



# ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

## EVALUATION OF UNDP CONTRIBUTION

# ZAMBIA



HUMAN DEVELOPMENT effectiveness COORDINATION  
efficiency COORDINATION AND PARTNERSHIP sus  
NATIONAL OWNERSHIP relevance MANAGING FO  
sustainability MANAGING FOR RESULTS responsiver  
AN DEVELOPMENT responsiveness NATIONAL OW  
NATIONAL OWNERSHIP effectiveness COORDINATION  
efficiency COORDINATION AND PARTNERSHIP sus  
NATIONAL OWNERSHIP relevance MANAGING FO  
sustainability MANAGING FOR RESULTS responsiver  
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT effectiveness COORDINATION





**ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS**  
**EVALUATION OF UNDP CONTRIBUTION** **ZAMBIA**

## REPORTS PUBLISHED UNDER THE ADR SERIES

Afghanistan	Egypt	Peru
Argentina	Ethiopia	Philippines
Bangladesh	Georgia	Rwanda
Barbados	Guatemala	Serbia
Benin	Guyana	Seychelles
Bhutan	Honduras	Sudan
Bosnia & Herzegovina	India	Syrian Arab Republic
Botswana	Jamaica	Tajikistan
Bulgaria	Jordan	Turkey
Burkina Faso	Lao PDR	Uganda
Cambodia	Libya	Ukraine
Chile	Maldives	Uzbekistan
China	Montenegro	Viet Nam
Colombia	Mozambique	Yemen
Republic of the Congo	Nicaragua	
Ecuador	Nigeria	

### EVALUATION TEAM

<b>Team Leader</b>	Erik Lyby
<b>Team Members</b>	Honorine Muyoyeta Jorry Mwenechanya
<b>EO Task Manager</b>	Urs Nagel
<b>EO Research Assistant</b>	Zembaba Ayalew

#### ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS: MALDIVES

---

Copyright © UNDP 2010, all rights reserved.  
Manufactured in the United States of America.

The analysis and recommendations of this report do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Development Programme, its Executive Board or the United Nations Member States. This is an independent publication by UNDP Evaluation Office.

Cover photos provided by Urs Nagel and UNDP Zambia.

**Design:** Green Communication Design inc.

**Production:** Consolidated Graphics

# FOREWORD

The current country programme of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in Zambia will come to an end this year, and a new country programme will be submitted to the UNDP Executive Board for its approval. In order to support the process of understanding UNDP's contribution to Zambia's development over the past years (2002 to 2009), and provide recommendations that may assist in the formulation of the new country programme (2011 to 2015), the UNDP Evaluation office has conducted an Assessment of Development Results (ADR). The ADR is an independent country-level evaluation that examines the relevance of UNDP in Zambia and assesses its strategic positioning.

During the period under review, Zambia has achieved growth rates averaging about 5 percent per annum and maintained a peaceful democratic environment. At the same time, the country continues to face serious development challenges including widespread poverty and high income disparity. Zambia is at the epicentre of the HIV/AIDS pandemic that affects virtually all its citizens in a variety of ways, and places a tremendous burden on the country's social and economic development. A resource-rich country, Zambia's environmental sustainability constitutes a serious concern, with projections indicating that the related Millennium Development Goal (MDG) is unlikely to be achieved by 2015.

Throughout, UNDP Zambia has been an ally of the Government of the Republic of Zambia in its effort to address a range of development needs, particularly in the areas of governance, environment and energy and HIV/AIDS. The evaluation suggests that UNDP's contribution to the fight against HIV/AIDS has been particularly notable. The promotion of gender equality has been a cross-cutting concern, which has received increasing attention over the past few years, but is

not considered to have been effective. UNDP has been a strong advocate of the MDGs and has supported the Government in MDG monitoring. It has worked closely with the Government in preparing national Human Development Reports, and has contributed macroeconomic studies. As a partner in the Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia, UNDP has played a lead (gender) or co-lead (governance, environment) role in the sectoral sub-groups of the Cooperating Partners' Group. According to the evaluation, UNDP's overall contribution was limited, in part, as a result of programme resources spread too thinly across many initiatives and insufficient attention given to ensuring sustainability. While cooperating partners and non-governmental organizations would have preferred UNDP to play a stronger role in advocacy, the Government appreciates UNDP as a consistent partner. The evaluation suggests that, within the context of the United Nations country team, UNDP missed opportunities to develop more joint initiatives.

The evaluation recommends that the UNDP's country programme in Zambia should focus more narrowly on upstream policy-level support in areas where it has clear comparative advantages *within* its three established primary thematic areas of cooperation, and especially in the area of governance. Moreover, it is suggested that there is much scope for strengthening UNDP's contribution to gender equality, particularly in cooperation with the United Nations country team, other cooperating partners and civil society. A review of UNDP's partnership strategy is advised, both as a means of leveraging its support to the Government more effectively and, in this context, of developing a systematic approach towards capacity development. The findings and recommendations of the evaluation thus highlight that there are advantages in providing consistent, long-term support to countries in the achievement of development

results, but that UNDP must be ready to adjust its approach in line with its corporate mandate and the changing development environment. It is my sincere hope that this report has provided an opportunity to reflect on UNDP's contribution to development results in Zambia, and to identify ways in which the country programme can be further strengthened over the coming years.

A number of people contributed to the evaluation. I would like to thank the independent evaluation team, led by Mr. Erik Lyby, and its members Ms. Honorine Muyoyeta and Mr. Jorry Mwenechanya. I also wish to thank Ms. Mary Chinery-Hesse, who took part in the inception phase of the evaluation, for her invaluable insights and advice. The evaluation would not have been possible without the constructive support and contributions of our colleagues in the Zambia Country Office: Resident Representative Mr. Macleod Nyirongo, Country Director Ms. Viola Morgan, Deputy Country Director (Programme) Ms. Georgina Fekete, Deputy Country Director (Operations) Ms. Dancilla Mukarubayiza, the evaluation focal point and Economic Adviser Mr. John Wayem and all other programme and project staff who assisted the team in conducting this evaluation. I also thank the external

reviewers of the draft report, Ms. Anne Gilles and Mr. Oliver Saasa. My sincere gratitude is extended to all the people in Zambia who have taken time to respond to the requests by the evaluation team: government officials, local administration officials, community representatives, civil society actors, development partners, villagers, trainers, men and women. Special thanks go to the staff of the Ministry of Finance and National Planning, the central coordinating ministry responsible for UNDP's development cooperation with the Government, for their support to the ADR process, and particularly to Mr. Emmanuel Ngulube, Permanent Secretary for Budget and Economic Affairs. Finally, I would like to thank our colleagues in the Evaluation Office for their support: Mr. Urs Nagel, the Task Manager of this evaluation, as well as Mr. Oscar Garcia, Ms. Thuy Hang To, Ms. Cecilia Corpus, Ms. Caroline Monyi, Mr. Anish Pradhan and Ms. Zembaba Ayalew.



Saraswathi Menon  
Director, Evaluation Office

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose and scope	1
1.2 Methodology	1
<b>2 DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES AND NATIONAL STRATEGIES</b>	<b>9</b>
2.1 Country context	9
2.2 Poverty and human development	10
2.3 Government response	14
2.4 External assistance	18
<b>3 UNDP'S RESPONSE AND STRATEGIES</b>	<b>19</b>
3.1 UN in Zambia	19
3.2 UNDP's response	19
3.3 Democratic governance	23
3.4 HIV/AIDS	25
3.5 Energy and environment	27
3.6 Gender equality	27
3.7 Poverty and MDGs	28
<b>4 CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT RESULTS</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1 Fostering democratic governance	31
4.2 Responding to HIV/AIDS	34
4.3 Energy and environment for sustainable development	36
4.4 Promoting gender equality	42
4.5 Poverty and MDGs	46
4.6 Other cross-cutting issues	50
<b>5 UNDP'S STRATEGIC POSITIONING</b>	<b>53</b>
5.1 Management, planning, monitoring & evaluation	53
5.2 Strategic relevance of UNDP practice areas and non-project activities	53
5.3 Responsiveness to changes	55
5.4 Contribution to UN values	55
5.5 Strategic partnerships	56
5.6 Contribution to UN coordination	58
<b>6 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<b>59</b>
6.1 Development results	59
6.2 UNDP positioning	60

<b>ANNEXES</b>	<b>63</b>
Annex 1: Terms of reference	63
Annex 2: List of documents consulted	69
Annex 3: List of people consulted	77
Annex 4: Evaluation questions	83
Annex 5: Zambia HDI highlights	85
Annex 6: Zambia HDI indicators over time	89
Annex 7: Zambia at a glance	95
<b>TABLES</b>	
Table 1. CPD/CPAP outcomes per practice area	3
Table 2: Evaluated activities and stakeholders	5
Table 3: Poverty 1991 to 2006	10
Table 4: Achievement of MDGs	12
Table 5: Knowledge of HIV/AIDs	13
Table 6: UNDP results framework	21
Table 7: UNDP Zambia expenditures	22
Table 8: UNDP funding by practice area 2007 to 2009	23
Table 9: UNDP Zambia staffing 2002 to 2009	24
Table 10: Micro Bankers trust products	47



# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADR	Assessment of Development Results
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
CBO	Community-based organization
CCF	Country Cooperation Framework
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CPD	Country Programme Document
CPG	Cooperating Partners' Group
CSO	Civil society organization
EO	UNDP Evaluation Office
FNDP	Fifth National Development Plan
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GRZ	Government of Republic of Zambia
GTZ	German Technical Cooperation Agency
HDI	Human Development Index
HDR	Human Development Report
HIPC	Highly indebted poor countries
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
HPI	Human Poverty Index
JASZ	Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MFNP	Ministry of Finance and National Planning
MTENR	Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NUNV	National United Nations Volunteer
PLWHA	People Living with HIV and AIDS
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RBA	Regional Bureau for Africa
SAG	Sectoral Advisory Group
SNDP	Sixth National Development Plan
SPU	Strategic Policy Unit
UNCT	United Nations Country Team
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNGASS	United Nations General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS

UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
UNRC	United Nations Resident Coordinator
UNV	United Nations Volunteer

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The purpose of this report is to present an assessment of the contributions of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to development results in Zambia in the period 2002 to 2009. It covers two programming cycles known as the second Country Cooperation Framework (CCF-II) 2002 to 2006, and the current Country Programme Document (CPD) 2007 to 2010. The evaluation was carried out between June 2009 and January 2010, and its findings were designed to contribute to the new country programme, currently being prepared by the UNDP Country Office and national stakeholders. The Assessment of Development Results (ADR) addressed two main clusters of issues:

1. An evaluation of the extent to which UNDP has achieved the outcomes foreseen in its planning documents, thereby contributing to development results; this was accomplished through the application of the following evaluation criteria to a selection of UNDP Zambia's projects: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability.
2. The way in which UNDP has positioned itself in the national development context to add value in response to national needs; the evaluation criteria used were: strategic relevance, responsiveness, contribution to UN values, strategic partnerships and contribution to UN coordination.

UNDP's Country Programme is synchronized with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The UNDAF and the UNDP Country Programme in turn support the Government's Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP) and, in order to be fully in line with overall national priorities and plans, as from 2011 the UN response will be fully synchronized with the Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP).

The development challenges faced by Zambia are many. While the period under review has shown respectable economic growth rates averaging five percent per annum, poverty remains deep and widespread, although a slight reduction seems to have taken place. The economy is heavily dependent on one resource—copper; while copper prices helped spur the growth of recent years, the 2008 economic downturn led to sharp falls in copper prices, thereby seriously reducing the Government's revenue. In spite of major efforts to contain it throughout the period under review, corruption levels remain high and are recognized by the Government as a major threat to development. Zambia is ranked no. 165 out of 177 countries in the Human Development Index (HDI) in the UNDP 2007 to 2008 Human Development Report (HDR).

Zambia is at the epicentre of a mature HIV/AIDS pandemic with some 15 percent of the adult population infected with HIV. This is a severe blow to economic and social development at all levels. Another major challenge is presented in terms of environmental sustainability and the effects of climate change. The Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ) regularly reports on its progress towards meeting the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) by 2015 and states that almost all MDGs are achievable or potentially achievable—except for MDG 7 on environmental sustainability.

The GRZ and its cooperating partners in development subscribe to the principles of the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness and the 2008 Accra Action Plan. As a consequence, Zambia is moving forward towards aid harmonization and alignment in the framework of the mutually agreed—upon Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia (JASZ) 2007 to 2010. Within the FNDP and JASZ framework, 17 Sectoral Advisory Groups (SAGs) have been

set up, normally chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the related sectoral line ministry. In parallel with this, a Cooperating Partners' Group (CPG) has been established in order to coordinate and harmonize the external assistance. To do so, the CPG has established sectoral sub-groups mirroring the SAGs. UNDP and other UN agencies participate in the SAGs and CPG sector groups.

UNDP Zambia's mission is to build national capacity to help Zambia achieve the MDGs by focusing on:

- HIV/AIDS
- Energy and environment
- Democratic and economic governance.

The UNDP Country Office is organized into programme units according to the thematic areas mentioned above. In addition to these thematic areas gender equality has assumed prominence and become part of the programme unit on governance. Further, the Office has a Strategic Policy Unit (SPU) offering support to the GRZ in macroeconomic analysis, MDG monitoring and HDR preparation. The Country Office also has a United Nations Volunteer (UNV) Unit due to the high number of national and international UNVs employed in the Country Programme.

## **DEVELOPMENT RESULTS**

Overall, UNDP Zambia has provided important contributions to meet the development challenges that the country is facing. These contributions, listed below, are highly relevant to development challenges faced by Zambia.

### **EFFECTIVENESS**

Good progress has been made in the fight against HIV/AIDS as a major threat to economic, social and human development. Some progress is also notable in the field of democratic governance, although slower than expected. Innovative

approaches have been introduced in the area of energy and environment, but results are slow in coming. The MDGs have been integrated into Zambian monitoring and evaluation systems and knowledge about them is widespread. In many cases where expected results have not been met, this has been due to factors outside UNDP's control. With this proviso, UNDP has in general been effective in its contributions to development in Zambia.

### **EFFICIENCY**

UNDP's efficiency in achieving the expected outcomes has varied; UNDP's support in the battle against HIV/AIDS has been very efficient, not least due to the combined efforts of the Joint UN AIDS Team and the operational modalities in interaction with the National Aids Council. Good progress is being made towards the outcome of a decentralized, multi-sectoral and community-based response, reaching out to all districts.

### **GOVERNANCE**

UNDP's interventions in the governance sector include support to the Decentralization Secretariat, the National Assembly, the Electoral Commission and the Human Rights Commission. Support to the decentralization policy has, for various reasons not related to UNDP, stalled in spite of UNDP support to policy formulation and preparation of an implementation plan. UNDP support to parliament has been relatively small compared to that of other cooperating partners, making UNDP a fairly new and junior member of this group. UNDP has supported elections in 2006 and 2008. UNDP has helped the Human Rights Commission establish itself in five locations outside the capital, thereby making its services available on a wider scale. Some of UNDP's governance projects are small in terms of financing, while others, such as the elections programme, are large and very demanding in operational terms.

## **ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT**

UNDP is an important player in the energy and environment thematic area, which otherwise does not have widespread support from cooperating partners. The portfolio includes, *inter alia*, cooperation with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) on biodiversity and reclassification of protected areas; communicating to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC); action plans for MDGs at the community level and a project on Capacity Development for Sustainable Renewable Energy Management and Utilization. UNDP involvement in the latter project is minimal as it is implemented by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO). The main GRZ partners are the Ministry of Environment, Tourism and Natural Resources, the Environmental Council and the Zambia Wildlife Authority. In terms of energy and environment, UNDP has been confining itself to issues of national development priority and recording progress in the attainment of programme outcomes. Due to various delays, some of the projects will not be completed before the end of the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) period. If stopped prematurely, there is a risk that the impact of these activities will be compromised. The programme may thus fail to deliver expected development returns on investments by UNDP and the implementing partners.

## **GENDER EQUALITY**

UNDP's implementation of gender equality as a crosscutting issue within its main thematic areas has not been effective. Planning and implementation processes have lacked a systematic framework to carry out gender analysis, which is cardinal to the monitoring of progress. In the CCF-II, gender was treated as a crosscutting issue, but was not found to achieve the anticipated results, and women's empowerment reappeared as a favoured approach. However, in the CPG, gender remained an area of low status.

## **MICROFINANCE**

Outside the thematic areas are projects such as the Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project, which has duplicated the approach of the Grameen Bank in Zambia. The approach is relevant to Zambian conditions and its implementation has been efficient, but the scope for sustaining it without external assistance is questionable, as is the extent to which it can be up-scaled.

## **SPU**

The SPU works in close cooperation with the Ministry of Finance and National Planning as well as other partners, and promotes central UN products and values such as the HDR and MDGs. The work is upstream and the services are useful.

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

Sustainability issues were found in most of the evaluated projects, only some of which may be resolved. These issues are all linked to capacity in the implementing partner institutions, often related to high personnel turnover, and to the extensive use of UNVs as technical advisers whose expertise is not easily transferred into a ministry or district administration, or to a microfinance institution. The problems associated with transfer of technical assistance-generated capacity are well-known, and UNDP could benefit from making a systematic assessment of the successes and drawbacks in this area over say, the last five years.

## **RELEVANCE**

The selection of thematic areas has been relevant to national needs. However, UNDP has not always had the capacity to provide the robust, professional responses necessary to handle complicated and deep-rooted challenges such as, for example, gender inequality. UNDP has thus overstretched itself and spread its resources too thinly, resulting in limited impact. The pressure on UNDP capacity relates partly to the large number of small projects.

## UNDP'S STRATEGIC POSITIONING

### RESPONSIVENESS TO NEW CHALLENGES

There is a high degree of continuity in UNDP's work throughout the period under review. In fact, UNDP's involvement in HIV/AIDS, governance and the environment dates back to the 1990s. UNDP has mostly been responsive to new challenges that have arisen. In its support of the electoral process, for instance, UNDP was able to mobilize resources with five cooperating partners at very short notice for the emergency October 2008 elections following the death of the then President. Though challenges were met in the shape of long and bureaucratic procurement procedures, UNDP was able to support the Electoral Commission of Zambia in the coordination of the project. As a result, elections were held on the date required by the constitution.

UNDP's ability to respond to new demands or to changes in the development situation depends on available resources in terms of knowledge, funding and human capacity. Country Office staffing has remained at basically the same levels throughout the period under review, although the CPD and CPAP emphasize the need for adjustments to meet the challenges and opportunities of the changing situation in the delivery of aid to Zambia. Little adjustment, however, could be noted at the time of the ADR.

### CONTRIBUTION TO UN VALUES

In its contributions to UN values, UNDP is committed to promoting the realization of human rights as set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Charter, and also to championing the MDGs. UNDP has successfully worked to spread awareness of the MDGs in Zambia, as well as to make them operational in various development programmes. However, in the day-to-day work within the thematic areas, UN standards are not considered to be widely applied as operational tools for the strategic achievement of development results. While conventions and resolutions are referred to in the planning documentation, they are used less in the policy dialogue with the GRZ.

## STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS

With regard to UNDP strategic partnerships, GRZ appreciates UNDP as a special partner. The extent to which the GRZ departments effectively take ownership and leadership of UNDP-assisted activities varies.

The JASZ, which is the CP strategy for supporting the FNDP, provides the framework within which development assistance is now coordinated. UNDP participates in the GRZ-SAG framework as well as in the CPG sectoral groups. UNDP is the lead CP in the gender group and co-lead in the governance and environmental groups. Some cooperating partners feel the cooperation mechanism within the SAGs is not working well. Some SAGs rarely meet and many meetings are inconclusive and more for exchange of information than for decision-making, which could be a reflection of the relatively junior level of attendants. Participants maintained that these meetings were not productive, and that valuable time was spent debating process issues rather than in discussing those of strategic concern. This applies also to CPG sector groups where UNDP was lead or co-lead.

It should be emphasized that the general view of UNDP by cooperating partners is a positive one. They recognize the role that UN agencies can play and want them to assume a strong position in the JASZ framework. This is especially the case in sectors where UNDP is lead or co-lead, as these are seen as critical development drivers. This raises the question of leadership within UNDP's positioning, both within and outside the JASZ sectors.

Partners tend to see UNDP more as a convenor of meetings than as a dynamic leader who takes initiatives in consultation with the group, delegates tasks, synthesizes results and engages effectively with the GRZ at the appropriate levels on the implementation of agreed-upon interventions. They think UNDP has a unique position in this regard due to its special relationship with the GRZ, and they see important opportunities as being missed. UNDP for its part prefers

to see itself as the honest broker devoid of any political agendas beyond those laid down in the UN values and conventions. In order to play that role, UNDP is cautious as to how far it can go in pursuing political or delicate matters, lest it risk ruining its good relationship with the GRZ and in so doing, lose any potential influence.

### **PARTNERSHIPS WITH NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (NGOS) AND COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS (CBOS)**

UNDP partnership with NGOs and CBOs were found to be weak due to the major focus on government programmes. Zambia has a fairly vibrant civil society movement which, if well supported, could contribute effectively to the achievement of development results. Civil society partners, particularly in the governance and gender sector, recommended the development of a specific partnership strategy to address critical emerging issues in these sectors, such as support to the realization of the devolution of powers to the local governance structures.

### **CONTRIBUTION TO UN COORDINATION**

Progress in the UN reform process is slow. In terms of UNDP's contribution to UN coordination as part of the UN reform process, the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) meets regularly, but the number of coordinated UN activities is relatively low. The Joint Team on AIDS is the best example of pooling UN resources for a common purpose and in a common building. Joint projects are unusual, partly due to competition over resources, and also given different accountability systems among agencies, which makes pooling of financial resources in joint budgets (virtually) impossible.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

**In line with the CPD and CPAP, UNDP should concentrate its resources on fewer areas and adapt its staffing to better match the changing development cooperation architecture in Zambia. UNDP should apply a more**

**consequent sector orientation in its planning and concentrate on fewer areas within each sector.** The current sectors are relevant to national needs, but a better focus within each thematic area could contribute to higher efficiency and impact. It is further recommended that UNDP continue its support to combat HIV/AIDS within the Joint AIDS Team; activities within the democratic governance sector should focus on human rights and continued capacity development of the electoral commission; activities in the energy and environment sector should concentrate on natural resource management and climate change; and the work in gender should be placed within a broader UN framework.

**UNDP should build on demonstrated comparative advantages, but adapt its staff resources closely to the selected sectors and sub-sectors. It should maximize internal synergies within the Country Office.** Programme units should draw upon in-house resources, such as macro-economic experience in the SPU, to support their strategic work. Cross-cutting issues such as gender and HIV/AIDS should be mainstreamed by placing personnel dedicated to this purpose within each thematic area. The use of National UN Volunteers (NUNVs) in these positions should be considered.

**UNDP should focus on the upstream side of sector development.** UNDP should utilize its access to high-level expertise for sector policy analysis to guide interventions by GRZ and other partners. UNDP should formulate a concise capacity development strategy for the Country Office, probably with the assistance of the Regional Bureau for Africa (RBA) and the regional team. UNDP should further develop strategies for the achievement of sustainability in the various sectors, not limited to activities managed by UNDP, but looking at ways in which development results can be sustained over time.

**UNDP should effectively support the aid coordination arrangements, in particular the JASZ, and provide leadership that effectively engages all partners in areas where UNDP has**

**a clear and demonstrated advantage.** UNDP should only accept leadership in sectoral groups where it can use its special relationship with the GRZ to promote the processes that would positively influence the achievement of agreed-upon results. This would especially apply to the Democratic governance sector, where UNDP may be better placed than other cooperating partners to engage in a frank policy dialogue based on UN norms and conventions. Leadership in a sector should include efforts to ensure that all members of the group actively participate towards the achievement of common objectives.

**UNDP should take the initiative towards increased integration and collaboration within the UNCT. It is especially recommended that UNDP, in close cooperation with other UN agencies, prepare proposals for a One-UN Fund to be established under the Office of the UN Resident Coordinator. The purpose of the Fund should be to pool the financial and technical resources of UN agencies, thereby providing more effective responses to development challenges in Zambia. UNDP should take the lead in promoting this in the preparation of the new UNDAF and Country Programme.** The One-UN Fund will function as the common machinery facilitating joint projects involving several UN agencies with specific expertise, all of them working together on common tasks. This will go a long way towards harmonization and efficiency in UN responses. A joint resource mobilization strategy will be developed and donors will be encouraged to use the UN Fund when they want UN agencies to manage activities on their behalf.

**UNDP should work closer with stakeholders from Zambian civil society, not least with women's organizations in the human rights area, and in the areas of energy and environment.** Civil society organized in CSOs, NGOs or CBOs are important and legitimate partners in democratic and sustainable development, serving as watchdogs and channels of public opinion.

UNDP should increase its engagement with civil society, and assist CSOs with policy and strategic analysis, advice and financial support. UN conventions and other UN instruments should form the basis of UNDP's collaboration with CSOs in the fields of gender equality, human rights and environmental sustainability.

**UNDP should strengthen its capacity in developing evaluable results frameworks, as well as in the monitoring and evaluation of development results within an outcomes-based approach.** UNDP should ensure that staffing capacity is available to establish effective monitoring and evaluation systems of UNDP project and non-project activities, and to develop indicators monitoring these against outcomes, as described in planning documents. In the next Country Programme, UNDP should further ensure the formulation of outcomes, outputs and indicators that are 'SMART' (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound) in order to make sound assessments possible. As part of its upstream support to monitoring development in Zambia, UNDP should consider preparing a proposal for a joint UN programme of support to CSO data production activities for co-funding with cooperating partners. The support should focus on the relationships among economic growth, poverty and income distribution.

**UNDP should develop a systematic and operational approach to capacity development.** Drawing upon UNDP corporate research, the Country Office, jointly with other resident UN agencies, should develop a system for capacity strengthening at the institutional, organizational and human resource levels that is commensurate with results-based management and suited to Zambian conditions. The analysis should include the use of UNVs and other technical assistance personnel in sustainable ways. The system should include a plan for capacity development as an integral part of all project documents and workplans, and incorporate operational and measurable indicators of progress.



## CHAPTER 1

# INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The Evaluation Office (EO) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) conducts country programme evaluations called Assessments of Development Results (ADRs) to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP's contributions to development results at the country level. ADRs are carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.<sup>1</sup> The overall goals of an ADR are to:

- Provide substantive support to the Administrator's accountability function in reporting to the Executive Board
- Support greater UNDP accountability to national stakeholders and partners in the programme country
- Serve as a means of quality assurance for UNDP interventions at the country level
- Contribute to learning at corporate, regional and country levels.

The EO conducted an ADR in the Republic of Zambia during 2009. Its purpose was to contribute to the new country programme currently being prepared by the Country Office and national stakeholders. The Terms of Reference of the ADR are enclosed in Annex 1.

The specific objectives of the Zambia ADR fell into three parts:

1. To provide an independent assessment of the progress, or lack thereof, towards the expected outcomes envisaged in the UNDP programming documents. Where

appropriate, the ADR also highlighted unexpected outcomes (positive or negative) and missed opportunities.

2. To provide an analysis of how UNDP positioned itself to add value in response to national needs and changes in the national development context.
3. To present key findings, draw key lessons, and provide clear and forward-looking options thereby enabling management to make adjustments to the current strategy and next country programme.

### 1.2 METHODOLOGY

The Zambia ADR proceeded through the following stages:

- Collection and review of documented information through internet search, correspondence with the UNDP Zambia Country Office, and establishment of a dedicated website for the Zambia ADR.
- A scoping mission to Lusaka from 13 to 17 July 2009 by the ADR Team Leader, the EO Task Manager and a Special Adviser. This was done to define the scope and facilitate the selection of activities for in-depth evaluation. To this end, consultations were held with UNDP staff, other UN agencies, representatives of the Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ), multilateral and bilateral cooperating partners and civil society organizations (CSOs). The results of the scoping mission were outlined in an inception report that proposed a selection of activities, mapping of stakeholders and the methodology to be followed.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf>

- In the next step, the team leader consulted the UNDP EO and Regional Bureau for Africa (RBA) in UNDP Headquarters in New York for advice on corporate policies regarding capacity building, governance, gender equality, environment and HIV/AIDS.
- The main data collection mission to Zambia took place between 17 August and 4 September, 2009, and was performed by a team consisting of the team leader and two national consultants supported by the EO Task Manager. Following the data collection mission, the team drafted the main report, received comments from peer reviewers and the Country Office, and incorporated these into a draft final report, which was then presented to a stakeholder workshop in Lusaka for final consultations and validation.
- The methodology to be applied was largely developed during the inception phase, and reviewed and revised in the inception report. Consultations with EO theme managers led to the final polishing and inclusion of two additional projects for evaluation.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA

The approach to the ADR followed the three objectives outlined in 1.1 above. The first objective required the selection of a number of UNDP projects and non-project activities to be studied according to the following evaluation criteria:

- **Relevance:** The extent to which an activity reflected national needs and priorities
- **Effectiveness:** The extent to which planned results were being achieved, or were likely to be achieved at the level of outcomes
- **Efficiency:** The relationship between outputs and inputs in terms of human and financial resources, focus, timeliness management, etc.
- **Sustainability:** The extent to which results and benefits of the assessed activities would continue, or would be likely to continue, once initiatives were completed.

The assessments were based on the achievement of expected outcomes as stated in the relevant documents, as well as on the degree of integration of specific cross-cutting issues.

The second area—the way in which UNDP positioned itself—was regarded in light of the following criteria and strategic dimensions:

- **Strategic relevance:** Within the overall country development context
- **Responsiveness:** How UNDP was able to respond to concerns raised by the GRZ, implementing partners or cooperating partners, i.e. multilateral or bilateral donors, and CSOs
- **Contribution to UN values:** Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), international conventions and agreements to which Zambia committed herself
- **Strategic partnerships:** Where UNDP in cooperation with others was able to make a strategic impact
- **Contribution to UN coordination:** Progress with UN reform towards One-UN.

## EVALUATION QUESTIONS

A list of evaluation questions organized according to the above criteria was developed in the inception phase and used in the data collection process. This list, together with another list of more operational questions for informants from GRZ, cooperating partners and the UN system respectively, can be found in Annex 3.

## THEMATIC AREAS AND OUTCOMES

Most, but not all, of UNDP's work is based on the current Country Programme Document (CPD) and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for 2007 to 2010 and, earlier, on the second Common Country Framework (CCF-II) for 2002 to 2006. The ADR looked at projects both within and outside these country plans, as well as at some activities that are not classified as projects. The outcomes are defined as the intended change in development conditions

that UNDP interventions seek to support, at a level between the outputs produced by a project or other activity, and the impact it has. Table 1, below, shows the foreseen outcomes relating to each thematic area, together with the expected resources to be made available, as expressed in the current CPAP.

UNDP is engaged in other activities outside the CCF-II and CPD/CPAP. Among these are its contributions to poverty reduction through the application of the Grameen Bank methodology within the field of micro-credit to women, and the establishment of a course at the University of Zambia in the UNDP approach to human development, as employed in the Human Development Reports (HDRs). Other important activities include the UNDP's role in the overall cooperation picture, especially its function as chair or co-chair in the sector groups of the Cooperating Partners' Groups (CPGs) under the Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia (JASZ).

## SELECTION CRITERIA

While evaluability was one criterion for selection of interventions for in-depth study (projects for which there is insufficient information from too few sources to make validation meaningful should be avoided), a number of other criteria were identified and discussed with the Country Office management. These criteria were applied to a list of UNDP interventions to see how they would fit. While few of the selected projects fit all the criteria, the final selection did arrive at a sample that covered a wide range. The list of criteria was as follows:

- Poverty reduction: As the overall goal of FNDP
- UNDP leadership/coordination: In the Zambian development context, and with regard to UN integration
- Policy advice: As an area of UNDP corporate priority
- Operational projects: Such as pilot or demonstration projects.

**Table 1. CPD/CPAP outcomes per practice area**

	UNDP Practice Area	Intended outcomes	Resources USD '000
1.	Responding to HIV/AIDS	An effective, efficient National AIDS Council that is able to achieve its mandate.	Regular: 4,000 Other: 2,500 Total: 6,500
2.	Fostering democratic governance	An effective, efficient National AIDS Council that is able to achieve its mandate.	Regular: 2,600 Other: 10,000
		Decentralization of HIV/AIDS strategy to district level.	Total: 12,600
		An effective, efficient National AIDS Council that is able to achieve its mandate.	
3.	Energy and environment for sustainable development	Sustainable management of environment and natural resources incorporated into national development frameworks and sector strategies.	Regular: 2,000 Other: 9,558 Total: 11,558
4.	Promoting gender equality	Gender In Development Division capacity for mainstreaming gender in policies and programmes, and implementation of priority sectors of Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP) developed.	Regular: 1,400 Other: 2,000 Total: 3,400

Sources: CCF-II, CPD, CPAP.

- Capacity building and ownership: As objectives of most interventions
- Gender and environment: As cross-cutting issues
- Investment: Including examples of both large and small investments (above and below USD one million)
- Normative: How UNDP is promoting the most important UN standards, conventions and other international agreements that Zambia is committed to observe
- Time depth: The inclusion of projects from both CCF and CPD/CPAP periods
- South-South cooperation: Examples from the emerging aid cooperation architecture.

## EVALUABILITY

Activities were also chosen on the basis of their evaluability, and with a view to representing a broad selection of the UNDP Country Office practice areas over the two programming cycles, as well as some advisory and other activities falling outside the practice areas. A stakeholder mapping was then carried out. The selected activities are listed in Table 2 on page 5, together with the main stakeholders for each activity.

While some CCF-II projects were ‘too old’ to allow for detailed assessment (little information was available), others were ‘too new’—in both cases indicating low evaluability. A number of CPD/CPAP projects only started in 2008 and could not be expected to have produced substantive results in 2009. In general, evaluability is therefore strongest in CPAP projects that start early (in 2007) or have linkages to completed CCF-II projects. The CPAP itself has been the subject of a recent Mid-Term Review which provided useful information for the ADR.

## DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS METHODS

Given the time and resources available, the nature of the ADR is predominantly one of qualitative assessment. Within these constraints, it is of particular importance that all data are analysed and validated with considerable rigour. The common methods used for collection and analysis of evaluative information include:

- Literature/web search
- Desk study
- Key informant interviews
- Focus groups
- Triangulation
- Field visits
- Direct observation.

## LITERATURE AND WEB SEARCHES

Analysis of documentation commenced before the scoping mission to lay out the broader picture of UNDP Zambia activities since 2002, and a website was established containing documents available from the UNDP RBA and the Country Office. This was supplemented with documentation obtained in Lusaka during the scoping mission, such as recent review and evaluation reports, as well as other material that could only be found locally. These were subjected to desk study in the selection of activities to be evaluated, and more were collected during the main mission.

## Key informants and focus groups

Most interviews were with individual representatives of stakeholder organizations; however, in many cases where a discussion among different stakeholders could introduce additional perspectives, a focus group interview was organized. Focus groups with UNDP Country Office management, United Nations Country Team (UNCT) members, cooperating partners and CSOs were used in the scoping mission in the identification of key issues to be addressed.

**Table 2. Evaluated activities and stakeholders**

	Practice areas and selected activities	Main Stakeholders
<b>HIV/AIDS:</b>		
1.	Decentralization (multi-sectoral response)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ National AIDS Council</li> <li>▪ Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS</li> <li>▪ Provincial and District Administrations</li> <li>▪ CSOs and private sector</li> </ul>
<b>Governance:</b>		
2.	Support to HR Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ministry of Finance and Development Planning</li> <li>▪ National Assembly of Zambia</li> <li>▪ Zambia Human Rights Commission</li> <li>▪ Electoral Commission</li> <li>▪ Provincial and District Administrations</li> <li>▪ CSOs, e.g. Africa 2000 and Southern African Centre for Constructive Resolution of Disputes</li> </ul>
3.	Electoral Commission and HR Commission	
4.	Decentralized governance	
5.	Enhanced local governance	
<b>Environment:</b>		
6.	MDGs at community level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources</li> <li>▪ Ministry of Energy and Water Development</li> <li>▪ Environmental Council of Zambia</li> <li>▪ Zambia Wildlife Authority</li> <li>▪ Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives</li> <li>▪ Provincial and District Administrations</li> <li>▪ CSOs, e.g. Worldwide Fund for Nature, United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)</li> </ul>
7.	Second National Communication to United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)	
8.	Reclassification of protected areas	
9.	Sustainable renewable energy management	
<b>Gender equality:</b>		
10.	Joint gender support programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Gender in Development Division</li> <li>▪ Zambia National Women's Trust</li> <li>▪ Women for Change</li> </ul>
<b>Other:</b>		
11.	Microfinance for poverty reduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Micro Bankers Trust</li> <li>▪ Women beneficiaries</li> </ul>
<b>UNDP Leadership:</b>		
12.	Lead in CPG gender, governance and environment sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ GRZ ministries</li> <li>▪ Cooperating partners (bilateral donors)</li> </ul>
13.	UN integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ UN agencies in the Country Team</li> </ul>

Source: UNDP Zambia documents.

## Field visits

Most interviewing took place in Lusaka. However, four locations were identified for field visits based on practical considerations such as their accessibility and the possibility of combining visits to several projects in the same location:

- Chongwe District: 45 km east of Lusaka on the Great East Road. Combines HIV/AIDS activities and poverty reduction through microfinance, both with United Nations Volunteers' (UNV) assistance. Visits to Chongwe District were completed in one day.
- Chibombo District: 80 km north of Lusaka. Combining MDG dissemination, poverty reduction, HIV/AIDS and gender and environment. Visits to Chibombo District were completed in one day.
- Mazabuka: 145 km south-east of Lusaka on the road to Livingstone. Combines HIV/AIDS activities, decentralized governance and environmental projects.
- Chiawa: 250 km south of Lusaka by the Lower Zambezi National Park. The most accessible location for the large biodiversity project. Visits to Mazabuka and Chiawa were combined into a two-day trip.

The field visits lent themselves to a number of focus group sessions. This was especially the case with women micro-credit customers in Chongwe, community members in Chibombo and Mazabuka, the Town Council in Mazabuka and committee members of the Lower Zambezi Conservation Trust.

## CONSULTATIONS WITH THE RBA, BUREAU FOR DEVELOPMENT POLICY (BDP) AND EO

The Team Leader spent three days in New York on consultations with the EO, the RBA, and the BDP. Discussions with the EO and RBA focused primarily on specific ADR methodological issues, and on relating these to UNDP corporate policies. Advice from specialists of the BDP was obtained in the fields of gender equality, HIV/AIDS, capacity development and environment (the Global

Environment Facility, GEF). In addition, a telephone interview was organized with the former United Nations Resident Coordinator (UNRC) and UNDP Resident Representative in Zambia (now in Kenya).

## THE MAIN ADR MISSION

The evaluation team had three working weeks available for fieldwork. The work commenced with a teambuilding exercise, followed by a distribution of tasks among members. Meetings were held with EO staff responsible for each practice area in order to decide on the final selection of activities and the identification of stakeholders for key informant interviews. The team divided itself according to the tasks at hand, but ensured that in almost all cases interviews were conducted by two members, who could then compare notes afterwards. The same approach was followed for field visits.

The interview schedule was ambitious. Altogether, approximately 100 individual or group interviews were conducted, involving more than 200 people. Please see Annex 2 for a list of people consulted. Weekends were used for internal consultations and comparing and validating data. Triangulation was widely applied to ensure that empirical evidence from one source was validated (or discarded) against evidence from at least one other source. The main mission concluded with the presentation of preliminary findings to invited stakeholders.

## ANALYSIS PHASE

Drafting of the ADR report went through several stages. The first draft was subjected to internal (EO) and external reviews. The second draft was reviewed by the EO, the Country Office and RBA resulting in a third draft that was presented to stakeholders in Lusaka for final comments and validation.

## LIMITATIONS

The ADR process faced several challenges, one being the time allocated in comparison to the task to be accomplished. Other limitations arose from:

- Availability of comprehensive data on Zambian overall development: Outcomes as defined refer to changes in the development situation, for which the available statistics in Zambia only provided partial information. Effectiveness at the outcomes level thus becomes hard to establish.
- Attribution versus contribution: The UNDP is rarely the single source of inputs to an activity. The GRZ, cooperating partners and CSOs often play stronger roles, so a result can rarely be attributed to UNDP alone. In addition, it is often hard to identify the exact effects of UNDP's contribution.
- Availability of information: Access to the full picture of UNDP activities was a challenge, especially as regards the early CCF-II period where institutional memory was weakest. Most of the international UNDP staff joined the Country Office relatively recently. Likewise, the GRZ partner institutions have experienced high staff turnover. However, some national staff members of the Country Office have served for a longer time, as have some of the GRZ and civil

society partners. The evaluability of some CCF-II projects may therefore be uncertain and primarily relies on annual reports, the exception being when a CCF-II project is followed by a new project developed along similar lines in the CPAP. The selection of CCF-II projects, therefore, favoured projects linked to ongoing initiatives.

## REPORT OUTLINE

This ADR report continues with a chapter on Zambia's development challenges and strategies by the GRZ and its external cooperating partners. Chapter 3 outlines the response by the UNDP in Zambia. Chapter 4 moves on to the evaluation of UNDP's country programmes since 2002 in terms of the criteria outlined above, based on the selected projects or activities and cross-cutting issues. Chapter 5 addresses the way in which UNDP has positioned itself within the broader development cooperation architecture in Zambia. Chapter 6 presents the evaluation team's conclusions and recommendations.





## CHAPTER 2

# DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES AND NATIONAL STRATEGIES

### 2.1 COUNTRY CONTEXT

#### GEOGRAPHIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND

Zambia is a landlocked republic situated in south-central Africa, with a surface area of 752,000 sq. km., and is bordered by eight neighbouring countries: the Democratic Republic of the Congo to the north, Tanzania to the north-east, Malawi to the east, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana and Namibia to the south and Angola to the west. Administratively, Zambia is divided into nine provinces and 72 districts.

Zambia's total population numbers about 12 million, of whom about half live within a 30-km distance from the railway line between the Copperbelt in the North, via the capital Lusaka to Livingstone in the South. With high fertility and mortality rates,<sup>2</sup> Zambia's population is young, half being under the age of seventeen. The labour force was expected to reach 7 million by 2010.<sup>3</sup>

Zambia has maintained a peaceful democratic environment since the establishment of Independence in 1964. This environment supports sustainable socio-economic development interventions by its cooperating partners. According to its constitution, Zambia is a multi-party democracy whose parliament and president remain in office for five-year terms. The untimely death in 2008 of president Mwanawasa, who was serving his second term, led to presidential by-elections in October

of the same year. As a result, the former Vice-President, Mr. Rupiah Banda, was appointed President, pending the next scheduled elections in 2011.

As a legacy from the Second Republic (see next section), Zambia still has a highly centralized form of government and public service, and faces challenges in realizing aspirations of an open and market-driven economic regime. Central government undertakes most of the functions that have the greatest impact on people's lives and resources allocated at the local level are few. In some cases, the GRZ re-allocates funds budgeted for particular projects to others that that may be more sensitive to sudden political developments.

#### ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE

Since independence, the Zambian economy has relied strongly upon a single natural resource namely, copper. When high world market copper prices started to decline in 1973, the Zambian economy did the same. The first and second Republics under President Kaunda (the first, from 1964 to 1973 characterized by multi-party democracy, and the second, from 1973 to 1991 characterized by the One-Party State) saw Zambia transition from a middle-income country to a least developed country, due to a combination of low copper prices, inflexible and state-controlled economic policies and high costs associated with Zambia's being a prominent frontline state in the context of the liberation struggles in Southern Africa.

---

<sup>2</sup> An HIV infection rate of 15 percent contributes significantly to the high morbidity and mortality.

<sup>3</sup> According to the FNDP, pp. 33 to 34.

The Third Republic under Presidents Chiluba (1992 to 2001), Mwanawasa (2001 to 2008) and Banda (since 2008), was characterized by a return to multi-party politics and the opening up of the economy. This resulted in modest growth during the nineties with an average annual growth of 2.9 percent, or 0.9 percent per capita, as compared to a negative per-capita growth in the preceding years. In the period 2002 to 2008, under President Mwanawasa and assisted by high copper prices in the world market, the economy picked up and annual growth rose to 5 percent, or 2.7 percent per capita. Since the early 1990's, Zambia had accumulated an external debt of USD 7.1 billion that made debt servicing a heavy burden on the GRZ's ability to finance both its recurrent and development programmes. However, through the highly indebted poor countries (HIPC) and multilateral debt relief initiatives, Zambia's external debt was reduced to USD 635 million by the end of 2006.<sup>4</sup> Foreign direct investment remained modest for a long time, partly due to an investment climate characterized by high levels of corruption and investors' fears of nationalization of assets. More recently this has changed, particularly since countries in the South<sup>5</sup> have increased their economic involvement in Zambia.

However, once again, Zambia is currently hard hit by a significant drop in copper prices on the world market, in connection with the 2008 financial and economic global crisis.

## 2.2 POVERTY AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

In spite of having seen decent economic growth, debt relief and a period with a Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), abject poverty remains the greatest challenge to development in Zambia. Poverty statistics are probably not completely accurate and only exist up to 2006, but trends suggest that overall income poverty prevalence was reduced between 1991 and 2006 by 15 percent, although registering an increase in the late nineties. This is most significant in the rural areas, where the reduction was from 88 to 78 percent—still much higher than in the urban areas where 35 percent of the population lives. However, urban income poverty has increased in the same time period, from 49 to 53 percent. Table 3, below, outlines poverty statistics between 1991 and 2006.

In addition to this, it should be noted that a very high proportion of the poor live in extreme poverty. According to the 2004 Living

**Table 3. Poverty 1991 to 2006**

Population living in poverty	Percent Poor	Percent Poor	Percent Poor
Year	Zambia	Rural	Urban
1991	79	88	49
1993	74		
1996	69		
1998	73		
2004	68		
2006	64	78	53

Source: Central Statistical Office: Living Conditions Monitoring Survey 1991 to 2006.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p.10.

<sup>5</sup> Notably China, India, South Africa, Brazil and Egypt.

Conditions Monitoring Survey, 68 percent were living in poverty, then defined as having a monthly income of less than *Zambian Kwacha* 111,747. However, at the same time no less than 51 percent lived in extreme poverty, defined as earning less than *Zambian Kwacha* 78,223/month.<sup>6</sup>

Income distribution in *Zambia* is highly unequal. With a gini coefficient of 53 in 2003, the richest 20 percent of *Zambians* were reported to earn 56.6 percent of all income, while the poorest 20 percent shared a meagre 3.3 percent.<sup>7</sup>

Costs of living have gone up in recent years, and the annual inflation rate reported in July 2009 is now calculated at 14.3 percent.<sup>8</sup> The faith-based organization Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection has for many years calculated the value of a Basic Needs Basket for a family of six in different locations of *Zambia*. In July 2009<sup>9</sup> the Basic Needs Basket for Lusaka stood at *Zambian Kwacha* 2.2 million, while in Kasama in Northern Province it was 1.4 million. The corresponding amounts for rural areas vary considerably but remain significantly lower than for the big cities.

The UNDP Human Development Index (HDI) goes beyond measuring income and is based on a combination of indicators on health, education and income for 177 countries. *Zambia* is ranked no. 165 in the HDI for the 2007 to 2008 HDR.<sup>10</sup> UNDP also produces a Human Poverty Index (HPI), in which *Zambia* ranks no. 124 out of 135 developing countries surveyed. Details on *Zambia's* ranking in the HPI can be found in Annex 4. Further information on social and economic indicators over time, including HDI values, can be found in Annex 5.

*Zambia* regularly reports on progress towards achievement of the MDGs to the UN. The 2008 progress report states that *Zambia* is likely to achieve all but one of the goals; MDG targets on hunger, universal primary education, gender equality, maternal health and HIV/AIDS *are likely* to be achieved by 2015. The report further demonstrates that *Zambia has the potential* to achieve the MDG targets on extreme poverty, child mortality, malaria and other major diseases and water and sanitation. The only MDG target unlikely to be achieved, is that focusing on environmental sustainability. The breakdown is presented in Table 4 on page 12.

---

<sup>6</sup> FNDP p. 12.

<sup>7</sup> [www.earthtrends.wri.org/pdf\\_library/cp/eco\\_cou\\_894.pdf](http://www.earthtrends.wri.org/pdf_library/cp/eco_cou_894.pdf).

<sup>8</sup> MFNP website, <http://www.mofnp.gov.zm>, September 2009.

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.jctr.org.zm>.

<sup>10</sup> [http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/country\\_fact\\_sheets/cty\\_fs\\_ZMB.html](http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/country_fact_sheets/cty_fs_ZMB.html).

<b>Table 4. Achievement of MDGs</b>				
<b>Millennium Development Goals 1 to 7</b>	<b>MDG Targets 1 to 10</b>	<b>Achievable</b>	<b>Potentially achievable</b>	<b>Not achievable</b>
<b>MDG 1: Extreme poverty:</b>	<b>Target 1:</b> Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people living in extreme poverty.		X	
<b>MDG 1: Hunger:</b>	<b>Target 2:</b> Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger.	X		
<b>MDG 2: Universal primary education:</b>	<b>Target 3:</b> Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling.	X		
<b>MDG 3: Gender equality:</b>	<b>Target 4:</b> Eliminate gender disparity in primary and secondary education, preferably by 2005 and through all levels of education, no later than 2015.	X		
<b>MDG 4: Child mortality:</b>	<b>Target 5:</b> Reduce by two-thirds, between 1990 and 2015, the under-five mortality rate.		X	
<b>MDG 5: Maternal mortality:</b>	<b>Target 6:</b> Reduce by three-quarters, between 1990 and 2015, the maternal mortality ratio.		X	
<b>MDG 6: HIV/AIDS:</b>	<b>Target 7:</b> Halt, by 2015, and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS.	X		
<b>MDG 6: Malaria &amp; other major diseases:</b>	<b>Target 8:</b> Halt, by 2015, and begin to reverse the incidence of malaria and other major diseases.		X	
<b>MDG 7: Environmental sustainability:</b>	<b>Target 9:</b> Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and programmes, and reverse the loss of environmental resources.			X
<b>MDG 7: Water &amp; sanitation:</b>	<b>Target 10:</b> Halve, by 2015, the proportion of the population without sustainable access to safe drinking water and basic sanitation.		X	

Source: ZAMBIA—Millennium Development Goals Progress report 2008. Ministry of Finance & National Planning/UNDP.

## HIV/AIDS

Zambia is at the epicentre of the HIV/AIDS pandemic that affects virtually all its citizens personally in a variety of ways, and places a tremendous burden on the country's social and economic development. By 2009, the number of AIDS orphans is estimated to exceed 1 million. Life expectancy at birth has declined from 52 years in 1990 to 40.2 years.<sup>11</sup> As a consequence, the GRZ has declared HIV/AIDS a national emergency and called on all its cooperating partners to consider strategies that can help prevent new infections, design programmes that address specific problems brought about by HIV/AIDS, such as taking care of children orphaned by the disease and mitigate the effects of HIV/AIDS on poverty.<sup>12</sup>

The 2001 to 2002 Zambia Demographic and Health Survey<sup>13</sup> found that of the individuals tested for HIV, 16 percent were HIV positive, and women were more likely to be HIV positive than men (18 percent and 13 percent, respectively). In addition, HIV prevalence was more than twice as high in urban areas than in rural areas (23 percent and 11 percent, respectively). The survey also found that HIV awareness

among men and women was quite high, as indicated for women in Table 5 below.

However, overall only 9 percent of women and 14 percent of men were tested for HIV. These figures increased in the 2007 Zambia Demographic and Health Survey to 39 percent of women and 22 percent of men who were tested at some point in time. The overall prevalence rate was found to have decreased from 16 to 14 percent since 2001, but with high geographical variations, ranging from 7 percent (in the Northwestern and Northern Provinces) to 22 percent (in Lusaka Province).

## GENDER INEQUALITIES

Gender inequalities and gaps continue to persist in Zambia and are entrenched within society. Culture, deep-rooted traditional practices, faith-based belief systems, low levels of education for women and low representation of women in decision-making positions, are among many other factors contributing to the slow pace of women's advancement.

## ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT

Zambia is well-endowed with natural resources which, if managed sustainably, could create

**Table 5. Knowledge of HIV/AIDS**

Zambia Demographic and Health Survey 2001—participants' knowledge about HIV/AIDS	Percent
Percent of women age 15 to 49 who correctly stated two ways of avoiding HIV	66.3
Percent of women age 15 to 49 who correctly identified two misconceptions about HIV/AIDS	43.3
Percent of women age 15 to 49 who believe that AIDS can be transmitted from mother to child during pregnancy, delivery and breastfeeding	55.4
Percent of women age 15 to 49 who know of a place to get tested for HIV	64.4
Percent of women age 15 to 49 who have been tested for HIV	9.4

Source: Zambia Demographic and Health Survey 2001 to 2002.

<sup>11</sup> UNDP HDR: [http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/country\\_fact\\_sheets/cty\\_fs\\_ZMB.html](http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/country_fact_sheets/cty_fs_ZMB.html).

<sup>12</sup> Zambia Human Development Report 2007 p. v.: Message from the Government.

<sup>13</sup> Central Statistical Office, Lusaka, Zambia; Central Board of Health, Lusaka, Zambia; ORC Macro, Calverton, Maryland, USA. February 2003.

wealth and help to reduce poverty. Fifty-eight percent of the total land surface (752,000 m<sup>2</sup>) is suitable for agriculture, while only 14 percent is in use; there is a rich diversity of biological resources in various ecosystems found in forests, woodlands and grasslands.<sup>14</sup> Sixty percent of the country is forest, of which about 10 percent has been designated a protected area. Zambia has considerable wildlife estate in birds, reptiles and mammals and many natural heritage sites, including the Victoria Falls. The economy of the country depends heavily on the mining of copper and other mineral resources.

The environment underpins all kinds of agriculture, just as it does tourism. But in addition to these two sectors, the environment is a prominent feature of other economic sectors like land, mining, natural resources and manufacturing. In addition, the environment plays a key role in the sectors of health and water and sanitation. Thus, the GRZ concluded that “tackling poverty requires that adequate environmental protection and natural resource management are put in place.”

The areas of concern were:

- Land contamination from solid waste disposal
- Land dereliction and the risks of subsidence, related mostly to the mining of copper
- Pollution of water ecosystems from dissolved substances, heavy metals and oils
- Localized air pollution near manufacturing sites for fertilisers, lime and petroleum products
- The threat of climate change and projected changes in weather patterns characterized by floods and droughts.

Wood fuel is responsible for about 80 percent of Zambia’s total energy consumption.<sup>15</sup> During the period 1975 to 2003, about 2 percent of the total forest cover was lost every year to energy use and land clearance for agriculture. Between 1991 and 2001, Zambia reduced the consumption of commercial energy forms (petroleum, electricity and coal) from 32 percent to 21 percent. This low access to modern energy services was recognized as a proxy indicator for the level of poverty. To increase the options for energy supply, the GRZ aimed to step up the exploitation of indigenous sources in a sustainable way. Among the sources that could help meet these demands are solar, wind, geothermal, biogas and mini- and micro-hydro plants.

### 2.3 GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Zambia’s fundamental development challenge is to reduce poverty. The current strategies for poverty reduction are defined in the FNDP for the years 2006 to 2010, prepared by the Ministry of Finance and National Planning (MFNP) in cooperation with a wide range of stakeholders. Four<sup>16</sup> National Plans existed under the First Republic, but the practice of national planning was abandoned during the liberalization of the 1990s, when the country’s policy directions were guided by the Structural Adjustment Programme.

In spite of some economic growth during the Structural Adjustment Programme period, it was demonstrated that poverty also increased. As a consequence, the strategy changed and a PRSP was developed for the period 2002 to 2005, to more specifically focus on poverty reduction as the overall national development objective. It was projected that 67 percent of the USD 1.2 billion PRSP budget would be financed by donor

---

<sup>14</sup> Source: Ministry of Finance and National Planning: Fifth National Development Plan.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> Three of the plans were implemented during the First Republic. The fourth was also launched but quickly overtaken by structural adjustment programmes.

funds.<sup>17</sup> The PRSP also became an instrument for qualification to HIPC resources.

However, simultaneously, national plans were reintroduced in 2002 by the GRZ as the main framework for economic development. The entire period covered in this report was therefore guided by the Transitional Plan and the FNNDP. The overall theme of the FNNDP is: 'Broad-based wealth and job creation through citizenry participation and technological advancement.' The related strategic focus is on: 'Economic infrastructure and human resources development.' The FNNDP especially focuses on agricultural development as the engine of income. Other sectors complementing the agricultural focus include infrastructure, tourism, manufacturing, mining and energy. The FNNDP contributes to the 'National Vision 2030' which is: 'to become a prosperous middle-income country by the year 2030.'

The FNNDP also refers to human rights, which are described as rights that every human being possesses and is entitled to. Internationally, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights defines civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights that countries should respect.

## GOVERNANCE

Zambia has undertaken to make constitutional changes to the Republican Constitution several times since independence in 1964. The Mvunga Commission was appointed in 1991 to recommend a Constitution that would assist the country in re-entering a multi-party system. In 1993, the Mwanakatwe Commission of Inquiry was put in place to review the Mvunga Constitution following concerns from various stakeholders that it was a caretaker constitution meant only to allow multi-party elections. In 2003, the GRZ appointed the Mung'omba Constitutional Review Commission with the aim of addressing previous shortcomings. One of the key recommendations of the Constitutional Review

Commission was to set up the Constituent Assembly as a means of collecting views from citizens and concluding the constitutional review process.

A further process was put in place with the National Constitutional Conference. Contentious issues arose from this process which included issues of diversity and composition of the National Constitutional Conference. As a result, key stakeholders such as the CSOs, the Church and the Women's Movement do not participate in the National Constitutional Conference. The absence of such important groupings in national affairs, and in particular, in the constitution-making process, is viewed as problematic in the public debate. A Constitutional Commission is currently conducting a broad review of the Zambian Constitution. The outcome of these widespread consultations was expected to be published in 2009 but appears to be delayed; the Commission's recommendations are not likely to be made public in time for the 2011 elections, as the completion time for the National Constitutional Conference remains unclear.

Decentralization is recognized by the GRZ as a very important process for empowering citizens to govern themselves and manage their own resources; it has therefore been in the cards for a long time. In taking cognizance of the significance of decentralization, the GRZ embarked on the process of devolving central government functions to local authorities. It is important to note though, that the Decentralization Policy was already passed in 2002 and approved by Cabinet in 2004. However, the Decentralization Implementation Plan that was developed by 2006 had yet, in 2009, to be adopted by the Cabinet.

The FNNDP placed emphasis on the importance of human rights through the support to the Human Rights Commission which was established in 1996 specifically to focus on the protection and promotion of human rights. The

---

<sup>17</sup> Zambia PRSP document p. 13: <http://www.imf.org/External/NP/prsp/2002/zmb/01/033102.pdf>.

Human Rights Commission has since established six provincial offices through its decentralization programme and aims to eventually open offices in all nine provincial capitals, thereby making its services available to citizens at all levels.

Corruption, on the other hand, leads to human rights violations and affects many lives. It also constitutes an effective obstacle to foreign investment, and strong action is needed to combat it. The 2008 Transparency International Corruption Perception Index rates Zambia 115 out of 180 countries surveyed,<sup>18</sup> placing Zambia in the category of countries where attention is needed to address issues of corruption. The Anti-Corruption Commission operates under the Anti-Corruption Act No. 42 of 1996, which created an autonomous Anti-Corruption Commission. The Anti-Corruption Commission was charged with not being 'subject to the direction or control of any person or authority.' The GRZ is determined to transform the Anti-Corruption Commission into a more proactive, performance-based institution. During the FNDP, the Anti-Corruption Commission is expected to undertake several reviews of the laws on corruption, thereby strengthening the Commission and enabling it to apply internationally accepted best practices.

The GRZ has also recognized that since many other institutions are dealing with corruption, there is a need to harmonize the Anti-Corruption Commission's operations with those of other groups. The results of these combined efforts are expected to strengthen the administration of criminal justice and the rule of law in general during the FNDP.

## **HIV/AIDS**

Health sector reforms were introduced in the nineties, their main thrust being to break ineffective, centralized health care delivery

through the strengthening of district health systems that provide a defined set of cost-effective basic health services. This required decentralization of financial and administrative powers to the district level, and through their boards, to eliciting the active participation of communities in the decision making process.<sup>19</sup> The Ministry of Health defined six levels of service delivery: namely, the household, the community, the health post, the health centre, the district, the provincial/general hospital and the central hospital.

The early HIV/AIDS response in Zambia was coordinated by the health sector. However, in recognition of HIV/AIDS being a much broader development challenge than just a health issue, and in order to strengthen the multi-sectoral and multidimensional response, in 2002 the National HIV/AIDS/STD/TB Council was set up by an Act of Parliament. The mandate of the National Aids Council was to function as a national HIV/AIDS apex multi-sectoral coordinating authority charged with formulating and reviewing policies and co-coordinating activities related to HIV/AIDS, sexually transmitted diseases and tuberculosis. The National Aids Council's goal was to ensure effective monitoring and evaluation of programmes and resource mobilization, as well as to commission related research. The National Aids Council was established with representation from a cross section of society, including GRZ, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the private sector, religious organizations, youth, traditional leaders and People Living with HIV/AIDS (PLWHA). The National Aids Council reports to the committee of cabinet ministers on HIV/AIDS.

The vision of the GRZ<sup>20</sup> is to have 'a nation free from the threat of HIV/AIDS by 2030.' The goal is 'to halt, and begin to reverse the spread of HIV/AIDS.' Guided by the National AIDS Strategic Framework 2006 to

---

<sup>18</sup> Zambia scores 2.8 on a scale 1 to 10, where 10 is corruption-free.

<sup>19</sup> Terminal Evaluation Report of ZAM/98/002 AND ZAM/96/003. UNDP October 2000.

<sup>20</sup> National Aids Council 2009, op.cit.



2010, Zambia is implementing a number of HIV/AIDS/STD/TB interventions that fall under six complementary themes:

- Intensifying prevention of HIV
- Expanding treatment, care and support for PLWHA
- Mitigating the socio-economic impact of HIV/AIDS
- Strengthening the decentralized response by mainstreaming HIV/AIDS
- Improving the monitoring of the response
- Integrating advocacy and coordination of the multi-sectoral response.

Funding the battle against HIV/AIDS stood at USD 200 million for the year 2006, of which 14 percent came from national revenue. The remainder came from external funding, dominated by three main sources: the Global Fund to Fight HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, the World Bank Multi-country AIDS Programme and the US Government through the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief.

## **GENDER EQUALITY**

The GRZ attaches great importance to gender issues and in 2000, adopted the National Gender Policy to spearhead policy implementation. The GRZ also acknowledges that gender inequality is not only disadvantageous to those directly affected by discrimination but that it affects individuals, families and the human development of the nation as a whole. In order to ensure the participation of both men and women in the development processes of the country, the GRZ has set up a three-level structure for gender representation, at the national, provincial and district levels.

The Gender in Development Division of the Cabinet Office is the national machinery responsible for coordinating, monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the National Gender Policy. In addition, the GRZ through the FNDDP has committed itself to addressing the strategic needs of women and men in areas of education, skills development, economic empowerment of women and the review of laws discriminating against women and institutional capacity building. The FNDDP's long-term vision is gender equity and equality in the development process by 2030.

## **ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT**

The FNDDP has recognized that environmental degradation and poverty are mutually reinforcing and that the link needs to be broken. The Rio Earth Summit of 1992 raised awareness of the link between the environment and poverty. In addition, several studies in Zambia<sup>21</sup> have confirmed that poor communities tend to choose immediate gains rather than the greater long-term returns possible from sustainable use of natural resources.

The FNDDP has recognized a number of weaknesses, among them:

- Weak policy and implementation frameworks
- Weak institutional coordination across sectors
- Low technical capacity for formulation and enforcement of environmental standards
- Slow domestication of a large number of UN conventions to which Zambia is a signatory
- Inadequate community awareness of environmental issues
- Inadequate identification and protection of ecosystems.

---

<sup>21</sup> E.g. Mweemba and Hu in Applied Sciences Research Journal, 2008.

In addition, the effect of the FNDP declaration that agriculture and tourism are lead sectors for national economic growth and development increased the urgency of addressing a wide spectrum of environmental issues, including natural resource management.

## 2.4 EXTERNAL ASSISTANCE

For many years, Zambia has been heavily dependent on external assistance, although this dependence has declined relatively speaking in recent years, as the economy has grown. Out of the 2009 GRZ Budget of Zambia Kwacha, 15,279 billion or 69.7 percent, which is equivalent to 25.4 percent of gross domestic product, was financed from domestic revenues, while 18.1 percent<sup>22</sup> was derived from grants from cooperating partners. The balance of 12.2 percent of total expenditure was financed through domestic and external borrowing.<sup>23</sup>

Zambia subscribes to the principles of the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness

and the 2008 Accra Action Plan. As a consequence, Zambia and its cooperating partners are moving forward towards aid harmonization and alignment in the framework of the mutually agreed-upon 2007 to 2010 JASZ. Twelve bilateral donors together with the international financing institutions, the European Commission and the United Nations system are signatories to the JASZ.<sup>24</sup> Within the FNDP framework, 17 Sectoral Advisory Groups (SAGs) have been set up, normally chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the related sectoral line ministry. In parallel with this, a CPG has been established in order to coordinate and harmonize the external assistance. To do so, the CPG has established sectoral sub-groups mirroring the SAGs.

During the period under review, challenges in ensuring full accountability and transparency adversely affected some aspects of development cooperation. At the time of the ADR, cooperating partners had frozen their contributions to the health sector, and in other sectors, such as roads aid, were withholding contributions, pending the outcome of investigations.

---

<sup>22</sup> This is an average figure. External financing by cooperating partners is much higher in some sectors such as education, health, HIV/AIDS and roads.

<sup>23</sup> 2009 Budget Speech by the Minister of Finance and National Planning, National Assembly 30 January 2009.

<sup>24</sup> Altogether 17 cooperating partners participate in the JASZ.

## CHAPTER 3

# UNDP'S RESPONSE AND STRATEGIES

### 3.1 UN IN ZAMBIA

The UN supports the Zambian national strategy through the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). The UNDAF is prepared for five<sup>25</sup> years at a time and defines the UN's role in the country. The first Zambian UNDAF covered the period 2002 to 2006, after which the present UNDAF took over, covering the period 2007 to 2010. The UNDAF process supports and is being synchronized with the preparation of the Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP), which is to cover the period 2011 to 2015.

UNDP supported the first UNDAF through the CCF-II and is supporting the current UNDAF through the CPD, as operationalized in the CPAP. The period under evaluation in the present ADR therefore covers the CCF-II (2002 to 2006) together with the CPD (2007 to 2010).

The purpose of the UNDAF is to provide a comprehensive framework through which the UN can collaborate with the GRZ as well as non-state partners, and channel its combined resources to Zambia. In line with the UN reform agenda, the UNDAF represents a critical and practical contribution to the call for greater harmonization and integration of the UN system at the country level.

The current UNDAF focuses on four inter-related areas of cooperation in which the UN system can utilize its accumulated experience, technical expertise and financial resources towards achievement of the MDGs:

1. HIV/AIDS
2. Basic social services
3. Governance
4. Food security.

The UNDAF further mentions the promotion of gender equality and environmental sustainability, as cross-cutting areas in the support provided by the UNCT.

### 3.2 UNDP'S RESPONSE

The response by UNDP has shown considerable continuity over the years, with good governance, HIV/AIDS, and the environment as the mainstays of the various programmes. The first Country Cooperation Framework (CCF-I) (1997 to 2001), focused on these, as well as on agriculture, including rural development and food security. In 2000 to 2001, a UNDP Country Programme Review took place which, together with the UN Common Country Assessment and the PRSP process, informed the preparation of the CCF-II (2002 to 2005). The Country Programme Review recommended that the UNDP focus its next programme on policy and strategic interventions, especially in relation to poverty reduction, through support to the three areas mentioned above, and supplemented by information and communications technology.

In line with the recommended upstream orientation, UNDP would, in the CCF-II, address the following sub-objectives:

---

<sup>25</sup> The current UNDAF 2007 to 2010 only covers four year since UN programming will, in future, be aligned with the GRZ programming cycle. The next UNDAF is to coincide with the GRZ SNDP 2011 to 2015.

- Strengthen the GRZ and civil society's capacity to develop and implement Zambia's Vision 2030, including the establishment of a mechanism for civil society's participation in the process, especially with regard to the monitoring of programme outcomes.
- Assist the GRZ in effectively implementing the governance programme, through the adoption of the decentralization policy, the promotion of accountability by public institutions at national and district levels and the fostering of government, civil society and private sector partnerships.
- Support the GRZ in the domestication of international human rights covenants and conventions into Zambian law.
- Facilitate the continued participation of civil society in the development and implementation of the PRSP, while building its capacity to monitor poverty reduction indices and contribute to the goals of the Millennium Declaration.
- Strengthen the GRZ's capacity to implement national policies, frameworks and plans to reduce poverty, through the mitigation of

the impact of HIV/AIDS and environmental degradation.

Aligned with the UNDAF, UNDP Zambia's current mission as described in the 2006 to 2010 CPD and CPAP is to build national capacity to help Zambia achieve the MDGs by focusing its support on:

- HIV/AIDS (UNDAF focus area)
- Environment and energy (UNDAF cross-cutting issue)
- Democratic and economic governance (UNDAF focus area).

Gender equality was considered a cross-cutting issue in the CCF-II but assumed more prominence in the current UNDAF. Somehow this was not reflected in UNDP's CPD but reappeared in the operational plan for 2007 to 2010, the CPAP. An additional thematic area not captured in UNDP's operations structure, is known as Poverty and MDGs; it covers various kinds of advisory assistance to the GRZ, macro-economic analysis for pro-poor policy formulation and specific poverty-oriented projects outside the CCF-II and CPD.

<b>Table 6. UNDP results framework</b>					
<b>Cycles</b>	<b>Democratic Governance</b>	<b>Gender Equality</b>	<b>Environment &amp; Energy</b>	<b>HIV/AIDS</b>	<b>Poverty &amp; MDGs</b>
<b>2002 to 2006</b>					
<b>CCF-II objectives</b>	Strengthen the capacity of oversight bodies to demand and enforce accountability, transparency and effective coordination in public institutions.	Integrate gender in its three main thematic areas (governance, environment and HIV/AIDS).	Strengthen the institutional mechanisms for enforcement of environmental standards and the sustainable management of natural resources.	Support the formulation of the HIV/AIDS decentralized multi-sectoral policy and legal framework. Such support should strengthen the systems and processes for linking them at the national, provincial and district levels.	None specified.

(cont'd) ►

2007 to 2010					
<b>UNDAF outcomes</b>	Outcome 3: By 2010, institutions, systems and processes in support of the National development priorities strengthened.	Promotion of gender equality and empowerment of women is a cross-cutting priority of the UNDAF.	Environmentally sustainable development is a cross-cutting priority of the UNDAF.	Outcome 1: By 2010, the multi-sectoral response to HIV/AIDS at national, provincial and district levels scaled up.	Outcome 2: By 2010, access of vulnerable groups to quality basic social services increased.
<b>CPD outcomes</b>	Institutions strengthened to execute, coordinate and implement national development priorities based on democratic governance.	None specified.	Sustainable management of environment and natural resources incorporated into national development frameworks and sector strategies.	Mainstreaming and implementation of multi-sectoral and community responses to HIV/AIDS at sub-national, provincial and national levels strengthened.	None specified.
<b>CPAP outcomes</b>	Institutions strengthened to execute, coordinate and implement national development priorities based on democratic governance. Capacity developed for strategic forecasting and scenario-building to protect and promote freedoms and rights.	Gender in Development Division capacity for mainstreaming gender in policies and programmes and implementing priority sectors of FNDP developed.	Sustainable management of environment and natural resources incorporated into national development frameworks and sector strategies.	An effective, efficient National Aids Council that is able to achieve its mandate.	None specified.

Source: UNDP Country Office.

but relevant to the UNDAF. Table 6 shows the objectives and outcomes within the five practice areas, as described above.

Programme delivery is in principle through national implementing partners under the national execution modality. However, in practice, the operational modality is more of a mix of direct and national execution, as many implementing partners lack the capacity to ensure technically correct and accountable procurement, which then falls back on the UNDP. Some 75 percent of the overall procurement for UNDP projects goes through its Operations Unit in

the form of either ‘direct support’ (UNDP having full responsibility for procurement) or ‘direct payment’ (UNDP paying bills submitted by implementing partners). In the case of HIV/AIDS, a large proportion of the resources are advanced to the National Aids Council as the implementing partner, except for the volunteer living allowance, which was paid directly by UNDP to the UNVs, while a small fraction of the payments was effected through the request for direct payment modality. Expenditures by the UNDP Zambia Country Office for the period 2004 to 2008 are available as follows:<sup>26</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Total expenditure comprises programme core & non-core resources plus management expenditure. Management expenditure is non-programme expenditure. Regular resources are UNDP TRAC only.

**Table 7. UNDP Zambia expenditures**

	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
A. Total Expenditure (USD million)	7,15	9,47	20,76	11,00	19,90
B. Management Expenditure (USD million)	2,13	3,10	3,31	3,40	3,67
C. Regular Resources UNDP (USD million)	4,62	5,58	8,70	4,07	12,68
D. Ratio C/A (%)	64.66%	58.94%	41.89%	36.95%	63.69%
E. Ratio C/B (%)	216.69%	179.91%	262.59%	119.69%	345.18%

A breakdown of UNDP's core and non-core resources, budgeted and expended for each of the four practice areas during the period 2007 to mid-2009, was available and is presented in Table 8, below. Two key features stand out: first, the high allocations to governance in 2008 to 2009 due to the unexpected presidential by-elections, for which a reimbursement modality was agreed

upon with the Electoral Commission, and UNDP frontloaded USD 6 million after obtaining a waiver from headquarters; second, the modest funding allocated to gender up to 2009. Delivery rates vary, with the lowest at 47 percent for environment in 2007 and the highest at 91 percent for HIV/AIDS in 2008.

**Table 8. UNDP funding by practice area 2007 to 2009<sup>27</sup>**

HIV/AIDS	Resources			Expenditure		
	Core	Non-Core	Total	Core	Non-Core	Total
<b>2007</b>	1.000.000	1.634.660	2.634.660	705.409	861.854	1.567.263
<b>2008</b>	2.287.375	356.025	2.643.400	2.241.627	176.151	2.417.778
<b>2009</b>	1.512.908	3.430.000	4.942.908	1.607.000	325.000	1.932.000
Governance	Resources			Expenditure		
	Core	Non-Core	Total	Core	Non-Core	Total
<b>2007</b>	1.214.964	1.299.964	2.514.928	1.056.399	117.365	1.173.764
<b>2008</b>	7.932.100	290.000	8.222.100	6.803.264	241.118	7.044.382
<b>2009</b>	1.520.639	6.874.374	8.395.013	-5.305.940	6.173.358	867.418
Gender	Resources			Expenditure		
	Core	Non-Core	Total	Core	Non-Core	Total
<b>2007</b>	100.000	0	100.000	88.403	0	88.403
<b>2008</b>	255.000	0	255.000	252.330	0	252.330
<b>2009</b>	389.000	1.504.500	1.893.500	109.843	45.608	155.451

(cont'd) ►

<sup>27</sup> Please note that: 1. Expenditures for 2009 represent only about half for that year; 2. Table 8 excludes several programme activities not part of the 4 practice areas. The totals therefore do not add up to those in Table 7.

Environment	Resources			Expenditure		
	Core	Non-Core	Total	Core	Non-Core	Total
2007	707.840	2.668.000	3.375.840	465.709	1.484.068	1.949.777
2008	1.702.272	2.328.934	4.031.206	1.589.929	1.971.788	3.561.716
2009	1.540.500	4.069.760	5.610.260	n/a	n/a	n/a

Source: UNDP Zambia Country office.

Staffing of the Country Office during the period under review was as shown in Table 9, below. The number of local professionals has remained at 11 throughout, and international professionals have consistently numbered 4 to 5; only support staff has increased slightly. However, outside the regular UNDP staff, technical cooperation (project) staff members have functioned as advisers or as UNVs. The high number of UNVs, in particular, has added to combined capacity at the project level.

### 3.3 DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

UNDP support to the governance sector goes back to the the CCF-I (1997 to 2001). The CCF-II (2002 to 2006) underwent wide-ranging consultations within the GRZ and among other stakeholders in order to draw lessons and consolidate the GRZ's efforts in its development programmes, including the PRSP process.

The UNDAF for Zambia similarly developed its framework based on the GRZ's development priorities and programmes for the 2002 to 2006 and

2007 to 2010 periods. Key programmes of the governance section were expected to strengthen the capacity of oversight bodies to demand and enforce accountability, transparency and effective coordination in public institutions; they were also expected to strengthen the institutional capacity and mechanisms for enhancing service delivery by government and local authorities, with full participation by the communities.

The CPD outcome on democratic governance states that:

*...institutions are strengthened to execute, coordinate and implement national development priorities based on democratic governance...*

while the CPAP added to this outcome the capacity development for strategic forecasting and scenario-building to protect and promote freedoms and rights.<sup>28</sup>

Early support to the Electoral Commission of Zambia project aimed at strengthening the Commission by establishing management

**Table 9. UNDP Zambia staffing 2002 to 2009**

Year		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Local	N.O.		11	11	11	11	11	11	11
	G.S.		21	21	22	23	22	24	24
International			4	4	4	4	5	4	5
Total			36	36	37	38	38	39	40
% International/total			11.11	11.11	10.81	10.53	13.16	10.26	12.50
Variance				0	+1	+1	0	+1	+1

Source: UNDP Zambia Country Office.

<sup>28</sup> Please see Tables 1 and 6 for outcomes and Table 2 for the projects selected for evaluation.

systems to assist the Commission in conducting free, transparent and fair elections. The process involved strategic planning, which resulted in the identification of priority areas where the Commission needed to engage the public, the media and civil society. Support received through UNDP equally enhanced management skills and helped prepare the roadmap for the 2006 elections. Commission staff received on-the-job training regarding election management. Modules and training manuals were developed and trainers were instructed in the dissemination of voter and civic education. A national consultation process and civic awareness programme took place in all 150 constituencies. The strategic plan also opened the doors to Multi-Donor Open Trust Fund support to the 2006 presidential, parliamentary and local government elections. Through this fund, which was signed in November 2005, preparations for elections became more coordinated as funds came in, with Commission staff targeting the main activities of the 2006 elections.

Falling somehow outside the CPAP, but demanding considerable resources, was the Elections Support Project, for which preparations started in 2007. The project was meant for the 2011 presidential, parliamentary and local elections, however with the death of President Mwanawasa in 2008, the project changed direction, and was used to hold a presidential by-election in October 2008. Cooperating partners from the governments of Finland, Japan, Norway, Sweden, the United States of America, as well as the European Union, contributed over USD 11.5 million towards support to the 2008 by-election. The project is once again underway, aimed at supporting the Electoral Commission of Zambia in voter registration, voter education and the holding of elections at the three levels of government in 2011.

UNDP support to the Human Rights Commission dates from 1997 when the Commission was first established. The main support provided has been in the areas of training, participation in international conferences, technical advisers, materials

development, equipment and support to the decentralization process of the Commission. Until 2004, the Commission had only one office in Lusaka, but through collaboration with UNDP and other partners such as Norway, the Commission now has five other offices in the provincial capitals. In the recent past, beginning in 2007, the Commission has been able to produce the State of Human Rights Reports for the country. The reports are well researched and represent a major tool in informing the populace about the status of human rights in the country. Over the years, support by UNDP to the Commission has been incremental, and though other partners have played a role in the institutional strengthening of the Commission, UNDP has taken a lead position.

In the 2002 to 2006 period, support for the strengthening of decentralization and local coordination was channelled through the design, implementation and formulation of a mechanism promoting the consultative process of decentralization. This process involved local authorities and community-based organizations (CBOs), with the aim of having the decentralization policy approved by the end of the CCF-II period. With support from UNDP, the Decentralization Secretariat in the Cabinet Office provided leadership in designing the implementation frameworks, and provided a platform for coordination and collaboration between the GRZ and donors. UNDP also provided opportunities for exchange visits to other countries to draw on experiences and best practices. Peer exchanges of local councils were undertaken and provided learning opportunities for local leaders. The decentralization policy was finalized, adopted, simplified and translated into seven major languages during this period, thereby allowing the population access to the information contained in the policy. During the CCF-II period, UNDP played a supportive role through provision of technical expertise, in collaboration with other cooperating partners such as the German Technical Cooperation Agency (GTZ), which played a key role in the development of the Decentralization Implementation Plan.



### 3.4 HIV/AIDS

In June 2001, the United Nations General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS (UNGASS), adopted the Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS, 'Global Crisis—Global Action' (resolution 5-26/2) to express the commitment to addressing the HIV/AIDS crisis. More specifically, UNGASS declared a commitment by political and other leaders to implement multi-sectoral national AIDS strategies and integrate HIV/AIDS into poverty reduction-related development planning by 2003.

Initially, the UNDP's response was focused on prevention at the community level. However, with the Common Country Assessments and the development of the CCF-II, the focus changed towards addressing the pandemic at several levels simultaneously. A study by DeLoitte, commissioned by UNDP, especially recommended that support be given to the National Aids Council towards strengthening its analysis capacities and coordination role. The intended outcome of UNDP's HIV/AIDS project Zambia /01/007/99/F for 2002 to 2006 was consequently phrased as follows:

*Institutional capacity built at national, provincial and district levels to implement gender-sensitive and rights-based multi-sectoral strategies to prevent and mitigate the impact of HIV/AIDS.*

The outcome was to be achieved by producing the following outputs:

- Managerial processes for coordinating and evaluating management systems
- HIV/AIDS multi-sectoral planning, coordination and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms
- Policy guidelines and strategies for the protection of human rights for

vulnerable groups, and mitigation of impact of HIV/AIDS

- Strategies for private sector response to HIV/AIDS.

In the 2002 project document, each output was supported by a list of activities leading towards its production. However, no indicators were mentioned against which progress might have been measured.

Members of the UNCT came together to create a Joint UN Programme of Support on AIDS for the 2007 to 2010 period, which was approved and endorsed by the UN Theme Group on HIV/AIDS in October 2006. The resulting Joint Team on AIDS consisting of 13 UN organizations<sup>29</sup> underwent a thorough consultation process with the GRZ, cooperating partners and civil society in order to create the Joint Programme, which has four outcomes with 16 corresponding outputs. The roles and functions of the Joint Team are to ensure a strong, coordinated and strategic UN response based on the principle of the three 'Ones': One National AIDS Council, One Strategic Framework and One Monitoring and Evaluation Framework. To facilitate the Programme, staff of some of the Joint Team members moved into one building, the UN Annex.

In support of MDG-6 and the UNDAF Outcome 1 ('By 2010, the multi-sectoral response to HIV/AIDS at national, provincial, and district levels scaled up'), UNDP became a key player in the Joint Team on AIDS. The CPD 2007 to 2010 established the baseline against which UNDP activities would be implemented, stating that the National AIDS Council existed at the central level, but had limited linkages and weak mainstreaming capacities at national, provincial and district levels and in all sectors.

<sup>29</sup> Office of the UNRC, the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS, the World Health Organization, UNDP, the Food and Agricultural Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund, the United Nations Population Fund, the World Bank, the International Labour Organization, the World Food Programme, the International Organization for Migration, the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

The CPD 2007 to 2010 therefore includes outcomes and outputs on HIV/AIDS as follows:

<b>Outcome:</b>	'Mainstreaming and implementation of multi-sectoral and community responses to HIV/AIDS at sub-national, provincial and national levels strengthened.'
<b>Outputs:</b>	'Rights-based gender-sensitive HIV/AIDS interventions mainstreamed in all sectors at all levels.'
	'Decentralized HIV/AIDS response strengthened.'

The estimated budget for 2007 to 2010 was USD 5 million from UNDP core resources and 3 million from CPs. Annual workplans were prepared to guide the implementation of activities. UNDP's assistance was through the national execution modality and, unlike most other projects which use direct payment by UNDP, financial contributions to the Joint Programme were advanced directly to the National Aids Council. All procurement and administration was thereafter under National Aids Council responsibility.

UNDP support to the National Aids Council targeted core activities that would strengthen the National Aids Council as a co-ordinating body. The following activities were supported:

- Establishment of the National Aids Council
- Development of the National HIV/AIDS/STI/TB Intervention Strategic Plan
- Institutional capacity building at national, provincial and district levels for the development of management systems, and procedures for coordination and evaluation
- Capacity building for HIV/AIDS multi-sectoral planning, coordination and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms
- Policy development for guidelines and strategies towards the protection of human rights for vulnerable groups and gender sensitive responses through partner NGOs

- Development of strategies for private sector response to HIV/AIDS through the Zambia Business Coalition against AIDS.

A distinct feature of UNDP's ability to support the National Aids Council in fulfilling its mandate was an extended use of National UN Volunteers (NUNVs). In particular, this was evident in the decentralization efforts, with NUNVs assuming posts of District AIDS Coordinators in all 72 districts. The UNVs were integrated in the District AIDS Task Forces, providing the National Aids Council with a presence throughout the country. Support from UNDP included the provision of office equipment, transport and other logistics that facilitated functioning and outreach efforts of the District AIDS Coordinator's office and the District AIDS Task Force's office to remote communities.

UNDP also supports the decentralized AIDS response through the local authorities, the Municipal and District Councils. This support is channelled through the Alliance of Mayors Initiative for Community Action on AIDS at the Local Level, which forms part of a larger African initiative. This component established a small secretariat to coordinate and train local councilors and council staff on how to deal with HIV/AIDS in their communities. Training materials were produced, and a typical training course would result in participants generating a directory of locally available HIV/AIDS-related services, as well as a workplace policy for the council.

Realizing that there was little capacity for AIDS mainstreaming in line ministries, UNDP also extended support to them using 23 NUNVs as main interlocutors to train peer educators and focal points and develop mainstreaming strategies.

UNDP provides support to several NGOs such as the Kenneth Kaunda Children for Africa foundation, and continues to support the Network of Zambian People Living with HIV/AIDS. This collaboration has sharpened the focus on

the relationship between AIDS and poverty, and a number of interventions have included an income-generating component, or access to micro-credit, for PLWHAs.

UNDP has supported the Zambia Business Coalition against AIDS in strengthening the private sector in the multi-sectoral response. More specifically, UNDP has financed advocacy campaigns, training of peer educators, establishment of offices complete with necessary equipment and salaries for three members of staff.

Finally, UNDP has facilitated special studies, study tours and other activities of strategic relevance. The study tours included one to Brazil (on the modalities for the establishment of free anti-retroviral treatment); to Ghana (on trade-related intellectual property rights); and to Mozambique and Zimbabwe (on the feasibility of establishing an AIDS Fund in Zambia towards a more sustainable financing mechanism for the AIDS response).

These activities have also included drawing attention to high-risk groups, such as sex workers, men who have sex with men, highly mobile groups, intravenous drug users and others. While these groups are numerically small, they have a high potential for infecting others, and special strategies are needed to manage the risk they represent.

### **3.5 ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT**

While the first UNDAF excluded energy and environment, this was one of the thematic areas in the UNDP's CCF-II, the objective being 'to strengthen the institutional mechanisms for enforcement of environmental standards and the sustainable management of natural resources.' Following the end of the first UNDAF and the CCF-II, the UNDP in collaboration with the GRZ, formulated the CPD and CPAP 2007 to 2010 on the basis of the second UNDAF for the same period. The CPAP responded to the role established for the UNDP under the UNDAF, whose priorities reflected those of the

FNDP. One of the four CPAP outcome areas was environmentally sustainable development, which is also a cross-cutting issue under UNDAF 2007 to 2010.

The response of the UNDP has been in eight activities related to the environment and one related to energy. The GRZ implements the environment projects through the Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources, MTENR. The MTENR has delegated non-policy activities to statutory bodies, principally, the Zambia Wildlife Authority and the Environmental Council of Zambia. The Ministry of Energy and Water Development implements the activity on renewable energy. In line with the Paris Principles on Aid Effectiveness, the GRZ has established a SAG on environment, chaired by the relevant Permanent Secretary of MTENR. Through the JASZ arrangements, the UNDP is one of three lead cooperating partners for the CPG sector group on the environment.

### **3.6 GENDER EQUALITY**

The issue of gender cuts across all programming areas in the UN system and this commitment is reflected in various policy and planning documents. In the CCF-II, gender was an integral component of the three main thematic areas, namely HIV/AIDS, environment and governance. The thrust of UNDP support was through the mainstreaming approach and addressing gender issues by:

- Focusing on the special needs and concerns of women in relationship to HIV/AIDS
- Recognizing and promoting the role of women in the protection of the environment and the management of natural resources
- Ensuring that the domestication of international conventions and the formulation and implementation of national policies address the rights of women.

UNDP formulated its CPD (2007 to 2010) based on the UNDAF. In response to the FNDP and the need to prioritize gender issues, the

UNDP led the process in the development of a Joint Gender Support Programme for Zambia. The goals of the three-year programme were formulated as:

- Strengthened gender analysis capacity to formulate, design, review and implement gender-responsive policies, programmes and plans in Gender in Development Divisions and line ministries
- Gender-responsive legal framework in targeted economic, social, cultural and political spheres of national development
- Partnership for the implementation of innovative initiatives for economic empowerment of women facilitated and operational
- Enhanced institutional framework capacity for coordination, advocacy, reporting, monitoring and evaluation of gender mainstreaming in service delivery.

The Joint Gender Support Programme strategy was developed by taking into account the national priorities and challenges encountered in the field of gender mainstreaming. The Gender Support Programme's main objective was:

*...to strengthen the national capacity to mainstream gender in all legal, economic, political and social/culture spheres so that men and women benefit and participate equally in all development processes, [while the expected outcome was to ensure] priority sector line ministries have the capacity and are mainstreaming gender in sector policies, strategies, legal frameworks and plans by the end of 2009.*

In collaboration with other cooperating partners, the UNDP-supported programme is expected to increase the human resource capacity for the Gender in Development Division to effectively coordinate and provide technical assistance as well as skills enhancement. The programme capacity for enhancement of skills includes:

- Dialogue with the Management Development Division and Public Service Management

Division on the structuring and establishing of Gender in Development Divisions and gender Focal Points Systems

- Use of short-term and long-term technical assistance
- Sector-specific training in gender analysis, gender mainstreaming and gender-responsive budgeting.

### 3.7 POVERTY AND MDGS

The four UNDP practice areas relate directly to the UNDAF. However, UNDP is involved in other activities outside these areas that contribute to Zambian development, including poverty reduction, the human development paradigm, policy-relevant studies commissioned by the MFNP and support to dissemination, sensitization, needs assessment and progress monitoring activities related to the MDGs. Examples include support for setting up a pilot project introducing the Bangladeshi Grameen Bank model for microfinance, as well as various kinds of assistance to the GRZ in macroeconomic analysis, reporting on progress towards the MDGs and preparing the Zambian Human Development Reports.

#### UNDP'S RESPONSE 1: MICROFINANCE

The Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project was launched in 2004 as a pilot collaboration between the GRZ, the Government of Japan, UNDP, UNV and the Grameen Trust. Its purpose was to develop an effective model of non-collateral credit to the poor, based on women groups, and to build the capacity of local microfinance institutions. The selected microfinance institutions were the Micro Bankers Trust and the Institute of Cultural Affairs Zambia. However, the Institute of Cultural Affairs Zambia stopped its operations later on, and the project continued with the Micro Bankers Trust. Project costs since its inception stand at around USD 1 million.

## UNDP'S RESPONSE 2: MDG'S, HUMAN DEVELOPMENT, MACROECONOMICS

The Strategic Policy Unit (SPU) in the UNDP Country Office mainly addresses upstream issues related to national planning for poverty reduction, and its main partner in the GRZ is the Planning Department of the MFNP. The SPU works to a large extent on a demand basis and prepares annual workplans together with the MFNP. The workplans are derived from, and therefore fully synchronized with, those of the GRZ.

The MDGs are at the centre of the cooperation, with SPU providing support to the reporting of progress on MDGs. SPU considers the work on MDGs its biggest success, having created widespread awareness about the MDGs and seen them become integrated into the MFNP's reporting on the FNNDP. In addition, SPU provides policy and economic analysis on issues where MFNP needs special capacity<sup>30</sup> that is not locally available.

With the assistance of Zambian academics and through the use of consultative processes, the

Country Office through the SPU has, over the years, produced a series of National Human Development Reports addressing essential development themes:

- 1997: Poverty
- 1998: Provision of Basic Services
- 1999/2000: Employment and Sustainable Livelihoods
- 2003: The Reduction of Poverty and Hunger in Zambia: An Agenda for Enhancing the Achievement of the MDGs
- 2007: Placing Households at the Centre of the National HIV/AIDS Response.

As a new intervention, the Zambia Country Office has promoted the human development concept through the introduction of a human development course in the curriculum of the University of Zambia. UNDP staff remains involved in the related teaching seminars each semester.

---

<sup>30</sup> Recent studies include:

\*Zambia: Debt Strategies to Meet the Millennium Goals, 2007

\*Economic Policies for Growth, Employment and Poverty Reduction, 2007

\*Kwacha Appreciation 2005 to 2006: Implications for the Zambian Economy, 2007

\*Making it Possible—UN and Millennium Development Goals, 2005

\*Understanding the MDGs—Basic Information Kit 2006



## CHAPTER 4

# CONTRIBUTION TO DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

### 4.1 FOSTERING DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

#### PROGRAMMATIC RELEVANCE

The GRZ through the FNDD identified democratic governance as a cross-cutting issue throughout the entire spectrum of the governmental and non-governmental delivery systems. Specific areas of focus highlighted in the FNDD included constitutionalism, transparency, accountability, human rights and the full implementation of the Electoral Commission of Zambia.

According to the Zambia 2007 to 2010 Results Framework, the UNDAF outcome was to have the systems and processes in support of the national development priorities strengthened by 2010, while the CPAP outcomes were as follows:

- Institutions strengthened to execute, coordinate and implement national development priorities based on democratic governance
- Capacity developed for strategic forecasting and scenario-building to protect and promote freedom and rights.

The thematic area of democratic governance is therefore relevant to the objectives of the overall UN programme and responds to the national priorities as specified in the FNDD. In the general elections of 2006 and the emergency 2008 elections, UNDP was among the lead donors and mandated to manage the Elections Trust Fund from which many stakeholders benefited through accessing funds for implementation of various election programmes. The Trust Fund provided a practical example of the harmonization

of development cooperation as defined in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Other cooperating partners that contributed were Canada, the EU, Finland, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the United States of America.

#### EFFECTIVENESS

Projects implemented under the governance practice area have in most cases yielded significant results despite the number of challenges the overall sector faces. With the exception of the slow pace in approving the implementation plan of the decentralization policy, UNDP support to most of the other project activities was implemented according to plan, and development results were produced.

Outcome indicators to verify positive change were not specified in the planning documents. However, UNDP has contributed to the achievement of the intended outcomes through its support to the main institutions championing the democratization process, such as the Electoral Commission and Human Rights Commission. Through the support of UNDP, the Electoral Commission of Zambia has become a fully-fledged electoral institution with professional staff capable of managing the elections and leading to widely accepted election results. Specific areas of support to the Electoral Commission of Zambia have included establishment of continuous voter registration, implementation of civic and voter education, engagement with the media to ensure balanced reporting of all key stakeholders and training of local election monitors.

UNDP support to the Human Rights Commission has enabled the organization to

scale up its visibility through the establishment of offices in five additional provinces. The production of the Human Rights Reports by the Commission in the last three years has been as a result of direct support from the UNDP. The Human Rights Reports provide observations on the human rights situation in Zambia, as monitored by the Commission. They also examine and analyse the GRZ's strides in terms of a rights-based approach, and educate the general population in regard to human rights, their importance and the human rights situation in their country.

However, despite all the efforts invested in the preparatory stages of the decentralization process, the Decentralization Implementation Plan was not adopted, since GRZ wanted to review further the Plan before approving it. The key reason for the non-implementation of the Decentralization Implementation Plan appeared to be a reluctance to relinquish authority to local level structures by the central government. UNDP technical support was seen to dwindle during this period as other cooperating partners followed suit and left the whole process almost at a standstill. The development result of decentralized governance has therefore not been met.

In addition, UNDP has initiated specific projects in collaboration with other cooperating partners, such as the Parliamentary Support programme which, though small, has facilitated capacity building of specific committees through training. Training has included legislative drafting, parliamentary legal training and gender budgeting, while targeting specific legislative reforms such as the Private Members Bills process. Support provided by UNDP to the Public Service Management Unit has contributed to the implementation of the long-awaited restructuring of the public service, including the strengthening of the capacity of human resources.

## **EFFICIENCY**

Overall, UNDP support to the governance sector has been appreciated by stakeholders and national

partners, although in some cases challenges were faced along the implementation process. Through UNDP's global networks, experienced experts in various areas of governance were identified and played a significant role in building the capacities of the governance structures in Zambia.

Feedback from implementing partners and cooperating partners confirmed that UNDP support to the electoral process and the Electoral Commission yielded positive results, as election funds helped the Electoral Commission carry out most planned activities prior to and post elections. In the 2008 emergency, delays were faced in receiving funds, mainly due to the sudden nature of the election. Some concerns were also raised by partners in relation to UNDP procurement procedures, which were identified as lengthy and bureaucratic in nature. UNDP support to capacity development has strengthened the Electoral Commission of Zambia's quality assurance system and helped consolidate a voter education strategy.

As regards preparations for the 2011 elections, several obstacles were identified. New technology for voter registration based on biometric recognition is being introduced to replace defunct Polaroid photos, and an estimated 1,000 registration kits are being procured. However, due to protracted, unresolved issues between the Electoral Commission and the Department of National Registration, Passport and Citizenship, funding from the British High Commission to run a pilot introducing and testing the new equipment has been withdrawn. Given the short time available before the 2011 elections, it is likely that the new technology will be rolled out country-wide without adequate pre-testing. This could have a negative impact, both on the number of otherwise eligible voters who may not be registered, and on the number of complaints that will be received due to the unfamiliarity among staff members at polling stations with the new equipment and methodology. Given UNDP's long relationship with the Electoral Commission of Zambia, it might have been expected that



UNDP would assist in resolving the situation and hence contribute to the outcome of free and fair elections.

The cooperation agreement on the new elections project between the GRZ and UNDP was signed, and UNDP went into contribution agreements with cooperating partners. The cooperation agreement covered the programme areas of support by cooperating partners, including support to conduct on-going voter registration, civic and voter education, political party capacity building and capacity building for the Electoral Commission's organizational effectiveness. However, the funds were not released since the GRZ was still having internal consultations regarding some of the key components of the programme. By the time of the ADR, stakeholders expressed great concern about the delay, as this would affect timely implementation of the programme. Their main concern was that although the UNDP clearly provided quality technical assistance to the Electoral Commission, the Programme was not able to make the urgency of this delay sufficiently clear for the GRZ to take timely action. In spite of the likely negative impact on the achievement of CPD outcomes,<sup>31</sup> UNDP appeared to adopt a passive position in this regard, considering it to be internal GRZ business.

In the case of the Decentralization Implementation Plan's delayed approval, stakeholders were of the view that UNDP could have played a much stronger role in ensuring the GRZ's buy-in and speedy approval, especially considering UNDP had already invested heavily in this process. It should be noted however, that the lack of progress was also, to some extent, related to the inadequacy of financial resources. Non-implementation has resulted in widely expressed dissatisfaction at the level of local authorities who are consequently held back in their work.

UNDP has continued to support the National Constitutional Conference with the aim of ensuring citizens' participation through e-discussion forums, while the media strategy developed has enhanced information dissemination regarding National Constitutional Conference proceedings. CSO stakeholders in particular were of the view that UNDP could have used its support to the National Constitutional Conference to influence decisions on key areas of their concerns, such as composition and mode of selecting representatives to sit on the National Constitutional Conference. The ADR finds that the role of UNDP as an adviser to the GRZ should be limited to pointing out any obvious oversights in its composition, rather than in influencing decisions as such. As things stand, the progress of the National Constitutional Conference is lagging far behind schedule and a new constitution cannot be expected to come into force before, or in combination with, the 2011 elections.

UNDP is currently co-lead in the governance sector group. However, the effectiveness of UNDP leadership has been questioned by some partners. Participation in meetings has been low-level and limited to few members. Challenges to internal coordination stem from structural issues such as individual agency mandates and administrative and financial procedures.

## SUSTAINABILITY

UNDP's main approach to sustainability has been through the provision of capacity strengthening that will, over time, sustain results through skills and knowledge acquired. To that end, several tools were developed such as training manuals in the case of the Electoral Commission. Participation in international meetings, conferences and trainings contributed to enhancing the skills of many partners both in the public sector and in civil society.

---

<sup>31</sup> CPD outcome on governance being 'Institutions strengthened to execute, coordinate and implement national development priorities based on democratic governance.'

Good governance is the pillar of sustainable development. Programmes related to elections, human rights and decentralization form part of the GRZ's key areas of focus, and will continue to receive support from the GRZ through the budget process. A case in point is the Parliamentary Programme, which has been included in the national budget process in order to ensure it is rolled out to other parts of the country, and support to constituency offices, which has been sustained. However, in spite of this, other parts of the governance programmes will still depend largely on external CP support. This is the case with regard to the election support programme, which demands huge resources and will be dependent on donors to supplement the GRZ's efforts.

UNDP has contributed to the development of strategic plans and institutional capacities in the Electoral Commission of Zambia, the Zambian Human Rights Commission, the National Assembly and elsewhere, all of which should contribute to sustainability.

## **GOVERNANCE AS A CROSS-CUTTING ISSUE**

Good governance has been treated through the programmatic areas described above. Apart from the linkages between the multi-sectoral AIDS response which has a strong orientation to the local (decentralized) levels, there is little evidence to show that good governance has cut across the other sectors.

### **4.2 RESPONDING TO HIV/AIDS**

#### **PROGRAMMATIC RELEVANCE**

The UNDP support to the fight against HIV/AIDS is highly relevant both in terms of national priorities and vis-à-vis the UN programmes. The setup within the Joint UN Team on AIDS is a step towards UN integration in line with current reform initiatives. Within the UNDP

itself, the HIV/AIDS programme is consistent with the component on democratic governance, of which decentralization is a cornerstone. The programme is also designed to be highly gender-sensitive in realization of the differences between men and women as regards practices as well as impact.

#### **EFFECTIVENESS**

Official HIV prevalence rates in Zambia have fluctuated over the years, and it is difficult to determine with certainty the degree to which, if at all, they have decreased since 2000. Access to free antiretroviral therapy services would tend to increase prevalence rates since HIV-positive people on antiretroviral therapy live longer, and hence continue to appear in statistics. However, awareness has increased, with close to 100 percent of Zambians now knowing the basics about the disease. Voluntary counselling and testing has increased dramatically,<sup>32</sup> thereby allowing people to know their status and take the necessary precautions in the event of testing positive, which would include starting on antiretroviral therapy treatment. Even if the impact remains uncertain in terms of prevalence rates, increased awareness and widespread access to HIV/AIDS services, including free antiretroviral therapy, are important development results towards the goal of getting the pandemic under control. However, the Joint Team was not able to convince the GRZ to buy antiretrovirals in bulk together with other African countries, and as a result, the GRZ probably paid a higher cost than necessary for this medication.

Within the Joint UN Programme, UNDP has played a central role in the developing capacity and knowledge of HIV/AIDS countrywide. All provinces and districts now have AIDS Task Forces and AIDS coordinators interacting with the local communities. Local councils and the private sector have been drawn into the response. Workplace AIDS policies are increasingly being

---

<sup>32</sup> Number of clients tested for HIV at Voluntary Counselling and Testing centres and receiving the test results increased from 30,685 in 2005 to 341,249 in 2007, National Aids Council 2009, op. cit.

developed and people trained. Stigma is reported to have been reduced. Given the country's geography and poor infrastructure, this is no small achievement.

The fight against AIDS is a long-term endeavour, as recognized in the GRZ target of having a nation free of the threat of HIV/AIDS by 2030. Within this perspective, UNDP has been effective in its support to the National Aids Council in fulfilling its mandate, especially in terms of outreach. Strategies have been developed, training materials prepared and used and initiatives taken to ensure people at all levels are aware of the many dimensions of the disease.

### **EFFICIENCY**

UNDP seized an opportunity in the CCF-II and embarked on an ambitious programme. Rather than starting out with pilot activities, UNDP went full-scale for the multi-sectoral and decentralized response. With this approach, UNDP has managed to form partnerships with other cooperating partners and attract resources on a considerable scale, while simultaneously growing from very little, to some 35 percent of the Country Office's regular resources, in accordance with the Target for Resource Assignments from the Core (TRAC).

UNDP has been able to provide timely planned inputs and oversee implementation in an efficient manner. In this the UNDP was assisted by the modality used for procurement, through which funds were advanced directly to the National Aids Council. In relation to other partners—NGOs and CSOs—there have been complaints about late release of funds by the National Aids Council.

Programmatic efficiency of UNDP support in delivering a wide variety of services has been good. The combination of working upstream at the National Aids Council and line ministries and downstream with councils, Provincial AIDS Task Forces and District AIDS Task Forces, has

opened up valuable opportunities for learning and adjusting strategies based on practical experience in the field.

The extensive use of Zambian UNVs has facilitated these opportunities in a way that appears cost-effective compared with other possible modes of large-scale implementation. However, there are many reports to the effect that UNVs are seen as outsiders, be it in a district or a ministry, present on special terms and not part of the normal structure. Sustainability issues, detailed below, remain and may reduce the long-term results of using NUNVs.

At the district level, the existence of two 'parallel' structures has complicated the picture. The Decentralization Policy, developed with UNDP assistance in 2002, has not yet been implemented; hence the local councils have not been empowered to assume the rights and responsibilities that were intended. Instead, District Commissioners have been installed as political representatives of the central government. Relations between the two structures are often quite bad. Offices of the District AIDS Task Force and the District AIDS Coordinator fall under the District Development Coordination Committee, which is chaired by the District Commissioners. In the absence of effective decentralization, the strengthening of the offices of the District AIDS Task Force and District AIDS Coordinator may well have been the best alternative—while supporting the councils at the same time. This two-pronged approach by UNDP may be considered the best way to attack the problem of non-implementation of the decentralization policy.

### **SUSTAINABILITY**

The main modes of support have been through strategy development and capacity building at different levels. Sustainability therefore depends on the extent to which developed capacity will remain in place and develop further once support ends.

Much has been produced in terms of policy guidelines, training materials, manuals, peer education and counselling support to monitoring and evaluation systems, and much more. It may be assumed that these resources will remain in place and be used in the years ahead.

Much capacity has been developed in the NUNVs themselves, which begs the question, what will happen if, or when, the NUNVs leave? NUNVs in the line ministries are no longer in place, and their functions have been assumed by focal points. Some focal points hold senior positions which can be an advantage, except for the fact that they have many other duties and are often transferred. Others are more junior with less authority. The focal point system is not able to guarantee continuity of the mainstreaming capacity; fixed civil service positions of AIDS coordinators with clear job descriptions would likely provide for better sustainability. Similar problems can be found at the district level where the District Planning Officer is normally the focal point. These officers are also often transferred. Community AIDS Coordinators, as well as the members of the District AIDS Task Force, are unpaid volunteers. This was deemed problematic by several informants.

There are many testimonies to the need to keep the District AIDS Coordinators in office if the District AIDS Task Forces are to function well. An agreement has been made by which the National Aids Council will take over the NUNVs as government staff to keep them in their positions. However, at the time of this evaluation, conditions were still not fully agreed upon, and it could be difficult to sustain the existing gains achieved by the NUNVs within the system. Overall, sustainability prospects are problematic.

In the longer run, the high dependence on external funding of the AIDS response is cause for concern. The National Aids Council and its partners have so far been quite successful in resource mobilization, however, financing an upscale in the magnitude that will match the threat of HIV/AIDS will be very costly.

## HIV/AIDS AS A CROSS-CUTTING ISSUE

Attempts at mainstreaming HIV/AIDS were made in the line ministries and through the work with local councils with the Alliance of Mayors Initiative for Community Action on AIDS at the Local Level. References to HIV/AIDS were usually found in documents relating to policy and institutional development.

Little evidence was found that HIV/AIDS was included in projects under the governance and environment areas. Nevertheless, some implementers linked project impact on improved nutrition to better care for those living with HIV.

## 4.3 ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

### PROGRAMMATIC RELEVANCE

The environment underpins development efforts in all sectors, and will almost certainly feature prominently in the SNDP. The thrust of the SNDP can be expected to be similar to the FNDP and poverty will again be the major theme. The latest indications are that the FNDP has made little impact on the proportion of the population living in poverty. Under the circumstances, the third Zambian UNDAF, if properly aligned to respond to the SNDP, should place a similar emphasis on the environment. Since 2002, UNDP has worked with the GEF to promote important initiatives in environmental monitoring and management. Many of these activities need to be sustained over several programme cycles before producing tangible outcomes. UNDP should continue to work with the GEF in promoting the environment agenda in Zambia.

The thematic area of energy and environment figures large on UNDP mandate and is high on its global agenda. UNDP work arises from a recognition that:

*The poor are disproportionately affected by environmental degradation and lack of access to clean affordable energy services. Climate change, loss*

*of biodiversity and ozone layer depletion are issues that hold global importance and therefore cannot be addressed by countries acting alone.*<sup>33</sup>

There are six activity areas identified as:

1. Frameworks and strategies for sustainable development
2. Effective water governance
3. Access to sustainable energy services
4. Sustainable land management to combat desertification and land degradation
5. Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity
6. National/sectoral policy and planning to control emissions of ozone-depleting substances and persistent organic pollutants.

In addition, UNDP lists a number of specific initiatives, among them, the Environmental Governance Initiative. This effort aims to instil democratic governance in energy and environment matters. The goal is to produce tools for increasing the capacity of participating countries to protect the environment, while promoting the right of the poor to have reasonable access to energy and natural resources.

In 2005, UNDP executed projects on energy and environment in 127 countries. In the context of the MDGs, UNDP has a particular focus on MDG 7, on which hinges the attainment of nearly all the other goals. In its last reporting on MDGs, the GRZ considers MDG 7 'not achievable.'

To fulfil the mandate, UNDP has forged partnerships with other UN agencies whose work is closely related. Of particular significance is the GEF, a trust fund jointly operated by UNDP, the United Nations Environment Program and the World Bank, which supports work in the focal areas mentioned above. In addition, UNDP has considerable technical resources in the energy

and environment networks in various regions of the world.

UNDP's interventions in the environment contribute to development results in nearly all social and economic sectors. In so doing, programme activities address the key issue of endemic poverty, focusing especially on the rural communities, where extreme poverty is more prevalent. Similarly, the attention on renewable energy aims to support increased productivity and improve social well-being in the rural areas. The attention paid to the environment and energy is strategically appropriate and effective given the pervasive linkages of these areas to other sectors.

It can be concluded that the thematic area of energy and environment is of direct programmatic relevance to UNDP, and that it is well placed to leverage resources needed to effectively execute activities in Zambia.

## **EFFECTIVENESS**

The work of UNDP in environment and energy can be summarized as developing capacity, strengthening institutional frameworks, supporting policy development and piloting new approaches to community development. The goal is to catalyse action and give impetus to the development process, rather than to deliver the development outcomes themselves.

Nearly all the thematic lines that UNDP began in 2002 had been continued in the second UNDAF and were still being implemented at the time of the ADR. Therefore, the timing of the review did not permit a full and realistic assessment of contributions to broad development outcomes. Nevertheless, based on an appraisal of the appropriateness of the areas of intervention, the mix of methodological approaches used, the nature of some project outputs and the impressions gained from direct contact with participants in selected projects, it was possible to develop a sense of the projects' potential contributions to development outcomes.

---

<sup>33</sup> UNDP Fact Sheet, April 2005.

### **Capacity development for sustainable renewable energy management and utilization**

In energy, the intervention of the UNDP was instrumental in focusing attention on explicit implementation strategies for renewable energy development based on the National Energy Strategy of 2007. At the time of the review, a draft of the renewable energy implementation strategy had been prepared. Other components would follow, including the preparation of an implementation strategy and preparatory work for renewable energy pilot projects.

The formulation of sound implementation strategies for renewable energy supports UNDP's commitment to promote access to sustainable energy services. At the same time, the GRZ's review of the 1994 Energy Policy had concluded that the policy's weak results were attributable, in large measure, to the absence of an implementation framework. Therefore UNDP's identification of this activity addressed an important impediment to the attainment of the goals of the National Energy Policy, particularly in relation to renewable energy.

However, the UNDP limited its support mainly to the provision of funds to engage consultants and to hold consensus-building workshops, while UNIDO took over the implementation. Because of this, the UNDP had little or no influence on the technical quality of the outputs. Given its extensive resource networks in renewable energy, UNDP had the opportunity to engage the GRZ more meaningfully, thereby reinforcing efforts to diffuse the exploitation of renewable energy sources.

#### **Action plans for MDGs at the community level**

The development of action plans for MDGs at the community level applied a concept the UNDP had tried in Ghana and Uganda in partnership with an NGO, the Africa 2000 Network. At two rural pilot sites, participating villages had formed development associations coordinated by representative committees. The NGO was

working with the development associations to raise awareness of the existence of MDGs and their relevance to the development of the areas. Various activities were designed to develop the capacity of associations to define priorities and mobilize resources, especially their capacity to take advantage of the possibilities opened up by the MDGs. Essentially, the pilots aimed to establish and entrench modalities of participatory development management.

This approach to the implementation of the MDGs seems to be an effective way to raise awareness of the linkage of various factors and issues to the central challenge of poverty. In particular, at both sites, it was evident that association members could articulate the importance of protecting the environment in tackling endemic poverty. By targeting rural areas, the pilots situated themselves in communities where poverty levels were highest and most severe. From the discussions with association members, traditional leaders and local government representatives, there is little doubt that this initiative produced positive results. One of the most important was the associations' ability to mobilize additional development resources through the knowledge and skills acquired from the pilots. Through such initiatives, female-headed households could access Grameen-style loans, and associations were able to tap into a GEF Small Grants scheme.

However, the evaluation team questions the effectiveness of such small-scale projects on overall development outcomes. UNDP could probably be more effective by focusing its efforts on encouraging the implementation of the decentralization policy and supporting local government structures in drawing local communities into the development process.

#### **Second national communication to the UNFCCC**

The Environmental Council of Zambia had identified several studies to support the national communication. The Environmental Council expected that consultants would submit preliminary results of these studies in time for

the UN Conference of the Parties (COP)-15 Climate Change Summit in Copenhagen scheduled for December 2009. This meeting would lay the groundwork for a successor international agreement on climate change to the Kyoto Protocol, due to expire in 2012. This support was in line with the UNDP's objectives on climate change. In this instance, this activity was an effective approach to enabling Zambia to have a technical basis for defining an appropriate response to the global commitments on climate change.

UNDP is well placed to contribute specifically to adaptation mechanisms and mitigation measures. The thrust of its work in this area would be facilitation of studies to strengthen technical regulation by the Environmental Council. This is directly related to current preparation of the Second Communication to the UNFCCC, but possibly an added emphasis is called for to support enforcement of environmental standards. For example, mining activities in the new areas of the North-Western Province, while offering immediate economic benefits, pose serious long-term risks to the environment. The Environmental Council needs to have the technical capacity to ensure proper conduct of environmental impact assessments, but more importantly, adequate, continuous monitoring of production methods and waste disposal. The UNDP can draw on international practice and experience to great effect, especially on adaptation mechanisms.

No doubt these areas are fraught with social, political and technical complexities. But this should provide justification for maintaining UNDP presence, as it would give Zambia truly strategic support in a crucial area of development, and one to which the UN attaches great importance. Given the involved complexities, the approach to environmental sustainability should be based on a common and coordinated UN platform also involving agencies such as the Food and Agricultural Organization, the United Nations Children's Fund, the United Nations Population Fund, the International Labour

Organization, UNIDO and the non-resident United Nations Environment Programme.

### **Reclassification and effective management of the National Protected Area System**

At two demonstration sites, the UNDP provided support to MTENR to implement novel forms of community involvement in protecting natural resources and addressing poverty. This was a departure from traditional practices that tended to create conflict between human interests and the conservation of nature. This activity was implemented in the framework of the UNDP-GEF collaboration. The regional office of GEF in Pretoria, South Africa provided support to the Country Office on review of documents, policy development and on-site advice. The office also assisted with annual implementation reviews and maintained regular dialogue with the Country Office. The GEF representative explained that the demonstration sites were part of a wider African initiative to exploit more fully the economic potential of protected areas and to mainstream biodiversity management in production sectors. It was significant that even before the start of the project, the reclassification of protected areas had been embedded in the FNDP.

At the site visited—Chiawa, in the Lower Zambezi Game Management Area—the UNDP had provided technical assistance through the attachment of a UN Volunteer to the project backed by a unit of the Country Office. The evaluation team noted that a working partnership had been formed between the private investors and the local community. The partnership was already bearing fruit by helping the local community mobilize resources for farming projects in fenced-off areas, with the goal of improving human safety and preventing crop destruction by animals, especially elephants. The fundamental significance of achievements at the two demonstration sites is that it encouraged the community to view conservation in a positive light and reduced suspicion of private-sector interests. In this respect, the project facilitated the mutually beneficial relationship between local communities and tourism entrepreneurs.

The evaluation team noted that two of the projects, the Environmental Protection and Natural Resources Management Project and the Biodiversity Enabling Activity Add-on, prepared the ground for the current project on Reclassification and Effective Management of the National Protected Area System. Furthermore, other activities of the period 2002 to 2006, not included in the detailed review, were relevant to the current CPAP. These include the National Adaptation Plan of Action, which addressed coping mechanisms for climate change, and the National Capacity Self Assessment, which related to the implementation of the UNFCCC.

The above observations demonstrate that the UNDP was effective in addressing issues of development priority in the realm of environment and energy, and in recording significant progress in the attainment of programme outcomes. This continuation of themes from the first UNDAF is likely to contribute significantly to programme effectiveness. In particular, programmes with elements of community organization often need to continue beyond the standard 3- to 5-year duration allocated to projects. This is because of the time it takes to build community confidence and to remove the often well-founded apathy to short-term project interventions. Due to various delays, some of the projects will not be completed before the end of the CPAP period. If stopped prematurely, there is a risk that beneficial development impacts will be reduced, if not altogether lost. The programme will thus fail to deliver expected development returns on investments by the UNDP and its implementing partners.

The Reclassification project in Zambia is part of a major biodiversity initiative of the GEF covering 18 countries in Africa. The UNDP and GEF have already invested heavily in setting up the demonstration sites. The work needs to continue to the second and third stages in order to produce discernible impacts on development outcomes.

## EFFICIENCY

The UNDP provides technical, financial and logistical support, and the detailed procedures vary according to agreements reached with the GRZ, especially on financial management. In some projects, UNDP manages projects and programmes in collaboration with other agencies, notably the GEF. In order to increase the technical support available to the projects, the Country Office has recourse to a regional GEF office located in Pretoria, South Africa. The MTNER expressed the view that the UNDP needed more Country Office support to achieve higher efficiency in the more complex projects, such as the project on the reclassification of protected areas. This was also the opinion of the participating partners at the Chiawa demonstration site.

Project delays in environment and energy were common. Mainly they were attributable to:

- Inadequate or poor communication among the players
- Lengthy or unclear procurement procedures
- Late release of funds for activities.

Other sources of delays were external to the UNDP, such as low implementation capacity by the partners and unforeseen complications during project execution, as often happens.

Concerning procurements, the Country Office acknowledged that the demands of the energy and environment programme were burdensome on the Operations Department, owing to their highly technical nature.

In the JASZ framework, the GRZ and cooperating partners constitute a SAG on the environment, which provides an operational forum for approval of work plans and for tracking implementation progress. Based on views gathered from the Country Office, other cooperating partners and the GRZ, this SAG has not functioned well. Meetings were infrequent and tended to focus on processes rather than content.



Thus, opportunities for dealing with emerging implementation challenges were not used.

In the opinion of the UNDP, some of the problems were structural, especially the assumption that the environment could be treated as a distinct sector like energy or water. In fact, the environment consists of several disparate sectors, including forestry, fisheries, road transport and land and industry. Thus the SAG draws membership from several sectors with diverse focal interests, which renders discussion of content issues difficult. There was also the added problem that the MTENR, which chairs the SAG, was often unable to convene meetings.

However, the environment and energy portfolio has more projects than the Country Office has capacity to competently handle. This has contributed to inefficient implementation of projects that, in all other respects, appear to be soundly formulated. A narrowing of the portfolio is necessary to increase efficiency and prospects for the attainment of development outcomes. On this basis the UNDP should consider concentrating its efforts in two areas.

## **SUSTAINABILITY**

As pointed out earlier, the UNDP interventions in environment and energy aim to build policy and planning capacity and to test and refine new and sustainable approaches to tackling poverty. In this respect, success would mean that capacities had been built to fully integrate activities in regular government plans, allow communities the capacity to do more by themselves to escape the extremes of poverty and protect the environment that sustains them.

Both in CCF-II and during the current CPAP, the UNDP closely aligned its programmes to the development priorities that the GRZ set forth in the planning documents. Therefore at the level of the GRZ, this integration promoted ownership, which is a fundamental principle for the sustainability of projects. At the implementation level there were variations among activities. In general, there was a greater sense of ownership

for activities of an enabling nature, such as strengthening policy and planning or the training of staff. For example at the MTENR, the finalization of the National Policy on Environment in 2007, an activity under the Reclassification Project, involved wide consultation and the document enjoys legitimacy among stakeholders. Another example is the production of the institutional business plan by the Environmental Council of Zambia. The Environmental Council considers this to be an important milestone that has enabled the Council to carry out its mandate more effectively.

Nevertheless, the notion of ownership is less clear in projects that introduce novel working concepts. For example, in addition to slow progress of the project Reclassification and Effective Management of the National Protected Area System, suspicion lingers that the sharing mechanisms will not work. On the one hand the local community mistrusts the intentions of the Zambia Wildlife Authority; on the other, the Zambia Wildlife Authority has reasons to doubt community representatives' ability to properly manage their share of finances. In addition, not all the partners are happy with the revenue-sharing formula. Under circumstances, the prospect of sustaining new management systems based on partnerships seems questionable. More work is clearly needed to remove the threat that these attitudes pose to the future of the systems being tried out.

Another concern relates to the possibilities for replication and up-scaling. An example is the Localization of MDGs at the Community Level. The size of the pilot is quite small in relation to the whole local community, let alone the country. Because of its small size, the pilot outcomes may have little relevance to the complexities of broader community involvement. The project is meaningful only if it can achieve a reasonable size and be replicated in different communities. As noted earlier, even projects of this small a size demand a fair amount of administration, yet it is doubtful that the benefits can be diffused more widely in a sustainable manner.

## **ENVIRONMENT AS A CROSS-CUTTING ISSUE**

Environmental sustainability does not emerge strongly as a cross-cutting issue in UNDP's other practice areas—governance, HIV/AIDS, and gender.

However, between the CCF-II and the current CPD/CPAP the UNDP has focused much attention on raising the profile of the environment in the national development agendas for both the economic and social sectors. In particular, this applies to the many sector policies developed or reviewed in the last eight years. The National Policy on Environment of 2007 was the culmination of several years of efforts by GRZ, and UNDP assistance finally enabled the document to be produced. Similarly, the newly created Environmental Council of Zambia, which has a wide mandate in project licensing and in enforcing environmental standards, has worked closely with the UNDP. The development of the institutional business plan and various studies, some concluded, many others on-going, continuously enhance the capacity of the Environmental Council to carry out its responsibilities.

GRZ expects that the completion of current studies will enable Zambia to better regulate vital areas like water and air pollution. In addition Environmental Council of Zambia licensing is much more prominent than it was only a few years ago, and is now a central feature of project development and implementation in areas that include energy, mining and tourism.

UNDP support to improved management of natural resources, particularly wildlife, has merged objectives in gender equity, poverty reduction and health and food security. Nevertheless, environmental issues are pervasive and complex, and GRZ has assessed that among all the MDGs, the one on the environment is least likely to be attained. Logically, the environment must be a major focus of attention to promote the sustainability of achievements in nearly all other sectors.

## **4.4 PROMOTING GENDER EQUALITY**

### **PROGRAMMATIC RELEVANCE**

The protection and promotion of equality between men and women are recognized as fundamental concepts in the major international human rights instruments, including: The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), The International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (1966); The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) (1979); The UN Convention on the Elimination of Violence Against Women (1993); The Beijing Platform For Action (1995) and most recently, the MDGs, all of which are aimed at attaining gender equality and equity between the sexes. In addition, gender equality is a basic democratic requirement—without the effective inclusion of women, a country's democratic dispensation is not worth its name.

At a general level, UNDP's support to gender issues is in accordance with the development policies of both the GRZ and the principles of the UN on gender.

### **EFFECTIVENESS**

Mixed results have been achieved in the UNDP support to gender issues in relation to effectiveness, particularly in the CCF-II (2002 to 2006) period, in which no precise outcomes were specified during the design of the programme. In all the reviewed practice areas, for instance, only minimal progress was recorded towards project objectives with regard to gender. Mainstreaming gender in the governance sector, for instance, could only be traced through projects by the Electoral Commission, which utilized affirmative action in the recruitment and deployment of electoral officers. In the 2006 general elections, the Women's Lobby, an organization advocating women's representation in decision-making positions, received support through the Electoral Commission of Zambia to conduct voter education for women. Despite these efforts, very

few women were adopted in political parties. Selection and adoption procedures of political parties do not favour the inclusion of women.

UNDP has supported the process of decentralization for many years but the work did not integrate gender to show how decentralization would affect women and men, and in particular how decentralized services would affect women and men facing discrimination due to ethnicity, religion, age, disability or other factors. In the environment sector, although some efforts were made to design gender mainstreaming tools, they were not fully developed and were hampered by experts' limited knowledge of the environment. The whole exercise concluded with a checklist recommending gender mainstreaming at different stages.

Against this rather negative performance, there are also interventions that recorded progress towards planned outcomes. In the HIV/AIDS sector several interventions on gender were successfully implemented, and this can be attributed to the fact that project output met the high priority needs of the stakeholders. The development of the training manuals spearheaded by the National Aids Council and the gender training of all UNVs within the programme equipped UNVs with skills that helped them provide better support to communities. In human rights interventions, some progress towards objectives was observed in the area of advocacy. An example is the improved legislation on gender-based violence as submitted by the Technical Committee and recommended for inclusion in the constitution. This legislation includes the following:

- A call for a Gender Violence Act
- A call for an Equal Opportunity Act
- Recognition of marital rape
- Redefinition of offences such as rape
- Strengthening of most gender violence offences through the provision of mandatory minimum sentences

- Criminalization of certain activities that are not presently categorized as offences, such as early marriage.

Despite the challenges faced in mainstreaming gender in past programming cycles, the four outputs of the Gender Support Programme deal with pertinent issues of capacity development for mainstreaming gender. They do so by strengthening the institutional framework, legal reforms and women's empowerment. However, as the Gender Support Programme only started in 2009, no concrete outcomes have been recorded as yet. At the time of the ADR, the Gender in Development Division was in the process of recruiting staff with specific gender expertise, while the draft bill on gender-based violence had been accelerated and was under final review at the Ministry of Justice.

#### **EFFICIENCY**

In the CCF-II, UNDP viewed gender mainstreaming as the main means for supporting the promotion of gender equality at all levels, thereby ensuring that programmes integrated gender issues in all aspects of their work. However, the approach has met with many challenges; previous evaluations by other agencies have found that gender mainstreaming has not served its intended purpose and has yet to become visible. With the work of gender mainstreaming delegated to everyone, no-one carries ultimate accountability. This was acknowledged in the Joint Gender Support Programme, which has responded to national aspirations and addresses priority areas of the FNDP by putting women's empowerment back on the agenda.

Though gender interventions were of a cross-cutting nature in the 2002 to 2006 period, budgetary support to gender mainstreaming was very limited. Gender in the CCF-II was allocated 10 percent of the overall UNDP budget, HIV/AIDS 35 percent, governance 30 percent and environment 20 percent. Guaranteed funding to the sector is essential not only to ensure programme sustainability, but also to preserve

programme quality. With only one professional staff member working on gender, despite several prior recommendations to strengthen the capacity of the unit, the gender area is seriously understaffed. While some project partners appreciate the technical support they have received through consultants, trainers and facilitation of missions abroad by UNDP, they are still of the view that UNDP should assume a more aggressive role in championing the 'gender agenda' at the national level through high level advocacy. Partners have proposed, for instance, the need for UNDP leadership to continuously engage with national leaders on gender issues or issues such as climate change. Some of the proposed activities have included weekly briefings with the media, briefing of cabinet ministers and traditional leaders and planning meetings with the Head of State to obtain his buy-in on the gender agenda.

In the current CPD, intervention efficiency appears to have improved, as budgetary planning processes are jointly held through the CPG group on gender, in which UNDP is the lead organization. The cooperating partners supporting the gender programme have committed themselves to the principle of harmonization, and a trust fund has been established in which donor funds have been pooled. Activity budgets are used as a planning and disbursement tool, and disbursement of funds by cooperating partners to the trust funds is done bi-annually. A technical committee is assigned to ensure regular monitoring and evaluation of the programme.

The ADR revealed that gender has not been adequately mainstreamed into the programmatic work. Efforts were made in the environment sector to develop guidelines for gender mainstreaming, and several trainings for staff, community and resource management boards were held. However, challenges included a combination of inadequate tools and insufficient skills for gender mainstreaming in practice, coupled with the lack of gender analysis skills necessary to capture disaggregated data. In the governance practice area, the Electoral Commission of Zambia adopted a guideline that ensured gender

equity in the recruitment and deployment of electoral officers. However, the mandate of the Electoral Commission does not extend to the political parties' adoption and recruitment procedures. As a result political parties use their own judgement and internal procedures to adopt and nominate candidates, and these, in most cases, do not provide equal opportunities for men and women. In the human rights area, the development of comprehensive legislation to combat gender-based violence has been in process for a long while, with progress visible only recently with the passage of the draft bill to the Ministry of Justice.

The ADR, however, noted that while UNDP takes the lead in the gender sector, expectations from other CPs and stakeholders is that it should provide overall coordination for the implementation of the Gender Support Programme. However, gender within UNDP is treated as part of the governance practice area, hence rendering gender issues submerged and not very visible. At the time of the ADR, UNDP had only one staff member specifically working on gender, making the task more challenging. In addition, in terms of positioning within the UNDP organizational hierarchy the gender position is placed at the level of programme analyst, while the heads of governance, HIV/AIDS and environment units are at assistant resident representative levels.

## SUSTAINABILITY

The approach adopted under the CCF-II to mainstream gender in the main programmes has met with several limitations that affect the sustainability of gender mainstreaming. It is evident that limited capacity was one of the challenges faced during the period under review, as was the case in respect to the development of tools allowing for successful implementation of gender mainstreaming.

Despite the strong political commitment to gender by the GRZ, sustainability remains a concern as important activities of the current programme are still funded by UNDP and

its cooperating partners. However, despite this situation, the notion of ownership is clearer in the current programme, as evidenced by the administrative arrangement in place. For example the Gender in Development Division is responsible for managing the day-to-day implementation of the Gender Support Programme, while the CPs through the Trust Funds provide financial contributions to the programme. In addition, the ADR team was informed that in the 2010 budget, the Gender in Development Division is expected to have its own direct budgetary allocation rather than the current arrangement, whereby all the unit's resources are channelled through the cabinet office.

### **GENDER AS A CROSS-CUTTING ISSUE**

As mentioned, especially in the CCF-II, UNDP has taken measures to include gender as a cross-cutting issue in its different sector programmes. Results have been mixed and the Gender Support Programme was developed as a consequence.

The HIV/AIDS programme has, by nature, a strong gender orientation. Capacity building efforts in this practice area have, *inter alia*, included manuals development and gender training of UNV personnel. The National Aids Council has tasked a staff member with responsibility for gender in addition to her other duties, while advanced plans are in place to recruit a gender expert to the organization on a long-term basis. Despite the sector's efforts in integrating gender in its programmes, its challenges have also included limited capacity on data collection and gender analytical skills, and limited budgetary allocation to the mainstreaming approach.

The Electoral Commission developed gender affirmative action for deployment and recruitment of electoral officers.

The microfinance project addresses women only, which, while needed, can also have negative consequences, as when a woman is beaten by her husband over her money; in such cases, a women's group has addressed the husband and helped to re-establish peace. Project staff stated that they were very observant with regard to family dynamics and, in addition to meeting with and training women, they also held meetings with men to properly explain the project and anticipate any problems.

The CPD/CPAP projects in the environment sector that were the subjects of the evaluation, accounted for gender equity in different ways. In the Localization of MDGs there was parity of representation on the executive committees of the associations that were formed. In addition, some of the initiatives targeted women specifically. But ultimately, the impression was that men felt entitled to leadership, and women accepted this position. It was also speculated that men accepted women's participation in leadership as a strategy for securing resources made available by the projects.

In the Reclassification project there were no women representatives on the Partnership Trust and the men maintained that this was simply an outcome of a democratic electoral process. It was early days yet for the Trust because of implementation delays. However, the male interviewees pointed out that the off-shoot farming initiatives from this project targeted women. Here too, it was difficult to discriminate between fundamental changes of attitude and strategic opportunism.

However despite all efforts, gender mainstreaming in the UNDP has remained weak and lacks tools to monitor how gender is being integrated into projects. Existing gender inequalities at all levels of society demand more robust programmes and interventions to achieve positive results.

Partners meetings during the ADR stressed the need for the UNDP to approach gender issues in a more comprehensive and well-coordinated manner. They also recommended the need to take gender advocacy through continuous high-level meetings with GRZ ministers, championed by the UNDP Resident Representative. This was viewed as the only way to keep gender visibility at policy level in order to achieve the MDGs by 2015. UNDP was urged to strengthen in-house capacity to provide gender-disaggregated data and gender analysis in the next programmes, thereby informing programme design and implementation. Addressing cross-cutting issues will undoubtedly require the involvement of civil society and community CBOs to strengthen programme interventions.

## **4.5 POVERTY AND MDGS**

### **DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES**

The overall challenge of poverty was introduced above in section 2.2. The agriculture sector, in spite of its high and recognized potential, remains underdeveloped, and the rural population comprises the bulk of the poorest. In the urban areas the number of available decent jobs is small and an estimated half of the workforce ekes out a living in the low-producing informal sector. Poverty is multi-faceted, and the high HIV/AIDS prevalence rate adds a heavy toll to the incidence of poverty.

### **UNDP's response 1: Microfinance**

The Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project was launched in 2004 as a pilot collaboration between the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services, Government of Japan, UNDP, UNV and the Grameen Trust. The project employed UNVs in different capacities: international UNVs (initially two Bangladeshis with extensive experience from working in the Grameen Bank; following 2007 only one remained); two NUNVs as Branch Managers of Micro Bankers Trusts in Chongwe and Lusaka Urban, and eight NUNVs as Credit Officers.

The Grameen model is based on the formation of women groups of five members each; ten groups form a centre with a centre chief. Criteria for membership include the stipulation that women have permanent status in the locality. In addition, their incomes and ownership of assets are assessed—only the poorer qualify. The groups receive seven days training in which they start their compulsory savings accounts with Zambian Kwacha 3,000 per day. After successful completion of the training and saving process, each woman qualifies for a loan of Zambian Kwacha 500,000, while continuing to save Zambian Kwacha 3,000 per week. The repayment period is 50 weeks, or Zambian Kwacha 10,000 per week. The interest to be paid on credit is 30 percent per annum, while the savings generate a 2 percent rate of interest. With regular repayments, the loans can be replenished after six months (additional Zambian Kwacha 250,000). The second loan cycle is for Zambian Kwacha 800,000, and the last (fifth) cycle, for Zambian Kwacha 5 million. The intention is that after repeating five cycles, the client-member will have saved enough to run her business without the need for credit, or that she will have accumulated sufficient assets to access bank loans on normal terms.

Most loans are used for retail trading in markets or at the roadside, while others are used for food processing, pottery, tailoring, raising chickens or growing vegetables. Most women also use part of the money for consumption smoothening: food, clothing, school uniforms and other necessary expenses. While some loans go towards a family business, women insist that they personally keep control over the money. The loans are given to women individually, with the group serving as guarantor. The number of client-members passed the 5,000 mark in 2009, and repayment was close to 100 percent.

The women interviewed in Chongwe District expressed satisfaction with the programme, although several found the loan amounts too small and the repayment period too long—they

said they would be able to service larger loans faster. Starting with Zambian Kwacha 500,000 (USD 100), they reported, was not enough to establish a business. However, the Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project policy is that everyone goes through the same process, which clearly facilitates the administrative process and probably also contributes to the financial discipline of the clients.

Methodology for the Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project is based on carefully addressing the local communities through headmen and chiefs, conducting village meetings to explain the approach to women, occasionally having meetings with men, careful selection and training of members, ensuring timely disbursement and insisting on timely repayment. Well-tested training materials from The Consultative Group for Assistance to the Poor<sup>34</sup> are being used. Credit officers are those most directly in communication with members, a task that requires much hand-holding and counselling beyond money-related issues. Credit officers in the Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project were originally NUNVs. Going forward, they would be staff members of the host organization, the Micro Bankers Trust.

At its inception in 1996, the Micro Bankers Trust was an old microfinance institution established to provide wholesale credit to smaller microfinance

institutions for on-lending. This practice was not successful, as interest rates exceeded what microfinance institutions were prepared to pay, and in 2001 the Micro Bankers Trust went into retailing itself, using group methodology. Again the results were not good—groups of women and men were loosely organized and repayment low. UNDP found the Micro Bankers Trust had a weak field structure, with 18 offices in eight provinces, and was poorly staffed and supervised. The Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project became a vehicle for strengthening the Micro Bankers Trust. The two pilot sites in Lusaka and Chongwe were designed to run independently but to have their management assumed by the Micro Bankers Trust once they had become self-sustaining. The Micro Bankers Trust now has four branches: in Lusaka, Chongwe, Kabwe and Kafue, with branches in Chingola and Chipata about to be established. The next step would be to establish branches in Monze, Mongu and Mansa, thereby covering large parts of the country. Each branch would be staffed by a manager, an accountant and four credit officers.

The Grameen example has become known as Twende and is the main product of the Micro Bankers Trust. However, other Micro Bankers Trust products also exist, as shown in Table 10, below.

**Table 10. Micro Bankers Trust products**

Product name	Clients	Loan amounts Zambian Kwacha	Purpose	Repayment rates (approximate)
Twende (Grameen)	Women groups	0.5 to 5 mill.	Small business	95 to 100%
Agricultural equipment	Individual men and women	2 to 50 mill.	Irrigation, tractors; collateral required	Below 50%
Dairy	Individuals and cooperatives	20 to 50 mill.	Cattle for milk production	100%
Smallstock	Individual men and women	Max. 20	Poultry, pigs, goats	80%
Individual loans	Salaried or SMEs, men and women	5 to 50 mill.	Business, consumption	75 to 80%

Source: Micro Bankers Trust.

<sup>34</sup> The Consultative Group for Assistance to the Poor is a major donor group on microfinance.

UNDP support has been extended twice since 2007, and was projected to stop at the end of 2009. The UNVs have been taken over by the Micro Bankers Trust. However, more assistance will be needed to facilitate the institutionalization of the pilot experience and allow for the establishment of more branches. Overhead costs of microfinance are high in terms of personnel and transport, even if a shoestring approach is applied as was the case here. The Micro Bankers Trust's current portfolio stands at some Zambian Kwacha 5 billion (USD 1 million), while estimates indicate a need for a portfolio three times bigger.

### **UNDP's response 2: MDGs, Human Development, Macroeconomics**

The SPU is actively assisting in capacity development in strategic areas for poverty reduction, such as improving GRZ monitoring and evaluation systems for poverty tracking, and strengthening the capacity of the Central Statistical Office. The SPU has recently supported the CSO in a collaborative effort with United Kingdom's Department for International Development and GTZ, to improve the data quality and strengthen the analytical products emerging from the last (2006) Living Conditions Measurement Survey.

Further, the SPU is strongly engaged in supporting the UNRC in his functions within the UNCT and the wider development community. Evaluations and reviews of the CPs and the UNDAF, as well as the preparation of new versions (to start in 2011), also form part of SPU responsibilities. The Zambian Human Development Reports are also coordinated by the SPU, and the Human Development concept has been introduced in a new degree course at the University of Zambia.

### **PROGRAMMATIC RELEVANCE**

The activities mentioned above represent downstream and upstream responses to the poverty challenge. While clearly linked to the overall FNNDP theme of poverty reduction they do not

feature prominently in the CPD/CPAP or the UNDAF. Their strategic relevance may therefore be quite high, whereas their relevance to other parts of the CPD is less so.

The microfinance project has some linkages to the HIV/AIDS programme, and also has a strong gender orientation. However, in the absence of a technical home in the Country Office, the Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project is placed with the UNV Unit.

The SPU supports the UNCT and the UNRC in a variety of ways, thereby having a stronger role within the overall CPD. In this context, part of the SPU mandate is to provide upstream policy support to the programme areas as well, which seems to happen to a lesser degree. There would appear to be scope for closer cooperation with the HIV/AIDS, energy and environment and governance and gender areas, in that the strategic and economic expertise of the SPU could add value directly to those programmes.

### **EFFECTIVENESS**

The Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project has managed to develop a programme of microfinance (credit with compulsory savings) that has served over 5,000 clients in five years, thereby exceeding its own targets. The structures and procedures are good, and the quality of the portfolio strong. The project has therefore achieved its first objective with regard to reducing the impact of poverty in the two pilot locations. It has not achieved its second objective which was

*...to develop an effective and viable system of microcredit delivery for use not only by the two selected microfinance institutions but by others as well during or after the pilot phase.*

The system still needs support in order to be fully integrated into the Micro Bankers Trust, leave alone other microfinance institutions.

For a pilot project like the Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project, achieving its institutionalization objective must be based on two



factors: the recognition that microfinance is the lowest layer of the financial sector, serving those who are non-bankable according to commercial banking criteria; and the continued application of sound financial principles. This is fully understood by the international and national UNVs in the Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project. Only with financial and institutional sustainability will microfinance be able to go beyond small donor-supported projects and reach out to the millions of potential clients that need these services. This is an ambitious goal, and one that was not fully understood by those who initiated and financed the project.

The work of the SPU is distinctly upstream and its effectiveness is not as easy to determine, certainly not in terms of empirically documented reduction of poverty. Some activities were included in the CPAP workplan and have been achieved. However, work on the MDGs, the HDRs, the UNDAF etc. represents, among Zambians, a promotion of core UN values, thereby adding to the UN's contribution to global public goods.

Nonetheless, other strategic gaps remain, such as, for example, in the statistical analysis capacity of the CSO, an area where the SPU has also tried to help. The support to data improvement and statistical analysis capacity was provided by UNDP, led by the SPU, as an *ad hoc* exercise, on demand, and in furtherance of an SPU-commissioned study, which first discovered the CSO data weakness. Generally, support to national data production and analysis capacity falls outside the purview and capacity of any single UN agency, as various agencies provide such support, as needed, to data activities related to their mandates (i.e. the United Nations Population Fund to census activities and the Demographic and Health Surveys, and the United Nations Children's Fund to education statistics, etc). Strengthening the CSO data production activities through a joint UN support programme could be considered a priority, as national statistics form the

basis of development programmes. More robust data on HIV prevalence, poverty and income distribution would be useful.

## EFFICIENCY

The Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project has spent USD 1 million to reach its present stage—serving 5,000 women. Given the high repayment rate, much of this is loan capital that is being recycled. The project has now reached operational self-sufficiency in the two pilot sites (a target that was projected to be reached within 2 years). Nonetheless, if its targets were over-ambitious, the Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project's progress in and of itself has been quite efficient.

This is, to a large extent, due to the very low-key and cost-conscious approach that has been applied—an approach which is essential for the continued development of the programme. Higher costs can only be passed on to clients in the form of increased interest rates. Thirty percent interest per annum is probably quite reasonable for microfinance in Zambia,<sup>35</sup> and clients do come forward to take it, but the rate should not go much higher than that. Implementation efficiency is also due to the strong experience brought by the Bangladeshi UNVs from Grameen Bank, as well as to the technical support received from the Grameen Trust. The UNVs have also contributed with enthusiasm to making the project efficient.

The work of the SPU appears to have been carried out efficiently, with a small core staff and the use of partners and consultants for specific jobs.

## SUSTAINABILITY

The Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project was conceived as an example of South-South cooperation by UNDP, and there is little doubt that the Grameen approach is suitable to

---

<sup>35</sup> The alternative for most people being private informal lending which, in Zambia, often carries an interest rate of 100 percent on the amount—not per annum, but in all, often just until the end of the month.

Zambian conditions. However, it fell outside the other practice areas of the UNDP Country Office and relied entirely on the International UNV's experience for day-to-day technical guidance. The project design was over-ambitious and the project had to be extended twice.

The Micro Bankers Trust is not ready to assume full ownership and extend the process further. Internal capacity development has been insufficient and needs urgent attention. The Micro Bankers Trust is still an immature microfinance institution and is likely to need support for another five years. The Grameen Trust is prepared to continue supporting technically from a distance, but additional capital is also needed.

The NUNVs have now become Micro Bankers Trust staff, thereby ensuring that their capacities, obtained by working on the project, are being retained for the time being. However, the wider microfinance market in Zambia is competitive, and includes heavily subsidized microfinance institutions providing services at lower interest rates, and offering higher salaries to their staff. The Micro Bankers Trust must ensure that it is able to offer its staff members comparable conditions, lest they decide to go in search of greener pastures.

The nature of the SPUs' work is such that sustainability issues mostly relate to the maintenance of any capacities SPUs have helped generate. This depends to a large extent on the partner institution's ability to retain staff and make use of new systems. SPU support to capacity building in ministries is reported to have resulted in improved monitoring and evaluation by the MFNP.

#### 4.6 OTHER CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

Governance, HIV/AIDS, gender and environment have been considered as cross-cutting

issues in the respective sections above. The ADR includes the assessment of other cross-cutting issues, namely:

- Institutional capacity development
- South-South cooperation
- National ownership

#### INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT

*Both the programmatic and coordination roles of UNDP should be demand-driven, and guided by national ownership and impartiality. At the country level, its approach to development issues is one of support to capacity development, not of political conditionality.<sup>36</sup>*

Capacity development as a concept is delusive.

*We refer to 'competencies' when we focus on the energy, skills, behaviours, motivations, influence and abilities of individuals. We use the term 'capabilities' to refer to a broad range of collective skills that can be both technical and logistical or 'harder' (e.g. policy analysis, financial management) and generative, or 'softer' (e.g. the ability to earn legitimacy, to adapt). Finally, we use the term 'capacity' to refer to the overall ability of a system to create value.<sup>37</sup>*

Capacity development (or capacity building) has, in the past, focused much on the development of competencies in individuals to perform specific functions that were needed in their institutions, thereby adding to their collective capabilities. Capacity training was usually effected through various kinds of training. This focus was justified in the sense that institutions consist of the people working in it. However, the approach did not necessarily enable these institutions to change themselves, or to create the 'value' mentioned above. Hence the focus in the UN system has moved towards the institution itself rather than the individual. But do UN agencies themselves have the capacity to facilitate change and capacity development in other institutions? Is new

<sup>36</sup> UNDP Strategic Plan 2008 to 2011, III.A. United Nations values for development, paragraph 23.

<sup>37</sup> Peter Morgan: 'The Concept of Capacity,' European Centre for Development Policy Management, May 2006.

capacity being generated, and if so, how can we measure it? UNDP is grappling with these questions at both corporate and country levels, and strong, operational indicators for the creation of new capacity are, so far, generally absent in the planning documents.

The following factors are proposed for the assessment. Successful development of institutional capacity by UNDP would seem to depend on some, or all, of the following factors:

- Identification of strategic capacity or capability gaps that are constraints to reaching specified development objectives
- Identification of the most relevant partner institution for capacity and capability development to close the gaps
- Agreement with the analysis and preparedness by the institution's management to receive assistance in developing the identified capacities and capabilities
- Development of the approach and reaching mutual agreement about it
- The UNDP's internal and external capacity to provide the required support
- Strong leadership by the institution's management
- Timely implementation of the capacity development activities
- Absence of negative external interventions, pressure or passivity
- Relative stability in terms of restructuring and personnel transfers
- Ability to maintain the capacity over a certain period of time, e.g. 3 to 5 years.

All UNDP activities contain elements of capacity development, which can be short-term interventions or long-term commitments. Typical activities are the provision of technical assistance personnel, short-term consultancy support, workshops, fellowships, study tours and the provision of equipment such as transport and ICT.

In the HIV/AIDS practice area, UNDP has played a key role in the development of the National Aids Council. Involvement is long-term and has enabled the National Aids Council to reach out to the provinces and districts, thereby fulfilling an important part of its mandate. With the cooperation of several partners, UNDP has set up functional units (District AIDS Task Forces and District AIDS Coordinators) in all districts, equipped with the necessary means to effectively interact with local communities. The National Aids Council was the obvious partner institution, and the setup of UNDP within the framework of the Joint UN Team on AIDS has ensured that most of the success criteria mentioned above were fulfilled. As such, and in spite of remaining issues on sustainability, this may be seen as a model in capacity development.

The Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project is a case where South-South capacity transfer based on solid experience from Bangladesh has created new capacity at the local level—systems are in place, principles developed, etc. Longer-term institutional development, however, was not sufficiently taken into consideration at the planning stage, and serious sustainability issues remain.

The SPU's long-term cooperation with the MFNP in particular has contributed to enhancing the capacity of the Planning Division in policy analysis, monitoring and evaluation and other areas.

The many efforts towards developing competencies, capabilities and capacities in partner institutions have varied in approach and in degree of success. Benefits of the widespread use of short workshop-type training, often as retreats, are questionable, being either too short and *ad hoc*, and often not falling within any overall strategy. What stands out is the apparent lack of an overall approach to capacity development. This is problematic, not least with the great emphasis accorded by all stakeholders to this complicated mode of assistance. Guidance provided from UNDP RBA and the Regional Service Centre in this area seems to have been quite limited.

## **SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION**

Few cases of South-South cooperation were among the evaluated activities. The Microfinance and Poverty Reduction Project is the most obvious one, transferring a tested approach to micro-financing from Bangladesh to Zambia. The Sustainable Renewable Energy Project came from India via UNDP but was transferred to UNIDO. In both cases the technologies and approaches seemed appropriate for Zambia.

South-South cooperation is taking place on a large scale in Zambia but does not appear in the statistics on official development assistance of the Organization for Economic Cooperation's Development Assistance Committee. Cooperation with China goes back to railway and roads construction in the 1960s and has expanded greatly in recent years. India, Brazil, Egypt and other Southern countries have also increased their investments. It was the initial intention that the ADR would attempt to incorporate the views of these countries on the role of UNDP. However, the Chinese Embassy was not available to meet with the ADR team, and an interview with the Indian High Commission did not produce useful information in this respect.

The Southern countries do not see their cooperation with Zambia as development assistance but rather as broader arrangements of mutual interest. They function according to their own agreements with the GRZ and generally do not participate in activities within the CPG setup. The linkages are directly bilateral and UNDP does not play a role in forging them.

## **NATIONAL OWNERSHIP**

National ownership and leadership are cornerstones of UNDP's development policy. Over the period under review, UNDP Zambia has had a close relationship with the GRZ and responded to many requests from government departments.

The UNDAF/CPD processes, synchronized with the national development plans, have ensured a high degree of coordination.

However, the relationship is sometimes complicated. Some government departments are satisfied with UNDP taking the initiative and do not claim much ownership by themselves. In other cases involving situations where government action is not forthcoming, although clearly needed if objectives are to be met, UNDP holds back in order not to assume the lead and be viewed as pushing excessively. Several cases of this kind have been found in the governance and environment sectors. There is a frequent trade-off between the national ownership and leadership on the one hand, and the achievement of development results on the other. It is a difficult balance to find given the daily reality of politics and vested interests.

In addition, in a democratic society, national ownership is not synonymous with government ownership. As regards civil society, UNDP has collaborated with a number of NGOs and CSOs, often by using them as implementers of projects. As in any democratic society, the *raison d'être* of many CSOs is to keep politicians to their promises and fight against the misuse of power by public authorities. This naturally often brings CSOs in to conflict with those in power. Several CSOs interviewed in the present evaluation were of the view that the UNDP could and should work more closely and directly with them to further the democratic governance agenda, rather than always appear to be taking the GRZ's view.

As an intergovernmental organization, it is understandable if UNDP tends to see government as its primary counterpart. However, in recent years a more inclusive focus has developed in the UN system towards civil society, the private sector and other important stakeholders. More could be done by UNDP Zambia to widen its scope accordingly.

## CHAPTER 5

# UNDP'S STRATEGIC POSITIONING

### 5.1 MANAGEMENT, PLANNING, MONITORING & EVALUATION

The distribution of financial and human resources among practice areas, as well as the national execution and direct execution implementation modalities, has been described in section 3 above.

Financial management now appears satisfactory, and UN audit reports recorded that improvements had taken place in the early part of the CPD/CPAP period.

However, delays in payments and delivery of equipment are common complaints by implementing partners, and overall delivery rates vary in most cases between 65 and 75 percent of the budgeted amounts. Some delays can have serious negative impacts on projects. Some but not all delays are related to procurement; others are caused by factors within the GRZ—inter-ministerial disagreements, political events and inertia. Other delays result from protracted discussions among GRZ, CPs and other partners (e.g., in the gender programme, where discussions dragged on for nearly six months). Procurement delays also stem from complicated systems and procedures that are not well understood by implementing partners. Many small projects are very demanding on the capacity of the Operations Unit.

On the programming side, the CPAP is a framework upon which annual workplans are prepared. Workplans for 2007 and 2008 were reviewed and appear to spell out expected outcomes in reasonable detail. Workplans are supposed to be based on an annual CPAP review; yet there was no

evidence that this annual consolidated review had taken place for 2007 and 2008. However, a CPAP mid-term review was conducted instead.

Monitoring of activities was found to be incomplete and delayed. In recognition of this, Country Office management had initiated the recruitment of a Monitoring and Evaluation Officer.<sup>38</sup>

Most evaluated projects had undergone mid-term reviews and/or evaluations. Reports were generally available and useful to the ADR Team.

Cooperation between the Programmes and Operations Unit is good, with each participating in the other's meetings on a regular basis, thereby ensuring exchange of information and integration at the operational level. In 2008, a Country Office Management Team structure (made up of Policy and Programme Unit heads, the Country Director, Deputy Country Director—Programmes, and Deputy Country Director—Operations and, recently, the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer) was established, which has since become the fortnightly information-sharing and country-level decision-making forum on all policy and programme activities related to the Country Office.

### 5.2 STRATEGIC RELEVANCE OF UNDP PRACTICE AREAS AND NON-PROJECT ACTIVITIES

Considerable progress towards harmonization of development cooperation has taken place in the period under review. This is the case within the wider environment in the form of the JASZ, as well as within UN structures such as the

---

<sup>38</sup> Recruitment was concluded after the ADR mission and the new staff member joined the Country Office.

UNDAF, CCF, CPD, CPAP, etc., which have increasingly been synchronized with the national planning instruments, the PRSP and the FNDP. As most of these planning instruments are based on broad-based consultations, there is a relatively high level of agreement among stakeholders about what the national challenges are, and the various responses to them have been formulated accordingly.

All the three (later four) UNDP practice areas have responded to serious development challenges and as such, they are strategically relevant. Interventions by the Joint Team on AIDS addressed important capacity and implementation issues that needed attention. In the environment sector, UNDP had the opportunity to attract important funding support from the GEF, thereby leveraging the implementation of the GRZ's strategies. With the dramatic loss of forest coverage, the inclusion of sustainable energy was another obvious area of high importance—however, one that never occupied much space in the UNDP portfolio. The project on renewable energy sources reviewed earlier in this report was channelled from UNDP to UNIDO, which begs the question, why did UNDP choose to include it in the CPAP in the first place, rather than leave it elsewhere in the UNCT where more relevant expertise was available, in this case UNIDO?

The Country Office has been able to draw upon UNDP's corporate experience, capacity and policies, as well as its expertise in the Regional Service Centre in Johannesburg and the GEF Team in Pretoria. However, overall, assistance from the Regional Service Centre has not been recognized for its strength in the area of governance, the GEF Team has provided useful support to the environment, and the Joint AIDS Team has been self-reliant.

Clearly, important strategic issues are at stake. Does UNDP also have the resources to match the challenges and add value beyond what other stakeholders do? This discussion takes place at regular intervals, especially when new plans

are being prepared. It asks that hard choices be made and optimistic compromises avoided. Related to this is UNDP's corporate ambition to be regarded as a 'knowledge organization' with access to cutting-edge research capacity that can be drawn upon in the service of development at the country level. Most stakeholders consulted on this issue during the ADR saw UNDP more as a conventional donor than as a source of *avant-garde* knowledge. In instances where such knowledge was required, other organizations were more often approached.

While UNDP continued to support the GRZ through many development processes, it is not clear that it positioned itself in a strategic manner contributing to development results. The governance practice area, for instance, had many projects which were not coordinated in the form of a programme but rather supported on the basis of government requests. In the case of the decentralization process which UNDP supported for many years, UNDP was well positioned to engage policy-makers strategically, thereby ensuring that the implementation process would not come to a halt in the face of inertia and resistance to change. Stakeholders interviewed during the ADR were disappointed, however, feeling that UNDP took a back seat instead of pursuing the opportunity to make the GRZ accountable to its commitment on the devolution of power to the local structure of governance. This is a missed opportunity for UNDP to provide both policy guidance and the global technical expertise that it possesses.

Currently, UNDP support is spread too thin to make substantive and sustainable contributions to development results. In principle, UNDP is well placed to play a strategic role through its selected practice areas, but more coordination and the readiness to engage actively and on a continuing basis with partners—and especially with the GRZ—on strategic issues would improve prospects for the achievement of development results. More should also have been done in the planning stages to focus on areas with sufficient in-house resources, and to concentrate on fewer practice

areas. Ultimately, greater willingness to invest in capacity allowing UNDP to take a dynamic leadership role in the coordination mechanism would increase its strategic relevance.

### 5.3 RESPONSIVENESS TO CHANGES

There is a high degree of continuity in UNDP's work throughout the period under review. In fact, UNDP's involvement in HIV/AIDS, governance and the environment dates from the 1990s.

UNDP has been responsive to several changes that have arisen in the partnership with the GRZ and other implementing partners. In its support to the electoral process, for instance, UNDP was able to mobilize resources with five cooperating partners at very short notice for the emergency October 2008 elections following the death of the then President. Though challenges were met through long and bureaucratic procurement procedures, UNDP was able to support the Electoral Commission with project coordination which contributed to timely holding of elections.

Several civil society stakeholders affirmed that UNDP responded once they requested support. The women's organizations however stressed the need for UNDP to design a comprehensive programme on their behalf focusing on evidence-based advocacy rather than implementing short interventions without sustainable plans.

Another example of UNDP's responsiveness to change occurred when the GRZ mainstreamed gender in the FNDP (2006 to 2010) and prioritized gender mainstreaming interventions for socioeconomic empowerment of women. The Joint Gender Support Programme was then developed, taking into account the FNDP. UNDP, in collaboration with other cooperating partners, provides programme support and ensures coordination.

UNDP's ability to respond to new demands or to changes in the development situation obviously depends on the resources that are available in terms of knowledge, funding and human capacity. The staffing of the Country Office has remained at basically the same levels throughout the period under review (see Table 9 above): The number of local professionals has remained at 11 throughout; international professionals have consistently numbered 4 to 5; only support staff has increased slightly. In terms of staffing the Country Office, the 2007 to 2010 CPD stated the following:

*The Government and UNDP acknowledge that the Country Office will have to adjust the staff profile, management structure, and substantive content of its work to provide the quality support that Zambia needs in the 'new aid architecture.'*

The management structure has been adjusted and strengthened by the appointment of a Country Director in 2008. This facilitates distinguishing the UNRC's UN Coordination role from the day-to-day management of UNDP, which largely falls on the Country Director. Otherwise, no major adjustments to the staff profile and substantive content of UNDP's work can so far be noted in this period.

### 5.4 CONTRIBUTION TO UN VALUES

As part of the UN system, UNDP has a special responsibility to use internationally agreed-upon norms and standards as the foundation of its work, and to help governments effectively ratify and implement the standards they have agreed to in the various UN fora.

Among these, UNDP is committed to promoting the realization of human rights, as set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the UN Charter. UNDP is also assigned to be the champion of the MDGs. UNDP has successfully invested in increasing the public's awareness of MDGs, as well as helping to operationalize them in various development programmes. It has

also increased awareness of the human development paradigm through successful advocacy of the subject and, since 2007, by introducing a human development course at the undergraduate level into the curriculum of the University of Zambia.

In day-to-day work within the practice areas, UN standards are considered infrequently used as operational tools for the strategic achievement of development results. While international conventions and resolutions are referred to in the planning documentation, they are used less in policy dialogue with the GRZ.

An example of this is gender equality, which is the third of the eight MDGs, and one which UNDP views as both a means and an end to achieving all the goals. Gender equality has intrinsic development value, but will also contribute to achieving the other MDGs. Conventions such as the CEDAW represent potentially strong instruments in the policy dialogue. UNDP is expected to play a lead role in advocating key policy issues in relation to the priority areas of support, and the relevant conventions could provide a base for discussion. Partners championing the 'gender agenda' were convinced that UNDP could have represented them better in advocating for policy changes.

The newly passed NGO Act was cited as a case where UNDP could have played a role in the promotion of democratic governance, based on UN conventions. The resulting Act was heavily criticized by NGOs, as they felt it limited their democratic rights. Finally, the UNDP appeared to miss another opportunity to champion the inclusion of gender issues in the current discussions at the National Constitutional Conference. As one of the providers of National Constitutional Conference funding, UNDP would have been in a position to advocate for gender mainstreaming in the National Constitutional Conference, including the possibility of placing gender experts in the whole process, thereby providing the Commission with technical support on gender issues. Some partners questioned the credibility

of UNDP as custodian of UN conventions, and challenged the Programme to make conscious decisions as to its desired direction.

## 5.5 STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS

At the corporate level, the UNDP Strategic Plan 2008 to 2011 mentions the following types of UNDP partnerships:

- Partnerships that can leverage UNDP assistance
- Partnerships within the UN system
- Partnerships with non-governmental actors, in particular civil society and the private sector
- Partnerships within the wider development environment in the country.

As mentioned in 2.4 above, following the Rome Declaration on Harmonization in 2003 and the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness in 2005, Zambia embarked on a process of harmonizing and aligning aid modalities to national development priorities. The JASZ, which is the cooperating partners' strategy for supporting the FNDP, provides the framework in which development assistance is now coordinated. While not considering itself a donor, UNDP participates in the SAG framework as well as in the CPG sectoral groups. UNDP is the lead cooperating partner in the gender group and co-lead in the governance and environmental groups.

While the donors have made strong efforts to concentrate and harmonize their assistance, some feel that the cooperation mechanism within the SAGs is not working well. Some SAGs rarely meet and many meetings are inconclusive and more for exchange of information than for decision-making, something that is reflected in the relatively junior level of attendants. A similar picture emerged from the CPG sector groups where UNDP was lead or co-lead. Partners maintained that these meetings were not productive and that valuable time was spent debating process issues rather than in discussing those of strategic concern.



It should be emphasized that the general view of UNDP by many cooperating partners is a positive one. They recognize the role that the UN agencies can play and want them to assume a strong position in the JASZ framework. This is especially the case in sectors where UNDP is lead or co-lead, as these are seen as critical development drivers. This points to the question of leadership within UNDP's positioning, both within and outside the JASZ sectors.

Leadership in the sector groups can, in principle, take on three forms. Leaders can be:

- Convenors, calling meetings and letting the participants set the agenda
- Coordinators, forging compromises and facilitating processes
- Dynamic leaders, taking initiatives in consultation with the group, delegating tasks, synthesizing results and engaging effectively with the GRZ on the implementation of agreed-upon interventions.

Partners tend to see UNDP as the convenor, but would prefer to see UNDP as the dynamic leader instead. They think UNDP has a unique position in this regard due to its special relationship with the GRZ, and they see important opportunities as being missed. However, for a dynamic leader to be effective, other members of a sector group must also be prepared to undertake specific tasks, as agreed to by the group.

UNDP for its part prefers to see itself as the honest broker devoid of any political agendas beyond those laid down in the UN values and conventions. In order to be able to play that role, UNDP is cautious as to how far it can go in pursuing political or delicate matters, lest it risk ruining its good relationship with the GRZ and in so doing, lose any potential influence.

The objectives of the UN system and the cooperating partners are identical, as formulated in the MDGs and in the host of UN conventions supporting human development and human rights, to which all donors and aid recipient countries subscribe. In the practical application, however,

there are different approaches towards achieving those objectives, with political controversies often coming into play.

Within the Multilateral Organizations Performance Assessment Network mechanism, the bilateral cooperating partners perform regular evaluations of UN agencies at the country level. The 2008 Multilateral Organizations Performance Assessment Network survey of ten countries (which included UNDP Zambia) issued an overall positive assessment, realizing the different modes of operation at play among the multilateral and bilateral agencies. Nonetheless, the ADR still noted a tendency among some cooperating partners to view UNDP in the same way as other cooperating partners, rather than as an inter-governmental organization of which all donor and recipient countries are members. The national execution modality was not well understood. This was expressed, for example, through donor expectations for UNDP to contribute to harmonization and joint activities through the use of local administrative systems, rather than through self-implementation of projects. While this would be in the spirit of the Paris Declaration, for a variety of reasons such a course of action is less suitable for agencies such as UNDP than for bilateral donors. The strength of the UN system does not lie in contributing significant financial resources, but rather in areas of strategic importance where its international experience can add value. The best service the UN agencies can bring to a member state may very well be through its continuous campaigning on behalf of UN values. To be effective, this focus will undoubtedly involve taking positions that are sometimes unpopular with partners both inside and outside the government.

UNDP partnership with NGOs and CBOs were found to be weak due to the major focus on government programmes. Zambia has a vibrant civil society movement which, if well supported, could contribute effectively to the achievement of development results. Civil society partners, particularly those in the governance and gender sector, recommended development of a specific partnership strategy to address critical emerging

issues, in particular with regard to supporting the realization of the devolution of powers to the local governance structures.

## 5.6 CONTRIBUTION TO UN COORDINATION

The UNCT is the coordinating mechanism for all the resident UN agencies in Zambia, and is headed by the UNRC who reports to the UN Secretary General through the UNDP Administrator, in the latter's capacity as chairperson of the United Nations Development Group. The Office of the UNRC provides support to the programme aspects of UN cooperation, with a primary focus on facilitating collaborative programming and implementation of the UN programme for reform. Steps have been taken towards the implementation of UN reform, including bringing most of the agencies together in the UN House. The UNRC participates in different structures representing the UN as a whole and speaks publicly on behalf of the UNCT.

However, the number of coordinated UN activities is so far relatively small. The Joint Team on AIDS is the best example of pooling UN resources for a common purpose and in a common building—however, in some cases, a UN agency has been known to act on its own and not as part of the Joint Team. Joint projects are unusual, partly due to the agencies' different accountability systems, which makes pooling of financial resources in joint budgets virtually impossible. In addition, particularly as some UN agencies have a very small country presence, internal competition over donor resources can work against UN reform and harmonization.

The UNRC is also UNDP Resident Representative and the management of the UNRC's Office is anchored in UNDP. As part of the UN reform process, a number of new posts of UNDP Country Directors is being established in many countries, and the Country Director post was introduced in Zambia in 2008. This will facilitate the 'firewall' that should exist between

the Office of the UNRC, which bears responsibilities for the whole system, and the UNDP, one of several UN agencies with its own management.

In the corporate UNDP Strategic Plan 2008 to 2011, the UNDP is tasked with strengthening its role in promoting a more effective, efficient and coherent UN system at the country level. While overall coordination is ensured through the UNRC, there is considerable scope for speeding up the progress towards systemic coherence. The establishment of the Joint Gender Support Programme was a missed opportunity for pooling UN-agency resources, thereby producing a stronger response.

Many cooperating partners express that they welcome UN reform and believe that UNDP would appear stronger if more clearly based upon a joint UN mandate and agenda.

The CPAP states the following about UNDP and UN positioning (para. 29):

*The country office, in response to the lessons learnt, will seek to restructure itself to be able to provide support relevant under the terms of the FNDP and JASZ. In so doing, it will tap into resources available within headquarter-based units, the regional service centre and other elements of the UNDP group. The rapid pace of change in the way aid is being managed in Zambia poses considerable challenges to the current effectiveness of all cooperating partners, but promises tremendous opportunity for the United Nations country team, including UNDP, to add value if repositioning is successfully undertaken.*

The repositioning mentioned is therefore part of the current UNDP country programme. However, so far, progress in this direction has been quite modest and should be accelerated if results are to be achieved before the conclusion of the CPD/CPAP by December 2010. The preparation of the new UNDAF and CPD, in which UNDP plays a central role, offers the best occasion to effectively address these issues and adapt the structures to the new aid architecture in Zambia, as well as to the UN reform process.

## CHAPTER 6

# CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter synthesizes the analysis of the foregoing chapters and provides the recommendations of the ADR Team.

### 6.1 DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

Overall, UNDP Zambia has provided important contributions to meet the development challenges that the country is facing. Good progress has been made in the fight against HIV/AIDS as a major threat to economic, social and human development. Some progress is also notable in the field of democratic governance, although slower than expected. Innovative approaches have been introduced in the area of energy and environment. Central to it all, the MDGs have been integrated into Zambian monitoring and evaluation systems and knowledge about them is widespread. In many cases where the expected results have not been met, this has been due to factors outside UNDP's control. With this proviso, UNDP has in general been effective in its contributions to development in Zambia.

#### SELECTION OF PRACTICE AREAS

The selection of practice areas has been relevant in relation to national development challenges and UN priorities, and it has been tempting for UNDP to take them on. In addition, cooperation within the same areas has a long history. However, the UNDP has not always had the capacity to efficiently provide the robust, professional responses necessary to handle complicated and deep-rooted problems, such as, for example, gender equality. In attempting to do so, UNDP has overstretched itself and spread its resources too thinly, resulting in limited impact. Insufficient attention has been accorded to the repositioning and adaptation to new challenges that is mentioned in the current CPD.

#### HIGH VOLUME OF SMALL PROJECTS

The pressure on UNDP capacity relates partly to the high volume of small projects. In order to avoid frequent long delays in release of funds and delivery of goods, and to have more impact and value, it will be important to concentrate resources in a few large projects.

On the other hand, where UNDP has concentrated its resources on one initiative, such as its support to the battle against HIV/AIDS, it has been very efficient, not least due to the combined efforts of the Joint UN AIDS Team and the operational modalities in interaction with the National Aids Council. Good progress is being made towards the outcome of a decentralized, multi-sectoral and community-based response, reaching out to all districts.

#### GOVERNANCE SECTOR

UNDP's interventions in the governance sector have included many projects, some of which are very small in terms of financing, while others, such as the elections programme, are large and demanding in operational terms. To justify its efforts, UNDP might consider concentrating on areas where it has performed well, such as in the human rights area. All efforts of the governance team at UNDP could be invested in strengthening the capacity of a Human Rights Commission to assume national coverage, as well as in directly supporting civil society in playing the role of watchdog for democratic development. There seems to be little need for UNDP to manage the elections project, as capable local institutions are in place that could undertake this job (the 2001 elections basket was managed by a consortium of 17 NGOs). Handing off the management of the elections project would relieve UNDP of a huge operational task, thereby allowing for more upstream, policy-oriented work.

## **GENDER EQUALITY**

UNDP's implementation of gender equality as a crosscutting issue within its main practice areas has not been effective. The planning and implementation processes lacked a systematic framework in which to carry out gender analysis which is cardinal to the monitoring of progress. Considering the importance attached to gender in programming, and in particular to UNDP's prominent role through benchmarking progress towards the MDGs, UNDP should probably continue implementing gender as a crosscutting issue. However, for implementation to yield tangible results, UNDP needs to invest in building internal capacities across all sectors, thereby ensuring the attainment of expertise in specific areas of gender.

## **ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT**

UNDP is an important player in this practice area, which otherwise does not have widespread support from cooperating partners. UNDP should continue to work with the GEF in promoting the environment agenda in Zambia. However, the environment and energy portfolio is too diverse and has more projects than the Country Office has capacity to competently handle. This has contributed to inefficient implementation of projects that, in all other respects, appear to be soundly formulated. Trimming back the scope of UNDP's work in this area is necessary to increase efficiency and the prospect of attaining development outcomes. On this basis UNDP should consider concentrating its efforts in two areas, namely natural resources management and climate change.

The use of UNVs in the UNDP country programme has been extremely high. International UNVs and (on a large scale) NUNVs have made significant contributions to the HIV/AIDS and microfinance programmes. However, sustainability issues have been noted, as some NUNVs have been working in relative isolation from their colleagues in partner institutions. There are also outstanding issues with regard to the

prospect of retaining these individuals in their jobs under other, possibly less competitive conditions. The use of NUNVs on such a large scale can be viewed as an experiment from which lessons should be drawn for future use, and a critical assessment developed, addressing the feasibility of the 'voluntarism' concept in the Zambian context. Based on the experience of using NUNVs for mainstreaming HIV/AIDS in the line ministries, something similar might be considered for internal mainstreaming of gender equality within the UNDP Country Office, and perhaps, also within the wider UNCT.

## **6.2 UNDP POSITIONING**

UNDP is appreciated as a special partner by the GRZ. The extent to which the GRZ departments effectively take ownership and leadership of UNDP-assisted activities varies. As a cooperating partner, UNDP itself has assumed full or partial leadership in three of the CPG sectoral groups, namely gender, governance and environment. Weaknesses that tend to make the SAG and the CPG sector groups less effective have been recorded above, and leadership is found wanting in several sectors. Sectors where UNDP functions as lead or co-lead are among those in which more progress had been anticipated. UNDP leadership could be stronger if limited to sectors where UNDP can effectively engage in sector policy dialogue with GRZ in a dynamic manner, and coordinate other group members towards active participation in the work.

In spite of the many previous joint strategies and planning frameworks, progress towards UN reform is very slow, and preparations for a new UNDAF and CPD should be viewed as an opportunity to speed up the process. Joint projects are a next step in that direction, as they offer new occasions for cooperation among UN agencies without a loss of comparative advantages or a movement away from their specialized mandates. A joint funding mechanism in the form of a One-UN Fund administered by the UNRC, to which bilateral and multilateral cooperating partners (programmes or projects) could contribute

for agreed-upon purposes, would assist the process. A mechanism of this kind could include global funds such as the AIDS Fund and the GEF. The UNRC would then negotiate with agencies in the UNCT regarding division of responsibilities in accordance with their specialized competencies, and about conditions for their compensation.

In spite of a UNDP policy directive dating from 1999 to increasingly move towards upstream support, the balance remains in favour of operational activities. According to GRZ sources and cooperating partners interviewed during the ADR, UNDP Zambia presently does not have the resources to become a preferred adviser in particular sectors on a par with, for example, the World Bank. Strengthening the Country Office's internal capacity would be required for UNDP to effectively assume such a role.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**In line with the CPD and CPAP, UNDP should concentrate its resources on fewer areas and adapt its staffing to better match the changing development cooperation architecture in Zambia. UNDP should apply a more consequent sector orientation in its planning and concentrate on fewer areas within each sector.** The current sectors are relevant to national needs, but a better focus within each thematic area could contribute to higher efficiency and impact. It is further recommended that UNDP continue its support to combat HIV/AIDS within the Joint AIDS Team: activities within the democratic governance sector should focus on human rights and continued capacity development of the Electoral Commission; activities in the energy and environment sector should concentrate on natural resource management and climate change; and the work in gender should be placed within a broader UN framework.

**UNDP should build on demonstrated comparative advantages, but adapt its staff resources closely to the selected sectors and sub-sectors. It should maximize internal synergies within**

**the Country Office.** Programme units should draw upon in-house resources, such as macro-economic experience in SPUs, to support their strategic work. Cross-cutting issues such as gender and HIV/AIDS should be mainstreamed by placing personnel dedicated to this purpose within each thematic area. The use of NUNVs in these positions should be considered.

**UNDP should focus on the upstream side of sector development.** UNDP should utilize its access to high-level expertise for sector policy analysis to guide interventions by GRZ and other partners. UNDP should formulate a concise capacity development strategy for the Country Office, probably with the assistance of the RBA and the regional team. UNDP should further develop strategies for the achievement of sustainability in the various sectors, not limited to activities managed by UNDP, but looking at ways in which development results can be sustained over time.

**UNDP should effectively support the aid coordination arrangements, in particular the JASZ, and provide leadership that effectively engages all partners in areas where UNDP has a clear and demonstrated advantage.** UNDP should only accept leadership in sectoral groups where it can use its special relationship with GRZ to promote the processes that would positively influence the achievement of agreed-upon results. This would especially apply to the democratic governance sector, where UNDP may be better placed than other cooperating partners to engage in a frank policy dialogue based on UN norms and conventions. Leadership in a sector should include efforts to ensure that all members of the group actively participate towards the achievement of common objectives.

**UNDP should take the initiative towards increased integration and collaboration within the UNCT. It is especially recommended that UNDP, in close cooperation with other UN agencies, prepare proposals for a One-UN Fund to be established under the Office of the UNRC. The purpose of the Fund should be**

**to pool the financial and technical resources of UN agencies, thereby providing more effective responses to development challenges in Zambia. UNDP should take the lead in promoting this in the preparation of the new UNDAF and Country Programme.** The One-UN Fund will function as the common machinery facilitating joint projects involving several UN agencies with specific expertise, all of them working together on common tasks. This will go a long way towards harmonization and efficiency in UN responses. A joint resource mobilization strategy will be developed and donors will be encouraged to use the UN Fund when they want UN agencies to manage activities on their behalf.

**UNDP should work closer with stakeholders from Zambian civil society, not least with women's organizations in the human rights area, and in the areas of energy and environment.** Civil society organized in CSOs, NGOs or CBOs are important and legitimate partners in democratic and sustainable development, serving as watchdogs and channels of public opinion. UNDP should increase its engagement with civil society, and assist CSOs with policy and strategic analysis, advice and financial support. UN conventions and other UN instruments should form the basis of UNDP's collaboration with CSOs in the fields of gender equality, human rights and environmental sustainability.

**UNDP should strengthen its capacity in developing evaluable results frameworks, as well in the monitoring and evaluation of**

**development results within an outcomes-based approach.** UNDP should ensure that staffing capacity is available to establish effective monitoring and evaluation systems of UNDP project and non-project activities, and to develop indicators monitoring these against outcomes, as described in planning documents. In the next Country Programme, UNDP should further ensure the formulation of outcomes, outputs and indicators that are 'SMART' (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, time-bound) in order to make sound assessments possible. As part of its upstream support to monitoring development in Zambia, UNDP should consider preparing a proposal for a joint UN programme of support to CSO data production activities, for co-funding with cooperating partners. The support should focus on the relationships among economic growth, poverty and income distribution.

**UNDP should develop a systematic and operational approach to capacity development.** Drawing upon UNDP corporate research, the Country Office, jointly with other resident UN agencies, should develop a system for capacity strengthening at the institutional, organizational and human resource levels that is commensurate with results-based management and suited to Zambian conditions. The analysis should include the use of UNVs and other technical assistance personnel in sustainable ways. The system should include a plan for capacity development as an integral part of all project documents and workplans, and incorporate operational and measurable indicators of progress.

# TERMS OF REFERENCE

## ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT RESULTS IN ZAMBIA

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The Evaluation Office (EO) of the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) conducts country programme evaluations called Assessments of Development Results (ADRs) to capture and demonstrate evaluative evidence of UNDP's contributions to development results at the country level. ADRs are carried out within the overall provisions contained in the UNDP Evaluation Policy.<sup>1</sup> The overall goals of an ADR are to:

- Provide substantive support to the Administrator's accountability function in reporting to the Executive Board
- Support greater UNDP accountability to national stakeholders and partners in the programme country
- Serve as a means of quality assurance for UNDP interventions at the country level
- Contribute to learning at corporate, regional and country levels.

The EO plans to conduct an ADR in Zambia during 2009. The ADR will contribute to the development of a new country programme prepared by the Country Office (CO) and national stakeholders.

### 2. BACKGROUND

Zambia is a landlocked country situated in south-central Africa, bordered by the Democratic Republic of the Congo to the north, Tanzania to the north-east, Malawi to the east, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana, and Namibia to the south and Angola to the west. Zambia's total population numbers about 11.9 million, of which, according to the 2000 census, 35 percent live in the urban area.<sup>2</sup> As of 2006, Zambia ranked 163 out of 179 countries in UNDP's Human Development Index (HDI).<sup>3</sup>

In Zambia, UNDP works to advance human development; fight poverty and inequality; consolidate democratic governance at both national and local levels and promote environmentally smart development. UNDP is also fully engaged in the fight against HIV/AIDS and the promotion of gender equality. UNDP has supported Zambia's Transitional National Development Plan (TNDP) 2002 to 2005 and is committed to supporting its Fifth National Development Plan (FNDP) 2006 to 2011 and other national and local development visions, strategies and plans.

The completion of the 2007 to 2010 Country Programme Document (CPD) in Zambia presents an opportunity to evaluate UNDP contributions and shortcomings over the last programme cycles. These findings will be used as inputs to the upcoming CPD within the context of the UNDAF.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.undp.org/evaluation/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.zamstats.gov.zm/>

<sup>3</sup> [http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/country\\_fact\\_sheets/cty\\_fs\\_ZMB.html](http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/country_fact_sheets/cty_fs_ZMB.html)

### 3. OBJECTIVES, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The objectives of the Zambia ADR include:

- To provide an independent assessment of the UNDP's progress—or lack thereof—in achieving the outcomes envisaged in the UNDP programming documents. Where appropriate, the ADR will also highlight unexpected outcomes (positive or negative) and missed opportunities.
- To provide an analysis of how UNDP has positioned itself to add value in response to national needs and changes in the national development context.
- To present key findings, draw key lessons and provide a set of clear and forward-looking options, thereby enabling management to make adjustments to the current strategy and next Country Programme.

The ADR will review the UNDP experience in Zambia and its contribution to tackling social, economic and political challenges. The evaluation will cover the previous and ongoing country programmes (CCF 2002 to 2006 and CPD 2007 to 2010) Although it is likely that greater emphasis will be placed on more recent interventions (due to better availability of data, etc.) efforts will be made to examine the development and implementation of UNDP's programmes since the start of the period. The identification of existing evaluative evidence and potential constraints (lack of records, institutional memory, etc.) will occur during the initial Scoping Mission (see Section 4 for more details on the process).

Overall methodology will be consistent with the ADR Guidelines prepared by the EO (dated January 2009). The evaluation will undertake a comprehensive review of the UNDP programme portfolio and activities during the period under review, specifically examining UNDP's contribution to national development results. It will assess key results, specifically outcomes—anticipated and unanticipated, positive and negative, intentional and unintentional—and will cover

UNDP assistance funded from both core and non-core resources.

The evaluation has two main components: the analysis of development outcomes and the strategic positioning of UNDP.

#### DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

The assessment of development outcomes will entail a comprehensive review of the UNDP programme portfolio of previous and ongoing programme cycles. This includes an assessment of development results achieved and the contribution of UNDP in terms of key interventions; progress in achieving outcomes for the ongoing country programme; factors influencing results (UNDP's positioning and capacities, partnerships, policy support) and achievements/progress and UNDP contributions in practice areas (both in regard to policy and advocacy). The assessment will also include an analysis of the crosscutting linkages and their relationship to MDGs and UNDAF. An analysis of development results will identify challenges and strategies for future interventions.

While using the available information, the evaluation will document and analyze achievements against intended outcomes and linkages among activities, outputs and outcomes. The evaluation will qualify UNDP's contribution to outcomes with a reasonable degree of plausibility. A core set of criteria will be used to measure the design, management and implementation of UNDP's interventions in the country:

- **Effectiveness:** Did the UNDP programme accomplish its intended objectives and planned results? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the programme? What unexpected results did it yield? Should the Programme continue in its current direction or should its main tenets be reviewed for the new cycle?
- **Efficiency:** How well did UNDP use its resources (human and financial) in achieving its contributions? What can be done to



ensure a more efficient use of resources in the specific country/sub-regional context?

- **Sustainability:** Are UNDP's contributions sustainable? Are the development results achieved through UNDP contributions sustainable? Are the benefits of UNDP interventions sustained and owned by national stakeholders once interventions are completed?

It should be noted that special efforts will be made to examine UNDP's contribution to capacity development, knowledge management and gender equality.

## STRATEGIC POSITIONING

The evaluation will assess the strategic positioning of UNDP, both from the perspective of the organization and with regard to the development priorities in the country. This will entail an examination of UNDP's place and niche within the development and policy space in Zambia, and the strategies used to strengthen its position and contribution in the core practice areas; policy support and advocacy initiatives of the UNDP programme vis-à-vis those of other stakeholders, from the perspective of development results for the country; and a core set of criteria related to the strategic positioning of UNDP, including:

- **Relevance:** How relevant are UNDP programmes to the priority needs of the country? Did UNDP apply the right strategy within the specific political, economic and social context of the region? To what extent are long-term development needs likely to be met across the practice areas? What were critical gaps in UNDP's programming?
- **Responsiveness:** How did UNDP anticipate and respond to significant changes in the national development context? How did UNDP respond to national long-term development needs? What were the missed opportunities in UNDP programming?

- **Equity:** Did UNDP programmes and interventions lead to reduced vulnerabilities in the country? Did UNDP intervention in any way influence the existing inequities (exclusions/inclusions) in the society? Was the selection of geographical areas of intervention guided by need?
- **Partnerships:** How has UNDP leveraged partnerships within the UN system as well as with national civil society and private sector groups?

The evaluation will also consider the influence of administrative constraints affecting the programme, and specifically UNDP's contribution to development results (including issues related to the relevance and effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation system). If, during initial analysis, these are considered important, they will be included in the scope of the evaluation. Within the context of UN system partnerships and overall UN coordination, the specific issue of joint programme development will be highlighted.

## 4. EVALUATION METHODS AND APPROACHES

### DATA COLLECTION

In terms of data collection, the evaluation will use a multiple method approach that could include desk reviews, workshops, group and individual interviews at both headquarters (HQ) and the CO, project/field visits and surveys. The appropriate set of methods would vary depending on country context and the precise nature would be determined during the Scoping Mission and detailed in an Inception Report.<sup>4</sup>

### VALIDATION

The Evaluation Team will use a variety of methods to ensure that the data is valid, including triangulation. Precise methods of validation will be detailed in the Inception Report.

---

<sup>4</sup> The Scoping Mission and Inception Report are described in Section 5 on the evaluation process.

## STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION

A strong participatory approach, involving a broad range of stakeholders, will be applied. The identification of the stakeholders, including Government representatives of ministries/agencies, civil society organizations, private sector representatives, UN Agencies, multilateral organizations, bilateral donors and beneficiaries will take place. To facilitate this approach, all ADRs include a process of stakeholder-mapping that would include both UNDP's direct partners and stakeholders who do not work directly with UNDP.

## 5. EVALUATION PROCESS

The ADR process will follow ADR Guidelines, according to which the process can be divided into three phases, each including several steps.

### PHASE 1: PREPARATION

- **Desk review:** Initially carried out by the EO (identification, collection and mapping of relevant documentation and other data) and continued by the evaluation team. This will include general development-related documentation related to the specific country as well as a comprehensive overview of UNDP's programme over the period being examined.
- **Stakeholder mapping:** A basic mapping of stakeholders relevant to the evaluation carried out at the country level. These will include state and civil society stakeholders and go beyond UNDP's partners. The mapping exercise will also indicate relationships among different sets of stakeholders.
- **Inception meetings:** Interviews and discussions in UNDP HQ with the EO (process and methodology), the Regional Bureau for Africa (RBA) (context and county programme) as well as with other relevant bureaux (such as the Bureau for Development Policy, the Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery and others as appropriate, including UN missions).

- **Scoping mission:** A mission to Zambia in order to:
  - Identify and collect further documentation
  - Validate the mapping of the country programmes
  - Get key stakeholder perspectives on critical issues that should be examined
  - Address logistical issues related to the main mission, including timing
  - Identify the appropriate set of data collection and analysis methods
  - Address management issues related to the rest of the evaluation process, including division of labour among team members
  - Ensure the CO and key stakeholders understand the ADR objectives, methodology and process.

The EO Task Manager will accompany the Team Leader on the mission.

- **Inception report:** The development of a short inception report, including the final evaluation design and plan, background to the evaluation, key evaluation questions, detailed methodology, information sources, instruments used, plan for data collection, design for data analysis and format for reporting.

### PHASE 2: CONDUCTING THE ADR AND DRAFTING THE EVALUATION REPORT

- **Main ADR mission:** The mission of two (possibly three) weeks will be conducted by an independent Evaluation Team and focus on data collection and validation. An important part of this process will be an Entry Workshop where ADR objectives, methods and processes will be explained to stakeholders. The team will visit significant project/field sites as identified in the scoping mission.

- **Analysis and reporting:** The information collected will be analyzed in the draft ADR report by the Evaluation Team within three weeks after the departure of the team from the country.
- **Review:** The draft will be subject to:
  - Actual corrections and views on interpretation by key clients (including the UNDP CO, RBA and government)
  - A technical review by the EO
  - A review by external experts.
- **Audit trail:** The EO will prepare an audit trail to show how these comments were taken into account. The Team Leader, in close cooperation with the EO Task Manager, will finalize the ADR report based on these final reviews.
- **Stakeholder meeting:** A meeting with the key national stakeholders will be organized to present the results of the evaluation and examine strategies going forward. The meeting's main goals are to facilitate greater buy-in by national stakeholders, thereby encouraging them to apply the lessons and recommendations from the report, and to strengthen their national ownership of the development. The meeting also represents an important opportunity to demonstrate the necessary accountability of UNDP interventions at the country level. It may be necessary for the Evaluation Team Leader to incorporate some significant feedback into the final evaluation report.

### PHASE 3: FOLLOW-UP

- **Management response:** The UNDP Associate Administrator will request relevant units (in the case of ADR, the relevant CO and Regional Bureaux) to prepare a joint management response to the ADR. As a unit exercising oversight, the Regional Bureau will be responsible for monitoring and overseeing

the implementation of follow-up actions in the Evaluation Resource Centre.

- **Communication:** the ADR report and brief will be widely distributed in both hard copy and electronic versions. The evaluation report will be made available to the UNDP Executive Board by the time a new Country Programme Document is approved. It will be widely distributed in Zambia and at UNDP HQ. In addition, copies will be sent to evaluation outfits of other international organizations, as well as to evaluation societies and research institutions in the region. Furthermore, the evaluation report and management response will be published on the UNDP website<sup>5</sup> and made available to the public. Its availability will also be announced on UNDP and external networks.

## 6. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

### UNDP EO

The UNDP EO Task Manager will manage the evaluation and liaise with RBA, other concerned units at the headquarters level and the Zambia CO management. The EO will also contract with a Research Assistant to facilitate the initial desk review and a Programme Assistant to support logistical and administrative matters. The EO will meet all costs directly related to the conduct of the ADR. These will include costs related to participation of the Team Leader and international and national consultants, preliminary research and the issuance of the final ADR report. EO will also cover costs of any stakeholder workshops as part of the evaluation.

### THE EVALUATION TEAM

The team will comprise three members:

- The Consultant Team Leader, with overall responsibility for providing guidance and leadership, and for coordinating the draft and final report
- Two National Consultants, who will:

<sup>5</sup> [www.undp.org/eo/](http://www.undp.org/eo/).

- Provide expertise in core subject areas of the evaluation
- Undertake data collection and analyses at the country-level
- Assume responsibility for drafting key parts of the report
- Support the work of the main missions.

The Team Leader must have a demonstrated capacity in strategic thinking and policy advice and in the evaluation of complex programmes in the field. All team members should have in-depth knowledge of development issues in Zambia.

The evaluation team will be supported by a Research Assistant based in the Evaluation Office in New York. The Task Manager of the Evaluation Office will support the team in designing the evaluation; s/he will participate in the scoping mission and provide ongoing feedback for quality assurance during the preparation of the inception report and the final report. Depending on need, the EO Task Manager may also participate in the main mission.

The work of the evaluation team will be guided by the UNDP Evaluation Policy (2006), the Norms and Standards established by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). The members must adhere to the ethical guidelines established for evaluators in the UN system, and to the Code of Conduct, also established by UNEG. Evaluators will be required to sign the Code of Conduct prior to engaging in the ADR exercise.

### THE ZAMBIA CO

The CO will take a lead role in organizing dialogue and stakeholder meetings on the findings and recommendations, and in supporting the evaluation team in liaising with key partners, and make available to the team all necessary information regarding UNDP's activities in the country. The office will be expected to provide additional logistical support to the evaluation

team as required. The CO will contribute support in kind (for example office space for the Evaluation Team), but the EO will cover local transportation costs.

## 7. EXPECTED OUTPUTS

Expected outputs from the evaluation team led by the Team Leader, are as follows:

- The inception report (maximum 20 pages)
- The final report "Assessment of Development Results—Zambia" (maximum 50 pages plus annexes), which is consistent with the ADR 2009 manual and meets the quality standards outlined in the UNEG and UNDP guidelines
- An Evaluation Brief (maximum 2 pages)
- A presentation at the stakeholder meeting.

All drafts will be provided in English. In producing written materials, the evaluation team is expected to apply UNDP EO publications guidelines.

The final report of the ADR, to be produced by the Evaluation Team, will follow the following format:

- Chapter 1: Introduction
- Chapter 2: Country Context
- Chapter 3: The UN and UNDP in the Country
- Chapter 4: UNDP's Contribution to National Development Results
- Chapter 5: Strategic Positioning of the UNDP Country Programme
- Chapter 6: Conclusions, Lessons and Recommendations

Detailed outlines for the Inception Report, main ADR Report and Evaluation Brief will be provided to the evaluation team by the Task Manager.

## Annex 2

# LIST OF DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- Alliance of Mayors and Municipal Leaders on HIV/AIDS in Africa, 'Minutes of the Proceedings of the Fourth AMICAALL Steering Committee Meeting,' July 2007.
- Balasundaram, Rema Nair, 'Zambia UNDAF MTR Review,' UNDP Zambia, June 2009.
- Cheelo, Caesar & Jack Jones Zulu, 'Zambia: Debt Strategies to Meet the Millennium,' UNDP Zambia, August 2007.
- Chiselebwe, N., & K Hassan, 'Consultancy Service for Mid-term Review of the CPD and CPAP 2007 to 2010—Final Report,' UNDP Zambia 2009.
- Chitah, Mukosa Bona, 'Evaluation of UNDP's Role and Contribution in the HIV/AIDS Response in Southern Africa and Ethiopia,' UNDP Zambia, November 2004.
- Economist Intelligence Unit, 'Zambia Country Profile,' 2008.
- Electoral Commission of Zambia—Legal Department, 'Electoral Provisions in the Draft Mungomba Constitution Workshop Held at Safari Lodge, Siavonga from 17<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> July 2008,' July 2008.
- Electoral Commission of Zambia, 'Budgetary Requirements for 2008 Presidential Election—August to December,' 2008.
- Electoral Commission of Zambia, 'Electoral Code of Conduct,' Date unknown.
- Electoral Commission of Zambia, 'Establishment, Functions and Responsibilities,' Date unknown.
- Electoral Commission of Zambia, 'Voter Education and Training Programme Implementation Plan (April to November 2006),' May 2006.
- Electoral Commission of Zambia/Department of National Registration, Passport and Citizenship, 'Workshop Report,' March 2009.
- Gaile Baiba & Monica Chundama, 'Improved National Capacity to Negotiate and Implement Global Environment Commitment under the Environmental Protection and Natural Resources Management Project Final Report,' UNDP Zambia, December 2005.
- Government of Zambia Central Statistical Office, '2007 Demographic and Health Survey Key Findings,' 2007.
- Government of Zambia Central Statistical Office, '2007 Demographic and Health Survey,' March 2009.
- Government of Zambia Central Statistical Office, Zambia Central Board of Health and ORC Macro, 'Zambia Demographic and Health Survey 2001 to 2002,' Calverton, Maryland, USA, February 2003.
- Government of Zambia Ministry of Health, '2005 Annual Report,' September 2006.
- Government of Zambia Ministry of Health, 'National HIV/AIDS/STI/TB Policy,' June 2005.
- Government of Zambia, 'Minister of Finance and National Planning January 30<sup>th</sup> 2009 Budget Speech,' National Assembly, January 2009.
- Government of Zambia, Ministry of Health/ National AIDS Council, 'National Aids Spending Assessment for Period 2005 to 2006,' July 2008.
- Government of Zambia, Ministry of Trade & Industry/UNAIDS Zambia, 'Activity Report on the Zambia Patents Study for UNAIDS, October 2007,' 2007.
- Government of Zambia/European Development Fund, 'Contribution Agreement No. 9 ACP ZA January 1 2007' UNDP Zambia, January 2007.
- Government of Zambia/Gender in Development Division: 'National Gender policy,' 2000.

- Government of Zambia/Mazabuka Municipal Council /GTZ/UNDP, 'HIV and AIDS Related Services Directory,' 2008.
- Government of Zambia/Mazabuka Municipal Council /GTZ/UNDP, 'Workplace Policy—HIV and AIDS, Other Life Threatening Diseases and Disabilities 2008.'
- Government of Zambia/Ministry of Finance and National Planning, 'Submission of the GRZ/UNDP Annual Workplan for the Year 2008,' February 2008.
- Government of Zambia/National HIV/AIDS Council, 'Baseline Assessment of HIV and AIDS Mainstreaming Among Line Ministries,' May 2007.
- Government of Zambia/UNDP Zambia, 'Country Programme Action Plan for 2007 to 2010,' 2007.
- Government of Zambia/UNDP Zambia, 'Project Document Final: Strengthening Electoral Process in Zambia: Support to the 2009 to 2012 Electoral Cycle,' July 2009.
- Government of Zambia/UNDP Zambia, 'Project Title: Support to the 2006 Elections in Zambia,' 2005.
- Government of Zambia/UNDP Zambia, 'Strengthening Electoral Process in Zambia: Support to the 2009 to 2012 Electoral Cycle.' July 2009.
- Government of Zambia/UNDP Zambia, 'Strengthening Electoral Process in Zambia: Support to the 2009 to 2012 Electoral Cycle,' December 2009.
- Government of Zambia/UNDP Zambia, 'Understanding the MDGs—Basic Information Kit 2006,' 2006.
- Government of Zambia/UNDP Zambia, 'Zambia Millennium Development Goals 2003 Progress Report,' 2003.
- Government of Zambia/UNDP Zambia, 'Zambia Millennium Development Goals 2005 Status Report,' 2005.
- Government of Zambia/UNDP Zambia, 'Zambia Millennium Development Goals 2008 Progress Report,' 2008.
- Government of Zambia/United Nations, 'Joint United Nations Programme of Support on Aids 2007 to 2010', November 2006
- Government of Zambia/United Nations, 'United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2002 to 2006,' October 2001.
- High Level Forum 'Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness,' Paris, 28 February to 2 March 2005.
- International Labour Organization, 'Report of the Rapid Assessment on the Impact of HIV and AIDS in the Informal Economy in Zambia,' Date Unknown.
- Jesuit Center for Theological Reflection, 'Is the Debt Crisis Looming for Zambia: A Concise Analysis of the Current National Debt Scenario in Zambia,' April 2009.
- Jesuit Center for Theological Reflection, <http://www.jctr.org.zm>, 2009.
- Kapwepwe, M. C., 'Zambia Business Coalition on HIV and AIDS Strategic Business and Operation Plan for period 2007 to 2009,' March 2007.
- Kumwenda, Rosemary, Dr., 'National Aids Strategic Framework (2006 to 2010) Midterm Review Field Report Eastern Province,' UNDP Zambia, Date Unknown.
- Lafontaine, A., 'Assessment of Capacity Development Efforts of Other Development Cooperation Agencies. Capacity Development Initiative,' GEF-UNDP Strategic Partnership, July 2000.
- Liberty, Mweemba & Wu Hongjuan, 'Environmental Degradation and Rural Poverty in Zambia: A Silent Alliance,' Research Journal of Applied Sciences, 3 (5): 369 to 376, 2008.
- Livingston, David, 'Meeting of HIV and AIDS Technical Support Group to the Former African Heads of States and Government and Other African Leaders Africa Takes Charge,' August 2008.
- Macwan'gi, Mubiani, Dr., et al., 'Terminal Evaluation Report of Projects Community Oriented HIV/AIDS Prevention, Care and Support ZAM 198/002 and Support to NGO Activities for the Prevention and Control of HIV/AIDS ZAM 196/003,' UNDP Zambia, October 2001.
- Mochache, Jason. Dr., & Dr. Lawrence Mukuka, 'Zambia Terminal Evaluation Report Sustainable Lusaka Programme

- Project Number ZAM/97/002,' UNDP Zambia, December 2001.
- Morgan, Peter, 'The Concept of Capacity: Change and Performance,' European Centre for Development Policy Management, May 2006.
- Mulemwa, Jane, 'Final Evaluation of the UNV Support to People Living with HIV/AIDS Project in Malawi and Zambia,' United Nations Volunteer Program/Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), April 2002.
- Multilateral Organization Performance Assessment Network, 'Annual MOPAN Survey 2007,' 2007.
- Musona, David, et al., 'Report on the Terminal Evaluation of the Governance: Public Sector Restructuring, Decentralization and Local Governance Programme and the Economic Policy Analysis Project,' UNDP Zambia, October 2001.
- Musona, David, 'Review of Microfinance for Poverty Reduction Project Number ZAM/00/VO1,' UNDP, Zambia, March 2008.
- National AIDS Council, '2009 National Multi-sectoral AIDS Programme Workplan,' December, 2008.
- National AIDS Council, 'Joint Annual Programme Review 2006,' July 2007.
- National AIDS Council, 'Joint Review of the National HIV/AIDS/STI/TB Intervention Strategic Plan (2002 to 2005) and Operations of the National AIDS Council,' June 2004.
- National AIDS Council, 'Joint Review of the National HIV/AIDS/STI/TB Intervention Strategic Plan (2006 to 2010) and Operations of the National AIDS Council. Technical Report,' July 2007.
- National AIDS Council, 'National AIDS Spending Assessment for 2005 and 2006 Technical Report,' 2007.
- National AIDS Council, 'National HIV and AIDS Strategic Framework 2006 to 2010,' May 2006.
- National AIDS Council, 'Roadmap/Transition Strategy for DACAs and MACAs Functions from UNDP to the National Multi-sectoral Response to HIV/AIDS in Zambia,' May 2008.
- National AIDS Council, 'Technical Report Joint Mid-term Review of the National AIDS Strategic Framework 2006 to 2010,' January 2009.
- National AIDS Council, 'Zambia Country Report Multi-sectoral AIDS Response Monitoring and Evaluation Biennial Report 2006 to 2007,' January 2008.
- National AIDS Council, 'Zambia Multi-sectoral AIDS Response Monitoring and Evaluation Biennial Report 2006 to 2007,' January 2008.
- OECD Statistics, [www.oecd.org](http://www.oecd.org), 2009.
- Republic of Zambia, 'Fifth National Development Plan 2006 to 2010: Broad Based Wealth and Job Creation Through Citizenry Participation and Technological Advancement,' Lusaka, December 2006.
- Republic of Zambia, 'First Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper Implementation Progress Report for Period January 2002 to June 2003,' 2004.
- Republic of Zambia, 'Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper for Period 2000 to 2001,' July 2000.
- Republic of Zambia, 'Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper Preparation Status Report,' September 2001.
- Republic of Zambia, 'Second Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper Implementation Progress Report for Period July 2003 to June 2004,' 2005.
- Republic of Zambia, 'Vision 2030: A Prosperous Middle-Income Nation by 2030,' Lusaka, December 2006.
- Republic of Zambia, 'Zambia Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper,' March 2002.
- Republic of Zambia/UNDP Zambia, 'DRAFT: Strengthening Electoral Process in Zambia: Support to the Electoral Cycle 2009 to 2012,' March 2009.
- Republic of Zambia/UNDP Zambia, 'Project Terminal Report: Preparatory Assistance to Election in Zambia Project Document ZMB10/00059742,' Zambia, September 2009.

- Republic of Zambia/UNDP Zambia, 'Project Terminal Report: Support to 2008 Presidential Election in Zambia,' Zambia, September 2009.
- The Steadman Group, 'Media Monitoring and Verification Report of the Presidential By-Election Activities and Campaigns,' Zambia, December 2008.
- UNAIDS Zambia, 'Coordinated Multi-sectoral Response at the District Level for Period October 2003 to June 2004,' 2004.
- UNAIDS Zambia/Zambia Interfaith Networking Group on HIV/AIDS (ZINGO), 'Financial and Narrative Report for the UNAIDS PAF 2008/09,' June 2009.
- UNAIDS/UNDP Zambia, 'Proposal for 2008 to 2009: Build Institutional Capacity of FBOs Through the Zambia Interfaith Networking Group on HIV/AIDS for a Strengthened Faith-Based Response to HIV and AIDS,' UNAIDS, May 2008.
- UNAIDS/UNDP Zambia/The World Bank, 'Review Meeting on Integrating HIV and AIDS into Poverty Reduction Strategies,' February 2007.
- UNAIDS/UNTG on HIV/AIDS, 'Harnessing Partnerships on Comprehensive Care and Treatment,' August 2004.
- UNCDF Zambia, 'Concept Paper for Future Support to Local Governance and Decentralized Service Delivery, First Draft Report,' November 2005.
- UNDP BDP Energy and Environment Group, 'Fact Sheet: Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity,' April 2005.
- UNDP BDP HIV/AIDS Group, 'UNDP's Response to AIDS—Accelerating Global Progress on Human Development,' June 2008.
- UNDP Evaluation Office, 'ADR Method Manual,' New York, Draft, April 2009.
- UNDP Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results—Guidelines for Preparing Inception Report,' New York, November 2008.
- UNDP Evaluation Office, 'Assessment of Development Results at the Country Level: Strategy and Options,' March 2009.
- UNDP Evaluation Office, 'Evaluation of UNDP's Role and Contribution in the HIV/AIDS Response in Southern Africa and Ethiopia,' New York, May 2006.
- UNDP Evaluation Office, 'The Evaluation of UNDP's Contribution at the Country Level—Guidelines for an Assessment of Development Results (ADR),' New York, January 2009.
- UNDP Zambia 'Notes: Contributing Partners—Preparatory Assistance Project,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'UNDP Seminar Presentations to the Human Development Course Students at the University of Zambia: Proposed Approach to an Integrated Coordinated Presentation Covering 3 Topics,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'UNDP Seminar Presentations to the Human Development Course Students at the University of Zambia: The Role of UNDP in Advocating the Human Development Approach to Promoting Development in Zambia,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, '2005 Annual Report,' 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, '2006 Zambia Elections: Joint Technical Working Group Initial Concept Paper,' 2005.
- UNDP Zambia, 'ADR Information, UNV Unit,' 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Annual Workplan for Decentralization Implementation Program for Period January 2003 to December 2003,' November 2002.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Annual Budget and Expenditure for 2004 to 2009 by Practice Area,' 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Annual Budget and Expenditure for 2004 to 2009,' 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Annual Report for Project Number ZMB/00015682—UNDP Support to Multi-sectoral HIV/AIDS Response Initiatives,' 2004.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Annual Work Plan Democratic Governance for 2007 to 2010,' 2007.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Annual Work Plan for 2009,' April 2009.



- UNDP Zambia, 'Annual Work Plan: Support to the Electoral Cycle,' June 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Annual Workplan for the Year 2008 Capacity Development for Effective Coordination of National Response and Mainstreaming HIV/AIDS,' 2008.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Capacity Utilization UNV: Challenges and Lessons from UNDP Zambia,' April 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Challenges and Prospects: for Effective Private-Sector Participation in Global Trade in Africa,' April 2009.
- UNDP ZAMBIA, 'Comments on the 2007 MOPAN Survey,' December 2007.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Comments on the Concept Paper and Roadmap on the Preparation of Zambia's Sixth National Development Programme (SNDP) 2011 to 2015,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Concept Paper on UNDP and UN System Support to the Sixth National Development Plan Design Process,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Contributing Partners—Support to the Electoral Cycle 2009 to 2012,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Cooperating Partners Contribute 11.5 Million Dollars Emergency Support for 2008 Presidential Elections,' October 2008.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Coordinated Multi-sectoral Response at the District Level,' December 2002.
- UNDP Zambia, 'DRAFT: Conceptual Perspectives for Increasing Participation of Women in the 2006 Elections,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'DRAFT: Elections 2006 Progress Report March 2006,' March 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Economic Governance Workplan 2004,' 2003.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Economic Governance Workplan 2005,' 2004.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Economic Governance Workplan 2006,' 2005.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Economic Policies for Growth, Employment and Poverty Reduction: Case Study of Zambia,' 2007.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Economic Policies for Growth, Employment and Poverty Reduction: Case Study of Zambia,' 2007.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Elections Project Multi-Donor Trust Fund,' June 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Evaluation of UNDP's Role in the HIV and AIDS Response in Zambia,' September 2005.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Expenditure Detail—Project 00059742 Multi-Donor Support to ECZ,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'First Quarter Annual Workplan and Budget.' 2003.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Governance: Capacity Building Project for Strengthening Economic Governance.' November 2002.
- UNDP Zambia, 'HIV and AIDS 4<sup>th</sup> Quarter Workplan and Budget Project Number ZAM/01/007,' 2002.
- UNDP Zambia, 'HIV and AIDS Performance Parameters in 2006.' 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'HIV and AIDS Performance Parameters in 2007,' 2007.
- UNDP Zambia, 'HIV and AIDS Unit Semi-Annual Progress/Review Report 2006,' 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'HIV and AIDS, Gender and Poverty Annual Report 2005,' 2005.
- UNDP Zambia, 'HIV and Public Sector Capacity Impact and Responses,' 2007.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Human Resources Analysis 2003 to 2009,' 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Integrating HIV and AIDS Into PRSPs—Country Follow-up Activities Financial and Activity Report,' February 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Joint Review of Irish Aid Support to Mainstreaming Support Project Number ZMB10/00049510,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Justification for Extending Project Number ZMB10/00015682 for Period 2006 to 2007,' 2007.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Lessons Learnt from Zambia Capacity Utilization at Local Levels,' December 2005.
- UNDP Zambia, 'List of Projects, Strategy and Evaluation Documents as of 2008,' 2009.

- UNDP Zambia, 'Meeting with the Electoral Commission of Zambia Letter,' March 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'NAC Subcontract NZP+ to undertake HIV/AIDS interventions with Support from UNDP,' 2003.
- UNDP Zambia, 'National AIDS Council 2006 Annual Workplan and Budget for UNDP/DCI Supported Project,' 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'National AIDS Council's Second Quarter Budget 2006,' 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Note for UNCT Decision: UNDAF-Related Country Analysis: Options for UNCT Decision,' 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Notes: Contributing Partners—Presidential Elections,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Notes: Contributing Partners—Support to the Electoral Cycle 2009 to 2012,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Outcome Evaluation of UNDP Support to Decentralization HIV/AIDS Multi-sectoral Response Project,' January 2007.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Payments of the 2008 Presidential By-Election from the UNDP Elections Trust Fund,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Press Release: Finland Joins the 2006 Elections Trust Fund,' January 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Pro-Poor Policy Formulation and MDGs Project Number ZMB/00056573 Annual Progress Report for Period 1 January 2007 to 30 December 2007,' 2007.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Project Annual Report Promoting Business Development Among PLWH in Zambia for Period January to December 2008,' December 2008.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Project Documents for the Country Cooperation Framework 2002 to 2006,' 2002.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Pro-poor Policy Formulation and MDGs First Quarter Review,' 2008.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Pro-poor Policy Formulation and MDGs, Award 00047229,' December 2008.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Results Oriented Annual Reports 2004,' 2005.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Results Oriented Annual Reports 2005,' 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Results Oriented Annual Reports 2006,' 2007.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Results Oriented Annual Reports 2007,' 2008.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Results Oriented Annual Reports 2008,' 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Roll Out Internal and External Mainstreaming of HIV and AIDS in the Public, Private and NGO Sectors for Period July 2007 to December 2007,' 2007.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Second Quarter Review and Third Quarter Planning Meeting with the National AIDS Council,' July 2008.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Some Preliminary Evidence of the Impacts of the Global Financial Crisis on Zambia,' March 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Staff List for Country Office,' 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Staff Listing—RBA—Zambia,' 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Study Tour on the Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) and Essential Medicines,' 2007.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Support to Decentralized Multi-sectoral HIV and AIDS Response Project Number ZMB 10/00016582-ZAM/01/007,' 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Support to Economic Governance Project Number ZMB/00015681 Annual Progress Report for Period 1 January 2004 to 12 December 2004,' 2004.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Support to Economic Governance Project Number ZMB/00015681 Annual Progress Report for Period January 1, 2005 to November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2005,' 2005.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Support to Economic Governance Project Number ZMB/00015681 Annual Progress Report for Period January 1, 2006 to December 30<sup>th</sup>, 2006,' 2006.

- UNDP Zambia, 'Support to Multi-sectoral HIV/AIDS Response Initiative Project Number ZAM/01/007/01/99/F,' November 2002.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Support to Multi-sectoral HIV/AIDS Response Initiatives Project Number ZMB 10/00016582 Annual Project Report for Period January to December 2006,' 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Support to the Coordination Mechanism at the National Aids Council Multi-sectoral HIV/AIDS Response Initiatives,' 2004.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Support to the Zambian Electoral Cycle 2009 to 2012: Workplan and Budget (USD) 2009 to 2012,' July 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Terminal Report on UNDP Assistance 2003 to 2006 The Network of Zambian People living with HIV/AIDS,' November 2006.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Terms of Reference for a Comparative Study of the Costs of Electoral Processes in Selected African Countries,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Terms of Reference for a Consultancy to Produce the Zambia Human Development Report 2009,' 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Terms of Reference for UN System Staff Participating in the Sixth National Development Plan (SNDP) Country Analysis Process,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'UK Project Progress Report,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'UN Common Country Programme Process (CCPP) Training Facilitation,' Date Unknown.
- UNDP Zambia, 'UNDP Support to Multi-sectoral HIV/AIDS Response Initiatives Workplan and Budget Project Number ZAM/01/007,' 2003.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Zambia 2002 to 2010 Results Framework: Comparative Overview of Intended Results and Key Initiatives,' August 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Zambia Human Development Report 2009: Concept Paper for the ZHDR 2009 on Service Delivery for Sustainable Human Development,' June 2009.
- UNDP Zambia, 'Zambian 2007 Human Development Report,' 2007.
- UNDP Zambia/GRZ, 'Annual Programme Review: Meeting Highlights and Recommendations,' November 2007.
- UNDP Zambia/National AIDS Council, 'HIV and AIDS Mainstreaming Sensitization Workshop for the Police Service Command: Deputy Commissioners, Divisional Commanders and Key Senior Officers,' May 2008.
- UNDP Zambia/National AIDS Council, 'Leadership Development and HIV/AIDS: Hybrid Workshop,' July 2008.
- UNDP Zambia/National Aids Council, 'Summary of Cash Advance Requested by National Aids Council for First Quarter of 2008,' February 2008.
- UNDP Zambia/National Aids Council, 'UNDP Support to Multi-sectoral HIV/AIDS Response Initiatives Workplan and Budget-Project Number ZMB10/00015682,' 2004.
- UNDP Zambia/UNCDF Zambia, 'Concept Paper for Future Support to Local Governance and Decentralized Service Delivery First Draft Report,' Zambia, November 2005.
- UNDP, 'Empowered and Equal—Gender Equality Strategy 2001 to 2011,' New York, May 2006.
- UNDP, 'Review of NGO/NEX Audits for Period 2007,' July 2008.
- UNDP, 'Terms of Reference: Strategy and Policy Units in UNDP Africa Country Offices,' May 2006.
- UNDP/SNV Connecting People's Capacities, 'Promoting Business Development Among People Living with HIV/AIDS in Zambia Report for Period January to June 2008,' July 2008.
- United Nations 2005 World Summit, 'General Assembly Resolution 60/1, High Level Plenary Meeting of the 60<sup>th</sup> Session of the General Assembly, 14 to 15 September 2005,' New York, 2005.
- United Nations Executive Board, United Nations Development Programme, and United Nations Populations Fund, 'Country Programme for Zambia 2007 to 2010,

- Second Regular Session 2006, 11 to 15 September, New York: Item 3 of the Provisional Agenda,' 2006.
- United Nations Executive Board, United Nations Development Programme, and United Nations Populations Fund, 'First Country Cooperation Framework for Zambia 1997 to 2001, Annual Session 1997, 12 to 23 May, New York: Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda,' 1997.
- United Nations Executive Board, United Nations Development Programme, and United Nations Populations Fund, 'Evaluation Policy of UNDP, Annual Session 2006, 12 to 23 June, Geneva: Item 15 of the Provisional Agenda,' 2006.
- United Nations Executive Board, United Nations Development Programme, and United Nations Populations Fund, 'Second Country Cooperation Framework for Zambia 2002 to 2006, Annual Session 2001, 10 to 14 September, New York: Item 5 of the Provisional Agenda,' 2001.
- United Nations Executive Board, United Nations Development Programme, and United Nations Populations Fund, 'UNDP Strategic Plan, Annual Session 2008, 16 to 27 June, Geneva: Item 9 of the Provisional Agenda,' 2006.
- United Nations, 'Human Development Report Zambia 2009 Fact Sheet,' [http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/country\\_fact\\_sheets/cty\\_fs\\_ZMB.html](http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/country_fact_sheets/cty_fs_ZMB.html), 2009.
- United Nations, Zambia 'UNDAF 2002 to 2006,' 2001.
- United Nations, Zambia 'UNDAF 2007 to 2010,' 2006.
- United Nations, Zambia 'UNDAF MTR May, 2009 (zero draft).'
- United Nations/European Commission & Cooperating Partners, 'Joint Assistance Strategy for Zambia 2007 to 2010,' April 2007.
- Unknown Author, Grameen Trust Mission to Zambia Aide-Memoire, June 2008.
- Wayem, John. A. Dr., 'Possible Dimensions of the Effects of the Global Financial Crisis: Towards an Assessment of the Impact of the Crisis on Zambia,' March 2009.
- Wayem, John. A. Dr., 'The Importance of Corporate Governance in the Economic Growth of a Nation,' Zambia, UNDP Zambia, August 2009.
- Wayem, John. A. Dr., 'UNDP's Approach to Development in UN Member State,' UNDP Zambia 2009.
- Weeks, J. et. al., 'Kwacha Appreciation 2005 to 2006: Implications for the Zambian Economy,' 2007.
- World Bank, 'Zambia at a Glance,' August 2005.
- World Bank, 'Zambia's National Response to HIV/AIDS Project in Support of the Second Phase of the Multi-Country AIDS Program for Africa,' February 2009.

## Annex 3

# LIST OF PEOPLE CONSULTED

### GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS

- Vincent Chaila, Community Development Officer, Ministry of Community Development and Social Services
- Langiwe H.L. Chandi, Principal Energy Officer, Ministry of Energy and Water Development
- Mwelwa Chibichabo, Deputy Director, Finance, Electoral Commission of Zambia
- Elizabeth Chileshe, Head, Human Resources and Admin, Zambia Human Rights Commission
- Ben Chirwa, Director General, National HIV/AIDS/STD/TB Council
- Patrick Chishika, Senior Procurement Officer, Environmental Council of Zambia
- Ngosa Chisupa, Permanent Secretary, Cabinet Office
- Patrick Choolwe, Deputy Director, Sectoral Planning, National Planning Department, Ministry of Finance and National Planning
- Julius P. Daka, Manager, Planning and Information Department, Environmental Council of Zambia
- Godwin Fishani Gondwe, Chief Environmental Management Officer, Ministry of Tourism, Environment and Natural Resources
- Lazarus Kabampwe, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of the Government of the Republic of Zambia to the United Nations
- Mwiche Kabwe, Planning Specialist, UNDP Focal Point, Environmental Council of Zambia
- Dan Kalale, Director, Electoral Commission of Zambia
- Eric Kamoi, Legal Counsel, Electoral Commission of Zambia
- Joe Kapembwa, Director, Finance and Economic Section, Gender in Development Division, Cabinet Office
- Diana Kapsa, Planner, Ministry of Energy and Water Development
- Brown Kasaro, Deputy Director, IT, Electoral Commission of Zambia
- Boston Katongo, Coordinator, Project for Zambia's National Communication to UNFCCC, Environmental Council of Zambia
- Gladys Kristafor, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Community Development and Social Services
- Sitali L. Liwena, Projects Coordinator, Zambia Wildlife Authority
- Elizabeth Mwiinga Maliwa, District AIDS Coordination Adviser, Lusaka District
- Mutemwa Mate, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
- Mwaka Mukubesa, Acting Principal Budget Analyst, Ministry of Finance and National Planning
- Enock Mulembe, Director, Zambia Human Rights Commission
- Jack B. Munthali, Deputy Coordinator, Zambia's National Communication to UNFCCC, Environmental Council of Zambia
- Agnes Musungwa, Director, Monitoring and Evaluation Department, Ministry of Finance and National Planning
- Nicolas Mwale, Senior Planner, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
- O.A. Mwangase, Chief Meteorologist, Zambia Meteorological Department
- Emmanuel Ngulube, Permanent Secretary, Budget and Economic Affairs, Ministry of Finance and National Planning
- Henry Nkhoma, Director, Community Development, Ministry of Community Development and Social Services
- Rodgers Nkhoma, Area Game Warden, Chirundu, Zambia Wildlife Authority

Happy Phiri, Principal Clerk, PRP,  
National Assembly of Zambia

Lewis Saiwana, Director General,  
Zambia Wildlife Authority

Alfred Sakwiya, Director,  
Decentralization Secretariat

Henry Sichembe, Deputy Director,  
Technical Services, Ministry of  
Agriculture and Cooperatives

Alex Simwanza, Director, Prevention  
Multisectoral Response, National  
HIV/AIDS/STD/TB Council

Monde Sitwala, Deputy Director, Economic  
and Technical Cooperation Unit, Ministry  
of Finance and National Planning

Edwin Soko, Manager, Finance and Accounts,  
Environmental Council of Zambia

Brian Tembo, Counsellor, Permanent Mission  
of the Government of the Republic of  
Zambia to the United Nations

Akapelwa Wamupu, Monitoring and  
Evaluation Officer, Ministry of Finance  
and National Planning

Matonde Yeta, Permanent Secretary, Gender in  
Development Division, Cabinet Office

Ndashe Yumba, Director, Permanent Secretary

Davis Zulu, Acting Director, Ministry of Local  
Government and Housing

### **CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS**

Rashidull Alam, Technical Adviser (IUNV),  
Micro Bankers Trust

Justine Aongola, Chairperson, Residents'  
Development Committee

Lucia Banda, District AIDS Coordination  
Adviser, DACA (NUNV), Chongwe  
District HIV & AIDS Task Force

Makelesa Benson, Deputy Chairperson,  
Chongwe District HIV & AIDS Task Force

Carlington Bwalya, Chongwe Assistant Branch  
Manager, Micro Bankers Trust

Cherri Briggs, Member (leaseholder), Lower  
Zambezi Community Trust

Michael Chanda, Senior Technical Adviser,  
SHARe

Boniface Cheembe, Programmes Manager,  
Southern African Centre for Constructive  
Resolution of Disputes (SACCORD)

Theresa Chewe, Finance Manager, Southern,  
African Centre for Constructive Resolution  
of Disputes (SACCORD)

Ian Chibale, Director of Planning, Mazabuka  
Municipal Council

Sabita Chibutu, Youth Coordinator, Chongwe  
District HIV & AIDS Task Force

Happy Chigunta, Village Community  
Facilitator, Chibombo MDG  
Localization Project

Burton Chiinda, Secretary, Mazabuka MDG  
Localization Project

Lillian Chikoti, Head of Finance, Zambia  
National Women's Lobby

Mungule Chikoye, Board Chairman, Africa  
2000 Network

Stanley Chinhoi, Member (community  
representative), Lower Zambezi  
Community Trust

Elizabeth Chintu, Assistant Programme  
Officer, Women for Change

Douglas Chisanga, Member (community  
representative), Lower Zambezi  
Community Trust

Tim Featherby, Member (leaseholder),  
Lower Zambezi Community Trust

Lee Habasonda, Executive Director, Southern  
African Centre for Constructive Resolution  
of Disputes (SACCORD)

Wilkin Kaduli, Village Community Facilitator,  
Chibombo MDG Localization Project

Austin Kapushi, Chongwe Branch Manager,  
Micro Bankers Trust

Juliet Kofi, Village Community Facilitator,  
Chibombo MDG Localization Project

Maxwell Lisulo, Headman (Simwaba Village),  
Mazabuka MDG Localization Project

Thomas Lungu, Professional Assistant to  
the Local MP, Chibombo MDG  
Localization Project

Siachuma M. Masamu, CEO  
(MACO-MUNENGA CAMP),  
Mazabuka MDG Localization Project

Kenneth Mazala, Finance Officer,  
Micro Bankers Trust

Malambo Moonga, Programme Officer,  
Women for Change

Michelo Mooya, Vice Chairman, Mazabuka  
MDG Localization Project

Golden Munakalanga, Headman  
(Chatika Village), Mazabuka MDG  
Localization Project

Peter Musekese, HIV & AIDS Adviser,  
Mazabuka Municipal Council

Isaiah Museto, Member  
(community representative), Lower  
Zambezi Community Trust

Sidney Mushike, DATF Secretary, Chongwe  
District HIV & AIDS Task Force

Engwase Mwale, Executive Director, NGO  
Coordinating Council

Kenneth Mwansa, Country Director, Alliance  
of Mayors and Municipal Leaders on  
HIV/AIDS in Zambia

Assely Mwanza, Programme Officer, Zambia  
National Women's Lobby

Yvone Mweene, Village Community Facilitator,  
Mazabuka MDG Localization Project

Shadreck Mwiinga, Mayor, Mazabuka  
Municipal Council

C. Ngandwe, Managing Director, Changa  
Management Services

Nyambe Nyambe, CCD Programme Manager,  
Worldwide Fund for Nature

Sam Nyoni, Chief Health Inspector, Mazabuka  
Municipal Council

Machila Obert, Village Community Facilitator,  
Mazabuka MDG Localization Project

Ernest Sibande, Programme Officer, NGO  
Coordinating Council

Lovemore Sipuka, Association Chairman,  
Chibombo MDG Localization Project

Emmanuel Sikombe, Treasurer, Residents'  
Development Committee, Mazabuka

Lameck Simwanza, Programme Coordinator,  
Women for Change

Joseph Temba, Project Manager,  
Africa 2000 Network

Alfred Tembo, Finance and Administration  
Manager, Worldwide Fund for Nature

Francis Yamba, Executive Director, Centre for  
Energy and Environment Zambia

Maluba Wakunguma, Regional Coordinator,  
Micro Bankers Trust

Jackson G. Zindaga, Chair, Community  
Resources Board, Lower Zambezi  
Community Trust

## **UNDP COUNTRY OFFICE**

Elda Chirwa, Economist

Aneas Chuma, Former UN Resident  
Coordinator and UNDP Resident  
Representative

Georgina Fekete, Deputy Country  
Director (Programme)

Abdul Hannan, Former Deputy Resident  
Representative (Programme)

Michael Kaira, Operations Unit

Anock Kapira, UNV Programme Officer,  
UNV Unit

Stephen Kaunda, Finance Unit

Rosemary Kumwenda, Chief,  
HIV & AIDS Unit

Francis Mbilima, HIV & AIDS Unit

Viola Morgan, Country Director

Amos Muchanga, Programme Analyst  
Environment Unit

Dancilla Mukarubayiza, Deputy Country  
Director (Operations)

Winnie Musonda, Chief, Environment Unit

Dellia Mwale-Yerukun, Programme Analyst,  
Governance Unit

Macleod Nyirongo, UN Resident Coordinator  
and UNDP Resident Representative

Madhava. P. Rao, Senior Adviser to the  
Cabinet Office  
Fanny Siyumbwa, Common Services Unit  
Mike Soko, Chief, Governance Unit  
Mashike Yoyo-Sichinga,  
Human Resources Unit  
John A. Wayem, Economic Adviser

### **UNDP NEW YORK AND JOHANNESBURG**

Jennifer Colville, Capacity Diagnostics  
Coordinator, UNDP Bureau for  
Development Policy  
Randy Davis, Practice Manager, Gender Team,  
UNDP Bureau for Development Policy  
Elizabeth Fong, Deputy Director *i.a.*, Regional  
Bureau for Africa  
Oscar Garcia, Evaluation Adviser,  
UNDP Evaluation Office  
John Hough, Deputy Executive  
Coordinator (GEF), UNDP  
Bureau for Development Policy  
Ade Mamonyane Lekoetje, Country Adviser,  
Regional Bureau for Africa  
Saraswathi Menon, Director,  
UNDP Evaluation Office  
S. Nanthikesan, Monitoring and Evaluation  
Adviser, Regional Bureau for Africa  
Nadia Rasheed, Practice Manager,  
HIV/AIDS Group, UNDP  
Bureau for Development Policy  
Nik Sekhran, Senior Technical  
Adviser (International Waters &  
Biodiversity), UNDP Regional  
Service Centre, Johannesburg

### **UN COUNTRY TEAM**

Michael Gboun, Monitoring and Evaluation  
Adviser, Joint United Nations Programme  
on HIV/AIDS  
Kapil Kapoor, Country Manager, World Bank  
Baar Leerschool, Senior Protection Officer,  
Office of the United Nations High  
Commissioner for Refugees

Helen Mbao, Senior Operations Officer,  
World Bank

Geoffrey Musonda, Project Coordinator,  
Renewable Energy, United Nations  
Industrial Development Organization

Kebby Mutale, Nutritionist and Senior  
Programme Assistant, World  
Food Programme

Sansan Myint, HIV & AIDS Specialist,  
United Nations Children's Fund

Mona Nouredin, Representative, Food and  
Agricultural Organization

Josiah Ogina, Chief of Mission, International  
Organization for Migration

Duah Owusu-Sarfo, Country Representative,  
United Nations Population Fund

Pablo Recalde, Country Representative, World  
Food Programme

Lotta Ylwander, Country Representative,  
United Nations Children's Fund

### **MULITERAL AND BILATERAL COOPERATING PARTNERS**

Gilbert Cathal, Adviser, Social and  
Governance Section, Delegation of the  
European Commission

Gerry Cunningham, Head of Development  
Cooperation, Irish Aid

Tore Gjos, Ambassador,  
Royal Norwegian Embassy

Tori Hoven, Deputy Head of Mission,  
Royal Norwegian Embassy

R.D. Joshi, Acting High Commissioner,  
High Commission of India in Zambia

Juergen Kettner, Chargé d'Affaires and Head of  
Infrastructure Development, Delegation of  
the European Commission

Peter Jul Larsen, Minister Counsellor,  
Royal Danish Embassy

Rona Lubinda, Governance Adviser,  
Royal Danish Embassy

Sheila Lutjens, Deputy Mission Director,  
United States Agency for  
International Development



Lynn MacDonald, Gender Focal Point,  
United Kingdom Department for  
International Development

Lithumelo Mate, Gender and Environment  
Adviser, Royal Danish Embassy

Rio Mochizuki, Economic Attaché,  
Embassy of Japan

Harry Molenaar, Ambassador,  
Royal Netherlands Embassy

Wilfred K. Mwamba, Governance Adviser,  
United Kingdom Department for  
International Development

Bill Nolan, Ambassador, Irish Embassy

Johan Norman, Political Affairs and Trade  
Adviser, Swedish Embassy

Pierre-Paul Perrons, Acting High Commissioner,  
Canadian High Commission

Henrik Riby, First Secretary, Swedish Embassy

Kaoru Tsurita, Counsellor, Japanese Embassy

Paula Walsh, British High Commission



## Annex 4

# EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions from the ToR	Additional Evaluation Questions
<b>Effectiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Did the UNDP programme accomplish its intended objectives and planned results?</li> <li>▪ What were the strengths and weaknesses of the programme?</li> <li>▪ What unexpected results did it yield?</li> <li>▪ Should the programme continue in its current direction or should its main tenets be reviewed for the new cycle?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are there sufficient resources to realize the objectives of planned activities?</li> <li>▪ Did communication channels function effectively?</li> <li>▪ To what extent did UNDP experience from other countries contribute to the achievement of Zambia ADR objectives?</li> <li>▪ To what extent did the UNDP's role as strategist, centre of intellectual excellence, catalyst or implementer of pilot activities contribute to the achievement of objectives?</li> <li>▪ To what extent have ratified UN conventions contributed to the achievement of objectives?</li> <li>▪ Are there instances where UNDP-assisted activities have had negative impacts on women or on men?</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How well did UNDP use its resources (human and financial) in achieving its contribution?</li> <li>▪ What could have been done to ensure a more efficient use of resources in the specific country/sub-regional context?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Were serious delays in delivery encountered?</li> <li>▪ How did the partners (GRZ, CPs and civil society) view UNDP efficiency?</li> <li>▪ Were any critical gaps in UNDP's programming identified?</li> <li>▪ Does UNDP have the capacity to deliver at a level commensurate with the demand for its services?</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are UNDP's contributions sustainable?</li> <li>▪ Are the development results achieved through UNDP contributions sustainable?</li> <li>▪ Are the benefits of UNDP interventions sustained and owned by national stakeholders once intervention have been completed?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ In which areas has UNDP effectively contributed to the development of human, organizational or institutional capacity in Zambia?</li> <li>▪ Has UN support to institutional capacity development led to sustainable ownership by the supported institutions?</li> </ul>

(cont'd) ►

◀ (cont'd)

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Questions from the ToR	Additional Evaluation Questions
<b>Relevance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How relevant are UNDP programmes to the priority needs of the country?</li> <li>▪ Did UNDP apply the right strategy within the specific political, economic and social context of the region?</li> <li>▪ To what extent are long-term development needs likely to be met across the practice areas?</li> <li>▪ What were critical gaps in UNDP's programming?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are the objectives in keeping with real needs and priorities of the implementing partners as well as those of the intended beneficiaries? What is the extent of fit or disjuncture and why?</li> <li>▪ To what extent has the UNDP supported the GRZ in implementation of UN conventions?</li> <li>▪ To what extent has UNDP support facilitated South-South dialogue and knowledge sharing?</li> <li>▪ In which ways have gender equality and environmental sustainability been relevant as cross-cutting issues within each evaluated activity and how have such issues been addressed?</li> </ul>
<b>Responsiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How did UNDP anticipate and respond to significant changes in the national development context?</li> <li>▪ How did UNDP respond to national long-term development needs?</li> <li>▪ What were the missed opportunities in UNDP programming?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How has UNDP responded to the changed aid delivery architecture in Zambia?</li> <li>▪ Can you cite concrete examples of UNDP responding to immediate needs or requests for assistance?</li> <li>▪ If so, was the response timely and effective?</li> </ul>
<b>Equity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Did the UNDP programmes and interventions lead to reduced vulnerabilities in the country?</li> <li>▪ Did UNDP intervention in any way influence the existing inequities (exclusions/inclusions) in society?</li> <li>▪ Was the selection of geographical areas of intervention guided by need?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Can you cite substantive examples of UNDP projects resulting in reduced poverty or vulnerability?</li> <li>▪ Can you cite examples of UNDP directly contributing to more equality between women and men?</li> </ul>
<b>Partnerships</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How has UNDP leveraged partnerships within the UN system as well as with national civil society and private sector groups?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is there mutual agreement or understanding among partners on what should be achieved through the partnerships?</li> <li>▪ Is there clarity about the nature of UNDP's mandate and capacity as "a donor that is not really a donor"?</li> <li>▪ How do the structure and processes of GRZ and CPs impact UNDP's ability to be effective in a strategic role?</li> <li>▪ How do UNDP's own structures and processes limit or facilitate its strategic capability?</li> <li>▪ Can you cite good examples of the UNDP playing a strategic role in Zambia?</li> <li>▪ If so, under which circumstances did this occur?</li> <li>▪ What can be learned from these examples?</li> </ul>

# ZAMBIA HDI HIGHLIGHTS

## HIGHLIGHTS 2008 UPDATE

### HUMAN DEVELOPMENT INDICES: A STATISTICAL UPDATE RELEASED ON 18 DECEMBER 2008

#### The Human Development Index— going beyond income

Each year since 1990 the Human Development Report Office has published the human development index (HDI) which looks beyond gross domestic product to a broader definition of well-being. The HDI provides a composite measure of three dimensions of human development: living a long and healthy life (measured by life expectancy), being educated (measured by adult

literacy and enrolment at the primary, secondary and tertiary level) and having a decent standard of living (measured by purchasing power parity, PPP, income). The index is not in any sense a comprehensive measure of human development. It does not, for example, include important indicators such as gender or income inequality, or more difficult-to-measure indicators like respect for human rights and political freedoms. What it does provide is a broadened prism for viewing human progress and the complex relationship between income and well-being.

The HDI for Zambia is 0.453, which gives the country a rank of 163 out of 179 countries with available data (Table 1).

**Table 1: The GDI compared to the HDI—a measure of gender disparity**

HDI value 2006	Life expectancy at birth (years) 2006	Adult literacy rate (% ages 15 and above) 2006	Combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment ratio (%) 2006	GDP per capita (PPP US\$) 2006
1. Iceland (0.968)	1. Japan (82.4)	1. Georgia (100.0)	1. Australia (114.2)	1. Luxembourg (77,089)
161. Benin (0.459)	176. Sierra Leone (42.1)	112. Malawi (70.9)	123. Syrian Arab Republic (65.7)	148. Lesotho (1,440)
162. Malawi (0.457)	177. Angola (42.1)	113. Madagascar (70.7)	124. Singapore (64.4)	149. Kenya (1,436)
163. Zambia (0.453)	178. Zambia (41.2)	114. Zambia (68.0)	125. Zambia (63.3)	150. Zambia (1,273)
164. Eritrea (0.442)	179. Swaziland (40.2)	115. Cameroon (67.9)	126. Timor-Leste (63.2)	151. Benin (1,259)
165. Rwanda (0.435)		116. Angola (67.4)	127. Viet Nam (62.3)	152. Ghana (1,247)
179. Sierra Leone (0.329)		147. Mali (22.9)	179. Djibouti (25.5)	178. Congo (Democratic Republic of the) (281)

Source: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/>.

Note: Changes in HDI values and ranks between two reports result from revisions to data for each of the HDI's three components (four indicators) as well as from real changes in the level of human development in different countries. The data revisions this year especially those of the GDP per capita (PPP US\$) series have resulted in more substantial apparent movements in the HDI than is normally the case between successive publications. For these reasons, HDI values and rankings are not comparable across different publications.

### Human poverty in Zambia: focusing on the most deprived in multiple dimensions of poverty

The HDI measures the average progress of a country in human development. The Human Poverty Index for developing countries (HPI-1) focuses on the proportion of people below a threshold level in the same dimensions of human development as the HDI—living a long and healthy life, having access to education and a decent standard of living. By looking beyond income deprivation, the HPI-1 represents a multi-dimensional alternative to the \$1.25-a-day-(PPP US\$)-poverty measure.

The HPI-1 value of 41.8% for Zambia, ranks 124 out of 135 developing countries for which the index has been calculated.

The HPI-1 measures severe deprivation in health within the proportion of people who are not expected to survive to age 40. Education is measured by the adult illiteracy rate. A decent standard of living is measured by the unweighted average of people without access to an improved water source, and the proportion of children under age 5 who are underweight for their age. Table 2 shows the values for these variables in Zambia and compares them to those of other countries.

<b>Human Poverty Index (HPI-1) 2006</b>	<b>Probability of not surviving past age 40 (%) 2005</b>	<b>Adult illiteracy rate (% ages 15 and older) 2006</b>	<b>People without access to an improved water source (%) 2006</b>	<b>Children underweight for age (% ages 0 to 5) 2006</b>
1. Czech Republic (1.7)	1. Singapore (1.8)	1. Cuba (0.2)	1. Bosnia and Herzegovina (1)	1. Croatia (1)
122. Timor-Leste (41.0)	132. Lesotho (47.8)	91. Malawi (29.1)	104. Togo (41)	85. Lesotho (20)
123. Senegal (41.1)	133. Swaziland (48.0)	92. Madagascar (29.3)	105. Vanuatu (41)	86. Kenya (20)
124. Zambia (41.8)	134. Zambia (53.9)	93. Zambia (32.0)	106. Zambia (42)	87. Zambia (20)
125. Benin (44.5)	135. Zimbabwe (57.4)	94. Cameroon (32.1)	107. Haiti (42)	88. Vanuatu (20)
126. Central African Republic (44.6)		95. Angola (32.6)	108. Guinea-Bissau (43)	89. Côte d'Ivoire (20)
135. Afghanistan (60.2)		127. Mali (77.1)	123. Afghanistan (78)	135. Bangladesh (48)

Source: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/>.

## Building the capabilities of women

The HDI measures average achievements in a country, but it does not incorporate the degree of gender imbalance in these achievements. The gender-related development index (GDI), introduced in Human Development Report 1995, measures achievements in the same dimensions using the same indicators as the HDI, but captures inequalities in achievement between women and men. It is simply the HDI adjusted downward for gender inequality. The greater the gender disparity in basic human development, the lower a country's GDI relative to its HDI.

To measure the impact of gender inequalities on human development achievement, Zambia's GDI value, 0.444, can be compared to its HDI value of 0.453. Its GDI value is 98.0% of its HDI value. Out of the 157 countries with both HDI

and GDI values, 120 countries have a better ratio than Zambia's.

Table 3 indicates how Zambia's ratio of GDI to HDI compares to that of other countries, and also shows its values for selected underlying indicators in the calculation of the GDI.

The gender empowerment measure (GEM) reveals whether women take an active part in economic and political life. It tracks the number of seats in parliament held by women, the number of female legislators, senior officials and managers, the number of female professional and technical workers and the gender disparity in earned income, which reflects economic independence. Differing from the GDI, the GEM exposes inequality of opportunity in selected areas. Zambia ranks 91 out of 108 countries in the GEM, with a value of 0.425.

**Table 3: The GDI compared to the HDI—a measure of gender disparity**

<b>GDI as % of HDI</b>	<b>Life expectancy at birth (years) 2006</b>	<b>Adult literacy rate (% ages 15 and older) 2006</b>	<b>Combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment ratio 2006</b>
	<b>Female as % male</b>	<b>Female as % male</b>	<b>Female as % male</b>
1. Sweden (99.9%)	1. Russian Federation (123.1%)	1. Lesotho (122.5%)	1. United Arab Emirates (120.2%)
119. Cape Verde (98.1%)	154. Pakistan (100.8%)	103. Nigeria (79.0%)	119. Bolivia (93.3%)
120. Guatemala (98.0%)	155. Lesotho (100.6%)	104. Uganda (79.0%)	120. Ghana (92.5%)
121. Zambia (98.0%)	156. Zambia (100.6%)	105. Zambia (78.4%)	121. Zambia (92.0%)
122. Tunisia (98.0%)	157. Niger (96.9%)	106. Algeria (78.0%)	122. Nepal (91.6%)
123. Nicaragua (97.9%)		107. Cambodia (78.0%)	123. Guatemala (90.9%)
157. Occupied Palestinian Territories (92.8%)		135. Chad (31.3%)	157. Chad (60.4%)

Source: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/>.





## Annex 6

# ZAMBIA HDI INDICATORS OVER TIME

<b>Zambia</b>			
<b>Births attended by skilled health personnel (%)</b>			
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1996</b>	<b>2002</b>	
<b>Births attended by skilled health personnel (%)</b>	47%	43%	

Source: UN Data.

<b>HIV rate (%) in adults (15 to 49 years)</b>			
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2005</b>
<b>HIV rate (%) in adults (15 to 49 years)</b>	15.60%	16.93%	16.96%

Source: Unesco.

<b>Infant mortality rate (0/00)</b>			
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Infant mortality rate (0/00) both genders</b>	101	102	102
<b>Infant mortality rate (0/00) female</b>	100	101	101
<b>Infant mortality rate (0/00) male</b>	102	103	103

Source: UN Data.

<b>Life expectancy at birth (years)</b>			
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Life expectancy at birth (years) both genders</b>	52	42	43
<b>Life expectancy at birth (years) female</b>	53	43	43
<b>Life expectancy at birth (years) male</b>	50	41	42

Source: UN Data.

<b>Population living below the poverty line (% living on &lt; US\$1 per day)</b>			
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1990 to 2005</b>		
<b>Population living below the poverty line</b>	63.8		

Source: Human Development Report.

Data refer to the most recent year available during the period specified.

<b>Total prevalence of severe underweight (% ages 0 to 5)</b>			
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>2000 to 2007</b>		
<b>Prevalence of severe underweight (% ages 0 to 5)</b>	3		

Source: UN Data.

Data refer to the most recent year available during the period specified.

<b>Population with sustainable access to improved drinking water sources (%)</b>			
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2006</b>
<b>Population with sustainable access to improved drinking water sources (%)</b>	50	54	58

Source: UN Data.

<b>Comparison of select indicators of human poverty for Zambia</b>				
<b>Country Name HPI-1 Index for 2006</b>	<b>Probability of not surviving past age 40 (%) 2005</b>	<b>Adult illiteracy rate (% ages 15 and older) 2006</b>	<b>People without access to an improved water source (%) 2006</b>	<b>Children underweight for age (% ages 0 to 5) 2006</b>
<b>1. Czech Republic (1.7)</b>	1. Singapore (1.8)	1. Cuba (0.2)	1. Bosnia and Herzegovina (1)	1. Croatia (1)
<b>122. Timor-Leste (41.0)</b>	132. Lesotho (47.8)	91. Malawi (29.1)	104. Togo (41)	85. Lesotho (20)
<b>123. Senegal (41.1)</b>	133. Swaziland (48.0)	92. Madagascar (29.3)	105. Vanuatu (41)	86. Kenya (20)
<b>124. Zambia (41.8)</b>	134. Zambia (53.9)	93. Zambia (32.0)	106. Zambia (42)	87. Zambia (20)
<b>125. Benin (44.5)</b>	135. Zimbabwe (57.4)	94. Cameroon (32.1)	107. Haiti (42)	88. Vanuatu (20)
<b>126. Central African Republic (44.6)</b>		95. Angola (32.6)	108. Guinea-Bissau (43)	89. Côte d'Ivoire (20)
<b>135. Afghanistan (60.2)</b>		127. Mali (77.1)	123. Afghanistan (78)	135. Bangladesh (48)

Source: Human Development Report.

<b>Literacy Rate</b>				
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Adult literacy rate (%). Total</b>	65.00%	68.00%	69.15%	70.64%
<b>Adult literacy rate (%). Male</b>	73.04%	76.25%	80.91%	80.75%
<b>Adult literacy rate (%). Female</b>	57.36%	59.80%	61.84%	60.75%
<b>Youth literacy rate (%). Male</b>	67.27%	72.62%	77.73%	82.37%
<b>Youth literacy rate (%). Female</b>	65.52%	66.23%	66.31%	67.78%
<b>Youth literacy rate (%). Total</b>	66.38%	69.46%	69.09%	75.09%

Education Ratio								
Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002	2004	2005	2006	2007
<b>Gross enrolment ratio. Primary. Female</b>	77.16%	77.33%	77.31%	80.20%	100.66%	111.44%	1.158357	117.22%
<b>Gross enrolment ratio. Primary. Male</b>	83.65%	82.87%	82.51%	85.94%	105.29%	117.75%	1.179174	120.69%
<b>Gross enrolment ratio. Primary. Total</b>	80.42%	80.11%	79.92%	83.08%	102.98%	114.61%	1.168811	118.96%
<b>Gross enrolment ratio. Secondary.</b>	17.70%	20.65%	21.67%	25.42%	24.46%	27.30%	...	40.60%
<b>Gross enrolment ratio. Secondary.</b>	22.94%	25.58%	28.03%	30.64%	30.80%	33.42%	...	45.67%
<b>Gross enrolment ratio. Secondary.</b>	20.33%	23.12%	24.86%	28.04%	27.64%	30.37%	...	43.14%
<b>Net enrolment rate. Primary. Female</b>	66.54%	66.38%	66.56%	68.50%	83.29%	92.89%	93.57%	94.39%
<b>Net enrolment rate. Primary. Male</b>	69.10%	67.96%	67.34%	69.79%	83.09%	91.17%	90.42%	93.72%
<b>Net enrolment rate. Primary. Total</b>	67.82%	67.17%	66.95%	69.15%	83.19%	92.03%	91.99%	94.05%
<b>Net enrolment rate. Secondary. All programs. Female</b>	15.05%	17.46%	18.56%	20.72%	22.19%	24.92%	...	38.11%
<b>Net enrolment rate. Secondary.</b>	17.73%	20.95%	22.73%	25.08%	28.52%	31.19%	...	43.70%
<b>Net enrolment rate. Secondary. All programs. Total</b>	16.39%	19.21%	20.65%	22.91%	25.37%	28.07%	...	40.92%

Source: Unesco.

<b>Zambia Demographic Profile (1975 to 2010) Medium Variant</b>								
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1975</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2010</b>
<b>Population (thousands)</b>	4,899	5,774	6,785	7,910	9,108	10,467	11,738	13,257
<b>Male population (thousands)</b>	2,434	2,871	3,374	3,934	4,529	5,204	5,845	6,616
<b>Female population (thousands)</b>	2,464	2,904	3,411	3,976	4,579	5,263	5,893	6,641
<b>Population sex ratio (males per 100 females)</b>	98.8	98.9	98.9	98.9	98.9	98.9	99.2	99.6
<b>Percentage aged 0 to 4 (%)</b>	19.4	19.2	18.3	18	17.8	18.2	18.2	17.9
<b>Percentage aged 5 to 14 (%)</b>	27.7	28.1	28.3	27.7	27.2	27.1	27.8	28.3
<b>Percentage aged 15 to 24 (%)</b>	18.2	18.6	19.3	19.8	20.2	20.2	20.2	20.2
<b>Percentage aged 60 or over (%)</b>	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.8
<b>Percentage aged 65 or over (%)</b>	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.9	3	3
<b>Percentage aged 80 or over (%)</b>	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.4
<b>Percentage of women aged 15 to 49 (%)</b>	43.6	43.3	44.2	45.1	45.7	45.4	44.4	44.3
<b>Median age (years)</b>	16.5	16.3	16.6	17	17.3	17.2	16.8	16.8
<b>Population density (population per sq. km)</b>	7	8	9	11	12	14	16	18

Source: United Nations Population Division.

<b>Economic Profile</b>									
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1999</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>
<b>Total debt service as a % of GNI</b>	5.00	6.02	5.33	6.34	13.33	9.25	4.20	1.58	...
<b>GDP (local currency)</b>	7.4777E +12	1.00719E +13	1.3133E +13	1.635E +13	2.07028E +13	2.64E +13	3.28E+ 13	3.922E+ 13	4.55E+ 13
<b>GDP (local currency)</b>	7.08629E +12	9.5866E +12	1.2537E +13	1.568E +13	2.00259E +13	2.45E +13	3.01E+ 13	3.561E+ 13	4.1E+ 13
<b>GDP growth rate</b>	2.22	3.58	4.89	3.30	5.12	5.36	5.22	6.20	...
<b>GDP per capita (PPP) US\$</b>	872.36	903.22	950.71	980.53	1,033.76	1,100.12	1,170.95	1,259.27	...

Source: Unesco.

<b>HDI Trend</b>									
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>1975</b>	<b>1980</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>1995</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	
<b>HDI Rank—Low human development</b>	...	...	...	...	...	165	163	163	
<b>HDI value</b>	0.47	0.478	0.489	0.477	0.439	0.42	0.434	0.453	

Source: Human Development Report.



## Annex 7

# ZAMBIA AT A GLANCE

<b>Country</b>	
Geographical location	Zambia is a landlocked republic in south-central Africa, bordered by the Democratic Republic of the Congo to the north, Tanzania to the north-east, Malawi to the east, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Botswana and Namibia to the south and Angola to the west.
Land area	752,612 sq km
Terrain	Mostly high plateau with some hills and mountains with 56% potentially arable land, of which only one-sixth is currently being cultivated.
<b>People</b>	
Population	11,862,740 (July 2009 est.)
Age and gender structure	0 to 14 years: 45.1% 15 to 64 years: 52.6% 65 years and over: 2.3% 1.03 male(s)/female ratio at birth
Ethnic groups	73 ethnic groups, largest ones being Bemba, Tonga, Chewa, Lozi, Nsenga, Tumbuka, Ngoni, Lala, Kaonde Lunda (2000 census).
<b>Government</b>	
Type	Presidential republic
Key political events since Independence	Independence in October 1964 from Britain, UNIP government under president Kenneth Kaunda 1964 to 1991, One-Party state 1973 to 1991. Reintroduced multi-party politics with MMD government under presidents Frederick Chiluba (1991 to 2001), Levy Mwanawasa (2001 to 2008) and Rupiah Banda since 2008.
Parliament	Unicameral National Assembly (158 seats; 150 members are elected by popular vote, 8 members are appointed by the president to serve five-year terms). Last election was held in 2006 (next to be held in October 2011).
Major political parties (2008)	Movement for Multiparty Democracy (or MMD: 74 elected seats in the National Assembly—8 more nominated by President), Patriotic Front (or PF: 43 seats), United Democratic Alliance (or UDA: 26 seats), United Liberal Party (or ULP: 3 seats) National Democratic Front (or NDF: 1 seat). Three more seats are occupied by independents.
<b>Economy</b>	
GDP (PPP)	<i>total USD</i> 11.1 billion (2007) <i>per capita USD</i> 933 (2007)
Economic structure	agriculture: 16% (as of 2008) 85% (as of 2004) industry: 26.6% 6% services: 57.4% of GDP 9% of labour force
Major export commodities	Refined copper, crude materials (excl fuels), food & live animals
Major import commodities	Machinery & transport equipments, fuels, chemicals manufactured goods (chiefly refined copper).
Foreign direct investment net inflows (in USD millions)	984 (2007)

(cont'd) ►

◀ (cont'd)

<b>Life</b>	
Human Development Index Value	0.42 (2000) 0.434 (2005) 0.453 (2006) (163 out of all countries)
Poverty	63.8% living below USD 1.25 a day 81.5% living below USD 2 a day (2000 to 2007)
Life expectancy at birth	43 years (2006)
Infant mortality	102 per 1,000 live births (2006)
Access to improved water source	58% of population (2006)
HIV prevalence	16.96% of people aged 15 to 49
Adult literacy	70.64% of people aged 15 and over
Net primary enrolment rate	94.05% (2007)
Earned income by gender	Estimated ratio of women to men: 0.56 (2007)
Unemployment rate	50% (2005 est.)
Internet users	700,000 (2008)

Sources: UN and GRZ.











United Nations Development Programme  
Evaluation Office  
One United Nations Plaza  
New York, NY 10017, USA  
Tel. (212) 906 5059, Fax (212) 906 6008  
Internet: <http://www.undp.org/eo>

Sales #: E.10.III.B.9  
ISBN: 978-92-1-126280-3

