees struggled to continue with the projects after the UYF grant due to limited internal and external project funding. Ongoing projects proceeded much slower than expected and with minimum enrolment considering overwhelming demand in some cases. Some projects ended completely, seemingly marking the end of their relationship with UN-Habitat.

These findings offer a promising youth-led livelihood development agenda but they also send one clear and strong signal to funding agencies: the issue of long-term funding for project sustainability, expansion and replication deserves a closer consideration now than later. In the next section, I shift my attention to the Youth-to-Youth Fund program in West Africa, to derive broader recommendations, policy implications and conclusions to guide ongoing and future youth-led livelihood development programs.
CHAPTER V

DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS: YOUTH EMPLOYMENT NETWORK’S YOUTH-TO-YOUTH FUND

Introduction

The previous chapter presented data analysis and findings from the UN-Habitat Opportunities Fund for Urban Youth-Led Development (Urban Youth Fund) and its impact on youth organizations, beneficiaries and the community. This chapter presents data analysis and findings from the Youth Employment Network (YEN) Youth-to-Youth Fund (Y2Y) in West Africa—a comparable youth challenge fund. As with the Urban Youth Fund chapter, this chapter evaluates the impact of the Y2Y program and projects on youth access to sustainable livelihoods assets: human, financial, physical, natural and social capital. The YEN Y2Y provided youth-led organizations with grants of up to $50,000 to implement youth employment and entrepreneurship projects in the West African countries of Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia and Sierra Leone and also in East Africa. This chapter focuses on the Y2Y program in West Africa to pave the way for a comparative analysis with the Urban Youth Fund (UYF program) and a broad discussion of implications for youth-led livelihood development interventions presented in Chapter 6.

Chapter 1 introduced the research questions and Chapter 2 presented the sustainable youth livelihoods framework in the context of Sub-Saharan Africa. The review showed that youth access to financial resources such as income, social assets such as friends and social networks, human capital in the form of livelihood skills and knowledge, and physical assets such as access to land and working space, are central for sustainable youth livelihoods in the context of informal economies. The central aim of the study is to determine the extent to which youth-led
livelihood programs, funded through the Y2Y and UYF, enhance youth access to sustainable livelihood assets. The broad aim is to shed light on the potential of youth-led development in the quest for global youth employment creation and effective poverty reduction strategies.

Chapter 3 presented the research methods employed and the location of the Y2Y grantees included in this study and the sampling strategies that I used. In this chapter, I begin by summarizing the focus of the Y2Y projects followed by a qualitative impact evaluation of the projects using views from Y2Y project coordinators and key informants. The qualitative impact evaluation focuses on the impact of Y2Y projects on youth access to human, physical, natural, financial and social assets necessary for sustainable youth livelihoods in low-income and largely informal rural and urban economies. To ensure a comprehensive qualitative impact assessment, I also present the challenges faced by Y2Y grantees, the lessons learned, future aspirations of grantees and recommendations for the YEN from the perspective of youth project coordinators. Qualitative views from the youth project coordinators of comparison group organizations conclude the qualitative impact evaluation sections. I then shift to a largely quantitative impact assessment of Y2Y projects, using survey data from youth beneficiaries, grantees and comparison group organizations. I conclude the chapter by presenting remarks on the extent to which the Y2Y created decent and sustainable livelihoods for youth in West Africa.

**Foci of Youth-to-Youth Fund projects**

The Y2Y projects included in this study promoted youth livelihoods mainly through the creation of youth microenterprises and cooperatives. The microenterprises and cooperatives were created through projects that focused on young women’s empowerment, agriculture, youth employment and entrepreneurship, water and sanitation, energy, vocational skills training,
transition from school to work, community projects and services, among other themes. For example, the Messiah Partnership Trust (MPT) promoted youth employment and entrepreneurship in Freetown (Sierra Leone) through printer cartridge refill and recycling; the Youth Action International-Liberia (YAI-Liberia) promoted young women’s empowerment in Monrovia through vocational skills training and counseling; SOS Miskines promoted youth entrepreneurship and employment in Conakry (Guinea) through plastic waste recycling; the UJIV launched a beach cleaning and tourism promotion project to create youth employment in Abidjan (Ivory Coast); the Solidarity Youth and Action for Sustainable Development (SOJADD), Association for Integrated Development in Guinea (ADIGUI) and Union for the Agro-Pastoral Production (UPAP) promoted youth entrepreneurship and employment through diverse agricultural projects in Guinea; the Union of Young Volunteers of Coyah (UJIC) promoted youth employment through a public toilet construction project in urban Coyah (Guinea), and the Polio Persons Development Association (PPDA) trained disabled youth to make artisanal paper beads for sale in Makeni and surrounding regions in Sierra Leone.

The creation of cooperatives and micro-enterprises was a central theme in all of the Y2Y projects included in this study. The projects were implemented in both rural and urban areas with a bias towards agricultural projects in rural or semi-urban areas and recycling and environmental projects in and around large urban areas. Agricultural projects sometimes encompassed both rural and urban locations, thus benefiting both rural and urban youth. Guinea projects tended to be agricultural in nature, targeting both urban and rural youth in and around small and large cities, compared to strictly urban or rural based projects in Liberia, Ivory Coast and to some extent, Sierra Leone. Appendix 8 shows the 36 projects analyzed in this chapter including
grantee name and location, grant size, project focus, project location in rural and urban terms and the year the project was funded.

As shown in Appendix 8, I included 36 Y2Y grantees. They represented over 95% of all organizations funded by YEN since the 2008/2009 launch of the Y2Y program in the Mano River Union (MRU) countries (Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia, and Sierra Leone). By country, 19 (53%) of the grantees were from Guinea, 10 (28%) from Sierra Leone, 4 (11%) from Liberia and 3 (8%) were from Ivory Coast.

As noted in Chapter 3, 23 (64%) of the grantees were from the second round of the Y2Y launched from 2010-2011 in Guinea and Sierra Leone. The remaining 13 (36%) were from the pilot phase or the first round launched in 2008/2009. The 36 grantees received funding of between $5,000 and $50,000. Larger grant amounts of close to $50,000 were awarded during the pilot phase compared to the second phase when grants were $20,000 or less.

In terms of project location and target beneficiaries, there was a bias towards urban projects in the pilot phase but the second phase in Guinea and Sierra Leone somewhat redressed the imbalance through the inclusion of more rural and semi-urban agricultural projects. Some grantees, such as the PPDA, targeted disabled youth in both rural and urban areas even though they brought them to their central location in urban Makeni. Agricultural projects made it difficult to ascertain the exact location of the project since they were mostly implemented around urban centers, perhaps to take advantage of their transportation, customer and infrastructure services. This was mostly true in Guinea where several projects were located in peri-urban areas. As in most parts of West Africa, Guinea families own private land in urban areas and they can lease the land if they wish. This tradition may account for the large number of urban-based
agricultural projects funded in Guinea, even though agriculture has traditionally been practiced in rural areas. Overall, most projects crisscrossed rural and urban locations and benefited rural and urban youth as a result. In the next several sections, I present qualitative and quantitative impact assessments of the impact of the Y2Y projects on youth access to livelihood assets and decent employment opportunities.

The Impact of the Youth-to-Youth Fund program: thematic analysis of interview data and documents in NVivo

This section presents an analysis of Skype interview data collected from the project coordinators of eight Y2Y projects—six from Guinea and two from Sierra Leone. As described in Chapter 3, the project coordinators emailed their responses to the Skype interview questions shown in Appendix 2. Responses from Guinea were in French and a Children and Environments Center intern translated the responses to English. Responses from Sierra Leone were already in English and no translation or transcription was required. In addition to the Skype interview responses, I reviewed official Y2Y documents prepared by key informants, that is, the YEN employees who managed and coordinated the Y2Y program and projects. The official documents that I reviewed included a major report summarizing results from the 14 Y2Y projects funded during the pilot phase.³

I also reviewed mid-term data from Sierra Leone and Guinea projects funded during the second round of the Y2Y program in 2010/2011. The Regional Y2Y Program Coordinator for West Africa in collaboration with project coordinators, and a YEN assistant prepared the mid-

---

³ The pilot report, officially referred as the Mano River Union (MRU) Pilot Report, was a product of a major end of project evaluation exercise conducted by YEN Y2Y officials in collaboration with project coordinators and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) projects assistants. In addition to overview project results, the MRU report included testimonies from project beneficiaries.
term reports. They interviewed project beneficiaries and youth project coordinators and made personal observations to prepare the mid-term evaluations.

I analyzed Skype interview data and project reports using thematic analysis in NVivo. I imported all the interview data into NVivo and saved it under the “Internals”. I saved the interview responses and project report using their unique identifying names (mostly grantee names) to facilitate the coding process. I used NVivo because it made qualitative interview and report data management and analysis easier and faster. It was quicker to organize and retrieve interview data and reports in a single NVivo project compared to manual organization and analysis of approach. In NVivo, I read through my interview and report data and created themes or codes that reflected the Y2Y project impacts from the perspective of project coordinators and key informants in relation to my research questions. I continued to read through the data collapsing the themes that emerged further and grouping related themes together until I coded all the relevant data related to my research questions. In the next several sections, I present findings from the thematic analysis of interview data from project coordinators and results from project document reviews.

The impact of the Youth-to-Youth Fund on youth access to human capital: views from project coordinators and key informants

Technical training, moral support and capacity building

Youth project coordinators frequently expressed that the grant that they received from YEN allowed them to receive technical project management and implementation training, moral support and capacity building at the organizational level. Technical training included project monitoring and evaluation and business management skills. The coordinators felt that the Y2Y
grant legitimized their organizations and that signified moral support in the area of youth employment creation. The YEN funding enhanced the capacity of youth-led organizations to better address youth employment challenges. The ADIGUI, I’AE and ACNG project coordinators, for example, all said that they received technical, moral support and business creation skills through the YEN grant. The BBS, AJAHC and IBDDG project coordinators mostly felt that the project management skills that they received through the Y2Y enhanced the capacity of their organizations to create decent and sustainable youth employment. Below is how the AJAHC and IBDDG project coordinators described how the Y2Y grant impacted their organizations:

“We received tracking and project management training from YEN before work began, then training on employability through sports, all of which have contributed to strengthen our operational capacity on the ground. This project, through funding, but also the training that we received and tracking methods, really made us active and put trust in us for other future applications.” – AJAHC Project Coordinator.

“There were two agreements around the YEN grant: the signing of a contract between the YEN and our organization that allowed us to receive assurance on capacity building through project management, monitoring and evaluation. We then received training on youth employability through sports and project monitoring and evaluation.” – IBDDG Project Coordinator

The ADIGUI, I’AE, ACNG and BBS project coordinators considered the moral support that they received from YEN as an important factor that energized their organizations to focus on youth livelihoods and development. The BBS project coordinator said that they “received moral
support and business management training and assurance on effective business services.” The MPT project coordinator said that they received project and finance management, leadership and supervision skills through the Y2Y grant.

Key informant reports reinforced organizational-level impact experiences expressed by project coordinators:

“YEN and UNIDO staff provided close support and guidance at every stage of the grantees project implementation; from project design, to implementation to monitoring. This has been crucial to the success of projects and should be continued and further strengthened in future rounds. Grantees have found the various project management tools that were provided to them helpful. In subsequent rounds, a training course on these and other project management tools was provided before grantees began project implementation.” – MRU Report p.11

During end of project field visits, the YEN officials found that grantees considered technical training and management of personal finances to be the most valuable part of the training. They found that most grantees did not have previous project implementation experience and that the Y2Y project was their first major project experience. The grantees were grateful for the YEN and UNIDO technical training that allowed their organizations to make significant progress in creating youth employment within a short period of time.

Practical and business skills training to youth and women

Most project coordinators said that the Y2Y grant and subsequent project management and implementation training allowed their organizations to offer comprehensive practical and business
creation and management skills to youth beneficiaries, including disadvantaged informal youth and young women. For example, through the UJIV project, youth beneficiaries received practical training and basic business skills that allowed them to construct a restaurant. The youth successfully operated a restaurant and bungalows on a three kilometer stretch of the beach outside Abidjan. They used the practical skills that they gained from the project to clean and maintain the beach and they fully equip the restaurant and bungalows. The PPDA project coordinator said that “our organization, with the support from the YEN provided youth beneficiaries with technical training, business management training, life skills training, and training materials and startup kits.”

A review of key informant reports also found that, through the Y2Y projects, grantees offered practical training to youth beneficiaries. Practical skills training was considered a vital part of the training as it allowed youth to independently operate microenterprises and the practical training also allowed some youth to secure employment during the training. The MRU report summarized the nature of projects funded during the pilot phase as follows:

“The majority of projects that youth submitted did not just stop at training. They typically were training programs which would also equip the trainees and provide them with practical work experience so that they would be able to run their own micro-enterprises by the end of the project. The business skills and ICT training were the most valuable to job seekers.” - MRU Report p. 9

A focus on practical skills training is important because educational systems in Sub-Saharan Africa and other parts of the developing world have often been criticized for being too academic and theoretical (Jimenez, 2006). At the same time, the business creation skills component of the Y2Y should be applauded given that traditional vocational skills training
programs have mostly been dismissed for training youth for jobs that did not exist (Betcherman et al., 2007; Jimenez, 2006; Chant & Jones, 2005; Benell, 2007). In this regard, the Y2Y has been effective since it focuses on the creation and management of youth-initiated microenterprises and self-employment creation.

More significantly, in the context of informal economies, the Y2Y pilot projects and those in the subsequent rounds in Guinea and Sierra Leone offered life, business creation and practical skills to informal youth and young women. Informal youth and young women have been found to be among the most disadvantaged and segregated in urban and rural Africa (International Labor Organization, 2005; Sommers, 2007). According to the MRU report, approximately 60% of beneficiaries in the Y2Y pilot round were young women and nine of the 14 organizations that received funding specifically targeted young women. The young women received skills training in tailoring, cosmetology, jewelry, interior decoration, baking and pastry, among others. The GNIHONDE (Ivory Coast) beneficiaries, for example, were all young women who were trained in raising giant African snails which they sold on the markets and directly to food outlets around Abidjan. Most Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees also specifically trained disadvantaged informal youth mostly in urban areas: the AJAHC trained 21 unemployed youth from disadvantaged and informal neighborhoods in Conakry (Guinea); the I’AE project offered training to 20 slum youth in Kindia (Guinea); the MPT offered recycling and business skills training to disadvantaged slum youth in Freetown (Sierra Leone); and the IBDDG project coordinator said “we trained young suburban youth with occupations that lasted only four out of 12 months, and their work was informal and not full-time, just some farm work.”
The impacts of the Youth-to-Youth Fund on youth access to physical and natural capital: views from project coordinators and key informants

_Access to land and workspace_

Access to land for livelihood activities remains a major challenge for youth in low-income communities. Several studies have shown that youth access to land is limited and that youth informal workers and young women are often the main victims of urban evictions and harassment by municipal authorities (Brown, 2006; Yeboah, 2010). This study sought to assess the impact that the Y2Y and also the UYF had on youth access to land and working space for sustainable livelihoods. In the absence of secure access to land, youth livelihoods are often insecure and unsustainable (International Labor Office, 2002). The YEN Y2Y officials that I spoke to told me that the Y2Y projects facilitated youth access to land by bringing youth and land owners together. In most cases, the collaboration between youth beneficiaries and land owners was facilitated by grantees and it resulted in youth signing contracts with land owners that allowed youth to acquire land, mostly for agricultural activities. Youth beneficiaries paid land owners an agreed monetary compensation for the use of land and this allowed youth entrepreneurs to conduct their livelihood activities in a secure and sustainable manner.

The signing of contracts with land owners was a common practice for rural agricultural projects. As noted in the introductory section, in most parts of urban West Africa, families and individuals (mostly adults) often own large pieces of land which they lease or sell to interested parties. In urban areas, some Y2Y projects and especially pilot projects, benefited from generous land donations from city councils. For example, the Mayor of Agou provided land and office space for the FSL Snail Raising and Processing Project; the mayor of Grand Bassam provided land for the GNIHONDE Fish Smoking Project; and the mayor of Port-Bouet provided land for the
UJIV beach cleaning project in Abidjan allowing the UJIV to obtain restaurant and bungalow construction permits quickly. In Guinea, the ACNG initially experienced challenges but the mayor’s intervention allowed them to sign a contract to use the land:

“It (project) is in a private-rented space and we have had family problems and delays in obtaining a contract document and we decided to use public spaces. To access the private workspace again involved negotiations, preparation of a contract document valid for at least 24 months, renewable and signed by the transferor, the president of the district and authorized representative of our organization and a public contract document signed by the Mayor of the City” – ACNG project coordinator

Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees played a major role in facilitating youth access to land for project activities. In Sierra Leone, the YCSTA secured land for two cooperatives formed through the Value Added Cassava Processing Project and they gave youth supplies to build sheds where they conducted cassava processing. The BaCUDA secured five sites for their Giant African Snail Farming Project and they leased and fenced off five sites for trainees and graduates. Each site was given 500 start-up snails, which were laying eggs. Some grantees such as the I’AE, IBDDG and PPDA did not encounter any access to land challenges. The I’AE project coordinator said “our organization has encountered no difficulty in obtaining the ground because we had the agreement and returns and a two year renewable lease.” The IBDDG project coordinator also expressed that land was abundant and that they did not encounter any land access challenge as a result:

“Agricultural land for growing onions and other vegetable crops such as eggplant and tomato was 2 ha (1 per village). There were no difficulties in obtaining farmland because
there is enough land; we have taken care to develop land leases with landlords to avoid future conflicts.” - IBDDG project coordinator.

“We did not face any challenge in getting space for the implementation of the project, that was in fact the main reason why we converged all beneficiaries from other regions to the center for technical, business management and life skills training.” – PPDA project coordinator

Access to land, however, was not as easy for some Y2Y grantees. For example, the MPT and ADIGUI sometimes experienced serious challenges related to access to land and workspace for their organizations and youth beneficiaries. The MPT had to use an empty plot of land in a container shop and part of their office space as a work station for youth beneficiaries because access to land was difficult and expensive in Freetown. The ADIGUI project faced economic, access and social challenges related to land. Economically, the six acres of land they owned were not viable for agricultural activities as the land was too small; the five hectare piece of land they secured for the project was located 90 kilometers (55 miles) from their social base and it was inaccessible to most youth because of transportation challenges; and socially, access to agricultural land was made difficult by some ranchers who felt that their Y2Y project was in competition with their ranching business.

Whilst rural land is commonly considered a natural asset, findings from the Y2Y analysis clearly showed that access to rural land can be expensive and difficult for rural youth, something that has generally been associated with low-income urban youth. In most cases, rural youth beneficiaries of the Y2Y projects did not own land to conduct livelihood activities and they had to sign contracts with land owners to gain access to secure land. The land contracts involved youth
paying specified monetary compensation to land owners for a specified period of time. It was also clear from the analysis that delayed access to land also delayed some Y2Y projects. The analysis also showed that the support of local governments and particularly city council was vital in facilitating youth access to land at the grantee and youth beneficiary level.

**Access to start-up tools, materials and equipment**

As shown in Chapter 2, one barrier to youth microenterprise and employment creation resolves around limited access to start-up tools, materials and equipment (Schoof, 2006). The challenge in traditional vocational skills training programs has often been their inability to provide youth graduates with start-up toolkits or materials and equipment to commence self-employment activities. Key informants and project coordinators indicated that the Y2Y grants allowed youth organizations to purchase startup tools, materials and equipment that youth trainees and graduates needed to successfully launch microenterprises and cooperatives. In the words of one Y2Y official, Y2Y projects provided youth beneficiaries with “a complete training package” that included soft and hard skills training and startup toolkits. Soft skills included business creation knowledge and hard skills included practical skills training in agriculture. Start-up tools kits were provided to allow youth to start them to create micro-enterprises soon after graduation. The BBF in Liberia, for example, provided each cooperative with one bricklaying machine, one wheelbarrow, two shovels, and $125 in cash to allow youth beneficiaries to launch their businesses. The youth used the machines to manufacture high quality bricks that they sold in three different communities around Monrovia (Liberia). The I’AE project coordinator said that “all community youth benefit from the contribution of this project through the local workforce, the loan of materials and agricultural policy advice.”
The impacts of the Youth-to-Youth Fund on youth access to economic or financial capital: views from project coordinators and key informants

Creation of youth microenterprises and employment opportunities

Lack of access to financial or economic capital is a fundamental barrier to youth employment creation in low-income communities (Jimenez, 2006; Schoof, 2006). The sustainable livelihoods development literature review indicates that limited access to financial capital, such as income, prevents poor people from acquiring other central livelihood assets such as human capital in the form of education and knowledge, physical capital in the form of secure workspace, and limited social networks and livelihood opportunities (DFID, 1999). The Y2Y program provided financial grants to youth-led organizations to allow them to create youth microenterprises and jobs. Through the pilot Y2Y round, for example, the YEN provided over $450,000 to 14 youth-led organizations in the MRU countries (YEN & UNIDO, 2011). Over 60 youth-led enterprises and 565 decent jobs were created as a result. The average profit per month was estimated at $530 per cooperative and 75% of the pilot phase beneficiaries continued to have the jobs they secured through the Y2Y projects (YEN & UNIDO, 2011). The Y2Y pilot projects generated employment opportunities for youth beneficiaries who earned between $40 and $130 per month and $43 on average (YEN & UNIDO, 2011). The beneficiaries used their business knowledge and practical skills to create self-employment opportunities and some of them secured employment opportunities in private and public sectors.

The Y2Y projects have created diverse employment and income generation opportunities for youth beneficiaries. The SOS Miskines (Guinea) project, for example, created 15 permanent jobs and part-time employment opportunities to about 2000 mobile waste collectors. Over 2000 independent garbage collectors received an income from selling their plastic waste to SOS
Miskines. Their central recycling center hired permanent staff to operate the machines that converted plastic waste into plastic pellets. The project created jobs for youth who collected the plastic waste and transported it to the recycling center. Through UJIV’s Beach Cleaning and Tourism Development Project, ten urban youth were employed directly by the organization for the duration of one year and they assisted in the establishment of youth cooperatives. In Monrovia (Liberia), the YEFI Job Shop Project beneficiaries received a monthly stipend of $40 during the training and $100 monthly during their first three months of on the job training. Through the GNIHONDE Fish Smoking Project, 60 youth including 54 young women were trained in technical fish smoking and also basic business skills such as accounting. The young women shared ovens to produce smoked fish for sale. The UJIV beach cleaning and tourism project created construction jobs for youth who used their skills to build a restaurant and bungalows at the beach. Through the KEYDA’s Women in Sustainable Bee-Keeping Project, 60 young women were employed in sustainable beekeeping. They created six cooperatives and each one oversaw ten bee-hives and carried out maintenance, harvesting, honey production and marketing. The cooperatives focused on vegetable processing, clothing, weaving, carpentry, soap making and blacksmithing. Each of the cooperatives had an average monthly salary of $500. There was not enough data to determine whether or not the jobs created through Y2Y were full-time or part-time.

The Y2Y projects continued to create youth employment and income-generation opportunities through the second round of the fund in Guinea and Sierra Leone. The ADIGUI project created self-employment opportunities for 25 youth including ten young women. The ADIGUI project coordinator had the following to say about the income impact of their project on youth beneficiaries:
“These young children were deserted; no profession, no income and now they are organized small farmers with working capital and income. They earn at least 350,000 GNF ($42) monthly per person.” - ADIGUI Project Coordinator.

Also in Guinea, the ACNG project created income earning opportunities for nine youth who operated auto mechanics and carpentry cooperatives. The youth worked as master trainers, apprentices or electricians. Some I’AE beneficiaries earned as much as 900,000 GNF ($127) per month from various livelihood activities. The BBS project created employment opportunities for youth who worked as animators, technicians and radio journalists. The AJAHC project coordinator expressed that “I can say with certainty that this project has increased the income of beneficiaries.” The ADIGUI project coordinator said that “the project improved their (youth) living conditions and their capacity has been strengthened, they now see that their only way to succeed is work.”

However, not all Y2Y project beneficiaries secured decent employment opportunities and income. The MPT’s project beneficiaries, for example, worked part-time and did not earn as much income partly because they worked part-time and did not have adequate workspace:

“They (youth) mostly work on part-time basis and are mostly out in search of customers. They work part-time due to limited space and to minimize salary costs, this being a new business. They are 30 beneficiaries including 15 young women involved in entrepreneurship, printer ink refill, and IT business. They pay themselves based on income generated per month. We understand most of them are now able to meet their basic needs and being able to take care of their family through support from the project.” – MPT Project Coordinator
Also in Sierra Leone, the PPDA project coordinator was unaware of how much youth beneficiaries earned because they did not conduct a monitoring follow up to understand youth earnings.

“We were able to reach a total number of 29 youths during the course of the implementation of our project; out of this number, seven were males and 22 were females. They do production and marketing of bead products, and also provide charging facilities for community people. This (income), I can’t ascertain for now, except after further monitoring follow is done by our organization, and then I can get you a correct feedback on this.” – PPDA Project Coordinator

Through Y2Y fund projects, youth secured employment opportunities that in turn allowed them to generate income on a monthly basis. A few youth beneficiaries used income from project activities to support their families.

What the analysis of views from project coordinators and key informants missed was the complexity of youth beneficiaries’ livelihood activities after graduating from Y2Y projects. Previous studies show that low-income youth livelihoods are complicated because youth often engage in multiple income generation activities (Owusu, 2007). The income that youth reported may have resulted from a complex set of livelihood activities that revolved around the Y2Y project, if at all. For example, the AJAHC Project Coordinator said “Like most Guineans (even senior managers), many of these beneficiaries seek other jobs during unoccupied periods as they work on a rotation basis. They do that in order to increase their income and because they are now energized by the spirit of progress.” In such cases, the reported income of youth beneficiaries would be questionable in the absence of a comprehensive analysis of youth employment activities from regular monitoring and evaluation. As will be discussed in later sections, there
was often weak cooperation and transparency between some grantees and youth beneficiaries and in some cases, monitoring and evaluation were a challenge for Y2Y grantees. In later sections dealing with the quantitative impact evaluation of the Y2Y, I present a before-and-after analysis of youth livelihoods from the perspective of youth beneficiaries to complement the views from project coordinators and key informants.

The impacts of the Youth-to-Youth Fund on youth access to social capital: views from project coordinators and key informants

Social capital in the form friendships, relationships of trust, peer networks, working groups and associations is one of the key drivers of successful youth livelihoods in low-income communities (Brown, 2006; DFID, 1999). Previous studies have shown that low-income youth often consider social resources to be more important than tangible financial and physical resources (Chant & Jones, 2005). In the absence of regular employment income and weak financial and formal institutional support, informal youth workers often receive livelihood support from family members, friends, peer networks and informal associations. In this study, I wanted to assess the extent to which the Y2Y and also UYF enhanced youth access to social resources as a central component of successful youth livelihoods in the context of largely informal rural and urban African economies. In post-conflict West Africa, social capital creation is paramount given the potential for tribal and resource related conflicts (Sommers, 2003). Sustainable youth livelihood interventions demand that multicultural youth and community members work together peacefully. In the next sub-sections, I assess the extent to which the Y2Y program enhanced youth social capital using qualitative views from project coordinators and key informants.
Creation of youth cooperatives

Project coordinators and key informants expressed that Y2Y projects created cooperatives that brought diverse youth and community members to work together towards a common youth employment creation vision. The key informants that I spoke to revealed that the creation of youth cooperatives or enterprises was the main goal of the Y2Y program and projects by extension. The Y2Y facilitated multiple interactions between over 70 different actors that included local and national governments, private and non-profit actors. For example, the SOS Miskines project in Guinea, brought over 2000 independent waste collectors together. They created ten cooperatives that managed the waste collection business and paid households and independent waste collectors for the waste that they brought to their recycling center. The organization shared profits from the sale of recycled plastic with the ten cooperatives. The Job Shop Project formed the “The Art Shop” that was administered by five youth. The activities of the cooperatives included t-shirt making, logo and graphic design, and sign writing. The cooperative solicited contracts from companies and organizations that helped them to design and print project materials and they printed at least 100 t-shirts and ten billboards for sale every month. The GUIDE’s Commercial Exploitation of the Moringa Tree Project produced moringa powder, a nutritional supplement that they sold to wholesalers and directly to individual customers in Conakry, Labe and surrounding areas in Guinea.

The creation of youth cooperatives has allowed youth to earn more income compared to what they earned when they worked as individuals. This was the case for the IBDDG youth beneficiaries as expressed by the project coordinator:
“Another time young people worked individually and did not even think about joining a cooperative and making a monthly income. They were only tempted by the adventure and the dream of El Dorado city. With this project, they know about the benefits of the cooperative and have new ambitions to create other initiatives. They earn about 250 000 GNF ($35) per month and they believe they can earn up to 2,800,000 GNF ($397) per month with production experience.” – IBDDG Project Coordinator

In Sierra Leone, the Y2Y created cooperatives that brought together youth from diverse backgrounds to work together. Through the cooperatives, the PPDA found it easier to provide youth with startup toolkits without having to worry about the risk of individual beneficiaries selling the kits:

“After the technical, business and life skills trainings, youth beneficiaries were clustered into groups based on the location they came from and the startup kits were provided to the entire group not individuals, because we learnt in past projects that when startup kits were provided to individuals, they ended up selling them and become unemployed again. So, we wanted to avoid this menace and that is why we encouraged our beneficiaries to work in a cooperative system. Twenty-nine of the youths who went through our project are presently doing their business in the form of cooperatives in their different communities.”

- PPDA Project Coordinator

**Sense of pride, togetherness and expanded community networks**

The youth cooperatives that were created through the Y2Y projects allowed youth to gain a sense of togetherness and pride. The social capital that was created through cooperatives also allowed some youth beneficiaries to participate in community development projects. A Y2Y fund
official had the following to say regarding how Sierra Leone beneficiaries felt the Y2Y projects benefited them:

“In most of the interviews I have done so far, when I ask about the impact the projects have had on their lives, the reply is often about gaining a sense of pride and purpose (and gaining an income, of course). Lots of the youth were unemployed or underemployed, and with the jobs they have now, several respondents mentioned that they have improved their social status because they are now able to contribute something to their family and their community.” – Y2Y Program Assistant

Youth beneficiaries of the IBDDG project worked together smoothly because they already knew each other in their villages and did not have a problem adapting and collaborating. The IBDDG Project Coordinator said that “beneficiaries are young people who live in the same village or villages very close together. They know each other, are integrated and have no difficulty in adapting and accepting each other. They also frequent the same places of recreation such as soccer and recreational evenings.” This example illustrated that the existence of social capital made it easier for youth to work together in productive way. In some cases, such as the MPT project, youth-created businesses brought several community youth together allowing for social interactions. Community youth came to the MPT center to do their school work, printing, photocopying and they sometimes volunteered for the organization and accessed computer facilities at the Center. The AJAHC provided moral support to youth beneficiaries and other community youth:
“First, moral support, and it is of great importance to the youth; most were completely abandoned without hope. They made it clear that they did not fall out of fate and could, by their courage and dedication, change their own fate and inspire thousands of others.”

– AJAHC Project Coordinator

The Y2Y projects also created community-wide networks that strengthened community ties and cross-cultural collaboration. The BBS radio program allowed youth in different parts of Guinea to interact during live radio broadcasting that taught youth about Guinean culture and coexistence. In addition to conducting their activities, PPDA project beneficiaries participated in other agricultural and tailoring activities organized or implemented by local associations in various communities. The ADIGUI Project Coordinator indicated that their project benefited community members and people from all racial and religious backgrounds in Guinea:

“The indirect beneficiaries are those who buy young beneficiaries’ cheaper products and resell them elsewhere. They are those who want products from small poultry farmers, soap producers and market gardening. We provide these services to all young people from the base and average Guineans without regard to race and religion. The agricultural center provides services in all major production areas including access to training and inputs.” – ADIGUI Project Coordinator

Through the Borehole Repair and Water Purification Project, the CPYO expanded community networks despite some weaknesses on the part of the project coordinator:

“They are expanding their community network but the project coordinator is rather slow and not very proactive. His assistant though seems to be picking up some aspects of accounting and project management. The assistant has done a good job of getting
community leaders to contribute local materials and young volunteers to help with constructing the walls.” – E33 Mid-Term Report.

From the perspectives of project coordinators and key informants, the Y2Y has fostered community cooperation and networking through the creation of youth microenterprises and cooperatives. It is unlikely that the youth-run cooperatives and businesses would have existed today in the absence of the Y2Y program and projects.

What remains unclear is the extent to which the youth cooperatives and community networks participated in local and national decision making processes that bear on youth livelihood activities, interventions and practices. The views from key informants and project coordinators did not sufficiently shed light on the role of youth cooperatives beyond the creation of micro businesses that brought youth and community members together. From a sustainable rural and urban poverty reduction strategy perspective, local and national institutions such as local and national governments, and private sector should be fully engaged in sustainable livelihood development processes. Local planning authorities such as city councils have hindered youth livelihood development through forced evictions and restrictive zoning and land use planning practices. In extreme cases, national governments have launched massive nationwide evictions that disproportionately impacted youth entrepreneurs and women. It is, therefore, important that the cooperatives created through the Y2Y projects engage local and national governments on youth livelihood issues, especially in the context of informal urban economies of West Africa. In later sections, I present quantitative social capital outcomes views from the perspective of youth beneficiaries.
Challenges faced by Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees and youth beneficiaries: views from project coordinators and key informants

An understanding of the challenges faced by Y2Y grantees and youth beneficiaries is necessary as it helps enhance our understanding of the extent to which Y2Y projects impacted youth organizations, beneficiaries and the communities in which the projects were implemented. By exploring the challenges, this section highlights some negative impacts that resulted from the projects and the negative factors that contributed to the ineffectiveness of some funded projects. It is important to explore these negative factors as a means to guide future funding decisions and to fully contextualize project outcomes.

The major challenges that worked against successful Y2Y project implementation and results included lack of transparency, high youth expectations and miscommunication; business viability challenges; limited access to land, working space and production equipment; negative youth and community attitudes towards projects; delayed project funding and implementation; disruptions and conflicts during project implementation; and inadequate youth training. I present an analysis of how each of these negative factors impacted Y2Y projects and beneficiaries in the next sub-sections.

**High youth expectations, lack of transparency and miscommunication**

Project coordinators frequently referenced high youth expectations as a major challenge that they faced during project implementation. When youth enrolled in training, they had high expectations about the projects including the possibility of getting stipends and high salaries after graduation. It was difficult for grantees to manage such youth expectations given limited financial resources. The PPDA project, for example, failed to reach its target beneficiaries because it
struggled to fulfill the demands of trainees. The MPT project coordinator noted that beneficiaries blamed their organization when they (MPT) failed to meet their needs and that they had to clarify project costs and expenditures to beneficiaries to resolve the challenge:

“There were miscommunications and high expectations. Beneficiary expectations were high and they were blaming us for not providing all their needs/demands. But we had to explain to them and encouraged them by showing them the exact project costs and money provided by donors. Beneficiary’s direct contact with donors created some problems as they complained about project delays and limited funds. We had to invite the donors to several meetings to explain about the project and provided some life skills trainings and communication skills to youth.” – MPT Project Coordinator

Lack of transparency and miscommunication was frequently referenced in mid-term evaluations. In Sierra Leone, there was lack of transparency and miscommunication between grantees and beneficiaries in the ABA and BaCUDA projects as the following quotations show:

“The issue of handing over everything to the beneficiaries has not been clearly spelt out to the beneficiaries….they are not keeping records of their sales, their profit cannot be determined. The objective of setting up the cooperative not fully accepted by Artisan Black Smith, beneficiaries unclear on ownership.” – Artisan Blacksmithing Mid-Term Repot

“Some controversy on who is allowed to sign a land agreement in a family. Land agreements were not clearly written, open to misinterpretation. Secret deals had been cut on profit sharing where too much of profit was going to local chiefs and only 45% to
beneficiaries, this was reversed but was worrying that it had been arranged. Only discovered by chance.”—BaCUDA Mid-Term Report

There were also serious communication problems between grantees and youth beneficiaries in Guinea projects. In some cases, youth were completely unaware of the purpose of the Y2Y project and the cooperative concept—a central goal of the Y2Y program and projects. For example, the AJAHC project beneficiaries were misinformed about some aspects of the project and did not know that the Y2Y project would belong to them after the training. The misinformation caused problems, as beneficiaries complained that participation in the project was costing them too much money and that they had to borrow money to cover transportation and project fees. The SFRP/G project beneficiaries understood project concepts well but they were not clear on the profit sharing mechanism with the grantee after the training.

**Limited access to land, working space and production equipment**

In previous sections, most project coordinators and key informants reported that the Y2Y grant allowed grantees to secure access to land and materials and equipment for project activities. However, this was not always the case. Some grantees and youth beneficiaries found it difficult to access land for project activities. Lack of access to land delayed some projects and forced grantees to adjust their project plans:

“Originally scheduled for Kountia, we lost the chosen location because of delayed funding and that led us to finally implement the farm in Manéyah, in the prefecture of Coyah, 50 km (31 miles) from Conakry. This relocation cost us nearly the whole project because, while technical partners on the ground (YEN/UNIDO) urged us to use a local site, we were faced with the need to find a location at a lesser cost. Despite all the caution we have in this area,
the site chosen was the main obstacle for the project. The place was located in the city and was no longer suitable for a farm of this kind. Thus, we recorded throughout the project, illness, stress and theft that affected the production of chickens. However, we reduced the salary provided to staff and agreed to sustain the project. We also used loans whenever it was necessary. Finally, we now have another site that was negotiated for a new order of healthier chick rearing. Finding a suitable space for an income-generating activity is always a headache for youth. The best locations most of the time are more expensive for the planned activity while more affordable sites are technically unsuitable."

- AJAHC Project Coordinator

The I’AE project faced access to land challenges that resulted from jealous community members who demanded the cancellation of youth land contracts. They were forced to relocate project activities every time a land owner unexpectedly cancelled a contract. In Sierra Leone, land agreements delayed the start of PPDA’s Artisanal Paper Beads Project as the process was time consuming. Also, in Sierra Leone, access to land was costly and the MPT spent a lot of time looking for a viable site for youth businesses:

“Very expensive to rent a shop in central Freetown. We had to secure an empty plot of land and leased it for three years. We used a container as a shop. Caused delay in project delivery as too much time was wasted looking for a better place. The space is small and so cannot accommodate many beneficiaries at the same time.” – MPT Project Coordinator

Access to production equipment was a related challenge faced by some Y2Y grantees. The ADIGUI and I’AE beneficiaries found it difficult to access seed capital and the materials and
equipment that they needed to start businesses after graduation. In Sierra Leone, the CPYO beneficiaries experienced transportation challenges that impacted on their ability to attend practical training:

“Big problem for the training was transportation – beneficiaries didn’t have money for transportation to the borehole sites for the practical training, so sometimes only one or two went with the engineer. They have two options for their production site but the one that the chief proposed would have to undergo renovations. However, it seems like a better location for the well because less people use it and it has water all year round, and there are no fees to use it.” - Creative and Productive Youth Organization Mid-Term Report

Negative attitudes, delayed funding and conflicts

Negative youth and community attitudes towards Y2Y projects also impacted some grantees negatively. Negative youth attitudes resulted from the fact that some youth were more concerned about short-term project benefits and did not think about the long term benefits associated with participation in Y2Y projects. The delays experienced in the implementation of some projects also caused some beneficiaries to drop out of the projects. The PPDA Project Coordinator expressed how the young people’s desire for immediate benefits prevented them from participating in their project:

“Immediate benefits, the young people in those communities are interested in the immediate benefit they receive from projects, therefore, anything besides that, which will take more long time before they will start reaping the benefit, is very much difficult to get them involved.” – PPDA Project Coordinator
However, in most cases, negative youth and community attitudes were resolved through project awareness campaigns and through the provision of participation incentives in some cases. In Guinea, the IBDDG conducted awareness campaigns that convinced more youth to participate in the project and to understand that it was possible for them to create decent livelihoods in villages. In Sierra Leone, the MPT ran awareness campaigns and provided food for work and transportation incentives to attract and retain youth in their project. Also, in Sierra Leone, the BaCUDA Giant African Snail Farming beneficiaries remained confident about the viability of the snail farming business despite the negative myths that prevailed in the villages.

**Delayed project funding** made it difficult for some grantees to feed the beneficiaries, who in turn got frustrated by food shortages. This problem mostly impacted the AJAHC project in Guinea and the PPDA project in Sierra Leone. The AJAHC had to borrow money to cover beneficiary feeding and the PPDA communicated the problem to donors and made an adjustment to the project budget:

“The biggest challenge that we encountered during the implementation of this project was the illness or food shortage that arose when the second tranche was slow in coming. To overcome this, we sought to borrow money to compensate for the delay and we have used specialist services.” – AJAHC Project Coordinator

“The biggest challenge our organization faced during the implementation of this project was the feeding of beneficiaries that were converged from the other locations outside Makeni to our training centre. During the eleven days of finalizing the proposal in Freetown, the feeding of the beneficiaries did not cross our mind, except when we started the implementation. This challenge was therefore communicated to the donors as stated in
the agreement and both parties agreed that the organization cut down on the number of
generators to be provided to each cooperative to one and we used the balance fund to feed
the beneficiaries.” – PPDA Project Coordinator

A few projects were also negatively impacted by conflicts between grantees and project
coordinators and inflation related challenges. The I’AE project beneficiaries, for example,
quarreled with community pastoral farmers who felt that their farming and breeding business was
being threatened by Y2Y activities. In Sierra Leone, the PPDA beneficiaries went on strike after
realizing that they were responsible for their own food and they even threatened to damage the
project car and coordinator.

**Inadequate beneficiary training**

Project coordinators also reported inadequate beneficiary training as one of the challenges
experienced during project implementation. For example, the ABA in Sierra Leone was not
following the agreed training procedures and their training was non-structured. Their selection of
beneficiaries was also not clearly laid down as required. The PPDA had only trained youth
beneficiaries in bead making by the time of mid-term evaluations and some beneficiaries missed
the training. The AHEAD had also not adequately trained youth beneficiaries in the use and
maintenance of solar panels by the time of mid-term evaluations. However, their beneficiaries were
already earning an income by charging phones using solar energy.

In Guinea, the AJAHC, ADIGUI and ACNG complained that street and rural youth were
difficult to train. The coordinators felt that training illiterate youth required adequate funding and
long-term commitment that was beyond the capacity of their organizations. The AJAHC project
coordinator said that “the situation of these young people, who were mostly in the street before
approaching them, was a major challenge for our association. Raising chickens required constant monitoring on our part.” The ADIGUI project coordinator felt that “it is not easy to make such a project, especially if we lack the financial means. In rural areas where the majority is illiterate, it is the courage of endurance and perseverance that will lead us to the goal we must always keep in mind that we can do it.” The ACNG also found it challenging to train what the coordinator labeled “unprofessional youth” but they hired qualified professionals who assisted them with the training.

**Business viability challenges**

Even though most Y2Y projects were reportedly doing very well, a few projects faced business viability challenges. Among other factors, business viability challenges resulted from financial mismanagement and unsustainable business ideas associated with the implementation of untested project ideas. The challenge of untested projects failing was probably understandable given that the Y2Y program encourages youth to take business risks by implementing untested but seemingly innovative business ideas. However, financial mismanagement was a major concern that impacted negatively on the success of some projects:

“A total mismanagement of the funding with a deliberate misuse of the first tranche by the project coordinator and the president of a local NGO was discovered. The field was completely overgrown. The beneficiaries were not paid fairly despite the successful harvest and sale of the green beans. Beneficiaries were misinformed on the purpose of the Youth-to-Youth Fund.” - CAVEG Mid-Term Report

Other grantees such as the BFF found it difficult to sell the high quality bricks produced by youth beneficiaries as a result of storage problems. The rain season also impacted negatively on the Bee Keeping Project as the bees were not kept in the hives, resulting in lower honey production.
and sales. Following YEN’s recommendation, they recollected the bees and gave them special protection. Mid-term evaluations also revealed that the AHEAD project (Sierra Leone) proposal was weak and untested. Project implementation was slow as a result. One weakness of their project was that they hired volunteers who ended up being project beneficiaries. The CPYO Borehole Repair and Water Purification Project also faced serious viability challenges as observed during mid-term evaluations:

“...the business plan for this project is pretty murky and it almost seems to be becoming more of a humanitarian project than a sustainable business project. The idea of borehole repair and the production of drinking water need to be somehow made profitable in order for the youth to obtain long term employment. They have failed on making the repair component financially viable, now they must at least focus on the water selling business. Most of their expenses are classified as unexpected costs. The trainees aren’t really being trained to repair boreholes. The income-generating activities haven’t started yet.”

- CPYO Mid-Term Report

A related challenge was the inability of some youth beneficiaries to secure employment after graduation. For example, the YEFI’s Job Shop graduates found it difficult to secure job vacancies and they could not get commitment from employers for the three month practical attachment they needed. For the IBDDG project, the challenge that they faced was limited partners to promote youth businesses:

“For the moment, we are looking for these opportunities, but we have not had them yet. We have the advantages of creative ideas but we do not have partners to promote them.”

– IBDDG Project Coordinator
Lessons for youth-led organizations: views from project coordinators and key informants

The major lessons for youth-led organizations revolved around the need for transparency, community and local government support, motivated and enthusiastic beneficiaries, a strong project coordinator and team and the importance of researching project ideas fully prior to implementation. I present each of these lessons below using illustrative examples.

Select project beneficiaries carefully – youth-led organizations should select their project beneficiaries carefully to minimize having beneficiaries dropping out of the project or selecting ineligible beneficiaries. Care should be taken to minimize corruption in the beneficiary selection process especially when community members are involved in the selection process. When poorly educated youth are the target, youth organizations should be prepared to hire training specialists to provide further training and counseling. In such cases, project proposals should include the possibility of extended training and extra costs in the budget. The PPDA project coordinator advised youth organizations to select beneficiaries from project localities and to promote diversity in the selection process:

“If there is any youth-led organization planning to implement similar projects for the same target group as mine, I ask you note the following: select your beneficiaries from the main town or community where your project is based; do not select beneficiaries that are all physically challenged but have a mix flavor of able and disabled persons as beneficiaries; and employ staff outside your organization so that disciplinary actions will not be compromised.” – PPDA Project Coordinator

Keep beneficiaries enthusiastic and motivated to sustain project – the analysis had shown that beneficiary enthusiasm and motivation is a key driver of project success. When
beneficiaries are motivated they can sustain the project even during difficult times. Several projects experienced problems related to business viability, financial mismanagement and lack of transparency but in most cases, beneficiary motivation kept the projects going. In Sierra Leone, beneficiary motivation sustained the CPYO, ABA, AHEAD and MPT projects during challenging times. The MPT project beneficiaries were particularly motivated to complete the training and they regarded the project highly:

“Several beneficiaries gave up paying jobs to join the project. Beneficiaries can clearly see the logic and potential of the business plan. Beneficiaries were very optimistic about the project leading to decent employment. Many mentioned that they were happy to be learning new skills in a specific field, and quite a few also mentioned that they were the first operators in the cartridge recycling industry. It seems like they’ve really bought into the idea and are committed (willing to sacrifice their previous jobs) to make it succeed.”

- Messiah Partnership Trust Mid-Term Report

In Guinea, the ADIGUI and I’AE beneficiaries were motivated enough to complete the training and launch successful cooperatives.

**Community support is crucial** – local community support proved helpful in supporting most projects and youth businesses. When the community viewed projects positively, they encouraged youth participation in projects and facilitated youth access to important resources such as land. Land was mostly in the hands of private community members and grantees that worked collaboratively with community members benefited from secure access to project sites. Community support also ensured that businesses remained viable as community members became
dedicated customers. Lack of community support disrupted some projects when jealous community members demanded the cancellation of land contracts and relocation of youth businesses. Community support and involvement was central in the successful implementation of the ADIGUI, AJUDC and I’AE projects in Guinea. Conversely, skeptical community members tended to discourage youth participation in projects. Youth-led organizations should, therefore, budget for community awareness campaigns to rally community support for project sustainability.

**Lack of transparency hinders project success** – grantees should always remain transparent to beneficiaries to minimize conflicts and to keep beneficiaries motivated. When grantees were transparent it became easier to manage youth expectations and that allowed youth to trust the grantees. However, lack of transparency frustrated some youth beneficiaries and yielded grantee-beneficiary conflicts that derailed project implementation and success. The lessons and recommendations from the MPT suggested how youth organizations can promote transparency in their projects:

> “Be transparent and communicate well. Employ a dedicated project manager to work full-time on the project. Ensure ongoing reporting and free flow of information. Properly manage communications with donors and only say to beneficiaries what is necessary for them. Do not raise expectations. Treat the beneficiaries with respect and develop a code of conduct/bylaws to guide the process”. – MPT Project Coordinator

Ensuring transparency requires that grantees and beneficiaries work collaboratively throughout project implementation. For example, the success of the AJAKUS project in Guinea saw strong beneficiary-grantee cooperation as well as well-informed beneficiaries who were clear about the purpose of the project and expected benefits.
Local government support is crucial – In many cases, the support of local government proved helpful in facilitating youth access to land. Collaboration with city council saw mayors donating land for project activities to some grantees. The receipt of land donations quickened project implementation and minimized lengthy delays typically associated with obtaining suitable project sites and construction permits. Projects that lacked local government and community support were delayed substantially as land agreements took longer than expected. Youth-led organizations should, therefore, collaborate with local government as much as possible.

Capacity of project coordinator crucial – the capacity of the project coordinators determined the success of most projects. A good project coordinator with sound project and financial management and communication skills yielded project success and continuation, despite challenges. The capacity of the project coordinator to communicate with beneficiaries and community members well proved helpful for several projects. On the other hand, weak project coordinators resulted in some projects almost failing due to financial mismanagement, beneficiary frustrations and lack of community support. The role of the project coordinator in ensuring project success was best illustrated in the MPT Project:

“Excellent use of time and good communication with beneficiaries. They are a small organization but appear bigger because they are maximizing all resources and contacts. Good team and willing to work very hard for the success of their project. The key to successful implementation is a solid idea and a strong leader to execute. The coordinator and her team are in control and are executing the project well, with good contingency plans to ensure they stay on track.” – MPT Mid-Term Report

Youth-led organizations should, therefore, hire qualified project coordinators for project success.
Research untested project ideas fully – one of the main sources of the business viability challenge was the risk associated with untested business ideas. Some Y2Y grantees discovered midway through the project that their business models were not viable. In some cases, the grantees failed to budget carefully for the projects and had to substantially adjust their project plans and budget. The major lesson here is that youth-led organizations should always research project ideas prior to requesting funding to ensure that such businesses would be viable.

The Future of Youth-to-Youth Fund projects: views from project coordinators and key informants

When asked about their top non-financial needs, most project coordinators mentioned that they needed exchange experiences to share information; technical partners and project management training; and the materials and equipment for successful project implementation.

Exchange experiences – the ADIGUI, BBS, I’AE, IBDDG and PPDA project coordinators all mentioned that they needed exchange experiences to help them in future projects. The IBDDG coordinator said “we need exchange experiences with other youth organizations in other lands”; the BBS aspired for “opportunities to participate in international meetings”; and the PPDA aspired for “experience sharing across the Mano River Union and also between project coordinators in the same country.”

Technical partners and project management training – most grantees needed technical partners to assist them during project implementation. The AJAHC coordinator said “we especially need local partners who can support our hatchery project for the benefit of Guinean youth. And of course we always need to improve and benefit from further training.” The PPDA, ADIGUI,
ACNG, BBS, I’AE and IBDDG coordinators all said they needed project management training to enhance their project implementation capacity in future.

**Materials and equipment** – most project coordinators also mentioned that they needed materials and equipment to successful implement youth employment projects. The ADIGUI, ACNG, IBDDG, BBS and MPT particularly expressed that they needed materials and equipment to train more youth and to give to youth as startup toolkits after graduation.

**Recommendations for the Youth Employment Network and other funding agencies: views from project coordinators**

When project coordinators were asked about the recommendations they had for the Youth Employment Network and other funding agencies, many mentioned that the YEN should provide adequate and long-term funding, alternative funding sources and networks, and effective project monitoring and evaluation.

**Adequate and long-term funding** – the main recommendation from project coordinators was the need for adequate and long-term funding to enhance project outcomes and to promote project sustainability. Most project coordinators recommended that YEN should extend the project implementation duration to more than a year and that it should also consider long-term funding in this regard. Most project coordinators shared the views from the MPT project coordinator:

“Time duration for the implementation of the project need to be expanded as 12 months is not enough to deliver a good project. We can suggest that the project should last for 24 months. And the idea that a project should be handed to beneficiaries after 12 month of implementation is not good. This put the project at risk as the beneficiaries may not be able
to run the project on their own for a start ...so they may need more time to learn and fully prepare to manage the project. YEN should ensure that implementing agency/youth led organization has a long term commitment and benefit in the project as this will maintain momentum and generate long term interest. Just to create a young project and hand over to inexperienced beneficiaries is not good, and may lead to mismanagement and exclusion of some beneficiaries by powerful beneficiaries/project leaders. So they need ongoing supervision and monitoring and implementing agency must be empowered to have a say in the project as long as the project exists.” – MPT Project Coordinator

The ADIGUI and I’AE specifically recommended that YEN should fund successful projects for more than a year to ensure sustainability, expansion and replication. The AJAHC coordinator recommended that YEN should preserve the structures of Y2Y projects after the first year and that it should continue to fund youth projects given that young people were still inexperienced to successfully implement projects within a year. However, the YEN already launched a replication fund in Morocco and in East Africa and it has plans to launch more replication funding opportunities for past and successful Y2Y projects. In addition to the need for timely disbursement of funds, the PPDA coordinator also recommended that YEN should increase the funding amount and also reduce the percentage of grantee’s own contribution:

“YEN should increase the funding amount. The grant amount should be increased from $20,000 to at least $23,000. The percentage for own contributions should also be reduced from 25% to 15% due to the fact that most organizations applying for the Youth-to-Youth Fund grant are CBOs that rely mainly on the contributions from members and the community.” – PPDA Project Coordinator
Alternative funding sources and networks – most project coordinators recommended that YEN should provide them with information on alternative sources of funding after the Y2Y grant. They felt that YEN needed to provide a database of organizations that fund youth-led initiatives and other networking information that would facilitate access to funding sources and youth employment information. The AJAHC coordinator said “they (YEN) should provide a detailed list of various financial partners around the world and their focus areas and they should have real-time information on all tenders which they are aware of and which involve young people in our area (regions of Guinea and Conakry).” The IBDDG coordinator supported the AJAHC recommendation saying “aid organizations should find alternative funding sources to continue to help young people in various domains and they should establish partnerships with donors, bilateral and multilateral organizations.”

However, the YEN itself is a joint initiative of ILO, the World Bank and United Nations and it already implemented some of these measures. For example, YEN now has a one-stop funding and youth-development information marketplace (https://yenmarketplace.org/). The World Bank Youth Employment Inventory (http://www.youth-employment-inventory.org/) is also an important source of comprehensive global youth employment information. Since most grantees had slow and unreliable internet connections, it will take them some time to learn more about the existence and details of the YEN marketplace, World Bank Youth Employment Inventory and related resources.

Project monitoring and evaluation – Most project coordinators recommended constant project monitoring and evaluation. Most coordinators felt that the YEN needed to conduct frequent monitoring and evaluation exercises as a means to provide technical and project management
support to grantees and youth beneficiaries. Some coordinators recommended long-term project support and training in relation to monitoring and evaluation. For example, the IBDDG coordinator recommended that “do not drop your winners, help them with donors and international agencies, with government funding, training and understanding of the issue of youth employment and the means to achieve it.” The AJAHC coordinator recommended that YEN “provide more consistent funding to organizations while strengthening the monitoring means to ensure that applicable funds are used properly.” The ACNG also said that “YEN should extend all youth employment projects to an implementation period of at least 12 months of work with the possibility of monitoring the activities over a period of at least 12 months.”

In relation to constant monitoring and evaluation support, some grantees recommended that YEN should invest more in skills training and development and that it should use constant monitoring and evaluation exercise to educate youth on the importance of youth entrepreneurship.

**Qualitative impact assessment of the Youth-to-Youth Fund projects: findings from comparison group organizations**

To better understand the impact of Y2Y projects, I also analyzed qualitative data provided by 28 comparison group organizations on three open-ended questions that I included in the comparison group survey. Comparison group organizations were eligible but unsuccessful Sierra Leone applicants to the 2011 Y2Y application round. Chapter 3 introduced comparison group organizations and I present their full characteristics in a later section that compares them to Y2Y grantees. I wanted to understand how the challenges, needs and recommendations of comparison group organizations differed from those of Y2Y grantees. I presumed that the challenges they faced, their needs and recommendations to funding agencies would differ from those of grantees post-Y2Y projects.
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Lack of entrepreneurial skills, interest and motivation among intended youth beneficiaries was one of the challenges expressed by comparison group project coordinators. Comparison group project coordinators felt that it was difficult to train youth because they did not have an entrepreneurial spirit and that most of them were illiterate. They stressed that it was difficult for their organizations to recruit youth who lacked entrepreneurial skills, interest and motivation. The following quotations illustrate the frustration among comparison group youth coordinators in trying to attract youth participation in projects:

“*Youth do not see themselves as a group or class but as individuals. Pulling down syndrome is a problem among young people*” – Alternative Approaches to Commercialized Sex Coordinator

“They (youth) lack entrepreneurial skills...entrepreneurial skill is a must for the success of the youth-led projects. This is, however, lacking to a greater extent within youths –led projects. Until this skill is built and practically enhanced, the return on the investment could be marginal.” – Community Development Initiative Coordinator

“The major challenge is the mining activities in the area that attract many of the youths to make quick money, coupled with the lack of value for education by most parents.”

- Community Development Services Coordinator

“The youth are less motivated by benefits from organizations; and are therefore often hesitant to participate in any youth empowerment program.” – Leonard Cheshire Disability Coordinator
“Some demean the job training opportunity; they feel their statuses are more than the job. Some don’t treat the training seriously and want money during the training, and this is not funded. Others, because of personal and family commitment are unable to complete the training.” Peace Links Sierra Leone Coordinator

“Many young people, either trained or untrained are chasing very odd jobs with multinational mining companies since they cannot actually startup businesses on their own.” - Teach For Humanity Human Tech Coordinator

Most comparison group coordinators also expressed that limited access to credit and funding was a major problem for their organizations and youth compared Y2Y grantees. The Community Development Initiative (CDI) coordinator mentioned that access to credit was limited or none existent for their youth beneficiaries. The Teach for Humanity Human Tech (THHT) failed to provide any startup credit or materials and equipment to trainees and Movement for Sustainable Agriculture failed to offer any training because they lacked funding resources to so.

Limited access to materials and equipment and limited access to working space were other challenges expressed by comparison group project coordinators. However, unlike Y2Y grantees, most comparison group coordinators mentioned that they faced major transportation challenges. Some comparison group organizations also mentioned that they had inadequate knowledge and skills to explore and analyze issues of youth concern and interest in the community. Although most grantees indicated that they needed project management and technical skills training, they did not think that they lacked knowledge and skills to analyze youth problems. Rather, most of them needed further training to enhance their project implementation skills and outcomes.
Most comparison group coordinators also felt that they needed **strong community involvement, partnerships** and **transportation assistance** for their projects to succeed. Comparison group coordinators also similarly expressed that they needed **materials and equipment** and **staff training** to enhance their project activities and outcomes. However, there were notable differences between grantees and comparison group recommendations. One recommendation that was only mentioned by comparison group coordinators was the need for funding agencies to “**fund dedicated and legitimate organizations**”. The coordinators felt that funding agencies needed to be careful in the selection of organizations that they funded. To ensure that funding only goes to legitimate organizations, the coordinators felt that funding agencies should verify the authenticity and seriousness of organizations that they fund. The Communication and Information Technology Services (CIT) coordinator’s sentiments resonated with that of many other coordinators:

> “They (YEN and other funding agencies) should fund organizations that have the determination of improving youth’s empowerment so that they will be self-reliant. For the implementation to be successful, the funding agency should verify some organization requests to confirm if it is a true organization and to give chance to the vulnerable youths in need of the fund.” - Communication and Information Technology Services Coordinator

In relation to the need to ensure that only legitimate and determined organizations are funded, most comparison group coordinators recommended that funding agencies should “**constantly monitor and evaluate grantees.**” For example, PROTECT-SIL coordinator recommended that “they (funding agencies) should conduct office visits to be double check the presence in the areas that they (grantees) claim to be operating.” Peace Links Sierra Leone
coordinator recommended a reduction in bureaucratic conditions tied to funding and increased focus on mentoring, monitoring and reporting requirements. The Communication and Information Technology Services Coordinator recommended that “monitoring of funding given to the organization is necessary, to know if the beneficiaries are benefiting from the fund.”

The CDI coordinator advised funding agencies to emphasize “funding productive youth groups, NGOs and CBOs.” A related recommendation from coordinators was the need for funding agencies to fund sustainable youth employment programs. This differed from grantee’s recommendation of long-term project funding. Comparison group coordinators felt that it was important that projects with strong sustainability components receive funding in the first place and did not necessarily recommend continued funding to previously funded projects. Some comparison group organizations also recommended that funding agencies should focus more on funding young women’s empowerment projects and also rural-based youth employment projects. This recommendation did not emerge strongly from the views of grantee project coordinators and key informants.

The inability of some comparison group organizations to secure project funding may have made it extremely difficult for them to attract youth participation in their unfunded projects. Even though comparison group coordinators blamed youth’s lack of interest, skills and motivation for their fruitless recruitment campaigns, it was possible that youth knew about the funding challenges that their organizations faced and that may have been a major participation hindrance. Also, the fact that most comparison group coordinators needed strong community involvement, partnerships and materials and equipment signaled the capacity building and
project implementation challenges that they may have faced after their projects were not funded by the YEN.

Overall, comparison group organizations were more pessimistic about the possibility of attracting youth to their organizations and they doubted the capability of uninterested and uneducated youth to implement entrepreneurship projects. Most of them also seemed to have doubts about the authenticity and seriousness of some organizations that received grants from funding agencies. As a result, they recommended strongly that funding agencies should verify such organizations and monitor their project activities constantly. More than anything else, this recommendation probably reflected the frustration that comparison group organizations had after their projects were not funded. They probably knew about some “inauthentic” organizations that received grants from YEN or elsewhere and they probably felt that their rejected projects deserved such funding instead.

**Evaluating the Impact of the Youth-to-Youth Fund: survey findings from youth beneficiaries**

In previous sections, I focused on the impact of the Y2Y projects from the perspective of project coordinators and key informants. I also briefly focused on a qualitative impact assessment of the Y2Y projects by comparing the challenges faced by comparison group organizations and their needs and recommendations to those expressed by Y2Y grantees and key informants. The analysis has so far lacked the inclusion of voices from the end youth beneficiaries, that is, the young people whose views were often referenced by project coordinators and key informants in support of their views on project outcomes. An impact evaluation of the Y2Y program would be incomplete in the absence of direct voices from the intended youth beneficiaries. In this section, I present a quantitative before and after comparison
of the impact of Y2Y projects on youth beneficiaries using survey data collected from 335 youth beneficiaries in Guinea and Sierra Leone. As presented in Chapter 3, the survey data was collected directly from youth by YEN Y2Y officials in collaboration with project coordinators in Guinea and Sierra Leone during mid-term evaluations. As shown in Table 5.1, of the 335 surveyed youth, 170 (51%) of were from Guinea and 165 (49%) were drawn from Sierra Leone.

Table 5.1: The location of Youth-to-Youth Fund beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of surveyed Y2Y beneficiaries</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 5.2, 190 (57%) of survey participants were males compared to 144 (43%) females. Table 5.3 shows that, 116 (61%) of male participants were from Guinea and the remaining 74 (39%) were from Sierra Leone. For females, 91 (63%) were from Sierra Leone and the remaining 53 (37%) were from Guinea.

Table 5.2: Surveyed Youth-to-Youth Fund beneficiaries by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.3: The location surveyed Youth to Youth beneficiaries by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of survey participants</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% within Gender</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4 shows that about 176 (54%) of the beneficiaries were married and 141 (43%) were single. The remaining 10 (3%) were either divorced or widowed.

Table 5.4: The marital status** of Youth-to-Youth Fund survey participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid S</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Married = M, Single = S, Widowed = W, Divorced = D

Table 5.5 and 5.6 shows that there were more married males than females and that most of those that were married were from Guinea. Table 5.8 shows that 111 (34%) of the participants did not have any children and 220 (66%) had children of aged between one and seven years old.
These statistical results are important because they offer insights on potential differences in project impact by gender, project location and the marital status of project participants.

Table 5.5: Marital status of Youth-to-Youth Fund survey participants by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married (M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (S)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed (W)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced (D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6: Location of Youth-to-Youth Fund survey participants by marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of survey participants</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.7: Youth-to-Youth Fund beneficiaries’ number of children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of children</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>99.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next sub-sections, I focus on the activities of survey participants before they participated in Y2Y projects by gender and location. I then shift to an analysis of how the project impacted the participants including variations in reported earnings. When survey participants were asked what they were doing before participating in Y2Y projects, 131 (39%) said they were farmers, 80 (24%) self-employed, 53 (16%) unemployed, 36 (11%) were employed, and 33 (10%) were students as shown in Figure 12.
Figure 13: Activities of Youth-to-Youth Fund survey participants before the project

The above statistics were much more complicated because some self-employed participants were also farmers and students and those unemployed included school drop outs, graduates and students. Those who simply indicated they were employed also included some students. Some farmers sold their farming products on the markets and streets and became self-employed as a result, and the self-employed also included some students who worked part-time in family-owned businesses. Some students also conducted hawking and vending activities away from school. As shown in Table 5.8, 101 (77%) of the youth farmers were located in Guinea compared to 30 (23%) in Sierra Leone and 64 (80%) of the self-employed were from Sierra
Leone compared to 16 (20%) in Guinea. Most of those who were students were also from Sierra
and there was an even location distribution of those that simply indicated that they were either
employed or unemployed as below.

**Table 5.8: Youth activities before the project by location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity before the project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Sierra</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-employed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.1%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notably, as shown in Figure 14, 101 (30%) of all survey participants were young farmers
in Guinea and 64 (19%) were self-employed youth in Sierra Leone. This meant that about 50%
of participants were young farmers and self-employed youth before they participated in Y2Y.
projects. A chi-square test for independence revealed that there was a significant association between youth activity and the location of youth beneficiaries with a larger number of youth farmers observed in Guinea and a significant number of self-employed youth in Sierra Leone.

In terms of youth income before the project, young males earned an average of about $35 per month compared to about $27 monthly for young females. Halfway through participation in projects, young males earned an average of about $25 per month compared to about $21 per month for young females. In terms of expected salary after the project, young males expected to
earn $75 per month on average and young females expected to earn about $67 per month after the project. Overall, the average monthly income before the project was about $32 for both groups and it fell to about $23 midway through the training due to forgone self-employment income. The average expected monthly income at the end of the project for both groups was about $71 as shown in Table 5.9.

**Table 5.9: Youth beneficiaries’ income before and during the project and expected income by gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>(US$ per month) Income before the project started</th>
<th>(US$ per month) Current income</th>
<th>(US$ per month) Expected Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>35.33</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>44.272</td>
<td>30.386</td>
<td>60.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>26.58</td>
<td>20.74</td>
<td>67.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>46.371</td>
<td>37.252</td>
<td>48.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>31.52</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>71.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>45.337</td>
<td>33.529</td>
<td>55.847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The before and after income analysis indicated that young males generally earned more than young females and they were also more optimistic about their future income and that participation in Y2Y projects eroded monthly earnings for both young males and females. These findings support views from project coordinators that it was difficult for youth to participate in projects that did not benefit them financially. Given that participation in Y2Y projects tended to
erode the earnings of beneficiaries as they underwent training, it was not surprising that some participants dropped out and refocused their attention on immediate income earning opportunities as before.

The fact that young males generally earn more than young females has been supported by previous studies that found that most young females were often confined to family-owned and/or home-based enterprises and childcare and household activities that paid little to no income (Chant & Jones, 2005). These studies have also shown that young males tended to concentrate on high-risk and often rewarding informal income generating activities compared to young females. These underlying gender-based livelihood characteristics probably account for higher average income expectation by males and lower post-project average income expectation by young females.

When youth income activities are analyzed by location, those in Guinea earned slightly more after participation in the projects, whereas Sierra Leone youth earned less than 50% of what they earned before the project. Youth beneficiaries in Guinea were mostly young farmers who viewed participation in Y2Y projects as a means to earn supplementary income and employment during off-farm seasons. For Sierra beneficiaries, especially those who were based in urban areas, participation in Y2Y resulted in a drastic fall in income as they had to forgo high paying jobs to undergo training. This was also a theme that emerged during qualitative analysis of Sierra Leone mid-term projects and views from the project coordinators. However, Sierra Leone youth, who were mostly self-employed young females, expected to earn an average of about $88 per month compared to about $55 expected by Guinea beneficiaries, who were mostly farmers. As a result, the higher expected average income of $71 mostly reflected optimism by
self-employed Sierra Leone females who were still undergoing training but who expected higher earnings thereafter. Table 5.10 summarizes youth income by location.

Table 5.10: (USD per month) income before the project started (USD per month), current income, and expected income (USD per month) by location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>(USD per month) Income before the project started</th>
<th>(USD per month) Current income</th>
<th>Expected Income (USD per month)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>26.07</td>
<td>29.35</td>
<td>54.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>28.661</td>
<td>30.557</td>
<td>38.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>37.08</td>
<td>88.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>57.124</td>
<td>35.311</td>
<td>64.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>31.52</td>
<td>71.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>45.337</td>
<td>33.529</td>
<td>55.847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The young Guinean farmers were probably more realistic about the limited possibility of earning higher income from farming activities that were mostly seasonal in nature. This contrasted with self-employed youth in Sierra Leone who probably expected year-round
employment after the training given the “unlimited” possibilities often offered through self-employment activities, especially in urban areas.

The most important impact evaluation question in the youth questionnaire asked about how the Y2Y project had impacted their life. In response, 162 (51%) said that the project gave them **practical training and new knowledge**, 123 (39%) said the project was a **source of income and financial independence**, 64 (20%) said the project gave them **high hopes for a better life and job**, 48 (15%) said the project gave them **more acquaintances and improved social life**, 43 (14%) said the project provided a **source of employment and business viability**, and 22 (7%) said it was **too soon to tell**.

**Figure 15: How has the project impacted your life?**

The percentages in Figure 14 add up to more than 100% because some youth beneficiaries indicated that the Y2Y project had impacted them in more than one way. For example, practical training and new knowledge gave some youth beneficiaries high hopes for a better life and job; some of those who secured employment opportunities and business viability
also received monthly incomes that gave them financial independence and got connected to new friends and social opportunities in the process; and some of those that simply gained practical training and knowledge felt that it was too soon to gauge the impact of the project on their lives.

Thinking about these results in terms of the sustainable livelihoods and the research questions posed in this study, most Y2Y beneficiaries gained human capital in the form of practical knowledge followed by enhanced economic capital in the form of monthly income and financial independence. A good number of youth beneficiaries also gained social capital through more acquaintances and social interactions.

The voices of youth beneficiaries largely reflect the sentiments expressed by project coordinators in terms of the acquisition of practical skills and knowledge, creation of microenterprises, access to social networks and friends through cooperatives and beneficiary enthusiasm and motivation reflected by the high hopes for a better life and job among youth beneficiaries. However, youth beneficiaries did not express social capital outcomes associated with the creation of cooperatives as strongly as did project coordinators and key informants. Surprisingly, access to land, materials and equipment did not emerge as a significant theme in youth voices. Perhaps, youth beneficiaries considered access to land through contracts with land owners as a temporary phenomenon and did not see it as having a significant impact on their lives. Also, the lack of transparency and the reported land access challenges and conflicts may have resulted in negative attitudes among youth in the areas of land access and also materials and equipment. It is also possible that youth beneficiaries viewed access to land and materials and equipment as more of a benefit to grantees than themselves since grantees, in most cases, secured land and materials and equipment on behalf of youth beneficiaries. The project challenges that emerged in previous analysis may also explain why most youth beneficiaries considered access
to practical training and knowledge as the most benefit from the project, over and above a fundamental goal of gaining employment and increased income.

Overall, the mid-term voices from youth beneficiaries reflected short-term project benefits in the form of enhanced human capital and medium-term benefits through enhanced employment opportunities and social capital. The high hopes for a better job and life will likely see more and more youth leaning towards “source of income and financial independence” and “more acquaintances and improved social life” in the long-term. In the long-term, beneficiaries may shift their views from “practical training and knowledge” to “source of income and financial independence” given fundamental long-term income and financial goals. The absence of physical capital outcomes views from youth beneficiaries may mean that funding agencies should focus more on ensuring youth access to physical resources such as land, workspace, transportation, and materials and equipment to foster productive and sustainable youth livelihoods during the early stages of project implementation. Failure to enhance physical capital in the short-term will likely worsen youth access to physical resources such as workspace and toolkits in the long-term, something that will potentially hinder sustainable youth employment creation through youth cooperatives and self-employment.

It was significant that 125 (39%) of those who said they gained practical skills and knowledge were from Sierra Leone compared to 37 (12%) from Guinea. Another significant difference of project impact by location was that 110 (35%) of those who mentioned that the project offered them a source of income were from Guinea and the remaining 13 (4%) were from Sierra Leone. As highlighted earlier in this section, those in Guinea were mostly young farmers who were already engaged in independent or family farming and they considered participation in
projects as a source of supplementary income. They were, therefore, more likely to say that the project offered them income and financial independence since they were already earning basic income for day to day survival. Those from Sierra Leone were mostly self-employed youth whose incomes were eroded by participation in Y2Y projects. Participation in projects saw incomes of several youth from Sierra Leone falling to zero. In such cases, the youth viewed practical training and knowledge as a more significant benefit from the project. Figure 16 summarizes the impact of Y2Y projects by the location of beneficiaries.

Figure 16: Impacts of Youth-to-Youth Fund projects by location

There were no significant differences between the views of males and females regarding how Y2Y projects had impacted their lives. During mid-term evaluations, most youth beneficiaries expected to secure a full-time job after the training. Two hundred and forty-eight (75%) expected to secure a full-time job after graduation compared to 84 (25%) who did not expect a full-time job. This question was important because part of the ILO’s decent work agenda for youth involves creating full-time employment opportunities for. In this regard,
findings from youth beneficiaries were encouraging as they suggested that most of them expected decent full-time employment after the projects.

As shown in Table 5.11 and corresponding chi-square tables, when expectation of a full-time job was analyzed by location, 159 (64%) of those who expected a full-time job were from Sierra Leone compared to 89 (36%) from Guinea. A chi-square test for independence with Yates Continuity Correction (chi-square = 79.2, df = 1, N= 332, p= 0.00, \( \phi = .495 \)) indicated that there was a significant association between the expectation of a full-time job and the location of Y2Y beneficiaries, with those from Sierra Leone more likely to expect a full-time job compared to those youth from Guinea. Only 6 (7%) of those who did not expect a full-time job after training were from Sierra Leone compared to 78 (93%) in Guinea. It emerged from a further review of youth voices that most Guinean beneficiaries worked part-time as farmers during the farming season and that in most cases, they shifted to another livelihood activity during off-farm seasons. As a result, they were less likely to mention full-time employment since most of their activities were seasonal and temporary. Guinean beneficiaries were also mostly married young males based in small or semi-urban regions and farming was their central livelihood activity. The fact that most of them were married with children probably made it difficult for them to focus on securing a single full-time job; the financial pressures associated with marriage and children likely pushed them into a complex web of farm and off-farm livelihood activities. Sierra Leone beneficiaries, on the other hand, were mostly urban or rural self-employed youth who aspired for full-time employment and higher incomes after the training.
Table 5.11: Do you expect a full time job by location (Yes/No)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary Location</th>
<th>Expect a full time job (Y/N)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expectation of a full-time job also varied slightly by gender as shown in Table 5.12. Of the 84 youth who did not expect a full-time job after training, 56 (67%) were males compared to 28 (33%) of females. This was probably due to the fact that male beneficiaries were more likely to be farmers who engaged in alternate and part-time livelihood activities depending on seasons. As noted above, farming activities were mostly depended on seasons and it was not surprising that most of the males (farmers) did not expect a full-time job or higher income even after the training. Overall, 116 (80%) of all females expected full-time employment after the training compared to 132 (70%) of all males.
Table 5.12: Do you expect a full time job (Yes/No) * Gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expect a full-time job (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expect a full time job</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most youth beneficiaries, 135 (42%) mentioned that Y2Y projects could be improved by providing **more materials and equipment, 76 (24%) financial assistance, 42 (13%) improved beneficiary-grantee cooperation, 38 (12%) more training opportunities, 30 (9%) working space and transportation, and 59 (19%) had other recommendations. These recommendations from youth beneficiaries indicate that physical capital in the form of materials and equipment was not a significant impact of Y2Y projects. The recommendations confirm that most youth lacked access to materials and equipment and hence the recommendation for the provision of more materials and equipment to yield project success. The recommendation for more financial assistance also supported earlier findings where access to income and employment did not emerge as the top most referenced outcome of Y2Y projects. Since several youth lost income following their participation in projects, it was not surprising that they also recommended more financial assistance. Figure 17 depicts the youth recommendations.
Figure 17: Youth-to-Youth Fund beneficiaries’ recommendations

The need for materials and equipment was mostly recommended by Guinea beneficiaries and the need for more training opportunities was mostly recommended by Sierra Leone youth beneficiaries. Also, even though an insignificant number of youth indicated the need for workspace provision and beneficiary-grantee cooperation, it was interesting that almost all of them were from Sierra Leone. Table 5.13, 5.14 and 5.15 show the distribution of youth recommendations for more training materials and equipment, financial assistance and training opportunities respectively. A chi-square test for independence with Yates Continuity Correction (chi-square = 24.3, df= 1, N = 318, p = 0.00) indicated that there was a significant association between the need for more materials and equipment and the location of youth beneficiaries, with more Guinea beneficiaries associated with the need for more materials and equipment and Sierra Leone youth less likely to recommend more materials and equipment. This was probably a result of more young farmers in Guinea who needed materials and equipment such as farming inputs.
A chi-square test for independence with Yates Continuity Correction (chi-square = 6.6, df= 1, N = 318, p = .010) indicated that there was a significant association between the need for more financial assistance and the location of youth beneficiaries, with more Guinea beneficiaries associated recommending financial assistance compared to Sierra Leone beneficiaries.

**Table 5.14: How could the project be improved in future by location**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need financial assistance</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
beneficiaries recommending more training opportunities compared to Guinea beneficiaries. Those in Sierra Leone were previously self-employed and they probably recommended business creation and training opportunities to enable them to start viable businesses and self-employment opportunities. Instead, young farmers in Guinea needed materials and equipment to boost agricultural outputs and supplementary income.

**Table 5.15: How could the project be improved in future?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More training opportunities</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thinking in terms of sustainable youth livelihood interventions, Y2Y fund beneficiaries mostly recommended that funding agencies should enhance youth access to physical capital through the provision of materials and equipment and working space. The recommendation for enhanced physical capital was common in youth voices compared to related themes expressed by project coordinators and key informants. Youth voices also supported the need for adequate funding and long-term funding opportunities expressed by project coordinators and key informants. However, when youth beneficiaries spoke about financial assistance, they mostly referred to the need for stipend provisions during training as opposed to adequate funding opportunities to expand training and employment activities as favored by project coordinators.
Evaluating the impacts of the Youth-to-Youth Fund: survey findings from grantees and comparison group organizations

Previous sections presented qualitative data analysis of Y2Y project coordinators and key informants views and survey findings from youth beneficiaries in Guinea and Sierra Leone. This section presents complementary quantitative analysis and results from the 36 Y2Y grantees and 28 comparison group organizations introduced in Chapter 3. The 36 grantees that I included in this study represented over 95% of West Africa Y2Y grantees since the program was launched in 2008/2009. I also sent out a survey to 120 eligible but unsuccessful applicants to the 2011 Y2Y round in Sierra Leone; 28 (23%) of the organizations responded to the survey. I could not send the survey to Guinea comparison group applicants because it needed French translations. Table 5.16 shows that of the 64 organizations that I surveyed, 36 (56%) of them were grantees and 28 (44%) were comparison group organizations.

Table 5.16: Grantee and comparison group frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grantee</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I began the comparison of Y2Y grantees and comparison group organizations by analyzing baseline data provided in the application forms submitted by the organizations to YEN. I then entered the baseline and survey data in Microsoft Excel before importing the file in
SPSS. I used SPSS because it made it easier for me to compute simple frequency distributions and cross tabulations within and across grantees and comparison group organizations. I also chose SPSS because it allowed me to perform parametric and non-parametric tests to test the significance of survey findings as described in Chapter 3. I performed a chi-square test for independence (with Yates Continuity Correction) and there was no significant association between grantees and comparison group baseline data. I was particularly interested in understanding any variations in the focus areas of grantees and comparison group organizations to ascertain that they were similar in base characteristics. In this regard, there was no significant difference between grantees and comparison group organizations with respect to their focus on project themes of interest, that is, agriculture, environment, job and skills training, entrepreneurship, and water and sanitation (Chi-square = .361; .000; .762; .044; 2.175; df = 1, N = 64; p = .548; 1.0; .38; .84; .14 respectively).

Data from the Y2Y grantees indicated that the 36 organizations received $742,691 in total and the average grant was $20,630. Excluding 5 organizations that did not have job creation and employment data, 979 jobs were created for youth beneficiaries. The average number of jobs created per organization was 32 and the average cost of creating one job was about $685 as summarized below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total grant amount (N= 36):</td>
<td>$742,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average grant amount (N= 36):</td>
<td>$20,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total jobs created (N = 31):</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of jobs created (N = 31):</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost of creating one job (N = 31):</td>
<td>$685</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The organizations that received Y2Y grants were from Guinea, Ivory Coast, Liberia and Sierra Leone. They included 13 organizations from the pilot round in 2008/2009 and 23 from the second Y2Y round in Guinea and Sierra Leone. With respect to whether or not the size of the grant impacted on the number of jobs that the organizations created, I performed a bivariate correlation using Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation and there was no significant association between grant size and the jobs that the organizations created (see Table 5.17, page 288).

For comparison group organizations, I was also interested in knowing the action that they took after their project was not funded by YEN. As shown in Figure 18, 19 (68%) of them started the project without funding, 13 (46%) got funding from another source, 6 (15%) applied again in 2012 and 2 (7%) abandoned the project.

![Pie Chart](image)

**Figure 18: Actions taken by Y2Y applicants after their project were not funded**

The above percentages were above 100% because some organizations started the project without funding, applied again in 2012 and subsequently secured funding from another source(s).
I then compared grantees and comparison group organizations for all variables that were of interest to this study. The aim of the comparisons was to check whether or not Y2Y grantees were more likely to enhance youth livelihoods through the creation of decent jobs and access to income, social capital, human capital and physical capital through access to land and materials and equipment. I also wanted to understand the nature and extent of challenges experienced by grantees in relation to those experienced by comparison group organizations. Another area of interest related to an understanding of the extent to which grantee projects continued after the Y2Y grant and comparisons group indications in this regard.

In most cases, there was no significant difference between Y2Y grantees and comparison group organizations as shown in Table 5.17. However, there were a few areas where Y2Y grantees differed from comparison group organizations: the provision of materials and equipment to youth beneficiaries; the ability to assist youth beneficiaries to form cooperatives; the kinds of jobs that their youth beneficiaries were engaged in and the type of space that they used for such activities. The ability of grantees to use the funding that they received to organize youth into cooperatives was significant as only one organization out the 36 grantees did not form youth cooperatives through the Y2Y project. In comparison, half of comparison group organizations were unable to form youth cooperatives. The ability of grantees to organize youth into cooperatives also meant that their beneficiaries were more likely to use shared space with other youth compared to comparison group beneficiaries. Also, there were more grantees (project coordinators) who indicated that they provided youth beneficiaries with materials and equipment as startup capital compared to the comparison group.
On the other hand, more comparison group beneficiaries engaged in home-based enterprises and education and awareness campaign employment activities compared to grantee beneficiaries. The fact that some comparison organizations could not secure funding probably meant that they were also unable to form partnerships with land owners and local government to facilitate youth access to working space. As a result, their beneficiaries may have depended more on home-based enterprises. Table 5.17 summarizes all the statistical tests that I performed to compare grantees and comparison group organizations. Significant findings are highlighted in bold.

Table 5.17: Variables, outcome measures, grantee-comparison statistical tests and results (N ≤ 64)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/ research question</th>
<th>Outcome measure</th>
<th>Grantee-Comparison</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In what areas does your project focus? (Select all that apply.)</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence ($p =1.0; .38; .84; .14; \ldots$)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of training(s) has your organization given to young men and women in the past 12 months?</td>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence ($p = .38; .84; .14$)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant size (grantees only) effect on the number of youth and women assisted in securing employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bivariate Correlation (Pearson) ($r = .313, p = .086, N = 31$)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many youth and women have you assisted in securing employment or entrepreneurship in the past 12 months?</td>
<td>Financial capital Independent samples t-test ( (p = .76, .324) )</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many youth and women have you assisted who are self-employed?</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test ( (p = .329, .239) )</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About how much are these young men and women earning monthly in their respective employment or livelihood activities?</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test ( (p = .145) )</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have the estimated incomes of youth beneficiaries changed after the project?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence ( (p = .457) )</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your organization provided cash loans to youth?</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test ( (p = .741) )</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About how much in credit or loans (if any) has your organization been able to give youth beneficiaries?</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test ( (p = .741) )</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of jobs are the young men and women you have trained or reached through the project doing? (Select all that apply.)</td>
<td>Decent jobs Chi-square test for independence ( (p =.000, .003, .467, .295, . . .) )</td>
<td>X (home-based enterprises; campaigns)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of working space</td>
<td>Chi-square test for X (shared)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.17 (con’t.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>or land are the youth you assisted using for their livelihood activities? (Select all that apply)</td>
<td>independence</td>
<td>(p = 0.007, 0.249, 0.960, 0.777, 0.289, \ldots)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the youth have licenses or contracts with land owners for the space(s) that they use?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>(p = 0.452)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About how much are youth beneficiaries paying per month in total for the livelihood space or land?</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>(p = 0.831)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your organization been able to provide youth beneficiaries with the materials and equipment they need to start their businesses?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>(p = 0.033)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have youth beneficiaries been able to secure any materials and equipment or business loans from other sources?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>(p = 0.566)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From whom have youth beneficiaries been able to secure any materials and equipment, loans or credit facilities? (select all that apply)</td>
<td>Physical and natural capital</td>
<td>(p = 0.134, 0.276, 0.437, \ldots)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of working space</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>X (shared)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Test Used</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or land are the youth you assisted using for their livelihood activities? (Select all that apply)</td>
<td>independence (p = 0.007, 0.249, 0.960, 0.777, 0.289,…)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please describe the type of space in which your organization works (select all that apply):</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence (p = 0.808, 0.548, 0.466, 0.558, 0.100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your organization been able to partner with any other organization in the past 12 months?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence (p = 1.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whom did you partner with (Select all that apply)</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of partnership emerged between your organization and the partner(s) in # 24? (Select all that apply)</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence (p = 0.296, 0.387, 0.387, 0.563, 0.349)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your organization been able to assist youth beneficiaries to form cooperatives, support groups, or associations in the past 12 months?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence (p = 0.025)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many cooperatives were formed through the</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td></td>
<td>X (total youth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Statistical Test</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project in the past twelve months including the total number of youth members in the cooperative?</td>
<td></td>
<td>$(p = .082, 0.20)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What challenges did your organization face in the past 12 months (Select all that apply.)</td>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence $(p = .615, .117, .669, .643,\ldots)$</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been able to secure funding from elsewhere to continue with your organization’s activities in the past 12 months?</td>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence $(p = 1.000)$</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your organization been able to expand youth employment activities in the past 12 months?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence $(p = .182)$</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the above survey findings were limited by a small sample and inconsistent data in some cases. Since most grantees could not complete the survey, it was difficult to extract consistent or specific survey data in mid-term and final project reports. As a result, there was a lot of missing data and that also limited the average responses per survey question. Despite this limitation, the results suggested that Y2Y grantees were better positioned to create and enhance youth access to social, physical and economic capital through cooperatives, microenterprises and partnerships.
The impacts of the Youth-to-Youth Fund on youth access to decent and sustainable livelihoods

The Y2Y program in West Africa created decent and sustainable employment for youth through direct financial support and capacity building for youth-led organizations to enable them to create youth cooperatives and micro-enterprises. As the analysis has shown, the Y2Y has largely succeeded in enhancing the capacity of youth organizations to address youth employment through the creation of cooperatives, young women’s empowerment and imparting skills training to some of the most disadvantaged youth in rural and urban West Africa. The 36 organizations included in this study received close to $1,000,000 in direct financial support from the YEN and they, in turn, created close to 1,000 jobs for young men and women. An evaluation of Y2Y pilot projects show that 85% of beneficiaries had a job by the end of the Y2Y pilot phase and that 75% of them continued to have that same job a year after graduating from the training (YEN & UNIDO, 2011). In addition, findings from the pilot Y2Y phase in the MRU indicated that the projects created 61 microenterprises that brought over 70 public, private and non-profit actors together. The collaborative effort boosted the earnings of youth beneficiaries and enhanced youth access to important livelihood resources such as land and income. More importantly, 60% of the pilot round beneficiaries were young females and nine of the 14 grantees specifically targeted young women. Although there was a bias towards urban-based projects in the pilot phase, some projects established locations in urban as well as rural areas and benefited both rural and urban youth as a result. These findings from the pilot phase show that the Y2Y program enhanced youth access to human, financial and social assets towards sustainable and decent youth employment creation.
The central aim of this study of the Y2Y program was to use multiple sources of evidence to assess the extent to which it created decent and sustainable youth employment for youth in post-conflict, low-income West African communities. Results from the pilot round were generally encouraging and positive but they needed to be complemented with a further analysis of future rounds of the Y2Y program launched in Guinea and Sierra Leone in 2010/2011. The concept of decent youth employment creation goes beyond the mere creation of youth employment opportunities and cooperatives. It includes a thorough analysis of the type of jobs that were created, the working conditions, rights and freedom of association linked to the jobs created and the extent to which such employment opportunities self-sustained (International Labor Organization, 2002, 2005, 2007). To this end, I analyzed qualitative and quantitative views from Y2Y project coordinators and beneficiaries to further explore and quantify decent youth employment concepts. I also compared survey findings from grantees and comparison group organizations. As the analysis has shown, the income, skills, and social benefits reported from the pilot phase continued during the second phase but the full success and potential of the Y2Y was also hindered by several challenges during the second phase in Guinea and Sierra Leone. Some Y2Y project coordinators mentioned serious challenges related to access to secure working space for their organizations and youth beneficiaries; inadequate funding to expand project activities; and negative youth and community perceptions of their projects. An analysis of mid-term project data from Guinea and Sierra Leone also indicated that a few grantees experienced serious business viability challenges as a result of lack of transparency, miscommunication and deliberate financial mismanagement by project coordinators. In most cases, beneficiary enthusiasm, community support and YEN intervention rescued the projects that faced viability and management challenges. Even though most of the challenges were
generally overcome, their mere existence fundamentally limited the extent to which the Y2Y program and projects created decent and sustainable jobs for youth.

From youth beneficiary’s perspectives, access to decent income and employment was not yet at the top of how they felt Y2Y projects had impacted their lives. Rather, most of them considered that access to practical skills and knowledge was the greatest benefit from participating in Y2Y projects. Suggesting that they still lacked access to decent income, most youth beneficiaries recommended that they needed financial assistance from funding agencies and grantees. This was mostly because participation in Y2Y projects had generally eroded the earnings of some beneficiaries and especially those in Sierra Leone. Beneficiaries from Guinea were also involved in multiple farm and off-farm income generating activities that complicated their path to decent employment. Sierra Leone beneficiaries, who were previously self-employed, suddenly found themselves with zero income since they did not have enough time left for self-employment activities. However, the fact that most youth considered that Y2Y projects enhanced their access to income mid-way through project implementation was encouraging. Even more encouraging, was that 75% of youth beneficiaries expected a full-time job after the training. Most beneficiaries were also more networked with peers and they had high hopes for a better job and life after the training. Part of the ILO decent work agenda is the provision of full-time permanent jobs for youth in low-income communities. In most parts of the developing world, youth and women work in the informal economy where they are often exploited by adult employers and those that are self-employed often work long hours in undesignated workspaces, where they constantly face harassment and eviction by planning authorities. Most informal youth also do not have the freedom to associate and fight for improved working conditions and earnings. The decent work agenda entails addressing all these challenges. The expectation of a
full-time job that dominated youth voices was a positive finding and it remains to be seen how that expectation will evolve in the coming years.

Overall, these findings show that the Y2Y program is clearly well positioned and equipped to create decent and sustainable youth employment opportunities in post-conflict West Africa, despite challenges. Targeted youth beneficiaries were clearly motivated and enthusiastic about the project in most cases but their expectations were sometimes unmatched by grantees that lacked financial resources to provide basic incentives to sustain their participation. In other cases, youth motivation was eroded by lack of transparency on the part of grantees, uncommitted land owners, limited training, delayed project commencement, business viability challenges and limited transportation to and from project sites. The YEN Y2Y should consider addressing some of these challenges in future rounds of the Y2Y in West Africa and elsewhere. The fact that most previously funded Y2Y projects continued after the YEN grant and the external funding opportunities and partnership created by the Y2Y depicted largely successful and sustainable Y2Y projects. Findings from this study are limited by a small sample and a reliance on mid-term project data but they do offer funding agencies an opportunity to explore these emerging issues further. In the next chapter, I compare the Youth Employment Network Youth-to-Youth Fund with the UN-Habitat Urban Youth Fund in an effort to derive comprehensive lessons, recommendations and conclusions. Comparative Y2Y and UYF findings, discussion and implications seek to guide future youth-led development practice and policies toward decent youth employment creation, sustainable youth livelihood interventions and global poverty reduction efforts.
CHAPTER VI

COMPARISONS, DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

An overview of the Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees

This chapter presents a comparative analysis of findings from the Urban Youth Fund (UYF) analysis and the Youth-to-Youth (Y2Y) analysis. Chapter 4 presented data analysis and findings from the UYF and Chapter 5 presented data analysis and findings from the Y2Y program. In this chapter, I present a comparative evaluation of variations and similarities in the impact of the UYF and the Y2Y programs. The comparative evaluation is important to allow for a broad discussion of the effectiveness of the youth-led livelihood development approach as an avenue for sustainable youth employment creation, poverty reduction and sustainable urban development planning and management in low-income countries. The UYF and Y2Y programs provide funding to youth-led projects considered to be the most innovative and creative in addressing youth livelihood and related challenges.

The aim of this study was to evaluate the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y facilitated youth access to livelihood assets necessary for decent and sustainable livelihood in low-income countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. This chapter begins by presenting a justification for comparing UYF and Y2Y and an overview of the UYF and Y2Y results. This is followed by a qualitative comparative analysis of the impact of the UYF and Y2Y on youth access to physical, social, human and social assets using data presented in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5. The chapter then presents a brief quantitative evaluation of similarities and differences in the impacts of the UYF and Y2Y. The last section focuses on a discussion and interpretation of findings from the comparative analysis and also the full analysis presented in the previous two chapters. The discussion and interpretation section assesses the implications of findings for sustainable
livelihood interventions, the sustainable livelihoods framework and sustainable urban
development and management in informal economies.

**Justification for Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund comparisons**

The UYF and UYF are the best known youth-led development programs ever
implemented by international development organizations in SSA. Given that youth-led
development is a recent concept, I compared the two programs to allow for an in-depth
understanding of project outcomes and a broad exploration of challenges, lessons, conclusions
and recommendations for funding agencies, youth-led organizations, policy makers and
practitioners concerned with youth-led livelihood development interventions.

A justification for comparing UYF and Y2Y programs was fundamentally based on the
fact that both programs provide grants to youth-led organizations considered to have the most
innovative projects to address youth and community challenges, particularly in the area of youth
employment and entrepreneurship. I analyzed baseline data for UYF and Y2Y grantees and
found no fundamental differences in the characteristics of the organizations. For example, the
major themes in both UYF and Y2Y grantee projects were entrepreneurship, jobs and skills
training, employment creation, environment, young women’s empowerment, water and
sanitation, and agriculture. A chi-square test for independence indicated that there were no
significant differences in UYF and Y2Y projects for entrepreneurship, environment, job and
skills training, empowerment of women, and water and sanitation respectively. One difference
that emerged was in the area of “agriculture” (chi-square = 7.041, df = 1, N = 67, p = .008)
where there were more Y2Y grantees compared to UYF grantees. However, most Y2Y grantees
implemented agricultural projects that promoted entrepreneurship, job and skills training and
employment creation. The fundamental goal of youth entrepreneurship and employment creation was common in both UYF and Y2Y projects.

For the 31 UYF grantees included in this study, UN-Habitat awarded them $468,646 in total and about $15,118 on average. The UYF grantees in turn created about 1,629 jobs in total and about 68 jobs per grantee on average. The Youth Employment Network on the other hand, awarded $742,691 and about $20,630 per grantee on average to the 36 grantees included in this study. The Y2Y grantees in turn created about 979 jobs in total and about 32 jobs per grantee on average. The average cost of creating one job was $218 for the 24 UYF grantees with available jobs data compared to $685 for the 31 Y2Y grantees. However, the differences in the number of jobs created by the grantees probably resulted from the way the data was collected. Data from UYF grantees was mostly self-reported by project coordinators during interviews and in final project reports. It is possible that the coordinators exaggerated the number of jobs they created to make their organizations look good. On the other hand, data from the Y2Y was probably more accurate as it was collected by YEN officials in close collaboration with project coordinators and field assistants. After removing outliers, the total number of UYF jobs created fell to 860 from 1,629 and the average number of UYF jobs created dropped from 68 to 43 per grantee. For the Y2Y, the total number of jobs fell from 979 to 676 and the average number of jobs created dropped from 32 to 27 jobs per grantee. The average cost of creating one UYF job increased from $218 to $336 per job while the cost per Y2Y job created fell from $685 to $608 without the outliers as shown in Table 6.1.
Table 6.1: An overview of Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Youth-to-Youth Fund Overview</th>
<th>Urban Youth Fund Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total grant amount: $411,124 (N = 25)</td>
<td>$288,946 (N = 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average grant amount: $16,105</td>
<td>$14,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total jobs created : 676</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of jobs created : 27</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average cost of creating one job : $608</td>
<td>$336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 6.1, the Y2Y awarded high grants on average compared to the UYF program between 2009 and 2011. However, the differences in the sources of employment data raise questions about the reliability of self-reported UYF employment data.

**Qualitative comparison of the impact of Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund programs**

The UYF and Y2Y programs both enhanced youth access to human capital. At the grantee level, project coordinators received project management and implementation skills. Through the UYF and Y2Y projects, grantees in turn offered business creation and management skills to youth beneficiaries. Financially, the UYF and Y2Y provided grants that enhanced the capacity of youth-led organizations to implement youth livelihood projects. The UYF was strong in the creation of **revolving funds** that enabled youth beneficiaries to access business startup capital. Another related theme that was also commonly expressed by UYF grantees was the
creation of self-employment opportunities for young women. For Y2Y grantees, the creation of youth microenterprises and cooperatives was the major focus of the projects. Unlike some UYF grantees that tended to have broad youth development goals including youth employment and entrepreneurship, most Y2Y grantees specifically created youth microenterprises that enhanced youth entrepreneurship and employment opportunities. Access to financial capital allowed UYF and Y2Y grantees and youth beneficiaries to access land, working space, materials, equipment and startup tools. However, the Y2Y was stronger in the provision of startup toolkits compared to the UYF program. For the Y2Y program, the provision of startup tools was a contractual requirement for all grantees whereas this was an option for UYF grantees.

In terms of social capital enhancement, the major theme in UYF grantees was the creation youth networks, discussion forums, groups and resource centers. For example, UYF grantees such as TDFY, G2Mi and Tears Group Kenya created youth resources centers that brought beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries together. The UYF created networks and forums fostered community cooperation and collaboration in the area of youth employment creation. In some cases, the youth resources centers attracted positive community attitude and partnerships and improved relations with national government as in the case of the FOH in Nigeria.

On the other hand, the Y2Y specifically enhanced youth access to social capital through the creation of youth cooperatives. The youth-run cooperatives oversaw youth-led projects after the training and allowed youth beneficiaries to run projects independently. In most cases, the youth cooperatives brought youth and community members together and fostered a sense of pride and togetherness among youth and community members. In the words of one Y2Y official “the whole point about the Y2Y program is the creation of youth-run cooperatives.” As with the
UYF resources centers, Y2Y cooperatives also allowed grantees and youth beneficiaries to expand community networks. Table 6.2 summarizes the comparative impact of the UYF and Y2Y on youth access to livelihood assets.

Table 6.2: Views of project coordinators on the impact of Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund on their organizations and youth beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livelihood assets**</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Urban Youth Fund</th>
<th>Youth-to-Youth Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human capital</strong></td>
<td>Project planning, management &amp; implementation skills</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practical and business creation skills training</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moral support</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical capital</strong></td>
<td>Access to working space and land</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to materials, equipment, and startup tools</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial capital</strong></td>
<td>Grants to youth-led projects</td>
<td>$$$</td>
<td>$$$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth microenterprises</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revolving funds</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social capital</strong></td>
<td>Youth cooperatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth resource centers</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expanded community networks</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Stronger presence is indicated in bold and larger font size**
Before the training, most UYF beneficiaries were unemployed school leavers (69%) and the remainder of them was either employed (17%) or students (14%). Those who were employed engaged in activities that included urban farming, community development and self-employment. In comparison to the UYF, most Y2Y beneficiaries were employed (74%) and remaining groups were unemployed (16%) and students (10%). The fact that most UYF grantees indicated that they were unemployed before joining the project should be interpreted with caution given that project coordinators expressed that they mostly trained informally employed youth in slum areas. It is possible that UYF beneficiaries who indicated that they were unemployed simply meant that they did not have formal employment and did not consider informal employment as a legitimate income generating activity.

Overall, the activities of UYF beneficiaries reflect the challenges faced by youth in larger urban centers where most UYF projects were implemented. Whilst most Y2Y beneficiaries were farmers in semi-urban and rural areas in Guinea and Sierra Leone, most UYF beneficiaries were youth who lived in slum areas. In terms of marital status, UYF beneficiaries were mostly “single” compared to married Y2Y beneficiaries. The variations in youth beneficiary activities also suggest that farming is an important source of livelihood for youth in smaller or semi-urban areas where families and community members may own large pieces of land as in Guinea. However, in large cities such as Nairobi, Kampala and Port Harcourt where some UYF projects were implemented, youth beneficiaries were mostly recruited from slum areas where access to land for farming and self-employment activities was generally difficult or impossible. Table 6.3 summarizes the activities of UYF and Y2Y beneficiaries before they received training.
Table 6.3: Activities of Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund beneficiaries before the training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity before the project</th>
<th>Urban Youth Fund beneficiaries (% of total, N = 60)</th>
<th>Youth-to-Youth Fund beneficiaries (% of total, N = 335)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed (self-employment, farming, informal employment)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impacts of Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund on youth beneficiaries

After the training, most UYF beneficiaries indicated that the project had given them practical skills training and new knowledge (42%). Some UYF beneficiaries also indicated that the project had given them startup capital (19%), source of income and financial independence (17%), more acquaintances and improved social life (15%), and high hopes for a better life and job (11%).

Unlike UYF beneficiaries, most Y2Y beneficiaries indicated that the project gave them a source of income and financial independence (53%) and also practical training and new knowledge (51%). Most Y2Y beneficiaries were self-employed youth and farmers before joining the project and the project gave them supplementary income, in addition to the practical skills. Other Y2Y beneficiaries indicated that they benefited from more acquaintances and
improved social life (10%), high hopes for a better life and job (20%), and a few said it was too soon to tell (7%). Table 6.4 summarizes the impact of the UYF and Y2Y projects from youth beneficiaries’ perspectives.

Table 6.4: Perceived impacts of Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund projects on youth beneficiaries’ lives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livelihood assets</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Urban Youth Fund (N = 59)</th>
<th>Youth-to-Youth Fund (N = 315)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial capital</td>
<td>Source of income and financial independence</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>Practical training and new knowledge</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical capital</td>
<td>Offered startup toolkits</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>more acquaintances and improved social life</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>High hopes for a better life and job</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Too soon to tell</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results show that most Y2Y beneficiaries considered access to financial capital and human capital as the greatest benefits from participating in projects. Urban Youth Fund beneficiaries, on the other hand, benefited from practical training and new knowledge that also enhanced their human capital. Some UYF also benefited from access to startup capital through the revolving funds set up by grantees, something which was absent among Y2Y grantees. The absence of “materials, equipment and startup tools” among both UYF and Y2Y beneficiaries was surprising given that project coordinators mentioned that they provided such resources to
youth. For Y2Y beneficiaries, it is possible that most youth did not separate access to startup tools from the practical and skills training component of the project. For UYF beneficiaries, the results are limited by the fact that the 60 beneficiaries were drawn from six grantees only.

**Challenges experienced by Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees**

The challenges faced by UYF and Y2Y grantees and youth beneficiaries during project implementation included **limited access to working space, land and production equipment** (physical capital challenges); **inadequate project funding and delayed release of project funds** (financial capital challenges); **price fluctuations and business viability challenges** (financial capital challenges); **limited access to startup capital** (financial capital challenge); **inadequate beneficiary training** (human capital challenge); **negative youth and community perceptions** (recruitment challenges); **high youth expectations, lack of transparency and miscommunication**; project administration including **weak capacity for monitoring and evaluation** (capacity building challenges); and **disruptions from community and city councils**. UYF and Y2Y grantees experienced these challenges to varying degrees and some challenges were more pronounced in one program than the other.

Negative youth and community perceptions adversely impacted beneficiary recruitment for both UYF and Y2Y grantees but this was a common problem faced by UYF grantees. Irregular youth attendance and high participant drop out among UYF reflected lack of interest and frustration among some UYF beneficiaries. Limited access to land and working space was equally a challenge for both UYF and Y2Y grantees. However, the challenge for most UYF grantees was the inability to secure affordable working space or land for projects and youth beneficiaries. Urban land was highly prized in most cities where UYF projects were implemented and access to land was a serious challenge. As a result, some UYF grantees
conducted training sessions at rented houses where space was limited to train a significant number of youth. UYF beneficiaries were also forced to engage in home-based enterprises and informal employment activities. These land access challenges were typically reported in G2Mi, YAI-Uganda, FOH, and EYA projects. Contrary to UYF grantees and beneficiaries, Y2Y grantees and beneficiaries experienced delays in securing access to land as they awaited contracts from land owners or permits from local government. As such, land was mostly available for Y2Y grantees and beneficiaries but land acquisition was a lengthy process.

There were also variations in the administrative challenges reported by UYF and Y2Y grantees. Some UYF grantees experienced project administration challenges as their project coordinators lacked conflict resolution skills to train youth from diverse backgrounds. Another challenge for most UYF grantees was the inability to conduct monitoring and evaluation after the projects ended. UYF grantees felt they needed to follow up on beneficiaries but lacked adequate training and funding to do so. Also, for UYF grantees, business viability challenges emanated from price increases and city council-initiated evictions and community unrests. UYF grantees also commonly reported delayed funding release and inadequate access to startup capital.

High youth expectations, lack of transparency, miscommunication, inadequate beneficiary training and business viability challenges were more pronounced challenges in Y2Y grantees. YEN officials discovered these challenges during fieldwork and follow up visits. It is possible that such challenges also equally impacted UYF grantees but the project coordinators simply chose not to disclose in self-reported evaluations, fearing that such challenges would tarnish their organization’s credibility. Table 6.5 summarizes the challenges experienced by UYF and Y2Y grantees.
Table 6.5: Challenges faced by Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge**</th>
<th>Urban Youth Fund</th>
<th>Youth-to-Youth Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>limited access to working space, land and production equipment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate project funding and delayed release of project funds</td>
<td>$$$$</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited access to startup capital</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate beneficiary training</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative youth and community perceptions (recruitment challenge)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High youth expectations, lack of transparency and miscommunication</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project administration including weak capacity for monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City council and community disruptions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strong presence is indicated in bold and large font size**
The challenges illustrated in Table 6.5 suggests that access to land and working space was more of a challenge for UYF grantees compared to Y2Y grantees. Access to land may have been easier for Y2Y grantees because some projects were located in rural areas where access to land through contracts with land owners was relatively easier. Y2Y grantees in urban Guinea also acquired land from private land owners who owned large tracts of land in cities and towns. This was mostly not evident in UYF grantees located in major urban centers where land is mostly owned by city councils and individual families rarely owned large tracts of land.

The fact that UYF grantees received lower grantee amounts on average compared to Y2Y grantees probably explains why most of them indicated funding related challenges. Y2Y grantees also benefited technically from constant monitoring and evaluation conducted by UNIDO project assistants and hence did not mention monitoring and evaluation challenges. Even though UYF grantees equally benefited from the initial project management and implementation challenges, they did not receive constant monitoring and evaluation assistance from UN-Habitat once the projects started. City council disruptions through evictions and changes in regulatory standards mostly impacted UYF grantees in major urban centers compared to Y2Y grantee projects, most of which were implemented in smaller cities and semi-urban areas.

A comparison of lessons learned from Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth programs

There are lessons that emerged from the analysis of challenges faced by UYF and Y2Y grantees. One lesson that emerged from both programs is the need for funding agencies and grantees to research untested projects through comprehensive financial, technical, and partnership needs assessments. As shown in Chapter 4 and 5, some UYF and Y2Y grantees underestimated project budgets and training requirements because they did not research the
project needs fully. As a result, most of them had to adjust their project plans including reducing the number of beneficiaries and foregoing some training materials and equipment.

The business viability challenges pronounced in some Y2Y grantees were a result of inadequate pre-project studies to determine the **viability of proposed businesses**. On the other hand, some UYF grantees could not continue after the UYF grant because they did not address project sustainability in project proposals. Most of them did not have the **technical and financial capacity** to continue after the UYF grant. Youth-led organizations and funding agencies, particularly UN-Habitat and YEN, should therefore address project **sustainability** issues early and throughout the project. They can foster project sustainability through developing strong technical and financial partnerships with local government, MFIs and community members.

There is also a **beneficiary recruitment** lesson that emerged from the UYF analysis in Chapter 4. Youth-led organizations should develop a solid beneficiary recruitment plan to minimize **negative community interferences** and to ensure that only **eligible beneficiaries** are enrolled. In the absence of a solid beneficiary recruitment plan, over-age beneficiaries can be recruited through corrupt activities. An **extended beneficiary recruitment** plan may be required to make sure that only eligible youth benefit from training programs. A good beneficiary recruitment plan was implemented by YAI-Uganda and it involved **multiple field visits** to targeted slum areas and **extensive interviews** with **potential beneficiaries** and their **families**. This was all done prior to the final recruitment and training commencement. As a result of its collaborative and extended recruitment plan, YAI-Uganda reported that it did not experience the challenge of beneficiaries **dropping out** of the training or **lack of interest** once the training began.
Another important lesson from the Y2Y and UYF analysis is the important role of 
community and local government support. For example, the support of local government saw 
several mayors donating land to Y2Y projects during the pilot round in Ivory Coast and Guinea. 
Local government support also quickened the issuing of construction and business permits for 
Y2Y grantees. In the absence of adequate local government support, some UYF grantees faced 
eviction and project relocation challenges. UH-Habitat country offices can facilitate meetings 
and discussions between grantees and local governments. The YEN should connect grantee 
activities to Lead Country Network youth employment activities to foster collaboration at the 
local and national government level.

Community members also played an important role in facilitating youth access to land. A 
related lesson, particularly from Y2Y grantees, is the importance of beneficiary enthusiasm 
and interest in a project. When beneficiaries are enthusiastic and motivated, they tend to sustain 
projects in the event of implementation constraints. This was evident when Y2Y grantees such 
the ABA, experienced business viability challenges and yet beneficiaries were determined to 
complete the training. To maximize beneficiary enthusiasm, there is need for transparency and 
effective communication on anticipated project benefits. Transparent and honest grantees were 
capable of managing youth expectations effectively. Honest grantees also tended to foster 
grantee-beneficiary cooperation and they kept beneficiaries motivated. This was clearly achieved 
by the MPT when it launched a re-education exercise to sensitize beneficiaries on the expected 
project benefits and the funding that it secured for the project. As a result, MPT beneficiaries 
were reportedly more realistic and motivated to complete the training as they trusted the 
organization more. Grantees should, therefore, recruit project coordinators with effective
communication and teamwork skills to ensure effective community mobilization and beneficiary motivation.

An important lesson from UYF grantees is the need for youth-led organizations to be sensitive to young women’s needs. The possibility of young women participating in projects depended strongly on the willingness of their parents and husbands. As a result, some UYF grantees such as FOH and G2Mi in Nigeria, conducted extensive community educational campaigns to educate parents about the benefits of having young women participate in projects. The FOH and G2Mi both visited potential beneficiary homes to seek enrolment permission from young women’s parents and husbands. Projects targeting young women should, therefore, expect and prepare for recruitment challenges peculiar to young women in some cultures. In the absence of parental and spousal support, it is often difficult for young women to attend training sessions regularly. In some cases, young women’s risk of dropping out of the project would be high, especially when they are informally employed and have children to take care of financially. For example, the high beneficiary drop out reported by the NAYA project coordinator was a result of young single mothers choosing informal employment to support their school-going children over unpaid training sessions. Table 6.6 summarizes the lessons learned from UYF and Y2Y grantees.
Table 6.6: Lessons for youth-led organizations and funding agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson learned**</th>
<th>Urban Youth Fund</th>
<th>Youth-to-Youth Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research technical, financial and partnership needs of untested projects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a collaborative and extended beneficiary recruitment plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government and community support is crucial</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address project sustainability issues early and throughout by developing strong technical, financial and beneficiary partnerships</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic and motivated beneficiaries can sustain project during difficult times</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of transparency hinders project success</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit project coordinators with effective communication and teamwork skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strong presence indicated in bold and large font

The above lessons have the following implications for UN-Habitat and YEN:

- Consider funding projects that have been fully researched and tested to minimize business viability challenges;
- Consider funding projects that exhibit or promise a strong partnership with local government to facilitate youth access to land;
Consider providing long-term technical and financial support to enhance project sustainability;

Consider advisory services to grantees during beneficiary recruitment process;

Consider providing some sort of incentives, such as stipends to motivate beneficiaries;

Consider offering project planning and management training to at least two officials per grantee to enhance grantee’s project implementation capacity; and

Consider the provision of non-financial needs such as transportation, to keep beneficiaries motivated. Reliable transportation services can help beneficiaries to attend training sessions regularly. UN-Habitat and YEN can link grantees to external non-financial assistance opportunities. Alternatively, they can facilitate transportation partnerships between grantees and country offices.

The aspirations of Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees and youth beneficiaries

The following were the main aspirations of UYF and Y2Y grantees:

- Project management training
- Project expansion
- Creation of youth cooperatives and employment opportunities (UYF only)
- Strengthening technical and financial partnerships
- Acquisition of materials and equipment (Y2Y only)
- Sourcing funding through fundraising, self-financing and external sources (UYF only)
- Strengthening monitoring and evaluation (UYF only)
- Exchange experiences among Y2Y grantees and other youth development stakeholders at the regional and global scale (Y2Y only)
The aspirations of UYF and Y2Y grantees and youth beneficiaries in many ways reflect on the challenges that they faced and the potential for project sustainability. Most UYF grantees aspired to expand their projects through specific training programs and components such as social entrepreneurship. They also aspired to expand projects through creating youth cooperatives that would generate employment opportunities. Some UYF grantees also aspired to secure funding through fundraising activities, self-financing through revolving funds and exploring external funding opportunities. On the other hand, most Y2Y grantees aspired to further project management training, acquisition of materials and equipment and more YEN-facilitated youth-development exchange experiences.

The analysis of UYF grantees’ responses suggests that the desire to expand projects will depend on the ability of grantees to secure funding. Following in the footsteps of Y2Y grantees, most UYF grantees aspired to create youth cooperatives to generate youth employment opportunities. UYF grantees also aspired to enhance project sustainability through social entrepreneurship projects and financial partnerships. For Y2Y grantees, their aspirations suggest a desire for further project management training to boost project implementation skills. They also aspired to YEN-facilitated exchange experiences, perhaps suggesting that they needed more partners and lessons from other youth-led organizations. This aspiration may mean that youth-organizations in smaller urban centers and rural areas are more likely to have networking challenges compared to urban-based youth-led organizations.

Most Y2Y beneficiaries expected to secure a full-time job (75%) after the training while 25% did not expect a full-time job. On the other hand, most UYF beneficiaries expected to secure permanent and full-time self-employment by expanding businesses and opening new ones. Some UYF grantees aspired to receive further training, and financial independence. The
aspirations of UYF and Y2Y beneficiaries indicate that they mostly expected decent and sustainable employment opportunities after the training. Those who did not expect a full-time job after the training were mostly young Guinea farmers whose livelihoods revolved around seasonal agricultural and self-employment opportunities.

Recommendations from Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Fund grantees

Most UYF grantees recommended that UN-Habitat should **disburse funds in a timely way** to ensure timely project execution and realization of project outcomes. They also strongly recommended that UN-Habitat and other funding agencies should consider **long-term project funding** to ensure **project sustainability**. UYF grantees also commonly recommended that UN-Habitat and other funding agencies should **fund more job creation projects** as opposed to advocacy and awareness campaigns projects. The need for **constant monitoring and evaluation** by funding agencies was another strong recommendation from UYF grantees. Most Y2Y grantees also recommended **long-term funding** and **alternative funding sources and networks**. The recommendations from UYF and Y2Y grantees are summarized in Table 6.7.
### Table 6.7: Recommendations from Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation**</th>
<th>Urban Youth Fund</th>
<th>Youth-to-Youth Fund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simplify funding application and selection process</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disburse funds timely</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop flexible funding criteria</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate and long-term and funding</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative funding sources and networks</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund more job creation and youth employment projects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project monitoring and evaluation assistance</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Higher presence indicated in bold and larger font

The recommendations from UYF and Y2Y grantees suggest that funding agencies should focus more on timely disbursement of funds, long-term funding, job creation projects and project monitoring and evaluation assistance.

Urban Youth Fund and Y2Y beneficiaries recommended that funding agencies should provide **materials and equipment, financial assistance, more training opportunities, working space and transportation.** They also recommended that funding agencies should foster improved **cooperation** between grantees and trainees and also among youth beneficiaries. The recommendations from youth beneficiaries suggest that they experienced challenges related
to access to physical, financial, human and social assets necessary for sustainable youth livelihoods.

**Quantitative comparison of the impacts of Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund programs**

This section presents a quantitative comparison of UYF and Y2Y project outcomes. The quantitative comparison complements the qualitative comparison presented in preceding sections. The quantitative comparison focuses in the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y projects facilitated youth access to financial, physical, social, and human capital. The quantitative comparisons aim to assess the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y created decent and sustainable jobs for youth in low-income communities. The analysis uses survey data presented in Chapter 4 and 5 to compare the UYF and Y2Y project impact across the variables shown in Table 6.8 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Survey question(s) guiding the comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Financial capital**                 | - How many youth and women have you assisted in securing employment and entrepreneurship through the project in the past 12 months?  
   - How many youth and women you have assisted are self-employed?  
   - How much are the youth and women you have assisted through the project earning monthly?  
   - Have you provided cash loans to youth?                                                                                                       |
| **Social capital**                    | - Have you assisted youth beneficiaries to form cooperatives, associations or working groups through the project?  
   - Total number of youth members and women in the cooperatives?                                                                                      |
| **Physical capital:**                 | - What kind of working space are the youth and women you have assisted using for livelihood activities?  
   - Have you provided youth beneficiaries with the materials and equipment that they need to start livelihood activities?                                        |
| **Human capital:**                    | - What kind of training did your organization gave to youth beneficiaries through the project?                                                                                  |
| **Decent jobs**                       | - What kind of jobs are the youth and women you have trained through the project engaged in?  
   - How much are youth and women you have assisted through the project earning monthly?  
   - What kind of working space are the youth and women you have assisted using for livelihood activities?  
   - Do the youth have licenses or contracts with land owners for the space(s) or land that they use?                                                  |
| **Project sustainability**            | - Is your project still ongoing?  
   - Have you been able to secure funding from elsewhere to expand or replicate the project?                                                             |
As shown in Table 6.9, Y2Y grantees received higher grants on average compared to UYF grantees. However, UYF grantees assisted a significantly higher number of youth in securing employment and entrepreneurship through their projects compared to Y2Y grantees. Urban Youth Fund grantees also assisted a significantly higher number of young women in securing self-employment opportunities compared to Y2Y grantees.

Access to financial capital

Urban Youth Fund project coordinators reported that youth beneficiaries paid about $66 per month on average for the spaces that they used compared to $37 per month reported by Y2Y grantees. Urban Youth Fund project coordinators also reported that their youth beneficiaries earned about $85 per month on average compared to $63 per month on average compared to Y2Y grantees. These differences, perhaps, reflect the fact that urban space is generally expensive in large urban centers compared to smaller urban centers and rural areas (Rakodi & Lloyd-Jones, 2002; Brown, 2006).

The fact that the earnings reported by UYF project coordinators differed from those reported by youth beneficiaries raises questions about the actual beneficiary incomes. For example, UYF project coordinators reported that youth beneficiaries were earning $85 per month on average compared to about $62 per month on average reported by youth beneficiaries. Youth-to-Youth Fund project coordinators reported that youth beneficiaries were earning about $63 per month compared to $23 reported by youth beneficiaries during mid-term evaluations. However, during mid-term evaluations, Y2Y beneficiaries expected to earn about $71 per month on average after the training. This suggests that Y2Y project coordinators probably reported a more accurate figure given beneficiary’s income expectations. UYF project coordinators probably
overstated youth beneficiaries’ income to make their organizations and project outcomes look good in the eyes of UN-Habitat and potential funding agencies.

As shown in Table 6.10 on page 323, UYF beneficiaries earned about $3 per month compared to about $32 per month for Y2Y beneficiaries. This was because UYF beneficiaries were “unemployed” before the project compared to Y2Y beneficiaries who were mostly farmers and self-employed youth. As a result, the monthly earning of UYF beneficiaries increased significantly after the project. Participation in Y2Y projects lowered the average earnings of most Y2Y beneficiaries but they expected to earn slightly more than what the UYF grantees were earning after the training.

The higher earnings for UYF beneficiaries probably reflect the differences in the viability of urban and rural based livelihood activities. The incomes of most Guinea Y2Y beneficiaries revolved around seasonal farming activities and that may have lowered their average monthly earnings. However, as shown in Table 6.10, an independent sample t-test indicated that there were no significant differences in average working space costs and earnings between UYF and Y2Y beneficiaries. Table 6.9 summarizes the comparative averages across questions of interest.
Table 6.9: Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund group statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey question</th>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Size</td>
<td>Y2Y</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20630.31</td>
<td>11512.587</td>
<td>1918.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UYF</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15117.61</td>
<td>6732.921</td>
<td>1209.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4a_Howmany_youth_have</td>
<td>Y2Y</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.58</td>
<td>34.115</td>
<td>6.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you_assisted_insecuring_employment</td>
<td>UYF</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>68.70</td>
<td>71.002</td>
<td>14.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4b_Number_who_are_women</td>
<td>Y2Y</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25.67</td>
<td>40.869</td>
<td>9.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UYF</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46.67</td>
<td>45.577</td>
<td>10.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5a_Howmany_youth_have</td>
<td>Y2Y</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26.27</td>
<td>25.904</td>
<td>7.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you_assisted_who_are_self_employed</td>
<td>UYF</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43.63</td>
<td>33.059</td>
<td>7.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5b_Number_who_are_women</td>
<td>Y2Y</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>8.787</td>
<td>2.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UYF</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.85</td>
<td>19.769</td>
<td>5.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7_About_how much are you</td>
<td>Y2Y</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37.14</td>
<td>19.591</td>
<td>7.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the_beneficiaries_paying_per_month</td>
<td>UYF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66.30</td>
<td>62.074</td>
<td>19.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12_About_how much are they</td>
<td>Y2Y</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62.59</td>
<td>26.235</td>
<td>6.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earning_monthly</td>
<td>UYF</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84.92</td>
<td>52.142</td>
<td>15.052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Based on SPSS summary statistics
Table 6.10: Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund beneficiary reported and expected monthly income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beneficiary type</th>
<th>(USD per month) income before the project started</th>
<th>(USD per month) current income</th>
<th>(USD per month) expected income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y2Y Mean</td>
<td>31.52</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>71.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>45.337</td>
<td>33.529</td>
<td>55.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UYF Mean</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>61.81</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>14.561</td>
<td>56.669</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td>27.46</td>
<td>28.60</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>43.553</td>
<td>39.937</td>
<td>55.847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Access to social capital**

The Y2Y program significantly promoted the creation of youth cooperatives more than the UYF program. For example, only one out of the 36 Y2Y grantees did not create youth cooperatives compared to 14 of the 31 UYF grantees. As noted in Chapter 5, the creation of youth cooperatives was a contractual requirement for Y2Y grantees. However, UYF grantees were not required to create youth cooperatives and most of their graduates worked as individuals after graduation. A chi-square test for independence indicated that there was a significant association between applicant type and the creation of youth cooperatives as shown in Table 6.11 below.
Table 6.11: Has your organization assisted youth beneficiaries to form cooperatives through the project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey question</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Applicant Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y2Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29 Has your organization been able to assist youth beneficiaries to form cooperatives through the project?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (2-sided)</th>
<th>Exact Sig. (1-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>17.220a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuity Correction</td>
<td>14.867</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio</td>
<td>19.435</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher's Exact Test</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of Valid Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.94.  
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Access to physical and natural capital

Most UYF project coordinators expressed that access to urban land was very difficult and expensive for youth. On the other hand, it is possible that Y2Y beneficiaries secured cheaper land from land owners in rural and semi-urban centers where access to land was reportedly not a major challenge.
Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund summary statistics

Table 6.12 presents an overview of statistical tests that I performed to compare the impacts of UYF and Y2Y projects. Significant and non-significant results are indicated with an “X” and p values (p ≤ 0.05) that yielded significant differences are shown in bold.

Table 6.12: Urban Youth Fund and Youth-to-Youth Fund Survey questions, measures, statistical tests and results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/research question</th>
<th>Outcome/measure</th>
<th>UYF-Y2Y grantees</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In what areas does your project focus? (Select all that apply.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Foci of projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence (p = 0.008)</td>
<td>X (agriculture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of training(s) has your organization given to young men and women in the past 12 months?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence (p = 0.008)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human capital</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many youth and women have you assisted in securing employment or entrepreneurship in the past 12 months?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent samples t-test (p = 0.014)</td>
<td>X (number of employed youth and women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many youth and women have you assisted who are self-employed?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent samples t-test (p = 0.015)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About how much are these young men and women earning monthly in their</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent samples t-test (p = 0.140)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has your organization provided cash loans to youth through the project?</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>( p = .034 )</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of jobs are the young men and women you have trained or reached through the project doing? (Select all that apply.)</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>( p = .048, .016, .015, .044, .637 )</td>
<td>X (home-based enterprises; informal employment; campaigns; ICT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of working space or land are the youth you assisted using for their livelihood activities? (Select all that apply)</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the youth have licenses or contracts with land owners for the space(s) that they use?</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>( p = .185 )</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About how much are youth beneficiaries paying per month in total for the livelihood space or land?</td>
<td>Independent samples t-test</td>
<td>( p = .252 )</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your organization been able to provide youth beneficiaries with the materials and equipment they need to start their businesses through the</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence</td>
<td>( p = .137 )</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.12 (con’t.)
Table 6.12 (con’t.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project?</th>
<th>What kind of working space or land are the youth you assisted using for their livelihood activities? (Select all that apply)</th>
<th>Chi-square test for independence ( (p = .565, .905, .257, .623, .243, \ldots) )</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has your organization been able to assist youth beneficiaries to form cooperatives, support groups, or associations in the past 12 months?</td>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence ( (p = .000) )</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>What challenges did your organization face in the past 12 months (Select all that apply.)</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence ( (p = .001, .048, .004) )</td>
<td>X (Inadequate funding, late disbursement of funds, and uncommitted partners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your organization been able to partner with any other organization through the project in the past 12 months?</td>
<td>Partnerships and capacity building</td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence ( (p = .279) )</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence ( (p = .000) )</td>
<td>X (Commercial Bank)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is your project still</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-square test for independence ( (p = .249, .649, .343, .619, \ldots) )</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Whom did you partner with? |
| What kind of partnership emerged between your organization and the partner(s) |
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The quantitative findings indicate that the Y2Y program was strong in strengthening of youth access to social capital through cooperatives. On the other hand, UYF beneficiaries significantly engaged in home-based enterprises, informal employment, educational campaigns, and ICT related jobs. Urban Youth Fund projects also created a significantly higher number of self-employment opportunities for young women compared to the Y2Y. In terms of partnerships, UYF were more likely to partner with commercial banks in the provision of youth start-up capital compared to the Y2Y fund.

In the next sections, I present a discussion and interpretation of findings using the sustainable livelihoods lens and the decent livelihood principles. I also reflect on the implications of findings for sustainable urban development planning and management in the context of Sub-Saharan Africa. I particularly focus on the implications of youth-led livelihood programs for spatial planning and the informal economy challenge. I also discuss the implications of youth-led
livelihood interventions on youth and gender mainstreaming in urban planning, development and management processes. Finally, I present the contributions and limitations of research findings.

**Discussion and interpretation of findings**

**Integration of sustainable livelihood principles in projects**

In the new understandings of poverty through the sustainable livelihood framework, wealth as an objective is replaced by well-being and employment in jobs by livelihood (Chambers, 1995:173). From Chambers’ perspective, poverty is understood not only as lack of income, but also low or inadequate livelihood assets. Understanding urban poverty from this angle implies a reorientation of development thinking and a new paradigm necessitating that poor people take a lead in defining and addressing their poverty, deprivation, ill-being, powerlessness and vulnerability (Chambers, 1995; Moser, 1998; Moser, 2007; Moser, 1993; Moser, 2008). The new development paradigm thus denotes putting the last first or the first last (Chambers & White, 1997). Sustainable livelihood development interventions demand that poverty conceptualization and measurement embrace both monetary and non-monetary approaches (Satterthwaite, 2002). The sustainable livelihood framework acknowledges that income and consumption measures fail to capture elements of urban poverty manifested through low levels of physical, human and social assets (Rakodi & Lloyd-Jones, 2002; Mitlin, 2003). The main principles of sustainable livelihood development interventions described in Chapter 2 include the promotion of holistic development, people-centered development, building on poor people’s strengths, dynamic livelihood development interventions, macro-micro linkages between national and local governments and sustainable development. This section discusses the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y embraced these sustainable livelihood principles.
The UYF and Y2Y program and projects promoted the principles of sustainable livelihoods in several ways. They promoted **holistic development** through funding multiple livelihood projects, that is, skills development, youth employment and entrepreneurship, environmental education, young women’s empowerment, waste recycling and management, among others. The challenge funds promoted people-centered development through a bottom up approach that allowed youth to define their own innovative projects. UN-Habitat and YEN did not dictate the type of projects but they specified the kinds of projects that they would fund and set maximum grant amounts. As observed in Chapter 4 and 5, some youth-led organizations could not meet their project goals because the grant they received was inadequate. By having a final say on the grant amounts for youth projects, UN-Habitat and YEN limited the extent to which people-centered development was realized.

Through the identification of registered youth-led organizations with the most innovative ideas and local partnerships, UN-Habitat and YEN **built on the existing strengths** of youth. One strength of the sustainable livelihood framework is that it views people as resources and central actors in development projects. This is contrary to the traditional view of poor people as being dependent, vulnerable and in need of help. YEN and UN-Habitat acknowledge youth as resources through the provision of grants and capacity building of youth-led organizations with the most creative solutions to youth employment challenges. By supporting youth entrepreneurs, they promoted an asset-based approach to development that places youth assets at the center of youth employment creation programs.

Another sustainable livelihood principle that was promoted by UYF and Y2Y was **dynamic development** through mid-term and final project requirements. Urban Youth Fund and
Y2F grantees worked in close collaboration with UN-Habitat and YEN, respectively, to document progress reports, challenges, lessons and recommendations. The mid-term and final project reports allowed for a **two-way communication** between funders and grantees even though some UYF reports were incomplete. As noted in previous comparisons, feedback through monitoring and evaluation was strong in the Y2Y program compared to the UYF. Through the Y2Y, YEN officials conducted a series of mid-term and final project visits, interviewed beneficiaries and project coordinators. They documented findings in mid-term and final reports and made specific recommendations for individual grantees. The promotion of dynamic development was relatively weak in the UYF program. In contrast to the Y2Y, UN-Habitat relied heavily on self-reporting by grantees and only conducted minimum field visits. This was because the UYF is spread out across the world while the Y2Y is concentrated in West Africa. As a result, most UYF grantees recommended extensive **monitoring and evaluation** by UN-Habitat to enhance communication and constant feedback between grantees, beneficiaries and UN-Habitat. In this study, I interviewed youth project coordinators who shared their project implementation experiences, lessons, challenges and recommendations to funding agencies. I will share results from this study with UN-Habitat, YEN, youth-led organizations and funding agencies to promote dynamic development.

The promotion of **macro-micro linkages** was another central sustainable livelihood principle that was promoted by both the UYF and Y2Y projects. As noted in Chapter 5, most Y2Y projects fostered strong partnerships with local governments and community members. Through the partnerships, youth-led organizations secured important resources such as land. The youth projects also promoted community development through the creation of small businesses that benefited community members and contributed to local economic development efforts at the
municipal level and poverty reduction at the national government level. However, partnerships with national government were rarely achieved or sought in most Y2Y projects. The lack of effective partnerships with national government limited the extent to which local youth-led projects translated into national development efforts. However, micro-macro linkages were evident in some UYF projects. For example, the YAI-Uganda beneficiaries benefited from a government youth fund after graduation. In Nigeria, the success of the FOH project saw improved relations between the organization and the Nigerian Government. In Ghana, the NORPRA project involved close collaboration between youth beneficiaries and government ministries in the area of urban governance and youth access to finance. NORPRA promoted youth access to microfinance in line with the government’s youth participation, entrepreneurship and employment drives. These examples, and others presented in Chapter 4 and 5, indicate that UYF and Y2Y projects promoted micro-macro linkages to varying degrees depending on local circumstances and partnerships in place.

Last but not least, the principle of sustainable development was evident in the UYF and Y2Y programs but to a significantly lesser extent in the UYF program. The Y2Y program had strong project sustainability plans evidenced by the mandatory creation of youth cooperatives and plans for project replication during the third phase of the program. The creation of youth cooperatives promoted the economic and social sustainability of funded projects. Some UYF grantees also created revolving funds that fostered project sustainability in financial terms. The UYF and Y2Y both promoted environmental sustainability through the funding of waste management and environmental entrepreneurship projects. Environment projects also sought to promote social entrepreneurship as in the case of the Green Youth Entrepreneurs Project in Dakar, Senegal. As shown in Chapter 4 and 5, several recycling projects were also funded in big
cities as a means to promote youth employment and environmental hygiene. Institutional sustainability was promoted in both programs through partnerships with youth development stakeholders including local NGOs, international organizations, local governments and community members.

*The quest for enhanced youth livelihood assets*

At the centre of the DFID framework are the livelihood assets that the urban poor employ to withstand external shocks and vulnerabilities and to deal with the external structures and processes that impact on their livelihood strategies and desired outcomes (DFID, 1999). Proponents of the sustainable livelihood asset framework postulate that effective poverty-reduction strategies must begin with an understanding of poor people’s tangible and intangible assets or resource endowments (Brown, 2006; DFID, 1999; Rakodi & Lloyd-Jones, 2002). The livelihood asset approach is people-centered, viewing the urban poor as active agents in urban poverty-reduction efforts (Rakodi & Lloyd-Jones, 2002). The sustainable livelihoods approach is rooted in qualitative and participatory approaches to poverty conceptualization and measurement. According to Brown and Lloyd-Jones (2002), the availability of assets on its own is not sufficient—access to assets is vital for secure urban livelihoods.

Figure 18 illustrates the sustainable livelihoods framework. As shown in the previous section, the UYF and Y2Y programs built on youth’s assets and embraced a youth-centered approach to youth employment creation. The next section discusses the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y enhanced youth access to human, social, physical, financial and natural assets.
As shown in Chapter 4 and 5, the UYF and Y2Y programs facilitated youth access to financial capital through the provision of direct funding to youth-led organizations. Along with the grants, youth project coordinators received capacity building through project planning, management and implementation training (human capital). The youth project coordinators in turn used the project management training to provide skills training (human capital) to youth beneficiaries. Youth beneficiaries in turn created youth micro-enterprises which created youth employment opportunities and income (financial capital). In the case of the Y2Y program, most youth beneficiaries also created youth cooperatives that enhanced their financial and social

Source: Adapted from DFID (1999); Rakodi & Lloyd-Jones (2002)

Figure 19: The sustainable livelihoods framework for poverty reduction
capital. Also, in the process of setting up businesses, most youth accessed working space and planned urban space (physical capital) and rural agricultural land (natural capital). Through the projects, some grantees secured further funding to expand training activities (human capital) and expand their workspaces (physical capital). Most UYF and Y2Y grantees also formed technical partnerships that enhanced youth livelihood knowledge (human capital) and networks (social capital). As such, by giving grants to youth-led organizations, the UYF and Y2Y facilitated youth access to other livelihood assets. These programs illustrate DFID’s (1999) observation that access to one livelihood asset has the potential to enhance access to other assets.

**Financial capital**

According to DFID, increased financial capital is one of the central livelihood outcomes that low-income people seek to achieve. The fact that low-income people generally lack financial capital underscores the importance of other livelihood assets for those working in the informal economy. Depending on context, the urban poor can easily convert financial capital into other forms of assets and thus directly contribute to enhanced livelihood outcomes (DFID, 1999). As shown in the comparative sections, the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y facilitated youth access to financial capital through microcredit schemes and loans was limited by inadequate funding. Yet, in SSA, savings and micro-credit are particularly vital for women in their quest for sustainable income generation (Landman & Napier, 2010; Mills, 2007; Mitlin, 2008; Mitlin, 2010). Savings and credit schemes often afford the urban poor access to better quality housing and housing improvement (DFID, 1999; Satterthwaite, 2002a). Poor women often find it more difficult to access and control credit compared to poor men (DFID, 1999). In some cases, microcredit and savings schemes help the urban poor to mobilize themselves to participate in local decision making processes (Satterthwaite, 2002a). It is too early to fully assess the impact
of UYF revolving funds on youth access to credit. Data was also not available to determine the impact of Y2Y cooperatives on youth access to saving schemes and microcredit facilities.

**Human capital**

Human capital denotes poor people’s skills, physical strength and health status, that together contribute to desired urban livelihood strategies and outcomes (DFID, 1999). Even though the accumulation of human capital was mostly achieved by UYF and Y2Y programs through capacity building workshops on project management and various skills training to youth beneficiaries, it was not always easy for young women. As noted in Chapter 4, in countries such as Nigeria, young women required the approval of their parents and husbands to participate in UYF project training. This is in line with previous studies that showed that parents in SSA still prefer to educate a boy to a girl (Sharif, 1998), and that unlike boys, girls are considered a valuable asset for unpaid domestic chores (Chant & Jones, 2005).

**Physical capital**

Access to secure shelter is an important physical asset for the informal urban poor, both as a productive and reproductive space (Payne, 2002). According to Payne, access to secure housing in the right location, with easy access to sources of employment and public amenities, is a precondition for survival and success in the urban informal economy. As shown in Chapter 4, UYF beneficiaries depended on home-based enterprises even after the training because they could not secure working space in CBDs. The UYF funded projects that promoted access to secure housing such as the FITZ project in Zimbabwe and CYM in Zambia. Some UYF beneficiaries such the CYM project graduates established housing construction companies after graduation. Through the UYF and Y2Y projects, grantees and youth beneficiaries also received materials, equipment and startup toolkits that boosted youth access to physical capital.
Besides access to housing and public space, adequate public transportation and secure shelter, access to infrastructural services such as water and energy is also crucial for those working in the informal economy (Ali, 2002; Harpham & Grant, 2002). The Y2Y CPYO facilitated youth and community access to water points through a borehole repair and water purification project. The AHEAD implemented a solar energy charging station to promote community access to electricity. According to DFID (1999), lack of access to water and energy is a central component of urban poverty. In the absence of water and electricity connection, the urban poor lose considerable time in non-productive activities, travelling long distances in search of firewood and water. Access to public transportation to and from project sites was a serious problem for Y2Y grantees in Sierra Leone and Guinea. Yet, low-income people rely heavily on public transportation to and from work (Mbara & Maunder, 1997). Previous studies have shown that limited access to public transportation, especially in cities, restricts the urban poor’s participation in livelihood activities by constraining access to customer and product markets (Mbara & Maunder, 1997).

Social capital

Social capital is considered a vital component of the poor’s livelihood strategies. According to Meikle (2002), social capital develops through associations based on gender and age, religion, political views, neighborhood, kinship, employment, savings and credit groups and links with CSOs. In positive terms, social capital helps the poor in accessing land, trading places start-up capital, among other things. In negative terms, social capital may mean exclusion of the urban poor from participation in the informal economy based on ethnic, kinship, social and political networks (Phillips, 2002). According to Philips (2002), social capital in the form of informal networks and associations facilitates the urban poor’s access financial resources.
Through the Y2Y created cooperatives, youth beneficiaries gained access to new friends, employment groups and networks. Y2Y beneficiaries also reported that the cooperatives strengthened their relationship with village friends as they spent more time together. By working in groups, Y2Y and also UYF beneficiaries gained access to land and working spaces. The EYA project beneficiaries in Ethiopia acquired startup capital through the Responsive Scholarship Seed Fund only when they worked in groups. The EYA also provided materials and equipment to youth beneficiaries who worked in groups.

The macro-level role of youth cooperatives, youth groups and networks was not clear from the analysis. Even though the creation of youth cooperatives was the central component of the Y2Y program, it was not clear how the youth cooperatives facilitated youth participation in livelihood decision making processes and external threats and policies that impacted on youth entrepreneurs. The development of youth discussion forums, networks and resource centers was also a central feature in some UYF projects. The discussion forums allowed youth to share ideas and youth employment information. However, the role of the information and discussion forums in facilitating youth participation in local and national decision making processes was not apparent. As a result, the role of youth cooperatives and discussion forums in promoting micro-macro linkages was not apparent. This could be the focus of a future study.

**Natural capital**

Natural capital generally refers to naturally existing resource stocks from which the urban poor can derive livelihoods (DFID, 1999). In the sustainable livelihood framework, natural capital is strongly impacted by external vulnerability factors such as droughts, earthquakes and air pollution. One debatable aspect in the literature is whether or not natural capital exists at all in...
According to Payne (2002), in urban areas, land is best treated as a physical asset as opposed to natural capital applicable to rural areas. The comparative analysis has shown that the promotion of youth access to natural capital was strong in Y2Y agricultural projects. For example, FJS and BaCUDA projects focused on giant African snail farming and promoted youth and community access to a natural source of meat; KEYDA trained youth in sustainable beekeeping project that facilitated youth and community access to wild honey; GUIDE project trained youth in commercial exploitation of the Moringa tree; and AVGRN launched a reforestation project to promote youth employment. These projects and others facilitated youth access to natural resources in rural and semi-urban areas of Guinea and Sierra Leone.

Urban agricultural projects launched through the UYF and Y2Y challenges the assertion that natural capital is insignificant or irrelevant in urban areas (see Rakodi & Lloyd-Jones, 2002). According to the DFID, access to natural capital in urban areas is gendered—women and men have differential access to natural capital, with men commanding better access than women (DFID, 1999). This was evident in Guinea Y2Y projects where the majority of youth farmers were married young men.

One debatable aspect that emerged from the Y2Y analysis relates to the extent to which rural land can be considered a natural asset for youth. Whereas access to land was not a major challenge faced by youth farmers in Guinea and Sierra Leone, the land acquisition process was often lengthy and costly. Youth beneficiary farmers signed contracts with adult land owners after paying stipulated fees. It was clear that most youth did not own land and that land was mostly in the hands of adults. Whilst this is not a new finding, the challenges faced by youth in accessing
rural land raises a broader question on the extent to which land can be considered a “natural resource” for youth. The term natural resource inaccurately suggests or assumes easy access and abundance, which was not always the case for unmarried youth and female Y2Y beneficiaries. In the comparative section, there was no significant association between program type and access to land challenges. Y2Y rural youth beneficiaries experienced delayed land access, just as the UYF beneficiaries could not access land for self-employment in cities. These findings suggest that funding agencies and youth-led projects should not underestimate the challenges that rural youth experience in accessing land for farming and livelihood activities.

**The role of planning policies and practices**

As shown in Figure 6.1 above, the livelihood assets of the poor are impacted by the external policy, institutional and process environment which may facilitate or hinder people’s access to livelihood assets. For example, the FITZ youth entrepreneurs benefited from positive City of Mutare policies that facilitated access to workspace, urban land and building permits. However, access was difficult and time consuming for some grantees and youth beneficiaries. In Cameroon, the Initiative for Youth Employment and Development Project relocated to peri-urban Bamenda after the city council increased rental charges in the CBD. In Nigeria, gender discrimination policies made it difficult for FOH and G2Mi beneficiaries to access public workspaces in central cities. As a result, most young women beneficiaries engaged in home-based enterprises. Particularly for UYF projects, access to urban land and workspace was hindered by rigid spatial planning processes, laws, policies and the institutional and regulatory framework governing access to and use of urban space. For example, the VICYOMO project was disrupted after the Limbe City Council abruptly implemented bylaws that made temporary
VICYOMO project structures illegal and up for eviction. In that case, youth access to physical, economic and social capital was disrupted.

The lending policies of banks also made it difficult for most youth beneficiaries to access startup capital for their businesses. In most cases, banks required collateral that youth did not have. In Ethiopia, the Endurance Youth Association youth beneficiaries combined collateral to access loans and in some cases, family members or other youth members provided collateral for those who did not have it. Corruption and bureaucracy tendencies at most Nigerian banks also prevented FOH and G2Mi beneficiaries from accessing business loans. In Cameroon, local and central government officials were reportedly too corrupt to help UYF grantees and beneficiaries access land, loans and government funds. As a result, UYF grantees in Cameroon relied heavily on external funding opportunities and self-financing to implement projects.

**The impact of the vulnerability context on youth access to livelihood assets**

Urban Youth Fund and Y2Y entrepreneurs were also negatively impacted by shocks from seasonality, price fluctuations and the rain season. As shown in Chapter 5, a review of Sierra Leone mid-term reports revealed that some Y2Y projects were hindered by seasonality factors that prevented them from operating during the rain season. Unexpected price increases also hindered the success of some Y2Y and UYF projects as the grantees could not purchase the required training materials and equipment, resulting in reduced enrolment and brief training sessions. When this happened, youth beneficiary’s access to human, economic, physical and human capital was minimized. However, youth beneficiaries devised positive and collaborative strategies to minimize the negative impacts of price increases and seasonality effects. As shown in Chapter 5, most Y2Y beneficiaries in Guinea engaged in farming during the rain season but
shifted to other self-employment activities during off-farm seasons. Most Guinea beneficiaries were already young farmers who earned an income before the project. However, they chose to participate in Y2Y projects as a means to increase their employment opportunities and to supplement their income from farming activities. These were important coping mechanisms that allowed the beneficiaries to withstand the shocks.

**The quest for decent youth employment creation**

One of the central questions that this study sought to address was the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y created decent and sustainable employment opportunities for youth in low-income SSA communities. As shown in the preceding discussions, the UYF and Y2Y promoted sustainable livelihood principles and access to livelihood assets in many ways. The creation of employment opportunities per se does not guarantee access to decent and sustainable employment using the ILO decent work principles. According to the ILO (2005), decent work for youth implies the promotion of freedom of association and social dialogue; access to secure workspace free from harassment and eviction (land and tenure rights); gender equality in youth employment creation; access to decent income over and above poverty datum lines; and the promotion of full-time permanent livelihood opportunities as opposed to temporary or part-time employment opportunities. This section summarizes the promotion of decent work principles in UYF and Y2Y projects to assess the extent to which decent work principles were realized.

**Freedom of association and social dialogue**

The Y2Y and UYF promoted freedom of association among youth through the creation of cooperatives, youth groups, discussion forums and networks. However, as noted earlier on,
there was limited evidence suggesting that the cooperatives and networks facilitated youth participation and higher level social dialogue in youth employment policies and practices. The dialogue was mostly between grantees and youth beneficiaries concerning the immediate needs of youth cooperatives and groups. For example, there was no evidence of social dialogue between UYF youth groups and local government authorities in Cameroon when grantees faced relocation and evictions. There were a few exceptions. The NORPRA project in Ghana facilitated meetings and discussion forums between youth beneficiaries, government officials and banking institutions. The TDFY’s Vijana Forum online portal facilitated national youth dialogue on youth employment creation. The forum also allowed young Tanzanians living in the Diaspora to participate in youth livelihood and development discussions. The FOH also worked closely with local and national government to address youth employment challenges in Bono State, Nigeria.

**Secure workspace provision**

Access to secure workspace and land was a challenge for most UYF and Y2Y beneficiaries. As shown in previous quantitative comparative section, UYF beneficiaries who accessed workspace paid considerably higher rental charges. This was despite the fact that most beneficiaries did not have contracts or licenses with land owners. For example, the G2Mi young female beneficiaries paid up to $100 per month to slum landlords in Port Harcourt (Nigeria) even though they were frequently evicted by the landlords.

Access to secure workspace was particularly a challenge for most UYF female beneficiaries as most of them engaged in home-based enterprises. As shown in the quantitative comparative section, UYF beneficiaries more often engaged significantly in informal employment and home-based enterprises compared to Y2Y beneficiaries. This implies that most
UYF female beneficiaries did not engage in decent work after the training. According to the ILO (2002), decent work deficits are most pronounced in the informal economy where youth are underpaid despite working for long hours. In the formal economy, most youth also engage in temporary and often precarious livelihood activities with limited social protection, representation and rights (ILO, 2002; 2005). Most UYF beneficiaries reported that they were not earning enough income because the work that they did was temporary. On the other hand, some Y2Y beneficiaries had their contracts with land owners revoked abruptly following conflicts with land owners and adult farmers. Overall, it was encouraging that about 75% of Y2Y beneficiaries expected full-time employment after the training and a majority of UYF beneficiaries aspired to open up new businesses that would generate permanent self-employment opportunities.

**Young women’s employment**

The decent work agenda also implies the promotion of sustainable employment opportunities for young females. As shown Chapter 1, young females are more likely to engage in informal employment compared to young males. They are also more likely to earn significantly less than young males (ILO, 2002). This is because young females tend to engage in low-risk informal livelihoods and home-based enterprises that pay little to no income. Previous studies have also shown that young females tend to have low educational levels compared to young men and that they tend to be concentrated in unpaid household chores and childcare activities (Chant & Jones, 2005). On the other hand, young males tend to engage in high-risk informal livelihoods in prime urban locations where they earn significantly higher than their female counterparts. Most UYF and Y2Y projects included young women’s empowerment as one of their goals and this was especially true for UYF grantees. For example, 53% of UYF beneficiaries were young females compared to 43% for Y2Y grantees. However, for Y2Y Sierra
Leone grantees, 63% of youth beneficiaries were young females. The number of young females was lower in Guinea where 62% of the beneficiaries were young males. Overall, both programs offered skills training opportunities that boosted young females’ access to practical skills, self-employment opportunities and financial independence. In the future, young women’s empowerment projects should shift young females’ livelihoods from part-time and home-based enterprises to full-time and permanent employment opportunities previously dominated by young males.

**Access to income**

Decent work for youth also implies the creation of employment opportunities that pay salaries over and above the minimum necessary for basic survival (ILO, 2005). As noted in Chapter 4, UYF beneficiary income increased significantly after the training. This was because most of the beneficiaries were drawn from slum areas where access to decent employment opportunities was previously rare. UYF beneficiaries reported that they did not have an income before they received the training and that UYF projects presented an opportunity for them to earn monthly income. It was difficult to make a firm conclusion on youth beneficiary income since UYF project coordinators reported higher youth earnings compared to what youth reported.

For Y2Y beneficiaries, those in Guinea gained supplementary off-farm income after receiving the training. However, as shown in Chapter 5, Sierra Leone beneficiaries lost income during the training as they could not continue with self-employment activities. Guinea beneficiaries were also engaged in multiple part-time employment activities especially during the off-farm seasons and that complicated youth’s path to decent income.

Overall, the analysis suggests that access to decent employment and income was possible for some beneficiaries after the training but it was complicated for most of them. However, most
youth beneficiaries expected permanent or full-time employment and higher income in the long-term, all of which are central decent work ingredients.

**Factors that complicated youth access to decent livelihoods**

Young men and women beneficiaries’ path to decent livelihoods was complicated by fundamental barriers to youth entrepreneurship and employment creation. As shown in the baseline analysis in Chapter 3, 4 and 5, youth entrepreneurship was a core component of the UYF and Y2Y programs. Youth entrepreneurship allowed youth to use their creativity and innovation to implement income generating projects. However, previous studies have shown that youth entrepreneurship promotion is a challenge in low-income countries. According to Schoof (2006), there are barriers including socio-cultural legitimacy and acceptance, access to finance, administrative and regulatory framework, among others that limit youth entrepreneurship in low-income communities. The factors that influence youth entrepreneurship are shown in Figure 19
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*Source: Schoof (2006)*

**Figure 20: Factors that influence youth entrepreneurship**
As shown in the introductory comparative section, it was sometimes difficult for UYF and Y2Y grantees to recruit youth into their projects because of negative youth and community attitudes towards entrepreneurship projects. Parents wanted their children to go through formal education because they considered it a more acceptable way for youth to secure respectable formal employment opportunities. There were also cultural barriers that prevented young women from participating in projects and informal employment opportunities in public places. Youth beneficiaries also experienced access to startup finance barriers even after receiving business creation and management training. Banks held negative attitudes towards youth businesses as they doubted the viability of youth-initiated businesses. Grantees that applied for startup finance on behalf of youth beneficiaries such as the FOH, waited for over a year before they received a response from the National Bank of Nigeria.

According to the ILO (2005), the regulatory and administrative framework is vital in creating conditions that enable youth employment creation and economic growth. This was not always possible for UYF and Y2Y grantees and beneficiaries. Some city councils disregarded property rights when they evicted youth and demolished their workspaces. The urban planning regulatory framework was also a hindrance to youth entrepreneurship and employment creation. Abrupt changes in planning legislation and standards resulted in the eviction of some grantees and youth beneficiaries in Cameroon. Bureaucratic tendencies in the issuing of project construction permits also delayed the implementation of some UYF and UYF projects.

On the other hand, some grantees expressed that it was difficult to offer entrepreneurship training to illiterate rural youth and urban slum youth. These grantees had to hire specialists to train the youth and it was an expensive and time consuming process. There
were also political and community unrests that disrupted Y2Y projects in Guinea and UYF projects in Nigeria.

These fundamental youth entrepreneurship challenges limited the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y created decent and sustainable youth employment opportunities. However, youth entrepreneurs devised collaborative ways to overcome the challenges. In most cases, youth enthusiasm and motivation kept the youth on track. This is in line with the ILO’s 2005 observation that young women and men bring enthusiasm, hope and new ideas; willingness to learn and be taught; openness to new skills and technology; realistic expectations; adaptability; among other traits to the labor market. As shown in Chapter 5, even inadequate transportation facilities and lack of transparency and miscommunication from grantees could not discourage continued youth participation in Y2Y projects.

Towards a sustainable youth-led livelihood development framework for rural and urban Africa

In the preceding sections, I discussed the extent to which the UYF and Y2Y programs promoted sustainable livelihood principles, access to livelihood assets and decent employment opportunities. It was clear from the discussions that the promotion of livelihood principles and access to assets and decent work was hindered by cultural barriers, administrative and regulatory frameworks, access to finance, limited entrepreneurship training, and external shocks.

Given the findings from Chapter 4 and 5, the comparative assessments and preceding discussions, I propose a bottom-up sustainable youth-led livelihood development framework that begins with a firm collaboration between several youth development stakeholders as shown in Figure 20 below. The framework suggests that funding agencies should first understand the limits to youth-led development imposed by existing transforming structures and processes.
and the **vulnerability** context. Failure to fully consider the external factors that may hinder or facilitate youth access to livelihood assets limited the extent to which some UYF and Y2Y projects enhanced youth access to livelihood assets. A sustainable youth-led livelihood development framework implies that funding agencies, local and national governments, youth organizations, NGOs, community members, and youth entrepreneurs should work collaboratively to identify and implement **context-sensitive** projects. For example, youth-led NGOs and funding agencies can partner with local and national governments to support informally employed youth through adequate provision of urban public space and infrastructural services (physical capital). Vocational, entrepreneurial and life skills training and non-formal educational programs can be collaboratively offered to uneducated youth to enhance their employment skills. Having livelihood assets in the form of physical, financial, social and human capital can allow low-income people to withstand external vulnerabilities, shocks and policy processes that threaten their livelihood assets and strategies (DFID, 1999, Rakodi & Lloyd-Jones; Brown, 2006).

On the other hand, youth-led organizations should also plan for unexpected disruptions that are often generated by transforming structures and processes and also the vulnerability context. A sustainable youth-led livelihood development framework implies that youth employ a combination of assets to positively influence transforming structures and processes and to adequately prepare for unexpected events from the vulnerability context. In addition to the five traditional livelihood assets (human, financial, physical, social, and natural capital), I propose a youth-led livelihood framework that acknowledges the important role of youth access to **Information and Communication Technologies** (ICTs) in the 21st Century. The ICTs projects implemented by UYF grantees suggested that access to ICTs such as computers and internet
access is now a central livelihood asset that cannot be adequately captured in traditional livelihood asset categories. The role played by social media such as Facebook and twitter in North Africa’s “Arab Spring” suggests that development agencies can potentially harness ICTs to enhance youth access to training and livelihood opportunities. As such, I propose ICTs as a sixth livelihood asset that requires particular consideration in future youth-led livelihood projects.

The sustainable youth-led livelihood framework also implies that low-income youth engage in **multiple livelihood strategies** to meet their livelihood goals and outcomes. As shown in Chapters 4 and 5, UYF and Y2Y grantees proposed youth empowerment projects that promoted broad goals beyond fundamental income goals. The broad goals included an enhancement of **non-financial** livelihood assets that youth employ to promote **decent jobs, well being, community development, sustainable development** and **poverty reduction**. Still, the realization of livelihood goals and outcomes is depended upon the existing transforming structures and processes and the vulnerability context. When youth succeed in meeting their livelihood goals and outcomes, their livelihood strategies and assets are also strengthened in the process. Enhanced youth livelihoods assets have the potential to positively influence the transforming structures and processes and to minimize negative impacts generated for the external vulnerability context. Figure 20 shows the resultant sustainable youth-led livelihood development framework for low-income youth in the context of informal SSA rural and urban economies.
Source: Modified from DFID (1999); Rakodi & Lloyd-Jones (2002); Chingunta et al (2005)

**Figure 21: The sustainable youth-led livelihood development framework**

In this study, the Y2Y and UYF represent an attempt by external development agencies (YEN and UN-Habitat) to enhance the livelihoods assets of low-income youth through the provision of financial resources to youth-led NGOs. Low-income people working in the informal economy including youth are often vulnerable to external shocks arising from evictions, insecure land tenure, inadequate land rights and civil wars as in the context of West Africa. Cultural beliefs and practices also hinder the extent to which young women can benefit from youth-led
projects or engage in decent livelihood opportunities. Negative youth and community attitudes towards entrepreneurship and self-employment opportunities hinder youth access to training and livelihood opportunities. Despite the fundamental challenges to decent youth livelihoods, low-income youth employ livelihood assets at their disposal to realize desired livelihood outcomes.

The revised sustainable youth-led livelihood development framework is anchored in a full understanding and acknowledgement of the broader context in which youth-led livelihoods occur. The new framework also implies that funding agencies and youth development stakeholders should collaboratively enhance non-financial livelihood assets to promote sustainable youth employment, decent work, community development and poverty-reduction. In the revised framework, youth-led NGOs, local and national governments, youth ministries, community members and international development organizations work collaboratively to identify and implement youth livelihood programs.

**The role of transforming structures and processes**

Transforming structures and processes include key actors in urban governance such as national and local government, NGOs and international development organizations, CBOs and associations, informal networks and associations, and community members. In most, if not all African countries, the provision of basic services has been delegated to lower levels of government through decentralization policies and programs (Owusu et al, 2012). However, the effectiveness of decentralization at the local or city level has been limited by inadequate financial resources and central government interference (Goodfellow, 2012). Decentralization initiatives were meant to foster people’s participation in urban governance and to ensure accountability and transparency at the local level. The challenge has been lack of institutionalized structures to facilitate people’s participation in decision making processes and service provision (Goodfellow,
In Uganda for example, the effectiveness of non-state actors has been limited because important decisions are still made at the central government level (Goodfellow, 2012). In Zimbabwe, the 2005 nationwide eviction campaign was a decision made at the national government level for implementation at the local government level.

NGOs are an important non-state actor at the local government level. Informal groups often work in collaboration with NGOs and international organizations to deliver services such as recycling and waste management (Lindell & Utas, 2012). Whilst NGOs often advocate the inclusion of informal groups in urban governance, they can also work as agents of central government and international funding agencies (Meagher, 2013). By working as agents of global development organizations, NGOs can impose global interests on low-income people, undermining the genuine needs of the people they purport to represent (Meagher, 2013).

CBOs and community members can be very powerful as in West Africa. Community members own land and they can allocate land to developers without the knowledge of city authorities and without any regard to planning regulations and policies. Formal planning systems always lag behind informal developments in many West African cities (Owusu et al, 2012). In Ghana, chiefs approve most land deals in urban and peri-urban Accra where they rarely consult land use planning regulations before development projects are implemented (Owusu et al, 2012). As a result, powerful urban land owners have made it difficult for urban planners to enforce land use and zoning regulations in cities such as Accra. In Accra, land acquisition is mostly through customary arrangements and the role of local government has been limited to the issuance of development permits (Owusu et al, 2012).

Despite political interferences, urban spatial planning remains an important component of the transforming structures and processes. Studies show that urban spatial planning can either
hinder or promote the full participation of youth in urban economies. Planning designates zones for various economic activities in cities through zoning and land use planning. Through zoning and land use planning, informal employment activities are barred from designated residential, commercial, industrial, open spaces and most public spaces (Brown, 2006; Rakodi & Lloyd-Jones, 2002). By extension, land use planning defines property rights and denies the urban poor access to most city spaces (Hansen, 2005; Hansen, 2010; Kamete, 2010).

Informal networks and associations can facilitate or hinder poor people’s access to livelihood resources. In urban Africa, informal associations do not necessarily represent the interests of the poor because they are sometimes infiltrated by corrupt elites and public officials. Poor people can also be excluded from informal livelihood associations based on gender, ethnicity, age and income (Lindell & Utas, 2012). In some countries such as Nigeria, informal associations have enriched elite members and trapped low-income members in cycles of dependency and marginal informal activities (Nzeadibe & Anyadike, 2012). In Uganda, corruption among leaders of informal associations has made it difficult for poor people to participate in local decision making processes (Goodfellow, 2012). In Kampala, President Museveni has infiltrated informal groups in an attempt to secure votes from them. As a result, informal groups often approach the President directly with their grievances, rendering decisions by the Kampala City Council useless. The Ugandan President and local politicians have effectively protected informal groups from eviction by the Kampala City Council. However, those who do not belong to informal groups aligned to the President remain excluded from important livelihood decisions and their livelihoods are insecure from eviction and harassment (Goodfellow, 2012). Political interference has limited the role of urban planners in enforcing spatial planning and zoning legislations in Kampala (Goodfellow, 2012). In Kigali, most
informal groups have clear communication channels with the Kigali City Council and that has allowed the council to promptly address informal economy grievances (Goodfellow, 2012). In Nairobi, Addis Ababa, and Goma (Democratic Republic of Congo), informal associations regulate important sectors of the urban economy such as transportation services, solid waste management and trade (Lindell & Utas, 2012).

The above discussion suggests that the creation of UYF and Y2Y youth networks and associations may not be adequate on its own. The UYF and Y2Y created networks will need the support of politicians to effectively advocate for youth entrepreneurs’ needs. The above examples also show that there are no institutionalized structures to engage youth associations and networks. This suggests that youth-led organizations should not simply create youth networks but they should also advocate for their institutionalization and recognition in local governance. Exclusion and inclusion based on gender, age, income and ethnicity will also need to be addressed for inclusive youth livelihoods. There are also many non-state actors that bear on youth access to livelihood assets beyond local and national government. In West Africa, community land owners have an important bearing on youth access to land and spatial planning.

The implications of youth-led livelihood programs for sustainable urban development planning and management in Sub-Saharan Africa

The participation of youth and women in urban development planning and management policies is vital in SSA, where children and youth represent the largest population group living in poverty (UN-Habitat, 2013; UN-Habitat, 2010; World Bank, 2009; Urban Management Program, 2003). The traditional view of youth as the future neglects the important political and economic contributions being made by youth in the present day in SSA (United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, 2009). The UYF and Y2Y youth-led development approaches view
youth as assets and acknowledge the potential role of youth–led projects in youth employment creation and sustainable urbanization. In the next sub-sections, I discuss specific youth-led livelihood development implications for sustainable urban development planning and management in Sub-Saharan Africa.

**Youth participation in urban youth employment creation**

According to Miller (2004), city governments have a comparative advantage in urban job creation in four areas: the regulatory environment, the informal economy, investment policies and their ability to create local employment alliances. City governments have a unique opportunity in their ability to employ **regulatory frameworks** to improve young people’s employment prospects (Kuiper & van der Ree, 2005; S. Miller, 2004). They can create a flexible regulatory framework that fosters youth entrepreneurship and employment creation. Young people will benefit from urban policies favoring informal employment given their disproportionate share in informal employment activities (Miller, 2004). Specifically, urban planning policies and processes can either hinder or facilitate young people’s access to livelihood assets in the informal economy (Kuiper & van der Ree, 2005; Rakodi & Lloyd-Jones, 2002; Rakodi & Leduka, 2004).

Youth-led entrepreneurship and employment creation has important **spatial planning** and development implications for local and city government authorities. The sustainable livelihoods framework implies that planning policies and processes are part of the local-level transforming structures and processes that define the livelihood strategies of the urban poor. The regulatory framework for planning has a strong and direct bearing on the livelihood assets of the urban poor: urban administrative procedures or processes set out the path for land delivery processes
and planning standards dictate the type of the built environment expected, while regulations also set out what land uses are permitted and prohibited on a given piece of land (UN-Habitat, 2009; Watson, 2009; Lusugga, 2006). The urban livelihoods framework calls for urban policy approaches that enable the urban poor to supplement their human and social capital through improved access to physical capital (Brown & Lloyd-Jones, 2002). Urban planning processes can enhance access to physical capital by creating supportive regulations on zoning, plot development, public health by-laws and vendors’ licensing practices (Brown & Lloyd-Jones, 2002).

There are several ways in which planning policies and processes can positively promote youth employment opportunities through the UYF and Y2Y programs. Urban planners and managers should avoid evictions and relocations because they destroy youth access to physical, social and financial assets. Instead, they can develop flexible zoning and land use regulations, planning standards and procedures that facilitate youth access to land and public transportation systems.

The central task for urban planners and managers in SSA is to harness youth interests, creativity and innovation towards decent youth employment opportunities and harmonious urban development. To achieve this goal, urban land use planning and development should never be employed as an instrument of repression and oppression against youth entrepreneurs and other marginalized groups.

**Integrated rural and urban development**

The Y2Y program funded rural-based youth-led projects that created employment opportunities for rural youth. The creation of youth employment opportunities for rural youth
addresses rural-urban migration challenges and fostered rural-urban connections. These are critical urban development and management challenges in SSA.

Urban and peri-urban agricultural projects implemented by Y2Y and UYF grantees have important implications for sustainable urban development and management in SSA. Urban agriculture has long been identified as a central urbanization challenge in SSA. The promotion of youth agricultural projects in urban and peri-urban areas implies that urban land use policies should embrace such youth projects through adequate land provisions and agricultural permits. However, urban land is highly prized in most parts of SSA. City governments should therefore facilitate youth access to urban land at a minimum or zero cost to promote viable farming activities. Peri-urban farming also has implications for urban expansion and it requires that urban planning authorities balance the need for more housing with the need for youth employment creation through urban farming. Peri-urban farming also fosters rural and urban connections that potentially promote viable youth self-employment opportunities.

The Y2Y directly promoted rural and urban connections through rural-based youth-led initiatives. Rural-based projects created decent jobs for rural youth and curbed rural-urban migration in the process. The creation of rural youth employment opportunities promote balanced economic development between rural and urban areas and fosters an integrated rural and urban development framework (Tacoli, 2007). Potentially, this is an important way to achieve sustainable urban development.

**Partnerships and capacity building in urban service provision and management**

The UYF programs also facilitated partnerships between youth-led organizations, city councils, national governments, NGOs, and the private sector. Through the UYF and Y2Y
programs, youth implemented waste management and recycling projects with implications for urban management and service provision in low-income communities. The challenge for city governments and urban planning and management officials is to fully engage the youth cooperatives in the development of informal economy, land use planning and investment policies that directly impact youth livelihoods and urban development processes.

The waste management and recycling projects implemented by youth entrepreneurs addressed an important urban management challenge in SSA. Some of the recycling projects saw the emergence of partnerships between youth groups and city councils. For example, the Voi Youth Forum partnered with the Voi City Council in Kenya and launched a successful recycling project that created jobs for slum youth. There is an excellent opportunity for city governments to partner with youth-led organizations to address urban waste management challenges, especially in slum areas. Such partnerships would legitimize and encourage environmental and social entrepreneurship in low-income communities. City governments are clearly in a better position to craft legislation that supports youth-driven recycling and waste management entrepreneurship initiatives. The analysis of UYF and Y2Y projects has shown limited partnerships arrangements between local governments and youth entrepreneurs in this regard. Yet, this is a promising avenue to promote environmental hygiene, urban health and local government service delivery capacity.

As shown in Chapter 4 and 5, there were limited partnerships between youth entrepreneurs and city governments. Youth entrepreneurs reported city-initiated evictions in Cameroon and there were common delays in the issuing of construction and business permits by local government officials. In some cases, it was impossible for youth entrepreneurs to secure
land ownership permits from local governments. City governments can potentially harness youth creativity and innovation in urban youth employment creation by speeding up the issuance of permits to youth businesses.

Local and national governments are too often positioned to expand and replicate youth-led projects in collaboration with external funding agencies or single-handedly. The partnership between Blantyre City Council and the CYO in Malawi is a good financial partnership example that can be emulated in other cities. Through the ICT for Youth Development Project, Blantyre City Council trained CYO staff in financial management. As the CYO focused on project implementation, the Blantyre City Council managed the project finances whilst offering further financial management training to CYO staff.

**Gender mainstreaming in urban development and management processes**

Youth-led livelihood development projects also present a unique opportunity for city government to facilitate young women’s participation in planning processes. According to UN-Habitat (2013), young women are one of the most disadvantaged groups in urban development processes. As the preceding sections have shown, young women are often trapped in home-based enterprises and low paying informal economic activities. In some cases, young women’s mobility and access to public space for employment activities is limited by discriminatory practices. The UYF and Y2Y supported youth-led projects that empowered young women through entrepreneurship skills training. The training created self-employment and income earning opportunities for young females, including teenage mothers, and created opportunities for young women to participate productively in the urban economy.
The young women empowerment projects offer collaborative opportunities for city and national governments to engage young women in their quest for gender equality. Yet, this opportunity was largely untapped in the cities where UYF and Y2Y projects were implemented. Most young female entrepreneurs trained through the YAI-Uganda, CI-Gambia, FOH and G2Mi projects continued to work from their homes after the training. Most of them also found it difficult to access microcredit from banks. The First Lady of Bono State’s Nigeria initiative should be emulated elsewhere. Her Mercy Vincent Foundation partnered with FOH to promote further training in ICTs specifically for young female entrepreneurs trained by the FOH. She donated computers to FOH and promoted its project across the state and nationwide. This initiative showed that government officials have the potential to partner with youth-led organizations to promote skills training and income earning opportunities. Government officials can also market youth-led projects to enhance project visibility, legitimacy and acceptance in societies where entrepreneurship is lowly regarded.

**Informal economy mainstreaming in urban development and management processes**

Most studies show that participation in the informal economy in SSA is gendered and that female traders typically outnumber male informal traders in any given city (Brown, 2006b; Hansen, 2004; King, 2006; Mitullah, 2004; Skinner, 2008). Paradoxically, female informal traders have been found to be poorer than their male counterparts as women often concentrate in low risk informal activities with lower profit margins (Chen et al., 2002). According to Chen (2002), the link between participation in the informal economy and being poor is stronger for women than men. An enabling approach to the informal urban economy by local and national governments in Africa should be underpinned by a fundamental regard for human rights, property rights and access rights (Brown & Rakodi, 2006). As part of such an enabling
approach to the informal economy, urban spatial planning should acknowledge and integrate gender-based constraints and opportunities in housing, transportation, informal trading and urban service provision (Brown & Lloyd-Jones, 2002; Brown & Rakodi, 2006). Young females are particularly disadvantaged in several spheres of the urban economy due to their lower education status compared to male youth and also African cultural beliefs that restrict female labor to unpaid domestic chores (Grierson & Schnurr, 2003; ILO, 2010; Sharif, 1998). The UYF and Y2Y programs are important avenues for gender and informal economy mainstreaming in urban development and management in SSA.

The UYF and Y2Y analysis has shown that local and national level policies and processes shape youth livelihoods in the informal economy to varying degrees depending on context. City governments are uniquely qualified to facility youth participation in youth employment creation. They can provide land and partner with youth organizations, groups and cooperatives in urban service provision and youth employment initiatives. In the process, disadvantaged youth from slum areas and young women secure employment opportunities and participate in urban economic development.

**Youth participation in local and national decision making processes**

According to Beall (2000), pro-poor urban development planning practice and policy cannot be understood outside of the consideration of the responses of the urban poor themselves and the conditions under which collective action shifts from isolated or self-contained, self-help activities to wider engagement in urban politics. Conflict between different interests in the city signals one of the limitations of any policy approach to urban poverty reduction that focuses on
poor areas alone, without recognizing how they link into the wider socio-politics of the city (Beall, 2000).

The cooperatives and microenterprises created through Y2Y and UYF present an excellent opportunity for local governments to engage youth in decision making processes. However, as shown in Chapter 4 and 5, there was no evidence suggesting that the youth cooperatives worked collaboratively with local and national government to address the challenges that youth entrepreneurs faced. The cooperatives and youth groups were mostly created to facilitate youth access to startup capital, working space and materials and equipment. However, there were a few exceptions in Ghana where the NORPRA project promoted social dialogue between youth and government ministers and in Ethiopia where EYA youth groups worked with sub-city governments (WORDAs) to facilitate youth access to land in Addis Ababa. In most cases, UYF youth groups did not engage in other activities outside of project-related livelihood activities and they did not belong to outside community associations. This limited the extent to which the groups engaged local government in decision making processes.

**Towards an asset-based approach to urban development and management in Sub-Saharan Africa**

In the revised sustainable livelihoods framework, urban development planning and management paradigm shifts planning from its dominant concern with the physical environment and buildings to a central focus on understanding and enhancing youth livelihood assets. From this perspective, the new planning approach employs an asset-based approach to support young people working in the informal economy in a responsive, participatory and holistic manner (Mitlin, 2003; Moser, 1993; Moser, 2008). From Moser’s perspective, an asset-based approach to planning should focus on reducing inequalities and expanding the opportunity structures for
the urban poor and disadvantaged households including youth entrepreneurs and young women. The livelihood assets analysis suggests an urban planning approach that is participatory and collaborative. At the city scale, planning policies should acknowledge youth-led development organizations as equal partners in poverty-reduction efforts. Such an acknowledgement demands that city governments and planners positively support youth self-employment and informal livelihoods through youth-centered collective action.

There are a few renowned cases of participatory and collaborative urban planning, development and management approaches to the informal economy. Documented cases of informal economy integration in urban planning policy and practice exist in Botswana, Tanzania and South Africa. I review these cases below to draw lessons to guide sustainable urban development and management for Sub-Saharan Africa.

The Municipality of Gaborone (Botswana) has developed and implemented an impressive informal economy policy as part of a wider response to urban poverty in the city (Mosha, 1999). Mosha reported the successful development of mixed-income residential neighborhoods in Gaborone by the Gaborone City Council (GCC) over the years. The GCC has since adopted a policy requiring the mixing of all income groups in the planning of any new district in the city. Mosha reported that the mixing of low, medium and high income groups in Gaborone is unique in the Southern Africa region. Regarding informal economic activities, the GCC allows informal economic activities on residential plots and most low-income residents earn a living from small-scale, home-based informal economic activities. Planning for the informal economy has also seen the GCC zoning specific areas for informal economic activities. Mosha noted that informal traders are openly given trading licenses with no harassment or eviction cases as is the norm in
many other SSA cities. As such, residents of Gaborone can freely engage in informal economic activities and informal economic activities contribute to the wider urban economy.

In the area of housing, Mosha reported collaborative and innovative approaches by the GCC, CBOs and the Self-Help Housing Authority (SHHA) established within the GCC. The SHHA was established by the GCC in 1974 to speed up the delivery of affordable housing to low-income people in Gaborone. Since its inception, the provision of low-cost housing for the urban poor has significantly improved, to the extent that any low-income resident willing to own a house has been capable of doing so much faster and easier than before the SHHA. Mosha reported that the SHHA, in collaboration with the GCC, successfully relaxed building regulations for low-income housing areas. For instance, Gaborone’s low-income residents are allowed to use temporary or permanent materials when building their homes as long as the materials used are durable. Following the success of the SHHA in Gaborone, Self-Help Housing Authorities have since been extended to all towns and cities across Botswana. Interestingly, and quite rare in the context of SSA, Mosha reported that squatters in Gaborone are given a Certificate of Right (COR) by the GCC, giving squatters tenure security and that in some cases, squatters are issued a Temporary Occupancy Permit (TOP), prior to the issuance of COR. At the national scale, Mosha reported that there have been committed collaborative urban poverty-reduction efforts between the central government, communities, CBOs and NGOs with a remarkable success. The Gaborone case shows that responsive urban planning polices led by local planning authorities are possible with commitment from all stakeholders.

In Dar es Salaam (Tanzania), Nkya (2006), reported a successful rights-based approach to street trading through the 1992 Sustainable Dar es Salaam Project (SDP). Nkya reported that
in response to the increased number of street traders in Dar es Salaam, UN agencies consulted in reviewing the Dar es Salaam Master Plan, successfully convinced the Dar es Salaam City Council (DCC), to adopt a rights-based approach to street trading in the city. The initiative culminated in the launch of the SDP in 1992. Nnkya reported that following the SDP, a Working Group on Managing the Informal Micro-Trade was established. Through the SDP, street trading in the city has since been legitimized and the participation of street trader organizations has been enhanced. Nnkya also reported that in 1997, the Dar es Salaam City Commission successfully adopted the Guidelines on Petty Trade (GPT), which sets out a framework for managing street trade. The GPT puts the management of street trading under street traders’ organizations in close collaboration with the DCC. Finally, Nnkya reported a few challenges including the exclusion of some street traders along Zanaki Street in the CBD, based on non-membership to street traders’ organizations. Overall, Nnkya concluded that in comparison to other cities in SSA, Dar es Salaam has provided a much more conducive policy framework for the informal economy and street trading in particular. Beyond the SDP, Mhamba & Titus (2001) reported a provision for independent community-based land use planning in Tanzania. However, the approval of community-made plans by the DCC has been slow owing to complacency on the part of planning officers (Mhamba & Titus, 2001).

In Durban (South Africa), a collaborative area-based urban planning approach has emerged to integrate street trading at the busy Warwick Junction (Skinner, 2008). Skinner reported that in 1996, the Durban City Council or the eThekwini Municipality, in collaboration with street traders at the Warwick Junction, launched an ambitious area-based initiative aimed at providing the requisite infrastructural services at Durban’s busiest transportation exchange. The transportation exchange, otherwise known as the Warwick Junction, with an average of 400,000
commuters each day, is one of South Africa’s busiest transportation exchange centers (Skinner, 2008). Skinner reported that the area-based approach adopted a sector-by-sector approach to street trade management. Following its launch, some 1,000 traditional medicine traders were accommodated on their own space with all the requisite infrastructural and shelter requirements.

The area-based approach has been extended to all major street trading ventures at the Warwick Junction. Skinner noted that in an attempt to ensure the smooth management of street trading at the Warwick Junction, and also across metropolitan Durban, the Durban City Council adopted an Informal Economic Policy (IEP) in 2001. The IEP barred the harassment and eviction of street traders and acknowledged the informal economy as an integral part of the Durban economy. The IEP also puts the management of street trade at the Warwick Junction under street trader organizations in close collaboration with the Durban Department of Health. Skinner reported that Durban Department of Health officials began training street traders on safe food handling and other business skills. Although the Durban story remains a success to this day, some policy reversals have been reported during the days leading to the 2010 soccer World Cup tournament (Lindell, 2010). Some street traders were evicted at the renowned Warwick Junction and also close to the beach area to pave way for the construction of soccer World Cup facilities (Lindell, 2010).

In her review of street trading in Africa, Mitullah (2004) noted that South Africa’s enabling national policies on the informal economy encouraged and continue to encourage action at the city level. Mitullah gave an example of the 1986 South African Constitution and the 1991 Business Act which both make provisions for street trading, urging city authorities to recognize and support street trading. Also, Mitullah observed that the 1995 South African Government’s

There have also been scattered responsive and inclusive urban planning approaches reported from across SSA, aimed at integrating the informal economy into urban plans. Kamete (1999a) reported the Government of Zimbabwe’s passing of Statutory Instrument 216 of 1994, titled Regional Town and Country Planning (Use Groups) Regulations. The legislation, for the first time in the history of urban planning in Zimbabwe, lifted a ban on small-scale commercial and industrial activities on residential properties (Kamete, 1999a). In other words, the statutory instrument legalized small-scale informal economic activities on residential plots. Kamete observed that following Statutory Instrument 216, the home in urban Zimbabwe officially acted both as a shelter and an economic workspace. However, as observed during the 2005 urban evictions across Zimbabwe, all home-based informal economic activities were demolished even though they were all considered legal under the Statutory Instrument 216 of 1994. Cases of sudden informal economic policy changes engineered mainly by central governments have also been reported in Lesotho (see Setsabi, 2006).

In Kitale (Kenya), Majale reported a successful employment creation program through a collaborative and participatory slum upgrading initiative (Majale, 2008), involving the Kitale Municipal Council, the NGO ITDG, Kenya Institute of Planners, the Kenya Broadcasting Corporation, slum dwellers and their organizations. Majale noted that the collaborative slum upgrading program successfully created employment for several slum dwellers and identified several Local Economic Development (LED) opportunities for slum dwellers and their
organizations. In Oshakati (Namibia), there have been self-sustaining collaborative efforts between CBOs, NGOs and the Oshakati Municipality in response to rapid urbanization, population growth, environmental stress, economic and resource constraints (Frayne, Pendleton, & Pomuti, 2001). In a related case, in Rufisque (Senegal), the NGO ENDA in collaboration with community members from nine low-income neighborhoods in Rusifique, embarked on the ENDA-Third World experiment (Gaye & Diallo, 1997). Through the initiative, ENDA and community members began the construction of low-cost community infrastructure and sanitary facilities. Gaye and Diallo reported that the ENDA-Third World experiment successfully generated livelihoods for several youth and increased community participation in infrastructure provision in Rusifique.

Although the ENDA project benefited unemployed youth, it was not specifically designed for youth—it was a project meant to benefit all community members and youth benefited most because they comprised the majority of the unemployed and were more interested in participating in the project. Related employment projects for the urban poor in Kenya and Namibia were also not specifically focused on youth. NGOs, CBOs and international development agencies must give specific attention to youth employment in urban development projects given that youth unemployment is three times higher than that of the general adult population (ILO, 2010).

Overall, a sustainable urban development and management framework for SSA must include the participation of all stakeholders including youth, community members, local and national government, NGOs, CBOs, private sector and international development organizations.
**Contributions of the study**

As the first major evaluation of youth-led livelihood initiatives in Africa, this study has practical and theoretical implications for youth-led development; urban planning, development and management; and sustainable livelihood interventions in the context of SSA.

I explored youth-led experiences, challenges, lessons, aspirations and recommendations from the perspective of youth entrepreneurs in low-income countries. In most low-income countries, young men and women are excluded from effective participation in development projects that impact their lives. I gave youth entrepreneurs a rare opportunity to freely share their experiences and recommendations to UN-Habitat and YEN. I could have simply used only secondary data and archival records but I chose to also listen to and document youth views. The youth entrepreneurs were happy someone who was interested in their work, including the challenges that they face and the aspirations they had. As shown in Chapter 1, traditional youth livelihood interventions often failed, partly because they were externally driven with minimum input from youth. In this study, I challenged youth-led organizations to collaborate with end beneficiaries as they conducted follow up interviews with beneficiaries to learn about project outcomes. In the process, youth project coordinators engaged in project monitoring and evaluation exercises that they most likely would not have done in the absence of this study. The participation of youth in project evaluation positively drives the global youth-led development agenda forward.

This study has theoretical and practical implications for gender and informal economy mainstreaming in sustainable urban development and management in Sub-Saharan Africa. The study has shown that it is possible for city governments and youth entrepreneurs to work together but also that outdated urban planning systems continue to hinder livelihood initiatives in SSA.
This study’s contribution is its documentation of positive collaborative experiences between city government and youth groups and associations. These initiatives were mostly in the area of recycling and waste management projects in slum and informal areas. The informal economy poses serious urban development and management challenges in SSA. The study has shown that slum youth are capable of launching innovative waste management projects that promote urban environmental sanitation and sustainable urban development in low-income communities. The challenge for urban planning and management authorities is to harness such youth-led initiatives. Urban planning authorities can and should work collaboratively with youth entrepreneurs to facilitate youth access to secure urban land, housing, transportation to and from workplaces, among other areas.

As shown in Chapters 4 and 5, the UYF and Y2Y supported young women’s empowerment projects, which has implications for gender mainstreaming in rural and urban youth-led development. The UYF and Y2Y young women-led projects indicated that it is practically possible for young women to launch successful employment and entrepreneurship projects that, in turn, positively transform their lives and communities.

Theoretically, I presented a sustainable youth-led livelihood development framework based on research findings. My framework modifies the sustainable livelihood framework by emphasizing the importance of collaborative efforts in youth-led development initiatives. I also suggested adding a sixth livelihood asset, ICTs, given its important role in many UYF projects. Youth entrepreneurs expressed that access to computers and internet enhanced employment opportunities in ways they had never imagined. For example, through the Vijana Forum in Dar es Salaam, young Tanzanians, rural and urban, at home and abroad, all met in a single virtual
space where they deliberated on youth development challenges that impacted Tanzanian and African youth, shared youth employment opportunities, youth-related news and projects and charted a way forward. In Malawi, young secondary school youth were introduced to the outside world through the ICT for Youth Development Project. The project did not only benefit school children but it also technologically enlightened their teachers. In Kenya, KHCS implemented an ICT training project that imparted computer knowledge and skills to slum youth. After the training, some youth opened their own computer maintenance businesses, others secured formal employment opportunities, and a majority of them planned to employ the computer and ICT skills they gained to open new SMEs and self-employment opportunities. These examples suggest that ICTs are a new form of capital that deserves a distinct recognition in sustainable youth-led livelihood interventions in SSA.

I also suggest that enhanced youth livelihoods can transform the transforming structures and processes and also the vulnerability context. The sustainable youth-led livelihood framework implies that youth are capable of designing innovative projects that potentially shift the attitudes of urban planning and management authorities. For example, FITZ launched an ambitious Integrated Urban Youth-Led Development Project in Mutare (Zimbabwe) that brought together city council, local NGOs, and youth groups in the city. They collaborated in conducting a research project that documented youth development challenges in the city and identified access to housing as a top priority for youth. Equipped with the youth housing data and information, FITZ made housing provision a central component of its project. It approached the Mutare City Council and requested land for housing construction and youth employment activities. Over 300 youth gained access to land and housing as a result of the initiative.
Sustainable livelihood interventions have traditionally failed to acknowledge the capacity of youth organizations to influence local and national policies practices. An asset-based youth-led livelihood development framework acknowledges the possibility of a two-way relationship between transforming structures and processes and youth entrepreneurs. Innovative youth projects can also potentially withstand the impact of the vulnerability context. As the analysis of Guinea Y2Y projects has shown, young farmers developed complex and multiple farm and off-farm livelihoods to withstand seasonality and commodity price shocks associated with farming activities.

Overall, I suggest that UYF and Y2Y youth entrepreneurs often seek multiple livelihood asset enhancements, community development and poverty reduction beyond mere income increases as implied in monetary poverty assessment and interventions.

**Limitations of the study**

Findings from this study are limited by my inability to conduct fieldwork to observe the project outcomes reported by project coordinators, youth beneficiaries and key informants. As shown in the analysis chapters, project coordinators generally reported higher project outcomes compared to what youth beneficiaries reported. It is possible that project coordinators overstated project impacts to make their organizations and themselves as coordinators look good in the eyes of outsiders. Since project coordinators knew that findings from the study would be shared with funding agencies, they may have thought that negative project outcomes could jeopardize their funding prospects. Most of them were actively exploring funding opportunities to expand and replicate their projects and they may have reasonably thought that positive project results potentially improve their chances of securing funding.
I took several steps to minimize the potential effect of exaggerated project outcomes. I conducted Skype interviews with project coordinators and quizzed them about project outcomes during live conservations. The interviews presented an excellent opportunity for me to complement data that I collected through email surveys and the secondary mid-term and final project reports. Y2Y mid-term and final project reports were also prepared by YEN officials and the reports were probably more accurate compared to self-reported UYF projects. In addition to the views expressed by project coordinators during Skype interviews, I analyzed survey data gathered by YEN and UN-Habitat officials from 395 UYF and Y2Y beneficiaries during mid-term and final project evaluations. I also administered a survey to UYF and Y2Y comparison group organizations to compare project outcomes between youth organizations that received funding and those that did not. For both programs, I also reviewed major reports prepared by YEN and UN-Habitat officials. The YEN-prepared mid-term and final project reports were particularly helpful in complementing data that was translated from Guinea Y2Y grantees where language barriers prevented me from conducting Skype interviews.

Another limitation of the study was the inability to conduct rigorous statistical tests given a “Small N.” There were not enough grantee and youth beneficiary responses to enable a rigorous quantitative assessment of the UYF and Y2Y projects. As a result, it is not possible to generalize findings from the study in the absence of a large N. However, I used extensive qualitative assessments to complement the limited quantitative assessments that I conducted. As shown in Chapters 3, 4, 5 and 6, each chapter contains qualitative and quantitative sections that both fed into the chapter conclusions. Throughout, I combined qualitative and quantitative data collection methods and analysis techniques to qualify and quantify findings. I also compared the views from project coordinators and key informants to those expressed by end beneficiaries to
derive common themes. I complemented qualitative views from a small number of project coordinators with a quantitative analysis of 395 views from youth entrepreneurs.

The comparative analysis is limited by inconsistent data and variations in project contexts. I used data from UYF and Y2Y projects that were implemented between 2009 and 2011 and it was difficult to obtain consistent data across time. Some of the projects started earlier than others within the same year; others received smaller or larger grant amounts compared to others; others were still ongoing whilst others had ended; and some grantees also received additional funding and non-financial support from other organizations. The inconsistency in data may mean that youth entrepreneurs were exposed to other external factors such as access to credit and income opportunities through the assistance of other organizations. In that case, it is difficult to solely attribute youth entrepreneurs’ employment opportunities and enhanced livelihood assets to the UYF and Y2Y projects, especially given the weak capacity for monitoring and evaluation among grantees and funding agencies.

Urban Youth Fund and Y2Y both promoted youth-led livelihood development but there were some fundamental differences in their approaches even though differences in the baseline characteristics of grantees were statistically insignificant. For example, the Y2Y projects included in the study were all from West Africa and the Y2Y also supported youth-led organizations in both rural and urban locations. The UYF on the other hand, strictly supported urban-based youth-led organizations. These fundamental differences limited the extent to which systematic comparison could be made. The differences in the grant amounts also made it somewhat difficult to compare project outcomes between well-funded and under-funded
grantees. Overall, the data that I collected from different countries can help funding agencies and policy makers to contextualize project outcomes and to make basic comparison across countries.

Finally, interview and survey data from six Guinea Y2Y grantees were in French and they needed extensive translation before the analysis began. The CYE intern who translated the interviews was not a native French speaker and it is possible that she may have misunderstood some of the deep nuances the coordinators detailed in email responses. To address this challenge, I included closed-ended survey questions that were more or less similar in meaning to open-ended questions. I then compared closed-ended survey and open-ended interview responses to ascertain that responses were closely aligned.

Conclusion

The UYF and Y2Y programs fundamentally seek to positively transform the lives of low-income youth through the enhancement of financial, human, social, physical and natural assets central in decent youth employment. The Y2Y was particularly strong in enhancing youth access to financial and social assets. Y2Y grantees received significantly higher grant amounts compared to UYF grantees and they succeeded in organizing youth into cooperatives and microenterprises that empowered youth economically and socially in post-conflict West Africa. On the other hand, UYF grantees significantly promoted youth access to financial capital through the creation of revolving funds and collaboration with commercial banks and micro-credit institutions. Y2Y and UYF beneficiaries also reported that participation in projects enhanced their access to practical skills and knowledge, financial independence, more acquaintances and improved social life.
However, fundamental challenges have so far hindered the full realization of decent employment creation for youth: inadequate funding to expand and replicate projects; limited access to land and workspace; limited access to materials, equipment and startup tools; negative youth and community attitudes; limited access to start-up finance; rigid administrative and regulatory frameworks; weak capacity for project monitoring and evaluation; and lack of transparency and miscommunication. Despite these challenges, youth entrepreneurs were motivated, enthusiastic and determined to succeed. Over 75% of UYF and Y2Y entrepreneurs expected full-time employment in the near future and most of them were already engaged in productive self-employment initiatives. Most UYF and Y2Y grantees aspired to expand and replicate previously funded projects and most of their projects were still ongoing in December 2012. They had forged advisory, technical, workspace, materials and equipment and financial partnerships with local NGOs, microcredit institutions, banks, local and national governments, and international development organizations to strategically sustain projects. Project funding was clearly slow in coming but there was no sign that the youth entrepreneurs would give up soon. The future of youth-led livelihood development in SSA looks promising. Youth entrepreneurs’ livelihood assets and motivation have been boosted through the UYF and Y2Y. UN-Habitat and YEN should continue with the UYF and Y2Y. They should now consider collaborative efforts to enhance youth access to land, startup finance and micro-macro linkages towards sustainable youth employment creation and integrated rural and urban poverty reduction.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

In Chapter 6, the comparative analysis of the UYF and Y2Y pointed to broad and specific conclusions. Typically, a youth-led organization would receive a grant of between $15,000-$16,000 on average from UN-Habitat or YEN. The successful youth-led organization would also receive capacity building in the form of project and business management training for project coordinators. The grantee would then offer comprehensive skills training to youth in the form of entrepreneurship training, vocational skills, life skills and on-job training. Entrepreneurship training was the most commonly favored approach to youth employment creation. Along with the knowledge and practical skills, youth entrepreneurs also received materials, equipment, startup tools, business management training and mentorship from the grantee. The goal of the training was typically youth employment creation through the setting up of youth microenterprises and cooperatives. This meant that youth entrepreneurship was a central component of UYF and Y2Y projects. Typically, the grantee organized youth into working groups or cooperatives after graduation. For the Y2Y, most youth graduates were organized into cooperatives whereas most UYF graduates chose to work as individuals after graduation. The youth microenterprises and cooperatives largely promoted self-employment creation by and for youth. An insignificant number of UYF or Y2Y graduates secured formal employment opportunities.

The path to youth employment creation was generally not smooth. There were common challenges that hindered the effectiveness of UYF and Y2Y projects:
• **Negative youth and community attitudes:** Beneficiary recruitment was a common challenge faced by grantees. Targeted beneficiaries were unable to participate in projects that did not immediately benefit them financially. They were already working in the informal economy where they earned basic income to meet everyday needs. Those who joined the training sometimes dropped out half-way due to financial challenges and general lack of interest. Youth beneficiary parents also preferred formal education and despised informal entrepreneurship and vocational skills training. A successful beneficiary recruitment drive typically involved grantee working in close collaboration with youth, parents and community members.

• **Inadequate and/or delayed funding:** In many cases, funding was either inadequate or it was adequate but disbursed late for some UYF projects. In response, grantees either reduced the number of youth they trained or shortened the duration of training. Delayed funding might mean that the project started late and at a time when the original project budget was no longer realistic. After the training, inadequate funding prevented most grantees from conducting further training through project expansion or replication. Typically, UYF grantees conducted small scale training through self-financing, revolving funds or external funding opportunities.

• **Limited access to workspace and land:** This prevented most organizations from recruiting enough beneficiaries since they did not have enough space to conduct the training. This was a common challenge for UYF grantees based in large urban centers. When land was generally available, the process to acquire land certificates was long and impossible in some cases. This was commonly the case with Y2Y grantees. Typically,
grantees did not own the space that they used for training. They mostly used rented private spaces, borrowed spaces, shared spaces or space donated by local government. Some organizations also used their office spaces as a training venues and this limited the number of trainees they were able to accommodate at any given time. Grantees that received land donations from local government did not report any access to land and workspace challenges.

- **Inadequate materials, equipment and startup tools:** The materials and equipment used during the training were commonly inadequate because of inadequate or delayed project funding. UYF and Y2Y trainees commonly worked in groups to share the materials and equipment. Access to materials and equipment was a problem during and after the training. Some grantees also received materials, equipment and startup donations from external sources.

- **Weak capacity for project monitoring and evaluation:** Most UYF and Y2Y grantees did not have adequate training in project monitoring and evaluation. They also did not have adequate funding and transportation to track project beneficiaries scattered across a wide geographical space. The common solution was to only track those that were readily available or scrapping monitoring and evaluation altogether. The extent of monitoring and evaluation challenges is reflected by the fact that most grantees recommended strengthened project monitoring and evaluation.

**Typical grantee’s path to decent youth employment creation**

The typical grantee path to youth employment creation is shown in Figure 22. As the diagram shows, a typical grantee overcame the barriers to training. The grantee then offered
entrepreneurship skills, vocational training and on-job training to unemployed and underemployed urban and rural youth. For UYF, the grantee targeted urban youth only, whilst the Y2Y grantee typically trained both rural and urban youth. Typically, the grantee also included young women’s empowerment as a major component of the training. The youth entrepreneurs that the grantee trained either worked in groups or as individuals after the training depending on training requirements and local circumstances. For the Y2Y program, the grantee commonly created youth cooperatives that allowed youth to create joint microenterprises and self-employment opportunities.

**Figure 22: Typical UYF/Y2Y grantee’s path to decent youth employment creation**
Successful youth microenterprises and self-employment opportunities typically led to project recognition and community appreciation. Project and beneficiary recognition yielded external funding opportunities and partnerships. However, access to land, materials, equipment and startup loan challenges meant that some youth were unable to start their own businesses or could not work in groups. In that case, they went back to informal employment and home-based enterprises or remained unemployed. As a result of expensive rental in prime urban locations, many UYF beneficiaries engaged in home-based and informal employment activities after the training.

*Typical youth entrepreneur’s path to decent livelihood opportunities*

At the UYF and Y2Y youth entrepreneur level, the path to decent livelihood opportunities was evidently lengthy and complicated. Before and during the training, the unemployed and underemployed youth, students, farmers, and self-employed youth experienced fundamental challenges: negative parental and community perceptions; gender biases that discriminated against young women; lack of transparency and miscommunication from grantees; limited access to land, startup finance, and materials and equipment. As shown in the analysis and comparative chapters, limited access to land and startup finance persisted after the training. It was expensive for youth to rent workspaces and land for self-employment and joint livelihood opportunities. Access to business loans and credit was difficult for youth entrepreneurs because bank collateral requirements were unrealistic for low-income youth largely drawn from urban slum areas and remote rural communities. The common solution to land access challenges involved youth entrepreneurs working in groups, home-based enterprises and informal employment in undesignated zones. Grantees also sought partnerships with banks, local NGOs, local and national governments and international organizations to enhance youth access to land.
and financial capital. However, working space and financial partnerships were not enough to ease youth access to land and startup finance. Despite the challenges that they faced, most youth completed the training and engaged in promising income generating activities. Those youth who did not have an income during and after the training still had high hopes for a better life and job. The major benefits from the training were perceived to be practical training and new knowledge; access to income and financial independence; improved social life; and high hopes for a better life and job. Figure 23 shows the typical youth entrepreneur’s path to a decent livelihood opportunity through an UYF or Y2Y project.

Source: Author

Figure 23: Typical youth entrepreneur’s path to a decent livelihood opportunity
**Typical community-level impacts of an UYF/Y2Y project**

As the analysis in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 has shown, youth-led businesses and self-employment opportunities benefited communities in many ways. At the community level, UYF and Y2Y projects created youth employment opportunities for youth who were previously perceived as being unproductive. UYF and Y2Y beneficiaries were mostly drawn from disadvantaged slum areas and rural communities. Young women who were previously segregated in training programs received entrepreneurship, life skills and vocational training through UYF and Y2Y projects. Previously, the youth did not have a decent and reliable source of income and the training was a source of financial independence for them. They previously engaged in precarious informal livelihoods and often depended on their parents. The UYF and Y2Y projects helped create and prepare for decent income earning opportunities that allowed youth to support themselves and their families. As a result, they received appreciation from parents and friends. In the process, the youth entrepreneurs acted as role models for other community youth.

More importantly, youth-led businesses contributed to rural and urban development through recycling, waste management, housing construction, and agricultural activities. They yielded community collaboration in youth employment creation as they brought together community members, youth organizations, public and private sectors, local and national governments, and international development organizations. Community collaboration and networking paved the way for social cohesion in post-conflict communities ravaged by decades of ethnic violence. UYF and Y2Y projects also promoted environmental entrepreneurship and sustainability in degraded urban slums and remote rural communities. Typical community-level
impacts of an UYF or Y2Y project and associated youth-led businesses are depicted in Figure 24.

**Figure 24: Typical community-level impacts of an UYF/ Y2Y project**

*Typical impacts on youth access to livelihood assets*

The principal aim of this study was to evaluate the extent which the UYF and Y2Y programs facilitated youth access to financial, human, physical, social and natural capital in informal rural and urban SSA economies. Part of the study’s aim was also to assess the challenges that hinder youth access to livelihood assets and decent employment opportunities. The broad aim was to assess the extent to which youth-led livelihood programs created decent and sustainable youth
employment opportunities in low-income SSA communities. Given the comparative discussion and the above concluding remarks on the path to decent youth employment creation, decent livelihoods and subsequent community-level impacts, the following livelihood asset conclusions are evident:

- **Access to financial capital:** At the grantee level, access to financial capital was the fundamental benefit gained through the UYF or Y2Y grant. In most cases, the grant was not enough to meet the overwhelming demand for training. The grant often did not match the level of training that illiterate and lowly educated youth needed. Both UYF and Y2Y grantees sought additional external funding to increase youth enrolment and to offer extended training when it seemed necessary. As shown in the analysis, some grantees succeeded in securing external funding opportunities but most of them did not. As a result, most grantees recommended that funding agencies should provide adequate and long term funding.

At the youth beneficiary level, grantees assisted youth in securing employment and entrepreneurship opportunities during and after the training. Some youth-led businesses also employed other community youth and created income generating activities for non-beneficiaries as a result. In the process, youth gained access to monthly income and financial independence. Many youth beneficiaries secured startup finance and loans through the UYF revolving funds and Y2Y cooperatives. However, a majority of youth beneficiaries also lost income during the training. They were previously self-employed but they lost the opportunity to continue with income generating activities while they attended unpaid training sessions. This was especially evident in Sierra Leone where beneficiary incomes dropped to zero for most trainees during the training. After
the training, it was also difficult for youth to access business loans from banks because they lacked adequate collateral. Some UYF grantees formed partnerships with commercial banks and others created revolving funds that offered startup capital to youth entrepreneurs but these efforts were not enough. As a result, most youth entrepreneurs recommended that UN-Habitat and YEN provide financial assistance in the form of stipends during the training and startup capital after the training.

- **Access to human capital:** At the grantee level, this was promoted through project management and business training to youth project coordinators before and during project implementation. The project and business management training boosted the capacity of youth-led organizations to implement projects. However, the capacity building effort was limited by the fact that training was only offered to project coordinators because of limited funding.

At the youth beneficiary level, grantees offered practical training through on-job training and vocational skills training. Youth beneficiaries also received soft skills in the form of business creation and management training, life skills, and mentorship training. Some UYF graduates also offered skills training to family members, friends and community youth. However, grantee’s ability to recruit the most disadvantaged youth was hindered by negative youth and community attitudes that discouraged youth participation in projects. Grantees also did not have enough funding to offer extended training to illiterate youth recruited from slum areas and rural communities. In the end, some youth beneficiaries did not receive adequate training to prepare them for self- and formal employment opportunities. The youth felt that they needed further training to
compete in the job market but the grantees did not have enough funding for further training.

- **Access to physical capital:** At the grantee level, physical capital was mostly enhanced through expanded workspaces, access to urban land, and project materials and equipment. Through the UYF and Y2Y, most youth-led organizations expanded their workspaces to accommodate training activities. They also expanded workspaces as their offices acted as incubators for youth-led business after the training. However, as the analysis repeatedly shows, access to workspace and land was a serious challenge for most grantees. Access to land through local government donations, shared space with other organizations, borrowed space, and renting private spaces did not completely eliminate grantees’ land access challenges.

  At the youth beneficiary level, grantees collaborated with community members and local governments to facilitate youth access to land. These collaborative efforts were evidently successful in the Y2Y pilot projects even though the land acquisition process was often slow. Youth beneficiaries who lived in major cities such as Port Harcourt, Nairobi, Kampala, Bamenda, and Freetown, experienced land and workspace access challenges the most. As a result, some of them went back to informal economic activities and home-based enterprises. Home-based enterprises were commonly associated with UYF female beneficiaries. Access to materials and equipment was also a challenge because grantees did not have enough funding. Most youth shared the materials and equipment during the training and shared startup toolkits after the training. However, Y2Y beneficiaries were better prepared in this regard because grantees were required to provide “a complete training package” that included practical training, soft skills training,
and startup toolkits. UYF beneficiaries addressed the problem by forming working groups that allowed them to share working tools and equipment. However, transportation challenges hindered the extent to which both UYF and Y2Y beneficiaries could work together. Inadequate public transportation facilities prevented some UYF beneficiaries from working in group. Some Y2Y beneficiaries also missed on-site training altogether because public transportation to and from project sites was not available.

- **Access to social capital:** At the grantee level, social capital was initially promoted through training workshops that brought youth-led organizations together. However, networking among grantees was not evident beyond the UN-Habitat or YEN initiated workshops. As a result, most UYF and Y2Y grantees aspired to more exchange and networking opportunities. They recommended that funding agencies promote international exchange experiences to allow them to learn from other youth-led organizations. They felt that exchange experiences can also provide unique opportunities to learn about external funding opportunities and potential partners for their projects.

  At the youth beneficiary level, access to social capital was facilitated through grantee- and youth initiated micro-enterprises and cooperatives. As shown in the analysis chapters, some grantees organized youth into working groups to facilitate access to land, materials, equipment, startup tools, and bank loans. They also organized youth into working groups to facilitate the sharing of ideas and boosted youth social capital as a result. The youth cooperatives and enterprises brought youth from diverse backgrounds together and strengthened cultural ties and friendships in the process. As shown in Chapter 6, the creation of cooperatives was stronger in Y2Y projects compared to UYF
projects. As a result, youth entrepreneurs reported that participating in Y2Y projects improved their social life.

There was a hindrance to social capital creation for some grantees. For example, some grantees, such as EYA in Ethiopia, found it difficult to organize diverse youth into working groups as youth rejected the idea for cultural reasons. Grantees such as the G2Mi and YPPD also found it logistically impossible to organize youth into working groups.

At the community level, youth-led businesses brought together community youth, youth organizations, NGOs, international organization, private and public actors. The youth businesses acted as a meeting point for community members which enhanced community networking. Though to a limited extent, youth-led businesses motivated local and national governments to collaborate with youth-led organizations in the area of entrepreneurship and employment creation. However, as the analysis has shown, youth projects and businesses were often disrupted by community and political unrests in Nigeria, Ivory Coast and Guinea. There were also city council initiated evictions that disrupted youth businesses in Cameroon. These negative factors destroyed social ties and networks and limited youth access to social capital.

- **Access to natural capital:** The Y2Y promoted youth access to natural capital through agricultural projects in rural and semi-urban areas. The agricultural projects facilitated youth access to land for agricultural activities. In rural areas, land is considered a form of natural resource whereas in urban areas, land is generally considered a form of physical capital (DFID, 1999; Rakodi & Lloyd-Jones, 2002; Brown, 2006). There were also several Y2Y projects that facilitated youth access to natural resources such as forests,
land, and water. However, the analysis has shown that youth access to agricultural land was limited because adults mostly owned the land. Youth entrepreneurs signed contracts with adult land owners to secure access to land for the projects. Even so, the contracts were sometimes cancelled prematurely, which threatened the viability of youth businesses.

Natural capital did not emerge as a significant theme in UYF projects. This is in line with previous studies that have shown that the existence of natural capital is limited in urban areas (see Rakodi & Lloyd-Jones, 2002, Brown, 2006). However, in West Africa, most UYF and Y2Y urban youth entrepreneurs secured access to land through family inheritance and contracts with adult land owners. The fact that land exists as a form of natural capital in most parts of urban West Africa challenges the assertion that natural capital is insignificant in urban areas, at least for West Africa.

**Access to decent and sustainable employment opportunities**

Decent work for youth implies that youth are engaged in permanent full-time employment with freedom of association, rights, social protection, and adequate income (ILO, 2002; 2005). Decent work for youth also implies that youth employment activities are conducted freely without fear of harassment and eviction. The UYF and Y2Y offered skills training to informal slum youth and lowly educated rural youth who did not have much hope. The youth previously engaged in insecure, low-paying, part-time, seasonal and intermittent informal jobs—a clear reflection of decent work deficits. They also did not have strong social networks and ties to boost livelihood initiatives and fight for better wages and working conditions.

Through the UYF and Y2Y, youth beneficiaries received practical skills and business creation knowledge; access to monthly income and financial independence; access to social
networks and acquaintances; and access to land, startup capital, materials and equipment. Even those who did not have decent income during and after the project still had high hopes for a better job, income and social life. Over 75% of youth entrepreneurs expected a full-time and permanent job through self-employment and microenterprises. As a result, decent work was something most youth did not have but clearly hoped for. The analysis has shown that a typical youth entrepreneur’s path to a decent and sustainable livelihood opportunity was complicated and long but not impossible. Challenges remained that stood in youth entrepreneur path to sustainable and decent employment:

- Negative community and parental perceptions discouraged many youth from participating in projects. As a result, some youth dropped out of the training and went back to informal family- and own-account informal employment activities that paid little to no income. Gender biases also worked against young women’s path to decent livelihoods. Cultural biases favored the education of boys over girls and some parents strongly opposed the participation of girls in projects. The parents needed extensive educational and awareness campaigns beyond what the grantee resources permitted.

- During the training, slum youth and lowly educated youth found out that they needed extensive training beyond what the grantees could offer. As a result, they were not adequately trained to start their own businesses or compete in the job market with formally educated youth. This was particularly true for UYF beneficiaries who received computer and ICTs skills training—the grantees only offered them basic training and yet the job market required them to have advanced computer and ICT skills. This complicated their path to decent employment as they found themselves back to where
they started. They acquired basic computer skills that potential employers considered inadequate for a permanent full-time job.

- Access to land was also a challenge after the training. As shown in the analysis chapters, land or workspace was highly prized in urban areas. Access to land was possible but unproductively slow for most Y2Y projects. Youth entrepreneurs found that after graduation, they did not have a secure workspace and land to start businesses.

  In Nigeria, some G2Mi female entrepreneurs went back to informal landlords in slum areas where they secured land that was very expensive considering the income they earned. They could not secure land in Port Harcourt because they were not connected to local government officials and influential people in the city. Also, in Nigeria, the FOH female beneficiaries engaged in home-based enterprises because access to land was impossible in Maiduguri. In Cameroon, local government officials were too corrupt to help VICYOMO and ABU-YES beneficiaries. In fact, the Bamenda City Council abruptly changed the city’s building codes and bylaws and in the process ABU-YES beneficiaries were evicted.

  There were a few positive UYF examples in the area of land access: the FTZ collaborated with the Mutare City Council and over 300 youth gained access to land as a result; the sub-city WORDAs secured cheaper land for youth beneficiaries in collaboration with EYA in Addis Ababa; ward councilors and community members approached the Kabwe City council to facilitate access to land for CYM project beneficiaries; and the YPPD gave youth beneficiaries recommendation letters that legitimized youth businesses in the eyes of community land owners and the Makeni City
Council in Sierra Leone. For the Y2Y, local governments played a major role in facilitating youth access to land in Ivory Coast and Guinea during the pilot round. Overall, limited access to land narrowed youth entrepreneur’s path to decent employment; enhanced access to land eased the path for some youth beneficiaries.

- Access to startup capital was a major challenge faced by youth entrepreneurs. Banks did not trust that youth beneficiaries could succeed and they also required collateral beyond the reach of many beneficiaries. Many youth beneficiaries collaborated to raise the required collateral but they still could not secure enough business loans and credit. Some youth entrepreneurs secured collateral from their parents but those were a privileged minority. Limited access to startup capital also meant that youth entrepreneurs found it difficult to purchase the equipment and startup tools that they needed to create decent self-employment opportunities.

- Transportation to and from project sites was also a major challenge experienced by some youth entrepreneurs. Yet, previous studies have shown that low-income people depend heavily on public transportation to and from places of employment (Mbara & Maunder, 1997). Inadequate transportation prevented youth entrepreneurs in Guinea and Sierra from travelling to and from project sites. Inadequate and expensive public transportation also prevented youth entrepreneurs in Nigeria from working together to offset land and startup capital access challenges. As a result, the path to decent income and employment became complicated and slow for young entrepreneurs in the absence of reliable public transportation.
• There were also seasonality and natural factors that complicated youth entrepreneur’s path to decent employment opportunities. For example, youth farmers in Guinea shifted employment activities between farming and off-farm seasons. In the absence of multiple self-employment opportunities, young farmers’ incomes were eroded during off-farm seasons. As a result, they engaged in a complex web of livelihood activities, uncharacteristic of decent and sustainable livelihoods. Some youth projects were also disrupted during the rain season as the youth entrepreneurs found it impossible to operate in temporary structures. Consequently, the youth entrepreneur’s path to decent employment became a nightmare.

Access to decent and sustainable employment is a long-term goal that will take funding agencies, grantees, and youth entrepreneurs long to accomplish. This study has shown that UYF and Y2Y grantees and youth entrepreneurs are positively moving towards decent employment opportunities. The path has so far been complicated and slow but not impossible. There were promising partnerships in the area of land access and financial capital. Evidently, the creation of cooperatives has also brought diverse youth and community members together. However, the role of the cooperatives and microenterprises beyond meeting the immediate needs of youth entrepreneurs was not evident. Decent and sustainable youth employment implies the full participation of youth in local and national economic decision making processes. The study found no concrete evidence suggesting that youth cooperatives, groups and microenterprises played a significant role in this regard. If the trend continues, the path to decent employment and livelihoods will remain incomplete. An encouraging finding was that most youth expected a higher income in future through permanent and full-time employment. There is no question that
this could be achieved but the potential hindrance from the fundamentals challenges discussed throughout the study should never be underestimated.

As the study has shown, youth entrepreneurs have the innovation, enthusiasm, and determination to achieve decent and sustainable employment at any cost. International development organizations, community members, public and private sectors and NGOs are uniquely positioned to harness and scale up youth initiatives towards productive and decent employment opportunities. YEN and UN-Habitat have clearly shown that this is possible; other private and public sectors must now follow suit. The evidence presented in this study guides youth livelihood development stakeholders to craft evidence-based policies and programs in this direction.

**Recommendations**

Given the above conclusions, theoretical perspectives from literature and my own personal and professional experience, I propose the following recommendations to funding agencies, grantees, and youth entrepreneurs:

**Funding agency-level recommendations**

- **Provide adequate and long-term funding**

  In most cases, UYF and also Y2Y projects slowed down after the stipulated one-year funding cycle or ceased completely once funding dried up. Project coordinators reported difficulties in expanding or replicating projects in the absence of continued funding from UN-Habitat and YEN. Limited organizational budgets and weak strategic financial partnerships also hindered project continuation. Organizations whose projects ceased recommended that UN-Habitat fund successful projects beyond one year. The one year funding rule was thought to be inadequate and unsustainable given the need for project expansion and replication. Some
organizations also felt that they needed to offer youth graduates start-up loans and working tools but did not have enough funding to do so. A few projects were still ongoing but at a very slow, pace with restricted enrollment and brief training sessions. In most cases, projects continued with external donor funding, self-financing from beneficiary loan repayments, and limited financial assistance from local partner organizations.

The analysis has presented enough evidence that the provision of long-term and adequate funding holds the key to sustainable youth employment creation. For example, most 2009 UYF grantees struggled to continue after the UN-Habitat grant: The Girls to Mothers Project (Nigeria) has not been able to continue due to inadequate funding; AISEC-Senegal lacked adequate financial resources to expand its project to places outside Dakar; the Initiative for Youth Employment and Development Project and ICT for Youth Development Projects were both ongoing but at a much slower pace due to limited funding; the Youth Participation in Urban Settlement Project in South Africa officially ended after the UYF grant; and EYA worked in three out of the 119 sub-city regions in the populous Addis Ababa; and the VCIYOMO Piggery Farming Project officially ended after the UYF grant.

It is also important to note that the YEN Y2Y planned a third funding phase that will specifically focus on project expansion and replication. An Y2Y replication fund has already been launched in Morocco and YEN has plans to replicate and expand successful youth-led projects in Guinea and Sierra Leone. UN-Habitat should consider following in YEN’s footsteps.

- **Fund rural and peri-urban projects**

  This recommendation particularly applies to UN-Habitat’s UYF because the YEN Y2Y already provides funding to rural and urban projects. Acknowledging the power of rural-urban
connections is vital in sustainable poverty reduction strategies (Tacoli, 2003). Rural development stimulates urban development and vice-versa. As a result, the separation of rural and urban areas is counterproductive in sustainable livelihood interventions (Tacoli, 2003).

- **Provide technical, financial and project management training to at least two members of a youth-led organizations.**

  So far, YEN and UN-Habitat have both focused on training the project coordinator. However, this seems to be an inadequate capacity building approach because if the project coordinator fails, as noted in some Sierra Leone Y2Y projects, the whole project will be in jeopardy. The Y2Y projects in Sierra Leone indicated that the capacity of the project coordinator is a central ingredient in project success. The accumulation of human capital may be considered an end in itself given that poverty is often measured using literacy levels and ill-health (DFID, 1999). UN-Habitat and YEN should promote wider access to human capital for youth-led organization staff and not just the project coordinator.

- **Encourage and fund projects that involves partnership with local governments or city councils to facilitate youth access to land**

  Youth-led organizations cited fundamental challenges related to access to urban land or working space for their organizations and youth beneficiaries. Access to urban land was limited for most youth organizations due to high rentals. For example, KHCS in Kenya was paying $US150 per month for a rented private office that they also used for training purposes. High rentals in urban Bamenda (Cameroon) forced the ORGIIS to relocate its project to suburban Bamenda where access via public transportation was difficult. Some organizations used their
offices as training venues and that limited the number of youth they could train at any given
time. Others such as YAI-Uganda rented multiple houses to conduct training activities.

In a few cases, partner organizations donated land for training purposes. However,
effective partnerships in the area of land access were lacking in most cases and it should now be
encouraged or required at best. An exception was CYO (Malawi) where strong partnership with
the Blantyre City Council allowed Council to donate a venue for training and also to offer
financial administration and capacity building. For VICYOMO (Cameroon) graduates, local and
central government officials, including Limbe City officials were reportedly too corrupt to help
youth beneficiaries who needed access to agricultural land. AISEC-Senegal’s Green Young
Entrepreneurs graduates acquired land from family members but it was cumbersome for them to
acquire land ownership certificates from the government.

Available literature highlights several ways in which access to secure urban land is vital
for successful youth livelihoods in low-income countries. Access to secure urban land for
employment activities opens up opportunities for direct participation in the planning,
development and use of urban land (Jimenez, 2006; UN-Habitat, 2010). With access to secure
land, youth can also gain the collateral necessary for access to credit and financial resources.
Access to secure urban land is thus necessary for protection, voice and empowerment of youth in
urban development processes (Jimenez, 2006). The benefits of secure access to land are many;
UN-Habitat and YEN should carefully consider prioritizing youth-led projects that involve
strong partnerships with local government including access to land at the minimum. Funding
youth entrepreneurs who would become landless soon after training is an unsustainable youth-led
development approach that should be addressed.
• Encourage and fund projects that includes financial partnerships with banks or other financial institutions to ease youth access to startup capital

Most grantees pointed out that it was not a good idea to simply train youth in the absence of start-up capital upon graduation. Grantees did not have enough money to provide loans to youth beneficiaries after graduation. As such, most beneficiaries were forced to work in groups as a means to pull financial resources together. It was also difficult for youth to access loans from banks due to limited collateral and negative perception by financial institutions and the community in general. Some grantees sought partnerships with banks and conducted outreach programs to market their projects to community members, and banks. In the same way that workspace partnership with local government should be encouraged or required financial partnership with banks or other financial organizations should also be encouraged as much as possible. In other words, UN-Habitat and YEN should give funding priority to youth-led projects that will facilitate youth entrepreneurs’ access to startup capital after the training.

• Strengthen monitoring and evaluation

UN-Habitat and the YEN should foster long-term partnerships with grantees and youth beneficiaries during and after the project through monitoring and evaluation. As shown in Chapter 1, monitoring and evaluation foster learning and project sustainability as it allows funding agencies to implement evidence-based policies and practices. Currently, there are no post-project M & E procedures for UN-Habitat and YEN to track grantees and youth beneficiaries beyond one year to gauge project sustainability in line with sustainable livelihood and decent employment creation goals. UN-Habitat can strengthen M & E by facilitating technical partnerships between grantees and country offices. YEN can also facilitate M & E partnerships between Y2Y grantees and YEN Lead Country Network.
Strengthening M & E can motivate youth entrepreneurs and provide valuable lessons to funding agencies in the long-term. Giving youth-led organizations grants for a year and letting them go does not seem productive given the challenges documented in this study. Grantees lacked external funding opportunities and technical partnerships to expand and replicate projects. In most cases, strategic partnerships for project sustainability were completely missing. For example, the relationship between some UYF grantees and UN-Habitat ended abruptly and upon project completion. Yet, most organizations felt they needed continued UN-Habitat follow ups, communication, monitoring and evaluation and funding beyond the stipulated one-year funding rule. This was clearly evident in the case of Southern African Youth Movement where there has not been any communication with UN-Habitat since the project ended in 2011. Southern African Youth Movement officials wanted to continue with the project, including exploring land use related projects such as urban agriculture, but did not know how to proceed once the UYF grant ended. The monitoring and evaluation gap should be closed through technical assistance to promote sustainable youth employment creation and long-term partnerships.

- **Fund more women-centered projects**

The study has shown the need for more gender-sensitive projects in youth employment creation. Access to livelihood assets such as land, social networks and startup capital is particularly a challenge for young women who are often discriminated. Young women typically have low educational levels and they tend to engage in home-based enterprises and unpaid household work (ILO, 2005; Schoof, 2006). In the informal economy, young women often engage in low risk activities that also have a low rate of return. In most parts of Sub-Saharan Africa, parents generally prefer to educate a boy to a girl (Sharif, 1998). As a result, the need for human capital enhancement is particularly important for female youth.
UN-Habitat and YEN should consider funding projects that seek to promote young women’s access to savings and credits to boost female youth access to financial capital. According to Miles (2001), access to financial capital is especially vital for women informal traders in urban Africa. In SSA, savings and micro-credit schemes are largely employed by poor women in their quest for sustainable livelihoods (Landman & Napier, 2010; Mills, 2007; Mitlin, 2008; Mitlin, 2010). Savings and credit schemes often afford the urban poor access to better quality housing and housing improvement (DFID, 1999; Satterthwaite, 2002a). In some cases, microcredit and savings schemes help the urban poor to mobilize themselves to demand better working conditions (Satterthwaite, 2002a). I, therefore, recommend that UN-Habitat and YEN prioritize young women’s projects to enhance female youth access to human, financial and social assets and yield gender equality in youth employment programs.

- **Consider more special funding windows** (UN-Habitat 2011 Zanzibar Window and YEN Y2Y-West Africa are good examples)

UN-Habitat should consider funding urban agriculture projects or recycling projects in southern Africa. So far, most recycling projects are concentrated in East Africa, as if other SSA cities do not experience waste management challenges. Waste management and recycling is a widespread problem in SSA (UN-Habitat, 2009). The global youth employment crisis demands that such special funding windows focus more on job creation and entrepreneurship projects and less on advocacy, governance and awareness campaign projects.

- **Facilitate local and international exchange experiences and better ICT access for grantees**

Most Y2Y grantees appeared disconnected because they did not have reliable access to the internet. The YEN should particularly consider ICTs projects in West Africa to enhance
youth entrepreneurs’ access to information capital in the 21st Century. An alternative would be for YEN to provide sources of information and external funding opportunities to grantees during project implementation and management workshops. Y2Y grantees were unaware of the existence of important resources for youth entrepreneurs such as the World Bank Youth Employment Inventory (http://www.youth-employment-inventory.org/), the YEN Marketplace (https://yenmarketplace.org/) and the UN-Habitat Global Youth Desk and Global Youth Research Network (http://www.globalyouthdesk.org/). Even if grantees were to know about these resources, they likely may not be able to access them because most of them do not have reliable internet connections.

I recommend priority funding for ICTs projects also based on my inability to conduct Skype or phone interviews with all grantees in Sierra Leone because they did not have access to internet and telephone services. The need for exchange experiences suggests that funding agencies should consider funding ICTs projects for youth. Access to computers and internet has the potential to close information and international networking deficits reported by grantees. The Y2Y should seriously consider this option in West Africa where communication between grantees and YEN officials was also reportedly difficult because of poor telecommunication infrastructure. The cost of maintaining and upgrading the ICT infrastructure can be addressed through financial partnerships between grantees and private sector, community members, local and national governments, youth entrepreneurs and international development actors.

• Provide non-financial assistance

Findings from this study have shown that grantees and youth beneficiaries need non-financial resources to succeed and these should also be prioritized in the future. Such non-financial resources may include the provision of a motor vehicle in place of a grant to facilitate
transportation to and from project sites. Access to one asset can enhance youth access to other assets (DFID, 1999). Youth entrepreneurs reported that inadequate public transportation hindered access to decent livelihood opportunities during and after the training.

- **Collaborate to avoid duplication**

  Sustainable livelihood interventions require institutional collaboration and linkages at all levels to avoid duplication of activities (DFID, 1999). For example, YEN first came up with the idea of youth challenge funds in Africa and UN-Habitat “copied” the idea but the two organizations have not collaborated since then. The potential for duplication remains in the absence of collaborative efforts. This study has laid a foundation for YEN-UN-Habitat collaboration. I presented the similarities and differences in the two approaches and compared the impacts of Y2Y and UYF projects, including challenges and lessons learned. Collaboration can be fostered in many ways. YEN and UN-Habitat should launch a joint challenge fund involving shared responsibilities. For example, YEN can provide technical assistance to UYF grantees in West Africa. Alternatively, YEN and UN-Habitat can pull financial and technical resources together to replicate successful Y2Y and UYF projects on a large scale.

_Grantee-level recommendations_

- **Invest in beneficiary recruitment and community partnerships**

  Findings from this study suggest that grantees should involve parents and community members to ensure that the most disadvantaged youth are identified to benefit from projects. Community involvement proved important in facilitating youth access to land in the UYF and Y2Y projects. The support from community members also ensured that youth-led businesses were culturally acceptable and that community members acted as reliable customers for youth
products. Gaining full community support demands extended entrepreneurship education and project awareness campaigns targeting parents and youth beneficiaries.

- **Develop and strengthen workspace and financial partnerships**

  Grantees should partner with local governments and city council especially if their projects promote youth entrepreneurship and self-employment, all of which require that youth entrepreneurs’ access to secure land or workspace during and/or after the training. In Ethiopia and Zambia, access to land for UYF beneficiaries was facilitated by sub-city government units and Ward Councilors. In Zambia, Ward Councilors negotiated with municipal authorities to facilitate UYF graduates’ access to working space. Grantees should as well consider financial partnerships with banks to enhance youth access to financial capital after graduation. FOH partnered with a local bank in Nigeria to facilitate youth entrepreneurs’ access to startup capital after the training.

- **Link youth groups, associations and cooperatives to wider decision making processes at the local government and national level**

  Youth cooperatives can act as important avenues for youth voice in community development processes. As the study has shown, the cooperatives are not connected to macro-level processes as yet. Sustainable livelihood interventions imply that micro-level processes are linked to macro-level processes to ensure that higher policy making is informed by local realities and projects. For example, EYA in Ethiopia and FOH in Nigeria linked their youth groups to local banks to facilitate access to financial capital. The same linkages should be promoted at the local and national government level to promote youth participation policies in youth livelihood policies and programs. One way in which the urban poor can access financial capital is through informal networks and associations (Phillips, 2002). As a result, workers in informal economy
in urban Africa and elsewhere including youth, are increasingly organizing themselves to defend the right to decent livelihoods (Chigunta et al., 2005; Hansen & Vaa, 2004; Kamete, 2010). The UYF and Y2Y created microenterprises and cooperatives have the potential to enhance youth access to banking and microfinance institutions. Grantees have an important role to play in linking youth groups and cooperatives to wider institutions at the local and national level.

- **Propose ICT projects**

Grantees should propose ICTs projects or include access to computers and internet in project proposal especially if access to information is a challenge in project locations. For now, youth-led organizations with internet access can visit the World Bank Youth Employment Inventory (http://www.youth-employment-inventory.org/); the YEN Marketplace (https://yenmarketplace.org/), and UN-Habitat Global Youth Desk and Global Youth Research Network (http://www.globallyouthdesk.org/); and Making Cents International (http://www.makingcents.com/) for comprehensive youth employment and livelihood information. Other important sources of information and funding opportunities for youth-led NGOs include Funds for NGOs (http://www.fundsforngos.org/), the Opportunity Desk (http://opportunitydesk.org/) and Advance Africa (http://www.advance-africa.com/).

**Youth-level recommendations**

- **Educate parents about the value of youth entrepreneurship**

Youth entrepreneurs should educate parents about the value of youth entrepreneurship using evidence from friends and training programs. They should also let parents know that self-employment and entrepreneurship is now “the new normal” and that formal education can no longer guarantee formal employment. Even so, access to formal employment does not guarantee success in a young person’s life (Chant & Jones, 2005).
• **Be realistic about potential project benefits and be patient**

Youth entrepreneurs should be realistic about the benefits from projects such as the Y2Y and UYF, particularly income after the project. They need to understand that substantial benefits will be realized in the long term and not in the short term. To be successful entrepreneurs, youth should reorient their way of thinking from the concern with short-term benefits to a preoccupation with long-term benefits.

• **Extend training opportunities to your peers, community members and parents**

Youth should continue to act as role models in their communities to ensure sustainable community development and poverty reduction through collaborative efforts.

• **Above all, be optimistic and enthusiastic in everything that you do**

The study has shown that youth enthusiasm has the potential to sustain projects during difficult times. The enthusiasm reported from Y2Y projects should be embraced by youth entrepreneurs. When youth are enthusiastic about what they do, they are less likely to drop out of the training.

*Recommendations for planning practice*

Rapid informal and youth economic activities have many implications for planning practice. In countries and regions where customary land tenure systems persist, planners must work with community members and chiefs to promote harmonious urban development and management. Planners must educate community members and chiefs about existing land use regulations and policies to ensure that developers and entrepreneurs receive development permits.
before construction begins. The ability to work with community members demands flexibility on the part of planners in terms of land use and zoning regulations. According to Rakodi (2002a), the separation of residential areas based on income impinges on the possibility of viable informal economic activities in mixed-income or mixed-use neighborhoods. Zoning regulations allowing mixed use developments could, therefore, minimize land use related conflicts by allowing informal economic activities in residential, commercial and industrial areas. Spatial planners should also upgrade informal economic activities as a means to integrate them into the mainstream urban economy as in Durban (South Africa).

As shown in Chapter 6, youth informal networks are an integral part of everyday youth livelihoods. Youth networks are an important way for youth to engage in sustainable livelihoods. Planners must engage youth networks and representative NGOs to integrate the interests of informal youth in land use planning processes. Special committees can be set at the local government level to represent the interests of informal youth in urban development and management (Goodfellow, 2012). Informal sector committees can ensure policy level recognition and institutionalization of informal economic activities (Meagher, 2013).

The institutionalization of informal economic activities can start as an informal arrangement between city authorities and youth entrepreneurs. City authorities can informally delegate door-to-door waste collection and recycling in informal settlements to informal waste collectors. This is already happening in cities such as Kampala (Katusiimeh et al, 2013), where informal waste pickers engage in door-to-door waste collection in slum areas and deliver the waste to a central location for formal city council collection. The informal arrangement can lower recycling costs for Kampala City Council if institutionalized (Katusiimeh et al, 2013).
Full recognition of informal economic activities requires continued advocacy and awareness campaigns by NGOs. The advocacy can focus on upgrading informal settlements, credit provisions, facilitating formal-informal procumbent arrangements and supporting long-term alliances between formal and informal economic activities (Meagher, 2013).

**Policy and community level recommendations**

At the policy level, national and local governments and youth-led organizations have an important role to play in promoting a positive view of youth in community development. This study has shown that national and local governments generally hold negative views on youth. In particular, informal youth are viewed as rebellious elements in society who are bent on breaking the law. As a result, youth entrepreneurship is rarely supported by local and national governments. Youth-led organizations and international development organizations must therefore advocate for the institutionalization of informal youth activities. This can be done through partnerships or co-provision in urban basic service provision such as recycling and waste management.

Youth-led organizations must also engage local and national governments to raise awareness on informal youth livelihoods and to promote dialogue between informal youth entrepreneurs and local governments. For example, the Family-in-Need Trust of Zimbabwe engaged Mutare City Council to facilitate youth access to land and improved youth-council relations. Over 300 youth gained access to land and work permits as a result. The Friends of the Habitat introduced its project beneficiaries to the Nigerian Government resulting in improved relations between youth entrepreneurs and national government in Maiduguri. There are also ongoing talks between Friends of the Habitat and the Nigerian Government to integrate youth-led entrepreneurship activities in the national youth policy. Through the UYF, the Urban Youth
in Governance and Development facilitated meetings between government officials and young people in Ghana. The positive dialogue between youth and Ghanaian government officials resulted in increased youth access to startup capital and mentorship.

The African Union has already paved the way for positive youth development by declaring 2009-2018 as the “Decade of Youth Development”. Many African countries have also crafted National Youth Policies that can positively transform youth lives if implemented. The challenge is for national governments to adequately fund youth ministries and programs. International development organizations should also collaborate with local NGOs to promote the implementation of youth empowerment and employment policies in developing communities. Policies that promote and implement youth employment programs can shift the view of youth from idle and lazy to productive citizens.

At the community level, local and international NGOs must educate community members and parents about young people’s creativity and potential. NGOs can launch advocacy campaigns to educate parents about the value of youth economic opportunities in poverty reduction and community development efforts. For example, the Kaswesha Housing Cooperative Society in Kenya and the Youth Partnership for Peace and Development in Sierra Leone invited community members to youth graduation ceremonies to promote a positive view of youth among community members. Youth Action International-Uganda educated parents and community members about the value of informal youth entrepreneurship in overall youth development. It successful convinced many parents to allow girls to enroll in the UYF project. In Kenya, former Tears Group Kenya trainees formed an alumni network to offer ICT and creative arts skills training to community youth and parents. As a result, community members viewed Tears Group
Kenya graduates as role models for other youth. These are some practical steps that youth-led organizations can take to foster positive perceptions of youth.

**Final thoughts**

Sustainable youth livelihood interventions demand that funding agencies, youth organizations, community members and youth entrepreneurs work together to identify the most promising youth livelihood projects. Successful livelihood interventions are a function of the transforming structures and processes that facilitate or hinder youth access to assets. These transforming structures and processes should be clearly identified and integrated in proposed projects to foster project sustainability and effectiveness. The vulnerability context also has a bearing on youth-led initiatives and should also be taken into consideration in the design of youth-led livelihood projects, particularly those depending on natural resources and projects proposed in conflict and natural disaster prone communities. At all levels, sustainable livelihood interventions demand accountability through constant monitoring and evaluation of development projects to ensure that project benefits reach intended beneficiaries. Sustainable livelihood interventions also imply that the full participation of youth in development projects should continue throughout, from design and implementation to monitoring and evaluation. YEN and UN-Habitat have promoted youth participation in project design and implementation. They should also facilitate youth participation in monitoring and evaluation exercises through constant fieldwork to understand project impacts and constraints fully.

Above all, sustainable livelihood interventions call for micro-macro linkages to ensure that national level poverty reduction efforts are informed by local realities and circumstances. The promotion of micro-macro linkages can also promote efficient use of scarce financial
resources by minimizing duplication of efforts. Marco-micro linkages can also foster institutional collaboration towards sustainable poverty reduction.

Overall, it is encouraging that Y2Y and UYF projects embraced most elements of the sustainable livelihoods framework even though both did not specify it as their operating framework. The quest for decent youth employment creation calls for a framework that acknowledges youth as central assets in youth employment creation whilst acknowledging the multiple constraints that low-income youth entrepreneurs encounter. After hearing youth entrepreneurs’ experiences and challenges, I proposed a context-sensitive sustainable youth-led livelihood development framework.

**Directions for future research**

A future study may begin with a full-scale impact evaluation that includes a larger number of grantees and youth beneficiaries than included in this study. Such a study will need clear indicators for monitoring and evaluation and a comparison group at the youth beneficiary level. If possible, the study should employ a randomized controlled experiment that delineates program participants from non-participants. The experiment could track project beneficiaries over a long period of time to determine the outcomes attributable to projects and potential intervening variables during the study period.

Another potential area of study could be an assessment of the role that youth cooperatives and microenterprises play in mainstreaming youth, gender, and informal employment in rural and urban development processes in SSA. There was not enough data in this study to make any conclusions in this regard. Given the challenges that young women face and the urgent need to address them, future study can focus on young women-led projects to identify gender specific challenges and needs. Another potential area of study could be a comparative assessment of
rural- and urban-based Y2Y projects to deepen our understanding of youth-specific, rural-urban interactions and the role of youth-led development in promoting integrated rural and urban development interventions.

Finally, one can conduct an ethnographic study that focuses on specific case studies. Best practice examples presented in Chapter 4 provide a basis for such a study. The study could explore the impact of UYF or Y2Y projects on end beneficiaries, including challenges, lessons and recommendations through in-depth interviews, direct observations and focus group discussions.
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INVITATIONAL EMAIL TO URBAN YOUTH FUND AND YOUTH-TO-YOUTH FUND PROJECT COORDINATORS

COMIRB #: 12-0465

Principal Investigator: Tizai Mauto

Protocol Title: Urban Youth Employment Programs in Low-Income Countries: Evaluating the Youth Employment Network Youth to Youth Fund and UN-Habitat Urban Youth Fund

Version date: 5/25/2012

The following is the proposed Invitational Email to Selected Youth to Youth Fund and Urban Youth Fund Grantees:

Subject: Invitation to Participate in Youth Employment Research

Dear________ (Project Coordinator or Representative)

I am writing to invite the participation of_____ (Organization Name) in my proposed student research project titled “Urban Youth Employment Programs in Low-Income Countries: Evaluating the Youth Employment Network Youth to Youth Fund and UN-Habitat Urban Youth Fund”. The purpose of this study is to evaluate and compare the effectiveness of youth-led projects funded through the Youth to Youth Fund and Urban Youth Fund programs to highlight and explore best practices to guide urban policy makers, funding agencies, international development agencies and youth-led Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). To this end, the study hopes to use evidence-based strategies to stimulate collaboration, coordination and cooperation among international development agencies, policy makers and practitioners concerned with the urban youth employment challenge in low-income countries. I selected your organization systematically from the list of past Youth to Youth Fund/Urban Youth Fund grantees available on the Youth Employment Network/UN-Habitat website. Your participation in the proposed study will be in the form of a one-time interview conducted through Skype and responding to any follow-up emails after the Skype conversation as needed. In addition to the Skype interview, I am also requesting your participation in related online survey that I will send
to you. The proposed one-time Skype conversation will last about an hour and the online survey may take up to 2 hours to complete. The Skype interview and the online survey will thus require up to 3 hours of your participation time. I may also send you follow up email(s) after the Skype interview and/or online survey for any clarification or further details.

Please note that your participation in the Skype interviews and web survey is completely voluntary. I would appreciate if you could respond to this email indicating whether or not you will be interested in participating in this study. The information that you provide will be confidential. Your consent will be sought should be there be any need to publicize any such information in future. Also, this study will be guided by the Colorado Multiple Institutional Review Board (COMIRB). To learn more about COMIRB, please visit:

http://www.ucdenver.edu/academics/research/AboutUs/comirb/Pages/comirb-home.aspx

Finally, feel free to send me any questions you may have about the proposed study.

Thank you and best wishes,

Tizai Mauto
PhD Student
College of Architecture and Planning
University of Colorado Denver
APPENDIX 2

SKYPE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR URBAN YOUTH FUND AND YOUTH-TO-YOUTH FUND PROJECT COORDINATORS
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Proposed Skype/Email Interview Schedule Based on Research Questions*
Skype Interview Schedule: Youth to Youth Fund/Urban Youth Fund Grantees—Project Coordinators

How does the Youth-to-Youth Fund (Y2Y) approach differ from the Urban Youth Fund (UYF) approach?

1. Other than the grant you received from Youth Employment Network/UN-Habitat, how else did the Youth Employment Network/UN-Habitat assist you in the implementation of the project?

Document reviews: variations in the Y2YF and UYF operational and managerial guidelines; what kinds of projects are funded by the Y2YF/UYF, at what cost?

What is the impact of the Y2YF and UYF on urban youth’s access to physical, social, financial and human capital?

2. How do the self-employed youth or entrepreneurs you have trained access working spaces for their activities? What kind of working spaces do these self-employed youth use for their livelihood activities? Do they have licenses for the spaces that they use for self-employment? Do they pay any tax to the local Municipality? If so, roughly how much tax do they pay monthly/annually? (Physical Capital)

3. Do the young people you have trained work in groups or as individuals before and after graduation? Why do you think they choose to work that way? Have the young entrepreneurs you have trained been able to form or join any support groups/associations/cooperatives/unions? If so, what kind of groups/associations/cooperatives/unions did they form or join and what role do the cooperatives/groups/associations/organizations play in young people’s everyday life?
Have any partnerships emerged between your organization and any other organization(s) following the Y2YF/UYF project? If so, what kind of partnerships emerged and what role do young people play in any such partnerships, if anything? *(Social Capital)*

4. Have young people you have trained been able to access credit or loans to start their own businesses? If so, how much were they getting, from whom and was it enough? Have you been able to extend any credit facilities to the young men and women you have trained? If so, how many young men and women beneficiaries have benefited from the credit facility? What kind of credit repayment arrangement was put in place? Have youth beneficiaries been able to repay their credit on time? If anything, what kind of income generating activities did those credit/loan recipients venture into? *(Financial Capital)*.

5. Through the Y2YF/UYF, have you been able to provide any employment skills training programs to youth? If so, what kind of skills training programs did you provide to youth? How successful were the skills training programs against your goals and objectives? *(Human Capital)*

To what extent is the Youth-to-Youth Fund (Y2Y) and Urban Youth Fund (UYF) creating decent and sustainable jobs for urban youth in low-income countries?

6. How many young men and women have benefited from the project so far? How many of the beneficiaries are young females?
7. Separately, how many young men and women have secured jobs or started their own businesses after the project?
8. What kind of jobs are the young men and women you have trained engaged in?
9. Have the estimated incomes of those youth you have trained or reached so far changed in any way after the project? If so, how did their incomes change roughly following this project?
10. Other than the selected Y2YF/UYF beneficiaries, have any youth from the community benefited from this project? If so, roughly how many other youth from the community have benefited from this project and in what way(s)? Is the larger urban community benefiting from this project? If so, in what way(s)?
11. Are young women and men beneficiaries involved in any other activities or projects in the community? If so, what kind of activities are they engaged in and to what effect?
12. Have you been able to reach and train young people working in the informal economy and/or those staying in the slums? If so, how many informally employed young men and women have you reached so far?
13. What is the status of the Y2YF/UYF project at this point? Have you been able to continue with the project or replicate the project elsewhere? If so, have you been able to secure funding from elsewhere for the project?

**Challenges and Opportunities**

14. What is the biggest challenge that you faced during the implementation of this project? How did you overcome the challenge?
15. What opportunities, if any, have been opened up for you following this project?
Lessons and Recommendations

16. What lessons would you like to share with other youth-led organizations planning to implement similar projects elsewhere?
17. What recommendations would you give to UN-Habitat/Youth Employment Network based on your experiences implementing this project?
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This survey collects end of project data from past UN-Habitat Urban Youth Fund / Youth Employment Network Youth to Youth Fund grantees as part of my University of Colorado Denver doctoral dissertation project titled: Urban Youth Employment Programs in Low-income Countries: Evaluating the Youth Employment Network Youth to Youth Fund and UN-Habitat Urban Youth Fund. The survey asks for information on your Urban Youth Funded (Youth to Youth Funded) Project, not your Organization in general, unless specifically stated. Your completion of this questionnaire will provide necessary data for me to comparatively evaluate the effectiveness of youth-led employment or entrepreneurship programs in low-income countries and to document best youth employment and entrepreneurship practices.

Project Overview

1. Please provide the following information about you, your organization and your project:
   Your name __________________________
   Your email address ____________________
   Your age ____________________________
   Name of organization __________________
   Name of project ______________________
   Project Start Date_____________________
   Project End Date_____________________ 

2. What is your position in your organization?
   □ President
   □ Chairman
   □ Project Coordinator
   □ Secretary
   □ Treasurer
   □ Founder
   □ Other (specify) _______________________ 

3. In what areas does your project focus? (Select all that apply.)
Access to Working Space and Tools

4. Please describe the type of space in which your organization works:
   - Shared space with another organization
   - Borrowed space
   - Your own space
   - Rented space
   - We have no space → Skip to # 6

5. About how much does your organization pay per month in total for all of your space(s) (in $USD), if anything?
   Monthly expense for space (in $USD) ____________________

6. What kind of working are youth beneficiaries using for their livelihood activities? (Select all that apply)
   - Shared space with other youth
   - Rented private space
   - Rented city/municipal space
   - Vacant lot
   - Public spaces
   - Borrowed space
   - Their own space
   - Other (specify) ____________________
   - Home-based space → Skip to # 8
   - They have no space → Skip to # 8

7. About how much are youth beneficiaries paying per month in total for the space(s) that they use (in $USD), if anything?
   Monthly expense for space (in $USD) ____________________

8. Have the youth beneficiaries you have reached through the UYF/Y2YF gained access to secure working space for their project activities?
   - Yes
   - No
9. Do the youth have licenses for the space(s) that they use?
   □ Yes → answer # 10
   □ No → Skip to # 11

10. About how much do the youth beneficiaries pay as the license fee for the space(s) (in $USD) if anything?
    Monthly expense for space (in $USD) ________________

11. Have you been able to provide working tools or start-up tool-kits to youth graduates?
    □ Yes
    □ No

Access to Financial Capital

12. Has your organization been able to provide youth beneficiaries with credit or loans after their graduation?
    □ Yes → answer # 13-16
    □ No → Skip to # 17

13. About how much in credit or loan has your organization been able to give youth beneficiaries?
    Average loan or credit to youth graduates (in $USD) ________________

14. Have the credit or loan facilities from your organization been adequate for youth graduates?
    □ Yes
    □ No
    □ Don’t know

15. Have all youth beneficiaries been able to repay their credit or loans on time?
    □ Yes
    □ No

16. How often does your organization require youth beneficiaries to repay their credit or loans and how much?
    □ Monthly repayment amount (in $USD) ________________
    □ Quarterly repayment amount (in $USD) ________________
    □ Annual repayment amount (in $USD) ________________
    □ Other (specify) ____________________________________

17. Have some youth beneficiaries been able to secure any credit or loans elsewhere?
    □ Yes → answer # 18-19
    □ No → Skip to # 20
    □ Don’t know → Skip to # 20
18. From whom have the youth been able to secure any loans or credit facilities? (select all that apply)
☐ Commercial Bank
☐ Building Society
☐ Micro-Credit Schemes
☐ Revolving Community Fund
☐ Other (Specify)________________________

19. Have the credit or loan facilities from elsewhere been adequate for youth graduates?
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Don’t know

Partnerships and Capacity Building

20. Has your organization been able to partner with any other organization following the Urban Youth Fund /Youth to Youth Fund Project?
☐ Yes ➔ answer # 21-22
☐ No ➔ Skip to # 23

21. Whom did you partner with (Select all that apply)
☐ National Government
☐ Youth Ministry
☐ Local Municipality or City Council
☐ Commercial Bank
☐ Local NGO
☐ International Organization
☐ Other (Specify)________________________

22. What kind of partnership emerged between your organization and the partner(s)?
(Select all that apply)
☐ Technical training
☐ Financial support
☐ Material and/or Equipment provision
☐ Mentorship training
☐ Working space provision
☐ Advisory
☐ Other (specify)____________________________
23. During the course of this Project has your **organization** received support from any of the following?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of support received</th>
<th>Financial</th>
<th>Materials or goods</th>
<th>Advice</th>
<th>Technical assistance/training</th>
<th>No support received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Has any of your organization’s management received training in any of the following areas as part of this project? (Select all that apply.)
- □ Administration
- □ Leadership/management
- □ Finance
- □ ICT
- □ Entrepreneurship
- □ No training received → Skip to # 26

25. What **organization** provided the most recent training?
   Name of organization ____________________

26. Has your organization been able to assist youth graduates to form or join support groups, associations or organizations after graduation?
- □ Yes → answer # 27
- □ No → Skip to # 28

27. What kind of support groups did the youth graduates form or join? (Select all that apply)
- □ Technical support groups
- □ Financial support groups
- □ Joint working groups
- □ Mentorship training
- □ Marketing and trading groups
- □ Other (specify) _____________________________
Access to human capital

28. What kind of training was given to young men and women through the Urban Youth Fund/Youth to Youth Fund Project? (Select all that apply.)

- Water & Sanitation
- Housing and construction
- Education
- Employment
- Entrepreneurship
- Life-skills training
- Computer skills training
- Business skills training
- Urban agriculture
- Recycling
- Other (specify) ________________
- None of the above Skip to # 30

29. How successful do you think were the training programs in # 28 above against your goals and objectives?

- Very Successful
- Successful
- Somewhat successful
- Limited success
- Unsuccessful
- Don’t know

Impact of Project on Youth and Community

30. What is the total number of youth your organization has reached through this project?

Total youth reached ________________

Number of youth reached who are women ________________

31. How many youth have you assisted in securing employment or entrepreneurship through this project, if any?

- Total youth ________________
- Number of youth who are women ________________
- Don’t know
- N/A

32. How many the youth have you assisted through this project are self-employed?

- Total youth ________________
- Number of youth who are women ________________
- Don’t know
- N/A
33. What kind of jobs are the young men and women you have reached doing? (Select all that apply.)

- Home-Based Enterprises
- Informal Legal Employment
- Water and Sanitation
- Housing and construction
- Education and Awareness Campaigns
- Formal Employment
- Entrepreneurship
- Life-skills training
- Computer skills training
- Business skills training
- Urban agriculture
- Recycling
- Other (specify) ______________
- Don’t Know

34. About how much (in $USD) are these young men and women earning annually in their respective employment or livelihood activities?

Approximate Average Annual earnings (in $USD) _________________________________
Don’t Know (explain)__________________________________________________________
N/A (explain)_____________________________________________________________

35. Have the estimated incomes of the youth you have reached changed in any after this project?

- Yes ➔ Answer # 36
- No ➔ Skip to # 37
- Don’t know ➔ Skip to # 37
- N/A ➔ Skip to # 37

36. How have the estimated of youth beneficiaries changed after the Project?

- More than doubled
- Doubled
- About the same
- Don’t Know

Challenges and Recommendations

37. What challenges did you face during the implementation of this project (Select all that apply.)

- Inadequate funding
- Late disbursement of funds
- Inadequate technical support
- Limited working space
- High participant drop outs
- Uncommitted partners
Limited training materials and equipment
Other (specify) ____________________
Didn’t experience any challenge

38. What recommendations, if any, would you give to UN-Habitat / Youth Employment Network to help improve the implementation and outcomes of future UYF/Y2YF projects?
Recommendation 1___________________________________________________________
Recommendation 2___________________________________________________________
Recommendation 3___________________________________________________________

Current Status of Project and Budget
39. Is your project still on-going?
☐ Yes → Answer # 40-41
☐ No → Skip to # 42

40. Have you been able secure funding from elsewhere to continue with the project?
☐ Yes
☐ No

41. Have you been able to replicate the project elsewhere?
☐ Yes
☐ No

42. How would you rate the effectiveness of your project in meeting its intended goals and objectives overall?
☐ Very effective
☐ Effective
☐ Somewhat effective
☐ Ineffective
☐ Still too early to tell

Please answer # 43-44 only if your Project is still ongoing, otherwise skip to # 45

43. What is this year’s budget for the Project (in $USD)?
Total budget ($USD) ____________________

44. How much funding comes from each source?
Local government ____________________
National government ____________________
Foundations ____________________
International development organizations ____________________
Loans ____________________
Earnings ____________________
Other (specify) ____________________
Please specify the "other" source:
Other source ____________________
45. Aside from monetary funding, what are the top three needs your organization will need continuing with this Project?

1. ________________________________
2. ________________________________
3. ________________________________

If necessary, feel free to email some pictures of your project to tizai.mauto@ucdenver.edu. Some picture ideas may include:

1. some youth beneficiaries engaged in their project activities
2. Picture(s) of some of the places where the youth project is taking place
3. Anything else as you deem useful

Again, my email address is tizai.mauto@ucdenver.edu.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME
# APPENDIX 4

**URBAN YOUTH FUND AND YOUTH-TO-YOUTH FUND BENEFICIARY QUESTIONNAIRE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Information</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Organization Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary's Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children and age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>Married / Single / Divorced / Widowed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When did you start working with (Organization Name)?</td>
<td>Month Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What were you doing before you joined the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What has the organization done for you since the beginning of the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment and Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Use local currency**

|  |
|---------------------|------------------|
| What was your income before the project started? | Per: day / month / year select the appropriate option |
| What is your income now? | Per: day / month / year select the appropriate option |
| Expected income at the end of the project | Per: day / month / year select the appropriate option |
| Are you making as much income as you would want to from the project? | Yes / No Explain why? |
| Have you been able to get a full time job or are you self-employed now? | Yes / No Explain why? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

|  |
|---------------------|------------------|
| How has the project impacted your life? | Yes / No Explain why? |
| What problems are you facing now? |  |
| How could the project be improved for the next time? |  |
### APPENDIX 5

#### URBAN YOUTH FUND GRANTEES AND PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee name &amp; country</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Project focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Endurance Youth Association (EYA), Ethiopia</td>
<td>Helping Urban Opportunity Neglected Youth (HUONY), Addis Ababa</td>
<td>Employment, entrepreneurship, youth women empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Youth Mobilization (CYM), Zambia</td>
<td>Community Youth Empowerment Project (CYEP), Kabwe</td>
<td>Employment, entrepreneurship, youth women empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tears Group Kenya (TGK), Kenya</td>
<td>Tears Art and Peace Empowerment Village (TAPEV), Nakuru</td>
<td>Theatre and arts, Employment, entrepreneurship youth women empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaswesha Housing Cooperative Society (KHCS), Kenya</td>
<td>Kaswesha Youth and ICT for Development, Nairobi</td>
<td>ICTs, jobs and skills training, employment, environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Action International – Uganda (YAI-Uganda), Uganda</td>
<td>Mengo Youth Vocational Skills Training, Kampala</td>
<td>Employment, entrepreneurship, youth women empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned Youth Organization (CYO), Malawi</td>
<td>ICT for Youth Development Project, Blantyre</td>
<td>ICTs, jobs and skills training, employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania Development Forum for Youth (TDFY), Tanzania</td>
<td>Establishment of Online Youth Information and Discussion Forum, Arusha</td>
<td>ICTs, jobs and skills training, employment, youth networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Partnership for Peace and Development (YPPD), Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Sustainable Livelihood For Peace and Development (SLPD), Freetown</td>
<td>Vocational skills training, Employment, entrepreneurship, youth women empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AISEC-Senegal</td>
<td>Green Youth Entrepreneurs (GYE), Dakar</td>
<td>Environmental awareness and education, Employment, entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization for Indigenous Youths Initiatives and</td>
<td>Recycling of Used Car Tyres for Job Creation, Limbe</td>
<td>Recycling, waste management, job creation, entrepreneurship,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Program Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability (ORGIIS), Cameroon</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Agriculture, job creation, entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victorious Youth Movement (VICYOMO), Cameroon</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Alleviation of Youth Poverty through Piggery, Limbe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Outreach Program Cameroon (YOP-CAM), Cameroon</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Initiative for Youth Employment and Development (IYED), Bamenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Habitat (FOH), Nigeria</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Sustainable Youth Empowerment, Maiduguri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls to Mothers Initiative (G2Mi), Nigeria</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>The Girls to Mothers Project (G2M), Port Harcourt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern African Youth Movement (SAYM), South Africa</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Youth Participation in the Urban Settlement, Pretoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Foundation Common Initiative Group (AFCIG), Cameroon</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Abakwa Urban Youth Entrepreneurship Scheme (ABU-YES), Bamenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love Planet Nigeria</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Poverty Alleviation among Disabled Youth, Kano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Youth Action, Inc. (NAYA), Liberia</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Good Girls Cooperative Pastry Project, Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Patriots in Research and Advocacy (NORPRA), Ghana</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Urban Youth in Governance and Development (UYOGOD), Bolgatanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Harvest Foundation Ghana (YHFG), Ghana</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Seamstresses Training Enterprise Project for Upper East region (STEP UP Project).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends in Life Education Peer Club (FLEP-Club),</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arise for Better Life Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Turning Point Project in Owerri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUWUKA JDA, Mozambique</td>
<td>Promoting School Environmental Youth Clubs, Maputo</td>
<td>Environmental awareness, best practices, waste management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Union People’s</td>
<td>Empowering Youth for Sustainable Planned Dar Es Salaam, Dar es Salaam</td>
<td>Youth participation, research, advocacy, governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment Foundations (AUPEF), Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care &amp; Rescue Program (CC&amp;RP), Uganda</td>
<td>Support for Income Generating Activities and Capacity Building Efforts of Child mothers (SUFIGA)</td>
<td>Young women empowerment, employment, entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Smallholders Foundation, Nigeria</td>
<td>Urban Development Secondary School Gardens, Owerri</td>
<td>Agriculture, job training and skills development, environmental education and awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family-In-Need Trust of Zimbabwe (FITZ), Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Integrated Urban Youth Development Project (IUYD), Mutare</td>
<td>Employment, entrepreneurship, job creation, job and skills training, youth participation, governance, best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Concepts Initiatives (BCI), Nigeria</td>
<td>Creating an Enabling environment for youth of Gwandu</td>
<td>Employment, entrepreneurship, employment, entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help Initiatives for People Organization (HIPO), Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Sustainable Youths Empowerment Project, Harare</td>
<td>Employment, entrepreneurship, youth women empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamaliza Environmentalist Youth Group (KWRG), Kenya</td>
<td>Kamaliza Waste Recycling Project, Nairobi</td>
<td>Environment, Employment, entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voi Youth Forum</td>
<td>Garbage is wealth and Work</td>
<td>Environment, employment, entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABOUT THE URBAN YOUTH FUND

This fund promotes the poverty reduction aims of Millennium Development Goals and the Habitat Agenda for better, more sustainable and equitable towns and cities throughout the developing world. It provides grants of up to $25,000 for new ideas and solutions for job creation, good governance, adequate shelter and secure tenure.

By undertaking research on best practices in youth-led development the fund will also create a greater awareness of the urgency to ensure that youth concerns are integrated into national and local development policies and strategies.

Applicant organizations must be led by young people aged 15-32 years and be based in cities or towns in developing countries to qualify for a grant. Support will be provided primarily for those working to improve slum conditions and to raise opportunities for young people growing up in poverty. Projects encouraging gender equality or involving partnerships with the government or the private sector are particularly encouraged.

Background

Globally, 85 percent of the world’s young people live in developing countries. An increasing number of these young people are growing up in cities. In many cities on the African continent, more than 70 per cent of inhabitants are under the age of 30. Young people, especially girls and women, are the most vulnerable to social problems caused by unemployment and poverty. With more than 200 million youth living in poverty globally, there is a clear need to meaningfully engage and support youth.

UN-HABITAT, which regards youth as a major force for a better world, supports young people in the drive to alleviate poverty. The Habitat Agenda commits governments and UN-HABITAT to work in partnership with youth and empower them to participate in decision-making in order to improve urban livelihoods and develop sustainable human settlements.

Governments which oversee UN-HABITAT in 2007 adopted a resolution to establish the UN-HABITAT Youth Fund. Its aims are to:

- Mobilize young people for better youth-related policy formulation.
- Help governments, non-governmental, civil society and private-sector organizations better understand and respond to youth concerns.
- Support youth information networks;
- Pilot and demonstrate new ideas on employment, governance, adequate shelter and secure tenure;
- Share and exchange best practices;
- Promote vocational training and credit mechanisms for entrepreneurship and employment;
• Promote gender mainstreaming in all urban youth matters.

The *Opportunities Fund for Urban Youth-Led Development*, as it is officially called, was launched on 4 November 2008 at the fourth session of the World Urban Youth Forum in Nanjing, China.

**How To Apply**

Applicants must respect the following procedures when filling in the application online for their application to be accepted:

The application is ONLY available online in the following languages; English, French and Spanish. The application must be made in the same language as the one selected, and must be completed in full. The system will not allow you to submit the application unless all fields are completed and all compulsory attachments are submitted.

Applications submitted in hardcopy or by e-mail will NOT be accepted.

Please make sure that you finish the application and submit all compulsory attachments in the system before the deadline. The deadline is final and not up for discussion.

Applications submitted to the Youth Fund go through a thorough evaluation process to guarantee impartiality and equal treatment of applicants.

**The Selection Process**

**The process consists of five steps:**

i. Applications are registered and given a unique reference number in the online database.

ii. Applications are subjected to an eligibility check to verify that they fulfil the basic criteria required to receive grants from the fund.

iii. Eligible applications go through a quality assessment and are scored on different criteria related to the quality of the project proposal and the priorities and objectives of the Urban Youth Fund.

iv. The highest rated applications from each geographical region are shortlisted.

v. The Steering Committee of the Fund reviews the shortlisted applications and decides on which applications to approve.

Source: www.unhabitat.org/youthfund
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URBAN YOUTH FUND PRESS RELEASE

UN-HABITAT's Urban Youth Fund awards 59 small grants to urban youth-led projects in 43 countries

Nairobi, 15 Aug 11
Now in its third year, the Urban Youth Fund established by UN-HABITAT with funding from the Government of Norway has supported several thousand young people across the world to improve their lives and their urban communities. UN-HABITAT recognizes the rapidly growing youth population in cities of the developing world as potential partners in sustainable urban development. "So many of us are working hard to make opportunities for ourselves and it is sad when local leaders won't trust us. The Fund is special because it sees we can make a difference if we are empowered," says Linda, 22, from Nairobi, Kenya.

In 2011, a record number of youth from across the globe applied to the Urban Youth Fund – nearly 6000 applications globally – reflecting the growing needs of urban youth but also the number of youth already engaged in development projects in their own communities. Of note in this year's call for applications was the surge in interest from Latin America, with a nearly 25% increase in applicants, and in the special region of Zanzibar within the United Republic of Tanzania. Zanzibar is now supported by a dedicated "window" within the Urban Youth Fund, a concept that UN-HABITAT hopes to replicate for other regions in future years.

Beyond the provision of individual grants, the Urban Youth Fund now offers an online space – the Global Youth Help Desk accessible at www.globalyouthdesk.org – where young people can learn from each other, share best practices, and access cutting-edge urban youth research material. The Global Youth Help Desk, officially launched at UN-HABITAT's 23rd Governing Council meeting in April 2011, is the virtual arm of the Urban Youth Fund, supporting inter-regional cooperation between youth-led organizations and easier replication of effective youth-run development projects.

"All of the winners represent the kinds of ideas we need – ideas brought to us by young people," said UN-HABITAT Executive Director, Joan Clos. "Our young generations are the future, and we need all their vitality, creativity and optimism to create better cities and better prospects."

Source: www.unhabitat.org/youthfund
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grantee name and location</th>
<th>Grantee Size</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>Focus area(s)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GNIHONDE, <em>Ivory Coast</em></td>
<td>$49,865</td>
<td>Construction of 30 ovens for smoked fish</td>
<td>Youth employment, young women empowerment</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2009/Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Des Jeunes d’ILO-Vanou (UJIV), <em>Ivory Coast</em></td>
<td>$26,405</td>
<td>Beach cleaning and tourism development</td>
<td>Youth employment/entrepreneurship, skills training, environment</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2009/Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraternité solidarité Jeunesse (FSJ) <em>Ivory Coast</em></td>
<td>$7,500</td>
<td>Raising and processing Giant African snails</td>
<td>Youth entrepreneurship, employment</td>
<td>Rural-urban</td>
<td>2009/Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Future Foundation (BFF) <em>Liberia</em></td>
<td>$8,719</td>
<td>Bricks for Life Project (BLP)</td>
<td>Youth employment, entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Rural-urban</td>
<td>2009/Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Action International (YAI) <em>Liberia</em></td>
<td>$40,598</td>
<td>Center for Women’s Empowerment</td>
<td>Vocational training, young women empowerment</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2009/Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iEARN <em>Liberia</em></td>
<td>$5,833</td>
<td>Creative Arts For Sustainable Empowerment (CASE)</td>
<td>Skills training</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2009/Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Education Foundation</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>Transition from School to Work</td>
<td>Life skills, job search skills, computer literacy</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2009/Pilot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative (YEFI)</td>
<td>(Job-Shop)</td>
<td>and basic management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS Miskines, Guinea</td>
<td>$44,000 Recycling plastic waste</td>
<td>Recycling, youth employment</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2009/Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Des Volontaires Pour La Gestion Des Ressources Naturelles (AVGRN), Guinea</td>
<td>$14,115 Reforestation Project</td>
<td>Youth employment, entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Rural-urban</td>
<td>2009/Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinée Initiatives Pour le Développement (GUIDE), Guinea</td>
<td>$30,305 Commercial Exploitation of the Moringa Tree</td>
<td>Youth employment, entrepreneurship, health</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2009/Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klin Salone Waste Management Association (KSWMA), Sierra Leone</td>
<td>$23,595 Employment Promotion and Private Waste Management</td>
<td>Youth employment, waste management, environment</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2009/Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafoima Youth Development Organization (KAYDO), Sierra Leone</td>
<td>$48,778 Mapaki Youth Training And Manufacturing Centre</td>
<td>Skills training, youth employment/entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2009/Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenema District Youth Development Agency (KEYDA)</td>
<td>$22,483 Women In Sustainable Bee-Keeping Activities</td>
<td>Young women empowerment, skills training, farming, entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2009/Pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sierra Leone</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sierra Leone</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sierra Leone</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sierra Leone</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sierra Leone</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association Bouyan Bouyan Style (BBS), Guinea</td>
<td>$19,730</td>
<td>Create a youth radio station</td>
<td>Culture, youth employment, education, awareness</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarité-Jeunesse-Action pour le développement durable (SOJADD), Guinea</td>
<td>$14,218</td>
<td>Production of compost</td>
<td>Agriculture, youth entrepreneurship, environment,</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réseau pour l’Education Communautaire(REC), Guinea</td>
<td>$17,140</td>
<td>Extracting oil red by the method &quot;Bondoïyo&quot;</td>
<td>Agriculture, youth employment, entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union pour la Production Agropastorale (UPAP), Guinea</td>
<td>$15,920</td>
<td>Production of palm oil and other related products</td>
<td>Youth employment</td>
<td>Rural-urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association pour le Développement Intégré en Guinée (ADIGUI), Guinea</td>
<td>$17,657</td>
<td>Production and marketing of Fria agricultural products</td>
<td>Agriculture, youth employment, entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Génération Nouvelle pour le Développement et l'Assistance Humanitaire (GENDAH), Guinea</td>
<td>$12,616</td>
<td>Cassava processing into gari and other products</td>
<td>Agriculture, youth employment, entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guinea</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association des Jeunes Unis pour le Développement Communautaire (AJUDC), Guinea</strong></td>
<td>$17,050</td>
<td>Establish a multifunctional platform in the CRD Madina Oula</td>
<td>Agriculture, youth entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association des Nutritionnistes Communautaires de Guinée (ANCG), Guinea</strong></td>
<td>$19,922</td>
<td>Integration of young graduates from the vocational training center (PSC) of Nzerekore</td>
<td>Vocational training, youth employment, entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Association des Jeunes et Amis de Kindia pour l’Union et la Solidarité (AJAKUS), Guinea</strong></td>
<td>$16,768</td>
<td>Installing a restaurant in the university campus of Boke</td>
<td>Youth employment, health</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Union des Jeunes Volontaires de Coyah (UJVC), Guinea</strong></td>
<td>$7,948</td>
<td>Construction of a public toilet block of 10 cabins at the gas station in Coyah</td>
<td>Public health, environment, youth employment</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiative de Base pour le Développement Durable en Guinée (IBDDG), Guinea</strong></td>
<td>$18,751</td>
<td>Intensive production of onions on a land area of 2 hectares</td>
<td>Agriculture, youth entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soutien à la Formation et à laPromotion</strong></td>
<td>$18,723</td>
<td>Young women in the fight against poverty and</td>
<td>Young women empowerment, health awareness,</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rurale en Guinée (SFPR/G), Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Disease through dirty hands in Kindia.</td>
<td>Employment, entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association des jeunes Amis de Hermakonon Cité (AJAHC), Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of a poultry farm in Kountia</td>
<td>Agriculture, youth employment, entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Avenir des Enfants de Guinée (CAVEG), Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Production and marketing of green bean and vegetable</td>
<td>Agriculture, health, youth employment</td>
<td>Urban-rural</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réseau Guinéen des Associations des Personnes Infectées et Affectées par le VIH/SIDA-Guinée Forestière (REGAP+GF), Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td>Insertion and socio-professional reintegration of people with families affected by AIDS</td>
<td>Services, skills training, youth entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Urban-rural</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocates for Human Empowerment and Development (AHEAD), Sierra Leone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Solar Energy Charging Stations</td>
<td>Energy, youth entrepreneurship, employment</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yawbeko Civil Society Tegloma Association (YCSTA), Sierra Leone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value Addition Cassava Processing and Marketing</td>
<td>Agriculture, youth entrepreneurship, employment</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative and Productive Youth Organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Borehole Repair and Water Purification</td>
<td>Water and sanitation, youth entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CPYO), Sierra Leone</td>
<td></td>
<td>conflict resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan Blacksmithing Association (ABA), Sierra Leone</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
<td>Scrap Metal Recycling</td>
<td>Recycling, skills training, youth entrepreneurship, employment</td>
<td>Rural-urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baoma Chiefdom United Development Association (BaCUDA), Sierra Leone</td>
<td>$13,958</td>
<td>Giant African Snail Farming</td>
<td>Agriculture, health, youth employment, entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Messeh Partnership Trust (MPT), Sierra Leone</td>
<td>$19,965</td>
<td>Printer Cartridge Refill and Recycling</td>
<td>Recycling, environment, youth employment, entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polio Persons Development Association (PPDA), Sierra Leone</td>
<td>$13,897</td>
<td>Artisanal Paper Beads</td>
<td>Skills training, youth employment, entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Rural-urban</td>
<td>2010/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Skype interviews and document reviews
APPENDIX 9

ABOUT THE YOUTH-TO-YOUTH FUND SIERRA LEONE

About the Youth-to-Youth Fund Sierra Leone

What is the Youth to Youth Fund for Sierra Leone?

The Youth to Youth Fund is a competitive grant scheme for youth employment. It supports innovative, small scale youth employment projects submitted by youth led organizations from Sierra Leone. These projects must be aimed at creating employment through entrepreneurship for young people (ages 15 to 35). A combination of grants ranging from 5,000 to 20,000 US$ and capacity building support will be awarded to the most innovative proposals. The main objective of the grant scheme is to allow national, local or community based youth led organizations to actively participate in employment generating projects. Ultimately this Fund will build the capacity of youth led organizations and enable youth to move from being passive recipients and become active participants in the promotion and creation of youth employment.

Who are the key partners?

The grant scheme is managed by the Youth Employment Network (YEN) through the support of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO).

What are the key objectives?

The objective of the Youth to Youth Fund in Sierra Leone is threefold;

1) The Fund will build the capacity of youth led organizations and enable youth to move from being passive recipients and become active participants in the promotion and creation of youth employment.
2) The Fund will give young people the opportunity to test innovative business ideas and gain experience and decent employment as micro entrepreneurs.
3) Learn from lessons and significantly expand on approaches and business ideas and that work

How Does it Work?
The Youth Employment Network starts by launching a call for proposals from non-profit, youth-led organizations in Sierra Leone. The winning proposals are selected based on various criteria including innovation, viability of the microenterprises created and sustainability of the organization. Winners receive funding and significant capacity building support to carry out their projects. While the funding allows youth led organizations to test their innovative ideas on helping youth start their own businesses, the capacity building support helps them continue activities after their year as a grantee is over.

The youth led organizations then recruit youth beneficiaries in their area to train. After the training, the organization helps the participants to form themselves into cooperatives and provides the cooperatives with the tools and equipment necessary to start up their businesses. The cooperatives then operate independently and provide employment for the beneficiaries.

What kind of support is provided to youth led organisations?

The grant scheme offers the following support:

1) The youth led organizations receive close support from our local field staff (Project Assistants) throughout the life of the project. The Project Assistants in each region assist the applicants with developing their projects, submitting their proposals, implementing their projects and monitoring their progress.

2) Once selected, the grantees are invited to a week-long capacity building seminar in Freetown, where their project plans are finalized and they are introduced to the monitoring and financial management tools they will be using over the course of their project. The grantees are required to keep monthly records of their expenditures and income, which are submitted to the Project Assistants at their monthly site visits. There are also midterm and final evaluations of the projects. Previous grantees have cited these monitoring and evaluation tools as instrumental in
reinforcing their capacity and management skills.

3) We support our grantees to network with other potential partners and donors through a showcase event for the finalists.
4) During the course of the project 3 peer review meetings are held to allow grantees to share their experiences and learn from each other.

Source: www.ilo.org/yen
Guinea Grant Winners 2011
Below is a brief description of each of the winners of the Youth Employment Network's Youth-to-Youth Fund in Guinea in 2011. The Y2Y provides capacity building and financing to high performing youth led organizations to implement youth entrepreneurship projects. Find here the list of the 16 winners in 2011!

**Organisation: Friends of the Environment**
**Project:** Production and marketing of small chilli

**Grant:** $15,313

**In a nutshell:** Friends of the Environment (EI) works to fight against youth unemployment in Kindia by enhancing local agriculture production and marketing of hot pepper.

**The Idea:** After finding strong demand for small chillis, Friends of the Environment (EI) will grow little peppers that are particularly favorable to agriculture. The marketing of this little pepper will enable young people in Kindia to find income-generating activities and reduce poverty through increasing demand from the small chili.

**Impact:** In the first phase, this project will create 20 decent jobs for youth beneficiaries through the set up of a profitable marketing company for small chillis. In addition to this, the project will help protect the environment through reforestation.

**Organization: Bouyan Bouyan Style**

**Project:** Create a youth radio station

**Grant:** $ 19,730

**In a nutshell:** In the idea is to highlight the activities of youth led organizations in the region of Kindia. Bouyan Bouyan Style will set up a radio station dedicated to youth.

**The idea:** Kindia is a region where there is a significant activity of groups of young people. Being itself an organization led by youth, Bouyan Bouyan Style knows the importance of communication in the development of various initiatives for young people. Thus Bouyan Bouyan Style will serve youth in Kindia by setting up a radio station that serves as a local catalyst for development through its communication functions, education, advocacy, mobilization and cultural activities.

**Impact:** The project will provide decent employment to 10 youth. The radio station will provide
a framework for dialogue and discussion on topics revolving around various problems afflicting the youth of Kindia and Guinea in general.

**Organization:** Solidarity, Youth and Action for Sustainable Development (SOJADD)

**Project:** Production of compost

**Grant:** $14,218

**In a nutshell:** Solidarity, Youth and Action for Sustainable Development (SOJADD) aims to strengthen the capacity of rural and urban youth to carry out income generating activities through the production and marketing of compost.

**The idea:** Solidarity, Youth and Action for Sustainable Development (SOJADD) will introduce young people to rural production of compost by recycling household waste and to allow the soil to enhance and generate significant resources. This measure will prevent rural dependence on buying chemical fertilizer. The compost produced by youth will be sold to farmers and could generate significant revenues.

**Impact:** This project will create 15 jobs by setting up a cooperative which will contribute to the fight against rural exodus. In addition to the compost material is better for the environment protection to chemical fertilizers.

**Organization:** Community Education Network

**Project:** Extracting oil red by the method "Bondoïyo"

**Grant:** $17,140

**In a nutshell:** The Community Education Network will integrate the improved method of extracting red oil "Bondoïyo" in the region of Guéckédou North.

**The idea:** In the region of Guéckédou south there is an improved method of extracting red oil by which young people remain central to the whole process of extraction. This method is called "Bondoïyo]. The process involves nuts, cooking, processing them into pulp, washing the pulp and filtering red oil. The speed and cost of this method is what the Community Education Network wants to import to Guéckédou north.

**Impact:** This project will increase the extraction capacity of the red oil and add value to the sector. Furthermore, 160 jobs will be created through 16 cooperatives spread over four DRP.

**Organization:** Union for the agro-pastoral production

**Project:** Production of palm oil and other related products
Grant: $ 15.920

**In a nutshell:** The Union for the agro-pastoral production aims at strengthening food security and the promotion of youth employment through the mechanization of the production of palm oil.

**The idea:** The palm oil constitutes 60% of natural vegetation in the forest region of Guinea. It is harvested throughout the year for its red oil. After the extraction of red oil, palm is considered an unimportant product. The Union for the agro-pastoral production will set up a mining and trading cooperative of palm kernel oil.

**Impact:** This project will add value to the kernel in a region where it is particularly abundant and improve the socio-economic needs of youth by creating 10 good jobs.

Organization: Association for Integrated Development in Guinea

Project: Production and marketing of Fria agricultural products

Grant: $ 17.657

**In a nutshell:** The Association for Integrated Development in Guinea will produce and sell onions and tomatoes to strengthen local agriculture.

**The idea:** The project is to produce and sell onions and encourage local consumption of onions. The project will also include the transformation of tomato paste and sell it in Boke and surrounding regions.

**Impact:** The local production of onions will help reduce dependence on the import of vegetables abroad. Ultimately this project will generate 15 jobs and 2 cooperatives for young beneficiaries.

Organization: New Generation for Development and Humanitarian Assistance

Project: Cassava processing into gari and other products

Grant: $ 12.616

**In a nutshell:** New Generation for Development and Humanitarian Assistance will develop the local agricultural sector by establishing a cooperative for processing of cassava into gari, starch and peel.

**The idea:** It is intended to sell these cassava products (peel, gari and starch) in two other localities (Conakry and Koundara) because that town is an excellent farming area. This project will also be an opportunity for New Generation Development and Humanitarian Assistance to train youth.
in agricultural techniques in order to allow them to be autonomous in the future.

**Impact:** This project will improve the living standards of rural and urban youth in the prefecture of Nzerekore by creating 20 jobs and a cost-effective and sustainable cooperative.

---

**Organization:** Guinean Network of Associations of People Infected and Affected by HIV / AIDS in Guinea forest (REGAP +)

**Project:** Insertion and socio-professional reintegration of orphans and vulnerable children with AIDS

**Grant:** $19,971

**In a nutshell:** REGAP + aims, through this project, to rehabilitate AIDS orphans through hairdressing and sewing.

**The idea:** AIDS orphans and other young people affected by HIV and AIDS have left school due to socio-economic problems, stigma and discrimination from their families (victims of HIV / AIDS). This training will facilitate their integration and socio-professional reintegration through income generating activities

**Impact:** 60 young people affected by HIV / AIDS will be trained and capable of developing income-generating activities and sustainable decent jobs through sewing, embroidery and hairdressing before the end of the project.

---

**Organization:** Youth United for Community Development

**Project Title:** Establish a multifunctional platform in the CRD Madina Oula.

**Grant:** $17,050

**In a nutshell:** The Association of Youth United for Community Development will establish a multifunctional platform to facilitate the transformation of a set of agricultural products such as cassava and fonio.

**The idea:** The idea of this project is to facilitate the processing of agricultural products through the use of a multifunctional platform that will reduce the physical effort of processing and increase youth income by encouraging entrepreneurship among rural youth.

**Impact:** The impact of this project is threefold. First it will reduce the efforts to transform these agricultural products. So this will facilitate the use of these products and encourage local consumption. Finally it will help raise incomes and encourage entrepreneurship among rural youth by creating 10 jobs and 2 cooperatives.

---

**Organization:** Association of Community Nutritionists of Guinea

**Project:** Integration of young graduates from the vocational training center (PSC) of Nzerekore
Grant: $ 19.922

In a nutshell: The Association of Community Nutritionists of Guinea will train unemployed graduates of PSC Nzérékoré in carpentry, auto mechanics and masonry and work to facilitate their employability.

The idea: The Association of Community Nutritionists of Guinea seeks to facilitate the integration of young unemployed graduates of the training center by training them in carpentry, auto mechanics and masonry and providing a jobs kit. Thus they will be able insert themselves by creating their own income generating activities through the established of three Cooperatives.

Impact: This project will set up three Cooperatives. In addition, this project will alleviate unemployment among young graduates with the creation of 20 decent jobs.

Organization: Youth Association and Friends of Kindia for Union and Solidarity

Project: Installing a restaurant in the university campus of Boke

Grant: $ 16.768

In a nutshell: Youth Association and Friends of Kindia for Union and Solidarity will train young people and provide them with basic tools to install a restaurant in the campus of Boke.

The idea: The Association of Young Friends of Kindia and the Union Solidarity intends to improve the living environment on campus by setting up by a restaurant offering quality service at cheap prices. In addition, the restaurant will provide a service for word processing, printing and copying. Youth beneficiaries trained and equipped will be responsible for the implementation of this project.

Impact: This project will improve the living environment of students and eventually contribute to their social and academic success. In addition 10 young people will find a decent job.

Organization: Union of Young Volunteers of Coyah

Project: Construction of a public toilet block of 10 cabins at the gas station in Coyah

Grant: $ 7.948

In a nutshell: The Union of Young Volunteers Coyah will promote self-employment for youth through the installation of paid latrines at the bus station.

The idea: The prefecture of Coyah is located just 50 km from Conakry. It has a large bus station where hundreds of passengers transit everyday. However it does not have latrines which means passengers defecate outdoors. The aim is to prevent the dangers associated with such practice, including health problems as well as protecting nature.
Impact: This project will be a great source of public health and an example of environmental protection. In addition it will provide decent employment to 6 young people through the creation of a cooperative.

Organization: Initiative for Sustainable Development in Guinea

Project: Intensive production of onions on a land area of 2 hectares

Grant: $ 18,751

In a nutshell: Initiative for Sustainable Development in Guinea equip young beneficiaries for intensive cultivation and marketing of onions.

The idea: After identifying young recipients the Initiative for Sustainable Development in Guinea will train youth in techniques of culture, particularly in irrigation. These youth will also be trained in sales techniques. The youth will receive the skills required to produce and market onions.

Impact: In addition to upgrading the local agricultural sector the project will contribute to the fight against the dependence on imported onions from abroad. In addition it will stimulate entrepreneurship and youth employment through the creation of 24 decent jobs.

Organization: Support for Training and Promotion in Rural Guinea

Project: Young women in the fight against poverty and disease through dirty hands in Kindia.

Grant: $ 18,723

In a nutshell: The Support to Training and Promotion in Rural Guinea intends to involve young women in the fight against poverty and disease by dirty hands in Kindia through the production and marketing of soaps at low prices.

The idea: The project will involve the production of soap by young women out of school and unemployed including awareness about hand hygiene. The project will, at the same time, fight against unemployment among young women by reducing disease through dirty hands in Kindia.

Impact: Through this project we will record a drastic reduction of diseases associated with dirty hands thanks to an awareness campaign. This project will help improve young women's entrepreneurship in the Kindia region. Finally it will offer 60 decent jobs.

Organization: Association of Young Friends of Hermakonon City

Project: Construction of a poultry farm in Kountia
Grant: $ 19,557

In a nutshell: The Association of Young Friends of Hermakonon City will construct a poultry farm in Kountia in order to train street kids and disadvantaged youth in the suburbs of Conakry.

The idea: In addition to the sale of eggs and chickens will also market manure. Ultimately this project will create income-generating activities and contribute to the integration of street kids and disadvantaged youth from the suburbs of Conakry and reduce crime in the city.

Impact: This project will contribute to reducing the insecurity in the suburbs of Conakry, mainly due to the idleness of young people, the main consequence of the lack of youth activities. In addition the project will create 21 jobs and a cooperative.

Organization: Future Children of Guinea

Project: Production and marketing of green bean and vegetable

Grant: $ 8,076

In a nutshell: Future Children of Guinea wants to promote local consumption by the production and marketing of beans and vegetables.

The idea: Future Children of Guinea has found that green bean is a food rich in protein. At the same time they found a shortage of beans in Kindia. Thus, this organization will, through this project, play a role in the consumption of this highly nutritional product. This project will also include production and marketing of vegetables like tomato, eggplant and pepper.

Impact: The project will promote the availability of green beans. Thus it will promote local consumption and a vision of self-sufficiency. In addition this project will provide 7 decent jobs to young beneficiaries.

Source: www.ilo.org/yen