

# ORPHANS AND VULNERABLE CHILDREN AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT INSTRUMENTS: LESSONS LEARNT FOR SUCCESSFUL INTEGRATION

WORKING PAPER



SEPTEMBER 2008

**SOCIAL POLICY AND SOCIAL PROTECTION CLUSTER  
UNICEF EASTERN AND SOUTHERN AFRICA REGIONAL OFFICE**

**WORKING PAPER**

**ORPHANS AND VULNERABLE  
CHILDREN AND NATIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT INSTRUMENTS:  
LESSONS LEARNT FOR SUCCESSFUL  
INTEGRATION**

**Nigel Taylor**

**A review prepared for:  
UK Consortium on AIDS and International Development  
OVC Working Group on behalf of UNICEF**

**Nigel Taylor  
Thembisa Development Consulting**

**Orphans and Vulnerable Children And National Development Instruments: Lessons learnt for successful integration**

© United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), Social Policy and Social Protection Cluster, Nairobi, Kenya, 2008

**Design and Layout: Makau Ngola**

**Cover Photo: UNICEF/ HQ96-1460/Giacomo Pirozzi**

**Social Policy and Social Protection Section  
Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office  
United Nations Complex Gigiri, Nairobi  
P.O. Box 44145 - 00100  
Nairobi, Kenya**

**September, 2008**

This is a working document. It has been prepared to facilitate the exchange of knowledge and to stimulate discussion.

The text has not been edited to official publication standards and UNICEF accepts no responsibility for errors.

The designations in this publication do not imply an opinion on legal status of any country or territory, or of its authorities, or the delimitation of frontiers.

The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not reflect necessarily the policies or views of UNICEF.

## Acknowledgements

This report represents the culmination of work on an initial desk study; field research in Uganda and Zambia (led by Deborah Bickel); telephone and e-mail research with key informants in Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia; and a final write-up and review process. As such, a great many people have contributed in different ways. Their willingness to input is appreciated:

Timothy Ahimbisibwe, Deborah Bickel, Penny Campbell, Arnold Chalwe, Chimwemwe Changwe, Ellita Chatipwa, Chilufya Chileshe, Raymond Chipoma, Madeline Church, Vicky Chuwa, Teri Collins, Sheila Marunga Coutinho, Juan Dupraz, Kate Eardley, Tom Fenn, Gabriel Fernandez, Emanuel Gonehasa, Charlotte Harland, Mayke Huijbregts, Davis Igulu, Nicola Jones, Jenninah Kabiswa, Paul Kagwa, Mirriam Kaluwa, Mulenga Kapwepwe, Ethel Kapyepye, Gorretti Kiza, Yvonne M Kwalombota, Suba Lungu, Petronella Mayeya, Anne Mumbi, Evarest Muhangi, Mulenga Mushuma, Florence Sembatya Musinguzi, Abigail Musonda, Confucius Mweene, Rose Nalwadda, Helen Namulwana, Flora Nyagawa, Beatrice Nyambe, Namwina Nyambe, Myo-Zin Nyunt, Michael Ochora, Roger Pearson, Charity Rutarema, Catherine Samiselo, Eric Sattin, Verena Schuster, John Siliya, Catherine Sozi, Diane Swales, Douti Talima, Longino Tisasirana, Bob Verbruggen, Sarah Wakadala, Batuke Walusiku, Ibrahim Wandera, Carol Watson, and Doug Webb

Very special thanks to Christina D'Allesandro and Stuart Kean for their support, encouragement and critical engagement.

## Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>i</b>
<b>Acronyms</b> .....	<b>iii</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>iv</b>
<b>1 Background: Orphans and Vulnerable Children and National Development Instruments</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>2 Method</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>3 The benefits and risks, and experiences of successfully achieving, integration</b> .....	<b>6</b>
3.1 Desk Study: Evidence from integration of other major issues .....	6
3.1.1 Benefits of integration .....	6
3.1.2 Risks of integration .....	9
3.1.3 Lessons in achieving integration .....	12
3.2 Experience in case study countries .....	13
3.2.1 Kenya.....	14
3.2.2 Malawi.....	16
3.2.3 Mozambique .....	18
3.2.4 Tanzania .....	21
3.2.5 Uganda .....	24
3.2.6 Zambia.....	26
3.3 Analysis: Making integration work best for orphans and vulnerable children .....	29
3.3.1 Integration into PRSPs has made little difference in the short-term....	29
3.3.2 Integration into sectors brings clear short-term benefits but the best route differed between countries.....	30
3.3.3 The value of a costed, multi-sector NPA.....	32
3.3.4 Addressing key issues for long-term benefits .....	32
3.3.5 Off-budget resources can challenge long-term national ownership. ...	33
3.3.6 Lessons about the process of achieving integration .....	34
<b>4. Recommendations</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>5. References</b> .....	<b>39</b>
<b>Appendices</b> .....	<b>42</b>
Appendix 1: Components of poverty focused development planning and financing .....	42
Appendix 2. A checklist of strategies for integrating vulnerable children into national planning and budget instruments.....	45
Appendix 3: Resources for Policy Influence .....	50

## Acronyms

<b>CBS</b>	Community-Based Services, Uganda
<b>DFID</b>	Department for International Development, UK
<b>ERS</b>	Economic Recovery Strategy, Kenya
<b>ESARO</b>	UNICEF Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office
<b>FNDP</b>	Fifth National Development Plan, Zambia
<b>FY</b>	Financial Year
<b>IMF</b>	International Monetary Fund
<b>K</b>	Zambia Kwacha
<b>KSh</b>	Kenya Shilling
<b>MCDSS</b>	Ministry of Community Development and Social Services, Zambia
<b>MFPED</b>	Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development, Uganda
<b>MGDS</b>	Malawi Growth and Development Strategy
<b>MGLSD</b>	Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development, Uganda
<b>MKUKUTA</b>	Tanzania's National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty
<b>NMSF 2008-12</b>	National Multi-Sector Strategic Framework on HIV/AIDS 2008-2012, Tanzania
<b>MTEF</b>	Medium-Term Expenditure Framework
<b>MVC</b>	Most Vulnerable Children
<b>MVCC</b>	Most Vulnerable Children Committee, Tanzania
<b>NAF</b>	Malawi National Action Framework for HIV and AIDS
<b>NASA</b>	National AIDS Spending Assessment
<b>NDP</b>	National Development Plan
<b>NPA</b>	National Plan of Action for Orphans and Vulnerable Children
<b>NSF</b>	National Strategic Framework
<b>NSP</b>	National Strategic Plan
<b>ODA</b>	Official Development Assistance
<b>OVC</b>	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
<b>PARPA</b>	Mozambique's PRSP
<b>PEAP</b>	Poverty Eradication Action Plan, Uganda
<b>PEN</b>	Mozambique's national AIDS strategy
<b>PEPFAR</b>	President's Emergency Fund for AIDS Relief, United States
<b>PES</b>	Mozambique's Annual Economic and Social Plan
<b>PMTCT</b>	Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission
<b>PRBS</b>	Poverty Reduction Budget Support
<b>PRSP</b>	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
<b>USD</b>	United States Dollar
<b>USG</b>	United States Government
<b>USh</b>	Uganda Shilling

## Executive Summary

In sub-Saharan Africa, an alarmingly high proportion of children are seen as being vulnerable, and in urgent need of assistance due to HIV and AIDS and other causes. Having high numbers of orphans and other vulnerable children brings long-term implications for national poverty and growth. Furthermore, national action to reduce poverty and promote growth provides an opportunity to comprehensively address the causes of vulnerability in children, and respond to the needs of vulnerable children. With the increased focus on nationally owned development plans as the backbone of long-term development there then appears to be a strong case to integrate the issue of orphans and vulnerable children into national development instruments. Integration involves considering the issue of orphans and vulnerable children throughout a national development instrument. Specifically, how the issue impacts on poverty and growth, how the causes may be addressed, and committing to effective responses to the needs of these children. It is argued that in general, integration should bring about higher level consideration of an issue, with improved coordination and links across sectors. It should promote greater ownership of the issue by key ministries such as finance, and result in increased domestic contributions to funding through the national budget, leading to better financial predictability and sustainability.

The third Global Partners' Forum for Children Affected by HIV and AIDS in 2006 made recommendations that reflect the apparent case for integration<sup>1</sup>. Consequently, the UNICEF East & Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO) contracted the OVC Working Group of the UK Consortium on AIDS and International Development to carry out this study<sup>2</sup> to explore the degree to which the situation of orphans and other vulnerable children is addressed in national development instruments. The study assumed that integration into national development instruments (including PRSPs, national budget, and sector plans including the national AIDS strategy) should bring tangible benefits for orphans and vulnerable children. On this basis it asked the following key research questions:

- **What are the key development instruments that have been used or may be used to improve the integration of orphans and vulnerable children into national policies and budgets?**
- **What have been the key advantages and disadvantages of integration into these development tools?**

---

<sup>1</sup> The Global Partners' Forum called for such integration in its Priority Recommendation 5: *"Integrate a multi-sector response for children affected by HIV and AIDS into development instruments, including Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers"*

<sup>2</sup> *"Moving upstream for children affected by HIV and AIDS: Integration into sector and national poverty reduction plans and budgets – a study in exploring the role of OVC in national development instruments."*

- **What are the lessons learned about critical steps to achieve a better integration of orphans and vulnerable children into various development instruments?**

The study consisted of three distinct phases: a desk review of existing literature on experiences of integration with other issues such as HIV and AIDS, child poverty, gender and disability; in-depth country case studies of Uganda and Zambia including a consultant's visit, and desk-based country case studies of Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique and Tanzania including contact with key informants such as the focal point for vulnerable children in the lead ministry, and UNICEF specialists.

### **Key findings**

1. **A costed, multi-sector National Plan of Action with strong political support appears to be key for creating opportunities to benefit vulnerable children in the short-term.** Whether this generates both short-term and long-term benefits depends on the particular country context. It is noteworthy that in both Malawi and Tanzania, the NPA had significant influence before it was finalised and launched.
2. **In all of the case study countries the integration of vulnerable children at the national policy level, particularly into the PRSPs, has made little difference in reality:** domestic contributions to the national budget have been minimal; coordination across sectors has remained a challenge; and the minimal government funding has made little difference to sustainability and predictability. Often the lead ministry for vulnerable children has lacked status and capacity to coordinate, or to influence the key ministries i.e. finance and planning to give leadership. Governments have been reluctant to give funding, and what has been given has been dwarfed by the huge amounts available from international donors, particularly PEPFAR. Even where additional funds have been made available for vulnerable children, there have been difficulties translating this into action, with frequent reallocations; hold-ups in disbursement, and weak operational capacity, especially in rural areas.
3. In contrast, **integration into sectors has brought clear short-term benefits to vulnerable children.** The needs of vulnerable children have been successfully integrated into several sectors. National AIDS instruments represent a specialized sector with especially high profile and dedicated funds. In all the case study countries, they have been important for drawing in external support for orphans and vulnerable children – often regardless of the causes of their vulnerability. However, the value of national AIDS instruments for vulnerable children may have peaked. Integration into social protection mechanisms has already brought about small



domestic contributions and is likely to be the most effective form of integration for vulnerable children in the foreseeable future, given growing donor interest, and the momentum to move away from *AIDS exclusivism* to more inclusive approaches to reach all vulnerable children, regardless of cause. Vulnerable children have also benefited significantly in a few cases where they have been integrated into the education or health sector plans and budgets. Overall, **the utility of integration into different sectors appears to have varied between countries, and changed with time within a particular country.**

4. If integration into development instruments is to bring about long-term benefits for vulnerable children, several key constraints must be addressed. These include: strengthening the role and capacity of ministries responsible for vulnerable children so that they are able to advocate more effectively for children's interests in future planning and budgetary negotiations, as well as coordinate responses for a wide range of sources. Government budget processes need to become more transparent and accountable so that the outcome reflects national priorities. These changes will take time. A twin track approach is therefore required to avoid children missing out in the short-term. Instruments bringing short-term benefits should be used in parallel to reform processes to enable the integration of vulnerable children into the PRSP and budget to bring long-term benefits. As government structures are increasingly decentralised these will need to be strengthened to manage and coordinate resources for vulnerable children. Surprisingly, it was only in Malawi that integration had been used as a basis for including vulnerable children in a successful proposal to the Global Fund (Round 5). Such funding has enabled Malawi to address weaknesses in government systems and fund pilot cash transfers for caregivers.
5. **Off-budget resources can challenge long-term national ownership.** For example, in the five study countries with PEPFAR programmes<sup>3</sup>, the USG funding for orphans and vulnerable children has been considerable and increasing year-on-year. It has been typically over ten times the size of budget contributions from domestic sources for vulnerable children (see Table 1). These amounts are welcome as they represent a critical contribution towards a more adequate urgent response to the needs of vulnerable children. However, there is an accompanying challenge that giving such large amounts, especially those that are channelled independently of national governments, may reduce the likelihood that the national government will utilise its own financial resources to support vulnerable children. While this may be pragmatic in the short term, the lack of domestic resources could undermine the potential for a

---

<sup>3</sup> Kenya, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia

consistent long-term response for children. The recent reauthorization of PEPFAR for FY 2009-2013, with a significantly increased financial commitment of up to USD 39 billion for HIV and AIDS, could enhance this disincentive effect. So, the language of “Partnership compacts” contained in the new PEPFAR arrangements is welcome.

6. **The process by which integration has taken place has varied both between countries, and over time within countries. This makes it difficult to produce a definitive list of what to do to achieve effective integration.** However, it is clear that the policy formulation and budgetary processes are not simply technocratic but political in nature, with stakeholders, both within government and outside, exercising varying degrees of influence. The key lessons of achieving successful integration have been synthesized in Appendix 2 to provide a checklist of strategies for policy makers, planners and advocates to use in seeking integration of vulnerable children into national development instruments and budgets. These are referenced to key tools found in a range of published resource materials for influencing policy changes that are summarized in Appendix 3.

**Key Recommendations are that:**

**National governments** should:

- Continue to strengthen the capacity of ministries responsible for fulfilling the rights, and meeting the needs of vulnerable children. This includes increasing budget ceilings to enable the recruitment and retention of appropriately skilled staff. There should be investment specifically to ensure that the ministry may advocate effectively for vulnerable children, and coordinate diverse responses.
- Continue to provide resources for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of National Plans of Action for vulnerable children.
- Ensure that PRSPs, National Development Plans (NDPs), Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs) and also, relevant sector plans and budgets<sup>4</sup>, clearly reflect the need to provide support for vulnerable children and to mitigate against causes of vulnerability, and have effective monitoring and evaluation plans to ensure delivery. These instruments should include reference to the NPAs and other relevant national child or social protection plans where appropriate.
- Use instruments bringing better short-term benefits in parallel with reform processes to enable the integration of vulnerable children into the PRSP/NDP and budget to bring long-term benefits. This twin-track approach will enable immediate scaled-up

---

<sup>4</sup> For different countries, the best balance in using these different instruments together will vary.

responses to urgent need, alongside building a sustainable long-term national response.

- Ensure that national annual budgets make provisions from domestic sources for a sustainable response to the needs of vulnerable children.
- Ensure that representatives of civil society, and vulnerable children, are meaningfully included in the policy development, planning, implementation and monitoring processes.
- Ensure that the policy development and implementation process is open and transparent. This should include making all key documents including PRSPs, NDPs, MTEFs, national budgets, sector plans, national AIDS strategies, NASAs and NPAs available via the internet<sup>5</sup>, and hard copy, in order to promote participation and accountability.
- Consider the opportunities of applying to the Global Fund in respect of vulnerable children, especially to strengthen government systems and capacity.

**Donors should:**

- Support national governments through providing resources to strengthen the capacity of key ministries responsible for vulnerable children, with increased funding for recurrent costs, including staff, and skills development to ensure that they may advocate effectively for vulnerable children and play an effective coordination role.
- Ensure that support for PRSPs, National Development Plans and MTEFs brings tangible benefits for vulnerable children, by engaging in policy dialogue with the IMF, World Bank and ministries of finance to ensure that budget ceilings do not constrain the necessary increase in recurrent costs for ministries responsible for vulnerable children.
- Assist sectors, particularly emerging responses such as social protection, to strengthen their planning and monitoring to ensure that the needs of vulnerable children are fully considered.
- Support civil society and vulnerable children to enable them to be meaningfully included in the policy development, planning, implementation and monitoring processes.
- Continue to make funding for orphans and vulnerable children available in ways that allow incentives for national long-term ownership, including contributions from domestic revenue. This may require a balance to be struck between direct support

---

<sup>5</sup> The AIDSPortal, [www.aidsportal.org](http://www.aidsportal.org) is available to use as a global repository for these documents. Contact: [aidsportal@aidsonsortium.org.uk](mailto:aidsportal@aidsonsortium.org.uk).

for urgent responses, and taking a longer-term approach to ensure a sustainable national response.

- Work with other donors to co-ordinate and harmonize their responses for vulnerable children in line with national planning, ensuring a comprehensive response across all sectors.

**Civil Society** should:

- Develop its capacity to engage meaningfully with the development and monitoring of national policies and financial commitments to benefit vulnerable children. This would include having the capacity to judge where limited time and resources should best be invested to achieve positive change.
- Advocate for and facilitate the inclusion of those representing vulnerable children and the children themselves (where appropriate) in the policy process.
- Continue to monitor the long-term benefits and challenges of integration.
- Document and share experiences both in-country and across the continent where possible.

“In spite of the compelling evidence which has been adduced about the difficult situation of OVC, .....OVC issues are not a priority for either the national or district and sub county levels. As such, OVC programming at all these levels remains weak.

*‘We don’t receive targeted funding for OVC work as a Community Based Department unlike health education and agriculture that receive conditional grants for [Program for Modernization of Agriculture] PMA, immunization and [Universal Primary Education] UPE. Most of our support is one-off donor funding by international agencies. They come for one year and go.’*

*Probation and Welfare Officer, Bushenyi district, Uganda “*

Source: Republic of Uganda, 2007a:6

## 1 Background: Orphans and Vulnerable Children and National Development Instruments

In contexts of high HIV prevalence, an alarmingly high proportion of children are seen as being vulnerable, and in urgent, and long-term, need of assistance. AIDS has orphaned<sup>6</sup> over 15 million children and this total is expected to reach 20 million just by 2010 (UNICEF, UNAIDS and WHO, 2007). Millions more are regarded as being “vulnerable” due to HIV and AIDS, for example, through chronic parental or guardian illness, or absence of household livelihoods. Furthermore, it is increasingly being recognised that many millions more children are vulnerable for reasons not necessarily linked to HIV and AIDS such as disability, living outside family care or extreme household poverty. Overall, in sub-Saharan Africa, the most highly affected region in the world, the number of orphans from all causes is likely to top 50 million within the coming few years (Webb, 2007). In some parts of Eastern and Southern Africa, up to a half of all children are considered vulnerable.

The UN Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS, 2001) was the first global policy document to specifically acknowledge the needs of children affected by AIDS. It has three articles (#65-67) that refer directly to children orphaned and made vulnerable by HIV and AIDS. Article 65 specified that national governments would develop and implement national policies and strategies to respond to the needs of orphans and girls and boys infected and affected by HIV and AIDS. In many countries these emerged as the National Plans of Action for Orphans and Vulnerable Children (NPA).

The NPA provides a unifying framework for bringing together the activities of all the different stakeholders under a set of common objectives and strategies, incorporating the activities of Government ministries, local government, international donors, and civil society. The NPAs

<sup>6</sup> **An orphan** is a child under 18 years who has lost one, or both, parents. **A double orphan** is a child under 18 years who has lost both parents.

provide an important policy platform to argue for increased support for vulnerable children. In 2007, 21 countries in sub-Saharan Africa had completed NPAs (UNICEF, UNAIDS and WHO, 2008). The NPAs clearly articulate a multi-sector response, including increased access to education, health care, comprehensive social protection and legal protection. This response must be long-term and consistent if vulnerable children are to reach their full potential.

The convergence of a number of trends in national development planning and financing means that poverty reduction and growth strategies, mainly in the form of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (**PRSPs**) or National Development Plans (**NDPs**), linked through Medium-term Expenditure Frameworks (**MTEFs**) to national budgets, are becoming central to a coordinated and sustainable response to poverty in many low- and medium-income countries. This response is implemented through **sectors** (such as health, education, and social development) and **decentralized** structures (such as regional and local governments) with funding from domestic government sources, and donors providing **poverty reduction budget support (PRBS)**. (Appendix 1 provides a description of the different national development instruments.) Many international donors are giving attention to general PRBS as part of increased aid flows, and/or as a substitute for funding projects or specific sectors. This increasing trend, largely led by European donors, is in line with commitments made in the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness in 2005.<sup>7</sup> Alongside this process, concerns at the broad socio-economic impact of the AIDS pandemic, and the need for a coordinated multi-sector response, have led to most affected countries developing a **National Strategic Framework** for responses to HIV and AIDS (**NSF**).

Having high numbers of orphans and other vulnerable children brings long-term implications for national poverty and growth. Furthermore, national action to reduce poverty and promote growth provides an opportunity to comprehensively address the causes of vulnerability in children, and respond to the needs of vulnerable children. With the increased focus on nationally owned development plans as the backbone of long-term development there then appears to be a strong case to integrate the issue of orphans and vulnerable children into national development instruments.

---

<sup>7</sup> Available at <http://www1.worldbank.org/harmonization/Paris/FINALPARISDECLARATION.pdf>

### **What do we mean by integration of orphans and vulnerable children?**

Integration involves considering the issue of orphans and vulnerable children throughout a national development instrument in terms of how the issue impacts on poverty and growth, how the causes may be addressed, and committing to effective responses to their needs. Confirmation of integration will come when the issue is addressed across the plan, particularly when indicators of successful interventions are identified. Indication of the increased availability of financial resources is taken as an initial measure of successful integration, but this is only one step on a journey towards improved lives. Other effects that should be seen in time are better coordination, and more predictable and sustainable funding that leads to more effective interventions.

This approach was echoed in the recommendations by the Global Partners' Forum for Children Affected by HIV and AIDS. In February 2006, the Global Partners' Forum called for such integration in its Priority Recommendation 5: *"Integrate a multi-sector response for children affected by HIV and AIDS into development instruments, including Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers"* (UNICEF, UNAIDS, and DFID, 2006.) As a consequence, in March 2007, UNICEF ESARO contracted the OVC Working Group of the UK Consortium on AIDS and International Development to carry out this study<sup>8</sup> to explore the role of orphans and vulnerable children in national development instruments.

The study assumed that integration into national development instruments (including PRSPs, national budget, and sector plans) should bring tangible benefits for orphans and vulnerable children. On this basis it asked the following key research questions:

- **What are the key development instruments that have been used or may be used to improve the integration of orphans and vulnerable children into national policies and budgets?**
- **What have been the key advantages and disadvantages of integration into these development tools?**
- **If there were any negative consequences from integration into particular development instruments, how may they be mitigated?**

What are the lessons learned about critical steps to achieve a better integration of orphans and vulnerable children into various development instruments?

---

<sup>8</sup> *"Moving upstream for children affected by HIV and AIDS: Integration into sector and national poverty reduction plans and budgets – a study in exploring the role of OVC in national development instruments."*

## 2 Method

The study consisted of three distinct phases:

1. **A desk review of existing literature** on integration of issues into national planning instruments alongside a focus on experiences with orphans and vulnerable children in six case study countries: Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia
2. **In-depth country case studies of Uganda and Zambia** that included a consultant's visit to hold semi-structured interviews with key informants, and a participatory workshop with key stakeholders.
3. **Desk-based country case studies of Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique and Tanzania** involving collection of additional documentation and telephone interviews with a limited number of key informants, such as the focal point for vulnerable children in the lead ministry, and UNICEF specialists, identified through UNICEF country offices.

In the desk review, newly published research and development instruments were reviewed, with particular attention paid to countries in Eastern and Southern Africa that have adopted National Plans of Action for Orphans and Vulnerable Children. There was a specific emphasis on those countries that were potentially selected for the case studies<sup>9</sup>. Lessons learnt from other major integration efforts were also explored and contributed to the review. The integration of HIV and AIDS into national development instruments proved to be the most important of these to consider, but the study also included the integration of child poverty, gender and social development issues. The desk review helped to frame questions for the in-depth country case studies.

The six countries for the case studies were selected based on the following criteria defined at the onset of the research: (1) a well owned National Plan of Action for Orphans and Vulnerable Children; (2) existence of an OVC Steering Committee; (3) a strong civil society group working on orphans and vulnerable children. Uganda and Zambia were subsequently selected as the two countries considered most appropriate for in-depth review based on two additional criteria: (4) a strong local contact and (5) the existence of institutional arrangements and/or potential for improved integration of vulnerable children in development instruments.

---

<sup>9</sup> Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia



This report addresses the key research questions through:

- **A desk study of integration of other major issues (Section 3.1):**
  - **Benefits of integration (Section 3.1.1) and Risks of Integration (Section 3.1.2)**
  - **Lessons in achieving integration (Section 3.1.3).**
- **Evidence from case study countries on experiences with the integration of orphans and vulnerable children (Section 3.2).**
- **An analysis of how to make integration work best for orphans and vulnerable children. (Section 3.3)**

A major challenge running through the study was whether to use the lens of “orphans and other vulnerable children” or “children affected by HIV and AIDS” in considering these questions. The former has been used primarily because the National Plan of Action for Orphans and Vulnerable Children provided the best reference point as to how a country defined “vulnerable children”, and then provided a basis to gauge the extent to which the needs of such children had been integrated. It is important to note that in many of the case study countries, the national approach strongly emphasizes all vulnerable children regardless of cause. So, Tanzania’s National Plan of Action is framed in terms of “Most Vulnerable Children” and addresses the most vulnerable five percent of all children; whilst the Kenya National Plan of Action acknowledges that of the nation’s 2.4 million orphans, 55 per cent have lost a parent for a reason other than AIDS.

### 3 The benefits and risks, and experiences of successfully achieving, integration

#### 3.1 Desk Study: Evidence from integration of other major issues

There has been little work reviewing experiences of integration of orphans and vulnerable children into development instruments, and as such little directly-related information was available from the desk review.<sup>10</sup> Due to this lack of information, in this study, the benefits and risks for orphans and vulnerable children are extrapolated from experiences with the integration of HIV and AIDS, with some reference to the integration of child poverty, gender and social development issues. The review focuses on the three development instruments that were most often found to be the targets of integration: PRSPs, sector plans, and national AIDS instruments such as National Strategic Frameworks for HIV and AIDS.

##### 3.1.1 Benefits of integration

###### PRSPs

###### a) **Putting the issue at the centre of national policy**

Integration can help to ensure that the impact of an issue (such as a high proportion of children being vulnerable) is factored into national development and growth strategies, and that high-level, cross-cutting responses necessary to mitigate the effects are adequately acknowledged. Also, integration should consider how to address underlying causes. Integration must be more than a paper exercise. Ideally, the development of these instruments would occur through a participatory process, thereby integration would reflect national ownership and provide a strong basis for accountability.

In practice, integration of child poverty into the Ethiopian PRSP did bring the benefit of positioning it within the national development discourse. The integration gave legitimacy at the broad national level to specific child-related policies that might otherwise have been marginalized because they fell within a weak sector. New trends were discussed more broadly, rather than only within the relevant sector, because of the link with the macro-analysis (Jones, 2007).

---

<sup>10</sup> A desk study on integration of children and young people that UNICEF and the World Bank carried out in 2004 (Bonnel, Temin and Tempest, 2004), found that the integration of HIV and AIDS in general into PRSPs remained weak, and the integration of orphans and vulnerable children was especially weak. It identified several challenges for effective integration.

Similarly DFID's recent evaluation of its AIDS strategy "Taking Action" found that including HIV and AIDS in PRSPs resulted in the funding of HIV and AIDS through PRBS, brought improved coordination, the creation of forums for dialogue, and links being made across sectors (Social and Scientific Systems, 2007: 61).

A practical application is that integration can lead different ministries to recognise the implications of, and their responsibilities with respect to, the issue, as occurred with HIV and AIDS. Overall, there can be better coordination between ministries based upon comparative advantage; with key ministries having greater ownership.

**b) Access to increased funds from general PRBS, better predictability and sustainability of financing**

General PRBS is becoming a component of some significance in increased national budgets<sup>11</sup>. In order to benefit financially, vulnerable children need to be a priority in the national budget, and the instruments that influence the budget development.

Increased contributions to the national budget from domestic sources should reduce dependence upon, and vulnerability to, donors, leading to more national ownership, and better financial predictability and sustainability (Kamigwi et. al., 2006). With integration of an issue into the PRSP, and then into the national budget, there is enhanced likelihood of government providing increased financial contributions to the budget from domestic sources for two reasons:

1. Those ministries that are well connected with the issue may advocate for responses to it being a key pro-poor priority, leading to interventions being factored into national budget allocations. For example, with the growing interest in providing social protection in the form of grants for HIV affected individuals, the necessary funding - which would be a new expenditure - could come from an allocation within the national budget.
2. In many countries, donor funding represents a very high proportion of financing for HIV and AIDS and orphans and vulnerable children, but this is largely off-budget and so outside government control and responsibility. If external funding is moved "on-budget" through integration, then government has more incentive to contribute complementary domestic funds, as an alternative to appearing to be doing nothing itself. In Tanzania, the

---

<sup>11</sup> In countries such as Uganda where general PRBS has been favoured, it has represented over 30 percent of total aid since 2001. For many other countries it has typically been between 10 and 20 percent of total Official Development Assistance. (IDD and Associates, 2006:20)

component for HIV and AIDS within the national budget has risen from USD 36m in 2004-5 to USD 382m in 2006-07. Although only 12 percent of the USD 382m was to be from government revenues, the process of bringing HIV and AIDS “on-budget” has affirmed the national priority afforded to HIV and AIDS whilst creating the fiscal transparency that donors demand. (Issa, Severo and Gray, 2006).

However, it is important to acknowledge that currently in many countries, the process of increasing domestic contributions has only just started and still has far to go – the contributions that national governments make for HIV and AIDS, and for orphans and vulnerable children, are minuscule compared to the volume of external funding, particularly from PEPFAR (see Section 3.3.5).

**c) Integration into the PRSP and national MTEF are pre-requisite for consideration in *decentralised* planning and budgeting.**

Government interventions are increasingly being made through decentralised structures such as district councils. These have to bid for funding in the national budget process. The procedures for this often require that plans and budgets have to follow the national lead set in the PRSP and MTEF. So, if an issue is not represented in these national-level instruments, it will not be considered at the decentralized level (Jones, 2007). Effectively, representation in the PRSP and MTEF has become a “ticket” required for consideration of an issue in planning, budgeting and implementation at the decentralized level.

**Sectors**

**d) Integration into a sector plan may provide “breathing space” before integration is achieved in the PRSP or national budget**

An issue will be understood better, and supported, from within a relevant sector whilst the necessary buy-in is being secured for funding from the national budget. This period provides space while the overall political commitment is being strengthened, and the experience may be used to develop an evidence base to influence high-lever integration.

A sector may provide an opportunity for innovation that the government owns and endorses. For example, there is increasing interest in using cash transfers for vulnerable people to provide social protection. Funding through a Social Development sector plan may provide a more tolerant environment for early

experiences of implementation than general PRBS under the scrutiny of the Finance Ministry. So, in Kenya, the pilot cash transfer scheme for caregivers of vulnerable children was funded from UNICEF funds, later complemented with a small, but growing budget line for the Children's Department.

### 3.1.2 Risks of integration

There is a considerable body of thinking that is concerned that although integration into national level policy instruments, particularly the PRSP, MTEF and budget process, may bring *long term* benefits through improved government policies and capacity, it is not the most appropriate way to generate resources for the *short-term to medium-term* response to the AIDS pandemic. There are various reasons for this:

#### **PRSPs/national budget**

a) **Integration into the PRSP without acknowledgement in the MTEF and translation into the annual budget will lead to slippage at national policy level.**

*"While the PEAP [Ugandan PRSP] points to HIV/AIDS as a cross-cutting priority to be mainstreamed across ...the economy, it falls short of outlining how this process is to be put in place, budgeted for, and monitored. By implication, AIDS is peripherally addressed in the MTEF, and rarely features in other sectors' Budget Framework Papers (BFPs)." (Lister et al, 2006: 92).*

Integration needs to be reflected in increased national funding commitments for the issue if it is to bring sustainable benefits. What appears in a national budget represents the culmination of a long process of negotiations drawing upon the MTEF, Budget Framework Papers and other technical inputs. Within this process, there are ample opportunities for technical, or particularly, political considerations to sway the outcome (DFID, 2007). For integration into the PRSP to be translated into recognition in the national budget, it needs to be acknowledged in the MTEF, and championed and protected in the subsequent budget process. This often requires political intervention. The most effective targets for intervention will depend on the balance of influence in a particular country between different players such as the ministry of finance, particular service ministries, the executive, parliamentarians, and international donors.

**b) Even if integration reaches the national budget, there is often significant mismatch between budget content and reality.**

Killick (2005) described Ghana's budget as a "ritualized façade" as there are regularly large deviations between budget estimates and actual spending, with large leakages in allocated funds between their release from the centre and arrival at the point of service delivery<sup>12</sup>. This may be largely to do with poor planning and presentation, especially the need to pay salaries not represented in the budget, and low prioritization in spend on some items (compared to budget), as much as corruption. For example, in Tanzania, some government departments appeared not to see HIV and AIDS as being important for them. So, in FY2005-06, only 25 per cent of funds in the budget appropriated for HIV and AIDS were programmed, and only 80 per cent of these were absorbed. (Issa, Severo and Gray, 2006).

**c) Once integration has notionally been achieved, there is the risk of reduced attention to the issue.**

During the Uganda case-study visit, several respondents referred to the "dilution" of HIV and AIDS and gender as a result of too great a focus on integration. A government stakeholder from the Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development (MGLSD) as well as a key donor respondent pointed out that the net effect of gender integration was that no money was allocated to the ministry for oversight of mainstreamed gender issues. The donor said regarding gender "*integration led to diluting the issue to the extent that MOG got no money for continuing to work on the issue or to address persistent lack of attention to gender concerns*". So, integration at the conceptual level was not consolidated in terms of funding to achieve change. Both respondents described a similar risk involved with integration of children.

Alternatively, the "champion" sector, may stop taking as much interest as previously because responsibility has been passed on, leading to overall loss of attention: "evaporation" (Moser et al., 2004).

**d) Weak "integration" into the PRSP, and then MTEF, may mean that action is not adequately reflected in downstream policies, plans and budgets.**

Social protection issues tend to be the responsibility of weak ministries, such as social welfare or gender, with little influence over national decisions (Bonnel, Temin

---

<sup>12</sup> For non-salary items, clinics suffered a leakage of 79 percent.

and Tempest, 2005; Green, 2006; Republic of Uganda, 2007a and 2007b). Such ministries are often marginalized, under-resourced, and lack the capacity to influence a powerful Ministry of Finance. So, they have weak influence on the outcome of the budget process that should be led by the PRSP and MTEF. So, even if there is an in-principle commitment to the issue in the PRSP, the specific follow-through in the national budget may not reflect this, and this in turn will be reflected “downstream” in sector plans and budgets that are dependent on the national budget. In Tanzania, for example, the ministry responsible for vulnerable children lacked the capacity to articulate and argue with the finance ministry for a scaled up programme (Payne and Neville, 2006:11).

**e) Shifting resource allocation from a specific sector into overall national level planning and budgeting may reduce availability of funding for specific interventions that are critical for the sector.**

General PRBS tends to disempower ministries that deal with social exclusion and gender, and strengthen the ministry of finance, leading to loss of funds previously dedicated to social issues (Payne and Neville, 2006:9). In particular, it may reduce funding for the civil society response that is critical for support for vulnerable children (Social & Scientific Systems, 2007: 70-72).

**f) Shifting analysis “upstream” to the PRSP and MTEF may lead to loss of quality and insight in crucial decisions**

- General PRBS may have reduced the room for policy dialogue between donors and governments on tricky issues because there is not the same attention to detail on issues within sectors as when there was direct involvement in sectors. (Payne and Neville, 2006:9)
- PRSPs tend to be brief and simplistic in treatment of particular issues. Donors may seek emphasis on simple measurement via existing indicators. So, important issues may be lost through reducing the discourse down to interventions chosen because the relevant indicators are already collected and easy to collect. (Jones, 2007).
- A government may fail to anticipate the effects of HIV and AIDS in the PRSP and national budget, such as increased numbers of orphans and other vulnerable children, sufficiently early due to the long time lag between HIV infection and AIDS-related effects, whereas sector instruments would be more sensitive to these (Social & Scientific Systems, 2007).

## Decentralization

- g) **There is widespread concern that integration extending down to decentralized implementation may lead to “slippage”** as decentralized structures often do not have capacity commensurate with their responsibility. The Uganda case study (section 3.2.5) exemplifies this.

## Sectors

- h) **Integration into a sector may be marginalized from national processes, decisions and resources, as sectors are one stage removed from national overall policy, and funding via the overall national budget.**

However, there could be ways to mitigate this through strengthening the accountability of decision-making processes whilst building up the capacity of a “champion ministry” to represent the sector.

- i) **The investment of time and resources into achieving integration may not be efficient**

The process of achieving integration may be protracted and complex. The actual benefits for the beneficiary group may be minimal, especially in the short-term. It is therefore not surprising that some respondents challenged the relative value of investing in achieving integration compared to other advocacy targets with potentially better returns in the short-term. There may need to be external investment to underpin advocacy for integration with long-term benefits, to complement advocacy for more tangible short-term gains.

### **3.1.3 Lessons in achieving integration**

The experiences within an UNDP/World Bank/UNAIDS Joint Programme to support the integration of HIV and AIDS into PRSPs<sup>13</sup> provide key lessons concerning the critical processes for successful integration (UNDP/World Bank/UNAIDS Joint Programme, 2007; World Bank, UNDP and UNAIDS, 2006). Further lessons come from experiences and analyses in the *Young Lives Project* in Ethiopia, India, Peru, and Vietnam, of advocacy to integrate child poverty into national development instruments (Jones, 2005; Jones with Tefera and Woldehanna, 2005; Jones, 2007). This in turn has drawn upon analysis of how to bring about policy change in general (Court, Hovland and Young, 2005; Keeley and Scoones, 1999). Finally, there are

---

<sup>13</sup> The Joint Programme was launched in mid-2005. It has worked with two groups of seven African governments – from mid-2005 (Ethiopia, Mali, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania (mainland), Zambia, and Zanzibar) and from mid-2006 (Burkina Faso, Burundi, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, and Uganda).



useful lessons concerning the integration of gender into national policy (Levy, 1996), including PRSPs in Bolivia, Mozambique, Tanzania and Vietnam (Bell, 2003) and Bolivia, Tanzania, Vietnam, Yemen (Whitehead, 2003).

The different experiences, with integration of different issues, produced a consistent message about effective tactics. These mirrored some general principles for successful advocacy:

1. Conduct analysis leading to appropriate evidence-based “asks” that are realistic, costed, prioritized, and not overly ambitious.
2. Identify key targets to influence (people and institutions that are influential, potential champions or gatekeepers)
3. Mobilize broad support with a range of influential allies. Use the participatory approaches anticipated within formal policy development processes to bring on board different stakeholders.
4. Use effective communication to address the needs and interests of key target audiences in a timely way.
5. Be persistent in follow-through.
6. Ensure that policy changes are put into practice: anticipate low capacity for implementation plans and slippage, have capacity to actively monitor for this, and challenge where commitments are not kept.

The key lessons of achieving successful integration have been synthesized in Appendix 2 to provide a checklist of strategies to use in seeking integration of vulnerable children into national development instruments and budgets. These are referenced to key tools found in a range of published resource materials for influencing policy changes that are summarized in Appendix 3.

### **3.2 Experience in case study countries**

The experiences of integration in the case study countries, in terms of both the outcome, and the processes to achieve integration, were derived largely from key informants, as documented accounts were not widely available. Although a number of common themes became clear, there were also distinctive differences between countries. These are analyzed in Section 3.3.

### 3.2.1 Kenya

Kenya is unusual in having achieved improved domestic commitments for orphans and vulnerable children without building upon integration into the PRSP or sectoral plans. Instead, these commitments occurred primarily because of effective leadership in the key government ministry, working collaboratively with UNICEF. Factors which encouraged this were the existence of underlying political support; the unusually powerful position of the government ministry responsible for vulnerable children - within Home Affairs in the Office of the Vice President; and the government's urgency to offer an alternative strategy to badly run private sector orphanages that were generating widespread complaints.

#### **The PRSP**

Kenya's current<sup>14</sup> Poverty Reduction Strategy takes the form of [the Economic Recovery Strategy](#) (ERS) that emphasizes achieving economic growth and macro-economic stability. Following the elections in 2002, the new government introduced the ERS to replace a classic PRSP. This new government wanted to show the public that it would operate differently from its predecessor and the ERS was prepared without development partner support. Although the ERS makes only passing mention of a national response to the needs of orphans, it did presage new government spending patterns that led to a budget line for vulnerable children in the national budget.

#### **National AIDS instruments**

In contrast, the [National HIV/AIDS Strategic Plan 2005/6-2009](#) (NSP) does have a specific commitment that: *50% of orphans and vulnerable children have access to protection, provision of food, shelter, education and health by June 2006* (Result 2.3.7)

The costing for the NSP acknowledges that the cost of resources for all mitigation programmes (totaling KSh 31.4 billion or USD 393 million over five years), was to a large extent represented in the resource needs for the orphans and vulnerable children programme. These needs were adopted from the costed OVC strategy for Kenya developed by UNICEF and the Ministry of Home of Affairs. (This amount represented 18 percent of the total cost of the plan over 5 years of KSh 178 billion (USD 2.22 billion)). So, the needs of orphans and vulnerable children were integrated into the costing, drawing directly from the costed NPA exercise.

---

<sup>14</sup> A medium-term development plan for 2008-2012 is currently in preparation.

### **Domestic commitments to social protection**

Enhanced domestic commitments to respond to orphans and other vulnerable children were reflected in a budget line for vulnerable children that the Ministry of Finance inserted into the national budget. The allocations from the national budget for this increased significantly from USD 0.7m (2005) to USD 2.5m (2007) - a trebling. There was a commitment to expand this. All of this money went as a government contribution to social protection through a cash transfer scheme to 10,500 households with vulnerable children (Pearson et. al., 2006). DFID and like-minded donors provided complementary funds. The Government committed to using any additional funds that became available to increasing the number of households covered to 100,000.

The government commitment to the cash transfer scheme to benefit vulnerable children came about primarily through collaborative working between senior management in the Ministry of Home Affairs and UNICEF Kenya. They wanted to test the approach, and with vision, preparedness to take risks, and supportive management, accessed UNICEF resources to implement a pilot scheme. A good team of technical resource staff, and the ability to bring in experts quickly, underpinned the successful process. Essentially, they realized an opportunity. Underlying factors that enabled this approach included:

#### Parliamentary support

UNICEF led a campaign during the 2002 general election to get candidates to sign a pledge of support for a platform of issues relating to vulnerable children (UNICEF Kenya, 2002). Fifty percent of elected MPs had signed the pledge, including the President, and 75 percent of the Cabinet. This led to the creation of a Parliamentary OVC Committee, debates in Parliament, and the preparation of a NPA with strong support.

#### A well positioned ministry with responsibility for vulnerable children

The Department of Children's Services that is responsible for vulnerable children, alongside other children's issues, came within the Ministry of Home Affairs<sup>15</sup>. This is a senior ministry – the Minister is the Vice President, and the Permanent Secretary tends to have seniority, and be a high performer. (This is a historic accident - the Children's Department has developed from a section of government that dealt with children in trouble with the law. This section was in the government department that ran the police, and justice services, which is now Home

---

<sup>15</sup> This changed in 2008. The Department of Children's Services is now under the Ministry of Gender and Children's Development.

Affairs.) So, issues concerning vulnerable children have had significant clout within government, particularly with the Ministry of Finance.

#### Seeking alternatives to private sector orphanages

Private sector orphanages had mushroomed as a result of media attention on “AIDS orphans”. Many were badly run, generating numerous complaints. The government was seeking alternative approaches that would better enable extended families to care for vulnerable children.

#### **PEPFAR**

The significantly increased funding from government must be put into context by making comparison with funding from PEPFAR. With the US government committed to spending at least ten per cent of its country budget on orphans and vulnerable children, and the total country budget for PEPFAR increasing to USD 368 million in FY 2007, USD 32 million was budgeted for orphans and vulnerable children in FY 2007.<sup>16</sup> The amount committed to Kenya seems likely to increase in coming years with the commitment of significantly increased funds overall with the reauthorization of PEPFAR for FY 2009-2013<sup>17</sup>.

#### **3.2.2 Malawi**

President Bingu wa Mutharika launched Malawi’s NPA on 16 June 2005, the Day of the African Child. The theme that year was orphans and vulnerable children. This meant that the NPA had high profile, and told the nation that the government saw orphans and vulnerable children to be important.

#### **National AIDS instruments**

The high profile and authority of the NPA led to orphans and vulnerable children being “inserted” into the **National Action Framework for HIV and AIDS (NAF)** that was launched shortly afterwards. Orphans and vulnerable children were included in the Impact Mitigation component with indicators:

- The number of Orphans and other Vulnerable Children receiving care/support (by type of support - psychosocial, nutrition, financial, district and gender)
- The number of community initiatives or community organizations receiving support to care for orphans (by district).

<sup>16</sup> <http://www.pepfar.gov/about/82463.htm> (Checked 05 August 2008)

<sup>17</sup> The Reauthorization Act provides for up to USD 39 billion to combat HIV and AIDS between 2009-2013. <http://www.pepfar.gov/documents/organization/107750.pdf> (Checked 05 August 2008)

Respondents saw this inclusion to have brought several advantages for orphans and vulnerable children.

There was a clear strong commitment to vulnerable children, who were stated to be an integral part of the AIDS response. This commitment could be quantified as the NAF had specific costed objectives and indicators. The inclusion in the NAF meant that there was increased advocacy for resources for vulnerable children via HIV and AIDS. In particular, Malawi included a strong component for orphans and vulnerable children in its proposal to Round 5 of the Global Fund. This proposal was successful, leading to funding to strengthen government systems and fund pilot cash transfers for caregivers.

### **Challenges in turning commitments into action**

However, respondents remained concerned that even with additional funding, ministries have limited capacity to act effectively at national or local level. There is a need to address some of the factors that impede the flow of funds to projects responding to the needs of vulnerable children, for example, by making rules and regulations simpler. Also, monitoring is not yet effective.

### **The PRSP (the MGDS)**

The strong commitment to orphans and vulnerable children reflected in the NPA also fed into Malawi's PRSP, [the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy 2006-2011](#) (MGDS). Orphans and vulnerable children are featured with medium-term outcome, objectives, strategies and indicators aligned with those in the NAF.

Respondents saw integration into the MDGs to have the specific advantages in that it raised the issue of non-AIDS vulnerable children, and increased interest and support for initiatives at national level, e.g. for social protection for caregivers. However, they identified several outstanding issues: there is no disaggregated budget allocation for children; and there are often discrepancies between allocations and actual spending. Strengthened decentralisation was seen likely to lead to a more effective response in time.

### **Achieving integration**

The first NAF made little mention of orphans and vulnerable children as it emphasized prevention and treatment. The National AIDS Council held a consultative process to develop a second NAF. The high profile of the NPA enabled the Ministry of Gender, Children, Women and Community Services with strong UNICEF support to make the case for inserting

orphans and vulnerable children. A committed group from government, civil society and donors worked together to achieve this.

### 3.2.3 Mozambique<sup>18</sup>

Mozambique provides an illustration of the challenges found in most of the case study countries of moving from policy commitments made in key documents to increased budgetary allocations and action for orphans and vulnerable children.

#### **The PRSP (PARPA)**

In Mozambique, the principal Government planning document is the Government Five-Year Plan, which under the Constitution must be produced by each new Government upon entering office. In 2000 and 2005, the Government also produced Mozambique's first and second Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PARPA I and [PARPA II](#)). The PARPA is an operationalization of the Government Five-Year Plan, focusing only on key sectors for economic growth and poverty reduction. On an annual basis, the Government produces an Economic and Social Plan ("PES") outlining priorities for the following year and the Review of the PES, which reviews PES implementation in the previous year.

The PARPA is important as it is the key instrument for the operationalization of the Five Year Plan, and is the basis for dialogue with the international donors that provide over 50 per cent of the government's budget. The second PARPA for the period 2006 to 2009 was developed in 2005. The elaboration process for PARPA II was considerably more broad-based and consultative than for PARPA I. "Cross-cutting" issues such as gender, HIV/AIDS, environment, food and nutritional security and disasters were mainstreamed throughout the document. PARPA II is considerably more child-friendly than PARPA I, setting out time-bound and quantifiable targets for the further realization of child rights, many of which contribute directly towards attaining the MDGs. Examples of such targets include:

- The proportion of children who have lost their mothers that attend school is the same as the proportion for non-orphans;
- The proportion of orphan children with low weight is the same as the proportion for non-orphans;
- 30 per cent of orphans and other vulnerable children live in families who are receiving external assistance, free of charge, in caring for these children.

---

<sup>18</sup> This section draws heavily upon UNICEF, 2006 p53-69 to which the reader is referred for further detail.

### **Moving from integration in the PRSP to achieving benefits for children**

Although children's issues are well featured in PARPA II, the linkages between priority actions and the budget remain weak. For example, the budget envelope for the Ministry of Women and Social Action (responsible for co-ordinating the national response to the orphan crisis created by the HIV and AIDS pandemic) is not expected to increase significantly over the period 2006 to 2009, remaining at below one per cent of budgeted resources in medium-term projection<sup>19</sup>. There are a number of reasons for this, linked to Mozambique's systems and capacities for planning and budgeting:

- There is duplication of planning and budgeting systems between the sectors and the central agencies due to the external financing available at sector level. This undermines the MTEF and the State Budget as instruments for making strategic resource allocation decisions.
- There is a separation between the planning and budgeting institutions (the Ministry of Planning and Development, and the Ministry of Finance) that is also reflected in the division between the planning and budgeting instruments. In particular, the State Budget does not relate strongly to the PES as it is formulated in an incremental, input-focused manner, rather than relating to outputs.
- The mechanisms for strategic allocation of resources are lagging behind. The strongest evidence of this is the high variance between budgets and actual expenditures at the institutional level. While the MTEF instrument provides an operational mechanism for programming spending over the medium term, the quality of its projection is weak. The MTEF has not yet proven possible to provide accurate estimations of the future cost implications of Government policies. One part of the reason is that, in the absence of a programmatic classifier or a detailed functional classifier, it is not possible to use the budget structure to cost out the policies and programmes being conducted within public institutions. The decision has been taken to introduce a programme classification system on a pilot basis from 2008 and comprehensively across Government from 2009. This is an important step forward, which should assist in addressing these weaknesses and, over time, in converting the Mozambican system into an effective policy-based budget, able to allocate public resources to agreed strategic priorities.
- Whereas the Five Year Plan is submitted for Parliamentary approval, the PARPA is accountable to the donors. This reduces the scope for public participation and accountability. Furthermore, Parliament's ability to scrutinize planning and budgeting

---

<sup>19</sup> This situation changed in the new 2008-2010 MTEF, where the budget allocation to Social Action increased substantially. However, the allocation remains relatively low at less than one per cent of the total resource envelope.

instruments is also weak – deputies don't have the professional or academic background or technical support to analyze complex budget issues.

- PARPA interventions are not properly costed.
- In terms of execution, liquidity constraints and bureaucratic hold ups often lead to delays in releasing funds. There is also substantial scope for reallocation of funds so that what is executed bears little resemblance to what Parliament agreed.

So, although the integration of orphans and vulnerable children into PARPA and the State Budget is expected to bring benefits in the long-term, much remains to be done at present. There are a number of tactics that government and donors are using to ensure that vulnerable children do not miss out whilst deeply rooted problems are addressed:

- PARPA II recognizes that certain types of interventions are particularly suited to “project type” funding modalities that deliver a rapid change in development outcomes through a significant initial investment, for example, a birth registration campaign.
- The indicators used in the Joint Annual Review exercise of government and donors include one for vulnerable children, as these receive frequent and high-level attention, and so provide a means to ensure that the relevant ministry does engage.
- To establish a PARPA working group on social action, including for vulnerable children, so that a form of social protection may be developed and rolled out from within PARPA's funding envelope.

### **National AIDS instruments**

The **Second National Strategic Plan 2005-2009 (PEN II)** emphasises support to all affected by HIV and AIDS rather than just orphans and vulnerable children. However, there is a specific commitment to ensure educational support to all orphans and vulnerable children as well as commitments to increased social welfare, more flexible civil registration and encouragement of adoption. There is a core indicator for impact assessment:

- Proportion of orphan children aged 6-17 years at school compared to non-orphans (by sex and province).

And two results indicators:

- No. of orphans and vulnerable children receiving community and home-based care/support (by type of support, district and sex).



- No. of community initiatives or CBOs receiving support in care for orphans and vulnerable children.

### **Achieving integration into the PRSP**

The integration of vulnerable children's issues into PARPA II occurred largely through interventions from UNICEF and donors. UNICEF made a strategic decision to present information on the situation of children to the government process. This was specifically through the dissemination of strategic information on existing disparities in the country, and structured engagement in numerous PARPA Working Groups, which enabled UNICEF to raise the issue of vulnerable children across the board. UNICEF also contributed to the drafting of relevant sections of PARPA II. It worked with like-minded bilateral donors on this. This externally driven process occurred in a context where dialogue is largely between the executive and donors - indigenous civil society remains weak just 15 years since the achievement of peace; and as indicated above, PARPA is not accountable to Parliament, and the ability of parliamentarians to scrutinize is also weak.

### **3.2.4 Tanzania**

Tanzania is unusual for several reasons: the official recognition of vulnerability in the [National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty](#) (widely known as "MKUKUTA") preceded the NPA; and the statutory role of decentralized government in addressing the needs of vulnerable children.

#### **The PRSP (MKUKUTA)**

Tanzania has a long history of recognizing the contribution of vulnerability to poverty, and in 2005 MKUKUTA presented a clear strategy for vulnerable groups, particularly under Cluster 2: Improvement of Quality of Life and Social Well Being. There were several commitments for orphans and most vulnerable children. Within Cluster II, Goal 2 includes *'improved survival, health and well-being of all children and women and especially vulnerable groups'*; Goal 4 includes:

*'adequate social protection and provision of basic needs and services for the vulnerable and needy'*; and Goal 5 includes *'effective systems to ensure universal access to quality and affordable public services'*. These were reflected in the [Guidelines for the preparation of medium-term plan and budget framework for 2006/07-2008/09](#). MKUKUTA predated the NPA that has taken a long time to get to launch. The final costed version of the NPA was reviewed and approved by the technical working group in December 2007 and officially launched in February 2008. While more work is needed on the costing and some of the technical aspects, the NPA provides more detail than MKUKUTA on strategies for vulnerable

children. Even prior to the approval of the NPA, its development coincided with work on other important policy documents. For example, stakeholders involved in the development of the NPA were also involved in the development of the National Multi-Sector Strategic Framework on HIV/AIDS 2008-2012 (NMSF 2008-12) providing, in this way, occasion for cross-fertilization of ideas and priorities around vulnerable children. The NPA also provides a basis for integration of key issues around vulnerable children into the emerging National Social Protection Framework, whose development was initiated in 2007 and is still ongoing.

### **National Multi-sectoral Strategic Framework on HIV and AIDS (2008-2012)**

Integration of most vulnerable children (MVC) into the NMSF 2008-12 should be beneficial in two respects:

- The second NMSF 2008-12 supports the establishment and active support for most vulnerable children committees, which have been set up from the district and down to the village level. The role of the district MVC Committee (MVCC) is to ensure a coordinated response for MVC by all partners in the district, including resource mobilization. The role of the MVCC at the village level is to identify MVC and ensure that MVC have adequate protection and access to all essential services. The MVCC are not new independent structures but are part of AIDS multisectoral committees that exist at the district, ward and village levels.
- A major challenge in advancing the national response is translating the NMSF into much more detailed and concrete operational plans. Based on the decentralization approach of planning and coordination prevailing in the country with the local government authority reform, this process will be divided in two major steps - development of national sectoral plans on HIV and AIDS and Integrated district plans on HIV and AIDS. The provision for most vulnerable children in the Impact Mitigation section of the NMSF 2008-12 will facilitate integration of MVC care and support into national and district plans and budgets.

These commitments mean that integration into the NMSF 2008-12 has brought about linkages from national policy level to operational level for most vulnerable children, and the (theoretical) provision of budget at district-level. It is noteworthy that although Tanzania's approach to identifying vulnerable children considers a broad array of factors contributing to vulnerability, beyond those that are HIV and AIDS-specific only, it has been the NMSF that has provided the impetus and statutory framework for MVC Committees and integration of MVC issues into district budgets.

Although there has been some progress in having the NMSF 2008-12 reflected in the budget guidelines, respondents cautioned that having the NPA reflected in the national budget is “still work in progress”, and that the “budget doesn’t surface everything.” Furthermore, MKUKUTA only represents a proportion of the national budget, so funding gains through representation in MKUKUTA may be limited. However, MKUKUTA does represent a significant sense of prioritization.

### **National Social Protection Framework**

The NPA, including its technical content and standing, as well as the partnerships its development has fostered, all provide a significant basis for ensuring that vulnerable children are properly integrated into the national social protection framework that is currently under development. As in Zambia (see below), this could provide an alternative vehicle to the NMSF for social protection activities, such as community responses and cash grants, for vulnerable children.

### **Achieving integration**

Policy development has taken place through a variety of partnership structures and processes – some more effective than others. Much of the content of the policy documents was to have been developed through Technical Working Groups working to high-level National Steering Committees. Membership of the former was derived from ministries, civil society organizations and co-opted donor representatives. In practice, some of these groups did not meet frequently, so work was organized through other groupings. It is clear that the both the processes and the presence of an NPA, which had been under development for a long time, even if not formally approved, was a critical factor in achieving integration into the NMSF. Work on the Social Protection framework is coordinated by the Poverty Eradication Division of the former Ministry of Economy, Empowerment and Planning, which has now merged with the Ministry of Finance into a new Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs: social protection work is guided by a task team composed of government and development partners. Children’s issues in Tanzania have involved a number of ministries including Community Development, Gender and Children; Labour, Employment and Youth Development; Health and Social Welfare; Education and Vocational Training; and Public Safety. A respondent commented that the need for collaboration between ministries was an impediment to progressing work on the NPA. Another noted that UNICEF had played a key role in representing children’s issues in the development of the NMSF. Stakeholders had found that they were “really struggling” to get most vulnerable children on the agenda of the Ministry of Finance. Eventually this achievement came through the NMSF rather than

through the NPA. With the social protection framework now the responsibility of the newly created Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs, this integration might be further facilitated.

### 3.2.5 Uganda

#### **The PRSP (PEAP)**

In Uganda, the Poverty Eradication Action Plan (PEAP) is an over-arching framework that guides public action to eradicate poverty. The current [PEAP II](#) acknowledges that orphans and vulnerable children constitute a large and growing share of Uganda's population, largely as a result of HIV and AIDS and war related deaths of parents. However, PEAP II has no outcomes, indicators or policy actions relating to orphans and vulnerable children. There is an allocation in the National Budget under the vote: Measures to improve human development: Support to AIDS Orphans and Children's Rehabilitation, within the Poverty Action Fund.<sup>20</sup> However, this totalled only US\$ 1.86 billion (approximately USD 1.2 million) in the 2006/07 Approved Budget with no projected increase in the projections for the following three years (Republic of Uganda, 2007c: A34). Activists described how the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development (MFPED) argued that child vulnerability reflected general poverty issues, and should therefore be addressed through investment in the priority areas of education, health and agriculture, rather than specific child-focused interventions (interview with author, October 2007).

#### **Weaknesses in the lead government sections**

In reality, the Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development (MGLSD), which is responsible for vulnerable children at the national level, and the corresponding Community Based Services (CBS) component of the District administrations, remain significantly under funded, with low technical and operational capacity. The direct budget allocation for MGLSD has not covered much of the reoccurring costs and institutional support required to coordinate and manage the extensive activities of civil society organizations in the sector made possible through large amounts of external funding. CBS staff describe how they are overloaded with a wide range of responsibilities (children, youth, gender, disability, community development) and demands on their time for individual case work (such as probation and child protection) alongside coordination and management, and have little means of getting out of their offices to visit communities (interviews with author, October 2007). To cite an official document from the MGLSD:

*"In spite of the frequent reference to OVC as a category that befits urgent attention and support by a cross-section of stakeholders, the evidence suggests that the priority which is*

<sup>20</sup> These funds are remitted to the Ministry of Gender Labour and Social Development under the 'Promotion of Children and Youth in Difficult Circumstances' (PCY) project which is operational in 19 of the current 80 districts of Uganda. (Republic of Uganda, 2007a: 10)

accorded to this category of children in planning and budgeting is rather low.” (Republic of Uganda, 2007a)

So, the inclusion of orphans and vulnerable children in the PEAP II brought little in the way of tangible benefits.

### **National AIDS instruments**

In contrast, orphans and vulnerable children are well integrated into the [revised National Strategic Framework 2003/04-2005/06](#) (NSF) and even more so into the draft **National Strategic Plan for HIV/AIDS Activities 2007/8-2011/12 (NSP)**. The revised NSF has a relevant Objective, Outcome, eight Activity Areas providing a comprehensive response, and three National Level Indicators and Targets:

14	<i>Number of OVC receiving psychosocial support</i>	40%
15	<i>Number of OVC receiving food and material assistance</i>	40%
16	<i>Ratio of current school attendance among orphans to that among non-orphans, aged 10-14.</i>	1.00 for Males and Females

The revised NSF includes all orphans and vulnerable children matching the criteria of the NPA, rather than only those whose vulnerability is directly due to HIV and AIDS.

In the draft NSP, there are additional indicators. The projected budget for orphans and vulnerable children in the draft NSP is 19 per cent of the total budget for HIV and AIDS.

### **Funding through the AIDS sector, particularly PEPFAR**

Significant external funding will accrue to support orphans and vulnerable children in general because of the linkage to the HIV and AIDS sector in Uganda. For example, support to orphans and vulnerable children is one of the eligible activity areas for the multi-donor Civil Society Fund that became operational under the Uganda AIDS Commission in 2007. PEPFAR contributions dwarf those from other donors. In FY 2007, over USD 20 million is available for this in Uganda<sup>21</sup>. One of the challenges of this is that funding is drawn through the AIDS sector, rather than by the MGLSD. However, some PEPFAR funding is being used to build institutional and technical capacity within the MGLSD and local government, and provide operational costs, at national and district levels.

<sup>21</sup> <http://www.pepfar.gov/about/82456.htm> (Checked, 05 August 2008)

### **The process of integration**

The MGLSD analyzed the reasons for the low priority of vulnerable children in budgeting and programming, with a view to influencing the outcome of the revision of PEAP II and other key planning frameworks (Republic of Uganda (2007a)). The resultant strategy (Republic of Uganda, 2007b) has four elements that reflect the principles for successful advocacy identified in Section 3.1.3:

- Establish the relationship between poverty reduction and OVC investment.
- Strengthen networks, partnerships and coalitions.
- Involve influential leaders in policy change at national, district and sub-county levels.
- Work closely with the media to generate support for OVC.

### **3.2.6 Zambia**

Zambia provides illustrations of how orphans and vulnerable children may be supported through other sectors – Education and Social Protection - in addition to HIV and AIDS, and of the revision of the NPA to enable effective implementation of commitments made in the latest National Development Plan.

#### **National HIV and AIDS Strategic Framework**

Orphans and vulnerable children are comprehensively integrated into the National HIV and AIDS Strategic Framework (2006-10) with a specific Strategic Objective “Protect and provide support for orphans and vulnerable children” under the Impact mitigation theme. There are two outcome indicators relating to receipt of basic external support, and school attendance.

#### **Integration into the Education and Social Protection sectors of the FNDP**

Responses to orphans and vulnerable children are specified similarly in the [Fifth National Development Plan \(2006-2010\)](#) (FNDP) in the Education and HIV and AIDS chapters, with one Key Performance Indicator relating to the number of orphans and vulnerable children receiving external support.

#### **Education**

The reference to orphans and vulnerable children in the Education chapter of the FNDP illustrates the important role that sensitive education policy and budgeting could play for this group. Access to education is a key priority for children themselves, caregivers, and the broader community, but is often denied because of economic barriers, even where there has been adoption of “universal primary education”. In Zambia, a small proportion of the total budget is allocated to bursaries to cover such costs for vulnerable children.

## **Social Protection**

Zambia provides an interesting study because vulnerable children were integrated into the Social Protection Chapter of the FNDP. This Chapter includes commitments to reforms focusing on issues including:

- The needs of disadvantaged women and children;
- Enhancement of child survival, development and protection interventions;
- Addressing the needs of children living with HIV and AIDS.

Using these commitments, and the National Child Policy, may provide a more effective basis to improve responses for vulnerable children in the long-term than using the inclusion of vulnerable children within the response to HIV and AIDS. The Ministry of Community Development and Social Services (MCDSS) will develop a new NPA to lead implementation of what is committed in the FNDP and National Children's Policy. In time, it is planned to establish a Zambian Commission for the Child. This agency would have a mandate to implement the NPA, and audit activities being carried out for vulnerable children. There have been positive trends in the national budget provisions for vulnerable children, for example, the creation of a specific budget line for street children, and provision for a Child Protection Unit under the Zambia Police Service.

## **Challenges to moving from integration in the FNDP to realizing benefits for children**

During the case study research, most government and all donor respondents said very clearly that they believed integration of child related themes into the FNDP was an essential component in addressing their needs in subsequent and planning processes. Civil society representatives did not express the same degree of certainty that integration has yet resulted in any visible improvement of budgeting flow toward this constituency. All stakeholders agreed that there was as yet little assurance that the budgets reflected much of an increase in child related allocations.

Respondents cautioned that even if there had been significant budgetary allocations for orphans and vulnerable children, it was unlikely that this would lead to demonstrably improved lives for ordinary children:

- Budgetary allocations are often severely disrupted and re-channeled before they ever reach the target beneficiary at the local level.
- There is inadequate data to track what is happening for children, or to track the multi-resource flows from government and externally for vulnerable children.

- Government structures at district- and local-level are very understaffed, under resourced and lacking in basic infrastructure to manage services, or oversee civil sector implementing partners.

Furthermore, there are concerns that a significant shift in donor support from project funding to budget support in Zambia is a threat to civil society organizations maintaining their level of service provision for orphans and vulnerable children (Siamwiza, 2007). Civil society organizations have been key to service delivery in education, health and social services funding, and provided most support to orphans and vulnerable children. Currently, there are few mechanisms for transfer of government funds to civil society institutions (with the exception of long term support to church affiliated medical services in some rural and underserved areas). During the case study visit, a government representative noted *“A lot of responsibility for children affected by HIV and AIDS issues lies under civil society but with the shift to direct budgetary support, resource allocation to civil society has become highly constrained ”*- A National AIDS Spending Assessment for Zambia reported a 52% drop in funding available for HIV CSOs between 2005 and 2006, a decline tentatively attributed to changes in the prevailing aid architecture and transitions in the resource environment (Mundy et. al., 2008)

### **Achieving integration in the FNDP**

A situation analysis on orphans and vulnerable children carried out in 2004, and the discussions it generated around vulnerability, were significant factors that contributed to the development of Zambia’s social protection strategy (adopted in 2004), and subsequently, the inclusion of social protection as a chapter in the FNDP.

More generally, there has been increased emphasis on social issues within the Budget, which has been reflected in increased allocations that would benefit vulnerable children.

Factors contributing to this are seen to include:

- Adoption of the Government’s macro-economic policy
- The MTEF being reflected in the Budget. For example, the MTEF 2007-2009 stated that one of the public spending priorities would be social sector spending, particularly on health, education, and water and sanitation.
- Advocacy arising from various adopted social policies, such as the National Child Policy, National Youth Policy, and the macro policy priorities of the FNDP 2006-2010.
- Government commitments to attaining the Millennium Development Goals.



**Table 1**

**Overview of the role of national policy instruments in bringing about short-term benefit for vulnerable children**

	Kenya	Malawi	Mozambique	Tanzania	Uganda	Zambia
<b>Relative contribution of instrument to short-term benefits for orphans and vulnerable children</b>						
<b>PRSP/NDP</b>	Nil	*	**	***	*	***
<b>National Strategy</b>						
<b>AIDS</b>	***	****	*	****	****	***
<b>Social Protection Policy</b>	**	**	In development	In development		***

Key

The relative contribution is comparative between instruments for a country and based on a scale of one (low) to five (highest).

### 3.3 Analysis: Making integration work best for orphans and vulnerable children

#### 3.3.1 Integration into PRSPs has made little difference in the short-term

According to the hypothesis being tested, integration into the PRSP should ensure that the needs of vulnerable children are factored into high-level policy, and promote improved coordination and links across sectors. In theory, it should also promote greater ownership of the issues by key ministries such as the Ministry of Finance, and result in increased domestic contributions to funding through the national budget, leading to better financial predictability and sustainability. However, in the case study countries the integration of vulnerable children at the national policy level, particularly into the PRSPs, has made little difference in reality:

1. Domestic contributions to the national budget in relation to vulnerable children were minimal.

2. Coordination across sectors remains a challenge, particularly with the lead ministry for vulnerable children often lacking status, and having weak technical and operational capacity.
3. There are challenges to the feasibility of increased domestic contributions bringing enhanced financial predictability and sustainability given the very low levels of government funding for responses to AIDS, including orphans and vulnerable children, both in absolute terms and in comparison to external funding. In particular, PEPFAR funding for orphans and vulnerable children, is over ten times as great as the government budget line in Kenya and Uganda, but remains off-budget. Although there are moves for some integration of PEPFAR funding into sectors in Mozambique, full integration of the huge amounts available seems very distant.
4. Even where some additional funds were made available for vulnerable children, the case studies from Malawi, Mozambique, Uganda and Zambia illustrated the difficulties of translating this into action, with reallocations frequent; hold-ups in disbursement, and weak operational capacity, especially in rural areas.

The anticipated risk that a move “upstream” to focus on the PRSP, may lead to the sector ministries responsible for vulnerable children losing direct control over critical policy and funding decisions was not borne out. This may possibly have been because the level of integration was so insignificant. In Mozambique, integration had the opposite effect in that the relevant ministry now has to be more engaged because of increased scrutiny through the Joint Annual review process.

Although responsibility for vulnerable children was being passed to district-level government as part of decentralization processes, again this was not as a consequence of integration into PRSPs. Indeed, in Tanzania, where processes with decentralized government offer potential benefits for vulnerable children, this is through the HIV and AIDS strategic framework. Elsewhere, it seemed unlikely that this responsibility would translate into significant action given the current constraints of local government.

### **3.3.2 Integration into sectors brings clear short-term benefits but the best route differed between countries**

A number of commentators have suggested that whilst integration into the PRSP is essential for the longer-term, it needs to be complemented through the use of a mix of instruments to bring about shorter-term benefits (Payne and Neville, 2006: 7). A review of DFID country evaluations concluded:

*“By focusing on mechanisms to build government capacity to tackle poverty in the medium to long term, there is a lower priority given to immediate and more direct support for services to alleviate poverty – leading to a risk of missing MDG targets. The rate of change through budget support may not be rapid enough. Thus, alternative investments with and outside government are needed alongside budget support for the more urgent achievement of lagging MDGs, including HIV/AIDS, water and sanitation, and malnutrition.”* (Barr and Barnett, 2006)

An evaluation of DFID’s programme in Ghana, where general PRBS accounts for 40 per cent of donor aid and 10 per cent of government budget, concluded that health and education are better supported through sector funding until there is public sector reform and better public financial management. To date, DFID has funded HIV and AIDS in Ghana through projects. Results have been positive with ‘reasonably effective performance’ compared to ‘performance stagnation’ in the health sector (Azeem el al., 2006: 53) (but Angemi (2005) argues that the opposite occurred in Uganda with funding through a Sector Wide Approach being much more effective in supporting primary health services.) The approach of funding HIV and AIDS through such a mix is found in many other countries where donors have encouraged PRBS, and general PRBS constitutes a significant proportion of external aid (Social & Scientific Systems, 2007:63).

In general, integration into a sector addresses many of the concerns about integration into the PRSP and national budget processes. The issue is protected better, and managed in a more informed way. There are various sectors into which successful integration of vulnerable children may occur. In many ways, national AIDS instruments represent a specialized sector with especially high profile and dedicated funds. In all the case study countries, they have been important for drawing in external support for orphans and vulnerable children – often regardless of the cause of their vulnerability (see Table 1). However, the value of national AIDS instruments for vulnerable children may have peaked. There is a growing trend to develop national social protection mechanisms, often with strong support from European donors (Chinsinga, 2007). Integration into these social protection mechanisms is already bringing about small domestic contributions, and is likely to be the most effective form of integration for vulnerable children in the foreseeable future, given growing donor interest, and the momentum to move away from *AIDS exclusivism* to more inclusive approaches to reach all vulnerable children, regardless of cause. Vulnerable children could also benefit significantly if they were integrated into the education or health sector plans and budgets, so that reforms for improved access to education and health were introduced in ways that were

sensitive to their needs. Section 3.3 demonstrated that each country context must be considered individually, and may change with time.

The integration of vulnerable children into social protection mechanisms illustrates the differences that may occur between countries. In Zambia and Mozambique, integration is occurring as a consequence of integration into the NPA/PRSP; in Malawi, funding for a pilot cash transfer scheme comes from the Global Fund after integration into the National Strategic Framework for HIV and AIDS; in Tanzania, it is a direct result of the NPA; whereas in Kenya it resulted from government and UNICEF management seizing an opportunity.

### **3.3.3 The value of a costed, multi-sector NPA**

A costed, multi-sector National Plan of Action with strong political support appears to be key to creating opportunities to benefit vulnerable children in the short-term. How this is used will depend on context – in Kenya, the political support for the NPA created favourable conditions for engagement with the Ministry of Finance to create a budget line. In Malawi, Tanzania and Uganda, integration from the NPA into the national AIDS strategy has enabled access to funds dedicated to the national response to HIV and AIDS. With the national policy in each of these countries clear that a child may be vulnerable for reasons other than HIV and AIDS, the NPA has therefore allowed access to funding for responses to AIDS in respect of all vulnerable children. In Mozambique, the inclusion of an indicator derived from the NPA in the Joint Annual Review has helped to bring about better engagement from the relevant ministry. It is noteworthy that in both Malawi and Tanzania, the NPA had significant influence before it was finalised and launched.

### **3.3.4 Addressing key issues for long-term benefits**

Strengthening the role of relevant ministries must accompany any work on increasing the recognition of vulnerable children within national development instruments. This would enable them to advocate for children's interests more effectively in future negotiations around longer-term outcomes for vulnerable children from the PRSP and budgetary processes, as well as coordinate diverse responses. Budget processes need to become more transparent and accountable so that the outcome reflects national priorities. These changes will take time. As illustrated in Mozambique, a twin track approach is required to avoid children missing out in the short-term. Instruments bringing short-term benefits should be used in parallel to reform processes to enable the integration of vulnerable children into the PRSP and budget to bring long-term benefits. As in Uganda, there should also be processes to strengthen decentralized structures and other agencies that will be increasingly

looked upon to handle funding for vulnerable children, so that they more effectively bid for, and manage, resources for vulnerable children within their jurisdiction.

Surprisingly, it was only in Malawi that integration had been used as a basis for including vulnerable children in a successful proposal to the Global Fund (Round 5). Such funding has enabled Malawi to strengthen government systems and fund pilot cash transfers for caregivers. The failure to engage with the Global Fund for funding for vulnerable children may be to do with perceptions that it will not favour applications in respect of vulnerable children; or that this is not where a comparative advantage lies, given the availability of funding for vulnerable children through PEPFAR in the other five focus countries.

### 3.3.5 Off-budget resources can challenge long-term national ownership.

For example, in the five countries with PEPFAR programmes<sup>22</sup>, the USG funding for orphans and vulnerable children has been considerable and increasing year-on-year. It has been typically over ten fold the size of budget contributions from domestic sources for vulnerable children. These amounts are welcome as they represent a critical contribution towards a more adequate urgent response to the needs of vulnerable children. However, there is an accompanying challenge that giving such large amounts, especially those that are channelled independently of national governments, may reduce the likelihood that the national government will utilise its own financial resources to support vulnerable children. While this may be pragmatic in the short term, the lack of domestic resources undermines the potential for a consistent long-term response for children. The recent reauthorization of PEPFAR for FY 2009-2013, with a significantly increased financial commitment of up to USD 39 billion for HIV and AIDS, could enhance this disincentive effect. So, the language of “Partnership compacts” contained in the new PEPFAR arrangements is welcome.

#### **PEPFAR: Bilateral Partnership Compacts<sup>23</sup>**

“The U.S. Government will pursue Partnership Compacts by which PEPFAR resources and other commitments will increase in partnership with countries dedicated to fighting their HIV epidemics. Through these compacts, host nations will strengthen their collaboration with the U.S. Government by:

- Increasing their own resources, according to economic ability, for HIV/AIDS and health systems so that the combined resources can achieve clear goals.
- Implementing policies and practices to optimize effectiveness of resources in key areas, e.g. health workforce expansion, gender equity, protection of the rights of orphans, effective HIV counseling and testing, and others to be identified as Partnership Compacts are developed.”

<sup>22</sup> Kenya, Mozambique, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia

<sup>23</sup> <http://www.pepfar.gov/documents/organization/107750.pdf> (Checked 05 August 2008)

### 3.3.6 Lessons about the process of achieving integration

It is clear from the case study countries that the context for integration varied between countries. Even within a country, it varied with time. Factors include:

- **The relevant strength of the lead ministry for vulnerable children, and of other stakeholders.** For example, in many countries, the lead ministry lacked profile and technical capacity to effectively influence the Ministry of Finance. In Kenya, the Children's Department came under the Office of the Vice President, and so had political and bureaucratic weight.
- **Prevailing attitudes towards vulnerable children, particularly in key ministries such as Finance, Planning, Education and Health.** In Uganda, the Ministry of Finance has argued that child vulnerability should not be addressed specifically, but through the national poverty reduction strategy that emphasizes enhanced access to education and health care, and support for agricultural development.
- **The existence of champions such as leading political figures.** President Bingu wa Mutharika launched Malawi's NPA on an auspicious date. Presidents Kikwete and Bush launched Tanzania's NPA. In Kenya, the 2002 elections brought into parliament and government a large number of MPs that had pledged to support specific measures for orphans and vulnerable children.
- **The relevant phasing of the development of the NPA in respect of key development instruments.** In Malawi and Tanzania, the availability of the NPA whilst the national AIDS strategy was under development, enabled significant content to be inserted into a key document. Where PRSPs pre-dated the availability of a NPA - as in Uganda with PEAP II - then they had weak content relating to vulnerable children.
- **External donor trends.** The growing interest of some donors in social protection has meant that the development of social protection strategies presents important opportunities to increase support for vulnerable children in Tanzania and Zambia. The continued high level of support for orphans and vulnerable children under PEPFAR means that this is significant in focus countries.

It is clear that the policy formulation and budgetary processes are not simply technocratic but political in nature, with stakeholders, both within government and outside, exercising varying degrees of influence. This means that there can be no prescriptive list of what to do to achieve effective integration. Instead, advocates need an array of tools and approaches that should be applied as is appropriate. These will balance technical approaches with the reality

that politics within government often overrides other issues, particularly in the budgetary processes.

Section 3.1.3 identified key steps in an effective advocacy process. The experiences in the case study countries reflected these.

1. **Analysis leading to appropriate evidence-based “asks”:** in Mozambique, UNICEF commissioned work to ensure that the case for integrating children into the PRSP (PARPA II) was clearly made.
2. **Identification of key targets to influence (people and institutions which are influential, potential champions or gatekeepers):** in Malawi, the approach to President Bingu wa Mutharika to launch the NPA led to a positive positioning of the NPA in the minds of the public and policy-makers.
3. **Mobilizing broad support with a range of influential allies:** in Kenya, UNICEF’s tactic of getting parliamentary candidates to pledge support for orphans and vulnerable children ensured broad cross-party support in the 2002-2007 parliament that created a favourable environment for the Children’s Department to push ahead with a cash transfer scheme. In Malawi, cooperation between representatives of government, donors and civil society on the Technical Working Group ensured effective integration into the national AIDS strategy. Similarly, in Zambia, the Social Protection Sectoral Advisory Group ensured that the FNDP’s social protection chapter reflected the needs of vulnerable children.
4. **Effective communication addressing needs and interests of key target audiences in a timely way:** in Uganda, the MGLSD’s analysis identified the need to demonstrate the economic benefits of investing in vulnerable children if the Ministry of Finance was to accept them as a priority in the next PRSP.
5. **Persistent follow-through:** in Uganda, a respondent commented on how children’s activists assumed wrongly that mention of vulnerable children in the PEAP II (PRSP) would make a difference. They were therefore not positioned to follow up when the words did not translate effectively into action.
6. **Ensure that policy changes are put into practice: anticipate low capacity for implementation plans and slippage, have capacity to actively monitor for this, and challenge where commitments are not kept.** Although commitments have often not led to action for vulnerable children, this has rarely been pursued. In part, this reflects the weakness of civil society’s voice in many countries, and difficulties in calling governments to account. In Mozambique, UNICEF ensured that the indicators used in the Joint Annual Review exercise of government and donors include one for

vulnerable children, as these receive frequent and high-level attention, and so provide a means to ensure that the relevant ministry does engage.

As indicated, the key lessons of achieving successful integration have been synthesized in Appendix 2 to provide a checklist of strategies to use in seeking integration of vulnerable children into national development instruments and budgets. These are referenced to key tools found in a range of published resource materials for influencing policy changes that are summarized in Appendix 3.



## 4. Recommendations

**Key Recommendations are that:**

**National governments should:**

- Continue to strengthen the capacity of ministries responsible for fulfilling the rights, and meeting the needs of vulnerable children. This includes increasing budget ceilings to enable the recruitment and retention of appropriately skilled staff. There should be investment specifically to ensure that the ministry may advocate effectively for vulnerable children, and coordinate diverse responses.
- Continue to provide resources for the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of National Plans of Action for vulnerable children.
- Ensure that PRSPs, National Development Plans (NDPs), Medium Term Expenditure Frameworks (MTEFs) and also, relevant sector plans and budgets<sup>24</sup>, clearly reflect the need to provide support for vulnerable children and to mitigate against causes of vulnerability, and have effective monitoring and evaluation plans to ensure delivery. These instruments should include reference to the NPAs and other relevant national child or social protection plans where appropriate.
- Use instruments bringing better short-term benefits in parallel with reform processes to enable the integration of vulnerable children into the PRSP/NDP and budget to bring long-term benefits. This twin-track approach will enable immediate scaled-up responses to urgent need, alongside building a sustainable long-term national response.
- Ensure that national annual budgets make provisions from domestic sources for a sustainable response to the needs of vulnerable children.
- Ensure that representatives of civil society and vulnerable children are meaningfully included in the policy development, planning, implementation and monitoring processes.
- Ensure that the policy development and implementation process is open and transparent. This should include making all key documents including PRSPs, NDPs, MTEFs, national budgets, sector plans, national AIDS strategies, NASAs and NPAs available via the internet<sup>25</sup>, and hard copy, in order to promote participation and accountability.
- Consider the opportunities of applying to the Global Fund with respect to vulnerable children, especially to strengthen government systems and capacity.

<sup>24</sup> For different countries, the best balance in using these different instruments together will vary.

<sup>25</sup> The AIDSPortal, [www.aidsportal.org](http://www.aidsportal.org) is available to use as a global repository for these documents. Contact: [aidsportal@aidsonsortium.org.uk](mailto:aidsportal@aidsonsortium.org.uk).

**Donors** should:

- Support national governments through providing resources to strengthen the capacity of key ministries responsible for vulnerable children, with increased funding for recurrent costs, including staff, and skills development to ensure that they may advocate effectively for vulnerable children and play an effective coordination role.
- Ensure that support for PRSPs, National Development Plans and MTEFs brings tangible benefits for vulnerable children, by engaging in policy dialogue with the IMF, World Bank and ministries of finance to ensure that budget ceilings do not constrain the necessary increase in recurrent costs for ministries responsible for vulnerable children.
- Assist sectors, particularly emerging responses such as social protection, to strengthen their planning and monitoring to ensure that the needs of vulnerable children are fully considered.
- Support civil society and vulnerable children to enable them to be meaningfully included in the policy development, planning, implementation and monitoring processes.
- Continue to make funding for orphans and vulnerable children available in ways that allows incentives for national long-term ownership, including contributions from domestic revenue. This may require a balance to be struck between direct support for urgent responses, and taking a longer-term approach to ensure a sustainable national response.
- Work with other donors to co-ordinate and harmonize their responses for vulnerable children in line with national planning, ensuring a comprehensive response across all sectors.

**Civil Society** should:

- Develop its capacity to engage meaningfully with the development and monitoring of national policies and financial commitments to benefit vulnerable children. This would include having the capacity to judge where limited time and resources should best be invested to achieve positive change.
- Advocate for and facilitate the inclusion of those representing vulnerable children and the children themselves (where appropriate) in the policy process.
- Continue to monitor the long-term benefits and challenges of integration.
- Document and share experiences both in-country and across the continent where possible.

## 5. References

- Angemi, Diego, (2005). *Economic Success or Human Development Failure? Development Partners or Development Parasites? The Truth Behind the Truth: Evidence from Uganda*. Presented at the International Conference on "Shared Growth in Africa," July 21-22, 2005, Accra, Ghana
- Azeem V., Akolgo B., Breakell L., Paalman M., Poate D., and Rothmann I., (2006). *Evaluation of DFID Country Programmes: Country study Ghana 2000-2005. Evaluation Report EV662*. London: DFID. <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/performance/files/ev662.pdf>
- Barr J., and Barnett C., 2006. *DFID Country Programme Evaluations: Synthesis of 2005/2006 Evaluations. DFID's Evaluation Report EV671*. Brighton: ITAD. <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/performance/files/ev671.pdf>
- Bell E., (2003). Gender and PRSPs: with experiences from Tanzania, Bolivia, Viet Nam and Mozambique. Bridge Development Gender Report No 67. Prepared for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Denmark, Brighton: IDS, [www.bridge.ids.ac.uk/reports/R67%20PRSP-w2.doc](http://www.bridge.ids.ac.uk/reports/R67%20PRSP-w2.doc)
- Bonnel, R., Temin, M., and Tempest, F., (2004). Poverty reduction strategy papers: do they matter for children and young people made vulnerable by HIV/AIDS? Results of a Joint UNICEF and World Bank Review, Africa Region Working Paper Series No.78 December 2004. New York: UNICEF. <http://www.worldbank.org/afr/wps/wp78.pdf>
- Chinsinga B., (2007). The Social Protection policy in Malawi: Processes, Politics and Challenges. Working Paper. Brighton, UK: Future Agricultures, September 2007. [http://www.future-agricultures.org/pdf%20files/SP\\_policy\\_malawi.pdf](http://www.future-agricultures.org/pdf%20files/SP_policy_malawi.pdf)
- Court J., Hovland I., and Young J. (Eds.), (2005). *Bridging Policy and development: Evidence and the Change Process*. Warwickshire and London, ITDG Publishing and ODI. [http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Publications/BRP\\_ITDG.html](http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Publications/BRP_ITDG.html)
- DFID, (2007). *Understanding the politics of the budget: What drives change in the budget process?*. A DFID practice paper. August 2007. <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/politics-of-the-budget.pdf>
- Green, M., (2006). *Improving Outcomes for Children Affected by HIV and AIDS: Recapitulating Social Policy and the State in Africa*. Technical consultation of Global Partners Forum on Children Affected by HIV and AIDS, UNICEF, UNAIDS and DFID, January 2006. London: UK Consortium on AIDS and International Development. [http://www.aidsportal.org/Article\\_Details.aspx?ID=1447](http://www.aidsportal.org/Article_Details.aspx?ID=1447)
- IDD and Associates, (2006). *Evaluation of General Budget Support: Synthesis Report. A Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support 1994-2004*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham. <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/performance/files/gbs-synthesis-report.pdf>
- Issa B., Severo C., and Gray H., (2006). *Raising the ceiling: mainstreaming HIV/AIDS into the Tanzania government budget since FY2003/04*. AIDS 2006 - XVI International AIDS Conference, 2006. Abstract no. THPE0980, [http://www.iasociety.org/abstract/show.asp?abstract\\_id=2191194](http://www.iasociety.org/abstract/show.asp?abstract_id=2191194)
- Jones N., (2005). *Reflections on Young Lives 2000-2005: Bridging research, policy analysis and advocacy to tackle childhood poverty*. Young Lives Working Paper No. 17, London, Save the Children UK. <http://younglives.qeh.ox.ac.uk/pdf/wp17.pdf>

Jones N., (2007). Interview with Dr Nicola Jones, ODI, London, 22 March 2007

Jones N., with Tefera B. and Woldehanna T., (2005). Research, Policy Engagement and Practice: Reflections on efforts to mainstream children into Ethiopia's second national poverty reduction strategy. Young Lives Working Paper No. 21, London, Save the Children UK, <http://younglives.geh.ox.ac.uk/pdf/wp21.pdf>

Kamigwi J. et al. (2006)

*Scaling up the Response to HIV and AIDS in Kenya: Mainstreaming through the Government Budget Process*. Nairobi, Constella Futures+, [http://www.constellagroup.com/international-development/resources/cf\\_mtef.pdf](http://www.constellagroup.com/international-development/resources/cf_mtef.pdf)

Keeley J., and Scoones I., 1999. *Understanding environmental policy processes: a review* IDS Working Paper 89, Brighton: IDS. <http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/wp/wp89.pdf>

Killick T., (2005). *The Politics of Ghana's Budgetary System*. CDD/ODI Policy Brief No.2 London, ODI. [http://www.odi.org.uk/PPPG/drivers\\_of\\_change/ODI-CDD\\_Policy%20Brief\\_2.pdf](http://www.odi.org.uk/PPPG/drivers_of_change/ODI-CDD_Policy%20Brief_2.pdf)

Levy C., (1996). *The process of institutionalising in policy and practice: the "web" of institutionalisation*. Working Paper 74, Development Planning Unit, University College, London. <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/dpu/publications/working%20papers%20pdf/wp74.pdf>

Lister S., Baryabanoha W., Steffensen J., and Williamson T., (2006). *Evaluation of General Budget Support: Uganda Country Report. A Joint Evaluation of General Budget Support 1994-2004*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham. <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/performance/files/qbs-uganda.pdf>

Moser C., and M'Chaju-Liwewe O., Moser A., and Ngwira N., (2004). DFID Malawi Gender Audit: Evaporated, Invisibilized or Resisted? London: DFID. <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/gender-audit-malawi1.pdf>

Mundy J., Collins Teri., Simwanza A., Mweene C., (2008). Strategic partnerships for co-ordinating the AIDS response: lessons emerging in Zambia. HLSP Institute and Zambia National AIDS Commission, May 2008. [http://www.hlspinstitute.org/files/project/218630/NAC\\_Civil\\_Society\\_Zambia\\_May08.pdf](http://www.hlspinstitute.org/files/project/218630/NAC_Civil_Society_Zambia_May08.pdf)

Payne L., and Neville S., (2006). Aid Instruments, Social Exclusion and Gender, Background Paper for DFID's internal guidance on Aid Instruments. London: Social Development Direct. <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/mdg/aid-instruments-gender.pdf>

Pearson P., Alviar C., and Hussein A., (2006). The Evolution of the Government of Kenya Cash Transfer Programme for Vulnerable Children between 2002 and 2006 and prospects for nationwide scale-up. Government of Kenya/UNICEF 2004-2008 country programme working paper, 2006; Number 2.

Republic of Uganda, (2007a). Advocacy with and for Orphans and Other Vulnerable Children: Findings from Qualitative Research in Uganda. Kampala: Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development/CORE Initiative <http://www.crin.org/docs/QualitativeStudyFeb5%5B1%5D%5B1%5D.07.pdf>

Republic of Uganda. (2007b). *The Ministry of Gender, Labour and Social Development Advocacy Strategy for Orphans and Other Vulnerable Children*, Kampala: CORE Initiative Uganda. <http://www.crin.org/docs/DraftAdvocacyStrategyMar6%5B1%5D%5B1%5D.07.pdf>

Republic of Uganda, (2007c). Background to the Budget 2007/08 Fiscal Year. *Re-orienting Government Expenditure towards Prosperity for All*. Kampala: Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development. [http://www.finance.go.ug/docs/BTTB\\_07.pdf](http://www.finance.go.ug/docs/BTTB_07.pdf)

Save the Children UK, (2006). Economic Learning programme Training Manual. Module 3: Policy. Planning and Public Expenditure Management. London, Save the Children UK. [povertyandeconomics@savethechildren.org.uk](mailto:povertyandeconomics@savethechildren.org.uk)

Siamwiza R., (2007). *Analysis of financing for the National HIV and AIDS response: civil society component*. A consultancy for the National HIV/AIDS/STI/TB Council, funded by DFID through the STARZ Programme. [http://zambia.jhuccp.org/resources/research\\_reports/AnalysisofFinancingfortheNationalHIVandAIDResponseCivilSocietyComponent.pdf](http://zambia.jhuccp.org/resources/research_reports/AnalysisofFinancingfortheNationalHIVandAIDResponseCivilSocietyComponent.pdf)

Social & Scientific Systems, Inc, (2007). Interim Evaluation of 'Taking Action: The UK Government's Strategy for Tackling HIV and AIDS in the Developing World': Final Report. Evaluation Report 676, DFID, Glasgow, <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/aboutdfid/performance/files/taking-action-final/contents.asp>

UNAIDS, (2001). *UNGASS Declaration of Commitment*, New York, UNAIDS. <http://www.icaso.org/ungass/dclonofcommnt.pdf>

UNDP/World Bank/UNAIDS Joint Programme on Integrating HIV and AIDS into Poverty Reduction Strategies, (2007). *Progress Review: Ethiopia, Ghana, Mali, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, Zambia*. Draft 3. 26 March 2007, Geneva: UNDP. (Document not published)

UNICEF Kenya, (2002). *UNICEF Election Campaign 2002*. A call to action for parliamentary candidates

UNICEF, (2006). *Childhood Poverty in Mozambique. A situation and trends analysis*. UNICEF, Maputo, <http://www.aidsportal.org/repos/SitAn%202006%20Mozambique%20Childhood%20Poverty.pdf>

UNICEF, UNAIDS, and DFID, (2006). Report on the Third Global Partners Forum on Children Affected by HIV and AIDS. Universal Access to Prevention, Treatment, and Care. February 9-10, 2006. London, England. <http://www.aidsportal.org/repos/Global%20Partners%20Forum%202006%20Mtg%20Rpt.pdf>

UNICEF, UNAIDS and WHO, (2007). *Children and AIDS: A stocktaking report*. New York: UNICEF. [http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/ChildrenandAIDSAstocktakingLoResPDF\\_EN\\_USLetter\\_15012007.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/ChildrenandAIDSAstocktakingLoResPDF_EN_USLetter_15012007.pdf)

UNICEF, UNAIDS and WHO, (2008). *Children and AIDS: Second stocktaking report. Actions and progress*, New York: UNICEF. [http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/ChildrenAIDS\\_SecondStocktakingReport.pdf](http://www.unicef.org/publications/files/ChildrenAIDS_SecondStocktakingReport.pdf)

Webb, D., (2007). From the individual to the system: The coming of age of programmes for orphans and vulnerable children. Exchange on HIV/AIDS, sexuality and gender: 1-4 (2) 2007. [http://www.kit.nl/net/KIT\\_Publicaties\\_output/ShowFile2.aspx?e=1343](http://www.kit.nl/net/KIT_Publicaties_output/ShowFile2.aspx?e=1343)

Whitehead A., (2003). *Failing women, sustaining poverty: Gender in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers*. Report for the UK Gender and Development Network, London: Christian Aid. [http://www.siyanda.org/docs/gad\\_failingwomen.pdf](http://www.siyanda.org/docs/gad_failingwomen.pdf)

World Bank, UNDP and UNAIDS, 2006. *Integrating HIV and AIDS into Poverty Strategies. Workshop Report, Mozambique, October 9-13, 2006*. Washington DC: Joint Programme of the World Bank, UNDP and UNAIDS to Strengthen Integration of HIV/AIDS in PRSP Development and Implementation. (Document not formally published)

## Appendices

### Appendix 1: Components of poverty focused development planning and financing<sup>26</sup>

#### Poverty Reduction Strategies (PRS)

Governments use two main national policies – a long-term policy, sometimes called **Vision 2020** outlining where the country wants to be by the year 2020; and a medium-term policy with an accompanying strategy often referred to as a **Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)**.

**The PRSP** outlines the current state of economic and social affairs in a country and gives a costed national strategy for reducing poverty and sustaining economic growth over the medium term, outlining macroeconomic, structural and social policies and programmes.

A PRSP should be developed through a participatory process involving different stakeholders including donors and civil society, and should follow five main principles. It should be country-driven, results-oriented, comprehensive, partnership-oriented and have a long-term perspective. The idea is to reach consensus on a set of achievable longer-term priorities, which have enough support to enable government to shift resources into areas that will have an impact on those priorities, such as basic social services, or basic infrastructure.

The development of a PRSP is a condition for a country to receive concessional lending from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and to receive debt relief under the Heavily Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) initiative. Some bilateral donors are also broadly linking their aid to PRSPs. A country needs to update its PRSP every three years, and PRSPs are monitored using an Annual Progress Report. PRSPs have come into use from 1999; so many countries have now developed their second generation PRSP.

**The Sector-Wide Approach (SWAp)** is a method of working that brings together governments, donors and other stakeholders within a sector such as Health or Education. The approach involves movement over time under government leadership towards: broadening policy dialogue; developing a single sector policy and strategy (that address private and public sector issues) and a common realistic expenditure programme; common monitoring arrangements; and more coordinated procedures for funding and procurement<sup>27</sup>. The SWAp aims essentially to increase the coordination and efficiency of development aid,

<sup>26</sup> This Box draws heavily upon Save the Children, 2006b, to which the reader is referred for further information.

<sup>27</sup> <http://www.sti.ch/health-systems-support/swap/swap-project/swapwebsite.html>

and stimulate recipient governments to take the leadership in strategy formulation and policy implementation. In reality, a SWAp is a process rather than a product, so the critical issue is to ensure that there is movement towards all donor and government funding being consistent with the sector strategic plan and contained in government budget forecasts. Sector plans should feed into a PRSP and in turn, reflect the PRSP, but in many countries it has taken some time to bring about alignment.

**Budget support** is where donors give money directly to a government to be used within its budget. General Poverty Reduction Budget Support (General PRBS) is usually contingent on donors accepting the PRSP, and being satisfied on an annual basis by progress made in respect of certain indicators. Once released to the government, it flows through government systems and may be used, along with funds generated within the country, to fund recurrent and capital costs contained in the national budget. So, donors hand over direct control of how the funds are used, but have some influence on the processes of developing the PRSP, and allocating resources between, and within, sectors. Sector budget support (Sector PRBS) is available in a similar way for any requirements within the sector strategy and budget.

**Decentralization** may be defined as the shift of power, functions, decision-making and finances from the central level of government down to the local level bringing them closer to the point of service. This is with the aim of increasing the effectiveness and accountability of services. It takes time, funding, and the development of capacity and new ways of working. So, its impact may take time to see.

**The MTEF** is a budget plan for three to five years that is developed every year to reflect the latest economic analysis and national priorities. The MTEF sets out:

- A statement of government spending targets (e.g. overall expenditure, levels of debt) based on medium-term macroeconomic projections.
- Medium-term expenditure projections for individual Ministries based on clearly defined sector policies/strategies. These provide a clear ceiling within which Ministries finalize sector policies, strategies and outputs.
- Activity and output budgeting that enables improved sector prioritization of policies and increases the efficiency of public expenditure.

The MTEF tries to bring together the amount of resources that are likely to be available (whilst keeping within the macro-economic policy framework) with a bottom up estimate of the current and medium term costs of carrying out national priorities as defined in the PRSP. There is a process of negotiation to address tensions; particularly how much money is made available overall, and how this is allocated between sectors, and within sectors. Where decentralized entities such as local government also have budgets, the process has to include this dimension. This process should build consensus about strategic resource priorities across government. Donors may well use the resulting budget as a basis for contributions of PRBS. If an issue such as responses for OVCs is to be well resourced in the final settlement for relevant sectors, it is important that it is factored into the MTEF. For this, the issue should feature as a priority within the PRSP, and be championed from the relevant sector(s). The Ministry of Finance is responsible for the process of drawing up the MTEF, and usually has significant influence on the outcome.

The **annual budget** provides the basis of government expenditure in all departments in a specific financial year. This is developed and approved alongside the development of the MTEF on the basis of a Budget Framework Paper (BFP). There may also be Sector and Local Government BFPs. The final budget represents the conclusion of a long drawn out process of negotiation within ministries, and across ministries (this is summarized in Figure 1, with a detailed example from Uganda in Appendix 2). The budget has to be approved by Cabinet, and also by Parliament. Then, once the financial year has started, funds may be disbursed against the budget.

In the past donor funding was usually for projects, and as such went straight to the implementing agency and did not go through the government's financial systems. So, it was said to be "off-budget". This made it difficult to clarify all aid, and financial flows, into the country. In many countries, where external aid comprises most of the expenditure on HIV and AIDS, it meant that the MTEF, based on "on-budget" funding, represented a very incomplete picture. Increasingly, recipient countries are asking that even project funding is passed through the government's financial systems so that it may be included in the overall budget analysis.



## Appendix 2. A checklist of strategies for integrating vulnerable children into national planning and budget instruments

Drawing upon the experiences in the case study countries, and those identified in the desk study, specific strategies for successful integration include:

1. **Analysis leading to appropriate evidence-based “asks”**
  - **Identify what integration should mean in operational terms** – what is the aim?
  - **Ensure that baseline data and strategic information is available.** Be clear about how children’s vulnerability may deepen poverty and frustrate growth; and, how poverty and growth increase children’s vulnerability. What are the implications of effective interventions, or failure to intervene, for vulnerable children?
  - **Develop “Asks” with a clear focus, prioritization and rationale with appropriate indicators.** Estimate costs of interventions, with an awareness of the long-term nature of the impacts on vulnerable children.
  - Planning instruments are strategic documents, but causes of vulnerability, such as HIV and AIDS, are dynamic. Therefore **anticipate changes over the lifetime of the PRSP.**

*Key Reference Tools<sup>28</sup> for this include:*

- ***Monitoring government policies: A toolkit for civil society organizations in Africa*** – Identifying Policies, page 20
- ***Advocacy Matters: Helping children change their world*** – Understanding the Policy Environment – Chapter 4

### 2 **Identification of key targets to influence (people and institutions which are influential, potential champions or gatekeepers)**

- **Establish the optimal instrument(s) in your country with which to integrate to achieve your objectives**, remembering that integration into a sector may bring about more effective short-term benefits, and that HIV and AIDS, social development, education and health could each bring benefits for vulnerable children.
- **Identify key institutions for these instruments.** The Ministry of Planning, Economic Development or Finance usually leads the development of the

---

<sup>28</sup> See Appendix 3 for Reference Tools

PRSP. The Ministry of Finance is critical for MTEFs and budgets. Sector ministries or agencies lead sector plans. However, the designated lead may not be the most powerful ministry for the issue – for example, the Education Ministry could play a significant role in enabling vulnerable children to access education, even if the Social Welfare Ministry formally leads the Social Protection agenda.

- **Identify key people to influence** within the relevant institution, for example, the person coordinating the drafting of the document.
- **Appreciate the balance between political and technocratic influences** on the development of the instrument, and plan accordingly:
  - In some countries, Parliament, particularly specific committees (such as the Budget Committee) have influence.
  - There will be high-level influencers such as prominent public figures who could be strategic.

*Key Reference Tools for this include:*

- ***Tools for Policy Impact: A Handbook for Researchers*** – Influence Mapping, page 26
  - ***Monitoring government policies: A toolkit for civil society organizations in Africa*** – Stakeholder Analysis, page 32 and Mapping Partners and Target Audiences, page 33
  - ***Advocacy Matters: Helping children change their world*** – Advocacy Targets, Chapter 5
2. **Mobilizing broad support with a range of influential allies. Use the participatory approaches anticipated within formal policy development processes to bring on board different stakeholders.**
- **Government constituted working groups** encompassing stakeholders from different spheres of government, donors, and a range of civil society groups will bring broader ownership and enhanced content to the integration.
  - **Forge alliances with those concerned for other issues of vulnerability** (such as child poverty, disability) and poverty more generally. Foster government, as well as NGO, allies.
  - **Gather donor support** - donors often have more leverage within government structures than civil society, but ensure that this is applied in a way that strengthens country ownership.

- **The National AIDS Commission (NAC) can be very influential, providing leadership, coordination and technical support** to key actors, ensuring alignment of PRSP processes with the National Strategic Plan, and enhancing capacity to mainstream HIV and AIDS, and potentially child vulnerability in development processes. It is essential that the NAC represent the issues of children affected by AIDS effectively.

*Key Reference Tools for this include:*

- ***Advocacy Matters: Helping children change their world*** – Building Added Strength, Chapter 7
- ***Monitoring government policies: A toolkit for civil society organizations in Africa*** – Identifying Policy Stakeholders, Chapter Three
- ***Tools for Policy Impact: A Handbook for Researchers*** – Stakeholder Analysis, page 24

### 3. **Effective communication addressing needs and interests of key target audiences in a timely way.**

- **Ensure that there is political and organisational leadership such that key Ministries accept that vulnerable children are a priority for them, and coordinate responses.** Get the key Ministries to see “integration” as their project. Ideally, the integration process should be formalised, with the establishment of a multi-sector team led from within a key Ministry. An adequately resourced and supported Project Facilitator or focal point is essential.
- **As evidence of commitment, ensure that guidelines for development and monitoring of key instruments require integration**
- **Talk the language, and address the interests, of key stakeholders such as the Ministry of Finance**
- Look for appropriate entry points – what is really relevant and important to each sector?
- Anticipate that there may be limited understanding of the needs, and how to respond to vulnerable children. Provide information that is packaged for key people’s needs at central, sector and decentralized levels.
- Anticipate that some people still regard health and education as a non-productive cost, rather than an investment in one of the factors of production. Put the business

case for investing in responses for vulnerable children, and the consequences to growth of not doing so.

- Ensure that there are people with specialist skills to engage effectively with key Ministries, particularly around budgeting – understanding processes, perspectives and language. Equip “advocates”, especially those from within responsible sections of government, for this.
- Make links to credible international processes and conventions that would bring gravity and urgency to integration.
- **Identify the key steps in the development of instruments and budgets and how to interact with them**
- Seize and create opportunities within ongoing planning and budgeting activities rather than creating parallel processes. Understand the “access” and “veto” points in the formal process.
- Make sure that planning and budget cycles for key instruments (National AIDS Strategies and NPAs) match national planning and budget cycles.
- However, recognize that policy-making and implementation may be an iterative process rather than a pure linear progression – an inherently political process consisting of a “web of inter-related decisions.”

*Key Reference Tools for this include:*

- ***Advocacy Matters: Helping children change their world*** – Making the Case, Chapter 6
- ***Networking for Policy Change: An Advocacy Training Manual*** – Messages: Informing, Persuading and Moving to Action, page 46
- ***Advocacy Tools and Guidelines: Promoting Policy Change*** – Getting Your Message Across, Chapter 8

#### **4. Persistent follow-through**

- Anticipate a need for sustained responses – a process rather than an event. In particular, commitments within PRSPs and MTEFs need to be reflected in operational plans at sector and decentralized level. This will need specific and sustained support.
- If they exist, ensure that guidelines requiring integration are adhered to.
- It is fine to start small and then build on success and expand each year.

5. **Ensure that policy changes are put into practice: anticipate low capacity for implementation plans and slippage, have capacity to actively monitor for this, and challenge where commitments are not kept**
- **Collectable but meaningful indicators for vulnerable children must be included in PRSPs and MTEFs with adequate monitoring and evaluation systems in place.** Monitoring and evaluation will need to extend down to sectors.
  - **Ensure that high-level integration into PRSPs does bring operational benefits in sectors and at decentralized level.** The biggest challenges may be in the development of implementation plans within sectors and decentralized structures. Anticipate particular problems with low capacity at decentralized level. These processes require sustained responses.
  - Develop capacity to track budgets and spending at different points
  - Get official agreement on how spending will be tracked within the National AIDS Spending Assessment.

*Key Reference Tools for this include:*

- ***Monitoring government policies: A toolkit for civil society organizations in Africa*** – Looking Into a Policy and Setting Your Focus, Chapter Four

## Appendix 3: Resources for Policy Influence

- a) **Monitoring government policies: A toolkit for civil society organizations in Africa.** Cafod, Christian Aid and Trocaire, 2007.

<http://trocaire.org/policyandadvocacy/policydocument.php?id=126>

This toolkit is especially designed to help African civil society organizations analyse and monitor government policy implementation. High-quality research, accompanied by strong campaigning and lobbying is a key way for local organizations to hold their governments to account.

- b) **Advocacy Matters: Helping children change their world. An International Save the Children Alliance guide to advocacy.** International Save the Children Alliance, 2007. <http://www.savethechildren.net/alliance/resources/publications.html>

This guide is for Save the Children staff and partners who are involved in advocacy. You can use it to help you run an advocacy workshop, or as a general advocacy resource.

The training material consists of a mixture of practical exercises and theory so that participants learn about advocacy in a way that is relevant to their specific needs and contexts, and they will come out of the workshop with a draft of an advocacy strategy.

The guide consists of two complementary manuals: the Facilitator's Manual and the Participant's Manual that are designed to be used together.

- c) **Tools for Policy Impact: A Handbook for Researchers. Research and Policy in Development,** ODI 2004.

[http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Publications/Tools\\_handbook.html](http://www.odi.org.uk/RAPID/Publications/Tools_handbook.html)

Tools are grouped under four headings, Research Tools, Context Assessment Tools, Communication Tools and Policy Influence Tools.

Policy Influence Tools include: Guidelines for writing effective policy briefs or papers; Modes and techniques for engaging and networking; 'Getting to Yes' – four steps to reach agreement with others without giving in; The '4 Ps' of being influential (passion,

position, power and persuasiveness); A Lobbyist's 'Hierarchies of Needs' – building relationships and allowing information to flow

- d) **Networking for Policy Change: An Advocacy Training Manual.** The Policy Project, 1999. [www.cedpa.org/files/741\\_file\\_networking\\_english\\_all.pdf](http://www.cedpa.org/files/741_file_networking_english_all.pdf)

The building blocks of advocacy are the formation of networks, the identification of political opportunities and the organisation of campaigns. Units contain background notes, learning objectives and handouts.

Includes sections on: What are Advocacy Networks?; The Policy Process: Government in Action; Messages: Informing, Persuading and Moving to Action

- e) **Advocacy Tools and Guidelines: Promoting Policy Change.** Care USA. <http://www.care.org/getinvolved/advocacy/tools.asp?>

Policy mapping. Setting a policy goal – “policy goals state the changes that policy makers need to carry out which will, ultimately, benefit people’s lives”. Identifying allies and opponents. Evaluating an advocacy initiative

For more information, please contact:  
Social Policy and Social Protection Cluster  
Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office  
United Nations Complex Gigiri, Nairobi  
P.O. Box 44145 - 00100,  
Nairobi, Kenya  
E-mail: [unicefesaro@unicef.org](mailto:unicefesaro@unicef.org)  
Website: <http://www.unicef.org>