



PSAM, Caritas Zambia. CSPR, JCTR

Baseline Study of the Zambia Social Accountability Monitoring Partnership

Laura Miti –PSAM

June 2013

A report of the baseline study on the organisational practices and public resource management monitoring strategies and activities of Caritas Zambia, Civil Society for Poverty Reduction, and the Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection as they existed before the three organisations entered into an MOU with the Public Service Accountability Monitor of Rhodes University South Africa.

Acknowledgements

On behalf of the Public Service Accountability Monitor sincere appreciation is extended to Caritas Zambia for funding this baseline study. Thank you too all the staff and members of Caritas Zambia, CSPR, JCTR and their partners who granted interviews and gave their insights into their work. Special thanks to Khazike Sakala, a most competent and dedicated assistant in the study.

Baseline Report Zambia Social Accountability Monitoring Partnership

1. Introduction

This is a report on the baseline study of the Zambia Social Accountability Monitoring Partnership as regulated by a Memorandum of Understanding between the Public Service Accountability Monitor (PSAM) based at Rhodes University Grahamstown South Africa; and three Zambian partners: Caritas Zambia, Civil Society for Poverty Reduction (CSPR) and the Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection (JCTR) hereafter referred to as Implementing partners. The baseline study was carried out in May 2013.

2. Background

The Public Service Accountability Monitor (PSAM) is a research institute situated in the School of Journalism at Rhodes University in Grahamstown, South Africa. PSAM adopts a systems approach to public resource management (PRM) monitoring, which appreciates social accountability as a right. PSAM further understands public resource management as a social accountability system. In this regard, PSAM proposes that an effective PRM framework will consist of five interlinked processes that render it into a social accountability system for service delivery. The processes are strategic planning and resource allocation, expenditure management, performance management, public integrity management and oversight. Based on several years of analysis and advocacy on public resource management related matters, PSAM has developed a set of PRM monitoring tools for use by civic actors engaging in systematic evidence based social accountability monitoring that seeks to utilise the information that is routinely produced in the implementation of these processes to strengthen accountability. PSAM asserts that applying a rights-based approach to social accountability can promote transparency and government responsiveness, thus further democracy. The right to social accountability obligates every state to justify and explain its decisions and actions as regards its management of public resources to its citizens as a matter of course and to take timely corrective action where weaknesses are identified. In addition, all citizens have the right to demand justifications and explanations from duty bearers as regards the decisions made in public resource utilisation when it fails to provide them adequately. Further the PSAM approach to social accountability approaches PRM monitoring as not an end in itself but an engagement that should translate into improved service delivery for citizens. Thus, effective social accountability monitoring must relate to the decisions government makes as regards the resources available to it. The management of those resources must result in improved service delivery for and progressive change in the lives citizens live.

In its regional work, the PSAM aims to answer the following research questions:

- 1) Whether and how understanding of the PRM as a system helps demand side actors engage better with PRM processes.
- 2) Whether and how the engagement leads to a better mutual understanding of service delivery problems.

- 3) Whether and how the improved understanding of the PRM as a system by demand side actors leads to a more productive interaction between demand and supply side in addressing service delivery problems.
- 4) Whether and how evidence-based engagement with the PRM system by demand side actors in Sub-Saharan Africa improves service delivery.

Partnership agreements are entered into with local organisations in Southern African countries that monitor public resource management as a central part of their own work. PSAM has partnerships with organisations in Tanzania and Mozambique and is currently in the process of entering into partnership with organisations working in Zimbabwe. These partnerships are the vehicle through which regional work is carried out. The partnership also provides an opportunity for PSAM to test the adaptability and applicability of the PSAM approach and tools to social accountability monitoring for sustainable improvement in service delivery outcomes as well as to document lessons for sharing with the wider community of practice.

One of the main activities carried out in a partnership is training of civic actors in PSAM tools that empower members of partner organisations to carry out systematic advocacy activities that target systemic weaknesses in their contextual PRM framework. The training courses are an adaption of the Fundamentals of Social Accountability Monitoring course offered by PSAM and accredited by Rhodes University, South Africa.

In March 2012, PSAM signed an MOU (2012-2014) with three Zambian civil society organisations with vast experience in carrying out accountability monitoring in the Zambian context: Caritas Zambia, Civil Society for Poverty Reduction (CSPR) and the Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection (JCTR). The MOU is the vehicle through PSAM will intervene in the Zambian context.

At the beginning of the project, negotiation and interaction was primarily with the secretariats of these three partner organisations. However, the intervention strategy was agreed to be implemented at the subnational level of all three organisations. Thus the subnational structures would be the focus of partnership activities. In this regard, three provinces - Southern, Eastern and Copperbelt were selected as the pilot areas of intervention. These were selected for being intersection areas of the partner organisation presence as well as politically representative¹.

This baseline study was a retrospective initiative carried out in 2013 a year after the MOU had been signed and the initial training activity implemented. It was the result of the PSAM Zambia team's realisation that the absence of zero-point information of how the partner organisations generally and individually carried out their social accountability monitoring work before interaction with PSAM, would compromise the validity of lessons drawn from ongoing activities. It was therefore understood that while best practice would have required that the baseline study be carried out soon after the MOU was agreed to, in 2012, it was still possible to extract information about the practices of the partner organisations before interaction with PSAM.² It was

¹It was agreed as prudent to ensure that the areas in which the intervention were carried out could not be seen as partisan. The three provinces selected therefore represent areas understood at the time to support the ruling party, Copperbelt, opposition, Southern Province and neutral Eastern Province.

² Staff members of the 3 organisations had been trained in the PSAM Fundamentals of Social Accountability Monitoring (FSAM) course before the MOU came into place, and it is acknowledged that this could have influenced changes in organisational approaches.

therefore decided to develop a baseline of the implementing partners PRM monitoring activities focusing especially on their subnational structures identified for pilot partnership intervention.

3. Baseline study objectives

In order to set a foundation for onwards monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the partnership interventions, the baseline study sought to:

- a. set out the practices and activities of the Zambian partner organisations as carried out before partnership interventions;
- b. to set out the existing (baseline) social accountability monitoring advocacy activities carried out by partner organisation groups in the areas in which partnership advocacy strategies will be implemented;
- c. identify benchmarks and indicators that can be used for organisational monitoring and evaluation during the interventions; and
- d. provide information that could be used for organisational and project lesson learning by PSAM and each implementing partner.

In essence, the scope and focus of the study is capturing the organisational monitoring and advocacy practices of partners as reflected in their planning, advocacy activities and reporting, with special focus on Southern, Copperbelt and Eastern Provinces, in order to monitor these after interventions. Emphasis in this baseline was placed on the training partner subnational groups received as the pilot phase of the MOU had the main objective of building the capacity of partner actors to implement a systematic approach to social accountability monitoring.

4. Study methodology

The baseline study was undertaken by the PSAM Zambia country lead accompanied by a Caritas Zambia intern. The methodology utilised was largely structured and unstructured interviews, focus group discussions and desk top review of reports and documents. The study team visited the 3 provinces of pilot intervention and also had interviews with the national secretariats. The list of individuals interviewed is appended to this report as Appendix II and the structured questions utilised in study are attached as Appendix I.

5. Baseline Findings

5.1 Caritas Zambia

Caritas Zambia is a department of the Catholic Secretariat of the Zambia Episcopal Conference (ZEC). Its core mandate is to implement the work of the two Commissions of Justice and Peace and Development. The two commissions initially operated as two separate Catholic Secretariat Departments of Justice and Peace and Development respectively. In 2001 it was however recommended by the Catholic Secretariat that more synergies and cooperation be instituted in the work of the Commissions. As a result, a semi-autonomous body, the Catholic Center for Justice Development and Peace (CCJDP), was created to incorporate the two commissions. In 2007, CCJDP was renamed Caritas Zambia by the Zambia Episcopal Conference but remained responsible for the work of the Commission for Development and the Commission for Justice and

Peace.³ Caritas Zambia's main day to day mandate, is to facilitate the work of its sub-national structures which are situated in 10 autonomous dioceses. Each of the dioceses develops its own strategic plan which should speak to that of National Office but does not necessarily do so. Each diocese is also responsible for raising its own funds.

Caritas Zambia's organisational work covers a large spectrum that includes among others, agriculture, disaster preparedness, spiritual formation and governance. Accountability monitoring work falls under Caritas' governance work. In the dioceses, governance interventions are carried out through Justice and Peace groups that are situated at each parish. The Justice and Peace groups have as their objective to identify, analyse and act upon instances of injustice as well as promote systems and practices that are consistent with the principles of justice and peace.⁴ The Justice and Peace groups constitute themselves into sub-groups that generally align themselves with programmes at the national office. PRM monitoring is largely carried out by the Economic Justice group.

In relation to Public Resource Management (PRM) monitoring which is the interest of this study, Caritas generally carries out the following in all dioceses:

5.1.1 Caritas Training

- Justice and Peace groups situated in parishes are trained in a 5-day course developed by Caritas Zambia and used in all the dioceses.
- These are initially trained under the formation (induction) training whose completion is a requirement for full membership of the Justice and Peace group.
- The trained Justice and Peace members constitute themselves into focus area sub-groups that include Economic Justice and Parliamentary Liaison groups.
- The Economic Justice group is further trained in budget tracking which is the main training in readiness for Caritas PRM monitoring.

5.1.1.1 Content of Training

The training the EJP groups receive consists of:

The National budget:

- Defining the budget
- Listing and explaining the main types of national budgets
- Listing and explaining the main objectives of a national government
- Listing and explaining the main stages of budget preparation
- Listing and explaining the main principles of good budgeting
- Listing and explaining levels of budget analysis
- Listing and explaining components of the Zambian budget (yellow book)
- How to analyse council plans and budgets
- Research skills
- Interview skills
- Report writing skills

³Based on *Caritas Zambia Profile*, written by Caritas Zambia

⁴Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace, *Formation Training Manua* , 2006

National Economic Planning:

- Defining the concept of national planning
- Setting out examples of country level economic and development objectives
- Setting out arguments for economic planning
- Setting out issues that should be taken into account when a national economic plan is developed
- Setting out reasons that would lead to the failure of a national economic plans⁵

5.1.2 Caritas Chipata

Caritas Chipata is part of the Chipata diocese and reports to the Bishop of Chipata. The diocese was visited on the 2nd and 3rd of May 2013 (the full list of individuals interviewed in each province is appended to this report as Appendix II). The specific findings in relation to the baseline objectives set out above were as follows:

5.1.2.1 Caritas Chipata pre-existing PRM work

- Budget tracking training as set out above.

- **Post Training Activities:**

The Caritas Chipata Justice and Peace group, in close collaboration with a number of local network partners, carries out the following PRM related activities:

- a) Monitoring the utilisation of the Constituency Development Funds by use of social auditing initiatives:
 - i. Trained groups track the release of CDF funds to the council
 - ii. They then carry out social audit interventions to verify that projects decided on by the CDF committee are implemented
 - iii. The quality of project work is monitored
 - iv. Any accountability issues discovered are taken up with the CDF Committee
- b) Budget tracking in the education and agriculture sectors as follows:
 - i. Identification of resources in Yellow Book
 - ii. Tracking of locally available resources (resources that are sourced/raised by the council directly and are not part of the national budget)
 - iii. Monitoring of Chipata District Council plans
 - iv. Engagement with the Chipata District Council budget. (Analysis of Yellow Book after national budget presentation in the fourth quarter of a year. At the beginning of the year, stake holder meetings are called the community is informed of identified allocations of interest. In July the following year the monitors engage with the sectors to see how much has been disbursed. This is done through a budget tracking exercise that depends on documents made available by officials.)
 - v. Council expenditure is monitored
 - vi. Council plans are related to implementation of projects
 - vii. Social auditing initiatives that seek to verify quality of projects relating to tracked funds are carried out.

⁵Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace, *Formation Training Manual*, 2006

c) Network Intervention in the formation of Task Forces:

- i. In Petauke, Nyimba and Mambwe districts, 20 residents per district from a broad spectrum to include churches, traditional leaders (with the exception of government officials) are trained to form a task force. The task force training is carried out in accordance with Caritas Zambia training set out above. The task force members are then introduced to the district administration via letters of introduction from the Permanent Secretary that allow them to enter government departments and access information. The aim of their interaction with duty bearers is to monitor the utilisation of funds tracked during the budget tracking initiative. The task forces carry out social audit interventions in collaboration with communities that verify the quality and quantity of government projects. *The trained task force members sometimes are sometimes utilised by other organisations like CSPR as it is difficult to draw lines on who participates in the various the community engagement activities undertaken.* The Task forces consider themselves an independent unit with its own leadership. They are funded by PELUM with the administration of the finances carried out by Caritas Chipata. The Task Forces report to the Justice and Peace Coordinator at each parish. Access to information to carry out the work set out above can be a big problem for the task forces. The work tends to depend on the good will of the sitting Permanent Secretary. At the time of the baseline study the last 3 PS's were reported to have been very good with facilitating the task force work and written introduction letters to Provincial Agricultural Officers (PACOs) and District Agricultural Officers (DACOs) that allowed the Task forces to access the information they required. In this period the Task forces had come to be known by the administrations they monitored and developed a good cooperative relationship. However, a change of administration is always considered a risk to ongoing work. Funding for task forces is from PELAM but is administered by Caritas

5.1.2.2 Benchmarks and indicators for onward learning

- In keeping with all dioceses, the Caritas Chipata groups and the Task forces they belong to are trained largely in budget tracking rather than the holistic view of the PRM frame work espoused by PSAM and envisaged in the MOU.
- In following to the above, advocacy initiatives that follow the training, while including other processes such as performance monitoring not included in the training, are also fragmented. Caritas Chipata and its partners will be monitored for a post training an adoption of a systematic approach to the interventions that seeks both the interlink ages in the identified weaknesses as well as their effect on service delivery.

5.1.2.3 Opportunities for lesson learning

Caritas Chipata diocese is doing interesting work that already targets more PSAM Social Accountability System processes than are set out in the Caritas training.

The organisational and practice changes that occur between training in a systematic approach to social accountability monitoring and uptake of the approach will be interesting to document. Because

Caritas Chipata's work is situated in strong networks it adds to the opportunities for lesson learning in the province that go beyond the partner organisation.

5.1.2.4 Other findings

The baseline interviews revealed that Caritas Chipata PRM work faces a major funding challenge. According to management, donors are not eager to fund the Economic Justice group and their interventions which means planned work is routinely not implemented. The baseline also showed that the Constituency Development Fund (CDF) is providing a very useful entry point for civic actors wishing to monitor the use of public resources as well as empower communities to demand accountability. The CDF therefore provides a useful entry point for the partnership to capacitate civic actors as well as communities to adopt a systematic approach to accountability monitoring. As the fund is managed at council level rendering it the most decentralised public fund, its management attracts much public comment. In the Eastern Province CDF monitoring has achieved much traction with various groups carrying out effective monitoring work.⁶ Training partner groups, to approach their CDF monitoring work through the prism of the five processes of the social accountability system would be a strategic starting point for subnational work.

5.1.3 Caritas Livingstone

Caritas Livingstone was visited on the 6th and 7th of May 2013. The organisation reports to the Diocese of Livingstone and therefore is under the authority of the Bishop of Livingstone.

5.1.3.1 Caritas Livingstone pre-existing PRM work

As with Caritas Chipata, PRM monitoring work in Caritas Livingstone is carried out through Justice and Peace groups. Economic Justice groups are trained using the Caritas training set out above. It has to also be noted that at the time of the baseline study, Caritas Livingstone had participated in the first partnership training delivered in Livingstone in July 2012. This was an adaptation of the Grahamstown Fundamentals of Social Accountability Monitoring course.

- **Post Training Activities:**

The Diocese has well constituted groups who however, at the time of the baseline study, were dealing with the challenge of the merger with the Development Commission (decision taken by the Bishops conference) which had caused organisational tension.

In the previous 10 years, emphasis had been on monitoring local issues through social auditing. Particular focus was given to tracking the locally important issue of the repeated national budget allocations to the revamp of the Mulobezi Railway that is of economic importance to areas in the Western Province that fall under Livingstone diocese. The group has record of its long term intervention in this issue with various duty-bearers and political administrations. Caritas Livingstone has also engaged with the findings of Auditor General's report by trying to link its findings to the failure to expended budgeted funds on the Mulobezi railway line.

⁶The baseline study interviewed the Chipata District Farmers Association who have achieved impact level work in monitoring CDF with and on behalf of farmers. The Association cooperates with Caritas in local networks both organisations belong to.

5.1.3.2 Benchmarks and indicators for onward learning

Caritas Livingstone as with Chipata will be benchmarked for its move towards a more systematic approach in its PRM advocacy activities. This is particularly so in that Caritas Livingstone members have been trained in the systematic approach to accountability monitoring.

5.1.3.3 Other Findings

As with Caritas Chipata, the baseline study found that Livingstone had major funding issues around its governance work. It was felt that subnational organisations were competing with Caritas Zambia for limited resources. Further, Caritas Livingstone expressed need for streamlining activities with the national office, so that the Accountability monitoring was “owned” by the subnational that implemented rather than directed from the national.

5.1.4 Caritas Monze

Caritas Monze was visited on 8 May 2013.

5.1.4.1 Pre Existing PRM work

Caritas Monze, in keeping with the Caritas structure, implements its budget work through Justice and Peace groups. However, these are being reconstituted after a period of challenges following the movement of the former coordinator to national office. The decision taken by the Zambia Episcopal conference to combine the work of Justice and Peace with that of its Development unit as set out above caused difficulties in Monze diocese as it did in Livingstone. In Monze, this led to the near collapse of governance work. However, the diocese is now in the process of reconstituting the Justice and Peace groups. Of particular emphasis is linking the governance and budget work that the Justice and Peace groups do to the issues of livelihoods as carried out by the Development groups. The diocese is in the process of seeking funding for this work. Focus now is on retraining the Justice and Peace groups right from the formation stage. The Caritas Monze coordinator expressed great interest in budget monitoring training which would be linked to particular service delivery issues.

5.1.4.2 Bench marks and indicators

Like Livingstone, some members of Caritas Monze had been trained in the PSAM course before the baseline was carried out. Caritas Monze in spite of this interaction before the baseline offers a good opportunity for groups to be trained the PSAM approach from the start of their work as the Justice and Peace groups are being reconstituted after challenges emerging from the merger discussed above. Caritas Monze would therefore present a good benchmark of uptake of approach where it was not competing with pre-existing work.

5.1.5 Caritas Ndola

Caritas Ndola was visited on 10 May 2013. Like Monze, Ndola was, at the time of the study, undergoing a process of reconstituting Justice and Peace groups after a major reorganisation in the diocese that does not follow the structure of other dioceses. A new strategic plan had just been finalised in this regard. Caritas Ndola emphasised the need of training for the groups that would be newly reconstituted.

5.1.5.1 Caritas Ndola pre-existing PRM work

Caritas Ndola Justice and Peace groups have been trained in accordance with Caritas process. The diocese has in the past emphasised budget tracking in the education sector. Justice and Peace group have carried out advocacy on the “free education policy” this had focused on the various “contributions” parents are asked to pay that add up to school fees therefore negating the free basic education policy announced by government. Caritas Ndola has also monitored service delivery by sitting on the District development coordinating committees.

5.1.5.2 Caritas Ndola Benchmarks and Indicators for Onward Learning

Caritas Ndola like Ndola will offer an opportunity for training new actors in accountability monitoring. They will therefore be benchmarked for uptake of the approach. The diocese could however be challenging to work with as it has instituted changes that mean it not follow the structure and processes of the others, emphasising its autonomy.

5.1.5.3 Caritas Conclusion

In relation to the PSAM approach Caritas pre-existing budget tracking training and subsequent budget tracking interventions in the identified dioceses can be strengthened in the following ways:

- Situating the budget tracking in a systemic approach that relates the resource allocation to other process is the social accountability system⁷
- In following on the point above, expanding the training to introduce Justice and Peace members to the systematic approach to social accountability monitoring
- Systematically linking the social accountability monitoring to service delivery failures
- Strengthening the identification and exploitation of entry points for the Justice and peace monitors engaging with each process of the social accountability system

5.1.5.4 Particular opportunities

- Caritas Zambia is developing a new Strategic Plan which has aligned its EJP work to the partnership MOU. This provides a unique opportunity to introduce the systematic approach to SAM to diocesan groups by leveraging Caritas Zambia own strategic plan
- Monze Diocese that is reconstituting groups and training them from the start presents a very good opportunity for interaction and institution of the systematic approach to SAM in the diocese. The Diocesan coordinator came across as especially excited and the training opportunity provided by the partnerships. His particular focus on linking traditional Justice and Peace budget work to livelihood issues that have service delivery questions is also of note
- Chipata has very strong ongoing work that provides a great opportunity of testing the approach in an area where relationships with duty bearer have already been built and a culture of demand for accountability established.

⁷the social accountability system understood by PSAM is set out above

5.2 C SPR

Civil Society for Poverty Reduction (C SPR) is a civil society anti-poverty advocacy network of over 140 organisation working for pro-poor development in different parts of Zambia.

C SPR, in its work, focuses on five sectors as follows Agriculture, Health, Education, Water and Sanitation.

C SPR, whose overall focus is poverty reduction, engages with these sectors to monitor whether communities are accessing services that are being delivered by service providers. With a secretariat in Lusaka, C SPR implements all its activities in the provinces where it operates under a provincial coordinator who has administrative control of C SPR activities.

The Provincial structure is made up of a Provincial Programme Management Team (PPMT) which is the C SPR provincial decision making body. It is constituted from member organisations. The PPMT breaks down into four Task Forces that are aligned with the four programmes at the secretariat as follows:

- Research and Policy Analysis (RPA)
- Civic Participation and Engagement (CPE)
- Advocacy Policy and Dialogue (APD)
- Information Management and Communication (IMC)

5.2.1 C SPR pre-existing work⁸

C SPR provincial interventions were visited as follows Chipata – 3 May, Livingstone 6 May, Monze 8 May, 2013.

C SPR social accountability work is carried out jointly by all its programmes with each being responsible for sections of it though a financial year.

To begin, members of the Research and Policy Analysis Task Force will carry out expenditure tracking in relation to service delivery issues in the five sectors of focus. The RPA analyses the Yellow Book with specific interest in the poverty reduction funds that are allocated to an identified issue in an identified sector in the district. The issue will be determined at provincial level as this will differ according to provincial context. A community whose capacity to engage with the budget has been built, will carry out budget tracking and service delivery monitoring as follows: Communities will be led to identify a service delivery issue. The RPA will engage with it in identifying budget allocations and monitoring for actual disbursements. By means of a score card, the community will then monitor the quality of service delivery at the point of delivery. The RPA will carry out further research on delivery questions and

⁸The baseline study found that the C SPR organisational structure and its PRM interventions are uniform in all the sub-national structures. For this reason C SPR Chipata Livingstone and Monze will be treated as one in this report.

produce a report on their findings. A copy of the report is given over to District Officials. At this point the **Civic Participation and Engagement Programme** takes over the work.

The Civic Participation and Engagement Task Force organises an **Interface Meeting** between the community and government officials in relation to the research findings. The report is simplified for the community who then have an opportunity to interact with the gathered officials. The community also has an opportunity to validate the research findings and expand on them if required. The community also asks questions on service delivery issues identified. The government officials for their part have the opportunity to interact with the community on service delivery issues, to respond to the research finding as well as answer community questions.

The CSPR's Civic Participation and Engagement Task force then notes the communities' concerns as well as government responses. These are condensed to be used for a subsequent interface meeting held at provincial level.

At this point, the Civic Participation and Engagement Programme hands over the intervention to the **Advocacy and Policy Dialogue (APD)** Task Team. The APD Task Team which is aligned to the APD Programme at the National Office. The advocacy work is escalated to the province is because the provincial level has influence on policy that the district does not have. The Provincial Dialogue brings together Provincial Sector Heads as well as other provincial officials. CSPR also invites other CSO's involved in PRM and service delivery monitoring to the meeting. Selected community members who attended the District Interface meeting also attend the Provincial meeting. The aim of Provincial Interface meeting is to allow stakeholders to make interventions on the basis of the research findings coming up from the District as well as engage with the report of the proceedings of the District Meetings. Provincial officials then provide responses on service delivery issues. Any issues that can be resolved at Provincial level are dealt with. The issues over which the province has no capacity are escalated to the national. At this level the work is taken over by the **Information and Management and Communication Programme**. The programme brings together all the information from the various provincial interventions for advocacy at the national level.

5.2.1.1 CSPR Training

Training for CSPR social accountability work is provided mainly to the PPMTs by the national office. The initial course was carried out years ago. An annual refresher course is conducted in every province for the PPMTs. This training uses the TOT model with the RPA task force then training communities in budget tracking.

Content of Training

The PPMT in a particular province will be trained on the following⁹:

- A general overview of the concepts of the budget, budget tracking and accountability covering the following concepts:
 - i. Budget

⁹Information taken from the CSPR training Manual of 2010

- ii. Expenditure
- iii. Revenue
- iv. Budget Tracking
- v. Accountability
- The rights that citizens enjoy in order to carry out PRM monitoring:
 - I. Sources of rights
 - Laws of a country
 - Principles and moral standards
 - II. Classification of Rights
 - Civil and Political Rights
 - Social, economic and cultural rights
 - Collective or “solidarity” rights
- Rationale and key aspects of monitoring budgets and service delivery
- Introduction to the community scorecard process methodology
 - I. Familiarisation with community scorecard process
 - II. Familiarisation with scorecard indicators and their application in measuring accountability
 - III. Introduction to steps necessary in preparatory work for community scorecard process
 - IV. Skilling participants in undertaking budget tracking and service delivery monitoring by use of the scorecard process

Members of specific task forces are further trained in skills needed in their particular interventions, such as, data capturing and analysis research methods, report writing, focus group moderation, advocacy skills, focus group etc.

5.2.1.2 CSPR benchmarks and indicators for onward learning

CSPR will provide a ready opportunity to apply monitoring of the full social accountability system from a rights-based approach. CSPR while displaying appreciation of more processes of the social accountability system, does not clearly articulate them nor espouse a systematic approach to their work. It will be benchmarked for progression to full implementation of the approach.

5.2.1.3 Opportunities for lesson learning

CSPR because of its internal documentation culture as well as theoretical grounding in the rights-based approach provides the most immediate possibility of testing question 1 of the PSAM RLP research questions.

5.2.1.4 CSPR Conclusion

Of the three PSAM partners, the baseline study found that CSPR had the most systematic and holistic approach to social accountability monitoring. While not all the process of the social accountability monitoring system were engaged with in interventions, opportunities to do so existed in the advocacy framework utilised by the organisation. CSPR pre-existing work showed the strongest appreciation of inter-linkages between accountability monitoring and improved service delivery. Further, it had the most structured and systematic approach to engagement with duty bearers. CSPR was also the only partner that directly articulated a rights-based approach to accountability in its training. CSPR also showed strong organisational documentation culture documentation.

In relation to the PSAM approach and partnership strategy, CSPR's training and subsequent budget and service delivery monitoring can be strengthened in the following ways:

- Strengthening the content of the rights based approach in the training
- Introducing and strengthening monitoring for inter linkages between identified service delivery failures and all the processes of social accountability system
- Introducing and strengthening monitoring for systemic service delivery failures
- Strengthening monitors ability to engage identify and engage with primary documents produced in the five processes of social accountability set out by PSAM
- Strengthening systematic approach to service delivery monitoring that views improved service delivery as a result of government working as social accountability system
- Strengthening the lesson learning aspect of CSPR interventions with government

5.2.1.5 Particular Opportunities

- Taking advantage of the depth and systematic nature of CSPR budget and service delivery monitoring work for lesson learning
- Taking advantage of CSPR community work for lesson learning
- CSPR is very interested in instituting the rights based approach in its work

5.3 JCTR

The Jesuit Centre for Theological Reflection (JCTR) is a research, education and advocacy team that promotes study and action on issues linking Christian Faith and social justice in Zambia and Malawi. JCTR began in 1988 as a project of the Zambia-Malawi Province of the Society of Jesus and is similar in orientation to other Jesuit social centres around the world¹⁰. JCTR has a secretariat in Lusaka that operates three programmes as follows< the social conditions programme, the Faith and Justice programme and the Economic Development Programme.

¹⁰JCTR website June 2013

The Centre engages in research on key social issues like cost of living, social implications of debt servicing, accessibility of healthcare and education, and integrity of local democracy with a strong publication advocacy aspect to its work. JCTR is routinely invited to represent civil society on government structures of accountability such as Sector Advisory Groups in the ministries. As an organisation, JCTR commands great respect for its advocacy experience and especially its Basic Need Basket that has become an institution in the fight for economic justice¹¹.

JCTR does not operate subnational offices but its work is informed by research carried out by volunteer outreach teams around the country.

The outreach teams mirror the work carried out at the secretariat carrying out local research as required by programmes. The outreach teams are made up of volunteers from varying backgrounds including churches, other NGOs and private individuals. The outreach teams are led by a part-time employee who reports to the outreach coordinator at the Secretariat. The Outreach Coordinator then facilitates research requirements of the programmes with outreach group activities. The baseline study was informed that unlike the Caritas Zambia and CSPR, JCTR structure is such that national office is not dependent on the subnational for its operational survival.

5.3.1 Pre-existing PRM work

In relation to PRM work, the baseline study found that JCTR outreach teams analyse the yellow book to identify resources for tracking. This analysis will be in relation to issues of service delivery in the local area. The findings are fed back to the secretariat for advocacy.

5.3.2 JCTR Training

JCTR outreach teams are trained by staff from the secretariat. The training prepares the teams to carry out social auditing on identified issues. The training prepares the outreach team members to:

- Identify a local service delivery issue
- Trace any allocations to the identified issue in the Yellow Book
- Carry out budget tracking to verify if allocated resources have been disbursed
- Tack if and how resources are spent
- Seek answers if resources are spent other than budgeted for

The outreach tams then carry out a budget tracking initiative whose findings are passed on to the national office for advocacy.

5.3.3 Benchmarks and Indicators for Onward learning

While the national JCTR office has the strongest PRM reputation, its work has the weakest relation to a systems approach to social accountability monitoring. The budget tracking work carried out by its subnational outreach teams is focused largely on resource allocation and expenditure. It would therefore be benchmarked for an adoption of the holistic approach to PRM monitoring.

¹¹ For several years, JCTR has carried out in Lusaka a monthly survey of prices of basic family necessities (e.g. food housing, etc.) comparing the finding with take-home wages.

5.3.4 Opportunities for lesson Learning

Because of its very fragmented approach to PRM monitoring, JCTR presents the most valid opportunity for the changes that occur in adoption of a systematic approach to social accountability monitoring as well as question 1 of the RLP research questions.

5.3.5 JCTR Conclusion

In relation to the PSAM approach and partnership strategy, JCTR's training and consequent budget and service delivery monitoring can be strengthened in the following ways:

Like the other two partners, JCTR work would be strengthened by adopting a systematic approach to PRM monitoring. Of the organisations JCTR came across as the organisation with the strongest research capacity and experience but also most fragmented approach. After the baseline, it is the opinion of the Zambia's desk that more interaction with JCTR needs to be carried out to identify areas in which their work would be directly strengthened.

5.3.6 Particular Opportunities

JCTR's profile and experience in budget and debt monitoring means they remain a valuable partner in the Zambian context. However, more interaction is needed in order to target the partnership activities in a way that most fulfils PSAM objectives for an overall strengthening of a systematic rights based approach to PRM monitoring.

6. Conclusion

The baseline study on PSAM's partner organisations was an informative initiative. It revealed that the partner organisations each carry out well-structured PRM training for their subnational groups who carry out calendar monitoring events. It also showed that the partners are not at the same level as regards a systems approach to social accountability monitoring.

None of the partners were benchmarked as monitoring all the processes of the social accountability system. The study revealed that the Public Integrity and Oversight processes were the least articulated in the work of the partners. The Auditor General's report for example which has a wealth of PRM information was hardly engaged with in the sub-national groups. Nor was the oversight function of councils or parliament seen as strategic to PRM monitoring.

Resource allocation and Expenditure Management received the most attention. Strategic Planning and Performance Management were engaged with but seemingly not always intentionally or understood as important. Further the link between accountability monitoring work and improved service delivery was not well articulated in the interventions. Caritas Zambia's training especially seemed to view service delivery improvement as a by-the-way result of the work to be carried out by trained actors with budget tracking being an end in itself.

A further point brought out by the study in relation to the PSAM approach is that other than CSPR the partners at sub-national do not have a well set out advocacy strategy for the information that comes out of the PRM monitoring work. Engagement with duty bearers is ad hoc.

CSPR, in this regard, is the most advanced and was identified as having the most theoretical approach to its PRM work which work is underpinned by a well set out advocacy strategy. Because CSPR systematically follows a service delivery issue from the local to the national it is more likely to engage with each of the processes even they are not identified as such. The focus on a service delivery issue

also links the organisation's advocacy work to change in the community that identified the issue at the beginning of the initiative.

Caritas Zambia was identified as having the furthest reach because of its situation in the church. However, it suffers the most organisational challenges due to the autonomy of the dioceses. This however can be strength in that each diocese has the ability to implement its own strategy without being handicapped by centralised challenges as is possible with CSPR and JCTR. Autonomy of the dioceses as strength was exemplified in that Chipata diocese had strong PRM initiatives situated in robust local networks, while Monze was struggling with survival issues. In the final analysis it can be stated that the partner organisation individually present different possibilities for learning for the partnership. They each can be used to test all four of PSAM research questions. Considering the three partners a unit is however an issue that will have to be reflected on for its efficacy.

Bibliography

Caritas Chipata *November 2011 – December 2012 PELUM Budget Tracking Initiative*

Catholic Commission for Justice and Peace, *Formation Training Manual 2006*

CSPR Annual Report 2012

CSPR Half Year Narrative Report January –June 2013

Chipata District Farmers *CDF Monitor* Vol 4 Issue 1 March 2013

Civil Society for Poverty Reduction *community Budget Tracking and Service Delivery Monitoring Training Manual 2010*

JCTR 2010-2012 Strategic Plan

Caritas Zambia 2010 -2012 Strategic Plan

Appendix I Interview questions and survey format

Concerning organisational practices:

- 1) What PRM activities does your Diocese routinely and historically carry out in a calendar year?
- 2) Approximately how many people do you train in PRM monitoring in a calendar year
- 3) What PRM events or processes do activities target?
- 4) Which sector/s to your PRM monitoring activities target?
- 5) What informs your choice of sector to monitor?
- 6) Are your PRM monitoring activities carried out during a calendar year connected to each other in any way?
- 7) If so how?
- 8) What are the immediate objectives of each of these activities?
- 9) What are the long term objectives of these activities?
- 10) What is considered immediate success in these activities?
- 11) What is considered long term success in these activities?
- 12) Why in your view must civic actors/community members engage in PRM monitoring?
- 13) How are the routine PRM monitoring activities monitored and evaluated?
- 14) Is there a theoretical concept in which your activities are grounded?
- 15) To what extent is theoretical concept streamlined in each of the PRM activities?

Concerning advocacy groups (i.e. provincial groups, network partners) activities

- 1) Does the diocese/organisation carry out or engage in training members to carry out public resource management/social accountability monitoring work?
- 2) If yes, what kind of training?
- 3) How often is the training done?
- 4) What are the specific objectives of the training?
- 5) What specific skills does the training aim to impart in participants?
- 6) What Public Resource Management Monitoring activities does the diocese/organisation carry out?
- 7) What is the objective of these activities?
- 8) How do they connect to your National Office objectives and activities?
- 9) How often do you carry them out?
- 10) What change to do you want to see in carrying them out?
- 11) What training did you receive in readiness for these activities?
- 12) What budget related work do you carry out?
- 13) How often do you carry out budget work?
- 14) What strategic planning monitoring work do you carry out?
- 15) Do you know what the Auditor General report is?
- 16) Do you carry out any work around the AG's report?
- 17) Is any work you carry out around the AG's report related to your budget work?
- 18) Do you utilise the findings of the AG in any other way we have not discussed?
- 19) Do you carry out an Expenditure tracking work?
- 20) Do you monitor how planned activities are implemented?

- 21) If you do monitor projects how does this relate to your budget tracking work?
- 22) Is this related to your budget work or AG's report work?
- 23) Do you work with Parliament or your council?
- 24) Is the work you carry out with parliament or your council related to your budget or AG's report work?

Data collection method

Primary	Interview	Programme Manager, Programme Officer
	Focus group	Provincial Coordinators/Groups, Field Workers
	Survey	
Secondary	Reports	Organisation
	Meeting notes/minutes	Organisation

- **Survey format**

Advocacy activities carried out by provincial groups					
- List of PRM activities					
Activity	Objective	Connection to organisation objectives	Frequency of activity	Desired impact of activity	Training provided (Y/N)
PRM monitoring activities carried out by groups:	Description of undertaking	Period carried out	Which other PRM activity listed is activity connected to?		
a. Budget analysis					
b. Evaluations of Strategic plans					
c. Expenditure tracking					
d. Auditor General report advocacy					
e. Work with Parliament or Council					
Organisational practices					
What PRM activities are carried out during the year?	Activity	Period carried out	PRM event targeted	Short-term objectives of activity	Long-term objectives of activity

Appendix II

Organisation Staff/Members Interviewed by organisation

<u>Caritas Zambia</u>	
Milimo Mwiba	Programmes Manager
Edmond Kangamungazi	Economic Justice Programme Specialist

<u>Caritas Chipata</u>	
Fr Vincent Daka	Director
John Zulu	Programmes Coordinator Governance
Andrew Phiro	Task Force Member
Steven Phiri	Monitoring and Evaluation Officer Chipata Dist Farmers Ass
Virgil Malambo	Coordinator Chipata District Farmers Ass (network partner)

<u>Caritas Livingstone</u>	
Francis Chanda	Director
John Mwewa	CCJP Coordinator
Prisca Mushondwa	GIZ support

<u>Caritas Ndola</u>	
Patrick Bwalya	Development Justice and Peace Manager
CSPR National	

<u>Caritas Monze</u>	
Solomon Phiri	Director

<u>CSPR National Office</u>	
Isabel Mukelabai	Programmes Manager
Raphael Phiri	RPA Programme

<u>CSPR Eastern Province</u>	
Max Nkhoma	Provincial Coordinator
Mary Mumba	RPA Task Team Chairperson
Franklin kayahalwe	RPA Task Team Member

CSPR Southern Province

Edna Kumwenda	Provincial Coordinator
Sibu Malambo	PPMT Member
Marian Chipemba	RPA Task Team Member

JCTR National

Innocent Ndashe	Outreach Coordinator
Twaambo-Kanene-Mwale	Information Officer

JCTR Livingstone

Moses Sakala	Outreach Team Leader
--------------	----------------------