



Republic of Zambia

**Ministry of Community Development and Social Services**

**Scaling up Shock Responsive Social Protection (P179095)  
Project**

**and Scaling up Shock Responsive Social Protection Project  
Additional Financing (P181711)**

**UPDATED**

**Stakeholder Engagement Plan**

**May 2024**

## Table of Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <b>1. Introduction</b> .....   | 5  |
| <b>1.1 Project Background</b> .....  | 5  |
| <b>1.2 ESS 10: Stakeholders Engagement and Information Disclosure</b> .....    | 7  |
| <b>1.3 Purpose of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)</b> .....              | 7  |
| <b>2. Brief Summary of Previous Stakeholder Engagement Activities</b> .....    | 7  |
| <b>2.1 Consultations and Disclosure</b> .....                                  | 9  |
| <b>2.1.1 Concerns raised by stakeholders during the consultations</b> .....    | 10 |
| <b>2.1.2 Risks/challenges raised during the consultations</b> .....            | 10 |
| <b>2.1.3 Strategies measures to address projected risks/challenges</b> .....   | 11 |
| <b>2.1.4 Observations/Lessons learnt during consultations</b> .....            | 11 |
| <b>2.1.5 Recommendations made from the engagement meetings</b> .....           | 12 |
| <b>3. Stakeholder Identification and Analysis</b> .....                        | 13 |
| <b>3.1 Project-Affected Parties (PAPs)</b> .....                               | 13 |
| <b>3.2 Other Interested Parties</b> .....                                      | 14 |
| <b>3.3 Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Groups</b> .....                            | 15 |
| <b>4. Stakeholder Engagement Plan</b> .....                                    | 16 |
| <b>5. Implementation Arrangements for Stakeholder Engagement Plan</b> .....    | 20 |
| <b>5.1 Roles and Responsibilities</b> .....                                    | 20 |
| <b>5.2 Stakeholder Engagement Methods</b> .....                                | 20 |
| <b>6. Information Disclosure for Project</b> .....                             | 21 |
| <b>6.1 Estimated Budget for SEP activities</b> .....                           | 23 |
| <b>Annexes</b> .....   | 29 |
| <b>Annex 1: Report on the consultations</b> .....                              | 29 |
| <b>1.0 Introduction</b> .....  | 31 |
| <b>1.1 Objectives of stakeholder engagements for SSRSP</b> .....               | 31 |
| <b>1.2 Dates when field visits were undertaken and districts visited</b> ..... | 32 |
| <b>1.3 Targets during stakeholders' engagement visits</b> .....                | 32 |
| <b>1.4 Project acceptance</b> .....  | 32 |
| <b>2.0 Concerns highlighted by stakeholders</b> .....                          | 33 |
| <b>3.0 Anticipated risks/challenges</b> .....                                  | 35 |
| <b>4.0 Strategies/Mitigation measures</b> .....                                | 36 |
| <b>5.0 Observations/Lessons learnt during the engagement meetings</b> .....    | 37 |
| <b>6.0 Recommendations</b> .....   | 38 |

7.0 Conclusion.....38

**Annex 2: Attendance list for the national virtual consultative engagement.....40**

**Annex 3: Attendance registers for physical meetings on stakeholder engagements .....42**

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

|          |   |
|----------|---|
| CDA      | Community Development Assistant                       |
| CGP      | Child Grant Program                                   |
| COVID-19 | Coronavirus Disease of 2019                           |
| CP       | Cooperating Partner                                   |
| CWAC     | Community Welfare Assistance Committee                |
| DEBS     | District Education Boards Secretary                   |
| DPO      | District Planning Officer                             |
| ASO      | Assistant Statistical Officer                         |
| DM&C     | Director Monitoring and Compliance                    |
| DDCC     | District Development Coordinating Committee           |
| DSW      | Department of Social Welfare                          |
| DSWO     | District Social Welfare Officer                       |
| ECT      | Emergency Cash Transfer                               |
| GBV      | Gender Based Violence                                 |
| G & C    | Guidance and Counseling                               |
| GEWEL    | Girls' Education and Women's Livelihood Project       |
| GRM      | Grievance Redress Mechanism                           |
| HQ       | Headquarters  |
| IA       | Implementing Agency                                   |
| IDA      | International Development Association                 |
| KGS      | Keeping Girls in School                               |
| M&E      | Monitoring and Evaluation                             |
| MCDSS    | Ministry of Community Development and Social Services |
| MCP      | Multiple Category Program                             |
| MDTF     | Multi-Donor Trust Fund                                |
| MIS      | Management Information System                         |
| MOF      | Ministry of Finance                                   |
| MOG      | Ministry of Gender                                    |
| MOGE     | Ministry of General Education                         |
| NGO      | Non-Government Organization                           |
| OHS      | Occupational Health and Safety                        |
| PAD      | Project Appraisal Document                            |
| PEO      | Provincial Education Office                           |
| PEO      | Provincial Education Officer                          |
| PDO      | Project Development Objective                         |
| PIM      | Project Implementation Manual                         |
| PIU      | Project Implementation Unit                           |
| PPE      | Personal Protective Equipment                         |
| PPM      | Pay Point Manager                                     |
| PSP      | Payment Service Provider                              |
| SCT      | Social Cash Transfer                                  |
| SDR      | Special Drawing Rights                                |
| SEA/ SH  | Sexual Exploitation and Abuse/ Sexual Harassment      |
| SRH      | Sexual and Reproductive Health                        |
| SWL      | Supporting Women's Livelihood                         |
| UN       | United Nations  |
| UNICEF   | United Nations Children's Fund                        |
| VAC      | Violence Against Children                             |
| WB       | World Bank  |
| ZMK      | Zambian Kwacha  |

## 1. Introduction

The parent Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) for the Scaling Up Shock Responsive Social Protection (SSRSP) Project (P179095) has been adopted by the proposed SSRSP Additional Financing 2 (AF) (P181711), which will continue financing the ongoing activities on this operation. The SEP was prepared in compliance with the World Bank Environmental and Social Framework (ESF), in particular ESS 1 Assessment and Management of Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts and ESS 10 Stakeholder Engagement and Information Disclosure. Under ESS 1, risks associated with the project have been identified which are likely to have differential impacts on different groups and subsequently appropriate mitigation. ESS 10 recognizes the need for transparent engagement with project stakeholders to ensure wide participation, increase opportunities for project acceptability and provide for citizen participation in the project life span. To this effect, the SEP was drafted clearly stipulating the process of consultation and disclosure of key project information that will be availed to relevant stakeholders during preparation and implementation of the project. The SEP further provides guidance on the process of stakeholder analysis, how to engage multiple stakeholders including vulnerable groups such as persons living with disability and how to engage in meaningful consultations as well as the process of providing feedback.

The SEP is a living document and has been disclosed to the public on the Ministerial website for Ministry of Community Development and Social Services (MCDSS). It will be periodically updated to highlight changes during project implementation. Its effectiveness will be monitored during project implementation and evaluated towards the close of the project. The project will be monitored by the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) through the Environment and Social focal persons at Provincial and District officials once the project becomes effective. In the interim, the point of contact for the Stakeholder Engagement Program is:

Name: Angela Chomba Kawandami (Ms.)

Organization: Ministry of Community Development and Social Services

Email: info@mcdss.gov.zm

Telephone: (260) 211 223319/235339

### 1.1 Project Background

The SSRSP AF will build on the existing Girls' Education and Women's Livelihood (GEWEL) Project (P151451) and the SSRSP parent project, co-financed by the International Development Association (IDA) and the GEWEL Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), and will continue to focus on building the Government's social protection system to support the poorest households in Zambia with unconditional cash transfers. The parent SSRSP project was approved on June 28, 2022, and became effective on November 10, 2022. The Project Development Objective (PDO) is to protect poor and vulnerable households' consumption in response to shocks in Zambia. The project focuses on stabilizing funding for the Government's national Social Cash Transfer (SCT) program at a time when the Government is facing fiscal challenges to respond to climate and other shocks.

#### Parent Project Description

The SSRSP project provides financing to cover cash transfers to the almost one million beneficiaries of the SCT program for a period of one year. The project has one component, the SCT, which finance bi-monthly cash transfers to poor and vulnerable households. The SCT currently provides a bi-monthly transfer of ZMW 400 for an average household and double this amount for households with a disabled person. Beneficiaries are selected through categorical as well as poverty targeting to identify people that are poor and are unable to work for reasons of age, disability, illness, or high dependency ratios.

The SCT also provides an education grant to households that have one or more girls enrolled in the Keeping Girls in School (KGS) program under the GEWEL project through the existing SCT payment system. This is to support households to cover other costs involved in attending school, such as uniforms, books, food, and transport, among others. The value of the grant is currently ZMW 600 per girl per year. This represents about 25 percent of the annual cash transfer value for the average household, or 12.5 percent of the annual cash transfer for households with a disabled member.

## **Rational and description of the SSRSP AF2**

On February 29, 2024, the GRZ declared a national disaster and emergency in response to the severe drought caused by El Niño weather conditions and exacerbated by climate change. The current weather patterns have brought the driest season in the last 40 years to many countries in Southern Africa. In Zambia, it has been estimated that some 9 million people are being impacted nationally by the on-going drought, with the food security of more than six million people in 84 of the 116 districts being threatened. Further, the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) Acute Food Insecurity Analysis predicted in November 2023 that approximately 2.04 million Zambians, representing 23 percent of the population, will be experiencing a food crisis or worse (IPC Phase 3). This has been compounded by sustained high inflation, undermining the consumption and food security of the poor and vulnerable. The GRZ has estimated financing needs of US\$940.6 million to provide life-saving and early recovery assistance to 6.6 million people in need of urgent humanitarian assistance around food assistance; education and school feeding program; health; nutrition; water resources; agricultural production livestock; and wildlife preservation and wellbeing. This AF is intended to address project cost overruns due to the increase in the SCT caseload.

The Government is committed to addressing emerging negative impacts on the welfare of the poorest and most vulnerable Zambians because of the on-going drought and other shocks. The GRZ has demonstrated its strong commitment to proactively responding to shock impacts on the poorest and most vulnerable households, while ensuring predictable and reliable delivery of the SCT. For example, through the MCDSS, it has progressively increased its financing to cover 65 percent of the total caseload in 2023 and 70 percent in 2024. Moreover, it proactively began implementation of pilot shock responses to inflation impacts in urban areas and food insecurity because of imminent drought prior to the national emergency declaration. Such efforts have served to stabilize the financing of the SP sector and the predictability of cash transfers to the poorest and most vulnerable, particularly during emergencies, in the face of shrinking fiscal space, double digit inflation, climate induced and other shocks. This has been critical to boost incomes and purchasing power to protect the consumption of the poor and prevent negative coping strategies and an irreversible impact on food security and human capital. Donors also remain strongly committed to the SP sector, in particular the SCT, as demonstrated by the current AF underway through the GEWEL MDTF.

The proposed AF will continue co-financing the sole component under the SSRSP - Social Cash Transfer and enable it to scale up both vertically and horizontally to address the on-going drought impacts. Initial assessments regarding the funding requirement vis a vis available total financing to support both horizontal and vertical expansion of the SCT program indicates that there will be a financing gap of some US\$275 million over the next one year for drought response. The grant will finance goods, non-consulting services, consulting services, training costs, operating costs, as well as cash transfers.

The AF will continue financing the existing activities under the SSRSP project. The project's sole component SCT will receive an increase in grant funding for the cash transfer to the SCT households, including the education grant for KGS girls, and the strengthening of delivery systems.

## 1.2 ESS 10: Stakeholders Engagement and Information Disclosure

As per ESS 10: Stakeholders Engagement and Information Disclosure, implementing agencies should provide stakeholders with timely, relevant, understandable and accessible information, and consult with them in a culturally appropriate manner, which is free of manipulation, interference, coercion, discrimination and intimidation. To meet best practice approaches, the project applied the following principles for stakeholder engagement:

- **Openness and life-cycle approach:** public consultations for the project will continue during the whole project lifecycle from preparation through implementation. Stakeholder engagement will be free of manipulation, interference, coercion, and intimidation;
- **Informed participation and feedback:** information was provided and widely distributed among all stakeholders in an appropriate format; conducted based on timely, relevant, understandable and accessible information related to the project; opportunities provided to raise concerns and assure that stakeholder feedback is taken into consideration during decision making;
- **Inclusiveness and sensitivity:** stakeholder identification was undertaken to support better communications and building effective relationships. The participation process for the project was inclusive and the stakeholders were always encouraged to be involved in the consultation process. Equal access to information was provided to all stakeholders. Sensitivity to stakeholders' needs was the key principle underlying the selection of engagement methods. Special attention was given to vulnerable groups, particularly women headed households, youth, elderly and the cultural sensitivities of diverse ethnic groups.

## 1.3 Purpose of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP)

Stakeholder engagement is an inclusive process conducted throughout the project life cycle. Where properly designed and implemented, it supports the development of strong, constructive and responsive relationships that are important for successful management of a project environmental and social risks<sup>1</sup>. Communicating early, often, and clearly with stakeholders helps manage expectations and avoid risks, potential conflict, and project delays.<sup>2</sup> In addition, the plan assists in managing stakeholder expectations which will have a bearing throughout the lifespan of the project. Further the SEP takes into consideration the different types of stakeholders and describes measures adopted to ensure groups that are differently affected are captured, particularly those identified as vulnerable. Hence, this SEP provided a plan to interact effectively with stakeholders to support project interests.

## 2. Brief Summary of Previous Stakeholder Engagement Activities

The SSRSP AF will build on the Bank's leading operation in the social protection sector in Zambia, the GEWEL and the SSRSP projects. Since commencing implementation in 2015, GEWEL has embedded regular consultations with its various stakeholders into its programming. Stakeholder engagement

---

<sup>1</sup> The World Bank (2017), The World Bank Environmental and Social Framework

<sup>2</sup> Pollet., T (2014), A Strategic Approach to Early Stakeholder Engagement

activities have included Government line ministries; Civil Society Organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations; Political leaders; Civic leaders; Provincial Administration; Districts Administration; Faith Based Organizations; Traditional Leaders; direct beneficiaries and wider community members; and Cooperating Partners.

There are a number of regular and needs-based consultation activities that take place, for example, to understand community perception of the project and implementation performance. These usually take the form of a community meeting or Focus Group Discussion during regular Headquarter (HQ) and Provincial monitoring activities. District staff (including DCDO, DSWO and DEBS) are regularly consulted to discuss potential challenges and areas to improve project design.

**Table 1: List of recent consultations that design takes into account**

| <b>Consultation</b>                                       | <b>Description</b>  | <b>Modality</b>                                 | <b>Frequency</b>        | <b>Impact</b>  |
|---|---|---|-------------------------|--|
| <b>GEWEL Additional Financing Workshop</b>                | Discussion between Government and Cooperation Partners to improve program design GEWEL  | Workshop  | September 2019          | Consolidated decision to expand GEWEL to include support to Social Cash Transfers  |
| <b>High level GBV Workshop</b>                            | Highlighted the extent of School related gender-based violence as a problem and the need to begin address with Senior Management  | Workshop  | December 2021           | Created the momentum to begin addressing school related gender-based violence in the Ministry of Education among senior management                             |
| <b>Joint Review &amp; Implementation Support Missions</b> | Consultation for GEWEL government stakeholders as well as Cooperation Partners to discuss various aspects of program performance  | National meetings                               | Bi-Annual               | Maintained project trajectory to achieve PDO   |
| <b>SCT Operational Guidelines Consultation</b>            | Brought together governmental representatives to improve PIM for frontline implementers so that it is more operational and modular, and provides more clarity on processes and design updates | Workshop  | December – January 2022 | Build consensus around changing aspects of SCT design to facilitate operational efficiency   |
| <b>Joint UN Program Consultations</b>                     | Discussion between government, Cooperation Partners and stakeholders on the preliminary findings from the review of the Joint UN Program  | Workshop  | October 2019            | Presented preliminary options to improve the early warning system to better meet information requirements to enable early and scalable food and cash response. |
| <b>GEWEL MTR Consultations</b>                            | Consultations with all levels of Government, Cooperation Partners and Districts   | Key Information Interviews, Meetings, Workshops | December – January 2022 | Resulted in identification of areas of improvement for the project and recommendations for future programming  |
| <b>Technical Working Groups</b>                           | Discussion among working groups comprised of government and development partner experts on specific   | National Meetings                               | Monthly                 | Resulted in identification of areas of improvement for the project and   |



|  |  |          |           |  |
|--|--|----------|-----------|--|
|  | subject areas – education grants, livelihoods, payments, shock responsive social protection, gender, GBV, GRM, program management, etc.          |          |           | recommendations for addressing implementation challenges   |
| <b>GEWEL Steering Committee</b>            | The highest government structure in the governance of the project and discusses policy issues affecting the implementation of the GEWEL Project. | Meetings | Quarterly | Provided policy guidance and high-level support to achieve PDO   |
| <b>District level GRM and GBV Meetings</b> | Engagement on the rollout of the GRM and monitoring of GBV issues and handling   | Meetings | Quarterly | Enhanced the rollout and functioning of the GRM through troubleshooting and capacity building on GBV referrals |

## 2.1 Consultations and Disclosure

The consultations on the parent SSRSP project began with a national virtual stakeholder meeting. The engagement was held in the month of October 2022. The participants included officers at national, provincial and district level. Later in the same month, the engagements were cascaded in nine (9) provinces across the country and participants this time were physically engaged. The targeted provinces included: Central, Copperbelt, Eastern, Luapula, Lusaka, Northern, North-Western, Muchinga and Western province. The main purpose of the consultations was to consult stakeholders on the design of the project and to obtain feedback thereof in relation to projected risks and/or challenges, including proposed mitigation measures aimed at addressing the perceived risks or challenges. The key audiences that were targeted included the following:

- Members of the Provincial Development Coordination Committee (PDCC).
- Members of the District Development Coordination Committee (DDCC), and
- Members of the community (Community Welfare Assistance Committee members, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of the Social Cash Transfers programme, civic and traditional leaders, representatives of Faith-Based and Non-Governmental Organizations).

From the engagements, over five thousand (5,000) participants were consulted on the project and the majority being members of the community. Taking into account the large-scale of directly affected population of this national program, the SEP endeavored to capture the views of sample communities in:

- Existing SCT supported districts

A mixture of urban and remote districts was covered during the consultations. Eighteen (18) randomly selected districts from 9 (nine) provinces participated in the consultations. Statistically, this sample represented 15.3 percentage of the total 116 districts. The specific parameters that were used to select the participating districts included the following:

- Districts where there is presence of various PSPs (MNOs, Banks, PPMs).
- Districts with high levels of poverty.
- Districts prone to climate change (e.g., drought, flood etc.).

Attendance registers for participants from *Lusaka, Northern, Central, Western, Muchinga, Eastern and Copperbelt* provinces on the engagement meetings are attached as annex 3 for reference purposes.

### **2.1.1 Concerns raised by stakeholders during the consultations**

- The following constitutes a summary of concerns that were gathered from the stakeholders on the during the engagements: Stakeholders about whether households receiving the Supporting Women and Livelihood (SWL) project will benefit from SSRSP project during times of shocks. It was explained that these are households that are on cash plus and that they will benefit under vertical targeting. It was further explained that vertical targeting embraces households that are benefiting from the Social Cash Transfer programme.
- There were concerns on what mechanisms will be utilized to deliver what is due to qualifying households. It was explained that the Social Welfare existing structures will be utilized to deliver the cash benefits. The teams explained that the Zambia Integrated Social Protection Information System (ZISPIS) will be used to disburse the funds. Various Payment Service Providers (PSPs), that is, the banks and mobile network operators including the Pay Point Managers will facilitate the payments.
- Stakeholders wanted to know whether different amounts will be disbursed to deserving households depending on the type of shock or whether there will be a standard amount that will be provided. It was clarified that a standard amount will be paid to eligible households and that this amount to be paid will be arrived at after undertaking vulnerability assessment on the magnitude of shock. Households on the SCT will collect their traditional grants plus the amount the amount that will be determined under the shock response. Conversely, it was explained that households that are not on the SCT will only receive the grants under the shock response for a limited period (that is, in relation to the length of the project) and they will be removed from the list thereafter while the SCT households will continue receiving their traditional bi-monthly transfers under the SCT programme.
- Participants wanted to know whether persons living with disabilities will have special considerations on the amount to be paid like in the case of the social cash transfers. On this concern, the stakeholders were enlightened that a standard amount that will be agreed after the vulnerability assessment is what will be paid across all eligible households. The only difference will be that the disabled clients will what is due to them under the SCT plus the amount that they will receive under the emergency cash response.
- There was a concern on what is being done to ensure that men are not left behind more especially when dealing with GBV issues and empowerment programmes as it was observed that emphasis on targeting is usually around women. The team explained that during the SSRSP intervention, all vulnerable households that meet the entry criteria will be considered under horizontal targeting, including households that are headed by men. On cases of GBV related issues, the stakeholders were reminded that a functional GEWEL GRM is in place and that for all cases of abuse they can use Childline-Lifeline toll-free lines to have them reported.

### **2.1.2 Risks/challenges raised during the consultations**

Various risks/challenges were identified during the consultations. Some are listed here below:

- DMMU not present in every district, hence undertaking of vulnerability assessment in shock affected districts may take too long to be accomplished. Dependency to undertake this activity may largely fall under the Head office and this may in turn delay the implementation of the response.
- The project may be marred by political infiltration, more especially during recruitment of new beneficiaries on the programme.
- Sustainability after end of project may be difficult to realize if government does not take full ownership of the programme.
- Pay Point Managers may face security challenges now that there will be extra amounts of moneys to handle. They will likely to frequent the banks more than before, hence this poses fiduciary risks.
- The project may destabilize the existing community coping mechanisms. This may create dependency on government related intervention among community members.

### **2.1.3 Strategies measures to address projected risks/challenges**

The stakeholders advanced the following strategies among others to address the identified risks:

- Government will require taking up full ownership of the project beyond the project end-date, that is, after the year 2025. This will address the issues around sustainability of the programme.
- Strengthening of DMMU structures at District level in readiness to provide effective response in times of natural calamities. DMMU is not currently present in every district and this may require to rely on the district DMMU committees. These are committees that are chaired by the office of the District Commissioner and in reality, a number of these committees are not fully active as learned from the engagement meetings. Therefore, the district committees require strengthening.
- Ensuring that all relevant parties/targets are well sensitized from the onset of the project. Information is power, hence every party involved including the would-be beneficiaries need to be aware of how the project is going to function, they need to know the eligibility criteria and on how they can submit concerns among other relevant information.
- There will be need of creating linkages with other social protection programmes. Concentration of social intervention programmes in one household optimizes the level of impact in terms of uplifting the living standards of these households. This also may be one of the bases that may be utilized to graduate clients that have become better-off from the SCT programme.
- Enhancing resilience among the effected households. This could be through strengthening linkages with other programmes, such as, the provision of business skills and savings.

### **2.1.4 Observations/Lessons learnt during consultations**

Below are some of notable observations and/or lessons that were drawn from the consultations:

- Stakeholder engagements are vital during introduction of any government project and/programme. Stakeholders need to learn about the design of project and how it will be implemented. The process also helps various stakeholders to own the project by providing feedback on what might affect them during the project implementation. Therefore, for districts that will be earmarked for the SSRSP project during the time of shock require implementation of stakeholder engagements if this has not been done.
- Stakeholders at every level were delighted to learn about the new initiative and showed some level of anxiety for the project to soon be implemented. Some clients thought registration under the new project would happen immediately in their respective districts and communities, but however, the purpose of the engagement meetings was made very clear to them.
- The use of local language at community level proved to be very helpful as it promoted inclusivity. Different members of the communities were able to freely express themselves around their expectations with regards to the project implementation. They were also able to freely ask questions pertaining to the SCT and the teams were able to clarify their concerns.
- The use of existing institutional structures will be helpful in either during onboarding of new beneficiaries on the project or administration of cash benefits to deserving households during the time of shocks. Thus, unlike creating new structures, the use of existing structures will reduce on delays for project implementation. Additionally, the use of the GEWEL GRM will ease the recording and resolution of complaints as processes and timelines are already clearly defined.
- The stakeholders appreciated the role that government has undertaken to enhance linkages on social protection programmes such as the cash plus programme. It was acknowledged among various stakeholders that this is a step in the right direction as this is likely to optimize the impact of the programmes at household level. The SCT beneficiaries were thankful to Government and Partners to be entitled to the cash benefits during times of shocks, as it were during the drought and covid-19 emergency cash responses.

### **2.1.5 Recommendations made from the engagement meetings**

The stakeholders submitted some of the following recommendations during the consultations:

- There is need for the SSRSP National level team to hold regular preparatory meetings in order to ready enough for any potential shock. Therefore, coordination and linkages among national parties responsible for facilitating the SSRSP project requires enhancement.
- Government to ensure full ownership the project beyond its end-date.
- Government to denounce political intrusion during project implementation.
- Existing institutional structures should utilized be to avoid delays in project implementation.
- The use of the GEWEL GRM will be useful unlike creating a separate complaint mechanism to address concerns that will arise during the project implementation. The GEWEL GRM is already functional at national scale and there is enough capacity to manage all concerns that may emanate from the project implementation.

Further details on concerns raised, potential risks during project implementation, mitigation measures that can help counter the risks, lessons learnt and recommendations made during the consultations can be obtained in the consolidated report attached to this document.

In addition, having held the consultative meetings at every level (National, provincial, district and community level), MCDSS, the World Bank, line ministries and other relevant institutions will validate and adopt the anticipated risks/challenges, proposed mitigation measures, lessons learnt and recommendation during broader national level workshop(s). The validation workshop on the consultation outcomes will be key for effective and efficient project management.

### 3. Stakeholder Identification and Analysis

This stakeholder analysis identifies and determines the likely relationship between the project and its various stakeholders. As there are no new and additional activities to be included under SSRSP, the identified stakeholders under the GEWEL Project and their description remains relevant for this SEP.

Stakeholders are those directly or indirectly affected by a project, as well as those who may have interests in a project and/or the ability to influence its outcome, either positively or negatively. Stakeholder analyses help to identify the perceptions, interests, needs, and influence of actors on the project. ESS10 classifies stakeholders in two broad categories: “Project-affected parties” (PAPs) and “other interested parties”. Within these categories, persons or groups may be categorized as especially disadvantaged or vulnerable.

#### 3.1 Project-Affected Parties (PAPs)

Project-affected Parties (PAPs) are defined as persons, groups and other entities within the project area of influence that are directly influenced (actually or potentially) by the project and/or have been identified as most susceptible to change associated with the project, and who need to be closely engaged in identifying impacts and their significance, as well as in decision-making on mitigation and management measures.

For the purposes of this Project, affected stakeholders are poor, vulnerable and labor constrained households across Zambia’s 116 districts. They may include the elderly (above 65 years old), severely disabled, chronically ill, child-headed households, female headed households. The SSRSP aims to protect **poor and vulnerable households’ consumption in response to shocks**.

**Table 2: Affected Stakeholders**

| Stakeholder                               | Description  |
|---|--|
| <b>SCT Beneficiaries</b>                  | Members of the ultra-poor and vulnerable households and typically including: elderly (above 65 years old), severely disabled, chronically ill, child-headed households, female headed households |
| <b>Community members in project areas</b> | Members of communities in which the Project is implemented   |

Stakeholders also include wider community members or non-beneficiaries of the project living in the target communities. They also include community members engaged as volunteers or assigned to focal point role to help deliver the Project, for example, see Table 3, below.

**Table 3: Affected Stakeholders (continued)**

| Stakeholder   | Description   |
|---|---|
| <b>Community Grievance Focal Points</b>             | Respected females that receive training and take responsibility for handling complaints including serious complaints related to GBV, SEA/SH   |
| <b>Community Based Volunteers</b>                   | These are females that provide mentorship support to targeted SWL beneficiaries. They train beneficiaries in Life and Businesses skills and take lead role in supporting SWL beneficiaries with formation of Saving Groups. |
| <b>Community Development Assistants</b>             | These are civil servants that have the responsibility of manning communities, they supervise CBVs with various tasks  |
| <b>Community Welfare Assistant Committees</b>       | These operate at village level they play critical role of community mobilization  |
| <b>Social Cash Transfer Pay Point Managers</b>      | The Pay Point Managers responsible for paying SCT beneficiaries   |
| <b>Civic leaders</b>                                | These are elected politically and are responsible to represent their respective communities in developmental matters at ward level.   |
| <b>Traditional leaders</b>                          | These include Traditional Chiefs and Village Headpersons. They play a role in mobilizing members of their respective chiefdoms and/or villages.   |
| <b>Representatives of Faith Based Organizations</b> | These are members that are selected to represent the clergy in developmental issues at District level.  |

### 3.2 Other Interested Parties

Other interested parties are defined as individuals/groups/entities that may not experience direct impacts from the project but who consider or perceive their interests as being affected by the project and/or who could affect the project and the process of its implementation.

For the purposes of this AF, **other interested parties** are described as institutions and organizations that will be directly involved in the delivery of the project from national (or HQ), district to community level. At national level, MCDSS is responsible for the implementation of the SSRSP AF. At district level, the District Commissioners of the target districts, Members of the council, the executive committee and its sub-committees and nongovernmental organizations working in such districts will be direct interested parties. At community level, the traditional leaders, area and village development committees and their subcommittees and community volunteers constitute some of the direct interested parties at community level.

Cooperation Partners at national level, representatives of NGOs at district and community level, religious groups and their leaders and communities in areas where the project will be implemented are some of other interested parties.

**Table 4: Other Interested Parties**

| Stakeholder             | Description   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>District</b>         |   |
| <b>Local Leadership</b> | These may be traditional, religious or political leaders (including ward councilors and Members of parliament) who have influence in the communities where the project is being implemented |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>District Development Coordinating Committees</b>             | This is a political arm of government at district level and is constituted by elected Councilors, Council Secretary, District Commissioner and Heads of respective government departments   |
| <b>District Community Development Officers</b>                  | These are civil servants stationed at district level whose main task is to attend to all issues within the district   |
| <b>Assistant Community Development Officers</b>                 | These are civil servants stationed within communities or in sub-centers   |
| <b>District Education Boards Secretary (DEBs)</b>               | These are civil servants stationed at district level whose main task is to attend to all issues within the district concerning the KGS girls.<br>The DEBS is the controlling officer of KGS at district level under the Ministry of Education   |
| <b>District Planning Officer (DPO)</b>                          | These civil servants stationed at district level whose main task is to attend to all issues within the district concerning the KGS girls.<br>The DPO is the KGS focal; point person at district level under the ministry of education and is in charge of all the enrollments, payments and all KGS activities at district level. |
| <b>Assistant Statistical Officer (ASO)</b>                      | These civil servants stationed at district level whose main task is to attend to all issues within the district concerning the KGS girls. Provide technical support to the implementation of the project<br>The ASO is in charge of entering all the KGS data onto the KGS MIS at district level                                  |
| <b>Provincial</b>   |   |
| <b>Ministry of Education (Provincial Education Office -PEO)</b> | Coordinate implementation of KGS in the province, monitor KGS activities in the province, Community sensitization, technical support  |
| <b>Provincial Education Officer</b>                             | These civil servants stationed at provincial level whose main task is to attend to all issues within the province concerning the KGS girls  |
| <b>Senior Planning Officer</b>                                  | These civil servants stationed at provincial level whose main task is to attend to all issues within the province concerning the KGS girls  |
| <b>National/HQ level</b>  |   |
| <b>GEWEL Coordinating Committee</b>                             | Direction, guidance on implementation   |
| <b>Ministry of Community Development and Social Services</b>    | Houses project implementation unit<br>-Third Project Component-ISSB housed at the Ministry  |
| <b>Gender Division</b>  | Coordinate implementation of all component of GEWEL including; SWL, KGS and SCT   |
| <b>Ministry of Community Development and Social Welfare</b>     | Coordinate implementation of grant payments with PSPs, Manage MIS for SWL, develop implementation materials and Oversee implementation<br>Community sensitization, technical support and mobilization for project implementation of community development projects.   |
| <b>Donors</b>   | Cooperation partners who co-finance the GEWEL   |
| <b>Media</b>  | May report on impacts of GEWEL to the general public.   |

### 3.3 Disadvantaged or Vulnerable Groups

Disadvantaged or vulnerable groups are persons who may be disproportionately impacted or further disadvantaged by the projects as compared with any other groups due to their vulnerable status, and that may require special engagement efforts to ensure their equal representation in the consultation and decision-making process associated with the projects.

Although the Project is largely expected to have positive impacts among beneficiary members of the target communities, there is still a possibility of individuals, families and communities being negatively affected by activities of the program. These may come from among the beneficiaries or non-beneficiary members of the target communities. The women and children, the youth, elderly, disabled and chronically ill are often times the most vulnerable because of their limited access to information due to physical, social, cultural and structural barriers within the communities. These categories of people will be particularly targeted with adequate information to understand the nature of project activities and anticipated positive and potential negative impacts of the project. They will also be provided with information on how to access the grievance redress mechanism of the project whenever the need arises.

For elderly members of the community that might have mobility challenges when it comes to accessing venues for program activities such as meetings, there will be consideration to organize meetings within manageable distances. Another envisaged challenge is high illiteracy levels in some of the target communities that will make it difficult for beneficiaries to read and understand written information pertaining to the project. Appropriate methods such as public meetings, visual media (posters, billboards, community videos), will be employed to reach out to such groups of people. Hearing challenges (due to age or birth) by some beneficiaries might require use of sign language aides in outreach and visibility tools as well as Public Address systems or megaphones, especially where the meetings attract large crowds of people.

Extra effort will be undertaken to reach out to non-beneficiary members of the target communities to make them understand the project targeting processes and capacity limits so that they do not feel disadvantaged. For the purposes of this Project, **disadvantaged or vulnerable groups** are described below.

**Table 5: Disadvantage or Vulnerable Groups**

| Stakeholder  | Description   |
|--|---|
| <b>Women in male-headed and female-headed beneficiary households</b> | May experience GBV/SEAH at home, or in transit to collect payments or attend trainings or meetings. |
| <b>The elderly</b>   | May have accessibility challenges   |
| <b>Disabled/persons affected by chronic diseases/bedridden</b>       | May have accessibility challenges   |

#### 4. Stakeholder Engagement Plan

Stakeholder engagement activities on the parent SSRSP project were held with various stakeholders at different levels. Firstly, a national virtual stakeholder engagement was held to collect views on the design of the project, environmental and social risks, mitigation measures, the grievance redress mechanism and the outline on how the engagements were going to proceed. The engagements were later cascaded at provincial, district and community levels. The engagements aimed at providing specific stakeholder groups with relevant information and opportunities to voice their views on topics that matter to them. SSRSP is a highly interactive program, and beneficiaries have frequent opportunities to interact face to face with program implementers (for example, during transfer pickups.). Stakeholders need to be kept informed at all stages of the project cycle as the project develops and evolves, including reporting on project environmental and social performance and



implementation of the SEP and grievance redress mechanism (GRM). This is important for the wider public, but equally and even more so for targeted vulnerable beneficiaries.

The SEP paid particular attention to especially vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, including the elderly, persons with disabilities, female-headed households, orphans and vulnerable children.

Table 6 outlines the consultations scheduled. MCDSS will lead the implementation of the SEP. The primary purpose of the engagement program for this project were to:

- Consult stakeholders on the proposed project design, anticipated environmental and social risks and impacts, mitigation measures, the draft engagement plan and the draft environmental and social risk management instruments; and
- Provide regular information and feedback to stakeholders related to project implementation progress and any other emerging issues throughout the project cycle.

**Table 6: Planned Stakeholder Engagement Activities**

| No. | Project Phase                | Engagement Activity  | Objective   | Targeted Stakeholders  | Time Frame    |
|-----|------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------|
| 1   | Project Preparation Phase    | National level Stakeholder Consultations   | Collect views on the design of the project, environmental and social risks, mitigation measures, grievance redress mechanisms and Stakeholder engagement plan | Representatives of Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies, Development Partners, NGOs, CSOs   | November 2022 |
|     |                              | Provincial level Consultations   | Collect views on the design of the project, environmental and social risks, mitigation measures, grievance redress mechanisms and Stakeholder Engagement Plan | PDCC members, NGO representatives, representatives for Faith-Based Organization  | November 2022 |
|     |                              | District level Stakeholder Consultations   | Collect views on the design of the project, environmental and social risks, mitigation measures, grievance redress mechanisms and Stakeholder Engagement Plan | DDCC members, civic leaders, representatives for local NGOs, representatives for local FBOs, traditional leaders   | November 2022 |
|     |                              | Community level Stakeholder Consultations  | Collect views on the design of the project, environmental and social risks, mitigation measures, grievance redress mechanisms and Stakeholder Engagement Plan | Members of target communities, local/traditional, religious, and political leaders, development sub-committees such as CWACs and disadvantaged and vulnerable groups | November 2022 |
| 2   | Project Implementation Phase | Project Inception meetings with District Councils  | Provide feedback on approved project design and orient district level stakeholders on their roles   | Members of the District Executive Committees   | November 2022 |
|     |                              | Community mobilization   | Mobilize and prepare target communities for project implementation  | Selected beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of project  | November 2022 |
|     |                              | Project Implementation Monitoring and Supervision Missions                                     | Provide and obtain on-going information and support on project performance, to monitor progress on results  | National, district, and community level implementers   | Bi-Annually   |
|     |                              | Project review meetings with selected stakeholders from National, District and Community level | Provide and get periodic feedback on project implementation progress and any emerging issues  | Selected National, District and Community level stakeholders   | Quarterly     |

| No.      | Project Phase                  | Engagement Activity        | Objective  | Targeted Stakeholders  | Time Frame                              |
|----------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|---|
|          |                                | Impact Evaluation          | To assess program impacts on beneficiaries.                                    | Beneficiaries and Implementers at district and community level               | Every 2 years                           |
|          |                                | Spot Checks                | To ensure program operational compliance                                       | Beneficiaries and Implementers at district and community level               | Annual                                  |
|          |                                | Process Review             | To assess program compliance and results                                       | Beneficiaries and Implementers at district and community level               | Annual                                  |
|          |                                | Beneficiary Surveys        | Obtain feedback on project implementation (impacts, experiences, expectations) | Selected beneficiaries of project  | Annual                                  |
|          |                                | CSO Platform               | Obtain feedback on project implementation                                      | Zambian civil society  | Quarterly                               |
|          |                                | Social Accountability      | Obtain feedback on project implementation (impacts, experiences, expectations) | Selected beneficiaries and implementers                                      | Pilot basis with potential for scale up |
|          |                                | GRM Review                 | To assess functionality and performance of the program's GRM.                  | Beneficiaries and Implementers at district and community level               | Annual                                  |
| <b>3</b> | <b>Project Close Out Phase</b> | Project close out meetings | Engage stakeholders on project exit strategy                                   | Beneficiary communities and groups, national and district stakeholders, CSOs | 2025                                    |

## 5. Implementation Arrangements for Stakeholder Engagement Plan

### 5.1 Roles and Responsibilities

The Stakeholder Engagement activities forms part of the Environmental and Social Commitment Plan (ESCP). This is a tool which will commit Management to ensuring that planned activities are implemented and form part of project approval documents which will be monitored by the World Bank. The monitoring and evaluation framework for the project will also have indicators on the ESCP whose implementation progress will be tracked and reported accordingly. ESCP Implementation progress report will be periodically produced and shared with stakeholders for review, deliberation and action.

MCDSS is responsible for the day-to-day program management for the parent SSRSP project and the proposed AF, including environmental and social management and addressing potential environmental and social risks. MCDSS will be responsible for engaging with stakeholders and managing the program's GRM and implementation of SEP. To implement the various activities envisaged in the SEP, the roles of the GRM and GBV Focal Points in MCDSS will be expanded to include Stakeholder Engagement under the SSRSP. Focal Points will need to closely coordinate with other key stakeholders, including other government agencies, CSOs and PAPs. Focal Points will make use of the Project's decentralized government structures at District and Community level to implement the SEP. Specifically, they will be responsible for: planning and implementation of SEP in coordination with other relevant agencies, manage and implement the GRM, coordinate and supervise activities, monitor and report on social performance to GoZ and World Bank, monitor management, resolution, and reporting of grievances.

### 5.2 Stakeholder Engagement Methods

#### **Public/community meetings**

Project launch meetings for national stakeholders were conducted followed by similar meetings at provincial and district level. At the community level, districts organized community gatherings to disclose relevant project information including information on targeting, environment and social impacts and the GRM. These events were conducted in the month of November 2022.

#### **Communication materials**

Written information was disclosed to the public through a variety of communications materials, such as brochures, flyers, posters, and on Government websites. The materials will be updated regularly with key project updates and reports on the project's performance. The website will also provide information about the grievance mechanism for the project's GRM.

#### **Surveys**

During the project implementation, relevant implementing agencies with support of GRM/Stakeholder Engagement Focal Points will organize a number of surveys to assess the quality of program implementation. These will include: Impact Assessments, Process Reviews, Beneficiary Surveys, etc.

#### **Grievance Redress Mechanism**

In compliance with the World Bank's ESS10, the project- specific grievance mechanism that was established for GEWEL will be extended to cover SSRSP to handle complaints and issues, including GBV referrals. Detailed communications materials (specifically a GRM brochure or poster) have been developed to help PAPs become familiar with the grievance redress channels and procedures. A GRM module has already been established and is functional across the country for GRM to enable accurate

capture and tracking of grievances from submission to resolution and communication with complainants.

### **Training, workshops**

Trainings on a variety of topics and issues will be provided to relevant government service providers. Issues covered will include sensitization to targeting, PIM, environment and social risk management, livelihoods, FM, labor issues, gender, case management, GRM, etc.

### **Reviews**

Program biannual review meetings will be organized to provide and collect periodic feedback on project implementation progress and identify and discuss new and emerging issues.

### **A focus on incorporating the views of Vulnerable Groups**

Appropriate and clear methods of communication will be used to inform in a timely manner, all participants about the meetings. This will include invitation letters where possible, stipulating the type and number of community stakeholder groups expected to come to the meetings. Where possible and necessary, separate consultations will be done with select interest groups during community meetings. The community meetings will be properly facilitated using a pre-designed discussion guide which will carry specific questions targeting vulnerable groups. Well experienced moderators will be used to conduct community meetings to ensure equitable participation and contribution of marginalized groups. The facilitating teams will have skilled note takers who will record the deliberations verbatim with the aid of voice recorders. Consent (verbal) or otherwise, will be sought from meeting participants before recorders are used in recording of proceedings. After completion of consultations, the field notes and transcriptions will be consolidated, analyzed and key issues incorporated into the relevant project documents.

## **6. Information Disclosure for Project**

Disclosing project information is essential for meaningful consultation on project design and for stakeholders to understand the potential opportunities of the project as well as its risks and impacts. Appropriate information will be provided to stakeholders depending on the stage of the project and the identified stakeholder information needs.

This will include information on the nature of the project design, the anticipated environmental and social risks and impacts, the proposed mitigation measures, the stakeholder engagement plan, grievance redress mechanisms and how stakeholder views were incorporated in the project design and management of environmental and social risks.

The Project will use a combination of methods to disclose information pertaining to the project in a manner that is commensurate with the nature of the identified stakeholders and environmental and social sensitivity of the project. For community level stakeholders, information will mostly be disclosed through public meetings organized within the communities. Deliberate efforts will be made to ensure that vulnerable groups of people such as women, persons affected with chronic illness, the elderly and disabled are adequately represented and heard in such meetings.

At national and district level, disclosure of information will be done through meetings with the representatives and heads of government departments. DDCC meetings, through printed and electronic copies of relevant project documents will be made available to stakeholders through appropriately designated places within reach of stakeholders, including government websites.

Communication to stakeholders on information disclosure programmes will be conveyed through relevant means depending on targeted audiences. Mostly, the project will use written forms of communication such as letters and electronic mails, community radio stations where available, and mobile public address system (ZANIS). Where possible social media platforms and groups will be created to assist in information dissemination to targeted stakeholders. All these processes, platforms, and channels will be linked to the GD, MCDSS and MoE Websites. Table 7 summarizes the key methods that will be used for disclosure of Project information at different stages of the Project.

Table 7 provides information on other means of project disclosure.

**Table 7: Information Disclosure**

| <b>When</b>                      | <b>With whom</b>  | <b>Frequency and timing</b>  | <b>Channels of Engagement</b>   | <b>Engagement methods</b>   | <b>Purpose</b>  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|
| <b>Project preparation stage</b> | MCDSS, National-Gender Division, MOE and other relevant government Ministries, Departments and Agencies and NGOs.                         | After approval by the World Bank   | In-person consultation meetings, round table stakeholder meetings, virtual meetings   | Workshops, virtual meetings, emails and letters   | Share information on project Design summary, Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Environmental and Social Commitment Plan, Grievance Redress Mechanism setup |
|                                  |   | After approval by the World Bank   | Community and National Radio station brochures and leaflets,  | Community and National Radio station, Public Address (PA) system brochures and leaflets | Share information on project Design summary, Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Environmental and Social Commitment Plan, Grievance Redress Mechanism setup |
|                                  |   | After approval by the World Bank   | Through printed and electronic copies at National, and District level focal offices as well as online portals   | Electronic media, DDCC meetings, community meetings                                     | Make available printed and electronic copies at National, and District level focal offices as well as online portals                                  |
| <b>Project implementation</b>    | District Focal Persons<br><br>Districts-Local Councils<br><br>Community-Project affected persons; vulnerable groups and local populations | Quarterly Review Meetings, Community radios, national radios, banners, newspaper placements, etc., | Stakeholders' meetings, community meetings, public address systems, radio phone-in programmes, Information leaflets, posters and brochures; audio-visual materials, MCDSS Websites; Press releases in the local media; and meetings | Members of target communities in target districts                                       | Share project activity and progress updates<br>Management Grievance Redress Mechanism   |
| <b>Project Closure</b>           | MCDSS, National-Gender Division, MOE  | Last quarter of project implementation   | In-person consultation meetings, round table stakeholder meetings, virtual meetings   | Project Closure and Review meetings   | Project Completion and evaluation Report<br>Exit Strategy   |

| When | With whom  | Frequency and timing | Channels of Engagement  | Engagement methods | Purpose |
|------|--|----------------------|---|--------------------|---------|
|      | and other relevant government Ministries, Departments and Agencies and NGOs. |                      | Community meetings, Information leaflets, MCDSS Websites; Press releases in the local media |                    |         |

### 6.1 Estimated Budget for SEP activities

The GRM/Stakeholder Engagement Focal Points in MCDSS will be responsible for planning and implementation of stakeholder engagement activities, as well as other relevant outreach and disclosure activities. In order to ensure successful SEP implementation, a series of activities are necessary for which the project has to provide adequate funding. The Stakeholder Engagement activities so far mentioned is part of other project documents, so it is possible that they have also been budgeted for in other plans. As such a tentative budget for the project's activities is reflected in Table 8. This table will be updated to include all stakeholder activities, including workshops, trainings, and program review and monitoring activities.

**Table 8: SEP Activities – Estimated Budget (5 years)**

| No. | Project Phase                | Engagement Activity                               | Objective  | Targeted Stakeholders   | Budget USD |
|-----|------------------------------|---|--|---|------------|
|     | Project Preparation Phase    | National stakeholders' consultation               | Obtain feedback on project design fundamentals, environmental and social risks with their corresponding mitigation measures, GRM and SEP | Representatives of line Ministries, Development Partners and NGOs   | 10,000     |
|     |                              | Provincial stakeholders' consultation             | Buying-in key decisions around project design, GRM and SEP   | PDCC members, representatives of NGOs and FBOs  | 20,000     |
|     |                              | District stakeholders' level consultation         | Collect views on project design, GRM and SEP   | DDCC members, civic leaders, representatives for local NGOs, representatives for local FBOs, traditional leaders                        | 40,000     |
|     |                              | Community stakeholder's consultation              | Collect opinions on project design and Grievance Redress Mechanism   | Members of target communities, traditional, religious, and political leaders, selected representatives of CWACs and marginalized groups | 40,000     |
|     | Project Implementation Phase | Project inception meetings with District Councils | Provide feedback on approved project design and orient district level stakeholders on their roles  | Members of the District Executive Committees  | 50,000     |
|     |                              | Community mobilization                            | Mobilize and prepare target communities for project implementation   | Members of target communities, CWACs, traditional, religious and  | 80,000     |

| No.          | Project Phase           | Engagement Activity  | Objective   | Targeted Stakeholders  | Budget USD       |
|--------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|------------------|
|              |                         |  |   | political leaders, beneficiaries, etc.                                 |                  |
|              |                         | Manage the Grievance Redress Mechanism   | Provide a systematic way of receiving, recording and resolving grievances from Project Affected Persons (PAPs)                        | Project Affected People at community, District and National levels     | 500,000          |
|              |                         | Project implementation monitoring and supervision missions                                     | Provide and obtain on going information and support on project performance  | National, district, and community level stakeholders                   | 200,000          |
|              |                         | Project review meetings with selected stakeholders from National, District and Community level | Provide and get periodic feedback on project implementation progress and any emerging issues  | Selected National, District and Community level stakeholders           | 100,000          |
|              |                         | Communication and Information – visibility and documentation                                   | Engage beneficiaries and implementers and document progress. Disseminate to achieve visibility through systematic outreach activities | Communities, district and national level stakeholders                  | 300,000          |
|              | Project Close Out Phase | Project close out meetings   | Engage stakeholders on project exit strategy  | Beneficiary communities and groups, national and district stakeholders | 25,000           |
| <b>TOTAL</b> |                         |  |   |  | <b>1,365,000</b> |

### Grievance Redress Mechanism

The GBV-responsive GRM for GEWEL has been rolled out country-wide to all 116 districts including: complaints boxes, community GRM-GBV Focal Points, communications-adapted for COVID (radio talk shows, ZANIS, flyers and community meetings where possible), Lifeline-Childline hotline, GRM module integrated into enhance Zambia Integrated Social Protection Information System (ZISPIS). Several steps have also been taken to harmonize KGS, SWL and SCT GRMs, including the management of boxes, regular coordination meetings to share and refer complaints at district level and coordination meetings among GEWEL components between all levels, including regular virtual meetings. Communities continue to access and make use of the GRM by registering complaints through available uptake channels. To ensure that the GRM is fully accessible and functional, capacity building and support activities continue to be provided to districts both virtually and through targeted face-to-face trainings where necessary. While considerable effort and forethought has been made to include safeguards in the design and implementation of the project in order to minimize and prevent potential adverse impacts from the project, there is always a possibility that interests of some individuals and groups may still be negatively affected by activities of the project. It is therefore expected that such instances may generate complaints from some beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of the Social Cash Transfer's programme. As such, provision of a mechanism for receiving, recording and resolving potential concerns and complaints that may arise from Project affected persons is necessary. Such a



mechanism would assist to provide early remedies to grievances so as to avoid unnecessary project implementation delays and obstructions.

A Grievance Redress Mechanism is a system through which queries or clarifications about the Project are responded to, problems that arise out of implementation are resolved, and grievances are addressed efficiently and effectively. The objective of the GRM is to satisfactorily address complaints (grievances) from beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of the Project. The goals of the GRM are to ensure people use the system, staff understand what is going well or poorly with program design and implementation, and communication messages around the GRM are tested and improved.

A GRM is an accessible and inclusive system, process, or procedure that receives and acts upon complaints and suggestions for improvement in a timely fashion and facilitates resolution of concerns and grievances arising in connection with a project.

An effective GRM provides project-affected parties with redress and helps address issues at an early stage. MCDSS has designated Grievance Focal Persons at the HQ level. At District level, the District Social Welfare Officer (DSWO) is the Grievance Focal Person supported by the Assistant Social Welfare Officers (ASWO) in management of complaints. The District officers are responsible for bi-monthly high-level monitoring and production of Monitoring Reports. At the HQ level, the Grievance Focal Person is responsible for weekly monitoring of the Grievance MIS Module, providing responses to complex or serious complaints which cannot be resolved at the district-level. At District level, the District officers are responsible for collecting forms, logging them in the Grievance MIS Modules, determining the appropriate responses (per guidelines), and delivering the responses to complainants. At community level, Community Welfare Assistance Committee (CWAC) members in collaboration with Community Grievance Focal Points for SWL and KGS takes charge of the box and ensuring forms are always available. The FPs also support to the District Grievance Focal Persons in delivery of response letters.

### ***Channels through which complaint forms are lodged***

#### **Channel 1: Complaint Box**

Complaint Forms are available near locked Complaint Boxes in a location chosen by the Project beneficiaries during the first sensitization meeting about the GRM. Mainly, the complaint boxes are placed at pay point stations. Complainant fills out the Complaint Form, tears off the bottom portion (so the complainant keeps a record of their Complaint Number) and puts the rest of the form in the Complaint Box. Complaint Forms are also available with Community Welfare Assistance Committee members. They can as well find them with Community Grievance Focal Persons or through Guidance and Counseling Teachers in schools. Forms are collected by District Grievance Focal Person every month (delivering responses to complaints collected previously). If Community Grievance Focal Person(s) receives a serious complaint, they immediately call it into District Grievance Focal Person.

#### **Channel 2: Community Grievance Focal Person**

The Community Welfare Assistance Committee members will be selected by the community members and endorsed by the District Social Welfare Office. These will comprise of 5 males and 5 females. They will be responsible for the Complaint Boxes and ensuring complaint forms are available. They will work closely with district staff on complaints related to GBV, SEA/SH, they will also contact the district office if forms are running low and assist beneficiaries to fill out Complaint Forms or receive complaints verbally.

### **Channel 3: Telephone Hotline for Serious Complaints**

A telephone hotline for serious complaints, such as GBV has been set up in collaboration with an NGO (Childline Zambia). Childline is an existing national hotline for GBV + HIV + other child protection related issues. Any abused person can call the toll-free hotline (#933 or #116) to: Receive counselling over the phone or Referral to appropriate services in their District. GEWEL will collaborate with Childline to ensure awareness of their service among SCT beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries, and to receive reporting from Childline on cases reported in all 116 districts in the country.

### **Channel 4: Walk-in Complaint**

Both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of the project that have means of going to the district office are eligible to lodge in complaints directly with the District Social Welfare Officer. The officer will enter the complaint details directly into the GRM module and ensure it is processed following the laid down procedures.

#### ***Steps to Register Complaints***

- Step 1: Lodging complaints

Complaints can be received in writing via Complaint Forms. They can also be made verbally to GEWEL FPs (CWAC members or District Staff). FPs can fill out a Complaint Form on behalf of the complainant.

- Step 2: Recording Complaints in Grievance MIS Module

Once back at District headquarters, the Grievance Focal Persons review the forms and divide them according to which program they relate to. Complaints for SCT will be given to the SCT GRM Focal Person, for KGS they will go the KGS, SWL complaints will go to SWL Focal Person GRM Focal Person, and complaints for any other program are referred to the appropriate District-level authority. Each Grievance Focal Person processes their respective complaints into the GRM MIS Module and generate response which they take back to the community.

- Step 3. For each complaint, the District Grievance Focal Person should consult the Complaint Categories and Responses section.

The majority of complaints will require no further investigation. For complaints which can be addressed at District level (e.g., CBV showing up late), the district-level staff should take appropriate action according to Ministry or program rules and standards. For complaints requiring HQ action (e.g., payments), the District Grievance Focal Person should contact HQ to request investigation and resolution. It is the responsibility of the district to regularly follow up with HQ on any pending responses required to resolve a complaint. District to send notification to HQ-level Grievance Focal Persons on all serious complaints (serious complaints will be resolved jointly with HQ).

- Step 4: Resolving Complaints & Issuing Responses to Complaints

Once a response has been determined for a complaint, the District Grievance Focal Person should process the complaint in the MIS Module and issue a response. Response letters should be delivered back to complainants in CWACs at least once per month when the District Grievance Focal Person goes to collect the Complaint Forms from the boxes. When complaints are referred to other programs (e.g., Health), the GEWEL team should refer the complaint to the respective government institution for further processing. For complaints where there is a contact phone number, a phone call may be used

to deliver the initial response on the complaint. However, the letter must always follow the phone call at a later date as well.

### ***Gender Based Violence Cases***

Since Gender Based Violence (GBV) and Sexual Exploitation and Abuse cases are substantively different from other complaints that are typically handled through the grievance redress mechanisms, their information will be handled in a special way within the GRM to ensure that the information is confidential. The GRM committees will be oriented on how to approach survivors and make referrals. Serious complaints raised through the GRM, including GBV cases are addressed immediately by referring GBV survivors to support services within the national GBV Referral Pathway. Additionally, FPs help link GBV survivors to services and support. When services are not available in the community, the Community and District Grievance Focal Person Persons work together with HQ to ensure that GBV survivors receive the support needed and follow up on cases. Information collected is kept to a minimum so as to avoid the potential for the survivor to be identified. Only the following elements related to a GBV allegation should be recorded: Age and sex of the survivor, type of alleged incident (as reported, in the survivors' own words), whether alleged perpetrator is, to the best of the survivor's knowledge, part of Project, whether survivor was referred to service provision. Additional information is normally gathered by the service providers using their existing survivor support protocols. Service providers will have their own internal reporting and case management system, where the detailed information on the case will be stored. This information shall be confidential and not part of the GRM process.

*GRM monitoring and evaluation* is undertaken alongside any other evaluation exercises for the project. This is possible using the GRM Monitoring Tool which is populated every quarter by district level staff. Monitoring is also done in the GRM module of MIS where all complaints are processed, resolved and copies stored.

### **Monitoring and Reporting**

The Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be periodically revised and updated as necessary in the course of SSRSP Project implementation to ensure that the information presented herein is consistent, and that the identified methods of engagement remain appropriate and effective in relation to the project context. Any major changes to the project related activities and to its schedule will be duly reflected in the SEP.

Biannual summaries and internal reports on public grievances, enquiries, and related incidents, together with the status of implementation of associated corrective/preventative actions will be collated by responsible staff and referred SSRSP's senior management. The summaries will provide a mechanism for assessing both the number and the nature of complaints and requests for information, along with the Project's ability to address those in a timely and effective manner. Information on public engagement activities undertaken by the project during the year may be conveyed to stakeholders in two possible ways:

- Publication of a standalone annual report on project's interaction with the stakeholders

The GRM and Stakeholder Engagement Focal Points will maintain a Stakeholder Engagement Log that chronicles all stakeholder engagement undertaken or planned. The Engagement Log includes location and dates of meetings, workshops, and discussions, and a description of the project-affected parties and other stakeholders consulted. The Project will also develop an evaluation form to assess the effectiveness of formal engagement process. The questions will be designed as appropriate for the relevant audience.

- Quarterly Narrative Reports will include reporting on Stakeholder Engagement including inclusion of new section on engagement and how feedback is being processed.
- A number of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) will also be monitored by the project on a regular basis, including the following parameters:
  - Number of public consultations held by districts
  - Number of communications materials on beneficiary rights developed and disseminated to beneficiaries
- Number of press materials published/broadcasted in the local, regional, and national media.
- Stakeholder Engagement progress will become a standing Agenda on Steering Committee and monthly Technical Committee meetings.

Standing Agenda of GEWEL Steering Committee and monthly Technical Committee Meetings.

Annexes

**Annex 1: Report on the consultations**

**Republic of Zambia**



**Report on Stakeholder Engagements on Scaling Up Shock Responsive Social Protection (SSRSP) Project**

**October 2022**

## Table of contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1.0 Introduction.....   | 3  |
| 1.1 Objectives of stakeholder engagements for SSRSP.....                | 3  |
| 1.2 Dates when field visits were undertaken and districts visited ..... | 3  |
| 1.3 Targets during stakeholders’ engagement visits .....                | 4  |
| 1.4 Project acceptance .....  | 4  |
| 2.0 Concerns highlighted by stakeholders .....                          | 4  |
| 3.0 Anticipated risks/challenges .....                                  | 6  |
| 4.0 Strategies/Mitigation measures .....                                | 7  |
| 5.0 Observations/Lessons learnt during the engagement meetings.....     | 8  |
| 6.0 Recommendations.....  | 8  |
| 7.0 Conclusion .....  | 9  |
| <b>Annex I:</b> Team Division .....                                     | 11 |
| <b>Annex II:</b> Attendance Lists .....                                 | 12 |

## 1.0 Introduction

The Ministry of Community Development and Social Services (MCDSS) had held a national virtual stakeholder engagement meeting on Scaling Up of Shock Responsive Social Protection (SSRSP) project with the Provincial Social Welfare Officers and District Social Welfare Officers in the second week of October 2022. The purpose was to enlighten the participants on the new project and to prepare for the engagement meetings with key stakeholders at provincial, district and community level in selected provinces and districts. Having held the national virtual stakeholder meeting, the Ministry cascaded the stakeholder engagements on the SSRSP project in selected districts of nine provinces namely: Central, Copperbelt, Eastern, Lusaka, Luapula, Northern, Muchinga, North-Western and Western province.

The SSRSP project is a project that builds on governments' leading social protection project, Girls Education and Women's Empowerment and Livelihoods (GEWEL) project which began implementation in 2015. In principle, implementing stakeholder engagement procedures is one of the requirements that has been outlined in the SSRSP Stakeholders Engagement Plan (SEP), and key to note is that the engagements are aimed at managing stakeholder expectations throughout the course of the SSRSP project life cycle.

The stakeholder engagement visits were aimed at: disseminating information among key stakeholders at different levels on the project design; sharing information on how the project will be implemented; buying-in key decisions from stakeholders on project design; gathering probable risks and/or challenges related to project implementation; and formulating measures or strategies based on the data collected that will help mitigate the expected risks and challenges. To ensure this was a reality, meetings were held with various stakeholders at provincial and district level. Additionally, public meetings with community members were also conducted to gather their perceptions on the project design and the anticipated risks associated with the project implementation, including the measures that should be put in place to mitigate the projected risks or challenges. Further, for community level meetings, local languages were used to cater for different groups and to enhance inclusivity for all community members.

With reference to the above background, this report provides: the specific objectives of the stakeholder engagements; the dates of field visits and the districts visited; an account on the opinions and concerns gathered among various stakeholders at different levels with regards to the project design; risks and challenges expected to be encountered during project implementation; the measures or strategies that should be put in place to address the foreseen risks or bottlenecks; the lessons learnt from the engagements; and recommendations for favorable consideration.

### *1.1 Objectives of stakeholder engagements for SSRSP*

The specific objectives for undertaking the stakeholder engagement visits include the following below:

- To raise awareness among key stakeholders (at national, provincial, district and community level) on the envisioned project design and to obtain feedback on their expectations, opinions and experiences in relation to the project implementation.
- To obtain feedback on the predicted risks and/or challenges during the project implementation.
- To formulate measures or strategies on how the anticipated risks or challenges will be addressed.

### 1.2 Dates when field visits were undertaken and districts visited

The field visits for the stakeholder engagements on SSRSP were conducted between **16-21 October, 2022**. There were nine teams that travelled in different directions simultaneously to ensure completion of the activity at the same time. In terms of the districts visited, the **table 1** provides details on the provinces and respective districts visited:

**Table 1:** Provinces and corresponding districts visited during engagement meetings

| Province      | Districts visited    |
|---------------|----------------------|
| Central       | Kabwe & Kapiri       |
| Copperbelt    | Chingola & Luanshya  |
| Eastern       | Chipata & Mambwe     |
| Lusaka        | Chongwe & Chilanga   |
| Luapula       | Mwense & Sanfya      |
| Northern      | Mungwi & Mporokoso   |
| North-Western | Solwezi & Zambia     |
| Muchinga      | Mpika & Lavushimanda |
| Western       | Kalabo & Senanga     |

### 1.3 Targets during stakeholders' engagement visits

Below is a list of stakeholders that were targeted during the visits:

1. Members of the Provincial Development Coordination Committee (PDCC) members.
2. Members of the District Development Coordination Committee (DDCC) members.
3. Members of the community (CWAC members, beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries of SCT, civic and traditional leaders, representatives of local NGOs and FBOs).

### 1.4 Project acceptance

Stakeholders at every level (Province, District and Community) appreciated the design for the SSRSP project as a progressive initiative. The fact that the SCT programme will be stretched during times of shocks to accommodate other vulnerable households not receiving the SCT grants elated the stakeholders.



## 2.0 Concerns highlighted by stakeholders

- The stakeholders wanted to know whether households receiving the Supporting Women and Livelihood (SWL) project will benefit from SSRSP project during times of shocks. It was explained that these are households that are on cash plus and that they will benefit under vertical targeting. It was further explained that vertical targeting embraces households that are benefiting from the Social Cash Transfer programme.
- There were concerns on what mechanisms will be utilized to deliver what due to qualifying households. It was explained that the Social Welfare existing structures will be utilized to deliver the cash benefits. The teams explained that the Zambia Integrated Social Protection Information System (ZISPIS) will be used to disburse the funds. Various Payment Service Providers (PSPs), that is, the banks and mobile network operators including the Pay Point Managers will facilitate the payments.
- Stakeholders wanted to know whether different amounts will be disbursed to deserving households depending on the type of shock or whether there will be a standard amount that will be provided. It was clarified that a standard amount will be paid to eligible households and that this amount to be paid will be arrived at after undertaking vulnerability assessment on the magnitude of shock. Households on the SCT will collect their traditional grants plus the amount the amount that will be determined under the shock response. Conversely, it was explained that households that are not on the SCT will only receive the grants under the shock response for a limited period (that is, in relation to the length of the project) and will be removed from the list thereafter while the SCT households will continue receiving their traditional bimonthly transfers under the SCT programme.
- Concerns were also around the timeframe for payments. Stakeholders wanted to know whether payments to deserving households will be disbursed as long as the shock is prevailing or whether it will be a once off payment. It was explained that a vulnerability assessment will be conducted by Disaster Management and Mitigation Unit and that depending on the magnitude of the shock, it will be determined whether the provision of the emergency response will last for either 3, 6 or 9 months and so on. It was also explained that the deserving households will receive their grants on monthly basis, but however, depending on what the Partners and the payment service providers will agree, payments may be agreed to be paid to beneficiaries either every two months or every three months as this may reduce the cost of administering transfers.
- Participants wanted to know whether persons living with disabilities will have special considerations on the amount to be paid like in the case of the social cash transfers. On this concern, the stakeholders were enlightened that a standard amount that will be agreed after the vulnerability assessment is what will be paid across all eligible households. The only difference will be that the disabled clients will what is due to them under the SCT plus the amount that they will receive under the emergency cash response.

- There was a concern on what is being done to ensure that men are not left behind more especially when dealing with GBV issues and empowerment programmes as it was observed that emphasis on targeting is usually around women. The team explained that during the SSRSP intervention, all vulnerable households that meet the entry criteria will be considered under horizontal targeting, including households that are headed by men. On cases of GBV related issues, the stakeholders were reminded that a functional GEWEL GRM is in place and that for all cases of abuse they can use Childline-Lifeline toll-free lines to have them reported.
- Participants wanted to know whether it is true if Ministry has more social protection programmes for women than for men. It was explained that the Ministry a number of programmes were both men and women can benefit. However, knowing that women are the most vulnerable in society, the Ministry has in place specific programmes, such as, SWL that aims at enhancing women participation in social protection programmes.
- Stakeholders wanted to know what monitoring mechanisms will be put in place for the SSRSP project. It was emphasized that monitoring is key to assessing and/evaluating the performance of the project. Thus, monitoring will be conducted during the course of the project implementation. How this will be done is outlined in the project document and the Standard Operation Procedures (SOPs).
- There were concerns whether there has been any analysis conducted to determine how many households so far have been graduated from the Social Cash Transfers to pave way for other households or whether Government is continuing to support the same households just for the sake of matching implementation with political pronouncements. It was explained that the actual numbers may not be given as of now but that the Ministry will soon undertake a systematic approach to graduate households that have become better-off by linking them to other social protection programmes. It was also brought to the attention of the stakeholders that there are households that have been existed from the programme, for example, Female Headed Households whose oldest children have turned the age 19 have exited the SCT programme. The system in use automatically exits them from the programme when their eldest child turns 19 years.
- Stakeholders wanted to know how the SCT grievance redress mechanism is performing. It was highlighted the redress mechanism is doing well in good number of districts and that what requires to be strengthened is awareness raising among community members to help increase the usage of the mechanism. It was also mentioned that a consultant was engaged to evaluate the performance of the mechanism in selected districts and the data once availed, will help in making informed decision on what requires to be done differently in enhance it usage and performance. And that the Ministry remains committed to ensuring that the mechanism is more accessible and that complaints are resolved within the given timelines, that is, two calenda months or 60 days.

- There was a concern around Pay Point Managers handling huge amounts of money and the stakeholders wanted to know what security measures have been put in place. In response to this concern, the team explained that a number of modalities have been put which include: limiting the threshold of cash carried by PPMs, training the PPMs in safety measures when handling cash transfers, limiting the visits to the banks, and introducing a deputy to limit the amount carried by each PPM.
- Stakeholders wanted to know what guidelines will be used during shocks. The participants were informed that the Ministry and Partners are in the process of developing the **Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs)** and that these will be supported by other instruments such as the **Environmental and Social Standards (ESS)**.

### 3.0 Anticipated risks/challenges

The perceived risk/challenges submitted by the various stakeholders include the following:

- DMMU not present in every district, hence undertaking of vulnerability assessment in shock affected districts may take too long to be accomplished. Dependency to undertake this activity may largely fall under the Head office and this may in turn delay the implementation of the response.
- There are numerous parties involve with each having its own roles and responsibilities. If not properly coordinated, it may lead to delayed implementation of the project.
- Lack of a unified beneficiary register to recruit new beneficiaries under horizontal targeting may cause delays in the implementation of the project.
- Roads may be washed away during heavy rains/floods (roads/bridges being cut-off) during an emergency intervention. This may make it difficult to reach out to affected households. Additionally, in such scenarios delivery of cash transfers may even be more difficult especially if there is poor mobile network connection.
- The project may be marred by political infiltration, more especially during recruitment of new beneficiaries on the programme.
- Sustainability after end of project may be difficult to realize if government does not take full ownership of the programme.
- Pay Point Managers may face security challenges now that there will be extra amounts of moneys to handle. They will likely to frequent the banks more than before, hence this poses fiduciary risks.
- The project may destabilize the existing community coping mechanisms. This may create dependency on government related intervention among community members.

#### 4.0 Strategies/Mitigation measures

The following highlight some of the strategies or mitigation measures that need to be employed to avoid or lessen the perceived risks and challenges associated with the project implementation:

- Government will require taking up full ownership of the project beyond the project end-date, that is, after the year 2025. This will address the issues around sustainability of the programme.
- Resources need to be made available well in advance to ensure that project activities are implemented according to plan.
- Strengthening of DMMU structures at District level in readiness to provide effective response in times of natural calamities. DMMU is not currently present in every district and this may require to rely on the district DMMU committees. These are committees that are chaired by the office of the District Commissioner and in reality, a number of these committees are not fully active as learned from the engagement meetings. Therefore, the district committees require strengthening.
- Enhancing mobile network coverage in all districts is key. This is likely to make it easier for payments to be disbursed via mobile money. Therefore, government needs to make emphatic effect by working with ZICTA and Telecommunication Agencies to ensure installation of towers for network in all parts of the district at national level.
- Ensuring that all relevant parties/targets are well sensitized from the onset of the project. Information is power, hence every party involved including the would-be beneficiaries need to be aware of how the project is going to function, they need to know the eligibility criteria and on how they can submit concerns among other relevant information.
- There will be need of creating linkages with other social protection programmes. Concentration of social intervention programmes in one household optimizes the level of impact in terms of uplifting the living standards of these households. This also may be one of the bases that may be utilized to graduate clients that have become better-off from the SCT programme.
- Enhancing resilience among the effected households. This could be through strengthening linkages with other programmes, such as, the provision of business skills and savings.
- Solidly protecting the project from political undertones. Top government officials need to take lead in denouncing the involvement of politics in the project implementation, more especially when it comes to recruitment of new beneficiaries on the programme.

- Awareness raising among community members in the shock affected districts needs to be strengthened from the onset of the project implementation. Relevant information needs to be clearly communication with regards to how the project is going to be implemented, the entry criteria, how concerns of by end-users will be lodged and addressed, the length of the project, and what will happen after the project among other relevant information.
- Develop standardized communications materials for shock responsive programmes (the materials must carry messages for all anticipated shocks, i.e., flood, drought, COVID-19 etc.).
- Ensuring that the GEWEL grievance redress mechanism is accessible to facilitate recording and resolution of any concerns of persons aggrieved during the project implementation.

## **5.0 Observations/Lessons learnt during the engagement meetings**

There were some observations and lessons learnt the stakeholder engagement visits and some of them include the following below:

- Stakeholder engagements are vital during introduction of any government project and/programme. Stakeholders need to learn about the design of project and how it will be implemented. The process also helps various stakeholders to own the project by providing feedback on what might affect them during the project implementation. Therefore, for districts that will be earmarked for the SSRSP project during the time of shock require implementation of stakeholder engagements if this has not been done.
- Stakeholders at every level were delighted to learn about the new initiative and showed some level of anxiety for the project to soon be implemented. Some clients thought registration under the new project would happen immediately in their respective districts and communities, but however, the purpose of the engagement meetings was made very clear to them.
- The use of local language at community level proved to be very helpful as it promoted inclusivity. Different members of the communities were able to freely express themselves around their expectations with regards to the project implementation. They were also able to freely ask questions pertaining to the SCT and the teams were able to clarify their concerns.
- The use of existing institutional structures will be helpful in either during onboarding of new beneficiaries on the project or administration of cash benefits to deserving households during the time of shocks. Thus, unlike creating new structures, the use of existing structures will reduce on delays for project implementation. Additionally, the use of the GEWEL GRM will ease the recording and resolution of complaints as processes and timelines are already clearly defined.

- The stakeholders appreciated the role that government has undertaken to enhance linkages on social protection programmes such as the cash plus programme. It was acknowledged among various stakeholders that this is a step in the right direction as this is likely to optimize the impact of the programmes at household level. The SCT beneficiaries were thankful to Government and Partners to be entitled to the cash benefits during times of shocks, as it were during the drought and covid-19 emergency cash responses.

## 6.0 Recommendations

Recommendations from the field visits on the stakeholder engagements are provided here below:

- There is need for the SSRSP National level team to hold regular preparatory meetings in order to ready enough for any potential shock. Therefore, coordination and linkages among national parties responsible for facilitating the SSRSP project requires enhancement.
- Government to ensure full ownership the project beyond its end-date.
- Government to denounce political intrusion during project implementation.
- Existing institutional structures should utilized be to avoid delays in project implementation.
- The use of the GEWEL GRM will be useful unlike creating a separate complaint mechanism to address concerns that will arise during the project implementation. The GEWEL GRM is already functional at national scale and there is enough capacity to manage all concerns that may emanate from the project implementation.
- The Standard Operating Procedures (SOPS) need to be finalized in good time as this will serve as reference document during the implementation of shock intervention.
- Government and Partners should heighten the agenda of providing integrated social protection programmes in one household. This move is likely to allow eligible households to rise above the poverty line in a shortest possible time. This may in turn enable some households that will be able to stand on their own to be graduated from the from the SCT programme.

## 7.0 Conclusion

The stakeholder engagements were successfully held in selected districts of nine provinces as earlier referred to in this report. The stakeholder engagements are one of the outstanding requirements of the SSRSP Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP). During the engagement meetings, stakeholders at provincial, district and community level in the selected districts were enlightened on the SSRSP project with regards to how it was going to function, the key

players involved in the project implementation, the selection criteria for districts to benefit from the project, types of households that are likely to benefit from the shock intervention, and the determination of the length of a shock response among other key information. Further, the engagement meetings allowed the visiting teams to gather feedback from the various stakeholders on their perceptions around the project design. Feedback was also obtained from different stakeholders on the projected risks and challenges associated to the project implementation. The engagement meetings provided an opportunity for stakeholders to devise strategies and/or mitigation measures that can be applied to counter the anticipated risk and challenges.

Some of the expected risks and challenges identified were around: delayed implementation of project due to lack of unified beneficiary register to facilitate recruitment of new beneficiaries under horizontal targeting; lack of presence of DMMU in a number of districts and if these are affected by shocks, conducting of vulnerability assessment may delay as the DMMU national level is the one to do it and this may lead to delayed project implementation; the project may not be sustainable if government does not take full ownership; the project may be marred with political undertone if government does not effectively denounce interference during the onset of the project; and that the project may destabilize the community coping mechanisms if targeted members of communities are not fully sensitized on the project just to mention but a few.

Conversely, the notable strategies that were proposed by the various stakeholders comprise of the following: government taking full ownership of the project even after the project closes; DMMU to strengthen the district level structures to ensure that they are ready enough to provide meaningful support during times of conducting vulnerability assessments as well as delivery of other services; to develop standardized communication materials for all potential shocks; promoting linkages to ensure integrated provision of social protection programmes; strengthening of coordination among national level players to ensure effective implementation of the project; and to ensure timely finalization of the Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) only to highlight a few.

In conclusion, recommendations for favorable consideration were made and most of which reflect on the strategies and/mitigation measures. What is now required is holding of briefing meetings at national to review the findings from the stakeholder engagements. The findings presented can also help the national SSRSP team to formulate an action plan so that activities that require immediate action can already begin.

## Annex 2: Attendance list for the national virtual consultative engagement

| S/N | FIRSTNAME        | LASTNAME    | NRC NO.     | STATION       | DESIGNATION              |
|-----|------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| 1   | Blessing         | Musopelo    | 245285/31/1 | Lunte         | DSWO                     |
| 2   | Bernadette       | Malungo     | 176677/71/1 | Lusaka - HQ   | SCT Manager              |
| 3   | Tikwiza          | Manda       | 241055/24/1 | Manyinga      | DSWO                     |
| 4   | Tundwe           | Simbile     | 303489/66/1 | Chembe        | DSWO                     |
| 5   | Grace            | Ngalande    | 711609/11/1 | Mansa         | DSWO                     |
| 6   | Catherine        | Musukwa     | 286011/61/1 | Kabwe         | Provincial Accountant    |
| 7   | Hadassah         | Kasonde     | 303544/43/1 | Nsama         | DSWO                     |
| 8   | Esnart L.        | Hagwanama   | 559613/11/1 | Lusaka-HQ     | IMO                      |
| 9   | Rodwell          | Chansa      | 277148/33/1 | Lunga         | DSWO                     |
| 10  | Konkola          | Miti        | 171972/10/1 | Chibombo      | ASWO                     |
| 11  | Catherine        | Zimba       | 323984/61/1 | Chipili       | DSWO                     |
| 12  | Mutale           | Chimba      | 957722/11/1 | Lusaka - HQ   | Payment Specialist - PIU |
| 13  | Stassia          | Choompa     | 286132/73/1 | Ndola         | DSWO                     |
| 14  | Prisca           | Mwanza      | 512829/52/1 | Luwingu       | DSWO                     |
| 15  | Damales          | Mwilima     | 249805/64/1 | Ndola         | SWO                      |
| 16  | Nkonga           | Elizabeth   | 245520/43/1 | Luapula       | SSWO                     |
| 17  | Sakamuna         | Enock       | 202645/31/1 | Luapula       | PSWO                     |
| 18  | Edmond           | Kampape     | 187003/49/1 | Mwansabombwe  | DSWO                     |
| 19  | Peter            | Musonda     | 199639/64/1 | Kawambwa      | DSWO                     |
| 20  | Sydney           | Chipi       | 687938/11/1 | Mwense        | ASWO                     |
| 21  | Janet            | Nkausu      | 137307/19/1 | Rufunsa       | DSWO                     |
| 22  | Chewe            | Nalomba     | 206680/45/1 | Milenge       | DSWO                     |
| 23  | John             | Chishale    | 385556/16/1 | Chitambo      | DSWO                     |
| 24  | Alinesi          | Mwanza      | 821779/11/1 | Mpongwe       | ASWO                     |
| 25  | Dumezweni        | Sibanda-    | 148286/15/1 | Luangwa       | DSWO                     |
| 26  | Chilly           | Simpasa     | 204059/42/1 | Lupososhi     | DSWO                     |
| 27  | peter ackson     | Zulu        | 243606/53/1 | Chavuma       | ASWO                     |
| 28  | Aaron            | Mwelwa      | 176234/31/1 | Copperbelt    | SSWO                     |
| 29  | Geoffrey         | Nakaanda    | 229553/71/1 | Kaputa        | DSWO                     |
| 30  | Chikwasha        | Humphrey    | 186113/18/1 | Itezhi-tezhi  | ASWO                     |
| 31  | Annette          | Hatembo     | 927361/11/1 | Chililabombwe | DSWO                     |
| 32  | Brian            | Chiile      | 849317/11/1 | Mpulungu      | DSWO                     |
| 33  | Fredrick         | Chilambwe   | 257817/66/1 | Mbala         | DSWO                     |
| 34  | Newton           | Chinyanta   | 313814/33/1 | Samfya        | ASWO                     |
| 35  | Ruth             | Kamanga     | 222791/63/1 | Chifunabuli   | DSWO                     |
| 36  | Paula            | Phiri       | 276742/66/1 | Shiwangandu   | ASWO                     |
| 37  | Abigail          | Pikiti      | 890869/11/1 | Chilubi       | DSWO                     |
| 38  | Sebastian        | Passuwa     | 243453/64/1 | Kasama        | PSWO                     |
| 39  | Mwiche           | Simasiku    | 817876/11/1 | Kalulushi     | DSWO                     |
| 40  | Mwape            | Ng'andu     | 26338143/1  | Chavuma       | DSWO                     |
| 41  | Sumbwanyambe     | Mukelabai   | 118423/86/1 | Kalumbila     | DSWO                     |
| 42  | Lichilana        | Akayombokwa | 534699/11/1 | Solwezi       | PSWO-NWP                 |
| 43  | Memory           | Musemangeji | 241242/24/1 | Mwinilunga    | DSWO                     |
| 44  | Collins Kingsley | Chavuta     | 577994/11/1 | Muchinga      | SSWO                     |
| 45  | Margaret Chibale | Chendela    | 151291/62/1 | Central       | PSWO                     |
| 46  | SYDNEY           | MUKEFUWA    | 208873/42/1 | LUSAKA        | FME SPECIALIST           |
| 47  | WALUSUNGU        | SIMUKOKO    | 239154/75/1 | LUSAKA        | M&I SPECIALIST           |



|    |           |              |             |              |                          |
|----|-----------|--------------|-------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| 48 | LUBASI    | MUSAMBO      | 619720/11/1 | LUSAKA       | MTA                      |
| 49 | Stephen   | Chiwele      |             | Lusaka       | SCT National Coordinator |
| 50 | Emeldah   | Chisulo      |             | Senga Hill   | ASWO                     |
| 51 | Thebuho   | Kavubya      | 295864/82/1 | Kafue        | DSWO                     |
| 52 | Adess T.  | Phiri        | 852096/11/1 | Mufulira     | DSWO                     |
| 53 | Emeldah   | Sanga Nkhoma | 568429/11/1 | Chilanga     | DSWO                     |
| 54 | Lumbani   | Mazunda      | 960803/11/1 | Central      | SSWO                     |
| 55 | Musa      | Phiri        | 209148/75/1 | Central      | SSWO                     |
| 56 | Chinda    | Mwila        | 252593/64/1 | Kasama       | DSWO                     |
| 57 | Christine | Phiri        | 382230/53/1 | Shiwangandu  | APO                      |
| 58 | Martha    | Mumba        | 380555/10/1 | Chisamba     | DSWO                     |
| 59 | Gorrety   | Moonga       | 240044/75/1 | Itezhi-tezhi | DSWO                     |
| 60 | Steven    | chadukwa     | 121465/10/1 | kabwe        | SWO                      |
| 61 | Musenge   | mumba        | 270935/66/1 | kabwe        | DSWO                     |
| 62 | Ernest    | mwanza       | 319347/10/1 | kabwe        | APO                      |
| 63 | Sandra    | Ndhlovu      | 280358/16/1 | Lusaka       | DSWO                     |
| 64 | Mubanga   | Musonda      | 247385/73/1 | chienge I    | DSWO                     |
| 65 | Meckson   | Machilika    | 295450/61/1 | Mufumbwe     | DSWO                     |
| 66 | Ruby      | Chilambe     | 265947/64/2 | Mufumbwe     | ASWO                     |
| 67 | Arcleo    | Kandunda     | 128153/81/1 | MCDSS        | GRM/PSEA/GBV             |
| 68 | Hellen    | Lungu        | 904676/11/1 | Kanchibiya   | DSWO                     |
| 69 | Victoria  | Lungu        | 840960/11/1 | Kanchibiya   | ASWO                     |
| 70 | Tabitha   | Chilongo     | 802130/11/1 | Northern     | SSWO                     |
| 71 | Emmanuel  | Chintu       | 643166/11/1 | Senga Hill   | DSWO                     |

## Annex 3: Attendance registers for physical meetings on stakeholder engagements