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### TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT Alliance</td>
<td>Action by Churches Together for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADL</td>
<td>Archdiocese of Lusaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI</td>
<td>Alternative Mining Indaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQHC</td>
<td>Access to Quality Health Care, JCPZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNB</td>
<td>Basic Needs Basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Christian Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAC</td>
<td>Community Advocacy Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO</td>
<td>Community-Based Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>Climate Change Adaptation, JCPZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Cooperation and Coordination Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCD</td>
<td>Catholic Committee for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCJP</td>
<td>Catholic Committee for Justice and Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCZ</td>
<td>Council of Churches in Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDF</td>
<td>Constituency Development Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAZ</td>
<td>Churches Health Association of Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHBC</td>
<td>Community Home-Based Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAC</td>
<td>Community Land Advocacy Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>Conference of Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Caritas Solwezi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSPR</td>
<td>Civil Society for Poverty Reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTPD</td>
<td>Centre for Trade Policy and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>Dan Church Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDCC</td>
<td>District Development Coordinating Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>District Land Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAZ</td>
<td>Economic Association of Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFZ</td>
<td>Evangelical Fellowship of Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>Extractive industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIP</td>
<td>Extractive Industry Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EITI</td>
<td>Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>Faith-based Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus group discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>Food Reserve Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender-based violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCF</td>
<td>Green climate change finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross domestic product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoZ</td>
<td>Government of Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRZ</td>
<td>Government of the Republic of Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBC</td>
<td>Home-Based Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILO</td>
<td>International Labour Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indaba</td>
<td>Zambian slang for get together in meetings, workshops etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCPZ</td>
<td>Joint Country Programme in Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCTR</td>
<td>Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEM–T</td>
<td>Joint Evaluation Mission – Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L&amp;T</td>
<td>Livelihood and Trade, JCPZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoA</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTENR</td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMA</td>
<td>Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAP</td>
<td>National Action Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAPA</td>
<td>National Adaptation Plan of Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA</td>
<td>Norwegian Church Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCRS</td>
<td>National Climate Change Response Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOCC</td>
<td>NGO Coordinating Council (for gender and development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHC</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Health Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOK</td>
<td>Norwegian Krone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD/DAC</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development/Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVC</td>
<td>Orphans and Vulnerable Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDCC</td>
<td>Provincial Development Coordinating Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PETS</td>
<td>Public Expenditure Tracking System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPCR</td>
<td>Pilot Project for Climate Resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRSP</td>
<td>Poverty Reduction Strategy Pater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWYP</td>
<td>Publish What You Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFAG</td>
<td>Resources, Finance and Accountable Governance, JCPZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>Rights Holders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACCORD</td>
<td>Southern Africa Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern Africa Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small and Medium Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>Strengths Weakness Opportunity and Treats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TL</td>
<td>Team Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFCCC</td>
<td>United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>United States Dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WiG</td>
<td>Women in Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILSA</td>
<td>Women and Law in Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC</td>
<td>Zambia Anglican Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAMI</td>
<td>Zambia Alternative Mining Indaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZCCN</td>
<td>Zambia Climate Change Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEC</td>
<td>Zambia Episcopal Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEIP</td>
<td>Zambia Extractive Industries Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZLA</td>
<td>Zambia Land Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZNW</td>
<td>International code for Zambian Kwacha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZNWL</td>
<td>Zambia National Women’s Lobby</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1.1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Joint Country Programme (JCP) in Zambia is the first generation of a fully merged joint programme between the three organisations: Norwegian Church Aid (NCA 50%), Dan Church Aid (DCA 30%) and Christian Aid (CA 20%). During the period 2011 to 2014 JCP supported 61 projects with 42 different Zambian organisations under five thematic programme areas. The total cost of the programme at the end of 2014 was NOK 105.3 million (USD 13.4/ZMW 94.0). During the same period, NOK 40.2 (USD 5.1/ZMW 35.7) million, was transferred to the projects with the partners.

The programme has been developed and implemented in partnership with Zambian partners, core partners being the church-based and faith-based organisations supplemented by a number of resource partners, through five thematic programmes: (1) Access to Quality Health Care (AQHC); (2) Climate Change Adaptation (CCA); (3) Livelihoods and Trade (L&T); (4) Resources Finance and Accountable Governance (RFAG); and (5) Women in Governance (WiG).

Relevance

The programme themes, all very relevant to the Zambian context and well linked to national policies, have added value to the partner organisations. There is evidence of networking, synergy and collaboration between partners within the RFAG and WiG programmes at national level, however this could be strengthened overall. Despite the potential for synergy, there are currently few linkages between the thematic programmes. The mix of faith based partners, with huge outreach and credibility, and more specialized CSOs an advantage. Another is the presence at local, provincial and national level, which result from the partner portfolio and the organizational structures of the partners.

There is a good fit between the partner portfolio and the thematic programmes, except for the Climate Change Adaptation programme, which is too narrow. The trade component of the L&T programme is also weak. The GBV work in the WiG programme does not appear to be very strategic or focussed.

Partners mention technical advice and capacity development, as well as sharing of experience between partners, as the main added value of JCP Zambia.

Effectiveness and impact

Implementation of the five thematic programmes has positively affected the cross-cutting goals of gender and economic justice. However, it is necessary to intensify efforts and find ways to scale-up as some results are rather limited compared to the scale of the challenges and the size of the country. JCP’s core partners stand out as a strong voice in Zambian civil society. This role is strengthened through the collaboration founded under the JCP, networking along the five thematic areas.

In general, significant progress has been made against the JCP outcomes. However, in some cases, the NCA global outcomes risk limiting the depth of change envisaged compared to what is possible in the Zambian context. With regards to mainstreaming of gender in the project, the participation of women has increased, but men are still dominating conversations and decision-making.

AQHC approaches are a combination of both health service delivery and advocacy. The programme’s focus has progressively expanded from social mitigation of HIV/AIDS to community health and wider public health, including maternal and child health, and malaria. AQHC has remained relevant to Zambia’s health priorities.
It has significantly increased the number of people gaining knowledge regarding symptoms of malaria and, hence, who seek timely medical attention. At the national level, the programme has played a critical role in the coordination of health advocacy issues. AQHC achieved outstanding results through influencing policy and provision of health services, and used innovative approaches implemented in community projects. 2011-2015 has been a learning process for AQHC with transition to broader community health interventions greatly strengthening the thematic area. Tremendous progress was made in engaging duty bearers for positive policy formulation and increased budgetary allocation.

Within the CCA programme there is a thin line between adaptation interventions and improved livelihoods, as most CCA activities feed into improved food security, water and natural resources management. Many of the CCA activities were found to be indistinguishable from livelihood income-generating activities. There is huge potential to link CCA advocacy at grassroots level to national and international level advocacy. The ‘family as a development unit’ concept appears to be an effective entry point for addressing gender imbalances at household level and empowering women to participate in community decision-making.

Under the L&T programme community members in 9 districts have been mobilised and sensitised on land rights, resulting in more communities fighting for their right to keep the customary land they live on and that provide them their livelihood. Moreover, targeted rights holders reported improved income status and ability to pay for farming inputs, household assets and education. Organic farming has contributed to improved nutritional status of children under 5 and PLWHA.

The RFAG programme has a strong partner portfolio, a strong coalition of civil society partners, comprised of church partners, with their broad outreach, and more specialised organisations. The core focus is on mobilisation and empowerment of rights holders at community level, as well as evidence-based advocacy at all levels. The networking and collaboration between JCP partners, especially through the advocacy platforms, is a strength. The budget monitoring component has contributed to improving government processes of distribution of public resources and increasing rights holders’ participation. JCP partners have contributed to changes in taxation frameworks and budget policies, as well as contributing to pro-poor changes in budget allocations, influencing both the income level and distribution of public resources within Zambia. Targeted communities have been empowered to (and do) claim their own rights. Spaces for engagement, between rights holders and duty bearers have been created. However, there is a need for closer follow up of partners working at community level, assisting them developing advocacy strategies based on power analysis.

Within the WiG programme there is evidence of synergy and collaboration between partners, particularly concerning knowledge transfer and capacity building, albeit mostly at national level. The programme has been successful in a number of projects that have increased the number of women taking up leadership positions at local government level and at the parish level. There is an increase in the number of women and men reporting cases of gender-based violence (GBV) in communities and improved linkages with duty bearers. JCP partners have been crucial in the development of the Gender Equality Bill, which has the potential to remove many of the barriers to women’s participation.

Efficiency

An important challenge for efficiency in the JCP has been the size of the whole programme: the number of programme areas, and projects within these. This creates a huge administrative burden on staff, as well as limiting the potential to achieve change at scale by funding larger, more strategic projects. One-year project funding with partners has also created inefficiencies, as well as constraining strategic, long term thinking by partners. Multi-year plans, updated annually, could provide an interesting alternative.
Sustainability

There are many examples of sustainability being addressed and achieved, particularly through rights-based empowering approaches at local level, combined with contribution to important changes in norms and legal frameworks. The thematic evaluations indicate the existence of very fruitful linkages with duty bearers at local levels where JCP has contributed to establishing effective local structures to mobilise and represent rights holders and transfer knowledge to them. There is evidence that some of the results in empowering rights holders are likely to be sustainable, whilst others will require continued support and funding. Involving men and supporting approaches which promote the family as a unit of development also offer opportunities for more sustainable results going forward.

The JCP has helped build partner capacity. Many partners are highly professionalised and specialised learning organisations. Others will need continued, tailored support. The churches are credible and legitimate structures at local levels, with strong leadership. Some, however, lag behind secular CSOs in professionalising. Overall strong, evidence-based monitoring and evaluation would help partners to become more effective and agile learning organisations. The funding environment is changing: foreign donor funding is likely to reduce, whilst new opportunities for domestic fundraising are opening up. JCP and partners will need well-evidenced and well-designed interventions in order to respond to this changing funding landscape.

The achievements and learning from the last four years provide a strong basis for increasing sustainability in future, and for consolidating the gains made. Sustainability can be strengthened by concentrating effort and funding to fewer projects in fewer geographic areas. JCP maintains some operational development projects, which should now be phased out to increase focus on rights-based, empowering approaches.

1.2 Recommendations

The following recommendations relate to the JCP programme as a whole. Please see annex 8 for the full set of recommendations, including those per thematic programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General recommendations for programme management, relevance, effectiveness and impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There needs to be stronger ownership of JCP by the 3 agencies, with greater clarity of the roles and responsibilities of each. Greater harmonisation of reporting requirements is also necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. JCP Management team should go to the field more to understand and address the issues on the ground and how these affect the work of the POs and partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Continue to apply principles of transparency and accountability to all aspects of internal procedures and in partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. JCP should strive to strengthen local (district and provincial) and national level linkages, coordination and networking between partners, especially on advocacy. District-level partner coordination meetings could be considered. Partner Platform meetings might also provide an opportunity for greater coordination and synergy at the grassroots, decentralised levels, if community and diocesan level staff are also represented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Within the thematic programmes the sharing of experiences and exchange visits between partners working is something to strengthen in future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Strengthen the synergy between thematic programmes (e.g. Livelihoods and Trade, AQHC, WiG). Increase, for example, linkages between REFAG’s budget monitoring work and the sectoral budget and policy monitoring work done by AQHC and Livelihoods and Trade partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strengthen partner participation in JCP strategic planning to identify where JCP’s and partners’ goals overlap and to increase partner participation in contextualizing the global outcomes, e.g. through setting context-specific indicators and relevant outputs. JCP and partners should also consider including impact indicators if the global outcomes of NCA are not ambitious enough compared to what the partners in Zambia can achieve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Intensify efforts and find ways to scale-up, for example by reducing the number of partners and projects. This would also reduce the administrative burden of the office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Exit projects which do not fit with JCP’s strategy and outcomes and completely phase out operational projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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2 BACKGROUND

2.1 PROGRAMME IN SHORT

The JCP Zambia 2011–15 is governed under a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between three funding agencies. The present MoU (2014–15) is an extension of the previous one (2010–13) to give the collaboration more time to find its form. The MoU states that: “it will build the resources and strength of civil society, particularly our local/national partners, to address poverty in Zambia and challenge the systems and structures that contribute to it.”

The organisations share the responsibility for raising funds and have agreed on a cost sharing model for the programme as follows: NCA to cover 50%, CA to cover 20% and DCA to cover 30%. The funds are secured as the programme is implemented. In all there have been 15 donors supporting the 5-year programme.

The funds for the programme have been obtained as follows:

NCA Funds: Income mainly from the Norwegian government – Norad and funding from the Royal Norwegian Embassy in Lusaka, as well as funds from private donors: private collected non-earmarked funds and earmarked funds.

DCA Funds: Comes from various sources including the Danish government – Danida, the DCA Give-a-Goat Project, FDF and several the Danish TV collections. Via DCA in Copenhagen JCP has also managed to gain a three-year contract through from Europe Aid.

CA Funds: From UK government through UK Aid Match Funds, DFID, and private funding through the USA-based Isdell: Flowers Foundation.

Figure A Donor Contribution to JCP 2011-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOK</td>
<td>NOK</td>
<td>NOK</td>
<td>NOK</td>
<td>NOK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norad General</td>
<td>3 536 281</td>
<td>4 072 606</td>
<td>5 321 573</td>
<td>4 521 874</td>
<td>17 452 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norad Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>272 536</td>
<td>155 000</td>
<td>427 536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norad Embassies</td>
<td>7 897 849</td>
<td>6 707 739</td>
<td>7 003 640</td>
<td>7 298 134</td>
<td>28 907 362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA Non Earmarked</td>
<td>1 940 813</td>
<td>471 008</td>
<td>887 930</td>
<td>1 020 502</td>
<td>4 320 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA Emergencies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-219 646</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-219 646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det Norske Fredskorpset</td>
<td>678 575</td>
<td>219 975</td>
<td>137 288</td>
<td>17 267</td>
<td>1 053 105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The MoU states that the Cooperation and Coordination Committee (CCC) has to agree on overall strategies and priorities in the JCP Zambia. It states that JCP Zambia is one programme, maintaining three identities. Most importantly, it states that the programme is to be guided by NCA’s Global Strategy 2011–15 and NCA’s procedures. It does also state that the development of the JCP programme is carried out in partnership with the three participating organisations, and that it is further developed and implemented in ongoing dialogue and cooperation with partners in Zambia.


JCP Zambia Country Plan 2011–15 has chosen two of the NCA five strategic priorities – Gender Justice and Economic Justice as the overall priorities. Furthermore, the 2011–15 Plan was composed of five NCA global programmes, all relevant to the contextual situation in Zambia. In addition most of them were more or less relevant for the strategies of all three organizations and previous portfolios. The merger was a compromise where it was agreed to “pool” partners, projects and staff under the umbrella of the five global thematic programmes– and therefore the JCP strategy had to be flexible at that time. All new initiatives and partners taken on after the merger needed to be more strategic and fully aligned with the new 5 year Country Plan for 2011-2015. The programme is implemented in partnership with local church and faith-based organisations (FBOs) as well as civil society organisations (CSOs) and networks.

### 2.2 The Goals and Objectives of the Programme

The Joint Country Plan 2011–15 (JCP 2012), which is the implementing strategy of the programme, has the overall goal:

“To contribute to creating an enabling environment that promotes Zambian citizens and especially the poor men and women, to own and actively participate in shaping the national development agenda for their benefit.”

The key priority of the programme is to mobilise citizens and equip them with the necessary knowledge and skills for obtaining Gender Justice and Economic Justice, through the objectives of the 5 chosen global programmes:
• Improve access to quality health care, in the synonymous programme called Access to Quality Health Care (AQHC).
• Reduce the vulnerability to climate change of poor and marginalised people and communities, in the programme called Climate Change Adaptation (CCA).
• Mobilise for sustainable livelihood (and trade) and reduce economic vulnerability, in the programme called Livelihood and Trade (L&T).
• Provide accountable governance of national resources for rights-based development, in the programme called Resources Finance and Accountable Governance (RFAG).
• Increase women’s participation in governance issues and structures, in the programme called Women in Governance (WiG).

2.3 THE EVALUATION PROCESS

This evaluation was planned according to the Strategic 5-year Country Plan 2011-2015. The evaluation was conducted by an external independent consultant team leader (TL) with internal team members from the three JCP funding agencies: NCA, DCA and CA. The idea was to form a team comprising members from each of the three agencies to enhance the ownership and learning internally, whilst the external team leader would help ensure objectivity. The CCC agreed to this during the meeting in September 2014. 4 of the internal team members were responsible for analysing the five JCP thematic programmes, with field visits to projects, whilst two team members - the team leader and financial management specialist - remained in Lusaka to evaluate organisational effectiveness and general management aspects of JCP. The evaluation team worked according to the requirements set out in the Terms of Reference (To R) (see Annex 1) which foresaw a thorough review of five selected partner projects. In practice 5 projects were involved in the field evaluation.

For each of the 5 programmes, time was also spent in Lusaka on document review and in meetings and workshops with partners. A wide range of stakeholders were met (see Annex 2 for list of people meet) and their views sought. The thematic reports were supposed to be analysed by the Team Leader to build the main report. However unfortunately the Team Leader was not able to do this, or make full use of the findings from the thematic reports. The solution found was for two of the team members to collaborate (4 days together in London in April and remotely thereafter) to produce this final report, drawing on the thematic reports and making best use of the draft produced by the team leader.

The evaluation team would like to thank the JCP management and staff for all their support during the evaluation. Furthermore we would like to thank all the Zambian partner organisations for arranging visits to the field, for participating in workshops and in meetings, and for sharing their views on the JCP programme.

The full analysis of the five programme areas is presented in the individual evaluation reports for the thematic programmes (annexes 3 to 7). The findings and conclusions from these have been synthesised in the main report.

2.3.1 PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

The main objectives of the evaluation were:
• To evaluate the relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of the JCP Zambia Country Plan
• To assess the progress against the programme objectives

1 The team was to have six team members, two from each partner organisation. In the end the team had four full-time female members and only one half-time (male) team member.
• To analyse what can be learned from the programme implementation and make recommendations for a future multiyear plan.

According to ToR, this was to be done by evaluating the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of the JCP Country Plan and its five thematic programmes.

2.3.2 METHODOLOGY

The evaluation team began its work on 22 January with a team building session – followed by a meeting with the JCP programme staff. On the 23 January the team conducted a workshop with partners, in order to get an overview of the programme and receive feedback from the partners on the overall JCP programme performance. A SWOT analysis was used to gather information from all partners in relation to programme performance during the workshop; furthermore outcome-level results analysis was carried out for each of the thematic programmes. The team members divided to visit different partners in the field\(^2\) as follows:

**Figure B: Partners and locations visited through the field trips**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>AQHC</th>
<th>L&amp;T</th>
<th>CCA</th>
<th>RFAG</th>
<th>WIG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>Church Health Association of Zambia</td>
<td>Zambia Land Alliance</td>
<td>Monze Diocese</td>
<td>Centre for Trade and Policy Development</td>
<td>Zambia National Women’s Lobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Kabwe, Central Province and Livingstone, Southern Province</td>
<td>Gwembe, Southern Province</td>
<td>Monze, Southern Province</td>
<td>Solwezi North-Western Province</td>
<td>Mpongwe, Muwanshya &amp; Mufulira Districts, Copperbelt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation team member</td>
<td>Beatrice</td>
<td>Mette</td>
<td>Mette</td>
<td>Karianne</td>
<td>Shuna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the field visits a few additional interviews with other partners were carried out in Lusaka. The four teams were paired with JCP programme staff to ensure in-house participation and to maximise learning opportunities from the evaluation.

The JCPZ programme staff participated in individual interviews regarding the JCP’s mode of operation and organisational design. These covered issues of management, financial control, staff development and the follow-up on the recommendations from the organisational review in 2013. A debriefing meeting was held on 5 February to report back to staff. Reporting back to the JCP partners and programme staff was done at a debriefing meeting on 6 February 2015, presenting and validate findings. A debriefing note was issued – but only sent to the JCP for comments – in order to rectify misunderstandings.

The evaluation followed the OECD/DAC Framework Approach\(^3\). To the extent possible, and in most cases, findings are based on triangulation methods. The findings in the main report draw on those from the thematic reports. Findings were selected based on verification between the two evaluators drafting the report, and a degree of triangulation: checking that the findings are reflected in at least two of the thematic reports. We also verified whether findings from thematic reports were also validated from other sources (such as partner and staff workshops).

For the thematic programme reports, the team used qualitative methods in gathering the information. Three methods were used to assess and analyse results for each of the thematic programmes:

1) Review of partner reports
2) Workshop analysis with some partners

---

\(^2\) Two partners were specifically chosen for an in depth visit at headquarter level – looking at headquarter operations, finance, monitoring and programme management.

\(^3\) The OECD/DAC (2010) documents see List of Documents Annex 9.
3) A more in-depth field research with 1-2 partners from each programme
4) Semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with partners, rights holders and duty bearers.

There were various limitations in the methodology. The main challenge in systematically assessing outcomes was that only a limited number of partners and projects could be visited. The methods used for assessing the other partners and projects within the thematic programmes were limited to workshops, partner interviews (where possible) and document review. Some specific limitations are worth mentioning in more detail:

1. There was insufficient time for systematic desk review and results analysis for all partner reports. Although lots of documentation was shared, in most cases a complete set of the most relevant and recent partner reports for each thematic programme was not made readily available to the evaluators. In some cases the reports available were produced before projects had not reached maturity.
2. Within the thematic programmes, not all partners were consulted and relatively few were interviewed or visited.
3. The ToR planned for a questionnaire to be carried out with all partners. This would have been an important method for systematically and directly consulting all partners, and aggregating and analysing responses. However the Team Leader decided not to use this method, for reasons that remain unclear to the other evaluation team members.
4. The time in the field was only 4–5 days and covered a wide area (e.g. relating to the AQHC, we had to travel to three different places – over 1,500km by car). Although limited, this was sufficient for the evaluators to compare with findings from document review and to make various recommendations and conclusions in the thematic reports.
5. In most cases participants for the focus groups and interviews were selected by partners.
6. The questions in the ToR on ACT-Alliance were not investigated.
7. There were flaws in the evaluation matrix and methods were not well aligned to the questions in all cases. There may also have been many more questions than could realistically be assessed with the time and resources available. With hindsight, further prioritisation of the questions, checking alignment with the proposed methods, would have been valuable. In practice the team members worked through these inconsistencies in developing the individual thematic evaluations, albeit more difficult and time-consuming than necessary.
8. The Team Leader did not develop harmonised tools for focus group discussions and interviews for use in the field. However, the 4 team members involved in the fieldwork worked collaboratively to share and develop these in order to achieve a common approach to the extent possible.

3 FINDINGS

3.1 RELEVANCE

The OECD DAC criteria define relevance as ‘the extent to which the aid activity is suited to the priorities and policies of the target group, recipient and donor’.

3.1.1. RELEVANCE OF THE JCP PROGRAMMES TO THE ZAMBIAN CONTEXT

The evaluation team finds that all 5 programmes are highly relevant to the Zambian context and also well linked to national policies. This is also confirmed by the fact that JCP partners are perceived as prominent actors by the Government in the areas they work, and in many of the programmes partners have been invited

---

4 There was also inappropriate guidance from the Team Leader about the length of the thematic reports the evaluators were to produce. Originally the Team Leader advised to produce short reports, 5-7 pages in length, before returning to their respective countries. It soon became clear that, even with the relatively limited data collection, we had far more material and questions to cover than would be possible in less than 7 pages. In the end, most of the thematic reports are significantly longer than this.
to participate in policy formulation or review by the respective Ministries. Please see examples in annexes 3 to 7.

Production of maize, Zambia’s staple food, increased by 27% from 2013 to 2014, creating a national surplus of more than a million MT. However, an increase of almost 68% in the vulnerable population was reported, and this was attributed to the occurrence of shocks. The estimated number of food insecure people is more than 350,000 (Regional FSNWG Update, July 2014). Increasing pressure on land has resulted in more cases of land grabbing and displacements. Apart from being a violation of land rights, this results in demotivation regarding sustainable and long-term investments in land use practices, such as tree planting, constructing physical structures, soil improvement techniques, introduction of additional livestock, etc. Moreover, the effects of climate change are becoming more apparent calling for sustainable watershed management, drought and flood control to ensure water for livestock and agriculture. The Government’s involvement in crop marketing (especially maize) through the Food Reserve Agency (FRA) distorts the market hampering sufficient development of private markets and price setting. In addition to this, knowledge of and efforts in storage of produce, processing and packaging, and accessing local or national markets are significant challenges for small farmers. Consequently, both the livelihood and trade components of the programme are relevant to the Zambian context.

Zambia has a high burden of disease, which is mainly characterised by high prevalence and impact of communicable diseases, particularly, malaria, HIV and AIDS, STIs, and TB, and high maternal, neonatal and child morbidities and mortalities. Through the Revised SNDP, 2014, government outlines a vision to ensure “Equitable access to quality health care for all by 2030”. Consequently, the Ministry of Health (MOH) outlines its strategic focus on Maternal, neonatal and child health and communicable diseases, especially malaria, HIV and AIDS among the key national health priorities (NHSP, 2011-2015). Therefore, the JCP’s Access to Quality Health Care (AQHC) programme is well aligned with government’s key priorities by focusing on malaria, maternal and child health, and HIV and AIDS. To further strengthen the relevance of the programme JCP is recommended to refocus the maternal and child health component to better address the underlying causes of maternal and infant mortality.

The Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) programme is also highly relevant. Over the past three decades Zambia has experienced climatic hazards, the most serious of which have been droughts, seasonal and flash floods, extreme temperatures and dry spells. Droughts and floods have increased in frequency, intensity and magnitude, adversely impacting on food and water security, water quality, energy and the sustainable livelihoods of especially the rural but also including the urban areas.

The Women in Governance (WiG) programme remains highly relevant to the Zambian development context. Zambia lags behind many of its neighbours in achieving the SADC (Southern African Development Community) 50-50 gender parity target in decision-making, especially at parliamentary and local government levels. The latest (2011) general elections resulted in a drop in the numbers of women elected to parliament (15.2 % to 11%) as well as to local government councilors (7% down to 6.1%). The barriers to women’s effective participation in decision-making are complex and multiform. The lack of proper legislation and slowness in adopting SADC quotas is an important challenge. Political party manifesto commitments are not enforced and some have been slow to adopt women candidates. The churches can be seen as an obstacle to increasing women’s participation in some ways, being overwhelmingly male-dominated hierarchies themselves. Positive change has been brought about by the churches, however, including through the WiG programme.

5 Amongst others, examples can be found in the RFAG report page 3, AQHC report page 11.
At the grassroots, there are many structural and cultural factors that inhibit women’s participation. Poverty places a heavy burden on women and girls to provide for the family. This leaves little time for participation, or even education in some cases. In turn this drives illiteracy and lack of information and confidence amongst women, which are further barriers. Patriarchy remains all-pervasive in Zambian culture, especially in rural areas. In practice households are male-dominated: the men are the gate-keepers and women need permission to participate in meetings.

The Resources, Finance and Accountable Governance (RFAG) programme is also found relevant to the Zambian context. In recent years, Zambia has registered consistent economic growth, averaging 6.2% growth in the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per year, and significant improvements in other key macro-economic indicators. Zambia was classified as a middle-income country in 2011, however over 60% of the population live in poverty, and over 42% are considered to be living in extreme poverty. Zambia’s Human Development Indicator (HDI) value for 2012 is in the low human development category, positioning the country at 163 out of 187 countries and territories (UNDP Human Development report 2013). The situation is further compounded by the inequities in the distribution of wealth and socio-economic infrastructure across the country, which currently favours the urban areas and adversely impacts on the provision of social services in rural hard-to-reach areas.

The mining sector accounts directly for 9 percent of GDP and 67% of exports. Indirectly, the mining sector may contribute as much as half of the GDP, however the minerals are exploited with minimal benefit to the Zambians. Zambia has seen economic growth without development, hence the tax, budget monitoring and redistribution, and extractive industry (EI) components of the RFAG programme are all relevant for removing barriers to development in the Zambian context, and are, through advocacy, addressing some of the root causes of the inequalities of Zambian society.

Significant changes in the context that might have an impact on future programming

Even though there is political space for the JCP partners to manoeuver there remains evidence of continued suppression of dissenting views and political intolerance during this 4 year period which has been visible through violent acts being perpetrated by political actors. The Government has proceeded with the implementation of the Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO) ACT 2009 with renewed calls for NGO’s to register under this legislation, which would potentially control and restrict the work of the organizations. Operationalization of the NGO ACT 2009 was mentioned by many of the RFAG partners as a potential threat for policy work, as it could reduce the space for civil society actors.

In 2011 Zambia was categorized as a lower middle-income country, posing funding challenges for future international aid. This might in the future especially hit the Livelihood and Trade programme because it concerns household income and relates to social spending for government, but no effect is yet seen on budget allocation. However, it may also be an opportunity as government domestic revenue will increase arising from a higher gross national income. This could provide a more favorable environment for lobbying on increased social spending.

If the Gender Equality Bill, which JCP partner WILSA has been part of producing, comes into force this will have wide ramifications and should help to remove many of the barriers to women’s participation. The recent appointment of Zambia’s first female Vice President following the recent Presidential by-elections is an important milestone in increasing women’s participation at the higher levels, and an important achievement celebrated by the women’s movement. However much remains to be done to increase the adoption of women candidates by political parties in future elections, but the new vice president may open new avenues for increasing focus on gender at national and local levels. With regards to the L&T programme there is evidence of pro-poor positive changes in land laws and policies, particularly regarding women’s rights to land ownership and inheritance; as well as improved enforcement of these laws by the judiciary.
3.1.2. SYNERGY, COLLABORATION AND COMPLEMENTARITY BETWEEN PARTNERS’ PROJECTS

With regard to networking, synergies and collaboration between partners, there has been progress in the RFAG and WiG programmes. This was recognised as a strength of the two programmes at the partner workshop (Lusaka, Jan 2015). Where there is collaboration, this is most often at national level (WiG and RFAG) and does not necessarily translate to collaboration and coordination on the ground, even where partners are working in the same areas. There is evidence indicating that partners working through advocacy platforms as part of their intervention strategy have increased the results and effectiveness of their programmes, as well as made them more relevant actors. Within RFAG this is seen particularly around advocacy work at national level where many of the partners are members of different advocacy platforms and campaigns, such as the Zambia Tax Platform, Publish What You Pay (PWYP), and the Alternative Mining Indaba event, and is evident through joint submissions by partners towards budget, legal frameworks, etc.

The same observation was made in the WiG programme, where at national level there is evidence of synergy and collaboration, particularly around knowledge transfer and capacity building. The secular women’s movement partners have been invited to transfer technical knowledge with the faith-based partners, including through the JCP indabas. An example is the training WILSA did with ZEC and CCZ on the draft Constitution. Partner reports also mention cases of partners networking and inviting other WiG partners to be involved in their activities e.g. ZINGO’s reporting on the Women Empowerment Platform attended by WILSA, ZEC and CCZ. However, networking and collaboration are areas to be strengthened in the JCP programme as a whole.

By comparison there has been less synergy and collaboration within the AQHC and the CCA programmes. The Climate Change (CC) advocacy work is, however, well linked up with global processes such as UN REDD+, COPs and there is collaboration with the non-governmental organisation (NGO) council technical committee on CC and Zambia Governance Foundation. In the L&T programme there is also not enough learning and sharing between partners within thematic areas to fully utilise the potential for synergy and joint contributions to programme outcomes.

Conclusions and recommendations synergy, collaboration and complementarity between partners

Partners within the RFAG and the WiG programmes are mostly Lusaka-based, but have decentralised structures that reach out to the community levels. This outreach and presence at different levels is an advantage, but JCP should strive to strengthen local (district and provincial) level linkages, coordination, collaboration and networking between partners, especially on advocacy. District-level partner coordination meetings could be considered, in addition to/instead of always having quarterly meetings at Lusaka level.

There is also need for better coordination within and between partners working at local and national levels. There is a potential for synergy for example within AQHC, where partners involved in advocacy such as CHAZ could take up issues pertaining to increased number of health facilities to improve access particularly for pregnant mothers. Better linkages with ZAC can facilitate such advocacy initiatives.

In general, increased sharing of experiences and programme exchange visits between partners working on the same programmes, for example, is something to strengthen in future.

3.1.3 SYNERGIES BETWEEN PROGRAMMES

There is scope for stronger coordination in future especially in implementation, where activities are overlapping, both thematically and geographically. As of now, there are very few linkages between the thematic programmes, in spite of the potential to create synergy. One exception is found in the AQHC and L&T programmes, where targeting is used as an entry point in livelihood activities, for instance in microfinance interventions by CHAZ, such as village banking. By targeting people vulnerable to various
diseases or addressing the impact of HIV on populations, livelihood activities contribute to important health outcomes. Moreover, budget monitoring, originally from the RFAG programme, is used as a methodology also under AQHC, producing health outcomes, and under L&T to produce outcomes such as increased national allocation to key social sectors.

Conclusions and recommendations on synergies between programmes
There is potential for strengthening the linkages between the thematic programmes. One way of doing this could be through targeting the same rights holders at local level (e.g. Livelihoods and Trade, AQHC, WiG).

For the RFAG programme there is a strong unused potential for synergies within the livelihood, trade and land rights components of the L&T programme. At local level it was evident that the programme could benefit from having strong links to the L&T programme of JCP in the areas of advocacy for livelihood and trade options in the communities, especially taking into account the high levels of poverty in the mining affected communities. The advocacy done by the communities is already closely linked to advocacy to protect their livelihoods. Linked to cases where the basis for their livelihood has been taken from them, resettlement, or they have been cut off from forests, dams, etc. The link is also strong to the land rights component of the L&T as well as issues relating to accountable use of natural resources.

For the WiG programme, where the L&T is operating in the same areas, for example, partners could coordinate targeting so that WiG rights holders, can also be involved in economic empowerment, as well as strengthening women’s voice and participation in livelihood related structures.

Furthermore, L&T has potential to create synergies with CCA by promoting resilience in agriculture to counter the effects of climate change and introduce disaster risk management and reduction, and with AQHC in relation to improving diversified diets for improved nutrition.

The CCA programme has the potential to create synergy with RFAG with regards to deforestation and other environmental protection, WiG through using the family unit as an entry point to women empowerment and participation, and L&T as described above.

3.1.4 The main contributions and added value of JCP, the JCP programme approach and faith-based identity

JCP programme approach – merging of the three agencies of DCA, CA and NCA
The programme merger between the three partners resulted in a much broader funding base from different back-donors in Europe, making it possible to go into negotiation with new donors (i.e. EU-funding/Diakonia) and an enhanced capacity to approach international funding agencies based in Zambia. The merger also resulted in reduced overhead costs not least on expat costs, on support staff, office rent, cars, as well as computers, software and internet connections, compared to having three separate offices and programmes before the merger.

The pool of partners brought into the merger by the different organisations has further increased and enriched the partner base for the programme, something that can be seen in the AQHC and WiG programmes. For example within WiG the faith-based organisations working on gender justice and GBV were NCA’s partners, whilst the secular women’s movement organisations working on political participation were DCA’s. This makes the partner portfolio advantageous in terms of providing a strategic mix of structures for reaching out to an important cross-section of Zambian society: formal and informal institutions, targeting both grassroots levels and to the political and faith leadership. In AQHC the merger provided a partner portfolio covering both advocacy/mobilization and service delivery, making it a more integrated programme. Moreover, the inclusion of the CA malaria component, which resulted in transforming the programme into a broader health programme, made AQHC more relevant to national policies and priorities. Merging the
partner portfolio resulted in some of the programmes being more of a compromise between what existed already in the 3 programmes than a fully integrated and coherent programme. This is the case for CCA, which can be categorised as a combination of NCA Water and sanitation projects and the DCA Right to Food programme.

In addition, JCP benefits from the expertise and technical support available from international staff from CA, DCA and NCA, mainly through advisory roles. From the 2013 organizational review partners reported that the merger had resulted in less reporting, especially the partners previously getting funding from two or all three of the agencies. One annual report could be submitted, using one format, instead of two or three reports on different formats (2013 organizational review). On the other hand, some partners reported the increase in bureaucracy particularly pertaining to financial requisitions and consequent disbursements. This has sometimes led to late disbursement of funds, thus affecting project implementation (AQCH report and partner workshop Lusaka 2015).

The JCP identity appears to be a bit confused depending on who you speak with and has not been rooted yet as a strong brand. On many occasions it seemed that the partners perceive JCP according to which organization they used to deal with. If they used to have a contract with DCA they would still refer to JCP as ‘DCA’ and so on and so forth. According to one external perspective from a civil society actor whose presence in Lusaka predates the merger: within JCP, NCA has a strong profile, DCA to a lesser extent, and Christian Aid is the ‘invisible partner’.

**CP programme approach built on NCA global programmes**

The JCP uses NCA’s global programmes as a framework, selecting from a list of global outcomes. In some cases this seems to have limited the ambition of the Zambia programmes, particularly for the RFAG and WiG programmes. There is evidence of impact-level which goes way beyond the planned outcomes. The issue is further discussed under chapter 3.1.5.

Many partners mention the technical advice as well as sharing of experience and partner platforms between partners within the same programmes as one of the main added value of JCP.

**JCP’s added value and faith based identity**

All programme evaluation reports (annexes 3 to 7) confirm that JCP has an added value beyond being a funding partner. Most partner respondents valued the technical support and capacity development they had received from JCP. The capacity development has among other consisted of financial and administrative training, training on HAP/accountability, training on budget monitoring using the public expenditure tracking system (PETS), training on policy analysis, advocacy and monitoring and evaluation, proposal writing, EU guidelines, etc. The partner workshop thematic group on management also reported capacity development as the main benefit from the JCP programme – as it is the only agency that supports this. Also cases with core programme support including admin were appreciated (Partner workshop Lusaka, January 2015).

Findings from field work and partner interviews point to an added value of JCP as an FBO. Moral integrity and high levels of accountability were mentioned as positive aspects linked to the faith-based identity. Additionally the outreach of the church was mentioned as an added value by many partners. No negative aspects were mentioned.

**Recommendations:**

---

6 All thematic reports and cost efficiency report.
- Contextualize the global programmes further by using the indicators from partners’ results frameworks rather than JCP indicators that the partners do not necessarily relate to or have ownership of.
- Better inclusion of partners in JCP planning processes to ensure appropriate contextualization of the global programmes.

3.1.5. Relevance of Partner Portfolio and Appropriateness of Partner Intervention Strategies and Programme/Project Design

JCP has 23 core partners and has assisted 61 small and larger projects with 42 different organisations during 2011 and 15. Presently (January 2015) JCP is implementing 44 projects with 23 partners. The high amount of administration and paperwork due to the many partners and projects was raised by staff as a challenge. In addition, the project approach was criticized by partners in the briefing workshop (the group with managers) and during interviews for being short-term and donor-driven projects, which in some cases resulted in limited impact.

One of the strengths of the RFAG programme is the composition of the partner portfolio, a strong coalition of civil society partners, comprised of church partners, which have a broad outreach, and more specialized organizations. Another strength of the partner portfolio is the organisational structures of the partners. The church networks have outreach, access, leverage and credibility at local level. They are also influential at a higher level. As such, the church partners provide an important platform for sharing messages to all levels of society. The partner portfolio is also one of the more obvious points of added value of the WiG programme. The partner portfolio within WiG is well balanced, achieving good mix of secular and church organisations, providing scope for mutual strengthening and complementarity. As mentioned above, the merger provided a partner portfolio covering both advocacy/mobilization and service delivery within AQHC, making it a more integrated programme. The CCA programme does not have a strong partner portfolio within the JCP, and has received the smallest share of funding. Also, under the L&T programme there are only few partners implementing the trade component.

In general, the JCP partners’ multi-layered composition and presence in all levels of society make them ideal for dealing with situations were different approaches are necessary and issues can and should be addressed at different levels in parallel. However, it seems like the potential of these unique structures could be utilised better, for example by intensifying targeted advocacy on a higher level in cases that cannot be solved at a lower level. For instance, the lack of and limited quality health service as evidenced in the ZAC project may, where applicable be taken up for advocacy by CHAZ. This mechanism/strategy is found used within RFAG where there is several success stories related to targeted advocacy on specific cases that have been taken to the national level, when they could not be solved at a local level.

Within CCA service delivery has been a major part of the implementation strategy. The change from a HIV/AIDS programme to AQHC resulted in the transition to a broader community health interventions greatly strengthening the thematic area. AQHC has achieved outstanding impact through influencing policy and provision of health services, and used innovative approaches implemented in community projects. Mobilisation, advocacy and service delivery have been major intervention areas for AQHC (Annex 3). Within WiG, RFAG and L&T most of the JCP partners’ core work focuses around mobilisation and empowerment of rights holders at community level as well as evidence based advocacy at all levels. Budget monitoring and awareness-raising on rights are among the intervention strategies that are common for most of the programmes.

Conclusions and recommendations on partner portfolio and intervention strategies
- The evaluation team recommends reducing the number of partners and projects. This would provide opportunity to scale up interventions and reduce the administrative burden on the office.
- The added value of the CCA programme is not clear, especially given the overlap with the Livelihoods and Trade programme. Given also the need for the JCP programme to have fewer programme areas to avoid thematic and administrative overstretch, it is recommended that the CCA programme merged into Livelihoods and Trade.
- The trade component does not feature strongly in the L&T programme, and JCP should consider whether to strengthen it or phase it out.
- Partners and JCP should develop a longer-term advocacy strategy to strengthen the linkages between community sensitization and national and international advocacy and documentation activities and make use of the comparative advantages supplied by the different partners and their unique structures. And by doing this strengthen links between local level advocacy and coordination with national level policy engagement and advocacy networking.
- Due to the fact that Zambia is now categorized as a middle income country the evaluation team recommends JCP to progressively increase investment on advocacy and budget monitoring work and move away from service delivery where appropriate\(^8\). Where possible, JCP should use partner service delivery as an entry point and basis for advocacy mobilization and policy monitoring.
- JCP could increase synergies between RFAG’s budget monitoring work and the sectoral budget and policy monitoring work done by AQHC and Livelihoods and Trade partners.
- JCP should also strengthen the link between local-level grassroots ‘peoples’ advocacy’ and national and international policy processes and engagement by partners.

### 3.1.6. Match between JCP’s and partners’ strategic priorities and alignment between JCP outcomes and partners’ objectives, capacity and value added

For at least WiG, AQHC and RFAG partner ownership of JCP’s outcomes and indicators is not strong. Some partners were for instance not aware of JCP’s indicators (AQHC).

When assessing the partners’ contribution towards the outcomes in the L&T programme, it became clear that there was an imbalance contribution by partners towards the programme outcomes, particularly in the beginning of the programme period. Towards the end of the programme, new partners and projects were taken on board, resulting in a more balanced contribution to all outcomes. Staff at the JCP office and partners alike appear to have progressed towards a more genuine programmatic approach.

In WiG the secular women’s movement partners’ work is very well aligned to the JCP outcomes, but the alignment of church partners to the WiG outcomes is not strong in all cases. It is unclear, for example, how church partners’ GBV activities are expected to achieve results in terms of increased women’s participation. There seems to be some confusion around the causal relationships between GBV/harmful practices on the one hand and power structures, patriarchy and women’s participation on the other.

Under the CCA programme the contributions to the four outcomes are not well balanced, and some outcomes have not been reported well on due to lack of partners to implement these.

The health programme became more relevant after the transition from a pure HIV/AIDS programme to a broader AQHC programme. However, smaller projects, such as those targeting OVC, need to be better defined in terms of their contribution to the AQHC objectives in order to maintain their relevance.

The exceptions are the RFAG where the partners’ outcomes match well with JCP’s outcomes, and where partners contribute towards one to three of the global outcomes under the programme. Several partners

\(^8\) Three out of four (all except AQHC) of the thematic reports make explicit recommendations to move away from service delivery.
said that even though their original outcomes where related and or could feed into JCP’s outcomes, some of them had slightly adjusted their outcomes to fit better with JCP’s set results framework.

In addition, some of the JCP Programme Officers report that ‘they sometimes have to bend over backwards’ to get the programmes to fit into the approved programme results framework. Partners are in close contact with the JCP programme officers during formulation of their goals, and the outputs and outcomes formulated in their projects are aligned to the outputs and outcomes of the JCP. This might affect the partners’ strategic choices, as they might move away from what they have identified as the main needs in the areas they work and adapt their projects in order to get funding. In order for the NCA global outcomes to be relevant there is need for proper contextualization, for example through developing contextualised and detailed outcome indicators.

The focus on global outcomes has resulted in some of the programmes being less ambitious than they might have been in the Zambian context (RFAG & WiG). In the two governance programmes the partners have achieved much deeper results than is expected in the global outcomes. There is no guarantee these impact-level results are reported on systematically, as this information is outside the scope of the results framework and therefore is not requested by JCP or NCA as part of the agreed performance measurement framework. On the other hand, if JCP and partners need to bend over backwards to fit within JCP’s results framework it might also mean that JCP should not support these projects, if they are not in line with the strategic choices of JCP. This applies for example to the GBV components under the WiG programme, as mentioned above.

**Recommendations on alignment between NCA and partners:**
- Consider exiting projects which do not fit with JCP’s strategy and outcomes.
- Church partners may need to be encouraged to scale up and shift their focus away from service delivery (in GBV) as this is likely to yield only limited results in a few geographic locations. Consider phasing out support to partners’ GBV work under the WiG programme, given this is not well aligned to WiG outcomes, and does not appear to be very strategic or focussed in general, especially where this is service-delivery based (e.g. Safe Haven building). Building construction (e.g. the Safe Haven fog GBV survivors) is particularly costly, diverting resources away from interventions more likely to bring about large-scale systemic, transformative change benefitting larger numbers of people.
- Strengthened participation of the partners in JCP strategic planning to identify what areas JCP’s and partners’ goals overlap and to allow partners to a greater extent participate in contextualizing the global outcomes, for example through context specific indicators and relevant outputs.
- JCP and partners should also consider including impact indicators if the global outcomes of NCA are not ambitious enough compared to what the partners in Zambia can achieve.

### 3.2 Effectiveness and Impact

The overview of the programme background and what the programme was designed to achieve is given in section 2.2. It also states the overall goal of the programme, and the development goals of the five thematic programmes.

Effect is defined in the OEDC/DAC (2010) glossary as “Intended or unintended change due directly or indirectly to an intervention” and Effectiveness as: “The extent to which the development intervention’s objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance.” Impact is defined in the OEDC/DAC (2010) glossary as “Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.”

9 Examples of this is found in the WiG and RFAG programmes.
As documented in the analysis of the five thematic programmes, the JCPZ programme has had many positive results. The work with partners has created synergies and networking between the partners within the specific thematic programme; e.g. under the Women in Governance theme, the Women’s Lobby draws upon work of other women’s organisations.

3.2.1 To what extent were the Programme immediate objectives and outcome indicators achieved? Why and why not? Are there any unintended results of the Programme?

In general, significant results have been achieved. In some cases these are much deeper than the change anticipated in the JCP outcomes. To have the most systematic approach possible to answer the question above, for each outcome we have verified the 2013 reporting by JCP of progress against outcomes with the findings in each of the thematic programmes – see below.

It should also be mentioned here that in some of the programmes (RFAG and WiG) it is necessary to intensify efforts and find ways to scale-up as some results are rather limited compared to the scale of the challenges and the size of the country. Furthermore, as is explored elsewhere in this report (under efficiency and sustainability), results have been constrained by various internal JCP factors, such as: cumbersome procedures; insufficient and delayed funding; processes for making and communicating decisions to partners being too long, while project implementation periods are too short; annual planning for partner projects. Partners have tended to implement their projects in relative isolation and there is scope for more effective planning, coordination and information-sharing with other JCP partners and stakeholders, especially at local level. Partner and community ownership of JCP planning and monitoring and evaluation has been rather limited. This point was made in the thematic reports (WiG, AQHC, RFAG, L&T), as well as in the partner and staff workshops.

Access to Quality Health Care (AQHC)

Overall the evaluation findings on achievement of outcomes for this programme positively verify the 2013 reporting on outcomes. The AQHC evaluation confirms, for example that there have been important changes in knowledge, attitudes and practices, including through reaching 21,227 people in 2013. For the indicator on the number of rights holders who go for malaria testing, the evaluation confirms that from 2012 to 2013 this increased from 19-48%. Another important result, reported by partner ZAC, is that in 2013 97.65% of the 12,286 households consistently and correctly used their bed nets.

The important results achieved by CHAZ in health advocacy, reported in the JCP 2013 report, can also be confirmed, such as advocacy wins relating to the health budget, ensuring resources reach health facilities, reducing medicine stock-outs and increasing citizen engagement (AQHC/Annex 3 p9). The Zambian government has now committed to allocate at least 15% of the national budget to health. This is an important advocacy win, but one which will require further monitoring and advocacy efforts to ensure, for example, that the commitment of 15% is actually allocated (AQHC p10).

The medicine tracking work piloted in 2013 at community level under outcome 2 has also yielded some really encouraging results, with pilot facilities reporting having adequate supplies of essential drugs (AQHC/Annex 3 p12). The Neighbourhood Health Committees (NHCs), although a good entry point for community engagement in improving health provision, have not yet been adequately utilised to realise this. Also, budget
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10 These points were made variously in the WiG, AQHC, CCA and RFAG reports triangulated further in the partner and staff workshop SWOT exercises.
11 This is a finding from the WiG, CCA, L&T and AQHC programme evaluations.
12 There was however one quantitative result in the 2013 evaluation which was not fully validated by the AQHC evaluation: the 2013 report refers to goats and treadle pumps being distributed to 650 households under Outcome 4, whereas this figure was 32 in the AQHC evaluation (p15).
13 AQHC report, Annex 3 pp8-9)
cuts meant that rights holders were not adequately engaged in advocacy and the NHC pilot initiative was not scaled up to other facilities.

Overall it can be said that the programme has also achieved a prominent position and results in national health advocacy, with various stakeholders (MPs, traditional leaders) being engaged, trained and sensitised on important issues such as budget allocation and tracking (AQHC/Annex 3 p10). However more attention could be paid in future to increasing the engagement of duty bearers at the community level. Moreover, there has been weak coordination of M&E for policy implementation work by civil society, with individual CSOs monitoring allocation in government expenditure. Going forward there is need for improved coordination and networking to ensure this is done in the most coordinated and effective way.

Climate Change Adaptation (CCA)
The results to report here are somewhat limited compared to the other programme areas. Firstly CCA only makes up a minor part of the JCP (less than 4% of total grants 2011-201414). The contributions to the 4 outcomes are also not well balanced. It is rather difficult to systematically verify the 2013 reporting with the evaluation findings for CCA as these were redefined in 2014.

There are however some points to note: firstly there is a thin line between adaptation interventions and improved livelihoods, as most CCA activities feed into improved food security, water and natural resources management. Many of the CCA activities were found to be indistinguishable from livelihood Income Generating Activities (e.g. sustainable farming, post-harvest handling, protection against animal diseases, construction of goat facilities, fruit tree planting, etc.). These can link up very well to livelihood activities, while advocacy activities at national and international level can feed into the global agenda.

Some of the lessons learned are also worth mentioning here. Some partners see CCA advocacy primarily as grassroots ‘peoples’ advocacy’ with very few links to national and international advocacy agendas. At community level, there is sensitisation that takes place so that the communities can have constructive and informed dialogue with their (e.g. local Councillors) who in turn will contribute to policy formulations at a higher level.

The ‘family as a development unit’ concept appears to be an effective entry point for addressing gender imbalances at household level and empowering women to participate in political decisions at community level. Understanding and implementing gender transformative analysis and activities could strengthen this method in the longer run.

There are very few linkages to other programme themes, in spite of the potential to create synergy, especially with WiG, RFAG and L&T. Disaster Risk Reduction is not strongly integrated in this programme, though it could increase sustainability in the longer run.

Livelihood and Trade (L&T)
The evaluation has revealed some impressive results and learning in this programme area. In general the field and desk evaluation have been able to confirm much of the output-level achievements reported by the JCP programme in 2013. As an example under the first outcome (‘RH’s are organised to secure sustainable livelihoods in rural and urban environments’), 5,000 community members in 9 districts have been mobilised and sensitised on land rights (the figure was 1,201 in the 2013 report) and over 20 community land advocacy committees were established.

The evaluation can also confirm results achieved in strengthening customary land tenure registration by ZLA under the second outcome on land rights. ZLA has also been an important resource to the Zambia Law
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14 JCP Zambia Four Year Report 2011-2014, table 10.1
Development Commission. Some of the really important advocacy outcomes achieved by JCTR and mentioned in the 2013 report can also be validated, such as the evidence-based advocacy by JCTR using the monthly Basic Needs Basket (BNB) for a rise in the minimum wage for lower bracket workers in 2012 and an increase in the income tax threshold. 15 Awareness and empowerment has escalated and political participation increased. Rights holders report that they now know and claim their rights.

More has been achieved beyond what was reported in 2013, for example more than 1,000 people supported to defend their land rights through provision of paralegal services16 and traditional leaders sensitised on the importance of promoting women’s access and land rights. Some important outcome-level achievements can also be mentioned, such as improved dialogue and collaboration between government, media and farmer groups in budget tracking, with smallholder farmers empowered to approach relevant government agencies, such as the Food Reserve Agency on issues related to inputs and produce marketing. The numbers reached are significant17, despite being lower than what was targeted because some of the projects did not get off the ground in 201318.

Beyond outcomes, there have been important impacts and significant changes in the lives of rights holders. Targeted rights holders reported improved income status and ability to pay for farming inputs, household assets and education. Organic farming has contributed to improved nutritional status of children under 5 and PLWHA19. It should be noted, however, that in the project visited by the team, there were discrepancies between what partners perceived as results, and what was reported by the community.20

Valuable lessons have been learnt and issues to reflect on in future programming. One is that trade does not feature strongly in the programme. Another is that there was not a strong link between local-level grassroots ‘peoples’ advocacy’ and national and international policy processes and engagement by partners. The ‘family as a development unit’ method introduced by Monze Diocese emerges as an effective means to achieve improved intra-household relations, resulting reportedly in more efficient use of income, a sense of common purpose in the family and increased gender equality 21. While empowered community members are committed and consulted, they need continuous support and networking to maintain motivation and improve outreach. There are also some encouraging examples of very constructive dialogue with local duty bearers (Southern Province) and of valuable linking to other and NGOs and engagement with councillors and MPs. It was also found that engaging central government (Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock) is also essential so that central government puts pressure on lower government levels to implement policies.

Resources Finance and Accountable Governance (RFAG)
For most outcomes a straightforward comparison was not really possible as the results reported in 2013 were often on different issues and processes than the 2015 thematic evaluation report. That said, on the whole a comparison with the achievements reported by JCP in the 2013 annual report, and that of the evaluation report confirms that important results have been achieved22. It was observed that on many issues deeper
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15 CCA/L&T results matrix (p4)
16 See the CCA/L&T results matrix (p3)
17 For example 9,000 rights holders in CHAZ target districts mobilised to create and run savings and loan groups and organic gardens.
18 This point was made in the 2013 JCP annual report: '9052 rights holders were organised in 2013 compared to the target of 15,000. This could be attributed to various factors, the most significant being that 3 planned projects did not take place’ (p20)
19 CCA/L&T results matrix (p3)
20 See the point on village registries and land certificates in the L&T/Annex 5 p8.
21 L&T Annex 5 p8.
22 For example the joint advocacy and budget analysis by partners in 2013 which successfully influenced the Joint Estimate and Accounts parliamentary committee and parliamentary debate so that key partner recommendations were adopted as policy.
changes were discernible by 2015, especially at community level. This gives the impression that JCP are underreporting compared to what partners are actually achieving.

Some really significant outcome-level results have been achieved. Notably the budget monitoring component of the RFAG programme has contributed to improving government processes of distribution of public resources and increasing rights holders’ participation. JCP partners have contributed to changes in taxation frameworks and budget policies, as well as contributing to pro-poor changes in budget allocations, influencing both the income level and distribution of public resources within Zambia.

The programme has achieved impact-level results. The changes for the rights holders affected are significant, e.g. construction of schools, access to water, etc. Targeted communities have been empowered to claim their rights. Spaces for engagement with duty bearers have been created. There are good examples of results from the rights holders’ engagements, such as rinsing of polluted water, adequate compensation in relation to displacements, etc. However, there were also examples of communities that had engaged the investors, the labour office, their civic leaders, and chiefs, but had reached deadlock, and further progress had been blocked, for example by corruption.

The evaluation revealed the complex environment partners and communities are operating in. Social accountability processes in mining areas face significant obstacles, not least the significant vested interests and ‘hidden’ power of the mining companies, which have thwarted advocacy efforts with local authorities. There are significant risks and constraints for communities in advocacy work in mining areas, requiring close accompaniment by partners and, possibly, JCP. The evidence points to the need for more strategic advocacy engagement, including at higher levels, nationally, to help facilitate and enable the change communities are trying to bring about, especially when communities are up against powerful vested interests23.

These are important results that could have a big impact on the lives of Zambians, however the scale of impact has not been measured. In general results have not been quantified so it is difficult to get an idea of scale and reach e.g. little detail on the exact number of budgets at local level that have been monitored, how many communities have claimed their rights from duty bearers. There has not either been any systematic measurement of the development impact of the results, such as how many families now have access to alternative livelihoods, how many children can go to school, how many got access to clean water, the impact of changes in policies, etc.

Where partners have worked together e.g. the above-mentioned joint national advocacy with the parliament in 2013, they have achieved some major advocacy wins. More synergy could be created within the RFAG programme. There is also strong unused potential for synergies with the Livelihood and Trade programme. Participation by women in the projects could also be improved24. Conflict sensitivity has not been very visible in the documents reviewed and should be strengthened in the RFAG programme.

**Women in Governance (WiG)**

Important results achieved and lessons learnt on strategies for increasing women’s participation in Zambia. The evaluation was able to confirm many of the good results in the 2013 JCP annual report, not least: leadership training for women councillors by ZNWL; strengthening of the women councillors’ network as a strategy for peer support and mentoring; a national Gender Audit conducted by ZNWL; domestication of international gender protocols by WILSA; progress in sensitisation on women’s participation within the churches and with traditional leaders; significant increase in numbers of women participating in church

---

23 ANNEX 6/RFAG evaluation report p18
24 The best example of gender mainstreaming in the RFAG programme is the implementation of gender sensitive needs assessment as part of the budget monitoring by CSPR, and JCP should facilitate for sharing of this method with other JCP partners – p18 RFAG/Annex 6.
structures e.g. at parish level. Political parties have also been encouraged to make commitments to increasing women’s participation, but this requires further monitoring.

WiG has contributed to three significant changes. Firstly the Gender Equality Bill – if it comes into force this will have wide ramifications and should help to remove many of the barriers to women’s participation. WILSA’s contribution was clear, given that the GE Bill was their brainchild and they played a key role in providing technical assistance for the production of the Bill. The increase in women’s participation in church structures at community level is also one of the most significant results achieved by WiG. There is evidence that the church in Zambia is moving forward on gender equality, despite the obvious structural constraints the wider Catholic communion is facing.

ZNWL has contributed significantly to the increase in women’s participation in local and national governance. The recent appointment of Zambia’s first female Vice President can also, in part at least, be claimed as a ZNW achievement, given their long-running work with the individual. ZNWL have placed themselves strategically on the issue of Women in Governance, and gained recognition for themselves, but also increased recognition that women’s participation is key to development in Zambia.

As noted in the 2013 JCP report, it is still early to see the outcome of the indicator on numbers of women adopted in local governance and parliamentary elections – this will only be known during the upcoming 2016 elections. However the field trip to the Copperbelt with ZNW revealed some really exciting and tangible development results have been achieved in wards where women councillors have been elected and received leadership training with ZNW25. This is in addition to the improvements in the quality of governance and deliberations in the district chambers, which was also confirmed through the interviews and focus group discussions. Through the field evaluation with ZNWLP we were able to gather evidence to confirm the important results achieved in increasing effective women’s participation in local governance on the Copperbelt. The results at individual, district council and community levels are very significant.

Clearly the actual results on the ground, achieved by ZNW, are much deeper than what is set out in the JCP WiG outcomes and include important impact-level changes at community level. In some cases the JCP/WiG outcomes do not reflect the deeper results partners are able to achieve, leading to underreporting. Whilst it is important for outcomes and indicators to be realistic and achievable, it is equally important that these reflect the depth of change possible in the Zambian context, and do not limit the ambition and potential of partners and communities.

3.2.2 CROSS CUTTING ISSUES/ACTIVITIES AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT OF PARTNERS

Gender mainstreaming

While there is always room for improvement in working for gender equity, gender awareness is evident in many of the projects and activities. Consequently, there is evidence of reflection around gender specific needs and mainstreaming of gender in all of the programmes. The extent of gender mainstreaming varies a lot between the projects and programmes. Also, there is no documentation of specific collaboration between the WiG programme/JCP’s WiG advisor and the other programmes on gender, which could have been a natural technical hub for this work. Gender is mainstreamed into the programmes largely through sensitising and training communities as well as through gender sensitive targeting of rights holders. Several of the partners report conscious efforts to recruit/encourage more women to be part of the community groups/organized committees (striving for a 50/50 balance) and report that the number of women participating has increased. Some of the partners provide gender disaggregated figures, and it has been an increase in women’s participation in some programmes. Notably, observations during the AQHC evaluation

25 For example a road built, a bridge repaired, water supply installed, see ANNEX 7/WIG (p11 and p16),
team’s visit to Mpunde revealed that despite IGA groups attracting the participation of more women than men most leadership positions held by men and most often dominated conversations. The same challenge was mentioned by some RFAG partners. Some partners (within RFAG) have highlighted the need for leadership training of women to enhance the women participation.

The best example of gender mainstreaming in the RFAG programme is the implementation of gender sensitive needs assessment as part of the budget monitoring by CSPR. The same organisation reported more women speaking out during community interface meetings than men, and that this contributes to the gender dimension of poverty being discussed. JCP should facilitate for sharing of this method with other JCP partners within RFAG, but also with JCP partners beyond RFAG as budget monitoring is one of the intervention methods used in most of the thematic programmes. For WiG focus on gender equality is the core of the very programme, however there is little evidence of WiG partners using power analysis and gender analysis in the project cycle. This applies to most partners within all programmes.

A common finding in the WiG, CCA, L&T and AQHC programmes is that approaches that involve men and women are often more successful. It is important to start at household level, village level and work up, involving men and gaining their trust and buy-in along the way. Men are the gatekeepers and their support is vital. This was demonstrated in some of the women councillors’ cases. The same approach has been used to ensure successful involvement of pregnant and mothers in the AQHC programme. Men are actively engaged in ensuring their spouses are adherent to PMTCT regimen and family planning decisions are mutually agreed. Involving men has also led to addressing other rights issues such as GBV. In CCA and L&T the ‘family as a development unit’ concept appears to be an effective entry point for addressing gender imbalances at household level and empowering women to increasingly participate in political decisions at community level. However, understanding and implementing gender transformative analysis and activities could strengthen this method in the longer run.

**Rights Based Approach (RBA)**

RBA is mainstreamed into the programmes largely through sensitising and training of communities. For the two governance programmes (WiG and RFAG) the main intervention strategies of the programmes are mobilisation of rights holders to claim their own rights and hold duty bearers accountable, and as such the core approach of the these programmes is rights based. For L&T and AQHC mobilization and awareness raising of rights holders are also one of the main intervention strategies. In the CCA programme there is evidence of increasing focus on rights at community and national level, but the potential of linking up to global processes on climate rights may not be fully utilised. Moreover, the CCA partners have embraced RBA principles, though there are still challenges in some organisations to apply these principles to internal transparency and accountability. Within AQHC JCP is the only donor supporting advocacy work through CHAZ, which is seen as an added value of the AQHC programme.

Some of the rights addressed by the programmes are the right to own land, rights to quality education, right to access primary health care, right to clean water, right to equal participation, right to a life free from stigma and discrimination. The partner organisations are increasing effective citizen participation through organizing advocacy groups; budget monitoring groups, including interface dialogue meetings with duty bearers, and participation in campaigns.
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26 WiG report p 12.
27 page 13 AQHC report
Involvement of rights holders in project design: The communities visited during the evaluation of the RFAG evaluation confirmed that they could influence the project activities, including what kind of training/capacity development they would receive.

Environmental protection
This is visible in the JCP programmes, but not to such a degree that it can be called mainstreamed. In AQHC nutrition projects deliberate efforts are made to incorporate environmentally friendly approaches to farming. This is also the case within CCA and L&T, where they focus on environmental sustainability through conservation agriculture. Project monitoring and partner reports document significant increases in productivity.

Increased economic activities and extractive industry activities bring with them environmental challenges. In the RFAG programme community members visited during the field trip confirmed that they had received sensitisation on how to protect their environment (rivers and forest) as part of the training from the partner. EFZ’s natural resource management project is specifically focused on the protection of the forest and the natural resource management projects of Caritas and CCZ also include protection of the environment from pollution, etc. Deforestation is a critical issue in the Zambian context, though it is not prominent in JCP CCA programme as it features prominently under the NCA Climate Change mitigation (vs CC adaptation) programme.

Conflict sensitivity
Conflict sensitivity/Do No Harm approach is not very visible in the JCP programmes. The high level of poverty, the vulnerability of the mining affected communities and the lack of protection from institutions established to protect the rights of the rights holders underlines the importance of inclusion of conflict analysis at least in some of the RFAG projects.

JCP’s role in strengthening civil society and capacity development of partners
Reference is made to chapter 3.1.5, where JCP’s added value has been discussed. In the RFAG programme many of the partners see it as their main role as empowering and mobilising communities to claim their rights from the duty bearers and linking issues on the ground with policy makers. As mentioned in the chapter on relevance capacity development was highly appreciated by the partners as JCP was among the few donors that supported capacity development, resulting in organizational development. Partner platforms are used for capacity building. These take place in the form of the annual Partner Indaba where all partners are invited for sharing of information, best practices, lessons learned from the previous year and expectations going forward. Technical platforms are also organized for each thematic programme, managed by the responsible Programme Officers and the Programme Manager.

As mentioned in chapter earlier, capacity development has consisted of financial and administrative training including finance training for JCP and partner Programme Officers, preparation of budgets, training on HAP/accountability, training on budget monitoring, training on policy analysis, advocacy, monitoring and evaluation, proposal writing, EU guidelines, technical advice on auditors’ role and how to address them, setting up filing systems, excel training, reporting procedures etc. In addition JCP has introduced the concept of Partnership in Practice, consisting of on the job training, where JCP staff is working together with partner colleagues on proposal writing, communication efforts, finance support e.g. how to make a proper AFS, or when CR works partners’ boards on governance and accountability. Capacity development efforts for the core partners have been very effective, not least on the financial side. The partners encountered in the field appreciated the guidance and learning in this respect. It has also facilitated their meeting other donor agencies’ requirements. The JCP partner platforms have been of great inspiration between the partners, and lots of cross-learning has taken place via these events. Furthermore, partners are very involved in decision making, and in relation to the future programme, have been involved
in drawing up the document: JCP 2014: “Ideas for Partnership Development”. This was developed with some of the JCP core partners in 2014 and shared on the Indaba in August 2014.

There is no doubt that the JCP has built capacity in a number of different organisations that influence governance – i.e. the assistance to the seven organisations, that were interviewed more in depth on operational and management issues during this evaluation, has meant that these organisations have been able to influence all three rights deficit areas of the thematic programmes: participation, equity and protection. For example, CHAZ has utilised various forums to ensure government commitment to allocate at least 15% of its national budget towards health. RFAG has supported partners that sit on the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative Council, and JCP partners are included for participation in the Provincial Development Coordinating Committees and District Development Coordinating Committees.

3.2.3 DOES THE JCP MAINTAIN AN EFFECTIVE PROGRAMME MONITORING SYSTEM THAT ALLOWS FOR LEARNING AND FOLLOW UP ON CHALLENGES?

JCP monitors the programmes at different levels. Using the NCA monitoring template, JCP Programme Officers are expected to monitor progress towards partner logframes, not the JCP’s. JCP often carries out joint monitoring visits with partners, and this was brought up by some of the RFAG as a very positive exercise, and was also mentioned in the staff workshop as being an effective approach to monitoring. It was also mentioned that inadequate and insufficient monitoring led to partners not receiving the required support, and that recommendations from monitoring visits were not being fed systematically into programme development. Possibly the extensive partner and project portfolio and geographic spread lead to overstretch and monitoring efforts by staff being spread too thinly.

There has not been a systematic use of baseline analysis or studies, although there is some positive experience of using baselines, e.g. from the Europe Aid-funded L&T project. Some partners have carried out research that could be used for baselines going forward (e.g. ZNWL Gender Audit). Some partners have carried out research that could be used for baselines going forward (e.g. ZNWL Gender Audit). A baseline on the results framework of the JCP RFAG programme was planned, but never carried out. In the WiG programme, for example, only a few partners appear to have carried out baselines. As a result it is unclear how they are measuring ‘changes in attitudes’ or even tracking increased numbers of women participating.

Some indicators (e.g. in RFAG and WiG) are not specific enough and do not give any information of the scope or significance of the change measured. There have been challenges in defining logframe and setting both quantitative and qualitative targets. The JCP’s indicators are not fully aligned with partner indicators, so it is not always clear how partner indicators and M&E activities feed into the JCP logframe, outcomes etc. Partners were not involved in setting indicators in all cases. In RFAG, for example, partners were consulted on the indicators but did not feel their views had been taken into account (ANNEX 6, p17), whilst WiG partners did not seem to have been involved in defining indicators, and AQHC partners did have much awareness or ownership of the JCP indicators. In the next phase of programming, it would be easier if the JCP’s outcome indicators directly related to partners’ indicators, so these are better ‘owned’ by partners. Again this could be achieved by partners playing a much more decisive role in planning.

Project conceptualisation does not stand out as a strong point in some partners’ documents. There appears to be some confusion between outcomes and outputs (RFAG and WiG). Partners have not been using SMART programme design with clear measurable objectives and indicators in all cases. Going forward, this is an area that JCP could strengthen, perhaps starting with a stronger M&E framework, with more rigorous baseline analysis, indicator definition and more detailed data collection planning. Partner and community capacity building may be required and tools developed e.g. to better capture and document outcome-level change.

There is also scope for strengthening the integration between project and programme M&E, evidence and documentation and the evidence base for advocacy and policy monitoring work within the programmes. The
budget and policy monitoring work in RFAG, AQHC and L&T, for example, would benefit from much stronger and better coordinated monitoring and evaluation frameworks for policy implementation, by JCP partners and their advocacy allies. Communities involved in the RFAG programme, for example, now monitor the effects of the mining companies on their communities, but this was not always documented. The AQHC evaluation also found that the coordination and documenting of policy monitoring work needed strengthening.

A general finding is that there is limited participation of community leaders and other rights holders in monitoring beneficiary group activities. This needs to be strengthened to ensure sufficient ownership, accountability and sustainability. There is a need for more participatory M&E at community level (WiG, also AQHC) and sharing of documentation and learning with communities.

3.2.4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT

Overall significant progress has been made against the JCP outcomes. The thematic evaluation reports have largely confirmed the results reported on in the 2013 JCP annual report. Furthermore there is also evidence of underreporting of results compared to partner reports and achievements on the ground. Beyond outcomes, there have been important changes in the lives of rights holders. The scale of the impact has not been systematically assessed and measured, however. The NCA global outcomes appear to be limiting the depth of change envisaged compared to what is possible in the Zambian context. There are many examples (e.g. from RFAG, WiG) of change happening faster and deeper than expected, with impact-level change being discernible that goes way beyond what was envisaged in the global outcomes and indicators. It is quite possible that deeper and more sustainable results could have been achieved through better synergies between the thematic programmes, and longer timeframes for partner projects.

It is important to recognise the complexity and unpredictability of the development processes the JCP and partners are fostering and engaging with. Social transformation, attitude and behaviour change do not follow predictable timeframes and processes. It is difficult, for example, to predict the resistance from duty bearers/other power holders and how the lack of political will can affect results. Likewise other stakeholders, traditional leaders in particular, have responded positively to engagement and acted as catalysts in ways that were not anticipated. Results are non-linear: it is possible to go backwards on some issues, while progressing in others, even more quickly than was expected.

For the development of the new strategic 5-year plan JCP should consider whether partner indicators, if they are relevant and of good quality, can be replicated and drawn up into the JCP results framework, as well as develop a baseline for the programme. Partners could have more room and opportunity to take a lead and work together to design the programme. A consortium approach might be an appropriate arrangement for some of the programmes to develop larger, stronger multi-partner initiatives. There is need to strengthen the M&E framework and practice at all levels. Further vertical and horizontal integration is required. Reporting would be less onerous if partners were using indicators that feed directly into the JCP programme indicators and results framework. Likewise M&E data collection and planning should be integrated with the data required for strong, evidence-based advocacy and policy monitoring. Improved coordination and data sharing between different civil society actors engaged in budget and policy monitoring is also necessary.

Partner capacity building has been quite effective, especially for financial management, but would benefit from being more bespoke, based on individual partner assessments. Gender awareness is evident in all programmes, as is the mainstreaming of rights based approaches, particularly through sensitisation and

28 During the visits to the two health facilities in the AQHC evaluation, it was observed that there was inadequate follow up on the use of allocated funds at facility level (AQHC p11).
training at community level. Where possible, opportunities should be sought to increase participation and ownership of M&E by partners and, more importantly, community and rights holders. Knowledge acquisition by rights holders to build their capacity to know, defend and access their rights are important dimensions of empowerment and rights-based development approaches. Such approaches may require further specialisation and investment of time by JCP partners and staff. To enable this, JCP management may need to find ways of simplifying internal processes and lightening the administrative burden on programme staff so they can spend more time with partners, and in the field with rights holders.

Gender awareness is evident in many of the projects and activities. There is evidence of reflection around gender-specific needs and mainstreaming of gender in all of the programmes, although this varies a lot between the projects and programmes. Gender is mainstreamed into the programmes largely through sensitising and training communities, as well as through gender-sensitive targeting of rights holders. A common finding in the WiG, CCA, L&T and AQHC programmes is that approaches that involve both men and women are often more successful. RBA is mainstreamed into the programmes largely through sensitising and training of communities. Environmental protection, on the other hand, is visible in the JCP programmes, but not to such a degree that it can be called mainstreamed.

Recommendations

- Strengthening efforts and strategies on internal synergy between thematic areas to improve outcomes and strengthen partners as actors in civil society e.g. WiG and access to land are linked up, the work on resources and food security reinforce one another.
- Strengthen advocacy through JCP coordination of learning, data collection and documentation to feed into partners’ joint advocacy strategy within the thematic programmes.
- Facilitate linkages between community levels and national and international levels to further strengthen advocacy. Make better use of Indabas, monitoring visits and capacity building exercises for this.
- There is scope for enhancing programme ownership of programme design by actively engaging partners in planning, starting with the 2016-20 strategy. JCP could work more closely with partners to define outcomes and indicators. Would a consortium approach be an appropriate arrangement for some of the programmes?
- Intensify efforts and find ways to scale-up. Some programme results, while deep, are meagre compared to the scale of the challenges and the size of the country.
- The JCP would benefit from further developing their M&E system with clearly defined indicators, baseline analyses and a plan for evidence to be collected for each indicator, when, how and by whom.
- Increasingly partners should own the baseline analysis, objectives, ToC and indicators, and JCP indicators should be directly drawn from partner/project indicators, so that the latter feed up into the former on an ongoing basis.
- Increased and improved documentation of results, especially at outcome and impact levels, and for more effective advocacy and policy monitoring work.
- Where possible rights holders should be actively involved in monitoring and evaluation as active participants in the development process. Aggregated project and programme impact should be shared with rights holders, for accountability and to increase their motivation and ownership of the results.
- In some cases the discernible results are much deeper than the NCA global outcomes and indicators. It is important that partners and POs do not feel constrained by these.
- JCP and partners should explore the potential for more gender sensitive baseline analysis and needs assessment, particularly for the budget monitoring. Moreover, to develop strategies with partners that seek to involve, sensitize and engage men.
- Continue to scale up ‘family as a development unit’ methods and strengthen gender further by emphasising intra-household gender analysis.
- Consider including power analysis as part of the context analysis and baseline for all projects and use these to inform advocacy strategies and have a clear picture of who to target. Projects should to a larger extent be built on an understanding of the barriers and opportunities facing the rights holders.
- Even though Zambia is a peaceful country some of the projects would benefit from conducting conflict sensitivity analyses, especially in the RFAG programme. It might be more appropriate to develop conflict sensitivity assessments at community, rather than national, level in some cases.
- JCP should continue capacity development of partners. There is room for improvement, for example by developing a more tailored approach to partner capacity building, based on a more systematic assessment of partner capacity.
- The partner indabas can be considered a strength of the programme. Partner platform meetings might also provide an opportunity for greater coordination and synergy at the grassroots, decentralised levels, if community/diocesan level staff are also represented.

### 3.3 Efficiency and JCP’s Mode of Operation and Organisational Design

Efficiency is defined in the OEDC/DAC (2010) glossary as: “A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc.) are converted to results.” The efficiency of the programme is linked to the JCP’s mode of operation and organisational design.

The merger of one country programme (from the NCA, DCA, CA) into one organisation has been difficult for staff members interviewed in Lusaka. Some reported that it was difficult to understand the change of implementation structures and to get used to NCA reporting systems, routines and guidelines. Also partners revealed that it was difficult to get used to the new ways of reporting, not least on the financial side. However, they eventually found that their capabilities in reporting both narrative reports and financial reporting had improved. Division of work and communication lines between JCP and the European headquarters as well as between the new JCP and the many partners had to find its feet in 2011, 12 and 13. An organisational review was undertaken in 2013, and interviews with staff indicate that they are now better integrated. The programme is closely attached to the lead agency NCA. The programme is still struggling to keep a close link on, and involvement with, DCA and CA, but this has improved in 2014.

Although most projects are implemented by partners, JCP also has some operational projects, mostly funded by private donors through NCA. The funding for these projects is generally low, but the work is very time-consuming and resource demanding. As, such, it could seem like some of the operational projects cost more than what is gained from them. Also, the strategic choice of having operational projects doesn’t fit with the overall goal of JCP.

During 2011–15 JCP had jointly assisted 61 small and larger projects with 42 different organisations. Presently the JCP programme is implementing 44 projects with 23 core partners. As of 31 December 2014, there are between three to seven partners in each programme. One partner organisation can implement up to four projects within two to three thematic programmes. The 44 projects are spread out in ten districts in Zambia. The geographical spread makes monitoring both costly and time consuming and JCP staff report that there is no time for sufficient monitoring of all projects.

Although many partners now submit multiyear proposals, JCP sign one-year agreements for each project. Projects that have to be extended can use the same project proposal but must update activity plan and related budget for a new one-year project agreement must be signed.
One of the reasons for having annual agreements is that the back donors of JCP only guarantee for funding annually. In addition, JCP often has more than one agreement with each partner. The reason behind is that funding to the same project might come from different back donors of JCP and must be accounted for directly to the back-donor agencies behind the three umbrella bodies NCA, DCA and CA. Another reason is that some of the JCP partners are implementing projects under several JCP thematic programmes, even if they are in the same geographical area. The NCA system allows for multiyear agreements, with the condition that JCP receives the expected funding from its back donors, but this has so far not been implemented by JCP. The one-year project circle and related paperwork and procedures are identified by the managers of the JCP partners as one of the key obstacles in relation to their own long-term and strategic planning. It gives little predictability for partners’ funding situation. A programme with many short-term and small projects is also very costly. A high amount, 33%, of the total cost has been used for administration and programme development and considerable time goes into reporting. In all NOK 25.6 million (USD 3.4 million) have been used on admin, which includes the cost of the programme staff in the programme section at JCP.

All new projects are approved by a Project Approval Committee. This arrangement is time consuming, but was established to be more transparent about how JCP approves projects (HAP requirement) and to avoid that approval is done by only one or two persons. In addition it provides for improving quality of project, interaction between JCP programme staff and sharing of experience. It is an arena where there is potential for strengthening the synergies between programmes as well as between departments, as Programme Officers responsible for different thematic programmes as well as finance staff participate in the committee.

At JCP the PO for the specific programme is the primary responsible for the project development under his/her programme. They are responsible for identification, design and development of projects in cooperation with their partners, advising on application procedures and quality standards. During implementation the responsible PO is giving technical support and paying monitoring visits to each project, but the POs report that they wished they had more time for technical support. The POs report they use around 30% of their time on deliveries to HO and donors (including budgets, plans, reports, proposals, etc.), 20% of their time on internal office deliveries and 50% of their time on deliveries to partners (including monitoring, capacity development)\(^{29}\). JCP's project procedures are workload heavy, not only the financial control part of it, but also for the management and programme staff. For example, the Country Representative signs off everything from partner agreements to travel settlements and receiving of returned per diem.

Currently managers seem to have to authorise minor amounts of expenditure and get involved in decisions that could be made at lower levels. The Programme Officers are passionate and committed, talented group. Their talent could be further unleashed if they were given more power to make decisions, e.g. over funding portfolio.

Overall, it seems like it is need for increased efficiency by closer communication and cooperation between programme and finance. This has been a focus as a result of follow up of the 2013 organizational review, but can be strengthened further. The need for better cooperation was also observed by some of the members of the evaluation team.

As for grant information management/project documents there is duplication between finance and programme, between paper and electronic, yet it is still not easy to access documents.

**Fig. C  Overview of structure for the flow of funds**

---

\(^{29}\) See see cost efficiency report in annex 8, p 2.
Figure C gives an overview of the structure for the flow of funding. The funds received from the above-mentioned partners go into five thematic programmes, which are many programmes compared to the annual budget. JCP also have operational projects (where JCP is implementing directly) in cooperation with a builder and local communities (e.g. schools, climate change adaptation (solar panels) and funded via earmarked funds from Norway.

Below, figure D, is an overview of expenditure per thematic programme from 2011-2014. The 'social mitigation of HIV and AIDS' and the 'access to quality health care' together make up the AQHC programme, and 'climate change mitigation' and 'climate change adaptation' together make up the CCA programme. The overview shows that the CCA programme only make up a minor part of the budget.

Early on JCP had many problems with the delay of decision-making, getting to know new financial systems, and getting the finance and administration section going. Until the end of 2013 there were severe delays in implementation because of the late transfer of funds and to such an extent that funds had to be returned unused to back donors and therefore JCP did not use its allocated budgets in 2011, 2012 and 2013. Partners felt that approval of projects and transfers in the “new joint JCP” was too slow. However, some of the delay was also due to partners not meeting requirements set out in the agreements. Since the beginning of 2014, the flow of funds has improved so that partners now get the funding in the first quarter of the year. The organisation has also shown that it is now able to tackle failing partners and inadequate transparency in partner records. Some partners are being phased out, and some are under close observation.

Fig. D Overview of expenditure per programme from 2011-2014.
3.3.1 RECOMMENDATIONS ON EFFICIENCY

An important challenge for efficiency in the JCP has been the size of the whole programme, including the number of programme areas, and the number projects within these. This creates a huge administrative burden on staff, as well as limiting the potential to achieve change at scale by funding larger, more strategic projects. The narrower a JCPZ programme is and the fewer projects that the JCPZ programme will have in the future, the more cost effective the implementation will be. JCP should reduce the number of projects and rather scale up the volume of the remaining ones.

JCP should phase out the operational projects.

Reduce the geographic spread of the programme.

The expenditure per thematic programme is not spread evenly, with the CCA programme only making up a minor part of the total budget as mentioned in the relevance chapter. JCP should consider having fewer thematic programmes in the next strategic period.

Fewer, larger projects within the programme areas. This would enable partners to scale-up to widen and deepen results, whilst also lightening the administrative load on the JCP programme, freeing up Programme Officers time for added-value work (e.g. networking, M&E/learning and technical assistance with partners).

Consider introducing an internship scheme as a means of increasing capacity. Where Programme Officers feel this would add value, they should be authorized and supported to try this out.

One-year project funding with partners has also created inefficiencies, as well as constraining strategic, long term thinking by partners. Multi-year plans, updated annually, could ease some of the workload.

Review current levels of authority to achieve more effective and timely decision-making. More tasks could be delegated from management level to the programme and administrative staff.

Also, JCP could consider employing interns for quite a number of tasks, including as back-up to workshops and other Indabas.

Review division of tasks, roles and responsibilities between admin/finance and programme staff. Currently it seems that programme staff are doing too much administration, some of which could be taken on by the admin and finance team. There might, for example, be room for better delegation of admin tasks in running workshops to lighten the load on programme staff?
Review the JCP administrative and financial procedures with a view to simplifying and streamlining, reducing internal paperwork and removing procedures that are not totally necessary for accountability and do not add value to the programme.

A more streamlined and efficient information management & filing system would increase efficiency.

### 3.4 SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability is often judged as the probability of continued long-term benefits after donor funding ends. Beyond financial or economic sustainability, environmental sustainability is also an important consideration, as are empowerment and capacity building in rights-based approaches.

The thematic programme evaluations found evidence of sustainability, especially through rights based, empowering approaches and advocacy and strong linkages at local levels. An overview is provided below. It should be noted that there was little mention of environmental sustainability in the thematic reports, except for in the RFAG and CCA reports. The CCA evaluation mentioned the current focus on conservation agriculture and sustainable animal husbandry, although the team did not get the chance to see specific related activities in the field.

It is quite possible that the sustainability of results has been constrained by the JCP programme being built on many different short-term small projects\(^{30}\), spread out over wide geographic and thematic areas. JCP is still also investing significant amounts of funding and time to operational projects, such as provision of water. It is perhaps understandable that JCP is operating under pressure from donors in Europe for tangible development projects, with visible, communications-friendly outcomes. It is important to recognise however that this is not a sustainable approach.

#### 3.4.1 EMPOWERING RIGHTS HOLDERS

In rights based approaches a key aspect of sustainability is improving rights holders’ ability to influence decision-making and to know and claim their rights, especially through advocacy\(^{31}\). Across the five programmes there are various examples of sustainability being achieved in this way. The JCP (especially through the projects visited in RFAG, WiG and AQHC) has focussed on awareness, empowerment and participatory advocacy and governance, helping to consolidate the shift away from hand-outs and needs-based activities. In some cases this has brought about positive change beyond the individual projects\(^{32}\).

There is evidence of sustainable change being brought about by the JCP programmes. There are examples of RFAG community advocacy groups being able to stand up and exercise their rights even in the absence of the partner staff. Likewise in the AQHC programme, the networking and collaboration with other CSOs and stakeholders has helped to harmonise and create an influential advocacy voice, particularly at national level.

The L&T programme evaluation observed that the increased participation of women and children in household decision-making could be sustainable if women continue accessing opportunity for economic empowerment.

---

\(^{30}\) 61 projects over 4 years, in five thematic programmes.


\(^{32}\) At community level, as a result of RFAG interventions, for example, empowerment was extended and applied to other areas such as health and education. There are incidents where RFAG-supported budget monitoring groups have voluntarily trained other groups outside of the programme.
It has not been possible to systematically assess whether these are trends beyond a handful of isolated examples and project areas visited. The sustainability of these results will depend on continued funding\(^\text{33}\), however. Many partners report that there is still a need for more sensitisation, accompaniment and training at community level to enable people to actively and effectively be able to claim their rights.

### 3.4.2 LOCAL STRUCTURES AND NETWORKS

Sustainability has also been achieved by supporting local community structures and working with state structures and services, rather than direct service delivery. There is scope for deepening and extending this state-society interaction. The AQHC evaluation, for example, found that in order to achieve even greater progress and sustainability of interventions, interventions should continue to hold government accountable for service provision, whilst enhancing the involvement of communities in demanding quality health services.

The JCP has contributed to establishing effective local structures to mobilise and represent rights holders. Some of the community structures in the L&T programme, for example, continue to serve as a platform for community mobilisation. Another example is the AQHC the neighbourhood health committees attached to the health institutions. These were found to be important organisational structures that may be sustainable, having been trained to interact with the health institutions to help the communities. The CCA evaluation found that church structures seem to be effective in providing outreach and stability, credibility and sustainability, while the Community Land Advocacy Committees, para-legal advisers, savings and loans groups and district dialogue livelihood advocacy groups appeared to be well understood and rooted in communities. In the Livelihood and Trade evaluation, the absence of linkages to the markets means that economic sustainability is weak, despite the significant increases in production.

The RFAG has been successful in creating structures and transferring knowledge. Some of the structures arising from the projects, as well as the knowledge they have attained through trainings, are sustainable, such as for some of the community-level advocacy and budget monitoring groups. There are good examples of community advocacy groups being able to stand up and exercise their rights even in the absence of the partner staff. Another example is budget monitoring groups that have voluntarily trained other groups outside of the programme.

The WiG evaluation found that there were opportunities for greater sensitisation and engagement with local district councils in the Copperbelt. This would help to create an enabling local environment for women’s participation in governance, as a complimentary strategy to building the capacities of women councillors.

The thematic evaluations indicate the existence of very fruitful interaction with duty bearers at community, village and district levels in the areas visited (L&H, CCA, WiG and AQHC). This is not true across the board, however, as far less fruitful cooperation was reported for some of the communities visited through the RFAG programme, where local duty bearers were heavily influenced by mining companies.

### 3.4.3 PARTNER SUSTAINABILITY

The JCP has helped build capacity within the partner organisations in two areas: (1) the administration and financial capacity to manage projects; and (2) the networking and platform formation. This capacity can be said to be relatively sustainable, as it may continue even if the JCP stops its assistance. In some cases (e.g. CCA) partner capacity building is being undermined by high turnover of staff.

---

\(^{33}\) The AQHC evaluation found that cuts in the AQHC advocacy budget had already led to rights holders not being adequately engaged and communities not involved in local policy and budget monitoring.
Uncertainty over continued JCP funding can create considerable instability for partners who cannot always easily mobilise alternative funding, even for the more successful and strategic projects\(^{34}\). Funding is increasingly a challenge for the CCA programme, as much of the available funding is allocated to the UN agencies and other large actors. The funding environment is changing, and there are concerns that Zambia’s recently-acquired lower middle income status will lead to reduced donor funding. Such developments are likely to negatively affect the sustainability of Zambian CSOs, which are still heavily dependent on donor funding. In a growing economy, however, there are also new opportunities for domestic fundraising\(^{35}\), which JCP partners could explore.

Whilst some partners are learning organisations, capable of adapting to changing contexts, others are less agile and adaptive. This may prove detrimental to their institutional sustainability (CCA). The church partners face particular constraints in developing into effective and professional organisations. Although the leadership is strong, at lower levels church recruitment processes prevent professionalization and specialisation. The practice of selecting and promoting staff on the basis of their faith and role in the church, rather than their professional or academic experience and technical, managerial expertise is a barrier\(^{36}\). On the whole JCP and partners could invest more in developing their monitoring, evaluation and learning frameworks and practice so they can learn more from their own experiences and embed more reflective, evidence-based decision-making.

### 3.4.4 Systemic Changes, Laws and Legal Frameworks and Gender

JCP has contributed to systemic changes in legal frameworks that are likely to be sustainable, for example, the Gender Equality Bill, bringing Zambia more in line with international norms and standards. However, continued effort is often required to achieve implementation and enforcement of new legal frameworks.

There is evidence that some of the changes brought about in women’s empowerment through the WiG programme are likely to be sustainable. National Women’s Lobby project has resulted in improved performance of women councillors in office, meaning this is likely to be long lasting for the individuals concerned. However the sustainability of the results of the WiG programme will also be determined by the continued support to promote women’s political participation in the upcoming local and parliamentary elections. At the time of the WiG evaluation, the uncertainty over continued JCP funding of the ZNWL Copperbelt project was delaying and inhibiting progress at all levels – not just for the partner, but, crucially, for the rights holders (women councillors and their communities).

In order to realise positive and sustainable results, for example in health and women’s empowerment and political participation, involving men is a crucial and integral aspect of sustainable development interventions (AQHC and WiG). The AQHC evaluation found there are evident gender disparities with women and girls bearing the larger burden of disease as compared to men and boys. Lack of male involvement in health programs hinders women’s freedom to access health care. The WiG programme found that involving men as key stakeholders and enablers of women’s empowerment was important for achieving deep and sustainable results.

---

\(^{34}\) JCP management decisions regarding funding for the ZNWL Copperbelt project in 2015 are likely to have a significant impact on sustainability of results. The lack of clarity over continued funding, at the time of the evaluation, had created a great deal of uncertainty with the risk of inertia and frustration, especially at the level of the rights holders.

\(^{35}\) In general there are increasing opportunities for local fundraising in Africa. See Michael Norton, 2009 ‘The Worldwide Fundraiser’s Handbook’ [here](#).

\(^{36}\) One example is that in Monze Diocese, where it is required that all posts above the level of field staff are filled by Catholics, whereas in Monze 6 out of 11 people are non-Catholics (CCA report, p8)
3.4.5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON SUSTAINABILITY

There are many examples of sustainability being addressed and achieved through, particularly through rights based empowering approaches at local level, combined with contribution to important changes in norms and legal frameworks. The thematic evaluations indicate the existence of very fruitful linkages with duty bearers at local levels where JCP has contributed to establishing effective local structures to mobilise and represent rights holders and transfer knowledge to them. There is evidence that some of the changes brought about in women’s empowerment are likely to be sustainable, whilst others will require continued support and funding. Involving men and supporting approaches which promote the family as a unit of development also offers opportunities for more sustainable results going forward.

The JCP has helped build partner capacity. Many partners are highly professionalised and specialised, learning organisations. Others will need continued, tailored support. The churches are credible and legitimate structures at local levels, with strong leadership. Some, however, tend to lag behind secular CSOs in professionalising. Overall strong, evidence-based monitoring and evaluation would help partners to become more effective and agile learning organisations. The funding environment is changing: foreign donor funding is likely to reduce, whilst new opportunities for domestic fundraising are opening up. JCP and partners will need a strong and well-informed analysis in order to respond to the changing funding landscape.

The achievements and learning from the last four years provides a strong basis for increasing sustainability in future, and consolidating the gains made. Going forward, sustainability can be strengthened by concentrating effort and funding to fewer projects and geographic areas. JCP maintains some operational development projects, which should now be phased out to enable more focus on rights based, empowering approaches.

1. Work with partners to design interventions based increasingly on mobilization, sensitisation and participatory advocacy and empowerment of rights holders at scale, rather than direct service delivery. Where there is a service delivery element (e.g. in AQHC), the evidence and best practice emerging should be used for advocacy leverage.
2. Completely phase out funding for operational projects.
3. Capacity building for advocacy work is required not only with partners, but also for communities and rights holders, so they can be empowered and participate effectively in advocacy and social accountability processes.
4. Continue to expand local advocacy groups and sensitisation of duty bearers, with a particular focus on including duty bearers in areas where large economic interests are at play and corruption levels may be high.
5. Involve men and invest in approaches which promote the family as the unit for development.
6. Support and allocate funding for partner organizational development and capacity building, based on partner capacity assessment.
7. Consider supporting partners to develop fundraising strategies, including progressively making the most of new opportunities for domestic fundraising.
8. Consider conducting partner organisational assessments for each new project agreement.