

BACKGROUND

Civil Society for Poverty Reduction (CSPR) is a civil society network, hosted by the Jesuits Centre for Theological Reflection (JCTR), that came together in October 2000 with the main objective of ensuring that civil society, from different backgrounds and in diverse locations effectively participated in the formulation of Zambia's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP). The PRSP was launched in July 2002 and reflects a fairly large amount of civil society's concerns in poverty reduction.

Despite its effectiveness in contributing to the formulation of the PRSP, civil society and the beneficiaries of these programmes are yet to see desirable levels of implementation and the hope for outcomes. Apart from monitoring the implementation of this plan, civil society needs to regularly conduct lobby and advocacy activities to provide a voice for the voiceless, to ensure that the government and donors are heading the right direction to the benefit of the poor.

For this reason, CSPR through the Information Dissemination and Advocacy Task Force, organised a three and half days training workshop in lobby and advocacy skills which took place from 20th to 23rd October, 2003 at Laughing Waters Lodge, thirty minutes out of Lusaka town.

WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS

INTRODUCTORY SESSION:

The introductory session was at 18:30hrs, on Sunday, 19th October. The aim of this session was to introduce concepts of advocacy and for participants to introduce themselves and the organizations represented.

The facilitator, Mr. Windu Matoka started the by prodding the participants that they need to be vibrant as they belonged to civil society and needed to speak for the voiceless. He welcomed everybody on behalf of CSPR. He reminded the participants that the workshop had been made possible by well wishers who had the interests of CSPR at heart and the participants should therefore utilize the four days wisely. His role was to guide the training so that participants are able to advocate effectively in activities of civil society.

Mrs. Besinati Mpepo, CSPR Coordinator, gave the welcome remarks. She informed participants that the workshop had been made possible by the support of cooperating partners such as DFID, GTZ, DIAKONIA and FES. She said the main aim of the workshop was to equip the participants in order for them to advocate effectively both within their organizations and the CSPR Network.

EXPECTATIONS:

The participants were asked when they expected to achieve from the training workshop and they came up with the following points:

- To learn more on advocacy and the many dimensions of using it.
- To be able to articulate issues on advocacy
- In order to understand what advocacy is
- How to measure successful advocacy

- Practical aspects of strategies that can be helpful in civil society’s work.
- How advocacy can work as a tool for development
- How to relate to government and the same time advocate for what we want.

Mr. Matoka assured the participants that by the time the workshop ended, they would have come up with an advocacy plan that could used in advocacy campaigns in the various organizations.

CONCEPTS AS ADVOCACY

To illustrate the basic concepts of advocacy, Mr. Matoka made a comparison of Zambia to a limited company, as in the table below:

ZAMBIA	COMPANY
PEOPLE	SHAREHOLDERS
CONSTITUTION	ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION
GENERAL ELECTIONS (five years)	ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING
PRESIDENT AND PARLIAMENT	BOARD OF DIRECTORS
CABINET	MANAGEMENT TEAM
DEVELOPMENT PLANS	VISION AND OPERATION PLAN
IMPROVED LIVING CONDITIONS	PROFITS

Coming from civil society, we should realize that Zambia is our only country. We should be looking at Zambia as a limited company made up of shareholders, just as Zambia is made up of people. When the people meet to form the company, they draw up an article of association – a document that governs the operations of the company. In the same way, Zambians at independence came up with a constitution drawn by the people, for the people and with the people. A company provides for an annual general meeting yearly to select a board of directors, while a country holds general elections every five years to elect a president and members of parliament. The Board of Directors appoint a management team, just as a president will appoint his cabinet. The management team is expected to set up the vision and operation plans, just as government draws up national development plans. The company’s plans are meant to bring in profits whose dividends go to the shareholders. Likewise, government development plans are meant to bring in improved living standards for the people. If the company does not work as expected, they have the right to question the board of directors and fire them. In ensuring that the right people are voted into power and development is brought to the people, the power rests in the people. That is where advocacy comes in, to ensure that we have the right people in power.

- It is up to civil society to educate the people on rights so that they are not manipulated.

- Why are we wallowing in poverty, if at all? We are stakeholders and we need leaders who come through the civil society so that they are accountable and transparent.

OBJECTIVES:

The objectives of the workshop were outlined as follows:

- (i) To introduce the different concepts of advocacy
- (ii) To take participants through the process of an advocacy campaign (the ten elements of an advocacy campaign)

GROUND RULES:

The participants were asked to draw up ground rules that would guide them throughout the workshop period. They came up with the following:

- ❖ Observe time
- ❖ Phones to be on silent tone
- ❖ Respect personal opinions
- ❖ Have energizers during long sessions
- ❖ Encourage active participation by all.

DAY TWO

THE THREE SECTORS OF SOCIETY

Mr. Matoka explained that democratic societies are made up of three sectors. These are the public sector, private sector and civil society. Civil society is a vital sector, as it is the citizens themselves.

- The three are intertwined because they interact and depend on each other and as such should operate as partners. All three sectors should find common ground
- Civil society should get well organized and advocate to make life better for the citizens – this is a critical role for civil society in Zambia. For example, civil society managed to halt the third term bid. Civil society has to intervene when things are not happening the way they should.
- To be effective, civil society needs to be alert and understand processes that lead to policy formulation.
- The onus would be on civil society to build capacity among citizens to make them aware of their rights. Advocacy cannot succeed if civil society is not made aware of their rights. There is also need to create awareness among citizens that some NGOs are morally upright and there's a lot of dignity in what they try to achieve on issues of national importance.

Citizens expect civil society to do certain things to improve and protect their well-being. They must be seen to supplement government's efforts. Whilst government has the mandate and power to do their job, civil society does not have surety to carry out their tasks, as there is no written policy to that effect.

It was observed that government may not know that they are supposed to be monitored by civil society as they most of the times ignore NGOs. However, NGOs should know what they want to do, and do it effectively. Then it would not be

possible for government to suppress their efforts. If civil society submits to hopelessness, nothing can be done. It is vital to be sure of their roles and responsibilities so as to give government the confidence to co-operate.

DEFINITION OF ADVOCACY

In this session, participants were asked to define advocacy from their own understanding. The following definitions came out:

- (i) A group of people that gets together to influence a specific issue
- (ii) Advocating for an issue on behalf of the people
- (iii) Knowledge, credibility, influence to change, enforce issues that affect the masses
- (iv) To talk on behalf of someone who is ignorant or who cannot talk (silent voice). Voicing out in an organized way.

A working definition from the attached manual was then given and the key terms defined:

Definition of Advocacy:

“A systematic, democratic and organized effort by concerned parties to change, influence or initiate policies, laws or programmes, so that disadvantaged citizens in particular and all citizens in general, may benefit.”

Systematic – must be properly planned. The five W and one H must apply (who what, where when why and how). There is need for a lot of resources in order to embark on a successful campaign, what activities will be lined up, strategic locations, rationale behind the activity, division of roles or responsibilities, lobbying for support from other stakeholders, come up with clear time-table of how everything will be done, and methodology to be applied.

Democratic – the campaign must involve people willingly – let the people support you because they feel it is a noble and beneficial cause. (By the people, for the people and with the people).

Organized – in terms of implementation, the actual action should be as planned – what you planned is what you actually do – everybody should know what is expected of them.

Change – to change policies and programmes that you do not like or that are not beneficial to the general citizenry. Initiate laws, policies that would be beneficial but are not yet in place so that disadvantaged citizens will benefit.

- There is no specific time frame for a successful advocacy campaign, but the process should neither be rushed nor dragged, depending on the issue. When rushed, a lot of mistakes may be made, omissions will occur. Some issues by nature are urgent, but still need planning, systematic and increase contingencies – the steps put in place as an insurance against mistakes.
- Planning will ensure safety valves are in place. It will also allow for monitoring and evaluation systems to measure the campaign.

ADVOCACY TACTICS

The facilitator guided the participants through the advocacy tactics in the manual, asking them to tick beside whichever tactic they felt their organization had used before. He later urged participants to write up a short report of the workshop and implore their organizations to use all the tactics as they go back to their various organizations. A SWOT analysis can be done on the tactics to see which tactics can be effectively applied in a specific advocacy issue and invite other like-minded organizations to share experiences as a learning process.

GROUP WORK:

Participants were divided into three groups and asked to answer two questions within twenty minutes.

Questions:

1. What can NGOs do in order to get more organized and stronger?
2. What legal environment must exist in any country for advocacy to work?

GROUP 1

1.
 - a. NGOs need to have more members
 - b. Create partnerships/coalitions with a clear structure and mandate
 - c. Build capacity for civil society organizations such as planning skills, financing, research
 - d. Share a clear mission and vision to accrue value to members.
 - e. Have focused specific objectives
2.
 - a. The need for a favorable environment
 - b. CSOs can also work in situations where negative laws exist
 - c. Removing oppressive Acts which are not in conformity with the tenets of democracy
 - d. Need to make a law that makes it mandatory for government to consult CSO in issues such as debt procurement, trade agreements, letter of intent
 - e. Access to information through the abolition of the State Secrets act

GROUP 2

1.
 - a. Strengthen existing networks
 - b. Build capacities to effectively carry out activities
 - c. Get more members
 - d. Understanding how government, private sector and civil society operate
 - e. Resource mobilization
2.
 - a. Freedom of association and speech.
 - b. Clear regulatory framework for formulation of NGOs
 - c. Independent judicial system
 - d. A legal framework to guide the relationship between government and civil society

- e. A legal framework to compel government to support civil society initiatives through funding

GROUP 3

1.
 - a. Capacity Building within NGOs in order to have a technical know-how on implementation of programmes and projects by government
 - b. Networking, giving organizations the opportunity to share information and co-ordinate activities, as well as comparing notes
 - c. Transparency to earn trust and confidence in project implementation.
2.
 - a. Freedom of expression
 - b. Freedom of Association
 - c. Separation of powers – the three organs of government may suppress the advocacy work.

SUMMARY

After submissions from the groups, Mr. Matoka gave a summary of what he hoped to achieve from the questions:

1. NGO advocacy and power – the measurement of the power/strength of an NGO that delivers, have a sound financial base and has impact on the ground. He guided the participants through the “*NGO advocacy and power*” principles in the manual, as well as the “*Advocacy and politics*”. He emphasized the NGOs must be aware of issues and be able to analyze them, if need be, experts should be engaged to give talks on issues that are not easily understood. Attracting attention is more feasible when an NGO can produce results.
2. Legal environment - “*Advocacy in democracy and democratic governance*”. It is up to civil society to amend or reinforce some laws if they feel they are too weak, and advocate for those that we feel are relevant to effective advocacy, to identify short comings that inhibit and impede our activities and work to improve and harmonize them to get what we want.

ADVOCACY AND RELATED CONCEPTS

The participants were again requested to go back into their groups. They were asked to study handout 2A in the manual – “*Advocacy and related concepts*”, and answer the given question.

Question – By giving examples on each concept, please identify ways in which Information Education and Communication (IEC), community mobilization and public relations can be used to enhance the enhance the advocacy process.

GROUP 1:

IEC – e.g. Unfair trade – gather (collect) simplify and dissemination to the public.

Education – to create awareness – this can be done through outreach, reading and identification of appropriate media such as electronic media, print, popular theatre and music.

Linkage – advocacy through information and persuasion and support through petitions.

Community mobilization – e.g PRSP implementation – conduct community audit services – e.g., water, health, education facilities.

- Information dissemination leading to community mobilization,
- To empower local communities to hold leaders accountable.

Public Relations – e.g., the ability to engage influential officials, both government and donors.

- Image building to reclaim lost glory through workshops, press releases, debates.
- Making informed decisions on policies.

GROUP 2

The group took the Third Term Bid as an example.

IEC – Information was disseminated through flyers, honking the green ribbon campaign, etc.

- The Oasis forum created awareness on the implications of the third term.

Public relations – the Oasis forum explained to the public who they were, what they stood for and why they were taking their stance through the media and other fora.

- The forum increased public perception of the issue at hand and won confidence/support of the people.

Community mobilization – they mobilized policy makers, private sector, civil society, students, the donor community through debates at national and district debates. They also held country wide meetings.

- The above can be used to enhance the advocacy process created community participation and ownership. In the end, the people’s wish prevailed when Chiluba backed down on his bid.

GROUP 3

Approach	Actor	Target Audience	Objective	Strategy	Measuring success
IEC	Community Based Organizations (CBOs)	Every member of the community	Raise awareness, provide remedies	Peer education, workshops, radio programmes, posters	Monitoring and evaluation processes
Community Mobilization (Issue – Child defilement)	Community Based Organization (CBOs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Headmen - Parents - Church - Schools - Rural 	To raise an enlightened society on issues of child	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sensitization workshops - Village meetings - Life skills 	Monitoring and evaluation

		Health Centers - Political leaders - Community members	defilement	training	
--	--	--	------------	----------	--

SUMMARY

Advocacy goal– Enactment of a law that provides for stiffer punishment of defilers.

IEC – Use it to raise awareness on the dangers of defilement in order to get support from target audience, e.g., community – women and youth.

Public Relations – seek to get the message “Stop child defilement” or “Stiffer punishment for child defilers”, included in commercial institutions, e.g., adverts.

Community Mobilization – take advantage of community mobilization programmes to include a message on the dangers of defilement and solicit their support in your advocacy.

SKILLS NEEDED IN ADVOCACY WORK

From the lesson learnt thus far, participants were asked what they thought were the skills needed to carry out effective advocacy. These were later compared and complimented to the “*Skills needed in NGO advocacy work*” in the manual. The following skills were suggested:

- Communication Skills
- Negotiating Skills
- Planning/strategizing skills
- Analytical skills
- Co-ordinating skills
- Research skills
- Mobilizing
- Self monitoring
- Documentation

The following points were subsequently noted:

- ❖ There is need to introduce member NGOs to leadership skills training for effective co-ordination of advocacy.
- ❖ A target audience is not an institution but the person who has to make the decision.
- ❖ There is need to identify special allies and persuade them to join your campaign.
- ❖ It is important to be able to read reactions (body language) to enable effective strategizing.
- ❖ The Advocates must be able to listen to what people are saying – they may bring out important points.
- ❖ Advocacy has its own risks and benefits. The higher the risk, the bigger the returns, as long as things are well calculated and well managed.

- ❖ It is essential to hold a high opinion of the organization and cause you are working for, as a low opinion will result in failure of the advocacy campaign (believe in what you are doing).
- ❖ Advocates should have the courage and perseverance to face forces working against the campaign.

EVALUATION OF DAY 2

At the end of the day, participants were asked to evaluate the day and point out any areas of improvement, if any.

- Lunch time should be more strict and according to the timetable to avoid losing time.
- The facilitation was very good and participative
- Too many disruptions from participants during sessions – urged to speak through the chair.
- The instructions on the last group work were not very clear – facilitator should give more guidance in the groups.
- Participants were urged to give positive criticism as this was a learning platform to build up from what other organizations are doing.

DAY 3

MEASURES TO AVOID CONFLICT

Noting that it was not possible to avoid conflict but instead *minimize* it, the participants gave what they thought would be measures to take in order to minimize conflicts during advocacy.

- ❖ Engage in dialogue – get to know each other.
- ❖ Broaden the networking base
- ❖ Have a spirit of give and take
- ❖ Find areas of collaboration (dialogue).
- ❖ Sharing our mission and vision and being transparent.
- ❖ Constructive criticism

Mr. Matoka then took the participants through the manual under the topic “*What NGOs can do to foster constructive relations with government and avoid (minimize) conflict*”, with some elaborations on some points.

- Good governance is democratic, transparent, has the rule of law, periodic elections, audits – government will be compelled to listen to comments from advocates with such attributes.
- People should not doubt when they look at your capacity to implement your activities. Certain resources can be outsourced.
- Most donors concentrate on project implementation and overlook costs for administration and staff capacity building and remuneration. Organizations need to find other sources of funding for these if they want to stay strong.

- If the organization's track record is bad, it will raise questions from government and other people who will doubt your credibility.
- Under the Societies Act, it is imperative to submit annual returns. There is need to be accountable to the public and government, not only to their source of funding. The target groups also need to know what the NGOs are doing. Reports may be intended for members, audience, donors, but these should also go to government wings.
- Sometimes, NGOs find barriers in consulting with government. Most times they're not co-operative. Other initiative of getting to government must be strategized. It is incumbent upon civil society organizations to remind government ministries of their duties. Government is slowly removing suspicious barriers, mostly due to pressure and to portray a picture that they are a listening government.
- Sometimes, donors come with activities which they impose as conditions for funding NGOs. However, it is essential that NGOs maintain the principles and independence as donors are the only reliable source of funds in Zambia at the moment due to the poverty situation. NGOs also engage in business ventures as a way of raising funds for projects.
- It is vital for NGOs to assess themselves from the point of view of government so that government will be willing to cooperate when advocacy campaigns are carried out.

CRITERIA FOR CHOOSING AN ADVOCACY ISSUE

After going through the topic of the "Criteria for choosing an advocacy issue in the manual, participants came up with a list of burning issues that are obstacles to the fight to reduce poverty as CSPR.

- I. Unclear government policy
- II. Poor rural infrastructure
- III. Misplaced priorities
- IV. Lack of trade guidelines
- V. Zambia's huge debt burden
- VI. Misallocation of poverty reduction funds
- VII. Failure to implement programmes by government
- VIII. Poor conditions of service for civil servants
- IX. High interest rates in lending institutions
- X. Late distribution of agricultural inputs
- XI. Lack of vision as a nation
- XII. Rampant corruption
- XIII. No separate funds for poverty reduction
- XIV. Lack of political will to fight poverty
- XV. Low levels of civic education
- XVI. High levels of illiteracy
- XVII. Poor management of public funds
- XVIII. Poor Governance
- XIX. Limited institutionalized for a for interaction

The participants were at this point asked to break into groups to analyze the list and come up with four, which they felt were critical issues.

ISSUE	GROUP 1	GROUP 2	GROUP 3
1.	Unclear Agricultural policy	Separate funds for Poverty Reduction	Debt
2.	Debt	Lack of prioritizing poverty reduction	Corruption
3.	Lack of trade Instruments	Limited institutions for interaction	Misallocation of Poverty Reduction Funds
4.	Lack of civic awareness	Poor rural infrastructure	Policy implementation

After intensive debate in plenary, the workshop came up with three issues which they felt were the most pressing issues. These would be used to come up with an advocacy campaign.

- (i) Poor Rural infrastructure
- (ii) Misplaced national priorities and misallocation of poverty reduction funds by government.
- (iii) Lack of policy and implementation in sectors related to poverty eradication.

Participants were asked to break into groups. Each group picked one topic and was asked to prepare problem statements and draw up a campaign strategy. These would be refined in plenary. The participants were asked to answer the “*Questions to ask within the ten elements*” in the training manual.

ABOUT THE PROBLEM STATEMENT

Mr. Matoka guided the participants through what should come out in a problem statement:

- Extent of the problem
- Identify the root cause
- Use Statistical Data where possible (quote source of information)
- Give practical examples.

EVALUATION OF DAY 3

- The day went well in terms of time management
- There was a complaint that the food was not enough at breakfast
- There was a request from the group that Mr. Matoka takes explain the “ten elements of an advocacy campaign” the next day, as most of them did not fully understand them.

- Mr. Matoka asked Secretariat (CSPR) to ensure that each participant gets the three copies of the advocacy plans that were to be prepared and presented by the three groups.

DAY 4

TEN ELEMENTS OF AN ADVOCACY CAMPAIGN

Referring to the training manual, some of the explanations given were as follows:

- ❖ The ten elements were a guide to show what sort of information should be included in an advocacy plan in order to ensure success.
- ❖ The ten elements were accompanied with questions to help guide the campaigners to bring out the relevant issues.
- ❖ Objectives are the incremental steps you take to achieve your goal – what you want to see. They must be SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound.
- ❖ The goal is the other side of the coin of the problem. Specific objectives lay out how you achieve your goals.
- ❖ You are targeting policy makers and therefore need to know the policy formulation process so that you engage the people from beginning to end.
- ❖ There are some influential people in society who may not be the policy makers, but by virtue of their influence can help achieve goals, e.g the donor community.
- ❖ Look for people who can add a voice to your cause, for example, donors who can influence the balance of payment. Identify those you feel can influence the government.
- ❖ An effective message should talk directly to the reader and compel them to join in the call of the advocacy campaign.
- ❖ Identify how you will put your message across to your target groups.
- ❖ Be very brief and to the point – come up with an action plan in tabular form by listing the activities that will be undertaken, by whom, when, where and how. Should there be a mistake, you will be able to correct where you went wrong. This tabular could include a means of verification.
- ❖ To undertake an advocacy campaign, you need the four ‘M’s – Manpower, Material, Machinery and Method, ie, how many people; what materials, eg, flyers, brochures, stationery; machinery includes motor vehicles and computers; what is the best and most effective and efficient way – best results at minimum cost.
- ❖ Identify those NGOs that would support your cause and the key players in public and government, e.g., use celebrities to give the message.
- ❖ Come up with a strategy for monitoring activities in order to compare the actual against the plan – where did we go wrong, what have we been doing right. Evaluation of information from monitoring will help identify where we need to make changes.

WRAP UP SESSION

In wrapping up the training, Mr. Matoka re-emphasized the concepts of advocacy, comparing Zambia to a Limited Company. He hoped that after the training, participants were now clear on the crucial role that civil society has to play in the development of the

country by making the private and public sectors accountable for their actions in issues affecting the nation. Civil Society should be well organized to be involved in the politics of ensuring that people know their rights so that they can advocate for development which would be beneficial to them.

Mrs Mpepo thanked Mr. Matoka for the good training and noted that the workshop had succeeded in fulfilling the expectations of the participants. She once again thanked the partners of CSPR for making the training possible. She also thanked the participants for their active participation.

Mr Michael Schultheiss from FES, who attended the last session, said that from the presentation of the group work, it was evident that a lot had been learnt and achieved. He said that FES was proud to have made a contribution to the training and also to be associated with CSPR because of the dynamic work that is being done. He wished the participants good luck in their endeavors, especially in implementing the planned advocacy activities.

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Participants were asked to evaluate the workshop by putting their comments in writing. The general view derived from the evaluations was that the workshop was a success and managed to meet the objectives as well as the expectations.

Content:

- This was good
- Needed tips on how to do research for advocacy
- Precise but rich in insights

Facilitation:

- Facilitation was good and a lot was learnt
- The facilitator was excellent, an open minded and very accommodating man

Usefulness:

- Has strengthened at network and organization level to do better.
- Has increased practical ability on advocacy

Venue:

- Good and conducive
- Average
- Unreliable power supply
- Food not fresh at times

General comments:

- Meals were not good at times, causing some participants to have running stomachs.
- The workshop was an eye opener to advocacy work.

- Where do we go from here?
- Participants who are not members of the advocacy task force should become members in order to make it more effective with the newly acquired knowledge.

PRESENTATION OF ADVOCACY PLANS.

GROUP 1 POOR RURAL INFRASTRUCTURE

1.0 PROBLEM STATEMENT

Zambia has for a long time neglected investment in capital expenditure, due to over-dependence on income from copper exports, which has over the years drastically dropped due to external factors (prices, production costs). Although income from copper reduced, government's expenditure continued to increase. Even though government recognized that income from copper was reducing, it went ahead to borrow at commercial rates in order to service its huge recurrent expenditure patterns. This policy to borrow resulted in government incurring huge interest rates which needed to be serviced. The reduced income from copper, the huge accumulated debt now standing at US\$6.5 billion and the ever increasing recurrent expenditure, have all contributed to inadequate funds for infrastructure development, particularly in the rural areas. As a result of this, schools, hospitals, roads, telecommunication systems, in rural areas are non-existent and where they exist, they have deteriorated.

Statistically, 73% of Zambians are poor. In the rural areas, 71% of people live in extreme poverty, twice as many as in urban areas (36%). In 1998, around two-thirds of households reported that they have changed their diet or reduced on food because of their economic problems. This shows us that most households are failing to survive in a decent way. This also shows us that chronic poverty is more pronounced in the rural areas. In order to address the problem stated above, government needs to design a well articulated and implementable programme to mitigate the serious gaps in rural infrastructure development.

The economic benefits of government designing a deliberate rural infrastructure development plan or programme are enormous, ranging from;

- (i) Access to large outlets to cities and towns would help the rural communities to transport their crops to competitive outlets and thus secure better prices for their produce.
- (ii) Increased capital expenditure in rural infrastructure will provide for better living conditions and access to good social services such as hospitals, schools, etc. (If so many children were to be enrolled into school, there would be fewer children out of school, fewer children working or running households and fewer girls involved in early sex resulting into unwanted pregnancies and related ills such as HIV/AIDS, STDs.)
- (iii) Increased capital expenditure will provide storage sheds for rural farmers, thus addressing the problem of late delivery of farming inputs. This would also provide for storage sheds to secure their crops from going to waste.
- (iv) Increased capital expenditure in rural infrastructure in rural infrastructure will provide for increased economic activities in the rural areas, eg., opening up rural areas could provide investment opportunities, with spill over effects to the rural community.

* Source of statistics: Simplified PRSP document –“The path away from poverty – an easy look at Zambia’s PRSP”.

GOAL

To have good infrastructure in rural areas.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

- 2.1 Ensuring that there is good road infrastructure in rural areas by 2010.
- 2.2 Advocate for increased allocation in the budget of capital expenditure to rural areas to 5% of the total budget by 2007.
- 2.3 Increase constituency development fund allocations for rural constituencies to K1billion by 2006, and ensure that it is used for capital investment.
- 2.4 Provide specific incentives to rural areas by enacting Rural Investment Act by 2004.
- 2.5 To open up rural areas to investment and development.

3.0 TARGETS

- 3.1 Members of Parliament and parliament as Cabinet
- 3.2 Investors
- 3.3 Small scale farmers, Zambia National Farmers Union and Community Based Organizations.
- 3.4 Traditional authorities (chiefs)
- 3.5 Headmasters and teachers.
- 3.6 Local government
- 3.7 Health personnel
- 3.8 Community Based Organizations

4.0 OTHER GROUPS

- 4.1 Donors – to pressurize conditionalities to make government to pass legislation to support rural infrastructure development.

5.0 ADVOCACY MESSAGE/S

TARGET AUDIENCE	MESSAGE	MEDIA
Ministers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works and supply • Local government • Agriculture • Commerce trade and industry • Finance • Lands 	Initiate programmes which prioritize rural infrastructure development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letters • Formal meetings
Donors	Put positive pressure on government to invest in rural infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings • Letters • Press

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Newsletters
Chairperson of appropriate parliamentary select committees	Support enactment of laws that foster rural infrastructure development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings to solicit support • Make research material available to them • Letters to members of parliament
Traditional authorities	Open up areas for development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Courtesy calls to explain campaign • Posters • Community Radio • Posters • Flyers • Letters
Local Government	Pass By-Laws that are biased towards rural infrastructure development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings • Flyers • Posters • Letters
Small Scale farmers, health personnel, headmasters	Partner with us as we advocate for rural infrastructure development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as above
Investors	Help us support the cause for rural development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posters • Flyers • Meetings with associations such as ZACCI, ZIC, etc

6.0 ACTION PLAN

Activity	By Whom	When	Where	How
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft letters to ministers, MPs 	Advocacy Committee	January 2004	Lusaka	Letters followed up by meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings with Local Government at district level, headmasters, teachers 	Advocacy Committee	By March 2004	District	Formal meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings 	Advocacy	By September	Palaces and	Formal

with traditional authorities	Committee	2004	Council Chambers	meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draw up Memorandum of Understanding with investors 	Advocacy Committee	By October 2004	Lusaka	Formal meeting

7.0 MATERIAL REQUIREMENTS

Human	Organizational	Financial
Secretariat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 driver - 1 administrative Officer - 1 Coordinator - Mobilization Coordinator - Non-paid staff (Volunteers) - Local Community Based Organizations - Consultants 	Office Space Office Equipment Stationery Transport Logistics	Assume costed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recurrent Expenditure US\$ 125,000 X 12% (Assume we have resources) Total budget US \$125,000

8.0 OTHER NGOs AND KEY PLAYERS

8.1 ZARD – Research and advocacy

8.2 LAZ – Legal advice

8.3 OASIS Forum/ Church – awareness and lobbying

8.4 KK and MMCI – educational campaigns.

9.0 MONITORING AND EVALUATION INDICATORS

Indicators	Monitoring	Evaluation
1. Number of new infrastructure constructed and old ones rehabilitated 2. Increased agricultural production, enrolment, access to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rapid Assessment Surveys Monthly review meetings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuous (three months) Overall evaluation at the end of the advocacy campaign

health facilities, access to markets		
3. Increased number of constituency capital projects		
4. Increased number of investors in rural areas		

GROUP 2
**MISPLACED NATIONAL PRIORITIES AND MISALLOCATION OF POVERTY
REDUCTION FUNDS BY GOVERNMENT.**

1.0 PROBLEM STATEMENT:

In Zambia, poverty is widespread. Over 80% of its population lives in abject poverty (Human Development Report). It is more prevalent in rural areas and higher among female headed households than male headed ones.

In order to address the situation, a PRSP was formulated in 2002 July, which was to be implemented through the PRP budget lines in the budget. Facts are that in 2002, K450billion was allocated to PRPs in the national budget of which K110.7billion was release, representing 24.5% of the total allocation. Of he K450 billion, K210billion was to come from donors and K240billion from domestically generated resources (GRZ, 2002/2003 budget). The above allocation represents 9% of the total national budget compared to other sectors like defense, which got 15%. Despite the low allocation, the actual disbursement was much lower, approximately 75.5% (ibid, 2002/2003). However, it was in the same year that we witnessed not less than four by re-elections which cost the electoral commission not less than K400million each, outside what government leaders spent during campaigns (ZNBC, 2003).

This year, 2003, government has allocated K420billion to PRPs (GRZ 2002/2003 budget), which indicates a decline from the previous year. The figure above has declined further due to the budget overrun incurred by government. By the second quarter of the year, less than 10% of the allocation had been released. This suggests that the expected impact of poverty reduction programmes on the overall poverty levels will not be felt. It is strongly felt that because of the above, there seems to be inadequate commitment from government and other donors. There is also lack of political will, poor fiscal management, law level and inconsistent constitution, leading to diversion of resources meant for poverty reduction and non prioritization of poverty issues.

GOAL

To contribute towards the priority setting of priority setting of poverty on the national agenda through the creation and strengthening of mechanisms aimed at appropriate allocation and disbursement of resources for poverty reduction.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

- 2.1 Ensure that poverty is a priority on the national agenda by 2005.
- 2.2 To protect resources aimed at poverty reduction by creation of a poverty fund by 2005.
- 2.3 Ensure that all funds allocated to poverty are disbursed directly to implementing agencies by 2005.
- 2.4 To strengthen participation of CSOs in decisions of allocation, disbursements, monitoring and evaluation of poverty funds by 2005.

THE ORGANISATION SPEARHEADING THE CAMPAIGN

CSPR is an NGO that has a vision of a poverty free Zambia. Its mission is to ensure the effective participation of civil society in poverty eradication in Zambia through poverty monitoring, information dissemination and advocacy and capacity building in partnership with government and other stakeholders.

CSPR’s justification for spearheading this campaign is derived from its active participation in the formulation of a poverty plan for Zambia. CSPR has realized that this plan is not achieving desired results for Zambia due to inadequate resource allocation and disbursement to poverty reduction.

CSPR is a strong network with branches in four provinces. Its members are organizations working around the different faces of poverty.

CSPR has been engaged in dialogue with government and international organizations both home and abroad on how best to achieve success in the battle against poverty. CSPR has been taken as a best case example of an effective civil society poverty network. Success in this advocacy campaign will increase the chances of achieving desirable results from the PRSP implementation and ultimately moving a step towards “A *POVERTY FREE ZAMBIA*”

3.0 TARGET AUDIENCE

Objective	Primary	Secondary
1.	The President of Zambia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minister of Finance • Vice President • Speaker of the National Assembly • MPs of the Economic Select Committee • Minister of Community Development • Senior chiefs •

2.	President Minister of Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic Advisor to the President • Secretary to the treasury • MPs (Eg. Select Committee) • Heads of international
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agencies eg British, USA, World Bank, IMF, UN, EU • Heads of missions – dean of donor community.
3.	Minister of Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretary to the Treasury • Heads of mission/ International Agencies
4.	Minister of Finance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Director of Planning • Permanent Secretary – budgeting • International Agencies • All Permanent Secretaries

4.0 OTHER GROUPS AFFECTED

- 4.1 Influential NGOs
- 4.2 Women for Change
- 4.3 LAZ
- 4.4 Rural Community
- 4.5 Women’s Community Based Organizations
- 4.6 Traditional rulers
- 4.7 Unions
- 4.8 Disabled Persons Organizations.

5.0 ADVOCACY MESSAGE

“Rank poverty first for Zambia

5.1 Media to use

- Meetings
- Letters
- Television

- Radio
- Posters
- Banners
- Theatre
- Ribbons (wreaths)
- Newspapers

6.0 Workplan

STRATEGIC PLAN – Group 3

Activities	By whom	When	Where	How	MoV	Resources	Indicators
1. Meetings with line ministries	Task Force	Jan. 2004 Dec. 2004 (monthly)	Line Ministries	Appointments with line ministry officials	*Minutes * Reports	*Stationery *Transport *Human Resources *Finances	12 meetings
2. Radio/ TV discussion (Community radio stations)	Stakeholders	January – June, 2004 (weekly)	ZNBC, Phoenix, Comm. Radio BBC	By featuring stakeholders on programmes	Audio/Visual tapes	*Finances *Human resource *Transport	24 programmes
3. T.V Documentary	Task Force	January – March, 2004	ZNBC	Commissioning Airing on ZNBC TV	Video tapes	*Finances *Human resources *Transport	1 documentary aired
4. Demonstrations/ petitions	All stakeholders	*UN Day of Poverty Eradication (27 th October, 2004) *Human Rights Day (10 th October, 2004) and other strategic days	Cairo Road to Freedom Statue/ route to be determined by nature of event	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mass mobilisation of all stakeholders. • Collection of signatures 	Photos, video, newspaper cuttings, report	*Finances *Human resources *Transport *Stationery	Stakeholders marching No of signature

5. Door to door awareness campaign	Task force and stakeholders, constituencies	Jan – Dec 2004 (quarterly)	- Line ministries - Donors	Canvassing through material distribution (literature)	Records of distributed material Records if	*Finances *Human resources *Transport	No. of houses/stakeholders, line ministries visited.
			- - NGOs/stakeholders		areas visited.		

6.0 WORK PLAN – Group 2

Activity (what)	How	Who	When	Where	MoV
1. Research	<p>* To assess the entry point for civil society participation in decision of allocation, disbursements, monitoring and evaluation of poverty funds.</p> <p>* To work at the dynamics, possibilities and legal aspects of a poverty fund.</p> <p>*To assess the possibility of all poverty funding to be directly disbursed to implementing agencies</p>	CSPR Advocacy Task Force and Researcher	By January, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSPR Secretariat • Provincial focal points • Government departments • Uganda and Malawi 	Research reports
2. Production of IEC materials (campaign)	T. Shirts, brochures, flyers, posters, banners, ribbons	CSPR Secretary with Information Dissemination and Advocacy Task Force	By end of February, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSPR Secretariat 	Campaign material
3. Social mobilization	<p>* Sensitisation</p> <p>*Create alliances</p>	CSPR Secretariat with Steering	By April end, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts 	Presence of allies and

	* Create networks	Committee and Provincial Focal Groups			networks Workshop reports
4. Popularise campaign	* Marching * Radio and Television programmes * Newspapers * Community media	CSPR media	By end of April, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Photos and videos of events • Newspaper cuttings • Programmes aired
5. Petitions	Collection of signatures	CSPR, volunteers and other NGOs.	By October 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Signed petition forms
6. Lobbying and canvassing of alliances and general public	* Round table meetings *Public discussions *Door to door *Public debates *Drama and music	CSPR Volunteers	By end of October, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity reports • Video and CD
7. Lobby of secondary target	*Letters Round table meetings	Influential CSO representatives * Champions	By end of October, 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant ministries • National offices • Missions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting reports • Copies of letters
8. Lobby of Primary target	*Letters *Dialogue	*Influential CSO reps * Champions	By November 2004	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of Finance • State House 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting reports • Copies of letters

ACTION PLAN – Group 1

Activity	By Whom	When	Where	How
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft letters to ministers, MPs 	Advocacy Committee	January 2004	Lusaka	Letters followed up by meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings with Local Government at district level, headmasters, teachers 	Advocacy Committee	By March 2004	District	Formal meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings with traditional authorities 	Advocacy Committee	By September 2004	Palaces and Council Chambers	Formal meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draw up Memorandum of Understanding with investors 	Advocacy Committee	By October 2004	Lusaka	Formal meeting

7.0 MONITORING AND EVALUATION INDICATORS

Indicators	Monitoring and Evaluation
Number of research reports produced	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quarterly assessments - Mid Term Review - Final evaluation (for overall programme) - Post evaluation (six months after campaign)
Number and type of materials produced Number of allies Number of networks Number of people supporting the cause (petitioners)	-
	-
Number of marches	-
Number of TV programmes Number of radio programmes Number of articles in print media	-
Number of signatures	-
Number of meetings held	-

Number of public debates and discussions held	
Number of performances	
Number of households visited	
Number of meetings held	
Number of letters sent and received	
Number of meetings held	
Number of letters sent and received	

Pitfalls for all

- Non support from strategic allies
- Unstable political environment
- Government resistance
- Bureaucracy
- Exploiters
- Infiltration by Non-Governmental Individuals
- Inadequate funding

RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

- Human power
- Materials
- Machinery
- Methodology – advocacy, campaigning, lobbying
- Logistical support

8.0 See secondary target audience.

GROUP 3

LACK OF POLICY AND IMPLEMENTATION IN SECTORS RELATED TO POVERTY ERADICATION

1.0 PROBLEM STATEMENT

In the past ten years, Zambia has continues to experience high poverty levels that now stand at over 73%, with the most affected being in rural areas (PRSP 2002-2004).

One major reason for this can be attributed to lack of clear-cut policies to guide the operations of some critical sectors that relate to poverty eradication. It has further been observed that where these policies exist, they are weak and fail to accomplish the intended objectives.

In the agricultural sector, for example, government has failed to come up with clear policies on the distribution of inputs and marketing. In the past, government used to supply input and buy agricultural products from farmers. With the new liberalized system, this is no longer the case. Co-operatives have closed and inputs have been distributed late to the farmers, thus causing food insecurity.

Another example can be alluded to the health sector. In 1992, Zambia embarked on Health Reforms Programme, which appeared to be one of the best programmes on the continent (PRSP 2202-2004). However, the reality is that Zambians have gotten more sick and health service delivery has noticeably been poor. Analysis shows that these reforms did not work due to poor implementation of policy. Despite the above setbacks, efforts to reduce poverty levels have continued to be shown. This can be seen by the formulation of a PRSP, which is a national plan in poverty reduction. However, the objectives of the PRSP to be achieved, government has to put in place clear-cut policies to guide the implementation process, since this is the major impediment affecting the effectiveness of the PRSP.

GOAL

To have policies formulated where they do not exist and to ensure the implementation of policies by the end of 2004.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

2.1 To ensure that effective policies based on priorities aimed at reducing poverty are urgently formulated.

2.2 To put pressure on government, so that it can start strengthening and implementing the existing policies.

3.0 TARGET AUDIENCE

3.1 Cabinet – The Secretary to the Cabinet

3.2 Permanent Secretaries

3.3 Line ministers

3.4 Dean of Donor Community

OTHER GROUPS

1. Donors
2. Grassroots' communities (churches, headmen, etc)
3. Investors
4. Local business community
5. Councilors

4.0 ADVOCACY MESSAGE

4.1 No policy, no development. Make Zambia poverty free NOW!!

4.2 No better policy, Kuya bebele – go - go!!

4.3 We demand for better policy for a poverty free Zambia NOW!!

5.0 MEDIA

5.1 T.V, radio, newspapers

5.2 Posters, flyers, banners/placards

5.3 T-Shirts, caps

Support groups

- NGOs/ CBOs/ CSOs

- LAZ
- Donor community
- Unions
- Grass roots communities
- Students

9.0 MONITORING/ EVALUATION

1. Monitoring will be ongoing during the period of the various planned activities. A report will be produced.
2. Evaluation will be based on information collected from monitoring.

CIVIL SOCIETY FOR POVERTY REDUCTION (CSPR)
 ADVOCACY TRAINING WORKSHOP – 20th to 23rd October, 2003.

ATTENDANCE LIST:

NAME	ORGANISATION	CONTACT DETAILS
1. Betty Chunga	ZARD	Zard@zamtel.zm
2. Lucy Saili	CSPR	291054
3. Humphrey Fumpa	CSUZ	232606, 097-875081
4. Theresa Chewe	SACCORD	223318, 096762734
5. Francis Banda	ODCMT	BOX 38665, LUSAKA odcmt@microlink.zm
6. Muleya Haachinda	NAPSSFZ	Box 37398, Lusaka. 231188, 097768208 fax: 236303
7. Precious M. Ng'onga	NGOCC	Box 37879, Lusaka ngocc@zamtel.zm
8. Mundia Matongo	Zambia Alliance of Women	097-873589/225573 zaw@zamnet.zm
9. Rosta Nachalwe	ZACCI	kitchamber@zamtel.zm (02)221681

10. Malawo Matyola	Zambia Council for Social Development	Box 51053, Lusaka. 097822203 zcsd@yahoo.com
11. Ivy Mutwale	Civil Society for Poverty Reduction	290154, 096-744965 cspr@zamnet.zm
12. Mulima Kasote	KARA Counselling	227086 hopekara@zamnet.zm
13. Godfrey Kumwenda	Zambia Land Alliance	222432/ 229641 land@coppernet.zm
14. Maria Pwele	FAWEZA	096-750932
15. Theresa Malamba	Jubilee Zambia	Box 70004, Ndola High Court.
16. Mwenya Ernest	Christian Children's Fund	Box 50148, Lusaka
17. Kasote Singogo	Private Sector Development Association	kasotesingogo@yahoo.co.uk 095-752721, 095-821452
18. Joyce Mfunne	Steadfast Action Foundation	
19. George M. Chimembe	CCJDP- Lusaka	P.O Box 32754, Lusaka 234655, 096748045
20. Nathan Lungu	National Youth Constitutional Assembly	P.O Box 50195, Lusaka 097-788425
21. Besinati Mpepo	Civil Society for Poverty Reduction	Postnet 302, Private Bag E891, Lusaka
22. Lotte Klinte	Civil Society for Poverty Reduction	Postnet 302, Private Bag E891, Lusaka
23. Gregory Chikwanka	Civil Society for Poverty Reduction	cspr@zamnet.zm 290154
24. Robert Kelly Salati	Operation Young Vote	P.O Box 37999, Phone: 222083, 096726970