



# Getting Back to the Basics: Taking It to the Next Level

## End-Review and Appraisal of Zambia NGO Coordinating Council Strategy 2012-16



Photo: Ken Opprann

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

P.O. Box 8034 Dep, NO-0030 OSLO  
Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway  
Phone: +47 23 98 00 00  
Fax: +47 23 98 00 99

ISBN 978-82-7548-675-0  
ISSN 1502-2528

Responsibility for the contents and presentation of findings and recommendations rests with the study team.  
The views and opinions expressed in the report do not necessarily correspond with those of Norad.

# Getting Back to the Basics: Taking It to the Next Level

End-Review and Appraisal of Zambia NGO Coordinating Council Strategy 2012-16

---

Final report December 2012

Team: Marilyn Lauglo, Team leader - NCG  
Beatrice Mwilu, Independent Consultant, Zambia  
Bodil Maal, Senior gender adviser, Norad  
Julia Berge, Financial controller, Norad  
Quality-assurance: Nora Ingdal NCG

## **ABSTRACT**

Results from 2011 were not clear due to the lack of a clear goal hierarchy linked to a monitoring system. For the next period, NGOCC can take its work to the next level by working in the changed landscape, returning to the basics of its core functions, and strengthening management.

**Disclaimer:**

*The views and opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy or position of the client, Norad.*

**Nordic Consulting Group**

Fr Nansenspl 4, 0160 Oslo

[www.ncg.no](http://www.ncg.no)

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The Appraisal Team extends a sincere thanks to NGOCC and the Norwegian Embassy in Lusaka for their support and engagement during this End-Review and Appraisal.

The intensive programme required many arrangements and considerable logistic support which we are grateful for having received from Moosho Imakando and Bridget Kalaba. The openness with which NGOCC approached this work was established by the Board Chairperson, Beatrice Gillo. The Secretariat, led by Engwase Mwale, demonstrated its willingness to follow-up on the Board's approach by meeting with us repeatedly and providing many internal documents. We also thank the PLO in North West, the focal point organisation, and the drivers for their assistance during our field trip in Copperbelt.

Finally, the Appraisal Team is grateful to all the member organisations and the branch chapters of national organisations together with key informants for generously giving their time and sharing their experiences. Their insights gave meaning to the many documents consulted.

**THANK YOU EVERYONE!**

Marilyn Lauglo, Bodil Maal, Beatrice Mwilu, and Julia Berge  
Oslo and Zambia  
September 2012

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY WITH KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This is a report of an Appraisal of the Zambia Non Governmental Organisation's Coordinating Council's (NGOCC) Strategic Plan 2012 -16 and a Brief End-Review of the period February – December 2011 funded by the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad) and the Royal Norwegian Embassy (RNE) in Lusaka.

The purpose of the assignment is dual: to document key lessons learned from the review period and to provide insights into the appraisal of the new Strategic Plan. This report comprises three components: the End-Review, the appraisal of the Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016, and a pre-award assessment of NGOCC's capacity and competence to carry out the programme plan. Recommendations to the RNE and NGOCC are provided.

Nordic Consulting Group in Oslo, Norway was selected to carry out the Appraisal and Review with Marilyn Lauglo, as Team leader and Bodil Maal, senior gender adviser, Norad, Julia Berge, financial controller, Norad, and Beatrice Mwilu as team members.

The assignment was carried out from July – September 2012 through document review, key informant interviews, group discussions, and a field visit to Zambia 12 – 25 August 2012. A four-day visit to the Copperbelt province provided the opportunity to meet with community-based organisations, branch chapters of national NGOCC member organizations (MOs), local NGOCC coordinating officers, and Government of Zambia (GRZ) officers. Altogether more than 200 people were met.

### **NGOCC's current status**

NGOCC, which was established 27 years ago, is known to be the “Voice of the women's movement”. It is a household name with considerable convening capacity as witnessed in June 2012 at the Mulungushi Centre where the new Constitution was discussed. It is often invited to the table when government consults on issues related to women and gender equality. In a recent report of the status of civil society in Zambia, NGOCC is accorded the second largest sphere of influence among 13 organisations or groups of organisations - being assessed to be a larger actor than churches and other faith-based organisations, opposition political parties, INGOs, and others.

NGOCC is seen to provide resources and opportunities to CBOs whose activities affect poor and vulnerable women in rural areas including those who are caring for orphans and vulnerable children. It creates communities of women through shared events and issues such as fighting gender-based violence, International Women's Day, and earlier activities related to Constitutional reform.

### **End-Review of the period 2011**

Although the End-Review was limited to the last year of the programme plan, programme documents relating to the entire period were consulted to see how the last year related to earlier ones. There were 3 documents that are relevant for reviewing the 2011 period. They differ when using terms such as “strategic objectives”, “objectives”, “overall goal”, “operational objectives”, and “interventions”. The related indicators, when presented are not useful for assessing programme progress. Baseline information was missing in most cases.

The Programme objectives for the entire period were found to be *relevant* to: a) the needs of Zambian women and society, b) NGOCC's organizational development, c) Norwegian development cooperation where women's rights, gender equality and civil society are high priorities.

The arrangement with the sub-granting mechanism through the Basket Fund was found to be *efficient* from the RNE's perspective in terms of reducing transaction costs related to the administration of

grants to civil society organisations (CSO). However, from NGOCC's side, the reporting on the overall Strategic programme was perceived to be inefficient due to lack of coordination between two major donors. NGOCC has had to prepare separate narrative and audit reports, and participate in a number of external reviews and evaluations.

It was not possible to assess *effectiveness and impact* of the 11 months period due to the lack of a logical goal hierarchy with activities, outputs, and expected outcomes related to programme objectives and in the absence of a monitoring and evaluation system.

The two indicators in the 2010 Programme Contract between the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and NGOCC related to *sustainability*: a) increase cooperating partners from 6 to 8 and b) at least two business institutions partnering with NGOCC, were not achieved in the programme period.

The Audit reports for 2010 and 2011 were not completed by the 30 April deadline as stipulated in the Contract between the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and NGOCC.

## **Conclusions and recommendations to the RNE**

### **Conclusion**

The Appraisal Team found that NGOCC is known to be the “voice of the women’s movement”. It is a household name with considerable convening capacity. A recent report on civil society in Zambia accorded NGOCC the second largest sphere of influence among 13 organisations or group of organisations. It was found to be a larger actor than churches and other faith-based organisations, opposition political parties, INGOs, and others.

### **Recommendation**

Given the long partnership between Norway and NGOCC, the Appraisal Team recommends continuing support to NGOCC for the next five-year period *after certain issues have been clarified and undertakings are made by NGOCC ensuring areas of management strengthening*. This will require more time and effort on the part of the Embassy than is usually the case. But, if the pieces are properly put into place now based upon a mutually open and frank dialogue, it should pay off for the future relationship between the RNE and NGOCC.

### **Areas for clarification before continuing Norwegian support**

1. The RNE should meet with the other cooperating partners in the field of gender to discuss how the donor community will organise its response to promoting gender equality in terms of priorities, roles, responsibilities, and funding modalities. This will help RNE identify its role, priorities, and ways forward in promoting gender equality in Zambia.
2. Together with NGOCC, the three main donors supporting NGOCC: RNE, ACBF, and ZGF should meet to agree a joint programme-based approach to NGOCC's Strategic Plan. Each party should make clear its expectations, role, and reporting requirements. The consequences of not following contract terms such as timely reporting should be made clear and adhered to. All donors should participate in the annual donor round table. Donors should confer after the six-monthly reports are submitted.
3. Dialogue between RNE and NGOCC is needed to agree on the intended purpose of the BF. This means that RNE needs to decide whether or how the BF is to be used in terms of the types of organisations, projects, and activities that can receive grants. Decisions need to be made about whether and to what degree the BF grants should go to:

- a. Supporting organisations working in the priority areas in NGOCC's five year strategic plan
- b. Strengthening CBOs - many of which have little stated gender transformational capacity but are carrying out income-generating activities
- c. Organisations with gender transformational potential

RNE's decision should be based on the *Action Plan for Women's Rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation 2007 – 2013*, Norwegian policy regarding support to civil society organisations, and RNE's priorities for its cooperation in Zambia.

#### **Undertakings by NGOCC**

4. Support to NGOCC should be agreed after NGOCC demonstrates that it is strengthening its competence in the following areas before entering a new contract period:
  - Financial management
  - A Programme Plan for 2013 – 2017 and an annual Plan of Action with a logframe linked to a monitoring system.
  - An M & E system that will show results and uses SMART indicators. Ways of including qualitative data and using participatory monitoring methods should be included in the system.

#### **Conclusions and recommendations to NGOCC**

**Conclusion 1:** NGOCC and some of its MOs have the foundation and competence to strengthen the needed elements for gender mainstreaming: a) robust gender analysis to inform policy making and policy implementation, b) skills to translate analysis into policies and programmes, c) resources and capacity within government and CSOs, and d) a cadre of gender experts to provide technical support to sectors.

**Recommendation 1:** Re-think the Strategic Plan into getting “Getting Back to the basics” of NGOCC's core functions of a) creating synergies among MOs, b) capacity building, c) developing and maintaining women's centres at provincial level, d) advocacy, and e) networking and information sharing.

**Conclusion 2:** Advocating for women's rights and taking issues identified by the MOs to decision-making levels is at the heart of the NGOCC's core work, However NGOCC has been unable to develop an Advocacy Plan. Constitutional Reform, implementation of the Anti-GBV Act, domestication of the SADC and CEDAW protocols, engendering annual budgets under the SNDP, gender budget tracking, and the Land Act have been selected as areas for advocacy in the Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016..

#### **Recommendation 2: Develop an updated advocacy strategy and for each topic:**

- Identify the target audience (national government, local authorities, politicians, other CSOs, donors, general public considering age, gender, geographical location)
- Decide on the central messages and goal for each topic
- Decide the activities for advocacy and in which arenas should they take place
- Identify NGOCC's allies and agents/drivers of change
- Agree on the lead MO for each advocacy effort
- Identify NGOCC's niche, role, and functions supporting the lead MO.



**Conclusion 3:** NGOCC is operating in a changed donor landscape but without responding to the new realities. The changed donor landscape includes MDGs being more prominent, an increased insistence on documenting results, new donors, funding possibilities and modalities. There are large arenas in different sectors where gender concerns are of critical importance e.g. HIV and AIDS, health, education, and agriculture.

**Recommendation 3:** Taking it to the next level requires new skills. NGOCC and its MOs' competencies need to be developed for working in this changed donor landscape. This includes familiarity with and visibility in the different arenas; mapping the changing arenas; understanding requirements, processes, and key events; participating in new funding modalities; and using modern information and communication technologies. NGOCC's Strategic Plan should focus on improving NGOCC's own skills as well as those of its MOs in this changed landscape

**Conclusion 4:** NGOCC has agreements and support from different donors. Further support will be sought from donors in the next 18 months. This is inefficient and time-consuming for NGOCC and does not foster unity and shared vision among the development partners.

**Recommendation 4:** Work with donors in a coordinated fashion. Try to obtain funding for the entire programme plan and budget; agree one joint financial and programme reporting mechanism that will satisfy all donors. Hold donors accountable to the principles of donor harmonisation and alignment (Paris, Accra and Busan).

**Conclusion 5:** There is an urgent need to implement an operational monitoring and evaluation system. Related to this are earlier appraisals that have found that the goal hierarchy of plans lack a coherent logframe.

**Recommendation 5:** Re-work the Strategic Plan into a Programme plan with a clear theory of change linked to a logical framework using NGOCC's M & E system but also include qualitative data and participatory reporting methods.

**Conclusion 6:** The financial audits for 2011 and 2010 raise issues that point to an urgent need to strengthen financial management.

**Recommendation 6:** NGOCC must improve the financial management of the entire organisation. Accounting, reporting, budgeting, understanding the financial monitoring by all units must be improved.

**Conclusion 7:** One of NGOCC's strengths is that it has MOs in all provinces. Efforts were made to include their voices in the last General Assembly where the Strategic Plan was discussed by providing information translated into local languages. Their voices could be even greater if networks for like-minded organizations were strengthened at provincial levels.

Greater presence at provincial levels gives more opportunities for work in local languages and for more local voices to be heard. A number of the visitation reports note difficulties related to the English literacy requirement. With decentralisation planned for education, health, and agriculture, there is an even greater need to support and network organisations so that they can have an impact at local levels.

**Recommendation 7:** NGOCC should increase its presence at provincial levels:

- a. Provincial liaison officers could be the central person in the provinces. They could liaise with MOs, branch chapters of national MOs, faith-based organisations, and non-NGOCC MOs working in sectors such as agriculture, HIV and AIDS, health, education, gender-

- based violence, poverty reduction **AND** with local authorities, and donors/INGOs working locally.
- b. There is a need to examine the functions, requirements, and needs for effective provincial liaison officers and the focal point organisations **AND** to provide adequate resources for them.

**Conclusion 8:** Young people were strikingly absent from meetings with NGOCC and MOs. They are suffering from significant gender inequalities in the areas of gender-based violence, HIV, and formal sector employment.

**Recommendation 8:** Systematically address generational transfer using both mainstreaming and targeted approaches. Increase the number of young people on the Governing Board so that there is a critical mass for their voices to be heard. Highlight how the different advocacy issues affect young people. Systematically use quotas for young people in NGOCC activities e.g. training and media events.

**Conclusion 9:** In 2003 NGOCC was asked to establish a Basket Fund with funding from RNE to support the work of the NGOs in enhancing the women's movement. The Appraisal Team found a lack of clarity about how the BF should be used. Similarly, few indications that the Basket Fund is being utilised strategically and in synergy with the work of the movement were found.

**Recommendation 9:** Agree with the RNE the overall purpose of the BF: what types of organisations, projects, and activities it can be used for. Discuss this with the MOs. If there is a serious divergence of views in the membership, consider separating the BF more from NGOCC

**Conclusion 10:** An assessment of the impact of the BF on NGOCC's core functions has not been carried out. This requires serious discussion among all the MOs (NGOs and CBOs). It appears to be leading to fragmentation of effort and it is not clear what the BF's costs are to NGOCC in terms of carrying out its core functions.

**Recommendation 10:** Consideration should be given to either creating greater separation of the BF outside NGOCC or continuing within NGOCC with clearer expectations of its use, cost, and results.

**Conclusion 11:** The Basket Fund's sustainability is vulnerable due to the lack of clarity around how it should be used, lack of summary reporting, and dependence on one donor

**Recommendation 11**

Ensure that information about the grants is in a database system that can produce summary reports that can provide readily accessible up-to-date information about the number of projects funded in each priority area, the organisations that received funding, the total amounts of funding allocated to each thematic area, different category allocations, types of organisations, and geographical location.

**Recommendation 12**

Develop an M & E system for the BF that goes beyond outputs but shows outcomes, and ultimately impact.

**Recommendation 13**

Act upon the draft Resource Mobilization and Fundraising Strategy. If it is not adopted, ensure that a sustainability strategy is implemented in the next 18 months.

## Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY WITH KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2. BACKGROUND</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1 Zambia Country Background	14
2.2 Civil society	16
2.3 The Gender Sector	17
2.4 NGOCC	17
<b>3. END-REVIEW OF PROGRAM</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1 Programme documents	20
3.2 Programme reporting	20
3.3 End-Review Discussion	22
3.4 The Basket Funds (Sub-Granting Mechanism)	23
<b>4. APPRAISAL</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1 Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016: Getting back to the Basics	29
4.2 Quality of underlying programme design	30
4.3 Quality of the planning process	32
4.4 NGOCC’s Capacity and Competence to Deliver	33
<b>5. DISCUSSION – A CHANGED LANDSCAPE, BACK TO THE BASICS, STRENGTHENED MANAGEMENT, CLARIFICATION OF THE PURPOSE OF THE BASKET FUND, AND YOUNG PEOPLE</b>	<b>37</b>
5.1 A changed landscape	37
5.2 Back to the Basics - Taking the work to the next level	38
5.3 Strengthened management	39
5.4 Clarifying the purpose of the Basket Fund	41
5.5 Young people	43

Some comments from NGOCC on the Report	44
Annex 1 Terms of Reference	45
Annex 2 Appraisal Team's Programme in Zambia	52
Annex 3 Methodology	54
Annex 4 Purpose and goals in programme documents for the 2007 – 2011 Plan period	64
Annex 5 Excerpt about NGOCC from an earlier evaluation	66

**ACRONYMS**

ACBF	African Capacity Building Foundation
AIDS	Acquired immune deficiency syndrome
BF	Basket Fund
CBN	Capacity Building and Networking Unit (NGOCC)
CBO	Community-based organisation
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CS	Civil society
CSO	Civil society organisation
DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
EU	European Union
GA	General Assembly
GBV	Gender-based violence
GIDD	Gender in Development Division, (GRZ)
GIZ	German Development Corporation
GMC	Grant Management Committee
GMU	Grant Management Unit (NGOCC)
GRZ	Government of Zambia
G-SAG	Gender Sector Advisory Group
HIV	Human immunodeficiency virus
ICT	Information and communication technology
INGO	International non-governmental organisation
M & E	Monitoring and evaluation
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MO	Member organisations
MP	Member of Parliament
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NGOCC	Non-Governmental Organisations Coordinating Council
NOK	Norwegian crowns (currency)
Norad	Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation
RNE	Royal Norwegian Embassy (Lusaka)
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SNDP	Sixth National Development Plan
SWAAZ	Society for Women and AIDS in Zambia
SWOT	Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats
TOR	Terms of reference
USD	United States dollar (currency)
WfC	Women for Change
WILDAF	Women in Law and Development in Africa
WLSA	Women and Law in Southern Africa
YWCA	Young Women's Christian Association
ZARD	Zambia Association for Research and Development
ZAW	Zambia Alliance of Women
ZCSD	Zambia Council for Social Development
ZGF	Zambia Governance Foundation
ZMK	Zambian kwacha
ZNWL	Zambia National Women's Lobby

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Non-governmental Organization Coordinating Council (NGOCC) is an umbrella organization with a membership of 106 member organizations (MO)<sup>1</sup> that are engaged in promoting gender equality in Zambia. The Royal Norwegian Embassy (RNE) in Zambia has long supported NGOCC financially and since 2003 has additionally supported a sub-granting Basket Fund (BF) function to NGOCC's MOs.

The current Programme support covered the period 2007 – 2011. This was extended as a no-cost extension through June 2012. NGOCC has prepared a Strategic Plan for the period 2012 – 2016 for which it is seeking funding from the RNE. In keeping with Norwegian development cooperation practice, a brief End-Review of the 2007 – 2011 Programme Plan and an Appraisal of NGOCC's 2012- 2016 Strategic Plan was commissioned by the RNE in Lusaka. Terms of Reference (TOR) for the assignment are found in Annex 1. It was expected that that the brief End-Review would provide useful insights for the Appraisal. The assignment was to build on the recommendations from the 2008 Basket Fund Review and the African Capacity Building Foundation's 2011 Mid-Term Review.

A four-person team was selected to carry out the brief End-Review and Appraisal. Document review began in July 2012. Team members from Norway comprising the Team leader, a senior gender adviser from Norad, and a financial controller from Norway joined the local Zambian consultant on 13 August. The Appraisal Team worked in Zambia from 13 – 24 August meeting relevant stakeholders, visiting MOs, interviewing key informants individually and in groups, and continuing to review documents. The Appraisal Team's programme is provided in Annex 2.

Details of the methodology including a) a list of organisations visited, b) people met, c) guidelines for the interviews and group discussions, and d) documents consulted are provided in Annex 3.

*Limitations of the study:* Considerable effort was made to get the views of small CBOs and NGOs working in remote or overlooked areas. This was to the disadvantage of learning about the large MOs. The directors of nine Lusaka-based MOs participated in a joint meeting and important views were gained there. However, careful examination of their programmes is missing from this report. No large Lusaka-based MO was visited individually although a Lusaka-based medium sized NGO and a CBO were visited. It was expected the Annual reports of the large MO would give additional information about the MOs finances but of the six annual reports received, only three included their financial audit reports.

The lack of summary information from the Grant Management Unit (GMU) on the Basket Fund has made it very difficult to give overall views of the BF. This report has relied heavily on the field visits to MOs.

Copperbelt is a well-resourced province. It has more infrastructure than many of the other provinces and there are more women in decision-making positions than other provinces. Only 10% of the districts in Copperbelt do not have women councillors compared to Northern Province where 67% of districts have no female councillors<sup>2</sup>. This has led us to conclude that if things are difficult in Copperbelt, they are likely to be even more difficult in other provinces.

A planned telephone meeting with the African Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF) did not take place. This limits our understanding of priorities for their support, possibilities of future support, and interest in working together with other donors.

<sup>1</sup> 106 MO according to the website; 109 organisations according to the draft 2011 Annual Report

<sup>2</sup> Draft Gender Strategy for Local Government in Zambia (undated) downloaded 10.09.12  
<http://www.genderlinks.org.za/article/zambia-local-government-gender-strategy-2009-09-21>

The draft version of this report was provided in September 2012. Final comments from the RNE and NGOCC were provided by December 2012. The Appraisal Team directs the reader's attention to some of NGOCC's comments which are provided on p. 44.

*Guide to the reader:* The report has six chapters in addition to an Executive Summary with key findings, conclusions and recommendations. **Chapter one** is a brief introduction; **Chapter two** describes the context for the program: Zambia country context, the situation of women, environment for civil society, background of NGOCC and Basket Fund, and overview of gender sector. **Chapter 3** covers the End-Review findings. **Chapter 4** provides the Appraisal of the Strategic Plan including an assessment of NGOCC's capacity and competence to carry out the proposed programme. **Chapter 5** discusses the findings. A summary of some of **NGOCC's comments** is provided before the annexes.

The report has **5 annexes**:

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

Annex 2: Programme for the Appraisal Team

Annex 3: Methodology

Annex 4: Terminology used in three programme documents in 2007 – 2011

Annex 5: A description of NGOCC from an earlier evaluation of support to Zambia

## 2. BACKGROUND

### 2.1 Zambia Country Background

Zambia is a southern Africa country with a population in 2011 of 13.5 million. In September 2011 national elections were held and there was a peaceful change of government. Over the past decade, Zambia has experienced continued economic growth resulting in the World Bank to group it among low middle-income countries. Although it is a relatively urbanised country with approximate 36% of its population living in urban areas, the majority of people are engaged in agriculture. Sizable portions of the population live in poverty. Sixty-four percent of the population lives under the \$1.25 per day poverty line; thirty-eight percent live in extreme poverty.<sup>3</sup>

The Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP) 2011 – 2015 is to guide the country's development in the next years. The theme for the medium-term plan is "Sustained economic growth and poverty reduction". Gender has been identified as a cross-cutting issue and gender equality issues are to be mainstreamed in all sectors.<sup>4</sup>

As Zambia develops into its middle income country status, the donor landscape will change. Private sector and foreign investments will continue to emerge. Traditional donor support to government will be reduced. Interest in supporting civil society will continue but civil society organisations (CSO) will need to show results. That CSOs are being challenged to show that they are effective is underlined in the development of CS assessments.<sup>5 6</sup>

A National Gender Policy was adopted in 2000. The machinery for progressing implementation was given to the Gender in Development Division (GIDD) which had a place at Cabinet Office.<sup>7</sup> The effectiveness of GIDD is reported to have varied over the years.<sup>8</sup> Originally starting as a "women in development desk", GIDD was established and after last year's election, this was elevated to a Ministry of Gender but together with child development. Recently this ministry has also been given Cabinet Office status. The gender focal points in the line ministries are said to have little knowledge of gender issues.<sup>9</sup> With the new government and new appointments to the Ministry of Gender, some in the women's movement are optimistic that addressing gender inequality will have a more central place in the near future. But, it is not yet known how many resources the Ministry of Gender will receive in the future budgets. Similarly, GRZ's priorities for improving the status of women and for gender equality are unclear.

Although the GRZ's *Vision 2030 "A prosperous Middle-income Nation by 2030"* identified "gender responsive sustainable development" as the first principle for achieving *Vision 2030*,<sup>10</sup> women and girls face considerable challenges. In 2011 Zambia is ranked 164 out of 187 countries in the Human Development Index and 131 out of 146 countries with data on the gender inequality index. The

---

<sup>3</sup> UNDP, 2011 *Human Development Report 2011, Statistical Annex*

<sup>4</sup> GRZ, 2011 *Sixth National Development Plan 2011-2015 "Sustained Economic Growth and Poverty Reduction"*

<sup>5</sup> UNDP, 2010, *A Users' Guide to Civil Society Assessments*

<sup>6</sup> UNDP, 2011, A. Anheier, A. Fowler, R. Holloway, A. Kandil, 'The Future of Participatory Civil Society Assessments: A Conceptual Analysis'

<sup>7</sup> GRZ, GIDD, Office of the President, Cabinet Office, 2000

<sup>8</sup> Jennings, Mary and Mpala Nkonkomalimba, 2011, 'Gender Sector Analysis and Mapping of Civil Society and Cooperating Partners Initiatives'

<sup>9</sup> Ibid

<sup>10</sup> GRZ, 2006, *Vision 2030*



Zambia Human Development Report 2011 notes gender inequality is deeply entrenched in Zambia.<sup>11</sup> It reports that mainstreaming gender into the development process has remained a challenge.<sup>12</sup>

The underlying causes of persistent gender equality are multifaceted and interlinked. The dual legal system with customary and statutory laws disadvantages women and girls. The Constitution includes a guarantee of human rights against discrimination but “negates this guarantee by allowing the application of customary law in matter of personal law (marriage, divorce, inheritance, devolution of property.”)<sup>13</sup> Zambia has yet to fully integrate international and regional protocols such as CEDAW and the SADC Protocol on Gender and Development that progress gender equality.

Poverty is pervasive, especially in rural areas. Women make up 70% of the labour in the Zambian agriculture sector<sup>14</sup> but lack access to resources for economic empowerment e.g. land, credit, training, agricultural and livestock extension services, and commodities such as fertilizer. The Global Gender Gap report gives Zambia the worst possible score in relation to women’s access to land ownership and mid-way scores on their access to bank loans and finance programmes.<sup>15</sup> Fewer women than men are employed in the formal labor sector where women make up only 22% of the non-agriculture paid labour force.

Sixty-one percent of females over aged 15 and older are literate compared to 81% of males.<sup>16</sup> Educational disparities between girls and boys continue despite nearly universal and equal early primary school enrolment. The primary school completion rate for girls is 82% while 92% for boys. The youth literacy rate for females aged 15 – 24 is 67%; while for same aged males 82%.<sup>17</sup>

It is especially in the political field that women are poorly represented.<sup>18</sup> In 2008, the Zambia Association for Research and Development (ZARD) published figures on the low number and proportion of women in decision-making positions.<sup>19</sup> After the 2011 elections, the proportion of women in Parliament declined from 15% to 11%. In an open letter to the President, on 2 November 2011, attention was drawn to the continued low representation of women in the current government. Women are in the following positions: 2 of 17 Cabinet ministers; 3 out of 18 deputy ministers; 1 out of 9 provincial ministers. No women are among the 8 nominated MPs.<sup>20</sup>

Gender-based violence has long been recognized as a serious problem that needs to be addressed.<sup>21</sup> A National Action Plan on Gender-Based Violence 2008 – 2013 was published in 2008 where GIDD is identified as the authority to coordinate the plan’s implementation. Implementation rests with a

<sup>11</sup> *Zambia Human Development Report 2011*, p. 35

<sup>12</sup> ZHDR 2011, p. 10

<sup>13</sup> Jennings, Mary and Mpala Nkonkomalimba, 2011, “Gender Sector Analysis and Mapping of Civil Society and Cooperating Partners Initiatives” p unnumbered, section 3.0

<sup>14</sup> UNDP,

[http://www.undp.org.zm/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=category&id=10&Itemid=20&8e2474a80d13c9785641fc2923161380=ee954f7d3226ba2bbff6fe5db8e6c912](http://www.undp.org.zm/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=10&Itemid=20&8e2474a80d13c9785641fc2923161380=ee954f7d3226ba2bbff6fe5db8e6c912) downloaded 14 June 2012

<sup>15</sup> World Economic Forum, Global Gender Gap Report 2011, Country profile

<sup>16</sup> World Bank, 2011 *African Development Indicators 2011*

<sup>17</sup> World Bank, 2011, *Little Data Book on Gender in Africa*

<sup>18</sup> World Economic Forum, Global Gender Gap Report 2011, Country profile

<sup>19</sup> An overview of the position can be found at: <http://www.widnet.org.zm/news.php?id=64> , downloaded 1 August 2012

<sup>20</sup> <http://www.genderlinks.org.za/article/zambia-letter-to-the-president-on-low-representation-of-women-in-cabinet-2011-11-22> downloaded 3 September 2012

<sup>21</sup> GRZ, GIDD, 2008, “National Action Plan on Gender-Based Violence 2008 – 2013”

<sup>22</sup> UN, Human Rights Council, 2011, “Report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and Consequences, Rashida Manjoo”, A/ HRC/17/26/Add.4

number of sectors: health, legal/justice, education, and social welfare. NGOs are seen to have an important role to play along with government.

HIV and AIDS prevalence is reported to be 14.3% of the adult population with 16% women and 12% men being HIV positive.<sup>23</sup> In 2007, HIV prevalence among young women aged 20 – 24 was 12% while among same aged men it was 9%. Antenatal sentinel surveillance among pregnant women aged 20 – 24 was reported to be 28% in 2008 – 2009.<sup>24</sup> Fortunately, approximately 90% of those over age 15 needing anti-retroviral therapy are accessing it but only 28% of children aged 0 – 14 are.<sup>25</sup> Eight hundred thousand orphans have lost one or both parents to AIDS.<sup>26</sup>

With regard to other health issues, the maternal mortality ratio is estimated to be 470 per 100 000 live births.<sup>27</sup> Unmet contraceptive need for married women aged 15 – 49 is reported as 27%.<sup>28</sup> Unsafe abortion is estimated to account for 30% of maternal mortality.<sup>29</sup> Skilled attendance at birth is only 47%.<sup>30</sup>

## 2.2 Civil society

A recent report on civil society in Zambia comments “Zambia’s socio-economic, political and cultural environment is not very conducive to the flourishing of civil society.”<sup>31</sup> The report further notes that while government welcomes CS supplementary role in service delivery, the relationship becomes hostile when organizations advocate for good governance and call upon the State to uphold the law.<sup>32</sup> It should be remembered that this country study was carried out before the 2011 elections where an opposition party was elected into government. The study found that the main strengths of Zambian CS are: a) its ability to mobilise into social movements on contentious governance issues, b) strong sectorial networks among like-minded CSOs, and c) CSOs have a strong influence on tackling social issues in the country.<sup>33</sup>

One observer has commented that with the new government, people and NGOs are waiting to see how it will react when confronted with opposition and criticism – there is a level of uncertainty that finds some CSOs unwilling to take strong critical stances now. The NGO Act which came into force in January 2011 with its restrictions on NGOs is seen to be part of a hostile environment for CSOs but it is yet to be seen how it will be implemented.

<sup>23</sup> GRZ MOFNP & MOH and USA Government PEPFAR, 2010 “Partnership Framework between GRZ MOFNP 7 MOH and Government of USA”

<sup>24</sup> UNGASS, 2011 Zambia Country Report

<sup>25</sup> UNGASS, 2011 Zambia Country Report

<sup>26</sup> Norad, 2010, *National HIV and AID/STI/TB Council Zambia*

<sup>27</sup> World Bank, 2011 *Little Data Book on Gender in Africa*. As in many countries, MMR is estimated. For Zambia the range is reported to be between 250 – 680 deaths per 100 000 live births.

<sup>28</sup> GRZ, Central Statistical Office, MOH, Tropical Diseases Research Centre, University of Zambia, 2009, *Zambia Demographic and Health Survey 2007*, p. 106

<sup>29</sup> Reported in the Daily Mail 23 June 2012, <http://www.daily-mail.co.zm/?p=6305>, downloaded 04.09.12

<sup>30</sup> World Bank 2011, *Little Data Book on Africa*

<sup>31</sup> Zambia Council for Social Development and Civicus (World Alliance for Citizen Participation), 2010, *The Status of Civil Society in Zambia: Challenges and Future*. P 54.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid, p. 57.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid, p. 59

### 2.3 The Gender Sector<sup>34</sup>

Recently there has been a greater interest in working systematically in the gender sector among the cooperating partners (CP). The main partners in Zambia are DFID, Ireland, Finland, Norway, GIZ, EU, and indirectly, Sweden. Norway, DFID, and possibly the EU will be channelling part of their efforts through UNDP which will be launching a new programme.

In 2011 DFID and Irish Aid commissioned a gender sector analysis to identify how best to support GRZ and civil society in advancing gender equality and women's empowerment. The analysis concludes that there is no clear vision of what CSOs want to achieve in the field of gender. Organisations may work on their core business but that there is little shared advocacy, analysis, or research. "There is a broad consensus that gender issues have lost momentum in Zambia, that the women's movement is not nearly as dynamic as it was in the in the 1990s..."

Similarly the GRZ machinery for implementing gender equality has been weak or non-functioning. GIDD is responsible for implementing the 2000 National Gender Plan but has had an inconsistent past. When it was located the Cabinet Office, it had a very small budget. It was responsible for convening the Gender Consultative Forum but meetings were irregular and have not been called for some time. There has been a gender sector advisory group (G-SAG) to advice on the implementation of national development plans but it is yet to be seen whether it takes an active role with the SNDP. Line ministries are expected to have a gender focal point but many observers noted that often these were people with no gender expertise and in most cases; this was delegated to junior officers. Similarly, at provincial level, there is a gender focal point but (s)he is often located in a ministry where (s)he has little influence on matters affecting women.

### 2.4 NGOCC

NGOCC is an umbrella organisation established in 1985 with thirteen member organizations. The brochure commemorating *NGOCC at 20 years* writes that prior to 1985, "...NGOs worked in isolation. It was, however, realised that the process of empowering women needed concerted effort and hence, NGOCC was born to facilitate networking, nationally and internationally."<sup>35</sup> NGOCC's vision and mission have undergone some changes over the years as documented in the Baseline Survey.<sup>36</sup> At the present:<sup>37</sup>

NGOCC's vision: *A society where women fully participate and benefit from social, cultural, economic and political development*

NGOCC's mission: *To champion women empowerment and gender equality and equity through coordinated institutional and capacity development to members, advocacy and linkages with government, local and international partners.*

NGOCC's functions:

1. To coordinate and create synergies of the activities for member organisations.
2. To initiate, develop and maintain Women Coordinating Centres in Zambia.

<sup>34</sup> This section is largely based on the analysis by Jennings, Mary and Mpala Nkonkomalimba, 2011, 'Gender Sector Analysis and Mapping of Civil Society and Cooperating Partner Initiatives' but many of the observations were also expressed by key informants.

<sup>35</sup> NGOCC, 2005, *NGOCC at 20 years*

<sup>36</sup> Jule Development Associates International (JUDAI), 2012, "Baseline survey on the socio-economic status of women in Zambia"

<sup>37</sup> NGOCC Arrangement of Articles (Constitution), amended 2008

3. To initiate capacity building for member organisations.
4. To establish and maintain a system of information, documentation and communication on women's issues.
5. To hold regular meetings, workshops and seminars for member organisations.
6. To facilitate networking within the women's movement and other organisations on gender and development issues.
7. To mount and coordinate campaigns, demonstrations and marches on matters of common concern.
8. To initiate projects which are in line with its coordinating role, and
9. To enforce the adherence to the NGOCC code of conduct by member organisations

As of 2011, NGOCC had a membership of 50 NGOs and 56 community-based organizations. In 2011, it had a total income of ZMK 15 567 775 000 (NOK 17.821 million) which was slightly more than its total expenditures.

NGOCC is known to be the “Voice of the women's movement”. It is a household name with considerable convening capacity as witnessed in June 2012 at the Women's Constitution Conference where the new draft Constitution was discussed and 1000 people attended. It is often invited to the table when government consults on issues related to women and gender equality. A recent report on civil society in Zambia accorded NGOCC the second largest sphere of influence among 13 organisations or groups of organisations. NGOCC was assessed to be a larger actor than churches and other faith-based organisations, opposition political parties, INGOs, and others.<sup>38</sup> The 2012 Baseline survey concludes that “NGOCC has continued to be officially recognized as representing the Women's Movement and an entry point for addressing gender issues.”<sup>39</sup>

The RNE support dates back to 1989<sup>40</sup> when NGOCC along with a small number of other women's organizations received support from Norway. In 2003, it agreed a sub-granting mechanism with NGOCC as the intermediary for a Basket Fund (BF). Table 1 shows the Norwegian support to NGOCC from 1999 – 2011.

---

<sup>38</sup> Zambia Council for Social Development and Civicus, 2010, “The Status of Civil Society in Zambia: Challenges and Future Prospects”

<sup>39</sup> Jule Development Associates International (JUDAI), 2012, “Baseline survey on the socio-economic status of women in Zambia”

<sup>40</sup> Rakodi, Carole 2005, “Evaluation of the Strategy for Women and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation (1997-2005), Country case study: Zambia”, p. 39

**Table 1** Norwegian funding to NGOCC 1999 – 2011

<b>Year</b>	<b>Amount (NOK)</b>
1999	800 000
2000	800 000
2001	1 500 000
2002	1 500 000
2003	7 008 240
2004	8 800 000
2005	5 000 000
2006	7 000 000
2007	6 400 000
2008	10 000 000
2009	10 500 000
2009	Mid-Term Review 58 258
2010	5 000 000
2011	9 228 474
<b>Total</b>	<b>73 594 972</b>

*Source* Norad's PTA accounting system

### 3. END-REVIEW OF PROGRAM

NGOCC's total expenditure in 2011 was ZMK 15.211 billion. The RNE support that year was ZMK 10.496 billion (NOK 12 044 000). This made up 75% of NGOCC's donor income. If one excludes the funds for the BF, it represents 41% of NGOCC's overall donor support.<sup>41</sup>

#### 3.1 Programme documents

The End - Review required examining programme documents related to the entire 2007-2011 period and not just the reporting from 2011. There were three key documents: a) the Five Year Programme Plan 2007 – 2011, b) the Proposal for Institutional Support and Sub Grants Towards the Empowerment of women and Promotion of Gender Equity and Equality for July 2010 – December 2011, and c) 2011 Annual Operating Plans and Budgets. Aligning these documents with each other is hampered because they use terms such as “strategic goals”, “operational objectives”, “objectives”, “activities”, “intervention logic”, differently in each. The Strategic goals for the period changed slightly with each document as is shown in the Annex 4

#### 3.2 Programme reporting

Given the lack of consistency among the programme documents, it is not surprising that the reporting for 2011 did not give an easily understandable overview of what had been achieved. Activities were reported but not in the order presented in the 2011 Operating Plans and Budgets. Some activities were reported in the six monthly reports which were not in the 2011 Operating Plans and Budgets and vice versa.

The 2010 Monitoring and Evaluation System does not appear to have been implemented as nothing from Table 1 in the M & E System report was made available to the Appraisal Team.<sup>42</sup>

There were no summary reports in the two six-monthly reports for 2011, so one could not see how many of the planned activities were carried out. More importantly, there was no information on the outcomes of these activities i.e. what difference the activities made. When looking at the six-monthly financial reports, it was difficult to link the activities with “income and expenditure” statements for 2011.

##### *Donor Round Table meetings*

The Appraisal Team reviewed the minutes of the Donor Round Table meetings held in 2010 and 2011 for the previous years.

Although the 2010 Donor Round Table meeting does not cover the period specified for the End-Review in the TORs, minutes of that meeting gave some insights. Of the 8 donors to NGOCC in 2009, only the RNE and Diakonia attended the meeting. Representatives from four other agencies were present but these were not NGOCC donors. Nor did they become donors the following year.

One of the agenda items was the Recommendations from the Mid-Term Review (MTR) completed in December 2009. The MTR recommended the set-up of an M & E system with clear indicators for more effective reporting of results. NGOCC reported that the M & E system was underway and had been incorporated in the 2010 Work plan. Another recommendation was to strengthen the provincial structures. NGOCC reported that in addition to visitations, it had planned for organizational development, provincial Open days, and inter-provincial exchange learning visits. It noted that it had

<sup>41</sup> These figures are taken from the external financial audit and differ from the figures in the Norwegian PPT.

<sup>42</sup> NGOCC, 2010, 'Monitoring and Evaluation System'

considered a mixed approach with provincial liaison officers and focal point organisations. It raised the problem of getting donor support for provincial centers.

The 2011 Donor Round Table meeting for 2010 was held at the time stipulated in the Contract but it appears that the audited report was slightly delayed beyond the 30 April requirement. Again, although NGOCC had 7 donors in 2010, the RNE, the Zambia Governance Foundation, and Action Aid were the only ones attending.

Agreed action points from the 2010 meeting were not listed in the 2010 meeting minutes. Nevertheless, there were a few issues which warranted following-up at the 2011 meeting e.g. the training of trainers, a sustainability plan in relation to young people, and an advocacy strategy linked to grass-roots MOs. Only the sustainability issue was raised at the 2011 meeting.

The Head of Development Cooperation, RNE reminded the meeting that it was important for both parties to adhere to the Contract terms.

NGOCC raised the issue of how time-consuming it was to report to all donors and asked for one institutional audit. The donors could not agree on that because not all donors (Diakonia and ACBF) were present. No follow-up action was agreed to pursue NGOCC's request. NGOCC also pointed out it had participated in evaluations every year from 2008 – 2011, which was very time-consuming. They asked donors to harmonize their TORs to avoid duplicated work.

NGOCC had had a "Restitution Meeting" with the ACBF on 17 May 2011 where the ACBF Mid-term Review findings and recommendations were presented. This was presented at the Donor Round Table meeting but the points noted in the minutes do not adequately reflect the conclusions and recommendations of the Restitution Report.

Agreed action points were minuted from the Donors Round Table meeting along with an action plan related to 2010 Audit issues.

#### *Audited Financial reports*

The 2011 audited financial report raises a number of issues that will be discussed below when looking at the Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016.

#### *Mid-Term Review 2009 and the ACBF Mid-Term Review 2010*

A Mid-Term Review of NGOCC's Strategic Plan 2007 – 2011 was commissioned by the RNE and reported in December 2009. The African Capacity Building Foundation commissioned a Mid-Term Review of the NGOCC Phase II project and reported in February 2011. ACBF has been supporting NGOCC since 2000. Its earlier support was for women in decision-making positions. Its current support has three components: a) training and leadership development, b) research communication and advocacy, and c) governance and management. It was scheduled to end in May 2012 but has been extended until April 2013.

The ACBF MTR was very thorough and its observations resonated with the Appraisal Team. The report of the 17 May NGOCC Restitution Meeting with ACBF has summarized the MTR's main findings. Actions to be taken by NGOCC were agreed at the meeting and all were to be completed by the end of 2011. However, the Appraisal Team did not have the time to find out whether they had been carried out.

Many of the summarized findings from the Restitution Meeting are strikingly similar to those found by the 2009 Strategic Plan MTR. They are presented here because the Appraisal Team is in full agreement with them based on their experience with the End-Review and Appraisal.

1. Lack of an overall organisational M & E
2. Lack of an advocacy strategy
3. The evolving capacity needs of the diverse membership should form the basis of the capacity needs programme. More systematic attention should be given to determining capacity needs of MOs.
4. An over-dependence on consultants has undermined capacity among NGOCC staff
5. Provincial level presence is inadequate
6. Information and communication systems are weak. Language barriers between NGOCC and MOs in rural areas reduce opportunities for working together on advocacy issues.
7. The BF is vulnerable without other funders than the RNE
8. GIDD has not been effectively implementing the National Gender Plan which has hampered NGOCC's opportunities to work systematically on national gender policy issues

Summing up, one observes that a large number of similar issues has been raised and recommended, but there has been little action to follow-up the implementation.

### **3.3 End-Review Discussion**

*Relevance:* The Programme Plan for 2007 – 2011 was relevant for NGOCC's organizational needs and to women in Zambia in progressing gender equality. Furthermore, it was relevant to Norwegian development assistance with its priorities on gender equality and support to civil society. It was in full accord with the Norwegian Action Plan for Women's Rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation 2007 – 2009, extended to 2013 in three of the four prioritised areas: women's political empowerment, women's economic empowerment, and violence against women. The fourth Norwegian priority, sexual and reproductive health and rights, was only touched upon in the BF support to prevent and mitigate HIV and AIDS.

*Efficiency:* From the perspective of the RNE, the agreement was efficient in that having an intermediary take on the sub-granting function through the BF saves considerable time and effort that the RNE would otherwise have to spend in administering and following-up a larger number of organisations. This might have been the case at the beginning of the 2007 – 2011 Programme Plan period, but over the past year, RNE is finding that it is spending a disproportionate amount of time understanding the annual and six-monthly reporting.

From NGOCC's perspective, they have found it an inefficient use of their time to have so many evaluations and to prepare for more than one audited financial report. It would have been better if the Donor Round Table and the Restitution Meet had been combined.

*Results: Effectiveness and Impact:* The Appraisal Team was not able to assess results because the goals, objectives, expected outcomes, and activities were not linked in a logical manner nor were they linked to a user friendly monitoring and evaluation system. The M & E system that NGOCC reported in 2010 does not seem to have been operationalized. We found reporting to be fragmented. We were unable to get summary overviews of outputs and were unable to discern outcomes. There was no base-line information against which to measure outcomes.

Agreements were made after the Donors Round Table and the ACBF Restitution meetings. It is not clear whether they have been followed up.

Clear guidance was given for the 2011 annual reports and audited accounts. Although the importance of adhering to Contract terms was raised by the Head of Development Cooperation at the 2011 Donors Round Table meeting, the RNE did not receive the audited financial report until August 2012.



The annual report was to include a theory of change; this is not in the 2011 draft Annual report. NGOCC was to ensure that the M & E system was operationalized so as to inform NGOCC reporting systems; the Appraisal team saw no evidence of this.

*Sustainability:* the End-Review did not find that the programme had achieved the indicators related to sustainability. They were: a) Increasing donors from 6 to 8 and b) Partnering with at least 2 business institutions. It is of concern that there were eight donors in 2009 and only six in 2011.

### **3.4 The Basket Funds (Sub-Granting Mechanism)**

#### ***3.4.1 History of the BF***

Norway has been the sole supporter of the Basket Fund since 2003. This arose from an agreement between two main gender equality cooperating partners, the Netherlands and Norway, to have a “division of labour” whereby the Netherlands would continue to fund and manage support to GRZ’s Gender in Development Division (GIDD).

It was intended that Norway would continue to fund and manage contributions to CSOs through NGOCC as an intermediary in addition to continuing its core funding.<sup>43</sup> At the time, Norway was supporting a handful of organizations: the Zambia National Women’s Lobby (ZNWL), Women for Change (WfC), Women in Law and Development in Africa (WILDAF), Women and Law in Southern Africa (WLSA), and the YWCA. Harmonisation of procedures, increased efficiency and reduction of transaction costs were reasons given for this. This was in keeping with overall Norwegian development assistance at the time when all embassies were expected to reduce the number of contracts they were handling.

The Appraisal Team has not had the time to see the levels of funding from RNE to the other women’s organisations prior to 2002. Nor have we looked at the amount of funding NGOCC was receiving from other donor such as the Netherlands, prior to the establishment of the BF.

GIDD and NGOCC were told that the total amount of financial support would remain the same. NGOCC was thus asked to establish a Basket Fund and handle the grant management to the NGOs. Although hotly discussed within NGOCC, an analysis of how this would affect the character of NGOCC expanding from being a coordinator for the women’s movement to being a donor/sub-granter, was not done.

Norway’s support to NGOCC increased from approx. NOK 1.5 million in 2002 to NOK 7.0 million in 2003. Annual support has remained approximately at this level since.

#### ***3.4.2 Operation of the BF***

The Board of Governors has a sub-committee specifically for the BF. Approval of grants is made by a Grant Management Committee made up of people external to NGOCC.

The BF is managed through a Grant Manager, reporting to the Executive Director, who is assisted by an Accounts officer and an M & E officer. The Grant Management Manual (2011) covers procedures for ensuring transparency of the process of managing and accounting for the grants given through the BF. It includes procedures for: accounting for the donor funds; applications for grants; the approval of applications by the Grant Management Committee; accounting, monitoring, and evaluation of disbursed funds; and utilization of the funds by NGOCC.

---

<sup>43</sup> Rakodi, Carole, 2005 “Evaluation of the Strategy for Women and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation (1997 – 2005), Country case study: Zambia, p 38 & p 40.

The criteria for receiving BF are: a) the managerial capacity, b) previous usage of funds, c) governance issues, and d) type of activity to be pursued. The Appraisal Team did not have the time to see whether recommendations from the 2008 BF review to make the decisions around allocations more transparent had been implemented.

The Grant Management Manual says that there should be six-monthly and annual reporting on the BF. Annual audited financial reports on the GMU are produced. Annual reports are produced but they cover NGOCC's and the GMUs work for the entire year with no separate reporting on the BF. The information in the 2011 draft Annual report and the two six monthly reports do not give information about the use of BF for priority areas in terms of the amount of money allocated for each area, the number of projects funded, the number of organisations receiving funding, or the category of organisation funded. The financial report for the first six months of 2011 is uninformative. Figures given in the narrative report for July – December 2011 do not match figures in the income and expenditure statement.

At the time of the Appraisal, the 2011 audit reports had just been received and were being examined. The RNE requested feedback from NGOCC on some audit figures (“amount spent on behalf of GMU by NGOCC”) as well as an action plan on the issues raised by the auditors in the management letter. Annex 5 is an excerpt from a Norad Evaluation Report on development support to Zambia 1991 – 2005 which gives the history of support to NGOCC and the reporting mechanisms that were established in 1999.<sup>44</sup> The internal grant management review of the Norwegian Embassy in Lusaka in June 2012 included NGOCC. The Review characterised the overall grant management standard at the Embassy to be “very good”.

### **3.4.3 Use of the BF**

In 2011, ZMK 5,001,111,000 (NOK 5 743 431) was sub-granted to 83 MOs.

The Appraisal Team was not able to find documents that indicate what the original thoughts were in 2003 about how the BF was to be used. Although it was assumed that the organisations that had earlier been receiving Norwegian support would continue to access this, it seems that there was the added expectation that the BF could be used to support small community-based organisations in rural areas.

Throughout the 2007 – 2011 period, indications of how the BF should be use differed in different documents. The 2007-2011 Programme Plan states that the Strategic Goal of the BF is to “have enabled its membership to address priority development issues affecting women and children.” The objective is “to contribute to poverty eradication and women empowerment”. Five priority areas are identified. The Appropriation Document for support to the 2007 -2011 Programme Plan simply notes that 80% of the support is allocated to the Basket Fund without details. The Grant Management Manual states that “The programmes by NGOCC members that will qualify for funding should be in line with the NGOCC vision and mission.” NGOCC's 2009 Annual Report states that the objective of the BF is to improve the socio-economic status of women. In the 2010 TORs for the Board's Basket Fund Sub-Committee, five priority areas and how much should be allocated to each is listed: a) economic empowerment (25%), b) mitigation of HIV and AIDS (25%), c) increasing women's participation in decision-making processes (20%), d) gender-based violence (20%). and e) promoting young women's participation (10%),

NGOCC has linked its Capacity Building and Networking Unit (CBN) with the BF under its Membership Development and Support Program. The draft 2011 Annual Report reports that trainings

<sup>44</sup>Oxford Policy Management, 2008, *Evaluation of Norwegian Development Support to Zambia (1991 – 2005)*, Norad Evaluation Report 4/2007

were held in Proposal, Report writing, financial management and Project and Financial Management. It does not appear that there was any capacity building training activities related to the five thematic areas identified for the BF. (Note NGOCC's comment in the Endnote.)

#### **3.4.4 Basket Fund reporting**

Narrative reporting is the preferred form of reporting from the Grant Management Unit. The 2011 Grant Management Manual says that "Monitoring will be in form of site visits, reviews, as well as quarterly financial and activity reports." The draft 2011 Annual Report reports that on-spot monitoring of projects funded by the BF was conducted at the same time as the annual membership visitations were carried out.

The visitations to each province are extensive, usually lasting up to 10 days. Although BF monitoring was listed among the objectives for the visitations, we noted that neither a GMU staff member nor a Grant Management Committee (GMC) member were in the visitation group in 3 of the 7 reports reviewed. The format for Visitation reports gives an overview of activities, achievements, challenges, future plans, capacity needs, follow-up on earlier recommendations, and recommendations. Separate reporting on specific BF supported inputs was not apparent. (Note NGOCC's comment in the Endnote.)

Systematic and summary reporting on the BF was not found. Information about the 2011 grants that team members received was inconsistent. Although requested, the Appraisal Team did not receive information on the number of projects, the number of MOs, and the total amounts allocated to the five thematic areas in 2011.

#### **3.4.5 Field Work**

The Appraisal Team's field visits to CBOs and NGO found that all had received funding through the BF although not necessarily in 2011. BF was important for their income generating activities: farming, gardening, sewing items that were sold, establishing a piggery, poultry raising, grocery store, buying property and using the proceeds of that to care for orphans, establishing a savings and loan system, and starting new income generating activities.

The BF and incomes derived from the income generating activities have been used to pay for: seeds, property, a hammer mill, cooking utensils, food, skills training, school fees, shoes, and uniforms for orphans and to provide for home-based care. One of the CBOs in a peri-urban area was proud of its savings which it is planning to use to establish a community school next year.

Over the years, the MOs had received some NGOCC training: project management, entrepreneurship, leadership, skills training, gender and development, gender-based violence, HIV and AIDS, and nutrition. In one group, the men commented that the gender training resulted in their taking children to the health station. In another, the HIV&AIDS training helped to reduce stigma in the community. In one group, efforts were made to rotate who attended trainings; in another the difficulties posed by the lack of training in the local language and the required literacy levels was discussed. Cascading of training was attempted but not always successful sometimes due to lack of training materials in local languages and lack of interest.

One of the CBOs in a remote rural location had hosted a visit from five other NGOCC MOs as part of NGOCC's networking activities.

At least two of the MOs visited had been started by the Catholic Church but support was eventually withdrawn when the development workers were no longer able to work with the groups. Training by Women for Change was thought to be best adapted to local needs. The CBOs visited seemed to have an internal identity and supported each other in various informal ways. We note that one of the earlier

BF recipient CBOs that had been suspended due to poor governance nevertheless was still functioning, trying to correct its weaknesses, and qualify for future BF support. It valued the NGOCC support it had received and found that the other organisations that could have helped (its mother organisation and a provincial NGO) had not monitored or supported it on a regular basis.

The NGOs whose activities were similar to the CBOs had a wider donor base, were better linked with like-minded organisations, and seemed to benefit from more and relevant training.

The BF is not directly available to local branch chapters but should be channelled through their national offices. The branches varied considerably in the support that they received from their head offices. One (a service provider) had daily contact; others (a volunteer advocacy organisation) had hardly any support. All were aware of NGOCC and to some degree participated in their events e.g. International Women's Day, 16 Days of Activism, International AIDS Day). Three of the four wished they could access the BF directly.

#### **3.4.6 Basket Fund Discussion**

Since the Appraisal Team has had to rely on the narrative reporting, meetings with GMU staff, interviews with key informants, and visits to 9 MOs and 3 branch chapters, answers to questions in the TOR regarding impact, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability of the BF are somewhat anecdotal and incomplete.

NGOCC manages to reach into rural areas through the BF and it is present in all nine provinces in addition to Lusaka. Although MOs must be a registered organization for 3 years before joining NGOCC, once they are a MO, they become part of the NGOCC family and identify with it. However, some of the annual visitation reports noted that this identity is very tenuous. Other national level organisations may have branch chapters in different parts of Zambia but it does not appear that any other women's organization has the extensive reach of NGOCC. More than once we heard women say that it was good to know that they had not been forgotten.

On paper it can be argued that BF's 2007-2011 five priority areas in theory are aligned with NGOCC's mandate. But, without more information about projects activities and outcomes, it is not possible to say how the economic empowerment, gender-based violence, and women in decision-making positions grants were used. The BF grants may have supported small components within larger programmes carried out by the large MOs which are effective in carrying out NGOCC's mandate. Or, the economic empowerment and HIV & AIDS BF grants may have only gone to income-generating activities without any transformation empowerment.

As with the End-Review in general, without summary reporting on outcomes, it is not possible to say much conclusively about the BF's *effectiveness*. The combined capacity building and BF visitations seem to be largely focused on the MOs' organisational functioning, financial accountability, and in imparting information on NGOCC's overall direction. There was little about gaining information on important grass-roots issues.

It is difficult to generalise about the BF's *impact*. It has a different significance to the small CBOs than to the larger MOs. Much of the recent NGOCC training for CBOs has focused on organisational capacity building: project management, leadership, governance and management, which is only one of NGOCC's core functions.

One could argue that the income generating activities have enhanced the economic status of women but the Baseline Report estimates that very few women are indeed reached. One could also argue that increased competence in organisational work could be used for other gender equality activities in the long-term.

The visitation reports show that NGOCC is aware of the need for more competence among the smaller MOs in NGOCC's core areas of advocacy, lobbying, and gender transformation but a systematic way forward is not apparent in the Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016. The ACBF MTR and the Baseline Survey found that organisations join NGOCC simply to access BF but that finding may be more complex. Because MOs are required to have been registered for 3 years before joining NGOCC, they apparently have a pre-existing identity. There is nothing that indicates that they do not benefit from exposure to training in gender equality.

Greater NGOCC presence at local levels could facilitate exchange of information, networking, and giving greater voice to local needs that would help transform the social, cultural, and political position of women. Networking with like-minded organisations, local government and traditional authorities, the police, and resources within the agriculture, health, HIV & AIDS, education sectors would strengthen the work of the CBOs (many of which are working in isolated areas or overlooked urban areas) and would build more systematic impact.

It appears that the smaller MOs have received very little, if any, training in the five 2007 – 2011 BF priority areas: HIV and AIDS, economic empowerment, women in decision-making positions, gender-based violence, and increasing the participation of young women.

The Appraisal Team did not visit enough MOs to say whether there are negative effects among the MOs but the divide between the smaller CBOs and the larger MOs has led to fragmentation of effort which will be discussed in the Discussion section below.

The Grant Management Manual gives details about how financial management and accountability for the BF. The 50/40/10 disbursement practice is intended to ensure correct use of funds. This appears to be in order but reporting on the use of the BF should be improved.

The requirement that the final 10% needs to be “retired” before a MO can apply in the next call for support can be an obstacle to the smooth running of programs. Delays in confirming the final 10% can be from NGOCC's side rather than from the MO's. An effective NGOCC provincial presence could assist in confirming the use of funds.

Recommendations from the 2008 BF Review regarding transparency of the BF allocation decision do not appear to have been implemented. The Appraisal Team did not have time to fully examine whether the following recommendations from the 2008 BF Review had been implemented:

- Establish criteria for measuring a MO's managerial capacity in terms of financial systems & procedures, human resources, buildings & maintenance,
- Record the assessment of the GMC for the 4 criteria used for each grant applications
- Ensure that the indicators given for measuring the project's success are relevant, realistic, and measurable

The GMU said that its monitoring system was different from the NGOCC's overall one but provided no written examples of it. The Grant Management Manual states that monitoring consists of site visits, reviews as well as quarterly financial and activity reports. As noted above capacity building and GMU visitations do not always include a GMU staff member.

It appears that monitoring is largely concerned with the correct use of the financial BF input. When reviewing the 2011 BF report for Copperbelt in preparation for the field visit, we find the section on

“performance analysis” for the different MOs was inconsistently reported. The form that is appended to the Grant Management Manual in 2008 (Appendix 6) does not appear to be part of the 2011 manual. If points under “performance” were well documented, NGOCC would have qualitative material demonstrating the effectiveness of the BF.

NGOCC held a Resource Mobilization training in late January 2011 which resulted in a draft strategy for 2012 - 2016. If implemented and successful, this would presumably assist in increasing the BF’s *sustainability*.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> NGOCC, 2011, ‘Resource Mobilization and Fundraising Strategy 2012 – 2016’ prepared by Grand Corporate Business consultants

## 4. APPRAISAL

### 4.1 Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016: Getting back to the Basics

The Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016 has been presented as the programme document for Norwegian support. Its budget is nearly ZMK 120 billion (NOK 137.7 million; USD 23.9 million) over a five year period. Other significant donors during part of the programme plan are the African Capacity Building Foundation and the Zambia Governance Foundation.

The Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016 begins with an assessment of central obstacles to the full participation of Zambia women in the country's social, cultural, and political development. The situation analysis comprises a stakeholder analysis and a SWOT analysis. It is said to include recommendations from the 2007 – 2011 MTR. NGOCC says it used a very consultative approach involving all MOs to develop the Plan which was adopted at the General Assembly in November 2011.

The SWOT analysis was carried out in October 2011 and the Strategic Plan includes findings and recommendations from consultations with members. Reflecting its highly diverse membership, the findings are presented as issues raised by non-Lusaka based MOs, their capacity building needs, and issues raised by Lusaka-based MOs. Included in the Plan document are resolutions made by MOs and the Governing Board.

The Plan reflects upon the twelve critical areas on the 1995 Beijing Platform for Action and the Strategic Plan is aligned to eleven of these areas.

Four Strategic objectives are identified:

- i. By 2016, NGOCC has influenced gender-sensitive and responsive legislation with 2 operational objectives
- ii. By 2016, NGOCC has contributed to the advancement and protection of women's rights with 2 operational objectives
- iii. By 2016, inequalities in access to health services are reduced with 2 operational objectives
- iv. By 2016, Zambia has a Media landscape which contains the voice of women as well with 3 operational objectives

Four "results" are needed in order to align all MOs to NGOCCs vision:

1. By 2014, at Least 50 % of MOs Have Operating Management and Governance System in Place
2. By 2012, Revised and Improved NGOCC Coordination Strategy in Place
3. By 2014, NGOCC Communication and Information System in Place and Accessible by MOs
4. By 2016, NGOCC MO BF supported programmes and activities realigned towards the Beijing Platform for Action

Four "Outputs" which NGOCC must deliver:

1. NGOCC Governance System Functional Throughout Planning Period
2. Well-Functioning NGOCC Management Systems and Structures at National and Provincial Level
3. From End of 2014 Onwards, NGOCC and Member NGOs Produce Quality Reports
4. From 2012 onwards, NGOCC MO basket fund supported activities focus on women's empowerment only

Activities are listed and grouped with milestones, operational objectives, results and activities, and outputs. The activities (Section 4) can be linked with the Strategic Budget (Section 6).

## 4.2 Quality of underlying programme design

The strategic objectives that focus on the political and legal framework have identified a major area that presents obstacles to women's empowerment and gender equality in Zambia. Moreover, they build on NGOCC's core functions of capacity building, advocacy, and networking.

However, the Appraisal Team has found the Strategic plan for 2012 – 2016 to be a confusion of Strategic objectives, operational objectives with "4 results" arising from "5 outputs" related to internal management strengthening. The strategy map does not link the internal "results" and "outputs" with the operational and strategic objectives.<sup>46</sup>

The Appraisal Team and others also questioned the reference to the 1995 Beijing Conference as 'back to basics' when it is almost 20 years ago. Many noted that more than half of Zambia's population was born after 1995 and the world has changed tremendously since the Beijing Conference.

The Strategic Map on p 21 shows an array of interlinking boxes of outputs, results, operational objectives, and strategic objectives which is difficult to understand.

This is explained by NGOCC as "The achievement of the four strategic objectives and their respective operational objectives depends to a large part on the adoption of a strategy, which would ensure that NGOCC's considerable resources are all and exclusively used by the Secretariat and all member organisations for the purpose stated in the vision of NGOCC."<sup>47</sup>

Disentangling these and comparing with the Strategic Budget one finds that the activities can be categorised in the following groups<sup>48</sup> (some of which overlap). They are activities:

- a. Directly aimed at achieving NGOCC's organizational mission: "To champion women empowerment and gender equality and equity through coordinated institutional capacity development to members, advocacy and linkages with local and international partners".
- b. Strengthening the work of the Secretariat
- c. Strengthening the MOs' internal capacity and competence as well as their participation in the women's movement
- d. Relating to the Basket Fund grant management and capacity building of the MOs receiving BF.

Activities in category a above and their operational objectives account for approximately 24% of the planned budget.

Activities under "results" and "outputs" relate to categories b, c, and d above and account for approximately 28% of the budget.

Activities related to the grant management unit and MO capacity building account for approximately 20% of the budget.

The BF allocation appears to account for 28% of the total budget.<sup>49</sup>

A theory of change would help understand the logic between Sections 4 and 6. One finds internal inconsistencies with some activities are included in one section but not in the other. Numbering in the

---

<sup>46</sup> p. 21 of Strategic Plan

<sup>47</sup> p. 19 of the Strategic Plan

<sup>48</sup> Some of the activities overlap more than 1 group

<sup>49</sup> These are very rough estimates because when looking at the individually listed activities, more may be to Basket Fund grants and less to the overall GMU administration.



two sections does not match. The expected outcomes i.e. results from the different activities or groups of activities are not clearly stated.

- No baseline information is included to show the current state of Active participation in the Constitution Reform Process (Milestone 1 under Operational Objective 1.a: Advocacy for Legal Reforms). What are these 9 activities expected to achieve? It is not clear what will be different after these activities are completed.
- Gender equality in the SNDP (Milestone 1 under Operational Objective 2a: Gender Equality in National Programmes). The SNDP has already been accepted and is ready for implementation. It is not clear how the 18 activities listed here will ensure that the gender equality will be monitored in the first and subsequent years of implementation.
- Improved Access to Maternal Health Services in 10 Districts within NGOCC Operational Areas Advocated for (Operational objective 3a under Operational Objective 3a Reduction of Maternal Mortality. It is not clear how the 8 activities listed here will improve access to maternal health services. How will access be measured? Which maternal health services will be looked at? Which districts will be selected and why?
- Throughout the planning period, NGOCC advocates for positive coverage of women in the media (Operational objective 4c under Operational Objective 4.c: Media Watch). This is neither included in the Summary of Strategic Plan<sup>50</sup> nor in the Detailed Strategic Plan Budget<sup>51</sup>

It is unclear who will be responsible for activities in section 4 which sometimes lists “MOs” without identifying which. We find that the GMU will be responsible for operational objectives 3A Reduction of Maternal Mortality and 3b Gender-Sensitive HIV/AIDS prevention and question whether it has capacity and competence to fulfil this.

Section 7 on Monitoring System Design does not seem to have taken account of NGOCC’s M & E system developed in 2010. The indicators select do not match the “ideal characteristics of indicators” given on p 11 of the M & E document.<sup>52</sup>

In its current form, the monitoring system will not give information about the progress of the plan.

#### ***4.2.1 Lessons learned from earlier programmes***

In addition to not using the M & E system in this Strategic Plan, there were other recommendations from the 2009 MTR and the 2011 ACBF MTR which are insufficiently addressed in the Plan. Most notably:

- The development and roll out of an advocacy strategy is only budgeted for in Year 1
- Setting up a provincial office is budgeted for only in Year 1. This activity comes under “Revised and Improved NGOCC Coordination strategy in place” which is allocated only 0.4% of the budget. One additional provincial office is insufficient for strengthening provincial presence.

<sup>50</sup> pp. 39 – 40 Strategic Plan

<sup>51</sup> pp. 41 – 62 Strategic Plan

<sup>52</sup> The Appraisal Team notes that these characteristics do not include the criterion that they are feasible so that achievement of some of the indicators in Section 7 appear to be doomed to fail (unless baseline data can show that they are achievable). Examples of this are the indicators: ‘NGO Act repealed by 2012’ and ‘At least one shelter for victims of GBV in each district by 2016’

- The overall improvement in communication and information is allocated 4.7%
- Needs-based capacity building assessment is budgeted for in Years 1, 3, 5 but it is hard to determine to what extent that will be followed up throughout the period.
- Over-dependence on external consultants has undermined capacity of the secretariat. The one output that appears to be geared towards capacity building at the Secretariat is “Well functioning NGOCC Management systems and structures at national and provincial level”. This is allocated only 3.7% of the budget.
- Attempting to find other donors is allocated 2.1% of the budget.

#### **4.2.2 Budget**

The Appraisal Team is not able to assess whether the budget is realistic. Similarly, there is insufficient detail for us to assess allocations to administration vis avis programme. NGOCC says that the budget is based on previous expenditures with an inflationary increase. We simply note that the Year 1 budget is 32% higher than the 2011 expenditures.

*The assessment of sustainability and risks* is very lightly dealt with. While NGOCC can assume that peace, political stability, and economic growth will continue, the Strategic Plan does not address the possibility that there will continue to be weak commitment to gender equality by GRZ. The issue of staff turnover which NGOCC has experienced the past two years is not addressed. The budget includes an item called “Implement the outcomes of the job evaluation” and budgeted for this only in 2012. But, if the job evaluation survey indicates that salaries need to be increased considerably to attract and retain the right calibre of staff, this budget line should be higher and in any case needs an allocation in more than Year 1. Finally, the Plan does not address the possibility that the BF loses donor support.

#### **4.3 Quality of the planning process**

NGOCC took considerable effort to include all MOs in the consultative process for the Strategic Plan from the beginning. It provided oral translation into local languages at the General Assembly (GA) where 80% of MOs attended. Nevertheless, the Appraisal Team heard that some organisations had not been part of the consultative processes before the GA. We also heard that some small MOs had difficulties commenting on the Plan because they had not received a written copy in their local languages which would have enabled them to reflect upon it.

A stakeholder listing is given in the Plan document but it is unclear how the listed stakeholders participated in formulating the Plan. The column showing “Expectation of stakeholder towards NGOCC” appears to be a mix of things. The Plan does not show how NGOCC will work with the different stakeholders: government, cooperating partners, other CSOs, traditional authorities.

The Plan does not give an overview of on-going and planned programmes in the field by other actors such as government (Ministry of Gender and line ministries). This could reflect that there was a change of government round the time the Strategic Plan was being developed and there was uncertainty around the government’s gender priorities and machinery for gender equality. But, the on-going policies of relevant line ministries (e.g. agriculture, health, education), cooperating partners, other CSOs, and other institutions such as the National AIDS Council are also not covered. The Plan makes no links with the SNDP in the background justification and only refers to it in the lists of activities.

The Plan lists resolutions by the MOs and the Governing Board but it is not clear how these have been incorporated in the Plan.

#### 4.4 NGOCC's Capacity and Competence to Deliver

The TORs for the Appraisal call for a Pre-award assessment whose purpose is to evaluate NGOCC's capacity to prudently manage the programme's resources. There are two main areas of concern: a) organisational structure and governance and b) resources. We found that the external financial audit report was submitted after the TORs were written and therefore refer to it for answers to some of the questions under financial management.

##### 4.4.1. Organizational structure and Governance

NGOCC's governance structure comprises four bodies:

1. General Assembly which meets annually and is to take all final decisions made by NGOCC. It is made up of all MOs
2. Board of Trustees whose main functions are a) to act as a conciliator between any disputes among the membership, Governing Board, Secretariat and outside bodies and b) safeguard NGOCC's assets including its good name
3. Board of Governors whose main functions are to provide overall policy guidance, direct the formulation and review of the Strategic Plan, approve reports, manage NGOCC assets, appoint the external auditor, consider new members for approval, determine the conditions of work for the Secretariat, and is accountable for the Executive Director.

There are twelve members of the Board plus the Executive Director who is an ex-officio member. The Board should meet quarterly. There are currently ten sub-committees (standing committees) which are to meet at least once a year. In addition there is an Executive Committee of the Board made up of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, Secretary, Treasurer, Legal Advisor, and Publicity Secretary who must be Lusaka-based. It meets as required in the absence of the full Board.

4. NGOCC's Constitution does not state what the function of the secretariat should be. It notes that a Secretariat should be established and that the duties of the Executive Director are "...to manage and conduct NGOCC business in accordance with the policies and decisions taken by the General Assembly and the Board of Governors."<sup>53</sup> The Executive Director is accountable to the Board and is to perform any other duties as so directed. Other points in the Constitution about the Secretariat relate to "Vacancy in Position of Executive Director", "Appointment of Staff", "Conditions of Service of Staff", and "Disciplinary Code".

The Board Chairperson is the chief spokesperson for NGOCC. The Board of Trustees shall not make any public statements about NGOCC without the approval of the Board.

The 2009 MTR, the 2012 Baseline Survey, and the ACBF MTR (indirectly) has found NGOCC's governance structure to be sound.

It is clear from the minutes of the last Executive Committee meeting (among other evidence) that NGOCC's Board of Governors can be actively involved in NGOCC policy and direction. We found the boundaries between the Secretariat and the Board to be a bit blurry. It was explained that due to staff turnover and vacancies, the Board had been more active in the past year than usual.

---

<sup>53</sup> Arrangement of Articles, Amended 2008, Part V, pt. 62 – 67.

#### **4.4.2 Human resources**

The Appraisal Team understands that NGOCC has struggled in recent years to fill some central positions, most notably the Finance and Administration Manager and M & E officer (still vacant). In the GMU, the Grant Manager and M & E officer were new in 2011. Moreover the Programmes manager position has only recently been established through the ACBF grant and is not a permanent position. NGOCC finds that it difficult to compete with salaries offered in the INGO sector.

Although a secretariat job evaluation has been conducted, it is not clear how NGOCC will act upon it and whether it will offer competitive salaries. We note that the ACBF grant “tops up” some salary costs. Similarly, the Board of Governors is dependent on voluntary participation and for a nine month period in 2011 – 2012, there was no Treasurer. The ACBF MTR was critical of the functioning of the project sub-committee for their project which may reflect difficulties finding volunteers to serve on the sub-committees.

These vacancies, NGOCC’s stated problem of competing with the INGO sector, problems retaining senior staff, and the ACBF “topping up” of salaries may indicate that NGOCC has not kept up-to-date about the salary levels required for recruiting and retaining the quality of staff it needs.

We have examined the job descriptions of the middle and top level staff. We note some shortcomings but think these should be considered within the constraints noted above and that the secretariat job evaluation has been conducted:

- Communication and Advocacy Coordinator position is solely concerned with the promotion of NGOCC and not with the advocacy of critical gender equality issues. We note that requirements for the position do not include experience, knowledge, or demonstrated skills with modern ICT although the Documentation office position and to a lesser degree, the Information Officer positions require this.
- Finance and Administration Manager has responsibility for both finance and human resources but the required minimum qualifications and experience relate only to finance
- Programmes manager position does not have any requirements relating to M & E although that is a listed function in the “purpose” of the position
- Capacity Building and Networking Coordinator position does not require any formal qualification, knowledge, or skills in training although experience of that is required for the Capacity Building Officer
- It is the NGOCC and GMU Accounts officers that prepare the reports, not the unit managers

#### **4.4.3 Internal policy and management environment**

The Appraisal Team asked for a number of policies and strategies that had been referred to in the MTRs and which we thought were most relevant to the Appraisal. We found:

- That a new advocacy policy did not exist. The current Communications and Advocacy Policy Implementation Guidelines date from before 2003 and directs attention to NGOCC’s information sharing and media relations and is not related to how NGOCC will advocate around relevant gender equality issues
- The Monitoring and Evaluation system, 2010, (as noted in the section on the End-Review) does not appear to have been implemented. NGOCC said that the process for implementing was delayed but it is difficult to accept that given the central importance of this in the 2009 MTR and the 2011 ACBF MTR, that this has not gotten further.
- The sustainability policy dates from 2004 although a Resource Mobilization and Fundraising Strategy for 2012 – 2016 has been drafted as an outcome of training conducted early in 2011. It is unclear why this is still in draft form and does not appear to have been widely circulated.

- The Appraisal Team did not find an overall arching capacity building strategy or information that provided an overview of capacity building needs among MOs.

The Appraisal Team examined the minutes of the last ACBF project steering committee, (which is a Board sub-committee) held in April 2012 This is the sub-committee which was found by the ACBF MTR to have "...not adequately fulfilled its stewardship role for which it was established" having met only 25% of the times it was supposed to during the review period.

Since the Appraisal Team had only requested minutes of the most recent sub-committee meetings, we do not know how many times the Project sub-committee had met after the availability of the ACBF MTR in February 2011 and April 2012.

The April 2012 minutes portray an active and engaged sub-committee with an eye for detail and a stated intention of not being a rubber stamp to approve ACBF funded items and activities. It is interesting to note that when looking at the Procurement Plan, the sub-committee commented that the USD 500/day consultancy fee was low and should be checked before the final workplan and budget are submitted. This is perhaps another indication that NGOCC has not been keeping up-to-date on real costs for different activities.

#### **4.4.4 Financial Management**

The assessment of the financial system is largely based on:

- NGOCC's "Financial system and procedures manual: 2011
- TORs for the Finance sub-committee, Finance sub-committee report for second quarter 2012
- The external Audit reports from 2010 and 2011 (not been approved by the RNE at the time of the appraisal) for NGOCC and the GMU.
- Meetings with NGOCC's Finance and Administration Manager, NGOCC Accounts Officer, and the GMU Grant Manager.

"The Financial system and procedures manual" is a thorough guide concerning accounting responsibility and procedures, controls governing bank and cash management, controls governing acquisition, monitoring, and reporting of NGOCC's fixed assets, and procedures for controlling the authorisation of expenditure. We note that at the last Finance sub-committee meeting, changes here were recommended to move more authority to the Secretariat.

The "Financial system and procedures manual" does not cover internal reporting procedures other than the quarterly, six monthly and annually reports for donors. Such reports are not designed to guide management. The Appraisal Team does not have sufficient information to assess the internal reporting procedures, other than the comments offered by the Financial Audit.

In the 2011 "Matters Arising" Financial audit report, it reported that "Our review of the accounting and internal control systems in operation at the organisation and the evaluating of key internal controls revealed certain matters that we believe require immediate attention." Here they refer to "material weaknesses" in the incorrect recognition and apportionment money from the RNE, reconciliations of the control account to sub-ledgers, the management of fixed assets, inconsistencies and discrepancies encountered when carrying out the audit due to staff turnover, inadequate handover when staff change, and the lack of institutional memory.

Moreover, the reports notes “matters arising from the 2010 audit”<sup>54</sup> which do not appear to have been adequately addressed in 2011: inaccurate PAYE computation which continued in 2011, grant capitalisation, expensing of capital expenditure, record keeping in North West province. We note also that the 2010 Financial Audit found a co-mingling of donor funds which again points to inadequate bank management although this was corrected by 2011.

The Grant Management Manual calls for a 50/40/10 disbursement of BF yet, the 2011 Audit report notes a significant deficiency regarding project implementation for one of the projects.

Regarding the adequacy of the external Financial Audit, we note:

- That for 2010 and 2011 the letters to management state that the “financial statement present fairly” and that “...financial performance and cash flows for the year ended in accordance with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles” despite the “material weaknesses” noted both years
- In 2010, there was a “payable” of ZMK 2.4 billion to the GMU which appears as an expense under expenses for the GMU in 2011 GMU
- The Financial audit is consistently late
- A discrepancy in reporting of 2010 GMU expenses for “Visitations” is different in the 2010 and in 2011 audits (ZMK 70 338 000 in the 2011 Audit and ZMK 76 645 000 in the 2010 Audit).

Given these the above, we question the adequacy of the external Financial Audit.

The Governing Board’s Financial sub-committee includes the Treasurer and is supposed to meet at least quarterly. The Appraisal Team only asked to see the minutes of the most recent Finance sub-committee meeting so we do not have a complete picture. However, we found it puzzling that the meeting was held in August 2012 but was for the second quarter of 2012. It appears that the Finance sub-committee had been recently re-constituted which, if true, may explain some of the weaknesses in the financial management for 2011. Nevertheless, if this was a first meeting, we wonder why the 2011 Financial Audit was not discussed. Attention was given to TOR for the 2012 Auditors and an “interim audit” which should be completed by September 2012. This needs further explanation.

---

<sup>54</sup> A 2010 ‘Matters Arising’ report was not provided to the Appraisal Team so we have only seen references to financial management weaknesses in 2010 from other reports.

## **5. DISCUSSION – A CHANGED LANDSCAPE, BACK TO THE BASICS, STRENGTHENED MANAGEMENT, CLARIFICATION OF THE PURPOSE OF THE BASKET FUND, AND YOUNG PEOPLE**

### **5.1 A changed landscape**

NGOCC is recognised as the “voice of the women’s movement” in Zambia. It is well known at the household level through its frequent media appearances. It has tremendous convening capacity at national and local levels. It is recognised by civil society actors as a player in the field.

The Gender Sector Analysis by DFID and Irish Aid described an environment where there is a lack of a clear vision for the women’s movement among CSOs, a lack of a coordinated approach to gender equality among the cooperating partners, and a lack of clarity regarding government commitment and priorities around gender equality.

NGOCC has developed a strategic plan in this diffuse arena around which there is no single burning issue to rally the women’s movement. This is reflected in some of the statements captured in the Strategic Plan consultations with the Lusaka-based MOs: “loss of oneness in the women’s movement”, “adoption of one issue NGOCC could rally around”, “fostering unity”, “support from network not forthcoming”.

Meanwhile other areas are more clearly defined: health, HIV and AIDS, education, agriculture, human rights. The Paris Agreement on donor harmonisation has changed the landscape of funding arrangements with the moves to sector wide agreements and budget support,

The MDGs and the human rights movement have also changed the landscape for the women’s movement. When first launched, the MDGs were woefully gender insensitive. Only MDG 3 reflected a concern for gender disparities and it did so inadequately. However, those working in child health (MDG 4), maternal mortality (MDG 5), and especially HIV & AIDS (MDG 6) quickly became aware that they would not be effective if they did not address underlying gender imbalances and norms that were adversely affecting their areas of work. These, together with education (MDG 2) and poverty and food (MDG 1) and the human rights movement are large arenas with scope for traditional “gender” organisations to work. However, a 2009 review of aid effectiveness in the health sector found that “CSOs are still weak in Zambia, and those representing women and vulnerable communities are no exception. There are some national organisations for gender equality, but their involvement in the health sector is marginal. Occasionally, some representatives attend meetings in the health sector, but their main priority and area of work is fighting for women’s rights in the broader political context.”<sup>55</sup>

The Paris Agenda (confirmed in Busan 2011) Agreement has also changed the landscape in funding arrangements for CSO with different modalities for support. The Gender Sector Analysis points to the un-coordinated approach to gender that the cooperating partners have taken. NGOCC can take a proactive role to get donors to act in a more concerted manner, meeting with them to define their roles, priorities, responsibilities, and funding modalities.

NGOCC’s request at the 2011 Donor Round Table meeting to have a coordinated approach for review is fully understandable and reasonable. The Appraisal Team wishes that NGOCC had pursued this

---

<sup>55</sup> Action for Global Health, Javier Pereira, 2009, ‘Zambia: Aid effectiveness in the health sector: A case study’

more actively. Donors sometimes need to be reminded of international commitments expectations of harmonised donor actions.

## 5.2 Back to the Basics - Taking the work to the next level

Zambia, strengthened by a group of seasoned gender activists, has had a strong women's movement. Moreover, a meeting with nine large Lusaka-based member organisations showed that there was complete agreement with NGOCC's vision, mission, and values. Attending were the Association of Zambian Women in Mining, National Council of Catholic Women, SWAAZ, WfC, WILDAF, YWCA, ZARD, ZAW, and ZNWL, The organisations represented have specialised areas of focus applicable to a wide range of gender issues.

The Gender Sector Analysis lists four building blocks needed for gender mainstreaming:

- robust gender analysis to inform policy making and policy implementation
- skills to translate analysis into policies and programmes
- resources and capacity within government and CSOs
- a cadre of gender experts to provide technical support to sectors<sup>56</sup>

These building blocks are all things that NGOCC and their large MOs have the foundation for developing and providing. But, they will be doing this in the changed landscape.

Until GRZ shows what its priorities are going to be, Strategic objectives 1 & 2 in the Strategic Plan are important:

- By 2016 NGOCC has influenced gender-sensitive and responsive legislation, with operational objectives related to advocacy for various legal reforms and domestication of International agreements and protocols
- By 2016, NGOCC has contributed to the advancement and protection of women's rights with operational objectives related to engendering national policies, budgets, and processes and promoting greater representation of women at national and local levels

Concentrating on Strategic objectives 1 & 2 requires a clear advocacy strategy where **for each issue** it is necessary to:

- Identify the target group audience e.g. national government, local authorities, politicians, other CSOs, donors, general public (considering age, gender, geographical location)
- Decide on the central messages and goal for each issue
- Decide the advocacy activities and in which arenas should they take place
- Identify NGOCC's allies and agents/drivers of change
- Agree on the lead MO for this advocacy effort
- Identify NGOCC's niche, role, functions for each issue in its support to the lead MO

It cannot be ignored that with its diverse membership, NGOCC faces great challenges in fulfilling another of its core functions: capacity building. The capacity needs of the smaller CBOs are different from the larger MOs. Much attention has been given to raising the management and governance competence of the small rural based organisations. The small MOs visited by the Appraisal Team that received NGOCC training have all commented upon its benefit.

Nevertheless the large MOs also have capacity building needs. Entering and working effectively in the changed landscape requires different skills such as mapping the arena, identifying the key actors,

---

<sup>56</sup> Jennings, Mary and Mpala Nkonkomalimba, 2011, 'Gender Sector Analysis and Mapping of Civil Society and Cooperating Partners Initiatives'



understanding processes and key events, and understanding funding modalities and requirements. This is a potential area for both NGOCC and its large MOs. And, as with the advocacy strategy, it is important that NGOCC and the MOs identify their roles to ensure complementarity, best use of comparative advantage, and synergies.

## 5.3 Strengthened management

### 5.3.1 Implementing Lessons Learned

NGOCC's Strategic Plan 2007 – 2011 was subject to two mid-term reviews. Arising from these is the Baseline Survey carried out earlier this year. Many of the same conclusions have been repeated by the different reviewers. Among the central conclusions are the following:

1. There is an urgent need for an operational M & E system
2. There is a need for an advocacy strategy
3. Capacity building programmes need to meet the needs of all MOs
4. An over dependence on external consultants has undermined the competence of NGOCC staff
5. Provincial level presence should be strengthened
6. Information and communication systems are weak.
7. The BF is vulnerable without other funders than the RNE

This Appraisal is in full agreement with the above. NGOCC has a solid reputation now but unless these and other issues are addressed immediately, that reputation could be eroded in five years.

### 5.3.2 Financial management

Transparency around financial management and the ability to show results are essential for continuing support. NGOCC has suffered from large turnover of staff in recent years, including the Finance Manager position. The current Finance and Administration Manager has been in post a relatively short period and it is widely acknowledged that she did not benefit from a proper handover. But having one competent person in place is not enough. RNE has stated that employing a fully qualified accountant (CIMA or ACCA) is of critical importance. This is a conditionality for support for the new strategic plan.

The 2011 and 2010 Financial Audits indicate that the overall financial management is not up to the standard required for an organisation whose main asset is its good name. As noted earlier under 4.4.4, the 2011 financial audit found five “material weaknesses” which need to be addressed and that in four of the areas of “material weakness” identified in the 2010 financial audit, recommendations had not been fully implemented.

The Appraisal Team does not think strengthening financial management can be adequately done by bringing in external technical assistance. The overall culture of financial management and showing results needs to be developed through “learning by doing” or “learning on the job”. NGOCC has two ways to ensure sound financial management - through the Executive Director<sup>57</sup> and the Board's Finance Sub-Committee.

The Board's Finance Sub-Committee is supposed to meet at least once a quarter.<sup>58</sup> The Sub-Committee's report for the second quarter 2012 indicates that the committee had been inactive for some time. It recommended that it meet monthly “so as to provide oversight on the financial management especially that there were no previous meetings. This shall stand until such a time when

<sup>57</sup> The first duty listed on the Executive Director's job description is “Accountable for all aspects of operations, including strategic planning and budget, financial management:”

<sup>58</sup> Terms of Reference for the Finance Sub Committee of the NGOCC Board of Governors (undated)

the committee feels that they can meet every quarter.”<sup>59</sup> In two of the management responses to the nine audit report’s areas of material weakness, it was said that the “Board Finance Committee was now in place to provide relevant oversight”.

External consultants have been used for a number of NGOCC’s organisational strengthening initiatives: developing the M & E system, drafting a Resource Mobilization and Fundraising Strategy, providing gender expertise, and carrying out the Baseline survey. The Appraisal Team did not find any tangible sustained outcomes of these instances of external assistance.

### ***5.3.3 Theory of Change Frameworks Linked to the Monitoring and Evaluation System***

A common thread that ran through the appraisals for the 2007 – 2011 Strategic Plan, the Program Document for 2010 – 2011, and the request for bridging finance in August 2012 is that the logframe *needs to be clear with inputs, activities, outputs, outcomes, and impacts*. The observation that NGOCC is over dependent on external consultants and that this has undermined the Secretariat’s competence is exemplified by the presentation of the Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016 with its confusion of outputs, results, milestones, strategy, operational goals, and strategic goals. The lack of using the M & E framework from 2010 underscores this problem yet again. The repeated recommendation about M & E reflects the need for a coherent logframe. RNE has stated that support for the Strategic Plan will be dependent on NGOCC developing an effective M & E system that will measure results.

### ***5.3.4 Communication & information***

Communication and information technology has developed quickly. Participating in the changed donor landscape requires up to date communication technology. The ACBF MTR noted that NGOCC’s ICT needs updating. We see that NGOCC’s webpage still lists 106 MOs while the draft 2011 Annual report says that membership has risen to 109. Few documents are posted, news items are rare. Links to information sources are quite limited. We are unable to find any information about how to apply to the BF on NGOCC’s webpage.

Similarly, communication for those who cannot use electronic means should be improved. The fieldtrip provided a clear example of a letter regarding possible funding that was delivered far too late for an organisation to apply for it. (Note NGOCC’s comment in the Endnote.) The Appraisal Team also heard about how important it is to provide information and training in local languages. Many more people who are often marginalised would benefit if training were provided local areas rather than in Lusaka.

### ***5.3.5 Strengthened provincial presence***

Improved communication is one of the reasons the Appraisal Team is strongly recommending strengthened presence in the provinces. Another is that there are many sectors working at local levels that NGOCC MOs would benefit from networking and sharing information with. These are agriculture, HIV & AIDS, health, education. An active PLO could help make those connections. If decentralisation is implemented, a PLO could also facilitate links with local authorities. On the fieldtrip to Copperbelt, we found that the PLO is the chairperson of Northwest province’s gender sub-committee. *Maintaining women’s centres is one of NGOCC’s core functions* as stated in the Constitution.. The Appraisal Team finds one additional provincial office in the next five years to be too few. An NGOCC presence in each province should be the aim. It is however, important to carefully tailor the PLO job descriptions for work at local level and to provide her/him with the working conditions needed to carry out her/his work effectively.

---

<sup>59</sup> Finance Committee Report for the Second Quarter 2012, dated August 2012.

## 5.4 Clarifying the purpose of the Basket Fund

Using intermediaries to support CSOs is one of the modalities that is increasingly used as part of donor harmonisation. The Basket Fund is one such arrangement. Originally started to reduce transaction costs on the part of donors, it is a model that is being used in many places. The BF has been in place for 10 years but its purpose has never been explicitly articulated by the RNE or NGOCC. For RNE, the use of BF grants should be based on a) the Norwegian *Action Plan for Women's rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation 2007 – 2013*, b) Norwegian policy regarding support to civil society organisations, and c) RNE's priorities in Zambia.

One can question whether being an umbrella organisation can be combined with being a donor i.e. the BF. A 2007 study carried out for the Nordic Plus countries looked at different models for support to CSOs.<sup>60</sup> In their study, they note the possible weaknesses of indirect support through an intermediary like NGOCC. But they also note many more strengths which we think pertain here:<sup>61</sup>

- Ability to reach more CBOs, wider geographical coverage
- Ability to channel larger funds
- Can provide economies of scale
- Umbrella organisations with thematic competence can provide systematic strengthening by engaging many CSOs
- Umbrella organisation can strengthen networking, umbrella activities, mutual learning, capacities
- Detailed response to CSO proposals enables incremental improvement
- Capacity development using tailor-made approaches suitable for different levels of CSOs and phases of proposals
- Transparency may be high because CSOs are closer to the umbrella organisation than they are to donors
- Transparency can be high when objectives and procedures are defined in a systematic and formal manner

NGOCC's view of the BF is also unclear. While hotly debated when deciding to take on the BF, NGOCC now has 10 years' experience with it. An assessment of the impact of the BF on NGOCC's core functions has not been carried out. This requires serious discussion among all the MOs (NGOs and CBOs). It is not clear what the costs of the BF are to NGOCC in terms of carrying out its core functions but it does appear that there is a fragmentation of effort, especially with regard to capacity building.

It is imperative that the NGOCC and RNE together with any potential BF funders have a serious discussion about purpose of the BF and how to achieve long-term, lasting results. Should it be used for activities that are prioritised in each five-year programme – in which case these might change with each new programme period? Should BF grants go towards enhancing women in development (which is a strong component of the Norwegian *Action Plan for Women's Rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation 2007 – 2013*)<sup>62</sup> or should they only go to organisations which demonstrate gender transformative potential? Does the RNE find value in NGOCC's extensive reach into remote areas that are often overlooked by others? Or, in reaching people who are often marginalised? The BF means more to small CBOs than simply the funding; it brings along support through training and monitoring. Members feel it adds voice to their small and often unheard voices.

<sup>60</sup> Scanteam, 2008, 'Support Models for CSOs at Country Level'

<sup>61</sup> Ibid, p 38

<sup>62</sup> Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2010, *Action Plan for Women's Rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation 2007 – 2013*

The RNE and NGOCC may differ about the purpose of the BF. Full discussion of these differences is to be encouraged in order to come to a robust way forward. NGOCC's Board, Secretariat, and MOs should be actively engaged in these discussions.

The RNE may see value in continuing to support and strengthen small CBOs carrying out income-generating activities without deliberate gender transformation. This has serious implications for NGOCC's capacity building and management strengthening efforts. If a substantial portion of the BF is used to support small CBOs whose main focus is on income-generating activities, can it be moved outside NGOCC and established as a separate Fund? Or could those CBOs be supported from other more sector specific funders in, for example, HIV & AIDS or agriculture? If exploring other potential funders, one would need to ensure that they have a gender sensitive perspective and can point to a record of having been supportive of women's organisations.

If the purpose of the BF is to enhance NGOCC's mission, it should then be kept within NGOCC. Programming, resources, and expected results would be different than if a central focus of the BF is placed on strengthening small CSOs.

*An M & E system for BF impact cannot be developed until there is clarity about its purpose.*

One of the key informants said that NGOCC faces a dilemma by trying to be a movement and having coordinating functions which require some standardized procedures. This is further exacerbated by the BF which requires even more "bureaucratisation". This is an issue that should be squarely faced both within NGOCC and with the RNE. The impact of the BF on NGOCC has not been examined properly earlier. How much of NGOCC's efforts should go to increasing gender awareness, governance, and management of the CBOs? What are the views of the other donors to NGOCC's non-BF activities? Could they support the BF?

Questions about the BF's sustainability are apparent. The status of NGOCC's draft resource mobilization and fundraising strategy is unclear. While the Appraisal team viewed positively some of the identified resource mobilization strategies such as engaging the private sector, mapping community assets, exploring opportunities arising from corporate social responsibility interest, and using more young volunteers, it appears that there has been no further progress in moving the resource mobilization strategy forward.

Another feature of the changed donor landscape is that Zambia is securing its status as a middle-income country. Many donors have started talking about phasing out their work as the Netherlands and DANIDA already have. Developing sustainability plans for the existing BF is therefore crucial in the next two years.

Summary information about BF grants should be regularly compiled and easily available. Despite repeated requests from the Appraisal Team for summary information about the BF grants, this was not received. Without greater transparency around the use of the BF and its outcomes, it is difficult to see how it can attract more donors.

Information about the availability of BF grants should be widely circulated. Currently it is made known to MOs through letters and the PLO. Information about it should be on the website.

It should be pointed out, that the BF grants comprised about one-third of NGOCC's annual expenditure last year. Yet it was administered by only three people. (Note NGOCC's comment in the Endnote). It is quite admirable that they have been able to carry out the extensive pre-award activities and account for the financial inputs as well as they have. It has been said that MOs join "just to

access the BF.” The BF is not simply the financial grant. Along with it comes a fair amount of support in the form of training and monitoring. More than once we heard that it meant a lot to an organisation that they were noticed -that someone knew about them.

## **5.5 Young people**

Finally, there is another important issue that has not often been raised by other reviews but was very obvious to the Appraisal Team: the involvement of young people in the movement. This is an area that requires immediate attention. Clearly both a mainstreaming and a targeted approach are needed. Efforts-to-date to mainstream have not been effective. A targeted approach with quotas for various activities is needed. A single person on the Governing Board is not enough. There is a need for a critical mass of young people so that their voices are heard. Quotas for their participation in training activities and in media and public events should be considered. When developing the advocacy strategies, youth issues should be identified and young people who can publicly advocate for them should be prominent in NGOCC’s face to the public.

### Some comments from NGOCC on the Report

Pt. 3.4.3 last paragraph: “The report needs to highlight the fact that the trainings planned for by NGOCC during the strategic period under review did not necessarily mean training MOs in the priority thematic areas. This is given the fact that MOs access funding for projects in line with their mandates and where they have experience and expertise on the ground. NGOCC focused on providing capacity enhancement in the areas of financial management, proposal writing, gender and development, lobby and advocacy, among others. These interventions were meant to support our MOs as they implemented their projects for better participation of their members and more focus on interpreting results of their projects from a gender perspective.”

Pt. 3.4.4 “...Where GMU staff are not part of the monitoring teams, a prior review meeting is done between GMU staff and those on the teams which are either PLOs or other programme staff from secretariat. This is part of teamwork and experience sharing to leverage resources but also ensure sustainability in terms of human resources monitoring BF projects.”

5.3.4 regarding letter informing about funding possibilities. NGOCC writes, “...earlier communication had been made with all MOs in the previous month about the funding opportunity. The report should state that the letters were being sent for record purposes and for those that may have missed the earlier communication to respond in the shortest possible time unlike missing out completely from the opportunity.”

5.4 Last paragraph regarding the BF administration. “...GMU staff are supported by the Board and all units in secretariat in terms of strategic support, programme support in terms of implementation including trainings, member affiliation support, monitoring by PLOs and other programme staff as well as general administrative services provided by support staff like drivers, office assistants, among others.”

## **Annex 1 Terms of Reference**

### **Draft Terms of Reference for an appraisal of NGOCC strategic plan 2012-2016 and a Brief End review Covering the Period February 2011-December 2011(ZAM-10/0024)**

#### **1.0 Background**

The Non-governmental Organization Coordinating Council (NGOCC) is an umbrella organization with a membership of about 110 women's organizations engaged in gender and development issues in Zambia. NGOCC's mission is to champion women empowerment and gender equality and equity through coordinated institutional and capacity development to members, advocacy and linkages with local and international partners. The Norwegian Embassy has a long history of supporting NGOCC from as far back as 1985 when NGOCC was established. The Norwegian support has assisted NGOCC develop into a strong civil society organization championing women's rights in Zambia. The Embassy provides both institutional support and sub-grants. The sub-granting mechanism (basket funds) was introduced in 2003 to facilitate efficiency in the delivery of aid and to streamline the Embassy portfolio.

The Embassy's recent support to NGOCC has been towards the NGOCC strategic plan covering the period 2007 to 2011 both for institutional support and sub-granting. NGOCC had some left over activities and has requested the Embassy to consider a no-cost extension. The Embassy has approved a no cost extension up to June 2012 to allow NGOCC complete some of the remaining activities. NGOCC has submitted to the Embassy its next strategic plan for the period 2012 to 2016. The Embassy intends to support NGOCC's strategic plan and has incorporated planned support to NGOCC in the Embassy plan for 2012.

Despite the effort that NGOCC is making in addressing gender disparities and women's rights issues in Zambia, there is still a lot of work to be done. The gender inequality index for Zambia ranks Zambia at 124<sup>th</sup> out of 137 countries which is extremely low. This is evidence that NGOCC faces enormous obstacles and challenges to contribute to creating equity and equality between men and women.

The NGOCC strategic plan is designed to accelerate the responses to some of NGOCC's priority areas of focus on gender in the next five years. The development of the strategic plan has been done through a long consultative process. The theme of the strategic plan is "getting back to basics". This denotes a commitment to re-energize the work on gender and women's rights issues and consolidating the critical mass needed to advocate and lobby for positive change that will enhance the socio-economic, political and cultural rights of women. Revisiting the Beijing platform for action has been central in guiding the development of the strategic plan by way of assessing NGOCC's performance on the twelve critical areas of concern.

The strategic planning period covers four strategic objectives that are further divided into a number of operational objectives as follows:

By 2016, NGOCC has influenced gender-sensitive and responsive legislation.

By 2016, NGOCC has contributed to the advancement and protection of women's rights.

By 2016, inequalities in access to health services are reduced.

By 2016, Zambia has a media landscape which contains the voice of women.

NGOCC has always recognized the need for its strategies to take an orientation from the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (the Fourth World Conference on Women, 1995), which also upholds the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), which was adopted in 1979. In addition NGOCC is further guided by the provisions of Zambia's National Gender Policy, which directly draws on the Beijing Platform for Action in its

critical areas of concern. In this regard, NGOCC's new Strategic Plan 2012 - 2016 has been formulated in alignment to the critical areas of concern as outlined in the Beijing Platform for Action.

To assess the development and impact of the program two reviews have so far been undertaken during the 2007-2011 period. A review of the basket funds was conducted in 2008. In 2011 a review was carried out by the African Capacity Building Foundation (ACBF). This end of project review should build on the recommendations from these two reviews. Therefore, this review is generally focused to the period February 2011 to December 2011 only.

### **1.1 Purpose**

This assignment has two specific purposes. Firstly, to undertake a brief review of the period February 2011 to December 2011 i.e. the latter part of the strategic planning period 2007-2011 and secondly to appraise the proposed NGOCC strategic plan for the period 2012-2016. Has NGOCC successfully achieved its outputs and realized its objectives during the period under review? The team will document key lessons learned during the period. The brief review will provide useful insights and feed into the appraisal of Norwegian support to NGOCC's strategic plan 2012-2016<sup>63</sup>.

Where necessary it is expected that the team will provide substantiated advice on changes to the strategic Plan as well as suggest areas or components to be included that would enhance the overall quality of the program.

The combined appraisal and brief end review should be structured according to relevant Norad and MFA manuals. A detailed scope of work can be found below. However, if the team is aware of issues which can influence the project and are not mentioned in the TOR, then these issues should be included.

### **1.2 Scope of Work/Priority Issues**

The brief end-review shall assess to what extent the program has reached its objectives and document the main experiences gained from the program. It should further document what can be learned and improved if Norwegian support were to be continued in the next five years. It should also consider that a number of reviews have been conducted in the past. As mentioned in the background above, this end review restricts itself only to the period of the last review to the end of the strategic plan i.e. February 2011 to December 2011. Considerations on progress on the no cost extension activities in 2012 can be made. The review should draw on the recommendations of previous reviews in order to avoid duplication of effort. Other reviews conducted before the strategic planning period 2007-2011 may be referred to if deemed necessary. A review of the basket funds was conducted in 2005 and a review of both the institutional and basket funds was also undertaken in 2006.

## **2.0 Brief End Review NGOCC February to December 2011**

The review shall concentrate on the period February 2011- December 2011, but if found relevant to the end review, events before this period can be taken into account and referred to. The report shall among other things spotlight the results achieved. It shall cover but not necessarily be limited to the following issues:

### **Impact**

- To what extent is the programme contributing to improving the status of women, women's rights, reducing gender disparities and what positive impact has it had on gender equality and equity.
- How has the intervention affected the well being of women in Zambia (intended or unintended)?

---

<sup>63</sup> The strategic Plan 2012-2016 constitutes the program document



- What do member organizations of NGOCC perceive to be the effects of the program?
- To what extent does the intervention contribute to capacity development and strengthening of NGOCC member organizations?
- Would the identified changes have taken place without the program?

### **Effectiveness**

- To what extent do development changes accord with the planned results of the program?
- Is the identified development the result of intervention rather than external factors?
- What are the reasons for the achievement or non achievement of results?
- What can be done to make NGOCC more effective?
- Was the established monitoring and evaluation system effective in directing implementation of the programme components?
- To what extent have the programme activities delivered as planned?
- Briefly assess the results achieved through the project as compared to their set goals, objectives and outputs.

### **Efficiency**

- How efficiently are resources utilized?
- Could more of the same result have been produced with the main resources?
- Relevance
- Is the program consistent with the livelihood strategies and conditions of women in Zambia?
- Does the program support country ownership?
- How technically adequate is the program to respond to current challenges women in Zambia face?
- Can the NGOCC program be replicated elsewhere?
- How consistent is the NGOCC program with Norwegian policies and priorities?
- How consistent is it with Zambia's development priorities?

### **Sustainability**

- Did relevant stakeholders participate in planning activities?
- Are member organizations characterized by good governance including effective management and organization?
- How much support does NGOCC enjoy with relevant local institutions and authorities?
- Does NGOCC have the financial capacity to maintain the benefits after donor support is withdrawn?
- Is the program to any extent harmful to the environment?
- What are the economic, financial, environmental and institutional sustainability issues?

### **2.1 Other Specific Issues**

- Review how the recommendations from the previous reviews were followed up in the design of the last phase of the project.
- Review the risk assessment and management of risk.
- Assess who are the other donors contributing to the institutional support to NGOCC and how is their support contributing to influencing NGOCC achieve its objectives?
- At institutional level, Assess the performance of the implementers of the project including:
- Coordination capacity of NGOCC

- Management (planning, management/implementation, reporting)
- Governance (quality of overall leadership and policy guidance from the board, governance structure)
- Members involvement and role of member organizations in governance
- Financial accounting systems and practice
- Procurement practice
- Assess proposed new staffing structure
- Cooperation with the Zambian authorities particularly the Ministry of Gender and Child Development (formerly Gender and Child Development division).
- Assess the added value of NGOCC's networking efforts both locally and abroad.
- The extent to which rural women are benefiting or otherwise.
- Capacity to utilize funds in a given time

## **2.2. Specific Issues of the Basket Funds (Sub-Granting Mechanism)**

The Impact, Efficiency, Effectiveness and sustainability of the Grant Management Unit:

### **Impact**

- Is the basket fund contributing to building systemic impact or is there fragmentation of effort in some parts?
- Are there any negative effects that the basket funds may have created between NGOCC and its members or amongst member organizations?
- To what extent has the capacities of member organizations been built
- To what extent is the basket fund contributing to enhancing the social, economic, cultural and political status of women

### **Efficiency**

- Efficiency of disbursement frequency to member organizations and reporting.
- How can NGOCC improve the terms and rules for disbursements and reporting for better efficiency (reducing the gap between administrative expenditure and basket funds absorption)?
- The financial management and procurement practice.
- How are lessons learnt from the field visits considered in the program?

### **Effectiveness**

- Is the basket fund contributing to enhanced advocacy and lobbying skills. Is the critical mass needed for advocacy being built particularly in the rural areas or is the lobbying and advocacy role of NGOCC been weakened? Are there any changes in the communities in attitudes and provision of basic services emanating from NGOCC members lobbying and advocacy efforts including changes at policy level?

- How is the process of awarding grants implemented and what needs to be changed? What is the level of transparency?
- How effective is the monitoring and what tools are being used?
- Are the thematic focus areas for the grants matched with the mandate of NGOCC?

### **Sustainability**

- What efforts is NGOCC making to attract other funding organizations to the basket fund?

### **3.0 Appraisal of the NGOCC Strategic Plan 2012-2016**

#### General issues:

1. Briefly describe current government policy, priorities and plans in the gender sector.
2. Briefly describe on-going and planned programs in the field of gender by other actors.
3. Briefly assess potential financing sources for NGOCC in particular for the sub granting funds.
4. Briefly describe what the key structural barriers to gender equality exist in Zambia. Are these properly addressed in the programme document?

#### **NGOCC Strategic Plan 2012-2016 Related Issues:**

5. Assess NGOCC's capacity and competence to deliver.
6. Assess the budget in terms of realism. Particularly focus on allocations to administration vis a vis program
7. Assess the relevance of the programme with regards to gender equality, equity and women's rights in light of the critical areas of concern in the Beijing platform for action.
8. Assess the quality of the underlying analysis and planning process of the programme, including participation of relevant stakeholders in the process.
9. Are there lessons to be learned from experience with the previous strategic plan or other similar programmes which should be included in the program?
10. Are there other planned or on-going gender programs that may influence the planned programme? How will NGOCC coordinate and cooperate with other gender programs like the one implemented by the Ministry of Gender and Child development?
11. Assess the relevance of Norwegian support to NGOCC in relation to Zambia's priorities and plans.
12. Assess the possibilities for co-operation with other institutions and programmes.

#### **Program Questions**

13. Assessment of Program Design
  - The quality of the design elements, (goal, purpose, outputs, inputs), e.g. consistency and realism

- The quality of the Indicators and Means of Verification (data sets) identified at all levels of the design elements. Are the indicators sufficient and appropriate to give valid and reliable information on outcome and impact?
  - The quality, simplicity and user friendliness of the monitoring system for the program
  - Are relevant and reliable baseline data available?
  - Are relevant risk factors identified, analyzed and are mitigating actions integrated in the programme design?
  - There is a need to move towards building from past gains to achieve greater and systemic impact. How can NGOCC achieve this in the next five years?
14. Assess and discuss the need for continued Norwegian support to NGOCC in the next five years and address the following critical questions:
- An important component of the strategic plan is aligning the strategic plan to revisiting the 12 critical areas of concern in the Beijing Platform for Action. What extent is the strategic plan aligned to the twelve critical areas of concern?
  - “Getting back to basics” is the theme of the strategic plan that seems to suggest an inherent acceptance that NGOCC could have performed better than it has in the last five years and that there are positive lessons from the past that should be considered. An assessment of these lessons should be outlined and an assessment of whether the strategic plan in its current form will help NGOCC get back to the basics. If not what changes should be made to the strategic plan?
15. Assessment of sustainability and risks
- Policy and framework conditions (incl. corruption)
  - Socio-cultural and gender aspects (incl. HIV/AIDS)
  - Economic and financial aspects
  - Institutional and organisational aspects
  - Environmental aspects
  - Technical/technological aspects
  - Financial management
  - Any other significant risks that may prevent achievements
  - of results.
16. Discuss whether continued support to NGOCC strategic plan 2012-2016 is advisable, taking into account the role of civil society regarding gender, Zambian gender challenges, gender policy and Norwegian action plan for women’s rights and gender equality in development cooperation.
17. Undertake a pre-award assessment of NGOCC

### **Implementation of the end Review and Appraisal**

The combined brief end-review and appraisal will be undertaken by a team of consultants to be recruited by Norad. Preferably, the team to include a gender expert from Norway, include one local gender expert from Zambia. The team leader should have documented experience on gender issues in

Africa with experience in rural development programs. Experiences with gender networks would enhance the team. An expert in financial management should also be a part of the team.

***Source of information and methodology to be applied***

The review and the appraisal shall be based on a field visit to Zambia. It is anticipated that the visit should take maximum 10 days. The team leader shall have 3 working days for preparation, 4 days for preparing the draft report and 2 days for the final report in addition to 10 field days (21 days with travel).

Generally the exercise will include:

- Review program documents, including progress reports and MTR
- Meeting and discussion at the Embassy
- Field visits
- Meeting government officials at the Ministry of Gender and Child development
- Meeting the gender CP Troika –Ireland, UNDP and DFID
- Diakonia
- Action Aid
- Meeting NGOCC member organizations

***Timetable for preparation, field work and finalization of report***

The team should preferably be starting the field work in May/June 2012.

Field work May/June 2012

Presentation of key findings and recommendations to the embassy in Zambia,

Draft report within two weeks after completion of field work,

Norad, The Norwegian Embassy and NGOCC shall provide comments to the draft report within 10 days after it has been received,

The final report shall be submitted within one week after receiving the comments.

**Reporting**

The report should not exceed 30 pages and include an executive summary (max 5 pages) with main findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.

The main report can be supplemented by annexes if need be.

The report shall be in English.

The draft report shall be in electronic form and submitted to the Norwegian Embassy in Lusaka and to Norad/ NUMI.

The report should be addressed to Norad with a copy to [emb.lusaka@mfa.no](mailto:emb.lusaka@mfa.no).

**Annex 2 Appraisal Team's Programme in Zambia**

<b>Date &amp; time</b>		<b>Activity</b>	<b>Participating team member</b>
<b>13.08.12</b>	06.00 hrs	Arrival of Team British Airways	
	09.00 hrs	Meeting with Senior program officer, program officer, and Financial quality controller, RNE	All
	11:00 hrs	Meeting with management, RNE	All
	14:00 hrs	Stakeholders meeting, RNE	All
<b>14.08.12</b>	09:00 hrs	NGOCC Board and Management, NGOCC	All
	16:00 hrs	HIV/AIDS Regional Team, Swedish Embassy	ML, BM
<b>15.08.12</b>	09.00 hrs	UNDP meeting, UNDP	All
	11:30 hrs	Meeting with directors of large NGOCC MOs: Assoc. of women in mining Nat'l Council of Catholic Women, SWAAZ, WfC, WILDAF, YWCA, ZARD, ZAW, ZNWL	All
	14:30	Meeting with key gender activists: Gladys Mutukwa, Sara Longwe, Mary Kazunga, Lucy Muyoteta, Marian Munyinda, NGOCC	All
<b>16.08.12</b>	06:00	Depart for Copperbelt Province	All
	11:00	PS, Copperbelt Province	All
	12:30	Gender focal point, Copperbelt Province,	All
	15:30	Kitwe Branch chapter, ZNWL	All
<b>17.08.12</b>	09:00	Branch chapter, PPAZ	ML, JB
	09:00	ASAWA	BM, BMwilu
	14:30	Branch chapter, YWCA	ML, JB
	14:30	Branch chapter, FAWEZA	BM, BMwilu
<b>18.09.12</b>	10:00	CHEP	All
	14:00	Ipusukilo Women's Club	All
<b>19.09.12</b>	10:00	Twikatane Women's Club	ML, BM
	10:00	Kantanshi	Bmwilu, JB
	14:00	Depart Ndola	All
<b>20.09.12</b>	07:45	Sr. Programme Officer, Financial Quality Controller, RNE	All
	09:00	NGOCC Sr. management & Board Chairperson	All
	11:00	NGOCC Board Chairperson	ML

	11:00	NGOCC Communications & Advocacy management	BM
	11:00	NGOCC Financial & administration Mgr, Grant Mgr, Account Officer	BMwilu, JB
	15:00	Gender adviser, Swedish Embassy	ML, BM
<b>21.09.12</b>	08:45	Gender troika lead, DFID	All
	10:00	Earlier Programme officer, RNE	ML, BM
	10:00	Financial Quality Controller, RNE	JB, BMwilu
	14:00	Kwasha Mukwenu	BMwilu, JB
	15:30	Tasintha	BMwilu, JB
<b>22.08.12</b>	08:00	Zambia Governance Foundation	All
	10:00	Church Health Association of Zambia	ML
	14:00	Ministry of Gender	ML
	14:00	Zambia Media Women Association, Media Institute of Southern Africa	BM
	16:30	Planned Parenthood Association of Zambia	ML
<b>23.08.12</b>	10:00	USAID Population, Health, and Nutrition	ML, BMwilu
<b>24.08.12</b>	09:00	Feedback of Preliminary findings	All
<b>25.08.12</b>	11L00	Depart Lusaka	All

### Annex 3 Methodology

The document review included:

- Programme documents related to NGOCC's 2007 – 2011 Programme Plan and the 2012 – 2016 Strategic Plan
- NGOCC policies, reports, minutes of meetings, and internal documents related to the organization's governance and management
- Mid-term review Dec 2009
- African Capacity Building Foundation's (ACBF) Mid-term review 2011
- Government of Zambia (GRZ) documents e.g. national Gender plan, SNDP, Nat'l Action Plan on GBV, GIDD gender status paper
- RNE programme documents
- Background documents related to gender issues, civil society, cooperating partners' country programmes

Meetings were held with NGOCC and relevant stakeholders in Lusaka. A four-day provincial field trip to provide insights from local community based organizations (CBOs), branch chapters of national MOs, provincial coordinators, and local government officers.

Copperbelt province was selected because it had the largest number of MOs (12). The Appraisal Team wanted a balance of organisations based on size, urban/rural location, areas of work focus, categories of BF recipient, non-BF recipient. Copperbelt also had 12 branch chapters of national NGOs based in Lusaka. The selection of MOs visited is given in Table 1.

After planning for the provincial visit started, it was discovered that some of the information regarding the BF recipients and areas of work focus was inaccurate. SWAAZ headquarters declined the visit to its branch chapter in Chingola.

Being such a large team, it was possible for team members to carry out more than one interview, focus group discussion, and meetings at the same time. All together interviews/meetings/ visits were arranged with:

- NGOCC management and Board
- Member organizations (4 + Directors of 9 large MOs)
- Branches of National MOs (4)
- CBOs (4)
- RNE
- Development partners (4)
- GRZ officers (3)
- Other key informants (4)



Table 1 MOs and Branch Chapters selected for the Provincial visit

Copperbelt Province					
Member Organisation	Area of Focus	Branch of Lusaka based MO	Received grant in 2010 - 2011	Urban/rural	NGO/CBO
International Association for the Advancement of Women in Africa (ASAWA)	Empowerment of women in Zambia, economically, politically and religiously			Rural	NGO
Ipusukilo Women's Hope Farming and Development Club	Poverty eradication through Agro Farming for sustained food security		XX	Urban	CBO
Kantanshi B. Association	Promotion of women and men in socio-economic development through advocacy skills training		XX	Urban	CBO
Twikatane Area Women Association	Women's empowerment, gender equality, entrepreneurship development and training		Applied 17 call	Rural	CBO
Copperbelt Health Education Project (CHEP)	Health Education		X	Urban	NGO
Forum for African Educationalists in Zambia FAWEZA	Advocacy for educational policies & programmes for advancement of girls' education	Yes			Branch chapter
Young Women's Christian Association YWCA	Women's human rights, Advocacy, Primary health care, Skills training & youth work	Yes	Nat'l org		Branch chapter
Zambia National Women's Lobby ZNWL	Women's human rights, Women's Access to decision-making	Yes	Nat'l org		Branch chapter
Planned Parenthood Association of Zambia PPAZ	Reproductive health	Yes			Branch chapter
Society for Women and AIDS in Zambia SWAAZ	Society for women and AIDS in Zambia	Yes	Nat'l org		Branch chapter

## List of People Consulted

### Royal Norwegian Embassy

Moosho Imakando	Sr. Programme Officer
Gilbert Kalyandu	Financial Quality Control
Namayuba Chiyota	Assistant Programme Officer
Torfinn Arntsen	Minister Counsellor

### NGOCC

#### Board members

Beatrice Grillo	Chairperson
Mary Mulenga	Vice Board Chairperson
Grace Manyonga	Secretary
Emily Sikwazwe	Publicity Secretary

#### Secretariat

Engwase Mwale	Executive Director
Lister N. Siame	Finance and Administration Manager
Bridget Kalaba	Programmes Manager
Chilufya Siwale	Grant Manager
	Communication & Advocacy Coordinator
Emelda Banda	Capacity Building & Network Training Officer
Maambo Mudenda	GMU M & E officer
Florence Lufunsa	Grants Accounts Officer
	NGOCC Accounts Officer
Priscilla Chama	Provincial Coordinating Office, NW & Copperbelt Provinces
Mabel Mugala	Focal point organisation representative

### Directors, Lusaka-based member organisations

Cecilia Lipupa	Association of Zambian women in mining
Christine Katungula	National Council of Catholic Women
Prisca Chitomfwa	Society for Women and AIDS in Zambia (SWAAZ)
Emily Sikazwe	Women for Change (WfC)
Muzi Kamanga	Women in Law and Development in Africa (WILDAF)
Royter Choongo-Phiri	Young Womens Christian Association
Edah Chimya	Zambia Alliance for Women
Priscilla Chandeshe (?)	Zambia Association for Research and Development
Juliet K. Chibuta	Zambia National Women's Lobby

### Government of Zambia

Christine Kalamwina	Acting PS, Ministry of Gender and Child Development
Simon Kapilima	Gender Adviser, Ministry of Gender and Child Development
Joe Kapembwa	Director Economic & Finance, Ministry of Gender and Child Development
Stanford Msichili	Permanent Secretary, Copperbelt Province
Andieya Lengalenga	Principal Planner, Provincial Planning Unit, Copperbelt Province

### Member organisations

Copperbelt Health Education Project (CHEP)	Roy Mwilu, Exec. Director, & 6 staff
International Association for the Advancement of Women in Africa (ASAWA)	Joyce Muwamba, Chairperson & 7 committee members together with approximately 35 others including 10 men.

PPAZ	Edford G. Mutuma, Exec. Director Sophie Baumgartner, Project Coordinator Michael Chisonde, In-charge, Kitwe Center Clotinda Phiri, Coordinator and Mbuyana, Head of Programmes
Tasinthe	20 women
Ipusukilo Women's club	19 people: 16 women, 3 men
Kantanshi	17 women
Kwasha Mukwenu	20 participants, 17 women, 3 men
Twikatane Women's club	8 women
FAWEZE, Branch Chapter	Mariette Hamukale, Coordinator, & 2 male volunteers Also visit to the Shelter
YWCA Branch chapter	3 volunteers; 2 women, 1 man
<b>Cooperating Partners</b>	
Dellia Mwale-Yevokun	UNDP
Michael Lushbahi	Zambia Governance Foundation
Barbara Nost	Zambia Governance Foundation
Valery Roberts	DFID
Njawa Nkandu	Gender focal point, Swedish Embassy
Jorge Velasco	Dep. Team Leader, PHN, USAID
Masuka Musumali	FR & MNCH Advisor, USAID
Beatrice Hamusonde	Gender adviser, USAID
<b>Other key informants</b>	
Joint meeting gender activists	
Mary Kazunga	
Sara Longwe	
Marian Munyinda	
Gladys Mutalawa	
Lucy Muyoyeta	
Tori Hoven	Previous Minister Counsellor, RNE
Dhally M. Menda	Director of Programmes, Church Health Association of Zambia (CHAZ)
Sally Chiwama	Zambia Media Women Association (ZAMWA)
Herbert Macha	Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA)
Monica Munachonga	Jule Development Associates International
Dag Sundelin	Regional HIV & AIDS Team for Africa
Katja Isaksen	Regional HIV & AIDS Team for Africa
Other cooperating partners and organisations attending the Stakeholders and Feedback meetings	

## INTERVIEW GUIDELINES

### *NGOCC Board and Secretariat*

**Purpose:** To gain an understanding of how NGOCC views the situation of gender equality in Zambia, how NGOCC governance, financial management, organisational capacity, planning process for Strategic plan

The Appraisal Team had a two main meetings with the Board and Secretariat on 14 and 20 August. Questions arose based what was learned in the field and from other key informants

1. Follow-up from mid-term review: M & E, advocacy policy, capacity needs assessment, Management at provincial level
2. Purpose and function of Board is described in a TOR or other document? How are people elected to the Board? How long can they serve?
3. Purpose and function of the Trustees? Copy of the document?
4. Constitution? Copy?
5. General assembly every year? How much participation?
6. Brief description of how Strategic Plan is developed: Started, MO input. How many MO participate, provincial input, provincial MO inputs. How are priorities developed? Deal with different interests among the MO?
7. Follow-up from ACBF Mid-term review
8. Views on the DFID/Ireland report
9. Information on the ACBF grant: Is it for specific programs? How can money be used? How reported?
10. Who wrote last Prog. plan? Last and next Str. Pl.M & E. Implementation?
11. Is any specific person responsible for following-up funding opportunities? What has been done to attract other funders to NGOCC? Basket Fund? Follow-up on Action AID request for proposals from last donor meeting?
12. Letter that just went out to Copperbelt from the AU. When received at NGOCC?
13. Details on financial management, BF from GMU, advocacy programme, and capacity building programme

### *Large Lusaka-based member organisations*

**Purpose:** To assess their identity with NGOCC in terms of purpose, vision, mission and values

1. Participation in the Strategic Planning process
2. How are differences among member organisations resolved?
3. Challenges faced by MOs
4. Added value of NGOCC
5. Views of the Basket Fund

### *Medium sized NGOs, and CBOs*

**Purpose:** Relationship with NGOCC, identify with NGOCC, linkages, communication

1. Brief description of the MO: area of work, ways of working, frequency of meetings, relationship to the BF (applied, recipient – amounts and number of times)
2. Use of the BF
3. Experience of working with NGOCC: training; increasing voice of the MO, adding to advocacy efforts; information & communication; participation in meetings, workshops, seminars; links with other like-minded organisations;
4. Awareness of different legal processes: constitutional reform, Anti-gender based violence Act,
5. Impressions of /added value of NGOCC

### *Government officers*

**Purpose:** To gain an understanding of the overall context for gender equality and the government unit's role in improving this, and views of NGOCC

1. What is the role and function of the Min. of Gender/provincial focal point, district, how large is your budget?, How many people are working on gender issues with you? Are there policy documents that are central to your work? How do you work with the gender focal point?
2. Description of the sector: What are the main gender challenges in (Zambia, in this province)? Who are the most important government institutions, organisations, donors working on gender? Where are processes for participating in SNDP (planning, implementation, M & E) SAG? Where are entry points for CSO to voice their views on the Constitutional reform, GBV Act, Land Act, NGO Act, Domestication of regional protocols?
3. What is your general impression of NGOCC? Can you think of a specific contribution(s) that NGOCC has made in the field of gender? How do they differ from the other gender/women's organisations?

#### *Norwegian Embassy*

**Purpose:** To gain an understanding of the country context, Norwegian priorities, Embassy capacity to work with NGOCC

1. Context: identification of main actors in gender sector, CSO, health, media.
2. Norwegian priorities: Significance of gender in overall RNE portfolio (now in the future), importance of CSO support,
3. Embassy capacity: Given the efforts to reduce transaction costs, what opportunities does the Embassy have to work with gender issues. Capacity to monitor?
4. Impressions of NGOCC

#### *Cooperating partners*

**Purpose:** to gain an understanding of the gender context, CSO context, entry points for influence, views of NGOCC

1. Brief description of the organisation. Programmes carrying out? Relationship to the gender sector
2. Description of the gender sector: main issues, most important actors, assessment of GRZ efforts, main challenges to CSO, entry points for influencing
3. General views of NGOCC in terms of general perceptions, confidence that others have in NGOCC, linkages, information sharing, uniqueness

#### *Sector specialists: Health and media*

**Purpose:** To gain an understanding of the context for Strategic objectives 3 & 4 related to health and media

1. NGOCC's work and visibility in the sector
2. Entry points for NGOCC to work in health and media
3. General impressions of NGOCC

## DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

### NGOCC documents

#### *Strategic Plan 2012 - 2016*

- 2012 “Strategic Plan 2012 – 2016 Getting Back to the Basics”

#### *2011 Reporting*

- 2011 draft Annual Report
- 2011 Six monthly report July – December including income & expenditure statement
- 2011 Six monthly report January – June including income & expenditure statement
- 2011 Financial audited statement for NGOCC which included GMU, ACBF, and Matters Arising
- 2011 Annual operating Plans and Budgets
- “Five Year Programme Plan 2007 – 2011; Solidarity for Sustainability of Women Empowerment”
- “2010 Proposal: Institutional Support and Sub grants towards the Empowerment of Women and Promotion of Gender Equity and Equality in Zambia”
- 2011 Annual operating Plans and Budgets

#### *Pre-2011 reporting*

- 2011 Minutes of the NGOCC Donor Round Table Meeting
- 2010 Financial audited statements for NGOCC and for the GMU
- 2010 Minutes of the Donor Round Table meeting (unsigned)
- 2010 Annual Report
- 2009 Annual Report
- “Final Report 2011 – 2012” by Gender and Policy Analyst – Julia Hamaus

#### *Governance and managerial framework*

- Arrangement of Articles (Constitution), amended 2008
- Terms of reference for 6 Board sub-committees and GMC
- Most recent minutes of 5 Board Sub-committee meetings
- Financial systems and procedures manual
- Grant Management Manual (March 2011)
- 15 job descriptions and MOU for the Focal Point Organization
- 7 Provincial visitation reports and 1 visitation to a Lusaka-based MO
- 2011 Basket Fund Copperbelt Visitation report
- Special report from International Association for The Advancement of Women in Africa (ASAWA) 2012

#### *NGOCC policy environment*

- 2010, “Monitoring and Evaluation System”
- 2011, draft “Resource Mobilization and Fundraising Strategy 2012 – 2016” prepared by Grand Corporate Business consultants
- Communications and Advocacy policy implementation guidelines (undated but before 2003)
- Sustainability policy for NGOCC Coordinating Body (undated, perhaps 2004)
- Procurement policy and procedure
- Policy for networking and co-operation with other organisations
- Award Policy Guidelines

#### *ACBF project*

- 2011 NGOCC Restitution Meeting Report, Promotion of Gender Equality and Equity in Zambia, Phase II Project

- 2011 Concept Notes on ACBF Funded Activities for the Period January 2012 to December 2012
- (undated) Project Proposal for Enhancing Institutional Capacity for Promotion of Gender Equality and Equity in Zambia, submitted to ACBF

#### *Other NGOCC publications*

- *The Constitution Making Process and the Women of Zambia*
- *Analysis of the HIV and AIDS; National Policy and the HIV and AIDS Strategic Framework*
- 2009 *An Analysis of the 2010 National Budget from a Gender Perspective*
- Bungano News July – December 2011
- 2005, *NGOCC at 20 years*

#### **Government of Zambia documents**

- 2012, National AIDS council, *Zambia Country Report to UNGASS*
- 2011 *Sixth National Development Plan*
- 2010 MOFNP & MOH and USA Government PEPFAR *Partnership Framework between GRZ MOFNP 7 MOH and Government of USA*
- 2008 GIDD, *National Action Plan on Gender-Based Violence 2008 – 2013*
- 2007 Central Statistical Office, MOH, Tropical Diseases Research Centre, University of Zambia, 2009, *Zambia Demographic and Health Survey 2007*
- 2006, *Fifth National Development Plan*, “Gender and Development” chapter
- 2000, GIDD, Office of the President, Cabinet Office *National Gender Policy*

#### **Royal Norwegian Embassy documents**

- 2012 letter, Agreement dated 5 November 2010 between MFA and NGOCC regarding Institutional Support and Sub-Grants July 2010 to December 2011--Addendum 1
- (undated) Appraisal of NGOCC 2007 – 2011 Strategic Plan; Joint response from ACBF, Diaconia, Forum Syd, and the Norwegian Embassy
- 2012 Grant management review of the Norwegian Embassy in Lusaka
- 2011 Agreement between Norway and GRZ regarding Development Cooperation concerning Poverty Reduction Budget Support
- 2010 Contract between Norwegian MFA and NGOCC regarding Institutional Support and Sub-grants July 2010 to December 2011
- 2010 letter, NGOCC Appraisal of the new programme document for 2010 – 2011
- 2007 letter, Appraisal of NGOCC’s Strategic Plan for the period 2007 – 2011
- 2007 Appropriation document Support to NGOCC Co-ordinating Council for Five Year Programme plan/ ZAM 2388
- 2006 Advisory Forum Platform for Dialogue, NGOCC

#### **Norad reports and documents**

- 2011, ITAD and LDP *Joint Evaluation of Support to Anti-Corruption Efforts, Zambia Country Report*, Report 6/2011-Study
- 2011, Norad Gender Equality Team, *Lessons Learned from Gender Reviews of Norwegian Embassies*, Norad Report 24/2011 Discussion
- 2008, **Results Management** in Norwegian Development Cooperation, *A Practical guide*
- 2008, Oxford Policy Management, *Evaluation of Norwegian Development Support to Zambia(1881 – 2005)* Evaluation Report 4/2007
- 2008, A. Skjelmerud, V. Halvorsen, D. Hamuwele, M. Tawanda, C. Simumba *Gender and AIDS in the Embassy portfolio, Report from a review for the Norwegian Embassy in Lusaka*, Norad Report 6/2009 Discussion

- 2007, Scanteam, *Support Models for CSOs at Country Level, Zambia Country Report*, Norad Report 6/2008 Discussion
- 2007, Scanteam, *Support Models for CSOs at Country Level, Synthesis Report*, Norad Report 1/2008 Discussion
- 2007, *Assessment of Sustainability Elements/Key Risk Factors, Practical Guide*
- 2005, *Development Cooperation Manual*

#### Other reviews of NGOCC's work

- Jule Development Associates International (JUDAI), 2012, "Baseline survey on the socio-economic status of women in Zambia; Final report"
- Jule Development Associates International (JUDAI) 2009. "Mid Term Review. NGOCC Strategic Plan 2007 – 2011: Final Report"
- Lauglo, Marilyn, 2008, "Review of the Basket Fund" Final Report
- Mpofo, Nomasomi 2011, 'Draft Report Mid Term Review of the Performance of the Second Phase of the NGOCC, Lusaka, Zambia, Report for ACBF

#### Other reference sources

- African Development Bank Group, 2010, *Republic of Zambia 2011 – 2015 Country Strategy Paper*
- DFID 2012 "Operational Plan 2012 – 2015 DFID Zambia" downloaded 30.07.12
- DFID Zambia, 2011 "Business Case for the Adolescent Girls Empowerment Programme"
- Jennings, Mary and Mpala Nkonkomalimba, 2011, "Gender Sector Analysis and Mapping of Civil Society and Cooperating Partners Initiatives"
- Kruse, Stein-Erik, 1999, Norwegian Missionary Council Office for Development Cooperation, *How to Assess NGO Capacity*
- Mpala Nkonkomalimba, 2012 "Gender Sector Cooperating Partner Meeting"
- Mudenda, Mweembe Muleya. 2006, "The Challenge of Customary Land Tenure in Zambia" presented at the XXIII FIG Congress, 'Shaping the Change' Munich, Germany 2006
- Mumba, Moonga Hangoma and Rudo Phiri Mumba, "An Assessment of civil society's impact on the national budgeting process in Zambia A Case Study for the Civil Society Index"
- Perira, Javier, 2009, Action for Global Health, "Zambia: Aid Effectiveness in the health sector, case study"
- Rakodi, Carole, 2005, "Evaluation of the Strategy for Women and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation (1997-2005), Country case study: Zambia"
- Regional HIV & AIDS Team, "Regional HIV & AIDS Team Contribution Overview"
- Regional HIV & AIDS Team, "Memorandum, Strategy for regional work on HIV and AIDS, SRHR, and on the human rights of LGBT persons in sub-Saharan Africa"
- Scanteam, 2008, *Support Models for CSOs at Country Level*
- UN, Human Rights Council, 2011, "Report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and Consequences, Rashida Manjoo", A/ HRC/17/26/Add.4
- UNDP, 2011 *Human Development Report 2011, Statistical Annex*
- UNDP, 2010, *A Users' Guide to Civil Society Assessments*
- UNDP, 2011, A. Anheier, A. Fowler, R. Holloway, A. Kandil, "The Future of Participatory Civil Society Assessments: A Conceptual Analysis"
- UNDP, 2008 Joint Gender Support Programme
- UNDP, Country Programme document (2011 – 2015) downloaded 15.08.12
- USAID, "USAID/Zambia Maternal Child Health and Reproductive Health Programs"
- USAID, "Implementation and Procurement Reform" downloaded 23.08.12
- USAID, Office of the Inspector General, 2011, "Audit of USAID/Zambia's Gender-related HIV/AIDS Activities" audit report no. 4 – 611-11-006-P



- World Bank, 2011, *Little Data Book on Gender in Africa*
- World Bank 2011, *Little Data Book on Africa*
- World Bank, 2011 *African Development Indicators 2011*
- World Economic Forum 2011, *Global Gender Gap Report 2011, Country profile*
- Zambia Council for Social Development and Civicus (World Alliance for Citizen Participation), 2010, *The Status of Civil Society in Zambia: Challenges and Future Prospects.*

## Annex 4 Terminology used in three programme documents

### Purpose and goals in programme documents for the 2007 – 2011 Plan period

In the *Five Year Programme Plan for 2007 – 2011*, we find that:

Purpose: To contribute to empowerment of women and promotion of gender equity and equality in Zambia

Strategic Goals for the programme period:<sup>64</sup> (NOK 31.9 million from 2007 – mid-2010)

- Enhance the institutional & technical capacities of its members to champion gender equality & equity
- Contribute to the improvement in social status of women, particularly rural and vulnerable women in rural areas
- Have enable (sic) its membership to address priority development issues affecting women & children
- Provide leadership in advocating for the necessary legal, institutional and policy changes to promote gender equality and equity
- Be a more efficient, effective, accountable and dynamic organization capable of implementing programmes to meet its vision

The Appropriation Document does not identify any indicators but refers to the Programme Plan where outcomes and impacts were many and listed on:

- Pp 23 – 24 for Membership development and support. 10 major outcomes and 12 expected impacts
- P 31 for Basket Fund where none were identified referring to expected BF evaluations in 2008 and 2010
- Pp 40 – 42 for Communications & advocacy. 39 outputs worded in terms of activities, outputs, and outcomes and 4 ‘broad expected impacts’.
- P 47 for Governance and Management. 26 ‘outputs’ of which some are worded as activities and 9 ‘expected impacts’.

In the revised document in 2010, *Proposal for Institutional Support and Sub Grants Towards the Empowerment of women and Promotion of Gender Equity and Equality for July 2010 – December 2011*

Strategic Objectives: <sup>65</sup> NOK 17 mil for 18 month period

- Financially viable, technically and institutionally strong MOs jointly working to positively influencing society on gender equality and equity
- Financially viable and sustainable Coordinating Council able to coordinate and champion gender equality and equity among its MOs in an efficient and effective manner

Operational objectives:

- a. By the end of 2011 NGOCC has enhanced the institutional and technical capacities of its members to champion gender equality and equity
- b. By the end of 2011 NGOCC has enhanced the financial capacities of all its MOs to enable them address priority development issues affecting women, men and children
- c. By the end of 2011 NGOCC is providing leadership in advocating for necessary legal and institutional policy changes that promote gender equality and equity

<sup>64</sup> Decision document

<sup>65</sup> Contract for July 2010 to December 2011

- d. By the end of 2011 NGOCC operating as an efficient, effective, sustainable, accountable and dynamic organization capable of implementing programmes

Main indicators:

- Contribute towards domestication & implementation of at least 3 regional and international level instruments through advocacy
- Contribute towards the reduction of Female Headed Households living below the poverty datum line from 70% to 50%
- Contribute to 30% of land allocated to women
- Contribute towards 50% of women participating in decision making at all levels through capacity building and advocacy
- Increase the number of Members Organizations with financial, institutional and technical capacity from 55 to 71
- At least 60% of Member Organizations from the current 50% participating in joint engagements
- Increase cooperating partners from 6 to 8
- At least 2 business institutions partnering with NGOCC

In the approved *2011 Annual Operating Plans and Budgets*

Strategic Objectives:

- Financially viable, technically and institutionally strong MOs all speaking with one voice and positively influencing society on gender and equity (CBN) (CAP) (WOLAR) (provinces)
- Financially viable, technically and institutionally strong MOs all working together to positively influence society on gender equality and equity (GMU) (GAM)

Operational objectives for the different units and projects:

- By the end of 2011 NGOCC has enhanced the institutional and technical capacities of its members to champion gender equality and equity (CBN) (WOLAR) (provinces)
- By the end of 2011 NGOCC has enhanced the financial capacities of all its MOs to enable them address priority development issues affecting women, men and children (GMU) (GAM)
- By the end of 2011 NGOCC is providing leadership in advocating for necessary legal and institutional policy changes that promote gender equality and equity (CAP)

Indicators are not given but one could perhaps see an attempt to indicate results through the identification of 'Outputs' and 'Planned Achievement'. However these do not meet the criteria of SMART<sup>66</sup> indicators and lack baseline data.

Examples:

- At least 60% women participating in the 2011 elections at all levels
- At least 60% of MOs access funding according to priority areas: (HIV& AIDS, Women in Decision-making, Young women participation, GBV, Economic empowerment)
- 60% MOs able to identify and follow up advocacy issues from their own constituencies and sharing advocacy information among them

---

<sup>66</sup> SMART: specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-based although since these related to the 2011 plans, they could be thought to be time-based.

## **Annex 5 Description of NGOCC from an earlier evaluation**

### **Excerpt about NGOCC from an earlier evaluation**

From: **Oxford Policy Management, 2008, *Evaluation of Norwegian Development Support to Zambia (1991 – 2005)*, Norad Evaluation Report 4/2007, Pp 112 - 113**

#### **ZAM-99/145 - Non-Governmental Organisation Coordinating Committee**

##### **Background**

NORAD support to the Non-Governmental Organisation Coordinating Committee (NGOCC) from 1999 to 2001 was intended to strengthen an organisation it considered a focal point for the women's movement in Zambia. Support was justified by an In-depth Evaluation commissioned by NORAD in 1998 following previous support to programmes of NGOCC. The Evaluation found that NGOCC activities targeted at networking women organisations, lobbying and advocacy and sensitisation of the public on gender issues were having positive impact on the organisation's affiliates spread throughout the country. The NGOCC needed support because it could not fund operations solely from the subscriptions of its affiliates. Many were small and struggling. Provincial and district level structures likely to have the greatest impact on the wellbeing of women at the grassroots were also weak.

##### **Approach/Strategy**

A total of NOK 2,400 was to be disaggregated as follows: (i) General support (NOK 1,500,000); (ii) Setting up financial and administrative systems (NOK 300,000); and (iii) Strengthening provincial/district activities (NOK 600,000). In this period the NGOCC was receiving support from other organisations as well including Sweden, Cordaid, MS Zambia, DANIDA, Kepa Zambia and UNDP. NGOCC prepared one semi-annual report for all its supporters including NORAD. Therefore, Norwegian support operated on minimal reporting requirements. This reflected the small size of the support as well as the need not to tax the administrative capacity of the organisation.

Support to the NGOCC thus mixed dedicated funding and general support. General support indicated NORAD's view that activities of the NGOCC were already sound and effective. This was confirmed by the 1998 Evaluation. NGOCC only needed to be helped to continue carrying these activities. Dedicated support picked on the two areas of weakness pointed out in the Evaluation. By helping to establish the financial and administrative systems and strengthening the sub-national structures of NGOCC, dedicated support would augment general support to NGOCC operations.

##### **Impact and Sustainability**

Both the contract between NORAD and NGOCC and the Decision Document do not specify the objectives of the support although this can be inferred from the three areas that were funded. No review or evaluation was required. NORAD relied on the semi-annual reports from NGOCC which also included a financial report. This was a general report covering many other areas not funded by NORAD.

There is therefore no objective basis for assessing the impact and sustainability of this support. Nevertheless, from the number of activities that NGOCC continued to undertake and the very high profile that the organisation assumed on critical matters of the country since then, there are good indications that this support, together with that from other funding agencies, has left an enduring impact on the organisation. NGOCC is playing an important facilitatory role for the women movement at all levels. It has also been central to the fight for a better

constitution in Zambia which is pivotal to good governance and the creation of an environment in which gender equality can be more reasonably tackled.

### **Key Observations**

Although the NGOCC support was small in the light of the overall size of Norway's aid to Zambia, there are nevertheless some insights this cooperation helps to inform the evolution of Norway's development cooperation with Zambia.

Funding the NGOCC was a strategic entry point for supporting the empowerment of women in Zambia, a key principle of Norwegian development cooperation. By helping to strengthen an umbrella organisation with 56 affiliates at the time, the outreach of Norwegian aid was more far reaching than could be achieved with the level of funding actually provided.

Beyond women empowerment, Norway funded an organisation that had started to take centre stage in the civil society movement and its fight against factors that threatened to undermine Zambia's young democracy. The NGOCC played a clear leadership role in 2001, the last year of Norway's support, in opposing attempts by the Chiluba government to change the constitution on the tenure of the presidency from two to three terms. The NGOCC represented civil society in the Oasis Forum which coordinated opposition to amendments to the constitution. The other members of the Oasis Forum were the Law Association of Zambia and a representative of the three mother church bodies. From the power relations view point, the choice of the NGOCC was also strategic.

Although small in size, support to the NGOCC had already showed marks of principles that were to be emphasised after March 2004 with the signing of the Harmonisation in Practice among the like-minded donors and later contained in the Paris Declaration in March 2005. It has been pointed out above that the NGOCC received support from other sources at the time Norway was also funding it. The principle of basket funding was apparent in the general support Norway extended. Norway also accepted the principle of using common formats, content and frequency for periodic reporting. In helping the NGOCC establish its financial and administrative systems, Norway helped to improve the NGOCC's capacity to meet the challenge of reporting to many donors at the same time.

**Norad**

Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation

Postal address:

P.O. Box 8034 Dep, NO-0030 OSLO

Office address:

Ruseløkkveien 26, Oslo, Norway

Tel: +47 23 98 00 00

Fax: +47 23 98 00 99

[postmottak@norad.no](mailto:postmottak@norad.no)

[www.norad.no](http://www.norad.no)

