

BACKGROUND

CSPR is a Civil Society Network that came together in October 2000 and had the main objective of ensuring that civil society from different backgrounds and in diverse locations effectively participate in the formulation of Zambia's Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP). The PRSP was launched in July 2002 and reflects a fairly large amount of civil society's concerns in poverty reduction.

CSPR members felt that the depth of unity shown by civil society during the PRSP formulation should be extended to monitoring the PRSP and other policies, programs and activities aimed at poverty eradication.

To that effect, CSPR carried out a baseline study in September, 2002, on the levels of poverty, people's awareness on the PRSP projects and how it would affect their livelihood. A Rapid Assessment was then conducted in May, 2003, to measure the effect of the PRSP since its implementation and also to compare changes since the baseline. The two reports were compared, analysed and subsequently presented to government at a round table meeting.

This is a report of the government round table meeting held at Blue Crest Executive Guest House on Thursday, 10th July, 2003 at 09:30hrs.

1.0 WELCOME REMARKS

The welcome remarks were made by the moderator, Mr. Grayson Koyi from Civil Servants Union of Zambia (CSUZ)/ Zambia Congress of Trade Unions (ZCTU), a member of the CSPR Steering Committee.

He thanked government for making time to attend the meeting and receive submissions from Civil Society for inclusion in the first progress report the government is currently preparing in respect to the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) process.

Mr. Koyi's remarks were followed by self-introductions by participants.

2.0 OVERVIEW OF THE CSPR POVERTY MONITORING ANALYSIS REPORT

Mr. Koyi started the proceedings by giving a background to the report that was being submitted to the government. He explained that the report was a critical analysis comparing the two surveys carried out by the CSPR, that is, the baseline Survey of 2002 and the Rapid Assessment Survey of May 2003. He pointed out that individual reports for each province were available at the CSPR secretariat.

Mr. Koyi outlined the context of the study (attached), explaining that it was hoped that some lessons drawn from the meeting would enable CSPR improve on future analyses.

The objectives of the analysis were explained as follows;

- (i) To assess whether the issues promised/planned in the PRSP were actually being implemented on the ground as reviewed by the participatory assessments.
- (ii) To assess the impact of PRSP interventions both at district and household levels.
- (iii) To make comparison of issues between target monitoring issues at baseline (September/October 2002) and now (May 2003).
- (iv) To make recommendations on data gaps in the participatory assessments for improved monitoring of the PRSP.

The analysis also had an objective to show whether key issues that the CSPR was monitoring were being represented in budgeting.

3.0 PRESENTATIONS

Presentations were made by sector by member organizations of CSPR and according to their organization's scope of operation. All presentations were based on the analysis report.

3.1 Water and Sanitation

This sector was presented by *Mr. John Kalleher, from Water Aid.*

He noted that from the report, it was clear that there was no change in the water sector. None of the constraints outlined in the PRSP seem to have received any attention since the baseline survey. The report also indicated an increase in water borne diseases.

Mr. Kalleher noted that the 5 per cent of the total budget allocated to the sector was disappointing. He observed that those in decision-making were unaware of the importance of water in eradicating poverty. He said this demonstrates a failure link of this sector to other sectors of production. There has been no attention to hardware and development of capacity to manage and implement issues of water and sanitation. He said that the failure to pay attention to improved hygiene was a genuine oversight on the part of the implementers. The 30 per cent allocation to the provision of water supply only represents 6 per cent of the targeted people.

3.2 Education

The sector was presented by *Ms. Maria Pwele, representative of the Forum for African Women Education in Zambia (FAWEZA).*

The presentation revealed that the government policy of free education at primary level has generally increased the school enrolment. However, retention becomes hard after grade seven level, as fees have to be paid thereafter. The allocation to the education sector is not enough and the distribution of material erratic. Some books for certain grades have not yet

been produced, while some materials have not reached targeted schools. Science kits are not available in schools, making it very difficult for lessons to go as planned.

It was suggested that provision of Anti-Retroviral Drugs (ARVs) should not just end at teachers, but should also be extended to parents, as it will decrease the high prevalence of orphans dropping out of school. Overall, it was noted that the few improvements observed since the baseline have been overshadowed by the overwhelming constraints still being faced in the education sector.

3.3 Agriculture

This sector was presented by *Ms. Isabel Tembo from the Program Against Malnutrition (PAM)*.

It was observed from the onset that the budget line should have included irrigation in order to promote food security, as most Zambians are currently dependant on rain fed crops for food security, which has aggravated the poverty situation. The year 2003 recorded a better-input delivery system, but there is still a cry for a better marketing system. The newly introduced market flow price may improve the situation. Although there is an improvement in production, there is still need to improve funding, as it is usually late and inadequate. Currently, only 30 per cent of small scale farmers are being addressed in the interventions.

3.4 Tourism

Sector presented by *Mr. Ernest Mwape from CONASA*

The sector is heavily reliant on the private sector to invest, but there is great need for the local community to be empowered. Instances of poaching have reduced relatively since the involvement of the local communities in monitoring their game reserves. Monies realized from the hunting concessions have increased local participation as it entitles the people to 40% of the income.

The local community has been involved at a very negligible level in tourism, that is, in traditional dances and crafts. This has not made any impact on the poverty levels.

3.5 Mining

Presented by Mr. Ernest Mwape

The Mines and minerals development sector policy is still lagging behind and there is no supervisory attention from the departments responsible for small-scale mining. This will protect the communities from danger and ensure that investors are exploring and not actually mining when they say so. There is need to supplement current regulations to include local

communities so that they benefit and consequently reduce levels of poverty. Part of the royalties from mining should remain with the local communities.

In conclusion, it was observed that both mining and tourism sectors seem informal, resulting in loss of revenue by government and there are no benefits for the local communities. There is thus need to formalize the two sectors. There is also need to improve upon data collection now that the two have been identified as economic sectors.

3.6 Health

Sector presented by Ms. *Maria Nkunika from Steadfast Action Foundation*. It was discovered that in some rural areas, people still do not believe that HIV/AIDS exists. They claim that the cases that they have seen are of patients who have traveled to their areas with the disease. There is need for voluntary counseling and testing sensitization in these areas.

Government was at this point praised for the introduction of Traditional Birth Attendants (TBA) and Community Health Workers (CHW). They were encouraged to continue with the progress. They were however implored to look into the issue of providing protective clothing to the TBAs and CHWs. Staffing in health centers however is still erratic and needs to be improved.

3.7 General implementation issues

This presentation was made by Mr. *Gregory Chikwanka from CSPR Secretariat*.

- There is low awareness of the PRSP at district level. This raises questions on how it is going to be implemented at district level. The District plans are not informed by the PRSP and therefore do not seem to have a link to the PRSP.
- The involvement of other stakeholders in PRSP implementation is not clearly outlined. CSPR needs guidelines on how to link interested stakeholders to the Ministry of Finance and National Planning and to the whole implementing process.
- There is need for government to ensure that all projects done by stakeholders are linked to PRSP interventions to.
- Civil society would like to urge government to seriously mobilize funds for poverty reduction programmes so as to speed up the implementation process. There is need for information flow on disbursement of PRSP funds. This is needed even at all levels including at the district.
- The government should have in place a deliberate policy to make information on PRSP available to all parties interested in the PRSP.

4.0 GOVERNMENT RESPONSE

Government, through Mr. Mulilo, was given an opportunity to respond to the report.

4.1 Mr. Mulilo thanked CSPR for the comprehensive report. He acknowledged that CSPR was always two steps ahead of government and that it was government's desire to work at the same level as civil society.

He however noted that the component on what has been done with the funds disbursed was distinctly missing from the report.

4.2 He further acknowledged that government needed to move in by making that kind of information readily available.

4.3 As stakeholders, it is important to look at specific interventions, the output and outcome and if it is positively impacting the people it was meant for.

4.4 He revealed that the ministry was currently working on a policy on PRSP and how to involve everyone who is interested in the Poverty Reduction Programs. All sectors involved were invited to give policy analyses on poverty reduction. The framework being developed has outlined major guidelines on how different stakeholders would be involved in the PRSP interventions. Government will table the framework with civil society so that the stakeholders agree on the stipulated roles.

4.5 The next PRSP cycle intends to seriously involve the private sector in making contributions. Government intends to hold a national conference to discuss how best all sectors can work together.

4.6 Mr. Mulilo implored civil society to get involved in implementation.

5.0 GENERAL DISCUSSION

After the government responded to the report, the moderator opened the floor to the meeting to make general comments, ask questions and make clarifications. The following points came out:

5.1 CSPR neglected to investigate the cross cutting issues such as gender, environment and AIDS/HIV. He stressed that it would be important for civil society to include these issues as they are the ones who advocated for them to be included in the PRSP.

5.2 In respect of the Millennium Development goals (MDGs), government does not seem to be making much progress. This was attributed to lack of priority in implementation.

5.3 There were conflicting views in the report, such as under agriculture, which resulted in inconsistency. This would need further clarification.

5.4 It was suggested that government should involve other stakeholders even in the design of the policy framework, as this will create a sense of ownership.

5.5 If government had made impact in urban areas in the implementation of the PRSP, then the effect on the poor would not be significant as PRSP aims at reducing poverty in the poorest areas.

5.6 The lack of awareness on the PRSP will result in lack of monitoring and evaluation of the interventions.

5.7 The agricultural sector only seemed successful (timely delivery of inputs) because of intervention from the international community such as the FAO programs, not necessarily the PRSP interventions. There is need to make clear indications on what actually went into agriculture from the PRSP so as to ascertain if government really did make an impact.

5.8 Government should seriously consider taking on civil society as partners in implementation of programs that they may not be able to implement due to lack of capacity (sub-contract).

5.9 Programme for the Advancement of Girls Education (PAGE) has improved the enrolment of girls but they usually fall out at initiation and due to early marriages, among other reasons.

*CSPR will embark on training on budget tracking for members so as to be more effective in monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the PRSP interventions.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The moderator closed the meeting by saying that civil society considered it necessary that government be the first recipients of the outcome of the monitoring analysis as they are strategic partners.

He said that there would be need to revise the report to make it more consistent and ensure that it tallies with the norms, that is, the cross cutting issues.

The need for a formal forum for information sharing was re-emphasized. This would allow for clarification of issues, experience sharing and releasing of necessary statistics and information. The report would be used to create awareness to the general public as to what is being done to reduce poverty.

LIST OF ATTENDANCE:

NAME	ORGANISATION	CONTACT NUMBER	E-MAIL ADDRESS
1. Ms. Maria Nkunika	Steadfast Action Foundation	236953/4	steadfast@microlink.zm
2. Ms. Helen Samatebele	Program Against Malnutrition (PAM)	235941/2	pam@zamnet.zm
3. Fr. Pete Henriot	Jesuits Centre for Theological Reflection	290410	phenriot@zamnet.zm
4. Mr. Ernest Mwape	CONASA	250456/253354	rhino@zamnet.zm
5. Mr. Golden	MOFNP – PEMD	251862	golden_mulilo@yahoo.com

Mulilo			
6. Rev. Charles Banda	MOFND-PEMD	251862/096-450053	revbanda@coppernet.zm
7. Mr. Kasote Singogo	PSDA-CSPR	096752116	ksingogo@zic.org.zm
8. Ms. Isabel L. Tembo	Program Against Malnutrition	235941/2	pam@zamnet.zm
9. Mr. Matongo Mundia	Zambia Alliance for Women (ZAW)	225573	zaw@zamnet.zm
10. Prof. Venkatesh Seshamani	University of Zambia	227193	sesh@zamnet.zm
11. Ms. Maria Pwele	FAWEZA	252859/096-750932	
12. Mr. John Kalleher	WaterAid	290698	wateraid@zamnet.zm
13. Ms. Besinati Mpepo	CSPR	290154	cspr@zamnet.zm
14. Ms. Ireen Musonda	MOFND – PEMD	250886	imusonda70@yahoo.com
15. Ms. Ivy Mutwale	CSPR	290154	cspr@zamnet.zm , imutwale@zamnet.zm
16. Ms. Lotte Klinte	MS – CSPR	290154	cspr@zamnet.zm
17. Mr.	CSPR-Secretariat	290154	gchikwanka@zamnet.zm

Gregory Chikwanka			m
----------------------	--	--	-------------------