



2022:23

Sida Decentralised Evaluation

FCG Sweden

Strengthened Accountability Program II

Final Report

Strengthened Accountability Program II

Final Report
April 2022

Bente Topsøe-Jensen
Bwalya Penza
Chiwama Musonda

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2022:23
Sida

Authors: Bente Topsøe-Jensen, Bwalya Penza, Chiwama Musonda

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

Sida Decentralised Evaluation 2022:23

Commissioned by Sida, Embassy of Sweden in Zambia

Copyright: Sida and the authors

Date of final report: 2022-04-29

Art. no. Sida62554en

urn:nbn:se:sida-62554en

This publication can be downloaded from: <http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

Table of contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms	i
Preface	iii
Executive Summary	iv
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Background, purpose and objectives	1
1.2 Evaluation object and scope	2
1.3 Evaluation criteria and questions	2
1.4 Structure of the report	3
2 Methodology	5
2.1 Overall approach	5
2.2 Methods and tools for data collection and analysis	5
2.3 Adjustments, limitations and constraints	8
3 Diakonia's SAP II program - Brief description	10
3.1 Diakonia's vision and SAP II Theory of Change	10
3.2 SAP II - Brief description	12
3.3 Main deviations in implementation	16
4 Discussion of Main Findings	17
4.1 Brief context analysis	17
4.1.1 General country context	17
4.1.2 Political context	18
4.2 Diakonia's program management capacity	19
4.2.1 Governance structure	19
4.2.2 Country Office capacity	20
4.2.3 Grant management approach	23
4.2.4 Monitoring, evaluation and learning	28
4.3 Achievement of results	30
4.3.1 Gender Equity and Equality	31
4.3.2 Equitable access to and distribution of natural resources	33
4.3.3 Social and environmental accountability	35
4.3.4 Partner organizations' capacity	38

4.3.5	Harmonization and synergy	41
4.4	Cross-cutting issues	44
4.4.1	Gender	44
4.4.2	Environment	47
4.4.3	Conflict sensitivity	48
4.5	Lessons learned	50
4.5.1	Implementation principles	51
4.5.2	Community level engagement	51
4.5.3	Program management	51
4.5.4	Communication	52
5	Conclusions and Recommendations	53
5.1	Conclusions	53
5.1.1	Relevance - Is the program doing the right thing?	53
5.1.2	Coherence - How well does the intervention fit?	54
5.1.3	Effectiveness - Is the intervention achieving its objectives?	55
5.1.4	Efficiency - How well are resources being used?	56
5.2	Recommendations	57
5.2.1	Organizational structure and capacity	57
5.2.2	Program management	58
5.2.3	Program implementation	58
5.2.4	External relation	59
5.2.5	Overall conclusion and recommendation	60
	Annex 1 – Terms of Reference	61
	Annex 2 – Evaluation Matrix	73
	Annex 3 – Data Collection Tools	76
3.1	E-questionnaire	76
3.2	Interview checklist - implementing partners	79
3.3	Interview checklist - resource organizations	83
3.4	Interview checklist - rights holders	86
	Annex 4 – Documentation	88
	Annex 5 – List of Interviewees	96
	Annex 6 – SAP II Partner Organizations	100
	Annex 7 – Contracts and Disbursements	102
	Annex 8 – Program and Partner Objectives	105
	Annex 9 – Partner Organizations - Summary Findings	110

Abbreviations and Acronyms

AD	Africa Directions
CDF	Constituency Development Fund
CO	Country Office
COD	Country Office Director
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
CTPD	Center for Trade Policy and Development
DB	Duty bearers
DC	District Commissioner
EITA	Extractive Industries Transparency Alliance
EITI	Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative
EoS	Embassy of Sweden
ET	Evaluation Team
FAO	Finance and Administration Officer
FCG	Finnish Consulting Group
FIC	Financial Intelligence Center
FODEP	Foundation for Democratic Processes
GCO	Grants Compliance Officer
GEE	Gender Equality and Equity
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
JCTR	Jesuit Center for Theological Reflection
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
MISA	Media Institute for Southern Africa
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NGOCC	Non-governmental Gender Organizations' Coordination Committee
NLACW	National Legal Aid Clinic for Women
NRM	Natural Resource Management
PCC	Program Coordination Committee
PF	Patriotic Front
PO	Program Officer
QA	Quality Assurance
RH	Rights holders
SACCOIRD	Southern Africa Center for Constructive Resolution
SAP	Strengthened Accountability Program
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SEA	Social and Environmental Accountability
SEK	Swedish Kroner

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

TOR	Terms of Reference
UPND	United Party for National Development
WDC	Ward Development Committee
WFC	Women for Change
YAD	Youth Alliance for Development
ZCM	Zambia Chamber of Mines
ZHECT	Zambia Health Education Communication Trust
ZMW	Zambian Kwacha

Preface

This evaluation was contracted by Embassy of Sweden in Lusaka, Zambia through the Sida Framework Agreement for Evaluation Services, and conducted by FCG Sweden.

The Evaluation Team consisted of Bente Topsøe-Jensen (team leader), Bwalya Penza and Chiwama Musonda. The final report was quality assured by Susan Tamondong, whose work was independent of the evaluation team. Christian Carlbaum from FCG Sweden provided project management support.

The evaluation team would like to express its thanks to the Embassy of Sweden in Lusaka, the Diakonia Country Office, and the Strengthened Accountability Program II partner organizations for extensive support, willingness to provide information, set up meetings and answer endless questions.

Executive Summary

BACKGROUND

The evaluation of Strengthened Accountability Program Phase II (SAP II) running from 2018 to 2022 was commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in Zambia. It took place from late December 2021 with inception and data collection in January and February 2022, and data verification and analysis in March and April 2022. The evaluation took place towards the end of the program period, with under a year left of the 2022 no-cost extension period.

The *overall purpose* of the evaluation was to evaluate progress and results of the SAP II based on a number of specific evaluation objectives with focus on assessment of outcomes, results and achievements; determination of effectiveness and efficiency of interventions; identification of key learnings and key change/success stories. The evaluation objectives adhered to selected OECD/DAC evaluation criteria - relevance, coherence, effectiveness and efficiency. The *scope of the evaluation* was the SAP II program period from 2018 to 2022 with focus on Diakonia Country Office's and partner organizations' capacity to implement the program and the delivery of interventions in selected project sites. It focused on the geographical areas in North-Western and Southern Provinces with field data collection carried out in North-Western Province. The evaluation included document review, approximately 50 face-to-face and virtual interviews and focus group discussions, as well as e-questionnaires to 14 implementing and resource organizations. The ET maintained a close contact with Diakonia and the Embassy of Sweden throughout the evaluation process to ensure a utilization focus and engagement of primary users.

The evaluation report presents the findings, conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations for the Embassy of Sweden, Diakonia and partner organizations. A draft version of the report was presented and discussed with Diakonia and the Embassy of Sweden, and at a verification meeting with partner organizations. Comments from these sessions have been incorporated in the final version.

DIAKONIA AND SAP II

Diakonia is the joint development organization of two Swedish churches and one of the major Swedish non-governmental organizations. Diakonia's work is founded on Christian principles with a focus on human rights and with people at the center as driving force for a just, equal and sustainable world. The organization has been active in Zambia since 2003 with a strong focus on support to human rights and civil society. The program activities are governed by Diakonia's overall strategic framework, which

comprises of a global strategy, a country strategy and a number of thematic strategies, including e.g. gender and environment.

The SAP II program was built on experience from SAP I (2014-2017) with focus on awareness creation, organization and mobilization through capacity building and empowerment of rights holders and CSOs, and collective action and advocacy systematized through integrated human rights-based approach and a strong focus on gender equality and equity. The underlying program theory of change is based on the assumption that knowledge of rights combined with increased capacity to act leads to empowerment, which again allows rights holders to demand accountability from private and public duty bearers on equitable access to and distribution of national resources.

Diakonia as fund manager holds the overall responsibility for implementation of SAP II, which is carried out by local partner organizations supported by a number of resource organizations responsible for capacity building of implementing partners. The initial ten implementing partner organizations were reduced to seven towards the final year of implementation, as three partnerships were terminated because of financial incidents. Implementing partners were organized in three thematic clusters: gender equality and equity, natural resource management, and social and environmental accountability. SAP II operated in 13 districts in five provinces, which represents a considerable expansion compared to SAP I, which only operated in one province. SAP II has a special focus on the extractive industry sector, i.e. mining companies and their obligations in terms of corporate social responsibility.

The overall program budget was SEK 41.4 million of which approximately SEK 11.5 remained underspent by the end of 2021. The SAP II implementation period starting by mid-2018 and was characterized by a number of external and internal obstacles, which resulted in low budget execution. Among the hindering factors were the late inclusion of resource organizations a year after program start. The COVID-19 pandemic in 2020-2021 and the freezing of funds by the Swedish Embassy during the major part of 2021 were all factors that provided a bumpy implementation and caused difficulties in gaining momentum. As a consequence of the low budget execution and constraints encountered, the program had a no cost extension for 2022.

MAIN FINDINGS

Political context. Zambia is considered a stable country with successful democratic elections held every five years. Under the previous regime there was increasing state intolerance towards civil society and any voices critical of the government. However, with the shift in government after the August 2021 elections the new regime has made utterances towards greater commitment to civil liberties. Albeit it is still early days to see how the recent changes in government practice and structure will impact the political environment in relation to gender equality, environmental awareness, decentralization of resources, and transparency and accountability in the mining sector. But currently it appears that Zambia is experiencing a more open political environment.

Program management capacity. The overall responsibility for policy and strategy development lies with the Sweden-based global board. The Diakonia governance structure in Zambia is lean and consists of a three seats board with internal members established in 2019. There are no external board members, which the evaluation team saw as a lost opportunity in terms of having external strategic input as well as national level legitimacy. The country office is likewise lean with only eight well qualified staff members with relevant degrees matching their positions. A number of key staff positions were changed in 2020-2021, which resulted in a temporary pressure on the country office capacity. The current team is gaining momentum, but the deliberate lean structure represents a major challenge to meet the requirements in terms of timeliness in response, as well as specialized capacity, e.g. in monitoring and evaluation. The evaluation team experienced that the country office filing system does not allow easy document retrieval. Additional fundraising to reduce the dependency on Swedish funding has started but is yet to yield concrete results.

Grant management. Partners were selected based on their potential contribution to the overall program, and partnerships are based on a contract. Diakonia undertook a capacity assessment of partner organizations in 2018, which provided the basis for an overall as well as individual capacity building plans. Disbursements were in general delayed due to the late project start in November 2018 and further suffered momentum in 2021 due to the freezing of funds from the Embassy of Sweden. Diakonia operates a detailed risk assessment and monitoring of partner organizations with a four-level classification reflecting a close monitoring of financial and administrative performance. This led to the untimely termination of three partnerships as financial and governance incidents were detected. There was, however, limited change in the initial risk status of partners, hence limited development in terms of capacity and reduced risk. Diakonia handled occurrence of incidents according to internal procedures and guidelines, which however, resulted in long processes with no legal actions taken. Annual audits are carried out by internationally recognized companies contracted for five years periods.

Monitoring, evaluation and learning. The monitoring, evaluation and learning is based on the program results framework and annual work plans. Partners report twice a year to Diakonia, including narrative and financial reporting. The reporting format has a keen focus on learning, which is again reflected in the discussions at the Partner Coordination Committee meetings with partner management and operational levels. Monitoring, evaluation and learning is institutionalized, but the feedback structure is time consuming and does not match the available human resources at Diakonia Country Office. Diakonia reports to the Embassy of Sweden on an annual basis.

Achievement of results. The SAP II results framework revised in September 2019 integrated comprehensive information from the 2019 baseline study. The baseline study is an important reference document for SAP II, and the participatory data collection process contributed to a broad understanding and ownership by partners. SAP II implementation stumbled with COVID-19 restrictions and the 2021 freezing of funds, which have required substantial adjustments to initial plans in terms of activities

and approach. In spite of this, the evaluation found that SAP II for the *gender outcome area* has produced considerable results on the ground in terms of women's engagement and gender awareness, and some provision of evidence for national level advocacy. For outcome area 2 on *natural resources*, program activities focused on engagement between rights holders and duty bearers, and despite challenges in terms of late disbursements, fulfilment of SAP II and partner objectives and expected outcomes has generally been successful. In terms of *social and environmental accountability* under outcome 3, SAP II and partners succeeded in increased engagement between communities, traditional leaders and mining companies, as well as increased commitment from private sector to meet community needs and address environmental concerns.

Partner organizations' capacity. There is a keen focus on capacity building for enhancing implementation efficiency and effectiveness. The late introduction of the resource organizations resulted in targeted capacity building only starting one year into implementation, which in some cases were untimely, e.g. in case of formulation of indicators and setting up of monitoring mechanisms. The set-up with resource organizations responsible for capacity building was amended over time to include peer capacity building, e.g. on gender mainstreaming, and the transition of a resource organization to implementing partner. This calls for a more flexible and organic set-up in future.

Harmonization and synergy were promoted through frequent exchange at Program Coordination Committee meetings as well as through the cluster set-up emphasizing on the ground coordination. Despite this, the evaluation team saw examples of top-down decisions on change in rights holders' program affiliation, which was considered disruptive to the harmonic program implementation.

Cross-cutting issues. SAP II operated with three cross-cutting issues: *gender, environment and conflict sensitivity*. These issues were amply addressed throughout the program implementation with most emphasis on gender, which was present in all partner programs. Also environment and conflict sensitivity played a prominent role in relation to engagement of mining companies, private sector and government institutions.

LESSONS LEARNED

The entire SAP II is based on lessons learned from SAP I, and learning represents a thread of consistency throughout the program implementation and monitoring. Key learning issues collected from partners centered around the themes of implementation principles, community level engagement, program management and communication.

CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation team concluded that the SAP II program is a valuable and **relevant** investment with a strategic focus on human rights, gender, rights holders' voice and

environmental issues, as well as the capacity to adapt the program to changed circumstances. Learning is a bearing element in the program approach, and monitoring of change and compilation of lessons learned has led to timely and pertinent program changes.

The program approach is unique with solid evidence of **coherence** and synergy among partner organizations, as well as with different stakeholders. However, the evaluation team found that Diakonia could explore further the evidence generated by SAP II in a broader civil society engagement.

In terms of **effectiveness**, there is substantial evidence for implementation of planned and adjusted activities on the ground, but limited evidence on how this is linked to national level advocacy. Diakonia plays a limited role in national level advocacy, but a number of the partner organizations, e.g. WFC and NGOCC are technically capable of facilitating such vertical linkages. In spite of a strong focus on capacity building there is so far limited documented results of these efforts, mainly due to the challenges encountered during the program implementation period. This resulted in e.g. limited unfolding of the established cluster model. The established monitoring, evaluation and learning system is based on systematic collection of data and feedback from Country Office to partner organizations. The limited country office capacity is, however, a bottleneck to enhanced effectiveness. In spite of this, Diakonia has delivered comprehensive and well-informed narrative annual reports to the Embassy of Sweden.

The **efficiency** of SAP II was difficult to assess due to the described challenges in implementation. The grant management approach appeared solid and well-structured, albeit resource demanding to a degree which challenged the human resources available at the country office.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations are based on the overall conclusion that SAP II has not been given the opportunity to fully demonstrate its potential due to the extraordinary contextual circumstances under which it was implemented. Consequently, the recommendations are based on the assumption that there is a time horizon beyond the current program period, where lessons learned and experience gained can be unfolded and scaled up.

In terms of the **organizational structure and capacity**, the evaluation team recommends:

1. to identify 2-3 external board members from like-minded CSOs operating in similar fields, academia with technical knowledge relevant to the Diakonia country program, media or communication specialists to enhance visibility or reputable individuals / resource persons;
2. to accelerate the fundraising efforts to strengthen organizational sustainability and reduce single-donor dependency;

3. to strengthen monitoring capacity at the country office by contracting a staff member with this specialization, alternatively by upgrading skills with existing staff, or by hiring specialized consultant to review the monitoring system, volume of data collected and procedures for aggregation of data;
4. to engage the planned additional capacity for the grants compliance function as soon as possible to establish momentum;
5. to review and systematize the filing system and train all staff in the use of the system to allow for easy localization, sharing and use of filed documents.

In terms of the **program management**, the evaluation team recommends:

6. to calibrate the details of the approval procedure and process with the available human resources and operate with advance payments in order to avoid break of momentum in implementation of program activities;
7. to speak more openly in the partner group about occurred problems and to act promptly when cases are detected.

In terms of the **program implementation**, the evaluation team recommends:

8. to establish a continued skills upgrading on gender mainstreaming among the partner organizations building on the positive experience from previous trainings by WFC and NGOCC.
9. to rethink the resource organization set-up and consider a more flexible network with focus on peer exchange, including also formal training / capacity building and allowing all participating partner organizations in implementing role as well - combined with a systematic coordination of training events. e.g. through a centrally managed training budget is recommended;
10. to consult with involved partner organizations and rights holders' groups before any changes in terms of affiliation are made;
11. to apply a systematic approach and an extraordinary effort during the remaining period of SAP II to document results in qualitative as well as quantitative terms, as this will be a strong argument for continued program implementation.

In terms of the **external relations**, the evaluation team recommends:

12. to take a more independent, visible and proactive role in national advocacy;
13. to engage directly in national level beyond the current circles and actively bring forward experience from community level interventions.

The **overall conclusion and recommendation** of the evaluation team is therefore:

14. that there is solid indication of successful implementation in terms of approach and results and therefore reason for continued commitment to support Diakonia's SAP program.

1 Introduction

The evaluation of Strengthened Accountability Program Phase II (SAP II) was commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in Zambia. It took place from late December 2021 with inception and data collection in January and February 2022, and data verification and analysis in March and April 2022. The evaluation took place towards the end of the program period, with under a year left of the 2022 no-cost extension period. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020-2021, no midterm review of the program was carried out.

The primary intended users of the evaluation were Diakonia and its implementing partners, as well as the Embassy of Sweden. The evaluation had a keen focus on learning and documentation of results and findings, conclusions and recommendations presented in the evaluation report aim at supporting the remaining part of the program implementation, as well as provide an input to the assessment of possible further support.

1.1 BACKGROUND, PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

The **purpose and objective** of the evaluation was to evaluate progress and results (impact) of the SAP II. The ToR¹ provided a list of *evaluation objectives* with focus on assessment of outcomes, results and achievements; determination of effectiveness and efficiency of interventions; identification of key learnings and key change/success stories. The evaluation objectives adhered to selected OECD/DAC evaluation criteria - relevance, coherence, effectiveness and efficiency. The evaluation was backward and forward looking, compiled lessons learned, and provided recommendations on possible further support to Diakonia Zambia.

The evaluation is meant to assess and document the extent to which the program has performed against its targets or achieved results with a focus on efficiency in the utilization of resources, grant and partner management, relative strengths and comparative advantage of Diakonia and partners, identify the key learnings and good practices from the program, make recommendations for improvement in identified areas, and inform a realistic framework for future/successor program and funding. ²

¹ Annex 1. Term of Reference, p.5.

² Ibid., p.2

1.2 EVALUATION OBJECT AND SCOPE

The **evaluation object** was the SAP II, which builds on experience from the first phase of the program SAP I implemented by Diakonia from 2014 to 2017 with funds from the Embassy of Sweden in Zambia. SAP II represented an expansion in terms of number of implementing partners from the initial five to ten implementing partner organizations, and the involvement of four resource organizations with specific capacity building focus. In terms of geographical coverage, SAP II represented an expansion from the initial three districts³ in North-Western Province to 13 districts in North-Western, Copperbelt, Luapula, Lusaka and Southern Provinces. The SAP II consisted of three components: Awareness and knowledge building, Organization/mobilization of rights holders (RH) and civil society organizations (CSO), and Collective action/ advocacy. In addition to these three program components, the evaluation also focused on Diakonia's program implementation capacity, and the implementing partner organizations and resource organizations' performance to assess results and capacity.

In terms of **scope**, the evaluation addressed the SAP II period from 2018 to 2021, the ten on-going and terminated implementing partners, the four resource organizations and the five provinces in which the program operated. The evaluation scope was further amplified by the number of specific issues and challenges identified⁴ as important for a comprehensive evaluation of the SAP II program, i.e. unequal representation of women and youth; lack of right claiming ability of rights holders; limited access to information; inadequate responsiveness of private sector actors to community needs; inadequate attention to environmental sustainability; and lack of conflict prevention/ resolution mechanisms at local level.

1.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS

The four OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, coherence, effectiveness and efficiency guided the evaluation. They were unfolded in a number of specific evaluation questions⁵ organized in an Evaluation Matrix with indicators and data collection instruments and sources of information.⁶ In addition, also the cross-cutting issues of gender, conflict sensitivity and environmental effects were addressed.

Evaluation criteria	Evaluation questions
1. Relevance	1.1 To what extent has the intervention objectives and design responded to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and have they continued to do so if/when circumstances have changed?

³ SAP I was working in two districts (Solwezi & Chavuma) in the first year of implementation. Solwezi was then split into two districts (Solwezi and Kalumbila), whereby the number of districts increased to three.

⁴ ToR, p.4.

⁵ Annex 1 Terms of Reference, p. 6-7.

⁶ Annex 2 Evaluation Matrix

	1.2 To what extent have lessons learned from what works well and less well been used to improve and adjust intervention implementation?
	1.3 Evaluate the relevance of intervention of SAP II as an input to the decision whether or not it shall receive continued funding.
2. Coherence	2.1 How compatible has the intervention been with other interventions in the country, sector or organization where it is being implemented?
3. Effectiveness	3.1 To what extent has the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups?
	3.2 To what extent has Diakonia's capacity building and thematic support to their implementing partners improved their capacities?
	3.3 To what extent have the interventions of different implementing partners been harmonized?
	3.4 Has the M&E system delivered robust and useful information that could be used to assess progress towards outcomes and contribute to learning?
4. Efficiency	4.1 To what extent has the intervention delivered, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way?
	4.2 To what extent has the Diakonia's grant management approach been efficient and effective?

For more details on the interpretation of the evaluation questions, see *Annex 2 Evaluation Matrix*.

1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT

The evaluation report contains an Executive Summary followed by a number of background chapters: Chapter 1 Introduction providing the background, purpose and objective of the evaluation, as well as the object and scope, valuation criteria as well as the brief presentation of the report structure; Chapter 2 Methodology, which describes the overall approach, methods and tools used for data collection and analysis, as well as limitations and constraints encountered; and Chapter 3 Diakonia's SAP II program presents the evaluation object in terms of vision and theory of change, objectives and main features. Chapter 4 Discussion of main findings is the main chapter of the report, where findings are presented and discussed in a number of sub-chapters: 4.1 Brief context analysis including the general country context and the political context; an analysis of governance structure, Country Office capacity, the Grant management approach, and Monitoring, evaluation and learning mechanisms in 4.2 Diakonia's program management capacity, including; an assessment of results in 4.3 Achievement of results presented according to the four main program objectives; a discussion of Gender, Environment and Conflict sensitivity in 4.4 Cross-cutting issues; and finally Chapter 4.5 Lessons learned based on partner organizations' statements. Chapter 5 Conclusions and recommendations contains a summary of conclusions against the evaluation criteria and evaluation questions, and a presentation of short, concise recommendations addressing Diakonia's organizational structure and capacity,

program management and implementation, external relations and an overall recommendation on future direction.

The annexes comprise the terms of reference; evaluation matrix; data collection tools (e-questionnaire, interview checklists for implementing and resource partners and rights holders); list of received documents; list of interviewees; SAP II partner organizations; an overview of contracts and disbursements; program and partner objectives; and summary findings on partner organizations.

2 Methodology

2.1 OVERALL APPROACH

The evaluation approach was participatory and utilization focused to assure a backward and forward looking evaluation with a distinct learning focus. The participatory approach and the utilization focus aimed at ensuring that recommendations emerging from the evaluation are operational and rooted in shared analysis of key findings. The approach was iterative and flexible to allow for adjustments of the methodology to match the opportunities and limitations set by the changing context on the ground. There were a number of adjustments to the intended methodology in order to accommodate the encountered opportunities and constraint⁷ - see 2.3 Adjustments, limitations and constraints below. This has allowed for a broader and more inclusive data collection, as well as opportunities to observe through participation.

The evaluation has involved the evaluation users actively, in particular Diakonia and the Embassy of Sweden, from the evaluation design during the Inception Phase to the co-formulation of recommendations and review of the draft reports. Specific opportunities for consultations and provision of input included meetings for start-up, inception, midway status and the ET's participation in Program Coordination Committee (PCC) meetings.

2.2 METHODS AND TOOLS FOR DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

The evaluation has applied a mixed methods approach for data collection with emphasis on qualitative data collection through e-questionnaires, virtual and face-to-face interviews and focus group discussions. The evaluation made use of the following methods and tools for data collection:

Document review of background documents provided by Diakonia and Embassy of Sweden and from others sources. The document review also included relevant websites (e.g. of partner organizations) and has guided the preparation of interview checklists and planning field data collection. Relevant documents included project documents, progress reports, budgets, policies, strategies and guidelines. The cross-reading of e.g. progress reports, minutes from regular meetings, risk logs etc. have allowed assessment of change and progress over time. See *Annex 4 List of Documents*.

Identification of key stakeholders / informants was done based on information from the explorative interviews with Embassy of Sweden and Diakonia management and

⁷ The intended methodology was presented in details in the Technical Proposal (November 2021) and the Inception Note (February 2022).

program staff, as well as extensive contact lists from partner organizations.⁸ Based on the mapping, informants for interviews were identified with the purpose of covering a representative sample of different categories, i.e. Diakonia management and program staff; Diakonia Regional Office; Embassy program staff and financial controllers; resource and implementing partner organizations; local and national authorities; private sector (mining) companies and rights holders. The final selection of informants among the gross list of stakeholders was based on the geographical focus of the field data collection, i.e. involving as broad a range of informants' categories as possible within the field data collection area.

E-questionnaire (qualitative) to all partner organizations. An e-questionnaire was shared with all resource and implementing partner organizations covering the following areas: grant administration, resource allocation, monitoring / reporting, capacity assessment and capacity building, implementation, and lessons learned / reflection. All organizations but one responded⁹ and the information collected provided a solid platform of evidence and information for the following interviews. Due to late submission of the e-questionnaires, a number of the interviews were, however, carried out prior to receiving the filled in e-questionnaire. *See Annex 3.1 E-questionnaire.*

Participatory observation at the PCC meetings. The ET's participation in two PCC meetings provided the opportunity to observe and understand the level and nature of formal interaction / feedback loops between Diakonia and the partners, as well as the triangular interaction between Diakonia, implementing partners and resource organizations. The first PCC meeting (7-9 February 2022) provided the opportunity to meet with program and financial staff from all partner organizations and to present the evaluation purpose and scope and discuss the questionnaire. The second PCC meeting (3 March 2022) provided the opportunity to meet with the executive management level of implementing and resource organizations and to discuss and verify a number of preliminary findings. However, the directors opted to provide comments once the evaluation has been completed and the full evaluation results had been shared.

Field data collection took place in North-Western Province in February 2022, involving interviews with partner organizations, local authorities and rights holders in the districts of Kalumbila, Kasempa, Mufumbwe and Solwezi. For Southern Province, a FGD with the three main partner organizations operating in Southern Province was organized, as physical field data collection in this province was not undertaken.

Interviews were carried out as virtual or face-to-face semi-structured interviews based on interview checklists. Interviews with rights holders (RH) were carried out as focus group discussions with participation of women, men and youth at community level and based on checklists. The checklists ensured that all relevant topics were systematically covered and information necessary to respond to the evaluation questions was gathered. The interview checklists were tailored to the respondent's expected area of experience and knowledge. A total of 49 interviews were carried out, of which nine as focus group

⁸ The Stakeholder Mapping was presented in the Inception Note, Annex 3, 07.02.2022.

⁹ In spite of various reminders, Caritas Zambia never returned the filled in e-questionnaire.

discussions (see table below). The ET has systematically kept and shared written records for internal sharing and analysis. All interviews have been on the basis of voluntary participation and confidentiality. *See Annex 3.2 Interview checklist.*

Table 1: Number of interviews per category of informants

Informants interviewed	Interviews
Diakonia Country Office Zambia	4
Diakonia Regional Office Nairobi	1
Embassy of Sweden Zambia	3
Partner interviews	10
Thematic FGD with Southern partners ¹⁰	1
Resource organizations	4
Rights holders FGDs	8
Local authorities and government	9
National institutions and government	5
Private sector mining	4
Total	49

The **data analysis** included a *context analysis* of the general and political context, as well as the gender and human rights situation in order to contextualize the evaluation of SAP II and its activities. The context analysis framed the assessment of the overall program intervention, and identification of strengths and weaknesses. The *evaluation criteria and questions* have guided the data collection, and the analysis of findings is based on the underlying *5 capabilities' framework*¹¹, whereby findings are related to Diakonia's and SAP II's capabilities to act and commit, to deliver on objectives, to relate to external stakeholders, to adopt and self-renew, and to achieve coherence. Findings are sustained by *most significant change cases* from various informants. All information has been *triangulated* to ensure reliability and validity of findings and to mitigate any biases caused by applying one single method or a single observer.

A high level of **evaluation ethics** was maintained through a participatory, transparent and gender-sensitive approach in dealings with all stakeholders, and data providers (interviewees, partner participants, external informants etc.). Particular attention was paid to power relations within groups, which could have influenced the composition of group participants, to ensure a secure space that enabled each participant to speak freely. All stakeholders have been informed of the purpose of the consultations and how their information would be used and shared and in cases where interviews were recorded, prior permission from interviewees was obtained. All data have - to the extent

¹⁰ Caritas Zambia, MISA and WFC..

¹¹ The interlinked capabilities to 'commit and act', to 'relate and attract', 'balance diversity and coherence', to 'create results' and 'to adapt and self-renew', which are the five core capabilities that add up to organizational capacity and allow organizations to perform and sustain themselves. https://www.betterevaluation.org/en/resources/discussion-paper/capacity-change-performance-study_5c-approach

possible - been gender disaggregated and focus groups and selection of respondents has been based on gender balanced sample.

2.3 ADJUSTMENTS, LIMITATIONS AND CONSTRAINTS

The evaluation took place towards the end of the overall program period, i.e. starting in December 2021 with only one year left, i.e. the 2022 no-cost extension, which the program was granted due to limited budget execution in the previous years. The limited budget execution was due to the **COVID-19 pandemic**, which mainly affected implementation in second and third quarter of 2020, where the program came to a standstill followed by adaptation to working under health restrictions.

In 2021, a **forensic audit** was commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden due to various incidents of financial mismanagement at the Diakonia Country Office, as well as with partner organizations. Disbursement of funds was frozen while the forensic audit took place from April to December 2021, and activities were limited to what was possible with funds carried over from 2020. The ET has not analysed the background for the Forensic Audit process or its results, as the audit process was still not fully completed when the evaluation took place, e.g. with Diakonia providing a management response and follow-up plan to the Forensic Audit, while the Embassy of Sweden resumed disbursements in late 2021.

There is no doubt, however that the entire process in combination with the COVID-19 restrictions affected program implementation in 2020 - 2021 and the degree to which SAP II has been able to accomplish its overall objectives and achieve the expected results.

Due to the changes in the COVID-situation in Zambia during the period in which the evaluation was carried out, **adjustments to the plans and methodology** were necessary. On the positive side, the restrictions for travelling and physical presence were eased and the ET was able to undertake field visits and participate in Diakonia's meetings with partner organizations. This allowed for a broader outreach, inclusion of more informants, especially among the last-mail-beneficiaries of the program, i.e. community groups, women's groups and radio listeners' clubs, as well as verification through participatory observation. However, it also turned out to be more time consuming than initially foreseen, when the evaluation was planned as a mainly virtual exercise, as it involved physical travel and attendance in meetings over several days. The fact that the team leader was working remotely, while the Zambia-based team members undertook all field data collection has required elaborate note taking and additional team discussions.

The initial methodology anticipated the selection of two to three partner organizations for in-depth **case studies**. This plan was changed, as the number of partner organizations was relatively limited (ten implementing partners and four resource organizations), and the ET opted for including all partner organizations through e-

questionnaires and interviews. This approach provided a substantial empirical evidence base for the evaluation, as well as the identification of a number of illustrative Most Significant Changes cases.

During the inception phase, the Embassy brought up the additional issue of **comparing program performance** in the former SAP I program area, i.e. North-Western Province with performance in the Southern Province where activities were started during SAP II by a number of the implementing partners. The question was linked to the difference in ownership structure of mining companies in the two program areas. The North-Western Province is characterized by the presence of international mining companies familiar with concepts of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and therefore potentially responsive towards dialogue with local communities and assuming responsibilities. The mining taking place in the Southern Province is predominantly artisanal, license-based mining with local ownership structures less receptive towards assuming CSR. The ET found it difficult within the scope of the evaluation to provide and substantial analysis of these structural differences and their potential influence on program performance. This would require additional time and possibilities for in-depth interviews.

Finally, in spite of a very open and constructive contact and dialogue with the Diakonia Country Office in Zambia, the ET experienced some **difficulties in timely reception of requested background information**. The late response - and in some cases failure to provide the requested documents - was presumably due to difficulties in localizing the documents, as well as limited human resources to respond to the requests.

3 Diakonia's SAP II program - Brief description

3.1 DIAKONIA'S VISION AND SAP II THEORY OF CHANGE

Diakonia is the joint international development organization of two Swedish churches,¹² one of the major Swedish non-governmental organizations (NGO), and a member of the ACT Alliance.¹³ The organization operates with a three-layer structure - the head office in Sweden, regional offices in Africa, Asia, the MENA-region and Latin America, and country offices. "The three levels have distinct, yet complementary roles that ensure the overall objective of Diakonia is achieved effectively, efficiently, and in accordance with the agreements with funding partners."¹⁴ The country office in Zambia responds to the regional office in Kenya.

Diakonia's overall policy builds on five Christian values: solidarity, justice, courage, commitment and accountability. It is centered around human rights principles and has a keen focus on people as the driving force in change processes for a just, equal and sustainable world.¹⁵ Diakonia's overall theory of change operates with three building blocks:¹⁶ *people*, who can change the world by using their own voice and their own identity; *knowledge* being turned into effective agency; and the *nature and direction of action and towards whom it is directed*, which is basically about enhancing rights, voice and civic space. In addition, Diakonia also operates with a clearly defined goal of gender justice through a feminist policy.¹⁷

Diakonia has been present in Zambia since 2003 with a strong focus on support to human rights and civil society, including support to civil society during the lengthy and still ongoing constitutional revision process.¹⁸ The engagement in Zambia is based on a Country Strategy and Country Program¹⁹ to which all programs are aligned. The 2016-2020 Country Program focused on democracy, social and economic justice and gender, which corresponded to the country strategy priorities and three main

¹² Uniting Church in Sweden and the Swedish Alliance Mission.

¹³ <https://actalliance.org/>

¹⁴ SAP II 2018-2021, funding proposal submitted to Embassy of Sweden in Zambia by Diakonia Zambia Country Office, 23.01.2018, p.7.

¹⁵ Diakonia's policy, 28.05.2020.

¹⁶ Diakonia Global Strategy 2015-2020, p. 17; Diakonia's Global Strategy 2021 and onwards, final version, approved 03.12.2020., p. 5-6.

¹⁷ THE GOAL IS GENDER JUSTICE. THE WAY THERE IS FEMINISM, A Feminist Rationale for Diakonia's Gender Justice Work, Diakonia, n.d.

¹⁸ <https://www.diakonia.se/en/where-we-work/africa/zambia/>

¹⁹ DEMOCRACY, SEJ AND GENDER PROGRAMME 2016-2020, Diakonia Zambia Country Office, n.d.

intervention areas.²⁰ The Country Strategy was updated in December 2020 for the period of 2021-2025 and maintains a strong focus on fostering change and people as the main driver. The updating was closely linked to the development of the Diakonia Global Strategy, which was a joint effort based on a number of studies and consultations within country office, regional office and head office level.

It includes three main change processes, their justification and link to Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs):²¹

- Increased level of Rights Holders' (especially women and youths) influence on participatory development, decision making/governance and political processes at local and national level for improved accountability, quality of life and gender justice.
- Building and strengthening rights holders' resilience in environmental protection and management especially for women and youths through promotion of alternative livelihoods.
- Strengthen CSOs to become resilient and better represent the rights holders' interests.

The strategy process was guided by Diakonia head office and included consultations with external stakeholders, but limited engagement with partner organizations. The global strategy and new direction of Diakonia was, however, presented to partner organizations' directors at the PCC meeting in December 2020; and the new strategy was presented to the same audience at the PCC meeting in February 2022. The official launch planned in early 2021 was postponed due to COVID-19 restrictions and freezing of funds in 2021, but finally took place on 22 March 2022.

The SAP II program focused on awareness creation, organization and mobilization through capacity building and empowerment of rights holders and CSOs, and collective action and advocacy systematized through integrated human rights based approach (HRBA) and a strong focus on gender equality and equity.²² The approach of combining a strong community engagement with dialogue and demands for accountability from private sector (mining companies) was considered innovative intervention logic by the Embassy of Sweden when the SAP II proposal was appraised.²³ The SAP II program proposal did not have an explicit theory of change, but nevertheless presents a causal chain of actions with expected outcomes. Therefore, based on the program proposal, the following theory of change was reconstructed:

²⁰ Zambia Strategy 2016-2020, Diakonia, n.d; DEMOCRACY, SEJ AND GENDER PROGRAMME 2016-2020, Diakonia Zambia Country Office, n.d.

²¹ Zambia Country Strategy 2021-2025, final draft, Diakonia, 08.12.2020.

²² Integrated Strengthened Accountability Project (SAP - Phase II), Concept Note, Diakonia, September 2017, p.7; Strengthened Accountability Programme (SAP) - Phase II, 2018-2021, Funding Proposal submitted to the Embassy of Sweden in Zambia by Diakonia, Zambia Country Office, January 2018, p.24-25.

²³ Strengthened Accountability Program II: Diakonia Zambia, Appraisal of Interventions, Embassy of Sweden, Lusaka, June 2018.

If rights holders (men, women, youth), community leaders and policy makers are aware of and have knowledge of their rights, **then** they are empowered to promote women's rights and influence practices and policies for gender equality; and **if** CSOs have capacity to demand transparency and accountability from local and national level duty bearers (DB) (government and private sector), **then** they can implement their mandates and effectively deliver rights based social, political and economic program; and **if** CSOs and rights holders are supported to take collective action and advocacy initiatives, **then** targeted duty bearers (state institutions and corporates) become transparent and are accountable to rights holders in the administration and governance of national/natural resources; and **then ultimately**, rights holders are empowered to hold duty bearers accountable for equitable access to and distribution of national resources.

3.2 SAP II - BRIEF DESCRIPTION

SAP II is essentially a scale-up of the previous SAP I program 2014-2017, operating with some of the same implementing partners, while including additional partners; operating in the same geographical area, while expanding to additional provinces, and addressing the same issues of gender inequality, unequal distribution on wealth, unequal representation of vulnerable groups (youth and women), and the low capacity of local CSOs to secure organizational sustainability and engage in advocacy.

Main lessons learned from SAP I ²⁴

- *Advocacy and behavioral change require a long-term intervention to fully yield lasting results*
- *Advocacy requires stronger, joint action to achieve tangible results in the form of policy change*
- *Dialogue is a powerful vehicle for engaging multiple, often opposed stakeholders, but requires time to build mutual trust*
- *Innovative approaches through private sector engagement provided valuable opportunities for learning*
- *Frequent engagement and collaboration are necessary among partners to enhance synergy and mutual benefits and minimize the risk of duplication, double counting of results and clashes in planned activities.*
- *Benefitting from comparative advantages and partners' relative strength require sufficient time and honest dialogue.*
- *Resource mobilization must be a constant priority to ensure continuity of interventions.*

Based on lessons learned from SAP I, the design of SAP II was rights-based, and the main approach was a non-confrontational advocacy and capacity building of implementing partners in order to effectively mobilize rights holders at the grassroots level in the five target provinces. The four-interrelated SAP II outcomes as well as the

²⁴ Summarized from Strengthened Accountability Program (SAP) - Phase II, 2018-2021, Funding Proposal submitted to the Embassy of Sweden in Zambia by Diakonia, Zambia Country Office, January 2018, p.11-12.

cross-cutting priorities of gender equality and equity, environment and conflict sensitivity were anchored in the Swedish 2018-2022 Strategy for development cooperation with Zambia.²⁵ The overarching goal of the SAP II is improved quality of life of communities (specifically women, youth, the poor and other vulnerable groups) in natural resource rich, rural and peri-urban areas of Zambia. Empowering of rights holders in order for them to hold duty bearers accountable for equitable access and distribution to national resources responds to the Swedish 2018-2022 aim of contributing to reduced inequality and strengthened resilience, greater respect for human rights, democracy and the rule of law and economic development that is inclusive and sustainable in terms of the environment and climate.

SAP II supported the following goals and objectives of the Swedish 2018-2022 Strategy²⁶

Goal: Human Rights, Democracy, Rule of Law and Gender Equality - with the following objectives: Improved capacity and increased democratic space in order to promote and strengthen human rights, democracy and the rule of law, increased gender equality, particularly in terms of political participation and economic empowerment, increased social protection for people living in poverty, improved conditions for democratic governance, reduced corruption, increased responsibility and accountability in public institutions and strengthened capacity in public institutions; and strengthened capacity in public institutions, including capacity to mobilize additional actors and resources for additional development. SAP II Program Outcomes 1, 2 and 3 and respective intermediary outcomes respond to this objective. SAP II activities were developed by partner organizations to achieve these program outcomes and respective intermediary outcomes.

Goal: Environment, Climate, Renewable Energy and Sustainable, Inclusive Development and Livelihoods - with the following objectives: Sustainable use of natural resources, increased sustainable productivity and production in agriculture and increased resilience to climate change; improved opportunities for sustainable livelihoods, with a focus on productive employment with decent working conditions, particularly for women and young people; increased capacity to engage in sustainable trade, access to markets and value-chains for small-scale farmers, entrepreneurs and businesses; and greater access to renewable energy and improved energy efficiency. Program Outcome 1 of SAP II, as well as the cross-cutting issues of environment and conflict sensitivity respond to this objective. Equally activities of partner organizations were designed based on this objective and are also in line with Program Outcome 1 and intermediary outcomes.

In addition, SAP II was in harmony with the Seventh National Development Plan (7NDP), which is Zambia's blueprint for development from 2017-2021. It is a building block formulated to meet the goals of Vision 2030. The Vision 2030 is a long-term plan that expresses the aspirations of the Zambian people to live in a strong and dynamic, middle-income industrial nation that provides opportunities for improving the well-being of all. It embodies values of socio-economic justice underpinned by the

²⁵ Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Zambia 2018-2022, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Sweden, n.d.

²⁶ *ibid.*, p. 2-3.

principles of gender-responsive, sustainable development; democracy; respect for human rights; good traditional and family values; positive attitude towards work; peaceful co-existence; and public-private partnerships. The Vision 2030 outlines long-term national and sector goals for attaining desirable socio-economic indicators, to fulfil the Zambian people's aspirations.

The SAP II runs from **June 2018 to 31 December 2022** with an overall budget of SEK 41.4 million of which approximately SEK 11.5 million remained unspent by end of 2021. The initial program period ended by 31.12.2021 but was no-cost extended up to 31.12.2022. The low budget execution was caused by limited activity level during COVID (2020) and the freezing of disbursement from Embassy of Sweden during 2021 while a forensic audit was undertaken to investigate alleged mismanagement of funds. The forensic audit was concluded by December 2021, and funds were subsequently released by the Embassy of Sweden to Diakonia Head Office in Sweden in late December 2021 and to some of the implementing partners immediately, to others only in February-March 2022.

With the SEK 41.4 million budget, the SAP II program represents 57 percent of the overall implementation budget of Diakonia in Zambia. The country office also operates with minor funds from the Swedish CivSam²⁷ grant (SEK 20.4 million) and EU funds (SEK 11.4 million / EUR 1.1 million).

As fund manager, **Diakonia holds the overall responsibility for program implementation**, which is carried out by local partner organizations, supported by local "resource organizations" with a specific mandate for capacity building of the implementing partner organizations. The implementing partners - of which five of ten were partners during SAP I - were pre-selected during the SAP II formulation process in 2018. There were a number of additional pre-selected partners but based on the organizational capacity assessment carried out in second half of 2018, two applying organizations were not accepted for SAP II program support.

Currently, seven of the initial ten **implementing organizations** are active, i.e. Media Institute for Southern Africa (MISA), Foundation for Democratic Processes (FODEP), Jesuit Center for Theological Reflection (JCTR), Caritas Solwezi, Women for Change (WFC), Non-governmental Gender Organizations' Coordination Committee (NGOCC), and Caritas Zambia. The partnership with Southern Africa Center for Constructive Resolution (SACCORD) was terminated in January 2021 due to a financial incident. Also, the partnerships with Extractive Industries Transparency Alliance (EITA) and Youth Alliance for Development (YAD) were subject to investigations of financial incidents and the partnerships were effectively terminated by end of March 2022.

The implementing partners are organized in **thematic clusters** based on their specific focus area with one of the members being designated as cluster lead: Gender Equality and Equity (GEE) is led by NGOCC; Natural Resource Management (NRM) is led by

²⁷ <https://fuf.se/en/sida-enheten-for-civila-samhallet-civsam/>

JCTR; and Social and Environmental Accountability (SEA) is led by Caritas Solwezi. Some partner organizations participate in more than one cluster, when their focus area justifies it. Also, the presence in the same geographical areas is basis for collaboration within the same cluster. *See Annex 6 SAP II partner organizations* for more details on partner organizations.

The four **resource organizations** were selected based on their capacity in specific areas, which correspond to thematic priorities in which Diakonia's implementing partners need strengthening: Africa Direction (AD) on youth, National Legal Aid Clinic for Women (NLACW) on women and gender, Center for Trade Policy and Development (CTPD) on documentation and advocacy on natural resources, and Zambia Health Education and Communication Trust (ZHECT) on normative changes in relation to women and youth. The distinction between implementing and resource organizations is, however, fluid in the case of WFC and NGOCC, which have a dual role, using their gender expertise, and have as gender cluster leads been building gender mainstreaming capacity of other implementing partners. And lately, i.e. in February 2022, AD received an additional budget for direct implementation of activities during the remaining program period.

The SAP II program **operates in 13 districts** in the provinces of Copperbelt, Luapula, North Western and Southern and seeks to strengthen the local-national advocacy chain based on evidence input from rural based partner organizations. The current geographical outreach represents a considerable expansion compared to SAP I, which only operated in North Western Province.

The SAP II operates with a **special focus on the extractive industry sector**, i.e. mining companies and their obligations in terms of corporate social accountability. Capacity building and strengthening of local level advocacy capacity aimed at holding public and private sector duty bearers accountable is a key feature of the SAP II program. The SAP II program approach is considered innovative because of the public-private partnership and locally anchored innovative advocacy methods.

The SAP II program operates with a **deliberate rights focus**, involving capacity building of rights holders with a specific focus on women and youth, as well as targeted interventions on duty bearers to ensure their transparency and accountability. It addresses fulfilment of the SDGs number 1 (poverty), 5 (gender equality), 8 (decent work and economic growth), 10 (reduced inequalities) and 17 (partnerships).²⁸ The three results areas are well described in the ToR: Gender Equity and Equality, National Resource Management, and Social and Environmental Accountability. Main program stakeholders include an unconventional mix of local and national government institutions, mining companies, CSOs, traditional and faith leaders, media, churches and small-scale miners. Specific outcomes are defined for each of the results areas, all contributing to the overall program objective of "rights holders (men, women and

²⁸ <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>

youth) being empowered to hold duty bearers accountable for equitable access to and distribution of national resources”.

The Swedish contribution to the SAP II program is aligned with the first strategy area of Human Rights, Democracy, Rule of Law and Gender Equality of the Strategy for Development with Zambia 2018-2022.

3.3 MAIN DEVIATIONS IN IMPLEMENTATION

The SAP II agreement between the Embassy of Sweden and Diakonia was signed in June 2018, and contracts with the major part of the implementing partner organizations were signed in November 2018 followed by the first disbursements in December 2018. The contracts with resource organizations were only signed in November 2019, i.e. a year after with the first disbursements in December 2019.

The first years of implementation were characterized by a number of obstacles. First of all, the staggered start of implementing partners and resource organizations with a full year's gap, whereby the fourth objective was only fully addressed from January 2020. Second, in early 2020, Zambia experienced the so-called gassing incident, i.e. “spraying of unknown chemicals in people's homes by unknown people in several parts of the country [which] almost resulted into a full-blown conflict as people started taking the law in their own hands and attacked anyone they suspected [...] The situation affected program implementation in the first quarter of the year as most partners were unable to travel to their project sites for implementation.”²⁹ Third, the global COVID-19 pandemic, which affected program implementation from March 2020 and onwards, where physical meetings, field monitoring visits and what was previously known as “normal work” was interrupted and only gradually replaced by new virtual ways of working. Fourth, the freezing of funds by the Embassy of Sweden while a forensic audit was undertaken from May to November 2021 due to financial irregularities at the Diakonia Country Office's management of program funds caused adjustments in terms of carry-over of unspent funds or use of currency exchange gains. And fifth, the change of key management staff at the Diakonia Country Office, where a new Country Director took up the position in March 2020, and new financial management staff took up positions in 2021.

Due to these obstacles, the program did not have a smooth implementation, and this has affected the overall performance. In spite of this, the ET found that an exceptional flexibility and capacity to adapt the program has maintained a certain momentum.

²⁹ SAP II, 2020 Annual Report, Diakonia, 31 March 2021, p. 8-9.

4 Discussion of Main Findings

4.1 BRIEF CONTEXT ANALYSIS

4.1.1 General country context

Zambia is considered a stable country with successful democratic elections held every five years. The current president Hakainde Hichilema of the United Party for National Development (UPND) was elected in August 2021, after defeating President Edgar Lungu of the Patriotic Front (PF). In addition, Zambia is experiencing a large demographic shift and is one of the world's youngest countries by median age.³⁰

The period between 2019 and 2021 saw increased state intolerance of criticism, clampdowns on civil society, public protests, and online activism as well as the passing of the unpopular Cybersecurity and Cybercrimes Draft Bill and Public Order Act which are widely considered as repressive. In 2019 the Patriotic Front (PF), the then ruling party in Zambia, initiated a process to implement major amendments to the 2016 constitution on the pretext of addressing gaps in the constitution. The process culminated in the introduction in Parliament of the 2019 Constitution Amendment Bill No. 10 of 2019. The Bill was widely unpopular throughout the country and was not enacted into law. The political context was further dominated by discussions on poor governance of public resources following the release of the 2019/2020 Financial Intelligence Center trends Report and the 2019 Auditor General's Report, which continued to show glaring cases of misapplication and misappropriation of funds.

Zambia had its first reported case of COVID-19 in March 2020. To manage the adverse impact of the emergence of COVID-19, government introduced prevention measures that among other things restricted economic activities, public movements and adversely affected CSOs work. Most CSOs responded to the challenges brought about by restricted movements and gatherings by implementing some activities virtually such as workshops, trainings etc. Rural areas with poor internet network however were difficult to reach and little or no implementation took place during this period. Diakonia and its partners closed operations for the second and third quarter of the year, which affected timely implementation of planned activities for 2020. In North-Western province, it was widely felt that the COVID-19 restrictions were used to curtail freedom of assembly. In addition, the gassing incidents that took place between late 2019 and mid-2020 saw the government impose other restrictions on movements and large gatherings. This was especially true in the Western and North-Western Provinces where violence around the gassing incidents was significantly higher than other parts of the country.

³⁰ <https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/zambia-population>

This contributed to the slow down or halting in implementation of the projects under the SAP II.

Many saw these restrictions as a method for the then ruling PF government to slow down and manipulate voter registration, especially in areas where the perception was that opposition UPND had strong support (Southern, Western and North-Western Provinces). The PF government's strong-arm methods resulted in dwindling political and civic space. The run up to the August 2021 elections was marred with rampant political and electoral violence and suppression of media freedoms. The closing down of the independent station Prime TV (a major critic of the PF government) is one example of this. There were increasing arrests of opposition and civil society figures as well as several arrests of private citizens for "insulting the president" on social media limited free speech, so it was a very difficult time for civil society organizations to do their work.

4.1.2 Political context

With the new government came changes. The government's 2022 budget among other things makes commitments to recruit 30,000 new teachers and 11,200 healthcare staff, increase social expenditure, support small businesses, and invest more attention in agriculture. It also vows to decentralize resources, including by increasing the Constituency Development Fund from ZMW 1.6 million to ZMW 25.7 million. It also abolishes school fees for government schools providing free education for all.

In mining, the government has formulated a better mechanism of collecting royalties, but questions remain, stemming from the previous administration's takeover of the Glencore-operated Mopani copper mines and its handling of the liquidation of the Vedanta-owned Konkola mines. It remains to be seen whether the new administration will return these mines to previous owners or seek new investors. There are also still question marks over how the government will finance its plans, especially after reducing taxes.

The new president has shown greater commitment to civil liberties and stopped the culture of violent political cadres operating in markets and bus stations. He has also, maintained plans to review the constitution, enhance judicial independence, and improve the operations of the electoral commission.

However, when it comes to inclusion the new government falls short of the previous administration and the targets set by the various regional and international treaties that Zambia is signatory to. Women in decision-making positions are only a handful; just five cabinet ministers are women, which is half the figure under Lungu. To address electoral imbalances, the constitution allows the president to nominate eight persons to parliament, but Hichilema filled all the slots with men except one. Only one of Hichilema's ten provincial ministers is female and only a few district commissioners (DCs) are women. More recently, 3 women were appointed as Permanent Secretaries for Special Duties under the president's office. However, the administration has been at pains to explain what exactly these special duties are, and these appointments are

seen as ceremonial and a way of the administration trying to show that they are including women in decision-making positions. In addition, there have been no appointments of either youth, constitutionally defined as someone between the ages of 18 and 35, or persons with disabilities.

The Ministry of Gender was restructured to a gender division under the Office of the President. It is too early to tell what kind of impact this will have on gender equity and equality in Zambia. A good starting point would be the setting up of a gender commission as prescribed in the Gender Equity & Equality Act; and, domestication of the regional and international pacts that Zambia is a signatory to.

The fortunes of SAP II have changed in that it is now operating in ruling party dominated areas (North-Western and Southern Provinces) with government staff and civil servants who are willing to work hand in hand with the program to ensure the development of their respective areas. If the decentralization of resources is realized, the new commitments provide a perfect landscape for a possible next SAP to work with relevant stakeholders in promoting transparency and accountability targeting duty bearers and rights holders. It is also an opportunity for implementing partners to look at how the national level commitments under the new government drill down to provincial and district level.

SAP II navigated well topical socio-political issues, particularly in empowering rights holders to address issues around mines and the environment, and to influence duty bearers on issues of better access to education and health services, clean water, better roads, and other services within their communities. Moreover, SAP II has helped with the participation of women and youth in shaping the development of communities particularly at ward level people used to have tendency not to consider the opinions of women and youths in Ward Development Committees (WDC). However, there is now an increase of participation from women and youth in these meetings and their ideas are being embraced.

4.2 DIAKONIA'S PROGRAM MANAGEMENT CAPACITY

The program management capacity of the Diakonia Country Office is crucial for the success of the SAP II program. In the present chapter, findings on the organizational capacity, including the governance structure, the country office capacity, the grant management capacity, systems and practices for monitoring, evaluation and learning, and application of lessons learned are presented.

4.2.1 Governance structure

Diakonia's three-layer governance structure includes the global, regional and country levels. Diakonia Zambia is one of the branches in the Africa region reporting to the Regional Office in Kenya, which ultimately reports to Diakonia Head Office in Sweden. Diakonia Zambia is oversighted by the Directors at the Regional Office who in turn reports to Head Office in Sweden, where the Global Board responsible for governance is based. Diakonia Zambia has no local governance committee/body

overseeing governance, but has a constitution duly adopted and filed with the Zambian government authorities.

The overall responsibility for policy and strategy development, as well as oversight therefore lies with the global level board,³¹ whereas the country level board holds operational and administrative responsibility for implementing the policies and strategies. At country level, the board is lean and internal; in the case of Zambia consisting of only three members, i.e. the regional director and the Country Office Director (COD) with the country office Finance and Administration Officer (FAO) as secretary. Only when national legislation in the specific country requires, does the country board count external members.³²

In Zambia, the board was established in 2019 and is supposed to meet quarterly, but for various reasons, i.e. COVID-19 and management transitions at regional and country level, only four meetings have been held so far (March 2019, December 2020, April 2021 and December 2021). Topics discussed at the meetings are operational, i.e., program progress, human resources and fund-raising initiatives.³³

The ET noted the internal character of the board, which was justified by the nature of the program. The Diakonia regional director was quite firm on the advantage of having an internal structure with policy and strategy decision power centralized in Stockholm, as Diakonia regional and country offices are not independent organizations, but operational branches.³⁴ Only in cases, where the national legislation requires a board with external members is this set up. The ET sees a risk of lost opportunities in terms of external strategic input as well as national level legitimacy in not having a board with external members from e.g. national civil society, academia, media or other relevant stakeholder groups.

4.2.2 Country Office capacity

The country office in Zambia is one of nine country programs in Africa which refers to the regional office in Nairobi, which again refers to the international department at head office in Sweden.³⁵ The Zambia country office has a total of eight staff members, including management, program and financial management staff. There is no support staff (e.g. drivers), and the cleaning is outsourced on a service contract.

The Diakonia staff in Zambia is well qualified with relevant degrees matching their positions. The two program officers (PO) working with SAP II have been with Diakonia for several years and this continuity results in a strong institutional memory and in-depth knowledge of the partner organizations. The third PO joined Diakonia in April 2021 and works with other programs funded by CivSam and the EU. There have, however, been major changes in other key positions during the program

³¹ THE STATUTES OF DIAKONIA, adopted by the Diakonia Annual Meeting 2014-06-15, latest revision 2021-09-08.

³² Interview with Diakonia Regional Office, 10.02.2022.

³³ Minutes from Zambia Country Office Board meetings, 2019, 2020 and 2021.

³⁴ Interview with Diakonia Regional Office in Nairobi, 10.02.2022.

³⁵ Diakonia Zambia Country Office Organogram.

implementation period. The former CD, who had been with the organization for slightly over two years, left in mid-2019 and was replaced by the current in March 2020, immediately before the COVID-19 pandemic turned implementation upside down and at a time where the problems related to the financial management irregularities at the country office began to surface. Due to detected irregularities in the financial administration, the contract with the former FAO was not renewed while Grants Compliance Officer (GCO) resigned for personal reasons. The GCO position was replaced immediately, while a finance staff from the Regional Office was seconded to the Country Office in Zambia as acting FAO until end of December 2021 when the new FAO was in place. In principle, a second GCO should be hired, but this had not yet happened when the evaluation took place. Interviews with partner organizations underlined the importance of having sufficient capacity in this position as the GCO works hand-in hand with the POs in the supervision and monitoring of partners, including physical visits to verify documentation and make sure implementation is in line with compliance requirements.

Gender was formerly the responsibility of the Country Director, but since the change in this position (in 2019), one of the Program Officers assumed the responsibility. However, the officer has had no formal gender training and relies on the support of the organization's Gender Adviser who is placed with direct reference to the Secretary General at head office. There are no "subject matter specialists" e.g. on environment in the Country Office organizational chart.

The staff changes in 2020-2021 resulted in a temporary pressure on the country office capacity. The ET observed that the current team is gaining momentum, but the deliberate lean structure represents a major challenge to meet the requirements in terms of timeliness in response, as well as specialized capacity in e.g. monitoring and evaluation. The hands-on and engaging character of Diakonia's partner supervision and monitoring is especially demanding in a situation where human resources are scarce to match the number of partners. Several respondents among implementing partners emphasized that the feedback from the Diakonia country office was good and detailed, but very often delayed. As explained by one of the responding organizations: "Report submissions have time frames, however this is not the case with feedback on submitted reports from Diakonia, once reports are submitted, feedback on the respective reports has no time frame. Feedback is at times received as much as two months past submission."³⁶

³⁶ Response to e-questionnaire, February 2022.

Table 2: Diakonia Country Office staff qualifications³⁷

Position	Qualifications
Country Director	Master's Degree International Development & Economics Bachelor's Degree Economics
Finance & Administration Officer	Master's Degree Business Administration Full ACCA (Chartered Accountant - Fellow)
Grants & Compliance Officer	Full ACCA (Chartered Accountant - Associate)
Accounts & Admin Assistant	Business Administration Diploma
Project Accountant	ZICA (Licentiate/Student)
Program Officer	Mass Communication & Economics Degree
Program Officer	Development Studies Degree
Program Officer	Demography and Development Studies Degree

In terms of country office management and coordination, there is a small management group headed by the country office director and with the participation of one program officer and the finance and administration officer. The management group meets bimonthly and has oversight responsibility of program and finance and reports to the Regional Office on a regular basis. The Regional Director and other regional office staff meet with the country management team on a regular basis to discuss issues raised in the country management report. Staff meetings are held monthly to discuss accomplished activities and plans. As the office is small, there is frequent informal exchange among staff.

Interviews with CO staff indicated that the **filing system** was well-established and operational using the FixIt-platform used by Diakonia. However, the ET found reason to comment on the efficiency of the filing system and handling of documents, as there were several examples where the localization and sharing of key documents requested for the evaluation took extremely long time and in some cases were not successful, e.g. the *signed* MoU with Zambia Chamber of Mining was never received, albeit a draft version was made available. Also, minor examples of changed documents, wrong file names and an overwhelming amount of orthographic errors in some documents were found. These problems were also noticed by the Embassy of Sweden which had experienced requests from Diakonia for documents submitted by themselves.

The Diakonia Zambia program is financed mainly by Swedish funds, i.e. the main funds from SAP II budget, but also from CivSam and EU funds have Swedish origin. Diakonia is aware of the risk of dependency of only one donor, and a resource mobilization strategy is currently being prepared and is expected to be ready by mid-2022. The strategy formulation process is guided by regional and head offices. Diakonia's strict ethical principles require careful scrutiny of eligible funding sources and head office approval. The overall responsibility for setting fundraising and resource

³⁷ The table is based on information provided by Diakonia Country Office, March 2022.

mobilization priorities for the Africa region lies with Regional Office, and the Country Director has a key responsibility to ensure funding for the country program. In Zambia tentative contacts are established to other donors, e.g. the ACT Alliance and the EU. In the particular case of the lean Zambia country office, human resources for fund raising are also not available.

4.2.3 Grant management approach

In the following section, the assessment of the grant management approach applied by Diakonia is closely linked to the assessment of the financial management capacity of the country office.

The grant application process for SAP II was not an open call but a **purposeful selection of partner organizations**, which started as early as 2017, where Diakonia submitted a concept note and a full application to the Embassy of Sweden, which was finally approved after a number of (budget) revisions in June 2018. Diakonia started the consultative processes with partner organizations already in 2017 involving the participation of 20-25 organizations in the formulation of the SAP ii proposal. This included extensive context analysis and development of a theory of change. When the proposal was formally approved and signed by the Embassy of Sweden in early June 2018, the concept notes from 16 organizations were therefore already prepared by eligible partner organizations and assessed by Diakonia. Among the organizations were five³⁸ which had been partners under SAP I in the 2014-2017 period.

After signing of the contract with the Embassy, Diakonia then requested partners to submit the full applications including budget, results frame work and an annual work plan, which were assessed alongside the concept notes, capacity and organizational assessments. As the final approved budget was smaller than initially planned, Diakonia opted for working with 10 implementing partners starting in November 2018 with budgets ranging between SEK 450,000 and SEK 860,000. As the Embassy of Sweden was determined to allocate a major share of the budget to implementation to ensure value for money, Diakonia started identifying resource organizations, which would have a specific role related to capacity building of the implementing partners. Among the four resource organizations, two (AD and CTPD) had submitted concept notes in June 2018, and in mid-2019, another two organizations were invited to present concept notes, i.e. NLACW (June 2019) and ZHECT (September 2019). This process resulted in signing of agreements in November 2019 with the four resource organizations, a year after the program started, with SEK 306,500 budgets.

Contracts were initially signed with the implementing organizations for a short period, but then amended once or twice, most recently to cover the no-cost extension. *See Annex 7 Contracts and disbursements.* The contracts are simple, yet comprehensive and contain clear information on the conditions, i.e. that budgets and work plans are approved on an annual basis and disbursements triggered by approval of narrative and

³⁸ The SAP I partners carried over to SAP II were: Caritas Zambia, Extractive Industries Transparency Alliance (EITA), Jesuit Center for Theological Reflection (JCTR), Foundation for Democratic Processes (FODEP) and Youth Alliance for Development (YAD).

financial reports, work plan and budgets. Disbursements take place twice a year and follow the biannual reporting periods of January to June and July to December. The requirement of an annual audit based on ToR from Diakonia, as well as joint monitoring visits and the imperative of capacity development based on an agreed plan is also part of the contract. (*See Chapter 4.5.2 Building partner organizations' capacity below for more details*). Diakonia's policies and guidelines are attached (code of conduct, anti-corruption, procurement, audit) and secure adherence to Swedish standards. Although Diakonia encourages the partners to have non-interest gaining bank accounts, some implementing partners reported that accrued positive interest rates and exchange rate differences were used to maintain activities in 2021, where disbursement of funds was frozen.

Based on Information gathered from partner organizations and Diakonia, the ET found that **disbursements**, especially the year's first disbursement, were made late. There are various explanations to this. In 2018, disbursements were made in December, i.e. immediately after the signing of the contracts with implementing partners in November 2018. Consequently, in 2019, the first disbursements were also made late, i.e. in the period from March to July with the second disbursements, except for a few, in the period of September - November. As the contracts with the resource organizations were signed only in November 2019, the first disbursements were made in December same year. Two implementing partners received three disbursements in 2019. In 2020, the first disbursement was still very late, apparently due to the time necessary for the country office to process the approval of narrative and financial reports from the previous year, as well as assess the concept note, work plan and budget for 2020. In 2021, due to the freezing of funds from the Embassy of Sweden, disbursements only took place in December after the approval and clearance of the forensic audit report. The country office informed that late submission by partners of narrative and financial reports (deadline 15th February) as well as cautious withholding of disbursement to mitigate risks of partners holding major balances also influenced the disbursements. The ET found that the late disbursement in 2019 was justified by the late start of the program in 2018, whereas the 2020 disbursements were delayed due to the comprehensive and time-consuming approval process combined with limited human resources at the country office. It is difficult to assess whether the late disbursements actually influenced implementation with partners, as other factors also impacted the implementation pace, e.g. COVID-19 and the forensic audit process.

Table 3: Disbursements per month

	2018	2019			2020		2021***
Disbursements	1st	1st	2nd	3rd**	1st	2nd	1st
January							
February							
March		2					
April		1	1				
May		4			5		
June		2	2		2		
July		1					
August					1		
September			2	2			
October			4		2	5	
November	9		1				
December	1	4*				6	6

* The first disbursement to resource organizations was made in December 2019.

** In 2019, two implementing partner organizations received three disbursements.

*** The 2021 disbursements were made in December for activities in 2022.

Information on the latest 2022 disbursements made in February not available.

An important part of Diakonia's capacity assessment of partner organizations is the on-going **risk assessment** which is updated on an annual basis by the GCO in collaboration with the program officers. Diakonia has an elaborate system for risk assessment and keeps a log-book on each partner, with a 4-level classification: green (no risk), yellow (low to medium risk), amber (medium risk) and red (severe risk). The first step was assessment of the partner's application for project funding, followed by periodic or quarterly assessment through partner office visits (to analyze internal systems) and also through review of formal semi-annual or annual financial and narrative reports. The initial assessment (partner application for project funding) was largely based on ascertaining if identified internal and external risks were related and might have hindered the attainment of goals of the SAP II and what risk reduction strategies or mitigation measures would be employed to address this. Based on this, an assessment report was prepared by the relevant Program Officer and conclusions and applicable recommendations were made.

The risk assessment identified a number of foreseen risks and indicated appropriate actions to be taken, either by the organization itself or through capacity building initiatives under SAP II. Among the most frequently registered risks were governance issues, e.g. lack of compliance with statutes; board being too operational; no time limit for board membership; need for updating constitution; and financial management issues, e.g. lack of proper procedures; low cash flow capacity; prior incidents of misappropriation of funds. Also, a number of risks related to limited gender and conflict management capacity - which would have negative impact on the contribution to SAP

II's cross-cutting priorities - were identified along with shortcomings on strategic plans, institutional memory, human resource and exit plans.

It was interesting that among the ten implementing partners with whom Diakonia signed contracts in November 2018, classification did not change much over the years in spite of capacity building efforts and other support initiatives from Diakonia. Of the ten organizations, five were classified as no-risk throughout the SAP II period (JCTR, Caritas Zambia, Caritas Solwezi, NGOCC, WFC); one as low to medium risk (FODEP); and two as severe risk through all three years (YAD and SACCORD). Only two organizations changed categories, i.e. from medium risk in 2019-2020 to no risk in 2021 (MISA); and from severe to medium and back to severe risk (EITA). Of the partners with severe risks identified, SACCORD, EITA and YAD had their contracts terminated. The fact that only one organization registered lasting improvement in terms of risk is of concern, as it indicates that the measures taken are either not adequate or sufficient, and the organization not receptive to support, or Diakonia has been too patient before taking action.

In this context, the ET has also looked at Diakonia's **handling of incidents**. "The term incident is used when a Diakonia employee is reporting an incident that has already happened; usually concerning partner level. For instance, if corruption is discovered at partner level it is called an Incident. If serious irregularities at partner level are confirmed, this may lead to the phasing out of the concerned partner.³⁹" Handling of complaints and incidents happens through the complaints and response mechanism, which deals with both complaints over Diakonia by third parties and with various types of incidents with partner organizations. There are two categories: *operational complaints/ incidents* which are usually solved through dialogue, and *serious complaints/ incidents*, which involve sexual exploitation and abuse, all forms of harassment, fraud and corruption, security breaches, and unethical business practices.

SAP II experienced a number of serious financial incidents with partner organizations as well as some internal financial/administrative irregularities in the country office, which led to the forensic audit in 2021⁴⁰. The partner cases were detected through regular control and follow-up and were reported to the country office director and to Diakonia regional and head offices and the Embassy of Sweden. Diakonia uses an *incident tracking tool*, in which all occurrences and actions taken from detection to closure are registered. In addition, after closing an incident, Diakonia CO filled in a *final learning report*, where the incident is analyzed and lessons learned are identified.

The risk assessments of partners were discussed with the desk officer at the Embassy of Sweden at the onset of the program. In spite of high-risk rating, it was agreed that Diakonia should continue partnership with some partners from previous phase. These

³⁹ Diakonia PME Handbook, 2015, p. 59-60.

⁴⁰ As mentioned in Chapter 2.3, the evaluation did not deal with the internal incidents at the country office during 2020-2021, as they are dealt with in detail by the external Forensic audit commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in 2021 and followed up by Diakonia.

partners should be monitored closely, and if needed phased out during the program period.

The evaluation has looked at **two cases where incidents occurred**:

- According to the Diakonia Zambia Partner Register, the risk assessment of SACCORD disclosed that the Board of SACCORD had no term limit, weak financial management system giving rise to potential for fraudulent activities and risk of deregistration due to a backlog of unpaid taxes. Despite identification of these high-risks, the partnership was not suspended, until misappropriation of funds occurred. The red flags identified at the beginning of the partnership (including a weak financial management system) could have been the basis for not continuing the partnership. It is also not clear how Diakonia Zambia engaged SACCORD to address other identified risks based on the proposed mitigation measures before the partnership was terminated. However, lessons learned from the incident indicated the need for a strong focus on further strengthening partner organizations' management and financial staff on accountability requirements.
- EITA's risk assessment was initially rated high, before improving to medium-risk in 2020. However, the assessment was elevated to high-risk the following year. Some of the identified risks pertained to poor documentation and filing system, lack of compliance with statutory obligations, constitutional issues and misappropriation of funds by the Executive Director. With the high risk identified from the outset, Diakonia Zambia could have considered termination of the partnership. A number of mitigation measures were proposed but with no effect, and the partnership was terminated with effect from 31 March 2022. EITA had been requested to repay the outstanding amount, but this had not yet happened by January 2022.⁴¹

In the 2018 Annual Report, Diakonia stated a lesson learned regarding the mutuality in commitment and accountability, which the partnership agreement implies and concluded that “if one partner organization does not honor the commitments and obligations agreed upon, there may be need for immediate action and follow up by Diakonia...”.⁴² In spite of the fact that Diakonia reported incidents to the Embassy of Sweden, it was noted by the Embassy that it took too long, as the incidents were first reported internally to the Diakonia Regional Office and Head Office and then to the Embassy. It was appreciated that Diakonia actually detected the cases and acted upon them, but the Embassy has stressed the importance of more prompt action and more detailed information upfront. Interviews with partner organizations also indicated that well-performing partners felt that the extraordinary patience with peers not respecting the contractual obligations hampered the overall trust among SAP II partners. The ET found that some of the cases would have qualified for filing with the police, something that did not happen, as Diakonia opted for a more pacific solution, e.g. not renewing contracts, repayment of funds etc. The 2020 Annual Report contained a comprehensive

⁴¹ Incident Report – Extractive Industry Transparency Alliance (EITA), 2022.

⁴² 2018 Annual Report, SAP II, 31.03.2019, p. 17.

list of lessons learned from the SACCORD case⁴³, and the very strong focus on compliance and accountability in partner capacity building sessions and during the recent 2022 PCC meetings with project and finance staff and with directors is a consequence of the bitter experiences harvested with SACCORD.⁴⁴

Annual audits are undertaken by internationally recognized companies which are contracted for a five-year period. In 2020, a new audit period started after an open tender process, and BDO replaced Grant Thornton. The annual audit consists of two audit processes: audit of the financial reports for the Zambia Country Program, and review of the income and expenditure statements for partner organizations based on partners' audit reports.⁴⁵ Consequently, there are two audit reports - one covering the funds operated by CO and another covering the grants operated by partner organizations. Funds from the Swedish Government for SAP II are disbursed to Diakonia HO in Sweden and from there to CO in Zambia for the program activities handled directly by the CO, and directly to the individual partner organizations for project implementation. Audit reports are accompanied by management letters and Diakonia CO prepares a follow-up plan and a management response. The audits have been unproblematic, but in relation to the 2020 audit, there was a misunderstanding in terms of the scope of the audit when the new auditor made the 2020 audit, and the Embassy did not approve the first version.

4.2.4 Monitoring, evaluation and learning

Diakonia's approach and practice to monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) is described in the PME Handbook.⁴⁶ MEL is an integrated part of the project/ program implementation, and there is an explicit focus on learning and documentation of change. The baseline study from 2019 allowed for adjusting the initial program results framework and specific targets, which again impacted on the work plans and budgets of the partner organizations.

The SAP II monitoring and reporting is based on the program results framework and specific annual work plans against which partner organizations report on a biannual basis. The reporting schedule is outlined in the Partner Agreements, indicating the obligation of the partner organization to report twice a year to Diakonia (narrative and financial) as well as present an annual audit report. Diakonia has provided a format for the reporting, which has been updated / revised during the life span of SAP II, latest in late 2021 / early 2022 for the 2021 annual report. The end of year reports contain a contextual analysis, finance and administration, summary of activities, a results analysis in relation to SAP II objectives with focus on change, record of initiatives under the cross-cutting issues, assessment of organizational capacity including capacity building efforts, governance issues, sustainability considerations, and a risk analysis

⁴³ Annual report 2020, SAP II, 31.03.2021, p. 41.

⁴⁴ Final learning report SACCORD - SAP II 2018-2021, September 2021.

⁴⁵ Terms of Reference for annual audits 2018, 2019 and 2020.

⁴⁶ PME Handbook, Diakonia, May 2015, p. 11-12. The ET requested, but did not receive the specific guidelines for monitoring, evaluation and learning, which the PME Handbook refers to prior to closing the present report.

and mitigation plan, account of deviations, challenges and lessons learned, stakeholder analysis, adjustments, and the way forward. The reports are accompanied by a number of obligatory annexes: approved and signed financial report, approved budget and work plan for coming year, results framework and stories of change.

Diakonia CO assesses the reports and provides a comprehensive response, which is the basis for disbursement of the coming year's budget. As discussed above, partners often experience delays in receiving the feedback, albeit they are satisfied with the quality and level of detail in the responses, which reflect a genuine hands-on knowledge of the program from the Diakonia POs. The ET found that the frequency of reporting and substantial feedback, combined with the number of implementing partners does not match the resources available at the Diakonia CO. The fact that POs are charged with the responsibility of on-going program follow-up, capacity building and coordination without specific resources allocated for MEL is an unsustainable situation, and a reinforcement of resources for this area is needed.

The two-tier PCC meetings with 1) partner organizations' directors, and 2) with Program Officers and Finance and Administration Officers provide an important platform for exchange of lessons learned, success stories and challenges. The first-tier PCC is required to meet a minimum of two and maximum of four times a year (in addition to other impromptu meetings called by Diakonia Zambia and partner organizations). The second-tier PCC are on the other hand required to meet at least three times a year (and also participate in meetings convened by Diakonia Zambia or other partner organizations) as outlined in the Framework for Collaborative Implementation of the 2018-2021 SAP II. In connection with PCC meetings, joint field monitoring visits have been carried out a few times in 2019.

The ET found that the Diakonia monitoring system is operational and allows for aggregating information from partners for overall program monitoring against objectives and targets. This is presented in annual narrative reports to the Embassy of Sweden. The Embassy of Sweden monitors the SAP II implementation through the annual narrative and financial reports from Diakonia CO followed by an annual review meeting. This should be supplemented by observations from joint field visits, but there were no field visits from 2018 until October 2021, where COVID-19 travel restrictions were finally lifted. A mid-term review of the program was planned for 2020, but postponed due to COVID-19 and the forensic audit, and finally cancelled and substituted by the present evaluation.⁴⁷

However, the volume of information and the careful feedback system is resource demanding and requires systematic attention to ensure that lessons learned (challenges and success stories) are transformed into knowledge and systematically applied towards program adjustments or strengthening of the program going forward. Diakonia Zambia encourages partner organizations during PCC meetings to adopt success stories as part of their programming, but due to limited resources and the interrupted and

⁴⁷ Interview with Embassy of Sweden, January 2022.

uneven implementation in 2020-2021, lessons learned have not yet been translated into new knowledge and new ways of working.

4.3 ACHIEVEMENT OF RESULTS

In this chapter, the results achieved under program outcomes 1 to 4 are discussed with the aim of assessing achievements against plans, as well as the adherence to HRBA and overall gender mainstreaming. In principle, both HRBA and gender principles are embedded in the program results framework and explicitly stated through the focus on the rights holders and duty bearer interaction, as well as the genuine focus on gender equity and equality, disaggregated baseline information and targets/ milestones.

Not surprisingly, the evaluation saw a close relationship between SAP II and partner organizations' objectives. Partners' concept papers were from the outset developed in line with the objective and outcomes of SAP II. Before approval, Concept Papers were assessed by Diakonia Zambia to ensure that they met the partner selection criteria. Diakonia Zambia supported partner organizations through aligning their organizational objectives to those of SAP II (including intermediary outcomes). This was cardinal before signing the Partnership Agreements. The mandate for each implementing and resource partners was to contribute to the achievement of SAP II objectives through fulfilment of their own objectives. Hence there is a mutual reinforcement between SAP II and partners, and SAP II objectives and program outcomes complement those of the partner organizations. Activities were developed by partner organizations based on the aligned objectives and program outcomes and intermediary outcomes (including free expression and communication for development, ensuring a free, fair and credible electoral process, advocacy regarding legislative reforms for laws governing the conduct of elections, advocacy for good governance in natural (extractives) and national (taxes and profits) resources, advocacy for transparency and accountability in the extractives sector and capacity building). For more details on the correspondence between SAP II objectives and specific partner organizations' objectives see *Annex 8 Program and partner objectives*.

The SAP II results framework was revised in September 2019⁴⁸ and integrated the comprehensive information gathered during the 2019 baseline study carried out in direct collaboration with the implementing partners.⁴⁹ The baseline study covered all 13 districts and contained general data, as well as specific data on the three thematic areas corresponding to the intermediary outcomes of the program: gender, natural and national resource management, and social and environmental accountability. The baseline study is an important reference document for SAP II, and the participatory data collection process contributed to a broad understanding and ownership by implementing partners of the challenges to be addressed, as well as a level of ownership to the program results framework and objectives.

⁴⁸ SAP II Results Framework, 30.09.2012 - Annex 1 to the 2020 Annual Report.

⁴⁹ Baseline Study Report, SAP II and implementing partners, September 2019.

When assessing the degree to which achievements have been satisfactory, it is important to take into consideration that the SAP II program stumbled in COVID-19 restrictions as well as the freezing of funds and never really gained momentum. This said, the ET found that implementation has been characterized by a high degree of adjustments and flexibility, mainly triggered by the COVID-19 restrictions and changed conditions for program implementation. According to the 2020 Annual Narrative Report, Diakonia Zambia and its partners suspended operations during the second and third quarters of 2020 (after the first COVID-19 case was reported in March 2020), but in spite of this some community facilitators continued conducting awareness meetings informally while observing the official COVID-19 guidelines. The suspension did, nevertheless affect the timely implementation of program activities and achievement of results. In response, Diakonia Zambia allowed for flexibility in programming and thus enabling its partners to implement some activities virtually (e.g. meetings, trainings and workshops). However, the successful undertaking of such adjustments has been hampered by poor connectivity and limited knowledge, as well as limited opportunities for physical monitoring visits, verification and follow-up.

4.3.1 Gender Equity and Equality

Program Outcome 1: *Rights holders in targeted districts of Zambia are promoting and influencing practices and policies for gender equity and equality.*

- *Women, men, boys and girls are advocating for gender equity and equality at local and national level*
- *Women and youth benefitting from empowerment initiatives and opportunities at local and national levels.*
- *Policies and legislation that address gender disparities are popularized and implemented.*

Under Program Outcome 1, NGOCC and WFC managed to engage an estimated 3,626 RHs (out of which 1,685 were women and 2,211 men) in Solwezi, Mufumbwe, Kalumbila, Kalomo and Zimba districts. The activities included capacity building (using specialized methodologies and approaches such as the Participatory Education Methodology tools)⁵⁰ and awareness-raising using the radio (working with MISA Zambia). Radio programs included both female and male discussants in the ratio of 60 and 40 percent respectively. On the other hand, WFC uses the RIVER Code, which is a form of contract with communities it has been working with through empowerment with knowledge and information using role-play. Various trainings were conducted in gender awareness and advocacy, leadership, social accountability, gender budgeting, budget analysis and budget tracking. Further, gender and leadership targeting women in three chiefdoms of Southern Province led to the formation of 65 groups (which

⁵⁰ The PEM tools are used by WFC to effectively engage with communities with low education or literacy levels. These tools enable these communities to effectively analyse situations, problems, causes and effects using pictorial tools (critical analysis). The tree analysis is used to determine and differentiate levels of development, where interventions would take communities in terms of development and also helps communities to visualise where they would like to be using pictorial interpretations.

included women and the youth) from 42 villages representing four wards⁵¹. By the end of 2020, at least 776 community group members (out of which 484 were females and 292 males) were trained and empowered by WFC with different messages on gender equity and equality, SGBV, early marriages, advocacy, human rights and leadership. This also included addressing cultural practices by reaching rights holders (2,218 women and 1,473 men) which limit inclusiveness and female participation through Area Associations (AAs) in Kalomo and Zimba of Southern Province.

Women engagement through women's clubs⁵²

Results of NGOCC's work are formation of women's clubs in response to increased allocations for the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) through the activities supported and implemented with the NGOCC. There has been an increased awareness about women's rights and where to source or seek for empowerment funds. The women have also become change agents and participate more actively in government sub-structures, development programs and activities via WDCs and DDCCs. Also, more women were elected in 2021 as zonal leaders on the WDCs.

In North-Western Province, Caritas Solwezi trained targeted communities in Ikelengi, Kalumbila, Kasempa, Solwezi and Zambezi in green charcoal production⁵³ and village banking techniques. By the end of 2020, 350 RHs had benefited from this (140 women, 105 men and 105 youths). Whereas not much has come out of green charcoal due to limited consumer awareness (as confirmed during field interviews in Solwezi and Kasempa), nine (9) village banking groups were formed with 15 members each: Ikelengi (3), Kalumbila (2), Kasempa (2) and Zambezi (2).

SAP II outreach increased by the end of 2020 via the approach of using community radio stations. MISA Zambia facilitated at least 27 radio programs in the target districts of Lufwanyama and Mpongwe (9), Kalomo and Zimba (9) and Solwezi (9). The NLACW facilitated the creation of four (4) para-legal desks in Ikelengi, Kalumbila, Mushindamo and Mwinilunga districts with a view to increase awareness and knowledge on laws and policies that address gender disparities and women's rights violations.

The Government was also engaged through the Forestry Department to support the training of targeted community groups in beekeeping techniques. The SAP II supported the procurement and distribution of 50 beehives, 20 smokers, 20 swarm boxes and 20 work-suits. It was decided that in Ikelengi women and men would separately manage the apiaries. Honey production has continued and Caritas Solwezi is supporting these groups with marketing aspects. On the other hand, a youth-led cooperative in Kasempa acquired funding for fish farming from the Ministry of Youth, Sports and Arts (MYSA) under the Youth Empowerment Fund (YEF) after benefiting from YAD activities and

⁵¹ Annual Report (2019), Zambia Strengthened Accountability Program Phase 2 (SAP II) Contribution No. 11624, Diakonia Zambia, Lusaka, Zambia

⁵² Interview with Mufumbwe Town Council, February 2022.

⁵³ Green charcoal is a source of energy with minimal impact on the environment. It is produced through clean processes out of biomass. It looks to cut back on pollutants produced through more conventional charcoal production methods.

interventions, e.g. training in community engagement and governance and working with in and out of school youth and civic leaders. Further, EITA facilitated the creation of six (6) inclusive working groups in Mansa comprising 90 women and 90 youths and empowered them in various areas facilitated business linkages with the Luapula Foundation (for village banking) and other economic empowerment initiatives.

Whereas there is significant progress on the ground in the project sites, there was need for more work to influence gender policy and legislative reforms as not much has been achieved since 2018. There is need for more work to operationalise the Gender Equity and Equality Act No.22 of 2015 and establishment of the Gender Equity and Equality Commission (GEEC), especially after the dissolution of the Ministry of Gender (MoG)⁵⁴ by the new Government which came into power in August 2021. There is need for closer engagement with the new regime to build on the achievements recorded since 2018.

The fulfilment of SAP II and partner objectives and expected outcomes has generally been influenced by the availability of resources, timely disbursement of program funds, availability of human resource in the partner organizations and willingness of both RHs and DBs to participate in the process. It has also been dependent on the political context and environment in which SAP II has been operating, particularly in the North-Western Province which was perceived to be an opposition stronghold prior to the August 2021 Presidential and General Elections. Notwithstanding these factors, significant progress has been made towards the fulfilment of objectives and expected outcomes.

4.3.2 Equitable access to and distribution of natural resources

Program Outcome 2: *Rights holders (men women, youth) are holding duty bearers accountable and demanding for equitable access and distribution of national resources.*

- *Rights holders participate in development and governance processes*
- *Rights holders claim their rights to accessing improved and quality public services in targeted sectors*
- *Corporate sector align CSR initiatives to local and community development plans*

Under Program Outcome 2, 2019 registered a major increase in the engagement between RHs and DBs (particularly government at the district level, local authorities and the private sector working in the project sites of the North-Western Province). In order to sustain, accelerate and strengthen this engagement, Diakonia Zambia signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with the Zambia Chamber of Mines (ZCM) during the implementation of the first phase of SAP. This helped set focus on exploring accountability initiatives and Corporate Social responsibility (CSR) through annual conferences involving the mining industry and CSOs.⁵⁵ The MoU has been used as the basis for dialogue and interface meetings between communities and mining companies

⁵⁴ The scrapping of the Ministry of Gender (MoG) resulted in the formation of the Gender Division under the Office of the President at Cabinet Office. In principle, this move should result in greater impact of gender reforms, programs and activities since the representation is now at a much higher level of Government.

⁵⁵ Interview with ZCM, February 2022.

(particularly FQML and Barrick Gold Corporation) or between RHs and DBs (various community development issues such as gender, youth, environment and climate change and generally CSR⁵⁶. RHs in various community groups were trained on how to effectively engage with DBs, types of question to ask and how to prompt feedback from DBs: social accountability, budget tracking, public service delivery etc. One of the most prominent results under this is the formation of Radio Listening Clubs in various parts of North-Western Province, including Kasempa, Mufumbwe and Solwezi which engage with DBs. The formation of these clubs and holding of various discussions (within the thematic areas of SAP II) on community radio stations has made it easier for RHs and DBs to effectively engage e.g. the grading of the main road in Muzabula township of Solwezi in 2020 involved the engagement between the Muzabula Radio Listening Club and local authority and Member of Parliament.⁵⁷

Various examples of successful engagement between RHs and DBs have been outlined in the Partner Activity or Narrative Reports as well as Diakonia Zambia Annual Narrative Reports, and confirmed through field visits. These include the decentralization of dental services at Jokwe Health Center and upgrading of the maternity at Luyaba Health Center in Zimba district of Southern Province. This included the participation of the private sector in this venture in collaboration with the WfC. In Chavuma district of North-Western Province, JCTR-supported community groups conducted a social audit on why construction of the Chavuma Police Station had stalled since 2012, despite funding for materials and payment to the contractor already having been made⁵⁸. The audit established that the contractor had misappropriated the funds and corrective action (including prosecution of the contractor) was initiated. By 2020, RHs working with JCTR in Chavuma influenced the location of a Health Post and Borehole in Kamisamba Ward. Social accountability activities led by RHs (after prior interventions by the NGOCC) also led to 38 out of 56 farmers in Mufumbwe being refunded their contribution towards the Farmer Input Support Program (FISP) for the 2018/19 agricultural season.

Demanding accountability⁵⁹

When interviewed about the changes in the local community, in relations with local authorities and mining companies, and in behavior in general, the rights holders listed a number of significant changes experienced after participating in the community training: Members of the Manyama community, through the members of the three groups affiliated to SAP II are more knowledgeable about how to do business and “are now capable of doing e.g. bricklaying anywhere in Zambia”. The members of the three groups are aware of their rights and can no longer be intimidated - they are teaching other members of the community about their rights. The participants in the FGD also stated that their ability to audit the performance of public service

⁵⁶ This was established during interviews with both Kansanshi Mining PLC (which is owned by FQML) and Lumwana Mining Company Limited (which is owned by Barrick Gold Corporation).

⁵⁷ This was confirmed through Focus Group Discussions (FGD) during the field visit of the North-Western Province of the evaluation exercise of the SAP II.

⁵⁸ This was confirmed during the comprehensive and detailed partner interview with JCTR (as well as in the 2018 Diakonia Zambia Annual Report).

⁵⁹ FGD interview with Manyama Community Groups, February 2022.

workers (teachers, nurses etc.) had improved. This resulted in improvement of reporting time for teachers at school, as they are confronted (i.e. held accountable) by members of the three community groups. However, pupils are still not learning well as there is shortage of school teachers and inadequate school infrastructure. The activities the three Manyama community groups have had impact on political decisions of duty bearers as the group representatives table issues of community concern for discussion, e.g. groups are involved in the WDCs (including women and the youth); and programs and activities are discussed in the WDCs and Kalumbila Town Council.

As a result of improved engagement between RHs and DBs, mining companies (including Barrick Gold or Lumwana Mining Company and First Quantum Minerals Limited (FQML) and its subsidiary Kansanshi Mining Limited) have also become more receptive and aware about environmental concerns and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). The interface meetings have resulted in FQML taking a lead in road maintenance works in Solwezi and Barrick Gold Corporation construction a mother's shelter at Kalumbila General Hospital in Manyama among other things.⁶⁰

Despite the challenges experienced in disbursement of program funds, the fulfilment of SAP II and partner objectives and expected outcomes has generally been successful. The engagement between RHs and DBs in the public sector, including local authorities and central Government at the district level has significantly improved. This engagement has resulted in improved public service delivery: health, education, water and sanitation and community security, etc.

4.3.3 Social and environmental accountability

Program Outcome 3: Targeted duty bearers are ensuring social and environmental accountability in the management and exploitation of natural resources.

- Private sector are complying with local and international standards of improving environmental sustainability and community resilience especially of women in extractive industry areas.
- Private sector are complying with local and international standards of improving environmental sustainability and community resilience especially of women in extractive industry areas.

Under Program Outcome 3, further achievements were recorded under SAP II. District and Provincial Chiefs' and Mining Indabas have been held since 2019 through to 2021 arising from a joint collaboration by SAP II implementing partners: Caritas Solwezi, Caritas Zambia, JCTR and YAD. These have been held in various districts of North-Western Province and also Mansa in Luapula Province. The resolutions have provided input to the National Mining Indaba.

These initiatives are appreciated by the Ministry of Mines and Minerals Development (MMMD)⁶¹ which stated that they had mainly dealt with CTPD, and only to a lesser degree with Caritas Zambia and Diakonia under the SAP II. Activities included **i.a.** the

⁶⁰ This was confirmed separately during a Focus Group Meeting with the Kaumba Community Group in Manyama and also an interview with the Council Secretary for Kalumbila Town Council.

⁶¹ Interview with MMMD, February 2022.

co-hosting of and participation in the 2021 National Mining Indaba; dissemination of findings from the CTPD research on gold mining; and formulation of Policy Briefs on Zambia's mining sector and the state of the economy; discussion of mining tax issues and financial models.⁶² The CTPD engagement was appreciated by the MMMD, especially in the areas of advocacy and research related to the gold mining industry and its importance for the Zambian economy, as well as influencing revisions to the tax regime (in particular the Mineral Royalty Tax (MRT)).

Further, SAP II partners such as JCTR, Caritas Solwezi and EITA have been facilitating interface meetings between RHs and FQML and Barrick Gold Corporation with a focus on community resilience (including men and women). At least 60 RHs (50 percent participation by both gender) have participated in such engagements during 2020.

In terms of private sector compliance with local, national and international standards for improving environmental sustainability and community resilience (including women involved in the extractives sector), improvements were registered in Lufwanyama as a result of Caritas Zambia interventions. Regular engagements have been facilitated by Caritas Zambia between communities, mining companies and the local authority to develop common and joint solutions to challenges being experienced. As a result of improved revenue collection by the Lufwanyama Town Council, the local authority was able to procure a grader during 2020. Caritas Zambia provided further interventions with the Chilobe Tin Community Mine in terms of organized and responsible mining practices. This resulted in the cooperative obtaining a cooperative licence before embarking on applying for a relevant mining licence. Empowered RHs have also been engaging transparently with their traditional leader in Lufwanyama regarding mining rights (hence improved engagement). Prior to interventions by SAP II, a kilogramme of Tin was being sold at ZMW 35, but by 2020 this had risen to ZMW 55 (thanks to SAP II interventions). During 2019, Caritas Zambia led research (through EITI-partner led campaign) which identified a gap regarding accounting systems for mineral revenues for over a hundred years of mining activity in Zambia. This was the basis for launching "Show us the Money" campaign by Caritas Zambia.⁶³

SAP II interventions have resulted in structured engagement and dialogue between mining companies and communities as facilitated by JCTR. Regular meetings are now held between mining companies and RHs (in 2020 a total 60 RHs participated, out of which 29 were women, in interface meetings with FQML in Solwezi and Kalumbila).⁶⁴

This meeting identified main challenges experienced by disadvantaged groups in the community (such as women, youth and children) face as a result of mining induced activities. Action points and interventions were developed on how best stakeholders (communities, mining companies and public sector) could best respond to these challenges.

⁶² Diakonia informed that for the first time in 2022, the Mining Indaba will be co-hosted with MMMD and Diakonia is part of the steering / organizing committee.

⁶³ Based on Diakonia Annual Reports (2018, 2019 and 2020) and interviews with SAP II partners

⁶⁴ Based on Diakonia Annual Reports (2018, 2019 and 2020) and interviews with SAP II partners

Further, in terms of building community actions around environmental accountability, partners such as Caritas Solwezi embarked on forest restoration activities with communities and RHs in selected districts of the North-Western Province. By the end of 2020, capacities of at least 90 farmers (broken down as 35 females, 31 males and 24 youths) in practices of Farmer Management Natural Regeneration (FMNR)⁶⁵ in order to promote forest restoration with indigenous plants, sustainable land use, food security and community forest management. Like other parts of the country, North-Western Province has recorded a significant reduction in forest cover due to human activities such as wood processing, conventional charcoal burning, indiscriminate forest fires and land clearance for industrial and construction activities. With SAP II interventions, three tree nurseries were established in three wards, one each in Ikelenge, Kasempa and Zambezi districts. During 2019, Caritas Zambia facilitated the establishment of dialogue mechanisms involving councillors and traditional leaders in mining areas, mining company representatives, officials from the Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MLSS) in Mansa district and the Luapula Small-Scale Miners' Association (LSSMA) in order to develop local actions regarding mining activities as well as dialogue between RHs and DBs.⁶⁶

During 2019, Caritas Zambia and Caritas Solwezi contributed to resolving conflict regarding community displacement arising from mining activities in Jifumpa area of Kasempa district in the North-Western Province (a Game Management Area (GMA)). The proposed expansion of mining activities by Ruida Investments Limited was going to impact livelihoods. The two SAP II partners worked with local traditional leadership, Kasempa Town Council and Ruida Investments Limited to develop a MoU which addresses community concerns and needs. Caritas Zambia and Caritas Solwezi were aiming at supporting RHs with articulating their concerns.⁶⁷

And in terms of state and state institutions adherence to and enforce policies and legal frameworks in the management and governance of natural resources, various interventions have been undertaken by Caritas Zambia, including research on artisanal and small-scale mining in Luapula and Southern provinces (with the aim of upholding best practices in mining and also community empowerment in this area). Other partners such as JCTR have been instrumental in raising awareness in this area through electronic media such a TV documentary on Diamond TV in 2020 regarding community voices on the changes and impact of mining activities on human rights, livelihoods and the environment.

Conflict mediation⁶⁸

The Lumwana Mining Company Limited has been interacting and engaging with Caritas Solwezi, EITA and JCTR. The core activities of Barrick Gold Corporation cause social impact leading to

⁶⁵ The main objective of the FMNR is to influence and support better community environmental practices by promoting participatory sustainable forest restoration, afforestation and eco-wood-based bio-energy generation as part of localized approaches to climate change mitigation and adaptation.

⁶⁶ Based on Diakonia Annual Reports (2018, 2019 and 2020) and interviews with SAP II partners

⁶⁷ Based on Diakonia Annual Reports (2018, 2019 and 2020) and interviews with SAP II partners

⁶⁸ Interview with Lumwana Mining Company Limited – Barrick Gold Corporation, February 2022.

a lot of grievances from the community such as the blasting that was being done at the mine in 2019 wrecked a lot of homes. This led to protracted discussions over a period of time. During this period, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) or Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) were the conflict mediators and assisted in resolving the differences between the mining company, communities, Kalumbila Town Council and Office of the District Commissioner (DC). It has been a general perception that Barrick Gold Corporation is a government institution, but JCTR has done extremely well in explaining the role of Barrick Gold Corporation or the Lumwana Mining Company Limited in the community. Meetings are convened to explain the civic roles of the Kalumbila Town Council (KTC), roles of central Government and also how Lumwana Mining Company Limited fits into this equation. The main changes as a result of these activities are that whereas it was difficult in the past to discuss any issues with civil society, the mining company is now able to engage the NGOs in convening meetings in order to have effective dialogue with the communities; and the mindset of local communities has changed from a previously aggressive and confrontational approach to a collaborative approach.

Interviews with Zambia Chamber of Mines (ZCM) and Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI) confirmed government's positive perception of CSOs' role in demanding accountability and promoting dialogue between local communities hosting mining operations and the mining companies. EITI stated that the conferences promoted in collaboration between e.g. CTPD and ZCM provided a framework for engagement, which is important to avoid confrontations, which had previously been the practice.⁶⁹ However, also the need for civil society to be better prepared in terms of technical skills, expert knowledge and solid evidence to argue their case was underlined.

Despite the challenges experienced in disbursement of program funds and the impact of COVID-19, the fulfilment of SAP II and partner objectives and expected outcomes has generally been successful. The engagement between communities, traditional leaders and mining companies, which was generally combative in the past, has significantly improved. This engagement has resulted in improved commitment from private sector to meet community needs and address environmental concerns and other CSR issues.

4.3.4 Partner organizations' capacity

Program Outcome 4: *Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandates and effectively deliver rights-based program*

- *Partner organizations have strengthened their institutional capacity.*
- *Partner organizations have strengthened technical capacities to deliver their mandate and to implement the program.*
- *Strategic collaborations established among partners to enhance capacity for innovation and efficiency for joint initiatives.*

In this section, the achievements in relation to Program Outcome 4 are discussed. As the initial capacity assessment undertaken by Diakonia CO in 2018 revealed major

⁶⁹ Interview with EITI, February 2022.

gaps, especially in terms of gender mainstreaming capacity, project monitoring, youth engagement and advocacy skills, the resource organizations were brought on board with the purpose of strengthening implementing partners' capacity. The capacity building of partner organizations was transversal and represented an effort to enhance the implementation through improving and strengthening the implementing partners' capacity. Strengthening the implementing partner organizations' capacity was intended as a means to achieve better results in implementation of Outcomes 1-3.

Table 4: Thematic capacity of resource organizations⁷⁰

Resource organizations	Thematic area for strengthening partner organizations' capacity
AD	Youth approaches in programming
CTPD	Research and advocacy approaches in programming
ZHECT	Organizational capacity building infusing HIV/AIDS, SRHR in the gender aspects of the program
NLACW	Gender elements, with an inclination to policy and legal frameworks
Peer organizations	Thematic area for strengthening partner organizations' capacity
NGOCC	Gender mainstreaming and approaches in programming
WFC	Gender mainstreaming and approaches in programming
SACCORD	Conflict mainstreaming and approaches in programming

The resource organization came on board after capacity building plans based on an organizational capacity assessment of each of the implementing partner organizations was undertaken in early 2019. Individual Capacity Building Plans for each implementing partner were prepared and based on these also an overall program Capacity Building Plan 2018-2021. The resource organizations stated the need for more detailed assessments before the actual training could take place from early 2020. The late start coinciding with the SAP II standstill period in 2020-2021 resulted in capacity building activities being undertaken in a different form and at a different pace than initially planned. And also, in the fact that follow-up and monitoring, i.e. verification of results, had not yet taken place when the present evaluation was carried out.

The main issues identified were governance issues, financial management, monitoring and formulation of indicators, youth engagement, gender mainstreaming. Some of the lessons learned stated by the resource organizations were the need for continuous capacity building, as various partner organizations had seen change of staff in management and financial management positions and consequent loss of momentum. As an example was mentioned the fact that FODEP changed executive director three times since 2018, and financial manager three times.

The model with resource organizations was used by Diakonia in the Lake Victoria Region and considered successful in terms of adding value and enhancing aspects of

⁷⁰ Based on Capacity Building Plans 2018-2021 for partner organizations.

peer learning and networking - rather than contracting external consultants with no hands-on knowledge of CSOs' specific needs.⁷¹

During the SAP II period, the following capacity building interventions were supported by Diakonia Zambia:⁷²

- In order to enhance program impact sustainability and build community ownership through social accountability, capacity build and training for implementing partner staff: WfC, YAD, EITA and FODEP and selected members of community groups in districts where NGOCC has been operating
- Building operational capacities of “weaker” CSOs or implementing partner organizations to ensure that they have effective program and finance and administration officers (POs and FAOs)
- Support to both resource and implementing partners with the procurement of Information Technology (IT) equipment, office furniture and other accessories, as well as one (1) motor vehicle each for eight (8) of the 10 implementing organizations
- Strengthening governance structures of some “weaker” implementing partners through the facilitation of the development of governance tools such as appropriate constitutions (for organizations such as YAD), facilitating the holding of regular board and scheduled Annual General meetings (particularly for EITA, FODEP, SACCORD and YAD), conducting of corporate governance, risk management and value-for-money training for all the 10 implementing organizations
- Strengthening financial and risk management systems to improve compliance and adherence with Diakonia requirements (and those of the Embassy of Sweden or SIDA) through the procurement of accounting and payroll software, providing onsite training to finance personnel and providing technical assistance to address backlogs on statutory payments (such as Pay As You Earn (PAYE) and social security contributions): Caritas Solwezi, EITA, FODEP, MISA Zambia and YAD
- Strengthen implementing partner capacities in programming efficiency and effectiveness through Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) training for MISA Zambia, training specifically identified partner staff (EITA, FODEP, YAD and SACCORD) in financial management as well as appropriate format for donor reporting or donor reporting requirements

Based on the Capacity Building Plan, the following resource partners or organizations have supported upgrading or improving capacities of staff from implementing partners in the following areas:⁷³

- Africa Directions (AD): training in effective youth programming and mentoring in order for partners to effectively engaged and deliver youth-focused initiatives: Caritas Solwezi, EITA and YAD

⁷¹ Interview with Diakonia Regional Office in Nairobi, 10.02.2022.

⁷² Based on review of Partner Annual Narrative Reports, Diakonia Annual Narrative Reports, as well as interviews conducted with both SAP II resource and implementing partners.

⁷³ The ET had limited and late access to Activity reports from the resource organizations and the information is mainly collected during interviews and from PCC presentations.

- Center for Trade Policy and Development (CTPD): mentoring and training in policy analysis and research and effective engagement on mining taxation and related tax reforms: all implementing partner organizations
- National Legal Aid Clinic for Women (NLACW): training of paralegals, including e.g. ethics, GBV, the court system, customary legal practices, psycho-social counselling, land resources and women empowerment etc.
- Zambia Health Education and Communications Trust (ZHECT): facilitated mentoring sessions with implementing partners, and development of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) tools with Caritas Solwezi and YAD. The remaining organizations - EITA, FODEP, MISA Zambia, NGOCC and WFC - have not yet received monitoring and evaluation training. For the partner organizations still with SAP II, this will be covered during the remaining period of the program in 2022.⁷⁴

The ET found that the keen focus on building capacity for enhancing implementation efficiency and effectiveness has been an appropriate approach. It was, however, less pertinent that the resource organizations were brought on board after the capacity assessment, and only started the training and capacity building activities after implementing partners has been operating for more than a year.

The ET also found that although the set-up with resource organizations as trainers has worked well, it has also been necessary to enlarge the scope and include also peers in the capacity building, e.g. WFC and NGOCC on gender issues, and to change AD's role from resource organization to implementing partner in 2022. The flexibility demonstrated is noteworthy, but also calls for a more organic set-up in the future, not necessarily operating with two categories of partners, but benefitting from individual capacities in a network of mutual capacity building.

4.3.5 Harmonization and synergy

SAP II offers a number of organizational platforms and structures which aims at enhancing learning and synergy. The joint monitoring visits and PCC meetings (discussed above) as well as the **clusters** are some of the important platforms. The clusters were meant to enhance joint activity implementation, to improve efficiencies and to enhance value for money (and by so doing avoid duplication of activities) and for partners to support one another. However, partners have not been able to meet regularly essentially due to conflicting partner schedules, interests and priorities.

This is in addition to lack of sufficient partner capacity to participate in cluster meetings (especially for the smaller partner organizations). Partners are also encouraged to participate in joint monitoring of activity implementation when Diakonia Zambia is out in the field, but also among partners themselves.

The ET found that albeit a commendable initiative, the clusters have not been yielding the expected result in terms of synergy. During interviews held with implementing partners, many stated their reluctance towards the way the clusters have been working, albeit the intention was regarded as positive. Some of the examples given focused on

⁷⁴ This was confirmed during the Directors' PCC meeting, March 2022.

meetings being unstructured with no formal assessments; lack of joint work plans and shared purpose resulting in individual silos rather than clusters; and the fact that few meetings were held in 2020 and none in 2021.

Despite the challenges of successfully implementing cluster arrangements, SAP II registered notable and **successful synergies among the Diakonia partners**, including complementarity through joint monitoring, joint advocacy and information-sharing, through use of partner resource persons on the ground to build local capacities. Some of these include the following:

- SACCORD collaboration with FODEP in Chavuma and Zambezi regarding the creation, training and capacity building of community-based conflict resolution committees. FODEP focused on strengthening WDCs based on its strength in decentralisation
- MISA Zambia collaboration with Women for Change (WfC) in Zimba district of Southern Province regarding the infusion of gender dimension in media training and engagement (MISA Zambia takes the lead on capacity building of media organizations to report on social accountability)
- JCTR collaboration with FODEP in Chavuma district of North-Western Province regarding interface meetings and stakeholder engagement on strengthened accountability, budget tracking and community service delivery monitoring. There is added value from FODEP on governance structures
- Multi-partner engagement and collaboration regarding organizing and undertaking of consultative meetings such as Chiefs' and Mining Indabas and other types of workshops or conferences. Apart from financial contributions, the collaboration amplifies and strengthens the advocacy voice (various aspects such as YAD on youth issues, Caritas Solwezi on community mobilisation, Caritas Zambia on natural resource management and environmental protection and NGOCC on gender issues while Diakonia Zambia supports the whole process)
- FODEP collaboration with EITA regarding community environment, capacity building of Community Groups or RHs and economic empowerment in Kalumbila district; collaboration with YAD regarding youth participation in sub-governance structures in Kalumbila; collaboration with Caritas Solwezi and Caritas Zambia in Mushindamo regarding capacity building of RHs on social accountability, budget tracking and service delivery monitoring; collaboration with NGOCC on issues of gender mainstreaming in Solwezi district of North-Western Province
- EITA collaboration with WfC and NGOCC on gender mainstreaming activities (including capacity building and participation in national annual activities such as 16 days of gender activism); collaboration with MISA Zambia on using radio to enhance development outcomes; collaboration with Caritas Zambia, Africa Directions (AD) and JCTR on social accountability training of RHs.

The ET did, however, also register cases where some **rights holder groups in the North-Western Province were transferred from one implementing partner to another** by Diakonia without sufficient preparation of neither groups nor partner

organizations. This happened in cases, where roles of some partners were deemed as essential for the whole program such as MISA Zambia⁷⁵ interventions or where partners have been implementing cross-cutting themes or interventions in North-Western Province, Diakonia Zambia requested that Radio Listening Clubs (rights-holders / community groups in Muzabula and Kisalala Community Groups in Solwezi) were transferred to Caritas Solwezi. These community groups - previously formed as Radio Listening Clubs - were to be handed over to partners working on key governance and accountability themes. There have been issues on how this process was managed, especially where changes were being made just before the forensic audit was instituted in 2021. The request by Diakonia Zambia for MISA Zambia to hand-over their project sites in North-Western Province to Caritas Solwezi was informally done i.e., through e-mails and follow-up phone calls. Ideally, formal arrangements and meetings ought to have taken place between Diakonia Zambia, MISA Zambia and Caritas Solwezi to, firstly, discuss the issue, get partner feedback (both in Lusaka and essentially in Solwezi or just any one of these districts). The final handover should have been done at the community-level with involvement of RH groups in the project sites. However, according to Diakonia Zambia there were different experiences with other partners (including the WFC) in other parts of the country such as the Southern Province.

There were further discussions to ensure that JCTR and Caritas Solwezi cover areas and communities that were abandoned by SACCORD in Chavuma, Mufumbwe and Zambezi after the termination of the Partnership Agreement. However, this could not materialise as such plans were overtaken by the forensic audit and also hampered by limited resources. On the other hand, the termination of the EITA Partnership Agreement has initiated discussions that should lead to the transfer of EITA RH groups to Caritas Zambia in Mansa and YAD RH groups to AD in Kasempa for the rest of 2022 before SAP II winds up.

The ET found that it is important to engage not only the implementing partners, but also the involved community groups in these decisions, as it may otherwise cause distrust and demotivation.

Awareness and knowledge at community level⁷⁶

The Radio Listening Club provided an opportunity for community members to have access to information by listening to radio programs, discuss and get inspiration to act as change agents in their local community. Not everybody has access to radio equipment, and the club therefore also provides a physical platform for accessing information. Before SAP II and MISA Zambia came to support programming of Mufumbwe Community Radio and the formation of Radio Listening Clubs, Mufumbwe experienced rampant cutting down of trees for charcoal burning and

⁷⁵ At inception of SAP II interventions and activity implementation, MISA Zambia was an implementing partner, but down the road Diakonia Zambia decided that MISA Zambia should cover the whole SAP II and not be restricted to any project site (and be allowed to be in charge of radio programs with community radio stations in all the project sites. This included joint monitoring and learning. Hence MISA Zambia is more of a resource than implementing partner (or a cross between the two).

⁷⁶ FGD interview with Kakilufya Radio Listening Club, February 2022.

also timber harvesting. This has now significantly reduced, as people in various communities of Mufumbwe are more knowledgeable on issues of development and their human rights due to their participation in the SAP II supported activities. Also, the number of SGBV incidents has continued to reduce due to the work with NGOCC and MISA Zambia: “The situation is not as it was as people have become more knowledgeable about the evils of this malpractice.” People are also now aware about which institutions (both private and public) to engage on issues that affect their livelihoods and generally issues of development.”

4.4 CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

4.4.1 Gender

From 2021 onwards, the new country strategy (2021-2025) states that Diakonia’s work is guided by feminist principles. These principles are about gender, as well as about awareness of power dynamics, representation, diversity, and inclusion, with an intersectional perspective. Since this guidance only came into effect in 2021 it will be a fundamental aspect of any future program to ensure that the implementing partners will have the capacity to mainstream gender using the guidance of feminist principles throughout their work. It is important to make the distinction between working on gender issues, and doing work based on feminist principles. Feminism is a social and political movement and ideology aimed at achieving the political, economic, and social equality of the genders. Even though Diakonia is not a feminist organization, the decision to work based on feminist principles has implications for processes, focus of work, and organizational structure.⁷⁷ According to the principles this means among other things:

- always starting from a feminist analysis of the context and power relations where we work
- addressing and working towards transforming the root causes of gender inequality, not just its manifestations and effects
- maintain gender justice as a goal in and of itself, and not just as something that will contribute to other goals such as democracy, human rights, peace, or economic development.

Two organizations - WFC and NGOCC - are already equipped with the technical skills to facilitate project implementation from a feminist perspective. For the other partners, most results were related to empowerment of women in terms of skills to enhance economic independence, rather than providing them with a voice and space to influence decisions. Both WFC and NGOCC play roles as resource partners to assist the other partners with building their gender mainstreaming capacity.

To address the gender mainstreaming issues and identify capacity gaps, gender audits on the partners began in mid-2020 but were not concluded by end of year. The process was done virtually, and most partners were having challenges adjusting this new way

⁷⁷ A Feminist Rationale for Diakonia’s Gender Justice Work THE GOAL IS GENDER JUSTICE.THE WAY THERE IS FEMINISM

of working. Limited capacity and inappropriate ICT resources/ infrastructure meant they could not participate effectively. The partners also showed a lack of willingness to participate in the audit in this manner.

The gender audit process and development of road map for capacity building in gender mainstreaming was facilitated by two gender partners (NGOCC and WFC) with support from NLACW (resource organization). A few capacity building sessions were also held in the last quarter of 2020 which included a series of gender policy advocacy and awareness trainings for all partners which ultimately led to the development of 2 policy briefs on: *Women's access ownership and control of land* and *Gender perspective to government contraction of loans and sustainable solutions*.

The capacity building sessions helped partners to mainstream gender in the project activities. Some partners still had capacity gaps, and these were provided with Diakonia's Gender Mainstreaming tool kit as a reference document for planning, implementation, and reporting of gender.

In addition, a study was commissioned on the gender dimensions of ongoing climate change adaptation projects in Zambia and SAP II partner projects with the aim of developing gender-sensitive approaches. Some of the key findings and recommendations included:⁷⁸

1. The concept of gender in relation to roles and responsibility was well understood by most partners in the context of sex-based social structures and used more broadly to denote a range of identities that do not correspond to established ideas of male and female.
2. Most projects ensured that both genders were well represented and benefited equally as it has been highlighted by the project results which includes gender-responsive indicators and sex-disaggregated data. However, what was missing is that the partners do not go a step further to include the gender analysis.
3. Most of partner projects were focused on empowering women and ensuring that there are no inequitable negative impacts on gender equality.

The study made several general recommendations and specifically to Diakonia, SAP II and future projects that they should focus on 'Promoting Leadership, Equitable Access to and Control over Resources by ensuring access to the resources (specifically land, forests, water, minerals) is equitable for women and men, including vulnerable groups. This could assist in addressing attitudes, social norms, and personal security which play a critical role in determining the choices available to rights holders.'⁷⁹

The partners have acknowledged that the assistance of WFC and NGOCC has helped move forward their gender mainstreaming work under SAP II. They have also attested to the usefulness of Diakonia's gender mainstreaming toolkit in guiding their work.

⁷⁸ SAP II Annual Narrative Report 2020, Diakonia Zambia

⁷⁹ Ibid

They made specific mention of the guide on ‘How to do Advocacy with a Gender Perspective’ as it provides a clear checklist and steps to follow. With these tools the implementing partners developed the capacity to consider the different experiences of men and women under the program as well as ensure the full and equal participation of both sexes.

FGDs in Kalumbila, Kasempa and Solwezi stated that women and youth are more engaged in community activities and advocacy in WDCs: *‘We balance sex for male and female and ensure the youths are included. Our Rights Holders ‘groups are normally 10 people so balance the committee as in 5 for each sex although more women are encouraged, and we ensure women take up leadership positions.’* - NGOCC

In Southern province a WFC group stated that a lot has changed since the groups under SAP II were created. There has been a reduction in female cleansing rituals and other negative traditional practices. Village committees are seeing a rise in women in decision making positions, and women are speaking up, where they were silent before. One woman rights holder in Kalumbila stated that she used to be afraid of talking to service providers, *“now if I go into a clinic and a nurse ignores me because she’s on her phone, I tell her she needs to serve me. I learned to speak up when things are not done properly.”*

Tukyia Women’s Development Club⁸⁰

The Tukyia Women’s Club stated that they now have structures at community level and use these structures to engage with public and private duty bearers, as well as traditional leaders. “The WDC has power and we know our rights. Every year we go to DC office and ask for the yellow book (budget) and see the sectors and allocations (budget tracking) to follow up with the District Education Board Secretary allocations.” They have registered increase in women’s participation in various committees and high positions, even in allocating land: women are collecting land as both headmen and women have been sensitized about the legal allocation of 30% for women, 20% youth, and 10% for the people with disability. The advocacy training of 16 local committees had resulted in women being incorporated in the WDCs and in radio stations having more female employees. In general, the WDC found that government had become more receptive, and also that there was an increase on enrolment of girls in school, also of girls going back to school because of sensitisation on government’s re-entry policy allowing girls back in school after they have given birth. Previously, people were not reporting incidents of GBV, but the number of reports had increased and there was an engagement with the Victim Support Officer at the Police. In general, the participants at the FGC stated that “women used to be inactive in the community but are now opening up and contribute in meetings and in committees”. The groups also engaged with traditional leaders to discuss the need for reduction of child marriages. They registered responsiveness from private sector companies. Some of the examples were the Javuma, which has agreed to sink a borehole for the community. The ward counsellor and members of WDC had been tasked to identify where to sink the borehole. Unfortunately, there were conflicts between different communities over location of the borehole,

⁸⁰ Focus Group Discussion held in February 2022.

resulting in the borehole still not being sunk. Also, Chinyama Construction provided planks and timber for roofing the Chizela market and the school. The WDC found companies were increasingly aware of their obligation for CSR activities because of the group of rights holders advising them to do so.

4.4.2 Environment

Environment sensitivity is a key mainstreaming area and a program result area, which is in line with the strategic Swedish development priorities.⁸¹ The goal is to minimize the negative environmental impact of the activities and create a positive impact on the environment. Diakonia Zambia is guided by the Environmental Policy⁸² which allows Diakonia to meet its environmental commitments without compromising its mission to change unfair political, economic, social, and cultural structures that generate poverty, inequality, oppression, and violence. The policy covers the following areas:

- i. Supporting sustainable development and advocating for climate justice
- ii. Minimizing the environmental impact from travel and vehicle use
- iii. Ensuring environmentally friendly offices; and
- iv. Managing our environmental impact

Diakonia Zambia has implemented some of the measures under the policy, including posters visibly displayed in the office to use recycled paper for printing drafts and turn off lights where they are unnecessary. Some partners have environment sensitivity as a major component of their project, while all partners have some element of environmental issues mainstreamed in their projects. All the partners are required to plan, implement, and report on their environmental mainstreaming activities, though this has come with its own challenges, which included the fact that several partners do not have environmental policies within their organizations, and some partners have found environmental mainstreaming as a new and technical phenomenon.

Diakonia has attempted to address this during its PCCs; providing partners with guidelines on how to mainstream environment at both the workplace and during project implementation. In addition, Rights Holders were sensitized on the negative impacts of mining on the environment, promotion of the use of sustainable organic agriculture methods of farming and green charcoal production, conservation of forests and biodiversity protection. Caritas Solwezi and Caritas Zambia (under the Diakonia head office CJIP) established nurseries for indigenous trees to ensure a wider range of indigenous tree species and fruit trees in selected project sites and schools in North-Western and Southern provinces respectively.

In addition, for the project's whose focus is on mining and the environment they have worked very closely with the Zambia Environmental Management Authority (ZEMA) and played a key part in ZEMA opening a branch in Solwezi. They also engaged with the Water Resource Management Authority (WARMA) and ZEMA on issues

⁸¹ Interview with Embassy of Sweden in Lusaka, February 2022.

⁸² <https://www.diakonia.se/en/how-we-work/quality-assurance/sustainability/>

pertaining to the development and finalisation of the Environmental Mitigation Plan (EMP). In NGOCC project sites, rights holders have partnered with an organization called Tecra Tech who is promoting alternative use of charcoal and some of the NGOCC members are part of the groups influencing this change. Caritas Solwezi has reported greater interest by community members and people switching from use of conventional to green charcoal as a measure used to determine reduction in deforestation. There is a reduction in the number of trees been cut down and production of green charcoal has increased.

SAP II's work around environment is relevant given the number of environmental issues surrounding mining companies; land use and management; and deforestation. One of the major challenges to natural resource management relates to ownership and management of land. About 94 per cent land is owned and managed by customary authorities, with only about 6 per cent being considered state land. Customary land is increasingly deforested and degraded, given pressure for alternative uses, especially among the poor, who cannot secure titles. Lack of freehold ownership has been shown to reduce the incentive to manage the land sustainably. Poorer households have demonstrated a higher dependence on fuel wood, use of medicinal plants and other forest products that pose challenges to natural resource management and climate change adaptation.

In some areas of Lusaka, Central, Copperbelt, Northern, North-Western, and Southern provinces, environmental degradation arises from land clearance for agriculture, unsustainable charcoal production and mining operations. The country has also been losing wildlife, thereby compromising potential nature-based tourism.

Current topical issues around this include: the setup of an international mine in Lower Zambezi and the degazetting of Forest 27 for the perceived benefit of politicians and more affluent people in Zambia. When in opposition, the incumbent government had promised to reverse the mining licence for the lower Zambezi mine and to restore Forest 27 back to its natural setting. However, the legal process around this has proved difficult. However, the government has stated its commitment towards Zambia's environmental sustainability with the creation of the new Ministry of Green Economy to deal with issues in this area. This provides Diakonia with a willing partner in government to work with on environmental sensitivity issues, including creating a strong base for wealth generation, youth employment creation and poverty reduction through sustainable extraction and trade in key sectors such as forestry.

4.4.3 Conflict sensitivity

Diakonia and partners work with a 'Do No Harm' policy. This means that the program must always show awareness and sensitivity to unintended impacts on conflict and take the proper measures to maximize positive impact and minimize harm. A Do No Harm analysis is carried out wherever the organizations work is carried out to ensure that work approaches, methods and strategies in the various projects do not have a negative impact on conflict but rather builds on and strengthens positive impact.

One way this has worked well for the program is through the formation of platforms which promote dialogue structures and engagement with key stakeholders in the project sites. This has helped to minimise the confrontational approach that existed in the past especially with the mining companies. For example, in Kalumbila, Caritas Solwezi facilitated dialogue with the community members and duty bearers, until the community members got compensation for their houses cracking because of blasting activities of Lumwana mining.

However, reaching this milestone was not without its challenges, e.g.:

1. Diakonia had a pending incidence with SACCORD, the partner identified as a resource in the program to build the capacity of the partners in conflict mainstreaming and resolution. With the incident running for the better part of a year before the decision to discontinue the partnership was made in November 2021, the partner could not play its role on the program.
2. Kalumbila Minerals Ltd (now trading as FQM Trident Limited) has had on going conflict with the community in Musele Ward, where community members have been complaining that their cassava is rotting because of suspected pollution from mining companies. The mines have refuted it, saying it is the acid in the soil. Rights holders engaged the duty bearers (DC's Office, District Agriculture Coordinator and Council) but nothing tangible happened. Several rights holders who were deemed to be influencing the community and alleged to have reported the matter to police were arrested. The matter is currently in the courts of law, and Prime TV interviewed Caritas Solwezi about the incident. Afterwards, FQM confronted Caritas Solwezi but no agreement was reached. However, Caritas Solwezi received reports from the community that the mine had started adding lime to the river they were polluting to reduce the acidity and have blocked off the area which is the source of the river where the rights holders are.

Diakonia and partners planned to undertake a Community Company Assessment (CCA) in Kalumbila to minimise the potential adverse effects of these conflicts on the program results, but this did not happen because of the suspension in funding and implementation during 2021. However, because JCTR, Caritas Solwezi and Caritas Zambia were still using their church structures to carry out some activities, they employed the use of Church social teachings by promoting the use of non-violent mechanisms of resolving conflicts to protect children and women, respect human rights, uphold the rule of law and build peace for all. This approach has continued, and lessons learned shared with partners through the most recent PCC meeting held in February 2022.

The implementing partners have also had conflicts among themselves. One example, shared among multiple partners, is the perception that EITA is getting incentives from the mines as it continually and openly supports the mines when the other partners criticise the mines on environmental issues. A further example is the recent Mining Indaba which Caritas Zambia and Caritas Solwezi organized with participation of the implementing partners. EITA decided to hold their own mining indaba at district level

in Kalumbila at the same time as the regional one, so that Kalumbila and Lumwana mines would not attend the bigger mining indaba. It took the intervention of Caritas Zambia who informed Kalumbila DAO that they would inform the mining minister about Kalumbila mines and the district authorities shunning the indaba. The EITA district meeting was cancelled as a result. Subsequently, Caritas and other SAP II partners started shunning EITA meetings.

Advocacy for CSR and conflict address - Kansanshi Mining Limited⁸³

JCTR and Caritas Solwezi have been advocating for support to improve township roads in Solwezi. Hence the Solwezi Municipal Council (SMC) has been working closely with the Road Development Agency (RDA) in order to effectively construct and rehabilitate these township roads. So far, five township roads have been tarred. This includes construction of the drainage system. The contract involves rehabilitation of many more roads. Kansanshi Mining Limited has an understanding with the SMC to support the road maintenance program. Sensitisation and awareness among the communities has increased due to interventions and advocacy by EITA, JCTR and Caritas Solwezi. These CSOs are also helping to link the surrounding communities to the CDF, teaching them on the approach and how to make meaningful submissions to the WDCs. Communities are now better organized since EITA, JCTR and Caritas Solwezi have heightened the need for interaction and engagement and also the need to work together. Previously the engagement between Kansanshi Mining Limited and communities and these CSOs was militant. Hence the engagement has mainly been on defining the roles of the Duty Bearers (DBs) and Rights Holders (RHs), issues of transparency and legacy. People now do understand that the ownership role and argument is now different from that of the Zambia Consolidated Copper Mines (ZCCM) era and also the new CSR initiatives.

4.5 LESSONS LEARNED

Diakonia through SAP II has a strong focus on lessons learned - the entire program is based on lessons learned from the previous program period, and structures for systematic capturing of lessons learned are established. This is explicit in report formats and focus at PCC-meetings as well as in the on-going dialogue with partner organizations. Due to the contextual challenges during the SAP II program implementation period, as well as the limited resources available at the CO, there is however, yet scope for improving the systematic transformation of lessons learned into changed practices and adjustments in program management and implementation.

During the evaluation, lessons learned were collected from implementing partners and resource organizations (see *Annex 9 Partner Organizations - Summary findings*). The ET has analysed the lessons learned identified by partner organizations and see patterns around implementation principles, community level engagement, program management, and communication.

⁸³ Interview with Kansanshi Mining Ltd in February 2022.

4.5.1 Implementation principles

Partner organizations stated that they have experienced the importance of accountability and have applied this principle in their own partnerships outside the SAP II context and thereby amplified the lessons learned. Various partners have stated that the network established through SAP II of implementing and resource organizations is an added value in itself, and that there is a strength in the unity provided by the network. The joint monitoring which has been practiced in terms of PCC meetings and field visits provided a platform for learning, which was appreciated, as was the set-up with resource organizations; albeit the latter was not fully utilized.

An important lesson learned from partners was the importance of having focus on conflict management and resolution - in the relationship between rights holders and duty bearers at community level, but definitely also internally in the program.

Having an open mind for learning is an important bottom-line learning sentence from partners in SAP II.

4.5.2 Community level engagement

The lessons learned during COVID-19 when it comes to community level work were multiple. The importance of field presence is overarching, but the new possibilities opened through virtual presence and communication have also yielded valuable lessons learned. One partner stated that the community driven approach was instrumental in times of limited direct engagement, but it is also a delicate balance, and limited engagement can also lead to demotivation.

Working virtually requires new technology (communication platforms) and new skills - with implementing partners as well as with the community groups. The overall lesson learned is that new ways of working have been explored, and it was possible to maintain a certain momentum. But it is also important to recognize that a mix of physical presence with virtual communication is necessary.

Apart from the lessons learned on virtual community work, it was also stated that a keen focus on sustainability is important when working with community groups to secure their future. Also, the importance of mixing economic activities with non-economic activities, e.g. advocacy was listed as a lesson learned related to sustainability.

4.5.3 Program management

The program management was an area of much attention from partner organizations, yielding a number of important lessons learned from what actually was practiced and from what was felt missing.

First and foremost, several partner organizations stressed the importance of effective and realistic planning with sufficient flexibility. The importance of operating with contingency plans and budgets was stressed by several, a fact amplified by COVID-19 and the derived need for readjustment of plans and reallocation of budgets. It was also

stressed that sustainability considerations must be incorporated in planning from the very beginning of an intervention.

Partners highlighted the importance of monitoring and evaluation, the continued documentation of results and collection of cases as an indispensable platform for learning. Also, the importance of verification of results through site visits and direct observation was stated as an important learning - triggered by the lack of possibility during COVID-19.

Several partners also recognized the importance of on-going skills upgrading and capacity building to be able to deliver the expected results. Also the availability of tools in the form of e.g. solid guidelines were seen as important to sustain the application of skills building.

4.5.4 Communication

Lessons learned related to communication were prominent among the partner organizations which have experienced a problematic partnership under SAP II and in some cases have had the partnership terminated. But not only - the importance of clearly balanced expectations from the onset of a program, as well as continued communication were mentioned by several partners as prerequisites for smooth implementation.

In the program implementation, lessons learned related to communication were stated in relation to the importance of supporting partners in their dialogue with potentially conflicts stakeholders (e.g. the mining companies). Communication as a conflict prevention and mitigation measures was identified as important, as was the support to partners in cases of conflict.

5 Conclusions and Recommendations

The conclusions from the analysis of findings in the previous chapters are presented as responses to the evaluation criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness and efficiency) and corresponding evaluation questions and indicators, which have guided the evaluation. Based on this, recommendations related to Diakonia's organizational structure and capacity, program management and implementation, external relations, as well as an overall recommendation on future direction are presented.

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

5.1.1 Relevance - Is the program doing the right thing?

***EQ 1.1** To what extent has the intervention objectives and design responded to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and have they continued to do so if/when circumstances have changed?*

***Indicator:** The program intervention supports the Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Zambia 2018-2022, the Zambia's National Development Strategy, and Diakonia's global and national strategies.*

The deliberate focus on human rights, gender equality, rights holders' voice and environmental issues confirms SAP II's relevance in relation to the overall strategic framework for the program interventions, i.e. the Zambia National Development Strategy (both medium and long-term), the Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Zambia 2018-2022, and Diakonia's own global, thematic and national strategies. Furthermore, the evaluation confirmed the relevance of the interventions at community level for rights holders (women, men, youth) who are provided with access to information, knowledge on rights and skills to demand accountability.

The ET verified that SAP II has adapted program implementation to the changing and challenging context created by the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent restrictions. Furthermore, the program faced challenges in terms of mismanagement cases internally at the CO, as well as with a number of the long-term implementing partners. As a consequence of these problems, Diakonia CO and partners operated for almost the entire 2021 without disbursements from the Embassy of Sweden. This situation was managed by the CO, which maintained contact with the implementing partners and succeeded in maintaining a minimum of activity level, which allowed for starting up in early 2022, when funds were finally released.

EQ 1.2 *To what extent have lessons learned from what works well and less well been used to improve and adjust intervention implementation?*

Indicator: *Program adjustments are documented and based on systematically summarized lessons learned.*

The formulation and preparation of SAP II built extensively on the lessons learned from SAP I - in terms of objective and program set-up, i.e. working with rights holders through complementary implementing partners. SAP II was a scale up of SAP I with emphasis on extending the scope, expanding geographical coverage and setting more focus on national level advocacy. During implementation, the monitoring systems have been designed to capture lessons learned as well as success stories / change stories, but due to the specific circumstances of low activity level in 2020-2021, there is so far limited evidence of adjustments being made on basis of systematically harvested lessons learned. The program has, however, made a number of pertinent and justified adjustments to meet the new situation under COVID-19, i.e. in terms of online work and digital communication with partners, as well as supported the partners in adjusting their programs accordingly. The high degree of flexibility has been a positive characteristic of the Diakonia program management, appreciated by the implementing partners.

EQ 1.3 *Evaluate the relevance of intervention of SAP II as an input to the decision whether or not it shall receive continued funding.*

Indicator: *The program has demonstrated significant results in terms of changed practices among various groups of program stakeholders - both rights holders and duty bearers - and capacity to change and adapt.*

The ET found the indications of results achieved so far promising. This said, it is evident that due to the specific circumstances and the standstill for the better part of the program period, it is difficult to demonstrate a full accomplishment of plans. Evidence from rights holders and implementing partner organizations, as well as external stakeholders does, however, indicate that the rights-based approach, the keen focus on gender and environment, as well as the dialogue-based approach applied in the demand for accountability from private sector and government duty bearers has yielded positive results. The ET considers SAP II as a valuable investment, which has faced a series of challenges - internal and external. It is only in the last year (2022) of implementation that the program will be able to gain some momentum and can demonstrate results

5.1.2 Coherence - How well does the intervention fit?

EQ 2.1 *How compatible has the intervention been with other interventions in the country, sector or organization where it is being implemented?*

Indicator: *Confirmed complementarity by internal and external program stakeholders and identified evidence of synergy.*

The ET found the SAP II approach unique and difficult to compare to similar initiatives in Zambia. There is solid evidence of synergy among partner organizations, as well as

with different other stakeholders. Interviews with different stakeholders - especially municipal government institutions, private sector (mining companies), and rights holders - demonstrated complementarity and synergy. This was interpreted in different forms - as a vehicle for dialogue within the mining sector, as catalyst for dialogue between rights holders and duty bearers, as provider of access to information and generation of knowledge. The mere organizational set-up of the SAP II provided a platform for a wide range of different partner organizations to establish collaboration and exchange of experience. The question is if it is sufficiently explored, as there were indications of tendencies to work in isolation (“silos”) without sufficient coordination among partner organizations operating within the same geographical area. The ET also found that Diakonia - presumably due to the somehow self-contained character of the organization, i.e. no external board members, centralized governance system and very lean structure - only to a limited extent engages in broader civil society networks. There is an opportunity for Diakonia to take a lead role in terms of creating synergies at national level with like-minded donor initiatives (that are being implemented in other parts of the country such as the USAID-funded 2020-2025 Local Impact Governance Activity).

5.1.3 Effectiveness - Is the intervention achieving its objectives?

EQ 3.1 *To what extent has the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups?*

Indicator: *Documented and verified results and extent to which a human rights-based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy were incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention.*

The ET found substantial evidence and documentation for implementation of planned and adjusted activities in the form of interventions at community level. There is, however, limited evidence of establishing a vertical link between evidence on the ground, i.e. community level, and national level advocacy work and policy influence. The responsibility for undertaking national level advocacy and dissemination of information is vested with the partner organizations, and Diakonia plays only an indirect, facilitating role in this. The ET found that a stronger profile from Diakonia would be conducive in channeling advocacy messages based on implementation evidence would enhance the scope of policy dialogue at national level. When it comes to the HRBA and gender mainstreaming approach, there is no doubt of a strong strategic focus in SAP II, as there is a clear and deliberate prioritization of working with poor women, men and youth at community level to enhance their voice and agency. However, the ET found that in spite of a focus on gender mainstreaming and women’s empowerment, only WFC and NGOCC among the implementing partners were fully equipped with the technical skills to facilitate this kind of project implementation. While WFC and NGOCC have provided some capacity building in to some of the partner organizations, there is still a need for further strengthening the gender capacity among partner organizations.

EQ 3.2 *To what extent has Diakonia's capacity building and thematic support to their implementing partners improved their capacities?*

Indicator: *Most Significant Change examples of enhanced capacity.*

EQ 3.3 *To what extent have the interventions of different implementing partners been harmonized?*

Indicator: *Documented and verified examples of synergy.*

The ET found that the established structures for capacity building of partner organizations - undertaking of organizational capacity assessment and preparation of individual and overall capacity building plans, as well as the contracting of resource organizations with the sole purpose of reinforcing the capacity of implementing partners to enhance their capacity to deliver against set targets reflects a genuine commitment to capacity building and partner strengthening. However, the documentation of concrete results so far is limited. This is due to the fact that only a limited number of capacity building activities have taken place, and to the fact that follow-up and monitoring of results is yet to happen. The thematic support was supposed to happen through the established clusters, but this set up - in spite of the genuine intentions - did also not get the opportunity to unfold adequately due to the stand-still in 2020-2021. The ET found that the limited success can be subscribed to the special contextual circumstances rather than the set-up as such, which appears well thought through and operational.

EQ 3.4 *Has the M&E system delivered robust and useful information that could be used to assess progress towards outcomes and contribute to learning?*

Indicator: *Program adjustments are documented and based on systematically summarized lessons learned.*

Diakonia has established a solid MEL system with systematic collection of information from partner organizations. It is based on agreed annual work plans and indicators that speak to the overall SAP II results framework and biannual narrative and financial reporting. Feedback mechanisms include detailed assessment of the report and dialogue with the partners at PCC meetings followed by disbursement of funds. The bottleneck in this context is the CO capacity in terms of sufficient as well as specialized human resources for the overall MEL task. In spite of this, Diakonia has delivered comprehensive and well-informed narrative annual progress reports to the Embassy of Sweden.

5.1.4 Efficiency - How well are resources being used?

EQ 4.1 *To what extent has the intervention delivered, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way?*

Indicator: *Satisfying execution level against volume of demonstrated results.*

EQ 4.2 *To what extent has the Diakonia's grant management approach been efficient and effective?*

Indicator: *Stable and uninterrupted program implementation.*

The ET found it difficult to respond to the present evaluation question due to the specific contextual circumstances under which SAP II was implemented. The standstill of activities in 2020-2021 suspended the timeliness criteria and influenced severely on the volume of documented results. Plans were adjusted and budgets calibrated to match the possible, including the budget adjustments made in early 2022 demonstrates a response to meet the expectations. But the results are yet to be seen. The ET found the grant management approach solid and well structured, albeit resource demanding to a degree that did not match the available human resources at the CO.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

The following *tentative* recommendations are presented for discussion at the meeting, where the draft evaluation report is presented. The meeting is scheduled for 25th March 2022. It is an integrated part of the methodology to involve Diakonia directly in the co-formulation of recommendations to ensure that there is comprehension and buy-in to the final recommendations.

The SAP II program was disrupted by several external shocks not under the control of Diakonia or the Implementing Partners, as well as internal incidents within Diakonia and some of its partners. Despite these challenges the program still recorded notable wins with its advocacy work in the communities. With issues of gassing, COVID-19, the forensic audit, and suspension of funding in the past, the program is starting to gain momentum. The recommendations are therefore based on the overall conclusion that SAP II has not been given the opportunity to fully demonstrate its potential due to the extraordinary contextual circumstances under which it was implemented. Consequently, the recommendations are based on the assumption that there is a time horizon beyond the current program period, where lessons learned and experience gained can be unfolded and scaled up.

5.2.1 Organizational structure and capacity

1. The governance structure of Diakonia in Zambia is lean with a small three-person Board with no external members. In order to enhance the legitimacy, strengthen oversight and allow for external inspiration, it is recommended **to establish a board with external membership**. External members could be 2-3 identified from like-minded CSOs operating in similar fields, academia with technical knowledge relevant to the Diakonia country program, media or communication specialists to enhance visibility or reputable individuals/ resource persons.
2. Diakonia in Zambia depends almost exclusively on Swedish funds, albeit from different sources. This represents a fragile and unsustainable dependency, which Diakonia is fully aware of. However, alternative fundraising is still incipient and awaiting the formulation of a fundraising / resource mobilization strategy later in 2022. The ET strongly recommends **accelerating the fundraising efforts** to strengthen organizational sustainability and reduce single-donor dependency.
3. The Diakonia CO operates with a very lean structure and limited human resources. There is a linear correspondence between availability of funds and human resources, nevertheless, the ET recommends to **prioritize the upgrading of MEL**

capacity at the CO, e.g. to enhance the capacity systematically harvest lessons learned and transform them into knowledge, as well as to free program officer time to provide timely feedback to partners. This should preferably be by contracting a staff member with this specialization, alternatively by upgrading skills with existing staff, or by hiring specialized consultant to review the monitoring system, volume of data collected and procedures for aggregation of data.

4. Another aspect of CO capacity is the financial management, which has suffered from the internal incident and consequent change of staff whereby momentum was lost. The volume of work should match the available human resources. To establish this equilibrium, the ET recommends **engaging the planned additional capacity for the grants compliance function** as soon as possible.
5. The ET verified several problems related to the filing, naming and localization of documents within the CO. Also documents with substantial number of orthographic errors were noticed. Proper and easily available documentation is important for documentation, institutional memory and organizational learning. It is recommended to **review and systematize the filing system and train all staff in the use of the system** to allow for easy localization, sharing and use of filed documents.

5.2.2 Program management

6. Timely disbursement of funds within the fiscal year has been a continuous problem with SAP II, originated in the late start in 2018 and reinforced by the contextual circumstances. However, the ET also found that the detailed assessment process with involvement of various layers with Diakonia is a cumbersome approval process which causes late feedback and consequently late disbursement. This is reinforced by the fact that disbursement to partners come via Sweden. It is therefore recommended to **calibrate the details of the approval procedure and process with the available human resources and operate with advance payments** in order to avoid break of momentum in implementation of program activities.
7. Diakonia has established a comprehensive system and practice for risk assessment of partner organizations. It is based on thorough prior capacity assessment and on-going monitoring of the identified risks and identified mitigation measures. Nevertheless, the ET found that acting upon consecutive risk situations with certain partners took too long and also caused other partner organizations to think that action was not taken. The ET recommends to **speak more openly in the partner group about occurred problems and to act promptly when cases are detected**.

5.2.3 Program implementation

8. SAP II has had a strong focus on gender with positive results from introduction of gender toolkit and advocacy initiatives. The gender focus was however, mainly unfolded in terms of women's empowerment and gender mainstreaming initiatives. While capacity building support has been provided to some of the partner organizations, there are still gaps in this area. The ET therefore recommends a **continued skills upgrading on gender mainstreaming among the partner organizations** building on the positive experience from previous trainings by WFC and NGOCC. In addition, partners will need to be introduced to the principles of

working from a feminist approach and familiarized with Diakonia's Gender Justice Policy in order to guide their future work.

9. The program set-up with focus on capacity building and learning through resource organizations, thematic clusters, joint monitoring and PCCs has only worked to some extent, as it has been unstructured and to some degree uncoordinated. There is a need to **rethink the set-up and consider a more flexible network with focus on peer exchange**, including also formal training / capacity building and allowing all participating partner organizations in implementing role as well. This combined with a systematic coordination of training events. e.g. through a centrally managed training budget is recommended.
10. There have been a number of program adjustments, the majority of which pertinent and reflecting timely response to contextual changes, e.g. COVID-19. However, some adjustments in terms of reorganizing rights holders' groups among implementing partners have not sufficiently taken into account the actual situation on the ground, nor the partners' needs and interest. The ET recommends a **thorough consultation with involved partner organizations and rights holders' groups before any changes in terms of affiliation are made**.
11. Acknowledging the bumpy implementation during the 2020-2021 period and the impact this has had on the systematic documentation of concrete results through compilation of success stories and lessons learned, the ET sees a need for a systematic approach and an extraordinary effort during the remaining period of SAP II to **document results in qualitative as well as quantitative terms**, as this will be a strong argument for continued program implementation.

5.2.4 External relation

12. One of the main intentions for SAP II was to establish the link from work on the ground to national level advocacy and policy influence drawing on the solid evidence generated through community level engagement in accountability demand and engagement with the mining industry. However, there was limited evidence of establishing such vertical chains of evidence. The main advocacy engagement has taken place through partner organizations with Diakonia at the backstage, and the ET recommends Diakonia to **take a more independent, visible and proactive role in national advocacy** (based on previous experience e.g. in the 2017 UPR process).
13. Resource mobilization is an imperative for Diakonia in the coming years. Playing a more active role in national level advocacy, through networks with other CSOs on key strategic priorities (environmental justice, taxation, CSR, gender, land issues etc.) would enhance Diakonia's profile and raise perspectives for fund raising. The ET therefore recommends that Diakonia **engage directly in national level beyond the current circles and actively bring forward experience from community level interventions**.

5.2.5 Overall conclusion and recommendation

The recent year (2021) has seen a political shift that provides a more conducive environment for implementation of the kinds of activities under SAP II. Working relationship with government, communities, mining companies and other stakeholders take time to build, and lasting impact cannot be brought about within the space of 2-3 years. The shift in the political scene provides myriad opportunities for a new SAP. The new administration has committed to reforms including introduction of free primary and secondary education, embarked on mass recruitment of health and teaching personnel and increased allocations for socio-economic programs and activities and CDF. The new commitments provide the perfect landscape for the next SAP program to work with relevant stakeholders in promoting transparency and accountability targeting duty bearers and rights holders. It is also an opportunity for implementing partners to look at how the national level commitments under the new government drill down to provincial and district level. Furthermore, implementing partners can also examine how far commitments / social contracts and promises by duty bearers such as MPs and councilors would feed into and inform the local, district, provincial and national development agenda under the recently launched 8th National Development Plan.

The creation of the new Ministry of Green Economy and Environment (MGEE) provides Diakonia with a willing partner in government to work with on environmental sensitivity issues, including creating a strong base for wealth generation, youth employment creation and poverty reduction through sustainable extraction and trade in key sectors such as forestry and mining. The new Government has committed (through the President's first speech to the first session of the 13th National Assembly) to implementing policy measures to promote economic transformation, particularly in job-rich sectors of agriculture, mining, tourism, energy, commerce and industry, green economy, transport as well as Information and Communication Technology (ICT). The president stated that Government is committed to fostering environmental sustainability and promoting green economy. A well-managed economy is critical for achieving economic recovery, sustained growth and improved livelihoods for Zambian people.

In addition, Diakonia, through NGOCC, as well as WFC and NLACW, can partner with the Gender Division in the Office of the President to positively shape the gender equity and equality landscape of the country. The government has been criticized for its lack of representation of women and youth in decision making positions and is keen to gain wins in this area. This is an opening for NGOCC to influence gender inclusive policy at national level so that it can be cascaded all the way to district level, building on the positive foundation under the SAP II.

Based on this in combination with the experience gained and investments made during SAP I and SAP II **the ET found solid indication of successful implementation in terms of approach and results and therefore sufficient reason for continued commitment to support Diakonia's SAP program.**

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference for the Evaluation of Strengthened Accountability in Zambia Phase two (SAP II)

Date: 5th November, 2021

1. General information

1.1 Introduction

Diakonia is the joint development organization of the Uniting Church in Sweden and the Swedish Alliance Mission. Diakonia's mission and overall goal is to change unfair structures – political, economic, social and cultural – that generate poverty and inequality, as well as oppression and violence. Diakonia works with individuals, local partner organizations and other actors to fulfil the right to a life in dignity for all people, regardless of their age, class, disability, ethnicity, gender, nationality, political conviction, religion or sexual orientation and identity.

Diakonia has been operating in Zambia since 2003. The Zambia country office entered into a development cooperation agreement amounting to SEK 19,035,000.00 with the Embassy of Sweden to implement the Strengthened Accountability Programme (SAP) running from 2014 to 2017. The SAP was implemented in three districts of North-Western province namely, Solwezi, Kalumbila and Chavuma, by 5 local partners: Caritas-Zambia; Extractive Industries Transparency Alliance (EITA); Foundation for Democratic Process (FODEP); Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflections (JCTR); and Youth Alliance for Development (YAD). With a focus on accountability in extractive industry, the main objective of the programme was to empower right holders to have increased access to resources through engagement with corporate and public sectors.

Another four-year (2018-2021) development cooperation agreement was entered into with the Embassy of Sweden in Lusaka on June 20, 2018. The grant amounting to Forty-One Million, Four Thousand Swedish Kronor (SEK 41,400,000.00) is aimed at supporting implementation of the Strengthened Accountability Programme Phase II (SAP II), a follow up programme to the SAP I. The current programme seeks to ensure that duty bearers are transparent and are accountable to Rights Holders in the equitable administration and governance of national resources (including natural resources). The programme is being implemented through sub-granting to thirteen (13) local Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) in 13 districts across the Copperbelt, Luapula, Southern, North-Western and Lusaka provinces of Zambia. The program also works in Lusaka for national level policy advocacy to strengthen linkages of local advocacy

in the program areas which are predominately rural. The 13 civil society organisations are Caritas, FODEP, JCTR, YAD, EITA, SACCORD, NGOCC, MISA Zambia, CTPD, YWCA, Africa Directions, PWYP, NLACW and ZHECT.

In order to improve the program outcomes, Diakonia builds capacities of the CSOs and encourages knowledge sharing among partners and regional organisations such as Bench Marks Foundation. This is expected to create communities that are aware of their rights and demand for accountability as well as ensure that the mining companies do not only make profit for themselves but also contribute to the development of the areas in which they operate (inclusive development).

The program is in the final year of implementation with an anticipated one year no-cost extension. The Embassy therefore, seeks to undertake an end of program evaluation to be carried out by an independent evaluator. The evaluation is meant to assess and document the extent to which the program has performed against its targets or achieved results with a focus efficiency in the utilisation of resources, grant and partner management, relative strengths and comparative advantage of Diakonia and partners, identify the key learnings and good practices from the programme, make recommendations for improvement in identified areas, and inform a realistic framework for future/successor program and funding.

Sweden's contribution is aligned to the priorities identified in the Strategy for Development Cooperation with Zambia 2018-2022, in particular under the first strategy area "Human Rights, Democracy, Rule of Law and Gender Equality." The program further complements other support areas the Embassy has towards civil society organisations aimed at increasing demand side of accountability by empowering citizens with human rights knowledge on one hand, and working with local authorities and the private sector to mobilise resources for development as well as employ inclusive development models. The program is innovative in its approach of using public private partnerships and innovative advocacy methods that promote local ownership of the initiative and sustainability beyond aid.

1.2 Evaluation object: Intervention to be evaluated

The Diakonia led Strengthened Accountability Program (SAP II) in Zambia programme is implemented in accordance with Diakonia's Strategy for Change and the guiding principles using three (3) components: 1) Awareness and knowledge building, 2) Organisation/mobilisation of RH and CSOs, and 3) Collective Action/advocacy.

The intervention seeks to ensure that the targeted duty bearers (government officials, local authority, mining companies, traditional leaders) are transparent and are accountable to Right Holders (RH) in the equitable administration and governance of national resources (including natural resources). To achieve the above objective, the program is segmented in 3 result areas focusing on Gender Equity and Equality, National Resource Management as well as Social and Environmental Accountability. The program uses a rights-based approach and interventions are aimed at empowering rights holders to participate in development and decision making processes with special attention on women and the youth. Further, the program works at influencing the process of demanding for inclusive participation, transparency and

accountability by the duty bearers at district, provincial and national level. Some of key stakeholders that the programme interacts with include State Institutions, district and local authorities, Corporate Sector (Mining Companies), CSOs, Traditional and Faith leaders, Media, the church groups and small-scale miners.

The overall goal and expected long-term change of the programme is as follows:

Expected Long-term Impact: *Improved quality of life of communities (specifically, women, youth, the poor and most vulnerable groups) in natural resource rich, rural and peri-urban areas of Zambia*

The program is working towards addressing challenges relating to cross cutting issues which include the following:

- i. Unequal representation and participation of women and youth in governance and development processes at both local and national level mainly attributed to cultural norms and practices (patriarchal society/ system);
 - ii. Lack of right claiming ability by Right Holders to demand for increased transparency and accountability in the management of national resources and improved public services provision.
 - iii. Limited access to information around the various positive and negative impacts of mining and the important role that communities can play in ensuring that revenues generated from the extractive sector and Corporate Social Responsibilities (CSR) benefit all RHs equally especially those in host communities of mining operations.
 - iv. Inadequate responsiveness of private sector driven interventions to community needs and expectations in improving community resilience especially for women and youths in extractive.
 - v. Inadequate actions by corporates and community towards environmental sustainability.
 - vi. Lack of mechanisms and platforms for addressing conflicts at local level.
- Implementation arrangements

Diakonia is a lead agency under this program while implementation is led by Nine (9) local organizations with unique project initiatives that contribute to the over program results. Implementation is at Provincial, District and community level targeting both duty bearers and RHs while national level is mainly targeted for advocacy on policy implementation and formulation. The programme is further supported by four (4) other local organizations termed as Resource Organizations that complement Diakonia's efforts to building capacity of the implementing partners to deliver their mandate on the program.

The total program budget amounts to SEK 41, 400 000.00 and to date SEK 29, 918 692.42 has been spent while the available balance stands at SEK 11 481 307. 58

The program is being implemented in four provinces of Copperbelt, Luapula, North Western and Southern. A total of thirteen (13) Districts are targeted and these include: Mansa, Lufwanyama, Mushindamo, Solwezi, Kalumbila, Mwinilunga, Ikelenge, Kasempa, Mufumbwe, Zambezi, Chavuma, Kalomo andimba.

Some specific issues/challenges that the evaluator should be aware of include:

- Weaknesses in sustainability and linkages of local level issues to national level advocacy.
- Consistent follow-up of issues into SAP II
- The absence of dedicated local coordination in some project sites, competing loyalties and priorities on the part of partners.
- Staff changes at both Diakonia Country Office and partner levels.
- Changes and transitions of office holders / duty bearers at local and national levels on political grounds and change of government resulting from the 2021 general results.
- From an administrative standpoint, funds disbursements to partners was severely delayed in the first year as result of late project kick start. While in the last year of implementation, a forensic audit was instituted on the programme which resulted in no disbursement to partners for the most of the year.
- Capacity to undertake research, learn, document and creating of a new body of literature and tools on key thematic areas and in turn encourages further analysis

The last evaluation was the end of SAP I evaluation conducted in 2017 commissioned by Diakonia.

For further information, the intervention proposal is attached as Annex D.

The intervention logic or theory of change of the intervention may be further elaborated by the evaluator in the inception report, if deemed necessary.

1.3 Evaluation rationale

The SAP program started as an innovative approach to accountability in the extractive sector in Zambia. SAP I was seen as a pilot on how CSOs can work with the private sector (mining companies in this case) to promote accountability, pro-poor planning and inclusive corporate social responsibility on one hand; and inclusive local authorities on the other hand. This was the only initiative funded by the Embassy to carry out traditional governance and human rights work and also to contribute to the agenda of building broader relations and supporting public institutions (Local authorities) to have capacity to raise resources. The Embassy therefore, wishes to carry out an evaluation to assess the extend to which the Diakonia approach has worked and assess performance of the set objectives. The evaluation is meant for learning and the results are meant to serve as key input into future program for Diakonia and inform decision-making regarding future Swedish support to Diakonia. The evaluation will focus on efficiency, effectiveness and relevance in order to ensure relevant learning from the SAP II.

2. The assignment

2.1 Evaluation purpose: Intended use and intended users

The purpose of the evaluation is to help the Diakonia Zambia as well as implementing partners and the Swedish Embassy in Lusaka to evaluate the progress and impact of the SAP II, as well as to provide evidence-based inputs on their respective future decisions. More specifically, the evaluation is intended:

- i. To assess the program outcomes in order to determine the extent to which the program has accomplished its results and reached its targeted groups.
- ii. To determine and document the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact of the interventions and highlighting any limitations with a view to determining relevant and future cooperation between Diakonia and the Embassy of Sweden in Lusaka
- iii. To identify, document key learnings, good practices and obtain recommendations on how to improve the next phase of the program.
- iv. To identify and document key change/success stories from the implementation
- v. To provide the Swedish Embassy with solid input that can inform decision-making on future support to Diakonia Zambia.

The primary intended users of the evaluation are Diakonia and its implementing partners, and the Swedish Embassy in Lusaka. The evaluation is to be designed, conducted and reported to meet the needs of the intended users and tenderers shall elaborate in the tender how this will be ensured during the evaluation process.

Other stakeholders that should be kept informed about the evaluation include the Government of Zambia in particular, local authorities in the target districts and other interested cooperation partners. During the inception phase, the evaluator and the users will agree on who will be responsible for keeping the various stakeholders informed about the evaluation.

2.2 Evaluation scope

The evaluation scope is limited to:

The SAP II program (2018 to 2021) as elaborated in the attached proposal including broader relations - engagement with private sector, their work with local authorities, gender, National resource management and social and environmental accountability. In addition to the actual program implementation, the evaluation should also assess Diakonia's grant management and capacity building interventions. The evaluation should be centred around the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability.

The Proposed timelines are as follows:

- Start up /inception phase – End of November/ December, 2021
- Field work – January, 2021

- End Date – 22th March, 2022

Given that these are holiday periods, the Consultant is free to suggest in consultation with end users different times.

The selection of a certain number of representative districts should be made by the evaluation team in the inception phase. Target groups to be included in the evaluation shall be Rights Holders (Women, men, youths, boys and girls), Duty bearers from targeted institutions/organizations, Traditional leaders, and Mining companies.

Other civil society organizations/groups engaged on the program. If needed, the scope of the evaluation may be further elaborated by the evaluator in the inception report.

If needed, the scope of the evaluation may be further elaborated by the evaluator in the inception report.

2.3 Evaluation objective: Criteria and questions

The objective of this end of program evaluate the efficiency and impact of SAP II interventions and formulate recommendations and lessons learnt for Diakonia's future programming. The evaluation should also review Sweden's financial support to the SAP II and formulate recommendations on how the embassy can improve their future support to Diakonia Zambia. The evaluation questions are:

Relevance: Is the intervention doing the right thing?

- To what extent has the intervention objectives and design responded to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and have they continued to do so if/when circumstances have changed?
- To what extent have lessons learned from what works well and less well been used to improve and adjust intervention implementation?
- Evaluate the relevance of intervention of SAP II as an input to the decision whether or not it shall receive continued funding.

Coherence: How well does the intervention fit?

- How compatible has the intervention been with other interventions in the country, sector or organisation where it is being implemented?

Effectiveness: Is the intervention achieving its objectives?

- To what extent has the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups?
- To what extent has Diakonia's capacity building and thematic support to their implementing partners improved their capacities?
- To what extent have the interventions of different implementing partners been harmonised?

- Have the M&E system delivered robust and useful information that could be used to assess progress towards outcomes and contribute to learning?

Efficiency: How well are resources being used?

- To what extent has the intervention delivered, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way?
- To what extent has the Diakonia's grant management approach been efficient and effective?

Furthermore, the evaluation should assess the following:

- Has the project been designed and implemented in a conflict sensitive manner?
- Has the project had any positive or negative effects on the environment? Could environment considerations have been improved in planning, implementation or follow up?

Questions are expected to be developed in the tender by the tenderer and further refined during the inception phase of the evaluation.

2.4 Evaluation approach and methods

It is expected that the evaluator describes and justifies an appropriate evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection in the tender. The evaluation design, methodology and methods for data collection and analysis are expected to be fully developed and presented in the inception report. Given the situation with Covid-19, innovative and flexible approaches/methodologies and methods for remote data collection should be suggested when appropriate and the risk of doing harm managed.

The evaluator is to suggest an approach/methodology that provides credible answers (evidence) to the evaluation questions. Limitations to the chosen approach/methodology and methods shall be made explicit by the evaluator and the consequences of these limitations discussed in the tender. The evaluator shall to the extent possible, present mitigation measures to address them. A clear distinction is to be made between evaluation approach/methodology and methods.

A *gender-responsive* approach/methodology, methods, tools and data analysis techniques should be used⁸⁴.

Sida's approach to evaluation is *utilization-focused*, which means the evaluator should facilitate the *entire evaluation process* with careful consideration of how everything that is done will affect the use of the evaluation. It is therefore expected that the evaluators, in their tender, present i) how intended users are to participate in and contribute to the evaluation process and ii) methodology and methods for data collection that create space for reflection, discussion and learning between the intended users of the evaluation.

⁸⁴ See for example UNEG United Nations Evaluation Group (2014) Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in Evaluations <http://uneval.org/document/detail/1616>

In cases where sensitive or confidential issues are to be addressed in the evaluation, evaluators should ensure an evaluation design that do not put informants and stakeholders at risk during the data collection phase or the dissemination phase.

2.5 Organisation of evaluation management

This evaluation is commissioned by the Embassy of Sweden in Lusaka. The intended users are the Embassy of Sweden in Lusaka and the Diakonia Country Office. The intended users of the evaluation form a steering group, which has contributed to and agreed on the ToR for this evaluation. The steering group is a decision-making body. It will approve the inception report and the final report of the evaluation and evaluate the tenders. The steering group will participate in the start-up meeting of the evaluation, as well as in the debriefing/validation workshop where preliminary findings and conclusions are discussed. Diakonia's implementing partners shall be part of the validation meeting. The steering Committee will constitute of representataion from the Embassy of Sweden in Lusaka and the core group from Diakonia.

2.6 Evaluation quality

All Sida's evaluations shall conform to OECD/DAC's Quality Standards for Development Evaluation⁸⁵. The evaluators shall use the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation⁸⁶ and the OECD/DAC Better Criteria for Better Evaluation⁸⁷. The evaluators shall specify how quality assurance will be handled by them during the evaluation process.

2.7 Time schedule and deliverables

It is expected that a time and work plan is presented in the tender and further detailed in the inception report. Given the situation with Covid-19, the time and work plan must allow flexibility in implementation. The evaluation shall be carried out 26th November, 2021 to 22nd March, 2022. The timing of any field visits, surveys and interviews need to be settled by the evaluator in dialogue with the main stakeholders during the inception phase.

The table below lists key deliverables for the evaluation process. Alternative deadlines for deliverables may be suggested by the consultant and negotiated during the inception phase. The nature of meetings shall be determined by the Covid situation i.e. virtual or physical.

Deliverables	Participants	Deadlines
1. Start-up meeting/s : Lusaka or Virtual	Embassy of Sweden, Diakonia Consultant team	Tentative: 26 th November, 2021
2. Draft inception report		Tentative: 10 th December, 2021

⁸⁵ OECD/DAC (2010) Quality Standards for Development Evaluation.

⁸⁶ Sida OECD/DAC (2014) Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management.

⁸⁷ OECD/DAC (2019) Better Criteria for Better Evaluation: Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use.

3. Inception meeting: Lusaka or Virtual	Diakonia, Embassy of Sweden and Consultancy team.	Tentative: 14 th December, 2021
4. Comments from intended users to evaluators (alternatively these may be sent to evaluators ahead of the inception meeting)	Diakonia, Embassy of Sweden and Consultancy team	Tentative: 17 th December, 2021
5. Data collection, analysis, report writing and quality assurance	Evaluators	10 th to 28 th January, 2022
6. Debriefing/validation workshop (meeting)	Evaluators, Embassy of Sweden, Diakonia, implementing partners	8 th February, 2022
7. Draft evaluation report		Tentative: 24 th February, 2022
8. Comments from intended users to evaluators		Tentative: 4 th March, 2022
9. Final evaluation report		22 nd March, 2022
10. Seminar ⁸⁸ - Lusaka	Diakonia, Embassy of Sweden, stakeholders including other cooperating partners	Tentative: 22 nd March, 2022

The **inception report** will form the basis for the continued evaluation process and shall be approved by Sida before the evaluation proceeds to implementation. The inception report should be written in English and cover evaluability issues and interpretations of evaluation questions, present the evaluation approach/methodology *including how a utilization-focused and gender-responsive approach will be ensured*, methods for data collection and analysis as well as the full evaluation design, including an *evaluation matrix* and a *stakeholder mapping/analysis*. A clear distinction between the evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection shall be made. All limitations to the methodology and methods shall be made explicit and the consequences of these limitations discussed.

A specific time and work plan, including number of hours/working days for each team member, for the remainder of the evaluation should be presented. The time plan shall allow space for reflection and learning between the intended users of the evaluation.

The **final report** shall be written in English and be professionally proof read. The final report should have clear structure and follow the layout format of Sida's template for decentralised evaluations (see Annex B). The executive summary should be maximum 3 pages.

The report shall clearly and in detail describe the evaluation approach/methodology and methods for data collection and analysis and make a clear distinction between the two. The report shall describe how the utilization-focused approach has been implemented i.e. how

⁸⁸ The Consultant should organize

intended users have participated in and contributed to the evaluation process and how methodology and methods for data collection have created space for reflection, discussion and learning between the intended users. Furthermore, the gender-responsive approach shall be described and reflected in the findings, conclusions and recommendations along with other identified and relevant cross-cutting issues. Limitations to the methodology and methods and the consequences of these limitations for findings and conclusions shall be described.

Evaluation findings shall flow logically from the data, showing a clear line of evidence to support the conclusions. Conclusions should be substantiated by findings and analysis. Evaluation questions shall be clearly stated and answered in the executive summary and in the conclusions. Recommendations and lessons learned should flow logically from conclusions and be specific, directed to relevant intended users and categorised as a short-term, medium-term and long-term.

The report should be no more than a maximum of 35 pages excluding annexes. If the methods section is extensive, it could be placed in an annex to the report. Annexes shall always include the Terms of Reference, the Inception Report, the stakeholder mapping/analysis and the Evaluation Matrix. Lists of key informants/interviewees shall only include personal data if deemed relevant (i.e. when it is contributing to the credibility of the evaluation) based on a case based assessment by the evaluator and the commissioning unit/embassy. The inclusion of personal data in the report must always be based on a written consent.

The evaluator shall adhere to the Sida OECD/DAC Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation⁸⁹.

The evaluator shall, upon approval by Sida/Embassy of the final report, insert the report into Sida's template for decentralised evaluations (see Annex C) and submit it to Nordic Morning (in pdf-format) for publication and release in the Sida publication database. The order is placed by sending the approved report to Nordic Morning (sida@atta45.se), with a copy to the responsible Sida Programme Officer as well as Sida's Evaluation Unit (evaluation@sida.se). Write "Sida decentralised evaluations" in the email subject field. The following information must always be included in the order to Nordic Morning:

1. The name of the consulting company.
2. The full evaluation title.
3. The invoice reference "ZZ980601".
4. Type of allocation: "sakanslag".
5. Type of order: "digital publicering/publikationsdatabas.

2.8 Evaluation team qualification

For this assignment, the team leader should be a Level 1 (senior specialist) or higher Consultant as stipulated in Sida's framework agreement for evaluations. In addition to the qualifications already stated in the framework agreement for evaluation services, the evaluation team shall include the following desirable competencies:

- Knowledge of social accountability, climate justice, gender equality and the civil society sector

⁸⁹ Sida OECD/DAC (2014) Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management.

- Knowledge of corporate social responsibility and human rights issues in the mining sector
- Technical competence in grant management/operations
- Local and contextual knowledge from Zambia
- Good interpersonal skills.

A CV for each team member shall be included in the call-off response. It should contain a full description of relevant qualifications and professional work experience.

It is important that the competencies of the individual team members are complimentary. It is highly recommended that local evaluation consultants are included in the team, as they often have contextual knowledge that is of great value to the evaluation. In addition, and in a situation with Covid-19, the inclusion of local evaluators may also enhance the understanding of feasible ways to conduct the evaluation. The evaluators must be independent from the evaluation object and evaluated activities, and have no stake in the outcome of the evaluation.

Please note that in the tender, the tenderers must propose a team leader that takes part in the evaluation by at least 30% of the total evaluation team time including core team members, specialists and all support functions, but excluding time for the quality assurance expert.

2.9 Financial and human resources

The maximum budget amount available for the evaluation is SEK800,000.

Invoicing and payment shall be managed according to the following: The Consultant may invoice a maximum of 30 % of the total amount after approval by the Embassy of the Inception Report and a maximum of 70% after approval by the Embassy and Diakonia of the Final Report and when the assignment is completed.

The contact person at the Swedish Embassy is the Program Manager, Governance and Human Rights. The contact person should be consulted if any problems arise during the evaluation process. Relevant Sida documentation will be provided by The Program Manager – Governance and Human Rights.

Contact details to intended users (cooperation partners, Swedish Embassies, other donors etc.) will be provided by The Program Manager – Governance and Human Rights. The evaluator will be required to arrange the logistics such as booking interviews, preparing visits, inception meeting and final dissemination seminar among others including any necessary security arrangements.

3. Annexes

Annex A: Data sheet on the evaluation object

Information on the evaluation object (i.e. intervention)	
Title of the evaluation object	Strengthened Accountability II (SAPII)
ID no. in PLANIt	11624
Dox no./Archive case no.	UM2018/05260
Activity period (if applicable)	2018 to 2021
Agreed budget (if applicable)	SEK800,000

Main sector ⁹⁰	Democracy, Human Rights and Gender Equality.
Name and type of implementing organisation ⁹¹	NGO
Aid type ⁹²	Core Support
Swedish strategy	Strategy for Sweden's Development Cooperation in Zambia.

Information on the evaluation assignment	
Commissioning unit/Swedish Embassy	Swedish Embassy in Lusaka
Contact person at unit/Swedish Embassy	Ms. Pezo Phiri – pezo.mateo-phiri@gov.se
Timing of evaluation (mid-term, end-of-programme, ex-post, or other)	End of Program Evaluation
ID no. in PLANit (if other than above).	

Annex B: Decentralised evaluation report template

Abbreviations and Acronyms

Preface

Executive Summary

1. Introduction
2. The Evaluated Intervention
3. Findings
4. Evaluative Conclusions
5. Lessons Learned
6. Recommendations

Template for decentralised evaluations at Sida

Annex C: Project/Programme document

⁹⁰ Choose from Sida's twelve main sectors: education; research; democracy, human rights and gender equality; health; conflict, peace and security; humanitarian aid; sustainable infrastructure and services; market development; environment; agriculture and forestry; budget support; or other (e.g. multi-sector).

⁹¹ Choose from the five OECD/DAC-categories: public sector institutions; NGO or civil society; public-private partnerships and networks; multilateral organizations; and other (e.g. universities, consultancy firms).

⁹² Choose from the eight OECD/DAC-categories: budget/sector support; core contributions/pooled funds; project type; experts/technical assistance; scholarships/student costs in donor countries; debt relief; admin costs not included elsewhere; and other in-donor expenditures.

Annex 2 – Evaluation Matrix

OECD/DAC evaluation criteria	Evaluation Questions in ToR	Indicators	Data collection instruments and sources of information
1. Relevance: <i>Is the intervention doing the right thing?</i>	1.1 To what extent has the intervention objectives and design responded to beneficiaries', global, country, and partner/ institution needs, policies, and priorities, and have they continued to do so if/when circumstances have changed?	<p>The program intervention supports the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Zambia 2018-2022 • Zambia's National Development Strategy • Diakonia's global and national strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review • Assessment of the validity of the program theory of change • Semi-structured interviews with identified informants (duty bearers and rights holders) including e.g. women, youth, marginalized & discriminated groups • E-questionnaire with partner organizations • A context analysis is necessary to document the changes in the context during the life span of the program - including the changes and transitions in offices caused by the 2021 elections.
	1.2 To what extent have lessons learned from what works well and less well been used to improve and adjust intervention implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program adjustments are documented and based on systematically summarized lessons learned (<i>same as 3.4</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of minutes from Annual Meetings, program progress reports, and partner reports • Systematic mapping of lessons learned and tracing of actions taken • Qualitative interviews with program stakeholders at all levels with focus on captured and applied learning

	1.3 Evaluate the relevance of intervention of SAP II as an input to the decision whether or not it shall receive continued funding.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program has demonstrated significant results in terms of changed practices among various groups of program stakeholders - both rights holders and duty bearers - and capacity to change and adapt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review Overall analysis of collected data and information
2. Coherence <i>How well does the intervention fit?</i>	2.1 How compatible has the intervention been with other interventions in the country, sector or organization where it is being implemented?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Confirmed complementarity by internal and external program stakeholders and identified evidence of synergy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document review Interviews with national level stakeholders, and with other official and private sector actors in same geographical area Analysis of program interaction with other stakeholders (NGOs, government and private sector actors) to identify synergy and/or complementarity - or overlap and/or competition
3. Effectiveness <i>Is the intervention achieving its objectives?</i>	3.1 To what extent has the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documented and verified results and extent to which a human rights-based approach and a gender mainstreaming strategy were incorporated in the design and implementation of the intervention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program results framework checked against progress reports. Special attention will be paid to different stakeholder groups, e.g. women and youth, rural/local and national stakeholders, public and private entities engaging with the SAP II program., e.g. by presence of key results on HR & GE. Verification through qualitative interviews and quantitative questionnaires. Cases of most significant changes will document and illustrate the relevance of the program objectives and design
	3.2 To what extent has Diakonia's capacity building and thematic support to their implementing partners improved their capacities?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most Significant Change examples of enhanced capacity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of capacity development plans against information from progress reports and interviews / questionnaires to identify achievements and gaps related to their capacities by means of SWOT analysis and Five Capabilities Framework.

	3.3 To what extent have the interventions of different implementing partners been harmonized?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documented and verified examples of synergy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review • Interviews with implementing partners and resource organizations to explore synergy and collaboration/ coordination versus overlap/ competition
	3.4 Has the M&E system delivered robust and useful information that could be used to assess progress towards outcomes and contribute to learning?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program adjustments are documented and based on systematically summarized lessons learned (<i>same as 1.2</i>) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-depth analysis of the M&E system - following the chain/flow of information: downwards from objectives and indicators through outcomes to implementation and upwards through reporting systems and compilation of data • Verification through interviews with program staff
4. Efficiency <i>How well are resources being used?</i>	4.1 To what extent has the intervention delivered, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Satisfying execution level against volume of demonstrated results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review of plans, budgets, financial and audit reports • Assessment of cost-efficiency and timeliness of implementation. • Special attention on the underspending in relation to overall budget to identify bottlenecks and possible improvements for agility.
	4.2 To what extent has the Diakonia's grant management approach been efficient and effective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stable and uninterrupted program implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document review • Interviews with program management staff, implementing partners and EoS Financial Controller • Assessment of the grant management system - calls, proposals, approval procedures, disbursement and reporting, trigger mechanisms and performance indicators. • Triangulation of perceptions of grantees and grant manager and reports.

Annex 3 – Data Collection Tools

3.1 E-questionnaire

Questionnaire for partner and resource organizations - SAP II

- The **purpose of the questionnaire** is to collect qualitative information from implementing SAP II partner and resource organizations, mainly related to the following dimensions of the partnership with Diakonia: Grant administration; Resource allocation; Monitoring/ reporting; Capacity assessment and capacity building; Implementation; Lessons learned; and AOB – providing an opportunity for you to comment on any other issues that you find are not covered by the questions.
- We suggest that the filling of the questionnaire is undertaken as a **joint exercise among the staff** of your organization working with the SAP II implementation. The filling of the questionnaire will provide an opportunity to reflect on your implementation of SAP II projects and collaboration with Diakonia.
- At the **coming PCC-meeting with Diakonia (7-10 Feb 2022)**, the Evaluation Team will participate during the entire meeting, which will provide an opportunity to share your experience and provide us with valuable input for the evaluation report. It will also provide a platform for a joint discussion and clarification of any issues related to the evaluation in general and the questionnaire in particular.
- All information will be treated as confidential and any examples or quotes used in the evaluation report will be anonymized and referred to as “response from a partner organization” without any further identification.
- Please return the filled in questionnaire latest 14 Feb 2022 to btj@benteconsulting.dk

Thank you for your collaboration!

Bwalya Penza

*Chiwama Musonda
Jensen*

Bente Topsøe-

	Organization	
	Filled in by (names and positions)	
	Date	
#	Questions	Answers - elaborate please 😊
1	Grant administration	
1.1	Describe your first contact with Diakonia. Who reached out - you or Diakonia? How was the project formulated? Describe!	
1.2	When were the disbursements made? Were the disbursements timely and according to budget and plans?	
1.3	Please describe the process of disbursement of funds?	

	Did Diakonia take you through the grant process in an induction meeting?	
1.4	How was the funding and disbursement in 2020 and 2021? Did you face any limitations in implementation due to lack of funds?	
1.5	Do you have any other donors? If yes, please list! What areas of implementation are they supporting? Does your work with other donors overlap with your Diakonia funded projects? How many percent of the 2022 budget do SAP II funds represent?	
2	Resource allocation	
2.1	Have resources been adequately provided for integrating human rights and gender equity in the intervention as an investment for benefits in short-, medium- and long-term benefits?	
2.2	To what extent to does the allocation and use of resources to targeted groups takes into account the need to prioritize women and individuals/groups who are marginalized and/or discriminated against?	
3	Monitoring / reporting	
3.1	Describe the monitoring and reporting annual cycle! (Results Framework, indicators, reports, feedback; field visits; dialogue etc.)	
3.2	How is the feedback dialogue with Diakonia? Strengths and weaknesses?	
3.3	How is your engagement mechanism with rights holders? What are the strengths and weaknesses?	
3.4	Do you split your targets according to age / sex / disability?	
3.5	Are lessons learned captured and used? Examples?	
3.6	Do you see your project as part of an overall program? If yes, how does it contribute to the overall SAP II program?	
3.7	Have you participated in PCC meetings? If yes, please describe benefits and weaknesses!	
3.8	If your work with other donors overlaps with Diakonia funded projects, how do you avoid double counting?	
4	Capacity assessment and capacity building	
4.1	How was the capacity (needs) assessment carried out? When did the assessment take place? Who was responsible for the capacity assessment?	
4.2	Was the Capacity Development Plan implemented? Who was responsible for the training? Describe results and challenges!	

4.3	What has been the Most Significant Change in terms of capacity building?	
4.4	Have you had any exchange with other SAP II partners?	
4.5	Are all staff equipped to deal with gender mainstreaming in the implementation of the project?	
4.6	Any suggestions for improvement?	
5	Implementation	
5.1	Describe how you work with gender? How do you select your targets? Do you disaggregate according to sex, age and disability? Have you as an organization received gender mainstreaming training? What gender mainstreaming tools do you use?	
5.2	Describe how you work with youth? Have you as an organization received youth engagement training? What youth engagement tools do you have?	
5.3	Describe how you work with environment / climate change? Have you as an organization received training in environmental /climate change issues? What environmental tools do you have?	
5.4	Describe how you work with conflict prevention/mitigation/resolution? Have you as an organization received training in conflict prevention/mitigation/resolution? What conflict prevention/mitigation/resolution tools do you have? Have you faced any conflicts? If yes, how were they resolved (if!)?	
5.5	How is your engagement with local government?	
5.6	Do you engage with private sector?	
5.7	Describe your engagement, if any, with other implementing and / or resource partners?	
6	Lessons learned - reflection	
6.1	What lessons could be drawn or learned from your other donors in terms of grant administration, capacity assessment and capacity building, implementation, COVID-19 mitigation and monitoring and reporting?	
6.2	What are your suggestions, if any, regarding improvements to the overall programming of the SAP II?	
7	AOB	
	Is there any other issue related to your collaboration with Diakonia in SAP II program that you would like to share?	

3.2 Interview checklist - implementing partners

The interview checklists are meant as guidance for semi-structured interviews to be carried out with a range of different informants. The sum of the answers will contribute to answer the overall Evaluation Questions and complement other sources of information from document review, questionnaires, in-depth interviews and observations. The checklists will be tested and revised if necessary.

- The **partner interview format** is in this folder:\\Dropbox\\Diakonia SAP II Zambia FCG FWC Sida 2022\\11 Partner interviews
- Please file the notes from each of the interviews in this folder – and add the organizations acronyms to the file name for identification.

Organization				
Persons interviewed (name, position)				
Interviewer				
Date				
2	Implementing partner organizations	Introduction	1. Give us a brief introduction to your partnership with Diakonia: How did it start? What are your main activities under SAP II? Strengths and weaknesses? What role does Diakonia Zambia play in this partnership?	
		Relevance	2. Does the SAP II program complement and sustain your own organization's strategy? In which areas? 3. How and to what extent are your activities informed by Diakonia's objectives and the SAP II? 4. To what extent are the Diakonia cross-cutting issues (gender, environment...) aligned to your overall strategy? 5. Did you carry out a needs assessment of the project action and activities with rights holders in accordance with SAP II? 6. How agile has the SAP II program been to adjust to operate under the COVID-restrictions? What did you do to adapt? How was the interaction with Diakonia on these changes? 7. In your opinion, does it complement and sustain the national development strategy?	

			<p>8. What is the Most Significant Change that you have seen as a result of the SAP II program?</p> <p>9. What are the three most important learnings you can draw from the partnership with Diakonia? Have they been used in adjusting the scope of the program or activities? If yes, what are these adjustments?</p> <p>10. What, if anything, could have been done differently to make the SAP II more relevant?</p>	
		Coherence	<p>11. How has the collaboration / exchange been with the other implementing partners?</p> <p>12. Which partner(s) have you been collaborating with in the implementation of project activities and in what areas? And how have you been collaborating with Diakonia Zambia?</p> <p>13. What value has each of the partners brought to the collaboration? How do you complement each other?</p> <p>14. Are there any contradictions in your partnership with Diakonia and collaboration with other partners? If yes, how and in what areas?</p> <p>15. How are the lessons learned from the SAP II program applied in a wider context, e.g. with other partners, in other programs, with Government or private sector?</p> <p>16. Has there been a link between local level implementation and national level policy influence /advocacy)?</p> <p>17. What are the main strengths and weaknesses of your partnership or collaboration with Diakonia and other partners?</p> <p>18. What, if anything, could have been done differently to make the SAP II more coherent?</p>	
		Effectiveness	<p>19. What are the main objectives of your collaboration with Diakonia? Consult the RF!</p> <p>20. Have you achieved the SAP II objectives? Or contributed to the achievement of objectives? Explain!</p> <p>21. Have the capacity assessment and capacity building plan been useful for your organization? Which have been the areas for capacity building? And which results? Any shortcomings?</p>	

			<p>22. What challenges and constraints have hampered the full achievement of expected results?</p> <p>23. Are there any unplanned and unexpected outcomes of the actions and activities and is there appreciation of these outcomes by both internal and external stakeholders?</p> <p>24. Has there been any change in the previous and current level of capacities in your organization and those of your collaborating partners?</p> <p>25. How often do you have dialogue meetings or engagements with Diakonia, other collaborating or implementing or resource partners and rights holders? What are some of the dialogue results? How is this dialogue assessed?</p> <p>26. How do you mainstream cross-cutting priorities in the implementation of actions or activities?</p> <p>27. How does your monitoring - reporting system work? Are lessons learned documented? Can change over time be registered?</p> <p>28. Which are your main target group and which activities have you implemented with them? Results? Challenges?</p> <p>29. How is the interaction with local Government authorities and other local stakeholders?</p> <p>30. Do you work with the mining companies? What is the experience in terms of dialogue and results?</p> <p>31. What, if anything, could have been done differently to make the SAP II more effective?</p>	
		Efficiency	<p>32. What is the experience with disbursement of funds from Diakonia? Timeliness?</p> <p>33. Explain the sequence of the disbursement - reporting cycle? Are there any bottlenecks? How does the control mechanism work? Decision-making structures, systems and procedures? Governance mechanisms?</p> <p>34. How does it work - compared to other donor funds your organization works with? Strengths and weaknesses? Suggestions for improvement</p> <p>35. What is the percentage of project activities and actions with satisfactory financial execution rates or performance?</p> <p>36. What is the percentage of project activities and actions with timely implementation?</p>	

			<p>37. What are the main challenges and constraints (including delays) that have affected or delayed implementation of project activities?</p> <p>38. What are the main strengths and / or weaknesses in the financing and activity implementation or delivery mechanisms?</p> <p>39. What, if anything, could have been done differently to make the SAP II more efficient?</p>	
		Winding-up	<p>40. Are there any other questions that we should have asked you? Any other important issues?</p>	

3.3 Interview checklist - resource organizations

The interview checklists are meant as guidance for semi-structured interviews to be carried out with a range of different informants. The sum of the answers will contribute to answer the overall Evaluation Questions and complement other sources of information from document review, questionnaires, in-depth interviews and observations. The checklists will be tested and revised if necessary.

- The **partner interview format** is in this folder:\Dropbox\Diakonia SAP II Zambia FCG FWC Sida 2022\11 Partner interviews
- Please file the notes from each of the interviews in this folder – and add the organizations acronyms to the file name for identification.

Organization				
Persons interviewed (name, position)				
Interviewer				
Date				
#	Informant category	Evaluation criteria	Issues to explore	Interviewer's notes
1	Resource organizations	Introduction	1. Give us a brief introduction to your partnership with Diakonia: How did it start? What are your main activities under SAP II? Strengths and weaknesses? What role does Diakonia Zambia play in this partnership?	
		Relevance	2. Does the SAP II program complement and sustain your own organization's strategy? In which areas? 3. How and to what extent are your activities informed by Diakonia's objectives and the SAP II? 4. To what extent are the Diakonia cross-cutting issues (gender, environment...) aligned to your overall strategy? 5. Did you carry out a needs assessment of the project action and activities with rights holders in accordance with SAP II? 6. How agile has the SAP II program been to adjust to operate under the COVID-19 restrictions? What did you do to adapt? How was the interaction with Diakonia on these changes? 7. In your opinion, does it complement and sustain the national development strategy?	

			<p>8. What is the Most Significant Change that you have seen as a result of the SAP II program?</p> <p>9. What are the three most important learnings you can draw from the partnership with Diakonia? Have they been used in adjusting the scope of the program or activities? If yes, what are these adjustments?</p> <p>10. What, if anything, could have been done differently to make the SAP II more relevant?</p>	
		Coherence	<p>11. How has the exchange been with the other Resource Organizations under SAP II?</p> <p>12. Which partner(s) have you been collaborating with in the implementation of project activities and in what areas? How has the collaboration / exchange been with the implementing partners? And how have you been collaborating with Diakonia Zambia?</p> <p>13. What value has each of the partners brought to the collaboration? How do you complement each other?</p> <p>14. Are there any contradictions in your partnership with Diakonia and collaboration with other partners? If yes, how and in what areas?</p> <p>15. Are the lessons learned from the SAP II program applied in a wider context, e.g. with other partners, in other programs, with government or private sector?</p> <p>16. Has there been a link between local level implementation and national level policy influence /advocacy)?</p> <p>17. What are the main strengths and weaknesses of your partnership or collaboration with Diakonia and other partners?</p> <p>18. What, if anything, could have been done differently to make the SAP II more coherent?</p>	
		Effectiveness	<p>19. What are the main objectives of your collaboration with Diakonia? Consult the RF!</p> <p>20. Have you achieved the SAP II objectives? Or contributed to the achievement of objectives? Explain!</p> <p>21. Have the capacity building efforts yielded the expected results with partner organizations?</p> <p>22. What challenges and constraints have hampered the full achievement of expected results?</p>	

			<p>23. Are there any unplanned and unexpected outcomes of the actions and activities and is there appreciation of these outcomes by both internal and external stakeholders?</p> <p>24. Has there been any change in the previous and current level of capacities in your organization and those of your collaborating partners?</p> <p>25. How often do you have dialogue meetings or engagements with Diakonia, other collaborating or implementing or resource partners and rights holders? What are some of the dialogue results? How is this dialogue assessed?</p> <p>26. How do you mainstream cross-cutting priorities in the implementation of actions or activities?</p> <p>27. How does your monitoring - reporting system work? Are lessons learned documented? Can change over time be registered?</p> <p>28. What, if anything, could have been done differently to make the SAP II more effective?</p>	
		Efficiency	<p>29. What is the experience with disbursement of funds from Diakonia? Timeliness?</p> <p>30. Explain the sequence of the disbursement - reporting cycle? Are there any bottlenecks? How does the control mechanism work? Decision-making structures, systems and procedures? Governance mechanisms?</p> <p>31. How does it work - compared to other donor funds your organization works with? Strengths and weaknesses? Suggestions for improvement</p> <p>32. What is the percentage of project activities and actions with satisfactory financial execution rates or performance?</p> <p>33. What is the percentage of project activities and actions with timely implementation?</p> <p>34. What are the main challenges and constraints (including delays) that have affected or delayed implementation of project activities?</p> <p>35. What are the main strengths and / or weaknesses in the financing and activity implementation or delivery mechanisms?</p> <p>36. What, if anything, could have been done differently to make the SAP II more efficient?</p>	
		Winding-up	<p>37. Are there any other questions that we should have asked you? Any other important issues?</p>	

3.4 Interview checklist - rights holders

The interview checklist for focus group discussions (FGD) with rights holders is meant as guidance for a semi-structured interview to be carried with different rights holders being part of the projects implemented by Diakonia's partners under SAP II.

The FGDs should be conducted in an open and conducive atmosphere, allowing all participants to contribute to the discussion. We anticipate 8-10 participants in each FD, with an equal representation of men and women. Participants will be encouraged to contribute in whatever language they are confident with, and if necessary, translation will be secured by one of the participants.

- Please file the notes from each of the interviews in this folder\\Dropbox\\Diakonia SAP II Zambia FCG FWC Sida 2022\\13 Field work data collection Feb 2022
- Add easily recognizable name to the file name, e.g. institution acronyms and date

Partner organization			
Location			
# of persons participating (m/f)			
Interviewer			
Date			
		Questions	Notes and observations
3	Rights holders	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tell us about your activities with xx organization! 2. What have been the main results and achievements? 3. What ways are the opinions and viewpoints of women and youth considered? 4. Have you seen any changes in behavior - in the community? With local authorities? Government departments? Private sector (including mining companies)? Others (please specify)? 5. Do the activities you are implementing impact political decisions (of duty bearers)? Locally - or maybe at national level? 6. What is the Most Significant Change? (case story) 	

		<ol style="list-style-type: none">7. What are your plans - as a community - for the future?8. What could have been done better to make the program more responsive to your needs? Strengths and weaknesses?9. Any other observations?	
--	--	---	--

Annex 4 – Documentation

Sida in Zambia

- Results strategy for Sweden's international development cooperation in Zambia 2013–2017
- Strategy for Sweden's development cooperation with Zambia 2018–2022, Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs
- Strengthened Accountability Program II: Diakonia Zambia, Appraisal of Intervention, 15.06.2018
- Minutes from Annual Meetings 2018/2019, 2020 and 2021

Diakonia

- ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK, Diakonia, 18.06.2014
- Diakonia's Policy, 28.05.2020
- Diakonia Annual Report 2020
- List of employees 2021-2022, Country Office Diakonia Zambia

Diakonia board and governance documents

- The statutes of Diakonia - Two principles, adopted 10.06.2012
- THE STATUTES OF DIAKONIA, adopted by the Annual Meeting 2014-06-15, latest revision 2021-09-08
- Minutes of the First Board Meeting for Diakonia - Zambia Country Office, 29.03.2019
- Minutes of Board meeting, 09.12.2020
- Minutes of Board meeting, 26.04.2021
- Diakonia Organizational chart
- Diakonia Zambia Country Office Organogram

Diakonia strategy and program documents

- Diakonia Global Strategy 2015 - 2020 (draft)
- Diakonia's Global Strategy 2021 and onwards, 03.12.2020
- Diakonia ZAMBIA COUNTRY STRATEGY 2016-2020 (Word and PDF)
- Diakonia Zambia Country Strategy 2021 - 2025, final draft, 08.12.2020
- Democracy, SEJ and Gender Program 2016 - 2020

Diakonia manuals and steering documents

Policy documents

- Use of Property and Technology - ICT, Diakonia policy, January 2013

- Information Technology, Policy, Diakonia, January 2013
- Child Safeguarding Policy, Diakonia, 09.12.2017
- Code of Conduct, Diakonia, 08.12.2018
- Environmental policy for Diakonia Africa, n.d.
- THE GOAL IS GENDER JUSTICE. THE WAY THERE IS FEMINISM. A Feminist Rationale for Diakonia's Gender Justice Work, n.d.
- Diakonia Gender Toolkit

Administrative manuals and guidelines

- Diakonia PME Manual, 05.02.2015 - without annexes
- Diakonia Procurement Guidelines, March 2021

Human resources management

- Global Conditions of Employment, Diakonia, n.d.
- REPORT ON STAFF BENEFITS, ALLOWANCES AND CONDITIONS, Diakonia, 14.11.2014
- Human Resource Policy, Diakonia, 08.04.2015
- Diakonia Global Human Resource Handbook, 29.06.2017
- Disciplinary and grievance handling policy for Zambia based staff, Diakonia, 01.06.2019
- Work Environment Policy, Diakonia, 25.04.2015 / 17.04.2020

Strengthened Accountability Program

- STRENGTHENED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAMME (2014-2017), End evaluation, 23.11.2017
- Strengthened Accountability Programme (SAP) - Phase II, 2018 -2021 Funding Proposal, 23.01.2018
- Framework for Collaborative Implementation of SAP-II, signed July 2020
- BASELINE STUDY REPORT, SAP II, DIAKONIA AND IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS, SEPTEMBER 2019

2018 -2021 SAP II grant application-grant application & Contract

- SAP II Concept Note- 20171006
- Grant Proposal Submission Letter-PDF copy, 23.01.2018
- 2018-2021 EoS Programme Proposal _ final
- Annex 1 - Results Framework
- Final Annex I Diakonia Results Framework SAPII_Revised- 300919
- Annex II - 2018-2021 SAP II Budget _Condenced_final
- Diakonia Detailed budget- 2018 Embassy of Sweden Proposal_Revised 18 05 2018 (FINAL) Annex 3
- Annex III - Risk Matrix
- Annex IV - Partner Profiles

- Annex V - Stakeholder Analysis
- Annex VI - Summary Briefing note SAP Evaluation 2017
- Diakonia- SIDA 2018-2021 Grant Agreement (SAP II)-20.06.2018
- Framework for Collaborative Implementation of SAP-II (PCC) MoU, July 2020

Framework for Collaborative Implementation of SAP-II

- **2018**
 - Diakonia 2018 Annual Budget _with Schedules_Final_12072018
 - Diakonia Zambia 2018_Q1April Q2 -211217
 - Diakonia Zambia CO 2018 Workplan_ (Updated Version)-18.06.2018
 - Final Copy of Diakonia Zambia CO 2018 Workplan_ (Updated Version)-18.06.2018
- **2019**
 - Budget with 2018 Opening Balance
 - Diakonia 2019 Annual Budget _with Schedules_Draft Embassy
 - Diakonia Zambia Country Office Workplan (2020)- 28.11.2019
- **2020**
 - Annual Budget 2020-Embassy
 - Diakonia Zambia Country Office Workplan - 2020
 - Proposed semi annual 2020 Budget Revision
- **2021**
 - Annual Work Plan 2021 Zambia Country Office (Update) - 03.09.2021
 - Annual Workplan 2021 SAPII Zambia Country Office- 11112020
 - Approval of Budget Freezing of Grant
 - Revised Annual Workplan 2021 SAPII Zambia Country Office- 20102021

Annual narrative and financial report

- **2018 Annual Reports SAPII**
 - Zambia CO 2018 Annual Narrative Report, final, 31.03.19
 - Annex 1 Risk assessment
 - Annex 2 2018 Financial Report
 - Annex 3 2018 Management Comments and Audit Action Plan
 - Annex 4 List of 2018 Partners and Disbursements
 - Grant Financial Statement 2018
 - Annual Review Meeting – Strengthened Accountability Program SAP II Embassy of Sweden, May 2019
- **2019 Annual Reports SAPII**
 - 2019 Annual Narrative Report to The Embassy -Final 06.04.2020 (Word and PDF)
 - Annex I Diakonia Results Framework SAPII_Revised- 300919

- Copy of 2019 Result Matrix - Final 06.04.20
- Copy of Diakonia Zambia Partner Register_2020
- Diakonia Management Report 31st December 2019 - Final
- Diakonia Sweden - FS 31 December 2019 Signed
- Diakonia Zambia CO Expenditure Jan- Dec Report Grant 384 2019 Programme Reporting
- Diakonia Zambia CO Financial Report Jan- Dec 2019 Grant 384
- Diakonia Zambia Partner Risk Matrix 2019-20
- Expenditure Report Jan - June 2019
- 2020 Annual reports SAPII
 - SAP II Annual Narrative Report 2020 Diakonia Zambia- 30.03.2021
 - Annex I SAP II Results Framework Diakonia Zambia- Revised 30.09.19
 - Annex II Diakonia Zambia Expenditure Jan-Dec report 280220
 - Annex III Audited Financial Statements 2020 Diakonia Zambia-29.03.2021
 - Annex IV Audit Management letter 2020 Diakonia Zambia- 29.03.2021
 - Annex IX SAPII Results Matrix 2020 Diakonia Zambia- 26.03.2021
 - Annex V SAP II Partner Risk Log 2019-2020 Diakonia Zambia-29.03.2021
 - Annex VI SAP II Partner Register 2021 Diakonia Zambia- 27.03.2021
 - Annex VII SAP II Partner Capacity Building Plans Diakonia Zambia- 27.03.2021
 - Annex VIII SAP II Stories of Change 2020 Diakonia Zambia- 30.03.2021
- EITA Incident case
 - 2021 Partner Incident Report EITA 25012022
 - EITA management report Sep 2021
 - Worksheet in 2021 Partner Incident Report EITA 25012022
 - Minutes Diakonia - EITA Board meeting, 06.12.2021

CO Audits and Program Audits

- 2018
 - Diakonia - CO Audit report 2018
 - Diakonia Zambia Management Letter 2018
 - Diakonia Zambia Grant Audit Report, 2018
- 2019
 - Diakonia Sweden Zambia 2019 Audit Report
 - Diakonia Management Report 31st December 2019 - Final

- SAP II 2019 Grant Audit Report
- 2019 Grant Audit Management Letter (1)
- 2019 Partners Management Letter Report Summary
- 2020
 - ToR Diakonia CO Audit - signed
 - 2020 CO Audit Contract
 - Office Audit Assessment Form - CO
 - Engagement letter and Contract 2020 - signed
 - Diakonia Sweden Zambia 2020 Audit Report
 - Diakonia - Management letter final draft for mgt comments (002)
 - Revised Signed - Updated Diakonia Financial Statements (1)
 - Audit Cover Letter
 - Partner Audit Comments and Action Taken-2020
 - Representation letter_Diakonia
- 2021
 - AUP_Appendix 3_DIAKONIA SWEDEN-Final
 - Management Letter Diakonia Sweden Zambia 2021-Final
 - Management Representation Letter- Signed

Annual meetings Diakonia - Embassy of Sweden

- Minutes of the 4th Annual Meeting for the SAP between Diakonia and Embassy of Sweden (Sida), 20.06. 2018
- Minutes of the 5th Annual Meeting for the SAP between Diakonia and Embassy of Sweden (Sida), 30.04.2019
- Minutes of the Second Annual Review Meeting for the SAP II between Diakonia Zambia and the Embassy of Sweden- Lusaka held on 14 May 2020
- Minutes of the Third Annual Review Meeting for the SAP II between Diakonia Zambia and the Embassy of Sweden- Lusaka held on 29..04.2021

Resource Organizations TORs, Agreements and Reports

- Diakonia Resource Organizations SAP II Zambia 20190228
- Partner Roles-Resource Organizations
- Africa Directions
 - Africa Directions ToRs-2019
 - SAP II Contract Africa Directions 2019-2020, Nov 2019
 - Narrative Report Nov 2019 to Aug 2020 Africa Directions, 14.09.2020
 - 2020 Annual Financial Report Assessment AD
 - Financial Report Assessment Nov 2019 to Aug 2020_Africa Directions
 - Financial Report 2019 to 2020 Africa Directions, 31.08.2020
 - Interim Financial Report Assessment 2020 Africa Directions, 23.12.2020
 - Semi Annual Financial Report 2021 AD, 211123

- Semi Annual Financial Report 2021 AD detailed, 211123
- NLACW
 - SAP II TORs NLACW 2019-2020, Nov 2019
 - SAP II Contract NLACW 2019-2020, Nov 2019
 - NLACW Amendment to Contract signed July 2021
 - 12 NLACW PCC Presentations, February 2022
- CTPD
 - CTPD ToRs 2019
 - SAP II Contract CTPD 2019-2020, Nov 2019
 - Contract Amendment No.(1) SAPII 2021-2022 CTPD 06.08.2021
 - Project Activity Narrative Report 2019 -2020 CTPD - 23072020
 - Annual Narrative Report CTPD 2020 - 13.04.2021
 - Financial Report Assessment 2019 CTPD
 - Waiver Narrative Report Assessment 2019 CTPD
 - 2020 Annual Financial Report Assessment CTPD
 - CTPD 2020 Annual Financial Report SAP II 30032021
 - Interim Financial Report Assessment 2020 CTPD 23.12.2020
 - Interim Financial Report 2019-2020 CTPD
 - Semi Annual Financial Report 2021 CTDP - 211124
 - Assessed 6MF 2021 CTPD - 211214
 - Resource Partners' Narrative Report Assessment - 21.02.2022
- ZHECT
 - TORs ZHECT_SAP II-2019
 - Contract SAP II ZHECT-2019
 - Contract Amendment 2021-2200 ZHECT - 221201
 - Narrative Report Feb to Jul 2020_ZHECT - 13082020
 - Waiver Narrative Report Assessment 2019 ZHECT
 - Annual Financial Report Assessment 2020 ZHECT - 211020
 - SAP II Financial Report Nov 2019 to May 2020_ZHECT_31.08.2020
 - Transaction List for Financial Report May 2020_ZHECT_31.08.2020
 - Interim Financial Report 2019-2020 ZHECT
 - Resource Partners' Narrative Report Assessment - 21.02.2022

Partner Capacity Assessments and Capacity Building Plans

- Consolidate Partner Capacity Building Plan 2018-2020_SAP II Zambia CO
- Feedback from Capacity Assessments and Register (Elvira)-02.08.2018
- Assessment of New Partner SACCORD 09 11 2018
- Assessment of SACCORD project funding 12 11 2018
- SACCORD Capacity Building Plan_2018 to 2021
- Assessment of MISA Zambia project funding 05 11 2018
- Assessment of New Partner MISA Zambia 05 11 2018
- MISA Zambia Capacity Building Plan_2018 to 2021
- Assessment of FODEP 05 10 2018

- Assessment of FODEP project funding 09 11 2018
- FODEP Capacity Building Plan_2018 to 2021
- Assessment of JCTR 05 10 2018
- Assessment of JCTR project funding 22 10 2018
- JCTR Capacity Building Plan_2018 to 2021
- Assessment of Caritas Solwezi project funding 26 10 2018
- Assessment of New Partner Caritas Solwezi 24 10 2018
- CARITAS SOL Capacity Building Plan_2018 to 2021
- Assessment of New Partner Women for Change 061118
- Assessment of Women for Change project funding 05 11 2018
- WFC Capacity Building Plan_2018 to 2021
- Assessment of New Partner NGOCC 07 11 2018
- Assessment of NGOCC project funding 08 11 2018
- NGOCC Capacity Building Plan_2018 to 2021
- Assessment of Caritas Zambia 24 10 2018
- Assessment of Caritas Zambia project funding 29 10 2018
- CARITAS ZAM Capacity Building Plan_2018 to 2021
- Assessment of YAD 30 10 2018
- Assessment of YAD project funding 31 10 2018
- YAD Capacity Building Plan_2018 to 2021
- Assessment of EITA 12 10 2018
- Assessment of EITA project funding 13 11 2018
- EITA Capacity Building Plan_2018 to 2021

Partner Agreements and Presentations

Partner applications

- *All partner applications with respective annexes*
- *Applications from PWYP and YMCA*

Partner contracts

- *All partner contracts and amendments*

Partner risk logs

- *Risk assessment logs for all 10 implementing partner organizations*

PP-presentations from PCC meetings 2022

- *Presentations from PCC meetings February 2022 and March 2022*

Partners Annual Reports & Assessments

1. SACCORD - 2018/19 . 2019 - 2020
2. MISA 2019 - 2020 - 2021
3. FODEP 2019 - 2020 - 2021
4. JCTR 2018 - 2019 - 2020 - 2021

5. Caritas Solwezi 2018 - 2019 - 2020 - 2021
6. Women for Change 2018 - 2019 - 2020 - 2021
7. NGOCC 2018 - 2019 - 2020 - 2021
8. Caritas Zambia 2018 - 2019 - 2020 - 2021
9. YAD 2018 - 2019 - 2020 - 2021
10. EITA 2018 - 2019 - 2020 – 2021

Other documents

- Memorandum of Understanding Diakonia - Zambia Chambers of Mine, draft, 2014
- Memorandum of Understanding Diakonia Zambia Institute of Chartered Accountants (ZICA), draft, 2014

Annex 5 – List of Interviewees

Name	Position	Organization	Date of interview
Embassy of Sweden			
Magdalena Svensson	First Secretary	Embassy of Sweden	07.02.22
Pezo Mateo-Phiri	Program Manager Human Rights & Governance	Embassy of Sweden	13.12.21 20.01.22 28.01.22 07.02.22
Karin Sahlén	Financial and Operational Controller	Embassy of Sweden	07.02.22
Chimfwembe Sichinga	Finance and Operational Controller	Embassy of Sweden	07.02.22
Antonia Grönval	Trade, Promotion and Communication Officer	Embassy of Sweden	07.02.22
Diakonia Regional Office Nairobi			
Linda Hammerberg	Regional Director	Diakonia Regional Office Kenya	10.02.22
Elvira Kamau	PME Coordinator	Diakonia Regional Office Kenya	10.02.22
Mildred Kemuma	Acting Regional Controller	Diakonia Regional Office Kenya	10.02.22
Diakonia Country Office Zambia			
Geoffrey Chongo	Country Officer Director	Diakonia Zambia	13.12.21 11.01.22 21.01.22 28.01.22
Edward Goma	Senior Program Officer	Diakonia Zambia	13.12.21 11.01.22 17.01.22 28.01.22
Maimbo Kalenge	Program Officer	Diakonia Zambia	13.12.21 11.01.22 18.01.22 28.01.22

Amos Lumpa	Finance and Administration Officer	Diakonia Zambia	16.01.22 28.01.22
Taurai Milimo	Grants Compliance Officer	Diakonia Zambia	13.12.21 16.01.22 17.01.22 28.01.22
National Government Institutions			
Foster Hamuyube	Head of research and Planning	Human Rights Commission	18.02.22
Talent Ng'andwe	Deputy CEO	Zambia Chamber of Mines	21.02.22
Lee Chileshe	Assistant Director	National Development Planning	19.02.22
Pamela Nakombe	Principal Planner	Ministry of Mines and Minerals Development	16.02.22
Ian Mwiinga	National Coordinator	EITI	15.02.22
Local and Municipal Authorities			
Naomi Testamashimba	Deputy Permanent Secretary	Office of the President, North Western Province HQ	21.02.22
Sikota Noanga	Provincial National Guidance Officer	Office of the President, North Western Province HQ	21.02.22
Florence Yungana	Community Development Officer	Kasempa Town Council	22.02.22
Ilijah Munyope	District Commissioner	Office of the President, Mufumbwe	22.02.22
Neboth Lubelenga	District Administrative Officer	Office of the President, Kasempa District Commissioner	22.02.22
Future Chibesa	District Planning Officer	Mufumbwe Town Council	22.02.22
Anthony Fulwe	District Administrative Officer	Office of the President / Solwezi District Commissioner	23.02.22

ANNEX 5 – LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Namakau Munali	Community Development Officer	Solwezi Municipal Council	23.02.22
Josephine Mwanza	Council Secretary	Kalumbila Town Council	25.02.22
Private Sector (mining)			
Cedius Chibilika	Supervisor	Kariba Minerals Ltd.	15.02.22
Martford Mumba	General Secretary	Federation of Small-Scale Mining Associations Zambia	16.02.22
Victor Nsana	Senior Supervisor	Kansanshi Mining Ltd. - First Quantum Minerals Ltd	21.02.22
Evans Chisengalumbwe	Community Safety Officer		
John Mubambe	Communications Officer		
Christopher Mukala	Sustainability Manager	Lumwana Mining Company Ltd. Barrick Gold Corporation	25.02.22
Implementing Partners			
Thomas Zulu	Program Officer	MISA Zambia	12.02.22
Mtumbi Malate	Program Officer Policy & Research	EITA	12.02.22
Micomyiza Diuudonnie	Program Officer	JCTR	12.02.22
Gilbert Chisenga	Program Manager	FODEP	13.02.22
Arthur Muynda	Program Manager	SACCORD	14.02.22
Edmond Kangamungazi	Head of Programs	Caritas Zambia	16.02.22
Petronella Phiri	Program Officer	YAD	17.02.22
Kunda Lubinga	MEL Officer	WFC	17.02.22
Lewis Miyanda	Program Officer	Caritas Solwezi	18/23.02.22
Edward Chisenga	Project Officer		
Pauline Zulu	Program Manager	NGOCC	18/23.02.22
Edward Kangamungazi	Program Manager	Caritas Zambia	03.03.22
Thomas Zulu	Program Manager	MISA	
Samson Kumwenda	Program Officer	WFC	
Resource Organizations			
Isaiah Mbewe	M&E Specialist	CTPD	12.02.22

ANNEX 5 – LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Chilufya Mwaba Phiri	Founder & Executive Officer	ZHECT	21.02.22
Mulako	Director of Research and M&E		
Grace Chisulo	Director of Finance and Administration		
Mary Matupa	Deputy Executive Director	NLACW	22.02.22
Stephen Kealeya	Program Accountant		
Raymond Kankomba	Senior Paralegal Officer		
Mark Chilongu	Executive Director	AD	23.02.22
Nelson Mumbi	Program Officer		
Bryan Sinyangwe	Finance Officer		
Theresa K Bwalya	Program Coordinator Girls' Club Coordinator		
Thandi Khunga	Youth Volunteer		
Community Groups			
Kaumba, Kapuna and Kisonge Groups		9 men / 7 women	21.02.22
Kakiluya Radio Listening Club		8 men / 8 women (all youth)	22.02.22
Kasempa Community Radio- Station		2 men	22.02.22
Kisalala Community group		7 men / 16 women	23.02.22
Muzabula Community Group		2 men / 14 women	23.02.22
YAD Youth Champions		3 men / 2 women	23.02.22
Tukiya Women's Club & Mfumbwe Caring Mothers		4 men / 3 women	22.02.22
Margrate Mudenda	Chairperson / WFC Group	SiaticHEMA Chiefdom, Sputhern Province	07.03.22
Participation in PCC meetings			
All implementing partner and resource organizations		Program Officers and Finance Officers	09-09.02.22
		Directors	03.03.22

Annex 6 – SAP II Partner Organizations

The participation in clusters has changed slightly over the years, and the initial division presented in the 2018 SAP II Annual Report differs from the division showed below from the 2019 Baseline Study Report.

Implementing partner		Geographical coverage	Thematic focus / clusters ⁹³			
			GEE ⁹⁴	NRM ⁹⁵	SEA ⁹⁶	Capacity
1.	Jesuit Center for Theological Reflections (JCTR)	Lusaka, Solwezi, Chavuma, Kalumbila		x	x	
2.	Media Institute for Southern Africa (MISA)	Lufwanyama, Solwezi, Zimba, Kalomo, Lusaka		x	x	
3.	Caritas Solwezi	Mwinilunga, Ikelenge, Zambezi, Kasempa, Kalumbila		x	x	
4.	Non-Governmental Gender Organizations Coordinating Council (NGGOCC)	Mufumbwe, Lusaka, Kasempa, Solwezi, Kalumbila	x	x	x	
5.	Women for Change (WFC)	Lusaka, Kalomo, Zimba	x			
6.	Foundation for Democratic Process (FODEP)	Kalumbila, Lusaka, Chavuma, Solwezi, Zambezi, Mushindamo		x	x	
7.	Youth Alliance for Development (YAD)	Mushindamo, Solwezi, Kasempa, Kalumbila, Mwinilunga		x		
8.	Caritas Zambia	Lusaka, Kalomo, Mwinilunga, Solwezi,		x	x	

⁹³ Each cluster has a lead: GEE is led by NGOCC; NRM is led by JCTR; and SEA is led by Caritas Solwezi.

⁹⁴ GEE - gender equality and equity.

⁹⁵ NRM - natural resource management.

⁹⁶ SEA - social and environmental accountability.

		Lufwanyama, Mansa, Kasempa				
9.	Extractive Industries Transparency Alliance (EITA)	Mansa, Kalumbila	x	x	x	
10.	Southern Africa Center for Constructive Resolution of Disputes	Lusaka, Zambezi, Chavuma, Mufumbwe		x	x	
	Resource organization	Geographical coverage	Thematic focus			
			GEE	NRM	SEA	Capacity
1.	Africa Directions (AD)	National				x
2.	Legal Aid Clinic for Women (LACW)	National				x
3.	Center for Trade Policy and Development (CTPD)	National				x
4.	Zambia Health Education and Communication Trust (ZHECT)	National				x

Annex 7 – Contracts and Disbursements

Contracts with and disbursement to partners (SEK)

	Partner organization	1.11.18-30.04.19(1)	01.05-31-12.19	01.01-31.12.20	01.01-31.12.22	2022 ? (9)	Total	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
1	SACCORD (2)	450 000	324 665	141 152	69 104		984 921	2018/12/18-225,000	2019/04/04-225,000 2019/04/03-324,665			
2	MISA (3)	540 000	706 951	600 150	535 000		2 382 101	2018/12/19-540,000	2019/05/31-353,476 2019/09/19-353,475	2020/05/26-300,075 2020/10/19-300,075	2021/12/15-267,500	
3	FODEP	550 000	698 500	535 000	400 000		2 183 500	2018/12/11-550,000	2019/05/31-349,250 2019/11/25-349,250	2020/06/30-267,500 2020/10/16-267,500	2021/12/15-200,000	
4	JCTR	861 425	920 553	745 560	635 000		3 162 538	2018/12/11-861,425	2019/07/03-460,277 2019/10/16-460,276	2020/05/25-372,775 2020/10/29-372,775		
5	Caritas Solwezi	850 000	911 859	700 500	690 828		3 153 187	2018/12/18-850,000	2019/05/30-455,930 2019/10/21-455,929	2020/06/24-350,250 2020/10/29-350,250	2021/12/15-345,414	

ANNEX 7 – CONTRACTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

6	WFC (4)	750 000	868 879	929 523	550 000		3 098 402	2018/12/18-750,000	2019/05/31-434,400 2019/10/16-434,439	2020/05/26-327,775 2020/10/26-601,748	2021/12/15-275,000	
7	NGOCC	750 000	787 387	406 500	500 000		2 443 887	2018/12/18-750,000	2019/06/13-393,694 2019/10/16-393,693	2020/08/14-338,750 2020/12/11-67,750	2021/12/15-250,000	
8	Caritas Zambia (5)	801 429	915 942	705 400	510 000		2 932 771	2018/12/11-801,429	2019/06/19-457,971 2019/09/24-457,971	2020/05/25-352,700 2020/10/26-352,700	2021/12/15-255,000	
9	YAD	510 000	702 982		482 394		1 695 376	12/11/2018-255,000	2019/03/21-255,000 2019/06/19-351,491 2019/09/24-351,491			
10	EITA(6)	450 000	650 500	510 400	310 000		1 920 900	2018/12/11-225000	2019/03/21-225,000 2019/06/24-325,250 2019/09/24-325,250	2020/05/26-255,200 2020/12/11-255,200		
11	AD (7)	306 350	0	0	0	589 790	896 140		2019/12/10-91,905	2020/09/17-153,175 2020/12/23-61,270		
12	NLACW (7)	306 350	0	0	0	300 000	606 350		2019/12/11-91,905	2020/09/14-153,175 2020/12/23-61,270		
13	CTPD (8)	306 350	0	0	210 000	210 000	726 350		209/12/10-91,905	2020/07/16-153,175		

ANNEX 7 – CONTRACTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

										2020/12/23- 61,270		
14	ZHECT (7)	306 350	0	0	0	250 000	556 350		2019/12/11- 91,905	2020/9/14- 153,175 2020/12/23- 61,270		
							26 742 773					

NOTES

- 1 Initial period 1.11.2018 - 28.2.2019 was extended to 30.04.19 for all implementing partners
- 2 SACCORD contract was changed to activity contract on 14.12.2020 and terminated by 31.01.2021
The original 4-years budget of SEK 1,935,410 was reduced to SEK 993,603 = a reduction of SEK 941,807
- 3 The contract and Amendment 1 have a budget of SEK 540,000 for year one, but from Amendment 2 this is raised to SEK 550,000.
- 4 The budget for year 3 was increased considerably, i.e. with SEK 273,973
- 5 Last year budget raised with SEK 100,000, otherwise unchanged.
- 6 Contract ended 30.09.2021
- 7 Were the contracts for the Resource Organizations (AD, NLACW, ZHECT) not amended?
- 8 The Amendment signed on 29.07.2021 by CTPD erroneously reads NLACW in the Introduction and the year 2020 has been corrected in hand to 2022
- 9 In the interview with NLACW on 22.2.22, they indicated that an additional budget was allocated for 2022?

Annex 8 – Program and Partner Objectives

- **Expected long-term impact:** improved quality of life of communities (especially women, youth, the poor and most vulnerable groups) in natural resource rich, rural and peri-urban areas of Zambia.
- **Overall program objective:** Rights holders (men, women and youth) are empowered to hold duty bearers accountable for equitable access and distribution to national resources.

Program Outcome	Intermediary Outcome	Related Partner Objective	Name of Partner
Program Outcome 1: Rights holders (RHs), in targeted districts of Zambia, are promoting and influencing practices and policies for Gender Equity and Equality (GEE)	Intermediary Outcome 1.1: Women, men, boys and girls are advocating for gender equity and equality at local and national levels	Ensure broad-based environmental awareness and the promotion of sustainable livelihoods and environmental accountability for the benefit of present and future generations.	Caritas Solwezi
	Intermediary Outcome 1.2: Women and youth benefiting from empowerment initiatives and opportunities at local and national levels	Strengthen the weak engagement that exist between DBs and RHs despite the established local structures.	SACCORD
	Intermediary Outcome 1.3: Policies and legislations that address gender disparities are popularized and implemented	Advance RHs' participation in development and governance processes among vulnerable communities in Zambia.	MISA Zambia
		Strengthen women's leadership for improved community activism and claim making capacities to achieve gender equality.	WFC
		Increase voice participation and leadership of women and girls including women living with disabilities for gender equality.	WFC

		<p>Promote citizens' engagement and women's empowerment in the natural resource peri-urban and urban areas of North-Western Province.</p> <p>Empower women to participate and benefit from natural resource management in North-Western Province.</p> <p>Address economic development through social accountability in the extractives sector, particularly in Mansa and Kalumbila districts (empower and develop the capacities of women and youth RHs benefiting from natural resources and economic empowerment initiatives).</p>	<p>NGOCC</p> <p>NGOCC</p> <p>EITA</p>
<p>Program Outcome 2: RHs (men, women and youth) are holding duty bearers (DBs) accountable and demanding for equitable access and distribution of national resources</p>	<p>Intermediary Outcome 2.1: RHs participate in development and governance processes</p> <p>Intermediary Outcome 2.2: RHs claim their rights to accessing improved and quality public services in targeted sectors</p> <p>Intermediary Outcome 2.3: Corporate sector aligns CSR initiatives to local and community development plans</p>	<p>Ensure broad-based environmental awareness and the promotion of sustainable livelihoods and environmental accountability for the benefit of present and future generations.</p> <p>Strengthen the weak engagement that exist between DBs and RHs despite the established local structures.</p> <p>Advancing RHs' participation in development and governance processes among vulnerable communities in Zambia.</p> <p>Enhancing service delivery through active citizenship.</p> <p>Contribute to improved wellbeing of Zambians, especially women, youth, the poor and vulnerable groups in North-Western Province through enhanced accountability.</p> <p>Train RHs (men, women and children) in human rights-based approaches to development.</p>	<p>Caritas Solwezi</p> <p>SACCORD</p> <p>MISA Zambia</p> <p>FODEP</p> <p>JCTR</p>

		<p>Strengthen women's leadership for improved community activism and claim making capacities to achieve gender equality.</p> <p>Increase voice participation and leadership of women and girls including women living with disabilities for gender equality.</p> <p>Enhance the capacities of RHs and CSOs in Kalomo, Zimba, Mansa, Lufwanyama and Mwinilunga to develop and promote exemplary policies and actions towards socially-just and environmentally sustainable development.</p> <p>Train youth champions on youth inclusion and participation in local democracy and accountability and human rights-based approach to development in Kasempa and Mushindamo districts.</p>	<p>JCTR</p> <p>WFC</p> <p>WFC</p> <p>Caritas Zambia</p> <p>YAD</p>
<p>Program Outcome 3: Targeted DBs are ensuring social and environmental accountability in the management and exploitation of natural resources</p>	<p>Intermediary Outcome 3.1: Private sector are complying with local and international standards of improving environmental sustainability and community resilience especially of women in extractive industries</p> <p>Intermediary Outcome 3.2: State and state institutions adhere to and enforce policies and legal frameworks in the management and governance of natural resources</p>	<p>Strengthen the weak engagement that exist between DBs and RHs despite the established local structures.</p> <p>Advancing RHs' participation in development and governance processes among vulnerable communities in Zambia.</p> <p>Contribute to improved wellbeing of Zambians, especially women, youth, the poor and vulnerable groups in North-Western Province through enhanced accountability.</p> <p>Sensitize DBs on local and international environmental standards and the adverse effects of their industrial activities on communities.</p> <p>Host communities and their economies benefit from the extraction of resources available in their areas.</p>	<p>SACCORD</p> <p>MISA Zambia</p> <p>JCTR</p> <p>JCTR</p>

		Address economic development through social accountability in the extractives sector, particularly in Mansa and Kalumbila districts.	Caritas Zambia EITA
Program Outcome 4: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandates and effectively deliver rights-based programs	<p>Intermediary Outcome 4.1: Partner organizations have strengthened their institutional capacity</p> <p>Intermediary Outcome 4.2: Partner organizations have strengthened technical capacities to deliver their mandate and to implement the program</p> <p>Intermediary Outcome 4.3: Strategic collaborations established among partners to enhance capacity for innovation and efficiency for joint initiatives</p>	<p>Strengthen the weak engagement that exist between DBs and RHs despite the established local structures.</p> <p>Advancing RHs’ participation in development and governance processes among vulnerable communities in Zambia.</p> <p>Enhancing service delivery through active citizenship.</p> <p>Contribute to improved wellbeing of Zambians, especially women, youth, the poor and vulnerable groups in North-Western Province through enhanced accountability.</p> <p>Increase JCTR’s organizational capacity and sustainability to deliver its programs to the expectations of its stakeholders.</p> <p>Strengthen women’s leadership for improved community activism and claim making capacities to achieve gender equality.</p> <p>Increase voice participation and leadership of women and girls including women living with disabilities for gender equality.</p> <p>Increase capacity of Caritas Zambia to implement its mandate and effectively deliver rights-based programs.</p> <p>Address economic development through social accountability in the extractives sector, particularly in Mansa and Kalumbila districts.</p>	<p>SACCORD</p> <p>MISA Zambia</p> <p>FODEP</p> <p>JCTR</p> <p>JCTR</p> <p>WFC</p> <p>WFC</p>

		Build capacities of SAP II implementing partners in policy research and policy advocacy at national level (in order for these partners to build capacities of RHs)	Caritas Zambia EITA CTPD
--	--	--	---

Annex 9 – Partner Organizations - Summary Findings

The summary information presented below is based on document review (application, budgets, work plans, capacity building plan, contracts, reports, risk log, etc.), e-questionnaires and interviews with partner organizations. The information is included as feedback to the partner organizations.

Gender equity and equality cluster

1. Identification	
Partner organization	Non-Governmental Gender Organizations Coordinating Council (NGOCC)
Website	https://ngooc.org.zm/
Contract period	<p>Contract number DKNZ/SAPII/4872, initially starting on 1st November 2018 and ending on 28th February 2019.</p> <p>The contract had the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On 01/05/2019 for the period 01/11/2018 to 30/09/2021 • On 14/12/2021 for the period 01/11/2018 to 31/12/2022 at an additional cost
Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Year 1: Period from 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019 = SEK 750,000 • Budget Year 2: Period from 1st May 2019 to 31st December 2019 = SEK 787,387 • Budget Year 3: Period from 1st January 2020 to 31st December 2020 = SEK 406,500 • Budget Year 4/5: Period from 1st January 2021 to 31st December 2022 = SEK 500,000
Project Name	Promoting Citizens' Engagement and Women's Economic Empowerment in Natural Resource-rich Areas of North-Western Province
Project partners	<p>NGOCC collaborated with SAP II partners under the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of economic issues and food basket on gender perspective – JCTR • Environmental issues – Caritas Solwezi • Provided training on gender awareness for Caritas Solwezi, JCTR and YAD • Apart from JCTR – other partners do not have gender policy – NGOCC helping other partners develop gender policies
2. Contribution to SAP II	

Main focus area thematic competence	The main focus areas or thematic competences are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Women and economic empowerment
Contributing to SAP II Outcome	NGOCC interventions and activities have been contributing to the following SAP II outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome 1: Rights holders (RHs), in targeted districts of Zambia, are promoting and influencing practices and policies for Gender Equity and Equality (GEE) • Outcome 2: Rights Holders (men, women, youth), are holding duty bearers accountable and demanding for equitable access and distribution of national resources. • Outcome 4: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandates and effectively deliver rights-based programs
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	The strengths include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very strong structures both at a national level and within the community • Gender focused organization able to implement using Diakonia's feminist principles
Weaknesses identified	The weaknesses include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity gaps in environmental issues • Do not have specific projects dealing with environment but hope to review this. At country level there is a climate change pillar and would like to have it under SAP
Most Significant Changes identified	The Most Significant Changes (MSCs) include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The accountability issue is most significant because people are now aware that they can question duty bearers and DBs are aware that they need to respond • At community level learned that it is not always about them waiting, they can start initiatives on their own and engage DBs like govt who is ready to assist
Lessons learned	The lessons learned include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learned that accountability in any program is critical. • Phased in accountability into other programs not under SAP II • Accountability Pacts – Land Pacts have been included in other programs • Because NGOCC is mainly working on economic empowerment they can try and do more engagement with corporate entities. For example, CSR initiatives with companies beyond the mines, as there are others making a lot of money who can be followed up on – including banks
4. Any other observations from Evaluation Team	
Notes	NGOCC plays a role of both resource partner (gender mainstreaming) and implementing partner

1. Identification	
Partner organization	Women for Change (WFC)
Website	http://www.wfc.org.zm
Contract period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract number DKNZ/SAPII/4865, initially starting on 1st November 2018 and ending on 28th February 2019. The arrangement was to sign subsequent contracts for the period 2019-2021 dependent on partner performance. First amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019 (granting two months' extension) Second amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th September 2021 (two years and five months costed extension) Third amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 31st December 2022 (one year and three months at an additional cost)
Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Year 1: Period from 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019 = SEK 750,000 Budget Year 2: Period from 1st May 2019 to 31st December 2019 = SEK 868,879 Budget Year 3: Period from 1st January 2020 to 31st December 2020 = SEK 929,523 Budget Year 4: Period from 1st January 2021 to 31st December 2021 = SEK 550,000
Project Name	Strengthening Women's Leadership for Improved Community Activism and Claim Making Capacities to Achieve Gender Equality project under SAP II
Project Partners	<p>Resource partner is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Center for Trade Policy and Development (CTPD): building research and analytical capacities <p>Implementing partners are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caritas Zambia: environmental issues and conducting the Mining Indaba Caritas Solwezi: environmental issues and conducting the Mining Indaba Foundation for Democratic Process (FODEP): interface meetings and stakeholder engagement
2. Contribution to SAP II	
Main focus area thematic competence	<p>The main focus areas or thematic competences are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gender equity and equality Gender equality
Contributing to SAP II Outcome	<p>WFC interventions and activities contribute to the following SAP II outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome 1: Rights Holders (RHs), in targeted districts of Zambia, are promoting and influencing practices and policies for Gender Equity and Equality, (GEE)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes 2: Rights Holders (men, women, youth), are holding duty bearers accountable and demanding for equitable access and distribution of national resources; • Outcome 3: Targeted duty bearers are ensuring social and environmental accountability in the management and exploitation of natural resources. With an estimated beneficiary reach of 5,160 rights holders and duty bearers (3,032 females and 2,128 males)
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	<p>The strengths include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even when funding did not come in 2021 WFC managed to carry on with activities even without the funding – started using telephone calls to follow up without physically being present • Approach is to ensure the activities are done by the groups themselves, so they have ownership
Weaknesses identified	<p>The weaknesses include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WFC have not maximized the use of community structures to push for provincial and national level advocacy because these groups are surely a force to reckon with and could be very instrumental in pushing for a gender and human rights agenda
Most Significant Changes identified	<p>The Most Significant Changes (MSCs) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DBs- being answerable to the RHs under the community scorecard. The scorecard measures how effectively the DBs are serving the community. • Engagement of local leadership - Early 2020 got duty bearers to meet with community and listen to the complaints of rights holders. In Mapatizya, they lobbied for more presence at police post where there was none and lobbied for agricultural extension officer where there was none, and both were achieved
Lessons learned	<p>Lessons learned include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A community-driven approach to development can be instrumental in times of limited engagement with communities the community members continued to implement activities and responded to social and gender issues on their own. • Limited community engagement can lead to doubts among some project participants regarding whether the project would be implemented as communicated at project inception. • Limited physical interaction with the targeted can also lead to reduction in membership for those who expect handouts from the project.

4. Any other observations from Evaluation Team

Notes	Strong focus on women's empowerment with strong structures working with women-led groups and cooperatives.
--------------	--

Natural Resource Management & Social and Environmental Accountability cluster**1. Identification**

Partner organization	Jesuits Center for Theological Reflection (JCTR)
Website	https://www.jctr.org.zm/
Contract period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract number DKNZ/SAPII/4863, initially starting on 1st November 2018 and ending on 28th February 2019. The arrangement was to sign subsequent contracts for the period 2019-2021 dependent on partner performance. First amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019 (granting two months' extension) Second amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th September 2021 (two years and five months costed extension) Third amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 31st December 2022 (one year and three months at an additional cost)
Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Year 1: Period from 1st November 2018 to 28th February 2019 = SEK 861,425 (same budget line for the amended contract period of 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019) Budget Year 2: Period from 1st May 2019 to 31st December 2019 = SEK 920,553 Budget Year 3: Period from 1st January 2020 to 31st December 2020 = SEK 745,550 Budget Year 4: Period from 1st January 2021 to 30th September 2021 = SEK 450,000 Budget Year 4/5: Period from 1st January 2021 to 31st December 2022 = SEK 635,000
Project Name	Phase 2 of the Strengthened Accountability Program (SAP II)
Project partners	<p>Resource partner is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Center for Trade Policy and Development (CTPD): building research and analytical capacities <p>Implementing partners are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caritas Zambia: environmental issues and conducting the Mining Indaba Caritas Solwezi: environmental issues and conducting the Mining Indaba Foundation for Democratic Process (FODEP): interface meetings and stakeholder engagement
2. Contribution to SAP II	

Main focus area thematic competence	<p>The main focus areas or thematic competences are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social and economic justice • Human rights
Contributing to SAP II outcome	<p>JCTR interventions and activities contribute to the following SAP II outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Outcome 1: Rights holders (RHs) in targeted districts of Zambia RHs are empowered to hold duty bearers (DBs) accountable for equitable access and distribution of national resources (including natural resources) • Program Outcome 2: Targeted DBs (state institutions and corporates) are transparent and are accountable to RHs in the administration and governance of national or natural resources • Program Outcome 3: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandates and effectively deliver rights-based social, political and economic programs
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	<p>The strengths include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JCTR has a strong relationship with RHs in the districts where it is operating from • Presence in the areas of implementation in the North-Western Province • Good relationships with communities, mining firms, local authorities, media and other stakeholders • Strong community structures since JCTR uses the structures of the Catholic Church
Weaknesses identified	<p>The weaknesses include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Projects implemented by JCTR are funded by donors, hence donor-dependent. Dwindling donor funds threaten the continued work of JCTR • Decision-making cannot be done locally in North-Western province by JCTR but has to be escalated to Lusaka (and this sometimes affects project implementation)
Most Significant Changes identified	<p>The Most Significant Changes (MSCs) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced capacities of JCTR officers involved in the implementation of SAP II activities • RHs have capacities to participate in the development agenda of their communities or localities and are also able to hold DBs accountable in the utilization of national and natural resources at the local level • Stakeholder dialogue meetings leading to improvement in the fulfilment of development programs such as the

	construction of a 1X3 classroom block at Kalombo Primary School and Kamisamba Health Post in Chavuma district (hence increased access to education and healthcare)
Lessons learned	<p>Lessons learned include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JCTR endeavors to apply what it has learned on SAP II to a wider context on issues that include COVID-19 and how partners react to the SAP II on issues of accountability and transparency) and how these could be handled better • Need for the SAP II to have a Contingency Plan and an accompanying budget to address challenges compounded by unforeseen developments such as the COVID-19 pandemic
4. Any other observations from Evaluation Team	
Notes	Formidable faith-based institution or organization (FBO) with permanent community structures around the country

1. Identification	
Partner organization	Extractive Industries Transparency Alliance (EITA)
Website	None. But does have a Facebook page: https://www.facebook.com/eita.org.zm/
Contract period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract number DKNZ/SAPII/4867, initially starting on 1st November 2018 and ending on 28th February 2019. • The arrangement was to sign subsequent contracts for the period 2019-2021 dependent on partner performance. • First amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019 (granting two months' extension) • Second amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th September 2021 (two years and five months costed extension)
Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Year 1: Period from 1st November 2018 to 28th February 2019 = SEK 450,000 (same budget line for the amended contract period of 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019) • Budget Year 2: Period from 1st May 2019 to 31st December 2019 = SEK 650,000 • Budget Year 3: Period from 1st January 2020 to 31st December 2020 = SEK 510,400 • Budget Year 4: Period from 1st January 2021 to 30th September 2021 = SEK 310,000
Project Name	Social Accountability for Economic Empowerment (SAEE) as part of the broader SAP II
Project partners	Resource partners were:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Center for Trade Policy and Development (CTPD): building capacities in research methods Zambia Health Education and Communications Trust (ZHECT): building capacities in the area of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) National Legal Aid Clinic for Women (NLACW): providing capacity building in the area of conflict resolution mainstreaming <p>Implementing partner was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caritas Zambia (Mansa district in Luapula Province and Lufwanyama district in the Copperbelt Province) in the area of social accountability and audit Jesuits Center for Theological Reflection (JCTR) in the area of social accountability and environmental protection Africa Directions (AD): on social accountability trainings of community groups or rights holders and building capacities for youth engagement MISA Zambia: using radio or media as tool of communication for development Women for Change (WfC): on gender-mainstreaming activities (capacity building and other annual activities such as participation in 16 days of gender activism) Non-Governmental Organizations Coordinating Committee (NGOCC): on gender-mainstreaming activities (capacity building and other annual activities such as participation in 16 days of gender activism) <p>The partnership between Diakonia Zambia and EITA was, however, terminated in December 2021 due to a number of audit issues.</p>
2. Contribution to SAP II	
Main focus area thematic competence	<p>The main focus areas or thematic competences are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social and economic justice Gender equality Human rights
Contributing to SAP II outcome	<p>EITA interventions and activities contributed to the following SAP II outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Outcome 1: Rights holders (RHs) in targeted districts of Zambia are promoting and influencing practices and policies for gender equality Program Outcome 2: Targeted DBs (state institutions and corporates) are transparent and are accountable to

	<p>RHs in the administration and governance of national or natural resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Outcome 3: Targeted DBs are ensuring social and environmental accountability in the management and exploitation of natural resources • Program Outcome 4: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandates and effectively rights-based programs
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	<p>The strengths include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach of community engagement was through carefully identified and screened groups which become permanent pillars of accountability in the society (way beyond the SAP II) • Capacity building programs initiated by Diakonia Zambia through the implementation of SAP II have been a significant boost to smaller partner organizations such as EITA
Weaknesses identified	<p>The weaknesses include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community groups easily disintegrate once projects phase out without a viable Exit Strategy or Sustainability Plan • Partners have not had critical input into the programming of the SAP II
Most Significant Changes identified	<p>The Most Significant Changes (MSCs) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of mindset of rights holders (RHs) towards development: Mansa (Luapula Province) and Kalumbila (North-Western Province)
Lessons learned	<p>Lessons learned include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for clarification of expectations at the beginning of the partnerships in order to have a seamless flow of implementation of activities • Key for partnership for small organizations such as EITA in broadening networking partnerships • Allow for continuous improvement to the partnership for effective program implementation (improvement in relationships) • Virtual interactions with community groups or rights holders (RHs) and duty bearers (DBs) sustained a bit of program activities at the height of COVID-19
4. Any other observations from Evaluation Team	
Notes	<p>Effective program staff and considerable impact on the ground, despite governance challenges arising from EITA leadership</p>

1. Identification	
Partner organization	Media Institute of Southern Africa Zambia Chapter (MISA)
Website	https://zambia.misa.org
Contract period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract number DKNZ/SAPII/4869, initially starting on 1st November 2018 and ending on 28th February 2019. The arrangement was to sign subsequent contracts for the period 2019-2021 dependent on partner performance. First amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019 (granting two months' extension) Second amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th September 2021 (two years and five months costed extension) Third amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 31st December 2022 (one year and three months at an additional cost)
Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Year 1: Period from 1st November 2018 to 28th February 2019 = SEK 540,000 (same budget line for the amended contract period of 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019) Budget Year 2: Period from 1st May 2019 to 31st December 2019 = SEK 706,951 Budget Year 3: Period from 1st January 2020 to 31st December 2020 = SEK 600,150 Budget Year 4: Period from 1st January 2021 to 30th September 2021 = SEK 330,000 Budget Year 4/5: Period from 1st January 2021 to 31st December 2022 = SEK 535,000
Project Name	Advancing Vulnerable Communities' Participation in Development and Governance Processes in Zambia (as part of the broader SAP II)
Project partners	<p>Resource partners were (facilitating production and airing of radio programs on any national radio):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Legal Aid Clinic for Women (NLACW): providing capacity building in the area of conflict resolution mainstreaming. NLACW also built capacity of MISA Zambia Program Officer in the area of gender advocacy (focusing on core-concepts in advocacy and policy engagement and also formulation of policy briefs) Center for Trade Policy Development (CTPD): training MISA Zambia in the area of mineral taxation and generally mineral tax policy issues

	<p>Training of the following implementing partners in the use of radio for development to train their community groups (as Radio Listening Clubs):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caritas Solwezi in the area of social accountability and audit • Jesuits Center for Theological Reflections (JCTR) • Extractive Industries Transparency Alliance (EITA) • Foundation for Democratic Process (FODEP) • Non-Governmental Organizations Coordinating Committee (NGOCC) • Women for Change (WfC) • Youth Alliance for Development (YAD)
2. Contribution to SAP II	
Main focus area thematic competence	<p>The main focus areas or thematic competences are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democracy • Social and economic justice • Gender equality • Human rights • Peace and conflict
Contributing to SAP II outcome	<p>MISA Zambia interventions and activities contributed to the following SAP II outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Outcome 1: Rights holders (RHs) in targeted districts of Zambia are promoting and influencing practices and policies for gender equality • Program Outcome 2: Rights holders (men, women and youth) are holding duty bearers accountable and demanding for equitable access and distribution of national resources • Program Outcome 3: Targeted DBs are ensuring social and environmental accountability in the management and exploitation of natural resources • Program Outcome 4: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandates and effectively rights-based programs
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	<p>The strengths include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising and improving visibility of SAP II on community radio programs in the areas of implementation • Providing cross-cutting role across all thematic areas of the SAP II and hence working closely with all implementing partners
Weaknesses identified	<p>The weaknesses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor response to media and communication support functions MISA Zambia has been providing to SAP II implementing partners

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach has been hampered by limited manpower and financial resources
Most Significant Changes identified	<p>The Most Significant Changes (MSCs) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved monitoring and report writing (as a result of partner capacity assessment and subsequent capacity building) • Since SAP II lacked a Communications Strategy MISA Zambia went to all the target 13 districts in 2020 where the program is currently being implemented (in order to facilitate community advocacy for improved development processes and outcomes)
Lessons learned	<p>Lessons learned include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for effective planning and communication to improve activity implementation and collaboration in SAP II • Need for timely review and provision of feedback on partner reports (Narrative and Financial Reports) • Use of virtual platforms (such as MS Teams, Zoom, Google meet) to continually engage with partners, rights holders (RHs) and duty bearers (DBs)
4. Any other observations from Evaluation Team	
Notes	<p>The role of MISA Zambia in SAP II was critical as their involvement was cross-cutting and was key to all the five thematic areas. However, there was need for a Communication Strategy</p>

1. Identification	
Partner organization	Foundation for Democratic Process (FODEP)
Website	http://fodep.blogspot.com/
Contract period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract number DKNZ/SAPII/4866, initially starting on 1st November 2018 and ending on 28th February 2019. • The arrangement was to sign subsequent contracts for the period 2019-2021 dependent on partner performance. • First amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019 (granting two months' extension) • Second amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th September 2021 (two years and five months costed extension) • Third amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 31st December 2022 (one year and three months at an additional cost)
Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Year 1: Period from 1st November 2018 to 28th February 2019 = SEK 550,000 (same budget line for the amended contract period of 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Year 2: Period from 1st May 2019 to 31st December 2019 = SEK 698,500 • Budget Year 3: Period from 1st January 2020 to 31st December 2020 = SEK 535,000 • Budget Year 4: Period from 1st January 2021 to 30th September 2021 = SEK 310,000 • Budget Year 4/5: Period from 1st January 2021 to 31st December 2022 = SEK 400,000
Project Name	Enhancing Service Delivery Through Active Citizenship Project (as part of the broader SAP II)
Project partners	<p>Resource partners were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zambia Health Education Communications Trust (ZHECT): in the area Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and financial management processes <p>Implementing partner was:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MISA Zambia: support in the development of a media Communication Strategy for FODEP • Jesuits Center for Theological Reflection (JCTR): strengthened accountability, budget tracking and community service delivery monitoring • Extractive Industries Transparency Alliance (EITA): community environment, capacity building of groups and economic empowerment • Youth Alliance for Development (YAD): youth participation in sub-governance structures • Caritas Solwezi: community capacity building on issues of social accountability and budget tracking, service delivery monitoring • Non-Governmental Organizations Coordinating Council (NGOCC): gender mainstreaming, etc. and joint advocacy with duty bearers through chiefs and mining indabas
2. Contribution to SAP II	
Main focus area thematic competence	<p>The main focus areas or thematic competences are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democracy • Gender equality • Human rights
Contributing to SAP II outcome	<p>FODEP interventions and activities contributed to the following SAP II outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Outcome 2: Rights holders (men, women and youth) are holding duty bearers accountable and demanding for equitable access and distribution of national resources

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Outcome 4: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandates and effectively rights-based programs
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	<p>The strengths include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributing to the same overall goal and FODEP has experience in issues of strengthening good governance and democracy • Advocacy for effective and efficient service delivery and strength in political and social accountability issues
Weaknesses identified	<p>The weaknesses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volunteerism might affect the continued existence of project structures once SAP II comes to an end • Staff turnover: FODEP has experienced five resignations of Finance and Administration Officers (FAO) and three Executive Directors (EDs) since the commencement of SAP II • Inadequate collaborations with other SAP II partners at both local and national levels • Increase in statutory liabilities: tax and social security contributions, respectively, to the Zambia Revenue Authority (ZRA) and National Pension Scheme Authority (NAPSA)
Most Significant Changes identified	<p>The Most Significant Changes (MSCs) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhanced knowledge among rights holders (RHs) to hold duty bearers (DBs) accountable and also duty bearers are now more responsive to the demands and needs of rights holders • Enhanced communication and interaction between rights holders and duty bearers (local authority and central Government) • SAP II has created demand for up-scaling the project to support the formation and orientation of WDCs or districts, constituencies and wards
Lessons learned	<p>The lessons learned include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strength in unity by bringing different implementing partners and resource organizations since there is complementarity and increased capacity building and sharing of lessons and working together • Aspect of joint monitoring is good since it brings implementing partners from what other partners are doing • Capacity building: the bringing on board of resource organizations (though not fully utilized) is good for the SAP II

4. Any other observation from Evaluation Team	
Notes	Effectiveness of FODEP in SAP II has been hampered by staff turnover. This also affects Diakonia Zambia and overall effectiveness of SAP II (as new officers, including CEO have to be subjected to partner capacity building)

1. Identification	
Partner organization	Southern African Center for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (SACCORD)
Website	None. But does have a Facebook page: https://www.facebook.com/saccord.zm/
Contract period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract number DKNZ/SAPII/4870, initially starting on 1st November 2018 and ending on 28th February 2019. The arrangement was to sign subsequent contracts for the period 2019-2021 dependent on partner performance. First amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019 (granting two months' extension) Second amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th September 2021 (two years and five months costed extension) Third amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 31st December 2022 (one year and three months at an additional cost)
Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Year 1: Period from 1st November 2018 to 28th February 2019 = SEK 450,000 (same budget line for the amended contract period of 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019) Budget Year 2: Period from 1st May 2019 to 31st December 2019 = SEK 649,330 Budget Year 3: Period from 1st January 2020 to 31st December 2020 = SEK 520,580 Budget Year 4: Period from 1st January 2021 to 30th September 2021 = SEK 315,500 <p><u>New conditions:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Year 1: Period from 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019 = SEK 450,000 Budget Year 2: Period from 1st May 2019 to 31st December 2019 = SEK 324,665 Budget Year 3: Period from 1st January 2020 to 31st December 2020 = SEK 141,152 Budget Year 4: Period from 1st January 2021 to 31st January 2021 = SEK 77,786

	The partnership between Diakonia Zambia and SACCORD was, however, terminated through a three-month termination notice on 31 st January 2021.
Project Name	Building a Peaceful, Democratic and Accountability Culture in the Management of National and Natural Resources in Rural Districts of Zambia (as part of the broader SAP II)
Project partners	Implementing partners were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forum for Democratic Process (FODEP) in Chavuma and Zambezi district of North-Western Province: creation of community-based conflict resolution committees (involved trainings and capacity building with FODEP). FODEP focused on strengthening Ward Development Committees (WDCs) • Non-Governmental Organizations Coordinating Committee (NGOCC) in Mufumbwe of North-Western Province: was still in the planning phase (joint cross-cutting activities: conflict resolution and gender mainstreaming)
2. Contribution to SAP II	
Main focus area thematic competence	The main focus area or thematic competences are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peace and conflict resolution • Democracy • Social and economic justice
Contributing to SAP II outcome	SACCORD interventions and activities were aimed at contributing to the following SAP II outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Outcome 2: Rights holders (men, women and youth) are holding duty bearers accountable and demanding for equitable access and distribution of national resources • Program Outcome 3: Targeted DBs are ensuring social and environmental accountability in the management and exploitation of natural resources • Program Outcome 4: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandates and effectively rights-based programs
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	The strengths include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SACCORD had existing structures at community (Chavuma, Mufumbwe and Zambezi districts of North-Western Province) and national levels • Open door policy for engagement with rights holders (RHs) in the communities and policy makers at national level

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unique thematic cross-cutting area of peace building and conflict management (could be among rights holders (RHs) themselves or between RHs and duty bearers (DBs) or among DBs themselves)
Weaknesses identified	<p>The weaknesses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of consistency in being on the ground with communities or RHs to implement activities and ensure sustainability Failure by project staff to follow internal SACCORD guidelines and controls on retiring imprest within a stipulated after undertaking an activity Misappropriation of project funds leading to accountability challenges and Diakonia Zambia raising financial incidents after expenditure verification Staff turnover and departure of key project or SAP II personnel
Most Significant Changes identified	<p>The Most Significant Changes (MSCs) were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since SACCORD was only involved in the implementation of SAP II activities for one year and two months, unable to attribute any MSC
Lessons learned	<p>The lessons learned were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for continuous and sustained communication between Diakonia Zambia and SAP II partners for seamless implementation of programmed activities Complete lack of conflict management and resolution mechanism in the management of national and natural resources in the target areas for SAP II Need for effective dialogue and engagement between Diakonia Zambia and its partners to ensure the successful implementation of project activities
4. Any other observations from Evaluation Team	
Notes	There are no winners in the termination of the Diakonia Zambia-SACCORD partnership. However, SAP II implementation lost out on mainstreaming of peace building and conflict management

1. Identification	
Partner organization	Youth Alliance for Development (YAD)
Website	None
Contract period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract number DKNZ/SAPII/4871, initially starting on 1st November 2018 and ending on 28th February 2019. The arrangement was to sign subsequent contracts for the period 2019-2021 dependent on partner performance.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019 (granting two months' extension) • Second amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th September 2021 (two years and five months costed extension) • Third amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 31st December 2022 (one year and three months at an additional cost)
Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Year 1: Period from 1st November 2018 to 28th February 2019 = SEK 510,000 • Budget Year 2: Period from 1st May 2019 to 31st December 2019 = SEK 702,982 • Budget Year 3: Period from 1st January 2020 to 31st December 2020 = SEK 505,348 • Budget Year 4: Period from 1st January 2021 to 31st December 2022 = SEK 482,394 <p>YAD did not receive any funds in 2020 because it had left over funds from 2019.</p> <p>In 2021 No funds due to the incidence at Country and Partner level.</p>
Project Name	Building Youth Voices in Local Democracy and Accountability
Project partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collaborated well with Caritas Solwezi and JCTR e.g. on Value for money – if working in same area, they use the same vehicle and share fuel costs • Collaborated on Chiefs Indaba / Mining Indaba • JCTR provided some helpful resources – short courses – share and ensure that YAD is progressing at the same pace • FODEP provided useful information in helping handle the project regarding accountability and youth participation • WFC – 2019 – capacity building in house training and invited partners (3-5 days) tackling social accountability – YAD / Caritas Sowlezi / NGOCC – Training really helped with work on social accountability.
2. Contribution to SAP II	
Main focus area thematic competence	<p>The focus areas or thematic competences are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Train youth champions on youth inclusion and participation in local democracy and accountability and human rights-based approach to development
Contributing to SAP II outcome	YAD interventions and activities contributed to the following SAP II outcome:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome 2: RHs (men, women and youth) are holding duty bearers (DBs) accountable and demanding for equitable access and distribution of national resources • Outcome 4: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandates and effectively deliver rights-based programs
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	<p>The strengths include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • youth are focused, and energy driven towards the project outcome on the other hand working with duty bearers helps achieve results as they incorporate some of the proposed project interventions and youth demands in the district plans and other development implementation.
Weaknesses identified	<p>The weaknesses include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The weakness in working with youths as a primary target is that youths are in their transit phase and the likelihood of having new members is very high on the other hand duty bearers tend to show off the project as theirs especially elected officials
Most Significant Changes identified	<p>The Most Significant Changes (MSCs) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QUAS councils in schools have instilled governance learning in schools – takes away idle time and involvement in bad vices • Opened space to see duty bearers as people who can be approached and not feared – open space for democracy – leadership is opportunity to bring about change where people are found
Lessons learned	<p>Lessons learned include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • YAD has learned of the strong need to focus on continuous building of skills and Knowledge of the quasi councils, community youth voices club and youth champions that have been formed which will in turn make youths to be part of the decision-making processes and put them in charge of their own destiny as regards to development. • If YAD is to achieve results and impact beyond 2022, the youth groups need to slowly take over the work YAD has been doing. This will promote sustainability and longevity of the SAPII results as the program/project is end in 2022. • COVID-19 had a negative impact on implementation in that Physical activities could not be conducted, but at the same time Virtual platforms were used although not very effective.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued capacity building and quick response helps in addressing the gaps identified. Monitoring and reporting helps to track the results.
4. Any other observations from Evaluation Team	
Notes	None.

1. Identification	
Partner organization	Caritas Zambia
Website	https://www.caritaszambia.org/
Contract period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract number DKNZ/SAPII/4868, initially starting on 1st November 2018 and ending on 28th February 2019. The arrangement was to sign subsequent contracts for the period 2019-2021 dependent on partner performance. First amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019 (granting two months' extension) Second amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th September 2021 (two years and five months costed extension) Third amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 31st December 2022 (one year and three months at an additional cost)
Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Year 1: Period from 1st November 2018 to 28th February 2019 = SEK 801,429 (same budget line for the amended contract period of 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019) Budget Year 2: Period from 1st May 2019 to 31st December 2019 = SEK 915,942 Budget Year 3: Period from 1st January 2020 to 31st December 2020 = SEK 705,400 Budget Year 4: Period from 1st January 2021 to 30th September 2021 = SEK 410,000 Budget Year 4/5: Period from 1st January 2021 to 31st December 2022 = SEK 510,000
Project Name	Strengthened Transparency and Accountability Project (STAP)
Project partners	Had good collaboration with JCTR & Caritas Solwezi – examples are policy and community engagement in Kasempa and Mwinilunga; Chiefs Indaba & mining indaba
2. Contribution to SAP II	
Main focus area thematic competence	<p>The focus areas or thematic competences are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Economic and Social Accountability Program (ESAP):</i> <i>Democracy and Governance Program (DGP)</i> <i>Livelihoods and Climate Change Adaptation Program (LCCAP):</i> <i>Conflict Transformation and Peace Building (CTPBP)</i>

Contributing to SAP II outcome	<p>Caritas Zambia’s interventions and activities contributed to the following SAP II outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome 2: Rights Holders (men, women, youth), are holding duty bearers accountable and demanding for equitable access and distribution of national resources. • Outcome 3: Targeted duty bearers are ensuring social and environmental accountability in the management and exploitation of natural resources • Outcome 4: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandates and effectively deliver rights-based programs
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	<p>The strengths include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caritas is the chair of EITI council – Influence on the EITI • Strong network and structures under CCJP
Weaknesses identified	<p>The weaknesses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technological - different levels of communities • Delayed funding affected the work plan and the implementation schedule. • The elections adversely affected the implementation of activities
Most Significant Changes identified	<p>The Most Significant Changes (MSCs) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chilubwe and Chilobe community used to mine tin on hills with no protection and lots of children mining. CZ helped them to form cooperatives and apply for mining license. • They did not get the license as chief in the area gave the consent letter to someone else knowing the community was interested. However, through the cooperatives they were able to increase the sale price of their tin from K35 per KG now K135 per KG – coz now able to negotiate – • The new mines minister visited the communities and promised that govt would license them. • There are no longer children mining • Caritas is the chair of EITI council – Influence on the EITI Act – especially regarding mining companies not paying taxes which had negative consequences for communities as no money is going into the councils to work on infrastructure and services. • When the Bill came out at close of 2020, Civil Society’s position and recommendations came out very clearly.
Lessons learned	<p>Lessons learned include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lufwanyama – council was not getting money from mining companies. Through dialogue they discovered it

	<p>was because they never used to send invoices to mining companies. So, CZ brokered communication. Now they get their council payments, and the community is happy because the council is putting the money into service delivery for the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Simply find out if the key stakeholders are talking to each other and understanding each other's needs • Did not document activities before only started documenting them as gains as it was a major by the way thing – like the simple lack of communication between the council and the mines. CZ is now actively documenting stories. • Technology at community level is important for communication, lesson learned because of COVID pandemic. It is important to have one or two tablets in community for virtual meetings and following up / reporting on activities. • Sustainability plan is very important. • Case study emphasis- Greater level of detail and study is required at each stage. • Allow for realistic timing and a thorough understanding of the challenges to doing business in the target sites. • In remote undeveloped areas a more holistic approach is needed to ensure delivery of all the potential impacts
4. Any other observations from Evaluation Team	
Notes	None.

1. Identification	
Partner organization	Caritas Solwezi
Website	https://www.solwezidiocese.org.zm/caritas-solwezi/
Contract period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract number DKNZ/SAPII/4864, initially starting on 1st November 2018 and ending on 28th February 2019. • The arrangement was to sign subsequent contracts for the period 2019-2021 dependent on partner performance. • First amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019 (granting two months' extension) • Second amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 30th September 2021 (two years and five months costed extension) • Third amended project period: 1st November 2018 to 31st December 2022 (one year and three months at an additional cost)
Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget Year 1: Period from 1st November 2018 to 30th April 2019 = SEK 850,000

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Year 2: Period from 1st May 2019 to 31st December 2019 = SEK 911,859 Budget Year 3: Period from 1st January 2020 to 31st December 2020 = SEK 700,500 Budget Year 4/5: Period from 1st January 2021 to 31st December 2022 = SEK 690,828
Project Name	Iluunga Environmental Project
Project partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ZECHT training in M&E, worked with CTPD on issues to do with gold mining in Mwinilunga, collaborated on many issues with JCTR especially in social accountability issues. In Kalumbila, accompanied community members until they got compensation from cracking houses because of blasting activities of Lumwana mining. Training from NGOCC on gender issues Host mining and chiefs' indabas and work together as partners
2. Contribution to SAP II	
Main focus area thematic competence	<p>The main focus areas or thematic competences are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental awareness and the promotion of sustainable livelihoods and environmental accountability for the benefit of present and future generations
Contributing to SAP II outcome	<p>Caritas Solwezi's interventions and activities contributed to the following SAP II outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome 1: Rights holders (RHs), in targeted districts of Zambia, are promoting and influencing practices and policies for Gender Equity and Equality (GEE) Outcome 2: Rights Holders (men, women, youth), are holding duty bearers accountable and demanding for equitable access and distribution of national resources. Outcome 3: Targeted duty bearers are ensuring social and environmental accountability in the management and exploitation of natural resources Outcome 4: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandates and effectively deliver rights-based programs
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	<p>The strengths include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental advocacy and community engagement Strong structures through the wider CCJP network Recognition within the community
Weaknesses identified	<p>The weaknesses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mismatch between indicators provided by Diakonia and what is prevailing on the ground. Diakonia say their

	<p>strategy now is more flexible, so for the program to be more relevant they should allow the partners to develop their own indicators according to what is prevailing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long distances to project sites and implementation areas make implementation challenging.
Most Significant Changes identified	<p>The Most Significant Changes (MSCs) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communities are more engaging and freer to speak on radio and television – used to be confrontational rather than engaging – so trainings help them engage and explain things without resorting to violence and confrontation. • So even when the program ends – communities will still be engaged • Livelihood programs have also been helpful • Mindset change – community members are beginning to understand their rights and holding duty bearers accountable.
Lessons learned	<p>The lessons learned include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to have a contingency allocation in the project budget to meet unforeseen circumstances or emergencies • Escalation of the COVID-19 pandemic has increased the cost of implementation • Blending non-economic and economic methods increases commitment of communities
4. Any other observations from Evaluation Team	
Notes	None.

Resource Organizations

1. Identification	
Partner organization	Africa Directions (AD) ⁹⁷
Website	https://africadirections.org/
Contract period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract for the period 01.11.2019 - 31.12.2020 signed 20.11.2019.⁹⁸ • The new 2022 contract as Implementing Partner was not yet available, when the evaluation report was finalized.
Budgets	<p>Budget for the first contract: SEK 306,350 - as Resource Organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2019: SEK 91,905 • 2020: SEK 153,175 + SEK 61,270

⁹⁷ Progress reports from AD were not available for the ET.

⁹⁸ The ET did not receive the contract for the 2021 period.

	Budget for the second contract: SEK 589,790 - as Implementing Partner
Project Name	Not applicable for Resource Organizations.
Project partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AD operated as a Resource Organization from 2019-2021, but had initially applied to become an Implementing Partner. In January 2022, agreement was made with Diakonia to transit to operate as Implementing Partner for the remaining program period up to 30.06.2022. As a Resource Organization, AD focused on capacity building of implementing partners on youth engagement and youth mainstreaming aimed at strengthening capacity to support youth participation and active citizenship in governance, rural community development and cooperation with local authorities, as well as strengthening of documentation, learning and evidence-based advocacy through participatory theatre and youth-centered community development models. AD has trained YAD, EITA and FODEP, and participated in exchange visit with Women for Change in Kalomo.
2. Contribution to SAP II	
Main focus area thematic competence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “AD is a youth led organization that aims to build the capacity, skills and confidence of Zambian youths from childhood so they can make informed decisions about their life, and to change negative peer pressure into positive peer education. Their expertise is required to support SAP II partners with youth engaging approaches.”⁹⁹ The main focus and competence was engagement of youth, girls and young women and mobilization and awareness building through the use of the Forum Theatre methodology. Strong capacity on gender transformative approaches and integrated gender mainstreaming.
Contributing to SAP II outcome	<p>AD interventions and activities contributed to the following SAP II outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program outcome 3: Targeted duty bearers are ensuring social and environmental accountability in the management and exploitation of natural resources Program outcome 4: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandate and effectively deliver rights-based programs

⁹⁹ SAP II Annual Report 2019, 31.03.2020, p. 28.

	<p>In their new role as Implementing Partner, AD will contribute to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program outcome 2: Rights Holders (men, women, youth) are holding duty bearers accountable and demanding for equitable access and distribution of natural resources.
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AD's main strength lies in youth engagement with focus on inclusion of girls and young women through a gender transformative approach. • AD has a strong awareness on the need to build awareness and knowledge of environment among young people. • AD has a long and acknowledged track-record in working with participatory theatre for change in community development and as a method for evidence-based advocacy for rights.
Weaknesses identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A major weakness in the SAP II implementation has been the lack of opportunity to monitor and follow-up on trainings and capacity building in 2021. AD therefore had difficulties in verifying results of the training efforts when the evaluation took place.
Most Significant Changes identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development of the Participatory Theatre for Change model is a major achievement of AD. It included the preparation of guidelines and principles, field testing and roll-out. As a result, implementing partners under SAP II are now capable of undertaking theatres themselves. • During COVID-19, a decision to go digital was taken by AD, i.e. start working through social media platforms at a bigger scale. This included the production of short videos targeted youth. The change was acknowledged by Diakonia and represented a flexible adaptation as well as an innovation in the hitherto approach to youth engagement. • AD also states MSCs from other partner organizations, e.g. EITA's use of public hearings involving multiple stakeholders; WFC's work with traditional leadership at village level scaled up through an exchange program in various project areas.
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In general, AD has a basic philosophy of learning, always open for taking in new thinking and approaches (the half cup approach). This has contributed to proving that youth-led organizations can be sustainable - AD is still operating after 20 years.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While working with training and capacity building of Diakonia's partners in Solwezi in 2020 and 2021, AD learned about the importance of engaging also mining companies in the awareness activities for them to be part of the projects through corporate social responsibility and in support of youth projects. • Through SAP II, AD had the first experience in working with the mining sector - an area which the organizations intends to pursue in future in order to strengthen the voice of the host communities and mining sector's contribution to local development.
4. Any other observations from Evaluation Team	
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AD stressed the PCCs as an excellent platform for exchange of lessons learned and experience and for scaling up the results.

1. Identification	
Partner organization	National Legal Aid Clinic for Women (NLACW)¹⁰⁰
Website	https://womens-legal-clinic.com/
Contract period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract for the period 01.11.2019 - 31.12.2020 signed without a date of signature. • Amendment for the period 01.01.2021 to 30.06.2022 signed 29.07.2021.
Budgets	Budget for the first contract: SEK 306,350 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2019: SEK 91,905 • 2020: SEK 153,175 + SEK 61,270 Budget for 2022: SEK 300,000
Project Name	Not applicable for Resource Organizations.
Project partners¹⁰¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-training test of implementing partners on advocacy skills and engagement with policy and lawmakers. • All 10 partner organizations have been trained. • Trained 8 candidates (4 female and 4 male) from three Implementing Partners namely, FODEP, YAD, EITA and NGOCC. (North-Western on methods for engaging boys and men to shift traditional norms and practices • Trained 23 field animators (paralegals) 13 female and 10 male from project target areas who were introduced to partners in their operational areas for enhanced coordination and referral of cases, etc. • Developed a Policy Brief on Women's Limited Access, Ownership, and Control of Land in Zambia: under the theme "A Hidden Treasure"

¹⁰⁰ Progress reports from NLACW were not available for the ET.

¹⁰¹ Including information from the NLACW PP-presentation used at the PCC-meeting, February 2022.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed a policy brief on loan contraction and sustainability. Copies of the briefs will be shared with partners and will also inform the engagement of parliamentarians during 1st quarter of 2022
2. Contribution to SAP II	
Main focus area thematic competence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “NLACW will build the capacity of partner organizations to effectively engage men and boys to address social norms and challenge patriarchy systems in operational areas for transformative change. The organization will further provide technical support to the project partners through the training in paralegal work of partner focal point persons in the various project sites.”¹⁰² NLACW has extensive experience and strong capacity within the area of legislation, gender, policy and law reforms.
Contributing to SAP II outcome	<p>NLACW interventions and activities contributed to the following SAP II outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Outcome 1: Rights Holders in targeted districts of Zambia are promoting and influencing practices and policies for Gender Equity and Equality Program Outcome 4: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandate and effectively deliver rights-based programs
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NLACW has a very strong profile on women’s rights, gender rights and legal aid, including also legislative advocacy. This is based on high level of professional skills and a profound knowledge and awareness of social norms and stereotypes causing discrimination against women. NCLAW deliberately works with both genders to ensure that laws and policies are strengthened to protect the rights of women and children on an equal basis with men.
Weaknesses identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NLACW found that there is a need for allocating resources for training in paralegal work to ensure compliance with the policy and the Legal Aid Act. In general, NLACW stated that there was limited structured coordination among the resource organizations beyond the PCC meetings, supposedly because they were brought on board after the SAP II program had already been implemented for a year.

¹⁰² SAP II Annual Report 2019, 31.03.2020, p. 28.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Furthermore, there was no coordination of gender capacity building undertaken by NLACW and WFC. Monitoring and follow-up of training was put on hold in 2021 and will take place in 2022.
Most Significant Changes identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NLACW noticed an increased capacity with the implementing partners trained in engaging in policy dialogue. This was confirmed by the fact that MISA, CTPD, NGOCC and JCTR were invited to engage in parliamentary submissions and thereby influence policy development at national level.
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The use of virtual platforms for training of implementing partners during COVID-19 was a challenge. It was, however, found useful and NCLAW adopted other initiatives to mitigate the challenges of e-training.
4. Any other observations from Evaluation Team	
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NLACW strongly emphasized the importance of the exchange that took place during the PCC meetings, which offer the opportunity for peer feed-back. But a separate forum for resource organizations would provide a platform for further strengthening the learning on capacity building.

1. Identification	
Partner organization	Center for Trade Policy and Development (CTPD)
Website	https://ctpd.org.zm/
Contract period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract number DKNZ/SAP/5029, initially starting on 1st November 2019 and ending on 31st December 2020. The arrangement was to sign subsequent contracts for the period 2019-2021 dependent on partner performance. First amended project period: 1st January 2021 to 30th June 2022 (granting one year six months' extension at an additional cost)
Budgets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Budget Period 1: Period from 1st November 2019 to 31st December 2020 = SEK 306,350 Budget Period 2: Period from 1st January 2021 to 30th June 2022 = SEK 210,000
Project Name	Zambia Strengthened Accountability Program II Resources Organizations Interventions
Project partners	<p>Implementing partners whose capacities were built were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Caritas Solwezi: mineral taxation trainings to better influence policy reform for effective tax policies Caritas Zambia: mineral taxation trainings to better influence policy reform for effective tax policies

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extractive Industries Transparency Accountability (EITA): mineral taxation trainings to better influence policy reform for effective tax policies and building research capacities • Forum for Democratic Process (FODEP): development of infographics and conducting the Mining Indaba in Mwinilunga • Jesuits Center for Theological Reflection (JCTR): mineral taxation trainings to better influence policy reform for effective tax policies and building research capacities • MISA Zambia: mineral taxation trainings to better influence policy reform for effective tax policies and building research capacities • Non-Governmental Organizations Coordinating Committee (NGOCC): issues of gender: review of gender policy and hosted a training on gender • Youth Alliance for Development (YAD): building research capacities, development of infographics and organizing the Mining Indaba in Mwinilunga • Women for Change (WfC): issues of gender: review of gender policy and hosted a training on gender
2. Contribution to SAP II	
Main focus area thematic competence	<p>The main focus areas or thematic competences are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social and economic justice • Research on gold mining • Dissemination of information and advocacy <p>“CTPD will work to build the capacity of partners so that they are better equipped to empower rights holders and hold duty bearers accountable by demanding for equitable access and distribution of natural resources. This follows the experience CTPD has gained over the years in doing similar kind of work.”¹⁰³</p>
Contributing to SAP II outcome	<p>CTPD interventions and activities have been contributing to the following SAP II outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Outcome 3: Targeted DBs are ensuring social and environmental accountability in the management and exploitation of natural resources • Program Outcome 4: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandates and effectively rights-based programs
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	The strengths include:

¹⁰³ SAP II Annual Report 2019, 31.03.2020, p. 28.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CTPD has strength in research methodologies and data analysis, policy research and reform (which are key for capacity building of implementing partners) • Good and useful networks at both national and local levels which are key for policy advocacy and influence • Enhancing of capacities of implementing partners is a catalyst to improved achievement of results at the local levels (both with rights holders (RHs) and duty bearers (DBs))
Weaknesses identified	<p>The weaknesses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CTPD would want to embrace both roles of implementing partner as well as that of a resource organization • Low or lack of interaction and coordination among resource partners or organizations (including CTPD, National Legal Aid Clinic for Women (NLACW) and Zambia Health Education Communications Trust (ZHECT)) • Work undertaken by resource partners only ends at capacity building (no follow-ups on determining the effectiveness of the training or impact of the training on the RHs and DBs)
Most Significant Changes identified	<p>The Most Significant Changes (MSCs) include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptance of findings of the Gold Mining Study by the Ministry of Mines and Mineral Development (MMMD) and adoption of the proposed Game Plan (leading to the discussions on the proposed formulation of the Policy on Gold and Manganese Mining in Zambia) • Research capacities and skills developed in implementing partners (though this cannot be a one-off event: should be ongoing and long-term)
Lessons learned	<p>The lessons learned include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the recent past Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) have failed to create a critical mass, but the approach used by Diakonia Zambia has responded to that failure • For CSOs at national and local levels to effectively conduct as CSOs, there is need to determine the level at which each CSO is (resource partners interacting with those interacting with communities or Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) to complement each other creates sustainability • How SAP II has pushed to identify strengths and gaps in organizational capacities which are used to complement each other and share lessons (hence used to

	adjust programming and introduce capacity building and has helped improve information sharing and enhance capacities)
4. Any other observations from Evaluation Team	
Notes	No evidence of collaborations between resource partners or organizations to undertake joint capacity building of implementing partners. This would foster and enhance capacity building

1. Identification	
Partner organization	Zambia Health education and Communication (ZHECT) ¹⁰⁴
Website	http://www.zhect.org.zm/
Contract period	<p>[Consult the Contracts and disbursement overview + the contracts for each organization]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract for the period 01.11.2019 - 31.12.2020 signed 01.11.2019. Amendment for the period 01.01.2021 to 30.06.2022 signed 29.07.2021 Amendment for the period 01.01.2021 to 30.06.2022 signed 10.01.2022
Budgets	<p>Budget for the first contract: SEK 306,350</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2019: SEK 91,905 2020: SEK 153,175 + SEK 61,270 <p>Budget for 2022: SEK 250,000</p>
Project Name	Not applicable for Resource Organizations.
Project partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ZHECT has provided capacity building of FODEP, Caritas Solwezi (building M&E system and financial management, and of YAD in reviewing and revising their constitution (capacity building with NGOCC and EITA still pending)
2. Contribution to SAP II	
Main focus area thematic competence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “ZHECT will together with Diakonia logically sequence capacity development interventions that will involve the use of an integrated Institutional Development Framework (IDF) Toolkit for partners to address shortcomings in the field of institutional development and program implementation approaches in among others: Service Delivery; Rights holders participation; Ability to work with central and local government; and Monitoring and Evaluation.”¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁴ Progress reports from ZHECT were not available for the ET.

¹⁰⁵ SAP II Annual Report 2019, 31.03.2020, p. 29.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ZHECT's main capacity building focus was building monitoring and evaluation capacity with implementing partners, including the definition of indicators and data collection tools. • ZHECT also trained implementing partner organizations in governance issues and finance and administration, i.e. formulation of policies and guidelines.
Contributing to SAP II outcome	<p>ZHECT interventions and activities contributed to the following SAP II outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Outcome 4: Partner organizations have increased capacity to implement their mandate and effectively deliver rights-based programs
3. Key Findings	
Strengths identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ZHECT saw an advantage in joining SAP II as a resource organization as it helped the organization fulfil its own strategic objective of building capacity of smaller CSOs. • ZHECT is a strong resource organization with extensive experience in capacity building. • ZHECT emphasized Diakonia's very proactive feedback and follow-up on implementation and reporting. • Feedback was once provided in a triangular arrangement between YAD, ZHECT and Diakonia, which was a very fruitful experience.
Weaknesses identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Late disbursements of funds did, according to ZHECT, characterize the SAP II program and delayed the implementation and accomplishment of the Capacity Building Plan 2018-2021. Also, the scarcity of funds limited the scope and results of capacity building activities undertaken. • In spite of good quality of feedback on reports, Diakonia's feedback was characterized by being late. • ZHECT found that there had been limited exchange of experience among involved partner organizations.
Most Significant Changes identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ZHECT had difficulties in identifying Most Significant Changes, as there had been no follow-up or monitoring in 2021, hence no information on the results and achievements of the capacity building activities. However, there is hope that the efforts to strengthen M&E capacity and capacity to provide data and evidence for decision making.
Lessons learned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ZHECT drew a number of lessons learned related to program management and implementation: importance

	of frequent on-site financial reviews and organizational checks, annual audits and solid financial and administrative guidelines.
4. Any other observations from Evaluation Team	
Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ZHECT stressed the importance of Resource Organizations being brought on board at the same time as Implementing Organizations, especially when capacity building in specific areas, e.g. governance and M&E influence directly on the quality of program implementation and results achieved.



Strengthened Accountability Program II

The purpose of the evaluation was to evaluate progress and results of the SAP II implemented by Diakonia with focus on determination of effectiveness and efficiency; identification of key learnings and success stories. The evaluation team concluded that the program is a valuable and relevant investment with a strategic focus on human rights, gender, rights holders and environmental issues, as well as the capacity to adapt the program to changed circumstances. Learning is a bearing element in the program approach, and compilation of lessons learned has led to timely and pertinent program changes. The program approach is unique with solid evidence of coherence and synergy among partner organizations, as well as with different stakeholders.

In terms of effectiveness, there is evidence for implementation of activities on the ground, but limited evidence on how this is linked to national level advocacy. The efficiency was difficult to assess due to unforeseen break of momentum in implementation during 2020-2021. The grant management approach appeared solid and well-structured, albeit human resources constraints at the country office. The report contains recommendations.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden. Office: Valhallavägen 199, Stockholm

Telephone: +46 [0]8-698 50 00. Telefax: +46 [0]8-20 88 64

E-mail: info@sida.se. Homepage: <http://www.sida.se>

