Evaluation of Norway’s support to women’s rights and gender equality in development cooperation

Annexes 1 to 10 of the Evaluation Report
1. Introduction

During the period 2007-2013 Norwegian support to women rights and gender equality in development cooperation has been guided by “The Action Plan for Women’s Rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation” (hereafter referred to as the Action plan). The plan was launched in 2007 and intended to boost efforts to promote women’s rights and gender equality in the international community and among Norway’s cooperation partners.

Norad’s Evaluation Department is now commissioning an evaluation of Norway’s support to women’s rights and gender equality in development cooperation during the period 2007-2013.

Background

The Action Plan emphasizes women’s rights and targeted measures to increase women’s control of their lives and to promote their right to participate in and exert an influence in all areas of society. The use of the term «women» in the strategy is inclusive, encompassing girls and women of all ages.

The term gender equality, as used in the Action Plan, implies equal rights and opportunities regardless of gender. It involves changing how the sexes relate to each other and bringing about a redistribution of power, resources and caregiver responsibilities between men and women. It means mutual respect, and freedom from gender-based violence and harassment. Gender equality is contingent on the realisation of women’s sexual and reproductive rights, including respect for women’s freedom of choice and self-determination. Gender equality is based on respect for human rights and the inherent value of all individuals regardless of gender, social or ethnic background, including indigenous status, religion and belief, disability, age and sexual orientation.

The Action Plan focuses on four strategic priorities for achieving a redistribution of power and resources between men and women:

- women’s political empowerment
- women’s economic empowerment
- sexual and reproductive health and rights
- violence against women

The Action Plan was developed to correct weaknesses that were identified in the evaluation of the strategy for women and gender equality in the development collaboration. The evaluation concluded that the issue of women and gender equality held a prominent position on the policy level in the Norwegian development partnerships, but that the challenge consisted of putting goals into practice. On this basis, the consultants recommended that the support for women and equal rights should be operationalized. The report also recommended that equal rights should be highlighted much more in the dialogue with partner countries and that the institutional capacity in this area needed to be strengthened. In addition, the evaluation pointed out that reporting on this issue was weak and needed to be improved.

1 Report 2005/5: Evaluation of the strategy for women and gender equality in the development collaboration, the Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research on behalf of the Evaluation Department in Norad.
The Action Plan was reviewed in 2009, assessing to what extent one had succeeded in correcting the weaknesses pointed out by the evaluation.²

The review showed that women and gender equality still rank high on the political agenda in Norway, but that it was difficult to show to what degree equal rights have been emphasised in the dialogue with partner countries. With regard to reinforcing the capacity and competence in this field, the review showed that improvements had been made in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Norad, but that the capacity in the foreign missions was still weak. Training in the field had not yet found its right form and reporting on results in this area still needed to be improved.

To improve the latter, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs selected six embassies in 2011 as pilot embassies for strengthened efforts for women’s rights and gender equality for a period of three years. The purpose of the initiative was to explore ways to make gender mainstreaming more systematic and results oriented.

In August 2013, the Action Plan was replaced by a new plan “Equal Rights- Equal opportunities” covering the period 2013-2015. The strategic priorities in the Action Plan are continued in the new plan although additional priorities are included e.g. secure women’s participation in peacebuilding efforts and in the fight against sexual violence in conflict.

Norwegian funding of Women’s Right and Gender Equality³

The total volume of Norway’s gender-marked aid for the period 2007-2012 was approximately 30 billion Norwegian kroner, including 1.6 billion earmarked for “Kvinnebevilgningen” a separate budget item for women’s rights and gender equality under the international development budget.⁴ This grant was established in 2007 to contribute to the implementation of the Action Plan⁵ mainly through supporting targeted women rights and gender equality issues that fall outside other funding opportunities.⁶

Africa is the region that has received the highest volume of gender-marked aid, followed by Asia and the Americas. During the 10-year period 2002-2011, the highest volumes have gone to governance followed by education and health and economic sectors.

Multilateral organisations is the largest group of agreement partners of gender marked funds over the 10-year period (2002-2011), followed by local (national) NGOs, Norwegian NGOs and governments/ministries in developing countries. The governments receiving the largest share of Norwegian gender marked aid during the 10-year period are Afghanistan, Malawi, Tanzania and Sudan.

2. Purpose

The main purpose of this evaluation is to provide the Ministry of Foreign Affairs with information

---


³ For more details, please consult the study Norwegian funding to Women’s Right and Gender Equality (annex 5). The study was conducted by the Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research on behalf of the Evaluation Department, in 2012. Please note that if not stated otherwise, the study is used as source for the information provided under this heading.

⁴ Source: Norwegian Aid Statistics, Norad.

⁵ St.prp. nr 1, Det Kongelige Utenriksdepartement. 2007-2008, Kap. 168.70 Kvinner og likestilling.

⁶ St.prp. nr 1, Det Kongelige Utenriksdepartement. 2006-2007, Kap. 168.70 Kvinner og likestilling.
that can be used to improve future efforts to promote women’s rights and gender equality in Norwegian development cooperation.

The main users of the evaluation will be the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA). The MFA refers to its political leadership, its officials, the Norwegian Embassies and the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad). Other users of the evaluation include implementing partners’ e.g. non-governmental organisations (NGOs). Other stakeholders who have direct or indirect interest in this evaluation include individuals, households, communities, and relevant local and national institutions and policy makers that benefit directly or indirectly from the interventions in the partner countries.

3. Objective and Scope

Objectives
The objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Assess and document results of Norwegian support to women’s rights and gender equality in development cooperation.
- Identify lessons learnt that can contribute to improving the planning, organization and implementation of future interventions to promote women’s rights and gender equality.
- The findings and lessons learnt of the evaluation should be translated into recommendations to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs regarding planning and implementation of development cooperation to promote women’s rights and gender equality.

Scope
The evaluation covers Norway’s assistance to women’s rights and gender equality for the period 2007-2013 in three selected countries.

All of Norway’s direct support to women’s rights and gender equality in these countries, whether targeting gender directly or gender mainstreamed, and regardless of institutions involved, are under evaluation. Indirect support to gender via core budget support to multilateral institutions is however not included.

The evaluation will assess the effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of Norway’s assistance both at the overall level and by in-depth studies of selected projects/programmes.

Effectiveness will be assessed by documenting results at outcome level, emphasising tangible improvements for women’s rights and gender equality.

Relevance will be assessed by looking into whether Norwegian support consists with national needs and priorities and whether the support is in line with the priorities in the Norwegian Action Plan. Sustainability will, amongst other be assessed by looking into whether or not the Norwegian support is influencing national ownership and processes to strengthening women’s rights and gender equality.

The consultant shall propose case countries and a sample of projects/programmes for an in depth study in each of the proposed countries during the inception phase of the evaluation. The case countries shall include two of the six countries where Norwegian pilot embassies for gender equality are located (Angola, Ethiopia, Malawi,
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Mozambique, Nepal or Uganda), and one other country. At least one case country should be in Sub-Saharan Africa and another one in South-East Asia. Case countries should be selected based on the volume of Norwegian gender-marked aid that is received including the volume of funds allocated through “Kvinnebevilgningen.” No country in conflict should however be selected.

The final selection of countries and the sample of activities are to be concluded in dialogue with stakeholders during the finalisation of the inception report.

4. Evaluation questions
The following questions will guide the evaluation:

- To what degree has Norwegian support to women’s rights and gender equality led to the intended outcomes? Contributing factors for the results achievement or the lack thereof should be discussed.

- To what degree has Norwegian support to women’s rights and gender equality led to unintended consequences, positive or negative?

- To what degree is Norwegian support to women’s right and gender equality relevant in view of national priorities, needs and possibilities?

- To what degree is Norwegian support to women’s rights and gender equality in line with the strategic priorities outlined in the Action Plan? Moreover, to what degree has funding through “Kvinnebevilgningen” been used in accordance with its intentions?

7 As outlined in the Action Plan, in the Stortingsmelding 11/ (2007-2008) and relevant grant scheme rules.

- To what degree has Norwegian support influenced, positively or negatively, on national processes to improve women’s rights and gender equality, for instance by influencing national ownership of the issues, or the capacity of national institutions and implementing partners?

5. Methodology
The nature of the evaluation object and the evaluation objectives poses some challenges with regard to methodology.

First, strengthening women’s rights and gender equality is a long-term goal; hence, the time span for the evaluation may be too short to expect that lasting results have materialized.

Second, it will be challenging to find measurements of improvements in areas like rights, empowerment and equality, in particular measurements that can be used across contexts.

Third, attribution of Norwegian assistance to identified improvements may not be viable due to, among others, the many contextual factors involved.

The team will propose an outline of a methodological approach that optimizes the possibility of producing robust, evidence-based assessments within the limitations of the mentioned challenges, explicitly addressing the issue of contribution/attribution.
The approach may include the components below:

• Reconstructing the intervention logic/theory of change behind Norway’s assistance at country and project/programme level, identifying key assumptions to be tested.

• Assessing how women’s rights and gender equality are taken into account in the analysing/preparation phase, design, implementation and results documentation of Norwegian development cooperation in the countries, including how the strategies have taken into account national contexts.

• Assessing changes with regard to women’s rights and gender equality in the case countries, using existing data on local, country or regional level. This may include statistical data, demographic and health surveys (DHS), household surveys, research, or monitoring and evaluation data collected from various development agencies and programmes.

• Analysing progress in thematic areas or geographical locations that has received support from Norway, and compare with progress in other areas.

• In-depth study of selected cases to assess contribution/ attribution of Norwegian support to improvements in women’s rights and gender equality.

• Surveys, interviews, discussions or other consultations with stakeholders including beneficiaries (individuals (women and men) and communities that benefit directly or indirectly from the interventions), national and local stakeholders (e.g. organisations representing women or women’s interests), implementing partners (e.g. international, multilateral and non-governmental organisations), government representatives as well as representatives from the Norwegian embassies, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Norad.

• A comparable between the case countries and between results from gender-targeted activities and activities were gender marked aid has been mainstreamed.

The evaluation shall be carried out according to OECD DAC’s evaluation quality standards and criteria as well as recognised academic and ethical principles.

Data availability
A mapping study of Norwegian funding to women’s right and gender equality during the period 2002-2011 is available (annex 5). Further data collection is the responsibility of the evaluation team. Access to archives will be facilitated by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Norad.

---


9 See for example the recent study done by ODI Review of evaluation approaches and methods by interventions on women and girls’ economic empowerment, Georgia Taylor and Paola Pereznieto, 2014

Validation and feedback workshops shall be held in the case countries before departure, involving relevant stakeholders.

6. Evaluation Team and organisation
The tenderer and the evaluation team shall be assessed based on the competency requirements as elaborated in section 6 (award criteria) of this tender document.

National consultants should be identified by the Consultant in consultation with the Evaluation Department once the final selection of case countries has been conducted.

The evaluation will be managed by the Evaluation Department in Norad. The evaluation team will report to Norad through the team leader. The team leader shall be in charge of all deliveries and will report to Norad on the team’s progress, including any issues that may jeopardise the assignment as well as proposals on how to deal with such issues.

All decisions concerning these Terms of Reference, the inception report, draft final report and final report are subject to approval by the Evaluation Department.

7. Budget and Deliverables
The project is budgeted with an input of 50 consultant weeks.

The tenderer shall quote a total price for the assignment, exclusive of costs related to data collection in case countries (i.e. travels and subsistence allowances).

The team leader is expected to budget for and participate in the following three meetings in Oslo: a contract-signing meeting; a seminar to present findings and to discuss possible recommendations for follow up with stakeholder representatives from MFA and Norad before the report is finalised and; a meeting to present the final report. The consultant may be requested to make additional presentations, in which case Norad will cover the cost outside the tender budget.

The team should budget for field studies in three countries.

Further specifications regarding the budget is given in annex 1.1 (Price)

The deliverables in the consultancy consist of the following:

- Inception Report not exceeding 20 pages to be commented by stakeholders before final approval by the Evaluation Department.

- One seminar in Oslo to present findings and to discuss possible recommendations for follow up with stakeholder representatives from MFA and Norad.

- Draft Final Report for preliminary approval by the Evaluation Department. The draft will be sent to stakeholders inviting them to comment on facts, findings and conclusions.

- Final Evaluation Report.

- Policy brief not exceeding 2 pages

- Seminar for dissemination of the final report in Oslo.
Data, presentations, reports (to be prepared in accordance with the Evaluation Department’s guidelines given in Annex 1.2 of this document) are to be submitted in electronic form in accordance with the deadlines set in the progress plan specified in section 7.2 of this tender document. Norad’s Evaluation Department retains the sole rights with respect to all distribution, dissemination and publication of the deliverables.
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Annex 3 – Interviews and data collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bodil Maal, Senior adviser</td>
<td>Norad, Section for Rights and Gender</td>
<td>Equality, Department for Economic Development, Gender and Governance, Norad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gørild D. Mathisen, Senior</td>
<td>Section for Rights and Gender,</td>
<td>Development, Gender and Governance, Norad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adviser</td>
<td>Sector for UN Policy, Dept for UN</td>
<td>and Humanitarian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilde Salvesen, Senior</td>
<td>Section for Peace and Security, MFA</td>
<td>Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schayen, Senior adviser</td>
<td>Sect for UN Policy, Sect for UN</td>
<td>Policy and gender equality, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrik Arthur, Senior</td>
<td>Section for UN Policy and gender</td>
<td>equality, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adviser/Ambassador at large</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristine Storholt, Assistant</td>
<td>Section for Rights and Gender, Norad</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inger Annette Sandvand</td>
<td>Section for Renewable Energy (REN),</td>
<td>Dahlen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dahlen, Advisor</td>
<td>Norad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odd Arnesen, Senior Advisor</td>
<td>Section for Agriculture and Forestry,</td>
<td>Norad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bjørg Skotnes, Coordinator</td>
<td>Peace and Security, Section for UN</td>
<td>for Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Policy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Annette Hubert,</td>
<td>Ethiopia Desk Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia Desk Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilde Rognlien Johansen,</td>
<td>Section for Sub-Saharan Africa, Unit</td>
<td>Senior Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Adviser</td>
<td>for West Africa, Ministry of Foreign</td>
<td>Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Svenskerud, Senior</td>
<td>Section for Sub-Saharan Africa,</td>
<td>Advisor/Desk Officer Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor/Desk officer Mozambique</td>
<td>Section for Sub-Saharan Africa,</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toril Langlete, Desk Officer</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bente Nilson, Senior Advisor</td>
<td>Education, Norad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kjersti Okkelmo, Senior</td>
<td>Education, Norad</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gro Lindstad, Director</td>
<td>FOKUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toril Hovden, Director</td>
<td>Department for Economic Development,</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Governance, Norad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ine Mareng</td>
<td>Recruitment Section</td>
<td>Department for Competence and Resources, Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erik Aakre</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Results Management Section, Department for Quality Assurance, Norad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariann Murvoll,</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Section for UN Policy, MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Edvard Eriksen,</td>
<td>Senior advisor</td>
<td>Section for Multilateral Development Finance and Global Economic Issues, MFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nina Strøm</td>
<td>Adviser</td>
<td>Global Health section, Norad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Osnes</td>
<td>Adviser</td>
<td>Department of Civil Society, Norad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredrikke Klander</td>
<td>Adviser</td>
<td>Department of Civil Society, Norad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gry Tina Tinde</td>
<td>Adviser</td>
<td>Research Section, Norad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Wetlesen</td>
<td>Adviser</td>
<td>Research Section, Norad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ETIOPIA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research instruments</th>
<th>Kembata Zone</th>
<th>Wolaita Zone</th>
<th>Adama</th>
<th>Bahir Dar</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community and institutional mappings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key informant interviews</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group discussions</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth interviews</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MOZAMBIQUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research instruments</th>
<th>Rural Electrification</th>
<th>Soy Bean/Agriculture</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cabo Delgado</td>
<td>Zambezia</td>
<td>Maputo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and institutional mappings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key informant interviews</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group discussions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth interviews</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEPAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research instruments</th>
<th>National/Ensuring Equal Representation in Policy and Decision Making</th>
<th>National Rural and Renewable Energy Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central level and Sanja</td>
<td>Surkhet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community mapping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDIs</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>146</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Tanzania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Siri Frette Allsted</td>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>Aid Administration, Norwegian Embassy in Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elisabeth Schwabe-Hansen</td>
<td>Counsellor – Political Affairs</td>
<td>Norwegian Embassy in Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Karadenizli</td>
<td>Deputy Representative</td>
<td>UN Women, Tanzania Country Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Zambia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chilufya Siwale</td>
<td>Grant Manager</td>
<td>NGO Coordinating Council (NGOCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engwase B. Mwale</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>NGO Coordinating Council (NGOCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernest Sibandze</td>
<td>Head, Capacity Building and Networking</td>
<td>NGO Coordinating Council (NGOCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari Marie Traedal Thorsen</td>
<td>Counsellor (Governance)</td>
<td>Royal Norwegian Embassy, Lusaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liane Moosho Imakando</td>
<td>Senior Programme Officer (Natural Resources and Gender)</td>
<td>Royal Norwegian Embassy, Lusaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumba Siyanga</td>
<td>Programmes Manager</td>
<td>NGO Coordinating Council (NGOCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Chitundu</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Programme Against Malnutrition (PAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namayuba Chiyota</td>
<td>Programme Officer (Gender, Human Rights and Social Sectors)</td>
<td>Royal Norwegian Embassy, Lusaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent M. Akamandisa</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>MUTAKAMWA PRODUCTIONS Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our country case study selection process is illustrated in Annex Figure 4.1 above and then described in more detail.

First, we categorized countries according to highest volumes of Norwegian gender-marked aid (2007-2013) and only considered the top 10 non-conflict affected countries that received that volume of funds, including funds allocated through the Women and Gender Equality Grant. We then excluded countries which are middle income (India) or approaching middle income status in the short to medium-term and will thus receive declining volumes of aid over time (Bangladesh). Of the eight remaining countries, we next had to select one Asian country and two African countries as per the TOR. Nepal thus became included automatically. Of the remaining African countries we were interested in providing a mix between Horn/East Africa and Southern Africa as these regions have very distinct socio-cultural traits which we hypothesized would significantly shape opportunities for promoting women’s empowerment and gender equality. In the Horn/East this left Ethiopia, Uganda and Tanzania. In Southern Africa, Angola, Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia. To further refine our selection we then looked at thematic concentration of programmes/projects per country with the aim of having countries that illustrated a good depth of programming in Norad’s four priority thematic areas. Given that Nepal is a good candidate to explore issues related to women’s political empowerment (in a post-conflict context), we were then looking for countries with strengths in the other areas. For both SRH rights and VAW Ethiopia emerged as a good candidate. For women’s economic empowerment, particularly in relation to energy (a major priority area for Norway), Mozambique emerged as a good option.
ANNEX TABLE 4.1: TOP 10 RECIPIENT COUNTRIES IN TERMS OF GENDERED AID (2007-2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recipient Country</th>
<th>Disbursements (1000 NOK)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>1 820 286,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>1 190 565,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>1 105 816,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>862 822,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>853 847,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>813 825,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>600 584,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>598 130,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>582 734,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>350 506,6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1 GUIDE FOR REMOTE KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

Aims:
A. to understand the country’s general programme portfolio and the extent to which gender is mainstreamed or targeted
B. to understand how WRGE results are reported and measured
C. to obtain their perspectives on what results have been achieved with regard to WRGE in the country in the period 2007-2013 (Action Plan)

1. Out of the 4 key areas that Norway’s Action Plan on Women’s Rights and Gender Equality focuses on (women’s economic empowerment; women’s political empowerment; violence against women and sexual and reproductive health), what are the key issue/s that need to be addressed in the country? (It can be more than one, in which case we should explore how they see the interrelation amongst these). What evidence do you rely on for understanding these?

2. In what ways do you analyse and bring in gender in your programme and project planning? What gender issues do you address in each of your sector programmes or projects?
   a. How do these gender issues align with national priorities?
   b. How do you ensure alignment between your (embassy, ministry, implementing agency) work on gender and the strategic priorities of Norwegian aid to WRGE?
   c. What are some of the strengths and weaknesses of your work on WRGE in that country? (first in general for non-embassy staff, and then in particular with respect to the work done with Norway)
   d. Lessons learned?
   e. Is gender mainstreamed across all programmes or targeted at women through specific projects? Can you please explain the differences (both in terms of planning and implementation)? How is this work funded differently through Norwegian aid?

3. Who is responsible for gender in the embassy/agency? Do you think the tasks carried out by this person are enough to effectively roll out WRGE objectives in programmes and projects in the country? Does he/she receive further support? From whom?

4. What are some of the key barriers to addressing gender in the context you currently work in? (tease out possible differences between perception of local and external staff)

5. Relationship with Oslo? With Norad? With MFA? (with respect to WRGE support in particular)

6. How are WRGE results measured? How are they reported? (e.g. reporting – requirements and monitoring). Are there differences in reporting on results –in general vs vis-à-vis gender?)
7. How are the funds disbursed? (on a periodic basis? Based on certain milestones or achievements?) Has the embassy faced any constraints to disburse these funds? What have they been? (for example, related to programme/project implementation or the country context?)

8. Please explain differences between WRGE related outputs and results.

9. Do you use a specific framework to report on WRGE outputs and results? (depending on interviewee, this could be reporting results to MFA, to Norad, to embassy) Do you find it useful? Is it purely quantitative or also qualitative? Is it compulsory or optional? (probe to see if they are obtaining result level reporting)

10. How do you assess the sustainability of past programmes?

11. What role does Norway’s ‘gender grant’ play in your portfolio and why? What is useful/not useful about it? (for embassy staff only)

12. What is in your view the most successful Norwegian funded gender project between 2007 -2013 and why? Least successful project and why?

13. What have been some unintended consequences stemming from your /Norway’s (?) work on gender (positive or negative)

14. Who are the Embassy’s key partners in the work you do on WRGE? (For non-embassy staff: Who are your key partners?)
   a. Relationships with civil society? Who do you work with and how effectively?
   b. Relationships with government counterparts? Who do you work with and how effectively?
   c. Cooperation with other donors

15. What results do you consider have been achieved with regard to Norwegian funded WRGE in the country in the period 2007-2013 (including in relation to the ‘Action Plan for Women’s Rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation’)
### 5.2 SUMMARY OF CASE STUDY INSTRUMENTS

#### ANNEX TABLE 5.2.1: INSTRUMENT SUMMARY FOR WRGE EVALUATION AT COUNTRY LEVEL – RESEARCH INSTRUMENT AND PURPOSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training with evaluation team</td>
<td>• To familiarise team with research purpose, methodology, approach,</td>
<td>• Country lead, national senior researcher, research assistant (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key informant interviews with embassy,</td>
<td>• To understand embassy structure, function, processes, distribution</td>
<td>• Head of Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including institutional analysis tool</td>
<td>of responsibilities, external relations, human resources, accountability</td>
<td>• Gender focal point,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>measures, focus on results, lessons learned about what works and</td>
<td>• Relevant sector specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>what doesn’t</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• General understanding of process that led to results (or not…)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key informant interviews with ministries and</td>
<td>• To understand institutional structure, balance of power, alignment</td>
<td>• Ministry of Gender (or equivalent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civil society</td>
<td>(relevance)</td>
<td>• Relevant thematic sector ministry – (where possible we will try to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To understand relationships with Norwegian Development Aid</td>
<td>include someone in a political leadership person as well as a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To identify national priorities and extent to which Norwegian Aid</td>
<td>technical expert)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is aligned</td>
<td>• Civil society organisations working in thematic sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To identify relevant sector challenges in terms of mainstreaming</td>
<td>• Civil society umbrella organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gender equality/ women’s rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aim is to understand results and contextualisation of results achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by Norwegian Development Aid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key informant interviews with other donors</td>
<td>• To get a comparative perspective on other donors engagement on WRGE,</td>
<td>• DFID and Sida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>their strategies, resource allocation, approach to results, type and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>efficacy of coordination mechanisms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project key informants</td>
<td>• To understand specific project trajectories, strengths, weaknesses,</td>
<td>• National level programme designers and managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relevance, effectiveness, sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Measuring and reporting results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To learn what evaluations have been undertaken and the extent to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to which emerging lessons have been taken up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local interviews</td>
<td>• To understand context in which Norwegian (co-funded) projects are implemented&lt;br&gt;• To understand district-level priorities and relevant alignment of Norwegian aid (relevance)&lt;br&gt;• To understand project perceptions and results (where they have this knowledge)&lt;br&gt;• To gain access to project community sites&lt;br&gt;• To help identify key stakeholders</td>
<td>• Relevant authorities – formal and traditional&lt;br&gt;• Project implementers (where relevant)&lt;br&gt;• Women’s civil society groups&lt;br&gt;• Any men’s groups working for gender equality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-level (per site)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group community mappings</td>
<td>• To get an overview of community history, key institutions, power relations, gender issues&lt;br&gt;• To understand perceptions about most significant change in gender relations in relevant sector&lt;br&gt;• To see whether there is any knowledge of Norway’s contributions and if so what are the perceptions</td>
<td>• Elders, religious leaders, local service providers (e.g. teachers, health clinic staff, extension officer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group discussion</td>
<td>• To understand men and women, adolescent boys’ and girls’ perceptions of gender roles and possible generational differences&lt;br&gt;• To understand local perceptions of key interventions needed to improve women’s lives&lt;br&gt;• To explore perceptions of most significant change brought about by Norwegian Development Aid’s project intervention as well as unintended effects</td>
<td>• 1 with men, with women, with adolescent girls (13-19), with adolescent boys (13—19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended observation of project site where applicable</td>
<td>• To observe dynamics at project site in terms of programme beneficiary-implementer interface, value-added/ utilization, meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-depth case studies</td>
<td>• To explore beneficiary and non-beneficiary perceptions/experiences of the project and its impact, including strengths and weaknesses&lt;br&gt;• To solicit beneficiary and non-beneficiary view on possible improvements</td>
<td>• Beneficiaries&lt;br&gt;• Non-beneficiaries&lt;br&gt;Include men where relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project key informants</td>
<td>• To understand project evolution and operationalization&lt;br&gt;• To understand project strengths and weaknesses&lt;br&gt;• To explore results and relevant impact pathways&lt;br&gt;• To explore lessons learned&lt;br&gt;• To explore thinking around sustainability post-project&lt;br&gt;• To explore the level of understanding of gender equity / women’s empowerment and how they operationalise it at project implementation level.</td>
<td>• Project implementers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 FULL CASE STUDY INSTRUMENTS

INTRODUCTION

Quantitative data collection and analysis

Purpose: to contextualise qualitative findings with possible insights into changes over time depending on data availability.

Examples of the type of information that will be analysed (depending on project, relevance, reliability and availability):

• Censuses, national household surveys, DHS on the position of men and women at national and relevant sub-national level
• Theme-specific quantitative data
• Project-specific quantitative data over time taken from gender analyses, baselines, regular M&E, mid-term reviews, evaluations.

Qualitative data collection and analysis

Please note that these instruments are guides only; they will be further developed with country teams once the specific projects for each country team have been identified in a day-long training in-country with the national experts. However, we are interested in learning about gender equality/ women’s empowerment programming in Norwegian Development Aid at country level in general; and then vis-à-vis two specific projects.

Principles and sampling

• 1 week in capital where we focus on broader embassy programme portfolio
• 2 weeks covering 2 project sites, at least one outside of the capital, where we will focus on one thematic priority area per country and look at 2 projects (mainstreamed and targeted intervention)

Introductory materials

A. Introduction when starting any exercise/ interview [tweak as appropriate per country and per sector and obviously simplify for local audiences]

“We are exploring how people in this community are affected by X issue and your perceptions and experiences of XX programme/ project. We are talking with men, women, boys and girls to understand how Norwegian Development Aid’s support in XX [country] is functioning and ways in which it could be strengthened. We think your views are very important and should inform discussions around policies and programmes that aim to improve individual and community wellbeing. We’ll be writing a report – there won’t be any immediate effects but longer-term we would hope that your views will be included.”

B. Basic information to ask in every community-level individual interview

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>[to be decided per country – but could be name or initials]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of birth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level – own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity/ caste</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### C. Information to collect at the beginning of every community mapping or focus group discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers of participants (at beginning): (at end):</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind of participants (men, women, beneficiaries, non-beneficiaries, etc.):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (average):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time start:</td>
<td>Time end:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note taker:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How was the process?** Was it participatory; did everyone take part in the discussion; did anyone dominate? did anyone walk out, why: was it difficult / easy to manage, why: were people comfortable / uncomfortable, why?: etc.

### D. Daily Report Format

*Please fill out these forms every evening as part of your daily debriefing process.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluations questions</th>
<th>Key findings</th>
<th>Expressions/quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what degree has Norwegian support to women’s rights and gender equality led to the intended outcomes? Contributing factors for the results achievement or the lack thereof should be discussed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree has Norwegian support to women’s rights and gender equality led to unintended consequences, positive or negative?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree is Norwegian support to women’s rights and gender equality relevant in view of national and subnational priorities, needs and possibilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree is Norwegian support to women’s rights and gender equality in line with the strategic priorities outlined in the Action Plan?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree has funding through “Kvinnebevilgningen” been used in accordance with its intentions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what degree has Norwegian support influenced, positively or negatively, on national and subnational processes to improve women’s rights and gender equality, for instance by influencing ownership of the issues, or the capacity of national institutions and implementing partners?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Key areas to probe further / follow-up (including interesting issues arising out of informal conversations (in a queue, bar, taxi, etc.) and observations)
2. Key challenges / limitations (related to questions, tools, context, etc.) (includes any need for clarification)
3. Names of key contacts and additional / follow-up interviews
**E. Transcript labelling**

Labelling of transcripts and translated interviews is very important but everyone has room for improvement! **This information needs to be shared with transcribers/ translators too.**

1. Label each word file as follows:
   - Instrument type
   - Date
   - Gender
   - Age
   - Location – district
   - [e.g. “IDI Sept 26 2013 Girl 15 Meo Vac”; e.g. “FGD Sept 13 2013 Boys 14-19 Doti”]

2. Ensure that each type of instrument is saved in a zip folder labelled appropriately [e.g. “IDIs with girls in Meo Vac” e.g. Marital Network Case Studies in Doti”]

3. Include information at top of word document for all translated/transcribed interviews as follows:
   - Type of instrument
   - Location [village, district, country]
   - Place where interview took place [e.g. village square; respondent’s home; school classroom]
   - Date
   - Age
   - Gender
   - Respondent initials
   - Interviewer
   - Interview duration
   - Comments on interview dynamics [e.g. relaxed, lots of interruptions, suspect respondent wasn’t as forthcoming as might have been etc.]

4. Summary table of total number of interviews by type and district/village

See example below for District X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of instrument</th>
<th>Number implemented</th>
<th>Number of people participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community mapping</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDIs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional analysis</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIIs</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>41</strong></td>
<td><strong>115</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NATIONAL LEVEL INTERVIEWS

a. Embassy: head of cooperation, gender focal point, relevant sector specialist(s) based on thematic priority; ensure national staff member is included

b. Ministries: up to four interviews – 2 per ministry (thematic plus gender)

c. Civil society: umbrella gender group; relevant thematic actors – 3 to 4.

d. Joint gender-donor-govt working group – group meeting if possible

Key informant interviews – with embassy

Aim is twofold:

D. to understand general programme portfolio and the extent to which gender is mainstreamed or targeted as well as (including any lessons learned from the pilot experience where applicable)

E. to get specific information on the projects under focus

16. What are the key gender issues that need to be addressed in the country? What evidence do you rely on for understanding these?

17. What is the process of developing your programme portfolio?
   a. How does it align with national priorities?
   b. How do you ensure alignment with Norway’s strategic priorities?

18. In what ways do you analyse and bring in gender in your programme and project planning? What gender issues do you address in each of your sector programmes? Experience with the pilot –
   a. How was it developed, what were the key objectives, how has it been rolled out, experiences to date?
   b. strengths and weaknesses
   c. Lessons learned?

19. Who is responsible for gender in the embassy? Similarities and differences before and after the pilot? Main contributions of the gender focal point? How does the GFP support other staff? What works and what are the obstacles?

20. (for gender focal point and other persons responsible for gender equality or women’s rights) Describe the type of support on gender of colleagues in other sectors in the embassy?
21. What are some of the key barriers to addressing gender equality and women’s empowerment? 
   a. (Consider possible differences between perception of local and external staff).

22. Relationship with Oslo? With Norad? With MFA? 
   a. Provision of advice – strengths, gaps, suggestions for improvements 
   b. Reporting – requirements and monitoring 
      i. General reporting on aid cycle (looped figure) – inclusion of gender 
      ii. Reporting on results – in general vs vis-à-vis gender

23. Is gender mainstreamed across all programmes or targeted at women through specific projects? How is this work funded?

24. How are the funds disbursed?

25. What kind of monitoring is undertaken and what kind of reporting is required from recipients? (probe to see if they are obtaining result level reporting)

26. What role does the gender grant play and why?

27. What is in your view the most successful gender project between 2007 -2013 and why? Least successful project and why?

28. What have been some unintended consequences stemming from the work on gender (positive or negative)

29. Who are your key partners? 
   a. Relationships with civil society? Who do you work with and how effectively? 
   b. Relationships with government counterparts? Who do you work with and how effectively? 
   c. Cooperation with other donors

30. Do you have an exit strategy for programmes that you support? If so how effective is it?

31. How do you assess the sustainability of past programmes?

**Key informant interviews – with ministries** 
(ministry of gender + thematic sector ministry/ies) and civil societies - questions to be adapted as appropriate)

1. Length of cooperation with Norway, types of programmes, type of support (e.g. funding, technical assistance, how close is this relationship); possible framing of gender issues and solutions

2. How are the funds disbursed? What kind of reporting do you have to provide? Who does it?

3. Changes over time in relationship with Norway, consistency of staff, type of support etc.

4. Have you observed an increased interest from Norway on gender in the past years? (have pilots had an effect?)

5. Cooperation with other donors? Relative importance of Norway?)
6. Norway’s strengths and weaknesses compared to other donors?

7. How important /relevant is gender equality / women’s empowerment in your sector? To what extent is this shaped by donor priorities?

8. What sources of evidence do you rely on to get a picture of men/women’s situation (focus on women’s needs)

9. Relevance – what are the key gendered challenges in your sector and to what extent is Norwegian support helping to address these?

10. Main barriers for women’s rights and gender equality in your country?

11. What is in your view the most successful gender project since 2007 and why? Least successful project and why?
   a. Broader lessons learned
   b. Unintended consequences of projects/programmes on gender (both positive or negative)

12. Sustainability/ownership- is there an exit strategy for the programmes?
   a. Do you have any examples of legacy or effects stemming from previous programmes?
   b. Are any of the programmes being continued by national partners or have any of the elements been incorporated/mainstreamed

13. Questions about specific projects evaluation team will investigate

Key informant interviews with other donors (Sida and DFID) + Institutional Analysis below

1. Emphasis given to gender equality and women’s empowerment by your organization?

2. Portfolio of gender programming?

3. Do you consider gender to be a national priority? If yes, what areas?

4. How do they measure and respond to results-based management?

5. Staffing

6. Relationships between country office and headquarters in terms of carrying out programming on gender equality and women’s empowerment

7. Level of intervention – e.g. support for individual organisations vs upstream policy advocacy work
Project key informants – national level
where applicable
(e.g. project officer, implementers, etc)
[2-3 interviews]

1. How long have you been involved in the project? What is your role in the project?
2. How did you get involved?
3. What were the origins of the project? Did it originate in country or was it suggested from Oslo?
4. What was the project design process? Were you involved and if so, how? Were local beneficiaries involved in the design and if so how?
5. At what point was the gender element introduced and how relevant has it been in the overall implementation of the project?
6. How is project funding disbursed?
7. Have the objectives of the project been met? Have there been unexpected results/impacts? Overall, what have been the key achievements or what do you think they will be? How do you measure this?
a. Did you do a baseline? What indicators do you use? How were they developed (by you, your partners, your beneficiaries)? What m&E have you undertaken? How are the results of monitoring fed back into the on-going project to improve it?
8. To whom do you have to report and according to what format? (What are your reporting mechanisms/requirements?)
9. What sort of support do you get from the embassy if any? Strengths/weaknesses of that support?
10. Coordination with other relevant interventions in the sector
11. Opportunities for strengthening going forward
12. Barriers to full achievement of original goal
13. Exit strategy/sustainability strategy
Institutional analysis

Who to ask?
• head of cooperation
• gender focal point
• relevant sector specialist
• ensure inclusion of local staff member if not included in the above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional analysis components</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management commitment and leadership on gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender focal point has clear job description and mandate, time allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender focal point – seniority of post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender focal point performance criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management accountability for mainstreaming gender and achieving results – including in job description and job performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity (building) on gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in local staff vis-à-vis gender (training?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment in diplomatic staff vis-à-vis gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational processes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear goals and messages on WRGE (women’s rights and gender equality) – including clear strategic and operational action plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme support to gender – including use of catalytic/strategic funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has an organisational gender audit been undertaken?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate gender in administrative routines and follow up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting on gender results in annual reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme portfolio, including WGE grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External relations</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor coordination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of policy dialogue to advocate for gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of engagement with civil society, including promoting meaningful participation (at what point do they come into the process, design?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of engagement with government partners, including promoting meaningful participation (at what point do they come into the process, design?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information sharing fora – discussion forums, knowledge management, quality of website content on gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilisation of external technical assistance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Gender Reviews of Norwegian Embassies 2011
**PROJECT LEVEL INTERVIEWS OUTSIDE OF CAPITAL**

Take pictures where possible

**Day 1**

**District-level interviews**
(district govt, relevant sector officials, traditional authorities, women’s civil society organisation/cbos) – also to secure entry/approval to communities

1. Length of cooperation with Norway, types of programmes, type of support (e.g. funding, technical assistance, how close is this relationship); framing of gender issues and solutions

2. Changes over time in relationship with Norway, consistency of staff, type of support etc.

3. Cooperation with other donors? Relative importance of Norway?

4. Norway’s strengths and weaknesses compared to other donors? (probe for any changes observed in their prioritisation of gender)

5. How important /relevant is gender equality / women’s empowerment in your sector? To what extent is this shaped by MDG/post-MDG priorities?

6. What sources of evidence do you rely on to get a picture of men/women’s situation (do women have a voice?)

7. Relevance – what are the key gender issues for women and men in your sector (Main barriers)

8. To what extent is Norwegian support helping to address these?

9. What is in your view the most successful gender project since 2007 and why? Least successful project and why?
   a. Broader lessons learned
   b. Unintended consequences of projects/programmes on gender

10. Sustainability/ownership- is there an exit strategy for the programmes?
   a. Do you have any examples of legacy or effects stemming from previous programmes?
   b. Are any of the programmes being continued by national partners or have any of the elements been incorporated/mainstreamed

11. Questions about specific projects evaluation team will investigate
Day 2-5 Community level
Community mapping - elders, religious leaders, teachers, nurses, etc. (non-govt)

**Aim:** to contextualise project-related findings within the community context

- Community context and history, power relations, donor /ngo programme interventions
- Understanding of gender division of labour, gender relations
- Understanding gender issues in relevant sector X
- Most significant gendered change in relevant sector
- To what extent has Norway-funded project contributed? How? Evidence?
**Focus group discussion – men and women, adolescent girls and boys separately**

Warm up with matrix on gender roles for men and women. Can probe for proverbs/ sayings...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>At home</th>
<th>Income-earning activities</th>
<th>In community decision-making bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The role of men and women ‘in the old days’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future roles and what is needed to achieve this?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What would be the most important interventions to improve the situation of women and men – get the group to rank using stones /cards etc

**EXAMPLE RANKING TABLE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Example: Hotline</em></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Example: School girls’ club</em></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc…</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention components/activities</th>
<th>Implications for men</th>
<th>Implications for women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Most significant change tool – related to project-specific intervention in relevant sector

What has changed in your life (reference to private and public) after project X?

Were there any negative effects?

Where there any unexpected effects? “what surprised you most from this project?”

What else do you think is necessary to improve your situation?

What is needed to ensure that the effects of the project you described last beyond the end of the project?
In-depth case studies – of programme beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries

(4 beneficiaries, 4 non-beneficiaries; gender balanced)

1. Why did you decide to become involved in the project? How did it come about? (selection of beneficiaries..)

2. Were you involved in project design?

3. Changes after the intervention?
   a. Individual
   b. In family/ intra-hh relations
   c. In community
   d. Vis-à-vis community leaders
   e. Vis-à-vis programme providers
   f. Vis-à-vis government officials

4. What sorts of things do you think could have been done differently in the context of the project?

5. Is the impact of the programme ongoing – are you still using the service/ skills etc.? why/why not?

6. For non-beneficiaries – how do you perceive the programme? Strengths, weaknesses, results? (have you observed any changes?) How did you learn about it? Why are/were you not part of it?
**Project key informants – site level**

[2-3 interviews]

1. How did you get involved? How long have you been involved in the project? What is your role?

2. What were the origins of the project? Did it originate in country or was it suggested from Oslo/capital of the country?

3. What was the process for project design? Were local stakeholders involved in the design? If so how?

4. At what point was the gender element introduced and how relevant has it been in the overall implementation of the project?

5. Did you receive adequate training? Was it gender-sensitive (include probes on issues of physical safety, harassment, housing, healthcare where appropriate).

6. How is project funding disbursed? (probe for bottlenecks and impact/effect)

7. What have been the key achievements or what do you think they will be? How do you measure this?
   a. Did you do a baseline? What indicators do you use? What sorts of M&E have you undertaken? How were findings utilised?

8. To whom do you have to report and according to what format? (What are your reporting mechanisms/requirements?)

9. What sort of support do you get from the national level (embassy, ministries, etc) if any? Strengths/weaknesses of that support?

10. Coordination with other relevant interventions in the sector

11. Opportunities for strengthening going forward

12. Barriers to full achievement of original goal

13. Exit strategy/sustainability strategy
Annex 6 – Maps of field sites
Annex 7 – Additional statistics

ANNEX FIGURE 7.1: TOTAL ODA TO FOCAL COUNTRIES, 2007-2013 (NOK ’000s)

Source: Norad/MFA 2015
ANNEX FIGURE 7.2: PROPORTION GENDER MARKED AID IN FOCAL COUNTRIES, 2007-2013

Source: Norad/MFA 2015
ANNEX FIGURE 7.3: GENDERED AID BY TARGET AREA IN ETHIOPIA, 2007-2013 (NOK ‘000s)

Source: Norad/MFA 2015
ANNEX FIGURE 7.4: GENDERED AID BY TARGET AREA IN MOZAMBIQUE, 2007-2013 (NOK '000)

Source: Norad/MFA 2015
ANNEX FIGURE 7.5: GENDERED AID BY TARGET AREA IN NEPAL, 2007-2013 (NOK ‘000S)

Source: Norad/MFA 2015
ANNEX FIGURE 7.6: GENDERED AID BY TARGET AREA IN TANZANIA, 2007-2013 (NOK ‘000s)

Source: Norad/MFA 2015
ANNEX FIGURE 7.7: GENDERED AID BY TARGET AREA IN ZAMBIA, 2007-2013 (NOK ‘000S)

Source: Norad/MFA 2015
ANNEX TABLE 7.1: TOTAL NORWEGIAN ODA BY AGREEMENT PARTNER, 2007-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Mozambique</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>Tanzania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>0.48%</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>2.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments/Ministries in developing countries</td>
<td>8.65%</td>
<td>63.69%</td>
<td>42.29%</td>
<td>45.53%</td>
<td>58.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilateral institutions</td>
<td>26.75%</td>
<td>4.61%</td>
<td>18.09%</td>
<td>4.32%</td>
<td>3.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO International</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
<td>6.07%</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td>4.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Local</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>5.04%</td>
<td>7.15%</td>
<td>18.86%</td>
<td>8.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO Norwegian</td>
<td>51.49%</td>
<td>7.81%</td>
<td>18.52%</td>
<td>18.04%</td>
<td>8.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian private sector</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian public sector</td>
<td>6.83%</td>
<td>1.78%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries private sector</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>9.93%</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
<td>4.45%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector in developing countries</td>
<td>1.27%</td>
<td>1.84%</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector other donor countries</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.14%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANNEX TABLE 7.2: USE OF WGE GRANT GLOBALLY AND BY COUNTRY, 2007-2013 (NOK '000S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WGE Grant</th>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Mozambique</th>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>Tanzania</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of projects</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of total number of projects</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total volume</td>
<td>1 924 065</td>
<td>91 658</td>
<td>64 921</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14 414</td>
<td>13 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of total ODA</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median grant amount</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>947</td>
<td>1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average grant amount</td>
<td>2032</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1510</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2218</td>
<td>1647</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aims: The programme aimed to promote young people’s sexual and reproductive health rights (SRHR) and needs, and sought to target the most vulnerable and marginalized adolescents and young people by providing them with knowledge, skills and opportunities required to make a successful transition to adulthood.

Approach/modalities for delivering WRGE results: the Joint Programme focused on 8 key modalities as follows:

1. Capacity building of IPs including youth run organizations
2. Supportive and enabling community environment (promotion of adolescents and young people’s participation, networking within youth clubs and associations)
3. Young people’s participation in programs which concern them: (Life skills and Peer Education, CC)
4. RH Services for young people
5. Pastoralist interventions (Capacity building, Strengthen linkage between organizations working on pastoral communities, Youth CC)
6. Gender: Developing conducive environment-RR, gender-based violence, early marriage a, FGM (Advocacy, Youth and CC: Capacity building of legislative and law enforcement)
7. Income generating activities: (support from credit institutions to improve their livelihood, vocational skill)
8. Evaluation, documentations of good practices dissemination of info.

Key findings on results: Joint programme documentation highlights the following key achievements:

- Provided 30 per cent (12/40) coverage of the country’s universities and 25 high spot areas in 25 woredas in 5 regions with different packs of SRH and HIV/AIDS prevention activities
- Reached close to 600,000 adolescent and young people with direct services
- Disseminated SRH messages to 3 million young people through print and billboards, electronic media, and mobilization activities
ETHIOPIA

**Project name:** Accelerating change towards zero tolerance to female genital mutilation in Ethiopia: Strategic Partnership with the Royal Norwegian Embassy for the abandonment of female genital mutilation. Joint Programme by Norwegian Church Aid and Save the Children. ETH-09/027 - Strategic Partnership: Fighting FGM; SCN 2013 ETH-3030 / ETH-09/027 Strategic Partnership on FGM; Strategic Partnership: “ETH-3030 / ETH-06/019- FGM and Other HTPs Prevention”

**Funding amount:** 68,143,900 birr / 23,212,765 NOK for Phase 1; 50 million NOK for Phase 2 (2011-2015)

**Years of funding:** Phase 1 (2007-2010) and Phase 2 (2011-2015).

**Aims:** Reduce female genital mutilation by 31% from the intervention areas by the year 2015 through a combination of awareness-raising, law reform and enforcement as well as economic incentive approaches.

**Approach/modalities for delivering WRGE results:** The programme focuses on six key modalities as follows:

1. Changing attitudes towards FGM of target communities *(Key indicators: Proportion of men and women who oppose the practice of FGM; Number of registered uncut girls; Number of ex-practitioners in the intervention areas who stopped practicing FGM and other harmful traditional practice (HTPs))*

2. Strengthening statutory national and regional laws against FGM and other HTPs enforced in the intervention areas *(Key indicators: Number of cases brought to the court and verdict given on perpetrators; Number of cases reported to the law enforcing bodies)*

3. Engaging with faith communities in the intervention areas to tackle FGM *(Key indicators: Number of faith communities that institutionalized/incorporated anti FGM messages in their works)*

4. Engaging with traditional/tribal/clan leaders to enforce traditional laws against FGM *(Key indicators: Number of FGM and related cases brought to and administered by traditional regulations; Number of traditional law enforcement institutions supported through the capacity building process)*

5. Providing assistance to victims of FGM and other HTPs in need of medical and counselling support in the intervention areas *(Key indicator: Proportion of FGM victims cured and integrated into the community)*

6. Advocating for FGM to become part of national and regional policy agendas *(Key indicator: Proportion of regional and national plans and policies which incorporated the issue of FGM)*

**Key findings on results:** at national level, key results of the Joint Programme have included the development of public statements by religious authorities from the major Christian denominations justifying efforts to abandon FGM on the basis of their own religious texts; and inclusion of HTPs as a key target in the 2011-2015 Growth and Transformation Plan. At subnational level key contributions have included the facilitation of public declarations of FGM free communities in intervention areas as a result of community awareness-raising activities; an increase in the number of registered uncut girls in schools (as a protective mechanism against vulnerability to the practice) and improved coordination with local government offices. While quantitative data is available for individual intervention areas, due to the limited quality of baseline data, it is not possible to provide robust and systematic aggregate figures.
MOZAMBIQUE

Project name: Cabo Delgado Rural Electrification Project (MOZ-04/286)
Funding amount: 349 million NOK
Years of funding: 2007 – 2012

Aims: The development objectives of the project are: i) Enhanced economic development by providing electric power to businesses and simplifying the establishment and/extensions, and ii) improved quality of life in local communities by providing reliable electric power supply [to public services].

Key findings on results: Improved access to/stability of electricity in public institutions such as schools and hospital, and a relatively limited number of private (1445) and business (219) connections primarily benefiting men. At the same time electricity has had a strong impact on women’s movements (by electrifying public spaces) and worldview (through access to media) with both positive and negative implications for women. An initial focus on WRGE and limited positive discrimination in terms of access to electricity and credit would have improved project outcome for women.

Approach/ modalities for delivering results for women/gender equality: The project has been gender blind, in a context where socio-economic and cultural gender inequality is so strong that targeted interventions would have been necessary in order to reach women and the poorest. Implemented by the Mozambique Electrical Utility (EDM) and Norwegian partners.
MOZAMBIQUE

Project name: Gender Mainstreaming in Energy Development Cooperation (MOZ-11/0033),
Funding amount: 7 million NOK
Years of funding: 2012-2014

Aims: To “ensure that both men and women have equal opportunities from the energy sector in order to participate in the community as well as in the country development process”.
Objectives: i) capacity building and gender mainstreaming for key energy sector actors; ii) creating electricity demand by mobilising women; iii) participatory market system development of energy for cocking; iv) capacity development and gender mainstreaming in environmental management of the petroleum development, and v) support to WWF-led civil society coalition for gender mainstreaming in petroleum development.

Approach/modalities for delivering results for women/gender equality: A combination of classical institutional gender mainstreaming through training of gender focal points and key energy sector actors, and targeted small scale interventions in order to create knowledge about and demand for electricity among women and reduce possible negative implications of gas and oil activities through training. Implemented by the international consulting company ENERGIA in cooperation with Mozambican partners.

Key findings on results: Results in terms of gender mainstreaming in the Ministry of Energy and its subsidiary institutions have been limited due to continued low priority of gender issues, limited impact of gender focal points and inadequate decentralisation of programme. Project on establishing small-scale businesses with women selling frozen products from containers promising, but inadequate attention to local market specifics threatens viability. Projects to limit possible negative social impacts of petroleum development have not been implemented, mainly due to lack of capacity/interest from main stakeholders.
MOZAMBIQUE

**Project name:** Soy Bean Production and Marketing in Northern Mozambique (MOZ-06/052)

**Funding amount:** 17 million NOK

**Years of funding:** 2007-2012

**Aims:** Bring about a more than ten-fold increase in the production and marketing of soybeans by small farmers in the Gurue area of northern Mozambique. Sub-objectives: i) Increase the amount of cultivated land through animal traction and the use of tractors; ii) Improve access to seeds and other inputs, to markets, and to credit and other business services; and iii) Assist in building strong farmer organizations. Additional objectives to secure land tenure for farmers, promote the use of nutritious soy protein in the diets of local families, and increase literacy among farmers, especially women were added after a 2009 review of the project.

**Approach/modalities for delivering results for women/gender equality:** From having primarily been a technological, market oriented project with no gender focus and no gender mark, the project gradually changed to accommodate women as this was seen as essential for overall success. The project is located in an area where women in the outset are heavily involved in agriculture and had a relatively strong position within the matrilineal kinship system; it was managed by an able partner (CLUSA) that knows the context well and is close to project activities; and the Embassy and the project staff has shown a capacity and interest to be flexible and change important aspects of the project towards women.

**Key findings on results:** The project has increased the amount of soya produced by farmers in the region, the number of farmers growing soya, the number of hectares of soya, and income household revenue. Moreover, the project assisted around 540 farmers, of which 250 were women, to obtain legal ownership of their farmland. Over 6000 people, mostly women, participated in the nutrition training program, and almost 3500 people graduated from the literacy program, of whom two-thirds were women. The project has enhanced the income of rural women, increased their relative independence towards men, and led to improvements in household diets.
MOZAMBIQUE

**Project names:** Women and Gender Equality Grant projects. 47 projects implemented by a total of 20 institutions.

**Funding amount:** 91,658,000 million NOK

**Years of funding:** 2010-2013

**Aims:** In the early phase the WGE Grant projects focused on sexual and reproductive rights, followed by attempts to direct more of the funds towards sector programmes. Recently the emphasis has been on ‘filling ‘gaps’ in the overall gender portfolio, including support to men’s involvement in gender issues (HOPEM), sexual and reproductive rights and safe abortions (Pathfinder) and gay rights (LAMBDa).

**Approach/modalities for delivering results for women/gender equality:** All interventions targeted at women, with the exception of HOPEM – Men for change. All projects a combination of advocacy work and concrete tangible interventions. Main challenges a high degree of centralisation, and an approach/language that is not always sufficiently adjusted to the lives of women in rural villages and urban shantytowns.

**Key findings on results:** The project folio under the Women and Gender Equality budget line is diverse and with relatively small projects. At the same time, the projects are carried out by specialised agencies, targeted at key constraints related to women’s rights and gender equality and are generally successful in reaching the objectives and showing results. Through the WGE Grant, Norway has also contributed positively to systemic, organisational as well as field-level results in a way that has proven very difficult with mainstreaming and sector-based approaches.
NEPAL

Project name: The Inter-party Women’s Alliance (IPWA). Ensuring Women’s Equal Representation at all the policy and decision making levels (NPL-11/0030)
Funding amount: 3.7 million NOK
Years of funding: 2012-2014

Aims: Its primary goal was “to pressure the party leaders, parliament and the government to address women’s issues” and ensure women’s equal representation at all policy and decision making levels through capacity building and awareness raising of IPWA members at central, district and local level as well as through advocacy, lobbying, interactions with pressure groups, research and dissemination of information.

Approach/ modalities for delivering results for women/gender equality: embassy provided funding to the Inter party women’s alliance (IPWA) which was used to support the core function, including office rental and support staff, as well as funding for training of all district chapters by central level staff, as well as financing for a National Conference undertaken in December of 2014.

Key findings on results: as a result of Norway’s support:

- Increased capacity, recognition, cohesion and legitimacy of women politicians strengthens their voice and their ability to advocate for women and influence the political agenda
- Strengthened alliance with increased capacity at both central and community level. Norway’s support was seen as instrumental in forming 9 district level IPWA chapters.
- As a result of the project all 75 district committees have an operating bank account, financial procedures and system in place and experience in managing funds.
Project name: The National Rural and Renewable Energy Program (NRREP) (NPL-10/0063)
Funding amount: USD 170.5 million with an expected 40% finance by the Government of Nepal (GoN) and the remaining 60% financed by external Development Partners
Years of funding: 2012-2017

Aims: Is a single programme modality which supports rural renewable energy development in Nepal, and builds on previous programmes such as the Rural Energy Development Programme (REDP) and the Energy Sector Assistance Programme (ESAP) I and II. By integrating alternative energy with the socio-economic activities in rural communities the NRREP aims to improve the living standard of rural population through increased employment and productivity while at the same time reducing dependency on traditional practices in a sustainable manner.

Approach/ modalities for delivering results for women/gender equality: The NRREP has three components: 1) Central Renewable Energy Fund; 2) Technical Support; 3) Business Development for Renewable Energy and Productive Energy Use. The Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) mainstreaming process is included under all three components, gender equality and social inclusion activities inbuilt into the outputs. The GESI mainstreaming approach of the NRREP consists of:

- Affirmative action and positive discrimination to the targeted groups
- Subsidies and credit facilities for the targeted groups
- Social mobilization and active participation to assess the needs of the targeted groups
- Frequent and critical analysis of demand and supply of services provided
- Work with likeminded and right holders organizations
- Coordination and collaboration with local bodies, line agencies, social leaders and media
- Capacity building of the stakeholders and partners at all levels (including community, district and central level)
- Creation of a platform for GESI responsive RET knowledge building, sharing and learning
- Piloting of action research adopting right based approach to reach poor women and men, and women belonging to janjati, dalit, madhesi, muslim and other backward communities (OBCs).
- Revisions from the lessons learned and up-scaling of the good practices.

Key findings on results:
- As a result of the NRREP gender disaggregated data is now available which provides a clear picture of the benefits received by women and socially excluded groups.
- Significant improvement of women’s involvement in Micro Hydro Project (MHP) and Productive Energy Use.
- Women were the beneficiaries of subsidies on solar installation and income generating support initiatives
- Through the project women’s participation in micro enterprises was promoted and technical support provided.
- Technologies promoted have a direct positive impact over women’s burden, for example, the solar pump takes away the need to walk for hours to collect water and reduces health risks from polluted water.
## Annex 9 – Comparison of 2009 Gender Review with 2014 findings

### ETHIOPIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations by 2009 review</th>
<th>Findings from evaluation in 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Improve coordination efforts with partners and NGOs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Embassy needs to follow developments in the NGO sector and raise any concerns related to the implementation of CEDAW, especially after the law was passed in 2009.</td>
<td>RNE has played an important role in continuing to fund national NGOs working on gender and rights issues and where this has not been possible has sought innovative solutions with public institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Embassy should prioritise field work participation with partners (for example, the Development Fund), in order to learn more about local partners and the socioeconomic and cultural context of programmes.</td>
<td>Embassy staff undertake short field visits to key projects but could perhaps do more to talk to a wider range of stakeholders and non-beneficiaries so as to gain more varied viewpoints about partner programme strengths and weaknesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Embassy should follow the work of the Development Partner (DP) Gender group and support the efforts of the group.</td>
<td>This did not emerge as an important part of the Embassy’s work on WRGE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Embassy should continue to raise gender issue concerns in dialogue with partners so as to minimize the “implementation gap” on gender issues.</td>
<td>The Embassy does raise gender issues in dialogue with partners but it appears to be as one issue among multiple. Moreover, examples reported to Oslo were only top line and non-specific in this regard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender mainstreaming

| **Gender mainstreaming** | |
| The Embassy should establish internal routines that automatically involve the focal point/gender adviser in the project process. | This has not happened. |
| Consultant with gender competence should be included in all reviews and evaluations. | It is not clear that this recommendation has been institutionalized – instead gender is more likely to be included as one of multiple concerns/dimensions to be considered. |
| The Embassy should systematically include gender equality in preparatory analysis and stipulate a gender component to programs proposed by implementing partners. | In terms of programmes on energy/climate change and agriculture, while gender is included as a consideration the analysis and programming action is quite modest. Embassy would appear to be following the letter rather than the spirit of this recommendation. |

### Monitoring and evaluation

<p>| <strong>Monitoring and evaluation</strong> | |
| Involve skilled gender advisers since many of embassy’s partner’s gender advisers lack the competence (and commitment) to implement gender policy. | This area does not seem to have been systematically addressed, although RNE staff have called upon Norad support periodically to help address some capacity gaps. |
| The Embassy should propose that the Development Fund and its partners establish a baseline, and set targets and indicators for their work. It is believed that the present monitoring procedures fail to document what is actually occurring on the ground. | The lack of attention to establishing rigorous baselines and sound monitoring and evaluation systems continues to be a serious concern. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations by 2009 review</th>
<th>Findings from evaluation in 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General budget support</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Select tax, fisheries, energy and statistics for areas of targeted focus on WRGE.</td>
<td>• Proposal to encourage Government to enhance general focus on gender through sector strategies, annual reports, relevant data etc. not followed up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Team should be organised at Embassy to work on cross-cutting issues (incl. gender).</td>
<td>• Proposal to increase focus on gender in sector support followed up for energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Request Ministries to provide sector strategies on gender</td>
<td>(even though sector not targeted in the Review).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage National Statistics Institute to work more with sex disaggregated data</td>
<td>• Limited impact through GBS and the Joint Review process as Norway discontinued budget support as of 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage Mozambique to prepare separate annual reports on gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fisheries</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with the Ministry of Fisheries and its Directorate of Small Scale Fisheries (IDPPE)</td>
<td>• Increasing focus on institutional development and aquaculture at the expense of small-sale fisheries (implemented by FAO).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to develop an action plan on gender</td>
<td>• Plans for gender focus in aquaculture delayed due to irregularities in sector cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sex-disaggregate statistics in fisheries</td>
<td>• Norwegian fishery partners still without social science/gender competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People with competence in social sciences/ gender should be included in review teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soya bean production/marketing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The project should serve as ‘good example’ of down-to-earth integration of women for other projects</td>
<td>• No clear signs of duplication in other projects except for the follow-up project on climate smart agriculture (PROMAC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support to civil society</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The gender budget line should be used for initiatives that are ‘strategic’ – i.e. clustered around the main RNE strategic priorities</td>
<td>• The WGE Grant has largely been used as proposed in the Review – albeit with better results for support through civil society than support though sector programmes (energy in particular).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It should also be ‘catalytic’ in the sense of being innovative and stimulate new initiatives and funding</td>
<td>• Norway did not join Sweden and other like-minded donors in the AGIR funding mechanism, but is in the process of joining as from 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Norway should look into joining Sweden in establishing a funding mechanism for women’s organisations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring and follow-up</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Embassy should establish a gender task force to support work in the different sectors</td>
<td>• Partly followed up during the period of the pilot Embassy initiative up to 2012, but with limited institutional embeddedness. Overall the gender focus has depended on the efforts of the individual gender officers, who have had limited impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Embassy should hold quarterly internal meetings on the status and challenges of integrating WRGE in portfolio</td>
<td>• Suggestion of selecting priority area for reaching poor women (i.e. with a primary focus on women) has not been followed up except in civil society support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Embassy should hold meetings between the different programmes and projects for exchanging experiences regarding WRGE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Norway should pick a priority area for poor women, like clean water, and support that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**NEPAL**

**Recommendation by Gender Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Findings from evaluation in 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The review team supports the Embassy’s current efforts at making an Action Plan for WRGE where all efforts are gathered. Such a plan might assist the Embassy in finding synergy effects between the different programmes and policies, especially between energy, education and governance</td>
<td>A gender review was developed in response to the recommendation to cover 2010-2012. In it, the many of the Review’s conclusions and recommendations were made specific reference to. Another gender strategic plan was developed to cover the 2013-2015 period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of the Action Plan could include a follow up of this report. The plan could be reviewed with the assistance of Norad after for example one – two years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gender Review report could be shared with key partners and potentially be used for workshops or seminars with the key development partners of Norway</td>
<td>It was used/ shared during the regional gender network meetings under the pilot initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depending on the capacity, the Embassy could consider taking a lead among the likeminded donors for promoting WRGE (the Embassy has been chair of 1325 for two years, and the team supports the Embassy’s wish that somebody else take over this chair)</td>
<td>The embassy passed over the chairmanship of the 1325 group in 2012 to UN Women, but has continued to provide support to UN Women in this role, there is no donor gender group in Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to support local Nepali WRGE channels like women’s media and watchdog organizations, including Gender Budgeting watchdogs</td>
<td>Women’s media was supported, no indication that support to Gender Budgeting watchdogs was provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Try and identify gender equality Change Agents in every sector and projects/programs.</td>
<td>The Gender action plan makes clear references to the identification of change agents, it is unclear how much this has translated into reality given that reporting does not go into that level of detail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify a pool of local WRGE experts that can be called upon for gender assessments and reviews, including Training of male WRGE experts</td>
<td>CVs relating of gender experts have been collected and used for reviews and/or evaluations. They have also been shared witht the wider international community when requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific initiatives like exploring to which extent conditions on women’s representation should be attached to funding, ex. 50% representation in all project/program activities, and employment in partner organizations.</td>
<td>No indication that this has been addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme recommendations: energy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Norway decides to support a new phase of ESAP, a Gender Audit could be performed, built on Ministry of Finance’s GRP and specific gender targets and indicators set. A Gender and Social Inclusion analysis of the upcoming programme should be conducted.</td>
<td>While a gender audit was not reported, a national gender expert with gender sensibility and skills was recruited. Norway supports the gender element (GESI) of the new National Energy joint donor program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Gender/energy expert should be engaged to make input to the new Programme Document. In the new phase, technical assistance on integration of GESI should be part of the new budget of the joint donor group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation by Gender Review**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Findings from evaluation in 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing at least one pilot “Energy Programme for Women”. This could be linked to:</td>
<td>a. The GESI element incorporated into the NRREP acts as a pilot. It also has an important element to promote economic empowerment through IGA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Utilizing the increased energy supply for women to economic activities (power for empowerment). The team understands that the Embassy has already initiated this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Exploring how girls’ training, education in energy technology and research on GESI aspects of energy can be supported (this can also be explored through Norway’s research program, NUFU and/or the Master program, NOMA).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make use of methodology and lessons learned from other countries like– regional and international network on gender and energy.</td>
<td>While this specifically was not reported, the embassy benefitted from NORAD’s Framework Agreement with Energia and its lessons learned in the other countries where it was piloted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special efforts should be made to include WRGE into the planning and development of a new energy strategy by the Embassy. Special efforts should be made to include WRGE into the planning and development of a new energy strategy by the Embassy.</td>
<td>An energy strategy was developed to cover the 2011-2020 period which very clearly identified GESI and objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Findings from evaluation in 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is a good opportunity for linking the Media Initiative, Rights and Social Transformation (MIREST) work of bringing CA members to the districts to be accountable to constituencies, with LGCDP/MLD</td>
<td>No indication that this has been addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The GESI strategy need to be monitored and included in the minimum performance</td>
<td>No indication that this has been addressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to work on identifying barriers to women`s participation in local governance and the VDCs in a meaningful way. Assess if there are training needs at local level, or encourage MLD to cooperate with NGOs/CBOs working with local empowerment initiatives of women.</td>
<td>RNE supports the IPWA and Sankalpa with a focus on capacity building at local level. Methodologies and content are defined by the partners.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Embassy administration and reporting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Findings from evaluation in 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tailor made gender trainings, example gender and energy, gender and climate changes could be ordered by Embassy, and provided by Norad in close cooperation with Nepali gender experts</td>
<td>No gender training stemming from the RNE in Nepal was reported to have taken place. There was training linked to the pilot (the workshops) and in the context of the Framework agreement with Energia. (funded through the WGE Grant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. INTRODUCTION

The specific objectives of the evaluation of Norway's support to Women's Rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation are to assess the effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of its work. Table 1 sets out the key evaluation questions as set out in the Terms of Reference. The Zambia Case Study presented here assesses the fit between the work of the Embassy of Norway in Zambia and the key questions. Following a presentation of the findings, the Conclusion returns to the questions below.

The case study on Zambia was prepared in December 2014 and January 2015. Skype discussions were held with three Embassy of Norway staff, and with staff from two projects supported by the Embassy under the Women and Gender Equality Grant: the Programme Against Malnutrition (pAM) and the NGO Coordinating Council (NGOCC). For each case study, the director was the lead informant, with M&E and gender staff providing additional information in the case of the NGOCC. A long-standing Zambian colleague of the author – an expert in gender analysis and rural development – was consulted in order to provide a knowledgeable but non-involved ‘outsider's view'. For each interview a questionnaire checklist was prepared and sent approximately one week in advance together with an explanation of the purpose of the study. This allowed interviewees to prepare appropriately. In the course of the discussions, further questions to help clarify some issues, or extend analysis of others, were posed. Budget allocations since 2007 were studied and tabulated. All the business plans covering the same period were translated and examined. A wide ranging literature review was undertaken, and the author's earlier work in Zambia for USAID Feed the Future/ CDCS provided further useful material.

This is primarily a desk study with selected key informant interviews. Limitations to the research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>1. To what degree has Norwegian support to women’s rights and gender equality led to the intended outcomes? Contributing factors for the results achievement or the lack thereof should be discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. To what degree has Norwegian support to women’s rights and gender equality led to unintended consequences, positive or negative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance</td>
<td>3. To what degree is Norwegian support to women’s right and gender equality relevant in view of national priorities, needs and possibilities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. To what degree is Norwegian support to women’s rights and gender equality in line with the strategic priorities outlined in the Action Plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. To what degree has funding through &quot;Kvinnebevilgningen&quot; (WGE Grant) been used in accordance with its intentions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>6. To what degree has Norwegian support influenced, positively or negatively, national processes to improve women’s rights and gender equality, including influencing national ownership of the issues, or the capacity of national institutions and implementing partners?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
process include the narrow number of interviews conducted (involving nine individuals in total), no discussions with beneficiaries in the field. This means that there is a limited ability to triangulate findings, and to provide recommendations (as opposed to tentative conclusions).

2. WRGE COUNTRY PROFILE

Zambia is a multi-ethnic nation with 73 ethnic groups. In 2010, its population was 13,046,508, with women constituting 51%. The majority of the population, 65%, was living in rural areas. Forty-six per cent of the population is under 15 years of age. Between 1980 and 2012, Zambia’s life expectancy at birth decreased by 2.6 years, mean years of schooling increased by 3.4 years and expected years of schooling increased by 0.8 years. Zambia’s GNI per capita decreased by about 5 percent between 1980 and 2012.

Zambia’s 2012 Human Development Index value of 0.448 is below the average of 0.466 for countries in the low human development group and below the average of 0.475 for countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. Zambia has a Gender Inequality Index value of 0.623, ranking it 136 out of 148 countries in the 2012 index. About one quarter - 25.7 percent - of adult women have obtained a secondary or higher level of education compared to 44.2 percent of men. For every 100,000 live births, 440 women die from pregnancy-related causes. The adolescent fertility rate is 138.5 births per 1000 live births. Female participation in the labour market is 73.2 percent compared to 85.6 for men (ibid.).

The reasons for Zambia’s mixed performance are complex and difficult to discuss in brief. It was relatively wealthy in the first decade after Independence in 1964, but a combination of external economic shocks, poor economic management and corruption contributed to economic decline. In the 1990s a one-party political regime and bureaucratic, state-led approach to development was replaced by political and economic liberalisation, followed by intensive implementation of a standard package of structural adjustment policies. This shake up did not generate many of the expected development benefits. Strong and continuing reliance on the copper sector, despite the fact that several mines are becoming depleted, and that it experiences wide fluctuations in profit margins due to world market pricing, has largely eclipsed development efforts in the agricultural sector, which is weakly developed, largely subsistence based and characterized by thin markets. No investments in manufacturing were made prior to Independence, and this sector remains weak.

2.1 Political empowerment

Contrary to trends across Sub-Saharan Africa, and the strong performance of Zambia’s immediate neighbours, the political representation of women is actually weakening. 11.5 per...
cent of legislative positions are currently held by women (14.6% in 2006), behind South Africa (42.3%) Angola (34.1%), Mozambique (39.2%) and Zimbabwe (15%). Only 106 of 709 candidates selected to stand for Parliament in 2011 were female. Female representation in local government is very low at less than 6 per cent whilst only 19 of Zambia’s 287 traditional leaders are women. However, in the recent presidential election (January 20th, 2015) new President Edgar Lungu moved swiftly to appoint the first female Vice-President the country has known, Honourable Inonge Wina, as well as appointing two other women to key positions: Ireen Mambilima as Chief Justice, and Margaret Mwanakatwe as Commerce, Trade and Industry Minister.

Women’s generally weak political empowerment is attributed by Embassy staff and other sources to a number of factors. These include an overriding lack of political will at all levels to address gender-specific challenges facing potential women candidates. The overall environment for women in politics is hostile with women in leadership roles being perceived as a threat by male counterparts. Campaigning is increasingly expensive yet women compared to men generally have much less access to funds. Their illiteracy rate is higher meaning that fewer women are available to be elected at lower levels, and fewer are available to move up the system. Cultural norms which stress the importance of women behaving modestly and refraining from voicing their opinions discourage many women from political activism at all levels.

There are huge capacity gaps between women activists in rural and in urban areas and it is very difficult for the majority of rural women to make their way up the system from local to district then provincial then national levels. Accountability between levels, and the division of responsibilities, between levels is often unclear.

The legal situation is fraught with difficulty for women attempting to challenge discrimination. In the current Constitution, Article 23 Clause 1 disallows discrimination of any person on basis of their sex or marital status or any other personal social attributes. However, the same Article 23 at Clauses 2, 3 and 4c-d, also allows exceptional discrimination based on customs, traditions, marriage and personal law. However, the women’s movement has fought for changes. In the last three of the five attempts to reform the Constitution women- as groups and as individuals - have proposed non-discriminatory Articles. These are reflected in the current Draft Constitution (2013) which makes provision for a Gender Equality Commission and requires that political parties ‘ensure that in nominations for elections there is equitable representation of each gender, persons with disabilities and the youth’. However, the Draft Constitution does not envisage a quota or any formal measure to address low levels of female representation. (The Southern African Development Community, of which Zambia is a member, has set a goal of 50 per cent.) (ibid.).


With respect to governance more broadly, many more women than men lack personal identifiers such as birth certificates and identity cards. This makes it difficult to prove the right to property, to secure paternal financial contributions for childcare (in cases where the father is not named on a birth certificate), to register bank accounts and set up businesses, and to participate in electoral processes. There are gender differences in the way women and men obtain personal identifiers. For reasons as yet poorly understood (if often surmised) women appear less willing to engage in institutional corruption, for example by providing ‘speed payments’ to obtain legal documents. Furthermore, such documents are issued at district centres remote from the majority of the rural population. This results in high incidental costs for both women and men, and more so for women given they have less time due to their many responsibilities, and fewer monies. Literacy is a compounding factor, with women less likely than men to be able to read and complete the necessary forms, or indeed study posters advising them of their rights.

2.2 Sexual and reproductive health
Cultural practices, poverty and gender inequalities combine to create some of the most significant health challenges in the world as reflected in the figures in Box 1 on the next page.

Meeting these challenges is very difficult. Zambia suffers from weak health infrastructure in terms of access, poorly trained and insufficient numbers of staff, and high costs. The Ministry of Health, the largest health provider, is able to employ only around 40 per cent of the clinicians required to staff health facilities. In rural areas many people live great distances from health centres. Seasonal flooding can cut people from such centres for many months. Ill people, and women about to give birth, face huge difficulties in reaching them at any time. Furthermore, many rural health centres are staffed by a single individual who has not had clinical training. The Ministry of Health is trying to recruit more personnel, yet it faces numerous constraints such as a high national wage bill, limited financial approval for new positions, and shortage of staff with the required training and experience. However, these issues alone do not account for inadequate health coverage. Many Zambian societies foster patterns of health seeking behaviours that delay or limit beneficial contact. Social barriers including gender inequalities and cultural practices further restrict access. With 68% of the population living in extreme poverty, the lack of financial resources at the household level contributes to low demand for health services even where these are free (due to the costs of travel and demands for payment even though services are supposed to be free).

2.3 Violence against women
Zambia has one of the highest rates of Gender-Based Violence (GBV) in the world. The ZDHS (2007) notes that 47% of women have experienced GBV since they were 15 (77% by a current/former husband/partner), and one third reported violence in the year preceding the survey. One fifth of women reported experiencing sexual violence during their lifetime. Of all women experiencing GBV, 46% have sought help but 41% never told anyone.

---


BOX 1: SEXUAL AND REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH CHALLENGES

Zambia exhibits high and increasing fertility rates (from 5.9 in 2002 to 6.2 in 2010; rural fertility at 7.5 is among the highest in the world). The average Zambian woman has her first child aged around 19, and in rural areas the percentage of young women aged 15 to 19 giving birth is increasing, from 6.6 percent in 2002 to 8.3 percent in 2007. In 2007, less than 10 percent of mothers received their first postnatal check-up within four to 23 hours of delivery. More than 90% of Zambian women receive some antenatal care, yet only 47% of women deliver in health facilities and 46% have assistance of a skilled health provider.

Contraceptive use is low at 33% among married women in 2007. Although modern contraceptives are widely available, some clinics refuse to distribute them without a husband’s consent. Other barriers include high cost, shortages, and overall weak access to clinics.

Zambia’s HIV epidemic has stabilized at high prevalence: 14.3% among adults and 16.6% among pregnant women. Adult HIV prevalence is higher among women (16.1%) than men (12.3%). Rates vary widely by province. Overall prevalence is higher in urban areas (19.7%) than in rural areas (10.3%). The Zambia Prevention, Care and Treatment Partnership (ZPCT II) notes: ‘it is not just that women and girls are more likely to be infected by HIV that makes this a highly gendered epidemic, or that they are more physiologically susceptible. It is that gender is an integral factor in determining an individual’s vulnerability to HIV infection, his or her ability to access care, support and treatment, and the ability to cope when affected.’ Specific gender-related drivers identified by ZPCT II include (i) social acceptance of gender-based violence, (ii) limited education opportunities for girls, (iii) male dominated decision-making regarding access to health care, (iv) high and generalised poverty, (v) an imbalance in power relationships at the household and social level, and (v) the customary legal system which maintains harmful social laws including wife inheritance and property grabbing.

At the same time, men are more likely than women to have multiple concurrent partners and engage in other high risk behaviours, whilst simultaneously being less likely to seek HIV Testing and Counselling (HTC) services, access People Living with HIV and AIDS (PLHA) support activities, and/or attend antenatal clinics or other reproductive services with their partners or wives.

26 ZPCT II (2010) Integrating Gender into HIV/AIDS Prevention, Care and Treatment.ZPCT II Gender Strategy.
GBV impinges upon the ability of development partners and government to attain their objectives in all sectors. The fear of violence, or of being turned out of their homes (a key issue when women have few resources), prevents some women for seeking diagnosis and treatment of illnesses like TB and HIV/AIDS. Due to the prevalence of cultural norms prescribing sexual submissiveness, and, again, the fear of losing their home, many women accept sex with partners even when they know that they have multiple concurrent partners. Partly because agriculture in Zambia is largely rain-fed, tensions around how to spend income after harvest can spill over into GBV. A NORAD funded study showed that women suffered higher levels of battery due to marital conflicts at this time. In cultures where lobola (bride price) is paid this is frequently considered a payment for the wife’s services and thus control over her earnings. Over time lobola has increased significantly in regarding the amount paid. Anecdotal evidence suggests that in such cultures lobola can perpetuate the subordination of women to men and potentially increases the risk of GBV, particularly when meeting household needs is a challenge. Problems can also arise in intermarriages between people from different cultures as a consequence of discrepancies between the varied expectations of partner. GBV facing men and boys should not be overlooked. Many boys aged five onwards are removed from schooling to act as herd boys to other families; they may be lodged with families who do not treat them well.

In 2011, the Government passed the Anti-Gender Based Violence Act (2011). This is one of the strongest Acts in SADC (Southern Africa Development Community). It provides for the establishment of a Gender Based Violence Fund to assist victims; the establishment of shelters, the provision of emergency monetary relief and measures to address harmful traditional practices. However, the Embassy notes that full implementation of the Act remains a challenge.

A large number of development partners including the United Nations, USAID and others are working closely with civil society organizations to tackle GBV. For instance a four-year US$ 15.5m programme between the Republic of Zambia and the United Nations aims to improve GBV survivors’ access to health services, to efficient justice delivery system and to protection and support services; and to enable the Gender and Child Development Division to coordinate an effective, evidence-based and multi-sectoral response to GBV in Zambia. Seven UN agencies including, UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, ILO, WHO, UNHCR and IOM are working with the Gender and Child Development Division, the Human Rights Commission, ministries, the House of Chiefs and faith based and CBOs. There is a strong and


34 http://www.zm.une.org/node/107
growing men's movement for gender equality, the Zambia National Men's Network, which is working with men and boys to act against GBV and to support women more broadly\textsuperscript{35, 36}.

2.4 Economic empowerment

The participation of women in the labour force (ages 15-64) in Zambia was 73.40 in 2011. The highest value over the past 21 years was 75.40 in 1998, while its lowest value was 73.40 in 2011. This compares with male participation rates of 86.00 as of 2011. Its highest value over the past 21 years was 86.40 in 1990, while its lowest value was 85.50 in 1998\textsuperscript{37}. Women experience lower wages and fewer employment opportunities than men. Women without any education earn 65\% of their male counterparts, whilst tertiary educated women earn 95\% of their male counterparts. However, most women do not study beyond the primary level. Their access to financial and legal institutions is also restricted in comparison to men, resulting in a lack of resources for female entrepreneurs. This results in a disproportionate number of women employed in the informal sector\textsuperscript{38}.

Women entrepreneurs in Zambia do not face a level playing field because they are constrained by an array of culturally specific rights and responsibilities that hamper their freedom to act in the best interests of their enterprise. The combination of gender-blind legislation, control over assets, and locally valid gender norms often permit men to benefit more than women from programmes that support economic development\textsuperscript{39}.

Women entrepreneurs in Zambia do not face a level playing field because they are constrained by an array of culturally specific rights and responsibilities that hamper their freedom to act in the best interests of their enterprise. The combination of gender-blind legislation, control over assets, and locally valid gender norms often permit men to benefit more than women from programmes that support economic development\textsuperscript{39}.

Rural poverty in Zambia is approximately 80 per cent, with 68 per cent of total population living below the national poverty line\textsuperscript{40}. There is a
tendency towards the feminisation of poverty: 60.4\% of households below the national poverty line are headed by women\textsuperscript{41}. Low levels of education among women, their small share of formal employment, and high HIV/AIDS prevalence have been identified as the major factors contributing to higher poverty levels among female-headed households. By way of contrast, men are more likely to have direct access to land (via the traditional leadership), or to own it through legal title. Further, men typically access or control other high value assets that contribute directly to productivity and incomes, such as the extension services, capital, machinery, and household labour\textsuperscript{42}. Many male-headed households experience extreme poverty, but there are significant differences with respect to coping strategies adopted by female-headed and male-headed households. For example, piece-

\textsuperscript{35}  http://www.ifad.org/knotes/household/cs_campfire_zambia.pdf


\textsuperscript{37}  http://www.indexmundi.com/facts/zambia/labor-participation-rate


work on farms is followed by 42 per cent of female-headed households as opposed to 36 per cent of male-headed households43.

Although there are variations between ethnic groups, the gender of the household head has significant implications with respect to the ability of women to participate in, manage, and benefit from, economic activities. Women in male-headed households typically access, though do not control, important productive assets by virtue of their relationship to their husband or other male kin. In farming households, women may not be able to determine how to apply their labour, typically being directed to work on the man’s fields in the morning and their own fields in the afternoon. Development agencies may find such women hard to reach since such households are generally represented by the male household head in financial transactions, training sessions, and in community level decision-making bodies. Yet their work may be critical to the livelihood of the entire household, since rural women in Zambia conduct the majority of agricultural tasks (estimated at 70-80%). Lack of human capacity development among women is a major development concern since it directly affects economic productivity.

3. NORWEGIAN SUPPORT TO WRGE

3.1 Overview of the work of the Norwegian Embassy in Zambia

The Embassy of Norway (Embassy) in Lusaka works across all WRGE strategic priorities: women’s economic empowerment, women’s political empowerment, violence against women (VAW), sexual and reproductive health. In terms of priority, the Embassy focuses strongly upon promoting women’s political participation, followed by women’s economic empowerment and women’s sexual and reproductive health. It appears that no changes have been made due to MTR recommendations or gender reviews. Although there is a strong emphasis on partner ownership of programmes, the Embassy ensures that the support it offers to WRGE programming is in line with Norwegian priorities.

Over the past few years the Embassy has streamlined its WRGE portfolio in order to focus efforts, achieve quality, and to devolve responsibility. For instance, in 2003 the Embassy worked with seven major partners working specifically on gender. Now it works with only one, the Non-Governmental Organisations’ Coordinating Council (NGOCC). The NGOCC has a grant management unit that provides sub-grants to qualifying members (104, of which 47 are Community Based Organisations with at least 50 members each, and NGOs with 100+ members each).

During the author’s Skype interview with staff at the Embassy, staff outlined key achievements in WRGE over the review period. These largely relate to gains in women’s political empowerment although the Embassy also finds its work on women’s economic empowerment in agriculture important. Generally speaking, the Embassy’s claims to have played an important, though not lead, role in these achievements appear justified (see Box 2).
The Embassy is conducting advocacy work around **Sexual and Reproductive Health (SRH)** with the NGOCC. In April 2014 the NGOCC held the first ever SRH conference in Zambia with Norwegian support. It was officiated by two key ministries, Ministry of Gender and Child Development and the Ministry of Community Development, Mother and Child health. Regarding **Violence against Women**, the Embassy offers support to the NGOCC, the Young Women's Christian Association, and the Young Men's Christian Association. They are working to make the provisions of the Anti Gender-Based Violence Act easier to understand among the general population, and are translating it into seven languages and braille to aid dissemination across the country. This had led directly to an increase in reporting GBV. In 2012, the Zambia Police, through the Victim Support Unit, reported more than 12,000 cases of GBV. In the first half of 2014, over 8,000 cases had been reported.

---

**BOX 2: KEY ACHIEVEMENTS IN WRGE 2007-2013 ACCORDING TO EMBASSY STAFF**

Our work on gender in Zambia has been directed to civil society and to the government. The Embassy in Zambia has consistently supported the Ministry of Gender and Child Development through UNDP and directly to the Non Governmental Organisations’ Coordinating Council (NGOCC). Despite being challenging, Norwegian support to gender in Zambia is recognised by the government and by many other players. The results are visible. We were instrumental, through funding our partners’ work, to:

1. The passing of the Anti Gender-Based Violence Act, 2011 by government. This was achieved as a direct result of civil society advocacy directed through the NGOCC and the Ministry of Gender. We are now discussing how to implement this Act.

2. The Draft Constitution includes a Bill of Rights. This addresses the duality of the legal system (customary and statutory law), which can be harmful to women’s interests. The new Constitution will favour statutory law. We are still in the process, but we are happy with the Draft Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Much of the success can be attributed to the work of the NGOCC.

3. The establishment of the Ministry of Gender and Child Development in 2012.

4. The Gender Equality and Equity Bill. This focuses on domesticating the CEDAW, the SADC Protocol on Gender and the AU Charter on Human and People’s Rights on the Rights of Women. When the Gender Commission is in place and the Bill enacted into law, we will be able to say in Zambia that we have domesticated the above instruments to a large extent.

5. Our work with farmers. We've contributed to a growing awareness that women form the majority of farmers in this country and that it is vital to reach them. We reach about 160,000 women farmers through various programmes. Promoting women and climate-smart agriculture through conservation farming is at the centre of this effort. We also work on promoting food security. In total we have reached, since 2007, 3.5 million women through our work with NGOCC and our regular agricultural programming.

---

44 16 days of activism against GBV launched. Posted in Gender, Headlines, Life and Style on November 25, 2014 by Online Editor [https://www.dailymail.co.zm/?p=12137](https://www.dailymail.co.zm/?p=12137)
Despite the Embassy’s strong focus on **women’s political participation** this work is proceeding slowly due to the many challenges outlined in the previous section. The Embassy is trying to strengthen the cadres of women leaders at lower levels. It is working with the Zambia National Women’s Lobby (ZNWL) to assist them to offer training on leadership, develop the capacity of local women leaders, and to help secure funds enabling women to run. It directs funding to the ZNWl through NGOCC’s basket fund. The Embassy also works at the highest political levels to improve women’s representation. This work is detailed below under Section 3.3.

The Embassy is working increasingly with men through the NGOCC and other partners such as in the agriculture sector. It considers that given the strong patriarchal customs in Zambia, working with men is critical. The NGOCC is women-dominated and focuses on developing women’s capacities at community level through partner NGOs. However, it recognizes the importance of working collaboratively with male-dominated leadership structures, for instance regarding land allocation. NGOCC partners are working with chieftainships to help them understand the importance of women’s right to own/manage land, including through the Zambia Land Alliance which is a key partner on women’s land rights in Zambia. Partly as a direct consequence of Norwegian support to the Ministry of Gender and Child Development and advocacy on women’s right to land by NGOCC a policy has been developed which stipulates that 30 per cent of new land allocations must be allocated to women. This policy has been decentralised to all districts.

The strong focus of the Embassy upon working with the NGOCC leads to expressions of concern by some stakeholders and observers. For instance, the Programme Against Malnutrition (PAM) considers that NGOCC is primarily an advocacy organisation yet many organisations supported by NGOCC require specialist, technical gender expertise. The work of PAM is discussed in Section 4. Section 5 provides an overview of the work of the NGOCC together with a critique.

### 3.2 Use of aid for WRGE

Between 2007 and 2013, overall Norwegian overseas development assistance to Zambia focused strongly on economic development and trade (63 per cent of funds). Good governance received almost one fifth of funds (19 per cent). Eleven per cent of funds were allocated to education, and 7 per cent to health and social services. (See Figure 1 in Annex 1.)

In terms of allocating gender markers over this time period, two thirds of projects did not receive a gender marker (59 per cent). Approximately one third were allocated Gender Marker 1 (23 per cent) and almost a fifth (18 per cent) Gender Marker 2. In other words, approximately two fifths of the Norwegian Embassy’s portfolio is gender marked. See Figure 1 on the next page (Figure 2 in Annex 1).

In terms of financial allocation between 2007 and 2013 the proportions allocated are slightly different, with non-gender marked projects receiving 69 per cent of funds. Only 8 per cent of funds were allocated to Gender Marker 2 projects (which represent 18 per cent of total projects). Gender Marker 1 projects received 23 per cent of funds. This is shown in Figure 2 (Figure 3 in Annex 1).
FIGURE 1: PERCENTAGE OF PROJECTS RECEIVING GENDER MARKERS
(2007 - 2013)

FIGURE 2: FINANCIAL ALLOCATIONS TO GENDER MARKED PROJECTS
(2007-2013)
Turning now to how gender marked funds were distributed between sectors, Figure 3 (Figure 4 in Annex 1) shows that more than one third (39 per cent) of gender marked projects are categorized as Good Governance. Economic Development and Trade, and Health and Social Services each account for 18 per cent of gender marked projects (i.e. approximately two fifths of such projects relate to these sectors). Gender marked projects in Education account for 15 per cent, and Environment and Energy for 9 per cent. These allocations clearly indicate the Embassy’s, and national partner, priorities with regard to work on WRGE. There are twice as many gender marked projects under ‘Good Governance’ than under Economic Development and Trade or Health and Social Services. This funding allocation contrasts sharply with overall funding by the Embassy, which, as noted above, commits 63 per cent of development assistance to Economic Development and Trade - well over three times as much in terms of percentage.

Finally, it is instructive to examine trends in awarding Gender Markers between 2007 and 2013. This shows that there has been a steady increase in the number of Gender Marker 2 projects over time, peaking in 2012. Conversely, awards of Gender Marker 1 projects have been fairly consistent, peaking in 2009 but maintaining a fairly even trajectory. Over that same time period, the number of non-gender marked projects has dropped significantly, reaching their lowest level in 2011 before increasing again in 2012 and 2013.
The process of awarding gender markers is simple, with the Embassy's management system (PTA) ticking off gender markers. Whereas 69 per cent of projects in Economic Development and Trade do not have a Gender Marker (Figure 4 in Annex 1), all projects in the agricultural sector have a Gender Marker. This is because almost all support is directed to conservation agriculture which is perceived to benefit women particularly (and because women form such a large percentage of farmers across the country). All women partner organisations to the Embassy, including the NGOCC, receive a gender marker. No projects in Finance or in Transparency International receive a Gender Marker. Projects in Finance account for a large proportion of funds.

3.2.1 Women and Gender Equality Grant
The Embassy has funded 7 projects from the Women and Gender Equality Grant, some through recurrent grants, covering the period 2007-2013 (see Annex). The total monies spent are NOK 14 414 062. The projects are:

1. Support to Development of National Gender Programme.
2. UN National Gender Programme.
3. Programme Against Malnutrition.
4. FAWEZA Support for High School Stipends for Girls.
5. Addendum to COMACO Phase II Gender and Climate Change.
7. Impact Study NGOCC.

Embassy staff consider the WGE Grant to be vital to their work on WRGE because it enables them to reach women directly. See Box 3.
3.3 Type of WRGE and engagement methods

The Embassy sits on the Gender Cooperating Partners Group (Gender CpG), which regularly meets to discuss, among other things policy issues that should be raised with government. The gender CpG is led by a troika. UNDP, DFID and Irish Embassy form the current Troika. The Troika is headed by UNDP which assesses all WRGE issues in Zambia. Policy issues are fed into a higher group called the Cooperating Partners Group (CpG), represented by heads of missions. The CpG has the power to discuss gender policy issues directly with government in different forums, including the level of the Secretary of the Cabinet, Secretary to the Treasury, and President. Indeed, the CpG meets regularly with high-level government officials to raise policy issues on gender and other sectors. Through this high-level dialogue, the government is able to keep donors informed of its plans.

The Embassy is moving more and more into a 'Beyond Aid' partnership. Together with many other bilateral partners it no longer offers budget support to the Zambian government. This ceased in 2013. Partnership now focuses on the exchange of experiences, developing capacity, strengthening investments and stimulating private sector development (including improved use of its resources, effective taxation - including of the copper industry), making better use of agricultural land, and taking steps to adapt to climate change. As a donor, the Embassy does not set the agenda for partners. The Embassy’s work is aligned to partner’s priorities. The government has a five year National Development Plan (NDP) in which it sets its priorities. These form the basis for government ministries to develop their strategic plans. For instance, the Ministry of Gender and Child Development Strategic Plan is based on the NDP The Embassy based its support (ended 2012) on the approved strategic plan. Box 4 discusses the Embassy’s WRGE support to various ministries.

Despite the success of the Embassy’s work on promoting gender in the ministries, and its key role in facilitating the creation of the Ministry of Gender and Child Development, some observers note that the process of rolling out gender

---

**Box 3: Embassy Staff Views on the WGE Grant**

The Women’s Grant enables to address women’s specific gender needs. For instance, the Embassy supports the National Legal Aid Clinic for Women (NLACW) which is a legal entity under the Law Association of Zambia and not an NGO or CBO like other projects we support under the NGOCC. We are using part of the Women’s Grant to support NLACW to help them address women’s land rights, GBV, and litigation in the law courts. Norway cannot fund such activities outside the Women’s Grant.

The Women’s Grant helps us support women friendly technologies such as solar food driers, improved stoves, and women-friendly farming equipment help to address women’s specific gender needs. There is a long way to go in Zambia before gender equality is achieved. Until that happens, special allocations for women’s specific gender needs are required to help close the gender gap. Overall funding is becoming more and more restrained and it is getting harder to take money for gender from the main pot. If we are to work closely with umbrella women’s organisations like the NGOCC then we definitely need the Women’s Grant. We therefore don’t agree that all funds should be integrated unless targeted funding is actually set aside in the general allocations for specific work on gender.
expertise is not yet complete: ‘The Ministry of Gender has not decentralized successfully so far. There are gender focal points at district and provincial level, but these are mostly district or provincial child development officers. They do not necessarily have an understanding of gender issues. This is a very specialized discipline and requires specialized training.’

3.4 Human Resources related to WRGE
The Embassy has a team of national and diplomatic staff working on gender issues (currently, two local programme officers and one diplomat). One of the national staff is a gender desk officer. Staff report that they have attended a number of high quality short courses on gender; these have assisted them to become more analytical on gender and to become aware of current issues, including progress on UN conventions on Women and Children’s Rights. Gender seminars conducted by NORAD for Embassy staff have been useful for learning and for sharing lessons with other Embassies. They are, in their view, a valuable learning platform and should be continued. Due to the regular turnover of Norwegian staff, institutional memory on WRGE is carried by the local staff, both of whom have many years of service at the Embassy. This is working well.

Embassy gender staff report strong, pro-active support from management and other staff to work on achieving WRGE. They see this support, particularly from management, as critical to facilitating their work at all levels, from project level to high level political discussions. Fellow staff without a gender brief typically discuss gender issues in planning sessions with their partners and in political dialogue; efforts are particularly strong in relation to projects in the agricultural sector. The gender staff go through the Annual Report with a gender lens and make comments across the portfolio.

3.5 Results reporting
Effective results reporting depends on having a good strategic plan and log frame together with meaningful indicators and baseline studies. Embassy staff work closely on a demand basis with national partners to help them develop their

BOX 4: CASE STUDY ON PROMOTING WRGE IN THE MINISTRIES

In 1980 the Ministry of Gender and Child Development was a mere division of government. The Embassy considers it contributed decisively to this positive change in status by working over many years on capacity development. Norwegian support to the Ministry of Gender and Child Development was channelled through UNDP and came to an end in 2012. Likewise through UNDP (2008-2012) the Embassy offered considerable capacity development to the Ministry of Lands, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives, Education, Health and the Ministry of Community Development and Social Welfare.

More broadly, Embassy staff report that, ‘We were asking questions around how WRGE policies could be pushed, legal frameworks altered, how to get international documents like the CEDAW domesticated (it was signed many years ago). All this questioning was necessary. Although we worked on capacity development Gender Focal Points (GFP) simply could not take effective decisions and had no budgets. The Ministry of Gender and Child Development has now launched a Gender Equality Policy. One provision is to have a GFP at director level with their own dedicated gender budget. We support this approach. Every district in Zambia now has a GFP.'
strategic plans. (The Embassy cultivates an ‘open door’ policy and fosters approachability.) Partners can build in requests for further training, for instance on gender analysis, training women for leadership, and budget management, into these plans. In the strategic plan, partner organisations and the Embassy agree on key results. Staff have worked to strengthen partner capacity on results reporting. Historically, it has proven particularly difficult for partners to develop good logframes and sound baseline studies to provide benchmarks for reporting; these issues, according to the Embassy, have mostly been resolved.

Despite this work, the Embassy recognizes it needs to significantly improve results reporting. It is in the process of developing a gender action plan (though it may not have this name). This is very much a work in progress with finalization anticipated by mid-2015. As part of this, a focused results framework is being created. The key is to ensure that national partners are able to feed into the results framework; it therefore must be suitable for a wide range of stakeholders to understand and use.

It is useful to conclude with observations made by a Zambian commentator who has worked with various Norwegian-funded projects. The quote illustrates the perceived contribution the Embassy is making to WRGE in the country; such impressions now need to be bolstered with clearer results reporting: ‘Overall, Norwegian Aid is good. They give you leeway to learn, work to the best of your ability, and make your own mistakes. There is no doubt that, through supporting the Ministry of Gender, Norway gets things done, particularly on women's economic empowerment. If farming women apply for a grant to farm chickens or develop another enterprise, and they succeed, then that money comes from Norway. If they then translate the money they earn into sending their children to school, to the clinic, or in healthy food thus combating malnutrition, then you can definitely attribute part of that success to Norway. They are also contributing the capacity building training of staff in various organisations, and the gender sensitization of citizens, which – if there are positive behavioural changes – can be partly attributed to Norway.’

4. CASE STUDY: PROGRAMME AGAINST MALNUTRITION

Discussions with project staff regarding PAM's technical capacity in relation to results showed that the Embassy relies primarily on NGOCC to provide PAM with gender training and related support. However, staff argued that there are three problems with this: (1) NGOCC simply does not have enough time to work with all its partners effectively, because there are so many, (2) NGOCC does not have partnerships with NGOs in every District. This means that some Districts, including Gwembe where this project is located, do not have local representation. This makes linking with NGOCC problematic at the local levels, and (3) Finally, and most importantly, the core work of NGOCC is advocacy for women's rights. However, PAM requires technical gender
PAM also wants its own gender officer, given the importance of reaching gender objectives, to provide consistent focused support over time. PAM staff received start up training from a consultant on gender analysis for its staff at the outset of the project. However, this training has proven insufficient, particularly among staff at the local, operating level. This is because expertise is so low. In particular, PAM notes that moving beyond basic output figures is difficult: 'Staff need to be able to really see if the benefits are accruing to women: is the project really leading to more benefits for women than we expected, or not? Staff do not know how to find this out.' As an organisation, PAM argues that understanding how to demonstrate results is very important and is, indeed, a morale-booster as much as a technical issue: 'We really want to show we have made a difference in the lives of the people. So many projects come and go, but assistance in the fields of food security, climate change, health, and farming. It would like the Embassy to provide technical gender specialists to all partners, including PAM, in these thematic areas.
which have a lasting impact? We really want to have some degree of confidence that some of the work we are doing make a difference.

PAM expressed a need for developing participant-focused outcome indicators, because all too often project staff discuss project indicators with families, but household members are thinking in more encompassing, longer-term trajectories and thus deploying very different, internally generated indicators. PAM said: 'It would be good to capture the perspectives of the women themselves. Sometimes they look at things differently to the way we do! For instance, they take the longer term view when it comes to outcomes. We may go to them to talk about increased household income so that this household can be able to meet its needs but the household members are thinking - I want to make sure I send my children to school. That is their outcome indicator - but ours is just the income! For us, our project is time bound. But they are thinking in the long term. We must try to strengthen those aspects that mean most to them when we are developing activities and doing the training.'

Overall, PAM is achieving a number of successes in terms of intermediate results as detailed in its various reports and through an independent mid-term review. These successes are not reviewed here due to our focus on exploring underlying issues and because the project has yet to be evaluated. In terms of activities, though, PAM is operating across many thematic domains including how to adapt to climate change, improve livestock productivity particularly through the 'pass on the gift' approach to the distribution of chickens and goats and better management, adopting conservation agriculture practices, and working on gender equity issues more broadly. In order to roll out their activities effectively, PAM has developed three broad strategies.

1. Focus on Women's Groups. To prevent 'male capture' of project benefits PAM works through already existing women's groups who have a constitution and which have ensured that all the executive positions held by women. Men may be present but as members. Over time, more and more women are setting up groups in response to the success of the original groups.

2. Sensitization at Community Level. PAM works closely with the women's groups, male heads of households, and traditional leaders to ensure men understand the importance of supporting women's livelihood activities. Before the project opened, and throughout the life of the project, regular village level sensitization meetings are held to discuss how gender equality helps promote development, and, conversely, how women's lower level of capacity hampers livelihood development. As a consequence, PAM staff note that: 'Men in E-WAS have started appreciating the work of women. For instance, we require women to build new housing for goats and chickens. This means cutting down some trees for logs. The men are assisting in this. We have not had any incidences of men disturbing the project by trying to take over key roles in women groups. These are women's activities and they want to be in control. Men perceive they benefit personally; they eat the vegetables, the meat, and they see the household benefits from the sales from food processing - where women are engaged in raising money.'
3. Complement Not Challenge Men's Livelihood Strategies. PAM deliberately does not work to engage women in male-dominated value chains, which in this area is maize. During feasibility studies PAM established that women already play an important role in managing small gardens and small livestock, so it has worked to professionalize these.

To date, men and traditional leaders have been supportive of the E-WAS project. However, PAM concedes that the project is in a honeymoon phase. If women really start to earn significant monies, it is possible tensions may arise at household level over income distribution. PAM argues, too, that structural gender inequalities, primarily centring on land allocation, remain unaddressed by the E-WAS project. It argues that an effective lobbying organization such as Women for Change is needed to lobby local leadership for change. It has begun discussions with NGOCC on this issue.

5. CASE STUDY: NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS’ COORDINATING COUNCIL

The Embassy’s major WRGE partner is NGOCC. Through the NGOCC, the Embassy disburses funds to a number of partners (who are members of the NGOCC network) working on gender in different thematic areas. The NGOCC has 27 staff, and 104 member organizations, approximately half (57) of whom are CBOs with a minimum of 50 members each, and 47 NGOs and FBOs with a minimum number of 100 members each. The NGOCC has a presence in all ten provinces of Zambia.

Members are divided into five groups for the purposes of sub-granting:
1. Legal and policy framework (e.g. Gender Based Violence, advocacy on the national Constitution).
2. Women Economic Empowerment.
3. Women Rights Advancement (especially decision making).
4. Reproductive Health, Maternal Health, HIV&AIDS.
5. Media and Advocacy.

In each of these areas, the NGOCC conducts research in liaison with members focusing on policy analysis and research, produces gender position papers and packages research outcomes in specific formats to ensure relevance to the members. It also convenes regular meetings and conferences on particular thematic areas. This enables similar organisations to share expertise and issues and provide learning platforms.

The partnership with the Embassy has been on-going since 2000. Starting with a financial partnership the relationship has evolved over time to one based on capacity enhancement. The NGOCC convenes the donor round table meetings at least twice annually. As a member of the Gender Forum and Sector Advisory Group on gender, the NGOCC works to develop relationships with the public sector to bring about WRGE goals. During the interview held with the NGOCC, staff stressed that its relationship with the Embassy was dynamic and based on mutual learning. Embassy gender staff share learning from its work with other partners, other sectors and countries, and Embassy staff also pay regular visits to WRGE projects run by NGOCC members in the field.
**Women's political empowerment**

Through the Basket Fund the NGOCC assists member organisations working to provide various civic education activities and support women seeking to take on leadership roles, and to engage in political parties. The NGOCC, together with the Zambia National Women's Lobby, trains aspiring candidates in public speaking, in political structures and in how to become active in politics. In advance of elections the NGOCC works with its members to identify potential women candidates in every province for positions at all levels. It also enquires actively into member organizations to find out if they are working to promote and support women wishing to stand in their local communities. The NGOCC supports this process by proposing criteria to help identify locally relevant development issues to see which candidates are truly representative.

Beyond this, the NGOCC analyses the manifestos of each party, and provides feedback related to WRGE goals. It then tracks whether the party is working to its WRGE commitments. Its advocacy work is evidence-based. It uses statistics to highlight gender gaps and tracks budgets down to beneficiary level, for instance a local health care centre, across the whole country. It has an eight member Gender Budgeting Team comprising of staff drawn from different member/sector organisations to ensure expertise in all areas. The starting point is the government's 'Yellow Book' which has different budget lines for each ministry. This allows the NGOCC to access a great deal of information on proposed spending. It then obtains authorization letters from the relevant Ministry (Finance) to visit establishments on the ground through its partners, in order to investigate how monies are being spent. This is a legal right. However, the NGOCC concedes that some establishments refuse to release sufficient information and in some cases receive little or no cooperation.

The NGOCC understands economic empowerment to be closely linked to political empowerment. It argues that, 'Women are not up to speed in articulating development issues. They find it hard to speak in public spheres. Even so, women are increasingly taking up public roles. This is because we involve women, men and youth in our discussions around the gender dimensions of particular issues. We are working with the traditional leadership to encourage them to work with women and allow them to take up leadership roles'.

**Capacity Development**

The NGOCC provides capacity development services to a range of actors. For ministry and technical staff it offers training in gender-responsive budgeting, for example. The Embassy also requests the NGOCC to provide capacity development to partners it considers to be weak on gender and to help broker relationships between partners and other stakeholders in the field. The NGOCC claims it offers continual capacity development on demand but concedes it lacks capacity to 'do everything'. It acknowledges that it treads a fine line between capacity development and actually getting involved in implementation with respect to the weakest organisations. A core part of the NGOCC's mandate is comprehensive targeted organizational capacity development as outlined in Box 6.
Reporting

Two years ago the Embassy worked with the NGOCC to develop a comprehensive, standardised, reporting framework to help members develop standardised funding proposals, identify and correctly report results on the ground, prepare quality reports, etc. They work closely with members to develop project documents, understand clearly the problem they intend to address, what they want to achieve, and the indicators they expect to use. The NGOCC acknowledges this is a work in progress as it takes time to internalise all the Results Based Management and Reporting principles and to monitor all the members effectively. It points out that many members are CBOs with very low levels of literacy. Accordingly it has worked to simplify and streamline documentation, including proposal formats to help such members devise and then monitor their activities. Forms for reporting are linked to enabling them to answer questions outlined in the proposals. They encourage members to move beyond output reporting by asking them to discuss the objectives of, for instance, a training course. If the intervention is on skills development, for instance, NGOCC asks the partner to provide evidence of application by trainees in their communities.

The NGOCC argues that it is difficult to make clear cause-result associations in gender work in the short term. This is because work on gender demands behavioural transformations and this is not tangible over a short period. It takes a few years - 'say three and more' - to see real change in how women and men approach different issues in their lives. The NGOCC pleads passionately, however, that change in gender relations is occurring at all levels, through their work and through societal change more broadly. For instance, men do not hesitate to take their children to a clinic these days, whereas in the past this never happened.

There are, currently, some discrepancies in the gender targets that have been proposed by the Embassy in the contract signed between NGOCC and the Embassy. The NGOCC is concerned that some of its members lack the capacity to meet the proposed gender targets and is currently pursuing to engage in a discussion process with

BOX 6: IN-DEPTH CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT OF MEMBER ORGANISATIONS

Each year the NGOCC works with 10 per cent of its membership (14 organisations) for in-depth capacity development through a process involving Organisational Capacity Assessment (OCA) tool. It focuses on the most needy members since some are regarded as ‘best practice’ members. It begins by making an appointment with a targeted organisation and ensures they understand the importance of the process. The NGOCC then asks them to administer a self-assessment. The aim is to promote the organisation’s ownership over the process and thus long-term sustainability. Following this the NGOCC deploys participatory methodologies and language to work with them more closely to identify their CD needs. It assists them to develop an action plan, for instance regarding strengthening their gender analysis skills or improved financial reporting. All aspects of organizational development are examined: governance systems, management, constitution, legal status, mission statement in relation to its articulation of gender, their structures, planning approaches, strategic and operational plans, human resources etc. Their advocacy strategy in relation to gender is discussed and ideas for working more effectively with the media provided. As appropriate the organisation is then linked up to other organisations and partners for further capacity development and partnerships.
the Embassy as the mid-term evaluation of the NGOCC Strategic Plan is done in 2015. Box 7 outlines concerns expressed by an experienced national expert in a separate interview regarding the effectiveness of NGOCC’s work. It must be stressed that this is a personal opinion and it appears that many of the issues are currently being addressed by the NGOCC as per the interview provided above. Nevertheless, this opinion is cited here to flag up concerns that require monitoring.

6. CONCLUSIONS
The specific objectives of the whole Evaluation of Norway’s support to Women’s Rights and Gender Equality in Development Cooperation are to assess the effectiveness, relevance and sustainability of its work. The questions in Table 1 (Introduction) structure the conclusion.

Effectiveness

To what degree has Norwegian support to women’s rights and gender equality led to the intended outcomes? Contributing factors for the results achievement or the lack thereof should be discussed.

The Embassy’s support to WRGE under Good Governance (women’s political empowerment) has been significant. Although many challenges remain to WRGE in Zambia, the Embassy has made an important contribution to promoting women’s voice, developing new legislation and bringing the Ministry of Gender and Child Development into being. This has been achieved through close cooperation with national partners, particularly the NGOCC, and its member organisations, as well as a productive relationship with the government. These are all highly visible outcomes and relevant to the on-going process of domesticating CEDAW.
Significant support has been given to the agricultural sector reaching a large number of farming women. This represents an overt recognition of the overwhelmingly female face of farming in the country and is therefore politically significant. There appear to be no doubt that economic benefits on the ground have been achieved. This said, the uncritical attitude of Embassy staff to the benefits of conservation agriculture (CA) for women is problematic, given that little peer-reviewed literature (as opposed to project documentation) supports this conclusion. A greater understanding of the interactions between locally prevailing gender relations and CA is required in order to develop gender-responsive CA projects. This said, the embassy is working with the NGOCC, its partners, and the National Legal Aid Clinic for Women to tackle some of the underlying structural factors which hamper women's economic empowerment. The most important of these is the co-existence of customary along statutory law. Draft legislation in the new Constitution will favour statutory law and is expected to benefit women in terms of promoting their independent access to productive assets including land. However, at local levels more needs to be done to work with customary decision-making bodies to support gender-responsive structural changes. Overall, the outcomes regarding women's economic empowerment are less clear.

The Embassy works on a number of programmes in the realm of strengthening women's sexual and reproductive health, and to counter violence against women. In line with its broader work with the NGOCC, some of this work involves advocacy and lobbying for improved reporting and legislative change. In this, important results have been achieved. A broader understanding of the Embassy's support to the 'nuts and bolts' of service delivery could not be obtained given the short time frame of this study.

To what degree has Norwegian support to women's rights and gender equality led to unintended consequences, positive or negative?

The Embassy sees its support to the NGOCC as ensuring that ownership over WRGE is held by a nationally recognized, effective partner. It is the NGOCC rather than the Embassy which is the primary point of contact for many Norwegian funded projects. However, the NGOCC is fundamentally a political lobbying and advocacy organisation based in Lusaka. It does not necessarily possess the technical gender expertise, despite its protestations, required to facilitate the work of partners on, for example, specialized aspects of women's economic empowerment. It relies on its members for this but it cannot be assumed that such members have the time or willingness to assist other members, or indeed possess sufficient capacity in the first place, in some aspects of WRGE.

It is not clear whether the NGOCC is effective enough at devolving decision-making and ensuring accountability.

Huge capacity gaps, though not of its making, remain between headquarters and rural structures, meaning that even in its own field of women's political empowerment an insufficient cadre of women at lower levels is being developed to work effectively at lower levels, or to move up through the system. This is, of course,
a massive enterprise in a country like Zambia which has historically exhibited a generally hostile attitude to women in politics.

Relevance

To what degree is Norwegian support to women’s right and gender equality relevant in view of national priorities, needs and possibilities?

The Action Plan states that the ‘promotion of gender equality must be linked up to the partner countries’ own development targets and international commitments, and tailored to local challenges and opportunities for change.’ This case study shows that the Embassy is an active discussant in national processes, and develops its strategy in line with Government’s development priorities and plans. It is working to the letter of the Action Plan in that it supports the country’s own agents of change at government level and in publicly elected bodies. It offers support to civil society through the NGOCC – as noted, a women’s organisation – and, mostly through this partnership, a wide range of NGOs, CBOs and networks. The Embassy cooperates with other development partners within the country and engages in dialogue across the region on the strategic priorities outlined in the Action Plan. This helps to ensure the Embassy is tuned into key WRGE debates and learning processes and thus continually relevant.

To what degree is Norwegian support to women’s rights and gender equality in line with the strategic priorities outlined in the Action Plan?

A leading challenge in Zambia, historically, has been women's weak participation in politics at all levels. In prioritising women's political empowerment the Embassy is recognizing this reality. The case for this emphasis is justified given the weakness of women's voice in formal decision-making structures, both state and customary, and widely-held cultural norms which inhibit women from speaking out. In supporting women's voice and the creation of enabling legislative and other frameworks through various partnerships, Norwegian support is helping to lay the framework for women and their representa-
tives to decide their own agendas and priorities in all strategic priority areas.

Norwegian support is important to women's economic empowerment, sexual and reproductive health, and ending violence against women in Zambia. In each of these areas, the Embassy is working broadly to the Action Plan. However, it was not possible to properly ascertain whether the support offered is fully relevant to the needs of each of these domains, or the degree to which support is effective in identifying and addressing underlying, structural gender issues as outlined in the Action Plan. For this, an in-depth study based on field research and discussions with key informants at all levels would be needed.

To what degree has funding through “Kvinnebevilgningen” (WGE Grant) been used in accordance with its intentions?

The Women and Gender Equality Grant funds the Embassy's most strategically important gender work with the NGOCC and with the National Legal Aid Clinic for Women. Grants are allocated
across the four thematic areas stipulated in the Action Plan. Allocations support women’s strategic and practical gender needs. Decision-making appears to be based on careful gender analysis.

**Sustainability**

*To what degree has Norwegian support influenced, positively or negatively, national processes to improve women’s rights and gender equality, including influencing national ownership of the issues, or the capacity of national institutions and implementing partners?*

Norwegian support is significantly effective in influencing national processes for WRGE and at facilitating national ownership.

Its reliance on the NGOCC to provide technical gender expertise to a great number of partners may hamper the effectiveness of those organisations to meet their WRGE goals. The NGOCC is primarily a women’s empowerment and capacity development organisation. The Embassy should consider how to provide specialist gender expertise more effectively.
ANNEX 1 – DATA

ANNEX FIGURE 1: NORWEGIAN ODA TO ZAMBIA (2007 TO 2013)

- Economic development and trade
- Education
- Emergency assistance
- Environment and energy
- Good governance
- Health and social services
- In donor costs and unspecified

Pie chart showing the distribution of Norwegian ODA to Zambia (2007 to 2013) with percentages.
### ANNEX FIGURE 2: NUMBER OF PROJECTS ALLOCATED BY GENDER MARKER (2007-2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Marker</th>
<th>USD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender marker 0</td>
<td>306189.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender marker 1</td>
<td>101738.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender marker 2</td>
<td>36962.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (approx.)</td>
<td>444891.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GENDER MARKED PROJECTS AS A PERCENTAGE OF ALL PROJECTS (2007-2013)

![Pie chart showing the percentage of projects by gender marker]

- Gender marker 0: 59%
- Gender marker 1: 23%
- Gender marker 2: 18%
ANNEX FIGURE 3: NORWEGIAN ODA TO ZAMBIA (2007 TO 2013) DISAGGREGATED BY GENDER MARKER
### ANNEX FIGURE 4: GENDER MARKERS BY SECTOR (2007-2013) (NUMBER OF PROJECTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target area</th>
<th>Gender marker 0</th>
<th>Gender marker 1</th>
<th>Gender marker 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total number of projects</td>
<td>Number of projects</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development and trade</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency assistance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and energy</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good governance</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social services</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In donor costs and unspecified</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>833</strong></td>
<td><strong>490</strong></td>
<td><strong>195</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex Figure 5: Projects in Economic Development and Trade

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Area</th>
<th>Gender Marker 0</th>
<th>Gender Marker 1</th>
<th>Gender Marker 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of projects in Economic development and trade</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proportion of Projects in Economic Development and Trade

- **Gender marker 0**: 69% (Blue)
- **Gender marker 1**: 19% (Red)
- **Gender marker 2**: 12% (Green)
### ANNEX FIGURE 6: TRENDS 2007 TO 2013 – NUMBER OF PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gender marker 0</th>
<th>Gender marker 1</th>
<th>Gender marker 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2013</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Gender marker 0 represents projects that focus on gender equality.
- Gender marker 1 represents projects that focus on women's rights.
- Gender marker 2 represents projects that focus on women's economic empowerment.

**Graph:**
- Blue line represents Gender marker 0.
- Red line represents Gender marker 1.
- Green line represents Gender marker 2.

**Y-axis:** Numbers from 0 to 90.
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