

## CARE ZAMBIA REPORT PROGRAM INFORMATION & IMPACT REPORTING SYSTEM (PIIRS) - FY 2017

## **CONTRIBUTION TO CARE INTERNATIONAL** Indirect reach **Projects/Initiatives Direct reach** 950 8 62.9 418.1 216.0 140.6 # of projects millions '000s millions '000s Global Zambia Global Zambia Global 7ambia 0.84% of all 0.66% of all 0.07% of all **CARE CARE** CARE





	CARE ZAMBIA'S REACH OVER LAST 3 YEARS					
		FY15	FY16	FY17	FY15-FY17 change	
Direct ('000s)	<b>o</b>	500.3	1,682.2	418.1	-16%	
Indirect ('000s)	og <b>O</b>	1,431.3	3,255.9	140.6	-90%	
Indirect ratio	×	2.9	1.9	0.3	-88%	

## CONTRIBUTIONS TO PROGRAM STRATEGY OUTCOME AREAS



- Reached 0 thousand disaster/crisis-affected people with life-saving humanitarian assistance, indirectly benefiting a further 0 thousand (2 projects/initiatives)



No projects working on Sexual, Reproductive & Maternal Health rights




- No projects working on the right to a Life Free From Violence





159,846 Reached 160 thousand people to support their food and nutrition security and resilience to climate change, indirectly benefiting a further 113 thousand (7 projects/initiatives)





**14,699** Reached 15 thousand women and girls to promote their access to and control of economic resources, indirectly benefiting a further 62 thousand (2 projects/initiatives)











13% of projects responded to the different needs and constraints of individuals based on their gender, but did little to change larger contextual issues that lie at the root of gender inequality. Only 0% of projects are gender transformative





50% of projects worked to make existing institutions and power relations more inclusive, but without significantly challenging and changing power dynamics. Only 0% of projects are transformational in terms of inclusive governance




13% of projects addressed the resilience of individuals and communities, but without tackling the underlying causes of the risks they face. Only 0% of projects are transformative in terms of resilience









0% of projects were fully focused on addressing SGBV, while a further 0% mainstreamed SGBV in other actions/thematic areas



Civil society strengthening activities were included in 29% of projects, but was an explicit objective in 14% of projects



0% of projects fully addressed vulnerability caused by climate change. 43% of projects had no strategy to address climate change vulnerability



Partners implemented all activities in 57% of projects, most activities in 43% of projects, and some activities in 0% of projects



0% of projects had an intensive advocacy focus, and a further 67% had a moderate advocacy focus



While 67% of projects promoted innovative solutions to poverty and social injustice, only 43% measured the impact of these innovations



71% of projects linked and worked with others to scale up proven solutions, and a further 0% took solutions to scale by ourselves

