

CARITAL NORWAY – ZAMBIA COUNTRY
PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMME
MID TERM REVIEW REPORT

NOVEMBER 2006

Submitted to the
Catholic Centre for Justice, Development and Peace
(CCJDP)

BY
Jule Development Associates International (JUDAI)
P O Box 51097 Lusaka Zambia
Tel.: 097-773309; E-mail: judai@coppernet.zm

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	Page 4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
RECOMMENDATIONS	12
SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION AND TERMS OF REFERENCE	15
• Terms of Reference	15
• Purpose and objectives of the Evaluation	15
• Key issues of focus for the MTE	16
• Interpretation of tasks & working definitions	17
• Evaluation Methodology	20
• Facilitating and constraining factors	21
• The Consultant	21
SECTION 2: COUNTRY CONTEXT	23
• Introduction	23
• Legal and socio-cultural factors	23
• Political and administrative (governance) factors	23
• Macroeconomic factors	24
• Poverty levels	25
• Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper	26
• Social services provision	26
• HIV/AIDS pandemic and national response	28
• Status on implementation of PRSP and MDGs	31
• Policy and Institutional frameworks for mainstreaming gender	31
SECTION 3: PROGRAMME OPERATIONAL AREAS & FOCUS	33
• Main sources of livelihood in operational areas	33
• Priority issues in operational areas	33
• Programme thematic focus and approach	35
• Refocusing and integration: ideal and practice	35
SECTION 4: PROGRAMME COORDINATION, MANAGEMENT, ADMIN	37
PROGRAMME COORDINATION	37
• Institutional framework for implementing programme	37
• Role of National CCJDP/National Office	37
• Role of National Steering Committee	38
• Role of Diocese Steering Committee	38
• Role of Parish Steering Committee	38
• Role of Centre Steering Committee	39
• Role of Centre Program Implementation Team	39
• Role of Community-based Functional Groups	39
PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT	39
• Financial management (budgets and procedures, planning)	39
• Auditing systems	40
• Absorptive capacity of Dioceses	41
• Reporting (Financial and Programmatic)	41
• Monitoring and Evaluation	41
• Technical support to thematic areas	42
• Integrating gender and HIV/AIDS	42
• Communication and information dissemination	43

• Capacity building (institutional, HRD)	43
PROGRAMME ADMINISTRATION	45
SECTION 5: PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE PROGRAMME	46
• Introduction	46
• Objectives for Implementing Partners	46
• Progress reporting	48
• Reporting format	49
• Activities, achievements and challenges (thematic)	49
SECTION 6: SELF-ASSESSMENT ON PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS	56
Introduction	56
Perceptions on strengths and weaknesses	56
Suggestions on way forward to address challenges	57
SECTION 7: IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAMME	58
• Introduction	58
• Programme Process	58
• Programme efficiency	59
• Programme Outputs	60
• Impact of programme	61
SECTION 8: CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS	63
• Conclusions	63
• Recommendations	67
REFERENCES	70
ANNEXES	71
1. Terms of Reference	71
2. List of people interviewed	75
3. Interview guides	77

ACRONYMS

AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ARV	Anti-Retroviral
CCJDP	Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace
CSC	Centre Steering Committee
CSO	Central Statistical Office
CPIT	Centre Programme Implementing Team
CNP	Caritas Norway Programme
CHAZ	Churches Health Association of Zambia
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child
CEDAW	Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
DSC	Diocese Steering Committee
GIDD	Gender In Development Division
GRZ	Government of the Republic of Zambia
HBC	Home Based Care
HDR	Human Development Report
HIPC	Highly Indebted Poor Country
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HRD	Human Resources Development
IEC	Information Education and Communication
ILO	International Labour Organisation
JUDAI	Jule Development Associates International
LCMS	Living Conditions Monitoring Survey
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MTE	Mid Term Evaluation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTCT	Mother-To-Child Transmission
NAC	National AIDS Council
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NSC	National Steering Committee
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PDSC	Parish Development Steering Committee
PLWHA	People Living With HIV and AIDS
PMTCT	Prevention of Mother-to-Child Transmission
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SAP	Structural Adjustment Programme
SSA	Sub-Saharan Africa
STI	Sexually Transmitted Infection
TOR	Terms of Reference
TBA	Traditional Birth Attendant
TNA	Training Needs Assessment
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
VCT	Voluntary Counselling and Testing
ZDHS	Zambia Demographic Health Survey
ZEC	Zambia Episcopal Conference
ZSCGA	Zambia Strategic Country Gender Assessment

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report outlines the work and findings of a Mid Term Review of the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme supported by Caritas Norway and implemented by partners (CCJDP/National Office, Kasama Archdiocese, Mansa Diocese, and Mpika Diocese) for one and half years (between August 2004 and August 2006) of its 3-year timeframe up to 2007. The main purpose of the mid term evaluation was *“to learn and contribute towards improving the performance of the Programme and recommend a workable way of ensuring the sustainability of the Programme beyond 2007.”* Focus was to:

- a) Identifying the achievements, failures, constraints and sustainability of the Programme in consultation with all key stakeholders;
- b) Provide a basis for accountability, including the provision of information to the donor, beneficiaries and other concerned stakeholder organisations;
- c) Review the effectiveness of the policies, systems and organisational structure of the Programme implementers;
- d) Review the efficient use of resources (financial, human and other)
- e) Review the justification of targeting, in terms of coverage and participants; and
- f) Come up with recommendations that will help to enhance the foundation of the Programme and guide the Programme during the phase-out (exit strategy) from the current communities into the new communities.

Specific key issues (scope) for review

a) Project foundation process:

Use of consultations with local people during inception stage and how this was done; appropriateness of programme to local problems, needs and priorities of target participants, and the physical and policy environment; use of existing initiatives to build upon; appropriateness of implementation strategy, timing and duration; and rationale of inputs (budget, materials and personnel).

b) Efficiency:

Cost-effectiveness, or otherwise, of the programme in achieving the desired results; availability of inputs timely and planned costs; appropriateness of duration of the project; monitoring of inputs for cost-effective implementation of activities; linkage/ networking with other relevant initiatives involved in similar activities in the dioceses; addressing factors causing delays in project implementation; whether or not structures (number and staff) of implementing partners and reporting tools enough for M&E; ability to recognise, capture and document impacts influenced by programme activities in the four thematic areas; and availability of work plans.

c) Effectiveness:

Achieving planned activities and outputs, and in analysing influencing factors (i.e. factors that relate to the broader environment that affect programme implementation positively or negatively) influencing factors may be facilitating (enabling) or constraining (limiting).

d) Impact (or changes influenced by program direct outputs):

Direct outputs e.g. integration of gender, HIV and AIDS and governance into livelihood by programme participants in their daily lives; the effects (positive or negative) or changes influenced by the direct outputs of the programme (anticipated or not) in all thematic areas of focus – e.g. the established groups are working well to contribute to their desired development, training received by participants is producing qualitative changes in the lives/practice, etc; and constraints in realisation of impact.

e) Sustainability:

The extent to which and how the programme is currently preparing communities now in order for them to own activities of the programme; the extent to which participants are likely to assume ownership the programme activities without external support; likelihood of replicating the programme in other areas; level of self-reliance of the project participants in organisational, technical and financial aspects, etc.

Programme Review Methodology

The MTR methodology was informed by: (a) the need to make the process highly participatory; and (b) the need to achieve a reasonable coverage of the beneficiaries of the program activities and facilitators, in order to obtain sufficient insight into program implementation process including engagement with various stakeholders involved in similar activities.

Main stakeholders of Review

- CCJDP/National Office (Programme Secretariat)
- Diocesan Steering committees
- Parish Steering Committees
- Centre Steering Committees
- Notable collaborating partners in the programme

Secondary sources of information:

- Reviewing program documents (Programme Document, Strategic Plan, Activity Plans, Progress Reports, Minutes of National Steering Committee; Monitoring Reports; etc), aimed at mapping out what knowledge exists about the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Programme and structure. This helped to produce an informed situation analysis of the Programme as a development-focused initiative over time, identifying key issues relating to programme focus, development and direction. The review of documents also

provided a basis for developing Interview Guides which were used in gathering primary data.

Primary sources of information:

Field level (parishes and centres in Mansa and Mpika Dioceses, and Kasama Archdiocese):

- Participatory evaluation workshops
- Focus Group Discussions
- Key informant interviews

Interviews within Lusaka:

- Key informant interviews involving Programme Manager, Programme Coordinator, Programme Officers from thematic areas of focus – all of whom are also members of the National Steering Committee.

Enabling and limiting factors

a) Enabling factors

- Support at all levels of the programme (National, Diocese, Parish, and Centre) in terms of access to documentation for review, and availability of selected target groups for interview.
- Logistical support from CCJDP/National Office for fieldwork travel outside Lusaka

b) Limiting factors

The timing of the MTR coincided with the national event of preparations and holding of the Tripartite (Presidential, Parliamentary and Local Government Elections) held on 28 September 2006. Planning of fieldwork activities had to take into considerations preparations for this event.

MAJOR FINDINGS OF THE MID TERM REVIEW

PROGRAMME FOUNDATION PROCESS

Findings of the MTR indicate that the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme aimed at educating people to become aware about their rights and responsibilities with a view to assisting them realise that they have potential and can positively change their living situation. The people's participation process being emphasised is aimed at capacity building at both institutional and human resources levels towards the programme objective. The specific the process adopted involved the following:

- a) The highly participatory approach through a series of consultative meetings and field visits involving intended partners in identifying community needs and priorities, and in determining the scope

(coverage) of the programme. This was in line with the aim of building and strengthening capacities at both institutional and community levels for improving livelihoods.

- b) In terms of institutional basis, the strategy of building upon existing local church/community structures in establishing the implementation framework consisting of steering committees at all levels and including village-based functional groups in selecting participants and mobilising communities for initial meetings was aimed at ensuring sustainability of programme activities and outputs beyond 2007.
- c) A consultative process was also adopted in determining the final content of the programme – i.e. implementing partners agreed to incorporate issues presenting challenges to communities (i.e. livelihood and HIV/AIDS) into the originally thematic areas identified by Caritas Norway (i.e. gender and human rights, a governance issue). This resulted in the programme focusing on four thematic areas.
- d) The establishing and strengthening of linkages/networking with relevant institutions and organisations (GRZ, civil society, church), not only provided opportunity for experience/information sharing, but also ensured collaborative work improving livelihoods at community level.
- e) The system of disbursing funds to Diocese which is guided by the “Equal Amounts Policy” adopted by CCJDP/National Office, not only promotes the spirit of partnership, but also enables dioceses to plan activities based on their prioritised needs.

PROGRESS IN PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION

- a) The programme is being implemented in three northern dioceses (Kasama Archdiocese, Mansa and Mpika Dioceses), based on commonly agreed upon factors - i.e. (a) Caritas Norway’s desire to have more partners hence the addition of Kasama Archdiocese and for reasons of its proximity to both Mansa and Mpika diocese originally selected; (b) existence of community programmes addressing needs at grassroots level; (c) available financial resources; (d) consideration of a parish’s potential to be effective in implementing programme activities thereby providing opportunity for identifying best practice examples; and (e) the need to be able to measure impact within the timeframe of 3 years of programme implementation.
- b) Activity planning and budgeting are done using a bottom-up approach, following guidelines from the National Office (which also consolidates the individual plans from the Dioceses).

- c) The programme utilises both internal and external expertise to implement activities at the different levels.
- d) At field level, HIV/AIDS (Mansa Diocese) and livelihood (Kasama Archdiocese and Mpika Diocese) related activities have predominated, while governance related activities (civic education) have tended to predominate at national level (National Office). For Mansa Diocese, livelihood was added later due to expressed need of partners and communities. Gender has been the least emphasized.
- e) In terms of the pace of progress in programme implementation, the three Dioceses are at different paces of progress, suggesting that they have different capacity needs. The slow process of restructuring (i.e. combining the Departments of Development and Justice and Peace or getting them to work together), has also contributed to slow pace of programme implementation.

DIRECT PROGRAMME OUTPUTS

- a) Structures for programme implementation (committees) established at all levels and functioning
- b) Specific skills training conducted – e.g. training of Programme Accountants in the Patel Accounting Package, which has strengthened skills in financial management
- c) Office equipment (including vehicles, computers, etc) procured as part of institutional strengthening, which has improved field travel and communications.
- d) A core team of local community have undergone Training of Trainers training
- e) Sensitisation and awareness raising workshops conducted on issues relating to gender, governance, HIV/AIDS as these impact on practical needs and activities related to livelihood improvement
- f) Activity Progress Reports produced and provide guidelines for budgeting and implementation of activities
- g) Gender and HIV/AIDS Assessments, and Baseline Studies (for Mansa Diocese and Kasama Archdiocese) conducted.
- h) Increased knowledge and awareness on issues related to programme thematic areas of focus – governance, HIV/AIDS, livelihood, and gender
- i) Achievement of food security at household level
- j) Increased number of women represented on decision making structures
- k) Training provided on animal husbandry skills

IMPACT OF THE PROGRAMME (CHANGES INFLUENCED)

- Though there is some improvement in collaborative linkages between the CNP and relevant GRZ institutions (Sector Advisory Groups), other churches and civil society organisations (Gender Forum, Oasis Forum, CHAZ, etc), this needs enhancing at field level.
- Integrated approach adopted and is being applied though to varying degrees according to diocese
- Gender and HIV/AIDS issues being raised and discussed at all meetings/ workshops at field level
- Improvements in initiatives on addressing gender issues – e.g. linkages between gender and HIV/AIDS working well in Mpika Diocese due to their use the traditional Bemba Mbusa Ceremony as a vehicle for educating married and engaged couples on dangers of HIV/AIDS and the need to treat men and women as partners
- Reduction in traditional practice of sexual cleansing
- Improved farming methods (crop diversification and shift from use of chemical to use of organic fertiliser)
- Improved crop storage
- More women are participating in decision making bodies
- Increased awareness on HIV/AIDS has resulted in reduced stigma and increased support to PLWHA
- Increased number of women enrolled in literacy classes and able to read and write
- Men becoming more supportive to women – e.g. in doing traditionally women's roles of cooking and taking children to under-5 clinics
- Improved HBC and VCT services provision in some communities.

CHALLENGES & CONSTRAINTS FACED

- Generally low levels of understanding of the overall aim of the programme at all levels, which has affected programme implementation in all respects
- Implementation of programme moving at different paces at diocese level due partly to differences in Dioceses' responses to need to restructure
- Low levels of understanding the concept 'gender' and lack of skills in gender mainstreaming
- Lack of a written sustainability strategy, resulting in uncertainty and anxiety about the future of the programme
- High staff turnover at development Coordinator level
- Reliance on volunteers at diocese level (Mpika and Kasama) and parish level (Mansa), which may affect morale and commitment
- Other programmes operating in the same areas paying allowances to workshop participants, which is in conflict with the guiding principles of the programme under review.

- Vast distances both within and between parishes, aggravated by poor road network and inadequate means of transport (bicycles). This makes monitoring difficult.
- Differences in entry points in programme implementation makes comparability, monitoring, learning from each other, and measuring impact difficult.
- Low skills in various areas - financial management and narrative reporting, gender analysis and mainstreaming
- The restructuring process which is incomplete
- Lack of a programme-specific M&E system to facilitate measuring of programme impact
- Differences in views and expectations on moral issues between church and other institutions including GRZ – e.g. on use of condoms
- Non-Catholics feeling the programme is Catholic
- High levels of corruption in the public service
- High illiteracy rates at field level, especially among women
- Women's subordination to men in society
- High HIV/AIDS still treated as primarily a medical/health issue

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

- a) The programme is relevant (has value) because of its focus on livelihood improvement (poverty reduction) through integrating three critical thematic areas of focus – gender, human rights, and HIV/AIDS – into livelihood activities
- b) There are variations among Dioceses in terms of understanding of the programme in terms of what it seeks to achieve – i.e. awareness raising on rights and responsibilities aimed at assisting people believe that they can use this awareness to improve their livelihood.
- c) The specific institutional capacity strengthening in terms of establishing an implementation structure and provision of appropriate office equipment, as well as human resources capacity strengthening (specific skills training) have contributed to achievement of most planned programme activities
- d) High staff turnover at Coordinator level and/or reliance on volunteers at parish level has negatively affected implementation of programme activities
- e) The strengthening of partnerships between and among implementing partners has promoted collaborative working relationships between church/communities and other institutions
- f) Implementation of the programme by the Diocese involved is occurring at different paces and focusing on different thematic areas – Mansa Diocese (HIV/AIDS), Kasama Archdiocese and Mpika Diocese (livelihood/cooperatives).

- g) A lot of sensitisation/awareness creation training activities have been conducted targeted at community members
- h) The process of restructuring seemed to have negatively affected programme implementation more in Kasama Archdiocese than in the other two dioceses, as reflected in the fact that implementation was only in its two and half months at the time of the field visit for this MTE.
- i) At field level, HIV/AIDS and livelihood (cooperatives) have received more emphasis in terms of activities than the areas of governance and gender.
- j) Strengthen formal linkages with national gender and HIV/AIDS machineries (GIDD and NAC) by inviting relevant Gender and HIV/AIDS Focal Points at provincial and district levels to represent their institutions on Steering Committees.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Management and structural issues

- a) Provide special support to Kasama Archdiocese to complete merging of the two departments to accelerate implementation as well as enhance the sense of ownership of the programme.
- b) Consideration should be given to standardization in terms of name or designation of the outcome of the restructuring or merging of the Departments of Development, Justice and Peace, to promote a shared identity.
- c) Harmonise requirements on professional qualifications of Programme staff at both Diocese and Parish levels, based on the assumption that all implementing partners and staff are expected to produce more or less similar results. This may also help in halting high staff turnover.
- d) Develop, disseminate widely and implement a written sustainability strategy to reduce anxiety, increase a sense of ownership, as well as political will and commitment to implement the programme.
- e) Encourage and strengthen dialogue with GRZ and other collaborating organisations on moral issues relating to methods of preventing the spread of HIV and AIDS
- f) Address the issue of allowances to workshop participants, volunteers, and professionals from other collaborating institutions who provide expertise, in consultation with other programmes that may be paying allowances
- g) Design and implement an M&E system with indicators that are sensitive to all cross cutting issues; and strengthen capacity/skills in M&E to facilitate application of the system.
- h) Strengthen linkages with both Gender in Development Division and National AIDS Council through invitations for them to be represented on Steering Committees at different levels. GIDD structure has Gender Focal Points at line ministries, Provincial Planning Units,

- DDCCs and specialised agencies; while NAC has Provincial AIDS Task Forces (PATFs) and District AIDS Tasks Forces (DATFs).
- i) Consider providing bicycles to facilitators/volunteers at Parish level, to address the problems associated with vast distances that they have to cover both between and within parishes, to implement programme activities.
 - j) Strengthen grassroots level lobbying and advocacy on the need for Government to grade/maintain feeder roads and deliver farming inputs timely, which will reduce costs for travel for monitoring and improve support to communities.
 - k) Given the fact that Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme has a fixed timeframe for its implementation (3 years), the issue of differences among Dioceses where Kasama and Mpika use volunteers, while Mansa employs full time Coordinators at parish level needs to be addressed. All the implementing Dioceses should employ appropriately qualified full-time staff. Currently, some of the persons used as volunteers at centre level are employed full-time elsewhere, and they may be aware about the practices of other programmes or organisations.

Programmatic issues

- a) National Office should facilitate a stakeholders' workshop to provide an opportunity to share ideas on issues raised by the MTR in order to agree on the way forward
- b) Provide more comprehensive orientation about the Programme, what it seeks to do and what it requires of all those expected to participate in its implementation. This orientation should be at all levels (national, diocese, parish and centre), not only for purposes of achieving a common understanding, but also facilitating adoption of harmonised strategies and methods for implementing programme activities.
- c) Conduct a comprehensive **Training Needs Assessment (TNA)**, to ensure cost-effectiveness and relevance of various types of training for skills building in all the thematic areas - conceptual understanding of each area and linkages between and among them; integrated approach to programme implementation; data collection and analysis methodologies; and documentation with a view to promoting integration and identifying best practices.
- d) Provide training in gender analysis and mainstreaming to programme staff, in line with Caritas Norway's emphasises on qualitative participation of women (i.e. not just balancing numbers or women being present in decision-making structures, but women being active participants – i.e. women actually participating in agenda-setting).
- e) Promote mainstreaming of cross cutting issues through development and preparation of Mainstreaming Manual with guidelines and checklists on each thematic area.

- f) The IEC materials relating to all four thematic areas of focus that are in English should be translated into local languages to increase awareness on issues through the literature thereby increasing potential for expanded outreach.
- g) Reporting format should be harmonised and follow the Logical Framework, to facilitate reporting by Activity.
- h) In terms of meeting immediate daily practical needs of participants (i.e. labour saving technologies such as hammer mills, Yenga Press, etc), the programme should explore ways of linking communities to other organisations that may involved in providing assistance in labour saving technologies and could help communities.

SECTION 1

BACKGROUND OF THE MID TERM REVIEW

1.0 Terms of Reference

This Mid Term Review (MTR) of the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme was conducted during the period September to October 2006. The main tasks were to examine processes and outputs of the Programme, identifying both facilitating and limiting factors in relation to implementation of the programme, as well as making recommendations on issues that need action in order to more effectively implement planned activities. Programme review is an important monitoring activity and tool as it helps in, not only identifying and understanding various factors (external and internal) that positively or negatively affect implementation, but also taking appropriate measures to address factors that are having a negative impact on implementation of the Programme activities. This makes the involvement of implementing partners and other collaborators, including potential collaborators in the MTR process of particular importance. The target group for the MTR consisted of various institutions, which are currently involved in implementing Programme activities. They were defined in the Terms of Reference (TOR) as the following:

- National Office (Programme Secretariat),
- Diocesan Steering Committees,
- Parish Steering Committees,
- Centre Steering Committees,
- Programme community participants,
- Notable collaborating partners in the Programme

1.2 Rationale and Purpose of the MTR

By August 2006, the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme had been running the one and half years, which marked its mid way to the end of its 3-year timeframe. The purpose of the mid term review was stated in the TOR as *“to learn and contribute towards improving the performance of the Programme and to recommend a workable way of ensuring the sustainability of the Programme beyond 2007”*.

1.3 Tasks of the MTR

- g) Identifying the achievements, failures, constraints and sustainability of the Programme in consultation with all key stakeholders;
- h) Provide a basis for accountability, including the provision of information to the donor, beneficiaries and other concerned stakeholder organisations;

- i) Review the effectiveness of the policies, systems and organisational structure of the Programme implementers;
- j) Review the efficient use of resources (financial, human and other)
- k) Review the justification of targeting, in terms of coverage and participants; and
- l) Come up with recommendations that will help to enhance the foundation of the Programme and guide the Programme during the phase-out (exit strategy) from the current communities into the new communities.

1.4 Key Issues/Scope

- a) Project foundation
 - Were the local people consulted during the inception and design of the programme? How was it done?
 - Appropriateness of the programme to local problems, needs and priorities of the target participants, including the physical and policy environment within which it operates.
 - Is the programme building on already existing initiatives?
 - Appropriateness of implementation strategy, timing and duration.
 - Rationale of budget, materials and personnel (inputs).
- b) Efficiency (Are there better and more cost-effective ways of achieving the same results?)
 - Availability of inputs timely and planned costs.
 - Is the duration of the project appropriate?
 - Monitoring of inputs to allow cost effective implementation of activities
 - Linkage/ networking with other relevant initiatives in the dioceses. For example, HIV and AIDS programmes in the dioceses. What collaborative mechanisms are in place and so far their benefits to the programme. Are internal institutional structures adequate to allow this?
 - Factors causing delays in project implementation.
 - Are the current implementing partner organisation's structure, staff (number and skill) and reporting tools enough to monitor and bring out information required to inform on programme impact. (Ability to recognise, capture document impact related issues raised by the programme activities in the four thematic areas).
 - Availability of planning schedules/ work plans.
- c) Effectiveness (Are results achieved in line with planned schedule of activities and outputs)
 - Are the right participants receiving the anticipated results (analysis of factors and assumptions for achieving objectives)
 - Likelihood of programme objectives to be achieved

- Any constraints in achieving the objectives.
- d) Changes produced / recorded as a result of the project? (impact)
- Integration/application of the 'soft' part (gender, HIV and AIDS and governance) with the 'hard' (livelihood) by the programme participants in their daily lives
 - Positive and negative effects, anticipated or not, in the thematic areas of the programme i.e. gender, HIV and AIDS, good governance and livelihood promotion.
 - Effectiveness of the established groups in fulfilling the objectives of the programme. Are they working well to contribute to their desired development?
 - Effectiveness and quality of the training the participants are receiving
 - Any other impacts to be anticipated in the future
 - Any constraints in realisation of impact.
- e) Sustainability
- How is the programme preparing the communities now in order to own the activities of the programme?
 - Level of ownership of programme by participants and livelihood activities without external support
 - Replication of the project in other areas (centres, parishes and dioceses)
 - Self-reliance of the project participants in organisational, technical and financial aspects. Are participants able to continue with the initiatives with external support?
 - Any other development achieved by the participants in achieving sustainability.

1.5 Interpretation of Terms of Reference & Working Definitions

- a) Focus areas in the TOR (b) to (e): To address these Terms of Reference, Evaluators relied on both interviews (using various techniques) with Programme staff and participants, as well as documentation made available for review.
- b) Term of Reference (a): Opinions of Evaluators are based on data and information from interviews with a sample of respondents selected to give a cross section of Programme activities (steering committee members at various levels, community participants who represented different players –GRZ, civil society organisations, churches, traditional leaders, etc). Time and budgetary constraints did not permit a survey of the intended beneficiaries at all levels, which made it difficult to assess impact of the Programme both quantitatively and qualitatively. Impact assessment requires a specific survey of all the intended beneficiaries.

- c) Overall, the three inter-related activities that were undertaken relate to three key concepts – i.e. review, evaluation and impact assessment.

Review:

Examination of processes and outputs of a programme, identifying both facilitating and constraining factors in implementing programme activities with a view to making recommendations on situations that need action for adjustments, or changes, or improvements necessary.

Evaluation:

Determining the value, relevance, importance of the a programme at given points in time (past, present, future) within a given broad implementation environment (social, economic, policy, legal, cultural, political)

Impact assessment:

Establishing with certainty whether or not a programme is producing its intended effect, which is done at two levels – i.e. Level 1: Identifying direct outputs programmes and activities (quantitative impact assessment); and Level 2: Identifying Effect of the direct outputs of programme activities or changes influenced by the programme activities (qualitative impact assessment). Impact assessment goes beyond direct outputs (e.g. workshop participation rates) and has to be considered at different levels:

- Direct beneficiaries (including community participants, members of steering committees, programme staff, management, etc);
- Ultimate beneficiaries (in this case rural communities in operational areas)
- Target groups of various users of outcomes of the work of the Caritas Norway – Zambia Programme – e.g. policy makers, technocrats, civil society organisations; and
- Recipients of information generated by the Programme and its participants – e.g. donor agencies, researchers (individuals and institutions), etc.

1.5.1 Other relevant working definitions

In addition to the definitions of the above terms contained in the TOR, other definitions of key concepts that are frequently used in the present impact assessment of the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Programme are defined below, for easy of reference.

Influencing factors: Refer to the broader implementation environment and include economic, social, cultural, policy, political, educational, public service delivery, etc factors. Influencing factors affect programme implementation positively or negatively – i.e. they may be facilitating/enabling or constraining/limiting.

Effectiveness: Refers to how well an organisation has been able to meet programme objectives by focusing on direct outputs of the programme, which entails examination of governance and management structures. A programme is likely to have a positive impact if the governance and management structures are effective. Effectiveness analysis is facilitated by availability of a Logical Framework and Reporting system that follows the Logical Framework format.

Efficiency: Refers to cost-effectiveness of a programme in terms of utilisation of resources (financial, human, material, time, other) with respect to service delivery. Assessing efficiency of a programme involves examinations of processes including strategic and action planning and budgeting tools/guidelines, a clearly defined Monitoring and Evaluation System with measurable Indicators, as well as Reporting Format.

Access: Refers to the opportunity to make use of a resource instrumental to production of goods and services (e.g. land, capital, cash income, education, skills, knowledge, information, etc), but without having control to decide on output and exploitation methods.

Control: Refers to authority to define (or decide about) the use and output of productive resources and to impose such definition or decisions on others.

Benefits: Refer to basic needs a human being requires to make and sustain a decent living – e.g. food, safe drinking water, education, health care, information and knowledge, decision-making power, etc.

Culture: Derives from the functions, traditions, economic and other resources, codes and rules (written and unwritten), as well as class and sex composition of societal institutions – all of which combine in a complex way to create gender roles, responsibilities and relations (division of labour between men and women).

Decision-making: Refers to a complex process that has other dimensions – i.e. (i) **Influence**, which is formal or informal pressure that is successful in imposing one's or group's point of view; (ii) **Authority**, which is legitimate power that derives from socio-cultural and legal norms of society; and (iii) **Power**, which is the ability to make one's or group's interests count even when others resist.

Poverty reduction: Refers to increasing incomes, reducing vulnerability, improving household food security, and sustainable use of natural and other resources.

Gender: Refers to and identifies social differences (reflected in activities, roles, forms of behaviour) between men and women. Gender is socially constructed (not biologically determined) and is about men and women in their social relationship to each other, which carries with it expectations and responsibilities

that are often the source/origin of gender issues (which call for debate to resolve them)

Human rights: Refer to entitlements in the form of protection of human worth and dignity – i.e. opportunity that contribute to human and social development such as security of employment, income generating activities, education, employable skills, decision-making power or choices, legal protection, etc.

Sustainability: Refers to continuation of programme outputs beyond its duration or timeframe, ownership and management of a programme or programme outputs by target beneficiaries, and potential of a programme for its replication to other areas. Assessing sustainability of a programme involves examination of strategies put in place to ensure that the programme will be sustained for the future.

1.6 Methodology for the Review

The MTE methodology was informed by: (a) the need to make the process highly participatory; and (b) the need to achieve a reasonable coverage of the beneficiaries of the program activities and facilitators, in order to obtain sufficient insight into program implementation process including engagement with various stakeholders involved in similar activities.

1.6.1 Sample at field level

- 3 Dioceses (Kasama, Mansa and Mpika)
- 6 Parishes, two (2) from each of the Dioceses; and
- 15 Centres distributed as follows: Mansa Diocese (5 Centres), Kasama Archdiocese (4 Centres), and Mpika Diocese (6 Centres).

1.6.2 Main sources of information

Secondary sources:

- Reviewing program documents (Programme Document, Strategic Plan, Activity Plans, Progress Reports, Minutes of National Steering Committee; Monitoring Reports; etc), aimed at mapping out what knowledge exists about the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme and structure. This helped to produce an informed situation analysis of the Programme as a development-focused initiative over time, identifying key issues relating to programme focus, development and direction. The review of documents also provided a basis for developing Interview Guides, which were used in gathering primary data.

Primary sources:

- Primary data gathering was done at two levels: i.e. (i) In operational areas through participatory evaluation workshops involving implementing partners, participants and programme staff from sampled Parishes and Centres from Mansa Diocese, Mpika Diocese, and Kasama Archdiocese; and (ii) National level (evaluation meetings with Programme Manager, Programme Coordinator, Programme Officers from thematic areas of focus).

1.6.3 Facilitating and constraining factors**Facilitating factors**

- Tremendous support and cooperation from the Programme Manager, Mid Term Review Coordinator, Programme Officers interviewed, and support staff at the National Office;
- Availability of Development Coordinators, Parish Priests, Programme staff, and participants from various Centres – for interviews and meetings
- Efficient logistical support provided by the CCJDP/National Office, which made it possible for the Mid Term Review to reach all implementing partners selected
- Excellent organisational skills on the part of the Dioceses and Parishes in relation to group meetings for interview.

Constraining factors

- Time limitation for the overall task. The volume of work and coverage for the MTR were too extensive in relation to the timeframe, particularly with regard to fieldwork (10 working days to cover 3 Diocese, 6 Parishes, 15 Centres).
- The timing of fieldwork in operational areas, which was undertaken in September 2006, coincided with the period of campaigning followed by Tripartite Elections (Presidential, Parliamentary, Local Government) held on 28 September.

1.7 The Consultant

The Mid-Term Review of the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme was conducted by JUDAI (acronym for Jule Development Associates International), a Zambian consulting company registered in 1995, providing development related services, supported by a highly qualified multi-disciplinary team development experts with extensive experience who have served as Consultants to governments and other development organisations at national level, in the region, and internationally. JUDAI offers services in the following broad areas of expertise:

- **Applied gender and development training, including training of trainers:** aimed promoting gender-oriented organisational change, developing and strengthening skills in development and gender analysis, for both managing change and for personal empowerment, as well as to ensure sustainability and cost-effectiveness of training.

- **Baseline research, evaluations and social impact assessments**, to contribute towards building a comprehensive data/knowledge base on major socio-economic changes and related social issues, to inform the development planning process, as well as to assist institutions (GRZ, NGOs, donor-funded projects, etc) to rationalise resource allocation.
- **Technical consultancy/Advisory Services**, aimed at assisting the development and change process arising out of implementation of macroeconomic policies and programmes and other factors/causes.
- **Networking**, to enhance collaborative work and information sharing/exchange
- **Maintenance of a database of experts and studies undertaken**, to assist different institutions to access the right kind of people for implementing their projects, as well as potential to train candidates for them.

JUDAI Consultants implemented the assignment through its Associates, namely: Ms Monica Munachonga (Principal Consultant), Priscilla Chileshe (Consultant), and Musheke Kakuwa (Research Assistant)

SECTION 2

COUNTRY CONTEXT OF THE PROGRAMME

2.0 Introduction

This section focuses on the country context and critically discusses an enabling environment for the promotion of improved livelihoods and general well being in relation to socio-economic changes, development priorities, policy and legal frameworks, as well as institutional arrangements and capacity for implementing the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme that focuses on gender, human rights, HIV/AIDS and livelihoods.

2.1 Legal and Socio-cultural factors

A constitution is important because it is a reflection of national values and norms; all other laws and sectoral policies derive their legitimacy. Zambia has a dual legal system consisting of customary law and received general/statutory law, which means it has two radically different and contradictory laws and norms that define and regulate the rights of individuals both within the family and in the economic and political spheres of life. While the Zambian Constitution protects all men and women against discrimination under Article 11, Article 23(4) negates this guarantee by allowing the application of customary law in matters of personal law (marriage, divorce, devolution of property). This negatively affects the ability of women, who are treated as minors under customary law, to fully participate in national decision-making, earn a decent living through employment or enterprise, and acquire and own property. Prevalence of property grabbing from widows is largely explained in terms of the dual legal system. The Zambian Constitution has, therefore, defined a power relationship between men and women that disadvantages women in terms of access to and control over resources in the private sphere, which is translated into gender-based inequalities in the public sphere (education, land, employment, business development, etc). Under the dual legal system recognised by the Constitution, there is consensus on definition of a child. Even under statutory law, the age marking maturity varies according to situations – e.g. 16 years for marriage, 17 years to obtain a driver's licence, 12-15 for formal employment, 18 years for entering into a contract, etc.

2.2 Political and Administrative (Governance) factors

Politics and the State play a central role in the distribution of scarce development resources and benefits among various social categories. Political ideologies influence the types of strategies adopted to achieve development, and for participation of men and women at all levels (Parliament, Cabinet, Local Councils, top and senior managerial positions in both the public and private sectors). Access to development resources tends to be affected by a number of factors including political patronage which tends to increase nearer elections time (when resource allocation tends to be disproportionately distributed against areas

or social categories perceived to support opposition parties). Generally, politicians tend to favour the idea of being associated with positive development projects in their constituencies, or to place barriers to projects they are unable to claim as the result of their personal contribution. Even the provision of seasonal credit tends to be politicised, promoting a culture of default. Another factor that affects access to resources, including decision-making power, is gender. Historically in Zambia, women's participation in national legislative and decision-making structures (which are critical for influencing socio-economic and other changes) has remained very low though limited progress has been made since 1991 when multi-party political system was re-introduced. For example, the number of female Members of Parliament has increased from 10 in 1991, to 16 in 1996, to 19 in 2001 (JUDAI 2001), and to 22 in 2006. This pattern of low participation rates of women also applies in the civil service). In general, available literature emphasizes that Zambia's development policies and plans have generally been unfavourable to women's participation in decision making, as reflected in the continued under-representation of women at all levels of politics and decision making. This suggests that, historically, there is a negative relationship between women and the State in Zambia.

2.3 Macroeconomic Factors

In 1991, Zambia shifted from a government-controlled to a free market system in which the economy would be private-sector led with minimum control by the Government. In the last 42 years since independence, Zambia has moved from being one of the middle income countries in SSA (with US \$1200 per capita in 1964) to being one of the poorest, its human development ranked 165 out of 174 nations in 2004, down from 153 position in 2000. This downward mobility has been due to both external factors (decline in terms of trade for copper) and internal factors (bad economic management, as well as accelerated implementation of Structural Adjustment Programme or SAP measures since 1991), which has worsened rather than improved the living situation of majority Zambians. Although Zambia reached the HIPC completion point in 2005 and has had massive debt cancellation, utilisation of the savings by the Government is still a matter of concern on the part of Zambians, civil society organisations and cooperating partners. The accelerated implementation of the SAP measures (liberalisation of trade, decontrol of prices of commodities, cuts in social sectors spending, privatisation of parastatals, liberalisation of agricultural input supply and crop marketing, etc) has not led to much economic development. Lack of government funding has negatively affected development opportunities in both agriculture and industry.

Industrial sector

Historically in Zambia, the Government has been the main employer of labour. In terms of formal employment opportunities under the free market system introduced in 1991, there have been massive losses of jobs, and stable sources

of security for individuals and families have been put to the test. The decline in formal employment has had a gender differentiated impact – e.g. the proportion of employed men declined from 39.0% in 1990 to 25.7% in 2000 (13.3% decline), while that of employed women declined from 14.7% in 1990 to only 9.0% in 2000 (5.7% decline) (CSO, 2003:84). Research studies have revealed that among those who were retired or retrenched under SAP measures, women tended to be younger and more educated, and also faced a higher probability of losing their jobs than their male counterparts (JUDAI, 2005:14). In general, women and female-headed households have been worse hit than men and male-headed households.

Agricultural sector

In the agricultural sector, the system has moved from a system of state supply and subsidy of inputs, subsidised credit and State marketing to a liberalised system where inputs are expensive and marketing facilities problematic. In the area of animal husbandry, diseases such as corridor have wiped out whole herds of cattle in much of Central, Southern and Western Provinces, thus, undermining the traditional form of savings and creating a draft power crisis.

The Informal Sector

The first Labour Force Survey, conducted in 1986, revealed that 77.2% of the labour force was working in the informal sector, which Zambia defines as *“consisting of all subsistence farmers, all own account workers and all employees in unlicensed and unregistered businesses”*. In Zambia, while formal employment has not been increasing to absorb labour force growth, self-employment has been increasing rapidly in response to reduced opportunities for formal employment (CSO, 2003 – 2000 Census of Population and Housing). Statistics indicate that informal sector employment tends to be more widely spread among women than men, which is explained, at least in part, in terms of the fact that formal education (which women generally lack) is not a pre-requisite (JUDAI, 2002). Statistics also indicate that female workers are more likely to be self-employed and to be “unpaid family workers” more than male workers (JUDAI 2005).

2.4 Poverty levels

Macroeconomic policies and measures have contributed to increased difficulties, particularly among low income groups, in terms of ability of people to fulfil family responsibilities due to decline in employment opportunities and increase in prices of essential commodities. Extreme poverty levels for Zambia have fluctuated and tend to be higher in rural than urban areas. Poverty is multi-dimensional and may be measured in a number of aspects – e.g. levels of malnutrition as reflected in the incidence of stunting in children (53% in 1995); poor health reflected in the spread of TB; the spread of HIV/AIDS; low survival rates as

reflected in high infant mortality rates (162/1000 in 2000); and decline in life expectancy. As indicated above, there is a tendency towards feminisation of poverty in Zambia – persons living in female-headed households are more likely to be extremely poor than those in male-headed households. Food poverty tends to be more prevalent among female-headed households (61%) compared to male-headed households (CSO/LCMS, 2004). Factors that contribute to higher levels among females include:

- Low levels of education among women
- Very small and declining share of formal sector employment held by women (12% compared to 88% for men in 2000);
- Higher risk women face in contracting HIV and other opportunistic infections due to biological factors, lack of access to resources, gender roles (care giving) which leave them more vulnerable than men, etc.

2.4.1 The Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)

The continued deterioration of the socio-economic conditions of the majority of the people compelled the Zambian Government and its cooperating partners to prepare and implement the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) in 2001, to address increasing levels of poverty affecting the majority of Zambians. The key strategies for poverty reduction were: (a) achieving economic growth through agriculture and rural development; (b) providing public physical infrastructure; (c) increasing productivity of urban based micro-enterprises and informal sector operators; (d) developing human resources; and (e) coordination, monitoring and evaluating poverty reduction programs and activities. From a gender perspective, although the PRSP refers to gender issues, there are many and complex barriers to poverty reduction, which include foreign debt, misdirection of public resources, economic decline, HIV/AIDS, and non-prioritization of human development. The PRSP did not adequately address and analyse the gender dynamics in the above variables and their gender-differentiated impact.

2.5 Public Services Provision

The poor performance of the Zambian economy adversely affected the key social sectors, namely education and health. The implementation of SAP measures has meant reduced Government funds available for provision of social services and other services – e.g. agricultural extension services, water and sanitation, roads, etc). The situation is briefly outlined below.

2.5.1 Education and training

Education is a key development indicator with strong connections to other development indicators (enhanced health status, income level, participation in decision making, reduced vulnerability to poverty, reduced fertility rates, etc). In the area of education, in 1991, the Zambian Government completely withdrew its

support to the provision of primary education; the burden shifted to the household where almost 100% of primary school requirements were pushed. These policy changes have had a gendered impact; available educational statistics show that enrolment, retention and progression of girls in the formal educational system has declined (World Bank, ZSCGA 2005). Government's failure to provide basic primary education is confirmed by the increasing number of community schools, which has meant reducing further chances of accessing quality basic education by majority of children from poor families or those orphaned due to HIV/AIDS, especially in rural areas. The significance of low education levels among women relates to the fact that it limits women's access to decent jobs, ability to improve their business skills, to move out of the cycle of poverty, and to participate in leadership and decision-making positions.

2.5.2 Infrastructure (roads, transport/ marketing facilities)

Road infrastructure

In most parts of rural Zambia, roads are in very bad condition and are impassable during the rainy season due to lack of government funds for rehabilitation. Rural Councils are virtually bankrupt and, consequently, grading of feeder roads is a thing of the Second Republic when Government policy placed a lot of emphasis on agriculture and rural development. Agricultural marketing problems have been worsened by bad road infrastructure, which has contributed to high costs for transportation, especially for small-scale village farmers the majority of whom are women. Government's withdrawal of subsidized agricultural services has also resulted in neglect and, consequently, dilapidation of Farmers' Training Centres and Institutes countrywide, thereby further reducing access to agricultural extension services by village farmers. Although the present Government has recognised the importance of agricultural cooperatives, as confirmed by the re-naming of the line ministry as Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, the implementation of the policy with regard to agricultural input supply and crop marketing is still problematic.

Water supply

With regard to provision of clean drinking water and sanitation services, although Government policy emphasizes the importance of providing safe drinking water and sanitation facilities through local authorities and private sector enterprises, implementation of the policy is problematic (Changa Management Services Ltd 2005). Access to safe water is sourced from protected wells, protected boreholes and taps, while unsafe water is sourced from rivers, lakes, streams, unprotected wells and unprotected boreholes. Statistics show that in 2000, the proportion of households with access to safe water was 49.1% and that access to safe water was more pronounced in urban areas (86.1%) than in rural areas (29.5%) (CSO, 2003). Water collection is the responsibility of women and, therefore, in the absence of protected water sources usually located closer to homes, most rural women travel long distances to collect water.

Energy supply

With regard to provision of electricity, another labour saving technology, statistics indicate that only 17% of total households in Zambia had access to electricity in 2000, and that access was even much lower in rural areas (2.2%) (CSO, Ibid.). In terms of telecommunications services, rural areas are much worse off than urban areas.

2.5.3 Health Care

Zambia's Health Policy Reform introduced in 1992, which resulted in restructuring of the Public Health Care Programme, stressed equity of access and quality of services 'as close to the family as possible'. However, macroeconomic policy and measures (i.e. cuts in social sector spending) have negatively affected implementation of health reforms. Difficulties faced by the Government to fund health services has led to the introduction of medical fees and de-institutionalisation of health care provision towards home-based care, especially for chronic illnesses (TB and HIV/AIDS). Policy change has negatively affected women and girls, the traditional care givers. Illness is a common reason for women's absence from both formal and informal employment and for schoolgirls not attending, or dropping out of, school (JUDAI 2005). Policy change has also had the effect of reducing people's access to modern health care facilities, and for women, the number who deliver at homes, leading to increase in maternal mortality rates especially in rural areas.

2.6 HIV/AIDS prevalence and national response

HIV/AIDS is officially acknowledged as the most serious public health, social and economic challenge faced in Zambia today – it is viewed as the biggest tragedy taking a heavy toll on all sectors of the economy and society at large. The high prevalence of HIV and AIDS in a situation of rising levels of poverty among the majority of the population has contributed to decline in life expectancy. According to the Zambia Demographic Health Survey (ZDHS) (2003) statistics indicate that in 2000 the national HIV prevalence rate stood at 16%, with the prevalence being higher among women (18%) than men (13%), and in urban (23%) than rural (11%). HIV and AIDS is a problem having a negative impact on all economic and social sectors; it is causing a depletion of skilled personnel at all levels, a reduction in rural household labour availability, and an increasing number of orphans. The pattern of HIV prevalence changes as females and males grow older, with the prevalence being higher for males than for females at age 45-49 (Table 1).

Table 1: HIV Prevalence by Age and Sex, 2001-2002

Age Group	Females	Males
15 –19	6.6	1.9
20 – 24	16.3	4.4
45 – 49	13.6	20.2

Source: Central Statistical Office (2003), ZDHS 2001-2002

There are challenges of combating the pandemic, including conflicting views on moral issues which contribute to lack of consensus about methods of preventing HIV infection – e.g. between the Government (which accept use of condoms), on the one hand, and church organisations which favour abstinence, on the other hand. Although the official approach has tended to treat HIV/AIDS as a medical issue, its spread is being fuelled largely by socio-cultural factors, including the following:

- Cultural practice of sexual cleansing in the event of death of a spouse, which is still practised in various parts of the country;
- Traditional initiation ceremonies involving adolescents, most of which promote subordination of females to males.
- Polygamy by which men acquire additional wives, some through inheritance of widows of deceased relatives
- The traditional practice of engaging a wife's young sister as a 'sexual helper' (known as *mpokeleshi* among the Bemba of Northern Province) during the older sister's breastfeeding period, to prevent the husband from going out with other women, or to reward him for good behaviour. .
- The institution of marriage payments (lobola), which gives husbands considerable power and authority over their wives in matters pertaining to sexual behaviour and reproductive rights.

2.6.1 National Response to HIV/AIDS and challenges

Zambia's National HIV/AIDS/STI/TB Policy recognizes HIV/AIDS as a public health, social and economic crisis that undermines all development efforts. The National HIV/AIDS Strategic Plans have consisted of inter-related interventions – i.e. prevention (limit the spread), mitigation (address the impact), care and treatment (support those already HIV-infected). Key features of the national response are as follows:

National vision: *Zambia free from HIV/AIDS*

National goal: *Reduce HIV prevalence rate among Zambians and improve health status of people living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA).*

Objectives

- *Promote responsible sexual behaviour by encouraging safe sex practices;*
- *Minimize mother to child transmission (MTCT) by increasing access to quality services;*

- *Make all blood safe for transfusion and promote the use of sterile syringes, blades, and needles;*
- *Improve the quality of life of PLWHA by encouraging positive living and preventing opportunistic infections;*
- *Provide appropriate care, support, and treatment to PLWHA and those with TB, STIs, and other opportunistic infections; and*
- *Provide improved care and support services for orphans and vulnerable children.*

Underlying principles

- *An appropriate legal framework is essential to the overall attainment of the vision.*
- *An appropriate national coordination and advocacy framework is essential.*
- *HIV/AIDS is a serious public health, social and economic problem that requires a multi-sectoral approach.*
- *Information, education and communication for behaviour change are a cornerstone for prevention and control.*
- *Providing treatment, care, and support is essential to minimise the impact of the pandemic.*
- *The human rights and dignity of all people, regardless of their HIV status, should be respected and stigma and discrimination against people living with HIV/AIDS should be eliminated.*
- *Gender mainstreaming is a central element in the fight against the epidemic.*
- *A supportive social and economic environment at all levels of society enhances the response by individuals, families, and communities.*

Major challenges to the national response include the following:

- Lack of legislation on HIV/AIDS, creating problems in terms of protection of human rights of PLWHA and victims of sexual violence (at high risk of HIV infection);
- Low capacity and analysis skills for mainstream gender into HIV/AIDS programmes and activities;
- The multi-sectoral approach that is reflected in the national vision is not being realized in actual implementation of activities, due weak institutional linkages;
- Over-emphasis on health aspect of HIV/AIDS – distribution of ARVs may be subsidized but there are additional yet-to-be-quantified financial costs (of travel and nutrition) that need to be considered; and
- Wide information dissemination on prevention (also urban biased), but limited impact on behaviour change.

2.7 Implementation of International/Regional Instruments

2.7.1 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

Like other UN member states, Zambia has incorporated all the eight MDGs into its programme activities. Most of the MDGs seek to redress gender imbalances that exist e.g. in education, HIV/AIDS, and health care. However, Zambia faces a lot of challenges in terms of achieving the MDGs mainly because of inadequate funding, especially to key sectors such as education, health and governance. For example, although the MDG Number Two “Achieve Universal Primary Education” is key to national development, attainment of universal primary education will not be possible, particularly for girls who have historically lagged behind boys. Positive effects of education (e.g. lower fertility, enhanced earning capacity and decision-making on sexuality) tend to occur after secondary and tertiary levels of education (The World Bank, 2004).

2.7.2 Other relevant International Conventions/Instruments

Zambia is a party to several other relevant International Conventions, which she has ratified or acceded to, including the UN Convention on The Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), the African Charter on Human and People’s Rights, etc. However, these Instruments have not been domesticated, a fact that could improve the rights of women and children, and facilitate their participation in issues of community and national development.

2.8 Policy and Institutional frameworks for mainstreaming gender

The long years of sensitisation and analysis, from 1975-1985 UN Decade for Women through 1995, have helped Zambia to develop institutional structures to address women’s and gender issues. First established was the Women in Development Desk to be responsible for activities relating to the women’s decade, later elevated to a Unit in 1984 in the National Commission for Development Planning within the Ministry of Finance, and then a Department within the Commission in 1992. Finally in 1996, it became the Gender in Development Division in Cabinet Office, Office of the President. The institutional framework for implementing the National Gender Policy introduced in March 2000 consists of: the Gender in Development Division; Parliamentary Committee on Legal Affairs, Governance, Human Rights and Gender; the Gender Consultative Forum; and Gender Focal Points in planning units of line ministries, Provincial Planning Units, District Development Coordinating Committees, and specialised government agencies. However, the structure is very weak and almost non-functional at all levels, especially at the line ministry, provincial and district levels. There is strong collaboration between government and cooperating partners, on the one hand, and civil society organisations, on the other hand. Key gender and development issues in Zambia include the following:

- The Constitution defines a power relationship between men and women which disadvantages women both in the private and the public spheres;

- Feminisation of poverty due to several factors, explained in terms of many complex factors, including: women's subordination to men, low levels of education, lack of access to resources, etc);
- Women's lack of property and inheritance rights under the dual legal system; predominance of customary law promotes property grabbing by relatives;
- Violence against women, which is explained in terms of lack of respect for the human rights of women;
- Higher HIV/AIDS prevalence and death rates among women/girls than men/boys;
- Under-representation of women in national decision making structures.

SECTION 3 OPERATIONAL AREAS AND PROGRAMME FOCUS

3.0 Main sources of livelihood in operational areas

As indicated earlier, the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme is being implemented in rural areas located in Mansa Diocese (Luapula Province), Kasama Archdiocese (Northern Province), and Mpika Diocese (Northern and Central Provinces), mainly for logistical and practical reasons. The provinces were basically rural and agricultural in character. There were also on-going community development programmes to which the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme could be linked.

Using a participatory evaluation approach, the Programme's operational areas were assessed in terms of main livelihood sources, perceived priority issues, and status of social services provision (see Matrix 1 below for summaries according to Dioceses and Parishes visited).

Matrix 1: Main sources of livelihood and status of social facilities

Operational Areas visited	Livelihood sources identified	Status on social facilities
Kasama Archdiocese (Chilubula and Mporokoso Parishes)	Agriculture (grain crops; livestock rearing -pigs, poultry) and fishing	Bad roads; lack of clean drinking water; lack of adequate and well equipped health facilities; no proper high schools; lack of trained teachers
Mansa Diocese (Kabunda and Twingi Lunga Parishes)	Fishing; agriculture (grain crops, vegetables) and trading or business enterprises;	Lack of marketing and transport facilities; lack of clean drinking water; poor health care facilities; high disease burden (malaria); no high schools; no police posts
Mpika Diocese (Kopa and St Joseph's Parishes)	Agriculture (grain crops; livestock rearing)	Poor health facilities; lack of high schools; lack of clean drinking water; long distances, bad roads

3.1 Priority issues identified in areas visited

Participants at the Participatory Evaluation Workshops conducted were asked to identify priority issues in their respective areas and who they thought were the most affected social groups. The consolidated responses are presented in the Matrix 2 below.

Matrix 2: Priority Issues, who is most affected, and what Programme should do

Priority development issue	Who is most affected	Suggestions on what Program should do
Poverty	Widows, elderly, orphans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More training in improved farming methods; • Assist in improving food crop storage facilities; • Provide more seed/inputs and farm equipment • Target more households; • Continued sensitisation on food security; • Provide more farm animals; • Provide training in food processing; • Establishing marketing depots
HIV/AIDS and increasing number of orphans	Everybody especially women and girls	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scale up awareness creation; • Train more counsellors and HBC providers; • Improved food production to enable communities support PLWHA • Provide equipment for processing foodstuffs (soya) for patients; • Support orphans to access education; • Provide bicycles to HBC providers; • Provide ARVs at community level
Health problems – high disease levels (malaria) lack of clinic, no TBAs and ambulance, long distance to hospital, lack of access to hospital admissions, lack of drugs	Everybody especially women who are the care givers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide bicycles to and train more TBAs; • Lobby GRZ to fund hospital to enable it admit patients, and to build clinics with maternity facilities; • Logistical support to people who are sick e.g. detergents, food, etc
Lack of clean drinking water	Everybody, especially women who have responsibility to collect water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby GRZ to sink bore holes
Poor road infrastructure/network	Community members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby GRZ for rehabilitation of roads;
Lack of transport and marketing facilities	Producers, community members	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby GRZ for provision of marketing facilities
Late delivery of farming inputs	Farmers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide adequate farming inputs timely
Lack of high school educational facilities	Children, communities & their families	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobby GRZ to build high schools or to upgrade basic schools

3.2 Programme thematic focus and approach

Caritas Norway's interest was to fund a programme focusing on gender and human rights with the aim of educating people about the human rights and civic responsibilities, which is perceived as a pre-condition for people-driven development. The Programme sought to contribute towards changing the mindset of the rural people from 'seeing themselves as mere recipients of development assistance' towards 'believing that they are capable of demanding their economic and social rights from Government'. For Rights Based Approach to be effective (or have social significance), it became necessary to relate it directly to people's daily practical life experiences or challenges. This is how, after consultative field visits and meetings, it was decided to connect gender and human rights issues to the two identified challenges at community level – i.e. HIV/AIDS and livelihood improvement, resulting in four (4) thematic areas of focus of the programme (gender, governance, HIV/AIDS, and livelihood improvement).

The programme's implementation methodology emphasised people's participation, which is appropriate and important for a number of reasons. Firstly, development is people-centred given the fact that all development programmes share a common long-term goal of improving the living conditions of people, which calls for a bottom-up (consultative) approach in problem identification, planning and implementation. Secondly, people's participation empowers communities in terms of promoting a sense of ownership of development process and outputs, which one of the pillars to sustainability of program outputs beyond the life cycle of a program. Thirdly, sustainability is ensured because a planned development intervention builds upon existing local knowledge and experiences.

3.2.1 Refocusing and Integration

The need to connect/link gender and governance (human rights) issues to challenges experienced at community level (livelihood improvement through mainly agricultural production and combating the HIV/AIDS pandemic which were acknowledged as major challenges facing targeted communities) called for an integrated approach to implementation of the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme. The approach whereby gender and governance issues were to be integrated and mainstreamed into existing or on-going community initiatives towards improving livelihoods and fighting against HIV/AIDS pandemic was appropriate because it facilitated a holistic approach to community development, and had direct relevance to people's immediate practical needs and experiences. **However, the integration approach also called for adequate orientation and appropriate skills training for all those expected to participate in implementing the programme.**

In focusing on the four thematic areas, the participating Dioceses have used different **entry points**, influenced largely by on-going activities. In this respect, Mansa Diocese is using HIV/AIDS as its entry point, while both Kasama

Archdiocese and Mpika Diocese are using livelihood improvement leaning towards cooperatives. The proposal for funding submitted to Caritas Norway was based on Reports of the Listening Survey (conducted by Mansa Diocese) and the Baseline Study leaning on cooperatives (conducted by Kasama Archdiocese).

SECTION 4

PROGRAMME COORDINATION, MANAGEMENT & ADMINISTRATION

4.0 Programme coordination

The implementation framework adopted was aimed at ensuring effective and efficient management of the programme, as it took into consideration key factors such as:

- Inclusion of non-Catholics in the structure;
- The community choosing their own representatives which would enhance sustainability of programme outputs, and ownership of the programme;
- Shortening the reporting channel, for quick and effective decision making;
- Appointment of a Parish level development steering committee to steer the process;
- Appointment of a Programme Coordinator at Parish level answerable to the committee, to enhance coordination and accountability

4.1 Structures, roles and responsibilities

The whole programme is coordinate based on the principle of partnership between the Church and communities with an open communication amongst them. This implies a system of sharing of decision making power and responsibilities. Coordination of the Programme occurs at different levels (i.e. national, Diocese, Parish, and Centre levels) at which levels specific structures (steering committees) were established. The roles and responsibilities of the various structures/committees which constitute the implementation framework are outlined below

4.1.1 Role of the CCJDP/National Office

The National Office serves as the Programme Secretariat and channel for funding the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme and is mandated with the responsibility for overall financial management and reporting. The National Office also has an implementing role in that it has responsibility to identify other Dioceses not funded under the Programme for support. It implements certain activities – e.g.

- Supporting Dioceses not funded under the Programme under review – e.g. *‘Meet your Candidate’* civic education programme under the Governance component.
- Playing a direct implementing role – e.g. advocating for Constitutional Review through a Constituent Assembly; capacity building targeting Diocese, as its basic function done either on request from the Dioceses or making interventions based on observed need relating to performance in programme implementation.
- Base line research studies – e.g. on Gender and HIV/AIDS

With regard to personnel, the National Office employs various categories of staff: Programme Managers, Partnership Manager, Accountant, and Programme Officers of the four thematic areas. They undertake baseline research studies and documentation of project activities, provide capacity building services to Dioceses, as well as guidelines for planning to all implementing partners. However, high staff turnover at partnership level has contributed to variations activity plans and reporting formats.

4.1.2 Role of the National Steering Committee (NSC)

The NSC consists of Programme Manager (Governance), Programme Manager (Human Resources Development), Programme Manager (Food Security); and Programme Coordinators (Thematic Area Specialists). The roles and responsibilities of the NSC seem to coincide with those of the National Office described above.

4.1.3 Role of the Diocesan Steering Committee (DSC)

It should be pointed out that Mansa Diocese did not establish a DSC. According to the Annual Report 2005:3, *“6 development Coordinators, 6 Parish Priests and staff took the role of steering programme implementation in the 6 parishes”*. The DSC consists of Development Coordinator (full-time), Specialists in Governance (also referred to as CCJDP), HIV/AIDS, Gender, Treasurer General, Pastoral Coordinator, and Accountant. The roles and responsibilities of the DSC are coordination, supervision, and monitoring progress programme implementation at field level. The DSC controls the disbursement and use of funds at the Diocesan level and acts as the link between the Parish and the National level.

4.1.4 Role of the Parish Development Steering Committee (PDSC)

At Parish level, the program structure comprises the Parish Priest, the Parish Coordinator, Chairpersons and Secretaries from Centres, and representatives of other churches. In some cases, only the Parish people constitute the Parish Steering Committee. Criteria for membership emphasize specialisation, which means the composition of the committee should be multi-disciplinary in nature. This provides an opportunity to bring or co-opt people from other organisations and institutions depending on potential contribution they can make to the Programme.

The roles and responsibilities of the Parish Steering Committee are coordination, supervision, conducting workshops, initiating and collaborating with other institutions and monitoring programme implementation at the Centre level. The Parish Steering Committee is a link between the Diocese and the Centres. They are also responsible for report writing and information dissemination.

4.1.5 Role of the Centre Steering Committee (CSC)

Members of the CSC come from different institutions, but must possess necessary qualifications and experience for purposes of implementing the Programme. At the Centre level, the Chairperson can be from other church-denominations. The primary responsibility of the CSC is that of implementing programme activities. The Centre Steering Committee facilitates workshops, selects target groups, monitors progress in implementation and serves as a link between the Parish and the Community.

4.1.6 Role of the Centre Programme Implementation Team (CPIT)

This structure was reported in Mansa Diocese only. The Centre Programme Implementation Team (CPIT) comprises of community members selected through Churches. The role of the CPIT is planning activities, identifying target groups for the activities, monitoring, and preparing reports.

4.1.7 Role of the Functional Groups at Community level

At community level, there are also functional groups linked to the CSC and serve as the vehicles for training programmes in particular skill areas such as income generating activities. These groups include Women's Groups, Farmers' Groups, Drama Groups, Anti-AIDS Clubs, Home Based Care groups, Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVCs). They are often formed after sensitisation sessions on the programme.

4.3 Programme Management

4.3.1 Financial Management

In terms of planning process, preparation of Strategic and Action/Implementation Plans is done using a bottom-up (participatory) approach. Dioceses are given guidelines with reference to the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Programme Document (2004-07) and the Strategic Plan (2004-2006). Annual review of the Programme Document is also done in a participatory manner to ensure relevance of originally planned activities. Since Annual Plans are based on the Programme Document, any changes made have to be approved by the National Steering Committee.

There is a general understanding that issues of finance are clearly stipulated in the Programme Document and accompanying procedures and guidelines. As a result, each implementing partner is able to develop their own budgets against their activity plans without much help from outside and expect approval of programme funds. All funds are sent in dollars to the National Office, which, in turn, disburses funds to the Dioceses in the same currency, on the basis of the **“Policy of Equal Amounts to all Dioceses”** applied. However, actual Kwacha

amounts available for implementing activities have been affected by the appreciation of the Kwacha, which has resulted in reduced funds available to the Dioceses, necessitating adjustments in planned activities. The Dioceses themselves make changes to their Kwacha budgets. In preparing their budgets, the Dioceses are given guidelines indicating a **ceiling** within which they budget. The National Office harmonises budgets prepared by Dioceses, and any cuts or adjustments to budgets are done only after consultations between Diocese and National Office. In terms of timing of disbursements by Caritas Norway, this has been done on schedule throughout. However, findings of this mid term review indicate that there are some issues at field level:

- Planned activities and associated budgets may not be in line with actual disbursement, necessitating re-prioritising activities to be implemented to suit funds available.
- Misunderstandings between Dioceses and National Office about funds available at the National Office for the programme. For example, the National Office had to withhold the Second Instalment for Kasama Archdiocese because the latter had not been able to utilise all its allocation under First Instalment, which has prompted the donor to arrange an audit of the Archdiocese.
- Different levels of understanding on how the financial system is supposed to operate – e.g. regarding unused funds and subsequent disbursements
- Low financial analytical skills, in some cases at field level, which contribute to inconsistencies in financial reporting. In some cases, financial reports sent have had to be revised. **Financial narrative reporting needs to be strengthened.**
- The appreciation of the Kwacha, which has led to reduction in actual funds available for implementing activities. This necessitates adjustments to planned activities by Dioceses.

4.3.2 Auditing system

With regard to the system of auditing used, the National Office and the Dioceses are audited individually by an auditing firm appointed by the National Office. The only exception is that under the programme, special assistance has been given to Kasama Archdiocese through a firm appointed by Caritas Norway, to meet the requirements of the Norwegian Government. Kasama Archdiocese was also unable to utilise all its First Disbursement, a situation that affects subsequent disbursements. Caritas Norway policy is that if funds are not utilised during a scheduled period, it has to be returned. For Kasama Archdiocese, non-utilisation of all the funds from the first disbursement resulted in CCJDP/National Office withholding the second disbursement while the problem of non-utilisation of the first disbursement was being sorted out.

4.3.3 Absorptive capacity of implementing partners

Programme expenditure rates under the programme have been low particularly for Kasama Archdiocese (2005), which has been attributed to a number of factors – e.g. delay in commencement of implementation of programme activities, and high staff turnover at Coordinator level. Review of relevant programme documents revealed gaps in information in terms of disbursements compared with actual expenditure for the period up to mid-term review. The three Dioceses involved seem to have been at different levels in terms of being prepared of ready to implement programme activities. In terms of comparison, the absorptive capacity is lowest for Kasama Archdiocese.

4.3.4 Reporting (Financial and Programmatic)

Each implementing partner is required to submit through the National Office a programmatic narrative, accompanied by a financial report, quarterly. Release of funds for the next instalment is, thus, determined by submission of an acceptable financial report. At Diocese level, any delay in submission of an acceptable financial report translates directly into reduced time for implementation of planned activities. Non-utilisation of funds disbursed also results in withholding of subsequent instalments, as happened for Kasama Archdiocese with respect to their Second Instalment which was withheld by the National Office because the Archdiocese had not utilised all funds under their First Instalment. The policy is that funds not utilised during a particular phase are moved to and treated as part of allocation for the next phase. What this means is that non-utilisation of funds does not constitute savings but, rather, a loss to an implementing partner. In general, interviews with key informants indicated that there are still inconsistencies or problems relating to quality of financial reporting, and that a standardised format is being considered.

Programmatic reporting was relatively more straightforward and done with some ease than financial reporting. However, there are still weaknesses relating to lack of depth and analysis of data collected on key issues relating to thematic areas of focus in most reports, which suggests the need for capacity building to include skills provision for Programme Coordinators in report writing. Details on these aspects are highlighted later below (**Section 5**).

4.3.5 Monitoring and Evaluation

All programme activities, resources and other inputs are monitored and evaluated from the perspective of improving livelihoods at community level. Special attention is given to monitoring and evaluating institutional and HRD capacities, procedures and management systems, training, baseline assessment and research studies, technical assistance (internal and external), programme objectives, targets and plans. The Committees at different levels are mandated with the responsibility of monitoring and evaluating programme activities, using

CCJDP procedures as a guide. Ideally, at the national level, M&E is supposed to be done jointly by a team of Programme Officers (subject matter specialists), led by the Programme Coordinator. However, interviews conducted revealed that by the time of this Mid Term Review, Programme Officers from the National Office had not yet undertaken joint monitoring visits. The explanation given was that the new M&E system has not worked well in actual practice in terms of the team of Programme Officers conducting monitoring and documenting the impact of the Programme jointly. However, Programme Officers concerned are yet to agree on how joint monitoring and documentation will be done. It was further indicated that in order to improve monitoring and documentation, more professional staff have to be recruited.

4.3.6 Technical support to thematic areas and management

Expertise is available in the four thematic areas at the different levels though to varying degree. At National Office level, out-sourcing of expertise is applied – e.g. from short-term consultants. Networking and information sharing are emphasized with several institutions and organisations including the Gender Consultative Forum, National AIDS Council, Gender In Development Division (GIDD), Oasis Forum, GRZ/Sector Advisory Groups (SAGs), Churches Health Association of Zambia (CHAZ), and other civil society organisations, in terms of obtaining documentation/materials for distribution to programme areas. The challenge identified with regard to IEC materials relates language barriers because of the fact that most of them are written in English and so are not suitable for use at grassroots level. CCJDP is in the process of translating IEC materials in selected local languages. At Diocese level, the National Office as well as local professionals (e.g. from GRZ) serve as sources of expertise.

4.3.7 Integrating/mainstreaming Gender

Integration and mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues is of particular relevance because they constitute important intervening variable in the assessment of programme impact. Unlike HIV/AIDS and other cross cutting issues, however, gender is unique because it does not only cut across social and economic sectors (e.g. livelihood improvement activities), but it also cuts across the other cross cutting issues - HIV/AIDS and governance. All other cross cutting issues of focus under this programme (HIV/AIDS and governance) have gender-differentiated impacts. In spite of this, however, findings of this Mid Term Review indicate that the Programme has no written policy frameworks, mainstreaming strategies, and guidelines/checklists to provide guidance for promoting mainstreaming and integration gender into the other three thematic areas of focus.

At field level, a comparison amongst the three Dioceses with regard to integrating gender into other focus areas indicates differences in terms of gender related initiatives and levels of practical application of gender and achievements made.

For example, initiatives for gender integration seem to be working well in Mpika Diocese because of the channel chosen – I.e. the CNP targets married couples or engaged persons for training through the traditional “Mbusa Ceremony”, whose training content includes negative effects of promiscuity (STIs) and benefits of treating men and women as partners. Gender sensitisation has also influenced changes with respect to sharing of gender roles – e.g. some men from both Mansa and Mpika Diocese were reported as having begun performing traditionally feminine roles (cooking and childcare or taking children to under-5 clinics).

Generally, findings indicate that levels of understanding of the concept ‘gender’ tend to be low. The term ‘gender’ tends to be understood to mean ‘balancing numbers of men and women’ represented in decision making structures, without going beyond to analyse relationships between those counted (e.g. how they communicate and participate in the structures).

4.3.8 Communication and Information Dissemination

The Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme was carefully designed to take care of issues of communication through steering committees at National, Diocese, Parish and Centre levels. Information dissemination is in form of reports and meetings. However, although the committees set up were to provide channels of communication, there are still many challenges. At partnership level, interviews revealed that there is a tendency to ignore or not to adhere to set deadlines for reporting. Secondly, there are also problems relating to breakdowns of computers and internet facilities. At Diocese level, long distances to be covered as well as reliance on volunteers result in slow progress due to low morale and commitment. For example, in Mpika, Parishes sometimes take up to three (3) months to communicate with Centres, resulting in late submission of reports or presentation of incomplete reports.

4.3.9 Capacity Building

Programme Officers representing all the thematic areas of focus at the National Office have the responsibility of providing expertise or technical assistance through provision of guidelines and direct interventions to Dioceses for capacity building, the basic function of the National Office. They are responsible for identifying capacity building needs of Dioceses, generating data through studies, monitoring visits and monitoring, to feed into planning process.

At Diocese level, some Dioceses have employed full time Programme Coordinator, while others use volunteers. In this regard, programme implementation may be affected by these differences in approach relating to recruitment, given the fact that full-time (paid) staff tend to be more committed than volunteers (unpaid workers). At this level, the roles and responsibilities of Programme Coordinator include: record keeping, coordinating programme

implementation activities, conducting training, monitoring and evaluating progress in implementation, and report writing.

4.3.9.1 Institutional capacity building

In terms of structural changes, the implementation of the programme required restructuring which involves the merging of the two Departments of Development and Justice and Peace at all levels. At the time of this Mid Term Review, this process had been completed for both the Mansa and Mpika Dioceses, while it was still on-going for the Kasama Archdiocese (a factors that has constrained programme implementation). The differential implementation pace was summed up during the interview at the National Office in the following words: *“Mansa Diocese is the model-setting Diocese, Mpika Diocese doing quite well, while Kasama Diocese still experiencing difficulties”* (Interview with Programme Officers, National Office, 12/10/2006).

Institutional capacity building has also involved procurement of office equipment (computers), vehicles, and other materials. The Programme has also been connected to the internet facility, which has improved communication. The Programme implementation framework has also been strengthened through the strategy of building and strengthening partnership between Church and community. This has resulted in strong collaborative work, with the Church/community structures providing leadership in initiating and implementing programme activities through people’s participation in the six (6) Parishes, two in each participating diocese. Having the Programme founded on existing local structures ensures acceptance by the communities and sustainability of the Programme.

4.3.9.2 Human resources capacity building (skills training)

Human resources capacity building has largely been through managerial and technical training, aimed at addressing one of the major constraints to effective implementation of programme activities. It is not clear whether or not a comprehensive Training Needs Assessment (TNA) had been conducted to provide a basis for designing the training undertaken in the areas of focus. A TNA is useful because it ensures that training is, not only relevant to actual work situations (tailor-made), but also cost-effective.

The tendency at diocese level to recruit or utilise different categories of Coordinators (i.e. some use Volunteers or Contact persons while others use full-time Development Coordinators) has posed a challenge in terms of efforts towards human resources capacity building. This is because different conditions of service are applied to persons doing work of equal value. These differences are illustrated below.

- Mansa Diocese has a Parish Coordinator (paid) and Community Volunteers (unpaid);
- Mpika Diocese has a Permanent Contact Person (unpaid) from Parish to Centre; and
- Kasama Archdiocese has a structure like Mansa Diocese but face other challenges, arising from the incomplete restructuring process referred to earlier.

The above discussion suggests that there are differences in term of perceptions about the CNP and requirements for its effective implementation. It is rather unreasonable to expect a Volunteer to give the same amount of time to programme work as a full-time Coordinator. There is also need for allocating resources (adequate funds and time) for training in analysis tools applicable to cross cutting issues (HIV/AIDS and gender) and the linkages between them because these are also highly technical areas of expertise.

4.4 Programme Administration

At national level, the programme gets inputs from GRZ/SAGs, the Oasis Forum, etc, and so feels it part of a bigger body of development actors, which improves implementation of programme activities. At Diocese level, the livelihood component brings in GRZ ministries (Agriculture and Cooperatives, Community Development and Social Services, Education, Health). The challenge arising from involvement of other collaborators relates to the issue of allowances for GRZ employees and volunteers. There is a tendency, on the part of the programme, to assume community members will make their contributions towards programme implementation on voluntary basis. However, this assumption tends to overlook the issue of people's struggles for survival and their need for time to meet survival needs of their families. Under the situation of economic hardships, individuals experience more difficulties in terms of reconciling between the demands of community development work and family responsibilities.

With respect to the issue of access to Programme equipment, especially vehicles, this seems to depend on the personality of a Bishop in charge of a diocese, given the fact that Dioceses operate on the principle of autonomy.

SECTION 5: PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMME

5.0 Introduction

This section looks at progress made in implementing the programme at different levels, identifying major achievements, lessons learnt, and challenges faced in the process of implementing activities.

5.1 Objectives for implementing partners

Different but inter-related programme objectives apply at different levels. The Consolidated Country Programme Document (2005: 6-7) stipulates objectives applicable at the different levels, which provide guidance for planning and budgeting to facilitate implementation of the programme. The objectives are reproduced below.

5.1.1 CCJDP, National Office

Strategic objective:

Empowered communities in the dioceses that actively engage in their development and demand responsive governance, leading to greater accountability

Operational objectives:

- 1. To enhance citizens engagement in local and national development and governance issues in 4 dioceses*
- 2. To equip 3 diocesan teams with HIV/AIDS skills/knowledge to promote justice by end of 2005*
- 3. To integrate HIV/AIDS in all CCJDP and 3 diocesan programmes by end of 2005*
- 4. To mainstream gender in programmes of CCJDP by 2005*
- 5. To strengthen the capacity of 3 diocesan teams in implementing gender responsive programmes by 2005*

5.1.2 Mpika Diocese

- 1. Strengthen democracy in Mpika Diocese through strengthening grassroots competence and structure for participation and influence in the civil society, public debate and development policy*
- 2. Increase women's participation and influence in Mpika Diocese so that they equally, to men, are participatory in setting the agenda needed for public debate and development policy.*
- 3. Fight HIV/AIDS catastrophe through preventive activities and in collaboration with public authorities support in consequence management.*

4. *Strengthen the Mpika Diocese advocacy work generally and to establish structures for social audit of the implementation of PRSP and HIPC specifically*
5. *To build institutional capacity for effective delivery of services*

5.1.3 Mansa Diocese

1. *Fight HIV/AIDS catastrophe through preventive activities and in collaboration with public authorities support in consequence management.
To establish appropriate structures and systems in order to ensure effective implementation of HIV/AIDS programmes in 15 centres of the 5 participating parishes by end of 2005
To undertake educational/sensitisation campaigns in order to increase awareness on HIV/AIDS in the target 15 centres by end of 2005
To advocate for the fight against HIV/AIDS in order to strengthen stakeholder intervention in all programme areas by the end of 2005.*
2. *To strengthen democracy in Zambia through strengthening of grassroots competence and structures for participating and influence in civil society, public debate and development.
To establish/strengthen structures that will facilitate the implementation of programmes to promote democracy and good governance in the target areas of the diocese by end of 2005
To lobby and advocate on social, political and economic issues affecting the communities in 18 centres by the end of 2005
To ensure economic empowerment of the communities in 18 targeted centres through appropriate interventions by the end of 2005.*
3. *To increase women's participation and influence so that they like men are participating in setting the agenda needed for debate and public policy
To establish appropriate structures and systems to ensure that issues of gender are adequately addressed in all 18 targeted centres by the end of 2005
To carry out gender awareness programmes in order to ensure active participation of women and men in development programmes in all 18 targeted centres by end of 2005
To lobby and advocate for gender issues with relevant organisations within the districts of the 18 targeted centres by the end of 2005*
4. *To strengthen the capacity of the Diocese in service delivery
To develop appropriate management systems and tools that will enhance transparency and accountability within the programme by end of 2005
To train programme staff in appropriate skills and competencies in order to enhance performance and service delivery by end of 2005
To create networks and maintain linkages with key stakeholders in order to facilitate effective service delivery both at the diocesan and parish levels by end of 2005*

5.1.4 Kasama Archdiocese

- d) *To improve food security at the household level and economic empowerment to 1,140 households by August 2007.*
- e) *Fight the HIV/AIDS catastrophe through preventive, treatment, support and care activities by August 2007.*
- f) *Strengthening democracy in Zambia through strengthening grassroots competence and participation of women so that they equal to men in setting the influence in the civil society, public debate and development policy by August 2007.*

It should be pointed out that from the Activity Plans reviewed for this MTR, there is no clear understanding of meaning and socio-economic implications of the concept 'gender'. Another observation is that for Mansa Diocese, the Activity Plans tend to place emphasis more on the Diocese's chosen 'entry point', which makes drawing comparisons on performance in implementing the programme difficult.

5.2 Progress Reporting

Progress reporting is done quarterly, semi-annually, and annually. The CCJDP/National Office prepares consolidated Annual Reports for submission to Caritas Norway. As explained in previous sections, the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme (2004-2007) addresses gender and governance issues which must be integrated into the two practical challenges of improving livelihoods and combating HIV/AIDS. Gender as a cross cutting issue is to be mainstreamed into governance as well as HIV/AIDS and livelihood improvement programme activities. Given the fact that the entry points for programme implementation at diocese level have varied – e.g. the entry point and emphasis for Mansa Diocese is HIV/AIDS, while for both Kasama Archdiocese and Mpika Diocese it is livelihood leaning towards cooperatives, this determines emphasis in reporting on activities by the Dioceses.

The mid year and annual progress reports made reviewed, which were prepared by the National Office covering all dioceses, and both Mansa Diocese and Kasama Archdiocese indicate that most of the planned activities for 2005 towards achievement of objectives of the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Programme (as stated in the Programme Document) were undertaken or implemented by the partners. However, the Evaluation Team was unable to assess performance of the Mpika Diocese due to non-availability of independent progress reports from the Diocese. However, the Team had accessed and reviewed the Activity Plans (2006) for all the participating Dioceses.

5.2.1 Progress Reporting Format

The Evaluation Team had access to and reviewed the Activity Plans and Progress Reports listed below, on the basis of which assessment was made:

- Strategic Plan 2004-2006 (CCJDP)
- Half Year Activity Reports 2005 (Kasama/Chilubula Deanery; CCJDP/ZEC; Mansa)
- Annual Reports (Kasama; Mansa; CCJDP/ZEC)
- Activity Report march-May 2006 (CCJDP/ZEC)
- Mid Year Report 2006 (CCJDP/ZEC)
- Activity Plans 2006 (CCJDP/ZEC; Kasama; Mansa; Mpika)

The Logical Framework (LF) was applied to all thematic areas (sub-programme). However, although activities and outputs are incorporated and feed into the LF of respective sub-programmes (Kasama and Mansa), there are still difficulties and inconsistencies in terms of reporting on actual outputs (e.g. numbers trained or participating in activities), especially for Kasama Archdiocese (Annual Report 2005). In terms of comparison, although for their Annual Reports 2005, both Mansa and Kasama report by Activity, the report by Mansa Diocese is more detailed and helpful because it documents both Planned/Implemented and Planned/Not Implemented activities, with explanations for the variances. On the other hand, the format used by CCJDP/ZEC (for consolidated reports) is 'by Objective'. There was no sample provided from Mpika Diocese. However, ***it is recommended that the format of "Reporting by Activity", based on the LF, which makes it possible to show comparisons between all planned and actual activities, be strengthened to facilitate monitoring and evaluation of programme implementation process.*** This will ensure that all planned activities are listed and rationales provided for those not implemented. This is helpful for purposes of assessing and measuring the pace of progress in implementing programme activities by the individual implementing partners.

5.3 Activities, achievements and challenges

In terms of performance regarding depth in activity planning and implementation of planned activities, statistics indicate that Mansa Diocese has done very well in virtually all aspects – i.e. institutional capacity building (i.e. equipping offices, recruiting and upgrading skills of professional staff, setting up implementation structures); awareness creation and skills training of various categories of participants from parishes and centres covered; functional groups formed; stakeholder meetings; baseline surveys in all centres. For example, according to Mansa Annual Report 2005, a total of Forty-two (42) activities had been planned, most of them *"centred on HIV/AIDS except in one Parish"* (page 3) and out of these, only seven (7) were not implemented (due to various reasons (including budgetary constraints, time constraint, staffing, non-availability of local Resource Persons)).

In terms of performance of the CNP, notable achievements and challenges were identified from various information sources used – i.e. review of programme documents, participatory workshops, key informant interviews and focus group discussions. A comparison among the dioceses is highlighted in the Matrices below according to thematic areas.

5.3.1 Achievements Identified: Livelihood Improvement

Kasama Archdiocese	Mansa Diocese	Mpika Diocese
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formation farming cooperatives • Diversification in agricultural crop production • Change from use of chemical fertilizers to organic/compost manure • Cooperatives ceased from being seasonal to operating throughout the year • Formation of Group Savings Schemes • Improved household food security • Conducting field days • Improved livestock keeping skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in barter system in favour of selling for cash • Knowledge on how to sell crops at reasonable prices. • Adoption of improved farming methods • Shift from chemical to organic fertilizers • Promotion of new food storage methods • Increased household food security • Improved food storage methods • Formation of cooperatives • Increased enrolment in literacy classes by women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved distribution of seed • Monitoring conducted • Improved seed loan recoveries (70% collected) • Changed behaviour towards loans by beneficiaries • Increased household food security • Access to seed through Seed Loans has led to good planning/ preparations • Improved farming methods • Crop diversification • Improved livestock keeping (poultry, pigs, goats) St. Joseph's)

5.3.2 Achievements identified: Governance

Kasama Archdiocese	Mansa Diocese	Mpika Diocese
Improved lobbying and campaigning skills Readiness of community to vote Increased knowledge of civic and human rights Increased freedom to debate issues; people no longer feel	Increased awareness on rights Improved understanding of good governance. Increased awareness on leadership qualities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in public interest to participate. e.g. in voting • Increased participation of women in decision- making. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in freedom of expression • Increased knowledge on how to choose good leaders • Improved leadership skills • Promotion of human rights • Setting up steering

<p>intimidated by politicians People not easily bribed Training of trainers in para-legal, economic justice, etc Opened para-legal office</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased knowledge on governance issues by leaders (traditional, church, etc) • Reduction in property grabbing cases 	<p>committees and centres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved communication between parents and children • Increased knowledge on governance issues • Reduction in violence & injustices in communities • Reduction in voter apathy – people ready to vote • Increased awareness of how to sell produce • Improved working relations • Improved leadership/ transparency • Increased knowledge of rights on land issues • Improved community participation in planning • Para-legal office opened to help resolve disputes • Succession rituals been discouraged – e.g. no more property grabbing
---	--	--

5.3.3 Achievements identified: HIV/AIDS

Kasama Archdiocese	Mansa Diocese	Mpika Diocese
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encouraging discussion in the home, work places, churches & schools • Increased number of people utilising VCT facilities and taking ARVs • Increased knowledge and information on HIV/AIDS • Improved care giving by family members • 2 CCJDP members 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People free to go for VCT (Kabunda) • More access to ARVs (Kabunda) • HBC care service provision (Kabunda) • Increased awareness of HIV transmission and how to protect self • Less stigmatization due to increased knowledge • Use of drama in awareness creation • Reduction in sexual 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased awareness on HIV/AIDS transmission, prevention and care • Reduction of stigma against PLWHA • Awareness of proper nutrition from locally available foods for patients • Reduced sexual cleansing • Changes in sexual behaviour in favour of one partner • Married couples have

<p>trained in palliative care</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More women going for PMTCT services • Reduced stigmatisation against PLWHA 	<p>cleansing and other traditional practices e.g. tattooing of sick people, sharing razor blades</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved fidelity in marriage • People stopped receiving condoms being distributed • Pastors and prayer leaders using HIV/AIDS knowledge in preaching 	<p>begun trusting each other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth taught how to protect themselves • More relatives taking care of patients • Increased HIV/AIDS awareness • Increased number of people going for VCT • Reduction in sexual cleansing and marrying off young girls • Improved knowledge on linkages between gender and HIV/AIDS
---	--	---

5.3.4 Achievements identified: Gender

Kasama Archdiocese	Mansa Diocese	Mpika Diocese
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women participating in community programs • Men more supportive to women • Sharing of traditional roles between men and women e.g. drawing water by men • Increased participation of women in decision-making • CCJDP staff members trained in gender • Gender issues often raised and debate freely at meetings • Improved appreciation of sharing of gender roles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased participation of women in household/ family decision-making • More women in leadership positions in government, church, villages, etc. • Men and women are sharing traditional gender roles – men now do women's tasks freely • More women enrolled for literacy classes; men not enrolling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved relations between men and women • Women now participate in decision making structures • Women's enrolment in schools/literacy classes has increased • Improved knowledge on linkages between gender and HIV/AIDS • Increased awareness on gender issues • Improved sharing of gender roles – e.g. men started cooking and taking children to under-five clinics • Gender balancing in leadership in churches and other organizations

5.3.5 Major challenges identified: Livelihood improvement

Kasama Archdiocese	Mansa Diocese	Mpika Diocese
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor road network • Vast distances to cover • Lack of inputs • Training in animal husbandry not done due to lack of funds • Lack of marketing facilities for cash crops (groundnuts, soya beans) • Lack of access to food processing equipment e.g. Yenga Oil Presses • Inability to cover entire community due to inadequate funding • No community mapping done • Implementation is only about 2 months • Shortage of funds – expected outputs not achieved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No proper shelters for food storage • Shortage of farming equipment • No agricultural extension officer • Late delivery and inadequate amounts of farming inputs • Few have been trained in farming methods • Lack of hammer mills • Inadequate support to orphans due to low yield in agriculture • High illiteracy rates especially among women 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of targeted beneficiaries small (60 per centre) • Lack of transport for monitoring and distribution of seeds and loan recoveries • Non delivery of livestock and cassava seed (plans not implemented) • Crop destroyed by weevils leading to non-planting • Lack of marketing facilities for produce • Some seeds not germinating • Late delivery of inputs • Poor rainfall/ drought • Animal diseases

5.3.6 Challenges identified: Governance

Kasama Archdiocese	Mansa Diocese	Mpika Diocese
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grassroots not yet strengthened in democratic values and practices due to the fact that programme is new • Slow pace of restructuring negatively affected civic education program for September Tripartite Elections <p>Poor road network Lack of transport Lack of funds</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority are outside the programme area and still ignorant of rights • Inadequate means of road transport and boats to reach targeted areas (Twingi Lunga) • Lack of funds led to the failure to invite aspiring candidates • Traditional norms against individual ownership of property/land. • Increased number of orphans (failing to meet their demands) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High levels of corruption in Government • Drunkenness • Elected persons do not work with the people or visit constituencies • Women and children still denied their human rights • Lack of transport for monitoring • Number of beneficiaries small (only 60 per centre)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of funds resulted in failure to invite aspiring candidate • Lack of transport and boats to reach targeted areas 	
--	---	--

5.3.7 Challenges identified: HIV/AIDS

Kasama Archdiocese	Mansa Diocese	Mpika Diocese
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program activities initiated from Diocese, not from Parish/Centre levels • Lack of transport • Lack of adequate funds • Late start of programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflict arising from different organizations teaching different ways of preventing HIV/AIDS. • Inability to include the majority of the needy • No VCT facilities (Twingi Lunga) • ARVs found at district only • No psycho-social counsellors • No equipment for HBC providers (e.g. gloves when handling sick people) • HBC providers unable to provide requisites e.g. soap, food, etc to the sick • Lack of transport to take sick to hospital 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People still fear going for VCT • Lack of IEC materials • Practices of other organizations & GRZ conflicting with social teaching of Catholic Church (use of condoms) • Lack of training on caring for sick • Lack of VCT facilities in some areas • Lack of access to food by most patients • Marrying off young girls without going for VCT • Lack of transport to visit patients • Lack of food suitable for patients

5.3.8 Challenges identified: Gender

Kasama Archdiocese	Mansa Diocese	Mpika Diocese
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Little involvement of community • Inadequate training due to lack of funds for gender activities • Irregular and few gender workshops held 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women not supporting each other. • Traditional system of sexual division of labour against women • Segregation in skills training e.g. women not included in training on construction of houses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oppression of women by husbands/men persists • Marrying off young girls • Early pregnancies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishermen not attending training at venues away from fishing camps 	
--	--	--

SECTION 6

SELF- ASSESSMENT ON STRENGTHS & WEAKNESSES OF PROGRAM

6.0 Introduction

This section presents self-assessment of the impact of the Caritas Norway – Zambia Partnership Programme by participants at workshops conducted. The participants were asked to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the Programme in relation to achieving its set objectives, and to make suggestions for the way forward. The consolidated responses are summarised below.

Participants' perceptions on strengths & weaknesses of program

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited coverage ensures efficient use of resources and makes it easy to measure impact after 3 years• Availability of management skills• Steering committees operating closest to grassroots• People's participation which is empowering and promotes ownership by communities• Effective collaboration with GRZ institutions and other organisations• Creating a group of trainers• High levels of commitment on part of staff and community members• Ability to improve household food security• High voluntarism spirit among community members• Founding the program on existing church/community structures ensures sustainability• Ability to reduce fear among community members through training• Ability to influence change in gender relations at community levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Limited coverage resulted in majority of poor being left out• Small number trained as trainers, which limits scaling up activities• Lack of access to transport (bicycles) for volunteers, which reduces their effectiveness• Cultural norms of sharing food has defeated objective of improving food security at household level• Delays in restructuring has resulted in delays in implementing program (Kasama)• Lack of incentives for volunteers and workshop participants, which could reduce morale• Inadequate funding especially for gender activities• Lack of clarity about the future of the program – no written sustainability strategy• Late disbursement of funds from Lusaka• Low levels of understanding of the concept 'gender' and how it interacts with the other thematic areas of focus.

Participants' suggestions on how to address weaknesses

- Provide more training for capacity building especially in Kasama Archdiocese due to late start
- Produce and disseminate simplified training materials in local languages
- Improve performance in HIV/AIDS in Mpika Diocese (St Joseph's Parish) through more training
- Improve funding to livestock rearing, as it is central to livelihood improvement
- Extend programme to 6 years to expand coverage/outreach
- Provide reliable transport at Parish level
- Provide support to Income Generating Activities to increase financial sustainability

SECTION 7 IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THE PROGRAMME

7.0 Introduction

This Mid Term Evaluation assessed both the process of implementing the Caritas Norway – Zambia Programme, its content outputs, identifying both achievements and challenges or constraining factors.

7.1 Assessment of Programme Foundation/Process

The process adopted for implementing the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Programme, which was highly participatory (through a series of consultative meetings and field visits) involving all prospective partners in defining the content and scope of the programme, was in line with the aim of building and strengthening capacities at both institutional and community levels for improving livelihoods. At institutional level, the involvement of existing Church/community structures as basis for the establishment of the implementation structures (i.e. steering committees and village level functional groups) in identifying and selecting specific participants/target groups, organising, mobilising and facilitating initial meeting afforded CCJDP National Office the opportunity to strengthen its institutional processes and procedures as well as skills of the Programme staff and field level partners in these respects.

The provision of office equipment, including computers to assist the implementing partners in financial management and building a community development database in the four thematic areas of focus was aimed at strengthening CCJDP's national role of generating data needed for planning and coordinating development programmes and activities. Secondly, the provision of transport and other telecommunications facilities (internet facility, vehicles) was aimed at improving communication between and amongst Programme levels, thereby increasing efficiency in implementing the Caritas Norway – Zambia Programme.

The integrated approach adopted focusing on four critical thematic areas (gender, HIV and AIDS, governance, and livelihoods) also facilitated collaborative work between the Church and other development actors at all levels (GRZ, civil society organisations, community structures/functional groups) in addressing the development needs and priorities identified in a participatory manner, which has potential to enriched the outputs of the Programme. It was expected that the implementing partners (National Office, Dioceses and Parishes) would make use of persons trained as Trainers/Facilitators through the agreed upon vehicles of community level training (i.e. various Functional Groups including Women's Clubs, Farmer Groups, Youth Groups, etc) in their respective capacity building activities. The Programme sourced expertise both internally (from Programme Officers at the National Office) and externally (from locally based professionals from line ministries and civil society organisations) to build capacity at different levels. The 3-year timeframe for the Programme is in line

with funding available and will provide adequate time for drawing lessons from the activities undertaken. Disbursements to implementing partners are made on an equal basis, given the equal number of parishes covered.

Finally, emphasis on using existing church/community structures (including traditional leadership structure) and people's participation approach have promoted acceptance and sense of ownership of the programme in communities though to varying degrees, given the different stages that participating Dioceses are implementing the programme.

7.1.1 Assessment of Programme efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

The geographical coverage of the Programme was limited to three northern dioceses (Mansa and Mpika Dioceses, and Kasama Archdiocese) and in each diocese, six (6) parishes, for a number of factors. Initially, Mansa and Mpika Dioceses were selected. However, Caritas Norway wanted more partners, which resulted in Kasama Archdiocese being added to the list mainly because of its proximity to the other two dioceses. Criteria used to choose dioceses included: (a) existence of on-going programmes to address community needs, location in same region of the country (logistical issues), (b) the identified needs of the areas targeted; (b) potential of a parish to provide lessons and best practice examples within the 3-year timeframe, (d) financial and other resources available; and (e) possibility of measuring impact within the Programme timeframe. The 3-year timeframe is adequate for drawing lessons from programme implementation, which is important for purposes making adjustments as necessary. Limited geographical coverage also makes it possible to conduct monitoring of programme implementation process, given the vast distances and bad roads even within parishes. Poor transport and road infrastructure have contributed to, among other things, delays in delivery of inputs and submission of progress reports.

Another important factor with regard to programme efficiency relates to strengthening linkages/networks with a wide range of relevant institutions (GRZ, civil society, other churches, traditional leaders, etc). This is being done through participatory planning and sharing meetings as well as training workshops have also contributed to implementation of programme activities.

Programme Management have also emphasized the need to recruit qualified staff to facilitate implementation of programme activities. However, although there is still a lot to do in terms of harmonisation regarding employing qualified full-time staff with similar conditions of service, human resources capacity development efforts have been fairly effective. Those who have received various types of training were able, during interviews and workshops, to identify specific skills gained from the different types of training provided – e.g. financial management, training others, coordinating programme implementation activities. However, a general need for specific training in analysis and integration skills

with respect to the four thematic areas, particularly for Programme Coordinators and Contact Persons/Volunteers who are also responsible for monitoring and evaluation of activities. Future training should include provision of report writing skills, at is currently a problematic area. The fact that preparation of reporting guidelines (financial and programmatic) for all implementing partners is on-going to ensure standardisation is a positive development.

Utilisation of financial resources differed according to implementing partner, with Kasama Archdiocese failing to spend most of its First Instalment, which resulted in the Second Instalment being withheld by the National Office. Low absorptive capacity and quality of financial reporting prompted Caritas Norway to offer assistance, through an auditing firm identified by them, to Kasama Archdiocese. This is to enable the Archdiocese to streamline their financial reporting in line with the requirements of the Norwegian Government.

7.2 Assessment of programme outputs (effectiveness)

Results of the Participatory Workshops, Focus Group Discussions, and Key Informant Interviews conducted during field visits revealed specific benefits communities have received from the Programme, which were identified as including: improved household food security, increased awareness and knowledge on governance, HIV/AIDS, and gender issues. Comparative statistics on numbers trained could not be accessed partly because some progress reports (e.g. from Kasama) had information gaps – e.g. a number of planned activities were implemented, but there is no indication on how many attended. On the other hand, the Annual Progress Report 2005 from Mansa Diocese indicates that most of the planned activities were implemented – e.g.:

- A total of about 1,801 people (men, women, youth) underwent training and sensitisation in various types of skills and issues (e.g. counselling, OVC support, governance issues, M&E, functional literacy instruction);
- 900 enrolled in literacy classes,
- 29 functional groups formed.

Results of Participatory Evaluation Workshops conducted in Mpika Diocese revealed that Training of Trainers (TOT) targeting 60 people (i.e. 20 married couples, 20 single/widowed, and 20 youth) in each centre were implemented. Training of Trainers is important because it is one of the key means of creating a core group of community Facilitators/Trainers, which is cost-effective, and promotes sustainability of a programme as opposed to reliance on external Resource Persons.

Major challenges identified which are affecting programme implementation negatively relate to poor road network, vast distances both within and between centres targeted (aggravated by bad roads), non-completion of the restructuring process, and reliance on volunteers at parish level.

7.3 Impact of Programme (Quantitative and Qualitative changes)

Impact assessment is directed at establishing with certainty whether or not a programme/project is producing its intended effect. A programme or project has impact if it achieves some change towards the desired direction. This means being able to demonstrate that the changes observed are the function of the programme or project, and whether or not the changes were originally intended as part of the objectives of the programme, and cannot be explained in other ways. Impact assessment has to be done at two levels – i.e. **Level One** at which direct outputs are assessed (e.g. actual number of persons trained or planned activities implemented (quantitative impact assessment), and **Level Two** which goes beyond assessment of direct outputs to include assessment of the effect or change influenced by direct outputs and the contributing environmental factors (qualitative impact assessment). Given that the programme is only half way through its 3-year timeframe, the impact identified for this review is mostly at the first level.

During the first half of the programme, integration of thematic areas of focus has proved problematic. The aim of the Program sought to educate community members, not only about their rights, but also to help them to believe in themselves as capable of changing their situation for the better. Livelihood is to provide the basis translating awareness and knowledge acquires on rights and responsibilities into practical realities of life. However, findings indicate that the idea of integration has not been well understood. The different thematic areas of focus as independent of each other, hence separate activities, budgets and reports. This situation calls for more concerted efforts in building both conceptual and practical skills. Secondly, lack of mainstreaming guidelines and checklists for use at different levels of programme implementation further weakens the integration approach.

The rest of this Section, therefore, attempts an assessment of the impact of the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Programme at the two levels - direct outputs (quantitative impact) and impact of the direct outputs (qualitative impact) . The assessments are summarised in the Matrix 3 below.

Matrix 3: Levels of Impact of the Programme (changes influenced)

Level 1: Direct Outputs of Program (Quantitative impact)	Level 2: Impact of Direct Outputs (Qualitative impact)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation framework consisting of steering committees at all levels put in place and functioning • Restructuring to merge two departments though occurring at different paces • Office equipment (computers, vehicles, internet facilities) provided • Training workshops conducted for Program accountants, Coordinators and other staff, and participants at community level • Specific training conducted in Palliative Care for CCJDP staff • A core group of community participants undergone a Training of Trainers (TOT) course are being used as Facilitators mobilising and sensitising the people • Community based Functional Groups e.g. women's clubs, Anti-AIDS clubs, farmer groups, literacy classes have been formed and strengthened, and serve as vehicles for training • Baseline and assessment studies undertaken on gender and HIV/AIDS • Paralegal Offices set up at field level, and are providing legal advice/services • Programme is working through Church structures aimed at ensuring sustainability of program outputs • Wide network of institutional linkages in all thematic areas of focus have been developed and strengthened, especially at national level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Though there is some improvement in collaborative linkages between the CNP and relevant GRZ institutions (Sector Advisory Groups), other churches and civil society organisations (Gender Forum, Oasis Forum, CHAZ, etc), this needs enhancing at field level. • Integrated approach adopted and is being applied though to varying degrees according to diocese • Gender and HIV/AIDS issues being raised and discussed at all meetings/ workshops at field level • Improvements in initiatives on addressing gender issues – e.g. linkages between gender and HIV/AIDS working well in Mpika Diocese due to their use the traditional Bemba Mbusa Ceremony as a vehicle for educating married and engaged couples on dangers of HIV/AIDS and the need to treat men and women as partners • Reduction in traditional practice of sexual cleansing • Improved farming methods (crop diversification and shift from use of chemical to use of organic fertiliser) • Improved crop storage • More women are participating in decision making bodies • Increased awareness on HIV/AIDS has resulted in reduced stigma and increased support to PLWHA • Increased number of women enrolled in literacy classes and able to read and write • Men becoming more supportive to women – e.g. in doing traditionally women's roles of cooking and taking children to under-5 clinics • Improved HBC and VCT services provision in some communities.

SECTION 8

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.0 Introduction

Based on the foregoing discussion of findings, the Mid Term Evaluation makes the following conclusions and recommendations that could be considered for the way forward.

8.1 Conclusions

8.1.1 Effectiveness of the Programme implementation process

- The provision for an implementation framework covering National, Diocese, Parish, and Centre/community levels, which has potential to enhance the coordination, management and administration of the CNP. However, the actual effectiveness of the framework varies at different levels.
- Refocusing has been a slow process, as confirmed by the fact that each participating Diocese has continued to put emphasis on their pre-Caritas Norway Programme activity – Mansa Diocese (HIV/AIDS); Mpika Diocese and Kasama Archdiocese (livelihood/cooperatives); National Office (governance). This suggests a lack of understanding of what the programme seeks to achieve at all levels.
- None of the implementing partners have taken gender as their entry point, thereby failing to see the critical linkages gender has to all the other areas of focus.
- Low absorptive capacity at diocese level, arising, at least in part, from the restructuring process with human resources development implications, has had a negative effect on implementation of programme activities though to varying extents.
- The provision of office equipment such as computers and vehicles has assisted the development structures established in terms of enhancing their capacity, not only with regard to implementation of their sub-programme related activities, but also implementation of their day to day programme activities on poverty reduction, democracy and development at national level. For example, the provision of computers should assist the National Office and Dioceses participating in improving their development based information management systems.
- The approach adopted whereby the Church in partnership with community level structures have been actively involved at all stages of Programme implementation (gathering baseline data, identifying and selecting communities and individuals to participate, planning and implementing

activities, preparing reports on activities, etc) was in line with the objective of building capacity at Diocese and community, as well as individual levels.

- The use of peer training in implementing the workshops to facilitate community mobilisation is important in terms of identifying potential Community Trainers and building/strengthening their capacities
- Staff changes (staff turnover) at Coordinator level under Kasama Archdiocese due to the restructuring process have undermined the capacity building efforts and sustainability of the Programme.
- Lack of a programme-specific M&E system makes it difficult to coordinate data gathering, analysis and report writing to feed into programme re-planning process.
- The training provided under each sub-programme has emphasized more on sensitisation or awareness creation about the thematic areas, and less on building skills for practical application of integration. This is an indication of a lack of understanding what the programme is seeking to achieve.
- Gender training is not like other types of training in that it is transformative. However, the programme under review has not treated gender training in this sense. Because of this, at the institutional level, there are challenges in terms of the manner in which the dioceses have applied gender. One of the reasons could be lack of clarity on the concept of gender and how it interacts with the other thematic areas.
- The lack of tools to facilitate integration of the cross cutting issues led to these issues being addressed separately at all levels, which is confirmed by the existence of different budget items for each of them.
- HIV/AIDS is still seem as a medical rather than a multi-faceted issue, which affects the way the programme is responding to the pandemic.

8.1.2 Value or Relevance of the Programme Outputs

- The Programme has relevance in that it emphasises that people have the potential to address the challenges they face in daily lives. The programme seeks to create awareness about rights and responsibilities, which are practically translated through the livelihood improvement programme. The focus on the Rights Based Approach means that the communities are not seen as beneficiaries, but as active participants with a duty to resolving their challenges.
- The decision to adopt an integrated approach to addressing all the four thematic areas is particularly important though not clear. For example, the

HIV/AIDS which impacts on all socio-economic sectors, is essentially a gender and development issue in Zambia and other countries in the region, when a number of factors are considered – e.g. the two common modes of transmission (heterosexual relations and mother-to-child), burden of care giving that falls disproportionately on women/girls, prevalence and death rates for HIV/AIDS that are higher among women/girls than men/boys, women’s culturally based subordination to men in society and, consequently, their lack of decision-making power. All these factors contribute to high poverty levels particularly among women and female-headed households.

8.1.3 Impact being created

- In terms of direct outputs of the programme, the Mid Term Review has revealed that a lot of community mobilisation through sensitisation **meetings and training workshops** targeting community based Functional Groups (Anti-AIDS clubs, Women’s clubs, Farmer Groups or Cooperatives, Savings Groups, etc) as the vehicles for specific training have been implemented, particularly in Mansa and Mpika Dioceses. In Kasama Archdiocese, however, implementation was only in its two and half months duration at the time of the field visit for this MTR, which means that most planned activities have not yet been implemented .
- The development of an M&E system with HIV/AIDS and gender sensitive indicators is yet to be done.
- In terms of assessing the effects of or changes influenced by the direct outputs (training outputs, office equipment, amounts of IEC materials distributed for awareness raising on HIV/AIDS, gender, and human rights), this cannot be easily done due to a number of factors that may affect or influence change at various levels – e.g. the tendency for organisational procedures and systems to be slow in terms of responding to change; the perceived small number of community members targeted to trained (e.g. 60 per centre in Mpika); the persistence of negative values and practices within communities. Secondly, assessing programme impact is made difficult by the presence of other institutions and organisations that are supporting or implementing similar programme activities. This makes it difficult to state with certainty whether or not the changes taking place or observed are the direct function of the Caritas Norway - Zambia Programme for the integrated approach to improve livelihoods of rural people.
- Self-assessments by participants at the evaluation workshops conducted revealed increased awareness and understanding of issues relating to HIV/AIDS, governance and gender issues, as reflected in the fact that these issues are being raised and discussed at meeting, and that people have begun speak out against corrupt practices. Participants also link acquisition of agricultural knowledge/skills, increase production and improved household security to the programme.

- In the case of Kasama Archdiocese, for the first half of the 3-year programme, focus was on livelihood with all staff involved in the programme located at Kasama and sharing one vehicle to cover a vast area. Since most of the staff were skilled in livelihood, it was difficult for them to take on board other thematic areas.

8.1.4 Challenges being experienced

- Generally low levels of understanding of the overall aim of the programme at all levels, which has affected programme implementation in all respects
- Implementation of programme moving at different paces at diocese level due partly to differences in Dioceses' responses to need to restructure
- Low levels of understanding the concept 'gender' and lack of skills in gender mainstreaming
- Lack of a written sustainability strategy, resulting in uncertainty and anxiety about the future of the programme
- High staff turnover at development Coordinator level
- Reliance on volunteers at diocese level (Mpika and Kasama) and parish level (Mansa), which may affect morale and commitment
- Other programmes operating in the same areas paying allowances to workshop participants, which is in conflict with the guiding principles of the programme under review.
- Vast distances both within and between parishes, aggravated by poor road network and inadequate means of transport (bicycles). This makes monitoring difficult.
- Differences in entry points in programme implementation makes comparability, monitoring, learning from each other, and measuring impact difficult.
- Low skills in various areas - financial management and narrative reporting, gender analysis and mainstreaming
- The restructuring process which is incomplete
- Lack of a programme-specific M&E system to facilitate measuring of programme impact
- Differences in views and expectations on moral issues between church and other institutions including GRZ – e.g. on use of condoms
- Non-Catholics feeling the programme is Catholic
- High levels of corruption in the public service
- High illiteracy rates at field level, especially among women
- Women's subordination to men in society
- High HIV/AIDS still treated as primarily a medical/health issue

8.1.4 Lessons learnt

- Programme is not well understood at all levels, hence variations in emphasis relating thematic focus
- Although Dioceses are autonomous, involvement in one programme like the one under review requires that there are common points of reference, which bind all parties – size of target group, qualifications of staff recruited, conditions of service to staff, etc.
- This programme demands a lot of flexibility in terms of the organisational culture (norms, practices, values), given the fact the programme emphasizes people's participation and high degree of communication across different levels
- Voluntarism should be considered in relation broader influencing factors and within local context and the practice in other dioceses.
- The terms 'gender' and 'gender mainstreaming' are used by many but understood by few. Gender mainstreaming tends to be interpreted to mean 'numbers of men and women participating' in structures or activities.
- While church values are amenable to promotion of gender equality, the internal structure, in general, tends not to be supportive of promotion of gender equality

8.2 Recommendations

8.2.1 Management and structural issues

- Provide special support to Kasama Archdiocese to complete merging of the two departments to accelerate implementation as well as enhance the sense of ownership of the programme.
- Consideration should be given to standardization in terms of name or designation of the outcome of the restructuring or merging of the Departments of Development, Justice and Peace, to promote a shared identify.
- Harmonise requirements on professional qualifications of Programme staff at both Diocese and Parish levels, based on the assumption that all implementing partners are expected to produce more or less similar results. This may also help in halting high staff turnover.
- Develop, disseminate widely and implement a written sustainability strategy to reduce anxiety, increase a sense of ownership, as well as political will and commitment to implement the programme.
- Encourage and strengthen dialogue with GRZ and other collaborating organisations on moral issues relating to methods of preventing the spread of HIV and AIDS
- Address the issue of allowances to workshop participants, volunteers, and professionals from other collaborating institutions who provide expertise, in consultation with other programmes that may paying allowances
- Design and implement an M&E system with indicators that are sensitive to all cross cutting issues; and strengthen capacity/skills in M&E to facilitate application of the system.

- Strengthen linkages with both Gender in Development Division and National AIDS Council through invitations for them to be represented on Steering Committees at different levels. GIDD structure has Gender Focal Points at line ministries, Provincial Planning Units, DDCCs and specialised agencies; while NAC has Provincial AIDS Task Forces (PATFs) and District AIDS Task Forces (DATFs).
- Consider providing bicycles to facilitators/volunteers at Parish level, to address the problems associated with vast distances that they have to cover both between and within parishes, to implement programme activities.
- Strengthen grassroots level lobbying and advocacy on the need for Government to grade/maintain feeder roads and deliver farming inputs timely, which will reduce costs for travel for monitoring and improve support to communities.
- Given the fact that Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Partnership Programme has a fixed timeframe for its implementation (3 years), the issue of differences among Dioceses where Kasama and Mpika use volunteers, while Mansa employs full time Coordinators at parish level needs to be addressed. All the implementing Dioceses should employ appropriately qualified full-time staff. Currently, some of the persons used as volunteers at centre level are employed full-time elsewhere, and they may be aware about the practices of other programmes or organisations.

Programmatic issues

- National Office should facilitate a stakeholders' workshop to provide an opportunity to share ideas on issues raised by the MTR in order to agree on the way forward
- Provide more comprehensive orientation about the Programme, what it seeks to do and what it requires of all those expected to participate in its implementation. This orientation should be at all levels (national, diocese, parish and centre), not only for purposes of achieving a common understanding, but also facilitating adoption of harmonised strategies and methods for implementing programme activities.
- Conduct a comprehensive **Training Needs Assessment (TNA)**, to ensure cost-effectiveness and relevance of various types of training for skills building in all the thematic areas - conceptual understanding of each area and linkages between and among them; integrated approach to programme implementation; data collection and analysis methodologies; and documentation with a view to promoting integration and identifying best practices.
- Provide training in gender analysis and mainstreaming to programme staff, in line with Caritas Norway's emphasises on qualitative participation of women (i.e. not just balancing numbers or women being present in decision-making structures, but women being active participants – i.e. women actually participating in agenda-setting).

- Promote mainstreaming of cross cutting issues through development and preparation of Mainstreaming Manual with guidelines and checklists on each thematic area.
- The IEC materials relating to all four thematic areas of focus that are in English should be translated into local languages to increase awareness on issues through the literature thereby increasing potential for expanded outreach.
- Reporting format should be harmonised and follow the Logical Framework, to facilitate reporting by Activity.
- In terms of meeting immediate daily practical needs of participants (i.e. labour saving technologies such as hammer mills, Yenga Press, etc), the programme should explore ways of linking communities to other organisations that may be involved in providing assistance in labour saving technologies and could help communities.

REFERENCES

Programme documents

CCJDP (2006), 2004-07 Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Programme

CCJDP, Strategic Plan 2004-2006

CCJDP, Country Programme on Governance, Gender and HIV/AIDS 2005-07

CCJDP, 2006 Mid Year Report – Caritas Norway –Zambia Country Programme

CCJDP, Consolidated Country Programme Document and Budget on Governance, Gender and HIV/AIDS

CCJDP, 2005 Half Year Narrative Report for Caritas Norway in Chilubula Deanary, January-June 2005

CCJDP, 2005 First Activity Report

CCJDP, Report on Caritas Norway Partnership Monitoring Visit to Kasama Archdiocese and Mpika Diocese, 5-16 September 2006

CCJDP, 2005 Annual Activities Report of the 2004-07 Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Programme

CCJDP, Archdiocese of Kasama – Caritas Norway 2006 Activity Plan

CCJDP, Activity Report for the Period 1 March – 31 May 2006 of the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Programme

CCJDP, Caritas Norway Sponsored Activities for 2006

Report on the Monitoring Visit Conducted in Kasama, Mansa, and Mpika, 8-19 May 2006, compiled by A. Musonda

Minutes of the Fifth Meeting of CCJDP, Diocese of Mansa, Diocese of Mpika, Archdiocese of Kasama and Caritas Norway Steering Committee, held in Mpika, 1 February 2005

Minutes of the 6th Meeting of CCJDP, Mansa Diocese, Mpika Diocese, Kasama Archdiocese and Caritas Norway Steering Committee, held at Spark Batteries Guest House, Mansa, 16 June 2005

Minutes of the Zambia – Caritas Norway Programme Meeting, 28 February, St Joseph's Parish, Chinsali

Minutes of the Caritas Norway – Zambia Country Programme National Steering Committee, held on 10th November 2005, at Blue Crest Executive Lodge Lusaka

Caritas Norway Stakeholders' Workshop, held at Spark Batteries Guest House, Mansa, 14-15 January 2005

Caritas Norway National Steering Committee Trip Report (undated)

Mporokoso Queen of Peace Parish, CCJDP – Caritas Norway 2006 Activities

Mpika Diocese, 2006 Activity Plan

Mansa Diocese, Programme Document for Democracy, Gender and HIV/AIDS in Partnership with Caritas Norway and CCJDP National Office 2004-2007

Mansa Diocese (2005), Caritas Norway Programme Mid Year Progress Report, January-June 2005

Mansa Diocese (2006), Caritas Norway Programme Action Plan

OTHER DOCUMENTS REFERRED TO

CSO (2004), Living Conditions Monitoring Survey Report

JUDAI (2006), Gender Analysis Framework for Planning for the National AIDS/STI/TB Council. Prepared for NAC

JUDAI (2002), Jobs Gender and Small Enterprises in Africa: Women Entrepreneurs in Zambia. Research Report prepared for the ILO

Changa Management Services Ltd (2005), Implementation Risk Management and Sustainability Strategy . Evaluation Report prepared for ZAMSIF

Munachonga, M. (2006), Report on Evaluation of the Capacity Building Programme for Integrating Gender into HIV/AIDS Programmes and Activities in Zambia. Prepared for The World Bank

Munachonga, M. (2005), Work-Family Conflict in Zambia. Research Report prepared for the ILO

ANNEX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. Background

The partnership between CCJDP and Caritas Norway started in 2004. the process leading up to the partnership had a number of preparatory initiatives taken which include; preparation of a document by the National Office arguing for Mpika and Mansa as strong possible candidates for the Caritas Norway partnership in 2003. the other initiatives taken included discussion sessions between CCJDP and Caritas Norway representatives and field visits. Regarding the field visits a follow-up visit was made in August 2003 when the Caritas Norway Programme Coordinator , accompanied by CCJDP staff, visited Mpika and Mansa Dioceses for familiarisation and getting better understanding of the context within which the prospective partners were operating. While CCJDP had recommended the two northern dioceses of Mpika and Mansa to be

part of the partnership, Caritas Norway representative added the Archdiocese of Kasama to the list of possible partners after visiting the Diocese.

Furthermore, Caritas Norway was invited to participate in the annual CCJDP and a partnership meeting with CCJDP and the northern Dioceses in November 2003, after which a specific meeting between Caritas Norway and prospective Zambian partners was held. Participants to the meeting were representatives drawn from CCJDP National Office, Caritas Norway, Kasama Archdiocese, Mpika and Mansa Dioceses. The purpose of the meeting was for partners to reach a common understanding of partnership and reflect on the expectations from both parties. Possible roles and responsibilities were also reflected upon. At the end of the workshop, a way forward was agreed upon which included the preparation of a Memorandum of Understanding and putting a National Steering Committee in place to consist of representatives from the three dioceses, CCJDP National Office and Caritas Norway.

The programme under the Caritas Norway and CCJDP partnership started in 2004 with mostly setting up the implementing structures and procurement of project equipment. The implementation of programme activities commenced in 2005 and expected to end in 2007. the programme has so far run for one and half years and hence the need for the mid term review.

The programme's focus is in four thematic areas, that is, promotion of good governance, gender, HIV and AIDS, and livelihood promotion. This happens through the strengthening of the church/community structure to be in the forefront to initiate and implement development in their respective communities through the people's participation in six (6) parishes in each of the three dioceses.

2. The rationale for the Evaluation

The Caritas Norway programme has been running for one and half years now, which marks its mid way to the end of the programme. The purpose of this mid term review is to learn and contribute towards improving the performance of the programme and to recommend a workable way of ensuring the sustainability of the programme beyond 2007. Focus will be to:

- a) Identify the achievements, failures, constraints and sustainability of the programme in consultation with all key stakeholders,
- b) Provide a basis for accountability, including the provision of information to the donor, beneficiaries and other concerned stakeholder organisations,
- c) Review the effectiveness of the policies, systems and organisational structure of the programme implementers,
- d) Review the efficient use of resources (financial, human and other resources)
- e) Review the justification of targeting, in terms of coverage and participants,
- f) Come up with recommendations that will help to enhance the foundation of the programme and guide the programme during the phase out (exit strategy) from the current communities into the new communities.

3. The main stakeholder of the Evaluation

The main stakeholders that will participate in the evaluation include the National Office (programme secretariat), Diocesan Steering Committees, Parish Steering Committees, Centre Steering Committees, programme community participants and notable collaborating partners in the programme.

4. Key Issues/Scope of the review

- f) Project foundation
 - Were the local people consulted during the inception and design of the programme? How was it done?
 - Appropriateness of the programme to local problems, needs and priorities of the target participants, including the physical and policy environment within which it operates.
 - Is the programme building on already existing initiatives?
 - Appropriateness of implementation strategy, timing and duration.
 - Rationale of budget, materials and personnel (inputs).
- g) Efficiency (Are there better and more cost-effective ways of achieving the same results?)
 - Availability of inputs timely and planned costs.
 - Is the duration of the project appropriate?
 - Monitoring of inputs to allow cost effective implementation of activities
 - Linkage/ networking with other relevant initiatives in the dioceses. For example, HIV and AIDS programmes in the dioceses. What collaborative mechanisms are in place and so far their benefits to the programme. Are internal institutional structures adequate to allow this?
 - Factors causing delays in project implementation.
 - Are the current implementing partner organisation's structure, staff (number and skill) and reporting tools enough to monitor and bring out information required to inform on programme impact. (Ability to recognise, capture document impact related issues raised by the programme activities in the four thematic areas).
 - Availability of planning schedules/ work plans.
- h) Effectiveness (Are results achieved in line with planned schedule of activities and outputs)
 - Are the right participants receiving the anticipated results (analysis of factors and assumptions for achieving objectives)
 - Likelihood of programme objectives to be achieved
 - Any constraints in achieving the objectives.
- i) Changes produced / recorded as a result of the project? (impact)
 - Integration/application of the 'soft' part (gender, HIV and AIDS and governance) with the 'hard' (livelihood) by the programme participants in their daily lives
 - Positive and negative effects, anticipated or not, in the thematic areas of the programme i.e. gender, HIV and AIDS, good governance and livelihood promotion.

- Effectiveness of the established groups in fulfilling the objectives of the programme. Are they working well to contribute to their desired development?
 - Effectiveness and quality of the training the participants are receiving
 - Any other impacts to be anticipated in the future
 - Any constraints in realisation of impact.
- j) Sustainability
- How is the programme preparing the communities now in order to own the activities of the programme?
 - Level of ownership of programme by participants and livelihood activities without external support
 - Replication of the project in other areas (centres, parishes and dioceses)
 - Self-reliance of the project participants in organisational, technical and financial aspects. Are participants able to continue with the initiatives with external support?
 - Any other development achieved by the participants in achieving sustainability.

5. Evaluation Methodology

The review will be conducted in the three dioceses implementing the programme. In each diocese, two parishes will be sampled, and in each parish at least two centres will be sampled.

- a) Review of existing documents
- b) Focus group discussions and other participatory techniques which the evaluating team will consider relevant
- c) Key informant interviews with CCJDP national office, local partners' authorities and implementing staff, and the programme participants.

6. Duration of the Task

The task should be completed within fifty (50) days.

7. Expected Outputs

- A draft report within 2 weeks after the field visit
- A power point presentation of key results/ preliminary findings which will be presented to the National Steering Committee and representatives of other stakeholders
- A final report, including the following:
 - a) Executive summary
 - b) Introduction/background – context, socioeconomic situation and analysis
 - c) Description of methodology
 - d) Limitations
 - e) Main findings
 - f) Conclusions and recommendations

8. Accountability

The Consultant shall be accountable to the Programme Manager, Human Development through the Programme Officer, Food Security and Livelihoods

ANNEX 2: LIST OF PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

Mansa Diocese: Kabunda Parish

Serial No.	Name of Participant	Position	Instit. Represented
1	Victor Kalembe	Parish Dev. Coordinator	Kabunda Parish
2	Fr. P. M. Lungo	Parish Priest	Kabunda Parish
3	Joseph Kasongo	Parish Chairman	Kabunda Parish
4	Goodson Mwewa	Centre Chairman	Luamfumu Centre
5	Felix Chibwe	Contact Person	Luamfumu Centre
6	John Mwewa	Secretary CPIT	Kabunda Centre
7	Charles J. Mulenga	CPIT	Luamfumu Centre
8	Bernadette Chama	B.C.P.	Luamfumu Centre
9	Bertha Muonga	CPIT	Anglican Church
10	Annie Mwamba	CPIT	C.M.M.L. Church
11	Beda M. Kalinda	CPIT	Catholic Church
12	Charles Chansa	CPIT	S.D.A. Church
13	Chipo C.S. Sike	Asst Prog. Officer (DDJP)	Catholic Church
14	Clement Chaswe	CPIT	UCZ/Kabunda
15	Sabina Kambikiya	Women's Club	Kabunda Centre
16	Rosemary Chola	CPIT	Kabunda Centre
17	Chama Kalubi	CPIT	UCZ/Kabunda Centre
18	Royd Kalaba	HBC	Kabunda
19	Charles Mwansa	CPIT	CMML/Kabunda
20	Symon Katuka	Mukunsa IV, Headman/ CPIT	Kabunda Centre
21	Frazer Mwansa	-	Kabunda Centre
22	Elestine Mwansa	CPIT/HBC	Kabunda Centre
23	Mercy Mulenga	CPIT/HBC	Kabunda Centre
24	Chalwe Mutale	Member CPIT	Kabunda Centre
25	Mary Simutowe	CPIT	Kabunda Centre
26	Maybin Mulenga	CPIT/HBC	Kabunda Centre
27	Winfreda Kapungwe	CPIT	Kabunda Centre

Mansa Diocese: Twingi Lunga Parish

Serial No.	Name of Participant	Position	Instit. Represented
1	James Mubanga	PDCS Treasurer	Chipako Centre
2	Godfrey Bwalya	PDCS Chairperson	Katanshya Centre
3	Chalikosa Kamfwa	PDCS V/Secretary	Kaminsa Centre
4	Simon Katai	CPIT Member	Kaminsa Centre
5	Bibian Chali	CPIT Member	Mabo Centre
6	Charles Chilinda	Traditional Leader	Kaminsa Centre
7	Newton Kunda	HBC giver	
8	Agatha Chibale	CPIT/PDCS Member	Mabo Centre
9	Majority Kalaba	HBC giver	Kaminsa Centre
10	Bruno Mpela	Traditional Leader	Kaminsa Centre
11	Kildar Dambwe	CPIT Member	Kaminsa Centre

12	Hungusa Kasonga	Instructor	
13	Joseph Tambule	CPIT Chairman	Njipi Centre
14	Florence Mubanga	CPIT Member	Mabo Centre
15	Venansho Kolala	Headman	Kaminsa Centre
16	Mary R.C. Chikonde	CPIT	Kaminsa Centre
17	Paul Mabo	CPIT	Mabo Centre
18	Benson T. Mutale	CPIT/PDCS	Njipi Centre
19	Matcelino Mpela	CPIT	Njipi Centre
20	Goodness F.C. Chalwe	CPIT	Njipi Centre
21	Fortunate S. Kambeta	Kabende Munshi	
22	Leonard B. Mwansa	PDCS V/Chairperson	Kalansha Centre
23	Godfrey Lwendo	CPIT Chairperson	
24	Sashi Mumba	CPIT Member	
25	Bwalya Bwale	CPIT Secretary	Kaminsa Centre
26	Prisilla Chalwe	CPIT	Mabo Centre
27	Benedict Lwambo	CPIT	Mabo Centre
28	Astridah Mwape	CPIT	Kaminsa Centre
29	Albina Mubanga	CPIT	Kaminsa Centre

Kasama Diocese: Mporokoso Parish

Serial No.	Name of Participant	Position	Instit. Represented
1	Evans Kapili	Secretary	Mulangwa Centre
2	Davis Nkole		Bwengo Centre
3	K.E Kabwe		CCJDP
4	Ephraim Changala	PSC	
5	Evaristo Franshi	Diocesan	CCJDP
6	Albertina Katwizi	PSC	
7	Lawrence Chilakwa	PSC V/Coordinator	CCJDP
8	Messy Cheme	Secretary Parish	CCJDP
9	Fr Nicholas Kaliminwa	Archdiocese Coordinator	CCJDP
10	Patrick Kunda	Parish Dev. Officer	Mporokoso Parish
11	Fr Kaphisha Katai	Parish Priest	Mporokoso Parish
12	Daniel B. Chileshe	CCJDP Member	Mporokoso Parish
13	Angella C. Kaimba	CCJDP Member	

Kasama Diocese: Chilubula Parish

Serial No.	Name of Participant	Position	Instit, Represented
1	Rodina C. Lupili	CCJDP Member	Chilubula Parish
2	Bonaventure Bwalya	CCJDP	Chilubula Parish
3	Mary Chileshe	CCJDP	Chilubula Parish
4	William Kampamba	Parish Dev. Secretay	Chilubula Parish
5	Alfred Shata	CCJDP	Chilubula Parish
6	Fr Amos Chushi	Parish Priest	Chilubula Parish
7	Emmanuel Kantini	CCJDP	Chilubula Parish
8	Abraham Mintor (?)	CCJDP	Chilubula Parish
9	Charles Katongo	CCJDP	Chilubula Parish
10	Agnes Kanzwa	CCJDP	Chilubula Parish
11	Martha Mintor (?)		Chilubula Parish

Mpika Diocese: Kopa Parish

Serial No.	Name of Participant	Position	Instit. Represented
1	Jonas Kasongo	V/Chairperson PSC	Kopa Musumba Centre
2	Mary Kabinga	Member	Kopa Musumba Centre
3	Maiko Chipili	Member	Namusulwa Centre
4	Grace Lombe	PSC	Musumba Centre
5	Christine Mulu	Chairperson	Kalila Centre
6	Peter Chewe	Chairperson	Namusulwa Centre
7	Thresa Chanda	Member	Musumba Centre
8	Bartholomew Bwalya	Contact Person	Kopa Parish
9	Jacklin Mayuko	V/Chairperson	Musumba Centre
10	Isaac Mwaba	Member	Namusulwa Centre
11	Annie Bwalya	V/Chairperson	Namusulwa Centre
12	Foster Chibesa	Member	Namusulwa Centre
13	Estella Chanda	Member	Namusulwa Centre
14	Silvia Ndafi	Member	Musumba Centre
15	Wilfred Mwape	Secretary Youth	Musumba Centre

Mpika Diocese: St Joseph's Parish

Serial No.	Name of Participant	Position	Instit. Represented
1	Alick C.Chola	Treasurer	Shilombe Centre
2	Kenny Shakalima	Member	Chibaye Centre
3	Lewis Mulenga	N.C.C.	Mutamba Centre
4	Francis Mumba	Chairperson	Mutamba Centre
5	Abel Mulenga	Member	Mutamba Centre
6	Moses Chibulu	Member	Mutamba Centre
7	Bernard Mubanga	Secretary	Mutamba Centre
8	Anerta Lombe	Member	Mutamba Centre
9	Belita Chanda	Member	Mutamba Centre
10	Kalikonga Sinkala	Member	Kabuka Centre
11	Clement Bwalya	Chairman Youth	Kabuki Centre
12	Charity Kafula	Secretary/widows	Kabuka Centre
13	Foster Bwalya	Chairperson/widows	Kabuka Centre
14	Grace Mutale	Treasurer/widows	Kabuka Centre
15	Francis Mulenga	Secretary PSC	Kabuka Centre
16	Gilbert Chilufya	Secretary	Chibaye Centre
17	Tresa Mubanga	Secretary	Chibaye Centre
18	Agatha Mubanga	Member	Chibaye Centre
19	Clementina Bwalya	PSC	Chibaye Centre
20	Martha Menya	PSC	Chibaye Centre
21	Francis Kalao	Member	Shilombe Centre

ANNEX 3: INTERVIEW GUIDES

A. GROUP WORK FOR ALL WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

In your small groups according to Centres, discuss and answer the following questions based on thematic areas of focus/activity (Governance, Gender, HIV/AIDS, and Livelihoods).

- What do you call this Programme, and who else is involved?
- Describe how your community got involved in this Programme.
- What ways has this Programme used to promote participation by community members?
- What Programme activities are you undertaking and the target groups of those activities under the following areas of Programme focus:
 - Livelihood improvement
 - Governance,
 - Gender, and
 - HIV and AIDS
- What have been major achievements or best practices in implementing the Programme in relation to:
 - Livelihood improvement
 - Governance,
 - Gender, and
 - HIV and AIDS
- What have been the major failures, and reasons for the failures?
 - Livelihood improvement
 - Governance,
 - Gender, and
 - HIV and AIDS
- What makes you proud about being part of this Programme?
 - Draw a picture that symbolises your feelings?

B. FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION (FOLLOWING GROUP WORK REPORTS)

In which particular communities are the problems/issues related to the following most prevalent?

HIV/AIDS issues?

Gender issues?

Governance issues?

Livelihood promotion issues?

Who in your communities is most affected by:

HIV/AIDS issues?

Gender issues?

Governance issues?

Livelihood promotion?

What is the way forward in effectively addressing the issues – i.e.:

HIV/AIDS issues?

Gender issues?

Governance issues?

Livelihood promotion?

Mention some of the negative impacts of the following on your communities:

HIV and AIDS; and
Gender

What should the Programme do in order to ensure that HIV/AIDS and gender are taken into account in:

Planning and budgeting,
Implementation of activities, and
Monitoring and evaluation and reporting?

6. In implementing this Programme, who has contributed and in what form/way among the following:

Community members (women, men, children, etc)?

Government?

The Programme?

Others collaborating with the Programme (please specify)?

In order to have more positive impact, what in your view should this Programme:

Do more of?

Do less of?

C. GUIDE FOR KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

- 1) What are the major developmental issues/problems in your area/district? (List in priority order).
- 2) Who is most affected by these issues/problems?
- 3) How did the communities deal with these issues before the Caritas Norway Program was implemented?
- 4) What process was adopted in engaging with the communities?
- 5) What were the criteria used for participation on Programme Steering Committees at the different levels?
- 6) How is the outreach or field programme:
 - a. Organised (geographical coverage)?
 - b. Managed and coordinated
 - c. Monitored and evaluated? Who is responsible and what tools are used?
- 7) In terms of implementing the Programme, who contributes and in what form among the following:
 - a. Community members (Men, women, children, etc)?
 - b. Local leaders?
 - c. GRZ?
 - d. CCJDP?
- 8) Is the idea of partnership between communities and the Church:
 - a. Working well? Give examples.
 - b. Not working so well? Give examples.
- 9) In which specific areas of focus would you say the Programme has:
 - a. Made significant achievements or successes? Identify best practices.
 - b. Little or no progress? Give concrete examples.
- 10) Which social groups do you think have benefited most from Programme implementation?
- 11) How do you see the future partnerships faring beyond this Programme?
- 12) What do you think should be done to ensure strengthening and sustainability of outputs of this Programme?

D. GUIDE FOR GROUP INTERVIEWS PROGRAMME STAFF

1. What is the overall development objective of the Programme under review?
2. How clear is this development objective and to what extent is it shared by community members and other stakeholders?
3. Identify key characteristics of a good development programme.
4. Which of these characteristics are present in, and which are absent from the Programme?
5. How do programme activities fit into:
 - a. The existing division of labour between men and women in communities?
 - b. Does this system interfere with programme activities? Explain.
6. How would you assess community members' response to the Programme?
7. What specific comments do you have on the following aspects of the Programme:
 - a. Geographical coverage and how the Programme is managed?
 - b. Systems in place (i.e. relating to, for example, Finance, planning and budgeting, HR management, organisational culture/values)?
 - c. Monitoring and evaluation system and reporting format?
 - d. Conditions of service?
8. What are the main challenges for the future?
9. What is your expectation of who should play what role in addressing these challenges?
10. What makes you proud about working with this Programme?
 - a. Draw a picture that symbolises your feelings?

E. INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR MEMBERS OF STEERING COMMITTEES

1. How did the community members (men and women) participate in the design and planning of the Programme?
2. Comment on the geographical coverage of the programme in relation to management, coordination and monitoring and evaluation.
3. Please clarify relationships between Steering Committees and Management and staff at the different levels:
 - a) What is the role of the Steering Committees?
 - b) What is the role of Management and staff?
4. Are the roles of the various structures clearly defined and understood by implementer and beneficiaries?
5. In actual practice, where are the areas of cooperation, and the areas of challenge?
6. What is your own assessment of the overall strengths and weaknesses of this Programme at the following levels:
Staff level?
Management level?
Steering Committee level?
Institutional linkages?
7. What challenges is the Programme faced with, and the way forward at the following levels:
 - a) Core programmes level?
 - b) Integrating cross cutting issues
 - c) Human resources capacity for programme implementation and management of the Programme?

- d) Systems (organisation and management policies and procedures, M&E)?
- e) Financing of the Programme and long-term sustainability?

F. GUIDE FOR NATIONAL OFFICE/STERERING COMMITTEE

1.0 Structures/governance system of the programme

- a. Structures supposed to be established at each level (National, Diocese, Parish, Centre) of the CNP
- b. Criteria for membership of these structures
- c. Roles and responsibilities of structures at various levels

2.0 PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT

Planning process

- a) At what levels is planning done? Elaborate.
- b) Are there guidelines for developing Action Plans

Financial management

- a) Who is involved in preparing budgets? (Procedures, decisions on budgetary adjustments or cuts)
- b) Criteria used for allocating funds to Diocese and activities? (Explanations variations in financial allocations to Diocese and activities)
- c) Criteria/conditions for budgeting for specific cross cutting issues
- d) Timing/schedule of disbursements?
- e) How often audit visits take place and by whom?
- f) Comment on financial analytical skills at various levels (national, Diocese, Parish, Centre levels).
- g) Views on absorptive capacity of various implementing partners

3.0 Reporting (financial and programmatic)

- a) Timing for financial reporting. Who is responsible?
- b) Is there a written Format and Guidelines for financial reporting?
- c) Timing programmatic reporting and who is mandated to do it?
- d) Is there a Format and Guidelines for programmatic reporting?
- e) Comment on quality of financial and programmatic reporting to date.
- f) What are the main factors for late reporting and submission of Reports?

4.0 Programme coverage/outreach:

- a) Comment on the geographical coverage vis-à-vis effectiveness and efficiency in programme implementation.
- b) What do you think would have been the ideal coverage? Why?

5.0 Monitoring and evaluation

- a) Who is are mandated with responsibility for M&E for the CNP activities?
- b) Are there tools and guidelines for use for Monitoring progress in implementing programme
- c) Are there guidelines and tools for Evaluating of impact of the programme?
- d) Are there a tools and guidelines for M&E integration of cross cutting issues?
- e) Is there a system for storing and disseminating data for the CNP?

6.0 Technical assistance

- a) What are the main sources of technical assistance for each of the specific for livelihood, governance, HIV/AIDS, gender, management?
- b) Comment on the effectiveness of technical support provided/received in each area?
- c) To what extent is technical support readily accessible?
- d) What have been the expressed needs of programme beneficiaries for technical support?

7.0 Capacity building:

- a) Comment on institutional capacity building in relation to programme implementation (office equipment, transport facilities, materials, etc)?
- b) Position on human resources capacity (managerial and technical skills for implementing programme activities)?
- c) What are the facilitating and limiting factors with regard to implementing training?

8.0 Communication channels (ideal and actual practice):

- a) How was the CNP designed in relation to facilitating communication?
- b) In your view, are communication channels between and within different levels of the programme clear?
- c) What are the dominant perceptions on transparency in communication? How do these perceptions affect relationships among actors?
- d) Would you say there are discrepancies between ideal and actual reality in terms of channels of communication? Give examples.

9.0 Programme administration:

- a) Who is contributing and in what form to programme implementation? Consider various actors (GRZ, Catholic Church, other Churches, Communities, Civil society)?
- b) Who is responsible for programme procurements? Comment effectiveness and weaknesses of the existing arrangement.
- c) How is the security of programme facilities and equipment ensured at the different levels?
- d) Would you say there is equitable access and use of programme facilities (office equipment, vehicles, bicycles, materials)?

10.0 Perceptions & associated implementation models

Field findings suggest the application of two different models of implementations

- a) CNP being fused into existing Church structures (Mpika)
- b) CNP being a stand alone programme, but getting assistance from existing Church structures (Mansa)
- c) CNP being regarded as a programme for Catholics

G. INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR COOPERATING PARTNERS

- 1) Why did your organisation decide to support this Programme?
- 2) What changes, if any, have you noticed during the period of implementing the Programme under review, especially in relation to addressing issues on::
 - a. Governance?
 - b. Livelihood improvement?
 - c. Gender?
 - d. HIV/AIDS?
- 3) Are there any concerns you have about coordination and management of this Programme?
 - a. programmatic reporting
 - b. financial reporting
 - c. HRD capacity/skill levels
- 4) What would you suggest that the Programme, in future, does:
 - a. More of in each area of the four focus areas?
 - b. Less of in these areas?
- 5) What are your future plans in terms of support to this Programme?
- 6) Any other comments?