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### Abbreviations or Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BNB</td>
<td>Basic Needs Basket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Christian Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAWs</td>
<td>Community Agricultural Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGPs</td>
<td>Community Growth Promoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAZ</td>
<td>Churches Health Association of Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHWs</td>
<td>Community Health Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLAs</td>
<td>Community Livestock Auxiliaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMESA</td>
<td>Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCA</td>
<td>DanChurchAid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>District Land Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC Rights</td>
<td>Economic Social Cultural rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FNDP</td>
<td>Fifth National Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSP</td>
<td>Food Security Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOSELI</td>
<td>Food security and livelihoods project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICESCR Rights</td>
<td>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTZ</td>
<td>German Technical Co-operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCTR</td>
<td>Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATC</td>
<td>Kasisi Agricultural Training Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACs</td>
<td>Land Advocacy Committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADA</td>
<td>Law and Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWF</td>
<td>Lutheran World Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACO</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCDSS</td>
<td>Ministry of Community Development and Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDDD</td>
<td>Monze Diocese Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA</td>
<td>Norwegian Church Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCC</td>
<td>National Constitutional Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACO</td>
<td>Provincial Agriculture Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELUM RD</td>
<td>Participatory Ecological Land Use Management Association Regional Desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLWHA</td>
<td>People Living with HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT 1</td>
<td>Programme Type 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT3</td>
<td>Programme Type 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT 4</td>
<td>Programme Type 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBA</td>
<td>Right Based Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNDP (Draft)</td>
<td>Draft Sixth National Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFC</td>
<td>Women For Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZCSCCN</td>
<td>Zambia Civil Society Climate Change Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZLA</td>
<td>Zambia Land Alliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main Messages and Learning

(i) The land and agricultural policies, legislative and institutional environment and the physical infrastructure in the programme areas have not changed significantly since the inception of the Programme. Hence the programme objectives are still relevant.

(ii) The new NGO Act has brought in new dynamics that pose new challenges to joint lobbying and advocacy activities.

(iii) The livelihood of rural rights holders can only truly and sustainably be improved when they themselves are key players and/or participants in the development process. The Rights Based Approach (RBA) employed by DCA in its Food Security Programme has strong potential as an alternative approach to development other than the conventional methods in use.

(iv) The RBA has shown to build the resourcefulness, confidence levels and outlooks of programme beneficiaries. It has further shown that when people develop a sense of pride about themselves they look for solutions together and there are fewer conflicts in such communities.

(v) Programmes or projects that adopt the Rights Based Approach are more likely to be involved in policy advocacy which usually takes more time to yield results. Therefore programme life longer than traditional project phase may be necessary.

(vi) A programme approach to implementation fosters synergies and capacity building such that several organizations are able to work together while each develops and contributes its comparative advantages to the development process. Such integrated mode of creating communities of practice is rather ideally more complementary, beneficial to the local communities and sustainable. However local cooperation among partners should be strengthened to allow for synchrony in some operational processes.

(vii) Whereas the beneficiary communities are vulnerable and had generally previously experienced shocks to food security, perhaps as a result of the RBA, they tended to find more dignity in receiving support to produce their own food and make their own livelihood decisions.

(viii) Conservation agriculture with proven low cost options which are more affordable, likely to demonstrate incremental gains, and protect the environment continues to be appropriate for food security interventions in rural communities.

(ix) Emerging issues within climate change, such as flooding and droughts are posing additional challenges to the attainment of food security in these communities which inspite of the current interventions need stronger interventions in irrigation and drainage.

(x) A lot of synergies within and without the programme have been noted, including some synergies in the implementation stages of PT3 with PT1 and PT4. However, these synergies can be strengthened by structured input from other programme types during the formulation stages of the PT3.

(xi) There are many communities in need. However, the Programme should consider to begin with a smaller area and more robust interventions, then expanding coverage as capacities are built. Such “small area” is relative, however, the current programme appears to be rather vast geographically to achieve best programme outcome and monitoring, and value for money.
Executive Summary

Background:
1. This final evaluation report is based on DanChurchAid Zambia’s Food Security (PT3) Programme carried out from January 2006 to December 2010. The programme was mainly implemented in Southern and Eastern Provinces (and to a limited extent in Central and Lusaka Provinces) through local partner organizations.

2. The overall purpose of the evaluation was to provide DCA and its partners and other stakeholders learning from evidence based information about the program to improve the projects and feed into the process of developing the successor programme.

3. The overall objective of the evaluation was to assess the extent to which the objectives of the current programme have been attained and make recommendations on considerations that could be made to better achieve the outcomes of the successor programme.

Programme context:
4. A programme approach was adopted as part of DCA global strategy. This allows DCA to contribute to capacity building of local partner organizations while promoting cooperation among them. Also because the partners are closer to the communities, they are able to ensure beneficiary participation in defining project priorities, and this can be more sustainable beyond DCA’s support.

5. The Partner Platform that has emerged out of DCA intervention has initiated a process whereby partner organizations share experiences and deliberate on matters beyond programme objectives.

6. The programme intervention areas and programme objectives were found to be still relevant to address the food insecurity issues which affect the target group both in the physical and political environment within which the programme operates because of socio-economic indicators existing in these areas.

Findings:
7. Rights holders have been broadly imparted with knowledge regarding their human right to food, land and equitable treatment, and increasing awareness was evident. However, not all rights holders have attained the desired capacity to fully claim their rights. This signals the need to continue with this programme.

8. Some implementing partners were originally not all aware of the rights based approach and hence DCA facilitated the enhancement of capacity among partner organizations to use this approach to promote sustainable agriculture and advocate against structural barriers to food security.

9. Since the programme hinges on the right to food using the rights based approach, partners need to be continuously capacitated on this innovative approach to development to enable them adequately empower the rights holders and duty bearers on their duties and responsibilities.

10. Food security and nutritional status of vulnerable rural poor in the target areas has been improved through increased adoption of sustainable production methods including conservation farming and agro-forestry that suit their environmental circumstances, crop diversification and increasing use of horticultural crops in the dry season. The use of the dry season meant that these beneficiaries were producing food throughout the year.
11. Irrigation of gardens is still largely from shallow wells using watering cans and this is labor intensive although in some areas treadle pumps have been introduced with success. Such should be replicated in programme areas in order to address the challenges faced especially by vulnerable beneficiaries such as people living with HIV/AIDS and female headed households.

12. Crop yields have increased owing to the adoption of sustainable agricultural practices and increased knowledge of the beneficiaries. However, these gains can be capitalized on through improved post-harvest techniques beyond mere grain bins and drying of vegetables. Fermentation and food product diversification are viable options.

13. These increased crop yields have led to an increase in household incomes as well as disposable cash. As a result, many beneficiaries reported affluence in terms of being able to purchase household goods, livestock, farming implements, groceries, clothes and paying their children’s school fees.

14. A culture of savings is gradually evolving in some communities where purchase of livestock can be viewed as a de facto village banking system since it can be sold or bartered for the required goods and services in times of need.

15. There was a sense that awareness had been raised enough to begin to change the culture of providing food and nutrition first to the male as per tradition, but now to ensure that the sick and children were priority to be fed nutritious meals. No indication was observed for women of child bearing age on this account.

16. The capacity of the target group to claim and uphold their right to food was measured through increased ownership, and or access to the factor of production – land. It was observed that an increasing number of beneficiaries have access to and ownership of land.

17. In many areas women have been able to gain recognition and more access to land in their own right as members of families. For instance there is increasing protection of widows’ right to land whereby they are not displaced from the parcel of land owned with the late husband.

18. The Chiefs and headmen have been made aware of their responsibility as duty bearers and it was observed that tremendous progress has been made for both rights holders and duty bearers to seek better ways to administer land matters with innovative approaches being initiated like the issuance of the Traditional Land Holding Certificate by traditional leaders. These traditional leaders are now lobbying for the recognition of this certificate by government on par with the title deeds that government issues on leasehold land.

19. The partners have gained a lot of confidence from both duty bearers and rights holders so much so that they are now requested to arbitrate on land conflicts by both parties. In response, the partners have encouraged the setting up of Community Committees to help further decentralize the resolution of these issues with fairness and expediency.

Lessons Learnt:

20. The formation of the Partner Platform by DCA has served as a catalyst to enhance exchange of information and commitment and thereby meets DCA’s facilitative role. This Platform has also provided an avenue for training of partners on new issues and approaches.

21. Sustainability of the programme can be viewed from many angles. These include the establishment of district and community level structures which will go on after the partners have exited these communities; seed multiplication systems and livestock “pass-on the gift”
concept that will continue providing these communities with means of production, and collaboration with government institutions. The knowledge that the rights holders acquire will also remain with them always while the involvement of traditional leaders can lead to evolution of cultural and traditional systems which will ensure continuity.

22. With improved incomes comes the risk of HIV and AIDS as people are influenced by their potential to afford anything, including multiple sexual partners and venture into polygamous marriages. This concern has been addressed through awareness among the beneficiaries and caring for the sick, and discussing the pandemic more openly so that both the infected and affected work together and support each other.

23. As a result of the above, communities have become more socially empowered with women speaking out on their own confidently and men respecting their views.

24. The complexities introduced by different organizational cultures and challenges were sometimes evident in the programme monitoring and evaluation process, such as late submission of reports by some partners. However steps were taken to make this more systematic based upon the log-frames of their respective projects.

25. There have been Programme responses to climate change through bringing this issue to the top of partner organizations agenda, facilitating trainings and the formation of the Zambia Civil Society Climate Change Network. At field level interventions have been instituted mostly in terms of crop diversification and promotion of sustainable farming methods.

26. A lot of synergies within and without the programme have been noted between Partners; Partners/DCA and government ministries, other NGOs and international organizations; between DCA programmes (PT1, PT3 and PT4); and between DCA and other stakeholders like Diakonia, the Finnish Embassy and GTZ.

27. The length of some projects does not correspond to the time required for the realization of results in the kind of issues the programme deals with (farming practices, cultural and policy issues).

Recommendations:

DCA and Partners:

(i) Both DCA and partners should realize that high staff turnover impacts negatively on the effectiveness of the programme and that they should consider to provide some form of incentives and morale to reduce this costly trend.

(ii) Partners should take into consideration the needs at the grassroots level in activity implementation, as well as the sequencing and timeliness of these so that rights holders’ confidence is increasingly built. Activities out of sequence are sometimes misconstrued to be not of priority to them.

(iii) The Partners Platform should ensure that the different level of development and capacities amongst the partners, and inconsistencies by partners’ representatives attending the platform do not create a challenge in their interactions and commitment to the shared ideals of the platform.

(iv) The Partners Platform should consider undertaking joint and more visible advocacy publicity strategies that address common challenges they face in addressing issues which affect food security such as those mentioned under external factors. This will attract more attention from the policy makers.
In order for DCA to effectively monitor all programme areas, it may be necessary to encourage implementing partners to adopt a gradual geographical spread of areas receiving DCA support.

The monitoring and evaluation systems and reporting at all levels should be synchronized with the programme logical framework to allow for improved results measurement while all projects should be evaluated to improve on programming.

Partners should ensure that financial systems (guidelines and procedures) are documented for continuity focusing on institutional capacity building.

DCA, through its partners, should ensure that local level staff benefit from the facilitative role and institutional capacity building activities it provides for improved programme impact.

Future programming:

The length of partner projects should be synchronized with the time required for the realization of results in the kinds of issues the programme deals with.

The Programme should further strengthen the claiming of rights by improving its work on justiciability.

The Programme needs to widen climate change adaptation (and possibly mitigation) measures beyond what is currently being done.

The Programme should consider incorporating DRR strategies. To make this effective, they should increase linkages to early warning systems.

The programme should consider having institutionalized strategic linkages to research institutions and other resources rather than have one off engagements (exchange visits, study tours, etc) or ad hoc arrangements.

When implementing microfinance projects, careful consideration should be taken in the selection of the types of products to embark on and procedures to put in place to ensure results.
Section: 1. Introduction

1 Background

This final evaluation report is based on the DanChurchAid (DCA) Zambia Food Security Programme (PT3) carried out from January, 2006 to December, 2010. The programme has mainly been implemented in Southern and Eastern Provinces (and to a limited extent in Central and Lusaka Provinces) through local partner organizations. Other stakeholders include local and international NGOs and bilateral donors that work in collaboration with these implementing partners, like Diakonia, the Finnish Embassy and GTZ.

1.1 Overall Purpose and Objective of Evaluation

“The purpose of this evaluation is to provide DCA, its partners and other stakeholders learning from evidence based information about the programme and related projects in order to improve the projects and feed into the process of developing a new programme to be implemented jointly by Norwegian Church Aid (NCA), DanChurchAid (DCA) and Christian Aid (CA) from 2011”.

“The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess the extent to which the objectives of the DCA food security programme 2006-2010 have been attained and make recommendations on considerations that could be made to ensure better achievement of outcomes in a successor programme”. The specific objectives, the scope and deliverables of the evaluation are provided in the detailed Terms of reference (ToRs) attached as Annex 1.

1.2 Methodology

In undertaking the assignment, an orientation meeting was held with DCA staff, desk literature review of pertinent reports and documents was carried out, and interviews were held with stakeholders in Lusaka. For field work, a participatory method was employed. The information obtained was then synthesized, and a debriefing meeting held with stakeholders. The orientation meeting for the assignment was held on 29th October 2010, and it was attended by the DCA Food Security and Relief Programme Officer and the DCA Regional Representative. This meeting enabled the DCA staff and Consultants to have a clear understanding of the terms of reference and identify things that needed to be put in place to facilitate smooth holding of the final evaluation. The matters discussed included aspects such as logistics, arrangements for field visits, and identification of documents to be reviewed. The desk study involved literature review of materials related to the FSP. The documents reviewed are listed as Annex 2: List of Documents Reviewed.

Stakeholder consultations were held with CHAZ, LWF, ZLA, MDDD, PELUM RD, Diakonia, JCTR, ZCSCCN and DCA staff. Field work involved visits to Chipata (LWF and ZLA projects) and Petauke (ZLA and CHAZ projects) in Eastern Province and Chibombo (CHAZ project) in Central Province. Initially field visits were only supposed to be conducted in Eastern Province. However, on the observation of CHAZ that the project site in Petauke was recently added to the project and might not provide valuable information on lessons learnt the evaluation team also visited Chipembi in Chibombo, the currently these include CHAZ, JCTR, PELUM Association, Women for Change, Zambia Land Alliance, Monze Diocese Development Department and LWF.
oldest project site in the CHAZ food security and nutrition project. Only three institutions were covered during field visits in the Eastern Province for a number of reasons. It was learnt that although JCTR was implementing a pilot project in Mambwe District, it did not have a physical presence there at the time of the evaluation. As for WFC which is present in Lundazi, consultants were informed that DCA does not fund Food Security Programme activities in that area. In the districts visited, the Evaluation team held meetings with collaborating partners, right holders, duty bearers (traditional leaders and government officials) and non-beneficiaries. The list of people interviewed is attached as Annex 4: List of People Interviewed.

After field work, a debriefing meeting attended by representatives from CHAZ, WFC, PELUM RD, JCTR, ZLA and DCA was held in Lusaka on Friday 26 November 2010 where initial findings by the Evaluators were presented. The comments and guidance received supported the preparation of this report.

Report synthesis was a process of triangulating all the foregoing information from the desk study, field work, debriefing meetings and experiential data from the Evaluation team vis-à-vis the assignment objectives and requested services. To achieve the objectives, the evaluation team critically reviewed the quality of Programme design and management. Programme activities in the four intervention areas were reviewed using the following evaluation criteria: relevance/appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability in relation to the Programme’s set objectives. Cross cutting issues and the external environment were taken into consideration in the evaluation.

1.3 Limitations of the Evaluation

1.3.1 Time Factor

Whereas the programme covers four (4) non-contiguous provinces, only six days were available for field work. Looking at the size of the programme and the distances between field sites, the field days were not adequate to effectively interact with the representative sample of the right holders. For instance, there was no time to hold one to one discussions with the right holders and visits to some Chipembi and Nyanje programme field sites had to be curtailed or cancelled due to limited time. Although it was envisaged that in Chipata the evaluation team would split in two, to be able to cover the scheduled programme, the team had to split into three.

1.3.2 Scope

The concentration of the field visits in Eastern and Central Provinces possibly will not reveal how different cultural traditional factors between provinces may have impacted on programme execution and result realisation.

1.4 Structure of the Report

The report is arranged in the following sequence:

The Executive Summary provides a quick capture of the report’s main contents. Section 1: Introduction outlines the background, the purpose, objectives, and scope of the evaluation, the methodology used in undertaking the evaluation and highlights the limitations of the evaluation. Section 2: Interventions and Context highlights the programme strategy, target group, intervention areas, geographical focus, the context of the evaluation, and the findings of earlier evaluations. Section 3: Findings are empirical data that the evaluators have presented as evidence relevant to the evaluation questions. They assess the programme for its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and inclusion (participation) of various stakeholders under each programme
objective. **Section 4: Lessons Learnt** highlights findings and conclusions that can be generalized beyond the evaluated intervention. **Section 5: Recommendations** indicate what actions the evaluators believe should be taken on the basis of the evaluation.
Section 2: Interventions and Context

2 Programme Interventions and Context

2.1 Programme Strategy and Target Group

The programme was implemented using a rights based approach. The main rights that were addressed were identified based on the articles of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESC Rights) which encompass the right to food. The primary target were rights holders that were considered to be the poorest of the poor i.e. the most food insecure especially HIV/AIDS affected households, women, children, child and female headed households, the disabled and elderly persons. However, recognising the existence of the extended family system in Zambia the programme also targeted some poor households who had responsibility for vulnerable groups such as orphans. The secondary target were moral duty bearers especially local NGOs. The main duty bearers targeted included traditional leaders, government, regional bodies and international organisations.

2.2 Programme Interventions Areas and Geographical Focus

The main programme intervention areas identified were: promotion of sustainable agriculture; support to income generating activities; empowerment of the poor through organisation and awareness raising; and advocacy/lobbying at national, regional and international levels. Eastern and Southern provinces were the main geographical focus areas. However, the programme also targeted areas in Central and Lusaka Provinces. This was done in order to allow for close monitoring of pilot projects and also to allow flexibility to partners that were focusing on other provinces beyond DCA’s main targeted areas.

2.3 Programme Context

2.3.1 Location

The DCA-Zambia Food Security Programme has mainly been implemented in Southern and Eastern Provinces (and to a limited extent in Central and Lusaka Provinces). These areas were selected from among the places that had experienced disruptions to agricultural production and food security in recent times, as a result of floods or drought.

2.3.2 Programme Context

One of the key activities that led to the development of this programme was a context analysis. The analysis focused on identifying structural factors that were contributing to the problem of food security in Zambia especially in relation to the rural poor at the time using the rights based approach. The analysis identified several structural barriers which were mainly due to inadequate policies and priorities as well as poor utilization of the natural resources. These included declining agricultural production, lack of employment for an increasing share of the population, increased food prices, seasonal fluctuations of available food and general low knowledge of nutrition information, child feeding and weaning practices. Other factors included natural disasters such as
droughts and floods, underdeveloped agricultural sector infrastructure, inadequate market accessibility, pest infestation to their harvests, lack of adding value to agriculture products and poor access to agricultural inputs and other production support services such as extension, agricultural finance, etc. The detailed analysis of structural barriers is provided in the Programme document (PT3 2005, pp. 9 – 10).

The context analysis recognised that the Zambian Government was signatory to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), which encompassed the right to food, over 80% of the Zambian population lived under poverty conditions of less than one US Dollar per day and survived on less than three meals per day. This segment of the population was exposed to risks of vulnerability including hunger, food insecurity, disease (including HIV/AIDS, malaria), high incidences of malnutrition, and poor access to clean safe water and proper sanitation services. Food insecurity often took its toll among rural households, where the majority of the population was found in the poverty bracket. Government’s role as duty bearer was not adequately fulfilled as people’s capacities to purchase or produce own food continued to be weak or violated.

Attainment of food security can only be achieved through fulfilment of basic human rights. Therefore, fulfilment of the these basic human rights calls for the right holders to be responsible for their rights as well as the government, as a duty bearer, in creating an enabling environment for the people and communities to be able to access the rights. A continuous violation of these rights entails the need for the empowerment of people and communities for them to be able to access these rights on one hand, and capacity building for partner organisations to enable them empower the people and communities on the other hand. On its own part, the government has a responsibility to provide an enabling environment for the above to obtain and be able to address food security issues. This role for government is acknowledged in existing policy documents like the FNDP, the NAP, the Vision 2030, the draft SNDP and the draft Constitution.

2.3.3 Programme history

The programme document was finalised in October, 2005 while implementation started in January, 2006. The mid-term evaluation was conducted from 1 to 12 October 2008 covering mainly the field activities in the Southern Province. Based on the recommendations of the midterm review, a number of adjustments were made to the programme document, including the revising of the log frame. This end of programme evaluation is now being undertaken as one of the planned activities.

2.4 Findings and conclusions of earlier evaluations

In October, 2008 a mid-term evaluation for the programme was conducted. The review found that programme strategy was still relevant in the Zambian context. It recommended that micro finance, climate change adaptation (in particular flood control), DRR/Relief, and a move towards including justiciability of the Right to Food should be strengthened through capacity development in the platform. It further recommended that LFA matrix should be revised with partners’ involvement. Following these recommendations, the programme had its LFA matrix revised and proceeded to work on the other suggestions.
Section: 3. Findings

3 Findings

3.1 Programme Design and management

DCA Zambia office took a programme approach in implementing the FSP and not a project approach. This was in line with the DCA global decision. In the programme approach DCA took a very active role in facilitating synergy among the different projects in the programme through promotion of networking (in the partner platform and joint capacity building of programme partners). The programme was implemented by partner organizations that already have a presence in and strong links with communities through previous and on-going support. DCA chose to work with different partners present in identified geographical locations of interest, or those involved in issues of interest to DCA objectives. For instance, ZLA had a comparative advantage on land issues as the only organization dealing specifically with land matters in Zambia at the time. In the same regard, DCA supported LADA because it was the only NGO providing paralegal services for human rights abuse in rural areas. This selection of various partners was meant to promote a participatory approach to development.

Some of the programme partners like LADA and ZLA were very young organizations that did not have very developed institutional capacity in M and E, strategic planning, financial management or governance whereas other partners such as CHAZ, JCTR and MDDD had stronger capacities. Therefore the programme conducted a number of activities that included capacity building initiatives as well as exposure and exchange visits as indicated in Annex 6, for the benefit of all the partners. In addition, DCA also provided capacity building to individual partners according to identified needs. DCA’s focus was to strengthen the partners’ capacities so as to optimize their contribution to the attainment of programme objectives and results. Based on the fact that the partners were not at the same level of organizational development, DCA applied flexibility in partner selection. In some cases, DCA did not seek to change the structures or modes of operation of implementing partners. For instance, DCA did not ask the partner for a new project proposal tailored for DCA funding but rather DCA supported a common project with other cooperating partners and the partner prepared only 1 report that was shared with all the funding partners.

3.2 Relevance/Appropriateness

3.2.1 Food security and nutritional status of vulnerable rural poor

The targeted provinces have experienced shocks and stress arising from the changes in the weather patterns (persistent droughts and periodic flooding) which reduce subsistence crop yields and farmers’ incomes. This situation is compounded by poor agricultural practices, lack of access to credit, low soil fertility, overgrazing, low rainfall, high infection of HIV/AIDS, high mortality rate, and low nutritional status of the target population. These have resulted in limited economic opportunities outside of agriculture, food insecurity, and severe environmental degradation due to drought and destruction from wildlife. Therefore the programme intervention areas and programme objectives mentioned in Section 1 of this report are still relevant to address the food insecurity issues identified in the programme context which affect the target group both in the physical and political environment within which the programme operates. In addition, as currently
set out, the intervention logic is sound (overall objectives, specific objectives, results/outputs, activities, inputs and assumptions).

3.2.2 The capacity of the target group to claim and uphold their right to food increased

“Only knowledgeable rights-holders know how to claim their right to food.” (FAO 2006, p. 8) During this study, it was noted that the rights-holders have been broadly imparted with knowledge regarding their human right to food, land and equitable treatment, and so there is increasing awareness. However not all rights holders have attained the desired capacity to fully claim their rights. There is, therefore, need to continue empowering them with knowledge to enable them develop the capacity to claim these rights. There is also need to continue raising awareness on their responsibility to claim their right to food. This can be done by making the right holders more aware about the ways in which Government’s role as duty bearer is not adequately fulfilled in terms of creating an enabling environment for them to purchase or produce own food. That is, making right holders more aware about ways in which their right to food security is violated and how they can in turn use that to make the government more responsive.

3.2.3 Enhanced capacity of DCA’s implementing partners to make use of the RBA

The DCA Food Security Programme hinges on the right to food and the RBA which is a new concept from the conventional development approaches partners have used in the past. Therefore, for the partners to be able to raise awareness among the right holders and duty bearers on their duties and responsibilities, and empower the former to claim their rights, they themselves need to be capacity built on a continuous basis. The enhanced capacity of DCA partners to use RBA has meant that they are meeting the objective to reduce food insecurity in a more sustainable way as beneficiaries are effectively gaining capacity to produce or procure food. However, in some cases staff turnover reduces the momentum gained with training beneficiaries.

3.2.4 DCA’s facilitative role to enhance capacity of partner organisations

DCA globally has a rights based commitment and works in a RBA in all its long term development programmes. DCA Zambia implements the FSP through partners some of whom did not seem to be very well conversant with the RBA, despite DCA having conducted training in RBA and conducted other training workshops. This could be as a result of high field-staff turnover leading to new officers who have not subsequently received the same training and/or lack of trickle-down effect of training from the national office of partners to local implementing levels. It is, therefore, relevant that the DCA facilitates the enhancement of capacity of partner organisations to use the rights based approach, promote sustainable agriculture and advocate against structural barriers to food security in a more effective way taking into consideration the identified challenges. One option remains for DCA to work with local training institutions in order to try to institutionalize the RBA concept as well as have a ready training source that partners can access.

3.3 Effectiveness

Under this evaluation criterion, the Evaluation Team assessed the extent to which results have been achieved, and analyzed the external and internal factors which influenced the achievement and/or non-achievement of the results under each objective.

3.3.1 Food security and nutritional status of vulnerable rural poor

The outcome indicators under this objective and the findings are discussed below:

1.1 *Increased adoption of sustainable agricultural practices particularly conservation and organic farming utilizing agro-forestry plant species, green and animal manure for field crop and garden fertilization*
Traditional and conventional agricultural production practices have proven unsustainable over the years because of poor yields or economically impractical requirements on the part of the rural poor. Therefore adoption of low input sustainable agricultural practices such as conservation farming, organic farming, and agro-forestry were promoted in the programme. In addition, in order to improve availability of food to and nutritional status of beneficiaries, gardening with irrigation and animal husbandry were also promoted.

The evaluation revealed that beneficiaries were increasingly adopting these sustainable practices in varying magnitudes of practice and according to their environmental circumstances, extent of exposure to available options and length of period in the programme as shown in the Table below.

Table 3-1: Adoption of sustainable production methods under the LWF FOSELI II project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Farmers</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers adopting permanent planting basins</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers adopting permanent planting pits</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers planting soil fertility enhancing plant species</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers with pegged (demarcated) fields</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LWF

The use of animal manure or compost, with or without pot-holing was prevalent. The beneficiaries did not perceive pot-holing to be laborious as they said it was comparable to the traditional ridging (in Eastern Province where they plant on ridges, not Southern Province). Crop diversification and horticulture (vegetable gardens with irrigation and fruits production) were observed to be strong, lending to green vegetation at a time of the year when it is usually dry. Beneficiaries were making sound decisions on the garden enterprise to undertake. For instance, in Nyanje, there was a move away from growing aerial crops such as tomatoes in the mountain areas because monkeys found these attractive and easy to harvest. Instead, they opted for crops like chilli and onions which repelled the monkeys. Agro-forestry had not found a strong hold across the programme areas, with only few mini-nurseries set up so far.

1.2 Increased diversification into drought tolerant food crops and reduced dependence on rain-fed agriculture

Increased diversification into drought tolerant crops is one of the strategies to improve household food security. This was also progressing rapidly with cassava as the main crop observed in the fields. Beneficiaries also informed of planting sweet potatoes.

Table 3-2: Adoption of drought tolerant crops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Farmers</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers accessing cassava planting material</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers accessing sweet potato planting material</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LWF

While it is still a challenge for most households in rural areas to grow crops during the dry season, numerous programme farmers maintained household gardens and participated in community garden initiatives. These gardens were largely maintained by supplying water obtained from shallow wells dug in the fields and using watering cans to transfer water. Only in few cases were gardens close to the stream to be able to obtain water from it. The distances from the homestead to the gardens varied, but several of them were relatively distant than desirable. With the perceived
benefit of gardens, a large number of beneficiaries are engaged in off-season crop production thereby reducing their dependence on rain-fed agriculture. However, rain-fed agriculture is still the predominant method of food crop production.

1.3 Increased crop yields, livestock production and diet diversification

The interventions employed in the Food Security Programme have largely shown success in increasing crop yields. This could be attributed to adoption of sustainable agricultural practices and increased knowledge of beneficiaries. Several of the farmers indicated that they now obtain higher yields from their fields compared to the pre-programme period. Data provided in the Table below present a comparison of yields between the pre-programme and programme periods for selected crops. However to capitalize on these gains, there will be need to build capacities in proper post harvest techniques that exist on the market beyond storage in grain bins and drying of vegetables, according to what the target group can grasp.

Due to limited market availability in terms of their ability to transport produce, the beneficiaries preferred to grow crops such as beans, onions and cabbages which can be stored for a much longer period even when the market is saturated, compared to tomatoes which easily get spoiled.

Table 3-3: Average lima (0.25 hectares) crop yields in kilograms reported by Programme farmers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Pre-programme Yield</th>
<th>Programme Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundnuts</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data collected from right holders in during interviews

Literature review reveals that the Programme has been promoting seed multiplication of open pollinated and indigenous varieties by facilitating training in seed production and supplying inputs; facilitating training in crop rotation, pest and disease control, erosion control and providing inputs for crop production; facilitating creation of community based agriculture extension structures and seed/grain banks; facilitating training and supply inputs for horticulture, livestock and fish farming; and promoting consumption of fruits, meat, eggs and fish. These activities have resulted in: improved access to seed and other plant propagation materials such that for instance in 2009, in LWF operational areas about 3, 131 targeted beneficiaries had access to planting materials while 728 targeted households in MDDD operational areas had timely access to maize seed; increased crop yields, food availability and utilization among the target groups to the extent that in LWF operational areas of Chipata district maize yields progressively increased and averaged 4.6 tonnes/hectare (t/ha) in 2008/9 season compared to the average of 0.6 t/ha in 2006 at the start of the project; reduced cattle mortality e.g. from 10% in 2006 to 2% in 2009 in MDDD operational areas in Southern Province; increased availability and access to draft power resulting in increase in the average size of land under cultivation (ha) for 19.8 % of the 1,260 targeted households in the MDDD project; increased construction of improved livestock structures among the direct and indirect beneficiaries; increased ownership of livestock among the targeted beneficiaries especially small livestock e.g. goats acquired through ‘pass-on-the-gift’; increased availability of fish harvested from ponds constructed and stocked by targeted beneficiaries; and increased access to organic fertilizer - animal droppings (2009 DCA Annual Programme Report). The livestock multiplied to a level where, in Southern Province, MDDD has even made suggestions to limit the number of goats per household because of their destructive nature when they are too many.

1.4 Increased incomes and savings and creation of self-sustaining revolving fund schemes among the target group
With increased crop yields and raising vegetable gardens has come increase in incomes and disposable cash. Many beneficiaries reported their new found ability to afford to purchase household needs and pay children’s school fees. They did not give the indication that a savings culture has emerged, and this could be largely because many of them are still in the deficit ownership phase and have to spend to buy essential items they previously were unable to get. They indicated that training had been given in village banking/micro-finance, and several groups were considering initiating this in the near future. However, purchase of livestock can be viewed as a de facto village banking system since the livestock can be sold in the time of need or bartered in exchange for preferred goods.

1.5 Reduced malnutrition among under 5 children, expectant mothers and People Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA)

It is traditional that men get to eat ahead of the females and children. However there has been raised awareness through training in food nutrition that children and the HIV/AIDS infected require regular nutritious meals. That there is a change of practice was demonstrated by the support groups giving priority to the nutritional needs of these groups. It was not obvious that there was a specific attention to women of child-bearing age in the same manner.

The programme facilitated training in nutrition and food processing; conducted community based educational campaigns on nutritional requirements of under 5 children, expectant mothers, and PLWHA; produced and distributed nutrition training manuals and other IEC materials. These activities have resulted in increased establishment of nutritional gardens and diversified vegetable production; reduced HIV/AIDS related stigma and increased acceptance of PLWHA in rural communities; improved knowledge on nutrition (especially its relationship with HIV/AIDS) and sanitation among targeted beneficiaries and community based volunteers e.g. CHAZ trained 882 beneficiaries on hygiene and sanitation issues and 950 on good nutrition in relation to PLWHA and children under the age of 5 years; increased weight gain among children under the age of 5 years and PLWHA included in the CHAZ growth monitoring and promotion interventions (2009 DCA Annual Report).

1.6 Increased use of labour saving farm technologies and activities

It is generally appreciated that one of the components of increased productivity is to use labour saving farm technologies. MDDD and LWF have implemented some of these technologies in irrigation as articulated in Section 3.9 of this report under “Climatic Change”.

3.3.2 The capacity of the target group to claim and uphold their right to food increased

The outcome indicators under this objective and the findings are discussed below:

2.1 Increased awareness and claim making on the right to food among targeted rights holders

The right to food can be met through the ability of the right holder to produce the food, or to purchase it. As majority of rural dwellers rely on agriculture for their livelihood it is imperative that they possess a parcel of land on which to grow food. Most of rural land is held under Customary Administration requiring the Chief, through the village headman or woman, to allocate land. It was observed that the programme and its partners have made tremendous progress to increase awareness on land ownership, promote better understanding through structures on the ground, and to provide advocacy and arbitration support. The existing situation is that both the right holders and duty bearers are seeking better ways to distribute land to residents and to administer land matters. Some of the programme areas have recorded increased request for arbitration on land issues suggesting that more people are seeking to claim this right. In response, the programme and its
partners have encouraged the setting up of Community Committees to resolve these issues with fairness and expediency.

On the side of generating income to be able to afford a better living, more beneficiaries are raising vegetable gardens not only for household food but also to be able to sell. Therefore this rising level of entrepreneurship supports the ability of the rights holders to claim that right to food through production or purchase. Available data shown in the Table below demonstrates that there is now decreasing levels of household food insecurity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Quarter of the year</th>
<th>Total number of beneficiaries</th>
<th>Food secure HH (Headed) %</th>
<th>Food threatened HH (Headed) %</th>
<th>Food insecure HH (Headed) %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Dec 2006</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Dec 2007</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Dec 2008</td>
<td>1366</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Dec 2009</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Dec 2010</td>
<td>1804</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: LWF Chipata

2.2 Increased land tenure security among the targeted rights holders especially marginalized groups

Traditional land has never been associated with title, rather the goodwill of the Chief. However, in the programme areas, aside from government efforts to encourage conversion of customary land to title, it was observed that these duty bearers are leading a progressive effort to increase land tenure security in their areas. For instance, the Chiefs have begun keeping registers of land ownership to support the legal claim to such. Previously, only registers of people were kept. In addition, these duty bearers are seeking to introduce a Traditional Land Holding Certificate which they are lobbying the government to recognise.

Increased land tenure security could also be demonstrated in the changes in traditional practices. In many programme areas, women are now outright land owners. In other cases, widows are now being allowed to retain land belonging to their late husband without fear or intimidation. Further, land holders are being encouraged to demarcate their land holdings with hedges to show the extent of their holdings. In addition, there has been increased demand among rights holders to be given title deeds to land in agricultural resettlement schemes; increased willingness among traditional leaders to work with District Land Alliance (DLA) in addressing land related problems in their areas of jurisdiction; greater involvement of duty bearers (traditional leaders and government officials) in seeking solutions to long term land disputes between legal title holders and squatters; increased lobbying and advocacy among DCA partners for reforms in land laws and policies in both customary and statutory land tenure systems e.g. ZLA advocated for the upholding of the dual land tenure systems in Zambia; increased involvement of DCA partners in formulation of land laws and policies e.g. ZLA gave submissions to the National Constitutional Conference (NCC) and also provided input to the Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP). All these point to the fact that the workshops, radio programmes, poster distribution and public forum discussions provided to build the capacities of communities are achieving laudable success rates.
3.3.3 Enhanced capacity of DCA's implementing partners to make use of the RBA

The outcome indicators under this objective and the findings are discussed below:

3.1 Increased involvement of partners in awareness raising and advocacy for the right to food at community and national level

All partners implementing DCA supported projects are using the right based approach (RBA) but in different magnitudes. Whereas not all are directly involved in advocacy or arbitration, the fact that beneficiaries are receiving training and increasing their claim making points to the effectiveness of the RBA as a necessary tool to achieve improved livelihoods. DCA partners are also growing in their appreciation, adaption and adoption rate of this approach. Very limited primary data was collected from right holders because some meetings could not take place. For instance, in Lembani village, people from four villages gathered with a view to come and get feedback on the land conflict not for the focus group meeting which the Consultants went to undertake. This was the same in Kapatamoyo village. In both cases, the right holders have been squatting on other people’s land with title for a very long time and have been told to vacate. Their argument was “how can we claim our rights to food when we do not have access to land?”. However, secondary data gathered from literature review revealed that awareness raising and advocacy for the right to food has been in various forms. For example, JCTR raised awareness and educated the National Constitution Conference (NCC) members, its constituency and the general public on the ESCR, and also urged government to consider adopting ESCR in the Zambian Constitution Bill of Rights arguing that this is important for human development. Other areas have been promotion of human rights by JCTR and ZLA, advocacy for policy changes in national poverty reduction efforts and participation in the formulation of national policies, advocacy for up-scaling of safety nets to all chronically poor households and provision of school feeding programmes to all pupils in rural areas; advocacy for changes in the tax regime for the mining sector and re-instatement of ‘wind fall’ tax in the mining sector so that more Zambians can benefit from mining activities; advocacy for increased funding to the agriculture sector and participation in the national budgeting process; monitoring government expenditure and national budget tracking (JCTR and PELUM RD); land conflicts, land Policy and impact of large scale investment on land (ZLA); and research on climate change in relation to root causes, effects, adaption and mitigation measures (PELUM-RD). There has also been increased involvement of DCA partners in improving advocacy skills among rights holders e.g. JCTR conducted an advocacy training workshop for the Justice and Peace members from 10 Catholic dioceses with a focus on how the Basic Needs Basket (BNB) can be used in various social justice activities. MDDD conducted advocacy training for its 42 community based volunteers. However, the outcome of this training could not be assessed with volunteers and right holders since no field visits were conducted in Southern Province due to limited time.

Although there has been increased involvement of DCA partners in raising awareness and advocacy, the results have been in different magnitudes. For instance, there has been increased use of the JCTR BNB by third parties for strategic planning and decision making, in salary negotiations among trade unionists, and as content in various independent publications. However, despite advocacy for increased budget allocation to the agricultural sector, there have been fluctuations in such allocations over the years: 6.8% in 2009, 7% in 2010 and 5.9% in 2011. The limited positive outcome out of the various advocacy campaigns undertaken have also been shown by e.g. making ESCR justiciable. This is mainly due to lack of responsiveness on the part of government and policy makers.

3.2 Increased involvement of DCA partners in advocacy on land tenure security, Economic Social and Cultural Rights, trade and public finance governance

ZLA has continued to be actively involved in advocacy for fair, equal and transparent land allocation in the statutory and customary land tenure systems by expanding its operations to new districts.
Other DCA programme partners, through the partner platform, have also shown great interest in advancing the call for tenure security in their operational areas in collaboration with ZLA.

Literature review reveals that JCTR’s work on the EPAs has created a lot of awareness on what EPAs are and how they will impact on the lives of various groups of people in society especially the farmers. The collaboration between JCTR and other civil society organizations has resulted in sustained pressure on the Zambian government, the Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA) and the European Union to be open and provide information on the EPAs and its implications on trade between the ESA countries and the EU. JCTR’s, through Jubilee Zambia, and PELUM’s decision to join the international ‘Stop EPAs, in their current form!’ campaign greatly strengthened international advocacy for fair trade agreements between Europe and the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) countries.

There has also been increased networking of DCA partners with like-minded and strategic institutions e.g.: JCTR collaborated with various stakeholders involved in trade issues such as government, NGOs, the private sector and professional associations nationally; JCTR collaborated with Human Rights Commission (HRC), Zambia land Alliance (ZLA), United Nations, Women and Law in Southern Africa (WLSA) on human rights; PELUM RD collaborated with the Food Sovereignty in Africa (AFSA) on natural resource conservation. Other advocacy areas are as discussed under indicator number 1 of this objective.

3.3.4 DCA’s facilitative role to enhance capacity of partner organisations

DCA committed itself to support implementing partners to have a better understanding of RBA principles and provided other training as shown in Annex 6 so that they could sufficiently be able to build capacities of their targeted beneficiaries. The fact that all partners have adopted the RBA (though in varying magnitudes) and that partners are providing training in sustainable production methods points to the effectiveness of the approach DCA has taken. The formation of the Partner Platform has served as a catalyst to enhance exchange of information and commitment to building partnerships thereby meeting the DCA’s facilitative role. It was observed that whereas the platform has been holding some meetings the function of this platform can be further improved, as articulated in Section 4 paragraph 3 of this report.

As discussed in Section 3.3.3, a lot of lobbying and advocacy work has been undertaken by DCA partners on various issues which affect food security at national/regional/international advocacy with a view to deal with those structural barriers to food security. Institutions involved in national lobbying and advocacy include JCTR, ZLA and PELUM RD. At Regional and international level, JCTR, PELUM Association and ZLA have links to international networks in Africa and beyond and sometimes advocate, lobby or partner with the World Bank and IMF.

While noticing the impact as observed above, how much of that can be attributed to DCA is limited by the financial contribution that DCA makes to the partners’ portfolios. The major Programme partners revealed that DCA contributes around 5% of their total portfolio. This was also confirmed by DCA: “The Food Security Programme has Partners of varying sizes and capacities. Some partners such as Monze Diocese, Lutheran World Federation, and the Churches Health Association of Zambia have a high budget absorption capacity based on the projects that they are implementing. Therefore, considering the size of these partners, the current budget is not sufficient as our contribution to their overall budget is very minimal”.

3.4 Efficiency

To assess the efficiency of the programme, the Evaluators looked at how far funding, personnel, regulatory, administrative, time, other resources and procedures contributed to or hindered the
achievement of results. That is, the Evaluators looked at whether or not the Programme was implemented as planned while utilizing resources in the most appropriate way compared to alternative ways, and having “value for money”.

Generally, all the partners indicated that DCA was mostly prompt in transferring monies for activities. However there were sometimes delays in transfers between implementing partner headquarters and district offices. This was never deliberate but as a result of different implementing partner administrative procedures. However, DCA mentioned that they face challenges in releasing funds on time to some partners due to some of the following reasons:

- Partners delay in submitting their proposals; this also causes delays in the project approval process within DCA. As result, disbursement of funds to partners is also delayed.
- A lot of time is spent (especially with smaller and new partners) on correcting documents that do not meet DCA standards. This in turn delays the approval process and disbursement of funds.
- Delays are also experienced when partners do not submit satisfactory financial reports. DCA then spends more time in providing support and correcting the partner on how to prepare reports that satisfy DCA reporting standards.

Nonetheless, the planned activities were all executed even if later than planned and funds were used for the intended purpose by the partners. Where activities were seasonal, synchronizing of training with those activities for beneficiaries affected the results of the programme. However, some partners do not always adhere to the DCA reporting deadlines. This affects the DCA internal reporting deadlines and the consolidation of their reports for audit purposes.

It was felt that high staff turnover and differences in partners’ capacities reduced the effectiveness and efficiency with which results were obtained. For instance because new staff did not benefit from previously planned and implemented training activities they were sometimes deficient in skills to be imparted on beneficiaries.

The length of project-life relative to the time that some officers were employed, or the relative time at which some beneficiaries joined the programme was a challenge where efficiency was concerned. Both categories therefore felt that programme life was short. In the case of employees, morale and dedication may have been negatively affected by anxiety as to whether they would still have a job in the ensuing short period. Beneficiaries may also have sometimes been suspicious of the commitment of the programme. Therefore, effort must be made to reassure both categories that meeting project objectives is more important than the indicated project-life.

When training is provided as per DCA facilitation role, mostly this is delivered to the national office (ZLA) with whom DCA has a Cooperation agreement. However, ZLA’s presence at grassroots levels is through DLAs. Observation in the districts is that such training does not always trickle down to the lower level structures of the partners which interact directly with right holders who are the target group of the DCA. This limits the efficiency with which officers interact with beneficiaries and capacity-build them to claim their rights. In some cases, officers reported having to train out of manuals without proper understanding of the content themselves.

As earlier alluded to, there seemed to have been a lack of broad sharing of the DCA programme document. All national officers as well as district office coordinators interviewed had not seen the DCA document, except for some parts of the document which were shared by DCA during partners’ platform meetings and during the revision of the log frame. Even access to such parts of the programme document seems to be at national level. The feeling was that some partners, including field officers who are the ones mostly in contact with the right holders, were seemingly not well
versed with the contents of the programme document for result focused project implementation and delivery on outcomes that would contribute to programme outcomes.

Some partners were already implementing projects with their own target groups before beginning to collaborate with the DCA. Therefore, in selecting them as partners, DCA may not have sufficiently met its objectives to capture the “poorest of the poor”. It was observed that some influential local “opinion makers” may have found their way into the groups. For example, in all villages visited, the village headmen were primary active beneficiaries of the projects not only in influencing other community members in adopting new ideas/innovations, but also in receiving material support. The latter sometimes denied legitimate persons’ access. Therefore, it will be important for DCA to work closely with partners in evaluating the selection process of the beneficiaries and ensure that duty bearers at lower levels (headmen and chiefs) are treated as such so that they do not benefit from material support at the expense of the needy people, by using their position in society.

In addition, the programme was implemented without undertaking a baseline study such that it is difficult to attribute the change which the programme has been able to bring about among beneficiaries.

The Food Security Programme has Partners of varying sizes and capacities. Some partners such as Monze Diocese, Lutheran World Federation, and the Churches Health Association of Zambia have a high budget absorption capacity based on the projects that they are implementing. Therefore, considering the size of these partners, the current budget was perceived not to be sufficient as DCA’s contribution to their overall budget is very minimal.

3.5 Impact of the programme

Under this programme objective, farmers have been able to realise a number of benefits. The one intangible benefit of this programme, which will survive way beyond programme life is the building of beneficiary ability and desire to claim rights. For instance, local committees and structures are being set in place to ensure and mediate rights related issues. With this comes a sense of independence and pride that can lead to many other achievements. The programme approach and achievements at this point lend credence to the saying “it is better to teach a man to fish than to provide him with fish”. At the risk of over-extending, one might conclude a change of attitudes has begun that will transfer on to generations.

More specific benefits are:

3.5.1 Food security and nutritional status of vulnerable rural poor

a) Adoption of less costly, sustainable, and environment friendly production methods (use of manure, crop rotation, conservation farming and agro-forestry) in portions of their fields. This has resulted in increased crop yield as demonstrated earlier on.

b) There has been crop diversification into vegetable and horticulture production, and growing of drought tolerant crops, which has resulted in improved food/nutrition security as evidenced by a reduction in the number of food insecure months.

c) Training in nutrition, hygiene and food processing and preservation has resulted in reduced child mortality rate and reduced number of under-weight children.

d) Other benefits include improved soil fertility, improved seed availability and access as a result of seed multiplication activities, improved water resource management skills, improved small livestock stocking, improved opportunity to increase disposable agro-based
income from sale of surplus produce and seed, and improved livelihood standards (Model Village). The income generated from crop sales is used for meeting children’s education and health needs, buying of supplementary foods, livestock (chickens, goats and pigs), home improvement, and meeting other household needs such as clothing, blankets, mattresses, and groceries.

3.5.2 The capacity of the target group to claim and uphold their right to food increased

a) The evaluation observed that women have become more assertive and involved in decision making due to the knowledge they have acquired.
b) There have been increased claims to land in order to exercise the right to food.
c) Men have become more gender sensitive, accepting female assertiveness and are able to carry out household chores which were taken to be women’s activities like cooking, washing, drawing water, preparing children for school, etc.
d) The right holders are increasingly able to claim their rights from partners and duty bearers.
e) Traditional leaders are able to claim their rights from government as duty bearers (e.g. the lobbying of government to have a process of converting state land back to traditional land)
f) Traditional leaders are better able to contribute to the policy making process on land issues (e.g. communique by chiefs to lobby government to adopt the Traditional Land Holding Certificate)

3.5.3 Enhanced capacity of DCA’s implementing partners to make use of the RBA

a) The adoption of the RBA by implementing partners in their projects has given rise to an increase in number of capable human rights advocates.
b) There is now enhanced capacity of implementing partners as social advocates: more organizations are available to address issues that affect food security in society 
c) Improved relationships resulting from mutual trust and confidence (e.g. Senior Chief Kalindawalo said at the beginning, people were suspicious of the RBA, but later they appreciated the information provided to them by DCA partners, especially on land issues).
d) Partners have gained trust from both the right holders and duty bearers as they are requested to be arbitrators on certain food security issues e.g. land disputes; various stakeholders use food basket information produced by JCTR to lobby for their right to food e.g. in negotiating for salary increments (trade unions)

3.5.4 DCA’s facilitative role to enhance capacity of partner organisations

a) The formation of the DCA partners platform has enabled different partners to gather information about one another which has facilitated their collaboration outside the platform where need be e.g. MDDD and PELUM RD worked on a documentary on climate change mitigation.
b) The platform has provided avenue for training of partners on new issues and approaches that may not necessarily be their co-business through knowledge sharing and updating another on their activities.
c) DCA has provided funding to improve internal management systems of some partners.

3.6 Sustainability

3.6.1 Food security and nutritional status of vulnerable rural poor

A number of systems have been built into the programme which will contribute to the continued realization of results after the programme comes to an end. These include the establishment of
district and community level structures: e.g. ZLA: DLAs, Community Land Advocacy Committees (LACs); LWF FOSELI Project – Community Agricultural Workers (CAWs) and community livestock auxiliaries (CLA), CHAZ – Community Health Workers (CHW), Community Growth Promoter (CGP); the seed multiplication systems; the livestock “pass-on the gift” concept; and the acquired knowledge and capacity built as a result of training of community members in sustainable agricultural practices (use of manure, agro chemicals, crop rotation, conservation farming, and agro-forestry), food processing and preservation, nutrition, hygiene, and RBA.

In addition, there has been collaboration with government institutions like Ministry of Lands, MACO, MCDSS which provide right holders with avenues to channel their claims and seek information. Programme implementation involves duty bearers in form of traditional leaders resulting in evolvement of cultural and traditional systems which are likely to exist irrespective of who the incumbent is.

### 3.7 Social Cultural Issues, Gender and HIV/AIDS

Some of the hindrances to development and self sustenance in rural communities are cultural and have been practiced and passed on from generation to generation. To address this and ensure affirmative responses from the communities and partners, DCA has addressed this in the design of the programme through its focus on the fourth human right: “The human right to equality of opportunity and freedom from discrimination based on gender or any other status” (DCA Programme document, 2005: p. 42). In addition, partners’ projects have continued to use the strategy of building the knowledge capacity and strengthening the economic outlook of beneficiaries from a socio-cultural point of view. The traditional leaders have been involved in this change process and so it has engendered acceptance by the male participants. Gender equality is built into the design of the programme therefore it is a requirement that both male and female representatives are elected on to committees.

With improved incomes in any society, comes the risk of HIV and AIDS as people are influenced by their potential to afford anything, including multiple sex partners and venture into polygamous marriages. This concern has been addressed through the HIV/AIDS awareness in the programme among the beneficiaries as this poses a risk for their future if the community is struck by the pandemic. Some partners projects (like the CHAZ Project) have provided a lot of awareness messages to the communities in the project areas on HIV/AIDS. Care and Prevention Teams (CPTs) have been formed to work with the affected and infected in communities and Health Centres provide VCT and some people are now accessing ARVs. The pandemic is relatively discussed more openly in the communities and those who are positive and negative work together in their support groups.

As a result of HIV/AIDS and gender awareness, communities have been socially empowered to some extent. This social empowerment was visible with women speaking on their own confidently and men respecting their views.

### 3.8 Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation in the programme is done at various levels:

1. Community level through community level structures (committees and volunteers) reporting to district level structures of partners;
2. District level structures of partners reporting to their head offices
3. Implementing partners reporting to the DCA, and
(iv) DCA reporting to DCA Head Quarters and the donors.

With regard to financial reporting, DCA partners have varying capacities. Some maintain their records according to generally accepted accounting practices whilst others need continuous support and guidance on record keeping and financial reporting. DCA has endeavored to offer support to each of their partners according to their needs and capacity gaps. Their needs are assessed during the DCA monitoring and follow-up support is immediately offered to them. In 2007 DCA also conducted a general training on financial management for all the partners.

With regards to narrative reporting, a number of challenges were observed in the way the monitoring and reporting is done. Firstly, there were concerns of late submission of reports by some partners which affected the meeting of deadlines by the DCA in terms of report submission and conducting of audits. Secondly, the monitoring and reporting done by at the first three levels in (i), (ii) and (iii) above is not systematic and it is not based on the log frames incorporated in the respective projects. Thirdly, the project log frame indicators were not synchronized with the programme log frame indicators in the programme document. This could be as a result of the fact that all partners mentioned that they have never been availed the programme document of the DCA. In that case, it brings concerns as to how the partners are able to ensure that the projects proposals are synchronized with the programme.

3.9 Climatic change

Programme responses to climatic change have been in form of crop diversification (adoptions of drought tolerant crops like cassava), promotion of sustainable farming practices, capacity building of DCA staff and partners as well as networking with like-minded organizations within ZCSCCN. At community level, some projects like MDDD and LWF have provided support in irrigation and training on DRR. For example, for the Integrated Development Programm 2007 – 2009 implemented by MDDD:

a) 32 households benefited from support of treadle pumps in Monze Diocese.

b) 6 communities benefited from solar driven water supply systems with communities enjoying tap water averting the drudgery of a hand pump and or bucket and chain.

c) 6 communities benefited from the support of improved hand dug wells equipped with hand pumps as opposed to the use of a bucket and chain.

d) 3 households benefited from support of rain water harvesting units placed right on their door step in this way reducing distance to water point.

3.10 Microfinance

Although one of the main recommendations made during the mid-term evaluation was to include microfinance in the programme, there was little evidence in terms of implementation. However, based on the training that has been conducted, a pilot project on microfinance for CHAZ has been approved, and MDDD has submitted a 2 year microfinance project proposal on Own Savings and Wealth Creation (OSAWE) to DCA for funding consideration from 2011. In addition, as earlier alluded to, the purchase of livestock could be seen as a de-facto saving in that in time of need, the animals can be sold to meet the need or be bartered in exchange of the good(s) required.

However, when implementing these microfinance projects, careful consideration should be taken in the selection of the types of products to embark on and procedures to put in place to ensure results. This is given a general poor repayment history in the country and the vastness of product ranges...
whose characteristics vary, each with its own merits and demerits. Learning from other microfinance projects could be of vital importance.

3.11 Synergies

A lot of synergies within and without the programme have been noted. Partners have been able to collaborate with one another as need arises. Partners as well as DCA have been collaborating with the government through the Ministry of Lands, MACO and MCDSS, as well as other NGOs and international organizations as discussed in other sections of the report. There appeared to be some synergies in the implementation stage of PT3 with PT1 and PT4. However, this type of synergy is limited as there seems to have been no input from other programme types into the formulation of the PT3. In order to strengthen these synergies it will be useful to have full participation of Programmes in each others’ plans at the design phase. Synergies also exist between DCA and other stakeholders like Diakonia, the Finnish Embassy and GTZ.

3.12 External Factors influencing the results of the programme

(i) The NGO Act

The NGO Act shows signs to impact negatively on those NGOs whose main activities are in advocacy since as of now the roadmap for its implementation is not known.

(ii) The Agricultural Sector Policies, Legislation and Institutions

As rightfully observed in the Programme context analysis, the issues affecting the food security are mostly as a result of the inadequate policies, legislation and institutions. Even the duty bearers (government officials) acknowledged the fact that these are real issues which still need to be addressed. Although Government policy promotes crop diversification, government marketing arrangements are only in place for maize. Even this is limited to cater strategic food reserves. For instance, in the 2009/10 season, the country produced 2.8 million tonnes of maize yet the estimated strategic maize needs are 1.5 million (PACO Chipata). There are challenges of marketing and storing the surplus. The situation is made worse when it comes to marketing of other crops other than maize. Although the Food Reserve Act provides for the Food Reserve Agency to include rice and cassava in strategic food reserve purchases, in the actual sense, this is done to a very limited extent.

Although Government has embarked on the review of the current National Agricultural Policy, the Agricultural Credit and Marketing Act, and the Land Act, most of these processes which started as far back as 2006 when the Programme was starting have not been concluded. Therefore, the Government has not been responsive enough in creating the enabling environment to address food insecurity issues.

(iii) Inadequate infrastructure development

This was an issue at the start of the Programme and still remains a critical issue. Inadequate infrastructure development was evidenced by almost impassable roads to some of the communities visited.
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4 Lessons Learnt

The livelihood of rural rights holders is intricately tied to land. As such there is no development programme that will be sustainable if it does not guarantee them access to land and the ability to produce food for household security and income. As such DCA decision to adopt the RBA along with partners exposes a new approach that other agencies may adopt to empower beneficiaries rather than to prop them up. Successfully applied, this approach further guarantees an imminent exit by the supporting organization, which is good for the communities.

While staff retention cannot be guaranteed, in order for projects adopting rights approach which require significant time for gestation to be most effective, they need to give strong consideration to staff morale and incentives in order to reduce staff turnover and its negative effects.

The partners’ platform is useful. However in order to be most effective, consideration must be made:

(i) On how to ensure that the different levels of development/capacities amongst partners does not create a challenge to securing unwavering commitment to the ideals of the platform.
(ii) To avoid inconsistencies in who attends the partners’ platform meetings on behalf of organizations which may build discontinuity and weaken commitment, DCA and the partners should implement item 3.5 of the final Platform Partners’ ToR.
(iii) To strengthen the alliance, relative to the expectations that may be of each member organization, rather than leaving it in the current loose form by revisiting the current mandate of the platform.

The geographical spread of activities and positive reliance on implementing partners to represent it has meant that DCA has not been able to monitor some areas effectively according to provisions in programme document (twice in a year). This takes away from the ability of DCA to make some decisions.

Several of the programme achievements prove difficult to track quantitatively because the reporting at project level is not systematic and has not been synchronised with the reporting at programme level. This is not done based on the programme logical framework. This is worsened when the programme is implemented without a baseline study as a benchmark for results achievement analysis.

The linkages between DCA and the partners are much stronger at national level and become less effective for those partners with decentralised structures. While it is recognised that organizations have their own structures and ways of operating, the consequence includes:

(i) Some training provided at national level not trickling down to the lower level structures of the partners which interact directly with right holders
(ii) Timely disbursement of funds to national levels not reaching lower level structures on time for efficient implementation of activities.
The length of some projects (one to two years) as well as their synchronies do not seem to correspond to the time required for realization of results in the kind of issues the programme deals with (farming practices, cultural issues, policy issues, etc.). This was the same observation made by some partners like MDDD, PELUM RD and LWF.

Some partners prescribe activities from the national level which do not correspond to the needs at hand at local level, and some of these activities are one off without provision for follow-ups.

Without clear selection criteria for partners and where partners are at various levels of development with probably different target groups from that of the programme, the attainment of results may be affected.

None adherence to reporting deadlines affects disbursement of funds which in turn affects the efficiency and effectiveness with which programme activities are implemented for attainment of results.
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5 Recommendations

DCA and Partners:
(i) Both DCA and partners should realise that high staff turnover impacts negatively on the effectiveness of the programme and that they should consider to provide some form of incentives and morale to reduce this costly trend.
(ii) Partners should take into consideration the needs at the grassroots level in activity implementation to give the rights holders’ confidence rather than prescribe activities which may not necessarily be in activity sequence, or priority to them.
(iii) The Partners Platform should ensure that the different level of development and capacities amongst the partners, and inconsistencies by partners’ representatives attending the platform do not create a challenge in their interactions and commitment to the shared ideals of the platform.
(iv) The Partners Platform should consider undertaking joint advocacy publicity strategies to address common challenges they face in addressing issues which affect food security such as those mentioned under external factors. This will attract more attention.
(v) DCA might want to have a relook at its geographical spread so that it is able to effectively monitor all areas and avoid spreading its finances and activities too much for better results. This can be done in liaison with its partners.
(vi) The monitoring and evaluation systems and reporting at all levels should be synchronised with the programme logical framework to allow for improved results measurement while all projects should be evaluated to improve on programming.
(vii) Partners should ensure that financial systems (guidelines and procedures) are documented for continuity focusing on institutional capacity building.
(viii) DCA, through its partners, should ensure that local level staff benefit from the facilitative role and institutional capacity building activities it provides for improved programme impact.
(ix) Given that 2011 is an election year, DCA and its partners should work to increase civic education to hedge against the right holders drifting back to a situation where they are dependent on handouts which characterize an election year. If this happened, it could compromise the achievements made so far by the Programme at right holders’ level and local duty bearers’ level (traditional leaders).

Future Programming:
(x) The length of partner projects should be synchronised with the time required for the realization of results in the kinds of issues the programme deals with.
(xi) The Programme should further strengthen the claiming of rights by improving its work on justiciability after a careful review with partners of the work that is currently being done compared to what still needs to be done.
(xii) The Programme needs to widen climate change adaptation (and possibly mitigation) measures beyond what is currently being done.

(xiii) The Programme should consider incorporating DRR strategies. To make this effective, they should increase linkages to early warning systems.

(xiv) The programme should consider having institutionalized strategic linkages to research institutions and other resources rather than have one off engagements (exchange visits, study tours, etc) or ad hoc arrangements.

(xv) When implementing microfinance projects, careful consideration should be taken in the selection of the types of products to embark on and procedures to put in place to ensure results.
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Annex 1: The Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

PT3, Zambia Food Security Programme Evaluation

1. Programme Background
The Zambia, food security programme document was finalised in October, 2005. Programme implementation started in January, 2006.

1.1. Programme Problem Analysis
One of the key activities leading to the development of this programme was a context analysis. The analysis focused on identifying structural factors that were contributing to the problem of food security in Zambia especially in relation to the rural poor at the time using the rights based approach. The analysis identified several structural barriers. Please refer to the programme document for details on these barriers. The analysis also identified the patterns and distributions of food security, food insecure groups and some of the key stakeholders in food security.

1.2. Programme Strategy
The programme was implemented based on the rights based approach. The main rights that were addressed were identified based on the articles of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESC Rights). The programme identified the primary target as rights holders that were the poorest of the poor i.e. the most food insecure especially HIV/AIDS affected households, women, children, child and female headed households, the disabled and elderly persons. However, recognising the existence of the extended family system in Zambia the programme was also going to target some poor households who had responsibility for vulnerable groups such as orphans. The secondary target were moral duty bearers especially local NGOs. The main duty bearers targeted included traditional leaders, government, regional bodies and international organisations. The main programme intervention areas identified were: promotion of sustainable agriculture; support to income generating activities; empowerment of the poor through organisation and awareness raising; advocacy/lobbying at national, regional and international levels. Eastern and Southern provinces were the main geographical focus areas. However, the programme also targeted areas outside these provinces. This was done in order to allow for close monitoring of pilot projects and also to allow flexibility to partners that were also focusing on other provinces beyond DCA’s main targeted areas.

The following were the initial objectives of the programme:

Development objective: Enhanced fulfilment of the right to adequate and nutritious food and sustainable livelihood for the target group in DCA’s working areas

Immediate objectives and related outcome indicators:

1) Food security and nutritional status of vulnerable rural poor (especially women, children, the disabled, the elderly and HIV/AIDS infected and affected) improved
1.1 Increased use of sustainable agricultural practices (conservation/organic farming and gardening, agro-forestry, animal husbandry)
1.2 Increased diversification into drought tolerant crops
1.3 Reduced dependence on rain-fed agriculture and increased adoption of irrigation
1.4 Increased use of labour saving farm technologies and activities
1.5 Increased crop yields and utilisation of proper post harvest techniques
1.6 Increased incomes and savings and creation of self-sustaining revolving fund schemes among the target group
1.7 Changed cultural practices and taboos with regard to fulfilling the specific nutritional needs of under five children, women of childbearing age and the HIV/AIDS infected

2) The capacity of the target group to claim an uphold their right to food increased
2.1 Increased awareness on the right to food and how to claim these rights among the target group
2.2 Increased land tenure security and number of households with title to land among the target group

3) Enhanced capacity of DCA’s implementing partners to make use of the rights based approach and ability to do advocacy on structural barriers to food security
3.1 Increased involvement of partners in awareness raising and advocacy for the right to food at community and national level
3.2 Increased involvement of DCA partners involved in advocacy on land tenure and seed security
3.3 Partners feed into DCA’s international advocacy on trade barriers and unfair trade (subsidised agricultural products)

4) DCA has been instrumental in facilitating enhanced capacity of partner organisations to use the rights based approach, sustainable agriculture and advocate against structural barriers to food security
4.1 Number of partners incorporating rights based approach in their projects planning and implementation
4.2 Number of partners using sustainable agriculture methods in projects
4.3 Number of DCA partners engaged in national/regional/international advocacy on structural barriers to food security
4.4 DCA has facilitated the formation of the food security partner platform and meetings

1.3. Current status of implementation and key achievements

1.3.1 Partner and project portfolio

At inception, the programme had 1 implementing partner and 1 project. By October, 2010 the following organisations were implementing projects in the programme: Lutheran World Federation (2 project phases-2006-2008 and 2009-2011) Monze Diocese Development Department (2 project phases-2007-2009 and 2010-2012); Women for Change2 (2 project phases-2005-2007 and 2008-2011); Jesuit Centre for Theological reflection (2 project phases-2007 and 2008-2010, Tree Africa

2 Women for Change is technically under DCA’s Political Space programme but some of the interventions in the partners’ project fall within the food security programme intervention areas.
Zambia (2005-2006), Kasisi Agricultural Training Centre (2005-2006); Participatory Ecological Land Use Management (PELUM) Association (3 different projects-2007-2008, 2009 and 2010-2012); Zambia Land Alliance (2 project phases - 2006-2008 and 2009-2012); Law and Development Association (2 project phases-2006-2007 and 2008) and Churches Health Association of Zambia (2 project phases-2006-2008 and 2010). KATC, Tree Africa Zambia and LADA have been phased out of the programme.

1.3.1 Partner platform

In 2006 the programme established a partner platform. This is a collection of all the programme partners implementing projects at a given time that meet regularly to discuss and act together on issues affecting food security generally. The partner platform was operating without written ToR up to 2010. The ToRs were developed and adopted by the platform in 2010. Initially the partners relied on DCA to organise the meetings and carry out all responsibilities related to the holding of meetings and other platform events. However, the partners started playing a more active role through hosting and chairing of meetings as well as facilitating capacity building of members of the platform through exchange of best practices and taking a lead in training on certain thematic areas. The platform also played a key role in the programme’s mid-term review.

1.3.2 Capacity building of partners

One of the biggest interventions of the programme has been capacity building of partners in project implementation related themes. Over the years DCA has facilitated training of partners through training workshops facilitated by area experts. Some of the training has also been through skills transfer facilitated through mentoring of partner staff by the DCA programme officer or finance officer. This has been done especially in relation to proposal and report writing. Some of the key issues where capacity building has been done include the rights based approach, monitoring and evaluation, logical framework approach, project cycle, HIV mainstreaming, gender mainstreaming, conservation farming, financial management, development of funding applications for EuropeAid and advocacy. DCA has also provided support for general organisational development issues e.g. development of finance and administration manual as well as organisational strategic plans. Some of the projects have conducted end of project evaluations. The partners have been responsible for the evaluations. However, DCA has provided technical support in the development of ToRs and sometimes participated in the project evaluation as a team member.

1.3.3 Project appraisal, implementation, monitoring and evaluation

Partners submit proposals for funding to DCA. DCA appraises the proposals based on standard appraisal procedures. Approval of projects is done through an established project committee consisting of the DCA regional representative, programme officers and finance and administration controller. Projects are only approved if they contribute to the objectives of the programme and related outcome indicators. In the interest of ensuring geographical focusing most of the projects are implemented in Southern and Eastern provinces. However, DCA has also provided support for projects implemented outside these provinces mainly because some implementing partners have a wider focus than the DCA focus areas. This is mainly the case with partners involved in advocacy work. Pilot projects have also been implemented in areas closer to Lusaka. This has been mainly for the purpose of facilitating closer monitoring by DCA. After projects are approved, partners are responsible for day to day project implementation. However, DCA conducts routine project monitoring at field implementation level at least once a year to each project. During this monitoring DCA provides technical support to the partner on identified gaps. Partners submit biannual and annual reports on project progress to DCA. DCA provides feedback to the partner on the quality of the report.
1.4. Mid-term evaluation main strategic findings and recommendations

In October, 2008 a mid-term evaluation for the programme was conducted. The review found that programme strategy was still relevant in the Zambian context. It recommended that micro finance, climate change adaptation (in particular flood control), DRR/Relief, and a move towards including justiciablety of the Right to Food should be strengthened through capacity development in the platform. It further recommended that LFA matrix should be revised with partners.

Following these recommendations the programme increased its involvement in climate change issues through networking with the Zambia Civil Society Climate Change Network (ZCSCCN) and capacity building of DCA staff and partners. The programme also incorporated micro-finance focusing on community managed initiatives. The DCA programme officer and relevant partner organisations have been trained on community managed micro-finance and plans are underway for a pilot micro-finance project to be implemented before the end of the programme. The programme also revised the LFA matrix in collaboration with the implementing partners (please refer to the programme matrix for the revised objectives and indicators).

1.5. Brief stakeholder analysis

The main stakeholders of the programme are DCA and the implementing partners. Currently these include CHAZ, JCTR, PELUM Association, Women for Change, Zambia Land Alliance, Monze Diocese Development Department and LWF. Other stakeholders include local and international NGOs and bilateral donors that work in collaboration with these implementing partners. Some of these are Diakonia, the Finnish Embassy and GTZ. At project implementation level some of the stakeholders are rights holders, including the vulnerable groups and decision makers such as traditional leaders. Another stakeholder has been government (central and local). Some of the implementing partners also work closely with church structures and leaders at national and community level making the church one of the important stakeholder. Other stakeholders are members of the networks that DCA has been participating in such as the Zambia Civil Society Climate Change Network. Some of the implementing partners have also been collaborating with international networks and multilateral organisations e.g. JCTR, PELUM Association and ZLA have links to international networks in Africa and beyond and sometimes advocate, lobby or partner with the World Bank and IMF.

1.6 Key achievement

Some of the programme’s key achievements include:

- Increased adoption of sustainable agriculture practices especially conservation farming among the targeted beneficiaries.
- Increased claim making among rights holders especially with regard to community based duty bearers such as traditional leaders with issues relating to land
- Increased food security especially among the most vulnerable rural poor such as female headed households supported by diversification into drought tolerant crops, seed multiplication, better food preservation and storage and diet diversification
- Increased involvement of DCA implementing partners in advocacy on inclusion of Economic Social Cultural (ESC) rights in the national constitution, increased land tenure security of the poor, rejection of the Economic partnership Agreement between the EU and African Caribbean Countries, increased budgetary allocation to the agriculture sector and other issues affecting the right to food of rights holders
- Increased access to income among the rights holders as a result of income generating activities
Increased awareness among rights holders on their human rights and how to seek redress for violations.

2. **Purpose and evaluation objective**

The purpose of this evaluation is to provide DCA, its partners and other stakeholders learning from evidence based information about the programme and related projects in order to improve the projects and feed into the process of developing a new programme to be implemented jointly by Norwegian Church Aid (DCA), DanChurchAid (DCA) and Christian Aid (CA) from 2011.

The overall objective of the evaluation is to assess the extent to which the objectives of the DCA food security programme 2006-2010 have been attained and make recommendations on considerations that could be made to ensure better achievement of outcomes in a successor programme. The specific objectives are to:

1. Assess the extent to which the programme has achieved its 4 objectives with special emphasis on the outcome and most significant changes brought about by the programme intervention
2. Assess the relevance and effectiveness of the programme strategy with special emphasis on
   - Programme implementation and monitoring LFA matrix
   - Geographical focus
   - Establishment and functioning of the partner platform
   - Main intervention areas (sustainable agriculture, awareness raising, advocacy and income generating activities)
   - Mainstreaming of climate change and micro-finance
   - Gender and HIV/AIDS mainstreaming
   - Partnership approach
   - Capacity building of DCA staff and partners in competencies relevant for programme implementation
   - Networking beyond the partner platform
3. Assess the relevance and effectiveness of the programme monitoring and evaluation system with special emphasis on
   - Programme monitoring tools
   - Linkage between partner and programme monitoring systems and ways in which these could be strengthened in the future programme
4. Assess the extent to which the programme was able to contribute to the objectives of the DCA’s global right to food policy
5. Assess whether the available resources were used efficiently in the implementation of the programme
6. Assess the synergy within the programme and with relevant DCA/NCA/CA programmes and make recommendations on what aspects of the programme should be strengthened, moved to another programme type or left out in a new phase of the programme to be implemented jointly between DCA, NCA and CA
7. Assess the programme impact and sustainability of its intervention at beneficiary, community and implementing partner levels
8. Assess the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of networking with sister agencies, CSOs and government during programme implementation
9. Assess the eternal environment within which the programme was operational and its influence on programme successes and/or failures.

3. **Scope**

**Time frame**
The evaluation is expected to be completed within 8 weeks (i.e. 40 working days)

**Geographical area**

This assignment will be conducted in Lusaka, Central, Eastern and Southern Provinces

**Projects**

The consultants will be expected to pick a representative sample to be included in the evaluation from the following on-going and completed projects. Selection of the relevant projects to be included in the sample should be based on perceived contribution of the projects to the outcome indicators in the LFA, size and level of organisational development of the implementing partner as well as logistical considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
<th>Geographical focus</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAZ</td>
<td>Gardening and nutrition project</td>
<td>2006-2008</td>
<td>PHS 1602</td>
<td>DCA own funds</td>
<td>Chipembi (Chisamba) and Macha (Choma)</td>
<td>Empowerment and service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAZ</td>
<td>Food security and nutrition project</td>
<td>2010-10</td>
<td>ERP 1010058-18</td>
<td>DCA own funds</td>
<td>(Chalabesa ) Mpika, (Fiwale) Masaiti, (Chipembi) Chisamba, (Nyanje) Petauke, (Macha) Choma and (Mbereshi) Kawambwa districts</td>
<td>Empowerment and service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCTR</td>
<td>2005-2007 Strategic Plan</td>
<td>2007-07</td>
<td>PHS 1955</td>
<td>DA NIDA</td>
<td>Nationally with special emphasis on some districts</td>
<td>Advocacy and empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCTR</td>
<td>2008-2010 Strategic Plan</td>
<td>2008-2010</td>
<td>PHS 2265</td>
<td>DA NIDA</td>
<td>Nationally with special emphasis on Lusaka, Kabwe, Ndola, Mongu, Livingstone, Monze and Mambwe districts</td>
<td>Advocacy and empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KATC</td>
<td><em>Moringa oleifera</em> for improved nutrition of small scale farmers</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>PHS 1494</td>
<td>DCA own funds</td>
<td>Chongwe</td>
<td>Empowerment and service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADA</td>
<td>Improvemen t of the legal and economic status of women and children</td>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>PHS 1825</td>
<td>DCA own funds</td>
<td>Southern province with special focus on Kalomo, Monze, Mazabuka and Choma</td>
<td>Empowerment, service delivery and advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADA</td>
<td>Improvemen t of social, legal and economic status of women an girls in Southern province of Zambia</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>PHS 2648</td>
<td>DCA own funds</td>
<td>Southern province with special focus on Siavonga, Mazabuka, Monze, Nawala, Itezhitezi, Gwembe, Choma, Kalomo and Kazungula</td>
<td>Empowerment, advocacy and service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monze Diocese Development Department</td>
<td>Integrated Development Project</td>
<td>2007-09</td>
<td>PHS 2015</td>
<td>DA NIDA and DCA own funds</td>
<td>Southern Province</td>
<td>Empowerment, advocacy and service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monze Diocese Development department</td>
<td>Water supply for villages in Monze diocese</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
<td>ERP 1010058-17</td>
<td>DCA own funds</td>
<td>Southern province</td>
<td>Empowerment and service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDDD</td>
<td>Sustainable Economic and Social Empowerment of vulnerable and marginalised rural communities in Southern province (SESE)</td>
<td>2009-2012</td>
<td>ERP 1010058-09</td>
<td>EU and DANIDA</td>
<td>Gwembe, Siavonga, Sinazongwe and Mazabuka</td>
<td>Advocacy, Empowerment and Service delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELUM RD</td>
<td>Promotion of indigenous traditional food in Zambia</td>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>PHS 2042</td>
<td>DCA Own funds</td>
<td>Nationally</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELUM RD</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>ERP 1010058-12</td>
<td>DA NIDA</td>
<td>Nationally</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PELUM RD</td>
<td>Budget tracking</td>
<td>2010-2012</td>
<td>ERP 1010058-19</td>
<td>DA NIDA</td>
<td>Nationally with special emphasis on Eastern and</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross-cutting activities
The programme conducted a number of activities that cut across partners. These included capacity building initiatives as well as exposure and exchange visits. Below is a break down of some of the cross-cutting activities under taken in the course of the programme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participating partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchange visit to KATC</td>
<td>6th December, 2006</td>
<td>PELUM Association, ZLA, LADA, CHAZ, LWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy workshop</td>
<td>17th July, 2007</td>
<td>LWF, ZLA, CHAZ, MDDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; E training</td>
<td>12th-14th December, 2007</td>
<td>LWF, PELUM Association, MDDD, JCTR, LADA, ZLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy workshop</td>
<td>5th-6th February, 2008</td>
<td>MDDD, PELUM Association, ZLA, LADA, JCTR, LWF, CHAZ, WFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement training</td>
<td>12th -13th 2008</td>
<td>PELUM, MDDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Education Methodologies training</td>
<td>November, 2008</td>
<td>LADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU application development workshop</td>
<td>18th -21th November, 2008</td>
<td>MDDD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The programme also held partner platform meetings at least twice a year at which issues affecting the programme were discussed.

The evaluation should not go into details with the projects, but only to look at how the results created by the projects have contributed to the achievement of the programme objectives and indicators. It is important to note that the data related to results at the level of the rights-holder would have to come from project level and therefore the evaluation should focus mainly on showing the project’s contribution to the programme objectives and indicators, and not go into details of output results at project level. This means that the programme evaluation must rely heavily on information from programme and project monitoring. Project reviews and evaluations and monitoring reports will be essential sources of information. Based on these documents, the evaluation team is expected to form a hypothesis which can then be validated through visits to the project sites and through interviews with the rights-holders and other relevant stakeholders. The criteria for selection must be clear from TOR and must be agreed on by the team leader.

4. **Key issues**

**Relevance**

*Key question:*
To what extent is the programme strategy relevant to the need identified? Especially related to the structural causes of rights violations in the given context?

*Sub questions:*
- Was the context analysis relevant and appropriate? Is it still?
- What is the added value of DCA and the programme approach (as opposed to project approach) in this particular programme?
- Is there a relevant and meaningful synergy and cohesion between the projects in the programme? I.e. in what way do the projects complement each other in achieving the programme goals? (Geographically, targeting, thematically, etc.)
- Is there synergy with other DCA programmes in the country, and with the efforts of other funding agencies?

*Key question:*
To what extent is the programme monitoring and evaluation system relevant?

*Sub questions:*
- Were the objectives and related indicators relevant and appropriate? Are they still?
- Were the other programme monitoring tools i.e. programme overview, programme progress chart and project monitoring visit and reporting format relevant and appropriate?
- Was there meaningful synergy and cohesion between the programme and implementing partners’ projects m and e systems?
Effectiveness

Key questions:

1) To what extent were the programme objectives achieved at outcome (and if verifiable at impact level?) Why and why not? Are there any unintended results of the programme?

Sub questions:

- To what extent were the activities implemented according to relevant DCA policy, especially related to RBA and gender?
- To what extent did the cross cutting activities, particularly the capacity building efforts achieve their objectives? Why and why not?
- To what extent has the monitoring undertaken in the course of the programme provided management with sufficient information to follow progress towards the desired results? Did management act accordingly?
- Is DCA (RO and HQ) an effective manager of this particular programme? (Strategic planning, staffing, resource management, monitoring, partnerships, etc.)

2) How have partnerships been enhanced as a result of the programme? (DCA and Partners, partners and rights holders, rights holders and duty bearers, and partners among themselves?)

Sub questions:

- How (with what criteria) were the partners selected? And how are they involved and what is their decision-making power in the planning and implementation of the programme including the cross cutting activities? Does the Partner Platform fulfil its purpose as identified by the programme?
- Does DCA deliver an adequate support, particularly with regards to capacity building, to the partners involved in the programme, and is DCA responsive to needs identified by partners? Does the support affect in a positive way the partners' capacity to implement its projects? Has DCA and the programme approach contributed to the organizational strengthening of the partner? In what way?
- Do the partners have the right skills to contribute to the achievement of the goals in the programme? And has the programme approach contributed to the effectiveness of the partners? An important part would be the capacity of the partner to influence the processes that the programme aspires to reach at the levels of the rights-holders, and the local and national authorities.
- Has the programme facilitated the access between the rights-holders and duty bearers? Has it had a positive effect on the relationship between beneficiaries and partners?
- Has the programme enabled the partner’s and DCA’s advocacy work with other relevant actors, e.g. facilitation of networks?
- Has the programme stimulated relations between partners in any significant way? Has this in turn had an effect on the programme?

Efficiency

Key question:
Has the programme approach, in this case, been a cost-efficient way to implement development assistance?

Sub questions:

- Could we have achieved the same with fewer resources? Or could we have achieved more results with the same resources?
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- What are the overall costs of the programme compared to the number of beneficiaries?

**Impact**

*Key question:*
What has been the impact at rights-holders level (outcome)? And at other levels that was supposedly addressed by the programme?

*Sub questions:*
- What are the most significant changes in the lives of the rights holders, their relation to the duty bearers, or the practice of the duty bearers that can be attributed to the programme?
- Did the programme approach enhance impact and focus of DCAs work as envisioned when the transition from project approach was initiated? In what way?
- Could the same impact have been achieved through project approach?

**Sustainability**

- Are the benefits from the programme, especially at rights holders’ level likely to continue after the finalization of the programme? Why and why not?

5. **Stakeholder involvement**

The following stakeholders will be involved in the evaluation.

1. DCA PT3 programme type advisor- will provide technical support in the development of the ToR for the evaluation. The advisor will also give an in-depth interview on relevant issues as determined by the evaluation team. In addition the advisor will provide comments and feedback on the report to the consultants and the RO until the report is finalised.
2. RR- will be involved in the development of the ToR, selection of the evaluation team and giving an in-depth interview to the evaluation team if required. In addition the RR will provide comments to the draft reports until the final version is agreed with the consultants and DCA HQ.
3. PO- will be responsible for providing input for the development of the ToR and participating in the identification of the evaluation team. The PO will also be in contact with the programme partners to arrange logistics for in-depth interviews as well as field visits. In addition the PO will provide comments to the draft reports and also provide the RR with support until finalisation of the report.
4. Partner platform- will participate in providing input in the development of the ToR, participate in the evaluation inception meeting and the evaluation debriefing meeting. The platform is also expected to provide comments to the report and participating in all relevant meetings related to the evaluation report.
5. Partners- will provide in-depth interviews to the evaluation team if required and will also facilitate field visits based on the projects that will be selected for this purpose by the evaluation team.
6. Rights holders- will participate in the field visits.
7. Other stakeholders will include DCA networking partners e.g. GTZ, Diakonia, Zambia Civil Society Climate Change Network, Plan International, Golden Valley Agricultural Research Trust, VSO in the programme as well as duty bearers e.g. traditional leaders, church leaders, government (including provincial, district and village officials) and local government officials in the areas where the projects are implemented.
6. Method

6.1 Literature review

The consultants are expected to conduct a literature review of all documents that are relevant to the programme. These include:

i) the programme document including programme matrix
ii) relevant partner project documents as selected during the sampling process
iii) relevant partner baseline and evaluation reports
iv) partner platform minutes and cross-cutting activities reports e.g. reports on trainings and exposure visits
v) DCA’s global policy on the right to food
vi) Programme biannual and annual reports
vii) DCA and partners’ Project monitoring reports
viii) Programme progress reports and project overviews
ix) Relevant project appraisal documents
x) NCA and CA global strategy on livelihood and trade
xi) Relevant national and global food security and poverty reduction reports and documents
(these are to be provided by the evaluation team and agreed with DCA)

6.2 Field visits

The evaluation team will conduct some field visits to implementing partner organisations and final project beneficiaries for the purposes of collecting information. Representative samples of partner organisations and final beneficiaries should be included in the evaluation.

6.2 Sampling techniques

The evaluation team will develop the sampling techniques to be employed during the evaluation for literature review and field visits. Given the size of the sample (i.e. partners), it is expected that purposive sampling will be employed to ensure that all relevant aspects relating to the programme are adequately covered. As much as possible field visits sites should deliberately include areas that have not been frequently visited during DCA monitoring visits and other missions. The final areas to be visited will be agreed between the evaluation team and DCA.

6.3 Data collection methods

The evaluation team will employ participatory data collection methods. The team should aim at creating an open atmosphere that can also accommodate unexpected information and critical remarks. The information collected should be both quantitative and qualitative. The evaluation is expected to suggest the data collection methods that will be employed to ensure that both quantitative and qualitative data is collected. It is important that all information is triangulated in order to increase the validity of the evaluation findings. It is therefore expected that in-depth interviews, focused group discussions and questionnaires are used in collecting information. However, in choosing the final data collection methods cost effectiveness will be emphasised.
6.4 Data analysis

The evaluation team is expected to thoroughly analyse the data using appropriate data analysis tools based on the relevant data collection method.

6.5 Dissemination of findings

The initial findings will be presented at a debriefing workshop to be held for the partner platform. At this meeting the partner platform will provide some reactions which should be taken into consideration in the final report.

6.6 Report

The evaluation team should prepare an evaluation report. The report is supposed to cover all objectives of the evaluation as spelt out in the final ToR. DCA and partners will comment on the draft report. The report will only be finalised after DCA is satisfied with the quality of the report. DCA will provide the evaluation team guidelines and standards that should be followed in writing the report.

7. Team composition

The evaluation team as a whole should possess following expertise:

- Proven expertise on food security and livelihood programmes using sustainable agriculture, advocacy, awareness raising and economic empowerment as the main interventions areas.
- Proven expertise on cross cutting issues such as Rights Based Approach, Gender and Climate Change.
- Proven experience from NGO and CBO based development assistance in Zambia
- Proven evaluation skills such as indicator development, sampling, participatory evaluation methodology, appreciative enquiry methods, focus group interviews, etc.
- Proven team leader and report writing skills
- Experience with faith based organisations in general and DCA in particular is an asset

Resources available outside the team

The evaluation team will be complemented by resources within DCA at Zambia and HQ levels

- The DCA programme type advisor will provide some technical support to the team on the rights to food
- The DCA Zambia Regional Representative will provide support on overall programme management issues in DCA as well as technical support on issues relating to synergy between the food security programme, other DCA programme types and the future joint programme to be implemented jointly with NCA and DCA
- The DCA finance and administrative controller will provide support to the team on issues relating to financial management of the programme and partner projects
- The DCA Political Space programme officer will provide support to the team related to synergy between DCA programme
- The DCA Food Security programme officer will provide support to the team on all relevant information on programme partners, programme monitoring and evaluation, cross-cutting activities, networking and all logistical support required by the evaluation team
• The NCA programme manager will provide all relevant support relating to the future joint programme

8. Timing & outputs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Duration of Consultancy</th>
<th>Persons responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29/10/2010</td>
<td>Pre-evaluation meeting Revision of ToRs with emphasis on method and approach Signing of concept</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>DCA and Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – 8/11/2010</td>
<td>Inception report writing / development of evaluation field instruments</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/11/2010</td>
<td>Inception report presentation</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Evaluation Team / DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 12/11/2010</td>
<td>Field visits within Lusaka</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Evaluation Team / DCA / Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 – 19/11/2010</td>
<td>Field visits outside Lusaka</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Evaluation Team / DCA / Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/11/2010</td>
<td>Debriefing</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Evaluation Team / DCA / Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/11/2010</td>
<td>Submission of 1st draft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 7/12/2010</td>
<td>Circulation of 1st draft for comments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DCA / Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 – 10/12/2010</td>
<td>Revision of the 1st draft for comments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – 15/12/2010</td>
<td>Circulation of 2nd draft for comments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DCA / Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/12/2010</td>
<td>Submission of consolidated comments to team leader</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 21/12/2010</td>
<td>Revision of 2nd draft and production of final report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Team leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/12/2010</td>
<td>Presentation of final report in triplicate (2 hard copies and 1 soft copy)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Evaluation Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total consultancy days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>25.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 2: Documents Reviewed

2) CHAZ Food and Nutrition Security Project – Phase 1, Beneficiary Performance Survey Report
3) CHAZ (January 2006) Food and Nutrition Security Project – Phase 1, Evaluation Report
4) CHAZ Food and Nutrition Security Project – Phase II Project Document April 2006 to March 2009
5) CHAZ Food and Nutrition Security Project – Phase II Project, Narrative Report April to December 2006 Document
6) DCA Document Review Guide
7) DCA Final (October 2005) Zambia Food Security Programme: January 2006 – December 2010
8) DCA Approval of changes to ongoing development projects – Procedure
10) DCA Monitoring Report of the Monze Diocese Development Department, 2-3 October 2007
13) DCA PT3 Zambia Food Security Programme Annual Report Format
18) Government of the Republic of Zambia, Vision 2030
19) Government of the Republic of Zambia, Draft SNDP
23) LWF Food Security & Livelihoods (FOSELI) Project 2006 Annual Report
30) PELUM (July/August 2008) “Review framework for institutional evaluation of PELUM Association”
31) Zambia Land Alliance Strategic Plan for the period 2005-2008
33) Zambia Land Alliance Annual Report 2006
34) Zambia Land Alliance Annual Report 2007
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RELEVANCE:
The relevance will be addressed by looking at the extent to which the programme strategy was relevant to the identified need with special reference to the structural causes of rights violations in the given context. Thus, it will be answered by considering the following questions in the ToRs:

- Was the context analysis relevant and appropriate? Is it still?
- What is the added value of DCA and the programme approach (as opposed to project approach) in this particular programme?
- Is there a relevant and meaningful synergy and cohesion between the projects in the programme? i.e. in what way do the projects complement each other in achieving the programme goals? (Geographically, targeting, thematically, etc.)
- Is there synergy with other DCA programmes in the country, and with the efforts of other funding agencies?
  - What aspects of the programme should be strengthened, moved to another programme type or left out in a new phase of the programme to be implemented jointly between DCA, NCA and CA?
  - Which ones should be introduced and why?

The relevance will also be addressed by looking at the extent to which the programme monitoring and evaluation system was relevant by answering the following questions in the ToRs:

- Were the objectives and related indicators relevant and appropriate? Are they still?
- Were the other programme monitoring tools i.e. programme overview, programme progress chart and project monitoring visit and reporting format relevant and appropriate?
- Was there meaningful synergy and cohesion between the programme and implementing partners’ projects m and e systems?

EFFECTIVENESS

The effectiveness will be addressed by considering the extent to which the programme objectives were achieved at outcome (and if verifiable at impact level), and the reasons for the outcome or the absence of it, presence and absence of any unintended results of the programme. The important questions will be the following:

- To what extent were the activities implemented according to relevant DCA policy, especially related to RBA and gender?
- To what extent did the cross cutting activities, particularly the capacity building efforts achieve their objectives? Why and Why not?
- To what extent has the monitoring undertaken in the course of the programme provided management with sufficient information to follow progress towards the desired results? Did management act accordingly?
- Is DCA (RO and HQ) an effective manager of this particular programme? (Strategic planning, staffing, resource management, monitoring, partnerships, etc.)

The second consideration for addressing effectiveness will be looking at how partnerships have been enhanced as a result of the programme (DCA and Partners, partners and rights holders, rights holders and duty bearers, and partners among themselves). The questions addressing this issue will include:

- How (with what criteria) were the partners selected? And how are they involved and what is their decision-making power in the planning and implementation of the programme
including the cross cutting activities (Exchange visits, advocacy workshops, M&E training, Procurement training, participatory education methodologies training, EU application workshop, Uganda budget tracking exposure visit, GART exposure visit, climate change workshop, and community managed microfinance training?)

- To what extent are partners practicing principles of accountability as
- Gender and HIV/AIDS
  - Programme interventions that address gender equality and HIV/AIDS at national level, either by a specific programme immediate objective and/or by activities under the programme
  - Programme interventions at non-national level to promote gender equality and HIV/AIDS?
  - Programme activities to promote access to and control over resources for women
  - Programme activities that actively involve men in gender equality activities?
  - Programme activities to promote equal opportunities for political participation and decision making for women and men?
  - Programme activities that challenge gender and HIV/AIDS stereotypes?
  - Programme activities to address barriers to gender equality and HIV/AIDS?
  - Which organisations under the programme work specifically towards gender equality and issues of HIV/AIDS?
  - Does any of the partners participate in relevant gender equality and HIV/AIDS networks, if yes which networks?

- Does the Partner Platform fulfil its purpose as identified by the programme?
  - Has the programme platform made the ToRs for their work?
  - Who chairs the platform meetings?
  - How many platform meetings have taken place in the programme period?
  - What were main issues discussed?
  - To what degree has partner ownership to the programme been increasing, and how have partners been using the platform as a flexible space for dialogue and influence?
  - Which were the main joint initiatives taken by the platform?
  - Which were the joint advocacy initiatives taken by the programme platform- if any?
  - What where the particular learning, successes and challenges?
  - Has DCA received any partner complaints? If so which one?

- Does DCA deliver an adequate support, particularly with regards to capacity building, to the partners involved in the programme, and is DCA responsive to needs identified by partners?
  - Does the support affect in a positive way the partners’ capacity to implement its projects?
  - Has DCA and the programme approach contributed to the organizational strengthening of the partner? In what way?

- Capacity building:
  - What have been the main achievements within capacity building of partners in the programme period and how is this been reflected in practice in partner’s organisations and projects?
  - How did capacity building ensure that capacity building plans reflected the needs as identified by themselves and during findings in the Project Monitoring Visit Reports
  - How is it ensured that the implementation capacities of cross cutting principles have been strengthened at project field staff level? – and, what are the challenges in this regard?
  - In relation to the implementation of capacity building plans, in what way has DCA liaised with nationally based resources and NGO support agencies?

- Do the partners have the appropriate skills to contribute to the achievement of the goals in the programme? And has the programme approach contributed to the effectiveness of the partners? An important part would be the capacity of the partner to influence the processes that the programme aspires to reach at the levels of the rights-holders, and the local and national authorities.

- Has the programme facilitated the interaction between the rights-holders and duty bearers? Has it had a positive effect on the relationship between beneficiaries and partners?
- Has the programme enabled the partner’s and DCA’s advocacy work with other relevant actors, e.g. facilitation of networks?
- Has the programme stimulated relations between partners in any significant way? Has this in turn had an effect on the programme?

EFFICIENCY

The issue of efficiency will be addressed by considering the extent to which the programme approach has been cost-efficient to implement development assistance. Thus the issue will be answered by the following questions:

- Could we have achieved the same with fewer resources? Or could we have achieved more results with the same resources?
- What are the overall costs of the programme compared to the number of beneficiaries?

IMPACT OF THE PROGRAMME

This issue will be evaluated by considering what the impact of the programme has been at rights-holders level (outcome) and at other levels that was supposedly addressed by the programme. Thus the following questions will address the issue of programme impact:

- What are the most significant changes in the lives of the rights holders, their relation to the duty bearers, or the practice of the duty bearers that can be attributed to the programme?
- Did the programme approach enhance impact and focus of DCAs work as envisioned when the transition from project approach was initiated? In what way?
- Could the same impact have been achieved through project approach?

SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability will be addressed by looking at the likelihood that the programme benefits, especially at rights holders’ level will continue after the finalization of the programme and the reasons for success or failure

CLIMATE CHANGE AND MICROFINANCE:

- Which Programme activities have positively reflected on the effects of climate change – for instance in terms of crop choice, soil, water and livestock management techniques, disaster risk reduction and disaster sensitive recovery?
- Which Programme activities have taken into account potentials for increased vulnerability for the most marginalised as a result of climate change, when assessing for empowerment, preparedness and other community activities?
- Which Programme activities have been considered and included the potential for documentation and campaigning for an enabling environment for climate change adaptation and mitigation?
- Which Programme activities have in their risk assessments taken into account that conflicts may be exacerbated by the effects of climate change?

EXTERNAL ENVIRONMENT:

- What was the eternal environment in which the programme was operational?
- What was its influence on programme successes and/or failures?
  - Have there been any events that have impacted the programme, e.g. conflict, natural disasters, etc
  - What have been the changes in national legislation and/or in the governments’ implementation of it? Has it influenced the programme positively and/or /negatively, and which actions that are needed?
Based on the risks and assumptions as mentioned in the programme matrix, how, and in what way have the situation evolved?

Did new risks and assumptions occur, if yes - How were such situations addressed?

PARTNERSHIP APPROACH: RIGHT-BASED COMMITMENT AND OWNERSHIP

- What is the relevance and effectiveness of programme interventions:
  - to influence policies, laws and resource allocations?
  - to influence the practices and attitudes of duty-bearers (moral and legal)?
  - to change relationships between rights-holders and duty-bearers?
  - to claim and access their rights and entitlements?
  - for increased access to justice

- Is the partners’ capacity adequate to work rights-based?

- What has been the role of each partner and stakeholder in the different stages/levels of the programme?

- To what extent did DCA and each partner/stakeholder fulfill their roles and obligations in terms of:
  a. Timeliness of disbursement of funds
  b. Management and implementation of project/programme activities
  c. Meeting reporting requirements
  d. Monitoring of project activities
  e. Holding and attending partners platform and other review, planning and consultation meetings,
  f. Other stakeholder consultations
  g. Timeliness in informing of any unforeseen problems, changed budget items, or changed circumstances which will affect implementation of the project/programme to a substantial degree, and informing in advance of any major alterations to the original project/programme design
  h. Sharing information, education and training materials, lessons and experiences
  i. Sharing resources

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR DCA HQ

Key Informant: Name:___________________________ Organisation:_____________________

Email:____________________ Contact No:__________________ Date:_____________

1. What are your views on programme design, management, implementation and monitoring?
2. Are you happy with the reporting on the measureable indicators of the programme as stipulated in the log frame over the evaluation period?
3. What are your views on design, management, implementation and monitoring of the partners’ projects in relation to the programme?
4. Are you happy with the reporting on the measureable indicators of the different projects and their cohesion with the programme?
5. What has been the role of each partner and stakeholder in the different stages/levels of the programme?
6. What are your perceptions/views on the adequacy of roles, coordination, feedback mechanisms between DCA and your partners based on the project proposals and the contracts?
7. Is the partners’ capacity adequate to work rights-based?
8. To what extent did DCA and each partner/stakeholder fulfill their roles and obligations in terms of:
   a. Timeliness of disbursement of funds
   b. Management and implementation of project/programme activities
   c. Providing technical and backstopping support
   d. Meeting reporting requirements for projects and the programme
   e. Monitoring of project and programme activities
   f. Holding and attending partners platform and other review, planning and consultation meetings,
   g. Other stakeholder consultations

Section 6: Annexes
h. Timeliness in informing of any unforeseen problems, changed budget items, or changed circumstances which will affect implementation of the project/programme to a substantial degree, and informing in advance of any major alterations to the original project/programme design
i. Sharing information, education and training materials, lessons and experiences
j. Sharing resources
k. Synergies
l. Rights based commitment
m. The functionality of the Partners Platform

9. What challenges have you faced in these collaborations and coordination mechanisms (internal and external)?
10. How have you tried to address these challenges over the programme period?
11. In your view, is the support you have rendered in project management and implementation been adequate to effectively and efficiently achieve programme objectives and results?
12. How has DCA facilitated the partners/stakeholders collaboration in the management and implementation of the programme?
13. How do you assess the relevance of each stakeholder?
14. Which gaps exist with regard to partners’ and stakeholders’ roles and collaboration?
15. What lessons have been learnt in terms of partnerships and stakeholder collaboration and project management and implementation?
16. Has each project been able to have an exit strategy?
17. What are your suggestions for improvement of the programme in terms of design, management and coordination in implementation, relevance, cohesion, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and replicability?
18. How can the roles of each stakeholder/partner be streamlined to improve coverage, relevance/appropriateness, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, replicability and sustainability of the project?

INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR RIGHT HOLDERS/VOLUNTEERS:

District:____________________ Date:____________ Site:________________________

1. When did you know about the existence of this project?
2. When did your community (site) start working with the project?
3. Do you know why your community (site) was selected to participate in the project?
4. What has been your involvement at different levels/stages of the project including needs identification?
5. As a community, were you involved in the identification of community needs being addressed by this project?
6. As a community did you agree with the Project Partner on the different components of the project?
7. Did DCA and the implementing partner explain to you as a community your involvement/participation for the success of the project?
8. In your opinion, did the information you received from the Project motivate you to participate in the project?
9. What support (equipment, capacity building, etc) have you been able to receive from the project under different project components?
10. To what extent have the community needs identified been addressed by the project?
11. What are the advantages and disadvantages of this project?
12. What vision did you have at the time of starting to work with the Project?
13. To what extent has it been achieved?
14. What changes has the project brought among you as direct beneficiaries?
15. What have been the benefits of this project to community members who have not been involved directly in the project?
16. What do you foresee as long term benefits of this project for your household?
17. What lessons have you learnt from this project?
18. What challenges have you had as you have participated in the management and implementation of the project?
19. How have you tried to resolve these challenges?
20. On the scale of 1 to 5, with 5 showing the most satisfaction, how do you rate the satisfaction of this project in your community/site?
21. What measures have you put in place for you to continue with the activities and benefits when the project comes to an end?
22. What are your perceptions on the way you have collaborated with different partners and stakeholders in this project?
23. What are your suggestions for the improvement of the different components of the project?
Annex 4: List of People Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Organisation/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme Stakeholders:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uffe Gjerding</td>
<td>Country Representative</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DanChurchAid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Chibuye</td>
<td>Programme Officer PT 3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DanChurchAid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna C. Murru</td>
<td>Programme Officer PT 1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DanChurchAid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buumba M Kaunda</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DanChurchAid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mette Lund Sorenson</td>
<td>DCA Food Programme Type Advisor</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DCA HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnes Yawe</td>
<td>Campaign &amp; Advocacy/Lobbying Off</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>PELUM-RD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Moyo</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lutheran World Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Zimba</td>
<td>Health Programme Manager</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CHAZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Chiluba</td>
<td>IGA Programme Manager</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CHAZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison Musonda</td>
<td>HIV/AIDS Programme Officer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CHAZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Spenser Nyendwa</td>
<td>Advocacy Officer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MDDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorcas Mbewe Mbozi</td>
<td>Country Representative</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Diakonia Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwape Sichilongo</td>
<td>CNRRN Regional Coordinator</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZCSCCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machaya Chomba</td>
<td>Advocacy Officer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZCSCCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minniver Chibuye</td>
<td>Social Conditions Prog Coordinator</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>JCTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Pete Henriot</td>
<td>Former Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>JCTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father Leonard Chiti</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>JCTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Kambobe</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>JCTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Muchina</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mbinji</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHIPATA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas Banda</td>
<td>Deputy PS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Eastern Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Obvious Kabinda</td>
<td>PACO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MACO - Eastern Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Muhango</td>
<td>Prov Social Welfare Officer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MCDSS - Eastern Province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robby Musendwa</td>
<td>DACO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MACO - Chipata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones Malama</td>
<td>District Irrigation Engineer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>MACO - Chipata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Phiri</td>
<td>Asst Community Development Officer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MCDSS - Chipata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Shapi</td>
<td>Asst Community Development Officer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>MCDSS - Chipata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Konkola Ngosa Victor</td>
<td>Ground Rate Collector</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Min of Lands – Chipata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allan Kason</td>
<td>District Coordinator</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chipata DLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Kamanga Banda</td>
<td>Programme Officer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chipata DLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vast Kuliwa</td>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chipata DLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noreen Miti</td>
<td>Community Facilitator</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chipata DLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Johns</td>
<td>VSO Volunteer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chipata DLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurent Zeka</td>
<td>Field Worker</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chipata DLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Tembo</td>
<td>Community Facilitator</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Chipata DLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitoshi Cosmas</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LWF - Chipata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Siagaba</td>
<td>Admin &amp; Logistics Assistant</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LWF – Chipata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nikiwe Msoni</td>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LWF - Chipata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Banda Muunza</td>
<td>Field Officer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LWF – Chipata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Sinyinza</td>
<td>Field Officer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LWF – Chipata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia Lungwe</td>
<td>Field Officer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>LWF – Chipata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadreck Sichalwe</td>
<td>Field Officer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>LWF – Chipata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lembani Village FGD with Headmen Chipata District Land Alliance (6)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elesani Phiri</td>
<td>Village Headman</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Ng’ombe</td>
<td>Village Headman</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.G. Mphanza</td>
<td>Village Headman</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Zamiagem Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damasio Phiri</td>
<td>Village Headman</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lemisasu Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austakio Ndhlouvu</td>
<td>Village Headman</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jage Tembo</td>
<td>Induna</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women Groups – Lembani Village Chipata District Land Alliance (76)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alina Phiri</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faless Mbewe</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Dailess Phiri  Member  F  Lembani Village
Monica Zulu  Member  F  Lembani Village
Griselia Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Cellia Tembo  Member  F  Lembani Village
Saraphina Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Josephine Phiri  Member  F  Lembani Village
Anna Nkhosi  Member  F  Lembani Village
Efemia Tembo  Member  F  Lembani Village
Susan Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Egenia Nyambi  Member  F  Lembani Village
Nosiyadi Lungu  Member  F  Lembani Village
Makilina Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Tiyesenji Nyambi  Member  F  Lembani Village
Valaria Tembo  Member  F  Lembani Village
Rosemary Daka  Member  F  Lembani Village
Constancio Mwale  Member  F  Lembani Village
Janet Moyo  Member  F  Lembani Village
Dailess Phiri  Member  F  Lembani Village
Charity Mwanza  Member  F  Lembani Village
Saraphina Phiri  Member  F  Lembani Village
Jenipher Phiri  Member  F  Lembani Village
Rita Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Elida Banda  Member  F  Lembani Village
Jenipher Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Ireen Moyo  Member  F  Lembani Village
Sarah Miti  Member  F  Lembani Village
Theresa Msoni  Member  F  Lembani Village
Alionsina Zulu  Member  F  Lembani Village
Aline Maseweswe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Pelina Phiri  Member  F  Lembani Village
Fatness Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Criodonia Phiri  Member  F  Lembani Village
Justina Daka  Member  F  Lembani Village
Esther Mwanza  Member  F  Lembani Village
Letesia Zulu  Member  F  Lembani Village
Constansia Phiri  Member  F  Lembani Village
Litiness Phiri  Member  F  Lembani Village
Agnness moyo  Member  F  Lembani Village
Franciscar Zingani  Member  F  Lembani Village
Esther Zulu  Member  F  Lembani Village
Paulina Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Onesta Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Margaret Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Shelly Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Victory Mphanza  Member  F  Lembani Village
Veledian Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Tilizonia Banda  Member  F  Lembani Village
Dolica Phiri  Member  F  Lembani Village
Pyela Phiri  Member  F  Lembani Village
Joice Nyirenda  Member  F  Lembani Village
Damaless Tembo  Member  F  Lembani Village
Rabecca Maseko  Member  F  Lembani Village
Albetina Phiri  Member  F  Lembani Village
Sevelina Soko  Member  F  Lembani Village
Agness Soko  Member  F  Lembani Village
Esther Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Dainess Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Ruth Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
Lusia Shumba  Member  F  Lembani Village
Falazia Moyo  Member  F  Lembani Village
Lairess Moyo  Member  F  Lembani Village
Dolica Banda  Member  F  Lembani Village
Theresa Mbewe  Member  F  Lembani Village
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### Women – Lembani Village Chipata District Land Alliance (61)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elina Phiri</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Tembo</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Mbewe</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Zulu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiyankhenji Mphanza</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliet Sakala</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilirani Phiri</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selenia Mbewe</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellen Zulu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salome Zulu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mwazida Phiri</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Men – Lembani Village Chipata District Land Alliance (61)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Moyo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanwell Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locas Zulu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Zulu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standford Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zacharia Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haward Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniss Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Moyo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nthosi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cazias Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Daka</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harison Kwenda</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davison Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrick Daka</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elesam Daka</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yotamu Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felix Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Daka</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisinyo Zulu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabvuto Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davy Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zongwayo Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Zulu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Moyo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabriel Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daness Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mafutani Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lameck Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Moyo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renard Moyo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisinyo Moyo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limackio Zulu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailaleti Zulu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yotamu Zulu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Nthosi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert Nthosi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philimon Zulu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bazilio Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hathan Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Mbewe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganizani Moyo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Daka</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jelicho Moyo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Lembani Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nthombimbi Village – Chipata DLA (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Daka</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alikanjero Nkhoma</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mabvuto Tembo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kacilala Zulu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Tembo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graxvesio Zulu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerady Tembo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afiki Tembo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Ngombe</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masauso Tembo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet Tembo</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia Tembo</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Agness Ngozo</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nthombimbi Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayeka Village – Chipata DLA (32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auleliano Miti</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ositankio Njobvu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eginesius Shawa</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Zulu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dasidelo Lukhelo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Jere</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezlemu Shawa</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Shawa</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sestino Tembo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvensio Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanduka Sakala</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikhonzenji Sakala</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Njobvu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John K Phiri</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alikanjelo Miti</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Miti</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses Miti</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Miti</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telesnio Njobvu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Lungu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry Njobvu</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Tembo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bathromeoyo Banda</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Banda</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominiko Mwanza</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestina Lukhelo</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onesta Lukhelo</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juliana K Phiri</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitalina Phiri</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enia Zulu</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anastazia Shawa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Nyambi</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Kayeka Village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kapatamoyo Chief – Chipata DLA (4)
Chief Kapatamoyo  Chief  M  Kapatamoyo Village
Andrew Banda  Chief Retainer  M  Kapatamoyo Village
Lyford C Banda  Local Court Justice  M  Kapatamoyo Village
Yelemiah Ngoma  Induna  M  Kapatamoyo Village

Kapatamoyo Group – Chipata District Land Alliance (21 Members)
Ackim Tembo  Headman  M  Ombelani Village
S Mwale  Member  M  Kapatamoyo Village
Fruster Nkhoma  Nduna  M  Kaunda II
Catherine Nguni  Member  F  Kapatamoyo Village
Bertha Banda  Member  F  Kapatamoyo Village
Lucy Banda  Member  F  Kapatamoyo Village
Songile Phiri  Member  F  Kapatamoyo Village
Dickson Banda  Member  M  Kapatamoyo Village
Mr Kamfwimbwa  Member  M  Kapatamoyo Village
Lucy Banda  Member  F  Kapatamoyo Village
Perollam Nkhoma  Member  M  Kapatamoyo Village
Maggie Katawa  Member  F  Kapatamoyo Village
Martin Tembo  Member  M  Kapatamoyo Village
Dolika  Member  F  Kapatamoyo Village
Esther Zulu  Member  F  Kapatamoyo Village
Sonzi Zulu  Member  M  Kapatamoyo Village
Mrs M Banda  Member  F  Kapatamoyo Village
Beauty Zulu  Member  F  Kapatamoyo Village
Joyce Jere  Member  F  Kapatamoyo Village
Janet Banda  Member  F  Kapatamoyo Village

Mtelezi Village - FOSELI project Sanjika camp, Zone 1 Chief Mpezeni (9 Members)
Headman Mtelezi  Headman and Member  M  Mtelezi Village
Esaya Mwale  Member  M  Mtelezi Village
Redson Lungu  Member  M  Mtelezi Village
Patrick Ngoma  Secretary  M  Mtelezi Village
Joseph Banda  Member  M  Mtelezi Village
Lucas Ngoma  Member  M  Mtelezi Village
Maxesio Ngoma  Community Volunteer  M  Mtelezi Village
Dorica Mwanza  Community Volunteer  F  Mtelezi Village
Nelia Ngoma  Member  F  Mtelezi Village

Kanyanja Village – FOSELI project Chinyanja camp.
Leonard Njovu  Community Volunteer  M  Kanyanja Village
Malizani Zulu  Member  M  Kanyanja Village
Aswell Ngoma  Member  M  Kanyanja Village
Simon Ngoma  Member  M  Kanyanja Village
Pius Miti  Vice Chairman  M  Kanyanja Village
Dyford Nyanga  Member  M  Kanyanja Village
Bogard Ngwenya  Member  M  Kanyanja Village
Sara Miti  Chairperson (Womens’ Group)  F  Kanyanja Village
Silas Ngwenya  Member  M  Kanyanja Village
Dison Miti  Member  M  Kanyanja Village
A. Mumba  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
Martha Jere  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
D. Zulu  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
Rachel Jere  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
E. Nyama  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
C. Phiri  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
Ireen Lungu  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
Anna Lungu  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
Mary Njovu  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
R. Miti  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
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C. Ngoma  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
V. Banda  Chairperson (Tandanjala Group)  F  Kanyanja Village
M. Phiri  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
Mai Soko  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
B. Jere  Chairperson (Farmers’ Group)  F  Kanyanja Village
R. Jere  Committee member  F  Kanyanja Village
Rita Zimba  Member  F  Kanyanja Village
J. Jere  Vice Secretary  F  Kanyanja Village

Mkuzye Ward Zone 8 – FOSELI Project
Elias Banda  Headman  M  Mapala Village
Isaac Banda  Community Agricultural Volunteer  M  Mapala Village
Joseph Ng’andu  Member  M  Mapala Village
Evans Banda  Member  M  Mapala Village
Mai Ng’andu  Member  M  Mapala Village
Mai Banda  Member  M  Mapala Village

PETEAUKE DISTRICT:
Moses Phiri  Coordinator  M  Petauke DLA Board & Mgt Committee
Andrew Kamanga  Programmes Officer  M  Petauke DLA Board & Mgt Committee
Cosam Zulu  Board Secretary  M  Petauke DLA Board & Mgt Committee
Greenfold Phiri  Treasurer  M  Petauke DLA Board & Mgt Committee
Moses Mwanza  Board Member  M  Petauke DLA Board & Mgt Committee
Hildah Zimba  Board Member  F  Petauke DLA Board & Mgt Committee
Monica Longwe  Board Member  F  Petauke DLA Board & Mgt Committee
Lillian Kamanga  Committee Member  F  Petauke DLA Board & Mgt Committee
Senior Chief Kalindawalo  Chief  M  Petauke
Philip Mwanza  Chief’s Induna  M  Chief Kalindawalo
Yobe Banda  Chief’s Induna  M  Chief Kalindawalo

SIKANKOMBA VILLAGE (Petauke DLA Model Village) - 7
Sikankomba Village Headman  M  Sikankomba Village
Simon Lungu  Chairperson  M  Sikankomba Village
Phillip Mwanza  Headman  M  Sikankomba Village
Lauzi Zimba  Secretary  M  Sikankomba Village
Davison Mumba  Treasurer  M  Sikankomba Village
Tyson Mumba  Committee Member  M  Sikankomba Village
Treasurer Chishimba  Committee Member  M  Sikankomba Village

Nyanje Mission Hospital (3)
Dr Mpoyi Mulumba  Head  M  Nyanje Mission Hospital
Emmanuel Phiri  Coordinator HIV Programme  M  Nyanje Mission Hospital
John Mvula  Nutrition Officer  M  Nyanje Mission Hospital

Kapandula CPT – Nyanje (14)
Kennedy Mwanza  Chairperson  M  Kapandula Care & Prevention Team
Mary Phiri  Home Based Care Leader  F  Kapandula Care & Prevention Team
Anna Banda  Member  F  Kapandula Support Group
Shawa Jackson  Secretary  M  Kapandula Support Group
Phiri Javan  Member  M  Kapandula Support Group
Zakeyo Phiri  Chairperson  M  Kapandula Support Group
Chikondwe Shawa  Member  M  Kapandula Support Group
Atiness Zulu  Secretary  F  Post Test Club
Anna Mtonga  Member  F  Post Test Club
Meius Banda  Member  M  Post Test Club
Joyce Banda  Member  F  Post Test Club
Moses Phiri  Member  M  Support Group
Stella Phiri  Member  F  Support Group

NYANTUMA “A” SUPPORT GROUP – Nyanje (17)
Borniface Banda  
Member  
M  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

Samson Banda  
Chairperson  
M  
Nyantuma “C” Support Group  

Thaulo Banda  
Adherence Supporter  
M  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

Joshua Njobvu  
Member  
M  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

Sainani Sakala  
Member  
M  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

Peter Banda  
Member  
M  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

Christina Banda  
Chairlady “A”  
F  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

Enala Phiri  
Member  
F  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

Eledi Zulu  
Member  
F  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

Prisca Banda  
Member  
F  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

Nelia Mwale  
Member  
F  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

Grace Zulu  
Member  
F  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

Brenda Phiri  
Member  
F  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

Patricia Phiri  
Member  
F  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

Grace Sakala  
Member  
F  
Nyantuma “A” Support Group  

NYANTUMA “B” SUPPORT GROUP – Nyanje (9)  

Phillip Njobvu  
Chairperson  
M  
Nyantuma “B” Support Group  

Mercy Banda  
Vice Chairlady  
F  
Nyantuma “B” Support Group  

Inele Mwale  
Garden Development  
F  
Nyantuma “B” Support Group  

Maria Chisi  
Group Leader  
F  
Nyantuma “B” Support Group  

Christine Phiri  
Development  
F  
Nyantuma “B” Support Group  

Stella Tembo  
Treasurer  
F  
Nyantuma “B” Support Group  

Violet Phiri  
Secretary  
F  
Nyantuma “B” Support Group  

Margaret Zulu  
Member  
F  
Nyantuma “B” Support Group  

Alina Ngoma  
Member  
F  
Nyantuma “B” Support Group  

Chipembi Mission Health Centre – CHAZ (7)  

Limbusha Sunday  
Administrator/Clinical Officer  
M  
Chipembi Mission Health Centre  

Harrison Musonda  
Programme Officer  
M  
Chipembi Mission Health Centre  

Emmanuel Banda  
Nutrition & Agric Officer  
M  
CHAZ Food Security & Nutrition Project  

Christopher Phiri  
Gardener  
M  
CHAZ Food Security & Nutrition Project  

Khumalo Elliot  
Community Health Worker  
M  
Chipembi Mission Health Centre  

Ivy Kambanya  
Community Health Worker  
F  
Chipembi Mission Health Centre  

Spiwe Nguni  
Community Health Growth Promoter  
F  
Chipembi Mission Health Centre  

Chipembi Health Post Community Care and Prevention Team (CPT) Members: (33)  

Beatrice Mumba  
Member  
F  
Momboshi Health Post CPT  

Delina Chisenga  
Member  
F  
Momboshi Health Post CPT  

Beatrice Nasilele  
Member  
F  
Momboshi Health Post CPT  

Beatrice Namukonda  
Member  
F  
Momboshi Health Post CPT  

Emary Muuziya  
Member  
F  
Momboshi Health Post CPT  

Christine Mudingwa  
Member  
F  
Momboshi Health Post CPT  

Annie Mwila  
Member  
F  
Momboshi Health Post CPT  

Eunice Mwape  
Member  
F  
Momboshi Health Post CPT  

Rosemary Musonda  
Member  
F  
Momboshi Health Post CPT  

Betty Mbewe  
Member  
F  
Momboshi Health Post CPT  

Febby Nakaonga  
Member  
F  
Momboshi Health Post CPT  

Idah Masawa  
Member  
F  
Momboshi Health Post CPT  

Eliza Mbewe  
Member  
F  
Momboshi Health Post CPT  

Nada M Mkoni  
Member  
F  
Chipamba Health Post CPT  

Mirriam Mutelo  
Member  
F  
Katuba Health Post CPT  

Dorothy Masuka  
Member  
F  
Katuba Health Post CPT  

Nicholas Masuka  
Member  
M  
Katuba Health Post CPT  

Agness S Siamabamba  
Member  
F  
Chamuka Health Post CPT  

Dennis Chopo  
Member  
M  
Chamuka Health Post CPT  

Majority Musho  
Member  
F  
Chamuka Health Post CPT  

Christine Lundako  
Member  
F  
Chamuka Health Post CPT  

Charity Nyirenda  
Member  
F  
Katubi Health Post CPT  

Lloyd Mwape  
Member  
M  
Katubi Health Post CPT  

Elliot K Khumalo  
Member  
M  
Katubi Health Post CPT  

Barbara Mafuwa  
Member  
F  
Suse Health Post CPT  

Sibeso Masialeti  
Member  
F  
Suse Health Post CPT  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belita Chisenga</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Suse Health Post CPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofiya Sakala</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Suse Health Post CPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbeces Mulungushi</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Suse Health Post CPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzan Mambo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Suse Health Post CPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Mwanza</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Suse Health Post CPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Chibuyu</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Suse Health Post CPT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophie Hikaambo</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Moombe Health Post CPT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: Format of the Report

Please find below a suggestion for a more specific format for the evaluation report for guidance for the evaluation team. You may find it useful to share the 1:3:25 principle with the team — the up-coming DCA evaluation policy recommending a 1 page main messages and learning, 3 pages executive summary, and 25 pages report in total!

By following a uniform format, evaluation reports tend to be easier to read and use. The format also facilitates syntheses of different reports for broader learning purposes, such as suggested in DCAs evaluation policy. The format could be included as an annex to the contract with the consultant’s thus providing early instructions on how the report should be prepared and what is expected to be delivered.

The report should not be longer than 25 pages exclusive of annexes. Following is a format for the report structure with explanation of the content in each section.

1. Executive summary
The executive summary of maximum two pages provides information about the evaluation and its purpose, emphasizing main findings, evaluative conclusions, recommendations and lessons to be learned. The summary should be self-contained and self-explanatory. Special care should be taken to prepare the executive summary, as it is may be the only part of the report that some people have time to read.

2. Introduction
The introduction presents the background and overall purpose and scope of the evaluation, including how and by whom it is intended to be used, (focus on accountability and learning, whether it is terminal or in preparation of a new phase, etc.) as well as the evaluation criteria employed and the key questions addressed. A brief summary of the methods applied with specific reference to how rights-holders and other stakeholders have been involved should also be included here. It also outlines the structure of the report and provides guidance to readers.

3. Background
This chapter describes the main characteristics of the evaluated intervention and its given context including location, history, organization and stakeholders. It should cover the focal problem addressed by the intervention, the objectives and the logic of cause and effect of the intervention. A description of activities carried out, key outputs delivered and overall costs should be included. The chapter should also cover the policy and development context of the evaluated intervention, including the assumptions about external factors that were part of intervention planning. When preparing the chapter, the evaluators should summarize the findings and conclusions of any earlier evaluations of the same intervention.

4. Findings and conclusions
Findings are empirical data that the evaluators present as evidence relevant to the evaluation questions. The findings are systematically presented in objective terms so that readers can form their own opinion about the strengths and weakness of the conclusions of the evaluation. They can be presented in various ways that can be decided upon by the RR and the team leader. It is of course important the author of the report is comfortable with the presentation. A couple of suggestions are:

- According to the standard ToR (i.e. according to evaluation criteria)
- According to an operation logic e.g. Design & planning, Implementation, Results, Cross cutting issues
- According to the logframe of the operation (by objective, activity or other)

The evaluative conclusions are the evaluators’ concluding assessments of the intervention based on the findings. They provide answers to the questions in the ToR and if possible, based on the data available, they pass an evaluative judgment as to whether the operation was relevant, effective, efficient, and sustainable. The evaluative conclusions are often best presented together with the underlying findings on which they are based, and not in a separate section as sometimes seen.

5. Lessons learned
Lessons to be learned are findings and conclusions that can be generalized beyond the evaluated intervention. In formulating lessons, the evaluators are expected to examine the intervention in a wider perspective and put it in relation to current ideas about good practice in the given context.

6. **Recommendations**
Recommendations indicate what actions the evaluators believe should be taken on the basis of the evaluation. Recommendations to DCA may cover the whole spectrum of aid management, including resource allocation, financing, design and planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. There may be particular needs that should be in focus – in this case the potential for synergy in the future ACT joint programme. Recommendations should always identify their respective addressees and be tailored to the specific needs and interests of each addressee. They should be clearly stated and geared to facilitate implementation.

7. **Annexes**
The report should include as a minimum following annexes: ToR, bibliography, list of people and institutions interviewed, description of methodology applied, (including research design, sampling, data collection instruments (surveys, checklists, interview guides, etc.), and analytical procedures. It should discuss the limitations of the selected methods as well as their strengths.
Annex 6: Some cross-cutting activities undertaken in the course of the programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participating partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exchange visit to KATC</td>
<td>6th December, 2006</td>
<td>PELUM Association, ZLA, LADA, CHAZ, LWF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy workshop</td>
<td>17th July, 2007</td>
<td>LWF, ZLA, CHAZ, MDDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; E training</td>
<td>12th-14th December, 2007</td>
<td>LWF, PELUM Association, MDDD, JCTR, LADA, ZLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy workshop</td>
<td>5th-6th February, 2008</td>
<td>MDDD, PELUM Association, ZLA, LADA, JCTR, LWF, CHAZ, WFC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement training</td>
<td>12th-13th 2008</td>
<td>PELUM, MDDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Education Methodologies training</td>
<td>November, 2008</td>
<td>LADA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU application development workshop</td>
<td>18th - 21th November, 2008</td>
<td>MDDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M &amp; E training</td>
<td>25th-28th November, 2008</td>
<td>PELUM Association, JCTR, MDDD, LADA, CHAZ, JCTR, ZLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda budget tracking exposure visit</td>
<td>16th-22nd August, 2009</td>
<td>MDDD, PELUM RD, JCTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GART exposure visit</td>
<td>24th November, 2009</td>
<td>LADA, CHAZ, PELUM, LWF, MDDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change workshop</td>
<td>26th February, 2010</td>
<td>MDDD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Managed Microfinance training</td>
<td>16th -20th August, 2010</td>
<td>MDDD, LWF, CHAZ, WFC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>