

## ANNEX 9 ZAMBIA COUNTRY CASE STUDY

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## ACCRONYMS

## 1 INTRODUCTION

## 2 COUNTRY CONTEXT REGARDING CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

2.1 Situation in Zambia Regarding Cross-Cutting Issues

2.2 Development of Finland's Development Assistance Portfolio in Zambia

## 3 POLICY DIALOGUE: FINLAND'S INFLUENCE

3.1 Bilateral Consultations

3.2 Budget Support and Sector Dialogue

3.3 Key Findings and Conclusions

## 4 MAINSTREAMING IN VARIOUS INTERVENTION MODALITIES

4.1 Budget Support

4.2 Sector Support

4.2.1 Education Sector Plan (2003-2007) (phasing out 2008)

4.2.2 Private Sector Support (on-going and MSME waiting for approval)

4.2.3 Environment Sector Support (initial, pre-appraisal stage):

Environment and Natural Resources Management and

Mainstreaming Programme (ENRMMP)

4.3 Projects

4.4 Local Cooperation Fund

4.5 Key Findings and Conclusions

## 5 RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROCEDURES

5.1 Division of Responsibilities and Procedures

5.2 Planning and Management Procedures

5.3 Key Findings and Conclusions

## REFERENCES

## ANNEX 1 SCHEDULE OF THE MISSION

## ANNEX 2 PEOPLE INTERVIEWED

## ACRONYMS

AU	African Union
BESSIP	Basic Education Sector Support Implementation Programme
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
GDD	Gender Disaggregated Data
CEDAW	Convention of Elimination of All Kinds of Discrimination Against Women
CPs	Cooperating Partners
CS	Civil Society
CSO	Central Statistical Office
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
EFA	Education for All
ENRMMP	Environmental Management and Mainstreaming Programme
ESSP	Education Sector Support Programme
EU	European Union
FNDP	Fifth National Development Plan
GBV	Gender-based Violence
GDU	Governance Development Unit
GER	Gross Enrolment Ratio
GIDD	Gender in Development Division
GRZ	Government of the Republic of Zambia
HIPC	Highly Indebted Poor Countries
HQ	Headquarters
ILO	International Labour Organisation
JASZ	Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia
LCF	Local Cooperation Fund
LCMS	Living Conditions Monitoring Survey
LD	Lead Donor
MACO	Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
MoETNR	Ministry of Environment, Tourism and Natural Resources
MoESP	Ministry of Education Sector Plan
MoST	Ministry of Science and Technology
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEA	Monitoring and Evaluation Advisor
MFA	Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland
MFNP	Ministry of Finance and National Planning
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSME	Medium and Small Scale Enterprises
NCBPGGZ	National Capacity Building Programme for Good Governance in Zambia
NGOs	Non Governmental Organisations
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children

PAF	Performance Assessment Framework
PD	Programme Document
PEMFA	Public Expenditure Management and Financial Accounting Programme
PLARD	Programme for Luapula Agricultural and Rural Development
PRSB	Poverty Reduction Support Budget
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PSDR	Private Sector Development Programme
PTA	Parent Teacher Association
PWDs	People with Disabilities
SADC	South African Development Committee
SAG	Sector Advisory Group
SC	Steering Committee
SCB	Supervisory Board
SWAP	Sector-wide Programme
TIZ	Transparency International Zambia
TORs	Terms of Reference
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USA	United States of America
USE	Universal Basic Education
WEDGE	Women Enterprise Development and Gender Equality Programme
WfC	Women for Change
WILDAF	Women in Law and Development in Africa
ZAEPD	Zambia Agency for Employment of Persons with Disabilities

# 1 INTRODUCTION

This Zambian country-specific report is part of the Evaluation of Human Rights and Equality, Democracy, Good Governance and Rule of Law in the Finnish Development Cooperation. The field mission was conducted 1-14 June 2008 particularly to assess how well the crosscutting issues have been mainstreamed at the country level and in programs, projects and other interventions. Schedule of the mission is attached as Annex 1.

We essentially assessed the mainstreaming of i) Human rights (in all of its aspects with special attention to the rights of the most vulnerable groups like children, PWDs, indigenous peoples and minorities); ii) Women's rights and gender equality; and iii) Democracy, good governance and rule of law. In addition, other cross-cutting issues as defined in the Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP) were part of the assessment particularly regarding the mainstreaming and policy dialogue processes. FNDP at present forms the basis for donor support in Zambia through the Joint Assistance Strategy arrangement.

We analyzed the extent to which the above crosscutting issues have been mainstreamed and integrated into the policy dialogue with the partner country and within the donor community, in direct budget support and the sector wide approach as well as programs and interventions. In addition we assessed the mechanisms and processes used and the division of responsibilities and resources available regarding mainstreaming. We studied all the relevant documentation and interviewed the Embassy of Finland staff members and partner country authorities, people involved in various interventions, representatives of other donors and some NGOs. In the beginning and at the end of the mission a briefing and de-briefing was consecutively held at the Embassy of Finland. The people interviewed are attached as Annex 2.

We used the analytical framework introduced in the main report of the evaluation. This country-specific report does not make any specific recommendations as the main report synthesises the country-specific reports and provides recommendations based on the joint analysis.

For assessing the mainstreaming of the cross-cutting issues the following aid modalities and interventions were selected in order to have experiences of a mixture of aid modalities, interventions at various stages of the project cycle and Finland's role as a cooperating partner:

- |                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| i) <i>Budget support:</i>          | Poverty Reduction Budget Support (on-going)   |
| ii) <i>Sector-wide approaches:</i> | Ministry of Education Sector Plan (MoESP) (2003 – phasing out June 2008);<br>Environment and Natural Resources Management and Mainstreaming Programme (ENRMMP) (post pre-appraisal stage) (Finland the lead cooperating partner);<br>Private Sector Development Reform Programme (PSDRP) 2006- 2008: Immediate objective 6: Local Empowerment – “Broad-based Wealth and Job Creation in Zambia: Economic Empowerment through MSME Development Programme” (ready for signing); |
| iii) <i>Bi-lateral project:</i>    | Programme for Luapula Agricultural and Rural Development (PLARD) 2006-2010 (with committed extension until 2012) (on-going);  |
| iv) <i>Local Cooperation Fund:</i> | LCF strategies and randomly selected interventions.   |

## 2 COUNTRY CONTEXT: CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

### 2.1 Situation in Zambia regarding cross-cutting issues

The Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP) 2006-2010 defines governance (*constitutionalism, human rights, transparency and accountability, democratisation, and administration of justice*), gender, environment, HIV/AIDS, and food and nutrition as cross-cutting issues.

While Zambia is described as one of Southern Africa's most stable democracies strengthening governance mechanisms continues to be one of its major challenges according to the CPs' (donors) country assessment. The Government has pledged its commitment to democratic governance and has embarked on building good governance.

In 2000, the “National Capacity Building Programme for Good Governance in Zambia” (NCBPGGZ) was launched and the term ‘good governance’ was first introduced in Zambia. Policy commitments for good governance were further outlined in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP, 2002-2004) which emphasized mutually reinforcing relationship between bad governance and deepening levels of poverty. Good governance was associated with larger growth rates and incomes for the poor. The current FNDP defines governance as i) constitution, legal and judicial issues (*constitutional reviews and reforms; restatement and review of the customary laws; review of the local court system; law reforms; quality of legal services* etc.); ii) human rights (*capacity building of HRC to enhance protection and promotion of human rights; reforms for the law enhancement agencies*); iii) accountability and transparency (*fight against corruption through capacity building and implementation of anti-corruption strategy*); economic governance (*public finance management reform; prevention of anti-competitive conduct*); and iv) democratization (*electoral, parliamentary and media reforms; decentralization; participation of civil society; review of public reform programme; mainstreaming gender*).

Zambia has ratified various international human rights conventions and treaties, and has put in place institutional structures and some legal frameworks for promotion of human rights. The ratified conventions and treaties include: The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1972); The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1984); The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the First Optional Protocol (1984); The African Charter on Human Rights and Peoples Rights (1984); The International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (1985); The International Convention on the Rights of the Child (1991) and The Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1998). At the regional level, Zambia has agreed to the African Charter on Human and People’s Rights which contains both civil and political and socio-economic rights. These treaties and conventions ratified by Zambia have not been fully integrated into national laws and citizens have limited knowledge of their rights and how to enforce them (State of Human Rights Report in Zambia 2007).

In 1996, the Human Rights Commission was established under Article 125 of the Constitution of Zambia. It is tasked to promote protection of human rights at all levels and build a sustainable culture of human rights in Zambia. The most common human rights violations received by the HRC are rights involving social security (non-payment of terminal or retirement benefits); mal-administration of justice; and poor working conditions. According to the HRC rights of many Zambians are violated on daily basis, and the scale of extreme poverty ensures that the most basic of human rights are not respected. According to the CPs’ joint assessment (JASZ), however, severe human rights violations in Zambia are currently rare, if any.

Economic, social and cultural rights are defined in the Constitution but it does not explicitly require that the Government respects, protects and fulfils these rights (right to education; right to health, and right to water and sanitation etc.). Discussion on the constitutional reform is on-going and the budgetary limitations of the Government to fulfil these rights are used by the Government as a justification for not accepting the changes in the Constitution.

The new government publicly declared war on corruption in Zambia which was a radical change from previous rule where corruption had not been addressed. The fight against corruption has helped to speed up reforms and has attracted some foreign investments to the country. Constraining the administration's efforts to reform, however, is the fact that corruption is still a significant problem at the political and administrative levels, as well as affecting the relations between companies and public officials. Many observers argue that the public campaign against corruption has not been consistent: People accused of corruption are allowed to remain members of the ruling party, anti-corruption institutions still lack adequate funds, sufficient staff and genuine independence from political influence, and there is evidence of serious maladministration within local governments and administrations. Observers have concluded that corruption has become a part of Zambian culture. Transparency International has not registered significant improvements in the public perception of corruption during the last 5-6 years in Zambia. Generally, however, both donors and CSOs agree that the new government has taken a major step forward by putting the fight against corruption on the agenda in Zambia. Enhanced financing to the Anti-Corruption Commission represented a break with former policies in Zambia.

Despite of multi-party democracy since 1991, Parliament is only marginally involved in the poverty reduction agenda which has limited the democratic oversight over the development process and political ownership of development process. Participation of CS has also been limited to periodic involvement in non-statutory mechanisms and processes and thus not what is expected in open democracy. The election monitors of the 2006 elections rated them as generally peaceful and well managed even though there were issues noticed related to the electoral/administrative

framework and uneven time usage in public media and campaigns. Press freedom has improved since the abolishment of one party state.

Protection of the right to life continues to be a key human rights issue, though, due to the death penalty clause. Application of death penalty has been suspended since the current government came in power in 2001, but it has not yet been abolished. The status of protection against arbitrary or unlawful deprivation of life, as well as protection against torture and other cruel, inhuman treatment in prisons is still alarming.

Children's rights are also a major challenge. There is no harmonisation in the definition of a child between the laws of the country and the customary definition. Whereas the Constitution defines a child as any person below the age of 15 years, customary laws use the criterion of puberty to determine the end of childhood. There is also no harmonisation in the definition of 'child' in the statutory laws (Adoption Act; Labour Laws; Wills and Interstate Acts). Children's birth registration problems, their corporal punishment and emerging child trafficking are issues of serious concern. For children under five, their quality of life with respect to nutrition is also relatively poor (CSO 2006 Living Conditions Survey).

While Zambia is party to various international and regional instruments on gender, which include e.g. CEDAW; Beijing Platform for Action; African Solemn Declaration on Gender; and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Declaration on Gender and Development, these international and regional instruments for promotion of gender equality have not been domesticated nor comprehensively integrated into the national laws. This is constrained by limited knowledge and skills in gender mainstreaming amongst legal experts. On the other hand, the implementation of the National Gender Policy (since 2000) has been weak due to capacity constraints, resulting in limited progress towards gender equity and equality. In the political arena, government recognizes the need to promote equitable gender representation at all levels of decision making positions in accordance with the African Union Solemn Declaration on Gender and the SADC Declaration on Gender and Development, which call for 50 percent and 30 percent representation of women in decision making positions respectively. However, there are still low levels of representation of women in all spheres of political decision making (12% in Parliament; 7% of local government councillors).

The current Constitution does not explicitly provide measures for gender equity and equality. Furthermore, the Constitution allows the practice of a dual legal system based on both statutory and customary laws. The latter is principally based on or rooted in male power, authority, and domination over women. While statutory laws do provide for more equality for women, especially for inheritance and ownership of land, a majority of the Zambian population still seek legal redress from the local courts that administer customary laws since they are less expensive and more accessible.

Gender inequalities continue to exist at all levels and in all sectors of national development. A situation analysis reveals that some challenges remain critical and fundamental to the country's achievement of its vision and goal on gender (and the MDGs). These include chronic and increasing poverty; institutionalised gender inequality as reflected in the low status and limited opportunities for women and girls; the multiple impact of HIV and AIDS and other chronic diseases on women and girls; gender based violence; low education achievement; limited employment or income generating opportunities; low levels of representation of women in all spheres of decision-making positions; and negative cultural practices that constrain women's advancement in economic, social, and political arena and the lack of an explicit affirmative action policy. This situation is further compounded by the duality of the legal system, limited gender mainstreaming capacities, and the lack of sex disaggregated and gender related data and information especially in the agriculture, governance and land sectors.

Mainstreaming gender into the political, social and economic sectors remains a major challenge. Gender mainstreaming is constrained by the limited gender analytical skills, limited sex disaggregated and gender related statistics and data and limited appreciation of gender mainstreaming as a tool for achieving development goals. There is inadequate appreciation of the linkages between gender-based violence, HIV and AIDS and their implications on gender equality and women's empowerment.

The CPs' joint country analysis (JASZ) emphasises that despite the fact that policy and institutional framework for the promotion of gender equality and empowerment of women is in place, deep gender inequalities and disparities still exist. As a priority response the CPs indicate: focus of capacity development and gender mainstreaming; development of accountability mechanisms that will ensure that national gender machinery is able to provide leadership and

coordination for gender mainstreaming as well and for CSOs to hold government accountable; equipping the policy makers, planners, economists and budget analysts with gender analysis skills; integration of international and regional instruments on gender into the national legislative system; and specific interventions that promote the empowerment of women. They also rise as a concern low level of funding for gender mainstreaming.

Regarding HIV/AIDS Zambia is one of the Sub-Saharan African countries worst affected. Estimates are that the prevalence rate is at about 16% in the group 15-49 years and about 1 million infected with HIV, of which over 200 000 are in need of anti-retroviral therapy (ART). About eight % of boys and 17 % of girls aged 15-24 are living with HIV and 40% of infants born to HIV infected parents and HIV infected. This is a tragic reality being experienced by families, communities and the whole nation. There is no aspect of life that has not directly or indirectly been negatively influenced by AIDS. It is a major cause of illness and death among the young and the middle aged, depriving households and society of a critical human resource base and thereby revising the social and economic gains. HIV/AIDS has a disproportionate impact on the lives of women and girls. Women and girls carry the brunt of the burden of caring for people living with AIDS and orphans while also securing a livelihood for the household. In addition, AIDS increases poverty by decreasing inter-generational transfer of life skills and knowledge on livelihoods, and reduces productivity in labour and thereby increasing poverty. HIV/AIDS, gender inequality and poverty are thus closely intertwined.

Malnutrition has long been recognised as a serious health problem in Zambia. Indicators for nutritional status of children under five 1990-2003 show no decrease in the prevalence of under-weight (under nutrition) and wasting (acute malnutrition) and an increase in the prevalence of stunting (chronic malnutrition) from 39.6% to 49%. The rates of stunting are among the highest in the region.

Policy on disability was launched only in April 2007 to promote integration and facilitate provision of services to PWDs and increase awareness on the needs, rights and obligation of PWDs. Disability issues are only marginally reflected in the FNDP, and at present none of the CPs has promotion of disability on their priority agenda.

## **2.2 Development of Finland's Development Assistance Portfolio in Zambia**

Finland is one of Zambia's long standing development partners. Development co-operation dates back as far as early 1970's. In the 1970's and 1980's, the main part of Finnish assistance was channelled through forestry, forest industries and agricultural programmes. Education became a major sector of co-operation in the 1990's but will be phased out in June 2008. The current development co-operation covers thematic areas of environment, private sector development, macroeconomics, agriculture and direct budget support for poverty reduction. In addition, local cooperation funds are used in different thematic issues. The current participation plan (2008) foresees the future cooperation to continue along the same lines. The financial volume has grown from MEUR 5.36 in 2004 to MEUR 18 in 2008, and is further expected to increase to MEUR 24 in 2010.

At present Finland's development cooperation is harmonised with the donor community through the Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia (2007-2010). Finland has been participating fully in the JASZ and its dialogue since 2006. The Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia (JASZ) is a national medium-term framework (2007-2010) which was developed by Cooperating Partners (CPs) to manage their development cooperation with GRZ in alignment with the FNDP. The JASZ represents the CPs' joint response to the Zambia's Vision 2030 and the FNDP which together constitute the national framework for reducing poverty and promoting sustainable expansion of the economy. The JASZ attempts to strengthen local ownership of the development process and enhance ODA effectiveness and mutual accountability by linking the international arrangements signed under the Paris Declaration (PD) and effectiveness criteria in Zambia's Aid Policy and Strategy to the FNDP. JASZ is a continuation of earlier attempts towards harmonisation. In 2003 a Harmonisation in Practise MoU (HiP MoU) was signed with the Nordic+ Group and became subsequently Wider Harmonisation in Practise (WHIP) MoU.

As a result of the JASZ division of labour Finland is a Lead Donor (LD) in environment; active donor in agriculture, macroeconomics and private sector, and a background donor in governance. It is phasing out of education sector in June 2008. In other cross-cutting 'sectors' than environment Finland is visible only as a background donor in governance. Regarding cross-cutting 'sectors' UN system, Norway and UK have the lead role. In gender UN alone has the lead role with Netherlands and Norway as actively involved. In HIV/AIDS, UN, UK and USA have the lead role.



The CPs having most leading positions are the World Bank and UN System – 10 out of 17. The leading positions of the World Bank are in the areas of agriculture, decentralisation, energy, macro-economics, private sector development and tourism. The focus of UN is on gender, governance, health and HIV/AIDS. UK is the next significant LD with five lead areas: governance, health, macro-economics, private sector development and social protection. It is notable that EC has only three lead positions: macro-economics, private sector development and transport. All other cooperating partners have only 1-2 lead positions.

### 3 POLICY DIALOGUE: FINLAND'S INFLUENCE

#### 3.1 Bilateral consultations

There has not been a specific country strategy for Finland in Zambia. In between 1999-2003 there were also no bi-lateral negotiations. New interventions apart from in education were not started since 2001 when Zambia was put for special follow-up of fulfilment of conditions for bi-lateral assistance. The 2004 and 2005 bi-lateral consultation mandate and agreed minutes formed in a way the country strategy. Since 2006 the Finnish development cooperation programming document of Zambia (Suomen *ohjelmayhteistyön ohjelmointiasiakirja* 2006) and recently the 2008 participation plan (*osallistumissuunnitelma*) complement the JASZ. JASZ and high level consultations based on the JASZ have partly taken the role of bi-lateral negotiations and thereby decreased their importance. At present there is no clarity in which form, if at all, bi-lateral negotiations will take place in the future. The Minister for Development Cooperation will visit Zambia tentatively in 2009, and after that bilateral negotiations are planned to be held. These visits have been used earlier to raise issues of concern by Finland. For example, the mandate of the ministerial visit of Minister Kiviniemi in 2006 included dialogue on Zambia's participation in the UN Human Rights Council.

Denmark held just recently bi-lateral negotiations where they had strong agenda and raised e.g. gender issues in general and Zambia not signing the SADCC Gender Protocol. Danish Embassy considered these visits very important in the absence of bi-lateral negotiations to raise individual donor's concerns directly with the Government.

The bilateral negotiation **mandate for 2004** (5.5.2004) includes in its *objectives for negotiations* references to cross-cutting issues in terms of supporting the public sector reforms (good governance), democracy, good governance and equality. It is not specifically mentioned whether the question is of social or gender equality. In the items for *policy dialogue on current situation in Finland and Zambia* the plan of action for gender in the Finnish development cooperation is specifically mentioned. The Zambian Government was to be informed that the MFA has prepared a plan of action for promotion of gender equality which according to the mandate means that Finland will more actively than before aim at supporting Zambia in its efforts to achieve the national and sectoral objectives for achieving gender equality. The dialogue mandate includes also discussions on the refugee situation in Angola and their repatriation to their country.

In the *dialogue on the enabling environment for implementation of the Zambian national development plan* the mandate includes items of democracy, good governance and human rights; PRSP and the economic reforms. Finland is to emphasize the anti-corruption aspects and encourage the anti-corruption and good governance efforts of the country. Zambian Government will be encouraged to strive for promotion of human rights and democracy and to complete the ongoing reforms (constitutional reform; media law; election laws). At the same time attention will be given to importance of open political environment and policy dialogue to ensure development in a politically sensitive situation. In addition the Government is to be congratulated of the progress made in relation to HIV/AIDS situation in a country. Importance of keeping the PRSP monitoring and evaluation process open is to be raised and its progress to be discussed. Also issues related to the equal distribution of wealth are to be raised in relation to the worrying figures in Zambia and the focus of Finland's support to economic development which leads to just distribution of wealth. This is particularly related to the analysis of relationship between economy and poverty reduction and its use in economic policy planning. Regarding good governance the Zambian Government is to be encouraged to continue the public sector reform and financial management reform. Finland is to support other donors in the requirements of strengthening the role of the Parliament in monitoring the budget preparation process and its implementation. In addition, the progress of decentralization and local government reforms, and ratification of the Kyoto Protocol were issues to be asked.

Regarding the *dialogue on strengthening of cooperation* Finland informs that since 2001 Zambia was specially monitored regarding fulfilment of the conditions of bi-lateral assistance, particularly related to corruption and suspicions

regarding conducting fair and just elections. After the 2001 elections the situation changed positively and the development cooperation could be re-started and Zambia was restated as a key partner country of Finland. The objective of Finland is said to be increasingly the trade and economic relations. In relation to this, private sector development as a sector choice for Finland was to be discussed. Anti-corruption efforts and development of enabling legal framework were defined as key issues for effective private sector to emerge and also for Finnish companies to get interested in Zambia.

Regarding *dialogue on development cooperation* the mandate identifies as biggest challenges for effectiveness of the development cooperation the economic situation of Zambia which affects allocation of resources to development cooperation and weak public administration and governance which affects efficient use of the available resources. It is said that there is criteria agreed upon between Finland and Zambia based on which choices of cooperation will be made. Requests of Zambian side were to be asked, though.

The **agreed minutes of the 2004 bilateral negotiations** (5-6 May, 2004): In the *political dialogue* both recognized the important role of civil society and Parliament in development. Zambian side stated that there is still room for improving the participation of civil society. As in the mandate the MFA informed of the Plan of Action on Gender Equality (the minutes say "to enhance gender balance in development). Finland committed itself to actively supporting Zambia in achieving the objectives set in national and sectoral policies with regards to gender equality. Both sides shared views on the importance of the good governance and a corrupt-free society as a precondition for well-functioning system. The Zambian side expressed commitment to fight against corruption and institutional mechanisms have been created for this purpose, but they are still in need of strengthening. Zambia also informed that to increase transparency and transparent use of resources and Activity-Based Budgeting has been adopted. A significant part of the dialogue was on commercial relations between Zambia and Finland, and issues like red tape and corruption were taken up as issues for Finnish investors. In the *dialogue on review of current development co-operation* the only reference to cross-cutting funds was related to LCF. It was informed that LCF includes projects in the areas of human rights, good governance, citizen's participation, democracy and access to justice. It was stated that gender equality, HIV/AIDS and promotion of equal participation with disabilities are cross-cutting issues for all LCF projects. In the *dialogue on future bilateral cooperation* the Zambian side presented agriculture, governance, industry, finance, environment, roads, science and technology and vocational training for Finnish support and Finland responded positively for agriculture and forestry. The minutes do not reflect dialogue on cross-cutting issues related to these areas. A proposal by the GRZ was made for supporting Anti-Corruption Commission and a direct support request for cross-cutting issues and was to be considered within LCF support. It was stated by the Finnish side that it will follow developments of the constitutional reform and electoral reform process, decentralisation and ratification of the Kyoto protocol.

The bi-lateral negotiation **mandate for 2005** (14-15.6.2005): In the general framework for cooperation it is noted that because of challenges of the democracy and good governance in Zambia the cooperation has been lowest in history in the beginning of the decade. As factors affecting development cooperation, promotion of market economy, promotion of democracy and HIV/AIDS are listed as main factors. As progress, processes of democracy and good governance (constitutional reform; electoral law; anti-corruption measures) and broad based and consultative PRSP process (NDP and vision 2030 development; district development strategy preparation) are mentioned. The mandate explicitly mentions that Finland requests progress in democracy, anti-corruption, human rights, HIV/AIDS, gender and environment. Mandate for *dialogue on development cooperation* includes a statement that the dialogue on human rights, democracy and good governance will be carried out mainly through EU according to the Cotonou agreement, article 8. It also mentions that support to civil society is essential and LCF as an instrument is most appropriate for this purpose.

*Dialogue on sector-specific support:* In the education sector support the purpose is to increase access to education at all levels and same opportunities to go to school despite of sex, location or other challenges and relevance of education. Purpose is also good governance, improved financial management and fight against HIV/AIDS. Special education needs and access of PWDs are mentioned as major challenges and Zambia is stated to need a national special education strategy. The mandate specifically emphasises the need for special and inclusive education. In the agriculture sector there are no references to cross-cutting issues. In the forestry sector the analysis includes lack of coherence of agriculture and policies, unsustainable agriculture methods, illegal logging and related corruption. It refers to weak public administration in the forestry sector which is unable to monitor the use of forests and implementation of regulations. Finland expresses its interest in supporting e.g. establishment of the forestry commission.

*Dialogue on budget support:* Reasons for BS are the commitment of Zambian Government for its implementation and donor commitment to harmonisation. The key tool to mitigate the political, economic and public finance risks related to PRSB is dialogue with which to influence the Government. The underlying principles in the MoU related to democracy, rule of law, good governance (public finance management) and anti-corruption are mentioned in the mandate. It is stated that unresolved conflicts related to not following the above principles can result in cutting the funding and in extreme cases withdrawing from MoU. According to mandate Finland will not include any own conditionalities in addition to the existing PRSB and PEMFA targets and indicators.

The **agreed minutes** of the bi-lateral negotiations (14.6.2005): In the Finnish delegation economic; democracy and good governance; education and forestry advisors were attending – not a gender advisor. In the *opening statement* of Finland, references to cross-cutting issues are made. It is said that Finland is convinced that good governance, democracy and respect of human rights and gender equality are key factors to make progress towards the goal of poverty reduction. Good governance issues (fights against corruption) are said to come to the forefront of the questions being closely monitored. *Political dialogue* included aspects of regional stability; regional cooperation; EU-Africa relations; democracy, and good governance and human rights. The Finnish side raised the issue of good governance and the results of the Finnish State Auditors' report on corruption in Zambia which states that Finland should not embark on budget support modality with Zambia before the public financial management system in the country improves considerably. In *dialogue on harmonisation* the Finnish side expressed its wish to have a corruption clause included in all MoUs and about the separate audits by Finnish auditors. In dialogue of budget support, it is said that Finland considers it but bases its decision on the progress of good governance aspects (PEMFA; IFMIS; procurement reform; finalisation of anti-corruption strategy and other measures against corruption).

The **2006 programming document** places particular emphasis on monitoring the development of good governance, particularly anti-corruption work. In the analysis of the operating environment issues of poverty and related wealth imbalance; access and better access of boys to school; HIV/AIDS and maternal health are featured. It is also mentioned that human rights situation is reasonable, and that Zambia has expressed interest to discuss human rights aspects as part of the EU political dialogue. Anti-corruption measures are also strongly featured. Concern of non-ratification of the SADCC and UN anti-corruption declarations is raised. In the mandate (*kannanmuodostus*), as per the JASZ division of labour Finland is particularly said to influence the budget planning through PEMFA programme; monitor the decentralisation process (local governance) and good governance; support and monitor the progress of anti-corruption work. Other cross-cutting issues do not feature as targets.

In the **2008 participation plan** it is explicitly mentioned that the cross-cutting issues of environment, gender, participation of the most vulnerable and HIV/AIDS will be 'taken into consideration' in the budget, sectoral and programme dialogue as well as in the planning and implementation of interventions. Environment programme is specifically a mainstreaming programme. Specific strategic interventions for supporting the cross-cutting issues are to be funded from the LCF. As a target for influencing the budget support in the mid-term implementation and monitoring of cross-cutting issues of environment, gender and HIV/AIDS are explicitly mentioned. Targets set in the participation plan for cross-cutting issues do not feature similarly in the result contract for 2008, apart from environment. It is specifically mentioned though that LCF will be used for supporting CSOs in good governance, democracy and human rights. Special emphasis is made in the policy dialogue on strengthening the democracy and good governance including corruption so that Finland's position will be taken into consideration particularly in bi-lateral meetings but particularly in EU dialogue.

### **3.2 Budget support and sector dialogue**

With new aid modalities like budget support, harmonisation and alignment through JASZ arrangement dialogue with the Government has changed from policy dialogue regarding sectors to policy dialogue on wider and systematic issues above sector lines. National ownership and national agenda of the FNDP are the key factors of development cooperation. As a result of the JASZ arrangement collectivism has replaced individual donor policy dialogue with the Government. There are no separate official dialogue forums in between the donors e.g. EU coordinating forum. Individual donors lose importance in policy dialogue, apart from those areas where they are the Lead Donors. On the other hand, collective voice of the cooperating partners has more emphasis than separate individual voices. How the interest of an individual donor is reflected largely depends on its role as per the division of the labour and involvement in the different working groups. There are also monthly meetings of the heads of the missions. The joint donor meetings are rare, and the main work is carried out in sub-sector meetings.

Budget support policy dialogue is a potential avenue to get cross-cutting issues on the agenda. At present, in this dialogue cross-cutting issues are on the agenda of the PRBS Group but do not transfer into mainstreaming, yet. They are treated as separate 'sectors' as defined in the FNDP. Finland is LD or active in environment; PEMFA (transparency; efficiency of public sector which decreases corruption) and has strong emphasis on this. In public finance management issues of transparency and oversight issues which lead to decreased corruption and improved management are issues which are promoted and has gained political support from Cabinet e.g. MoA funding was cut because of inefficiency of the ministry. Finland is also active in raising issues of inequality (taxes and expenditures) through MTEF budget comments and public expenditure side.

According to the division of labour CP Group meets monthly on process and substance of the PRBS. Sector specific groups meet as donor 'Troika' (Lead Donors) which is relatively good but still varies in between the sectors.

The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for the provision of direct budget support includes the following underlying principles: good economic and political governance as an essential element for economic growth and sustainable human development; poverty reduction through sustained broad-based economic growth, improved delivery of social services and cross-cutting issues; and democratic principles, rule of law, good governance, and integrity including anti-corruption. It also commits the GRZ to a process of dialogue based upon mutual trust and accountability. Such dialogue forms the basis for monitoring of the progress of budget support and is carried out both jointly by the GRZ and the PRBS group comprising of the CPs, and the PRSB group internally. Joint review process with the Government and PRBS group is carried out annually based on the jointly agreed upon Performance Assessment Framework (PAF). Meetings are scheduled for the second and fourth quarter of each year. Since the signing of the MoU two joint reviews have taken place, one in June 2007, and the other in September 2007.

High level meetings are organised in June each year to assess Zambia's commitment to the Underlying Principles, as well as performance, budget execution and expenditure priorities, also on the basis of the agreed upon Performance Assessment Framework (PAF). This meeting forms the highest level forum for policy dialogue regarding budget support, including in principle also the civil society and private sector. Prior to the high level meeting technical thematic working groups come up with their statements of the progress. At the same time the results of the Review form the basis for the CPs' indicative commitments for the consecutive budget year, and serve the purpose of informing Government's own planning and budgeting process through a review of progress achieved in key reform measures and development outcomes. As part of the latest review process, a special mission from Strategic Partnership for Africa (SPA) was invited to observe and analyse the Review process as a Learning Assessment during the last review. In addition, the Government has established sector-specific Sector Advisory Groups (SAGs) with participation of CPs, civil society and private sector. CPs have established their own PRBS Group for their internal dialogue. SAGs are called by PS but e.g. in environment the SAG is not very active. CSOs play an important but not significant role in all SAGs. CSOs are strong in many areas e.g. HIV/AIDS but in environment non-existing.

According to the 2008 participation plan, the Finnish Embassy considers budget support as a cross-cutting instrument for policy dialogue and has set promotion of cross-cutting issues as an objective in the participation plan. Embassy considers budget support also as an efficient tool for holistic implementation of the FNDP. In addition, it is considered as instrument which has impact in policy dialogue above the sectoral lines, particularly in dialogue considering the implementation of the underlying principles in the MoU and the Performance Assessment Framework (PAF). This framework is expected to enable the strategic and in-depth dialogue which crosses over the sectoral lines. Underlying principles in the MoUs are a tool for dialogue in good governance, rule of law and democracy i.e. on the specific aspects included in the MoU but other cross-cutting issues are not included in it. In addition, Finland does not consider budget support as an aid modality where conditional ties could be easily put in effect unless a major crisis occurs. Negative changes would significantly affect the GRZ budget. Finland's approach is based on positive pressure.

Reporting on the review meetings does not enable evidencing of issues raised by different participants so it is not possible to verify statements made by Finland during these processes. According to the JASZ arrangement the dialogue both with the GRZ and within the donor community is carried out through the Lead Donor (LD) mechanism. Finland is a LD in environment; active donor in agriculture, macroeconomics and private sector and a background donor in governance. In other words, regarding other cross-cutting 'sectors' than environment Finland is visible only as a background donor in governance. In the interviews with the donor community Finland's very active role in environment and macroeconomics was verified. A best practise is Finland's pressure to include environmental

indicators in the PAF which resulted in acceptance of the indicators in principle. However, this has not been operationalized, yet.

It is notable, that Finland does not yet have a verified role in promotion of gender equality, disability or HIV/AIDS in the budget support dialogue as they are responsibility areas of other CPs even though they have been explicitly included in the latest 2008 participation plan. A promising sign of a more active approach in promotion of gender equality is that Finland has indicated interest in the area of gender budgeting but the issue remains still at an 'idea stage'. Some discussions have been undertaken between the Embassy and the MFA Gender Advisor to map out possibilities of cooperation in this 'sector'. The problem has been the difficulty in finding a counterpart on the government side, particularly in the Ministry of Finance and National Planning. Another avenue would possibly be through the national economic cycle and the Planning and Economic Management Department of the same ministry. Gender budgeting is also included in the recently launched Joint Gender Support Programme (JGSP), with detailed results and activities and provides an opportunity for Finnish support. Since Finland is not part of the Gender WG, it seems that they have not been aware of this opportunity. The mid-term review of the FNDP could also offer an opportunity to high-light cross-cutting themes and is an opportune place to push gender budgeting to the agenda.

Finland does not participate explicitly in the human rights dialogue because they do not participate in the Human Rights WG. Human rights issues have been typically discussed with the GRZ as part of the Cotonou process where Finland successfully used the EU Chair period for raising issues of death penalty, prison conditions and duration of sentencing in the policy dialogue with the GRZ. This resulted in issues being taken up systematically in the budget comments; much larger number of sentences changes from death to life sentence; improvement of social conditions and budget increases for renovation and infrastructure development.

Embassy participates in the policy dialogue at the strategic level as part of the road map exercise i.e. monitoring of the process through PAF. Central Statistics is very weak and sector specific MIS needed are required. At present the monitoring mechanism does not provide GDD which is raised by Finland as part of the dialogue.

Much of the policy discussion is held between only between the GRZ and the donor community filtered through the LD mechanism. National level policy discussion e.g. between the GRZ, academic community and civil society is very limited. The academic community suffers of lack of support and civil society has not as yet fully developed a sufficient 'critical mass' of expertise to enable it engage effectively with government on policy and strategy development. While policy discussion with the donor community can help bring an international perspective to the debate, in the long term the progress depends on the dynamic tension between the state and civil society. At present civil society is participating in the national dialogue in a very limited manner. In budget support dialogue macroeconomics is a priority and performance criteria for donors for increased predictability.

### **3.3 Key Findings and Conclusions**

There is evidence that good governance issues including democracy (electoral frauds), rule of law and anti-corruption, were used as criteria for putting the development assistance on hold in 2001. These cross-cutting issues feature significantly all through the policy dialogue. As the bi-lateral negotiations were re-started in 2004, good governance (incl. rule of law, democracy and anti-corruption) remained strongly on the agenda. Finland used developments related to constitutional reform and electoral reform processes, decentralisation and signing of the Kyoto Protocol as criteria for joining the budget support arrangement. Progress was monitored at the bi-lateral policy dialogue level in 2005 when the ground for direct budget support was prepared. Finland did not join the budget support arrangement amongst the first donors, but monitored the progress and signed the MoU only in 2006.

Other cross-cutting issues of promotion of gender equality and HIV/AIDS issues have not been significantly featured in the bi-lateral policy dialogue. They have been incorporated in the background analysis or as informative statements. It is notable that the 2004 mandate included increased commitment for supporting gender equality based on Finnish Gender Strategy and Action Plan but did not transfer into programming. It is only in the Embassy 2008 Participation Plan that in addition to good governance variety of cross-cutting issues (environment; gender; participation of the most vulnerable; HIV/AIDS) are explicitly mentioned 'to be taken into consideration' in policy dialogue, planning and implementation of interventions. Similarly, the Plan explicitly emphasises adoption of the human rights based approach. No specific targets have been set for achieving this objective, though, and apart from environment cross-cutting issues do not feature similarly in the Embassy Result Contract for 2008.

There is some evidence that human rights based approach has influenced the sector choice of Finnish development cooperation in Zambia. Finland has strong interest in macroeconomics and public sector financial and management reforms through which it has an opportunity to influence to a certain extent e.g. the budgetary allocations and tax reforms to be more pro-poor and just. This also serves Finland's own interests in ensuring that enabling environment for budget support exists. Other recent sectors choices have been strongly influence by the new Decision-in-Principle which emphasises both environment and private sector development. For example, Finland is pulling out from education sector where it has active for many years. One reason for this certainly is that education is an over-crowded sector, but also that social sectors are not the priority in the new Decision-in-Principle. Lead sector choice, environment, is clearly influenced by the new Decision-in-Principle. Within sectors choices have been made which are in line with the rights-based approach e.g. Local Empowerment of the PSD and poor geographical areas (Luapula in agriculture).

Use of human rights based approach is not featured as an explicit criterion for sector selection, though. According to the 2008 Participation Plan sector selection is based on added value of Finland, its comparative advantage in relation to other donors (particularly Nordic+), and preferences of the Zambian Government. It is notable that promotion of gender equality was offered to Finland by the GRZ, but Finland declined. Finland also does not address human rights explicitly as it is not an active member of that particular Chapter and Working Group. In the analysis part of the 2008 Participation Plan human rights feature relatively strongly, but this does not necessarily translate into action apart from LCF support. LCF is used as an instrument to directly address human rights and other cross-cutting issues apart from environment and good governance. This has been a strategic choice. LCF support can directly address cross-cutting issues but it provides a forum for policy dialogue only in a very limited manner.

At present, Finland's role in the present policy dialogue is defined by the JASZ division of labour. Regarding cross-cutting issues Finland is visible in the policy dialogue regarding environment and some aspects of good governance. Other cross-cutting issues are promoted on *ad hoc* basis. Interviews with the Government and other donors did not provide evidence for visibility of Finland in other issues. In the interview with the MoFNP it was specifically mentioned that in 1996-2000 Finland was active in supporting gender, after JASZ it is non-active and should re-consider its position. MoFNP mentioned that women are increasingly affected by environmental and climate change and at least Finland should support addressing this issue in the sector they are leading. Environment came to the FNDDP very late as a 'sector' and also GIDD did not see correlation in between environment, climate change and gender but it is now included in the Joint Gender Support Programme.

Ministerial visits and negotiations on bi-lateral terms gain even more importance with the JASZ since they provide the only opportunity for an individual donor to have dialogue with the Government (experience of Denmark). Possibilities for dialogue at the high level are more limited in sequence and thematically. For example, once a year high level discussions dialogue is carried out on the selected themes which might not be interesting to all donors and thereby a possibility for a dialogue is in a way lost. Ministerial visits would provide an opportunity to address issues where Finland is not a leading donor but this needs to be followed by action.

## 4 MAINSTREAMING IN VARIOUS INTERVENTION MODALITIES

### 4.1 Budget support

#### Poverty Reduction Budget Support (PRBS)

The FNDDP includes a dual approach to address cross-cutting issues. In the document they are treated as separate sectors with the aim of both mainstreaming and development of specific interventions. Due to the nature of the budget support it is not possible to assess whether and how much the Finnish development cooperation funds directly promote implementation of any of the cross-cutting issues.

Provision of budget support in Zambia requires that Zambia continues to demonstrate commitment to four Underlying Principles as set in the MoU: i) pursuing sound macro-economic policies; ii) fight against poverty; iii) public financial management reforms; and iv) peace, democratic principles, the rule of law, good governance and integrity in public life, including the fight against corruption. It is notable that the budget support pre-conditions do not include human rights as an underlying principle. However, there is dialogue amongst the CPs and with the Government to include this principle in the MoU but it has not materialised, yet. At present the MoU does not include human rights as an underlying principle, but there is pressure by the CPs to include it.

The FNDP specifies the following as cross-cutting issues: Governance; HIV/AIDS; Environment; Gender and Development; Food and Nutrition. It is notable, that disability does not feature in the FNDP as a cross-cutting issue and that there are no CPs interested in promotion of disability. This can be partly attributed to the fact that in the country there are no strong and vocal CSOs as advocacy organisations to promote disability issues.

The strength in the FNDP is that cross-cutting issues are separately addressed in detail and not mainstreamed in the other Chapters. This has increased their visibility as issues and institutional structures, implementation mechanisms, policy guidance and budgets have been created for their operationalisation. This visibility has been of great importance. For example related to gender, mainstreaming efforts in Zambia failed to transfer from policy rhetoric to actual action on the ground. The FNDP brought cross-cutting issues back to the agenda and as a starting point treats them as specific sectors. This recognition of the fact that gender mainstreaming has not been effective as a strategy and has failed to produce the wished for results enabled bringing the issue back to the agenda. At the same time the weakness of the FNDP is that cross-cutting issues are not visible in the other Chapters and guidance for mainstreaming them in other sectors is not provided. However, this is a starting point which enabled establishment of institutional mechanisms for coordinating the cross-cutting issues.

These institutional mechanisms exist now for all cross-cutting issues (Ministry of Gender and Gender in Development Division; Governance Secretariat; National Aids Council; Human Rights Commission; Environmental Council). These mechanisms are to function as a driving force for addressing the specific cross-cutting issues and for their mainstreaming. Establishment of these mechanisms can largely be attributed to the contribution of the cooperating partners. At present mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues to other sectors is not sufficient. With the assistance of the cooperating partners some of these mechanisms are in a process of preparing the mainstreaming strategies as the next step. For example, regarding environment an Environmental and Natural Resource Management and Mainstreaming Programme is in a process of being development. Similarly, a Joint Gender Support Programme aiming at mainstreaming gender and having also specific interventions in this area is being developed. A challenge for mainstreaming environment is that portfolio of natural resources is shared amongst various ministries (e.g. Ministry of Mines and Minerals; Ministry of Agriculture) and coordinating role of the Environmental Council and the Ministry of Environment is not fully accepted. The legislative framework for environment exists e.g. in a form of compulsory EIAs but enforcement is still weak.

At the same time it is evident that the concept of mainstreaming is not very clear for and understood by most of the Government structures or even cooperating partners. MoFNP confirmed this as the main challenge for the development of the Sixth National Development Plan. Capacity amongst the Government varies, though, but overall understanding of what mainstreaming entails in practise is limited. Not understanding the practicalities of mainstream was also raised at the Embassy of Finland and in interviews with other CPs regarding their own capacity and human resources. Some CPs have human resources specialised in cross-cutting issues like gender and HIV/AIDS but technical expertise in these issues does not necessarily guarantee expertise in mainstreaming them in other sectoral plans.

Acceptance and willingness are also issues affecting mainstreaming. Both Government ministries and to a certain extent also cooperating partners protect their own 'turf'. Particularly for the Government Ministries it is difficult to mainstream, as their mandates follow strictly sectoral division and their specific role in implementation of the FNDP. Even though cross-sectoral issues are defined as cross-sectoral in the FNDP, the mainstreaming responsibility is not explicitly given to sectoral ministries and they do not feel necessarily mandated to do so.

There is still lack of capacity and tools for mainstreaming. In addition, there are conflicting interests in between e.g. environmental and agricultural policies and practises and despite of legal framework for environment, the policies and practises of other sectoral ministries and private sector overpower environmental concerns.

The most recent review process carried out in June 2007 included as pre-meeting working group thematic issues poor growth; tax policy; service delivery; gender; anti-corruption and developing institutional capacity. This indicates that issues of equality (pro-poor approach particularly related to agriculture), gender and anti-corruption are high on the agenda of both the Government and CPs. The results of the working group discussion are well reflected in the Joint Annual Review Report (September 2007).



The report indicates clearly the CPs' wish to allocate significantly more funding to those areas in which results can be achieved to improve the lives of women: HIV/AIDS prevention; constitutional reform; gender-based violence and economic empowerment of women. In addition CPs raised concern on the functioning of the policy and institutional framework which are in place.

These concerns are followed by action in the Matrix of Action which identifies actions and responsibilities of the Government. Regarding gender two actions were identified: for the MoE to develop policy action to achieve targets set for gender equity in education and inclusion of the Gender SAG into the Governance SAG to promote mainstreaming of gender issues.

For anti-corruption issues of signing or not signing the international policy frameworks was raised. Zambia's ascension to the African Union Convention and Combating Corruption was raised and wishes for Zambia to join the UN Convention Against Corruption. As outstanding issues CPs called for approval and implementation of the National Anti-Corruption Policy and Strategy; clarification of the institutional framework for the fight against complex economic crimes; and creating Criminal Assets Bureau. These were seen as indicators for Government's commitment to combating corruption and good governance.

In the assessment of underlying principles CPs in general acknowledged the commitment of Zambia in good governance principles but raised few concerns for dialogue. On the rule of law it was noted that the justice system does not meet the needs of the majority of people and that there is continued delay of cases in courts.

On political and democratic governance CPs were concerned of the pace of constitutional reforms where the continued disagreement on the mode of adoption of a new constitution between government and other stakeholders including opposition and civil society prevails. Transparency, independence and actual feasibility of the framework of the constitutional review process were a concern. CPs further insisted on more inclusive policy and political dialogue involving civil society. Role of the Parliament has been weak and its improvement was seen critical for improving accountability. Pace of the decentralisation process was also reported as a concern of the CPs as the policy existed at the time of the review only on paper and the approval of the Decentralisation Implementation Plan (DIP) is still outstanding. Regarding anti-corruption it was noted that the National Anti-Corruption Policy should be approved. It is notable that when reporting of the performance that of the cross-cutting issues only HIV/AIDS targets and scores are presented in the report (score 100%). Also in the CPs' statement on PAF performance only success of HIV/AIDS was mentioned regarding cross-cutting issues.

For the joint review process the Government prepares a National Development Plan's Annual Review documentation i.e. Economic Report, PEMFA Annual Progress Reports, Auditor General's Report and quarterly budget execution reports.

In the second joint PRBS review meeting (6 December 2007) the purpose was to: (i) discuss the progress made on the Action Matrix agreed upon in the first meeting; (ii) approve the PAF for 2007-2009; and (iii) confirm the Cooperating Partners' commitments for the coming budget year, based on the outcomes of the joint performance assessment and the reconfirmation of eligibility to direct budget support. Moreover, a more forward-looking policy discussion was held with respect to the new MTEF 2008-2010. In the main text reflecting the dialogue in the meeting cross-cutting issues were not featured. In the CPs' statement on confirmation of their 2008 commitments good governance, corruption and wider participation of civil society in the PRBS process were explicitly raised.

Discussions around the formulation of the Performance Assessment Framework have considerably strengthened the sector dialogue between Government and CPs and to a lesser extent, civil society through their participation in the Sector Advisory Groups (SAGs), who are responsible for signing off on the various indicators and targets included.

Monitoring of the PRBS is based on the Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) jointly development by the Government and the CPs. Development of the PAF is a continuous process. PAF is a tool for bringing in focal sectors and issues of strategic nature, which will facilitate dialogue between the MoFNP and line ministries. In the CPs' comments of the review process it is clear that the PAF process and budget support are not necessarily supported by all line ministries. PAF is said to be used as a tool for bringing in the line ministries and in doing so "the risk that that some sectors remain reluctant to the shift towards budget support will be avoided".

The new PAF includes around 30 indicators, equally balanced between the main areas of FNDP focus: (i) Public Sector Reform (public service management; public finance management); ii) Macroeconomic Management (macro-



economy; financial sector development; public sector pension fund); (iii) Wealth Creation (agriculture; infrastructure; private sector development); and (iv) Social Equity (health; education; HIV/AIDS). Cross-cutting issues such as gender are represented to a limited degree apart from HIV/AIDS despite of e.g. gender being a separate “sector” in the FNDP. Indicators in the education and health sector enable monitoring of regional and district imbalances and include some gender aspects. For example, in education completion rate for girls and boys is monitored by districts, as well as teacher/pupil ratio. In the health sector percentage of institutional deliveries and fully immunised children are monitored. Similarly, number of people tested for HIV/AIDS is monitored by districts. It is not clear whether these are monitored in a gender disaggregated manner. At least they are not reported in such a form. Reporting of other sector performances do not include cross-cutting aspects, but are very technical. This can be attributed to the fact that cross-cutting issues have not been mainstreamed in the work of the sectors and their targets.

‘Environment’ sector in the PAF, even if only virtually, has been included and identifying of a suitable and measurable indicator(s) is in a process of being developed.

The main challenge is that disability issues are the responsibility of the MoST and they are not aware of the disability issues and have difficulties in operationalising any activities. This has partly led to segregation.

## **4.2 Sector support**

### **4.2.1 Education Sector Plan (2003-2007) (phasing out 2008)**

Finland supported the Education Sector Support Programme (ESSP), Phase III, which ended in January 2004. The total disbursements during 2000-2003 were MEUR 7.9. The programme focused on basic education development, specifically infrastructure development, special education and HIV/AIDS. In 2004, Finland signed with the Government of Zambia and seven other donors a direct sector support MoU to the Education Sector Plan (ESP) (2003-2007). The signed MoU includes the commitment of the GRZ to respect of human rights, democratic principles, rule of law, good governance, transparency and accountability and forms the basis for cooperation. In the MoU GRZ also commits itself to respecting the international targets regarding the allocation of funds for the education sector.

In its first Article (Introduction) the MoU also indicates the GRZ commitment to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the right to education, Convention on the Rights of the Child and the objectives of the Education for All. The article further stipulates as the vision and goals provision of quality lifelong education for all which is accessible, inclusive, equitable and relevant to individual, national, global needs and value systems. In the sub-article it is specifically mentioned that ESP is based on fulfilling the fundamental right of every person in general and vulnerable groups in particular to be able to benefit from educational opportunities. It is explicitly mentioned both as overall goals and overall priorities that particular emphasis will be placed on addressing HIV/AIDS and gender equality in all of its interventions (sub-articles 1.4; 1.5; 1.6).

Support in the education sector shows the best practise of mainstreaming cross-cutting issues and promotion of human rights. Policies and the ESP are influenced by international commitments. Right to education as in the Convention of the Rights of the Child (1989) is articulated in the Millennium Development Goals of Zambia (two of which deal directly with education) and the six EFA objectives. Zambia education policy has always been aspired towards these international (and national) goals and objectives. Challenges are related to finance and capacity. The education policy has been dynamic in the sense that it incorporates both national situation analysis of the challenges of the time and the International Community’s agenda as per the EFA goals and the MDG’s. The EFA goals and the MDGs are effectively integrated in the policy. The policy, as the ESP, is premised on the right principles linking basic education to economic productivity and poverty reduction. All activities were tailored towards achieving MDGs, Education for All (EFA), SADC and AU provisions for education. Activities aimed at achieving gender parity and Universal Basic Education (USE) such as Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC) bursaries, expansion in education infrastructure, creating a gender responsive school environment, adequate teaching and learning materials, and creating a non-gender discriminatory legal environment.

Already in the preface of the ESP references are made to education as a human right, and access to and quality of education are described as major challenges. Furthermore, active participation of all stakeholders in solving the challenges is strongly encouraged. Access of the poor, girls and children with special needs to particularly high school and tertiary education is explicitly mentioned as well as mitigation of HIV/AIDS. Furthermore, the ESP is seen as a tool to sustain the already achieved gains in gender equity, quality and decentralisation throughout the whole system

by mainstreaming. The four overall goals are access and equity in educational provision; quality of education; administration, financing and management of education; and mitigation of the impact of HIV/AIDS. Moreover, overall goal of HIV/AIDS has as a target an education system that counters the HIV/AIDS pandemic and manages its impact on education delivery, poverty and gender inequity. Gender is thereby mainstreamed in the targets of the other cross-cutting issue, HIV/AIDS.

Strong emphasis on cross-cutting issues and rights-based approach is also reflected in the sector priorities which explicitly mention improved access, gender equity and quality in basic education (Grades 1-9). Furthermore, effective decentralisation of decision-making, procurement and financial management to districts and schools and management/mitigation of the impact of HIV/AIDS are set as priorities. Priorities also include addressing the regional imbalances and it is mentioned that “remote and disadvantaged areas will be specifically targeted for additional resource allocation, teacher deployment, and construction or rehabilitation of infrastructure”. Alongside this focus a number of strategies were to be adopted to target out-of-school children, particularly orphans and vulnerable groups. Targets set for poverty eradication strategy (PRSP) were incorporated in the ESP which in practise meant renewing emphasis on equity issues including abolition of school fees and uniforms, and providing greater support to girls’ education, HIV/AIDS orphans and children with special needs. ESP addresses the key manifestations of poverty in the education system in terms of improving completion rates, learning achievement, pupil and teacher attendance, health and nutrition, and overall quality.

Analysis of the ESP reveals that although the economic and social contexts are properly analysed, the analyses are not taken into account when it comes to target setting and strategy formulation (MTR). For instance the resource allocation criteria of the Ministry do not take into account the poverty status of each district or the distance of particular schools from the provincial capital. Based on this the MTR argues that in its implementation the ESP is not explicit on the fact that basic education is a human right. However, ESP has performed well on all the indicators of access both gross and net. The enrolment rate for girls of 97.87% [grades 1-7] is phenomenal in that it exceeds that for boys and is above the national average of 97.02%. The sustained investments in basic education over the years and the campaign for girls’ education have paid off. The contribution of BESSIP (mainly infrastructure development) and community schools is of significance here. In order to keep this momentum MoE should examine how this social capital from communities could be enhanced. The concept of community education centre i.e. combining adult literacy, early childhood education, and basic education at one centre could be explored. Special attention should be paid to enrolling the 36.63% girls (seven year olds) who are still out of school. Community/family based girl-child campaigns should be intensified and collaborated with the various women/gender movements.

Despite the introduction of free basic education for Grades 1-7, a number of children, particularly orphans, may not enrol in the government system for a variety of reasons. ESP addresses this by strategies including bursaries for basic clothing and school materials along with weekly boarding facilities. Also new arrangements were to be developed with community schools and interactive radio centres to provide specific access for out-of-school children.

The education sector, has recorded some marked success in increasing enrolments at all levels, particularly in primary school (Grades. 1--7). In 2007, the primary Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) reached 130 percent and completion rates rose to 91 percent. The gender disparity in enrolment is minimal especially at the lower educational levels. However, whilst there are more girls getting into school, retention of girls in the school system is a concern. The gender gap widens as one goes up the education ladder. Despite improvements in overall enrolment, there are still alarming dropout rates in grades 7 and 9. In 2007, the national gender parity index was 0.96 percent for grades 1-7 and 0.83 percent for grades 10-12. As a result, fewer girls are able to enter tertiary education especially universities and skills development. The rates are attributed to early marriage, pregnancies or simply demand for girls to assist with looking after the family. With boys too, poverty levels often force parents to take them out of school to assist with fishing, farming or small family businesses. In order to address the gender imbalances at higher levels of education, the Ministry of Education is implementing a mix of interventions such as the policy of free basic education, expansion of coverage combined with bursary provision; and the implementation of the pregnancy re-admission policy. Initiatives also include more effective sensitisation of traditional leaders, communities and parents, targeted grants and bursaries, and adjustment of school timetable and term dates to fit in with seasonal work activities. Visible improvement in literacy and numeracy also seems to encourage parents to keep both sexes in school.

Already under BESSIP a number of innovative, crosscutting programmes were incorporated into the new Ministry structures. These include HIV/AIDS, School Health and Nutrition, Special Educational Needs, and Gender and Equity, with a particular emphasis on girls’ education. The greatest challenge remains the management and mitigation

of the effect of HIV/AIDS on the teaching force in particular, but also on pupils, support workers and education officials throughout the country. Teacher attrition rates have been quoted as high as 1,600 basic education teachers lost to the system each year. This negates recent efforts to improve teacher output and redeployment. The Ministry of Education has developed a comprehensive HIV/AIDS strategy under BESSIP which will be scaled up. Activities under this programme include advocacy and sensitisation campaigns, development of workplace policies to provide counselling and protection to all in education institutions, and planning based on impact studies, particularly for the replacement of sick and absent teachers.

With nutrient supplementation there is a strong connection with the development of sustainable food security in the country as a whole. ESP encourages the expansion of agricultural production units at basic, high schools and colleges that will supplement the diet of pupils and students, as well as developing livelihood skills. In addition, through PTAs and Education Boards, parents are sensitised to contribute to their children's education by ensuring they do not go to school hungry. Partnerships with e.g. WFP are to be strengthened to ensure that targeted vulnerable school communities, particularly during periods of drought, are supported through carefully designed school feeding programmes.

A number of inclusive schooling initiatives have been expanded, including training of more teachers in identification and assessment of special needs pupils, and provision of specialist materials and equipment. Schools will be given incentives in the form of additional grants and/or bursaries to enrol more children with special needs from the local communities. The high school curriculum is also build on the life skills programme introduced in basic education, including information technology and appropriate psychosocial life skills such as HIV/AIDS, human rights and governance issues. In turn, all teacher education institutions will include life skills and the relevant practical subjects in their curricula.

Bursaries and special programmes have their own budget lines. The primary aim of the special issues programme is to respond appropriately to challenges facing the Ministry at a given time. It will ensure that these and other issues are co-ordinated and integrated across all strategic programmes. Situation analysis is based on GDD and the M&E system is able to provide GDD. All strategic elements are reflected in the sub-sectoral goals. ESP is very elaborate and accurately translates policy aims into measurable targets and /or performance indicators. The EMIS programme has developed comprehensive data on these verifiable indicators.

A high school sub-sector review was undertaken between the end of 2004 and early 2005. The high school sub-sector review report presents a comprehensive, wide-ranging assessment of the sub-sector, together with a wide array of recommendations covering cross-cutting issues of equity; access; gender; special education needs; school health and nutrition; and HIV/AIDS. Currently out of these three issues for the high school sub-sector are prioritised: local small day high schools, to cater for the increased numbers of Grade 9 leavers; dormitory facilities for female pupils; teaching and learning materials.

According to the JASZ country analysis achievement of universal primary education is on track which is attributed to the fact that user fees were lifted in 2000. Despite of long travel distances and still existing indirect costs enrolment rates significantly improved. In achieving 1-1 enrolment rates major achievements have been reached, however, other gender equality targets remain a challenge. Reversal of the high female illiteracy rate is mentioned as a concern as well as significant drop-out rates in secondary education.

Success factors are that education is and has been high on the government agenda; learning nature and responsiveness; international commitments; analytical capacity and technical expertise provided all through the development process; continuous monitoring; availability of data; MDG and EFA targets; now also gender parity index (as a result of issues being on the agenda); and good information system.

#### **4.2.2 Private sector support (on-going and MSME waiting for approval)**

The private sector support MoU includes human rights, democracy, rule of law and good governance as fundamental principles of cooperation (sub-§ 7 of § 1). In addition, MoU includes a corruption principle (§12).

As a whole, the Private Sector Development Reform Programme (PSDRP) (2006-2008) does not explicitly address any of the cross-cutting issues. The PSD Action Plan groups actions under six main reform areas: Policy Environment and Institutions; Trade Expansion; Infrastructure; Local Empowerment; Business Facilitation and Economic Diversification; and Laws and Regulations. Apart from Local Empowerment, no references to cross-

cutting issues are made. As part of programme justification crime and corruption are mentioned as prohibiting factors for PSD. This evaluation looks only at the MSME programme which is part of Local Empowerment reform area (Reform Area 6), and thereby the overall PSDRP. Finland's contribution to MSME development is through the "Broad-based wealth and job creation in Zambia: Economic empowerment through MSME development" programme (MSME).

Immediate objective of Local Empowerment is to "unlock the growth potential of the MSME sector through business development support and empowerment initiatives". As output it defines increased number of MSMEs taking part in economic activities. At the time of the PSDRP Programme Document development, the activities identified were limited.

In MSME programme human rights, gender and disability issues are very visible in the design, both at the level of policy support and action. Already in the background and justification, more precisely in situation analysis, cross-cutting issues are analysed. It is mentioned that wealth creation is limited only to a minority of the population, primarily in urban areas, and that unemployment particularly affects women, young people and PWDs. The challenges they face are further elaborated to include lack of technical and management skills; market, capital and information access. In addition, gender differences of labour force are analysed. In the policy analysis linkages with e.g. National Gender Policy are made.

Addressing cross-cutting issues in the programme document systematically continues when defining the target groups and beneficiaries. It is explicitly mentioned that gender of the owner-manager of the enterprise is a selection criteria and that affirmative action will be applied towards disabled entrepreneurs "by encouraging BDS providers to develop BDS products that enable people with disabilities to work their way out of poverty". The strategy thereby is both to mainstream e.g. gender and disability and to have specific interventions based on affirmative action. Similarly, extending of protection and rights are explicitly mentioned as part of addressing the legal status of the enterprises (both informal and formal enterprises are included). This is further continued when defining programme objectives, outputs and activities and in the log frame. The overall objectives (programme impact) defines pro-poor business model as an implementation model aiming at reduced vulnerability. It is also explicitly mentioned, once again, that women, youth and PWDs will have benefitted as a result of the changes.

Human rights issues deal with workers rights and ensuring just value chain. It has a link with the Joint Gender Support Programme and other connected programmes. Strategically it supports affirmative action for women and PWDs (specific projects).

Successful mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues in the design can be attributed to strong technical expertise provided both in MSME and cross-cutting issues either by the UN specialised agencies or other partners. Also the MSME uses an already tested approach, only adapted to the Zambian context.

Programme design has also benefitted from thematic audits, disability and gender audits, which have been used as a tool for mainstreaming these cross-cutting issues in the MSME programming from the design stages. Audits have included screening of legislation and programmes of some of the key ministries.

At the time of the mission the programme was not yet approved by the GRZ the reason being the programme's internal governance which was not necessarily in line with the ownership agenda. The ILO insisted on keeping the programme office in its own office instead of within the GRZ structure.

Expertise for programme development came from various UN specialised agencies. It combined UN programme for PSD with an existing Women's Entrepreneurship Development and Gender Equality Programme (WEDGE) which carries out affirmative action in support of women starting, formalising and growing their enterprises, and mainstreams gender equality issues into small enterprise development; it builds the capacity of and works directly with two women's entrepreneur organisations; the programme contributes inputs related to capacity development of BDS facilitators and provides, and the introduction of tools (e.g. GET Ahead for Women in Enterprise; The FAMOS Check for Female and Male Operated Small Enterprises; Improve Your Exhibition Skills; WED Capacity Building Guide; The Gender Sensitive Value Chain Analysis).

WEDGE programme's objective is to ensure that women and men have equal access to economic resources and business support to enable them to start, formalise and grow their businesses; it also contributes to the Global Employment Agenda's goal of ending discrimination in the labour market by focussing on policy issues that affect

women entrepreneurs; WEDGE also explicitly focuses to addressing the business development needs of women entrepreneurs with disabilities and those living with HIV/AIDS. Inclusion of Global Compact which works towards advancing ten universal principles in the areas of human rights, labour, environment and anti-corruption ensured focus on rights. ILO's Decent Work Country Programme Priority 1 emphasises more and better employment for the youth, women and PWDs.

Budget is not result-based so not possible to assess how much funding goes even to different components.

#### **4.2.3 Environment sector support (initial, pre-appraisal stage): Environment and Natural Resources Management and Mainstreaming Programme (ENRMMP)**

The objective of the Environment and Natural Resource Management and Mainstreaming Programme (ENRMMP; Draft 5)) is *“to increase relevance of the environment and natural resources sector in national development through building leadership capacity in the MTENR and the associated mainstreaming of and investment in key environment and natural resources issues”*. Currently, it is at the pre-appraisal stage with Finland as the Lead Donor for environment.

As in the other MoUs good governance, democracy and rule of law guiding principles are incorporated in the environment sector. However, in the actual PD there is no mentioning of the international and national human rights framework. As in the FNDP environment is considered both as a specific sector and to be mainstreamed in all Government strategies.

In the PD development of gender strategies; HIV/AIDs strategy; good governance and human rights strategy are mentioned regarding cross-cutting issues. It is mentioned that relevance of these issues requires design into the Programme, with the development of appropriate inputs, anticipated results and indicators however, this will be done later on during implementation. In its present form, cross-cutting issues are neither mainstreamed nor addressed specifically, and thereby also not reflected in the budget and the expertise areas covered by the budget. It is mentioned in the PD that this will be particularly important when Programme extends its impact from the MTENR and governmental level to civil society, CBOs and other activity-based output locations. Intention is to push them forward for consecutive years. In addition, definition and strategy of mainstreaming is not described in the PD.

PD includes participation of CS but CSOs are very weak in the sector and not being able to significantly contribute to policy dialogue. The PD does not include elements for their capacity building. PD promotes wider participation through academia; private sector; and a proposed Natural Resources Consultative Forum as a public/private interface, though. Any of the organisations/authorities responsible for cross-cutting issues are not foreseen to participate in the decision-making structures of the programme.

The draft pre-appraisal report (2 June 2008) places emphasis on the above flaws in the PD regarding cross-cutting issues and mainstreaming. It specifically mentions that national context regarding cross-cutting issues is not included and that activities and indicators are not developed. For example regarding gender and environment policy framework the existing Strategic Plan of Action for the National Gender Policy (2004-2008) provides one starting point for mainstreaming gender in environment. Another opportunity is to integrate the JGSP aspects of gender and environment in the ENRMMP. Similarly the HIV/AIDs policy gives insight to the actual action in the area. In many cases there is no need to develop a separate gender or HIV/AIDS strategy for the programmes like ENRMMP but to incorporate the aspects of the existing policy framework in the PD.

It also raises the issues of concern of the evaluation team, that ENRMMP does not have pro-poor focus and that it does not support decentralisation. In its current form (Draft 5) it is a capacity building programme for the relevant ministry, and does not reach beyond that. Justification is that it paves the way for the fully-fledged environmental SWAP and thereby the structures need to be strengthened. However, with the increased budget support which largely supports the upper governance structures and the delayed decentralisation process at least the sectoral programmes need to have a strong pro-poor and decentralised focus to be able to reach the actual beneficiaries in communities and bring immediate improvements in their living conditions.

The PD (Draft 5) is a result of work by two consultant teams who were guided by a joint task force composed of MTENR technical staff and CP representatives (Finland; Denmark; Norway and UNDP). Prior to the pre-appraisal team, after the PD was ready as it is now, Finland as the lead donor together with other CPs raised the issue of cross-cutting issues not being operationalised the PD. As a result the pre-appraisal team was asked specifically to look at

this issue (TORs). However, it is evident that the joint task force guiding the PD preparation process did not ensure that cross-cutting issues are operationalised and that the consultancy teams did not have expertise in mainstreaming the cross-cutting issues. Even though Finland is not an active member in the Gender Group of JASZ, according to the JASZ it should ensure that in the sectors where it is the lead cooperating partner, gender and other cross-cutting issues are mainstreamed – not only to include few lines in the PD but to translate these lines in activities, indicators, responsibilities and accountability. If the expertise of the lead cooperating partners in gender has been used in the design of the ENRMMP, it is not reflected in the document (Norway and UNDP lead donors in gender and good governance etc. and participated in the joint task force guiding the work of the two consultancy teams).

## 4.3 Projects

### Programme for Luapula Agricultural and Rural Development (PLARD)

The PLARD is a new phase in the 25-year history of Finnish-Zambian collaboration in the agricultural sector in Luapula Province. The PLARD inception phase was launched in April 2006 and resulted in a PD in May 2007. The overall objective of PLARD is *“to contribute to the development of the efficient, competitive and sustainable agricultural and rural sector, which ensures increased income and food security for the people of Luapula Province”*. The final programme document (PD) of PLARD was prepared as a result of the Inception Phase. Still at present some of the activities planned for the Inception Phase have not been completed. This also includes operationalisation of the cross-cutting issues. Within the JASZ arrangement PLARD is the only traditional bi-lateral project of the Finnish Government.

In the PD environment, gender and HIV/AIDS of the cross-cutting issues mentioned in the Finnish Development Policy are specifically mentioned. In addition, based on the country context and in line with the Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP) of Zambia, food security and nutrition has been identified as a cross-cutting issue. The PD states that during the Inception Phase the general context for cross-cutting issues has been established through review of existing documentation, in stakeholder consultations and through a specific gender consultancy.

The PD addresses cross-cutting issues as a separate issue as required in the PD format (Chapter 3.6). Objectives and strategies; component considerations and organisation for addressing cross-cutting issues is well identified. In addition, the policy framework for cross-cutting issues is presented separately which provides a wider context for addressing cross-cutting issues. However, none of the cross-cutting issues have been operationalised and translated into activities in the logical framework – not in the PD and even until now. One of the reasons can be attributed already to how the cross-cutting issues have been treated in the PD, as a separate issue.

Strength of the PD is that it clearly includes analysis of the cross-cutting issues, and it identifies a dual approach to address cross-cutting issues: both direct interventions and mainstreaming. According to the PD the main emphasis is on mainstreaming the cross-cutting issues in all Programme components and elements. Its weakness is that cross-cutting issues are treated as a separate issue, and actual mainstreaming is pushed for the forthcoming programme years. None of the actual component strategies mention cross-cutting issues.

Cross-cutting issues are also not visible at the overall objective, result, activity or component problem analysis level. In definition of the overall objective gender neutral language, “people of Luapula”, is used which is then reflected in defining the target beneficiaries in a gender neutral and non-disaggregated manner e.g. “fishing communities” and “viable producers and entrepreneurs”. This is not conducive for promotion of gender equality and improving the situation of HIV/AIDS positive persons, women, men or children. The PD itself states e.g. that division of labour in the fishing industry and crop growing is highly gendered which would require explicitly setting target groups in a disaggregated manner. Partly as a result, the monitoring system does not recognise these differences and is not disaggregated.

PLARD’s starting point is agriculture as a business opportunity. As a result it primarily operates with “progressive” or “intermediate” viable producers and entrepreneurs. It is expected that through a ‘trickle-down’ effect the poorer segments of the rural and urban communities will benefit through sales, employment opportunities and improved access to extension and training. They are defined as indirect beneficiaries. Monitoring of these changes is carried out only at household level, not in a disaggregated form (e.g. female-headed households; HIV/AIDS households). Indirect beneficiaries are not part of the decision-making process.

The main strategy of PLARD to address cross-cutting issues is mainstreaming but in reality cross-cutting issues are treated as a separate sector. This is particularly visible in addressing gender. The PD in its section on socio-cultural aspects identifies female-headed households; traditional land tenure arrangements; top-down male-dominated

decision-making structures (power issues) and its implications as major challenges in a society. Gender equality is conceptualised as issues related to basic rights; access to resources (services; knowledge; information); decision-making and division of labour. Even though e.g. women's economic empowerment is particularly defined as a PLARD strategy, this has not been operationalised, yet. Question is why all this knowledge and information has not translated into activities and budgets – not only related to promotion of gender equality but other cross-cutting issues as well?

The priority of addressing cross-cutting issues in PLARD is low. The prolonged start-up of the project and its Inception Phase has put pressure on the project to provide tangible results. The priority is on developing the technical aspects and full operationalisation of the components. Since cross-cutting issues are not included in the component strategies, activities and M&E system, they have automatically lower priority. At the same time there is lack of understanding of the value of addressing cross-cutting issues as development issues amongst some of the personnel, particularly those operationalising and implementing the components. In addition, the concept of overall mainstreaming is not clear. In addition, willingness and acceptance to address e.g. gender issues varies amongst the personnel.

PLARD has made attempts to use short-term consultants (e.g. gender) during the Inception Phase to operationalise the cross-cutting issues. However, these consultancies have been very short-term in nature instead of being an integral part of the whole planning process. As a result the recommendations of the consultants have remained at very general level and not translated into activities. At the same time with this evaluation the second leg of the gender consultancy took place. Despite of the fact that previous results of the consultancy remained at general level, the consultancy was again very short-term nature and enabled the consultant to stay in the field only for five days, report writing excluded.

The second consultancy was to focus on determining the optimal scope and focus for gender mainstreaming strategies and activities during implementation, including i) Gender screening analysis of current program interventions with identification of appropriate interventions and measures to integrate gender concerns; ii) Propose gender objectives and strategy for the four PLARD components; iii) Establishment of indicators for all interventions; and iv) Defining PLARD's comparative advantage at the interface with other key stakeholders in mainstreaming of gender concerns in program intervention. Deliberate measures will be taken to ensure gender mainstreaming and increase the contribution as well as effective participation to the development activities in PLARD. This process was to involve i) Defining gender objectives; ii) Identifying strategies and activities; iii) Identifying indicators for measuring performance and impact; iv) Implementation of action plan for gender mainstreaming; v) Monitoring and evaluation.

All these activities identified for the consultant were highly appropriate but not realistic within the duration of the consultancy. At this stage, in order to proceed with the mainstreaming process, semi- or long-term expertise (as a process) is required so that the mainstreaming process can be carried out as an on-the-job exercise, together with those planning, operationalising and implementing the components for them to internalise the process and justification. Short-term consultants can only assist in the process but there needs to be expertise also within the project team to ensure that the results of the process are also implemented. Consultancy of very short duration in case of gender was justified with limited financial resources by PLARD. However, PLARD has significant financial resources and at the same time encounters challenges with low disbursement rate. This implies that financial resources exist if there is willingness to re-allocate them to providing expertise in cross-cutting issues.

In the approved 2008 work plan allocation for cross-cutting issues is very minimal, only EUR 50 000, which is only 4% of the total annual budget. This includes only in-house events and meeting costs and reflects the present state of addressing cross-cutting issues in the absence of activities.

With regard to HIV/AIDS, discussions have been initiated with MACO regarding implementation of the work place policy. A structure already exists within MACO for the implementation of a work place policy including a work plan. However, there are no funds to implement planned activities. The strategy therefore is to review the current work plan and identify activities which can reinforce mainstreaming under PLARD and to support these activities. Given that PLARD does not have expertise in HIV/AIDS, the strategy is to identify organizations and NGOs with the required competence and comparative advantage to implement priority activities. These organizations will enter into contract with PLARD to implement activities based on agreed terms of reference, roles and responsibilities. PLARD will work through established structures at provincial and possibly district levels to implement HIV/AIDS programs.

Where these structures are weak, PLARD will seek to provide financial support to strengthen these structures to enable them carry out activities. The following activities have been planned for 2008 as part of PLARD to mainstream HIV/AIDS: i) Review of strategic HIV/AIDS concerns; ii) HIV/AIDS screening of programme interventions; iii) Defining HIV/AIDS objectives and strategies; iv) Prepare HIV/AIDS OVI; v) Identify PLARD HIV/AIDS advantage and preparation of action plan; vi) Integrating HIV/AIDS objectives, OVIs and action plans into work plan; vii) Supporting HIV/AIDS collaboration in Luapula; viii) Establishment of HIV/AIDS work place policy.

TORs of the environment consultant included explicitly considering gender, HIV/AIDS, food security and other cross-cutting variables in analysis. Expertise in these areas was considered 'added advantages'. As a result, regarding gender women's land rights were shortly analysed in the report, climate change screening was carried out and references were made on the impact of the HIV/AIDS. Otherwise the report was very technical, and not a regular EIA/SIA report with social aspects included.

According to the PD, in PLARD responsibility of mainstreaming cross-cutting issues lies with the Programme Director. The CTA is responsible for ensuring that cross-cutting issues are addressed during planning and implementation. In reality cross-cutting issues have been delegated to the Monitoring and Evaluation Adviser (MEA), who does not have sufficient expertise in the required areas. Mainstreaming cross-cutting issues in the specific components is not reflected as a responsibility in the TORs of the component coordinators which would make them accountable and increase importance of cross-cutting issues.

The M&E system and log frame (May 2008) still does not include activities or indicators related to cross-cutting issues. In the interviews with the personnel it was stated that PLARD cannot develop indicators because there are no activities, yet. However, PLARD as a project should first clarify what it wishes to achieve in relation to cross-cutting issues at the level of the objective and results, then develop indicators measuring these targets and define activities how to reach these targets.

The latest annual work plan (2008) sets a target for mainstreaming cross-cutting issues. By 2010 fully-fledged mainstreaming is expected to have taken place, and by 2009 mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues into all components should have been carried out. This poses serious challenges for the project. Mainstreaming and even addressing specific cross-cutting issues has been pushed forward. Experience from e.g. gender mainstreaming globally has shown that unless proper framework for mainstreaming including explicit objectives and results; indicators; activities; budget and technical expertise are provided at the early planning stages, cross-cutting issues will become add-on activities with very low priority. This has been again verified in case of PLARD. However, since the project is still at relatively early stages, there is possibility to successfully mainstream cross-cutting issues. However, this requires provision of proven technical expertise in mainstreaming and the specific cross-cutting issues.

According to the minutes of the Steering Committee (SC) and the Supervisory Board (SVB) decisions regarding cross-cutting issues have not been made in these meetings. Minutes do not reflect the dialogue, but based on the interviews and MFA and Embassy the dialogue concentrates more on the administrative and financial matters than substance. In the forthcoming meetings special emphasis should be placed on ensuring that the mainstreaming process progresses as planned and that sufficient technical and financial resources are provided. PLARD is at the cross-roads, after this it will be increasingly difficult to carry out the mainstreaming process as stakeholders and also beneficiaries (including communities) have already set their working practises. Finnish Embassy participation plan (2008) indicates explicitly that PLARD "improves the situation of women in Luapula". From this perspective keeping the promotion of gender equality on the agenda of these meetings together with other cross-cutting issues is an important tool for Embassy monitoring.

#### **4.4 Local Cooperation Fund (LCF)**

The Local Cooperation Fund as an instrument addresses directly cross-cutting issues of human rights, gender, and good governance (56% of LCF MEUR 1.1 budget in 2007) through support to local CSOs. Also HIV/AIDS and environment have been supported. In the 2008 proposal there is an increase of support to democracy of human rights (including equality; good governance; citizen education; legal framework; disability) totalling in 67%. HIV/AIDS support is 9% and unallocated funds planned for environment and natural resources 4.5%. Within democracy, good governance and rule of law LCF supports organisations such as Anti-Corruption Commission; Human Rights Commission; Transparency International Zambia; Drug Enforcement Commission. Other support



includes election support, legal aid and education, advocacy strategy development against gender-based violence; promotion of widows, orphans and vulnerable children; promotion of culture of constitutionalism; and disability.

The purpose of this evaluation is to assess integration of cross-cutting issues. The randomly selected LCF interventions directly address one cross-cutting issue each. In this chapter assessment of how other cross-cutting issues have been integrated in these interventions will be made. The selected LCF organisations/interventions are i) Zambia Association on Employment for PWDs (ZAEPD); and ii) Women in Law and Development in Africa (WiLDAF) – Zambia.

The ZAEPD's objective is to find and create agriculture employment opportunities for skilled PWDs. It has a strong human rights focus and rights-based approach as it addresses the right to work, inclusion and empowerment of women and girls. Empowerment of women and girls includes sexual and reproductive health (early pregnancies and preference for boys leading to abortions), which are taboos particularly related to PWDs and more so for intellectually challenged PWDs. At the same time one of its main target groups is mentally challenged PWDs and thereby the most vulnerable who are not able to demand their rights themselves. ZAEPD is a parent-based organisation. Its employment creation functions are decentralised in four Provinces (Luapula; Central; Lusaka and Copperbelt) thereby enabling broader participation of and increased opportunity for job seekers in the scheme. The objectives of the ZAEPD are also line with the Disability Policy to facilitate and deliver the acquisition of entrepreneurship and production skills. ZADEP is also an advocacy organisation for the rights of PWDs. On gender issues it cooperates with other PWD organisations which have different expertise. Their work also includes participation on the dialogue on employment laws and conditions of service for PWDs. They participated in the preparation of the FNDP as members of the WG on disability. The Finnish Embassy support to the project has ended. Despite of a good theoretical framework for operations implementation was very challenging and based on external funding. It is potential but needs technical assistance to be able to provide significant results. ZAEPD has just recently been introduced to PLARD.

## **4.5 Key Findings and Conclusions**

Regarding interventions in which Finland currently has direct responsibility for mainstreaming cross-cutting issues i.e. environmental support and mainstreaming programme and PLARD, mainstreaming has not been successful. The programme supporting environmental mainstreaming and preparation of SWAP is just in the beginning and needs to ensure that mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues will be carried out immediately, and that the programme is not approved prior this. Finland as the lead donor has the main responsibility. Similarly, PLARD as the only 'traditional' bi-lateral programme has potential to mainstream the relevant cross-cutting issues. It is at cross-roads, though. If the investment is not done now, it will be tremendously difficult to carry it out any later. Already established practises have been created where cross-cutting issues do not feature.

Out of the assessed interventions (LCF support excluded) in the SWAP of education and selected intervention of the PSD cross-cutting issues are best addressed, both as affirmative action (specific intervention) and mainstreaming. In the budget support the FNDP provides a framework for preparatory work towards mainstreaming cross-cutting issues in the next NDP. At present, cross-cutting issues are still conceptualised as separate 'sectors', but programmes for mainstreaming are already emerging as in environment and gender. These mainstreaming programmes are, however, thematically specific programmes. There is a danger that implementation of these programmes will remain equally excluded as cross-sectoral issues until now unless programmes really aim at mainstreaming and succeed in committing all concerned ministries in its implementation.

Most of the LCF support is directed to human rights; good governance and democracy issues and other cross-cutting issues are better featured and mainstreamed in the interventions than in other aid modalities.

When looking at the factors which have affected mainstreaming positively, all comes down to understanding the concept of mainstreaming; timing of mainstreaming cross-cutting issues (from design phase); provision of expertise for sufficient amount of time (from design phase); inclusion of cross-cutting indicators from the beginning; and establishment of a M&E mechanism which actually reports on progress.

All in all it is unrealistic to expect to have impact if programming relies only on mainstreaming. Specific interventions are needed at the same time. As the best practise mainstreaming and affirmative action in the support to the Local Empowerment part of the PSD can be raised again. Gender budgeting and ensuring that the environment programmes both address cross-cutting issues specifically and that they are mainstreamed provide opportunities. Support to capacity building in mainstreaming; special cross-cutting issue audits and provision of expertise on long-term (mainstreaming) to guide the processes also provide opportunities for increased effectiveness.

## **5 RESPONSIBILITIES AND PROCEDURES**

### **5.1 Division of responsibilities and procedures**

With the JASZ arrangement, and the Finnish assistance being part of the overall donor community assistance, the responsibilities and procedures regarding cross-cutting issues in practise lie more with the donor community in Zambia and its relations with the Government rather than in between the Embassy and the MFA. The “traditional” responsibilities and procedures apply only to the PLARD project.

As cross-cutting issues are treated as separate sectors in FNDP in JASZ they are also “divided” amongst the cooperating partners. The lead donors for governance are UN, Norway and UK; for gender UN; and for HIV/AIDS UN, UK and USA. The division of labour is to be based on the comparative advantage and expertise of the cooperating partner.

According to the Generic TORs for Lead Donors (11/05), it is the responsibility of the lead donor to lead the overall sector development it is responsible for, also the cross-cutting “sectors”. Even though cross-cutting issues are not specifically mentioned the Generic TORs imply that it is the responsibility of the lead donor of other sectors to contact those cooperating partners responsible for cross-cutting issues to ensure that they are incorporated and mainstreamed. It is the responsibility of those leading cooperating partners, like in case of environment Finland, to ensure that all support provided incorporates cross-cutting issues.

In principle, the JASZ arrangement provides potential for maximising the available donor resources for addressing cross-cutting issues. However, there is a risk that cross-cutting issues become only the responsibility of those cooperating partners for whom cross-cutting issues are delegated to. At present cross-cutting issues are further developed as “sectors” rather than mainstreamed in all development cooperation. Also linkages in between the cross-cutting “sectors” and cooperating partners responsible for them are vague. The Government together with the cooperating partners has started developing mainstreaming programmes e.g. in gender and environment. However, in practise as seen in the case of environment and Finland, the mechanism for cooperation and including cross-cutting issues which already have plans has not been operationalised and systematised, yet. Whether the cooperating partner contacts those responsible for cross-cutting issues depends still on the interest of the lead donor. In case the cooperating partner is not a lead donor then incorporation of cross-cutting issues depends, even more of the individual interest and expertise available at the Embassy.

In practise, in Zambia Finland’s responsibility regarding cross-cutting issues lies in environment as a “sector” and its mainstreaming. As in the whole JASZ arrangement, cooperating partners are not to directly contact the Government in issues beyond their delegated responsibility. However, as a lead donor Finland is expected to ensure that other cross-cutting issues are mainstreamed in environment interventions.

This shift caused by the new aid modality limits the possibilities of individual donors to directly influence the Government related to cross-cutting issues. At the same time, in order to exercise influence constant dialogue with the donor community provides opportunities which requires that expertise in cross-cutting issues needs to be at the country level.

In Zambia the Finnish Embassy is headed by the resident Ambassador, and the personnel includes councillors who are experts in specific thematic areas reflecting the priorities of Finland (e.g. macro-economics; private sector development; education/environment; agriculture) and programme officers (e.g. LCFs). These expertise areas do not specifically include any of the cross-cutting issues. Cross-cutting issues were not also specifically delegated as a responsibility to any of the councillors, and their promotion depends mainly on individual interest and possible expertise of the staff members. Also their job descriptions do not reflect any of the cross-cutting issues. However,

follow-up of gender and disability issues have been delegated to locally recruited programme officers, and HIV/AIDS to a staff member in financial administration.

In the absence of the second in command, the Finnish Embassy is understaffed compared to other Finnish Embassies in the main programme countries. Usually the second in command is responsible for development programming and as a regular staff member would bear the overall responsibility of ensuring the coherence of programming with the Finnish Development Policy - also related to cross-cutting issues. Now this responsibility has been shared amongst many staff members and particularly those who are not regular staff members and thematically further from development programming. These responsibilities are add-ons to their other duties. Even though these staff members do the follow-up, there is no systematic mechanism how this follow-up transfers into programming. Full staffing and having a regular staff member with the overall responsibility for mainstreaming cross-cutting issues would enhance mainstreaming also in reality.

There are no systematic linkages with the MFA Advisors in cross-cutting issues. Linkages depend largely on personal initiatives. MFA Gender Advisor is the only Advisor who has visited the country, specifically to support the PLARD based on her own initiative. The PLARD considered her visit useful and would have continued the cooperation had she remained in her position. Cooperation with the new Gender Advisor has not been established, yet. At times, Embassy personnel visits MFA documents at different stages are sent to the MFA area unit for comments. If considered important, request for action is prepared by area unit to seek views of the Advisors in cross-cutting issues. Comments have been considered useful and often fully incorporated as in case of private sector development (MSME project) where the comments of Gender Advisor were incorporated. Cooperation with other Advisors in cross-cutting issues is less frequent/non-existing.

Cooperation with Advisors was not considered sufficient only from MFA HQ. The expertise at the Embassy is not strong enough to ensure that cross-cutting issues are mainstreamed in the development assistance. In the midst of various and increasing responsibilities (increasing development assistance portfolio) and limited resources, Embassy personnel does not have time to search the mainstreaming tools and use them. The preferred way of increasing the Embassy capacity to plan and monitor is that the Advisors on cross-cutting issues visit the Embassy and go through whole programming together with the Embassy personnel. This would lead to increased understanding of cross-cutting issues in specific sectors by the personnel and thereby better monitoring of planning and implementation processes. Another alternative is to organise regional Embassy meetings specialised on cross-cutting issues, mainstreaming and their practical implementation. These two should be seen complementary, not exclusive. This requires increased time use by Advisors in the field, and shift in their priority setting and job description. Advisors should increasingly support Embassies at least in Finland's main partner countries like Zambia. With the joint assistance strategy arrangement this is even more important than before, since the contribution of Finland is part of the overall development assistance portfolio rather than individual projects.

At minimum the expertise of the staff members should enable them to be in a position to demand from and ensure that planning and other missions have sufficiently incorporated cross-cutting issues in the outcomes of the missions. Human resource development should be practical, preferably held at the country level and using the responsibility areas of participants as case studies.

Utilisation of Local Cooperation Fund and its management is decided by the Embassy itself. As the LCF responds to the applications made by the CSOs, inclusion and mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues depends on the applicant. Embassy does not have an active role in modifying the contents of the approved applications. As mentioned above, the focus of the LCF is in cross-cutting "sectors" and that other cross-cutting issues were reasonably well covered in the randomly selected interventions.

## **5.2 Planning and management procedures**

Apart from PLARD, planning of sectoral interventions is carried out jointly by Finland with other cooperating partners. As Finland is the lead donor only for environment, it is responsible for its overall planning process. In the planning process different cooperating partners might have different planning procedures which are not harmonised. These can lead to delays in finalising the documents. For example in case of environment, Finland funded the pre-appraisal report together with Denmark. Finland wished already at that stage to address evident flaws in the appraised document and prepare as a result a new improved document. However, Denmark funds appraisals and project document preparation process from different sources which led to fielding two different missions.

It is evident that at the planning stage of the environmental programme, the composition of the project document formulation team did not include expertise in cross-cutting issues or mainstreaming. As in case of PLARD these issues were pushed forward to be analysed and addressed during implementation. During the review process also by the Embassy/MFA it became evident that cross-cutting issues were not included and this was later criticized by the pre-appraisal mission. However, still during our mission it became a concern by the Embassy that the composition of the team to incorporate the pre-appraisal report recommendations in the PD might not have the required expertise in analysing, operationalising and mainstreaming cross-cutting issues. This to a certain extent shows that expertise in cross-cutting issues is not required in the TORs of the planning and design teams. As in the case of PLARD this expertise is an added value but not a basic requirement. As a result this expertise is not significantly valued by the bidders, and delegated to the members of the team (if delegated) who might have some the expertise in the cross-cutting issues which might not lead to quality outputs.

At present Embassy personnel does not use any tools for addressing and mainstreaming cross-cutting issues. This can be partly attributed to the fact that none of the personnel is responsible specifically for cross-cutting issues. Despite of cross-cutting issues being mentioned in the participation plan and that they are to be mainstreamed in all development cooperation, there is not specific expertise in the Embassy either in cross-cutting issues or mainstreaming. In a way, the only opportunity at the field level is to rely on other cooperating partners and their expertise in these issues. As experienced now Embassy personnel is over-worked and needs to choose their priorities. At the same time there is a need to improve and facilitate mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues. In practise, only very simple tool boxes would be useful, maximum A4 size “reminders” and checklists with concrete steps e.g. ‘Gender Equality in Planning’.

SIDA carried out just recently a gender profiling of SIDA assistance sectors in Zambia. SIDA carried it out it independently which is not exactly in line with the joint assistance strategy. However, SIDA wanted to make sure that all assistance they are providing is ‘gender screened’. SIDA has standard TORs for this exercise and it includes sectoral screening together with the legal framework regulating the particular sector. This can be considered a best practise, and Finland could carry out similar exercises regarding the key cross-cutting issues. These services could be outsourced. Another alternative is to support carrying out these ‘screenings’ jointly with other donors which would be more in line with the joint assistance strategy. SIDA, however, has shown example that also carrying out individual ‘screening’ exercises is possible within the joint assistance strategy. Carrying out these exercised in an in-depth manner would reduce the responsibility of the Embassy to monitoring of implementation. This would also give visibility to the cross-cutting issues and provide analytical background for policy dialogue.

Even though the 2008 participation plan of the Embassy places emphasis on cross-cutting issues, how this will be done is not yet operationalised and systematised. There has not been a forum to have in-depth dialogue on thematic issues as part of the Embassy management practises. The practise of having weekly programme meetings has just recently been initiated. These meetings provide an opportunity to have systematic dialogue and setting targets for promotion of cross-cutting issues, both in policy dialogue and regarding implementation of development assistance. Without systematising and operationalising the strategic choices made in the participation plan regarding cross-cutting issues there is a danger that they continue having a relatively low priority *vis-a-vis* other Embassy responsibilities and will be addressed only on *ad hoc* basis.

Reporting by the Embassy on budget support, poverty reduction is primarily making summaries of the PRBS bi-annual reviews and/or other assessments/evaluations made. For example, in reporting of the Special Partnership with Africa Forum’s Learning Assessment (2007) from the perspective of Finland issues of increased accountability, transparency and support to improving efficiency of governance were reported. Also a need for more inclusive budget dialogue towards civil society, Parliament and media was reported.

In general, PRBS group has paid special emphasis on reporting on cross-cutting issues and having dialogue with the Government.

### **5.3 Key Findings and Conclusions**

The biggest challenge regarding roles and responsibilities is that either in the budget support and JASZ arrangement or in between the Embassy and MFA there is no systematic and operationalized mechanism for mainstreaming. Donors responsible for ‘cross-cutting sectors’ in Zambia and similarly the Advisors of the MFA are involved only on *ad hoc* basis. This is particularly problematic in the policy dialogue, budget support and programming of sectoral interventions where Finland depends on the expertise provided by other donor agencies.

The 2008 Participation Plan targets for addressing cross-cutting issues need to be systematised – what kind of messages and when – and provided with expertise and resources. In the current pressure to have Embassies even with more limited human resources and centralise the expertise at the HQ level, this might not be realistic to expect. Services on monitoring the mainstreaming and implementation of cross-cutting issues in Finland's programming can be outsourced which would leave only monitoring function and acting on the recommendations to the Embassy. These can be audits on cross-cutting issues in Finland's support, based on SIDA's model. This is important for operationalising the targets of the Participation Plan. It is not sufficient that the policy and sector dialogue only emphasise that mainstreaming and addressing cross-cutting issues is important. This dialogue needs to be translated concretely into specific issues to be raised in the policy dialogue and implementation.

Discussions with the donor community verified that in the current JASZ arrangement new kind of people and expertise is required. They should be specialists in 'soft' issues. Before there was a need for more technical expertise but now competence development should focus on e.g. mainstreaming and rights-based approach. This should be mandatory training.

Consultancy companies do not pay sufficient attention to ensuring that planning teams include proven expertise in cross-cutting issues. Addressing cross-cutting issues is a general requirement in the MFA TORs for missions however with the limited resources accepted emphasis is on sectoral expertise rather than cross-cutting issues which are often delegated to team members who have some knowledge of the issue. Proven expertise in mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues might be more valuable than actual expertise in the cross-cutting issues themselves. Sufficient time should be allocated for planning missions/Inception Phase to design the programmes in a way that reflect cross-cutting issues at the level of objectives, results and activities and mainstreamed in the overall logical framework.

## REFERENCES

In addition to the documents below, programming and monitoring documents related to selected interventions; minutes of the official meetings; and correspondence between the Embassies and the MFA were reviewed.

Central Statistical Office (CSO), *the Monthly*, Lusaka, May 2008

Central Statistical Office (CSO), *Living Conditions Monitoring Survey*, Lusaka, 2004 and 2006

Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia (JASZ), 2007-2010

GRZ/PRSB Group, Poverty Reduction Budget Support (PRBS) Programme Joint Annual Review, June 2007: Joint Assessment Report, September 2007

GRZ//MFNP, Report on Progress under the Performance Assessment Framework for the Period 2006-2008 for the Joint Assessment of the Poverty Reduction Budget Support at the June 2007 Joint Annual Review (3<sup>rd</sup> Draft June 2007)

GRZ/MCI, Private Sector Development Reform Programme Document, 2006-2008

ZCSMBA/ZNFU, Zambia Voucher based Business Development Services for Small and Medium Enterprise Business Development. Phase I Proposal, Sept 2007

MFA/MACO, Programme for Luapula Agricultural and Rural Development (PLARD) Programme Document, May 2007

GDU, Enhancing Good Governance in Zambia: 2003 Status Report

Republic of Zambia, Fifth National Development Plan 2006-2010, Ministry of Finance and National Planning, Lusaka, December 2006

Republic of Zambia, National Gender Policy, Gender in Development Division, Office of the President, Cabinet Office, Lusaka, March 2000

Republic of Zambia, Strategic Plan of Action for the National Gender Policy (2004-2008), Office of the President, Cabinet Office, December 2002

State of Human Rights in Zambia 2007 – Human Rights in the Fifth National Development Plan, Human Rights Commission, 2007

Zambia: Millennium Development Goals Progress Report 2008 (draft)

Zambia: Millennium Development Status Report 2005, MDG Task Force, Lusaka, September 2005

## ANNEX 1 SCHEDULE OF THE MISSION

Day	Date	Activity	Location
Sunday	1.6.2008	Arrival of the international consultant Team meeting with Zambian expert Meeting with PLARD personnel	Lusaka, IC Hotel
Monday	2.6.2008	Briefing and individual meetings with Embassy personnel	Embassy of Finland, Lusaka
Tuesday	3.6.2008	Ministry of Environment, Trade and Natural Resources; Ministry of Justice; UNDP; Department of Development Studies and the University of Zambia	Lusaka
Wednesday	4.6.2008	Zambia Association for Employment of Disabled; UNDP; Gender in Development Division at Cabinet Office	Lusaka
Thursday	5.6.2008	Human Rights Commission; Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives; Netherlands Embassy	Lusaka
Friday	6.6.2008	Ministry of Education; Private Sector Development Programme; Environmental Council	Lusaka
Saturday	7.6.2008	Preliminary analysis and writing	Lusaka
Monday	9.6.2008	Norwegian Embassy; Danish Embassy; Embassy of Finland; Team meeting for analysis	Lusaka
Tuesday	10.6.2008	Ministry of Finance and National Planning; Embassy of Finland; Team meeting for analysis	Lusaka
Wednesday	11.6.2008	ILO; Preparation for debriefing	
Thursday	12.6.2008	Debriefing at the Embassy; Swedish Embassy	Lusaka
Friday	13.6.2008	Team meeting; analysis and writing	Lusaka
Saturday	14.6.2008	Departure of the international consultant	

## **ANNEX 2 PEOPLE INTERVIEWED**

### **Embassy of Finland**

Ms. Anne Ahonen, Counsellor, 12.6.2008

Ms. Sinikka Antila, Ambassador, 2.6.2008

Ms. Sari Jormanainen, Counsellor, 2.6.2008

Mr. Oskar Kass, Counsellor, 2.6.2008

Ms. Elizabeth Ndhlovu, Counsellor, 2.6.2008, 9.6.2008, 12.6.2008

Ms. Riikka Elina Rantala, Programme Officer, 10.6.2008, 12.6.2008

Ms. Melissa Säilä, Programme Officer, 10.6.2008, 12.6.2008

Ms. Wilma Viljanmaa, Counsellor, 2.6.2008, 12.6.2008

### **Finnish bi-lateral programmes**

Ms. Mari Laaksonen, Partner Liaison Officer, Programme for Luapula Agricultural and Rural Development (PLARD), 1.6.2008

Ms. Gun Mickels-Kokwe, Chief Technical Adviser, Programme for Luapula Agricultural and Rural Development (PLARD), 1.6.2008

Mr. Mighten K. Mpiya, Programme Director, Programme for Luapula Agricultural and Rural Development (PLARD), 1.6.2008

Ms. Charlotte Wonani, Gender Consultant, 3.6.2008

### **Government of Zambia**

Mr. Arnold M. Chengo, Senior Technical Advisor, Educational Quality Improvement Program (EQUIP2), Ministry of Education, 6.6.2008

Mr. Vanny Hampondela, M&E and Information Specialist, Governance Secretariat, 3.6.2008

Mr. E.C.J. Kalaba, Deputy Director, Programme Planning, M&E, Policy and Planning Department, Ministry of Agriculture and Co-operatives, 5.6.2008

Ms. Sindiso N. Kankasa, Human Rights, Constitutionalism and Democratisation, Governance Secretariat, 3.6.2008

Mr. D. Kasaro, National Programme Coordinator (PFAP), Ministry of Environment, Tourism and Natural Resources, 3.6.2008

Ms. Chasiya V. Kazembe, Chief Economist (Bilateral Unit), Economic and Technical Cooperation Department, Ministry of Finance and National Planning, 10.6.2008

Mr. Enoch Mulembe, Director, Human Rights Commission, 5.6.2008

Mr. Fredrick Mulenga, Principal Forestry Officer, Ministry of Environment, Tourism and Natural Resources, 3.6.2008



Ms. Rhoda Mutema Mwjinga, Specialist – Social, Legal and Governance, Gender in Development Division, Cabinet Office, 4.6.2008

Mr. Wiseman Sangulube, Chief Extension Officer, Ministry of Environment, Tourism and Natural Resources, 3.6.2008

Ms. Kayla Siame, Programme Coordinator, Private Sector Development Programme, Ministry of Commerce, Trade and Industry, 6.6.2008

### **Multi- and bi-lateral donor agencies**

Mr. Jeremias Blaser, Assistant Resident Representative – Governance, United Nations Development Programme, 3.6.2008

Mr. Gerry Finnegan, Representative for Malawi, Mozambique and Zambia, International Labour Organisation (ILO) Area Office, 11.6.2008

Ms. Tori Hoven, Counsellor, Economic Governance, Royal Norwegian Embassy, 9.6.2008

Ms. Majbrit Holm Jakobsen, First Secretary, Royal Danish Embassy, 9.6.2008

Ms. Judith Makulu Kumwenda, Policy Officer, Private Sector Development and Governance, Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, 5.6.2008

Mr. Olav Lundstol, First Secretary, Country Economist, Royal Norwegian Embassy, 9.6.2008

Ms. Eva Lövgren, Deputy Head/Economist, Development Co-operation, Embassy of Sweden, 12.6.2008

Ms. Delia Mwale-Yerokun, Programme Analyst: Gender and HIV/AIDS, United Nations Development Programme, 4.6.2008

### **INGOs and NGOs**

Ms. Mwiche Kabwe, Planning Specialist, Environmental Council of Zambia, 6.6.2008

Mr. Paul Mwazi, Zambia Association for Employment of the Disabled, 4.6.2008

Ms. Agnes Phiri, Project Manager, Zambia Association for Employment of the Disabled, 4.6.2008